# Reporting checklist for protocol of a systematic review and meta analysis.

Based on the PRISMA-P guidelines.

**Instructions to authors**

Complete this checklist by entering the page numbers from your manuscript where readers will find each of the items listed below.

Your article may not currently address all the items on the checklist. Please modify your text to include the missing information. If you are certain that an item does not apply, please write "n/a" and provide a short explanation.

Upload your completed checklist as an extra file when you submit to a journal.

In your methods section, say that you used the PRISMA-Preporting guidelines, and cite them as:

Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev. 2015;4(1):1.

| Reporting Item | Page Number |
|----------------|-------------|
| **Title**      |             |
| Identification  | #1a         | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | title page |
| Update         | #1b         | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | n/a |
| **Registration** |            | If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number | 2 |
| **Authors**    |             | Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | title page |
| Contact        | #3a         | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the | 16 |
| Contribution   | #3b         | |

---

**Note:** This checklist is designed to help authors ensure that their protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis is comprehensive and adheres to the PRISMA-P guidelines. Each item on the checklist corresponds to a specific aspect of the protocol, and the page numbers are provided to guide readers to the relevant sections of the manuscript. If an item does not apply, "n/a" is written, along with a brief explanation. The checklist is an invaluable tool for ensuring transparency and reproducibility in the systematic review process.
Amendments

If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments.

Support

| Source | Description | Score |
|--------|-------------|-------|
| Sources | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | 15 |
| Sponsor | Provide name for the review funder and / or sponsor | 15 |
| Role of sponsor or funder | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and / or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | 14 |

Introduction

| Section | Description | Score |
|---------|-------------|-------|
| Rationale | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | 3-6 |
| Objectives | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | 6 |

Methods

| Section | Description | Score |
|---------|-------------|-------|
| Eligibility criteria | Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review | 6 |
| Information sources | Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage | 7 |
| Search strategy | Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated | 8 |
| Study records - data management | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | 8-9 |
| Study records - | State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as PICO) | 8-9 |
| Selection process | Study records - data collection process | Data items | Outcomes and prioritization | Risk of bias in individual studies | Data synthesis | Meta-bias(es) | Confidence in cumulative evidence |
|-------------------|----------------------------------------|------------|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------|
| as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis) | Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators | List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis | Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE) |

9-10 | 9-10 | 10-11 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 12 | 13 | 11
The PRISMA-P elaboration and explanation paper is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License CC-BY. This checklist can be completed online using https://www.goodreports.org/, a tool made by the EQUATOR Network in collaboration with Penelope.ai