Additional File 3 Quality Assessment Tool PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Central journals from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Systematic Reviews 2015 4:1

An Editorial from the Editors-in-Chief of Systematic Reviews details why this checklist was adapted - Moher D, Stewart L & Shekelle P: Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. Systematic Reviews 2016 5:15

| Section/topic         | # | Checklist item                                                                 | Information reported | Line number(s) |
|----------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------|
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION |   |                                                                               |                      |               |
| Title                |   |                                                                               |                      |               |
| Identification       | 1a| Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review                      | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Update               | 1b| If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Registration         | 2 | If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Authors              |   |                                                                               |                      |               |
| Contact              | 3a| Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Contributions        | 3b| Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Amendments           | 4 | 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 | No                   |               |
| Support              |   |                                                                               |                      |               |
| Sources              | 5a| Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review                 | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Sponsor              | 5b| Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor                             | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | ☒ Yes                |               |
| INTRODUCTION         |   |                                                                               |                      |               |
| Rationale            | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | ☒ Yes                |               |
| Objectives           | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | ☒ Yes                |               |
| METHODS              |   |                                                                               |                      |               |
| Section/topic                  | #  | Checklist item                                                                 | Information reported (Yes/No) | Line number(s) |
|-------------------------------|----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------|
| Eligibility criteria          | 8  | Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review | ☒                             |               |
| Information sources           | 9  | Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage | ☒                             |               |
| Search strategy               | 10 | Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated | ☒                             |               |
| **STUDY RECORDS**             |    |                                                                                  |                               |               |
| Data management               | 11a| Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | ☒                             |               |
| Selection process             | 11b| State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis) | ☒                             |               |
| Data collection process       | 11c| Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators | ☒                             |               |
| Data items                    | 12 | List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications | ☒                             |               |
| Outcomes and prioritization   | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | ☒                             |               |
| Risk of bias in individual studies | 14 | 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 | ☒                             |               |
| **DATA**                      |    |                                                                                  |                               |               |
| Synthesis                     | 15a| Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | ☒                             |               |
| 15b                           |    | If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., $I^2$, Kendall’s tau) | ☒                             |               |
| 15c                           |    | Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression) | ☒                             |               |
| 15d                           |    | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | ☒                             |               |
| Meta-bias(es)                 | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | ☒                             |               |
| Confidence in cumulative evidence | 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE) | ☒                             |               |
