**PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist – Adile et al. – Salvage therapy for progressive, treatment-refractory or recurrent pediatric medulloblastoma: a systematic review protocol**

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 5:1

| Section/topic       | #   | Checklist item                                                                 | Information reported | Line number(s) |
|---------------------|-----|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION |     |                                                                                  |                      |                |
| Title               | 1a  | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review                         | ☒                    | 33-34, 47, 83  |
| Update              | 1b  | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such| ☐                    | NA             |
| Registration        | 2   | If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | ☒                    | 52             |
| Authors             |     |                                                                                  |                      |                |
| Contact             | 3a  | Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | ☒                    | 4-25           |
| Contributions       | 3b  | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | ☒                    | 404-408        |
| 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* | ☒                    | 330-336        |
| Support             |     |                                                                                  |                      |                |
| Sources             | 5a  | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review                    | ☒                    | 401            |
| Sponsor             | 5b  | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor                                | ☐                    | NA             |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c  | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | ☐                    | NA             |
| INTRODUCTION        |     |                                                                                  |                      |                |
| Rationale           | 6   | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known     | ☒                    | 67-80          |
| Section/topic          | # | Checklist item                                                                 | Information reported | Line number(s) |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Objectives            | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | Yes                  | 83-85          |
| METHODS               |   |                                                                               |                      |                |
| 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 | Yes                  | 95-146         |
| 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 | Yes                  | 149-171, 205-207 |
| 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 | Yes                  | 163, 171       |
| STUDY RECORDS         |   |                                                                               |                      |                |
| Data management       | 11a| Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | Yes                  | 174-181        |
| 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) | Yes                  | 184-190        |
| 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 | Yes                  | 191-211        |
| 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 | Yes                  | 214-221        |
| Outcomes and prioritization | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | Yes                  | 224-261        |
| 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  | Yes                  | 264-291        |
| DATA                  |   |                                                                               |                      |                |
| Synthesis             | 15a| Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | Yes                  | 294-300        |
|                       | 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., I², Kendall’s tau) | Yes                  | 302-310        |
| Section/topic                        | #  | Checklist item                                                                 | Information reported | Line number(s) |
|-------------------------------------|----|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|                                     |    |                                                                                | Yes | No  |                          |
| **15c**                             | 15c| Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression) | ☑  |     | 312-323                  |
|                                     | 15d| If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | ☑  |     | 325-327                  |
| **Meta-bias(es)**                   | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | ☑  |     | 287, 322-323             |
| **Confidence in cumulative evidence**| 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE) | ☑  |     | 277-291                  |