**Table S1: PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist**

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported Yes | No | Line number(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION | | | | | |
| Title | | | | | |
| Identification | 1a | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | √ | - | 2 |
| Update | 1b | If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such | - | √ | |
| Registration | 2 | If registered, provide the name of the registry (*e.g.*, PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract | √ | - | 41 |
| Authors | | | | | |
| Contact | 3a | Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | √ | - | 3–20 |
| Contributions | 3b | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | √ | - | 227–229 |
| 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 | - | √ | |
| Support | | | | | |
| Sources | 5a | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | √ | - | 224–226 |
| Sponsor | 5b | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor | √ | - | 224–226 |
| Role of sponsor/funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | - | √ | |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | | |
| Rationale | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | √ | - | 46–78 |
| Objectives | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | √ | - | 79–83 |
| 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 | √ | - | 91–116 |
| 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 | √ | - | 121–130 |
| 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 | √ | - | 126 |
| STUDY RECORDS | | | | | |
| Data management | 11a | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | √ | - | 137–148 |
| 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) | √ | - | 131–136 |
| 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 | √ | - | 137–148 |
| 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 | √ | - | 139–144 |
| Outcomes and prioritization | 13 | List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale | √ | - | 107–116 |
| 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 | √ | - | 149–154 |

*(Continued...)*

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Information reported | | Line number(s) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Yes | No | |
| DATA | | | | | |
| Synthesis | 15a | Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized | √ | - | 155–174 |
| | 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) | √ | - | 156–165 |
| | 15c | Describe any proposed additional analyses (*e.g.*, sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression) | √ | - | 166–174 |
| | 15d | If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned | √ | - | 156–165 |
| Meta-bias(es) | 16 | Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (*e.g.*, publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies) | √ | - | 175–177 |
| Confidence in cumulative evidence | 17 | Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (*e.g.*, GRADE) | √ | - | 178–183 |

This checklist has been adapted for use with systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Central journals from (Table S1).[1]

An Editorial from the Editors-in-Chief of Systematic Reviews details why this checklist was adapted.[2]

## REFERENCES

1. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, *et al.* Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.
2. Moher D, Stewart L, Shekelle P. Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. *Syst Rev.* 2016;5:15.