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)
			Yes	No	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION					
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	√	☐	14
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	☐	☐	Not applicable
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract	√	☐	31
Authors					
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	√	☐	Provided in editorial manager
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	√	☐	234-238
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	☐	☐	Not applicable
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	√	☐	67-68 and further detail in editorial manager
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	√	☐	As above
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	√	☐	70

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	√	☐	36-75
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	☐	☐	Not applicable for realist review in PICO format. Details provided in lines 79-84
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	√	☐	117 – 138 & 153-157
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	√	☐	142-151
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	☐	√	Not possible at this time due to need to focus the scope of the review as described in lines 117-138. This is in keeping with Realist Review methodology and the RAMESES guidelines
STUDY RECORDS					
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	√	☐	161 and 186-192

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
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)	√	☐	161-195
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	√	☐	186-192
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	√	☐	185-218
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	√	☐	185-218
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	☐	☐	Not applicable to realist review – see comments on quality 175-181
DATA					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	√	☐	199-218
	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)	☐	☐	Not applicable
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	☐	☐	Not applicable
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	√	☐	Realist 199-218
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	☐	☐	Not applicable
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	☐	☐	Not applicable