

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section/Topic	Item No	Item	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title	1a	Identification - identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review		
	1b	Update - 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 (such as PROSPERO) and registration number		
Authors	3a	Contact - provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author		
	3b	Contributions - describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review		
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	5a	Sources - indicate sources of financial or other support for the review		
	5b	Sponsor - provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor		
	5c	Role of sponsor or funder - 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		
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)		
METHODS				
Eligibility criteria	8	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		
Information sources	9	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		
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	11a	Data management - describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review		
	11b	Selection process - state the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)		
	11c	Data collection process - 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		
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as 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 synthesised		
	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 (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ)		
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as 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) (such as 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 (such as GRADE)		

* It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.

From: Kuna P, Gonem S, Busse WW, Bateman ED, Miller D, Barnes N, Wenzel SE, Pettipher R, Erpenbeck VJ. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

