PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review. Included in title.	Title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. Checklist included in project repository.	Abstract
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. Details in introduction.	Intro
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. Details in introduction.	Intro
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. Details in methods.	Methods
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. The Pubmed data repository was used + reference searches. Dates of searches and database version number are available in the collected metadata in the project repository.	Methods + Repository
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. Search terms and other search parameters are fully detailed in the project repository.	Methods + Repository
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. Details in methods – 1 person (the author) did all screening and reviewing.	Methods
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. Details in methods – 1 person (the author) did all screening and reviewing.	Methods
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. Details in methods.	Methods
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. Details in methods, and in the collected data files and associated README. Missing values were marked as null in the data and no assumptions or imputed values were entered in the data files. In some cases, the notes sections for individual studies includes some discussion on what missing values may be.	Methods + Repository
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. N/A – none used.	N/A
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. Details listed in methods – no quantitative measures where synthesized across studies.	Methods
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)). Details listed in the methods - studies were grouped by disorder, otherwise no eligibility selections were made.	Methods
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. Details of synthesis in the Methods section. Missing data was marked as missing with no replacement of values.	Methods

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. Information on individual studies is presented in Table 2, otherwise no visualizations were made of individual studies.	Table 2
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. Details on synthesis in methods – no meta-analyses were done.	Methods
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). No explicit methods used to explore causes of heterogeneity.	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. No sensitivity analyses done.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). No methods employed to assess risk of bias.	N/A
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. No methods employed to assess certainty.	N/A
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. Details of the search results in results.	Results
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. Reasons studies that might appear relevant but not included listed in methods. No specific examples cited.	Methods
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics. A summary of each included report is listed in Table 2, with an associated citation list. The full information for each study is available in the project repository.	Table 2 + Repository
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. No risk of bias assessment was done for individual studies.	N/A
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. Summary of outcomes across included literature and in subgroups reported in the results, including in Table 1.	Table 1 + Results
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. Results of the syntheses done (per disorder) reported in the results. Characteristics are summarized. No risk of bias among included studies analyses done / reported.	Results
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. No statistical syntheses done / reported.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. No cause of heterogeneity analyses done / reported.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. No sensitivity analyses done / reported.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. No risk of bias analysis done / reported.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. No certainty analyses done / reported.	N/A

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. Interpretation discussed in the paper.	Discussion
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. Limitations discussed in the paper.	Discussion
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. Limitations discussed in the paper.	Discussion
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. Implications, and suggestions for future research discussed in the paper.	Discussion
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. This review was not registered.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. A protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. A protocol was not prepared.	N/A
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. There was no support for this review.	N/A
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors. The author declares no competing interests.	Cover page
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. Collected literature data, data used for analysis, analysis code and other information can all be found in the project repository: https://github.com/TomDonoghue/AperiodicClinical	Repository

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71