009 Checklist

	#	Checklist item
	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.
ary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility cr participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.
N		
	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.
	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, compar outcomes, and study design (PICOS).
stration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provid registration information including registration number.
	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.
es	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.
	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.
	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicabl included in the meta-analysis).
ocess	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any proce for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.
	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions ar simplifications made.
ividual	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this wa done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.
es	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).
ts	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consiste (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis.

	#	Checklist item
s studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).
es	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indic which were pre-specified.
	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusio each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.
ics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period provide the citations.
studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).
al studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.
ts	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.
s studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).
s	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16
nce	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevanc key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).
	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval identified research, reporting bias).
	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future resear
	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders fo systematic review.

For more information, visit: **www.prisma-statement.org**.