The PRISMA 2020 reporting guideline writing guide

For writing impactful systematic review articles that can be understood and used by a wide audience.

|  |
| --- |
| Note |
| If you have not used a writing guide before, read about our suggested [writing process](https:/resources.equator-network.org/about/writing-using-reporting-guidelines.html).  This guide is not a template. Don’t expect to fill it in and end up with a finished article. Instead, think of it as an exercise book.   1. Collate information and make notes in this guide; 2. Delete the prompts and headings, reorganise your notes into a narrative structure, moving content to tables, figures, or appendices when appropriate, thereby creating a writing outline. 3. Draft, revise, and edit your text in a separate file, referring to your outline throughout.   Before you begin, double check that PRISMA 2020 is the [most applicable reporting guideline](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/index.html?#applicability) for your work. Other reporting guidelines have their own writing guide.  The [UK EQUATOR Centre training](https:/resources.equator-network.org/training.html) helps researchers develop writing skills and to use reporting guidelines (like this one) to write research articles and applications that are complete, concise, and compelling. It covers many of the items of the PRISMA 2020 reporting guideline, including how to prepare effective abstracts, titles, introduction and discussion sections, as well as how to use writing guides to create writing outlines, how to turn outlines into drafts, and drafts into polished text. |

# Title and Abstract

## [1. Title](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/title.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Identify the report as a systematic review. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [2. Abstract](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/abstract.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Include all items from the *PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts* checklist. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

# Introduction

## [3. Rationale](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/rationale.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [4. Objectives](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/objectives.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

# Methods

## [5. Eligibility criteria](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/eligibility-criteria.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What are the characteristics of the studies you included in the review?  What sort of people were being investigated? Were they healthy, or if not, what condition did they have and how was their condition diagnosed?  What treatment or treatments, or other type of intervention was being investigated in the studies?  What setting or settings were the studies carried out in?  What type of quantitative studies were included, randomised trials? Any trials? Observational studies? A mixture?  What was the primary outcome of interest?  How did you treat studies where the outcome of interest wasn’t measured?  How did you group studies which differed in other ways such as age of participants, or length of follow up?  Did you exclude studies for other reasons, such as when and where the results were published, and in what language?  Did you include unpublished studies, or studies reported in conference abstracts or on study registers?  Did you exclude studies if the outcomes of interest weren’t reported  Did you put the included studies into groups for analysis?  Did you group studies according to the design?  Did you group the studies depending on differences in the participant characteristics such as how they were diagnosed, or age, sex?  Did you group the studies according to variations in type of treatment, or how it was delivered?  Did you group the studies according to the primary outcome?  Did you group the studies according to the length of follow up?  How does your choice of groups support the objectives of the review? |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [6. Information sources](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/information-sources.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Which sources and search methods did you use to look for eligible studies?  Sources could include bibliographic databases such as MEDLINE CINAHL EMBASE) and search engines could include Ovid or EBSCOhost. You could also search study registers, online repositories, or organization or manufacturer websites such as the Health Research Authority or drug company or device manufacturer websites  Did you impose date restrictions on your searches?  What was the latest date you searched in each information source? |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [8. Search](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/search.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you keep a full record of each search strategy for each database? If not, make sure you re-visit the searches and create a record of it on the latest day it was searched. You will need to present all these strategies clearly in the supplementary information  For your search strategies, are the date or language or other limits justified in your eligibility criteria?  Did you use published approaches to limit your results to certain types of study, or did you devise your own method?  Did you use any automated strategies to identify search terms or index headings?  Did you validate your strategy by testing whether it could retrieve a set of clearly eligible studies?  Did you get your strategy peer reviewed or checked by another method or process?  Was your search strategy based on PICO (population, intervention, comparator, outcome) terms? If not, make sure you describe how you arrived at the concepts you did use. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [8. Selection Process](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/selection-process.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you use an automatic classifier to eliminate records before screening by humans? If so, report the number eliminated in the PRISMA flow diagram as ‘Records marked as ineligible by automation tools’  How many human reviewers independently screened titles and abstracts to decide whether to retrieve the full text? What process was used to resolve disagreements between screeners?  How many human reviewers independently screened each full text article to determine eligibility? What process was used to resolve disagreements between screeners?  How many stages of screening were there, and what rules did you have to guide the people involved in the process?  Did you use any other method to eliminate records, such as sets of already screened out records?  Were the people involved in the screening and selection process independent from the review authors?  Did you use crowd-sourcing or automation techniques in the process of selecting eligible studies? If so, how did you integrate these into the selection process?  Did you use a machine learning tool (e.g. Cochrane RCT Classifier) to eliminate records or replace a human screener? If so, report a reference to the version you used.  If you didn’t have enough information to decide if a study was eligible, what process did you use to obtain information from study investigators or other sources?  If abstracts or articles required translation into another language to determine their eligibility, what translation process did you use? |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [9. Data collection process](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/data-collection-process.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you have a method to collect data from each report?  Did you have more than one reviewer collecting data from each report? If so, did they work independently or together? If they worked independently, report how they resolved differences.  Did you have a process for contacting study investigators to obtain or confirm relevant data?  Did you use any automation tools to collect data? If so, report how the tools works, how it was trained, and what steps were taken to avoid and check for incorrect extractions.  Did you use software to extract data from figures? If so, specify which.  Did you translate any of the articles to help with data extraction? If so report how the articles were translated.  Did you use any decision rules to select data from multiple reports of the same study, and to resolve inconsistencies between different reports? If so, report the rules and steps. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## 10. Data Items

### [10a. Outcomes](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/data-items-outcomes.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you specify the measurement time frames for all the outcomes?  Did you extract all the results matching the outcome domains you had specified or did you make a selection? If you selected, how did you decide which ones to use, and does that match with your review objectives?  Did you change the processes used to select results, the definitions of the outcome, or the importance given to the outcomes in the review? If you did explain what changes you made and how the changes fit with your review rationale.  Did you give some outcomes more weight when interpreting the review’s results? If you did, explain why – for example, it could be because a recent core outcome set labelled it as being of the most importance to patients. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [10b. Other Variables](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/data-items-other-variables.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you seek data for any other variables and study characteristics, such as participant and intervention characteristics, sources of funding, potential conflicts of interest, or level of patient involvement in the included studies.  What did you do about missing or unclear information in the study reports?  Did you use any tools to help you decide which data items to collect? |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [11. Risk of bias in individual studies](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/risk-of-bias-in-individual-studies.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What tools did you use to assess the potential bias in the included studies?  Which characteristics of the studies did you examine to reach your assessment of the level of bias?  Did you break down the bias assessments into different components, or present an overall judgement of the whole study?  Did you make any adaptations to an existing bias assessment tool? If so, specify those adaptations  Did you develop your own tool to assess potential bias? If so, describe it and make it publicly available.  Did independent people carry out bias assessments on the same studies in parallel? If so, describe how disagreements between the assessors were resolved.  Did you need to contact study investigators to obtain or clarify information? If so, what was your process for doing this?  Did you use AI tools to assess risk of bias? If so, report how the tool was used, trained, and give details of the tool’s performance and internal validation. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [12. Effect measures](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/effect-measures.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Which effect measurements did you use for binary outcomes such as dead or alive - odds ratio (OR), risk ratio (RR) or risk difference (RD)?  Which effect measurements did you use for continuous outcomes such as body mass index - mean difference (MD), standardized mean difference (SMD) or ratio of means (RoM)  Justify all your choices of effect measures  What thresholds or ranges did you use to judge whether the size of the effect was large enough to be clinically important? Give the rationale for choosing them.  Were results from different studies re-expressed to a single type of effect measure in the synthesis – for example analyzing risk ratios from several different studies and calculating a single absolute risk reduction based on an assumed comparator risk |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## 13. Synthesis Methods

### [13a. Deciding which studies were eligible for each synthesis](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/synthesis-methods-eligibility.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What process did you follow to decide which studies had suitable data for each synthesis? |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [13b. Data preparation methods](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/synthesis-methods-data-preparation.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What did you do to prepare the data collected from studies for presentation or synthesis?  How did you handle missing summary statistics, or data conversions? |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [13c. Methods for tabulating or displaying results](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/synthesis-methods-tabulating-or-displaying-results.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What table structure did you use to display the results of individual studies, syntheses and characteristics of the data they presented?  What types of graphs did you use to display the results of individual studies and syntheses?  Did you group or order studies for tabular or graphical display based on study characteristics, such as size of the effect, or date the results were published? If so, describe why you chose to group or order them in this way.  Did you use any non-standard type of graphs? If so, justify your choice. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [13d. Synthesis methods](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/synthesis-methods-synthesis-methods.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Were you able to conduct a statistical synthesis or meta-analysis? If not, describe and justify the method you have used to combine and summarize the results of the studies in another way.  Were you able to conduct a statistical synthesis or meta-analysis? If so, report the software packages and version numbers used.  If you did a meta-analysis, did you use the fixed-effect, or random-effects model, and why?  What statistical techniques did you use - Mantel-Haenszel, inverse-variance or something else?  Did you use a formal statistical test for heterogeneity or perform a visual inspection of results?  If you did a statistical test, was it to detect the level of heterogeneity, the variance, the level of inconsistency or the difference in prediction intervals?  Did you use a random-effects meta-analysis model?  If yes, report which between-study (heterogeneity) variance estimator was used (e.g. DerSimonian and Laird, restricted maximum likelihood (REML)).  Also, report what method you used to calculate the confidence interval for the summary effect (e.g. Wald-type confidence interval, Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman).  Report any other details about the methods used, such as the method for calculating confidence limits for the heterogeneity variance.  Did you use a Bayesian approach to meta-analysis? If so, report both the prior distribution of the effects being analysed and the amount of heterogeneity across studies.  Did you analyse multiple effect estimates from a single study in a meta-analysis?  If so, describe how you accounted for the statistical dependency between these estimates. Did you do a multivariate meta-analysis, use multilevel models or a robust variance estimation?  Were you able to conduct the syntheses as planned? If this was possible or appropriate, report your reasons for that decision |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [13e. Methods for exploring heterogeneity](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/synthesis-methods-exploring-heterogeneity.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you investigate potential causes of statistical heterogeneity? If so, report whether you used subgroup analysis or meta-regression  Which factors did you explore?  What were the levels of those factors?  Which direction did you expect the effect modification to go in and why?  Were you able to conduct these analyses at study level – ie. where each study is included in one subgroup only)  Did you conduct within-study contrasts to compare subsets of participants from different studies in more than one subgroup?  How did you compare subgroup effects statistically?  If the data was not suitable for meta-analysis of effect estimates, did you use another method to investigate statistical heterogeneity? For example, you could use structured tables to view variation in results across study sub-populations.  Did you pre-specify the ways you were going to investigate heterogeneity or decide after you had collected the data? Report which investigations were pre-specified and which were decided on later |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [13f. Sensitivitiy analyses](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/synthesis-methods-sensitivity-analyses.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you conduct sensitivity analyses to check the robustness of your results? For example, did you remove studies at high risk of bias, or use an additional meta-analysis model?  Did you pre-specify your sensitivity analyses or decide after you had collected the data? Report which analyses were pre-specified and which were decided on later. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [14. Reporting bias assessment](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/reporting-bias-assessment.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you assess the risk of bias due to unreported results?  If so, specify the method or existing tool you used and the process you used to reach a judgement of overall risk of bias  Did you make any adaptations to the tool? If so, describe them and why they were needed.  Did you develop a new tool to assess risk of bias due to missing results? If so, describe how it works and make it publicly available.  Did more than one reviewer assess the bias due to missing results independently? If so, report how disagreements were resolved.  Did you have a process for obtaining missing results from study investigators?  Did you use an automation tool? If so, report how it works, how it was trained, and how you checked its performance. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [15. Certainty assessment](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/certainty-assessment.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What tool or system did you use to assess the level of certainty or confidence in the evidence?  Which factors did you consider and what criteria did you use to assess the precision of the effect estimate and the consistency of the findings across studies?  Did you assess any other factors affecting the certainty of the evidence?  What decision rules did use to judge the level of certainty?  What is the definition of each level of certainty?  Did you use any review-specific thresholds for assessing certainty, such as what range of effect size might be considered trivial, moderate or large for this review question? Make sure you give the rationale for choosing these ranges or thresholds.  Did you make any adaptations to an existing tool or system to assess evidence certainty? If so, report what adaptations you made and why.  Describe how you allocated the evidence certainty assessment tasks, whether any were done in parallel independently, and how disagreements were resolved between assessors  What processes did you use to obtain or confirm relevant information from investigators?  Did you use an automation tool to support certainty assessments? If so, how did it work, how was it trained, and how did you check the accuracy of its performance?  Use a clear method of displaying the results of certainty assessments, such as a Summary of Findings table.  Did you use standard words to convey the level of certainty in a particular effect size, such as “may” “probably” or “likely” (e.g. “hip protectors probably reduce the risk of hip fracture slightly”). If so, report the intended interpretation of each phrase or word and the reference for the source guidance |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

# Results

## 16. Study Selection

### [16a. Results of the search and selection process](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/study-selection-search-results.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Make sure you report the results of the search and study selection process clearly, preferably using a flow diagram. It should include the number of: records identified; records excluded before screening; records screened; records excluded after screening titles or titles and abstracts; reports retrieved for detailed evaluation; potentially eligible reports that were not retrievable; retrieved reports that did not meet inclusion criteria and the primary reasons for exclusion; and the number of studies and reports included in the review. If applicable, also report the number of ongoing studies and associated reports identified.  Is the review an update of a previous review? If so, report results of the search and selection process for the current review and also the number of studies included in the previous review and how they were selected.  Did you use automation tools? If so, make it clear in the flow diagram how many records were excluded by a human and how many by automation tools. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [16b. Excluded studies](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/study-selection-excluded-studies.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Were there any studies that appeared to meet the inclusion criteria, but were excluded?  For each of them, explain why they were excluded. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [17. Study characteristics](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/study-characteristics.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Present all the included studies in a tabular or graphic format which allows users of the review to compare the key characteristics easily.  Is the review of the effects of interventions? If so, present a summary of characteristics of the interventions of each study so they can also be compared easily. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [18. Risk of bias in studies](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/risk-of-bias-in-studies.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| What characteristics of each study were used to assess the risk of bias?  Have you explained your judgements, for example by quoting text from the reports of included studies? Present the judgements and explanations for each one clearly in a table or a figure.  Did you assess risk of bias for specific outcomes or results? If so, present these judgements in a forest plot alongside the results of each study. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [19. Results of individual studies](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/results-of-individual-studies.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| For all review outcomes, present each included study’s summary statistic for that outcome, even if it’s not included in your synthesis.  For dichotomous outcomes, report the number of participants with and without the events for each group; or the number with the event and the total for each group (e.g. 12/45).  For continuous outcomes, report the mean, standard deviation and sample size of each group.  For all review outcomes, present for each included study’s effect estimate and its precision (e.g. standard error or 95% confidence/credible interval). For time-to-event outcomes, present a hazard ratio and its confidence interval.  If you present this study-level data in a graph or described in the text, make sure you also include it in a table.  Did you use more than one source to obtain results data? If so, report where it came from (e.g. journal article, study register entry, clinical study report, or correspondence with authors),  Did you have to compute or estimate any results by using indirect information about the study? If so, give details of your methods. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## 20. Results of Synthesis

### [20a. Summary of studies](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/results-of-syntheses-summary-of-studies.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| It’s important to make it clear which syntheses were pre-specified in your protocol, and which were not.  For each synthesis, list the studies in a forest plot or a table.  Also summarize key characteristics and risk of bias of the studies in each synthesis. This should focus on the factors which help interpret the results of the synthesis. For example, some syntheses won’t answer the review question completely or will only indirectly address the review question. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [20b. Statistical results](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/results-of-syntheses-statistical-results.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| If you did meta-analyses, for each one report the number of studies, the number of patients, the summary estimate, the standard error or confidence interval, and a measure of statistical heterogeneity (e.g. 𝜏2, I2, prediction interval).  Did you summarize the effect estimates to synthesise the evidence? If so, report the number of studies, the summary effect size and its measure of precision (the p-value from your test).  Did you combine the p-values to synthesise the evidence? If so, report the number of studies and the precision (p-value from your test) and an interpretation of the result without an effect size. For example, “There was strong evidence of benefit of the intervention in at least one study (P < 0.001, 10 studies)”.  Clearly describe the direction of the effect for each synthesis (e.g. fewer events in the intervention group, or higher pain in the comparator group).  Did you synthesize mean differences? If so, specify the unit of measurement for each synthesis, (e.g. kilograms or pounds), the upper and lower limits of the measurement scale (e.g. 0 to 10 on a pain scale), the direction of benefit (e.g. higher scores denote higher severity of pain), and the minimally important difference you have specified in your methods.  Did you synthesize standardised mean differences? If so, give the details of the instrument to which the effect estimates are being re-expressed |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [20c. Heterogeneity](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/results-of-syntheses-heterogeneity.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you investigate causes of variations in the effect size depending on the characteristics of the population (e.g. aged over or under 60) or the intervention (e.g. invasive or non-invasive ventilation), or the quality of the study (e.g. high or low risk of bias)?  Was the data suitable for meta-analysis? If not, you could group the studies a table grouped by dose, or by risk of bias, and describe any observed patterns. Also acknowledge the limitations of the observational nature of your analysis.  Did you conduct subgroup analyses? If so, report for each analysis the exact p-value for interaction test, as well as, within each subgroup, the summary estimates, their precision (e.g. standard error or 95% confidence/credible interval) and measures of heterogeneity.  You could also calculate an estimate of the difference between subgroups and its precision.  Did you conduct a meta-regression? (not advisable for reviews with a small number of studies)  If so, report the exact p-value for each analysis as well as the regression coefficient and its precision.  You could also present a meta-regression as a scatter plot with the study effect estimates plotted against the potential effect modifier. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [20d. Sensitivity analyses](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/results-of-syntheses-sensitivity-analyses.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you conduct any sensitivity analyses? If so, make sure you report the results of all of them and comment on how robust you think the main analysis is, depending on the results of the corresponding sensitivity analyses.  It’s useful to present the results and assumptions made for the original and sensitivity analyses side by side in tables and/or forest plots. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [21. Risk of reporting biases in syntheses](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/risk-of-reporting-biases-in-syntheses.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Did you assess the risk of bias caused by unreported results in studies included in the review?  If so, did you use a tool, such as a questionnaire to make the assessment? Make sure you present your responses to the questions and the reasons for the judgements reached.  Did you test the effect of the inclusion of small studies using a funnel plot? If so, make sure you clearly specify the effect estimate and measure of precision you used  Did you generate a contour-enhanced funnel plot? If so, make sure you clearly present the ‘milestones’ of statistical significance (p = 0.01, 0.05, 0.1, etc.)  Did you do a statistical test for funnel plot asymmetry? If so, report the exact p-value and other relevant statistics, such as the standard normal deviation used to calculate it.  Did you carry out any sensitivity analyses to explore the potential impact of missing results? If so, present the results of each one compared with the results of the primary analysis.  Did you check whether the study report included all the results pre-specified in study registers, protocols or statistical analysis plans? It’s useful to do this to assess the level of selective reporting bias. You could present a matrix of planned outcomes and analyses compared with the ones reported in published articles.  Did you have to exclude some studies from the syntheses because of missing results data? If so, make sure the details of the studies with missing data are displayed clearly. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [22. Certainty of evidence](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/certainty-of-evidence.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Use a table to summarize the evidence for each of your primary outcome measures. Make sure you report the level of certainty you have for each  Have you made it clear what your reasons were for rating levels of certainty up or down? Giving explanations in footnotes to evidence summary tables (such as GRADE Summary of Findings tables) is not sufficient. Reasons for your conclusions about the certainty of the evidence should also be given preferably in layman’s terms in a plain language summary, in the abstract and results sections and in the discussion and conclusion sections. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

# Discussion

## 23. Discussion

### [23a. General interpretation of the results](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/discussion-general-interpretation.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence   * Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of * other evidence. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [23b. Limitations of included evidence](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/discussion-limitations-of-included-evidence.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review   * Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [23c. Limitations of the review processes](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/discussion-limitations-of-review-process.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Discuss any limitations of the review processes used   * Discuss any limitations of the review processes used and comment on * the potential impact of each limitation. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [23d. Implications](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/discussion-implications.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research   * Discuss implications of the results for practice and policy. * Make explicit recommendations for future research. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

# Other Information

## 24. Registration and Protocol

### [24a. Registration](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/registration-and-protocol-registration.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered   * Provide registration information for the review, including register * name and registration number, or state that the review was not * registered. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [24b. Protocol](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/registration-and-protocol-protocol.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared   * Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed (such as by * providing a citation, DOI, or link) or state that a protocol was not * prepared. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

### [24c. Amendments](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/registration-and-protocol-amendments.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol   * Report details of any amendments to information provided at * registration or in the protocol, noting: (*a*) the amendment itself, * (*b*) the reason for the amendment, and (*c*) the stage of the… |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [25. Support](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/support.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review   * Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the * review, specifying relevant grant ID numbers for each funder. If no * specific financial or non-fina… |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [26. Competing Interests](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/competing-interests.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| Declare any competing interests of review authors   * Disclose any of the authors’ relationships or activities that * readers could consider pertinent or to have influenced the review. * If any authors had competing interests, report how they were managed * for particular review processes. |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## [27. Availability of data, code, and other materials](https:/resources.equator-network.org/guidelines/prisma/items/availability-of-materials.html)

|  |
| --- |
| Things To Consider |
| 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   * Report which of the following are publicly available: templa… |

* Make notes here:
* …
* …

## How to cite

Describe how you used PRISMA 2020 at the end of your Methods section, referencing the resources you used e.g.,

‘We used the PRISMA 2020 reporting guideline(1) to draft this manuscript, and the PRISMA 2020 reporting checklist(2) when editing, included in supplement A’

If you use a reporting checklist, remember to include it as a supplement when publishing so that readers can easily find information and see how you have interpreted the guidance.
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