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# Methods

Analyses were performed as specified in the protocol using Stata 16 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas, USA). Briefly, we analyzed resource use (person-hours) on the log scale using extended interval regression (eintreg) and used a likelihood-adjusted-censoring inverse-probability-weighted regression adjustment (LAC-IPWRA; stteffects) model to estimate mean difference in time-to-completion. All analyses accounted for right-censored outcomes (ongoing reviews) and for nonrandom endogenous treatment allocation, which was modelled in terms of review field (welfare or healthcare) and whether any evidence synthesis (quantitative or qualitative) was planned. We re-expressed the estimates as ratios (relative resource use and relative time-to-completion) to aid generalization to other institutions. We present two-sided 95% confidence intervals and p-values where appropriate and interpret p-values less than 0.05 to be statistically significant. We also present the time-to-completion data using Kaplan-Meier estimates of survivor functions. We updated the preprint version of the protocol during data extraction but before starting the analysis or unblinding the statistician (CJR) to redefine the comparisons in terms of under- and overuse of machine learning (TODO: Cite revision). However, only two reviews were judged to have under- or overused machine learning, so it was not possible to perform the revised analyses. We therefore performed and report the analyses as originally planned.

# Results

TODO: Add results.

# References

TODO: Add references.

# Appendix 1 — Protocol Deviations

TODO: Describe any protocol deviations.

# Appendix 2 — Full Regression Results

TODO: Present full regression tables.