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

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Section and topic | Item No | Checklist item |  | |
| ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION | |  |  | |
| Title: |  |  |  | |
| Identification | 1a | Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review | The effect of psycholinguistic variables of response time and accuracy of single word recognition for readers both skilled and unskilled: a systematic review protocol | |
| Update | 1b | 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 | Not eligible | |
| Authors: |  |  |  |  |
| Contact | 3a | Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author | Emma L A Mills  Lancaster University  [e.mills@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:e.mills@lancaster.ac.uk)  Emma Mills  Psychology Department  Fylde College  Lancaster University  Bailrigg  Lancaster  LA1 4YW | Rob Davies  Lancaster University  [r.davies1@lancaster.ac.uk](mailto:r.davies1@lancaster.ac.uk) |
| Contributions | 3b | Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review | First Author | Second Author and Guarantor  QA Checks |
| 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 | No previously completed or published protocol for this review. Important protocal amendments will be added to the original document in a different colour font, dated and initialled by both authors. Versions of protocol will be uploaded to GitHub public repository to be made available on publication as supplementary data | |
| Support: |  |  |  | |
| Sources | 5a | Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review | Review is being undertaken as partial fulfilment of first author’s PhD research project and as such is supported by an ESRC studentship. | |
| Sponsor | 5b | Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor |  | |
| Role of sponsor or funder | 5c | Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol | The ESRC has no direct role in developing the protocol | |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | |
| Rationale | 6 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known | While many studies are published about the effects of item-level attributes on skilled readers’ word recognition, few concern atypical populations and consider the variation within this populations. This review will map (and possibly meta-analyse) the extant studies that include comparisons between typical and atypical reading participants and identify gaps in the literature with a view to framing further research questions | |
| Objectives | 7 | Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO) | To what extent does single word recognition vary as a function of item- and subject-level attributes across typical and atypical reading populations. | |
| 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: |  |  | | |
| Data management | 11a | Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review | | |
| Selection process | 11b | 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) | | |
| Data collection process | 11c | 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 I2, 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: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.*