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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section/topic**  | **#** | **Checklist item**  | **Reported on page #**  |
| **TITLE**  |  |
| Title  | 1 | Identify the report as a literature review.  | 11 |
| **ABSTRACT**  |  |
| Structured summary  | 2 | Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings;  | 1 |
| **INTRODUCTION**  |  |
| Rationale  | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known about your topic.  | 2 |
| Objectives  | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).  | 2 |
| **METHODS**  |  |
| Eligibility criteria  | 5 | 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.  | 0 |
| Information sources  | 6 | Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage) in the search and date last searched.  | 2-11 |
| Search  | 7 | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.  | 2-11 |
| Study selection  | 8 | State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility).  | 0 |
| Risk of bias in individual studies  | 9 | Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level).  | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Risk of bias across studies  | 10 | Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).  | 0 |
| **RESULTS**  |  |
| Study selection  | 11 | Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.  | 11 |
| Study characteristics  | 12 | For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.  | 3-11 |
| Synthesis of results of individual studies  | 13 | For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) summary of results and (b) relationship to other studies under review (e.g. agreements or disagreements in methods, sampling, data collection or findings). | 2-11 |
| **DISCUSSION**  |  |
| Summary of evidence  | 14 | Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).  | 2-11 |
| Limitations  | 15 | Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).  | 0 |
| **CONCLUSION**  |  |
| Conclusions  | 16 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.  | 8-10 |

*Adapted from:*  Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA statement*. PLoS Medicine*, 6(6), e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

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