



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Reported on page # |
|------------------------------------|----|---|--------------------|
| TITLE | | | |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both. | Line 6 |
| 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; systematic review registration number. | Line 36-62 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. | Line 76 - 85 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS). | Line 100-102 |
| METHODS | | | |
| Protocol and registration | 5 | Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number. | NR |
| Eligibility criteria | 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. | Line 109-112 |
| Information sources | 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. | Line 120-123 |
| Search | 8 | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated. | Line 120-127 |
| Study selection | 9 | State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). | Line 129-134 |
| Data collection process | 10 | Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. | Line 140-144 |
| Data items | 11 | List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made. | Line 142-142 |
| Risk of bias in individual studies | 12 | Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis. | Line 135-137 |
| Summary measures | 13 | State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). | Line 146- |



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

| | | | |
|----------------------|----|---|--------------|
| | | | 168 |
| Synthesis of results | 14 | Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I^2) for each meta-analysis. | Line 174-183 |

Page 1 of 2

| Section/topic | # | Checklist item | Reported on page # |
|-------------------------------|----|--|--------------------|
| Risk of bias across studies | 15 | Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies). | Line 138-139 |
| Additional analyses | 16 | Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. | Line 174-183 |
| RESULTS | | | |
| Study selection | 17 | 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. | Line 186-189 |
| Study characteristics | 18 | For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. | Line 191-204 |
| Risk of bias within studies | 19 | Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12). | Line 213 - 220 |
| Results of individual 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. | Table 1 |
| Synthesis of results | 21 | Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency. | Line 221 - 262 |
| Risk of bias across studies | 22 | Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). | Line 213 - 220 |
| Additional analysis | 23 | Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]). | Line 262 -283 |
| DISCUSSION | | | |
| Summary of evidence | 24 | 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). | Line 288-293 |
| Limitations | 25 | 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). | Line 338-345 |
| Conclusions | 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research. | Line 347- |



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

| | | | |
|----------------|----|--|---------|
| | | | 380 |
| FUNDING | | | |
| Funding | 27 | Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review. | Line 20 |

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 Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

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