PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
TITLE				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	Page 1, line 2	Title page
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.	Pages 2–3, lines 40–69	Abstract
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	Page 4, lines 95–112	Background
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	Page 4, lines 109–112	Background
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.	NA; No review protocol was published in advance	
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.	Page 10, lines 242–255	Inclusion criteria; Exclusion criteria

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.	Pages 9–10, lines 227–241	Search strategy
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Page 9, lines 230–234	Search strategy
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).	Pages 9–10, lines 236–242	Search strategy
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.	Page 10, line 260	Statistical analyses
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Page 10, lines 258–260	Statistical analyses; Supplemental Table
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.	NA; Risk of bias assessment is limited to ascertainment of study setting and design	Supplemental Table
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	Pages 10–11, lines 264–266	Statistical analyses
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.	Page 11, lines 267–272	Statistical analyses
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).	NA; Risk of bias assessment is limited to	Supplemental Table

			ascertainment of study setting and design	
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	Page 10, lines 262–266	Statistical analyses
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.	Page 11, lines 278–282; Page 11, lines 287–288; Page 13, line 322; Page 14, lines 350–351; Page 15, line 375	Results; Figure 1; Table 1; Supplemental Table
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.	NA; Data presented in supplemental Table	Supplemental Table
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).	NA; Risk of bias assessment is limited to ascertainment of study setting and design	Supplemental Table
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.	Pages 16–17, lines 411–428	Comparison of outcomes with different ICS techniques to nonapplication of

				any ICS in CEA; Figure 4; Supplemental Figure 3
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	Pages 16–17, lines 411–428	Comparison of outcomes with different ICS techniques to nonapplication of any ICS in CEA; Figure 4; Supplemental Figure 3
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	NA; Risk of bias assessment is limited to ascertainment of study setting and design	Supplemental Table
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	Page 16, lines 394–410	Comparison of outcomes with different ICS techniques to nonapplication of any ICS in CEA
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).	Pages 17–19, lines 433–485	Discussion

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).	Pages 20–21, lines 496–524	Limitations and Strengths
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	Pages 21–22, lines 533–550	Conclusions
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.	Page 23, lines 583–588	Acknowledgments; Funding; Disclosures;

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(7): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097 For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

Article information: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-20-2931

*As the checklist was provided upon initial submission, the page number/line number reported may be changed due to copyediting and may not be referable in the published version. In this case, the section/paragraph may be used as an alternative reference.

Updated on April 13, 2020