**PRISMA 2020 Checklist**

| **Section and Topic**  | **Item #** | **Checklist item**  | **Location where item is reported**  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **TITLE**  |  |
| Title  | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | P1 |
| **ABSTRACT**  |  |
| Abstract  | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. | P2 |
| **INTRODUCTION**  |  |
| Rationale  | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | P3 |
| Objectives  | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | P3 |
| **METHODS**  |  |
| Eligibility criteria  | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | P4-5 |
| Information sources  | 6 | Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted. | P4 |
| Search strategy | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | Supplement File 2 |
| Selection process | 8 | Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | P4 |
| Data collection process  | 9 | Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | P4-5 |
| Data items  | 10a | List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect. | P4-5 |
| 10b | List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information. | P4 |
| Study risk of bias assessment | 11 | Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process. | P5 |
| Effect measures  | 12 | Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results. | P5 and Supplement File 3 |
| Synthesis methods | 13a | Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)). | P5 and Supplement File 3 |
| 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | P5 and Supplement File 3 |
| 13c | Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses. | P5 and Supplement File 3 |
| 13d | Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used. | P5 and Supplement File 3 |
| 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | Supplement File 3 |
| 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | Supplement File 3 |
| Reporting bias assessment | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | Supplement File 3 |
| Certainty assessment | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | N/A due to time constraints |
| **RESULTS**  |  |
| Study selection  | 16a | Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram. | P5-6 and Figure 1 |
| 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | P5-6 and Figure 1 |
| Study characteristics  | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | Table 2 |
| Risk of bias in studies  | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | Supplement File 5 |
| Results of individual studies  | 19 | For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots. | Table 2, P6-9 and Supplement File 3 |
| Results of syntheses | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | P6-9 and Supplement File 5 |
| 20b | Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect. | P6-9 and Supplement File 3 |
| 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | Supplement File 3 |
| 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | Supplement File 3 |
| Reporting biases | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | Supplement File 3 |
| Certainty of evidence  | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | N/A due to time constraints |
| **DISCUSSION**  |  |
| Discussion  | 23a | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. | P9-10 |
| 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | P9-10 |
| 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | P9-10 |
| 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | P9-10 |
| **OTHER INFORMATION** |  |
| Registration and protocol | 24a | Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered. | P4 |
| 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | P4 |
| 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | Supplement File 2 |
| Support | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | P11 |
| Competing interests | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | P11 |
| Availability of data, code and other materials | 27 | Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review. | P5 and Supplement File 3 |

*From:*  Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

**MOOSE Checklist for Meta-analyses of Observational Studies**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No** | **Recommendation** | **Reported on Page No** |
| Reporting of background should include |
| 1 | Problem definition | P4-5 |
| 2 | Hypothesis statement | P5 |
| 3 | Description of study outcome(s) | Table 1 |
| 4 | Type of exposure or intervention used | Table 1 |
| 5 | Type of study designs used | P5 |
| 6 | Study population | P5 and Table 1 |
| Reporting of search strategy should include |
| 7 | Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | P5 |
| 8 | Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and key words | Supplementary File 2 |
| 9 | Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors | P5 |
| 10 | Databases and registries searched | P5 |
| 11 | Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion) | P5 and Supplementary File 2 |
| 12 | Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) | P5 |
| 13 | List of citations located and those excluded, including justification | Figure 1 |
| 14 | Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English | Table 1 |
| 15 | Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies | Table 1 |
| 16 | Description of any contact with authors | P5 |
| Reporting of methods should include |
| 17 | Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested | P7 |
| 18 | Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience) | P6-7 |
| 19 | Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding and interrater reliability) | P6-7 |
| 20 | Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate) | Supplementary File 3 |
| 21 | Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors, stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results | P6, P8, P14 and Supplementary File 3 |
| 22 | Assessment of heterogeneity | P14 and Supplementary File 3 |
| 23 | Description of statistical methods (eg, complete description of fixed or random effects models, justification of whether the chosen models account for predictors of study results, dose-response models, or cumulative meta-analysis) in sufficient detail to be replicated | P6 and Supplementary File 3 |
| 24 | Provision of appropriate tables and graphics | Figures 2, 3 and Supplementary File 3 |
| Reporting of results should include |
| 25 | Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate | Figures 2, 3 and Supplementary File 3 |
| 26 | Table giving descriptive information for each study included | Table 2 |
| 27 | Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis) | P14 and Supplementary File 3 |
| 28 | Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings | P14 and Supplementary File 3 |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No** | **Recommendation** | **Reported on Page No** |
| Reporting of discussion should include |
| 29 | Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias) | Supplementary File 3 |
| 30 | Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English language citations) | Published protocol |
| 31 | Assessment of quality of included studies | P6 and Supplementary File 5 |
| Reporting of conclusions should include |
| 32 | Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results | P15-16 |
| 33 | Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review) | P15-16 |
| 34 | Guidelines for future research | P16 |
| 35 | Disclosure of funding source | P17 |

*From*: Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al, for the Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) Group. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology. A Proposal for Reporting. *JAMA*. 2000;283(15):2008-2012. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.15.2008.