

PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review	N/A
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist	N/A
INTRODOCUTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge	Pg. 2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses	Pg. 3
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Pg. 21
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.	Pg. 3
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Pg. 3 & 21
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.	Pg. 3 & 4
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.	Pg. 3 & 4
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.	Pg. 3, 4 & Pg. 21

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention)	Pg. 21

		characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	
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.	Pg. 3, 4
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.	N/A
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)).	Pg. 3 & 4
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	N/A
	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.	Pg. 4
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	N/A
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported
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.	Pg. 3, 4 & 26

	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Pg. 3, 4 & 26
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Pg. 22 - 24
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	N/A
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.	N/A
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	N/A
	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.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	N/A
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	N/A
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Pg. 12 – 15
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Pg. 15

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Location where item is reported
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Pg. 15
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Pg. 12 - 16
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.	N/A
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	N/A
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	N/A

Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Pg. 16
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Pg. 16
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.	N/A

Appendix A: Critical Appraisal Skills Programme Systematic Review Checklist used to critique the quality of evidence in the review of the literature [32]

Article	<i>Article Title</i>	Yes	Can't Tell	No
Questions	1. Did the review address a clearly focused question?			
	2. Did the authors look for the right type of papers?			
	3. Do you think all the important, relevant studies were included?			
	4. Did the review's authors do enough to assess quality of the included studies?			
	5. If the results of the review have been combined, was it reasonable to do so?			
	6. What are the overall results of the review?			
	7. How precise are the results?			
	8. Can the results be applied to the local population?			
	9. Were all important outcomes considered?			
	10. Are the benefits worth the harms and costs?			
Score				

Appendix B: Critical Appraisal Skills Programme Qualitative Research Checklist used to critique the quality of evidence in the review of the literature [33]

Article	<i>Article Title</i>	Yes	Can't Tell	No
Questions	1. Was there a clear statement of the aims of the research?			
	2. Is a qualitative methodology appropriate?			
	3. Was the research design appropriate to address the aims of the research?			
	4. Was the recruitment strategy appropriate to the aims of the research?			
	5. Was the data collected in a way that addressed the research issue?			
	6. Has the relationship between researcher and participants been adequately considered?			
	7. Have ethical issues been taken into consideration?			
	8. Was the data analysis sufficiently rigorous?			
	9. Is there a clear statement of findings?			
	10. How valuable is the research?			
Score				

Appendix C: AMSTAR 2 critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both [35]

1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO?	Yes
2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?	Partial Yes: review questions, search strategy, inclusion/exclusion criteria, risk of bias assessment

<p>3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy?</p>	<p>Partial yes: searched at least 2 databases, provided key word and/or search strategy, justified publication restrictions (e.g. language)</p>
<p>5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?</p>	<p>Yes: at least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include</p>
<p>6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?</p>	<p>Yes: at least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies</p>
<p>7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?</p>	<p>Yes: justified the exclusion from the review of each potentially relevant study</p>
<p>8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?</p>	<p>Partial yes: described populations, described interventions, described comparators, described outcomes, described research designs)</p>
<p>9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?</p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p>10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?</p>	<p>Yes</p>

11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?	N/A: no meta-analysis conducted
12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?	N/A: no meta-analysis conducted
13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/discussing the results of the review?	Yes: included only low risk of bias studies
14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?	Yes: there was no significant heterogeneity in the results
15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?	N/A: no meta-analysis conducted
16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?	Yes: the authors reported no competing interests