PRISMA 2020 Checklist

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	p. 1. The title identifies a systematic review.
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	p. 1. Structured content is provided in the abstract, but not all PRISMA Abstracts items are reported.
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	pp. 1 to 5. Introduction, theoretical background and contribution statement.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	pp. 2 and 5. Review objectives and research questions.
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	pp. 6 to 9. Table 1 and Sections 3.5 and 3.6 describe eligibility and classification criteria.
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.	pp. 5 to 8. Scopus searches dated 5 May and 7 October 2026.
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	pp. 5 to 8. Both queries and restrictions are reported. The historical year filter cannot be verified from the archive.
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.	pp. 6 and 7. Selection procedure and historical records are explained.
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.	Partial: pp. 8 to 10. Spreadsheet extraction and coding procedures are described. Collector roles and independence are not fully specified.
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.	Partial: pp. 8 and 9. Functional categories are defined. A protocol for selecting all eligible outcome results is not reported.
	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.	pp. 8 to 10. Tables 3 and 4 define variables and rules for missing or unclear implementation evidence.
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.	Not reported. No formal study risk of bias assessment method is described.
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.	No effect pooling or meta-analysis. Descriptive counts and percentages are presented on pp. 10 to 22.
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)).	pp. 6 to 10. Eligibility and descriptive categories are reported.
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	pp. 8 to 10. Missing evidence rules and bibliometric metadata normalization are described.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	pp. 8 to 10. Classification tables and bibliometric display methods. Results on pp. 10 to 22.
	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.	pp. 8 to 10 and 18 to 22. Descriptive classification and bibliometrics.
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Not reported. No formal subgroup analysis or meta-regression of outcome heterogeneity.
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Not reported. The complementary search on p. 8 is not a formal robustness analysis.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	Not reported. Access bias is discussed on p. 26, but no formal assessment of bias from missing results is provided.
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Not reported. No formal certainty of evidence method is described.
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.	pp. 6 to 8. Figure 1 on p. 7 shows the current flow to 72 included reports. Table 2 gives provenance of corrected inclusion decisions.
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	pp. 6 and 7. Exclusion reasons are summarized.
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	pp. 11 to 14. Table 5 provides characteristics and citations for the 72 reports. Implementation recoding remains incomplete.
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Not reported. No study level risk of bias results are presented.
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.	pp. 11 to 14 and 22 to 26. Characteristics and selected case results are provided.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Partial: pp. 10 to 22. Characteristics and frequencies are summarized. Formal risk of bias is not assessed.
	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.	pp. 10 to 22. Descriptive counts and bibliometric analyses. No meta-analysis or pooled effect estimates.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Not reported. No formal investigation of causes of outcome heterogeneity.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Not reported. No formal sensitivity analysis results.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	Not reported. Access limitations are discussed on p. 26, but no synthesis level reporting bias assessment is provided.
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	Not reported. No formal certainty assessments are presented.
DISCUSSION			

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	pp. 22 to 27. Discussion and Conclusions.
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	pp. 22 to 27. Sample size, validation and transfer limitations are discussed.
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	p. 26. Search and access restrictions, incomplete recoding and uncertain historical records.
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	pp. 25 to 27. Maintenance implications and future research directions.
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.	p. 5, Section 3.1. The review was not prospectively registered. The reason and associated limitation are stated.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Not reported. Access to a separate protocol or an explicit statement that no protocol was prepared is not provided.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	Not reported. No prospective registration. Amendments to a separate protocol are not documented.
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	p. 27. Funding statement: no external funding.
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	p. 27. Conflicts of Interest statement.
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.	p. 27. Review records and data are available on request.

Reporting locations refer to the 32-page production proof. Partial identifies incomplete reporting. Not reported identifies information not provided in the manuscript.

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. This work is licensed under CC BY 4.0. To view a copy of this license, visit https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/