# PRISMA 2020 Checklist

| Section and Topic | Item # | Checklist item | Location where item is reported |
|---|---|---|---|
| **TITLE** | | | |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review. | Title page |
| **ABSTRACT** | | | |
| Abstract | 2 | See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist. | Abstract |
| **INTRODUCTION** | | | |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge. | Introduction, pp. 1–4 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses. | Introduction, pp. 3–4 |
| **METHODS** | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 5 | Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses. | Section 2.1.2 Eligibility Criteria, pp. 5–6 |
| 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. | Section 2.1.1 Search Strategy and Information Sources, pp. 4–5 |
| Search strategy | 7 | Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used. | Section 2.1.1 Search Strategy and Information Sources, Table 1, p. 5 |
| 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. | Section 2.1.3 Study Selection Process, pp. 6–7 |
| 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. | Section 2.1.4 Data Extraction and Quality Assessment, p. 7 |
| 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. | Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.6, pp. 7–8 |
| | 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. | Section 2.1.4 Data Extraction and Quality Assessment, p. 7 |
| 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. | Sections 2.1.4 and 2.1.5, pp. 7–8 |
| 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. | Section 2.1.6 Synthesis Methods, p. 8 |
| 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)). | Section 2.1.6 Synthesis Methods, p. 8 |
| | 13b | Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions. | Section 2.1.6 Synthesis Methods, p. 8 |

| 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. | Section 2.1.6 Synthesis Methods; Tables 2–4 |
| | 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. | Section 2.1.6 Synthesis Methods, p. 8 |
| | 13e | Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression). | Section 2.1.5 Risk of Bias, pp. 7–8 |
| | 13f | Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results. | Section 2.1.5 Risk of Bias, pp. 7–8 |
| Reporting bias assessment | 14 | Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases). | Section 2.1.5 Risk of Bias, pp. 7–8 |
| Certainty assessment | 15 | Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome. | Not applicable (narrative review without formal certainty scoring) |
| **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. | Section 2.1.3 and Figure 1, pp. 6–7 |
| | 16b | Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded. | Section 2.1.3 Study Selection Process, p. 6 |
| Study characteristics | 17 | Cite each included study and present its characteristics. | Sections 2.2–2.5 and Table 2, pp. 8–13 |
| Risk of bias in studies | 18 | Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study. | Section 2.1.5 Risk of Bias, pp. 7–8 |
| 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. | Sections 2.3–4.1; Tables 2–4 |
| Results of syntheses | 20a | For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies. | Sections 2.1.5 and 2.1.6 |
| | 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. | Narrative synthesis throughout Sections 2–7 |
| | 20c | Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results. | Sections 2.1.5 and 4.1.3 |
| | 20d | Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results. | Not performed |
| Reporting biases | 21 | Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed. | Section 2.1.5 Risk of Bias, pp. 7–8 |
| Certainty of evidence | 22 | Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed. | Not formally assessed |
| **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. | Discussion and Conclusions sections |
| | 23b | Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review. | Section 2.1.5 Risk of Bias; Discussion |
| | 23c | Discuss any limitations of the review processes used. | Section 2.1.7 Deviations from Protocol, p. 8 |
| | 23d | Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research. | Conclusions 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. | Section 2.1.7 Deviations from Protocol, p. 8 |
| | 24b | Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared. | Internal protocol at Fundación Universitaria Los Libertadores |
| | 24c | Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol. | Section 2.1.7 Deviations from Protocol, p. 8 |
| Support | 25 | Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review. | Acknowledgments/Funding section |
| Competing interests | 26 | Declare any competing interests of review authors. | Conflicts of Interest section |
| 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. | Data availability statement |

*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/