



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.	Page1/Line3-4	Title
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.	Page1/Line24-Page2/Line18	Abstract/Paragraph1-4
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	Page2/Line25-Page3/Line1	Introduction/Paragraph1
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	Note:The original study was not an RCT study,	Note:It's a cross-sectional study
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.	There is no protocol for this systematic review	There is no registration information.
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.	Page5/Line26-Page5/Line1	Study selection/Paragraph1
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.	Page3/Line24-Page4/Line5	Literature search/Paragraph1
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	Page4/Line4-19	Literature search/Paragraph1
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).	Page4/Line23-25	Study selection/Paragraph1
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.	Page5/Line5-8	Data collection and quality assessment/Paragraph1
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	Page5/Line8-11	Data collection and quality assessment/Paragraph1

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.	Page5/Line32-33	Data collection and quality assessment/Paragraph1
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	Page5/Line9-10	Statistical analysis/Paragraph1
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.	Page5/Line28-32	Statistical analysis/Paragraph1
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).	Page6/Line5-9	Statistical analysis/Paragraph1
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	Page6/Line1-5	Statistical analysis/Paragraph1
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.	Page6/Line22-30 Figure1	Study selection and characteristics/Paragraph1
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.	Page6/Line30-31 Table1	Study selection and characteristics/Paragraph1
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).	Page5/Line16-22 Table1	Data collection and quality assessment/Paragraph2
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.	Page7/Line1-5; Page8/Line16-20; Page8/Line21-22	Results/Paragraph2-6 Figure2A;Figure3A; Figure3B;Figure3C
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	Page7/Line5-10; Page7/Line20, 22-25; Page7/Line26-27	Results/Paragraph2-6
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	Page7/Line10-11; Page7/Line25-26 Page7/Line27-28	Results/Paragraph2-5
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	Page7/Line6-7;	Results/Paragraph2-6
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).	Page9/Line12-24	Discussion/Paragraph1
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).	Page10/Line12-26	Discussion/Paragraph4
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	Page9/Line25-Page10/Lin	Discussion/Paragraph2-3

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.	Page10/Line28-29	Acknowledgments

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/tcr-20-1813>

*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.