Appendix 1 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-analysis (PRISMA).

Section/topic	N.	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including: study 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, depending on study applicability.	1
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the review rationale based on the already known context.	2–3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of addressed questions, referring to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	3
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if there is a review protocol, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information, including registration number.	3–4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., considered years, language, publication status) considered in the eligibility criteria, giving rationale.	4
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with coverage dates, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and the last searched date.	4
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any used limits to allow its reproduction.	4
Study selection	9	Indicate the adopted study selection process (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	4–5
Data collection process	10	Describe the method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	5
Data items	11	List and define all variables used on the search for data (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any conducted assumptions and simplifications.	4–6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe the methods used for assessing risk of bias in individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information must be used in any data synthesis.	4–5
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	5–6
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods to handle data and combining study results, including measures of consistency (e.g., I2) for each meta-analysis (if one).	5–6
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).	NA
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	NA
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Present the numbers of screened studies, of the ones assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with exclusion reasons at each stage, ideally accompanied by a flow diagram.	Figures 1 and 6
Study characteristics	18	Present characteristics of each study for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	Table 2

Section/topic	N.	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on the risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	6
Results of individual studies	20	Present for all the considered outcomes (benefits or harms) for each study: (a) simple data summary for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	N/A
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each conducted meta-analysis, including confidence intervals and consistency measures.	N/A
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	N/A
Additional analysis	23	Present results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	N/A
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).	6–16
Limitations	25	Discuss study limitations and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	16–17
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	16–17
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe funding sources for the systematic review and other support systems (e.g., supply of data); role of funders in the systematic review.	17

N/A: not applicable.

Source: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med 2009; 6:e1000097.