





PRISMA 2009 Checklist of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

Section / Topic	Item no.	Checklist item	Reported on page no.
TITLE Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	
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.	
INTRODUCTION Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	
METHODS	-	Laffert for a few sets of a few forms for the few few sets of the Make address A	
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. Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g.,	
Eligibility criteria	6	years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with	
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. Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used,	
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	
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).	
Data collection process	10	review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	
Data items	11	duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	
Risk of bias in	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including	
individual studies		specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this	
Summary measures Synthesis of results	13 14	information is to be used in any data synthesis. State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means). Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including	
		measures of consistency (e.g., I²) for each meta-analysis.	
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).	
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta- regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	
RESULTS	47		
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with	
Study characteristics	18	reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size,	
Risk of bias within studies	19	PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations. Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment	
Results of individual	20	(see item 12). For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple	
studies		summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals,	
Synthesis of results	21	ideally with a forest plot. Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures	
Risk of bias across studies	22 23	of consistency. Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15). Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta- regression [see Item 16]).	
DISCUSSION	24		
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). Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g.,	
Limitations	25	incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias)	
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	
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.	

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(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097. For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

"The **EQUATOR** (Enhancing the QUAlity and Transparency Of health Research) Network is an international initiative that seeks to improve the reliability and value of published health research literature by promoting transparent and accurate reporting and wider use of robust reporting guidelines. It is the first coordinated attempt to tackle the problems of inadequate reporting systematically and on a global scale; it advances the work done by individual groups over the last 15 years..." lifted from the EQUATOR Network website.

For this issue of JAFES, selected checklists from the EQUATOR Network are featured for the main study types. The updated JAFES Instructions to Authors stipulate that manuscripts should ensure compliance with the appropriate EQUATOR Network Guideline to be considered for acceptance. The complete checklists and full guidelines are available at http://equator-network.org.