Systematic reviews and meta-analysis Autumn 2021

Organiser: NRSGH at NTNU in collaboration with NIPH
Course leaders: Eva Denison (NIPH) (eva.denison@fhi.no) and Lillebeth Larun (NIPH)
(lillebeth.larun@fhi.no)

Welcome to the course "Systematic review and meta-analyses". In the following information you will find details about the course organization, content, assignments, exam, and time expectations. We look forward to having you in the course.

Learning objectives:

This course aims to introduce PhD students and post-doc researchers to systematic review methodology and familiarize them with the process of conducting a systematic review. The focus will be on systematic reviews of effect, but reviews addressing qualitative research, prevalence, prognostic, and diagnostic questions will also be presented. The course is built around the steps for conducting a systematic review.

Question → Type of review → Search → Selection Criteria → Screening → Data extraction → Risk of Bias → Synthesis → GRADE

Course description and ECTS credits:

The course consists of webinars, digital resources, course work, assignments, three-days of interactive teaching and the possibility to submit an exam. A pass on the exam and the two assignments will give 5 ECTS credits.

The course will be delivered digitally. However, we encourage you, where Covid restrictions allow, to meet up with fellow students in your area in a local meeting room or classroom to participate in the online sessions and group work.

All times given are in CEST which is the same as GMT +1 which is the time in Oslo, Norway. This Time Zone Converter https://www.timeanddate.com/worldclock/converter.html might be helpful.

The course is organised around one group and one individual assignment and an exam. All three must be submitted to pass the course. You will also have access to supervision with a search specialist (1 hour) and a systematic review specialist (1 hour).

October 6th	Group assignment due
October 13th	Individual assignment due
October 18-20	Interactive teaching seminar
October 20th-November 24th	Supervision with a search specialist (1 hour) and a systematic review specialist (1 hour)
November 24nd	Exam due
December 16th	Exam results given

The course syllabus is a combination of reading materials, online learning modules and small group work followed by three interactive teaching days October 18th-20th , see the end of this document for

the reading list. To get the most out of the course we encourage full participation in the group work and teaching days, and you must attend at least 80 % to be able to submit the exam. You will need to set aside time to complete the assignments and write the exam, the estimated time for five credits is 125 hours which includes all the work to be done.

Detailed course information

*Can change based on student needs and other circumstances

Date	Activity	Assignment
Admission to the course	Write a research question in a PICOS format	Submit draft research question and type of review (for example: effect, qualitative evidence synthesis, prevalence etc) to lillebeth.larun@fhi.no by **September 15th**.
Pre course start	Familiarise yourself with course outline and course content	
21 September	Digital meeting 10:00-11:30 CEST	- Start investigating the different types of systematic reviews and core question types - Introduction to searching - Decide on date and time for group work meetings 1, 3 and 4
21 September-17 October	Complete online learning resources and reading individually	
21-28 September	Small group work 1: Review question and type of review (2.5 hours) (Without facilitator)	Group responsible for setting up the meeting to discuss their own question and type of review (Group assignment). A zoom room will be provided **September 23rd** and supervisor will be available between 10:00 and 11:00 CEST
28 September	30 minutes digital meeting followed by small group work 2: Discuss information sources and search strategy (2.5 hours) (Facilitator available to each group)	Introduction to the search process for group 1 and 2 at 10:00 to 10:45 and for group 3 and 4 from 12:00 to 12:45 Go through a search strategy for a systematic review. A zoom room will be provided all day
29 September-6 October	Small group work 3: Fill in group work assignment table and discuss (2.5 hours) (Without facilitator)	Group assignment due October 6th Group responsible for setting up the meeting to finalise the group assignment A zoom room will be provided **October 6th** and supervisor will be available between 10:00 and 11:00 CEST
6-13 October	Small group work 4 (2.5 hours) *Present challenges you are having with your protocol* (Without facilitator)	Individual assignment due October 13th Group responsible for setting up the meeting to discuss their individual assignments. A zoom room will be provided **October 11th** and supervisor will be available between 10:00 and 11:00 CEST

18-20 October	<u>Seminar</u> building on the online modules and your input from the group work (Teaching days)	
20 October- 24 November	Work on individual protocols	It is always a good idea to meet with your small group to discuss challenges and receive feedback Individual supervision (approximately 1 hour with search librarian and one hour with SR specialist)
24 November		Submit exam (SR protocol)
16 December		Receive grade

Assignment information:

Group assignment:

You will be provided with a table to complete, appendix 1. In the table, after discussing with the group and reaching a consensus you will write in the type of review and core question for each group member with justification along with other information- You will also be asked to reflect on the required reading and online learning and discuss areas of the systematic review process where you feel you need more clarification, understanding or support. The responses to this assignment will shape the content of the in-person teaching.

Individual assignment:

You will submit a draft of your systematic review protocol in the template provided, appendix 2, maximum two pages.

Exam information:

Acceptable protocols are those for full systematic reviews of recognised question types and scoping reviews. If the student chooses to write a protocol for a scoping review, they must show understanding of Risk of Bias and data analysis by presenting their hypothetical plans in an appendix. The template used for your individual assignment, appendix 2, can also be used for the exam. The exam should be maximum 10 pages, excluding references and appendixes.

The exam will be assessed using the PRISMA checklist. The assessment is pass or not pass. If you receive a pass this does not mean that your protocol is ready to be published but that you have understood the course material.

If your protocol does not pass, you will be given the opportunity to adjust and resubmit. You will have access to your supervisor for a further hour before resubmission.

Schedule for seminar for NRS8002 Systematic review, 2021

18th of October	19th of October	20th of October
Types of systematic reviews **Literature search**	**Selection of articles, screening, and data extraction** **Risk of bias** **Synthesis and meta- analysis**	**GRADE** **Protocol development and team composition** **Peer review of protocols**
09.00 -11.00 Types of systematic reviews (ED, HA) **11:00-12:00** Rapid reviews (CG)	**09.00 -10.45** Selection of articles and data extraction (ED) **11:00 – 12.00** Risk of Bias (AF)	**09.00 -10.00** Search follow up **10:15-12:00** GRADE and GRADE CERQual (ED, HA)
12.00 -12.30 Lunch	**12.00 -12.30** Lunch	**12.00 -12.30** Lunch
12.30 - 15.00 Search (MJ, IK)	**12.30 -15.00** Synthesis and meta-analyses (ED)	**12.30 -13.00** How to present results (ED, HA) **13.15 – 14.45** Protocol development and team experience and composition (LL) **14:45-15:00** Exam and supervision information (LL)
LL: Lillebeth Larun, lillebeth.larun@fhi.no ED: Eva Dennison, evamarie-louise.denison@fhi.no HA: Heather Ames, heather.ames@fhi.no CG: Claire, Glentonclaire.glenton@fhi.no	MJ: Marit Johansen marit.johansen@fhi.no IK: Ingvild Kirkehei ingvild.kirkehei@fhi.no AF: Atle Fretheim atle.fretheim@fhi.no	

The schedule will be flexible to focus on and accommodate the types of reviews that the registered participants plan on conducting. Feedback to the course schedule is part of the small group assignment presented above. Please fill in this part of the assignment accordingly so that the course best reflects the participants needs.

Required online learning resources:

Cochrane interactive learning module 1. https://training.cochrane.org/interactivelearning

Required reading

- Muka, Taulant, Glisic, Marija, Milic, Jelena, Verhoog, Sanne, Bohlius, Julia, Bramer, Wichor, Chowdhury, Rajiv, & Franco, Oscar H. (2020). A 24-step guide on how to design, conduct, and successfully publish a systematic review and meta-analysis in medical research. *European Journal of Epidemiology*, *35*(1), 49–60. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10654-019-00576-5
- Moher, David, Shamseer, Larissa, Clarke, Mike, Ghersi, Davina, Liberati, Alessandro, Petticrew, Mark, Shekelle, Paul, & Stewart, Lesley A. (2015). Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, *4*(1), 1–1. https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1
- Boland A, Cheery G, Dickson R. Doing a systematic review: A student's guide (2nd edition) SAGE Publishing . https://uk.sagepub.com/. en-gb/eur/doing-a-systematic-review/book251308#description
    - With online resources available here: https://bit.ly/3dQL83G

Literature searching

- University of Leeds. Literature searching explained. Available from: https://library.leeds.ac.uk/info/1404/literature_searching/14/literature_searching_explained/2
- Thompson, Emily A, Gann, Laurissa B, & Cressman, Erik N. K. (2019). Learning to successfully search the scientific and medical literature. *Cell Stress & Chaperones*, *24*(2), 289–293. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12192-019-00984-2

Optional online resources

General guidance

- Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. https://training.cochrane.org/handbook
- Gough D, Oliver S, Thomas J. An introduction to systematic reviews. Sage; 2017.
- Cochrane interactive learning. https://training.cochrane.org/interactivelearning. Access possible if your institution is a member or you can contribute to the work to get membership. https://www.cochrane.org/join-cochrane/students

Framing the question

- Using a framework to structure your question from City University of London https://libguides.city.ac.uk/postgraduate_research/frameworks
- Introduction to Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis from Johns Hopkins University via Coursera. Module 2- gives an overview of how to decide on the type and scope of your question and helps you operationalise it. https://www.coursera.org/learn/systematic-review

Deciding on a type of review

- Munn, Zachary, Stern, Cindy, Aromataris, Edoardo, Lockwood, Craig, & Jordan, Zoe. (2018). What kind of systematic review should I conduct? A proposed typology and guidance for systematic reviewers in the medical and health sciences. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *18*(1), 5–5. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-017-0468-4
- Munn, Zachary, Peters, Micah D J, Stern, Cindy, Tufanaru, Catalin, McArthur, Alexa, & Aromataris, Edoardo. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, *18*(1), 143–143. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x

Literature searching

University of Leeds – Library. Literature searching explained. Available from: https://library.leeds.ac.uk/info/1404/literature_searching/14/literature_searching_explained

Searching for systematic reviews video series by Lien Nguyen (Norwegian with English subtitles):

- Video 1: Introduction https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i7gg759AtPE (2:29)
- Video 2: PICO https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=r_9o9OTXs8I (3:10)
- Video 3: Search techniques https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4R3Nsj-P7ic (4:10)
- Video 4: From PICO to search boxes https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KjbeODB8_0I (3:23)

Study selection

- What's new. Part 2: Handbook Chapter 4 - guidance on selecting studies. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sV4sGNWIIBQ

Quantitative evidence synthesis

Prognostic research

Design: Often cohort studies.

Question: PO/PEO/PICO https://libguides.city.ac.uk/postgraduate_research/frameworks

RoB: Lack agreed standards for reporting and critical appraisal, but one example is the QUIPS- Quality In Prognosis Studies tool. https://www.google.com/search?q=QUIPS-+Quality+In+Prognosis+Studies+tool&rlz=1C1GCEA_enNO933NO933&oq=QUIPS-+Quality+In+Prognosis+Studies+tool&aqs=chrome.0.69i59j0i22i30.1045j0j7&sourceid=chrome&ie=UTF-8

Analysis: Large variability in the use of analytic methods

Examples

- Altman, Douglas G. (2001). Systematic reviews of evaluations of prognostic variables. *BMJ*, *323*(7306), 224–228. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.323.7306.224
- Hemingway, H, Croft, Peter, Perel, Pablo, Hayden, Jill, Abrams, D, Timmis, Adam, Briggs, Anew, Udumyan, Ruzan, Moons, Karel, Steyerberg, Ewout, Roberts, Ian, Schroter, Sara, Altman, Douglas, Riley, Richard, Brunner, N, Hingorani, Aroon, Kyzas, Panayiotis, Malats, Núria, Peat, G, Windt, Daniëlle. (2013). Prognosis research strategy (PROGRESS) 1: A framework for researching clinical outcomes. *BMJ. British Medical Journal (International Ed.)*, *346*. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.e5595
- PROGRESS (PROGnosis RESearch Strategy) framework – how to conduct prognostic research. https://www.prognosisresearch.com/progress-framework

Diagnostic and accuracy research

Design: Randomised clinical trials (RCTS)

Question: PICO where C is a Reference test (gold standard)

RoB: QUADAS-2: A Revised Tool for the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies https://www.acpjournals.org/doi/full/10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009?rfr_dat=cr_pub++0pubmed&url_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori%3Arid%3Acrossref.org

Analysis: Large variability in the use of analytic methods

GRADE: Grade handbook, Chapter 7. The GRADE approach for diagnostic tests and strategies https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html#h.f7lc8w9c3nh8

Examples:

- Smedslund, Giske, Fleitscher, & Brurberg. (2015). Screening tools for cognitive function and driving. 2015 Norwegian Institute of Public Health http://hdl.handle.net/11250/2475813
- Arentz-Hansen, H. (2014). Determination of fetal rhesus D status from maternal plasma of rhesus negative women. Norwegian Institute of Public Health. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK464905/

Effectiveness research

Design: Randomised clinical trials (RCTS)

Question: PICO https://libguides.city.ac.uk/postgraduate_research/frameworks

RoB: Risk of Bias 2 (RoB 2) tool https://methods.cochrane.org/risk-bias-2 and see also Cochrane handbook Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial https://folkehelse.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/1689/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B660F8CD3-7842-4EC3-B67E-727F5AFB6C15%7D&file=Information%20packet%20given%20on%20course%20acceptance.docx&ac

tion=default&mobileredirect=true

Analysis: Meta analyses or narrative summary see: Cochrane Handbook Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-10 or Cochrane handbook Chapter 12: Synthesizing and presenting findings using other methods https://folkehelse.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/1689/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B660F8CD3-7842-4EC3-B67E-727F5AFB6C15%7D&file=Information%20packet%20given%20on%20course%20acceptance.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true

GRADE: GRADE handbook https://gdt.gradepro.org/app/handbook/handbook.html#h.svwngs6pm0f2

Examples

Cochrane Library https://www.cochranelibrary.com/

Prevalence research

Design: cross sectional studies

Question: CoCoPop https://libguides.city.ac.uk/postgraduate_research/frameworks

RoB: Lack agreed standards for critical appraisal, but one example is:

Hoy, Damian, Brooks, Peter, Woolf, Anthony, Blyth, Fiona, March, Lyn, Bain, Chris, Baker, Peter, Smith, Emma, & Buchbinder, Rachelle. (2012). Assessing risk of bias in prevalence studies: modification of an existing tool and evidence of interrater agreement. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 65(9), 934–939.
https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2011.11.014

Analysis: Prevalence estimates will often vary between studies; Normal distribution is not always to be expected

Examples:

- Brurberg, Kjetil Gundro, Fønhus, Marita Sporstøl, Larun, Lillebeth, Flottorp, Signe, & Malterud, Kirsti. (2014). Case definitions for chronic fatigue syndrome/myalgic encephalomyelitis (CFS/ME): a systematic review. BMJ Open, 4(2), e003973–e003973. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003973
- Johnston, Samantha, Brenu, Ekua W, Staines, Donald, & Marshall-Gradisnik, Sonya. (2013). The prevalence of chronic fatigue syndrome/ myalgic encephalomyelitis: a meta-analysis. Clinical Epidemiology, 5, 105–110. https://doi.org/10.2147/CLEP.S39876

Etiology research – risk factors and causes

Design: Cohort or case control studies.

Question: PICO or other https://tees.ac.uk/lis/learninghub/cinahl/pico.pdf

RoB: Additional questions regarding selection of participants, matching and adjustment for confounding to assess risk of bias adequately.

Critical appraisal tools for example:

ROBINS-I ("Risk Of Bias In Non-randomised Studies - of Interventions") https://folkehelse.sharepoint.com/:w:/r/sites/1689/_layouts/15/Doc.aspx?sourcedoc=%7B660F8CD3-7842-4EC3-B67E-727F5AFB6C15%7D&file=Information%20packet%20given%20on%20course%20acceptance.docx&action=default&mobileredirect=true

The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of non-randomised studies in meta-analyses file:///C:/Users/lill/Downloads/appb-fm4%20(1).pdf

Analysis: Paired comparison in exposed versus unexposed individuals

Examples

- Gilbert, R., Salanti, G., Harden, M., & See, S. (2005). Infant sleeping position and the sudden infant death syndrome: systematic review of observational studies and

historical review of recommendations from 1940 to 2002. International journal of epidemiology, *34*(4), 874–887. https://doi.org/10.1093/ije/dyi088

- Søvik, S., Isachsen, M. S., Nordhuus, K. M., Tveiten, C. K., Eken, T., Sunde, K., Brurberg, K. G., & Beitland, S. (2019). Acute kidney injury in trauma patients admitted to the ICU: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Intensive care medicine, *45*(4), 407–419. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00134-019-05535-y
- Sterne J A C, SavoviÄ‡ J, Page M J, Elbers R G, Blencowe N S, Boutron I et al. RoB 2: a revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials BMJ 2019; 366 doi: https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898
- Joanna Briggs Institute. Critical Appraisal Tools. Available from: https://jbi.global/critical-appraisal-tools

Analysis

Narrative synthesis

Synthesis without Meta-Analysis (SWiM) webinars:

- Narrative synthesis' of quantitative effect data in Cochrane reviews: current issues and ways forward. Available at: https://training.cochrane.org/resource/narrative-synthesis-quantitative-effect-data-cochrane-reviews-current-issues-and-ways
- Reporting guideline for synthesis without meta-analysis. Available from: https://training.cochrane.org/resource/reporting-guideline-synthesis-without-meta-analysis-swim

Meta-analysis

- Summary Measures Used in Systematic Reviews: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=o0CMlXUAQCY
- Fixed Effects and Random Effects Models: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Vb0GvznHf8U
- How to Interpret a Forest Plot: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=py-L8DvJmDc
- What is Heterogeneity?: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KSKCTXciGjI
- Overview of Subgroup Analysis:https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1VbRzisl0mc
- RevMan Tutorial - Entering Data For Meta-Analysis: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uLDbJixeQmY&list=PLgp17bk2nACMassfBMJRbfSSvpTfMgLxu&index=10

GRADE

- Siemieniuk R GG. What is GRADE. https://bestpractice.bmj.com/info/toolkit/learn-ebm/what-is-grade/. Published 2021
- Cochrane. GRADE Approach. Cochrane Training Web site. https://training.cochrane.org/grade-approach. Published 2021.
- Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: Part 4 - Assessing Certainty of Evidence: The GRADE Approach. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jpp6OTWXSF8

Qualitative evidence synthesis

- Undertaking a qualitative evidence synthesis to support decision-making in a Cochrane context. https://training.cochrane.org/resource/undertaking-qualitative-evidence-synthesis-support-decision-making-cochrane-context

- o   Part 1: Qualitative research and how it fits into systematic reviews
- o   Part 2: How to choose a method for qualitative evidence synthesis
- o   Part 3: Framework synthesis, thematic synthesis, meta-ethnography
- o   Part 4: Confidence in qualitative evidence and reporting a qualitative evidence synthesis
- Cochrane SA Webinar: Formulating & refining questions for a QES. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=adP_l35cgds
- GRADE CERQual Webinar. https://quests.ie/dr-heather-ames-discusses-application-grade-cerqual-qualitative-evidence-synthesis-quests-webinar/
- Lewin, Simon, Bohren, Meghan, Rashidian, Arash, Munthe-Kaas, Heather, Glenton, Claire, Colvin, Christopher J, Garside, Ruth, Noyes, Jane, Booth, Andrew, Tunçalp, Özge, Wainwright, Megan, Flottorp, Signe, Tucker, Joseph D, & Carlsen, Benedicte. (2018). Applying GRADE-CERQual to qualitative evidence synthesis findings-paper 2: how to make an overall CERQual assessment of confidence and create a Summary of Qualitative Findings table. *Implementation Science : IS, 13*(Suppl 1), 10–10. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13012-017-0689-2

Scoping reviews

- Best practices for and reporting of scoping reviews https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5NtTSiCD580&t=14s
- Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews- https://journals.lww.com/ijebh/Fulltext/2021/03000/Updated_methodological_guidance_for_the_conduct_of.2.aspx?context=LatestArticles&casa_token=8Rr12Lt2KecAAAAA:PMr1RHHH5-dGJ8_pWljZS6xrmerRzyf4TsSzabcKtharOv4mNgQojp9JfKnB0QzW0OtyrGM6aZ5Qdb82vmESOogYYg
- JBI manual for evidence synthesis: Chapter 11: Scoping reviews https://wiki.jbi.global/display/MANUAL/Chapter+11%3A+Scoping+reviews

Systematic review tools

Screening tools

- Rayyan https://www.rayyan.ai/ Rayyan Resources. University of Oslo Library. https://www.ub.uio.no/english/courses-events/courses/other/medicine-rayyan/resources.html
- EPPI-Reviewer 4 Software for Research Syntesis. https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/CMS/Default.aspx?alias=eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/er4& EPPI – Reviewer User Manual. https://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/CMS/Portals/35/ER4_8_0%20user%20manual.pdf
- Covidence https://www.covidence.org/ Covidence user guide. University of South Australia. Available from: https://guides.library.unisa.edu.au/SystematicReviews/Covidence

Analysis

- RevMan https://training.cochrane.org/online-learning/core-software-cochrane-reviews/revman RevMan 5.3 User guide. Cochrane Training. https://training.cochrane.org/sites/training.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/resources/downloadable_resources/English/RevMan_5.3_User_Guide.pdf

- NVivo https://www.qsrinternational.com/nvivo-qualitative-data-analysis-software/home
  User manuals for NVivo. University of Oslo.
  https://www.uio.no/english/services/it/research/data-collection-and-analysis/nvivo/about.html

GRADE

- GRADEpro https://gradepro.org/

Referencing

- EndNote etc (referencing software) https://www.alfasoft.com/en/products/reference-tools/endnote.html
  EndNote: Help Guides, Getting Started Guides and Manuals. Clarivate.
  https://support.clarivate.com/Endnote/s/article/EndNote-Help-Guides-Getting-Started-Guides-and-Manuals?language=en_US
- Zotero (free referencing software) https://www.zotero.org/
  Zotero quick start guide. Zotero.org. https://www.zotero.org/support/quick_start_guide

Due: October 6th, 2021

Task 1 instructions:

- Each member of the group is to fill in one line of the table after presenting and discussing their review question with the group

Name	Review Type	Review question	PICO/SPIDER/ PerSPE(C)TiF	Suggested databases and search words

Task 2 instructions:

- Now that you have completed the required learning, discuss areas of the systematic review process where you feel you need more clarification, understanding or support. Write these into the box below. The responses to this task will shape the content of the in-person teaching.

Due:

- First draft October 13th, 2021: Maximum 2 pages. Can be in bullet point form
- Completed assignment November 24th, 2021; Maximum length 10 pages excluding references and appendixes

Please refer to the PRISMA-P Checklist for criteria for each section. http://www.prisma-statement.org/documents/PRISMA-P-checklist.pdf

If conducting a *Qualitative Evidence Synthesis* please use the template available here: https://epoc.cochrane.org/news/qualitative-evidence-synthesis-template

Title	
Protocol registration	
Support/funding	

Potential author team

Name	Contribution

1.0 Introduction
      1.1 Background
      1.2 Description of the intervention
      1.3 Rationale
      1.4 Objectives
2.0 Methods
      2.1 Eligibility criteria
            2.1.1   Inclusion criteria
            2.1.2   Exclusion criteria
      2.2 Outcomes and prioritization
      2.3 Information sources
      2.4 Summary of search strategy
      2.5 Study records
            2.5.1   Data management
            2.5.2   Selection process
      2.6 Data extraction
      2.7 Risk of bias of included individual studies (Move to appendix if conducting a scoping review)
      2.8 Data synthesis (Move to appendix if conducting a scoping review)
      2.9 GRADE assessment (Move to appendix if conducting a scoping review)
3.0 Timeline and resource use
4.0 References
5.0 Appendixes
      5.1 Complete search strategy for one database
      5.2 Other as needed for example if conducting a scoping review