Table 1. Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research (ENTREQ) Checklist1

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No.** | **Item** | **Guide and description** | **Page #** |
| 1 | Aim | State the research question the synthesis addresses. | 7 |
| 2 | Synthesis methodology | Identify the synthesis methodology or theoretical framework which underpins the synthesis, and describe the rationalefor choice of methodology (e.g. meta-ethnography, thematic synthesis, critical interpretive synthesis, grounded theorysynthesis, realist synthesis, meta-aggregation, meta-study, framework synthesis) | 8‒9 |
| 3 | Approach to searching | Indicate whether the search was pre-planned (comprehensive search strategies to seek all available studies) or iterative (to seek all available concepts until they theoretical saturation is achieved). | 7‒8 |
| 4 | Inclusion criteria | Specify the inclusion/exclusion criteria (e.g. in terms of population, language, year limits, type of publication, study type). | 8, supplementary material |
| 5 | Data sources | Describe the information sources used (e.g. electronic databases (MEDLINE, EMBASE, CINAHL, psycINFO, Econlit), grey literature databases (digital thesis, policy reports), relevant organisational websites, experts, information specialists, generic web searches (Google Scholar) hand searching, reference lists) and when the searches conducted; provide the rationale for using the data sources. | 7, supplementary material |
| 6 | Electronic search strategy | Describe the literature search (e.g. provide electronic search strategies with population terms, clinical or health topic terms, experiential or social phenomena related terms, filters for qualitative research, and search limits). | 7‒8, supplementary material |
| 7 | Study screening methods | Describe the process of study screening and sifting (e.g. title, abstract and full text review, number of independent reviewers who screened studies). | 8 |
| 8 | Study characteristics | Present the characteristics of the included studies (e.g. year of publication, country, population, number of participants, data collection, methodology, analysis, research questions). | 10, 37‒46, supplementary material |
| 9 | Study selection results | Identify the number of studies screened and provide reasons for study exclusion (e,g, for comprehensive searching, provide numbers of studies screened and reasons for exclusion indicated in a figure/flowchart; for iterative searching describe reasons for study exclusion and inclusion based on modifications t the research question and/or contribution to theory development). | 10, 52 |
| 10 | Rationale for appraisal | Describe the rationale and approach used to appraise the included studies or selected findings (e.g. assessment of conduct (validity and robustness), assessment of reporting (transparency), assessment of content and utility of the findings). | 10 |
| 11 | Appraisal items | State the tools, frameworks and criteria used to appraise the studies or selected findings (e.g. Existing tools: CASP, QARI, COREQ, Mays and Pope [25]; reviewer developed tools; describe the domains assessed: research team, study design, data analysis and interpretations, reporting). | 10 |
| 12 | Appraisal process | Indicate whether the appraisal was conducted independently by more than one reviewer and if consensus was required. | 10 |
| 13 | Appraisal results | Present results of the quality assessment and indicate which articles, if any, were weighted/excluded based on the assessment and give the rationale.  | 10 |
| 14 | Data extraction | Indicate which sections of the primary studies were analysed and how were the data extracted from the primary studies? (e.g. all text under the headings “results /conclusions” were extracted electronically and entered into a computer software).  | 8‒9 |
| 15 | Software | State the computer software used, if any. | 9 |
| 16 | Number of reviewers | Identify who was involved in coding and analysis. | 9 |
| 17 | Coding | Describe the process for coding of data (e.g. line by line coding to search for concepts) | 9 |
| 18 | Study comparison | Describe how were comparisons made within and across studies (e.g. subsequent studies were coded into pre-existing concepts, and new concepts were created when deemed necessary). | 8‒9 |
| 19 | Derivation of themes | Explain whether the process of deriving the themes or constructs was inductive or deductive | 9 |
| 20 | Quotations | Provide quotations from the primary studies to illustrate themes/constructs, and identify whether the quotations were participant quotations of the author’s interpretation | Supplementary material |
| 21 | Synthesis output | Present rich, compelling and useful results that go beyond a summary of the primary studies (e.g. new interpretation, models of evidence, conceptual models, analytical framework, development of a new theory or construct) | 10‒15, 35‒36 |

*From: Tong A, Flemming K, McInnes E, et al. Enhancing transparency in reporting the synthesis of qualitative research: ENTREQ. BMC Med Res Methodol 2012;12:181.*

Table 2. PRISMA 2009 Checklist

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **#** | **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, 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.  | 3‒4 |
| **INTRODUCTION**  |  |
| Rationale  | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.  | 6‒7 |
| Objectives  | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).  | 8 |
| **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.  | NA |
| 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.  | 8, supplementary material |
| 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.  | 7‒8 |
| Search  | 8 | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.  | Supplementary material |
| 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).  | 6 |
| 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.  | 8 |
| Data items  | 11 | List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.  | 8, 63‒65 |
| 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.  | 10 |
| Summary measures  | 13 | State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).  | 8‒9 |
| Synthesis of results  | 14 | Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I2) for each meta-analysis.  | NA (narrative/thematic) |

*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