PRISMA 2009 Checklist ------- EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PAIN

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE PAGE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
Funding	2	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review on your title page.	1
Bulleted statements	3	'Database?' and ' what does this review add?'.	3
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	4	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background and objective; databases and data treatment; results, conclusion; systematic review registration number.	3
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	5	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	4
Objectives	6	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	5
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	7	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.	6
Eligibility criteria	8	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.	6
Information sources	9	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.	6
Search	10	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	6
Study selection	11	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	7
Data collection process	12	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	7
Data items	13	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	7
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	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.	7

PRISMA 2009 Checklist -------- EUROPEAN JOURNAL OF PAIN

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Summary measures	15	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	7
Synthesis of results	16	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.	7
Risk of bias across studies	17	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	8
Additional analyses	18	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	8
RESULTS			
Study selection	19	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.	8
Study characteristics	20	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	8
Risk of bias within studies	22	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	8
Results of individual studies	23	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.	8
Synthesis of results	24	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	9
Risk of bias across studies	25	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	9
Additional analysis	26	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	9
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	27	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).	9
Limitations	28	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).	10
Conclusions	29	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	11

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