



Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/136633/>

Version: Accepted Version

---

**Article:**

Tricco, Andrea C, Lillie, Erin, Zarin, Wasifa et al. (2018) PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. pp. 467-473. ISSN: 0003-4819

<https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>

---

**Reuse**

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

1	<b>PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and</b>	
2	<b>Explanation</b>	
3	Andrea C Tricco <sup>a,b*</sup>	Email: triccoa@smh.ca
4	Erin Lillie <sup>b</sup>	Email: lilliee@smh.ca
5	Wasifa Zarin <sup>b</sup>	Email: zarinw@smh.ca
6	Kelly K O'Brien <sup>c,d,e</sup>	Email: kelly.obrien@utoronto.ca
7	Heather Colquhoun <sup>f</sup>	Email: heather.colquhoun@utoronto.ca
8	Danielle Levac <sup>g</sup>	Email: d.levac@northeastern.edu
9	David Moher <sup>h</sup>	Email: dmoher@ohri.ca
10	Micah D J Peters <sup>i,j</sup>	Email: micah.peters@unisa.edu.au
11	Tanya Horsley <sup>k</sup>	Email: thorsley@rcpsc.edu
12	Laura Weeks <sup>l</sup>	Email: lauraw@cadth.ca
13	Susanne Hempel <sup>m</sup>	Email: susanne_hempel@rand.org
14	Elie A Akl <sup>n</sup>	Email: ea32@aub.edu.lb
15	Christine Chang <sup>o</sup>	Email: christine.chang@ahrq.hhs.gov
16	Jessie McGowan <sup>p</sup>	Email: jmcgowan@uottawa.ca
17	Lesley Stewart <sup>q</sup>	Email: lesley.stewart@york.ac.uk
18	Lisa Hartling <sup>r</sup>	Email: hartling@ualberta.ca
19	Adrian Aldcroft <sup>s</sup>	Email: aaldcroft@bmj.com
20	Michael G Wilson <sup>t</sup>	Email: wilsom2@mcmaster.ca
21	Chantelle Garritty <sup>h</sup>	Email: cgarritty@ohri.ca
22	Simon Lewin <sup>u,v</sup>	Email: simon.lewin@fhi.no
23	Christina M Godfrey <sup>w</sup>	Email: godfreyc@queensu.ca

24 Marilyn T Macdonald<sup>x</sup> Email: marilyn.macdonald@dal.ca  
25 Etienne V Langlois<sup>y</sup> Email: langloise@who.int  
26 Karla Soares-Weiser<sup>z</sup> Email: ksoares-weiser@cochrane.org  
27 Jo Moriarty<sup>aa</sup> Email: jo.moriarty@kcl.ac.uk  
28 Tammy Clifford<sup>l</sup> Email: tammyc@cadth.ca  
29 Özge Tunçalp<sup>ab,ac</sup> Email: tuncalpo@who.int  
30 Sharon E Straus<sup>a,ad</sup> Email: sharon.straus@utoronto.ca

31

## 32 Author Affiliations

33 <sup>a</sup>Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's  
34 Hospital, 209 Victoria Street, East Building, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1T8, Canada

35 <sup>b</sup>Epidemiology Division, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, 155  
36 College Street, 6th floor, Toronto, Ontario, M5T 3M7, Canada

37 <sup>c</sup>Department of Physical Therapy, University of Toronto, 160-500 University Ave,  
38 Toronto, Ontario, M5G 1V7, Canada

39 <sup>d</sup>Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation (IHPE), University of Toronto,  
40 155 College Street, 4th Floor, Toronto, Ontario, M5T 3M6, Canada

41 <sup>e</sup>Rehabilitation Sciences Institute (RSI), University of Toronto, 500 University Avenue,  
42 Suite 160, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 1V7, Canada

43 <sup>f</sup>Department of Occupational Science & Occupational Therapy, University of Toronto  
44 160 - 500 University Ave, Toronto, Ontario, M5G 1V7, Canada

45 <sup>g</sup>Department of Physical Therapy, Movement & Rehabilitation Science, Bouvé College  
46 of Health Sciences, Northeastern University, 360 Huntington Ave, Boston,  
47 Massachusetts 02115, United States

48 <sup>h</sup>Centre for Journalology, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, The Ottawa Hospital, 501  
49 Smyth Road, PO BOX 201B, Ottawa, Ontario, K1H 8L6, Canada

50 <sup>i</sup>Joanna Briggs Institute, The University of Adelaide, Adelaide, South Australia, 5005  
51 Australia

52 <sup>j</sup>Rosemary Bryant AO Research Centre, Sansom Institute for Health Research,  
53 University of South Australia, Adelaide, South Australia, 5000, Australia

54 <sup>k</sup>The Royal College of Physicians and Surgeons, 774 Echo Drive, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S  
55 5N8, Canada

56 <sup>l</sup>CADTH (Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health), 865 Carling Ave,  
57 Suite 600, Ottawa, Ontario, K1S 5S8, Canada

58 <sup>m</sup>RAND Corporation, 1776 Main Street, Santa Monica, California, 90401-3208, United  
59 States

60 <sup>n</sup>Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Gefinor Center, Block B, 4th  
61 floor, American University of Beirut, Riad El-Solh, Beirut, Lebanon

62 <sup>o</sup>Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ), 5600 Fishers Lane  
63 Rockville, MD, 20857, United States

64 <sup>p</sup>Department of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Roger Guindon Hall, 451 Smyth Rd,  
65 Ottawa, Ontario, K1H 8M5, Canada

66 <sup>q</sup>Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, Heslington, York, YO10  
67 5DD, United Kingdom

68 <sup>r</sup>Department of Pediatrics, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta,  
69 11405-87 Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, T6G 1C9, Canada

70 <sup>s</sup>BMJ Open Editorial Office, BMA House, Tavistock Square, London, WC1H 9JR, United  
71 Kingdom

72 <sup>t</sup>Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence, and Impact, McMaster University,  
73 1280 Main St West, Hamilton, Ontario, L8S 4K1, Canada

74 <sup>u</sup>Norwegian Institute of Public Health, PO Box 4404 Nydalen N-0403, Oslo, Norway

75 <sup>v</sup>Health Systems Research Unit, South African Medical Research Council, Francie van  
76 Zyl Drive, Tygerberg, Cape Town, South Africa

77 <sup>w</sup>Queen's Collaboration for Health Care Quality: A JBI Centre of Excellence, Queen's  
78 University School of Nursing, 992 University Avenue, Barrie Street, Kingston, Ontario,  
79 K7L 3N6, Canada

80 <sup>x</sup>School of Nursing, Dalhousie University, PO Box 15000, 5869 University Avenue,  
81 Halifax, Nova Scotia, B3H 4R2, Canada

82 <sup>y</sup>Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research, World Health Organization, Avenue  
83 Appia 20, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

84 <sup>z</sup>Cochrane Editorial Unit, Cochrane, St Albans House, 57-59 Haymarket, London,  
85 SW1Y 4QX, United Kingdom

86 <sup>aa</sup>Social Care Workforce Research Unit, King's College London, Strand, London, WC2R  
87 2LS, United Kingdom

88 <sup>ab</sup>UNDP-UNFPA-UNICEF-WHO-World Bank Special Programme of Research,  
89 Development and Research Training in Human Reproduction (HRP), World Health  
90 Organization, 20 Avenue Appia, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

91 <sup>ac</sup>Department of Reproductive Health and Research (RHR), World Health Organization,  
92 Avenue Appia 20, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland

93 <sup>ad</sup>Department of Geriatric Medicine, University of Toronto, 27 Kings College Circle,  
94 Toronto, Ontario, M5S 1A1, Canada

95

96 \*Correspondence and requests for single reprints:

97 Dr. Andrea C. Tricco, PhD

98 Scientist, Knowledge Translation Program,

99 Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital,

100 209 Victoria Street, East Building, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1W8, Canada

101 Phone : 416-864-6060, Fax : 416-864-5805, Email : [triccoa@smh.ca](mailto:triccoa@smh.ca)

102

103 **Keywords:** knowledge synthesis, scoping reviews, reporting guidelines, research  
104 methodology

105 **Running Title:** The PRISMA-ScR statement

106 **Trial registration** - EQUATOR registration: [http://www.equator-](http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#55)  
107 [network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#55](http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#55)

108 **Word Count:** 147/200 (Abstract); 2583/3,500 words (Manuscript); 59/75 References; 1  
109 Figure; 1 Table; 3 Supplements

110 **ABSTRACT**

111 Scoping reviews, a type of knowledge synthesis, follow a systematic approach to map  
112 evidence on a topic; identify main concepts, theories and sources; and determine where  
113 the gaps are. Though increasing in numbers, the methodological quality and reporting  
114 quality of scoping reviews need improvement. This document presents the Preferred  
115 Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping  
116 reviews (PRISMA-ScR) checklist and explanation. Developed by a 26-member expert  
117 panel according to published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUALity and  
118 Transparency Of health Research) Network, the checklist contains 20 essential items  
119 plus 2 optional items. A rationale, along with an example of good reporting, is provided  
120 for each item. The intent of the PRISMA-ScR is to help readers, including researchers,  
121 publishers, commissioners, policy-makers, healthcare providers, guideline developers,  
122 and patients/consumers develop a greater understanding of relevant terminology, core  
123 concepts and key items to report for scoping reviews.

124

## 125 1. INTRODUCTION

126 Scoping reviews can be conducted to meet various objectives. They may examine the  
127 extent (i.e., size), range (i.e., variety) and nature (i.e., characteristics) of the evidence on  
128 a topic or question; determine the value of undertaking a systematic review; summarize  
129 findings from a body of knowledge that is heterogeneous in terms of methods or  
130 discipline; or identify gaps in the literature to aid planning and commissioning of future  
131 research (1, 2). A recent scoping review by members of our team showed that while the  
132 number of scoping reviews in the literature is increasing steadily, evidence suggests  
133 that both their methodological quality and reporting quality need to improve to facilitate  
134 complete and transparent reporting (1). Results from our survey on scoping review  
135 terminology, definitions and methods revealed a lack of consensus on how to conduct  
136 and report scoping reviews (3).

137 The Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) published guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews  
138 in 2015 (4) (which was updated in 2017) (5), based on earlier work by Arksey and  
139 O'Malley (6) and Levac et al. (7). However, a reporting guideline for scoping reviews  
140 currently does not exist.

141 Reporting guidelines outline a minimum set of items to include in research reports and  
142 have been shown to increase methodological transparency and uptake of research  
143 findings (8, 9). Although a reporting guideline exists for systematic reviews, the  
144 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)  
145 Statement (10), scoping reviews serve a different purpose than systematic reviews (11).  
146 Systematic reviews are useful for answering clearly defined questions (such as, Does  
147 this intervention improve specified outcomes when compared to a given comparator in

148 this population?), whereas scoping reviews are useful for answering much broader  
149 questions (such as, What is the nature of the evidence for this intervention? Or What is  
150 known about this concept?). Given the difference in objectives, and therefore, in the  
151 methodological approach (e.g., presence vs. absence of a risk of bias assessment or  
152 meta-analysis), the reporting items considered to be essential for systematic reviews  
153 would differ for scoping reviews – i.e., some PRISMA items may not be appropriate,  
154 while other important considerations may be missing (12-14). We deemed that a  
155 PRISMA extension for scoping reviews is needed to provide reporting guidance for this  
156 specific type of knowledge synthesis. This extension is also intended to be applicable to  
157 evidence maps (15, 16), which share similarities with scoping reviews, and involve a  
158 systematic search of a body of literature to identify knowledge gaps, with a visual  
159 representation of results (e.g., a figure, graph, etc.).

160

## 161 **2. METHODS**

162 The PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (hereafter, the PRISMA-ScR) was  
163 developed according to published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUALity  
164 and Transparency Of health Research) Network for the development of reporting  
165 guidelines (9).

### 166 **2.1 Protocol, advisory board and expert panel**

167 Our protocol was drafted by the research team and revised, as necessary, by the  
168 advisory board prior to being listed as a reporting guideline on the EQUATOR (17) and  
169 PRISMA (18) websites. The research team included two leads (ACT, SES) and two

170 research coordinators (EL, WZ); all of whom did not participate in the scoring exercises,  
171 and a 4-member advisory board (KOB, HC, DL, DM) with extensive experience with  
172 scoping reviews and/or the development of reporting guidelines. We aimed to have a  
173 representative expert panel in terms of geography and stakeholder type; including  
174 individuals with experience in the conduct, dissemination, or uptake of scoping reviews.

## 175 **2.2 Survey development and round 1 of Delphi**

176 The initial step to developing the Delphi survey via Qualtrics (an online survey platform)  
177 (19) involved identifying potential modifications to the original 27-item PRISMA  
178 checklist. The modifications were based on a research program carried out by members  
179 of the advisory board to better understand scoping review practices (1, 3, 20) and  
180 included: a broader research question and literature search strategy, optional risk of  
181 bias assessment and consultation exercise (whereby relevant stakeholders contribute to  
182 the work, as described in the Arksey and O'Malley framework (6)), and the inclusion of a  
183 qualitative analysis. For round 1 of scoring, we prepared a draft of the PRISMA-ScR  
184 (see Supplement 1) and asked expert panel members to rate the extent to which they  
185 agreed with the inclusion of the list of items in using a 7-point Likert scale (1=entirely  
186 disagree, 2=mostly disagree, 3=somewhat disagree, 4=neutral, 5=somewhat agree,  
187 6=mostly agree, 7=entirely agree). Each survey item included an optional text box  
188 where comments about the respective item(s) could be provided. The research team  
189 pilot-tested the survey for content and clarity prior to administering it, and we also sent  
190 bi-weekly reminders to optimize participation.

## 191 **2.3 Survey analysis**

192 An 85% consensus rule was selected *a priori* to signify agreement amongst the expert  
193 panel, to be conservative. This rule required that at a minimum, 85% of the panel *mostly*  
194 *or entirely agreed* (i.e. corresponding to the scoring values of 6 or 7 on the Likert scale  
195 used for each of the survey items) with the inclusion of the item in the PRISMA-ScR. If  
196 less than 85% agreement was observed, we considered the item to be discrepant. This  
197 standard was used for all three rounds of scoring to inform the final checklist. For ease  
198 and consistency with how the survey questions were worded, we did not include a  
199 provision for agreement on exclusion (i.e., 85% scoring values of 1 or 2 on the Likert  
200 scale). We summarized all of the submitted comments to help explain the scorings and  
201 identify any issues. For the analysis, the results were stratified by group (i.e., in-person  
202 meeting vs. online, hereafter e-Delphi participants) given the possibility that discrepant  
203 items could differ between the arms.

## 204 **2.4 In-person arm (round 2 of Delphi)**

205 We established the Chatham House rule (21) at the beginning of the meeting, whereby  
206 participants are free to use information that is shared but may not reveal the identity or  
207 the affiliation of the speaker. Expert panel members were provided the following: their  
208 individual results, the overall group distribution, median and interquartile range and a  
209 summary of the JBI methodological guidance (4), as well as preliminary feedback from  
210 the E-Delphi arm (described below). These data were used to generate and inform the  
211 discussion about each of the discrepant items from round one. ACT and SES facilitated  
212 the discussion using a modified nominal group technique (22), a consensus-building

213 method and panel members were subsequently asked to re-score the discrepant items  
214 using sli.do (23), a live audience-response system in a format that resembled the round  
215 one survey. For items that failed to meet the threshold for consensus, working groups  
216 were assembled (described below). The meeting was audio-recorded and transcribed  
217 using Transcribe Me (24), and 3 note-takers independently documented the main  
218 discussion points. The transcript was annotated to complement a master summary of  
219 the discussion points, which was compiled using the 3 note-takers' files.

## 220 **2.5 E-Delphi arm (round 2 of Delphi)**

221 Those who were unable to attend the in-person meeting participated via an online  
222 discussion exercise using Conceptboard (25), a visual collaboration platform that allows  
223 users to provide feedback on 'whiteboards' in real-time. We presented the discrepant  
224 items from round one as a single board in Conceptboard (25) with questions (e.g., "After  
225 reviewing your survey results with respect to this item, please share why you rated this  
226 item the way you did") assigned to participants as tasks, to facilitate the discussion. E-  
227 Delphi panel members were provided with the same materials as those distributed at  
228 the meeting and were encouraged to respond to others' comments and interact through  
229 a chat feature. The second round of scoring was conducted in Qualtrics using a similar  
230 format as in round one. We shared a summary of the Conceptboard (25) discussion, as  
231 well as the annotated meeting transcript and master summary document so that  
232 participants could learn about the perspectives of the in-person group before re-scoring.

## 233 **2.6 Working groups and round 3 of Delphi**

234 To enable panel-wide dialogue and refine the checklist items prior to the final round of  
235 scoring, we created working groups that collaborated by teleconference and email.  
236 Their task was to discuss the discrepant items; in terms of the key issues and  
237 considerations (relating to both concepts and wording) that had been raised in earlier  
238 stages, across both arms. To unite the data from the two arms, we conducted a third  
239 round of scoring using Qualtrics (19). This step involved the full panel scoring an  
240 updated list of items that had failed to reach consensus in the first two rounds across  
241 both arms, with the suggested modifications (relating to both concepts and wording)  
242 from all previous stages incorporated.

## 243 **2.7 Interactive workshop (testing)**

244 A workshop led by ACT and facilitated by members of the advisory board/expert panel  
245 (SES, CMG, CG, TH, MTM, and MDJP) was held as part of the Global Evidence  
246 Summit in Cape Town, South Africa in September 2017. The PRISMA-ScR was applied  
247 to a scoping review on a health-related topic (26) by participants (e.g., researchers,  
248 scientists, policy makers, managers, and students) to test the checklist .

## 249 **3. RESULTS**

### 250 **3.1 Expert panel**

251 A total of 37 individuals were invited to participate – of these, 31 people completed  
252 round 1 and 24 completed all 3 rounds of scoring. Results of the modified Delphi,

253 including the number of items that met agreement at each stage are presented in Figure  
254 1.

### 255 **3.2 Round 1 of Delphi**

256 For the in-person arm, which involved 16 individuals, 9 of the 27 items reached  
257 agreement. For the discrepant items, agreement ranged from 56% for item 15 (risk of  
258 bias) to 81% for items 3 (rationale), 16 (additional analyses), 20 (results of individual  
259 sources) and 23 (additional analyses). For the E-Delphi arm, which involved 15  
260 individuals, 8 of the 27 items met the 85% agreement threshold. For the discrepant  
261 items, agreement ranged from 40% for item 12 (risk of bias) to 80% for items 3  
262 (rationale), 25 (limitations) and 26 (conclusions).

### 263 **3.3 In-person meeting and round 2 of Delphi**

264 The 16 panel members who attended the in-person meeting in Toronto on November  
265 29<sup>th</sup>, 2016 were largely from North America, along with others from Australia, Lebanon,  
266 and the United Kingdom. Of the 18 discrepant items from round 1, 11 were re-scored  
267 after discussion. All reached the 85% threshold of agreement, except for one – item 7,  
268 information sources, which had 83% agreement. For the remaining seven items, the  
269 group felt that notable changes to the items were required, which formed the basis of  
270 action by the working groups.

### 271 **3.4 E-Delphi online discussion and round 2 Delphi**

272 Fifteen panel members were invited to participate in the online discussion exercise,  
273 from countries including Canada, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Norway, and South

274 Africa. Overall, 50% of panelists participated in at least one discussion on  
275 Conceptboard (25) (7/14) and 1 dropped out. Eleven individuals completed the second  
276 scoring exercise of the 19 discrepant items, whereby 5 items reached 85% agreement.

### 277 **3.5 Working groups and round 3 of Delphi**

278 There were 6 working groups (with one call per group), ranging in size from three to  
279 eight participants, with an average of five people per group. For round 3 of the Delphi,  
280 the 11 items that reached consensus during either round one or round two across both  
281 the in-person and E-Delphi arms were not included. The survey focused on the  
282 remaining 16 items that failed to reach consensus across both arms, to ensure that  
283 decisions made by one arm did not take precedence over the other.

284 A total of 27 people were invited to participate in round 3 of the Delphi; 16 from the in-  
285 person meeting arm and 11 from the E-Delphi arm. Overall, 24 out of 27 completed the  
286 final round of scoring and 3 individuals withdrew (2 from the in-person arm and 1 from  
287 the E-Delphi). Two of the 16 applicable items failed to meet the 85% agreement  
288 threshold; items 10 (data collection process) and 15 (risk of bias across studies). Item  
289 15 was subsequently removed from the checklist, though item 10 was retained but  
290 revised to exclude the optional consultation exercise step described by Arksey and  
291 O'Malley and Levac et al., which was the source of the disagreement. Furthermore, it  
292 was decided that the consultation exercise could be considered a knowledge translation  
293 activity, which could be conducted for any type of knowledge synthesis.

294 **3.6 Interactive workshop (testing)**

295 A total of 30 participants attended an interactive workshop at the Global Evidence  
296 Summit in September 2017 in Cape Town, South Africa, where minor revisions were  
297 suggested for wording of the items.

298 **3.7 PRISMA-ScR checklist**

299 The final checklist, with 20 items plus two optional items, is presented in Table 1. It  
300 consists of 10 items that reached agreement in rounds 1 and 2 (1,3,5,6,8,9,17,25-27),  
301 along with the 10 items that were agreed upon in round 3 (2,4, 7,10,11,14,18,20,21,24).  
302 Five items from the original PRISMA were deemed not relevant. They included: items  
303 13 (summary measures, excluded after round 1) and the following 4 items, which were  
304 excluded after round 3: 15 (risk of bias across studies), 16 (additional analyses), 22 (risk  
305 of bias across studies results), and 23 (additional analyses results). See Figure 1 for an  
306 illustration of the process. In addition, because scoping reviews can include many  
307 different types of evidence (e.g., documents, blogs, websites, studies, interviews,  
308 opinions) and are not conducted to examine the risk of bias of the included sources,  
309 items 12 (risk of bias in individual studies) and 19 (risk of bias within studies results)  
310 from the original PRISMA are treated as optional in the PRISMA-ScR.

311

312 **3.8 PRISMA-ScR Explanation and Elaboration**

313 Each of the PRISMA-ScR checklist items is elaborated upon in Supplement 2. In this  
314 document, each item is defined and accompanied by examples of good reporting from

315 existing scoping reviews to provide authors with additional guidance on how to use the  
316 PRISMA-ScR.

#### 317 **4. DISCUSSION**

318 The PRISMA-ScR is intended to provide guidance on the reporting of scoping reviews.  
319 To develop this PRISMA extension, we adapted the original PRISMA Statement and  
320 made the following revisions: five items were removed (as they were deemed not  
321 relevant to scoping reviews), two items were deemed optional, and the wording was  
322 modified for all of the items. Our reporting guideline is consistent with the JBI guidance  
323 for scoping reviews, as the JBI guidance is detailed and highlights the importance of  
324 methodological rigor in the conduct of scoping reviews. We hope that the PRISMA-ScR  
325 will improve the reporting of scoping reviews and increase their relevance for decision-  
326 making, and that adherence to our reporting guideline will be evaluated in the future,  
327 which will be critical to measure its impact.

328

329 The PRISMA-ScR will be housed on the websites of the EQUATOR Network's library of  
330 reporting guidelines and the Knowledge Translation Program of St. Michael's Hospital  
331 (27). To promote its uptake, we will create 1-minute YouTube videos to outline how to  
332 operationalize each of the items; offer webinars for organizations that conduct scoping  
333 reviews, and create 1-page tip sheets for each item. In the future, we will consider  
334 creating an automated email PRISMA-ScR dissemination tool, as well as an online tool  
335 similar to Penelope, which verifies manuscripts for completeness and provides feedback  
336 to authors as they prepare to submit their work to the BMJ Open journal (28). We will  
337 share the PRISMA-ScR widely within our networks, including the Alliance for Health

338 Policy and Systems Research, the World Health Organization (WHO) (29) and the  
339 Global Evidence Synthesis Initiative (30). We will also collect and review readers'  
340 suggestions to improve uptake of the PRISMA-ScR via an online feedback form on the  
341 Knowledge Translation Program of St. Michael's Hospital's website (27).  
342  
343 Study Protocol: Available at EQUATOR and PRISMA websites.  
344 Data Set: Available from corresponding author.

345 **CONTRIBUTIONS**

346 ACT developed the original idea, oversaw all stages of the project, facilitated the in-  
347 person meeting, wrote the manuscript draft, and is the guarantor for this manuscript. EL  
348 wrote sections of the manuscript and coordinated and operationalized all stages of the  
349 project with WZ. KOB, HC, DL, DM, MDJP, TH, LW, SH, EAA, CC, JM, LS, LH, AA,  
350 MGW, CG, SL, CMG, MTM, EVL, KS, JM, TC, and OT completed round 1 of scoring.  
351 KOB, HC, DL, MDJP, TH, LW, SH, EAA, CC, JM, LS, LH, AA, and MGW attended the  
352 in-person meeting and completed round 2 of scoring. CG, SL, CMG, EVL, and KS  
353 provided feedback on Conceptboard. DM, CG, SL, CMG, MTM, EVL, KS, JM, TC, and  
354 OT completed the E-Delphi round 2 of scoring. KOB, HC, DL, DM, MDJP, TH, LW, SH,  
355 EAA, CC, JM, LS, LH, AA, CG, SL, MTM, and KS participated in the working group  
356 discussions. KOB, HC, DL, DM, MDJP, TH, LW, SH, EAA, CC, JM, LS, LH, AA, MGW,  
357 CG, SL, CMG, MTM, EVL, KS, JM, TC, and OT completed the final round of scoring.  
358 SES developed the original idea, oversaw all stages of the project and facilitated the in-  
359 person meeting. All authors critically reviewed the manuscript and approved the final  
360 version.

361 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

362 We would like to thank the following individuals:  
363 Susan Le for supporting the coordination of the project and formatting the manuscript.  
364 Anna Lambrinos for participating in round 1 of scoring and attending the in-person  
365 meeting.  
366 Mai Pham for participating in round 1 of scoring and attending the in-person meeting.

367 Lisa O'Malley for participating in round 1 of scoring and in the E-Delphi round 2 of  
368 scoring.  
369 Peter Griffiths for participating in round 1 of scoring and providing feedback on  
370 Conceptboard.  
371 Charles Shey Wiysonge for participating in round 1 of scoring and providing feedback  
372 on Conceptboard.  
373 Jill Manthorpe for participating in round 1 of scoring.  
374 Mary Ann McColl for participating in round 1 of scoring.  
375 Assem M Khamis for assisting with the identification of examples for the Explanation  
376 and Elaboration document.  
377 Melissa Chen for providing administrative support for the in-person meeting.  
378 Jessica Comilang for providing administrative support for the in-person meeting.  
379 Meghan Storey for providing administrative support for the in-person meeting.

## 380 **FUNDING**

381 This work was supported by a Knowledge Synthesis grant from the Canadian Institutes  
382 of Health Research (CIHR) [grant # KRS 144046]. This funding body had no role in  
383 designing the study, in collecting, analyzing and interpreting the data, in writing this  
384 manuscript, and in deciding to submit it for publication. ACT is funded by a Tier 2  
385 Canada Research Chair in Knowledge Synthesis. KOB was supported by a Canadian  
386 Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) New Investigator Award. SES is funded by a Tier 1  
387 Canada Research Chair in Knowledge Translation.

388 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

389 DM led the development of PRISMA, has been involved in the development of several  
390 PRISMA extensions, is an executive member of the EQUATOR Network, and is the  
391 director of the Canadian EQUATOR Centre. MDJP is the chair of the Joanna Briggs  
392 Institute Working Group for Scoping Review Methodology and is the lead author of the  
393 Joanna Briggs Institute Scoping Review Guidance chapters and articles. CMG is a  
394 contributing author on the Joanna Briggs Institute manuscript Guidance for conducting  
395 systematic scoping reviews. KS is a full-time employee of Cochrane. All other authors  
396 have no potential (or perceived) conflicts of interest to declare. SES is an associate  
397 editor for the Annals of Internal Medicine; she was not involved in the peer review  
398 process or decision-making of the manuscript.

399 **ETHICAL APPROVAL**

400 Research ethics approval (REB 16-176) for this study was granted by the St. Michael's  
401 Hospital Research Ethics Board on August 15th, 2016.

402 **DATA SHARING**

403 The results from the three rounds of scoring are available from the corresponding  
404 author upon reasonable request.

405 **TRANSPARENCY STATEMENT**

406 The lead author affirms that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent  
407 account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been

408 omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as planned (and, if relevant,  
409 registered) have been explained.

#### 410 **SUPPLEMENTARY FILES**

411 Supplement 1: PRISMA-ScR round 1 survey (with information sheet)

412 Supplement 2: The PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR):

413 Explanation and Elaboration

414 Supplement 3: Letters of Permission

#### 415 **FIGURES**

416 Figure 1: Methods flow

#### 417 **TABLES**

418 Table 1: PRISMA-ScR checklist

419 **Table 1: PRISMA-ScR Checklist**

420

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Reported on page #
<b>Title</b>			
<b>Title</b>	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	
<b>Abstract</b>			
<b>Structured summary</b>	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results and conclusions that relate to the review question(s) and objective(s).	
<b>Introduction</b>			
<b>Rationale</b>	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review question(s)/objective(s) lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	
<b>Objectives</b>	4	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) and objective(s) being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts and context), or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review question(s) and/or objective(s).	
<b>Methods</b>			
<b>Protocol and registration</b>	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.	
<b>Eligibility criteria</b>	6	Specify the characteristics of the sources of evidence (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, and provide a rationale.	
<b>Information sources</b>	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with authors to identify additional sources) in the search, as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	
<b>Search</b>	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	
<b>Selection of sources of</b>	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening, eligibility) included	

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Reported on page #
evidence		in the scoping review.	
Data charting process	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., piloted forms; forms that have been tested by the team before their use, whether data charting was done independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence	12	<i>If done</i> , provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	
Summary measures	13	<i>Not applicable for scoping reviews.</i>	
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	
Risk of bias across studies	15	<i>Not applicable for scoping reviews.</i>	
Additional analyses	16	<i>Not applicable for scoping reviews.</i>	
<b>Results</b>			
Selection of sources of evidence	17	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	
Characteristics of sources of evidence	18	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	19	<i>If done</i> , present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	
Results of individual sources of evidence	20	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review question(s) and objective(s).	
Synthesis of	21	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review	

Section	Item	PRISMA-ScR checklist item	Reported on page #
results		question(s) and objective(s).	
Risk of bias across studies	22	<i>Not applicable for scoping reviews.</i>	
Additional analyses	23	<i>Not applicable for scoping reviews.</i>	
<b>Discussion</b>			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), explain how they relate to the review question(s) and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	
Limitations	25	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review question(s) and objective(s), as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	
<b>Funding</b>			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	

421

Mini-glossary of PRISMA-ScR terms
<p><b>Charting</b> – The process of data extraction in a scoping review is referred to as ‘data charting’, as per the Arksey and O’Malley (2005) and Levac et al. (2010) frameworks and the JBI guidance (2015, 2017).</p> <p><b>Critical appraisal</b> – Refers to the process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This terminology is used for items 12 and 19, instead of ‘risk of bias’ (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to be inclusive and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be included in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, policy documents).</p> <p><b>Information sources</b> - This is where <i>sources of evidence</i> (see definition) are compiled from such as, bibliographic databases, social media platforms, websites, etc.</p> <p><b>Sources of evidence</b> – A more inclusive/ heterogeneous term is used to account for the fact that different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, policy documents) may be eligible in a scoping review, as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with <i>information sources</i> (see definition).</p>

422    **REFERENCES**

- 423    1.    Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien K, Colquhoun H, Kastner M, et al. A scoping  
424    review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol.*  
425    2016;16:15.
- 426    2.    A Guide to Knowledge Synthesis: A Knowledge Synthesis Chapter: Canadian  
427    Institutes of Health Research; 2010. Available from: [http://www.cihr-](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/41382.html)  
428    [irsc.gc.ca/e/41382.html](http://www.cihr-irsc.gc.ca/e/41382.html). Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 429    3.    Colquhoun HL, Levac D, O'Brien KK, Straus S, Tricco AC, Perrier L, et al.  
430    Scoping reviews: time for clarity in definition, methods, and reporting. *J Clin Epidemiol.*  
431    2014;67(12):1291-4.
- 432    4.    Peters MD, Godfrey CM, Khalil H, McInerney P, Parker D, Soares CB. Guidance  
433    for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *Int J Evid Based Healthc.* 2015;13(3):141-6.
- 434    5.    Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Baldini Soares C, Khalil H, Parker D.  
435    Chapter 11: Scoping Reviews. In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). Joanna Briggs  
436    Institute Reviewer's Manual. The Joanna Briggs Institute, 2017. Available from  
437    <https://reviewersmanual.joannabriggs.org/>. Accessed on 14 June 2018.
- 438    6.    Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework.  
439    *International Journal of Social Research Methodology.* 2005;8(1):19-32.
- 440    7.    Levac D, Colquhoun H, O'Brien KK. Scoping studies: advancing the  
441    methodology. *Implementation science : IS.* 2010;5:69.
- 442    8.    Altman DG, Simera I. Using Reporting Guidelines Effectively to Ensure Good  
443    Reporting of Health Research. *Guidelines for Reporting Health Research: A User's*  
444    *Manual* 2014. p. 32-40.
- 445    9.    Moher D, Schulz KF, Simera I, Altman DG. Guidance for developers of health  
446    research reporting guidelines. *PLoS Med.* 2010;7(2):e1000217.
- 447    10.    Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for  
448    systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Bmj.* 2009;339:b2535.
- 449    11.    Tricco AC, Zarin W, Ghassemi M, Nincic V, Lillie E, Page MJ, et al. Same family,  
450    different species: methodological conduct and quality varies according to purpose for  
451    five types of knowledge synthesis. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2017.
- 452    12.    McInnes MD, Bossuyt PM. Pitfalls of Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses in  
453    Imaging Research. *Radiology.* 2015;277(1):13-21.
- 454    13.    Macaskill P, Gatsonis C, Deeks JJ, Harbord RM, Takwoingi Y. Chapter 10:  
455    Analysing and Presenting Results. In: Deeks JJ, Bossuyt PM, Gatsonis C (editors),  
456    *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Version 1.0.*  
457    The Cochrane Collaboration, 2010. Available from: <http://srdta.cochrane.org/>. Accessed  
458    on 14 June 2018.
- 459    14.    Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, et al.  
460    QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies.  
461    *Ann Intern Med.* 2011;155(8):529-36.
- 462    15.    Schmucker C, Motschall E, Antes G, Meerpohl JJ. [Methods of evidence  
463    mapping. A systematic review]. *Bundesgesundheitsblatt, Gesundheitsforschung,*  
464    *Gesundheitsschutz.* 2013;56(10):1390-7.

- 465 16. Miake-Lye IM, Hempel S, Shanman R, Shekelle PG. What is an evidence map?  
466 A systematic review of published evidence maps and their definitions, methods, and  
467 products. *Systematic Reviews*. 2016;5(1):28.
- 468 17. Reporting guidelines under development: Preferred Reporting Items for  
469 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR):  
470 The EQUATOR Network; 2017. Available from: [http://www.equator-](http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#55)  
471 [network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#55](http://www.equator-network.org/library/reporting-guidelines-under-development/#55). Accessed on 10  
472 January 2018.
- 473 18. Extensions in Development: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews  
474 and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA). Available from: [http://www.prisma-](http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/InDevelopment.aspx)  
475 [statement.org/Extensions/InDevelopment.aspx](http://www.prisma-statement.org/Extensions/InDevelopment.aspx). Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 476 19. Qualtrics 2018. Available from: <https://www.qualtrics.com/uk/>. Accessed on 10  
477 January 2018.
- 478 20. O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, Baxter L, Tricco AC, Straus S, et al.  
479 Advancing scoping study methodology: a web-based survey and consultation of  
480 perceptions on terminology, definition and methodological steps. *BMC health services*  
481 *research*. 2016;16:305.
- 482 21. The Royal Institute of International Affairs. Chatham House Rule, 2018. Available  
483 from <https://www.chathamhouse.org/chatham-house-rule>. Accessed on 14 June 2018.
- 484 22. Jones J, Hunter D. Consensus methods for medical and health services  
485 research. *Bmj*. 1995;311(7001):376-80.
- 486 23. Sli.do 2012. Available from: <https://www.sli.do/>. Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 487 24. TranscribeMe 2018. Available from: <https://transcribeme.com/>. Accessed on 27  
488 February 2018.
- 489 25. Conceptboard 2018. Available from: <https://conceptboard.com/>. Accessed on 14  
490 June 2018.
- 491 26. Lourida I, Abbott RA, Rogers M, Lang IA, Stein K, Kent B, et al. Dissemination  
492 and implementation research in dementia care: a systematic scoping review and  
493 evidence map. *BMC Geriatr*. 2017;17(1):147.
- 494 27. Knowledge Translation Program 2016. Available from:  
495 <https://knowledgetranslation.net/>. Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 496 28. Harwood J. Penelope London, UK Squarespace; 2017. Available from:  
497 <https://www.penelope.ai/>. Accessed on 28 February 2018.
- 498 29. The Alliance for Health Policy and Systems Research 2018. Available from:  
499 <http://www.who.int/alliance-hpsr/en/>. Accessed on 27 February 2018.
- 500 30. Global Evidence Synthesis Initiative (GESI) 2016. Available from:  
501 <http://www.gesiinitiative.com/>. Accessed on 27 February 2018.
- 502 31. San A, Hiremagalur B, Muircroft W, Grealish L. Screening of Cognitive  
503 Impairment in the Dialysis Population: A Scoping Review. *Dement Geriatr Cogn Disord*.  
504 2017;44(3-4):182-95.
- 505 32. Galloway T, Blackett H, Chatwood S, Jeppesen C, Kandola K, Linton J, et al.  
506 Obesity studies in the circumpolar Inuit: a scoping review. *Int J Circumpolar Health*.  
507 2012;71:18698.
- 508 33. Beller EM, Glasziou PP, Altman DG, Hopewell S, Bastian H, Chalmers I, et al.  
509 PRISMA for Abstracts: reporting systematic reviews in journal and conference  
510 abstracts. *PLoS Med*. 2013;10(4):e1001419.

- 511 34. Hopewell S, Clarke M, Moher D, Wager E, Middleton P, Altman DG, et al.  
512 CONSORT for reporting randomized controlled trials in journal and conference  
513 abstracts: explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Med.* 2008;5(1):e20.
- 514 35. Haynes RB, Mulrow CD, Huth EJ, Altman DG, Gardner MJ. More informative  
515 abstracts revisited. *Ann Intern Med.* 1990;113(1):69-76.
- 516 36. Piskur B, Beurskens AJ, Jongmans MJ, Ketelaar M, Norton M, Frings CA, et al.  
517 Parents' actions, challenges, and needs while enabling participation of children with a  
518 physical disability: a scoping review. *BMC Pediatr.* 2012;12:177.
- 519 37. Richardson WS, Wilson MC, Nishikawa J, Hayward RS. The well-built clinical  
520 question: a key to evidence-based decisions. *ACP J Club.* 1995;123(3):A12-3.
- 521 38. Andrew B. Clear and present questions: formulating questions for evidence  
522 based practice. *Library Hi Tech.* 2006;24(3):355-68.
- 523 39. The Joanna Briggs Institute. The Joanna Briggs Institute Reviewers' Manual  
524 2015: Methodology for JBI Scoping Reviews Adelaide, South Australia: The Joanna  
525 Briggs Institute; 2015. Available from:  
526 [https://joannabriggs.org/assets/docs/sumari/Reviewers-Manual\\_Methodology-for-JBI-](https://joannabriggs.org/assets/docs/sumari/Reviewers-Manual_Methodology-for-JBI-Scoping-Reviews_2015_v2.pdf)  
527 [Scoping-Reviews\\_2015\\_v2.pdf](https://joannabriggs.org/assets/docs/sumari/Reviewers-Manual_Methodology-for-JBI-Scoping-Reviews_2015_v2.pdf). Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 528 40. Tricco AC, Zarin W, Lillie E, Pham B, Straus SE. Utility of social media and  
529 crowd-sourced data for pharmacovigilance: a scoping review protocol. *BMJ Open.*  
530 2017;7(1):e013474.
- 531 41. Open Science Framework 2011. Available from: <https://osf.io/>. Accessed on 10  
532 January 2018.
- 533 42. Systematic Reviews. Available from:  
534 <https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/>. Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 535 43. JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports. Available  
536 from: <http://journals.lww.com/jbisrir/pages/default.aspx>. Accessed on 10 January 2018.
- 537 44. BMJ Open. Available from: <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/>. Accessed on 01 March  
538 2018.
- 539 45. Sav A, Salehi A, Mair FS, McMillan SS. Measuring the burden of treatment for  
540 chronic disease: implications of a scoping review of the literature. *BMC Med Res*  
541 *Methodol.* 2017;17(1):140.
- 542 46. Cardoso R, Zarin W, Nincic V, Barber SL, Gulmezoglu AM, Wilson C, et al.  
543 Evaluative reports on medical malpractice policies in obstetrics: a rapid scoping review.  
544 *Syst Rev.* 2017;6(1):181.
- 545 47. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C.  
546 PRESS Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *J Clin*  
547 *Epidemiol.* 2016;75:40-6.
- 548 48. Grey Matters: a practical tool for searching health-related grey literature:  
549 Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH); 2015. Available  
550 from: <https://cadth.ca/resources/finding-evidence/grey-matters>. Accessed on 10 January  
551 2018.
- 552 49. Duffett M, Choong K, Hartling L, Menon K, Thabane L, Cook DJ. Randomized  
553 controlled trials in pediatric critical care: a scoping review. *Crit Care.* 2013;17(5):R256.
- 554 50. Lenzen SA, Daniels R, van Bokhoven MA, van der Weijden T, Beurskens A.  
555 Disentangling self-management goal setting and action planning: A scoping review.  
556 *PLoS one.* 2017;12(11):e0188822.

- 557 51. Leung M, Perumal N, Mesfin E, Krishna A, Yang S, Johnson W, et al. Metrics of  
558 early childhood growth in recent epidemiological research: A scoping review. *PloS one*.  
559 2018;13(3):e0194565.
- 560 52. Tricco AC, Zarin W, Rios P, Nincic V, Khan PA, Ghassemi M, et al. Engaging  
561 policy-makers, health system managers, and policy analysts in the knowledge synthesis  
562 process: a scoping review. *Implementation science : IS*. 2018;13(1):31.
- 563 53. Zarin W, Veroniki AA, Nincic V, Vafaei A, Reynen E, Motiwala SS, et al.  
564 Characteristics and knowledge synthesis approach for 456 network meta-analyses: a  
565 scoping review. *BMC Med*. 2017;15(1):3.
- 566 54. Hutchinson J, Prady SL, Smith MA, White PC, Graham HM. A Scoping Review of  
567 Observational Studies Examining Relationships between Environmental Behaviors and  
568 Health Behaviors. *International journal of environmental research and public health*.  
569 2015;12(5):4833-58.
- 570 55. Hosking J, Campbell-Lendrum D. How well does climate change and human  
571 health research match the demands of policymakers? A scoping review. *Environ Health*  
572 *Perspect*. 2012;120(8):1076-82.
- 573 56. Strand M, Gammon D, Ruland CM. Transitions from biomedical to recovery-  
574 oriented practices in mental health: a scoping review to explore the role of Internet-  
575 based interventions. *BMC health services research*. 2017;17(1):257.
- 576 57. Constand MK, MacDermid JC, Dal Bello-Haas V, Law M. Scoping review of  
577 patient-centered care approaches in healthcare. *BMC health services research*.  
578 2014;14:271.
- 579 58. Tricco AC, Antony J, Zarin W, Strifler L, Ghassemi M, Ivory J, et al. A scoping  
580 review of rapid review methods. *BMC Med*. 2015;13:224.
- 581 59. Hall AJ, Lang IA, Endacott R, Hall A, Goodwin VA. Physiotherapy interventions  
582 for people with dementia and a hip fracture-a scoping review of the literature.  
583 *Physiotherapy*. 2017;103(4):361-8.