White Rose Research Online

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield and York

Deposited via The University of York.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/id/eprint/168701/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Arora, Monika, Chugh, Aastha, Jain, Neha et al. (2020) Global impact of tobacco control policies on smokeless tobacco use: A systematic review protocol. BMJ Open. e042860. ISSN: 2044-6055

https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-042860

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 including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS
University of Sheffield
UNIVERSITY of York

PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to address in a systematic review protocol*

Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Status	Corresponding Page number/Line number in the Manuscript
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION				
Title:				
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	✓	Page 3, Line 3
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	Not Applicable	
Registration	2	Mention Registration Number (such as for PROSPERO)	CRD42020191946	Page 2, Line 27
Authors:				
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	✓	Page 1, Line 4-21
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	✓	
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	Not Applicable	Page 14, Line 2-4
Support:				
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	✓	Page 14, Line 5-7
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	✓	Page 14, Line 5-7
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	✓	Page 1, Line 16-21; and Page 14, Line 5-7
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	✓	Page 5, Line 11-14
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	✓	Page 5, Line 16-24

METHODS				
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	✓	Page 5, Line 26-34; Page 6 Line 1-32; Page 7, Line 1-33; Page 8, Line 1-16; Page 7, Line 25-27
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	✓	Page 7, Line 29-33; Page 8, Line 1-16
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	✓	Page 8, Line 18-34; Page 9, Line 1-25
Study records:				
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	✓	Page 9, Line 27-29
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	✓	Page 9, Line 31-34
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	✓	Page 10, Line 1-8
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	✓	Page 10, Line 18-32
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	✓	Page 7, Line 7-23
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	✓	Page 10, Line 10-15
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	✓	Page 10, Line 17-32; Page 11 Line 1-16
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration	✓	

		of consistency (such as I^2, Kendall's τ)		
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)		Page 11, Line 1-16
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	✓ (described for narrative synthesis)	Page 10, Line 18-27
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	✓	Page 11, Line 1-8
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	✓	Page 10, Line 17-32; Page 11 Line 1-16

*** It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.