Protocol Registration Form

The content of this form is based on Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart LA. (2015). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews*, 4(1). doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-4-1. We strongly recommended that this form is completed in accordance with the recommendations in that paper.

Title

The title should identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review. If this is an update of an existing review, indicate this in the title. Examples: The effectiveness of task-based language teaching for adult learners of foreign or second languages. Protocol for a systematic review. *Or* The effectiveness of written corrective feedback for the acquisition of L2 grammar among primary-aged language learners. A protocol for an update of the systematic review by Bloggs and Smith (2020).

Main Contact/Corresponding Author

Name:
Institutional affiliation:
e-mail address:
Physical mailing address:

Additional Authors

Name:
Institutional affiliation:
e-mail address:
On the IDESR website, you will be able to add as many additional authors as you need.

Review Question(s)

Provide the review questions. For reviews of interventions, include reference to PI(E)CO, as appropriate (Participants, Intervention (Exposure), Comparator, Outcomes). Examples: What are the effects of study abroad compared to classroom teaching on vocabulary acquisition among adolescent learners of a foreign language? *Or* What is the impact on academic attainment of attending a bilingual school compared to a target language only school among minority language users?

Rationale

In no more than 300 words, describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.

Inclusion Criteria

List here the criteria to be used for inclusion in the review. As appropriate, include information about the population, interventions, comparators, primary outcomes, setting, study design(s), time frame, publication types, language(s) of publication, etc.

Information Sources

Describe all intended information sources. Include the names of electronic databases, journals or websites that will be hand searched, contact with study authors, grey literature sources, etc.

Search Strategy

Present the search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database such that it could be repeated by a third party. Include planned limiters, for example, date range, and location in the text (e.g. Title, Abstract, or Full Text). Present these as a Boolean phrase if possible. If Boolean phrasing is inappropriate for your review, present the search strategy in a way that can allow replication by a third party.

Data Management

Describe the mechanisms by which the data will be managed throughout the review. For example, say which data management software the review team use, e.g. Rayyan, EPPI Reviewer, Excel, Covidence, etc. Describe if these will change with different phases of the review (abstract screening, full text screening, data extraction, etc.).

Selection Process

Describe the method by which studies will be selected for inclusion at each stage of the review. For example, how many reviewers will screen abstracts/full texts? What quality assurance procedures will be in place in each of these phases (dual screening of all records, percentage dual screened then checked for consistency, etc.)?

Data Collection Process

Describe how data will be extracted from reports. Will a data extraction form be used? Will this be piloted? Will data be extracted independently by multiple reviewers? What is the process for obtaining data not contained in the reports (e.g. contacting authors directly)?

Data Items

List and define all data items that will be extracted (e.g. participant info, outcome measures, sources of funding, study design, etc.).

Risk of bias/trustworthiness of individual studies

Describe how risk of bias, trustworthiness, or quality of individual studies will be assessed. Name any specific tools, e.g. Gorard's Sieve, Maryland Scientific Methods Scale, Cochrane Risk of Bias Tool, EPPI Weight of Evidence Tool, etc. State how this information will be used in the synthesis.

Data Synthesis

Describe criteria under which quantitative synthesis will be performed. If quantitative synthesis is appropriate, describe preferred summary measure (Cohen's D, Hedges' G, etc.) and how these will be combined. Describe any additional planned analyses (e.g. sub-group analysis). If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe how data will be combined and summarised.

Meta-biases

Describe how meta-biases (publication bias, selective outcome reporting, etc.) will be addressed.

Confidence in cumulative evidence

Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed.

Sources of Funding

Specify any financial or other support for the review. Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor. Include funding reference number if available.

Role of Funders

Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol.

Anticipated or actual start date:

Anticipated completion date:

Other language resources

If you have other language versions of your protocol, please include a link here.

Current Status

☐ Ongoing
☐ Completed but not published
☐ Completed and published

For initial submissions select 'ongoing'. When you have completed the review, you should return to update the record accordingly. Your review status will be displayed next to your record in IDESR.

Details of Published Review

Once the review is complete, you should return to this form to add information about where it has been published. Include the full bibliographic reference and a link to the published document, a DOI or URL. You should link to a pre-print as soon as one is available, then update this information once the full review has been published. Your review will then be added to the IDESR database.