|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section/topic**  | **#** | **Checklist item**  | **Reported on page #**  |
| **TITLE**  |  |
| Title  | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.  | Done: systematic review |
| **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.  | See abstract section. No systematic review registration number available |
| **INTRODUCTION**  |  |
| Rationale  | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.  | See section ‘introduction’ |
| Objectives  | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).  | See section ‘introduction’ |
| **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.  | No registration of the review available |
| 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.  | Characteristics of the studies included are described in the supplemental tables S1 and S2 |
| 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.  | See section Methods 1.Published (“white”) literature review Methods 2.Unpublished (“Grey”) literature |
| Search  | 8 | Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.  | See supplemental document S1: Pubmed search strategy  |
| 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).  | See section Methods 1.Published (“white”) literature review |
| 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.  | See section Methods 1.Published (“white”) literature review |
| Data items  | 11 | List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.  | See Supplemental Tables S1 & S2 |
| 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.  | See sectionMethods 3. Analysis and assessment of risk of bias and data analysis |
| Summary measures  | 13 | State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).  | See sectionMethods 3. Analysis and assessment of risk of bias and data analysis |
| 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.  | See sectionMethods 3. Analysis and assessment of risk of bias and data analysis |
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|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Section/topic**  | **#** | **Checklist item**  | **Reported on page #**  |
| Risk of bias across studies  | 15 | Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).  | Only primary data included |
| Additional analyses  | 16 | Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.  | Not applicable |
| **RESULTS**  |  |
| Study selection  | 17 | 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.  | Flow chart presented as figure S2 |
| Study characteristics  | 18 | For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.  | Available in supplemental Table S1 and page 9 |
| Risk of bias within studies  | 19 | Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).  | Available in supplemental table 2 and in section Results, heading 4.Studies’characteristics |
| Results of individual studies  | 20 | 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.  | Not applicable |
| Synthesis of results  | 21 | Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.  | Not applicable |
| Risk of bias across studies  | 22 | Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).  | Available in supplemental table 2 and in section Results, heading 4.Studies’characteristics |
| Additional analysis  | 23 | Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).  | Not applicable |
| **DISCUSSION**  |  |
| Summary of evidence  | 24 | 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).  | See sections Results 4.Studies’characteristics Discussion 4.Limitations, Discussion 5.Perspective |
| Limitations  | 25 | 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).  | See sections Discussion 4.Limitations |
| Conclusions  | 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.  | See sectionDiscussion 1. PathogensDiscussion 2. Antimicrobial resistanceDiscussion 3. Empirical therapyDiscussion 4.Limitations,Discussion 5.Perspectives |
| **FUNDING**  |  |
| Funding  | 27 | Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.  | See sectionMethods 2.Unpublished (“Grey”) literatureAnd online submission system |

*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

For more information, visit: **www.prisma-statement.org**.
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