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**Author Pre-submission Checklist for Reviews and Updates**

*This checklist is for review authors and must be completed and sent to your Managing Editor when submitting a first draft of your review (or update) for editorial consideration.* ***Please note: your review will not be considered for editorial review if this checklist is not received by the editorial base!***

*This checklist is designed to help ensure that you have produced a draft of sufficient quality, and have incorporated major conduct and reporting requirements per Cochrane and EPOC. This is not an exhaustive list and authors are strongly encouraged to consult the following for additional information and guidance:* [*EPOC-specific resources for review authors*](http://epoc.cochrane.org/resources/epoc-resources-review-authors)and the [*Methodological Expectations for Cochrane Intervention Reviews (MECIR)*](https://methods.cochrane.org/mecir)*. The MECIR guidance has been incorporated within the RevMan software for easy reference.*

***If any of the items in Part 1 are not adequately addressed, your review will be returned to you and you will be asked to address these before your review can progress in the editorial process.***

**PART 1 - REQUIREMENTS FOR submitting a draft for editorial consideration**

*Instructions: Please ensure that you can check off “Done” for all of the items in the checklist below and provide a rationale for items that you indicate were “Not done”.*

**Table 1**

| **Item** | **Standard** | **Done** | **Not done** | **Author’s comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Headings**  | You have activated all of the recommended subheadings in the *Background* and *Methods* sections (see [EPOC protocol template](http://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/epoc_protocol_template.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| You have activated all of the subheadings in the *Results* and *Discussion* sections  |  |  |  |
| You have added subheading for the Plain Language Summary following the guidance here ([How to write a plain language summary of a Cochrane intervention review (PDF)](http://www.cochrane.no/sites/cochrane.no/files/public/uploads/how_to_write_a_cochrane_pls_27th_march_2017.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| **All studies fully incorporated** | Electronic search strategies have been run (or re-run) in full in all relevant databases within one year (preferably six months) of draft submission AND all search results are assessed for eligibility and included, excluded, or on-going studies (or ‘Studies awaiting classification’ only if all reasonable efforts to classify it in one of these ways have failed)\*. See [MECIR C37-38](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-conduct-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-c1-c75/performing-review-c24-75/searching-studies-c24-38) |  |  |  |
| **Risk of bias** | You have completed a *‘Risk of bias’ table* for each included study, with judgements about risks of bias, and explicit supports for these judgements. (See [Suggested risk of bias for EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/suggested_risk_of_bias_criteria_for_epoc_reviews.pdf) and [How to prepare risk of bias tables for review that include more than one study design](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_prepare_a_risk_of_bias_table_for_reviews_that_include_more_than_one_study_design.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| You have discussed the risk of bias assessments under Results > Risk of bias in included studies. See [MECIR R73-75](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-reporting-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-r1-109/results-r56-109/risk-bias-included-studies-r73-75) |  |  |  |
| **Summary of findings**  | Under *Methods > Data collection and analysis > Data synthesis*, you have inserted a subheading called ***Summary of findings*** and you have described how you have assessed the certainty of evidence using GRADE  |  |  |  |
| You have listed under the subheading Summary of findings the most important outcomes (maximum of 7) that are reported in the SoF tables(s). (see [Worksheets for preparing Summary of Findings tables using GRADE](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/worksheets_for_preparing_a_summary_of_findings_using_grade.docx)) See also: [MECIR C74-75](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-conduct-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-c1-c75/performing-review-c24-75/assessing-quality-evidence-and-summarizing-findings-c74-75) |  |  |  |
| You have prepared Summary of Findings table(s) using GRADE and have justified the assessments in the footnotes. You have changed ‘Quality of evidence’ to ‘Certainty of evidence’ in the tables (and other sections of the review where appropriate). (see [Worksheets for preparing Summary of Findings tables using GRADE](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/worksheets_for_preparing_a_summary_of_findings_using_grade.docx))  |  |  |  |
| For each ‘Summary of findings’ table you have provided a brief and informative heading, each outcome is in plain language and scales and units are clearly defined. You have referenced footnotes using superscript letters. See [MECIR R98-99](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-reporting-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-r1-109/results-r56-109/effects-interventions-r76-99) |  |  |  |
|  | You have included all of the most important outcomes in the SoF tables(s), including those for which there were no data |  |  |  |
| You have included full evidence profiles in an appendix. (Either exported from GRADEpro or provide tables similar to the one in Worksheet #2 in the resource [Worksheets for preparing Summary of Findings tables using GRADE](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/worksheets_for_preparing_a_summary_of_findings_using_grade.docx)) (*See example in this* [*EPOC review*](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD009926.pub2/full)*, appendix 3 and 4*) |  |  |  |
| **Reporting of effects** | You have organised results under Results > Effects of interventions so that the order is: Comparison 1 (followed by outcomes); Comparison 2 (followed by outcomes) etc. See [MECIR R76-99](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-reporting-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-r1-109/results-r56-109/effects-interventions-r76-99) |  |  |  |
| You have read and applied the principles for reporting the effects of an intervention (See [Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| You have used the standardised statements for reporting effects (See *Table 1* in [Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| You have used EPOC definitions for levels of certainty of evidence (see *Appendix 1* in [Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| **Consistency of reporting of outcomes and results** | You have checked that comparisons and outcomes are the same as those pre-specified in the protocol and have justified any differences in the section *Differences between protocol and review* |  |  |  |
| You have used exactly the same **terms** for outcomes in **all** sections of the review (see Table 2 below) including tables. |  |  |  |
| You have presented outcomes in the same **order** in **all** sections of the review (see Table 2 below). |  |  |  |
| You have consistently reported outcomes and results throughout the review. ***(To help you determine this, complete the table below)*** |  |  |  |
| **PRISMA study flow diagram** | You have provided a PRISMA study flow diagram and linked to *Methods > Selection of studies* and also *Results > Results of the search*.  |  |  |  |
| The numbers you have provided under *Results > Results of the search* match the numbers in the flow diagram |  |  |  |
| **Readability** | You have used language that is clear and straightforward. You have used active language throughout the review and you have avoided jargon and abbreviations. If English is not your first language, you have asked a native English speaker to proof-read the text. |  |  |  |

**Table 2: Consistency of reporting of outcomes and results**

*Instructions: Please complete the table below by copying and pasting the outcomes and the results from each of the sections of your review into the relevant column of the table (methods, results, etc.). TIP: You can use the split screen feature in RevMan to compare the reporting between sections of the review.*

|  |
| --- |
| **Comparison 1: *(write the first comparison here and make additional tables for each comparison)*** |
| **METHODS** | **RESULTS** | **SoF TABLE** | **ABSTRACT** | **PLS\***  | **DATA TABLES** |
| 1. List all outcomes presented in the Methods section **(***use a separate row for each outcome)* | 1. List the outcomes presented under Results > Effects of interventions(*Check that these are* *the same as the outcomes presented in the Methods section, including those for which there were no data*) 2. For each outcome, give the information you provided about the effect of the intervention and the certainty of the evidence (i.e. GRADE) *(see guidelines in Appendix 1 of* [*Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews*](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)*)* | 1. List the outcomes presented in the SoF table (*Check that you have included the most important outcomes, including those for which there were no data)(See* [*Worksheet #1*](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/worksheets_for_preparing_a_summary_of_findings_using_grade.docx))2. For each outcome, give the information you provided about the effect of the intervention and the certainty of the evidence (i.e. GRADE) *(see guidelines in Appendix 1 of* [*Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews*](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)*)* | 1. List the outcomes presented in the abstract(*Check that these are the same as the outcomes in the SoF table, including those for which there were no data)*2. List the results for each outcome (effect of the intervention, the certainty of the evidence (i.e. GRADE), the GRADE qualitative statement *(see guidelines in Appendix 1 of* [*Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews*](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)*)*  | 1. List the outcomes presented in the PLS(*Check that these are* *the same as the outcomes in the SoF table, including outcomes for which there were no data*)2. List the results for each outcome (effect of the intervention, the certainty of the evidence (i.e. GRADE), the GRADE qualitative statement *(see guidelines in Appendix 1 of* [*Reporting the effects of an intervention in EPOC reviews*](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_effects_of_an_intervention.pdf)*)* | 1. List the outcomes presented in the Data and Analyses tables **(***use a separate row for each outcome)**(You do not need to list the results for each of the outcomes here but please make sure that they are consistent with reporting in the other sections of the review)* |
| ***Example***:Mortality rate (neonatal, infant, and under-five years) | ***Example***:[Intervention] compared to [control] may lead to fewer deaths among children from birth to five years of age (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.68 to 1.10; low-certainty evidence) | ***Example***:Outcome: Mortality rate (under-five years)Control: 31 per 1000 live birthsIntervention: 27 per 1000 live births (21 to 34)Relative effect: RR 0.87 (0.68 to 1.10)Certainty of the evidence: Low | ***Example***:[Intervention] compared to [control] may lead to fewer deaths among children from birth to five years of age (RR 0.87, 95% CI 0.68 to 1.10; low-certainty evidence) | ***Example***:[Intervention] compared to [control] may lead to fewer deaths among children from birth to five years of age (low-certainty evidence) | ***Example:*** Mortality rate (under-five years) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

*\* Only complete this column for reviews managed by UK and Australia editorial sites. (PLS’ for reviews managed by the Oslo site will be produced by the editorial team.)*

**PART 2 - ADDITIONAL ITEMS**

*Instructions: The EPOC editorial team will also be assessing the following items when reviewing your draft. Please ensure that you can check off “Done” for the following items before submitting your draft for editorial consideration and comment on items that you indicate were “Not done”.*

**Table 3**

| **Item** | **Standard** | **Done** | **Not done** | **Author’s comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Searches** | If the searches are older than one year (or will be at publication), you have made a plan with the EPOC Information Specialist or another librarian to re-run the searches before publication |  |  |  |
| You have searched all mandatory databases (CENTRAL, MEDLINE, Embase), trial registries (clinicaltrials.gov, WHO-ICTRP) and any other sources and listed these under *Methods > Search methods for identification of studies* (see EPOC guidance on [how to report the search process](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_search_process_in_epoc_protocols_reviews_and_updates.pdf) and [Reporting search dates in Cochrane reviews](http://community.cochrane.org/editorial-and-publishing-policy-resource/cochrane-review-management/reporting-search-dates-cochrane-reviews)) |  |  |  |
| **Description of included studies** | Under Results > Description of studies > Included studies you have provided a brief summary of included studies. This should include: number of participants and a summary of the characteristics of the populations and settings, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and funding sources. See [MECIR R61](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-reporting-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-r1-109/results-r56-109/description-studies-r56-72) |  |  |  |
| In the Characteristics of included studies tables you have added the details of each included study. See [MECIR R56-72](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-reporting-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-r1-109/results-r56-109/description-studies-r56-72) |  |  |  |
| **Description of results** | You have summarised the results succinctly within the main text within Effects of interventions and presented the details of the individual study data in a results or Data and analysis table(s) (See [MECIR R76-99](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-reporting-new-cochrane-intervention-reviews-r1-109/results-r56-109/effects-interventions-r76-99) and [Analysis in EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/analysis_in_epoc_reviews.pdf) for additional information on describing and reporting results) |  |  |  |
| **Adverse effects** | You have considered and addressed any important potential adverse effects of the intervention(s). See: [Taking account of adverse effects in an EPOC review](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/taking_account_of_adverse_effects_in_epoc_reviews.pdf) |  |  |  |
| **Equity** | You have considered relevant disadvantaged groups. [Equity considerations in EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/equity_considerations_in_epoc_reviews.pdf) |  |  |  |
| You have addressed any evidence of differential effects and applicability in the results and discussion sections of the review. (See [Equity considerations in EPOC reviews](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/equity_considerations_in_epoc_reviews.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| **Subgroup analyses** | You have provided a clear description of factors that affect interpretation and judgement about the reliability of subgroup estimates. *This should include specification of whether each analysis was planned or post hoc. Any planed subgroup analyses that could not be done should also be reported.* (See [What are explanatory factors and why should they be included in protocols?](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/what_are_explanatory_factors.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| **Interpreting results** | You have avoided the use of terms such as ‘statistically significant’ or ‘non-significant’, interpreted statistical significance appropriately, and used plain language as recommended based on Summary of Findings tables. (See [Results should not be reported as statistically significant or statistically non-significant](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/interpreting_statistical_significance.pdf) and [Worksheets for preparing Summary of Findings tables using GRADE](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/worksheets_for_preparing_a_summary_of_findings_using_grade.docx)) |  |  |  |
| **Different scales** | You have explained the interpretation of results using scales, particularly with respect to the direction that indicates benefit rather than harm. |  |  |  |
| **Re-expressing results** | You have made sure that summary statistics are interpretable or are re-expressed in an interpretable way. *For instance, results might be re-expressed in absolute terms (e.g. assumed and corresponding risks, NNTs, group means), and outcomes combined with a standardized scale (e.g. SMD) might be re-expressed in units that are more naturally understood.* |  |  |  |
| **Consistency of conclusions** | Your conclusions in abstract, discussion and implications for practice with the Summary of Findings tables are consistent. |  |  |  |
| **Implications for practice** | Your conclusions are based only on findings from the synthesis (quantitative or narrative) of studies included in the review. You have not made recommendations. (See [Implications for practice](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/implications_for_practice.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| **Implications for research** | You have specified and justified Implications for research. (See [Implications for research](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/implications_for_research.pdf)) |  |  |  |
| **Changes in authorship** | You have reported any changes in the authorship of the Cochrane Review since the Cochrane Protocol was published in *Differences between the protocol and the review*. |  |  |  |
| **Changes to the protocol** | You have explained and justified any changes to the protocol or to the update (including any post hoc decisions about eligibility criteria or the addition of subgroup analyses) in the section *Differences between protocol and review*. The contact editor should compare protocol to review.  |  |  |  |
| **Methods not implemented** | You have documented lengthy aspects of the protocol that were not implemented (e.g. because no studies, or few studies, were found) in the section *Differences between protocol and review*, rather than in the Methods Section.  |  |  |  |
| **Length of the review** | You have checked that the text of the review is as short as possible. *Normally, this should be the length of a journal article (less than 5000 words). The abstract should be less than 500 words. Details and tables that are not likely to be of interest to most decision-makers and key stakeholders should be moved to appendices. This includes: text or tables that supplement the background, detailed search strategies, details or explanations of the methods, lengthy aspects of the protocol that were not implemented, detailed results, GRADE evidence profiles, and supplements to the discussion.* |  |  |  |
| **Acknowledgments** | You have added an Acknowledgment for the EPOC editorial base/satellite that managed your review.For reviews supported by Oxford editorial base/Melbourne satellite, please add:*National Institute for Health Research, via Cochrane Infrastructure funding to the Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Group. The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Systematic Reviews Programme, NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health.*For reviews supported by the Norwegian satellite, please add: *The Norwegian Satellite of the EPOC Group receives funding from the Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation (Norad), via the Norwegian Institute of Public Health to support review authors in the production of their reviews.* |  |  |  |
| **References** | You have checked that all references are in the correct format and are consistent with the [Cochrane Style Manual](http://community.cochrane.org/style-manual) |  |  |  |
| You have listed the protocol of the review under *Other published versions of the review* (Reference type: Cochrane protocol) |  |  |  |
| **Cochrane Style Manual** | You have proofread the review carefully in accordance with the [Cochrane Style Manual](http://community.cochrane.org/style-manual%22%20%5Co%20%22Cochrane%20Style%20Manual)  |  |  |  |
| **Spell check** | You have completed a spell check in RevMan  |  |  |  |
| **Validation check**  | You have completed a validation check in RevMan (*File menu > Reports > Validation report*), and made corrections where possible |  |  |  |
| **Author affiliations** | You have conferred with co-authors with similar affiliations and **all** have aligned your Archie accounts to reflect this. See Archie help menu [About addresses](http://www.cochrane-net.org/imshelp/resources/people/editing_adresses.htm) and [Contact details in reviews](http://www.cochrane-net.org/imshelp/resources/reviews/contact_details_in_reviews_.htm) . We will provide **one opportunity** to help you align any affiliations that may prove problematic.  |  |  |  |

**PART 3 - ADDITIONAL ITEMS FOR REVIEW UPDATES**

*For additional information and guidance about updating EPOC reviews, please see our* [*Resources for Authors*](http://epoc.cochrane.org/epoc-specific-resources-review-authors) *and* [*MECIR reporting standards for updates*](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-planning-conduct-and-reporting-updates-cochrane-intervention-reviews-u1-11-ur1-7/deciding-and-performing-update-u1-11-ur1-7/reporting-standards-specific-updates-ur1-7)

| **Item** | **Standard** | **Done** | **Not done** | **Author’s comments** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **What’s new section** | You have added an event “Updated” and described the update. *For example, “This is the first update of the Cochrane review published in 2005. A new search was conducted and other content updated”*. See [MECIR UR7](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-planning-conduct-and-reporting-updates-cochrane-intervention-reviews-u1-11-ur1-7/deciding-and-performing-update-u1-11-ur1-7/reporting-standards-specific-updates-ur1-7) |  |  |  |
| You have added an event “New citation: conclusions changed” or “New citation: conclusions not changed” and added text for the event under description. *For example, “No new studies were included in this update” or “Ten new studies were included in this update. The total number of included studies in the review is now 15”.* If new authors have been added for the update, this can also be noted. |  |  |  |
| **Abstract > Background** | You have indicated that this is an update. *For example, “This is the first update of this review….”* |  |  |  |
| **Abstract > Search methods** | You have reported the databases and other sources searched for the update with the most recent date of search for which the studies were fully incorporated (meaning no studies are listed as pending assessment). See [MECIR UR3](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-planning-conduct-and-reporting-updates-cochrane-intervention-reviews-u1-11-ur1-7/deciding-and-performing-update-u1-11-ur1-7/reporting-standards-specific-updates-ur1-7) (*To note – we recommend using the ‘replacement’ approach outlined in the MECIR guidance*) |  |  |  |
| **Main text > Background**  | You have indicated that this is an update and inserted a link to the previous version of the review. For example, “*This is the first update of the Cochrane review (Smith 2010*)” |  |  |  |
| **Methods > Search strategy** | You have reported the databases and other sources searched for the update.  |  |  |  |
| If any of the databases originally searched were not searched for the update, you have explained and justified this under *Differences between the protocol and review* |  |  |  |
| **Integrating findings** | You have presented findings for the totality of evidence for new and previously included studies and not just for the new studies (in Abstract, Results, SoF tables and plain language summary). See [MECIR UR6](https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual/standards-planning-conduct-and-reporting-updates-cochrane-intervention-reviews-u1-11-ur1-7/deciding-and-performing-update-u1-11-ur1-7/reporting-standards-specific-updates-ur1-7) |  |  |  |
| **PRISMA flow diagram** | You have included a PRISMA flow diagram showing one box for the number of studies included in the original review/previous update and an additional box for the new studies retrieved for the current update (*See example in this* [*EPOC review*](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD007071.pub3/full)*, Figure 1*) |  |  |  |
| **Changes to scope** | You have explained and justified any changes to review questions, objectives or eligibility criteria under the section *Differences between the protocol and the review* |  |  |  |
| **References** | You have referenced the previous versions of the review under *Other published versions of the review* |  |  |  |
| **Appendix** | You have reported all search strategies used for the update in an Appendix (see EPOC guidance on [how to report the search process](https://epoc.cochrane.org/sites/epoc.cochrane.org/files/public/uploads/Resources-for-authors2017/how_to_report_the_search_process_in_epoc_protocols_reviews_and_updates.pdf)) |  |  |  |