Peer review checklist: intervention protocol

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Protocol title |  |
| Name of peer reviewer |  |
| Date checklist due |  |

Thank you for agreeing to comment on this **protocol** for a **Cochrane Intervention Review**. A protocol for a **Cochrane Review** is published in advance of the review and indicates the intention to carry out a review. It should describe the rationale for the review, the objectives, and the methods that will be used to locate, select, and critically appraise studies, and to collect and analyse data from the included studies.

This checklist provides guidance on the areas we would like you to comment on, but feel free to comment on any aspect of the manuscript. Standard Cochrane methods are described in the [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current) and the methods in this protocol have been assessed by an editor. Note that the protocol will be copy-edited before publication. Please observe the normal conventions regarding confidentiality in dealing with this protocol.

**Cochrane Reviews** have a highly structured format and authors are expected to follow this format. Each protocol needs to be explicit and comprehensive. Please consider whether the planned action is appropriate and fits in with the objectives of the review. If you would like any more information on the items in this checklist, please go to the suggested sections in the [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current).

Further information on the Cochrane Peer Review policy is available from the Editorial and Publishing Policy Resource (<http://community.cochrane.org/editorial-and-publishing-policy-resource/cochrane-review-management/cochrane-peer-review-policy>).

**By submitting this form, you consent to Cochrane storing your contact details on our system to facilitate the peer review process. We never share personal data with third parties, all data are treated respectfully and securely. If you do not wish to be involved in Cochrane peer review, and would like your contact information to be deleted from our system, please email** support@cochane.org.

**If you have any questions or queries, please contact Tracey Remmington (****traceyr@liverpool.ac.uk****) or Nikki Jahnke (****nikkij@liverpool.ac.uk****).**

## Declaration of conflicts of interest

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Do you have any potential conflict of interest?** | **[ ]  Yes (details below)** | **[ ]  No** |
| You should declare and describe any present or past affiliations or other involvement in any organisation or entity with an interest in the outcome of the review that might lead to a real or perceived conflict of interest. You should report relationships that were present during the last 36 months, including, but not restricted to, financial remuneration for lectures, consultancy, travel, and whether you are an author of, or contributor to, a study that might be included in this review. You should declare potential conflicts even if you are confident that your judgement is not influenced.**If a conflict of interest is declared, you should discuss this with the Cochrane Review Group before proceeding with peer review.** |
| **Conflict of interest statement:** |

## Title/objectives

|  |
| --- |
| * Is the review question important to consumers, policy makers and healthcare providers?
* Does the title reflect the objectives, and vice versa??
 |
| **Comment:**  |

## Background

|  |
| --- |
| * Does the background section describe the global health issue, including incidence and prevalence, how it occurs, who is affected (including high-risk groups, vulnerable/disadvantaged populations), where it occurs, how it is diagnosed, and what the symptoms and consequences are?
* Does the intervention explanation include how it works and how it may have an impact on potential recipients?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Criteria for considering studies for this review

|  |
| --- |
| **Participants, interventions, and comparators*** Are the types of studies to be included (randomised trials, quasi-randomised trials or other designs) described? Are the types of studies appropriate to the clinical question?
* Are the participants adequately described and are the reasons for any restrictions appropriate?
* Are the study interventions and comparators clearly described and is their selection appropriate?
 |
| **Comment:** |
| **Types of outcome measures*** Is/are the primary outcome(s) meaningful to clinicians, patients (consumers), the general public, administrators, and policy-makers?
* Are all other important (beneficial and harmful) outcomes considered?
* Are appropriate methods of measuring each outcome and appropriate time points for measurement identified?
* If a Summary of Findings table is to be included in the Cochrane Review, have the most clinically relevant outcomes been selected for the Summary of Findings table?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Search methods for identification of studies (optional)

(*see* [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Chapter 4*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-04))

|  |
| --- |
| * Will there be a thorough unrestricted search for relevant studies using appropriate sources?
* Are there any additional resources that should be searched?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Data collection and analysis

(*see* [*Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Chapters 5 to 10*](https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/part-2))

|  |
| --- |
| * Are the criteria used to assess risk of bias clearly stated and appropriate?
* Are the planned statistical methods appropriate?
* Have sources of heterogeneity been identified and used to inform the proposed subgroup analyses?
* Are particular methodological issues likely to be encountered in the topic area (e.g. particular measures of effect size; studies with non-standard designs), for which methods have not been described?
* Are the sensitivity analyses appropriate? Any additional analyses that should be included?
* Are appropriate methods for summarising and interpreting their results, including consideration of the overall strength of the evidence, clinical importance of results, contextual factors, and considerations of equity described?
 |
| **Comment:** |

## Additional comments

|  |
| --- |
| **Comment:** |

## Peer reviewer acknowledgement

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| I agree to be acknowledged in the published protocol | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| I agree to be acknowledged on the CRG website | [ ]  Yes | [ ]  No |
| Please include your name and any affiliation as you wish it to appear: |  |

 **Please return the full form to Tracey Remmington (****traceyr@liverpool.ac.uk****) or Nikki Jahnke (****nikkij@liverpool.ac.uk****) or via the link in the Archie ticket email.**