Summary
The intent of this extension of Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) is to help readers (including researchers, publishers, commissioners, policymakers, health care providers, guideline developers, and patients or consumers) develop a greater understanding of relevant terminology, core concepts, and key items to report for scoping reviews. The final checklist contains 20 essential reporting items and 2 optional items.

Implications
The PRISMA-ScR will be housed on the websites of the EQUATOR Network’s library of reporting guidelines, and the Knowledge Translation Program of St. Michael’s Hospital. To promote uptake, we will do the following: create 1-minute YouTube videos to outline how to operationalize each of the items; offer webinars for organizations that conduct scoping reviews; and create 1-page tip sheets for each item.

What is the current situation?
- A survey of researchers and knowledge users revealed that there is a lack of consensus on how to conduct and report scoping reviews
- A reporting guideline for scoping reviews currently does not exist

What is the objective?
- To develop a PRISMA extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR)

How was the review conducted?
- The research team included 2 methodologists (project leads) and 2 experienced research coordinators, along with a 4-member advisory board with experience conducting scoping reviews and/or developing reporting guidelines. Twenty-six individuals with experience in the conduct, dissemination, or uptake of scoping reviews were recruited to join the expert panel
- The development of the reporting guideline followed the published guidance by the EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUAlity and Transparency Of health Research) Network
- In order to identify the items to include in the PRISMA-ScR checklist, a modified Delphi approach involving 3 rounds of agreement polling, facilitated discussions (in-person or online), and 6 working groups
- An 85% consensus rule was established a priori to signify agreement amongst the expert panel, and this was used for all three rounds of scoring

What did the review find?
- After inviting 37 individuals, 31 people completed round 1 and 24 completed all 3 rounds of scoring
- The final checklist includes 20 items, plus 2 optional items
- Five items from the original PRISMA were deemed not relevant: items 13 (summary measures) and the following 4 items: 15 (risk of bias across studies), 16 (additional analyses), 22 (risk of bias across studies results), and 23 (additional analyses results)
- In addition, because scoping reviews can include many different types of evidence and are not conducted to examine the risk of bias of the included sources, items 12 (risk of bias in individual studies) and 19 (risk of bias within studies results) from the original PRISMA were treated as optional
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