

Physical demands of tennis across the different court surfaces, performance levels, and sexes: a systematic review with meta-analysis

Sports Medicine

Babette M. Pluim, Marleen G.T. Jansen, Samuel Williamson, Cain Berry, Silvia Camporesi, Kristina Fagher, Neil Heron, Dina C. Janse van Rensburg, Victor Moreno-Pérez, Andrew Murray, Seán R. O'Connor, Fábio C.L. de Oliveira, Machar Reid, Miriam van Reijen, Tobias Saueressig, Linda J. Schoonmade, Jane S. Thornton, Nick Webborn, Clare L. Ardern

Corresponding Author:

Babette M. Pluim, b.pluim@knltb.nl

1. Section Sports Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Pretoria, Pretoria, South Africa
2. Amsterdam Collaboration on Health & Safety in Sports (ACHSS), IOC Research Center of Excellence, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
3. Department of Orthopaedic Surgery and Sports Medicine, Amsterdam UMC location University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands
4. Academic Center for Evidence-based Sports medicine (ACES), Amsterdam, the Netherlands
5. Medical Department, Royal Netherlands Lawn Tennis Association (KNLTB), Amstelveen, the Netherlands

Supplementary File 1. PRISMA-P 2015 Checklist

This checklist has been adapted for use with systematic review protocol submissions to BioMed Central journals from Table 3 in Moher D et al: Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Systematic Reviews* 2015 **4**:1

An Editorial from the Editors-in-Chief of *Systematic Reviews* details why this checklist was adapted - Moher D, Stewart L & Shekelle P: Implementing PRISMA-P: recommendations for prospective authors. *Systematic Reviews* 2016 **5**:15

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION					
Title					
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	1-3

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4-83
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and registration number in the Abstract	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	115
Authors					
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, and e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Title page
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	302-327
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	289-290
Support					
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	298-299
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	298-299
Role of sponsor/funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA
INTRODUCTION					
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	122-140
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	143-146
METHODS					
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (e.g., PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	154-188
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (e.g., electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers, or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	162-167
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	162-167
STUDY RECORDS					

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Information reported		Line number(s)
			Yes	No	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	201-204
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (e.g., two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (i.e., screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	204-218
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (e.g., piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	237-246
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (e.g., PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	239-246
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	191-198
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	21-218
DATA					
Synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesized	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	177-188
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data, and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (e.g., I^2 , Kendall's tau)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	221-234
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	250-251
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (e.g., publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	216-218
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (e.g., GRADE)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA