

## Reviewer checklist for Canadian Medical Education Journal – Scoping Review

Purpose: This checklist is a resource for reviewers to 1) identify key items and 2) provide feedback for a scoping review manuscript. While reviewers are not required to complete this form, the journal encourages reviewers to use this form as a guide when conducting their evaluation.

Instructions: Please indicate whether each checklist item is mentioned in the manuscript and/or supporting documents (Yes/No/Missing/ Not applicable). We encourage reviewers to provide comments or suggestions regarding the quality of manuscript.

Section	Item	Evaluation Description	Yes/No	Comments
<b>TITLE</b>				
Title	1	Is the report identified as a scoping review and appropriate?	Select one	Enter text here
<b>ABSTRACT</b>				
Structured summary	2	Are these categories included in a structured summary: background, objectives, eligibility criteria, evidence sources, charting methods, results, and conclusion?	Select one	Enter text here
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>				
Rationale	3	Is the rationale for a scoping review approach sufficiently described?	Select one	Enter text here
Objectives	4	Is an explicit statement of the research questions and objective(s) provided? Do they address PICOS or specify other key elements (e.g., population or participants, context, outcomes/concepts, study design)?	Select one	Enter text here
<b>METHODS</b>				
Protocol	5	Is a review protocol available and accessible? Is registration information provided?	Select one	Enter text here
Eligibility criteria	6	Did authors justify the characteristics of evidence sources of evidence considered in the eligibility criteria (e.g., publication years, language)?	Select one	Enter text here
Information sources	7	Are all information sources in the search clearly described (e.g., databases covered, authors contacted to identify additional sources, exact date of recent search)?	Select one	Enter text here
Search	8	Did authors provide a sample of the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including limits used?	Select one	Enter text here
Selection of evidence	9	Is a process for selecting sources of evidence clearly outlined (e.g., screening for eligibility, number of reviewers)?	Select one	Enter text here
Data charting process‡	10	Is an approach for charting data from included evidence sources described (e.g., calibrated forms, independent/concurrent data charting, conflicts resolved)?	Select one	Enter text here
Data items	11	Are all variables for data extraction defined, along with assumptions or simplifications made?	Select one	Enter text here

Critical appraisal of evidence sources	12	If done, did authors justify the approach to appraise each source of evidence for data synthesis?	Select one	Enter text here
Synthesis of results	13	What methods were used to handle and summarize charted data?	Select one	Enter text here
<b>RESULTS</b>				
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Did authors report numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included for review in a flow diagram? Were reasons given for exclusions at each stage?	Select one	Enter text here
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	Did authors adequately summarize the characteristics of charted data, along with corresponding citations?	Select one	Enter text here
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, did authors present data on the critical appraisal of included evidence sources?	Select one	Enter text here
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	Are data presented for each included evidence source relevant and comprehensive?	Select one	Enter text here
Synthesis of results	18	Are the charting results relevant to the review questions and objective(s)? Are they presented clearly?	Select one	Enter text here
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
Summary of evidence	19	Are the main results clearly summarized? Are interpretations linked back to research questions and objectives?	Select one	Enter text here
Limitations	20	Are limitations of the scoping review process addressed?	Select one	Enter text here
Conclusions	21	Is a general interpretation of the results provided with respect to the research objective(s), as well as potential implications?	Select one	Enter text here
<b>FUNDING</b>				
Funding	22	Are there any funding sources for conducting scoping review? If so, did authors describe its supporting role?	Select one	Enter text here

N.B., This checklist was adopted following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist. Further information can be found at this published article: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med.* 2018;169:467–473. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850.