Adapted AMSTAR-2 for use with reviews of priority setting

- **Item 1: Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review make it clear what type of research priority setting exercises they are focusing on?**
  - For yes—If the description is clear.
  - For no—If the description is not clear.

- **Item 2: Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol?**
  - For yes—If there is a protocol available and reported.
  - For no—If there is not available or not reported.

- **Item 3: Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review?**
  - For yes—If the authors describe and differentiate different type of studies and their implications in the review. Most these types of reviews just include any reporting of research priority setting without considering whether they have done evaluation or not.
  - For no—If the choice of the study design for evaluation is no appropriate for the objective.

- **Item 4: Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy appropriate for the research question and context of the study?**
  - For yes—If they are looking at all priority setting in an organisation (for example, WHO or Cochrane) and have demonstrated they have taken an appropriate strategy to find all studies. If it is a review of published peer-reviewed literature, it will follow the standard AMSTAR rules, that is, if at least two bibliographic databases were searched and provided key words and publication restrictions.
  - For partial yes—If they are only look at priority setting in an organisation and they have used a selection of the reports of that organisation.
  - For no—If no systematic approach to searching the literature has been outlined.
• **Item 5: Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate?**
  - For yes—At least two reviewers independently agreed on selection of eligible studies and achieved consensus on which studies to include OR two reviewers selected a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder selected by one reviewer.
  - For no—Study selection not completed in duplicate.
• **Item 6: Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate?**
  - For yes—At least two reviewers achieved consensus on which data to extract from included studies or two reviewers extracted data from a sample of eligible studies and achieved good agreement (at least 80 percent), with the remainder extracted by one reviewer.
  - For no—Data extraction not performed in duplicate.
• **Item 7: Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions?**
  - For yes—Authors provided a list of excluded studies and justified the exclusions.
  - For partial yes—Authors provided a list of all potentially relevant studies that were read in full-text form but excluded from the review.
  - For no—Authors did not provide a list of excluded studies or justifications for the exclusion.
• **Item 8: Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail?**
  - For yes—If they provide details of the research priority setting exercises.
  - For partial yes—If they mentioned what type of research priority setting was included.
  - For no—If they did not provide adequate details or descriptions of the included studies.
• **Item 9: Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the quality of individual studies and the research priority setting processes in the review.**
  - For yes—If they have a process in place and described and used it.
• For no—If no technique for assessing the quality of individual studies is described or implemented.

• **Item 10: Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?**
  • For yes—Must have reported on the sources of funding for individual studies included in the review. Reporting that the reviewers looked for this information but it was not reported by study authors also qualifies.
  • For no—Did not report on the sources of funding for individual studies.

• **Item 11: Did the authors use an appropriate approach to synthesize the information?**
  • For yes—If they used a systematic and critical approach to evaluate the studies—this might be statistical or narrative or a combination of both.
  • For no—If no approach was outlined for synthesizing the information.

• **Item 12: Did the synthesis process consider the quality of the studies when combining?**
  • For yes—If they have considered the quality of the studies when performing the synthesis.
  • For no—If they have not considered the quality of the studies when performing the synthesis.

• **Item 13: Did the interpretation and discussion of the results of the review considered the quality of the individual priority setting process or the evaluation study?**
  • For yes—If the interpretation and discussion considered the quality of the individual studies.
  • For no—If the interpretation and discussion did not consider the quality of the individual studies.

• **Item 14: Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any major discordance or differences in the results of the priority setting exercise or the evaluation of them?**
  • If you see some major differences either in the final priorities or how the process is implemented or evaluation results, the authors need to explain and rationalize them in the synthesis process.
• For yes—There was no significant heterogeneity in the results OR if heterogeneity was present, the authors discussed the impacts on the results.
• For no—If heterogeneity is present and they do not explain or report it.

**Item 15: Did they consider the impact of unpublished literature on the results?**
- For yes—If they discuss and consider the impact of unpublished literature on the results and interpretation.
- For no—If they do not discuss and consider the impact of unpublished literature on the results and interpretation.

**Item 16: Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?**
- For yes—The authors reported no competing interests OR The authors described their funding sources and how they managed potential conflicts of interest.
- For no—The authors did not report whether there were competing interests, conflicts of interest or funding sources.