

1. Translation:

Is the search question translated well into search concepts?

- No revisions
- Suggested revisions:

2. Operators:

Are there any mistakes in the use of Boolean or proximity operators?

- No revisions
- Suggested revisions:

3. Subject headings:

Are any important subject headings missing or have any irrelevant ones been included? Consider whether exploded terms, subheading, major emphasis and other subject heading devices are used to the best advantage.

- No revisions
- Suggested revisions:

4. Natural language:

Are any natural language terms, spelling variants, missing or have any irrelevant ones been included? Is truncation used optimally?

- No revisions
- Suggested revisions:

*Adapted from: Sampson M, McGowan J, Lefebvre C, Moher D, Grimshaw J. PRESS: Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies [Internet]. Ottawa: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2008. [cited 2013 Feb 13]. Available from: <http://www.cadth.ca/en/publication/781>

5. Spelling & syntax:

Does the search strategy have any spelling mistakes or system syntax errors or wrong line numbers?

No revisions

Suggested revisions:

6. Appropriate search filters:

Are the appropriate search filters being applied (e.g. systematic reviews, RCTs, guidelines, etc.)?

No revisions

Suggested revisions:

7. Limits:

Do any of the limits used seem unwarranted or are any potentially helpful limits missing (e.g. publication types, methodological filters, language, dates)?

No revisions

Suggested revisions:

8. Fields:

Are the appropriate fields being searched (i.e. title, abstract, registry number, etc.)?

No revisions

Suggested revisions:
