

Systematic review

1. * Review title.

Give the working title of the review, for example the one used for obtaining funding. Ideally the title should state succinctly the interventions or exposures being reviewed and the associated health or social problems. Where appropriate, the title should use the PI(E)COS structure to contain information on the Participants, Intervention (or Exposure) and Comparison groups, the Outcomes to be measured and Study designs to be included.

Interventions with a focus on physical literacy: A systematic review

2. Original language title.

For reviews in languages other than English, this field should be used to enter the title in the language of the review. This will be displayed together with the English language title.

English

3. * Anticipated or actual start date.

Give the date when the systematic review commenced, or is expected to commence.

19/05/2020

4. * Anticipated completion date.

Give the date by which the review is expected to be completed.

28/02/2021

5. * Stage of review at time of this submission.

Indicate the stage of progress of the review by ticking the relevant Started and Completed boxes. Additional information may be added in the free text box provided.

Please note: Reviews that have progressed beyond the point of completing data extraction at the time of initial registration are not eligible for inclusion in PROSPERO. Should evidence of incorrect status and/or completion date being supplied at the time of submission come to light, the content of the PROSPERO record will be removed leaving only the title and named contact details and a statement that inaccuracies in the stage of the review date had been identified.

This field should be updated when any amendments are made to a published record and on completion and publication of the review. If this field was pre-populated from the initial screening questions then you are not able to edit it until the record is published.

The review has not yet started: No

Review stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	Yes
Piloting of the study selection process	No	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No
Provide any other relevant information about the stage of the review here (e.g. Funded proposal, protocol not yet finalised).		
N/A		
N/A		

6. * Named contact.

The named contact acts as the guarantor for the accuracy of the information presented in the register record.

Jaime Barratt

Email salutation (e.g. "Dr Smith" or "Joanne") for correspondence:

Miss Barratt

7. * Named contact email.

Give the electronic mail address of the named contact.

jaimebarratt@gmail.com

8. Named contact address

Give the full postal address for the named contact.

308-12 Rockford Rd, Toronto, Ontario, Canada, M2R3A2

9. Named contact phone number.

Give the telephone number for the named contact, including international dialling code.

+19058021369

10. * Organisational affiliation of the review.

Full title of the organisational affiliations for this review and website address if available. This field may be completed as 'None' if the review is not affiliated to any organisation.

Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Department of Sport Science and Sport

Organisation web address:

www.sport.fau.de

11. * Review team members and their organisational affiliations.

Give the personal details and the organisational affiliations of each member of the review team. Affiliation refers to groups or organisations to which review team members belong. **NOTE: email and country are now mandatory fields for each person.**

Mr Johannes Carl. Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg
Miss Jaime Barratt. University of Queensland
Dr Clemens Töpfer. Friedrich-Schiller University of Jena
Dr John Cairney. University of Queensland
Dr Klaus Pfeifer. Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg

12. * Funding sources/sponsors.

Give details of the individuals, organizations, groups or other legal entities who take responsibility for initiating, managing, sponsoring and/or financing the review. Include any unique identification numbers assigned to the review by the individuals or bodies listed.

N/A

Grant number(s)

N/A

13. * Conflicts of interest.

List any conditions that could lead to actual or perceived undue influence on judgements concerning the main topic investigated in the review.

None

14. Collaborators.

Give the name and affiliation of any individuals or organisations who are working on the review but who are not listed as review team members. **NOTE: email and country are now mandatory fields for each person.**

15. * Review question.

State the question(s) to be addressed by the review, clearly and precisely. Review questions may be specific or broad. It may be appropriate to break very broad questions down into a series of related more specific questions. Questions may be framed or refined using PI(E)COS where relevant.

1) How is the theoretical underpinning of physical literacy interventions (definition, models, paradigmatic assumptions)?, 2) How are physical literacy interventions designed?, 3) How are physical literacy interventions measured at the outcome level and how effective are they?

16. * Searches.

State the sources that will be searched. Give the search dates, and any restrictions (e.g. language or publication period). Do NOT enter the full search strategy (it may be provided as a link or attachment.)

Sources: Bibliographic databases (including original articles, book sections, short reports).

Databases searched: ProQuest [ASSIA, ERIC, IBSS, Social Services Abstracts, Sociological Abstracts, Sports Medicine and Education Index], EBSCO [Psychology and Behavioral Sciences Collection,

PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

SPORTDiscus, APAPsycINFO, Teacher Reference Center, APA PsycARTICLES, CINAHL, PubMed/MEDLINE, Scopus, Web of Science, ScienceDirect, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials/CENTRAL, & EMBASE.

Search date from 05/19/2020 to 05/21/2020.

No language or publication period restrictions.

Searches will not be re-run prior to the final analysis.

17. URL to search strategy.

Give a link to a published pdf/word document detailing either the search strategy or an example of a search strategy for a specific database if available (including the keywords that will be used in the search strategies), or upload your search strategy. Do NOT provide links to your search results.

<https://www.sport.fau.de/files/2020/05/exemplary-search-strategy.pdf>

Alternatively, upload your search strategy to CRD in pdf format. Please note that by doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

Do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

18. * Condition or domain being studied.

Give a short description of the disease, condition or healthcare domain being studied. This could include health and wellbeing outcomes.

Physical Literacy

19. * Participants/population.

Give summary criteria for the participants or populations being studied by the review. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion criteria is open to any and all participants/populations. No exclusion criteria for participants/population.

20. * Intervention(s), exposure(s).

Give full and clear descriptions or definitions of the nature of the interventions or the exposures to be reviewed.

Intervention is defined as a concept for the design of interventions, and

Inclusion criteria for interventions will focus on physical literacy as either a) primary theoretical underpinning AND/OR b) a primary outcome.

21. * Comparator(s)/control.

Where relevant, give details of the alternatives against which the main subject/topic of the review will be compared (e.g. another intervention or a non-exposed control group). The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

No limitations set.

22. * Types of study to be included.

Give details of the types of study (study designs) eligible for inclusion in the review. If there are no restrictions on the types of study design eligible for inclusion, or certain study types are excluded, this should be stated. The preferred format includes details of both inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Inclusion of all study designs which involve an intervention of any type (e.g., qualitative and quantitative studies). Inclusion of original articles, book sections, and short reports; exclusion of conference contributions and abstracts. No exclusion criteria.

23. Context.

Give summary details of the setting and other relevant characteristics which help define the inclusion or exclusion criteria.

No exclusion criteria of contexts.

24. * Main outcome(s).

Give the pre-specified main (most important) outcomes of the review, including details of how the outcome is defined and measured and when these measurement are made, if these are part of the review inclusion criteria.

Main outcomes are explored through this review. However, please note: If studies measure physical literacy as a main outcome, this is an explicit additional inclusion criterion.

* Measures of effect

Please specify the effect measure(s) for you main outcome(s) e.g. relative risks, odds ratios, risk difference, and/or 'number needed to treat.

The potential application of meta-analytical procedures depends on the number of studies and the data provided in the primary studies. If so, transformations into Cohen's d are planned to enable comparisons across studies

25. * Additional outcome(s).

List the pre-specified additional outcomes of the review, with a similar level of detail to that required for main outcomes. Where there are no additional outcomes please state 'None' or 'Not applicable' as appropriate to the review

Not applicable.

* Measures of effect

Please specify the effect measure(s) for you additional outcome(s) e.g. relative risks, odds ratios, risk difference, and/or 'number needed to treat.

Not applicable.

26. * Data extraction (selection and coding).

Describe how studies will be selected for inclusion. State what data will be extracted or obtained. State how this will be done and recorded.

PROSPERO

International prospective register of systematic reviews

Multi-step eligibility screening (title screening, abstract screening, full-text screening), two independent raters, use of a third rater in case of disagreement at all stages;

Data extraction based on the following criteria: age, location, gender distribution, setting, theoretical underpinning (definition, models, other assumptions), intervention characteristics (duration, educators, prioritization of physical literacy aspects, linking of intervention components), measurements, primary outcomes

27. * Risk of bias (quality) assessment.

Describe the method of assessing risk of bias or quality assessment. State which characteristics of the studies will be assessed and any formal risk of bias tools that will be used.

Dependent on the study designs included, currently the use of the EPHPP instrument is planned (Thomas et al., 2004; <https://www.ephpp.ca/quality-assessment-tool-for-quantitative-studies/>)

28. * Strategy for data synthesis.

Provide details of the planned synthesis including a rationale for the methods selected. This **must not be generic text** but should be **specific to your review** and describe how the proposed analysis will be applied to your data.

Dependent on the number of included studies, qualitative synthesis (systematic review) and/or quantitative synthesis (meta-analysis) is conducted.

29. * Analysis of subgroups or subsets.

State any planned investigation of 'subgroups'. Be clear and specific about which type of study or participant will be included in each group or covariate investigated. State the planned analytic approach.

Not specifically planned.

30. * Type and method of review.

Select the type of review and the review method from the lists below. Select the health area(s) of interest for your review.

Type of review

Cost effectiveness

No

Diagnostic

No

Epidemiologic

No

Individual patient data (IPD) meta-analysis

No

Intervention

Yes

Meta-analysis

Yes

Methodology

No

Narrative synthesis

PROSPERO
International prospective register of systematic reviews

No

Network meta-analysis

No

Pre-clinical

No

Prevention

No

Prognostic

No

Prospective meta-analysis (PMA)

No

Review of reviews

No

Service delivery

No

Synthesis of qualitative studies

No

Systematic review

Yes

Other

No

Health area of the review

Alcohol/substance misuse/abuse

No

Blood and immune system

No

Cancer

No

Cardiovascular

No

Care of the elderly

No

Child health

Yes

Complementary therapies

No

COVID-19

No

Crime and justice

No

Dental

No

Digestive system

No

Ear, nose and throat

No

Education

Yes

Endocrine and metabolic disorders

No

Eye disorders

No

General interest

No

Genetics

No

Health inequalities/health equity

No

Infections and infestations

No

International development

No

Mental health and behavioural conditions

No

Musculoskeletal

Yes

Neurological

No

Nursing

No

Obstetrics and gynaecology

No

Oral health

No

Palliative care

No

Perioperative care

No

Physiotherapy

No

Pregnancy and childbirth

No

Public health (including social determinants of health)

No

Rehabilitation

Yes

Respiratory disorders

No

Service delivery

Yes

Skin disorders

No

Social care

No

Surgery

No

Tropical Medicine

No

Urological

No

PROSPERO

International prospective register of systematic reviews

Wounds, injuries and accidents

No

Violence and abuse

No

31. Language.

Select each language individually to add it to the list below, use the bin icon to remove any added in error.

English

There is not an English language summary

32. * Country.

Select the country in which the review is being carried out from the drop down list. For multi-national collaborations select all the countries involved.

Australia

Canada

Germany

33. Other registration details.

Give the name of any organisation where the systematic review title or protocol is registered (such as with The Campbell Collaboration, or The Joanna Briggs Institute) together with any unique identification number assigned. (N.B. Registration details for Cochrane protocols will be automatically entered). If extracted data will be stored and made available through a repository such as the Systematic Review Data Repository (SRDR), details and a link should be included here. If none, leave blank.

N/A

34. Reference and/or URL for published protocol.

Give the citation and link for the published protocol, if there is one

N/A

Give the link to the published protocol.

N/A

Alternatively, upload your published protocol to CRD in pdf format. Please note that by doing so you are consenting to the file being made publicly accessible.

No I do not make this file publicly available until the review is complete

Please note that the information required in the PROSPERO registration form must be completed in full even if access to a protocol is given.

35. Dissemination plans.

Give brief details of plans for communicating essential messages from the review to the appropriate audiences.

Dependent on the number of eligible studies and the information provided in the included studies, it will be decided whether the results will be put into one or two manuscripts (e.g., separately on the design and the effectiveness of interventions).

Do you intend to publish the review on completion?

Yes

36. Keywords.

Give words or phrases that best describe the review. Separate keywords with a semicolon or new line. Keywords will help users find the review in the Register (the words do not appear in the public record but are included in searches). Be as specific and precise as possible. Avoid acronyms and abbreviations unless these are in wide use.

Physical Literacy Interventions; Physical Literacy; Physical Activity; Health; Interventions; Programs

37. Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors.

Give details of earlier versions of the systematic review if an update of an existing review is being registered, including full bibliographic reference if possible.

N/A

38. * Current review status.

Review status should be updated when the review is completed and when it is published. For newregistrations the review must be Ongoing.

Please provide anticipated publication date

Review_Ongoing

39. Any additional information.

Provide any other information the review team feel is relevant to the registration of the review.

N/A

40. Details of final report/publication(s) or preprints if available.

This field should be left empty until details of the completed review are available OR you have a link to a preprint.

N/A

Give the link to the published review.

N/A