

Table (i): Suggested results to derive (as online supplemental)

Publication characteristics

- Number of publications included in the systematic review
- Range of years in which published and for each year, the number of included publications that were published during the year
- Number and percentage of publications for which PTA was not the main topic
- Number and percentage of English-language publications
- Measure of authors' conflict of interest

Spectrum and incidence of reasons (and conclusions if relevant for the review question)

- The broad types and narrow types of reasons (and conclusions)
- The total number of broad reason types and narrow reason types (excluding repeated reasons). For the purpose of sensitivity analysis count twice: 1) when types are individuated narrowly, and 2) when types are individuated broadly
- For each broad (narrow) reason type, the total number of reason mentions respectively

Reasons endorsed and conclusions drawn by individual publications

- For each included publication, the identity of all the reasons endorsed and any all-things-considered conclusion drawn by the publication. In our first systematic review of reasons, we presented, for example, all reasons endorsed for ensuring PTA and the reasons endorsed for the view that PTA need not be ensured.
- The largest number of broad and narrow types of reasons mentioned by any publication reviewed and by the systematic review itself. Purpose: to illustrate differences between the scope of reasons captured in informal vs. systematic reviews.

ⁱA *MeSH* term is a search term assigned to a Medline article depending on its content rather than vocabulary.

Appendix: How we developed, and how to customize, our model

We first read various methodology publications and systematic reviews, and discussed which data to extract. Then, we created an Excel spreadsheet with row headings for mentions in publications reviewed, and column headings for data types. We decided that some data types should concern the publication, e.g. the citation, whereas other data types should concern individual mentions, e.g. the passage in the publication that expresses the reason. Next, we identified eight publications which we already knew met the eligibility criteria, and which illustrated various reasons and challenges to analysis.

Each author then independently completed the spreadsheet for publication 1. Discrepancies between spreadsheets were identified, discussed and resolved; consequently, certain column headings were changed. We next re-coded publication 1 independently and repeated the process, and then independently completed the resulting spreadsheet for publications 2-3. The entire process was repeated until coding additional publications resulted in no further changes to

headings and until discrepancies between corresponding cells were easily resolved. Frequent discussions identified and addressed problems.

Throughout the process, we kept a list of questions answerable only after coding further publications. One such question was whether the same code should be applied *both* to reasons based on incentives for people to participate in research *and* to reasons based on the need to reward participants. We added questions and answers as data extraction progressed.

Authors should use the above process with an initial spreadsheet that uses the types of data we chose (listed below) as column headings. They should then modify the headings based on the content of the literature included in their systematic review of reasons and according to their specific review question and literature to review.