

ACCP Scoping Review Evaluation Criteria

For more detailed information about the criteria and to ensure adherence to recognized standards, we encourage you to refer to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist. You can access the PRISMA-ScR checklist via the following link: [PRISMA-ScR Checklist](#).

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Score	Description
TITLE				
Title	1	Identify the report as a SCOPING REVIEW .	0	0 = No identification of the report as a scoping review, and no conveyance of the review's area of focus.
	2	Convey the scoping reviews area of focus (such as diabetes mellitus, a therapeutic approach, an outcome, etc.)	1 2	1 = Clear identification as a scoping review, but no conveyance of the review's area of focus OR vice versa. 2 = Clear and comprehensive statement of objectives or questions, providing a strong foundation for the scoping review.
BACKGROUND				
Objectives	3	Provide an explicit statement of the main objective(s) or question(s) the SCOPING REVIEW addresses.	0 1 2	0 = No statement of objectives or question(s) provided. 1 = Partial, limited or unclear statement of objectives or question(s). 2 = Clear and comprehensive statement of objectives or question(s), providing a strong foundation for the scoping review.
METHODS				
Eligibility Criteria	4	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g.,	0	0 = No specification of characteristics of the sources of evidence or rationale provided.

		years considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	1 2	1 = Clear but limited specification of characteristics or rationale of the sources. 2 = Clear and comprehensive specification of characteristics or rationale of the sources.
Information Sources	5	Describe all information sources in the search (e.g., databases with dates of coverage and contact with authors to identify additional sources), as well as the date the most recent search was executed.	0 1 2 3	0 = No description of information sources or the date of the most recent search. 1 = Partial or unclear description of information sources or the date of the most recent search. 2 = Clear but limited description of information sources or the date of the most recent search. 3 = Clear and comprehensive description of all information sources in the search, including databases with dates of coverage, contact with authors to identify additional sources, and the date the most recent search was executed.
Charting Methods	6	Specify the charting methods used.	0 1 2	0 = No specification of charting methods used. 1 = Clear but limited specification of charting methods. 2 = Clear and comprehensive specification of charting methods, providing detailed information on the approach used for data extraction and synthesis.
RESULTS				
Included Studies	7	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed the eligibility, and	0	0 = No data on sources screened, assessed, or included and lacks reasons for exclusions.

		included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage.	1 2 3	1 = Incomplete or unclear information on numbers and reasons. Limited clarity in exclusions. 2 = Clear numbers provided, but limited detail. Reasons for exclusions are mentioned but lack full depth. 3 = Clear and comprehensive information on the numbers of sources screened, assessed for eligibility, or included, with detailed reasons for exclusions at each stage.
Synthesis of Results	8	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	0 1 2 3	0 = No results summary; no alignment with goals of the scoping review. 1 = Partial or unclear summary of results; minimal alignment with scoping review goals. 2 = Clear but limited summary of results; moderate alignment with scoping review goals. 3 = Thorough charting summary strongly aligns with scoping review goals.
DISCUSSION				
Limitations	9	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	0 1 2 3	0 = No discussion of limitations in the scoping review process. 1 = Partial or unclear discussion of limitations; minimal awareness of potential drawbacks. 2 = Clear but limited discussion of limitations; moderate awareness of potential drawbacks. 3 =

				3 = Thorough discussion of limitations, demonstrating a strong awareness of potential drawbacks in the scoping review process.
Conclusions	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	0 1 2 3	0 = No interpretation of results or discussion of implications and next steps. 1 = Partial or unclear interpretation of results; limited discussion of implications or next steps. 2 = Clear but limited interpretation of results; some discussion of implications or next steps. 3 = Clear and comprehensive interpretation of results; insightful discussion of implications and next steps.
OTHER				
Funding	11	Describe sources of funding for the included sources of evidence, as well as sources of funding for the scoping review. Describe the role of the funders of the scoping review.	0 1 2	0 = No information provided on funding sources for included evidence or the scoping review, and no description of the role of funders. 1 = Partial or unclear information on funding sources; minimal or unclear description of the role of funders. 2 = Clear and comprehensive information on funding sources for evidence and the scoping review; detailed description of the role of funders.
			Possible Total = 25	