OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

ISSN: 0974-8369
Biology and Medicine

Review article

Check list 1 Appendix S2: Quality appraisal of the included quantitative survey studies using JBI.

Studies	1. Is there a clear description of study participants?	2. Does the study focus on the topic of interest?	3. Were the participants randomised to study groups?	4. Were participants in each group treated the same? (Other than the intervention)	5. Were outcomes measured in the same manner for all participants?	6. Were the groups comparable at entry?	7. Is ethical rigour evident?	8. Was an appropriate analytical process used?	9. Was there adequate follow-up of participants?	Quality assessment scores
Yamamura et al. 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Stanescu et al. 2018	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Jung et al. 2016	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Unclear	Yes	Yes	High
Ekli et al. 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Homier et al. 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
Veenema et al. 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
Lam et al. 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
Hammad et al. 2019	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Skryabina et al. 2020	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	No	Yes	Unclear	Yes	High

Qualitative studies	1. Is there congruity between the stated philosophical perspective and the research methodology?	2. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the research question or objectives?	3. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the methods used to collect data?	4. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the representation and analysis of data?	5. Is there congruity between the research methodology and the interpretation of results?	6. Is there a statement locating the researcher culturally or theoretically?	7. Is the influence of the researcher on the research, and vice-versa, addressed?	8. Are participants, and their voices, adequately represented?	10. Is the research ethical according to current criteria or, for recent studies, and is there evidence of ethical approval by an appropriate body?	11. Do the conclusions drawn in the research report flow from the analysis, or interpretation, of the data?	Quality assessment scores
Pouraghaei, et al. 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Hammad et al. 2019	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	High
Sorani et al. 2018	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Zhang et al. 2013	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Yes	High
Zhou et al. 2014	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	No	Unclear	High
Reddy et al. 2009	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Zhang et al. 2017	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	Yes	Moderate
Skryabina et al. 2020	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Unclear	Unclear	Yes	Yes	High

Correspondence to: Badryah Alshehri, Department of Medical Biology, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, United Kingdom, E-mail: baa325@gmail.com

Received: 08-Jun-2022, Manuscript No. BLM-22-16092; **Editor assigned:** 10-Jun-2022, Pre QC No. BLM-22-16092 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 24-Jun-2022, QC No. BLM-22-16092; **Revised:** 01-Jul-2022, Manuscript No. BLM-22-16092 (R); **Published:** 08-Jul-2022, DOI: 10.35248/0974-8369.22.14.492.

Citation: Gormley K, Alshehri B, Mc Cutcheon K, Prue G (2022). The Use of Information and Communication Technology between Emergency Medical Teams in Emergency Situations: A Systematic Review. Biol Med. 14:492.

Check list 2: PRISMA 2020 check list.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
Title			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	1
Abstract			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	2
		Introduction	
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	3
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	3
		Methods	
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	03-May
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	5, 6 Fig 1
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	5,6 Fig 1
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	03-Jun
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	6
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	N/A
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	6
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	N/A
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Table 1
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	N/A
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	6
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	N/A
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	N/A
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	N/A
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	6
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	N/A
		Results	
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	6
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	5,6
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	6
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	6,7
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	N/A

Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	6
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	N/A
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	N/A
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	06-Oct
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	06-Jul
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	S2 table assessment
		Discussion	
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Oct-13
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	14
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	14
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	14
		Other information	
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	the review was not registered
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	a protocol was not prepared
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	the review was not registered
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	This study supported by Queens University Belfast only to use the library database, also it support the fees for the journal, but there is not role of the funders in the review
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare that are relevant to the content of this article
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	-Data extracted from included studies -Results of the searches of the electronic databases.