

Section / sub-section	Topic	Description	Further explanation	Checklist/Meta-data	Author response	Comments
Title	Title	indicate if it is an update/amendment: e.g. "A systematic map update"	question.	Meta-data	Evidence for humane stunning in the slaughter of wild-caught fish for food: A Systematic Map Protocol	
Type of review	Type of review	map update, systematic map amendment	updates [2]	Meta-data	systematic map	
Authors contacts	Authors contacts	authors must be provided.		Checklist	Yes	
Abstract	Structured summary	Background, the context and purpose of the review, including the review known. Protocol must indicate why this study was necessary and what it (e.g. in the formulation of the question) must be described and explained applicable).	the intervention or exposure to the outcome.	Checklist	Yes	
Background	Background			Checklist	Yes	
Stakeholder engagement	Stakeholder engagement			Checklist	Yes	
Objective of the review	Objective components	intervention(s)/exposure(s), comparator(s), and outcome(s).		Checklist	Yes	
Methods				Meta-data	Yes	caught fish for food ;
Searches	Search strategy		Details regarding search strategy testing should be provided.	Checklist	Yes	
	Search string	the string is formatted (e.g. Web of Science format)		Meta-data	Formatted for Web of Science: (*fish*) AND (stun* OR slaughter* OR welfare) AND NOT (stunt* OR pig* OR swine OR pork OR cattle OR cow* OR beef OR chicken* OR poultry OR turkey* OR lamb* OR sheep OR calf OR calves OR bull* OR jellyfish* OR crab* OR trematode*)	
	databases	List languages to be used in bibliographic database searches.		Meta-data	English	
	Languages – grey literature	based search engines.		Meta-data	English	
	Bibliographic databases	Provide the number of bibliographic databases to be searched.		Meta-data	Six	Scopus; Food Science Sour Electronic Theses Online Service (ETHOS); Digital Access to Research Theses (DART-Europe E thesis)
	Web – based search engines	Provide the number of web – based search engines to be searched.		Meta-data	Google scholar	
	Organisational websites	Provide the number of organisational websites to be searched.		Meta-data	Nineteen	[ <a href="http://fishcount.org.uk/">http://fishcount.org.uk/</a> ]
	comprehensiveness of the search	strategy was assessed (i.e. list of benchmark articles).		Checklist	Yes	10 Benchmark articles used to test the comprehensiveness of search string in Web of Science and Scopus - see Appendix 2
	Search update	review.	performed more than two years prior to review completion.	Checklist	n/a	
Inclusion criteria	Screening strategy	relevance/eligibility.		Checklist	Yes	
	Consistency checking	including the levels at which consistency checking will be undertaken and articles/studies. These must be broken down into the question key reasons for exclusion.		Checklist	Yes	
	Inclusion criteria			Checklist	Yes	
	Reasons for exclusion			Checklist	Yes	
Critical appraisal	Critical appraisal strategy	validity (including assessment of individual studies and the evidence base synthesis.	Optional	Checklist	n/a	
	Critical appraisal used in synthesis		Optional	Checklist	n/a	
	Consistency checking	tested.	Optional	Checklist	n/a	
Data extraction	strategy	(potentially providing forms/data sheets (ideally piloted), list if variables		Checklist	Yes	
presentation	Narrative synthesis strategy	base in the form of descriptive statistics, tables (including SM database)	of their findings) must be avoided. May include a summary of the outputs	Checklist	Yes	
	identification strategy	knowledge gaps (unrepresented or underrepresented subtopics that		Checklist	Yes	
	independence	articles to be considered within the review) in decisions regarding	should be prevented from unduly influencing inclusion decisions, for	Checklist	Yes	
Declarations	Competing interests	review authors may have.		Checklist	Yes	

#### References

[1] James, K.L., Randall, N.P. and Haddaway, N.R., 2016. A methodology for systematic mapping in environmental sciences. *Environmental Evidence*, 5(1), p.7.

[2] Bayliss, H.R., Haddaway, N.R., Eales, J., Frampton, G.K. and James, K.L., 2016. Updating and amending systematic reviews and systematic maps in environmental management. *Environmental Evidence*, 5(1), p.20.

[3] Haddaway, N.R., Kohl, C., da Silva, N.R., Schiemann, J., Spök, A., Stewart, R., Sweet, J.B. and Wilhelm, R., 2017. A framework for stakeholder engagement during systematic reviews and maps in environmental management. *Environmental Evidence*, 6(1), p.11.

[4] Collaboration for Environmental Evidence. 2018. Guidelines and Standards for Evidence synthesis in Environmental Management. Version 5.0. [www.environmentalevidence.org/information-for-authors](http://www.environmentalevidence.org/information-for-authors).

[5] Leeds Institute of Health Sciences. [https://medhealth.leeds.ac.uk/info/639/information\\_specialists/1500/search\\_concept\\_tools](https://medhealth.leeds.ac.uk/info/639/information_specialists/1500/search_concept_tools). Accessed 12/11/2017.