

SUPPLEMENTARY DATA PRISMA CHECKLIST

T

Selection / topic		Checklist item	Reported	Assessment
TITLE				
Title	1.	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both	No	Not applicable This is an original research article, not a systematic review
ABSTRACT				
Structured summary	2		Yes	Not applicable This is not a systematic review abstract
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Yes	Partially – provides backroung on childhood renal tumors and SIOP/NWTSG protocols
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS)	Yes	Yes – states aim to analyze neoadjuvant chemotherapy induced histological changes
METHODS				
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exist, if and where it can be accessed, and, if available, provide registration information	Not mentioned	Not applicable – this is not a systematic review
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility	Yes	Not applicable – this is a single center study
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources and last date of search	Not applicable	Not applicable – this is not a systematic review
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database	Not applicable	Not applicable – this is not a systematic review
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies	Yes	Not applicable - describes patient

				selection criteria instead
Data collection process	10	Describe methods of data extraction from reports and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Yes	Partially – describes data collection methodology
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought	Yes	Yes – describes histological evaluation criteria and staging
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures	Yes	Yes – describes categorization into risk groups and staging
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses if done	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
RESULTS				
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted	Yes	Yes – presents patient characteristics and outcomes
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study	Not mentioned	Not mentioned
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered, present, for each study: simple summary data for each intervention group	Yes	Yes – presents result for both SIOP and NWTSG groups
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency	Yes	Partially-provides statistical analysis of tumor size reduction
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study

Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done	Yes	Yes – provides comparative analysis between protocols
DISCUSSION				
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome	Yes	Yes – summarizes key findings and comparative advantages
Limitation	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level, and at review level	Yes	Partially – discusses limitations of each protocol
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence	Yes	Yes – provides conclusion favoring SIOP protocol
FUNDING				
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support	Not mentioned	Not mentioned

T

Selection / topic		Checklist item	Reported	Assessment
TITLE				
Title	1.	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both	Not reported	Title does not identify study as systematic review. This is a retrospective single-center study
ABSTRACT				
Structured summary	2		Not applicable	Abstract present but not structured as systematic review format
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Yes	Introduction provides rationale for comparing SIOP vs NWTs protocols
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS)	Partially	Objective stated but not in formal PICOS format
METHODS				

O

u

t

c

Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exist, if and where it can be accessed, and, if available, provide registration information	Not mentioned	Not mention of protocol or registration
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility	Not applicable	Single center study, not systematic review
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources and last date of search	Not applicable	
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database	Not applicable	
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies	Not applicable	
Data collection process	10	Describe methods of data extraction from reports and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Yes	
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought	Not detailed	Limited description of variables collected
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies	Not mentioned	No assessment of study quality/bias
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures	Yes	Survival rates, recurrence rates, mortality
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies	Not applicable	Descriptive statistics only
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence	Not applicable	Single study, not multiple studies
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses if done	Not mentioned	No additional analyses described
RESULTS				
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage	Not applicable	Patient selection flow chart provided (Figure 1)
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted	Not applicable	Single study design
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study	Not applicable	No risk of bias assessment

Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered, present, for each study: simple summary data for each intervention group	Yes	Results presented for SIOP vs NWTs
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency	Not applicable	No meta-analysis conducted
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done	Not reported	No additional analyses
DISCUSSION				
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome	Yes	Discussion summarizes findings and compares with literature
Limitation	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level, and at review level	Yes	Limitations mentioned: retrospective design, lack of multidisciplinary approach
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence	Yes	Clear conclusions provided
FUNDING				
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support	Not mentioned	Not mentioned

T
a
b
l
e

S
t
r
u
c
t
u
r
e
d
s
u
m
m
a
r
y

e
c
k
l
i
s

Selection / topic		Checklist item	Reported	Assessment
TITLE				
Title	1.	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both	Not reported	Title does not identify study as systematic review. This is a retrospective single-center study
ABSTRACT				
Structured summary	2		Partial	This study provide structured abstracts with objective, methods, result, and conclusions. However, they lack elements specific to systematic reviews (data sources, study selection, data

				extraction, synthesis methods) as they are primary research studies
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Yes	This studies adequately describe rationale, highlighting disparities in Wilms tumor outcomes between developed and developing countries, and the need for evidence-based approaches in resource limited settings
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS)	Yes	This study focuses on the role of pediatric oncologist in LMIC settings
METHODS				
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exist, if and where it can be accessed, and, if available, provide registration information	Not applicable	Not applicable as this is primary research study, not systematic review requiring protocol registration
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility	Yes	This study clearly define inclusion criteria patient ≤ 18 years with Wilms tumor diagnosis during specified time periods. Exclusion criteria are also mentioned (treatment abandonment, incomplete data)
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources and last date of search	Partial	This study describe their single center hospital databases as information sources with specific time periods. However, don't describe comprehensive literature research as expected in systematic review
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database	Not	No search strategies provided as these are retrospective cohort studies using hospital records, not systematic literature reviews
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies	Not applicable	This is a single center study analyzing own patient cohort

				rather than selecting studies from literature
Data collection process	10	Describe methods of data extraction from reports and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Yes	This study describe data collection methods from hospital records, including clinical, surgical, pathological, and follow-up data extraction processes
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought	Not detailed	This study comprehensively list variables collected including demographics, staging, histology, treatment modalities, complications, and outcomes
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies	Not mentioned	No assessment of study quality/bias
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures	Yes	This study clearly state primary outcome measures
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies	Partial	This studies describe statistical analysis methods, but don't involve meta-analysis or systematic synthesis as analyze single cohort
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence	Not applicable	Single study, not multiple studies
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses if done	Yes	This study describe subgroup analyses by stage, treatment protocol, and risk factor. Statistical significance testing and survival analysis stratification are well described
RESULTS				
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage	Partial	This study report patient numbers included and excluded with reasons (treatment abandonment, incomplete data) but this applies to patients rather than studies
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted	Yes	This study comprehensively present patient characteristic demographics, staging distribution, treatment

				modalities, and follow up data in detailed tables
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study	Not applicable	No risk of bias assessment
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered, present, for each study: simple summary data for each intervention group	Yes	This study present comprehensive outcome data including survival rates, confidence intervals, statistical comparisons, and subgroup analyses with appropriate tables and figures
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency	Not applicable	No meta-analysis conducted
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done	Yes	This study provide extensive subgroup analyses including stage specific outcomes, treatment protocol comparisons, and prognostic factor analyses with statistical significance testing
DISCUSSION				
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome	Yes	This study effectively summarize the main findings, compare results with international data, and discuss the clinical significance of their outcomes in the context of resource limited settings
Limitation	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level, and at review level	Yes	This study acknowledge significant limitations including small sample sizes, single center design, retrospective nature, missing data, and challenges in pathological diagnosis and staging
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence	Yes	This study provide clear conclusions with clinical implications for treating Wilms tumor in developing

				countries, emphasizing the importance of multidisciplinary care and adapted protocols.
FUNDING				
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support	Not mentioned	Not mentioned

T

a b c d e f g h i j k l m n o p q r s t u v w x y z	Selection / topic		Checklist item	Reported	Assessment
	TITLE				
	Title	1.	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both	Not reported	Title does not identify study as systematic review. This is a retrospective single-center study
	ABSTRACT				
	Structured summary	2		Partial	This study provide structured abstracts with objective, methods, result, and conclusions. However, they lack elements specific to systematic reviews (data sources, study selection, data extraction, synthesis methods) as they are primary research studies
l i s t	INTRODUCTION				
	Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Yes	This studies adequately describe rationale, highlighting disparities in Wilms tumor outcomes between developed and developing countries, and the need for evidence-based approaches in resource limited settings
	Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS)	Yes	This study aims to compare NWTSS and SIOP2001 protocols to determine the most appropriate approach for resource-limited settings

METHODS				
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exist, if and where it can be accessed, and, if available, provide registration information	Not applicable	Not applicable as this is primary research study, not systematic review requiring protocol registration
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics and report characteristics used as criteria for eligibility	Yes	This study clearly define inclusion criteria patient ≤ 18 years with Wilms tumor diagnosis during specified time periods. Exclusion criteria are also mentioned (treatment abandonment, incomplete data)
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources and last date of search	Partial	This study describe their single center hospital databases as information sources with specific time periods. However, don't describe comprehensive literature research as expected in systematic review
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database	Not	No search strategies provided as these are retrospective cohort studies using hospital records, not systematic literature reviews
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies	Not applicable	This is a single center study analyzing own patient cohort rather than selecting studies from literature
Data collection process	10	Describe methods of data extraction from reports and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	Yes	This study describe data collection methods from hospital records, including clinical, surgical, pathological, and follow-up data extraction processes
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought	Not detailed	This study comprehensively list variables collected including demographics, staging, histology, treatment modalities, complications, and outcomes
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies	Not mentioned	No assessment of study quality/bias
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures	Yes	This study clearly state primary outcome measures

Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies	Partial	This studies describe statistical analysis methods, but don't involve meta-analysis or systematic synthesis as analyze single cohort
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence	Not applicable	Single study, not multiple studies
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses if done	Yes	This study describe subgroup analyses by stage, treatment protocol, and risk factor. Statistical significance testing and survival analysis stratification are well described
RESULTS				
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage	Partial	This study report patient numbers included and excluded with reasons (treatment abandonment, incomplete data) but this applies to patients rather than studies
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted	Yes	This study comprehensively present patient characteristic demographics, staging distribution, treatment modalities, and follow up data in detailed tables
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study	Not applicable	No risk of bias assessment
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered, present, for each study: simple summary data for each intervention group	Yes	This study present comprehensive outcome data including survival rates, confidence intervals, statistical comparisons, and subgroup analyses with appropriate tables and figures
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency	Not applicable	No meta-analysis conducted
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies	Not applicable	Not applicable – single study

Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done	Yes	This study provide extensive subgroup analyses including stage specific outcomes, treatment protocol comparisons, and prognostic factor analyses with statistical significance testing
DISCUSSION				
Summary of evidence	24	Ssummarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome	Yes	This study effectively summarize the main findings, compare results with international data, and discuss the clinical significance of their outcomes in the context of resource limited settings
Limitation	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level, and at review level	Yes	This study acknowledge significant limitations including small sample sizes, single center design, retrospective nature, missing data, and challenges in pathological diagnosis and staging
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence	Yes	This study provide clear conclusions with clinical implications for th=reating Wilms tumor in developing countries, emphasizing the importance of multidisciplinary care and adapted protocols.
FUNDING				
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support	Not mentioned	Not mentioned

[1] [2] [3] [4] [5] [6] [7] [8] [9] [10] [11] [12] [13] [14] [15] [16] [17] [18] [19] [20] [21] [22] [23]

1. Cunningham ME, Klug TD, Nuchtern JG, Chintagumpala MM, Venkatramani R, Lubega J, et al. Global disparities in wilms tumor. *J Surg Res*. 2020;247:34-51. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jss.2019.10.044>.
2. van den Heuvel-Eibrink MM, Hol JA, Pritchard-Jones K, van Tinteren H, Furtwängler R, Verschuur AC, et al. Position paper: Rationale for the treatment of wilms tumour in the umbrella siop-rtsg 2016 protocol. *Nat Rev Urol*. 2017;14(12):743-52. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrurol.2017.163>.
3. Bhatnagar S. Management of wilms' tumor: Nwts vs siop. *J Indian Assoc Pediatr Surg*. 2009;14(1):6-14. <https://doi.org/10.4103/0971-9261.54811>.
4. Vujanić GM, Sandstedt B. The pathology of wilms' tumour (nephroblastoma): The international society of paediatric oncology approach. *J Clin Pathol*. 2010;63(2):102-9. <https://doi.org/10.1136/jcp.2009.064600>.
5. Pritchard-Jones K, Bergeron C, de Camargo B, van den Heuvel-Eibrink MM, Acha T, Godzinski J, et al. Omission of doxorubicin from the treatment of stage ii-iii, intermediate-risk wilms' tumour (siop wt 2001): An open-label, non-inferiority, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2015;386(9999):1156-64. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736\(14\)62395-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(14)62395-3).
6. Charlton J, Irtan S, Bergeron C, Pritchard-Jones K. Bilateral wilms tumour: A review of clinical and molecular features. *Expert Rev Mol Med*. 2017;19:e8. <https://doi.org/10.1017/erm.2017.8>.
7. Dome JS, Graf N, Geller JI, Fernandez CV, Mullen EA, Spreafico F, et al. Advances in wilms tumor treatment and biology: Progress through international collaboration. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33(27):2999-3007. <https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2015.62.1888>.
8. Chagtai T, Zill C, Dainese L, Wegert J, Savola S, Popov S, et al. Gain of 1q as a prognostic biomarker in wilms tumors (wts) treated with preoperative chemotherapy in the international society of paediatric oncology (siop) wt 2001 trial: A siop renal tumours biology consortium study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2016;34(26):3195-203. <https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2015.66.0001>.
9. Atun R, Bhakta N, Denburg A, Frazier AL, Friedrich P, Gupta S, et al. Sustainable care for children with cancer: A lancet oncology commission. *The Lancet Oncology*. 2020;21(4):e185-e224. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045\(20\)30022-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1470-2045(20)30022-x).
10. Rodriguez-Galindo C, Friedrich P, Alcasabas P, Antillon F, Banavali S, Castillo L, et al. Toward the cure of all children with cancer through collaborative efforts: Pediatric oncology as a global challenge. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33(27):3065-73. <https://doi.org/10.1200/jco.2014.60.6376>.
11. Rethlefsen ML, Kirtley S, Waffenschmidt S, Ayala AP, Moher D, Page MJ, et al. Prisma-s: An extension to the prisma statement for reporting literature searches in systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2021;10(1):39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z>.
12. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The prisma 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Bmj*. 2021;372:n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.

13. Sterne JA, Hernán MA, Reeves BC, Savović J, Berkman ND, Viswanathan M, et al. Robins-i: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *Bmj*. 2016;355:i4919. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919>.

1
4
.

Singhai A, Kureel M, Babu S, Kumar M, Dwivedi M, Rawat J. Comparison of SIOP and NWTSG protocols in Clinico-histological spectrum of Childhood Renal Tumors-A Tertiary Center Experience. *Int J Health Sci Res*. 2018;8(11):69-74. <https://doi.org/10.51985/IBUMDC2018048>.

16. Al-Jumaily U, Habeeb Rjeib HD, Alqanbar MF, Faraj S, Al-Khateeb DA. Improved outcomes of children with wilms' tumor in a low-middle-income nation: The contribution of a pediatric oncologist to successful management. *Asian J Urol*. 2025;12(1):93-9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajur.2024.04.008>.

17. Duc T, Hoang B. Treatment of nephroblastoma in developing countries - experience from a single center in vietnam with nwts 5 and siop 2001 protocols. *Int J Cancer Clin Res*. 2019;6. <https://doi.org/10.23937/2378-3419/1410113>.

18. Nakata K, Williams R, Kinoshita Y, Koshinaga T, Moroz V, Al-Saadi R, et al. Comparative analysis of the clinical characteristics and outcomes of patients with wilms tumor in the united kingdom and japan. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2021;68(10):e29143. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.29143>.

19. Souza FKM, Fanelli MCA, Duarte AAB, Alves MTS, Lederman HM, Cypriano MDS, et al. Surgery in bilateral wilms tumor-a single-center experience. *Children (Basel)*. 2023;10(11). <https://doi.org/10.3390/children10111790>.

20. Uittenboogaard A, Njuguna F, Mostert S, Langat S, van de Velde ME, Olbara G, et al. Outcomes of wilms tumor treatment in western kenya. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. 2022;69(4):e29503. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pbc.29503>.

21. Cui K, Hong P, Lin J, Hu Z, Gao Z, Tian X, et al. Hope and challenges in the diagnosis and treatment of wilms tumor: A single-center retrospective study in china. *Front Pediatr*. 2025;13:1527039. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2025.1527039>.

22. Nasir AA, Abdur-Raheem NT, Abdur-Rahman LO, Ibiyeye TT, Sayomi TO, Adedoyin OT, et al. Characteristics and clinical outcomes of children with wilms' tumour: A 15-year experience in a single centre in nigeria. *J Pediatr Surg*. 2024;59(5):1009-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpedsurg.2023.12.018>.

23. Guruprasad B, Rohan B, Kavitha S, Madhumathi DS, Lokanath D, Appaji L. Wilms' tumor: Single centre retrospective study from south india. *Indian J Surg Oncol*. 2013;4(3):301-4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13193-013-0248-5>.