

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a scoping review.	Scoping review is reported in the title of the review (page 1).
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary that includes (as applicable): background, objectives, eligibility criteria, sources of evidence, charting methods, results, and conclusions that relate to the review questions and objectives.	The revised abstract can be found on page 1 of the manuscript.
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. Explain why the review questions/objectives lend themselves to a scoping review approach.	We have also clarified why a scoping review approach is appropriate for our objectives, specifically, due to the exploratory nature of the review question, the heterogeneity of study designs, and the aim to identify key concepts and reporting practices rather than assess intervention effectiveness. The revised text can be found on page 3, in the last paragraph of the introduction.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the questions and objectives being addressed with reference to their key elements (e.g., population or participants, concepts, and context) or other relevant key elements used to conceptualize the review questions and/or objectives.	The review summaries the types of economic evaluations conducted, examines the methodologies used in these evaluations and outlines the cost components considered (e.g., prevention, treatment, and screening). Population: Children participating in school-based oral health programmes; Concept: Economic evaluations of caries prevention interventions. Context: School-based settings globally. All this info is reported on the last paragraph of Introduction, page 3.
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate whether a review protocol exists; state if and where it can be accessed (e.g., a Web address); and if available, provide registration information, including the registration number.	The research team did not register a protocol prior to conducting this scoping review. We will ensure protocol registration in future review.
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify characteristics of the sources of evidence used as eligibility criteria (e.g., years	No date restriction and only peer-reviewed articles published in English were included. Partial and full

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
		considered, language, and publication status), and provide a rationale.	economic evaluations were included. We included all economic studies that provided sufficient costing details in order to classify them as prevention, treatment or screening studies. Please read methodology chapter on page 4 of the manuscript.
Information sources*	7	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.	The search of the three databases was conducted in February 2025, with no date restrictions applied. In addition, relevant grey literature and policy documents were searched manually to supplement the database results. Methodology chapter, page 4.
Search	8	Present the full electronic search strategy for at least 1 database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	For transparency and reproducibility, the detailed search strategy for PubMed is provided in Appendix A, with similar adaptations made for the other databases.
Selection of sources of evidence†	9	State the process for selecting sources of evidence (i.e., screening and eligibility) included in the scoping review.	The methods section describes the process used for screening and selecting sources of evidence, including initial title and abstract screening followed by full-text review, as well as the criteria used to determine eligibility. The revised description is now available on page 4.
Data charting process‡	10	Describe the methods of charting data from the included sources of evidence (e.g., calibrated forms or forms that have been tested by the team before their use, and whether data charting was done independently or in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	Methods of charting the sources of evidence are described in the last paragraph of methods chapter, on page 5.
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought and any assumptions and simplifications made.	The key characteristic of each study is reported on Table 2, this is just a summary of the findings, more comprehensive table was used on Microsoft Excel. Also CHEERS items are reported, these assess reporting quality (Table 4 and Figure 2).
Critical appraisal of individual sources of evidence§	12	If done, provide a rationale for conducting a critical appraisal of included sources of evidence; describe the methods used and how this information was used in any data synthesis (if appropriate).	We did not critically appraise the evidence quality (e.g. risk of bias), but did assess reporting quality of economic evaluations using the Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) checklist. The rationale for this appraisal was to assess the

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
			completeness and transparency of reporting across studies, rather than to exclude studies based on quality. The appraisal results were used to identify commonly underreported elements and inform the discussion on methodological gaps in the current literature. However, they were not used to weight or exclude studies during synthesis. Please, read 5 th paragraph of Methodology chapter and Table 4 and Figure 2.
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling and summarizing the data that were charted.	The charted data were managed and organized using Microsoft Excel. We conducted a descriptive synthesis of the data, summarizing study characteristics, types of economic evaluations, intervention types, cost components, and reported outcomes. In addition, narrative summaries were provided to highlight trends, methodological approaches, and gaps in reporting. Please read quality reported and data synthesis on page 4 and 5 (Methodology session). A visual summary (Figure 2) was included to illustrate the CHEERS items most frequently unreported.
RESULTS			
Selection of sources of evidence	14	Give numbers of sources of evidence screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally using a flow diagram.	The PRISMA Flowchart describes the study selection and eligibility criteria. (Figure 1)
Characteristics of sources of evidence	15	For each source of evidence, present characteristics for which data were charted and provide the citations.	The key characteristics of included studies are presented in Table 2 and their study design is reported in Table 3. The characteristics of the included studies are reported in a narrative format. They are subdivided into three sub-chapters: prevention only, prevention & treatment, and screening. Please see structured sub-sessions in Results (page 5-6-7)
Critical appraisal within sources of evidence	16	If done, present data on critical appraisal of included sources of evidence (see item 12).	We did not perform a critical appraisal because the primary objective of this scoping review was to comprehensively map existing evidence without assessing study quality, which is consistent with recommended scoping review methodology.

SECTION	ITEM	PRISMA-ScR CHECKLIST ITEM	REPORTED ON PAGE #
Results of individual sources of evidence	17	For each included source of evidence, present the relevant data that were charted that relate to the review questions and objectives.	In the Results section, we added the table summarising key data from all included studies and a narrative summary describing the main findings by grouping them by costing components: prevention, prevention&treatment and screening. Please see Table 2 and page 5-6-7.
Synthesis of results	18	Summarize and/or present the charting results as they relate to the review questions and objectives.	Review objective is to examine economic evaluations of school-based dental programs and their cost components. This overview shows that most studies focus on short-term cost-effectiveness, indicating a need for longer-term evaluations. Few studies addressed broader societal costs or long-term impacts, highlighting gaps aligned with our review objectives to comprehensively evaluate economic evidence.
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	19	Summarize the main results (including an overview of concepts, themes, and types of evidence available), link to the review questions and objectives, and consider the relevance to key groups.	Summary findings are reported in the Discussion section, page 7-8
Limitations	20	Discuss the limitations of the scoping review process.	Please read limitations in the Discussion section, page 7-8
Conclusions	21	Provide a general interpretation of the results with respect to the review questions and objectives, as well as potential implications and/or next steps.	Caries prevention is a long-term investment, and evaluations should account for future cost savings from reduced treatment needs. Please see Conclusion section on page 9
FUNDING			
Funding	22	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.	This scoping review did not receive any specific funding.

JB1 = Joanna Briggs Institute; PRISMA-ScR = Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for Scoping Reviews.

* Where *sources of evidence* (see second footnote) are compiled from, such as bibliographic databases, social media platforms, and Web sites.

† A more inclusive/heterogeneous term used to account for the different types of evidence or data sources (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy documents) that may be eligible in a scoping review as opposed to only studies. This is not to be confused with *information sources* (see first footnote).

‡ The frameworks by Arksey and O'Malley (6) and Levac and colleagues (7) and the JBI guidance (4, 5) refer to the process of data extraction in a scoping review as data charting.

§ The process of systematically examining research evidence to assess its validity, results, and relevance before using it to inform a decision. This term is used for items 12 and 19 instead of "risk of bias" (which is more applicable to systematic reviews of interventions) to include and acknowledge the various sources of evidence that may be used in a scoping review (e.g., quantitative and/or qualitative research, expert opinion, and policy document).

From: Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA ScR): Checklist and Explanation. Ann Intern Med. 2018;169:467–473. doi: [10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850).

