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ABSTRACT

Background
Systematic reviews (SRs) have become increasingly popular to a wide range of stakeholders. We set out to capture a representative cross-sectional sample of published SRs and examine them in terms of a broad range of epidemiological, descriptive, and reporting characteristics, including emerging aspects not previously examined.

Methods and Findings
We searched Medline for SRs indexed during November 2004 and written in English. Citations were screened and those meeting our inclusion criteria were retained. Data were collected using a 51-item data collection form designed to assess the epidemiological and reporting details and the bias-related aspects of the reviews. The data were analyzed descriptively. In total 300 SRs were identified, suggesting a current annual publication rate of about 2,500, involving more than 33,700 separate studies including one-third of a million participants. The majority (77.9%) of SRs were reported in specialty journals. Most reviews...
History of PRISMA statement

3-day meeting held in Ottawa, Canada, in June 2005

PRISMA statement and E&E published in 2009

Cited >38,000 times

Endorsed by >400 journals
Rationale for updating PRISMA

Many advances in SR methodology in last 10 years
  • increasing access to new data sources
  • semi-automation of SR processes
  • new non-standard synthesis approaches

Opportunity to rearrange layout and rephrase items to increase clarity
Methods

- Review of literature
- Survey of methodologists and editors
- Consensus meeting
- Piloting by authors, editors and other end users
- Dissemination
Reporting quality of SRs

Evaluation of 300 SRs indexed in MEDLINE in Feb 2014

Epidemiology and Reporting Characteristics of Systematic Reviews of Biomedical Research: A Cross-Sectional Study

Matthew J. Page¹,², Larissa Shamseer³,⁴, Douglas G. Altman⁵, Jennifer Tetzlaff³, Margaret Sampson⁶, Andrea C. Tricco⁷,⁸, Ferrán Catalá-López³,⁹, Lun Li¹⁰, Emma K. Reid¹¹, Rafael Sarkis-Onofre¹², David Moher³,⁴,¹³

Reporting guidance for SRs

Selective review of 54 guidance documents
- PRISMA and its extensions
- Other reporting guidelines for SRs (e.g. MECIR)
- Tools for assessing SRs (e.g. ROBIS)
- Other methods papers

Collated 213 unique reporting items
Online survey about current and potential new PRISMA items
Invited 220 individuals:
• Members of PRISMA 2009 and PRISMA-P 2015 Groups
• Leads of all PRISMA extensions
• EiCs and AEs of *BMC Systematic Reviews* and *Research Synthesis Methodology*
• Cochrane Methods Group convenors
• Cochrane Scientific Committee members
• Others
Survey

110 respondents

>66% recommended:
• Keeping 6 existing items as they are
• Modifying 15 existing items
• Including 5 of 12 potential new items

Total of 150 pages of free-text comments
PRISMA Update Group contributors

Consensus meeting summary

Anticipate that:

• Many checklist items will undergo some tweaking
  • Use of more inclusive wording re different methods
  • Re-ordering of some items for better flow
  • Splitting of some current long items

• A small number of new items will be introduced

• Checklist will still focus on minimum to report in a SR
Next steps

Drafting/revision of updated PRISMA statement

Piloting checklist with review authors, peer reviewers, journal editors and other end users (email matthew.page@monash.edu if interested in piloting)

Dissemination in 2019 (journal publication, website updated, integration with SR software)

Development of online tools to facilitate use of the updated statement