Full title: Changing patterns in reporting and sharing of review data in systematic reviews with meta-analysis: the REPRISE project

Short title: Changing patterns in reporting and sharing of review data in systematic reviews with meta-analysis

Phi-Yen Nguyen[1], Raju Kanukula[1], Joanne E McKenzie[1], Zainab Alqaidoom[1], Sue E Brennan[1], Neal R Haddaway[2,3,4], Daniel G Hamilton[5], Sathya Karunananthan[6], Steve McDonald[1], David Moher[7,8], Shinichi Nakagawa[9], David Nunan[10], Peter Tugwell[8,11,12], Vivian A Welch[8,12], Matthew J Page[1,*]

[1] School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia

[2] Leibniz-Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research (ZALF), Eberswalder Str 84, Müncheberg, Germany

[3] Stockholm Environment Institute, Linnégatan 87D, Stockholm, Sweden

[4] African Centre for Evidence, University of Johannesburg, Johannesburg, South Africa

[5] School of BioSciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia

[6] Interdisciplinary School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

[7] Centre for Journalology, Clinical Epidemiology Program, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada

[8] School of Epidemiology and Public Health, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

[9] Evolution & Ecology Research Centre and School of Biological, Earth and Environmental Sciences, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia

[10] Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, Oxford University, Oxford, UK

[11] Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

[12] Bruyère Research Institute, Ottawa, Canada

***Corresponding author:** Dr. Matthew Page, School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, 553 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, Victoria, 3004, Australia. Telephone: +61 9903 0248.

Email address: matthew.page@monash.edu

ABSTRACT (300 words)

Objectives: To examine changes in completeness of reporting and frequency of sharing review materials in systematic reviews (SRs) over time; and factors associated with these changes.

Methods: We examined a random sample of 300 SRs with meta-analysis indexed in PubMed, Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, Scopus and Education Collection in November 2020. We compared the extent of complete reporting in these reviews against 110 SRs indexed in MEDLINE in February 2014. We examined associations between completeness of reporting and various factors (e.g. self-reported use of reporting guidelines, journal's data sharing policies) by calculating risk ratios (RR) and 95% confidence intervals (CI).

Results: Among 300 SRs from 2020, authors of only 7% shared their review data file(s) and 1% shared analytic code. Compared to 2014 sample, reviews in 2020 were more likely to reference reporting guidelines in their manuscript (RR=2.8, 95% CI 2.1-3.8), report the full search strategy for at least one database (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1-1.6) and methods of data preparation for meta-analysis (RR=2.2, 95% CI 1.4-3.5). Among reviews in 2020, those for which authors mentioned using reporting guidelines reported review protocols, study screening processes and numbers of records retrieved for each database more frequently than those that did not mention reporting guidelines; however the 95% CIs for these associations included the null. Reviews published in journals that mandated either data sharing or inclusion of Data Availability Statements were more likely to share their review materials (e.g. data, code files) (RR=8.1, 95% CI 3.1-21.5).

Conclusion: There was a notable increase over time in self-reported use of a reporting guideline, but we were uncertain whether it was associated with improved reporting of SRs. Data sharing policies of journals potentially encourage sharing of review materials. Further studies are needed to explore other facilitators or barriers to complete reporting in SRs.

52

53 ## INTRODUCTION

54 Systematic reviews provide a design for identifying, critically appraising and synthesising all available evidence
55 addressing a specific research question. A systematic review may also include meta-analyses, which is the
56 statistical synthesis of results across studies to produce a reliable estimate of the true effect. The recognition
57 of systematic reviews' role in evidence-based clinical practice and policymaking is reflected in the 20-fold
58 increase in the number of published systematic reviews between 2000-2019 (1).

59 To ensure systematic reviews are valuable to decision makers, authors should completely report the methods
60 and results of their review. Complete reporting allows users to judge whether the chosen methods may have
61 biased the review findings (e.g. if inclusion of studies is restricted to only those written in English). Incomplete
62 reporting of the methods prevents such an assessment and can preclude attempts to replicate the findings.
63 Several meta-research studies have evaluated the completeness of methods and results reporting in
64 systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Many of these have been narrow in scope, focusing on specific
65 medical specialties, health topics (2–6) or selected journals (7,8). While other studies have examined a more
66 diverse sample of reviews (9,10), the cohorts of reviews examined are no longer current.

67 To address incomplete reporting of methods and results in systematic reviews, several reporting guidelines
68 have been developed. Reporting guidelines provide a structure for reporting a systematic review, along with
69 recommendations of items to report (11). Key reporting guidelines for systematic reviews include the
70 Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement (12) and its
71 extensions (13), the Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews (MECIR) (14) and the
72 Methodological Expectations of Campbell Collaboration Intervention Reviews (MECCIR) standards (15).
73 Evidence from studies examining adherence to PRISMA suggest that for some items (e.g. inclusion of a flow
74 diagram) there was improvement after the introduction of the PRISMA statement in 2009, but that others (e.g.
75 mention of a review protocol) remained infrequently reported (13). Similarly, improvements in the reporting of
76 network meta-analysis (NMA) were observed after the introduction of the PRISMA-NMA extension (16);
77 however, the authors concluded that the improvements could not be attributed solely to the availability of this
78 extension. The extent to which adoption of reporting guidelines influences completeness of reporting remains
79 unclear.

80 In addition to complete reporting of methods and results, advocates for greater transparency of systematic
81 reviews (17,18) also recommend authors share systematic review data, analytic code used to generate meta-

82 analyses, and other materials used in the review (e.g. lists of citations screened, data collection templates).
83 Access to the data files facilitates independent verification of findings and updating of reviews when new
84 evidence becomes available (19). Infrequent sharing of data in systematic reviews in health research has been
85 observed, but these findings may not generalise to all health topics (4) or across journals (10). Moreover, the
86 types of data shared (e.g. unprocessed data extracted from reports, data included in meta-analyses) has not
87 been examined.

88 Many journals and funders now require, or encourage, study data to be shared, and in journal article
89 submissions, a statement provided regarding the availability of data (known as a *Data Availability Statement*)
90 (20). Some studies have explored the impact of such data policies (often termed 'open data policies') on the
91 frequency of data availability statements and data files among academic papers (21–24). However, none of
92 these studies included systematic reviews, and therefore their findings may not be generalisable to reviews,
93 which produce different types of data to that generated from clinical trials and laboratory experiments.

94 In view of the research gaps outlined above, we aimed to:

95 (a) evaluate the completeness of reporting in systematic reviews in a cross-section of systematic reviews with
96 meta-analysis published in 2020;

97 (b) evaluate the frequency of sharing review data, analytic code and other materials in the same cohort of
98 reviews;

99 (c) compare reporting in these reviews with a sample of reviews published in 2014;

100 (d) investigate the impact of reporting guidelines on the completeness of reporting; and

101 (e) investigate the impact of data sharing policies of journals on the frequency of review data sharing.

102

103 METHODS

104 This study was conducted as one of a suite of studies in the REPRISE (REProducibility and Replicability In
105 Syntheses of Evidence) project. The REPRISE project is investigating various aspects relating to the
106 transparency, reproducibility and replicability of systematic reviews with meta-analysis of the effects of health,
107 social, behavioural and educational interventions (25). Methods for all studies were pre-specified in the same
108 protocol (25).

109 Identification and selection of articles

We included a random sample of systematic reviews with meta-analysis of the effects of a health, social, behavioural or educational intervention in our sample (see S1 Appendix for eligibility criteria). To be considered a "systematic review", authors needed to have, at a minimum, clearly stated their review objective(s) or question(s); reported the source(s) (e.g. bibliographic databases) used to identify studies meeting the eligibility criteria; and reported conducting an assessment of the validity of the findings of the included studies, for example via an assessment of risk of bias or methodological quality. We did not exclude systematic reviews providing limited detail about the methods used. We only included systematic reviews that presented results for at least one pairwise meta-analysis of aggregate data. Systematic reviews with network meta-analyses were eligible if they included at least one direct (i.e. pairwise) comparison that fulfilled the above-mentioned criteria. Systematic reviews with only meta-analyses of individual participant data were excluded. Furthermore, only reviews written in English were included.

Using search strategies created by an information specialist (SM), we systematically searched PubMed, Science Citation Index (SCI) and Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) via Web of Science, Scopus via Elsevier and Education Collection via ProQuest for systematic reviews indexed from November 2nd to December 2nd, 2020. The last search was conducted on December 3rd, 2020. An example of the search strategy for PubMed was: (meta-analysis[PT] OR meta-analysis[TI] OR systematic[sb]) AND 2020/11/02:2020/12/02[EDAT]. Search strategies for all databases are available in S2 Appendix.

We used Endnote v9.3.3 for automatic deduplication of records, then randomly sorted unique records in Microsoft Excel using the RAND() function, and imported the first 2,000 records yielded from the search into Covidence (26) for screening. Two authors (MJP and either PN or RK) independently screened the titles and abstracts of the 2,000 records against the eligibility criteria. We retrieved the full text of all records deemed potentially eligible, and two authors (PN and either MJP or RK) independently evaluated them in random order against the eligibility criteria until we reached our target sample size of 300 systematic reviews. Any disagreement at each stage of screening was resolved via discussion or adjudication by the senior reviewer (MJP). A sample of 300 systematic reviews allowed us to estimate the percentage of reviews reporting a particular practice within a maximum Wald margin of error of 6%, assuming a prevalence of 50%; for a prevalence of less (or greater) than 50%, the margin of error will be smaller.

Data collection

Two authors (PN and either MJP, RK or ZA) collected data independently and in duplicate from all of the 300

systematic reviews using a standardised form created in REDCap v10.6.12, hosted at Monash University (27). Any disagreement in the data collected was resolved via discussion or adjudication by the senior reviewer (MJP). Prior to data collection, a pilot test of the data collection form was performed on a random sample of 10 systematic reviews in order to discuss any discrepancies and adjust the form as necessary. The full data collection form (S3 Appendix) includes a subset of items captured by Page et al. in their previous evaluations of completeness of reporting (9,10), along with additional items to capture some issues not previously examined. The wording of items in the data collection form was matched to that used in previous evaluations (9,10) to facilitate comparison.

The form consisted of three sections. The first section captured general characteristics of the review (e.g. journal name, funding source, conflicts of interest, type of intervention investigated). The country of the corresponding author were extracted using R code adapted from the *easyPubMed* package v2.13 (28,29). The interventions were classified as health, behavioural, social or educational interventions (see definitions in S3 Appendix).

The second section consisted of items characterising completeness of reporting and types of review materials being shared. For example, we recorded whether a full search strategy (i.e. including Boolean logic operators such as 'AND', 'OR', 'NOT' etc.) was described for each electronic database searched;; whether summary statistics and effect estimates for each study included in the index meta-analysis (defined as the first meta-analysis whose results were mentioned in the Abstract, or if not applicable, the Results section) were reported; and whether data files and analytic code underlying the meta-analyses reported were publicly available and how to access them. To facilitate our analysis of the impact of reporting guidelines on completeness of reporting, we also recorded whether the authors self-reported using a reporting guideline, defined as any document specifying essential items to report in a systematic review (e.g. PRISMA, MECIR or MECCIR standards, etc.)

The final section captured the data sharing policy of the journal where the article was published. A data sharing policy refers to the journal's requirements and expectations regarding public sharing of data and code used in the review. We examined each journal's instructions to authors and submission guidelines to capture whether the journal has a mandatory requirement for authors to include a Data Availability Statement, or to share all data and code used in the review, or both (30). These requirements correspond to level I-II of the Transparency and Openness Promotion Guidelines for data transparency (31). We also recorded whether the study was published in an evidence synthesis journal, defined as a journal that published exclusively systematic reviews and their protocols (e.g. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, The Campbell Library, JBI Evidence*

171 *Synthesis* or *Obesity Reviews*). All journal policy information was sought in August 2021.

172 We collected data from the main report of the systematic review, any supplementary file provided on the journal
173 server or any cited repository, as well as the review protocol if the authors specified that the relevant
174 information was contained therein. In the event of discrepancies between the protocol and the main report, we
175 gave preference to data from the main report.

176

177 **Data analysis**

178 We summarised general and reporting characteristics of the included systematic reviews using descriptive
179 statistics (e.g. frequency and percentage for categorical items, median and interquartile range for continuous
180 items). We calculated risk ratios to quantify differences in the percentage of reviews meeting indicators of
181 'completeness of reporting' and 'sharing of review materials' between the following groups:

182 (a) reviews published in an evidence synthesis journal *versus* published elsewhere;

183 (b) reviews of health interventions published in 2020 *versus* a previously examined random sample of 110
184 systematic reviews of health interventions indexed in MEDLINE in February 2014, for which similar items were
185 captured (9,10);

186 (c) reviews reporting use of a reporting guideline (e.g. PRISMA) *versus* not reporting use;

187 (d) reviews published in journals with *versus* without a data-sharing policy;

188 (e) reviews published in journals with *versus* without a policy that mandates either data sharing or
189 declaration of data availability, irrespective of whether the policy applies universally for all studies or specifically
190 for systematic reviews.

191 Risk ratios (RR) and Wald-type normal 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using the *epitool*
192 package v0.5-10.1 (R v4.0.3) (29). When the numerators were small (<5) in either group, or the outcome was
193 very rare (<5%) in either group, we instead used penalised likelihood logistic regression (implemented via the
194 *logistf* package v1.24 in R (32)). Penalised likelihood logistic regression has been shown to improve estimation
195 of the risk ratio and its confidence interval for rare events or unbalanced samples (33,34). The odds ratios from
196 these models can be interpreted as risk ratios when the events are rare in both groups (35). The RRs and their
197 95% CIs were displayed using forest plots (implemented via the *forestplot* package v1.10.1 in R (36)). We
198 define the equivalence range for all comparisons as 0.9 to 1.1 – any RR less than 0.9 or more than 1.1 is
199 deemed as an important difference.

200 We conducted two post-hoc sensitivity analyses, the first by excluding Cochrane reviews because they were
201 subjected to strict editorial processes to ensure adherence to methodological conduct and reporting standards,
202 and the second by excluding reviews on COVID-19 due to concerns about short publication turnarounds, which
203 could have an impact on reporting quality (37).

204

205 # RESULTS

206 **Results of the search**

207 Our search retrieved 8,208 records. Out of the first 2,000 randomly sorted titles and abstracts that were
208 screened, we considered 603 as potentially eligible and retrieved the full text for screening. We only needed
209 to screen the first 436 randomly sorted full text reports to reach our target sample size of 300. The full search
210 process was outlined in Fig. 1.

211

212 Fig. 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram of identification, screening and inclusion of systematic reviews

213

214 **General characteristics of systematic reviews**

215 Among the 2020 sample, half of the systematic reviews (n=300, 50%) were led by authors based in three
216 countries – China (32%), the United States (10%) and United Kingdom (8%) (S4 Appendix). The reviews
217 included a median of 12 studies (IQR 8-21), with 6 studies included in the index meta-analysis (IQR 4-10).
218 Most reviews (n=215, 72%) included a financial disclosure statement, of which 97 (32%) declared no funding.
219 Most review authors (n=251, 84%) declared having no conflict of interest. Common softwares used for meta-
220 analysis were Review Manager (n=189, 63%), Stata (n=73, 24%) and R (n=33, 11%).
221 The included reviews covered a wide range of topics. In nearly all reviews (n=294, 98%), the intervention was
222 classified as a health intervention, and in 37 (12%) as a behavioural, social or educational intervention in 37
223 (12%) reviews (some reviews examined both types of interventions). Almost two-thirds of the reviews (n=198,
224 66%) examined the effects of non-pharmacological interventions. Out of 24 ICD-11 categories of diseases and
225 conditions, our sample of reviews captured 23 categories. The top four categories (endocrine, nutritional or
226 metabolic diseases, diseases of the digestive system, the musculoskeletal system, and the circulatory system)
227 accounted for 46% of all systematic reviews.
228 The included systematic reviews were published across 224 journals. Five journals (accounting for 5% of all
229 systematic reviews) specialised in evidence synthesis; 141 journals (accounting for 66% of all systematic

230 reviews) outline a data-sharing policy in the instruction page for authors (S5 Appendix).

231 The general characteristics of the 2014 sample have been described elsewhere (10). In brief, the 2014 sample
232 consisted of 110 systematic reviews indexed in MEDLINE in February 2014, and was similar to the 2020
233 sample in many aspects, such as the sample size of each review (median=13 studies, IQR 7-23), size of the
234 index meta-analysis (median=6 studies, IQR 3-11) and the prevalence of non-pharmacological reviews (n=55,
235 50%). Similar to the 2020 sample, the reviews in 2014 were published in a wide range of journals (n=63),
236 addressed several clinical topics (19 ICD-10 categories) and were predominantly led by authors from China,
237 the UK and Canada (n=55 combined, 50%).

238

239 **Completeness of reporting of reviews and sharing of review materials in systematic reviews from 2020**

240 Of the items we examined, the most frequently reported included declaration of review authors' conflicts of
241 interest (n=281, 94%), each of the components of the PICOS framework in the eligibility criteria (89-99%),
242 meta-analysis model used (98%) and the effect estimates, together with the measures of precision, for each
243 study included in the index meta-analysis (96%) (S4 Appendix).

244 A large number of items were reported in less than 50% of reviews. These include a registration record (38%)
245 or protocol (4%) for the review, the interfaces used to search databases (e.g. Ovid, EBSCOhost) (37%), exact
246 start and end dates of the search range (45%), search strategy for sources that are not bibliographic databases
247 (17%), number of records retrieved for each database (42%), citation for at least one excluded article (22%),
248 methods of data preparation (data conversion, calculation of missing statistics, etc.) (34%) and the
249 heterogeneity variance estimator used for meta-analysis (21%).

250 In terms of sharing review materials, 20 systematic reviews (7%) made data files or analytic code underlying
251 the meta-analysis publicly available, which included two reviews (1%) that shared analytic code. All of these
252 reviews shared these data via supplementary files; two reviews additionally hosted data and analytic code in
253 a public repository. The most commonly shared materials were data files used in analyses, such as RevMan
254 (.rm5) files (n=12/20).

255

256 **Changing patterns of reporting between 2014-2020**

257 We compared 294 systematic reviews of health interventions from our present 2020 sample with 110 reviews
258 in the 2014 sample. Compared to the 2014 reviews, systematic reviews indexed in 2020 more frequently cited
259 a reporting guideline to guide their reporting (RR=2.8, 95% CI 2.1 to 3.8). In addition, systematic reviews in
260 2020 were more likely to report a full search strategy for at least one database (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.6),

261 total number of records retrieved (RR=1.2, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.3) and data preparation methods (RR=2.2, 95% CI
262 1.4 to 3.5). Systematic reviews in 2020 also had a lower rate of sharing meta-analytic data or materials than
263 those in 2014 (RR=0.2, 95% CI 0.1 to 0.4). For other reporting items, the estimated differences between the
264 2020 and 2014 were uncertain as the 95% CIs included the equivalence range (Fig. 2A-B).
265
266 Given the notable discrepancy in the number of Cochrane reviews between the 2014 and 2020 samples, we
267 conducted a sensitivity analysis in which we excluded Cochrane reviews from both samples (8 reviews from
268 2020 sample and 32 reviews from 2014 sample). Three main changes were observed compared to the original
269 analysis. Firstly, existing differences became more pronounced, as observed for citing a reporting guideline
270 (RR=2.0, 95% CI 1.5 to 2.6), full search strategy for at least one database (RR=2.0, 95% CI 1.5 to 2.7) and
271 data preparation method(s) (RR=2.1, 95% CI 1.2 to 3.6). Secondly, uncertainty was eliminated for some items,
272 whose 95% CI now exceeded the equivalence range: non-Cochrane reviews in 2020 were more likely to report
273 a protocol registration record (RR=4.5, 95% CI 2.2 to 9.2), funding source (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.6) and
274 dates of coverage for the databases (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.6). Lastly, after excluding Cochrane reviews,
275 the rate of sharing review data and code of reviews in 2020 became higher than those of 2014, although the
276 association was uncertain (RR=2.2, 95% CI 0.4 to 12.0).
277
278 Fig. 2A. Frequency of reporting items between systematic reviews indexed in 2014 and 2020
279 Fig. 2B. Frequency of reporting items between systematic reviews indexed in 2014 and 2020 (ctn'd)
280
281 **Impact of reporting guidelines on patterns of reporting in systematic reviews from 2020**

282 Of the 300 reviews, 245 (82%) reported using a reporting guideline. Systematic reviews using a reporting
283 guideline appeared to report more frequently a published or registered protocol (RR=1.3, 95% CI 0.9 to 2.0),
284 methods used in study screening (RR=1.2, 95% CI 1.0 to 1.4) and number of records retrieved for each
285 database (RR=1.4, 95% CI 0.9 to 2.2). The confidence intervals included and extended beyond the
286 equivalence range, suggesting that there could be important differences.
287 . For other items, however, evidence that reporting guidelines improved reporting was inconclusive, either
288 because the confidence interval extended beyond the equivalence range in both directions, or the upper limits
289 did not exceed 1.1 We conducted a sensitivity analysis by excluding systematic reviews on COVID-19 (n=6)
290 from both groups, but no notable changes were observed (Fig. 3A-B).
291

Fig. 3A. Relationship between citation of a reporting guideline and reported items

Fig. 3B. Relationship between citation of a reporting guideline and reported items (ctn'd)

Impact of journals on patterns of reporting in systematic reviews from 2020

Only 14 systematic reviews from 2020 were published in specialist evidence synthesis journals, including eight Cochrane reviews. Compared to 286 systematic reviews from 2020 published in non-specialist evidence synthesis journals, these reviews were more likely to report a protocol (RR=1.8, 95% CI 1.2 to 2.5), a full search strategy for at least one database (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1 to 1. 6), details of the screening process (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.2 to 1.4) and ROB assessment processes (RR=1.4, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.8), ROB results for individual studies (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.2 to 1.4) and data preparation methods (RR=2.2, 95% CI 1.5 to 3.3) (Fig. 4). In addition, these systematic reviews performed better in reporting items related to the search methods such as the interface used to search bibliographic databases (RR=2.2, 95% CI 1.6 to 3.0), search strategy for non-database sources (trial registers, Google Scholar, etc.) (RR=6.0, 95% CI 3.4 to 10.5), date of last search (RR=3.7, 95% CI 2.6 to 5.2) as well as extra details of search results such as citation for at least one excluded study (RR=3.3, 95% CI 2.1 to 5.2) and the number of retrieved records from each database (RR=1.8, 95% CI 1.2 to 2.5). They were also more likely to share relevant data and materials (RR=28.7, 95% CI 8.6 to 95.3).

Fig. 4. Relationship between journal type and reported items

A journal's mandatory requirement for data sharing or declaration of data availability was associated with a larger percentage of data or materials being shared with the published systematic review (RR=8.1, 95% CI 3.1 to 21.5). A larger percentage was also observed for these specific types of material: unprocessed data collected from included studies (RR=3.9, 95% CI 1.1 to 14.1) and data files used in analysis (RR=14.6, 95% CI 3. 6 to 60.0). .Results for other types of materials, such as files showing data conversions, analytic code and citations of all screened studies, are inconclusive due to small sample size (Fig. 5). Similar findings were observed when comparing between journals with any data-sharing policy (mandatory or not) and journals without one (S1 Fig.).

Fig. 5. Relationship between journal's data sharing requirements and reported items

DISCUSSION

Findings from our examination of 300 randomly selected systematic reviews indexed in 2020 indicate infrequent reporting of certain items, particularly the availability of a review protocol or registration entry, search strategy for all databases searched, methods of handling data (e.g. data conversions), and sharing of meta-analytic data. This aligns with previous evaluations (2,4,7,38). The scarcity of data and code availability is also echoed by other studies (6,8).

On reporting of systematic reviews

There are two possible reasons why we observed few notable improvements in reporting between 2014 and 2020. Many items were already reported frequently in 2014 (e.g. reporting of competing interests, eligibility criteria, meta-analytic models, effect estimate for each study), leaving little opportunity for improvement. This is reflected by the observation that the greatest improvements were found in items that had been reported by less than 50% of the systematic reviews in 2014 (Fig. 2). Furthermore, Cochrane reviews made up a smaller proportion in our 2020 sample (n=8, 3%) compared to 2014 (n=32, 29%), suggesting a rise in popularity of systematic reviews being produced outside of the auspices of an organisation with editorial processes dedicated to ensuring complete reporting. Our sensitivity analysis, which excluded Cochrane reviews, yielded larger estimates of differences between 2014 and 2020 reviews, suggesting that the improvements between 2014 and 2020 are driven by changes in non-Cochrane reviews. This is highly possible given that Cochrane reviews, owing to their stringent reporting requirements, tend to have less room for improvement than non-Cochrane reviews.

More systematic reviews in 2020 than 2014 cited a reporting guideline yet citing a reporting guideline was not clearly associated with more complete reporting for most items evaluated. This challenges the assumption that referencing a reporting guideline means that the authors have consulted the guideline while reporting the review. In reality, however, several factors could have affected the authors' decision to report (or not to report) certain items. Firstly, authors might not recognise that some items consist of multiple elements that need to be reported in details. For example, we observed among our sample a tendency to report the reviewer arrangement only for the study selection stage, not the subsequent data collection or ROB assessment stages. Secondly, inexperienced reviewers might only consult a reporting guideline at the point of writing up their review, only realising then that they have not recorded all details of the review processes (e.g. number of records excluded, data conversions performed). Thirdly, authors might not be aware of all statistical options available within meta-analytic softwares, and might incorrectly assume that readers can deduce the meta-analytic methods used simply from the name of the software and packages used.

354 In view of these findings, we recommend interviews be conducted with review authors to explore their
355 understanding of reporting guidelines and identify challenges in reporting of reviews. There are certainly needs
356 for development of tools that facilitate the reporting process. For example, a computer-based tool to break
357 down the PRISMA reporting recommendations into digestible steps would be useful for first-time reviewers.
358 Another example would be a guide specifying which details of the meta-analytic model to report on a forest
359 plot, and how to accomplish that in various meta-analytic softwares. Lastly, this raises the discussion on
360 whether a universal mechanism should be applied during peer review to verify that authors adhered to all items
361 of the reporting guideline they cited, and how to effectively enforce this.

362

363 **On data sharing in systematic reviews**

364 Our study demonstrates that presence of a data sharing policy by the publishing journal had positive impacts
365 on the frequency of sharing certain types of data necessary for replicating systematic reviews. The overall rate
366 of data and code sharing, however, leaves much to be desired. While two-third of our reviews (66%) were
367 subjected to some form of data policy by the journal in which their review was published, less than a third
368 (32%) complied to the policy by including a *Data Availability Statement* or actually sharing any data files; only
369 7% shared at least one type of file. A meta-research study featuring a similar percentage of journals with open
370 data policies (70%) found similar results (9% shared data or code, and 29% either shared data or included a
371 *Data Availability Statement* (or both)) (39).

372 The low rate of data and code sharing can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, the larger number of non-
373 Cochrane reviews in 2020 explains the less frequent availability of data and materials used for analysis in this
374 later sample (compared to 2014), as authors of Cochrane reviews routinely share RevMan files containing
375 meta-analysis data, which were rarely made available for other reviews. Secondly, there are motivational and
376 technical barriers to data sharing that cannot be sufficiently addressed by data sharing policies (40). For
377 example, while journals can encourage data sharing and suggest available options for data upload, reviewers
378 may lack the technical expertise and time to prepare and annotate their files for public view. Moreover,
379 concerns about data ownership, lack of incentives and fear of criticism can impede motivations to share review
380 data. Some studies have explored these barriers in general academia (40,41), but we are uncertain whether
381 researchers in evidence synthesis will face all of these barriers or even unidentified barriers unique to
382 systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Future studies in the REPRISE project will explore systematic
383 reviewers' perspectives on barriers and incentives to reporting and data-sharing in order to address these
384 questions (25).

385 Lastly, our findings also highlight the important role of supplementary files or public repositories for data
386 sharing in systematic reviews. Supplementary files and public repositories enable authors to share data and
387 materials necessary to validate the review process while keeping the main article concise and relevant to lay
388 readers. For example, authors can outline in a separate file the database-specific search strategy, number of
389 records retrieved and date of last search for each database consulted. We should endeavour to change the
390 notion that this information is less important and make sharing of review data and materials via
391 supplementary files or public repositories a standard practice for systematic reviews. In order to achieve this,
392 concerted efforts are needed to standardise data structures, establish fair use guidelines and create a
393 supportive environment for collaboration in the systematic review community.

394

395 **Strengths and limitations**

396 Although several other meta-research studies have explored completeness of reporting and the frequency of
397 data sharing in systematic reviews (2–5,7,8), our study offers several methodological advantages. Our sample
398 was obtained from several databases, and was not limited to a specific topic or journal. Our study captured
399 not only the frequency of data sharing, but also the type of systematic review data, code and materials being
400 shared. All stages of study screening and data collection were conducted by two authors independently, which
401 minimised random and systematic errors and increased accuracy. Lastly, we directly compared our 2020
402 sample with a 2014 sample that was retrieved and evaluated using the same criteria (9,10), thus minimising
403 the impact of methodological variations on temporal trends.

404 Nonetheless, our study was not without limitations. As a cross-sectional study, our results should be viewed
405 as generating hypotheses rather than proving a causal association (e.g. between data sharing policies and
406 actual sharing of systematic review data). Some items were reported by fewer than 50 reviews, such as sharing
407 of data & materials, heterogeneity variance estimator used, and a search strategy for non-bibliographic
408 sources. This leads to uncertainty in interpreting their risk ratios, as the 95% confidence intervals were either
409 too wide or crossed the null value (or both). Future studies should be conducted specifically for systematic
410 reviews reporting these items to ensure adequate power. Despite intending to include systematic reviews of
411 the effects of health, social, behavioural and educational interventions, the vast majority of reviews evaluated
412 the effects of a health intervention. Therefore, our findings are less generalizable to systematic reviews of the
413 other types of interventions. Lastly, our findings do not necessarily generalise to systematic reviews indexed
414 in databases other than the ones we searched or to systematic reviews written in languages other than English.

415

416 ## CONCLUSION

417 Improvements in completeness of reporting of systematic reviews were observed over time for a few items,
418 especially for items that were infrequently reported in 2014. There was also an increase in self-reported use
419 of a reporting guideline; however, citing a reporting guideline was not necessarily associated with improved
420 reporting. Sharing of systematic review data, analytic code and other materials was infrequent. Data sharing
421 policies could be an effective strategy to promote sharing of systematic review data and materials.

422

423 **Acknowledgement:** Not applicable

424

425 **Funding**: This research is funded by an Australian Research Council Discovery Early Career Researcher
426 Award (DE200101618), held by MJP. JEM is supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council
427 Career Development Fellowship (APP1143429). DM is supported in part by a University Research Chair,
428 University of Ottawa. NRH is funded by an Alexander von Humboldt Experienced Researcher Fellowship. DGH
429 is supported by an Australian Commonwealth Government Research Training Program Scholarship. RK is
430 supported by a Monash Graduate Scholarship and a Monash International Tuition Scholarship. The funders
431 had no role in the study design, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

432

433 **Data availability statement:** All datasets and analytic code can be found on the Open Science Framework
434 (DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/JSP9T).

435

436 **Author contributions**

437 PYN**:** Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft Preparation
438 RK, ZA**:** Investigation, Writing – Review & Editing
439 JEM**:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing
440 SEB, NRH, DGH, SK, SM, DM, SN, DN, PT, VAW**:** Writing – Review & Editing
441 MJP**:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

443

444 **REFERENCE**

445 1. Hoffmann F, Allers K, Rombey T, Helbach J, Hoffmann A, Mathes T, et al. Nearly 80
446 systematic reviews were published each day: Observational study on trends in epidemiology
447 and reporting over the years 2000-2019. J Clin Epidemiol [Internet]. 2021 Oct 1 [cited 2021
448 Nov 11];138:1–11. Available from:
449 http://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895435621001748/fulltext

450 2. Cullis PS, Gudlaugsdottir K, Andrews J. A systematic review of the quality of conduct and
451 reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in paediatric surgery [Internet]. Vol. 12,
452 PLoS ONE. PLoS One; 2017 [cited 2021 Sep 1]. Available from:
453 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/28384296/

454 3. Peters JPM, Hooft L, Grolman W, Stegeman I. Reporting quality of systematic reviews and
455 meta-analyses of otorhinolaryngologic articles based on the PRISMA statement. PLoS One
456 [Internet]. 2015 Aug 28 [cited 2021 Sep 1];10(8). Available from:
457 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/26317406/

458 4. Wayant C, Page MJ, Vassar M. Evaluation of Reproducible Research Practices in Oncology
459 Systematic Reviews With Meta-analyses Referenced by National Comprehensive Cancer
460 Network Guidelines. JAMA Oncol [Internet]. 2019 Nov 1 [cited 2021 Sep 1];5(11):1550–5.
461 Available from: https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamaoncology/fullarticle/2749257

462 5. Zhu Y, Fan L, Zhang H, Wang M, Mei X, Hou J, et al. Is the best evidence good enough:
463 Quality assessment and factor analysis of meta-analyses on depression. PLoS One [Internet].
464 2016 Jun 1 [cited 2021 Sep 1];11(6). Available from:
465 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/27336624/

466 6. López-Nicolás R, López-López JA, Rubio-Aparicio M, Sánchez-Meca J. A meta-review of
467 transparency and reproducibility-related reporting practices in published meta-analyses on
468 clinical psychological interventions (2000–2020). Behav Res Methods [Internet]. 2021 Jun 26
469 [cited 2021 Sep 1]; Available from: https://pubmed-ncbi-nlm-nih-
470 gov.wwwproxy1.library.unsw.edu.au/34173943/

471 7. Koffel JB, Rethlefsen ML. Reproducibility of Search Strategies Is Poor in Systematic Reviews
472 Published in High-Impact Pediatrics, Cardiology and Surgery Journals: A Cross-Sectional
473 Study. PLoS One [Internet]. 2016 Sep 1 [cited 2021 Sep 1];11(9):e0163309. Available from:
474 https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0163309

475 8. Polanin JR, Hennessy EA, Tsuji S. Transparency and Reproducibility of Meta-Analyses in
476 Psychology: A Meta-Review [Internet]. Vol. 15, Perspectives on Psychological Science. SAGE
477 PublicationsSage CA: Los Angeles, CA; 2020 [cited 2021 Sep 1]. p. 1026–41. Available from:
478 https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1745691620906416

479 9. Page MJ, Shamseer L, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Sampson M, Tricco AC, et al. Epidemiology
480 and Reporting Characteristics of Systematic Reviews of Biomedical Research: A Cross-
481 Sectional Study. PLOS Med [Internet]. 2016 May 1 [cited 2021 Jul 22];13(5):e1002028.
482 Available from:
483 https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1002028

484 10. Page MJ, Altman DG, Shamseer L, McKenzie JE, Ahmadzai N, Wolfe D, et al. Reproducible
485 research practices are underused in systematic reviews of biomedical interventions [Internet].
486 Vol. 94, Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. Elsevier; 2018 [cited 2021 Jul 22]. p. 8–18. Available
487 from: http://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895435617305358/fulltext

488 11. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann T, Mulrow CD, et al. Mapping of
489 reporting guidance for systematic reviews and meta-analyses generated a comprehensive
490 item bank for future reporting guidelines. J Clin Epidemiol [Internet]. 2020 Feb 1 [cited 2021
491 Sep 25];118:60–8. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31740319/

492 12. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, Group TP. Preferred Reporting Items for
493 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLOS Med [Internet]. 2009
494 Jul [cited 2021 Jul 22];6(7):e1000097. Available from:
495 https://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097

496 13. Page MJ, Moher D. Evaluations of the uptake and impact of the Preferred Reporting Items for
497 Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement and extensions: A scoping

498 review. Syst Rev [Internet]. 2017 [cited 2021 Sep 30];6(1). Available from:
499 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/29258593/

500 14. Cochrane. Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews [Internet]. [cited
501 2021 Dec 26]. Available from: https://methods.cochrane.org/methodological-expectations-
502 cochrane-intervention-reviews

503 15. The Campbell Collaboration. Methodological Expectations of Campbell Collaboration
504 Intervention Reviews (MECCIR) [Internet]. [cited 2021 Dec 26]. Available from:
505 https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/about-meccir.html

506 16. Veroniki AA, Tsokani S, Zevgiti S, Pagkalidou I, Kontouli K-M, Ambarcioglu P, et al. Do
507 reporting guidelines have an impact? Empirical assessment of changes in reporting before
508 and after the PRISMA extension statement for network meta-analysis. Syst Rev [Internet].
509 2021 Dec 10 [cited 2021 Sep 30];10(1):246. Available from:
510 https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34507621/

511 17. Mayo-Wilson E, Li T, Fusco N, Dickersin K. Practical guidance for using multiple data sources
512 in systematic reviews and meta-analyses (with examples from the MUDS study). Res Synth
513 Methods [Internet]. 2018 Mar 1 [cited 2021 Dec 26];9(1):2. Available from:
514 /pmc/articles/PMC5888128/

515 18. Wolfenden L, Grimshaw J, Williams CM, Yoong SL. Time to consider sharing data extracted
516 from trials included in systematic reviews. Syst Rev [Internet]. 2016 Nov 3 [cited 2021 Dec
517 26];5(1). Available from: /pmc/articles/PMC5096003/

518 19. Lakens D, Hilgard J, Staaks J. On the reproducibility of meta-analyses: six practical
519 recommendations. BMC Psychol 2016 41 [Internet]. 2016 May 31 [cited 2021 Aug 31];4(1):1–
520 10. Available from: https://bmcpsychology.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s40359-016-
521 0126-3

522 20. Moher D, Cobey KD. Ensuring the success of data sharing in Canada.
523 https://doi.org/101139/facets-2021-0031 [Internet]. 2021 [cited 2021 Nov 18];6:1534–8.
524 Available from: https://www.facetsjournal.com/doi/abs/10.1139/facets-2021-0031

525 21. Hardwicke TE, Mathur MB, MacDonald K, Nilsonne G, Banks GC, Kidwell MC, et al. Data
526 availability, reusability, and analytic reproducibility: evaluating the impact of a mandatory open
527 data policy at the journal Cognition. R Soc Open Sci [Internet]. 2018 Aug 1 [cited 2021 Sep
528 30];5(8). Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rsos.180448

529 22. Christensen G, Dafoe A, Miguel E, Moore DA, Rose AK. A study of the impact of data sharing
530 on article citations using journal policies as a natural experiment. PLoS One [Internet]. 2019
531 Dec 1 [cited 2021 Sep 30];14(12):e0225883. Available from:
532 https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0225883

533 23. Nuijten MB, Borghuis J, Veldkamp CLS, Dominguez-Alvarez L, van Assen MALM, Wicherts
534 JM. Journal Data Sharing Policies and Statistical Reporting Inconsistencies in Psychology.
535 Collabra Psychol [Internet]. 2017 Jan 1 [cited 2021 Sep 30];3(1). Available from:
536 /collabra/article/3/1/31/112350/Journal-Data-Sharing-Policies-and-Statistical

537 24. Federer LM, Belter CW, Joubert DJ, Livinski A, Lu Y-L, Snyders LN, et al. Data sharing in
538 PLOS ONE: An analysis of Data Availability Statements. PLoS One [Internet]. 2018 May 1
539 [cited 2021 Sep 30];13(5):e0194768. Available from:
540 https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0194768

541 25. Page MJ, Moher D, Fidler FM, Higgins JPT, Brennan SE, Haddaway NR, et al. The REPRISE
542 project: protocol for an evaluation of REProducibility and Replicability In Syntheses of
543 Evidence. Syst Rev 2021 101 [Internet]. 2021 Apr 16 [cited 2021 Jul 22];10(1):1–13. Available
544 from: https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-021-
545 01670-0

546 26. Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence Systematic Review Software, Melbourne Australia
547 [Internet]. Https://Www.Covidence.Org/. Melbourne; 2020 [cited 2021 Jul 22]. Available from:
548 www.covidence.org

549 27. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data
550 capture (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing
551 translational research informatics support. J Biomed Inform [Internet]. 2009 Apr [cited 2021

552 Jul 22];42(2):377–81. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/18929686/

553 28. Fantini D. easyPubMed: Search and Retrieve Scientific Publication Records from PubMed
554 [Internet]. Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN); 2019 [cited 2021 Jul 22]. Available
555 from: https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/easyPubMed/index.html

556 29. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing [Internet]. Vienna,
557 Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2013. Available from: http://www.r-
558 project.org/

559 30. Naudet F, Sakarovitch C, Janiaud P, Cristea I, Fanelli D, Moher D, et al. Data sharing and
560 reanalysis of randomized controlled trials in leading biomedical journals with a full data sharing
561 policy: survey of studies published in The BMJ and PLOS Medicine. BMJ [Internet]. 2018 Feb
562 13 [cited 2021 Jul 22];360:400. Available from: https://www.bmj.com/content/360/bmj.k400

563 31. Center for Open Science. The TOP Guidelines Summary Table [Internet]. Blackwell
564 Publishing Ltd; [cited 2021 Nov 11]. Available from: https://www.cos.io/initiatives/top-
565 guidelines

566 32. Firth D. Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. Biometrika [Internet]. 1993 Mar 1
567 [cited 2021 Sep 8];80(1):27–38. Available from:
568 https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article/80/1/27/228364

569 33. Doerken S, Avalos M, Lagarde E, Schumacher M. Penalized logistic regression with low
570 prevalence exposures beyond high dimensional settings. PLoS One [Internet]. 2019 May 1
571 [cited 2021 Sep 25];14(5):e0217057. Available from:
572 https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0217057

573 34. Heinze G, Schemper M. A solution to the problem of separation in logistic regression. Stat
574 Med [Internet]. 2002 Aug 30 [cited 2021 Sep 8];21(16):2409–19. Available from:
575 https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/sim.1047

576 35. Ranganathan P, Aggarwal R, Pramesh CS. Common pitfalls in statistical analysis: Odds
577 versus risk. Perspect Clin Res [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2021 Sep 25];6(4):222. Available from:
578 /pmc/articles/PMC4640017/

36. Johnston A, Kelly SE, Hsieh SC, Skidmore B, Wells GA. Systematic reviews of clinical practice guidelines: a methodological guide. J Clin Epidemiol [Internet]. 2019 Dec 12 [cited 2021 Jul 22];108:64–76. Available from: https://cran.r-project.org/package=forestplot

37. Abbott R, Bethel A, Rogers M, Whear R, Orr N, Shaw L, et al. Characteristics, quality and volume of the first 5 months of the COVID-19 evidence synthesis infodemic: a meta-research study. BMJ Evidence-Based Med [Internet]. 2021 Jun 3 [cited 2021 Aug 21];0. Available from: https://ebm.bmj.com/content/early/2021/06/03/bmjebm-2021-111710

38. Ioannidis JPA. The Mass Production of Redundant, Misleading, and Conflicted Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses [Internet]. Vol. 94, Milbank Quarterly. The Royal Society; 2016 [cited 2021 Aug 31]. p. 485–514. Available from: https://royalsocietypublishing.org/doi/abs/10.1098/rsos.190806

39. Alsheikh-Ali AA, Qureshi W, Al-Mallah MH, Ioannidis JPA. Public Availability of Published Research Data in High-Impact Journals. PLoS One [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2021 Aug 31];6(9):e24357. Available from: https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0024357

40. Van Panhuis WG, Paul P, Emerson C, Grefenstette J, Wilder R, Herbst AJ, et al. A systematic review of barriers to data sharing in public health [Internet]. Vol. 14, BMC Public Health. BMC Public Health; 2014 [cited 2021 Sep 1]. Available from: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/25377061/

41. Zhu Y. Open-access policy and data-sharing practice in UK academia: https://doi.org/101177/0165551518823174 [Internet]. 2019 Jan 21 [cited 2021 Sep 30];46(1):41–52. Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/0165551518823174

604 **Supporting Information**

605 S1 Appendix: Eligibility criteria for study inclusion

606 S2 Appendix: Search strategy

607 S3 Appendix: Data extraction form

608 S4 Appendix: Descriptive characteristics of systematic reviews indexed in 2020

609 S5 Appendix: List of journals and their policies

610 S6 Appendix: Comparison between reviews of health interventions in 2014 vs 2020

611 S1 Fig: Relationship between journal's presence of a data sharing policy and reported items



**There were 6,292 unique records after duplicates were removed, but we only needed to screen the first 2000 randomly sorted records to reach our target sample size.*

***We only needed to screen the first 436 of the 603 full text reports retrieved to reach our target sample size.*

Figure

Figure 2. Frequency of reporting items between systematic reviews published in 2014 and 2020



Figure

Figure 2. Frequency of reporting items between systematic reviews published in 2014 and 2020

(B)



Figure

Figure 3. Relationship between citation of a reporting guideline and reported items

(A)



Figure

Figure 3. Relationship between citation of a reporting guideline and reported items

(B)



Figure


Reported item
No. of studies (%)
Equivalence range
Evidence synthesis journals
Other journals
Risk ratio (95% CI)
Citation of a reporting guideline 245/300 (82) 14/14 (100) 231/286 (81) 1.2 (1.2, 1.3)
Funding source 215/300 (72) 11/14 (79) 204/286 (71) 1.1 (0.8, 1.5)
Conflict of interest 281/300 (94) 12/14 (86) 269/286 (94) 0.9 (0.7, 1.1)
Protocol / registration record 126/300 (42) 10/14 (71) 116/286 (41) 1.8 (1.2, 2.5)
Eligibility criteria - Participants 275/300 (92) 14/14 (100) 261/286 (91) 1.1 (1.1, 1.1)
Eligibility criteria - Intervention 296/300 (99) 13/14 (93) 283/286 (99) 0.9 (0.8, 1.1)
Eligibility criteria - Comparator 267/300 (89) 13/14 (93) 254/286 (89) 1.0 (0.9, 1.2)
Eligiblity criteria - Outcomes 298/300 (99) 14/14 (100) 284/286 (99) 1.0 (1.0, 1.0)
Eligibility criteria - Study design 278/300 (93) 14/14 (100) 264/286 (92) 1.1 (1.0, 1.1)
Interface used to search databases 112/300 (37) 11/14 (79) 101/286 (35) 2.2 (1.6, 3.0)
Dates of coverage of databases 241/300 (80) 11/14 (79) 230/286 (80) 1.0 (0.7, 1.3)
Date of last search 72/300 (24) 11/14 (79) 61/286 (21) 3.7 (2.6, 5.2)
Search strategy - Databases 214/300 (71) 13/14 (93) 201/286 (70) 1.3 (1.1, 1.6)
Search strategy - Trial register / other sources 24/140 (17) 7/9 (78) 17/131 (13) 6.0 (3.4, 10.5)
Screening method 233/300 (78) 14/14 (100) 219/286 (77) 1.3 (1.2, 1.4)
Data collection method 229/300 (76) 12/14 (86) 217/286 (76) 1.1 (0.9, 1.4)
ROB assessment method 185/300 (62) 12/14 (86) 173/286 (60) 1.4 (1.1, 1.8)
ROB assessment per study 231/300 (77) 14/14 (100) 217/286 (76) 1.3 (1.2, 1.4)
Total records retrieved 300/300 (100) 14/14 (100) 286/286 (100) 1.0 (1.0, 1.0)
Records retrieved per database 126/300 (42) 10/14 (71) 116/286 (41) 1.8 (1.2, 2.5)
Citing at least 1 excluded articles 65/300 (22) 9/14 (64) 56/286 (20) 3.3 (2.1, 5.2)
Data preparation methods 101/300 (34) 10/14 (71) 91/286 (32) 2.2 (1.5, 3.3)
Meta-analysis model (e.g. fixed-effects, random-effects) 294/300 (98) 14/14 (100) 280/286 (98) 1.0 (1.0, 1.0)
Meta-analysis method (e.g. Mantel-Haenszel, inverse variance) 218/300 (73) 11/14 (79) 207/286 (72) 1.1 (0.8, 1.4)
Heterogeneity variance estimator (e.g. DerSimonian-Laird) 50/235 (21) 2/12 (17) 48/223 (22) 0.9 (0.2, 3.7)
Summary statistics per study 215/300 (72) 11/14 (79) 204/286 (71) 1.1 (0.8, 1.5)
Effect estimate and measure of precision per study 288/300 (96) 14/14 (100) 274/286 (96) 1.0 (1.0, 1.1)
Sharing of data and materials 20/300 (7) 8/14 (57) 12/286 (4) 28.7 (8.6, 95.3)
0 0.5 0.9 1 1.1 1.5 2 2.5 3 3.5 4 4.5 5 5.5 6 6.5
<--- Favour other journals --- --- Favour evidence synthesis journals --->

Figure


Reported item
No. of studies (%)
Equivalence range
Mandatory requirement
No mandatory requirement
Risk ratio (95% CI)
All search strategies
81/300 (27)
27/74 (36)
54/226 (24)
1.5 (1.0, 2.2)
Sharing of other data/material
20/300 (7)
14/74 (19)
6/226 (3)
8.1 (3.1, 21.5)
Unprocessed extracted data
9/300 (3)
5/74 (7)
4/226 (2)
3.9 (1.1, 14.1)
Data conversions performed
1/300 (0)
1/74 (1)
0/226 (0)
9.2 (0.4, 231.9)
Data used in analysis
12/300 (4)
10/74 (14)
2/226 (1)
14.6 (3.6, 60.0)
Analytic code
2/300 (1)
1/74 (1)
1/226 (0)
3.1 (0.3, 30.3)
Citations of included & excluded studies
2/300 (1)
1/74 (1)
1/226 (0)
3.1 (0.3, 30.3)
Metadata of shared files
1/300 (0)
1/74 (1)
0/226 (0)
9.2 (0.4, 231.9)
0.5
0.9
1
1.1
1.5
2
2.5
3
3.5
4
4.5
5
<--- Favour not mandatory ---
--- Favour mandatory --->
Note: Mandatory requirements refer to a mandatory instruction for sharing of data and materials, or in the absence of such data, a Data Availability Statement stating why data was not shared and whether data is available upon request.

Figure