Title: Changing patterns in reporting and sharing of review data in systematic reviews with meta-analysis of the effects of interventions: a meta-research study from the REPRISE project

Authors

Phi-Yen Nguyen (0000-0002-0476-3385)[1], Raju Kanukula (0000-0003-0793-786X)[1], Joanne E McKenzie (0000-0003-3534-1641)[1], Zainab Alqaidoom (0000-0002-5880-3792)[1], Sue E Brennan (0000-0003-1789-8809)[1], Neal R Haddaway (0000-0003-3902-2234)[2,3,4], Daniel G Hamilton (0000-0001-8104-474X)[5], Sathya Karunananthan (0000-0002-4247-4752)[6], Steve McDonald (0000-0003-2832-5205)[1], David Moher (0000-0003-2434-4206)[7,8], Shinichi Nakagawa (0000-0002-7765-5182)[9], David Nunan (0000-0003-4597-1276)[10], Peter Tugwell (0000-0001-5062-0556)[8,11,12], Vivian A Welch (0000-0002-5238-7097)[8,12], Matthew J Page (0000-0002-4242-7526)[1,*]

[1] Methods in Evidence Synthesis Unit, 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

Word count: 4,794 words (excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables)

Keywords: systematic reviews, meta-analysis, evidence synthesis, reporting guidelines, checklists, data sharing, code sharing, data availability, code availability, open science, open data, academic journals, research reporting, research transparency, methodology research, methodological research, meta-research

ABSTRACT (330 words)

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

Design: Cross-sectional meta-research study

Sample: A random sample of 300 SRs with meta-analysis of aggregate data on the effects of a health, social, behavioural or educational intervention, which were indexed in PubMed, Science Citation Index, Social Sciences Citation Index, Scopus and Education Collection in November 2020.

Analysis/Outcomes: The extent of complete reporting and frequency of sharing review materials in these reviews were compared with 110 SRs indexed in February 2014. Associations between completeness of reporting and various factors (e.g. self-reported use of reporting guidelines, journal's data sharing policies) were examined 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 [2.1 to 3.8]), report the full search strategy for at least one database (RR=1.3 [1.1 to 1.6]) and methods of data preparation for meta-analysis (RR=2.2 [1.4 to 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 [3.1 to 21.4]).

Conclusion: Reporting in systematic reviews has improved between 2014-2020 for some reporting items. Frequency of sharing review materials remains low. There was an increase in self-reported use of a reporting guideline; however, it is uncertain whether citing a reporting guideline was associated with improved reporting. Data sharing policies of journals potentially encourage sharing of review materials.

SUMMARY BOX

What is already known on this topic

- Complete reporting of methods and results, as well as sharing data and analytic code, enhances transparency and reproducibility of systematic reviews. The extent of complete reporting and sharing data or analytic code among systematic reviews needs to be comprehensively assessed.
- Use of reporting guidelines, which are designed to improve reporting in systematic reviews, is increasing. It is unclear whether this increase had an impact on reporting of methods and results in systematic reviews.
- More journals are adopting open data policies which aim to promote data sharing. The impact of these policies on sharing data and analytic code in systematic reviews is also unclear.

What this study adds

- Reporting in systematic reviews has improved between 2014-2020, especially for items that had previously been infrequently reported. Frequency of sharing review data and analytic code remains low.
- Our study found an increase in self-reported use of a reporting guideline between 2014-2020; however, citing a reporting guideline was only associated with improved reporting of certain items.
- Our findings suggest data sharing policies of journals had a positive impact on sharing of review data and analytic code.

INTRODUCTION

Systematic reviews underpin many government policies and professional society guideline recommendations [1]. To ensure systematic reviews are valuable to decision makers, authors should completely report the methods and results of their review. Complete reporting allows users to judge whether the chosen methods may have biased the review findings. Incomplete reporting of the methods prevents such an assessment and can preclude attempts to replicate the findings. Several meta-research studies have evaluated the completeness of methods and results reporting in systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Many of these were narrow in scope, focusing only on reviews of specific health topics [2–6] or reviews published in selected journals [7,8]. In other studies, the examined sample of reviews were relatively more diverse, but were published almost a decade ago [9,10], or were evaluated against a small set of reporting outcomes [1].

Therefore, there is a need for a comprehensive, up-to-date evaluation of completeness of reporting among systematic reviews.

To address incomplete reporting of methods and results in systematic reviews, several reporting guidelines have been developed, with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement [11] among the most widely used. Reporting guidelines provide a structure for reporting a systematic review, along with recommendations of items to report [12]. Studies examining adherence to PRISMA suggest that for some items (e.g. inclusion of a flow diagram) there was improvement after the introduction of the PRISMA statement in 2009, but that others (e.g. mention of a review protocol) remained infrequently reported [13]. Similarly, improvements in the reporting of network meta-analysis (NMA) were observed after the introduction of the PRISMA-NMA extension [14]; however, the authors concluded that the improvements could not be attributed solely to this checklist. The usefulness of reporting guidelines in promoting more complete reporting therefore remains unclear.

In addition to transparent reporting, advocates for research transparency [15,16] also recommend authors share systematic review data files and analytic code used to generate meta-analyses, which enables independent verification of findings [17]. While all data for a meta-analysis is typically summarised in a tables or forest plots, sharing an editable file containing extracted data (e.g., CSV, RevMan) reduces the time and risk of errors associated with manual extraction of such data. This then facilitates the review's reuse in future updates and replications, or its inclusion in overviews of reviews and clinical practice guidelines [17,18]. Infrequent sharing of data in systematic reviews in health research has been observed, but these findings may not generalise to all health topics [4] or across journals [7]. Moreover, the types of data shared (e.g. unprocessed data extracted from reports, data included in meta-analyses) has not been examined.

In the past decade, an increasing number of journals have adopted policies on data sharing [19], with 29% of journals in Scopus recommending data sharing [20]. Journals can either make data sharing compulsory, or require authors to make a public statement regarding the availability of data (known as a *Data Availability Statement*) [21]. Some studies have explored the impact of such data policies (often termed 'open data policies') on the frequency of data availability statements and data files among academic papers [22–25]. However, none of these studies examined systematic reviews exclusively, and therefore their findings may not be generalisable to reviews, which produce different types of data to that generated from clinical trials and laboratory experiments.

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

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

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

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

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

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

METHODS

This study was conducted as one of a suite of studies in the REPRISE (REProducibility and Replicability In Syntheses of Evidence) project. The REPRISE project is investigating various aspects relating to the transparency, reproducibility and replicability of systematic reviews with meta-analysis of the effects of health, social, behavioural and educational interventions. Methods for all studies were pre-specified in the same protocol [26]. Deviations from the protocol for the current study are outlined in Supplemental data.

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 Supplemental data 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 (IPD) were excluded because all eligible systematic reviews in this study will be subjected to a reproducibility check in another component of the REPRISE project [26], and we lack the resources to reproduce IPD meta-analyses. 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. All searches were 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 Supplemental data.

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 [27] 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 absolute margin of error of 6%, assuming a prevalence of 50%; for a prevalence of less (or greater) than 50%, the absolute 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 [28]. 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 and the form was adjusted as necessary. The full data collection form (Supplemental data) includes a subset of items used in 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 previous evaluations [9,10] to facilitate comparison.

The form consisted of three sections (Table 1). The first section captured general characteristics of the review, which were all extracted manually, except for the country of the corresponding author, which was extracted using R code adapted from the *easyPubMed* package v2.13 [29,30]. The interventions were classified as health, behavioural, social or educational interventions (see definitions in Supplemental data). The second section consisted of items describing reporting characteristics of the review and the index meta-

analysis (defined as the first meta-analysis mentioned in the Abstract/Results sections), and data-sharing characteristics of the review. To facilitate our analysis of the impact of reporting guidelines, 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. All journal policy information was sought in August 2021.

We collected data from the main report of the systematic review, any supplementary file provided on the journal server or any cited repository, the review protocol if the authors specified that the relevant information was contained therein, as well as journal websites (Table 1). In the event of discrepancies between the protocol and the main report, we gave preference to data from the main report.

Secondary use of data collected on systematic reviews from 2014

We obtained the dataset previously collated by Page et al. [10], which included data on completeness of reporting and sharing of review data in a random sample of 110 systematic reviews of health interventions indexed in MEDLINE in February 2014. All systematic reviews included in this 2014 sample met the same eligibility criteria that the 2020 reviews had to meet. We extracted from the 2014 dataset individual review data for all reporting and sharing items that were worded the same or similarly as the items collected in the 2020 sample. Where necessary, we recoded data in the 2014 sample to ensure harmonisation with the 2020 sample. We did not collect any additional data on the systematic reviews (or the journals they were published in) in the 2014 sample.

Data analysis

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

(a) reviews published in 2020 in an evidence synthesis journal *versus* published elsewhere;

(b) reviews of health interventions published in 2020 *versus* reviews of health interventions published in

2014

(c) reviews published in 2020 reporting use of a reporting guideline (e.g. PRISMA) *versus* not reporting use;

(d) reviews published in 2020 in journals with *versus* without a data-sharing policy;

(e) reviews published in 2020 in journals with *versus* without a policy that mandates either data sharing or declaration of data availability, irrespective of whether the policy applies universally to all studies or specifically to systematic reviews.

Risk ratios (RR) and Wald-type normal 95% confidence intervals (CI) were calculated using the *epitool* package v0.5-10.1 (R v4.0.3) [31]. When the numerators were small (<5) in either group, or the outcome was very rare (<5%) in either group, we instead used penalised likelihood logistic regression (implemented via the *logistf* package v1.24 in R [32]. Penalised likelihood logistic regression has been shown to improve estimation of the odds ratio and its confidence interval for rare events or unbalanced samples [33,34]. The odds ratios from these models can be interpreted as risk ratios when the events are rare in both groups [35]. The RRs and their 95% CIs were displayed using forest plots (implemented via the *forestplot* package v1.10.1 in R) [36]. We defined an equivalence range for all comparisons as 0.9 to 1.1 – any RR less than 0.9 or more than 1.1 was deemed as an important difference.

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

RESULTS

Results of the search

Our search retrieved 8,208 records (Fig. 1). Out of the first 2,000 randomly sorted titles and abstracts that were screened, we considered 603 as potentially eligible and retrieved the full text for screening. We only needed to screen the first 436 randomly sorted full text reports to reach our target sample size of 300. All 300 included systematic reviews were verified to be indexed in PubMed; this ensures the comparison with systematic reviews indexed in MEDLINE in 2014 was appropriate. Citations of all records identified, screened, excluded and included are available on the Open Science Framework (DOI:

10.17605/OSF.IO/JSP9T).



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

General characteristics of systematic reviews

Among the 2020 sample (n=300), half of the systematic reviews (n=151, 50%) had a corresponding author based in one of three countries – China (32%), the United States (10%) and United Kingdom (8%) (Table 2). The reviews included a median of 12 studies (IQR 8-21), with index meta-analyses including a median of 6 studies (IQR 4-10). Most reviews (n=215, 72%) included a financial disclosure statement, of which 97 (32%) declared no funding. Most review authors (n=251, 84%) declared having no conflict of interest. Common softwares used for meta-analysis were Review Manager (n=189, 63%), Stata (n=73, 24%) and R (n=33, 11%).

The included reviews covered a wide range of topics. The intervention was classified as a health intervention

in nearly all reviews (n=294, 98%), and as a behavioural, social or educational intervention in 37 (12%) of reviews (some reviews examined both types of interventions). Almost two-thirds of the reviews (n=198, 66%) examined the effects of non-pharmacological interventions. Out of 24 ICD-11 categories of diseases and conditions, our sample of reviews captured 23 categories. The top four categories (endocrine, nutritional or metabolic diseases, diseases of the digestive system, the musculoskeletal system, and the circulatory system) accounted for 46% of all systematic reviews.

The included systematic reviews were published across 224 journals. Five journals (accounting for 5% of all systematic reviews) specialised in evidence synthesis; 141 journals (accounting for 66% of all systematic reviews) outline a data-sharing policy in the instruction page for authors (Supplemental data).

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

Completeness of reporting of reviews in systematic reviews from 2020

Of the items we examined, the most frequently reported included declaration of review authors' conflicts of interest (n=281, 94%), each of the components of the PICOS framework in the eligibility criteria (89-99%), meta-analysis model used (98%) and the effect estimates, together with the measures of precision, for each study included in the index meta-analysis (96%) (Table 2).

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

Sharing of data, analytic code and other review materials in systematic reviews from 2020

In our 2020 sample, 20 systematic reviews (7%) made data files or analytic code underlying the meta-

analysis publicly available, which included two reviews (1%) that shared analytic code. All of these reviews shared these data via supplementary files; two reviews additionally hosted data and analytic code in a public repository. The most commonly shared materials were data files used in analyses, such as RevMan (.rm5) files (n=12/20).

Changing patterns of reporting between 2014-2020

We compared 294 systematic reviews of health interventions from our 2020 sample with 110 reviews in the 2014 sample. Compared to the 2014 reviews, systematic reviews indexed in 2020 more frequently cited a reporting guideline (RR=2.8, 95% CI 2.1 to 3.8). In addition, systematic reviews in 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), total number of records retrieved (RR=1.2, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.3) and data preparation methods (RR=2.2, 95% CI 1.4 to 3.5). Systematic reviews in 2020 also had a lower rate of sharing meta-analytic data or materials than those in 2014 (RR=0.2, 95% CI 0.1 to 0.4). For other reporting items, the estimated differences between the 2020 and 2014 were uncertain as the 95% CIs included the equivalence range (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2. Frequency of reporting items between systematic reviews indexed in 2014 and 2020

Given the notable discrepancy in the number of Cochrane reviews between the 2014 and 2020 samples, we conducted a sensitivity analysis in which we excluded Cochrane reviews from both samples (8 reviews from

2020 sample and 32 reviews from 2014 sample) (Supplemental data). Three main changes were observed compared to the original analysis. Firstly, existing differences became more pronounced, as observed for citing a reporting guideline (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 data preparation method(s) (RR=2.1, 95% CI 1.2 to 3.6). Secondly, uncertainty was eliminated for some items, whose 95% CI now exceeded the equivalence range: non-Cochrane reviews in 2020 were more likely to report funding sources (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.6), protocol registration records (RR=4.5, 95% CI 2.2 to 9.2),) and dates of coverage for the databases (RR=1.3, 95% CI 1.1 to 1.6). Lastly, after excluding Cochrane reviews, the rate of sharing review data and code of reviews in 2020 became higher than those of 2014, although the association was uncertain (RR=2.2, 95% CI 0.4 to 12.0).

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

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



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 journal type and policies on patterns of reporting and sharing 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. 4A-B). 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), date of last search (RR=3.7, 95% CI 2.6 to 5.2), search strategy for non-database sources (trial registers, Google Scholar, etc.) (RR=6.0, 95% CI 3.4 to 10.5), as well as extra details of search results such as the number of retrieved records from each database (RR=1.8, 95% CI 1.2 to 2.5) and citation for at least one excluded study (RR=3.3, 95% CI 2.1 to 5.2). They were also more likely to share relevant data and materials (RR=28.7, 95% CI 8.9 to 92.3).



Fig. 4A. Relationship between journal type and reported items



Fig. 4B. Relationship between journal type and reported items (ctn'd)

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 21.4). 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 14.0) and data files used in analysis (RR=14.6, 95%

CI 3.6 to 59.7). 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 (Supplemental data).



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.

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 reporting of a review protocol (4%) or registration entry (38%), search strategy for all databases (27%), methods of handling data (e.g. imputing missing data, data conversions) (34%) and heterogeneity estimator used (21%). Other meta-research studies reported similar frequencies of reporting of review protocols (17%) [6], preregistration records (22%) [6], full search strategies for all databases (14%) [7], handling of missing data (25%) [4], or the heterogeneity estimator used (13%) [6]. Some discrepancies in these results can be attributed to differences in assessment criteria and the disciplines studied [38]. In our sample of reviews indexed in 2020, citation of reporting guidelines was common (82%), but was associated with improved reporting of some reporting items only, an observation shared by Wayant et al. [4]. We also reported a scarcity of data and code file sharing (7%), which is within the range of previously reported results (0.6%-11%) [4,8,39]. López-Nicolás reported that 98% reviews had some raw data available [6]; however their study considered effect sizes for each primary study as the minimum data required for reproducibility, while our study used stricter criteria (Table 2). Journals' open data policies were found to have positive impacts on the frequency of sharing certain types of review data and analytic code, which aligns with evaluations of other study designs [22,40].

Strengths and limitations

Although this topic has been explored in other meta-research studies [2–8], our study offers several methodological advantages. Firstly, our assessment of reporting captured several recommended reporting items in the PRISMA 2020 statement [41] which have not previously been explored. Therefore, our study provides a more comprehensive assessment of reporting in systematic reviews, and thus creates a useful benchmark for future meta-research studies to compare against**.** Our sample was obtained from several databases, and was not limited to a specific topic or journal. Our study captured not only the frequency of data sharing, but also the type of systematic review data, code and materials being shared. Lastly, we compared our 2020 sample with a 2014 sample that was retrieved and evaluated using the same criteria [9,10] thus minimising the impact of methodological variations.

Nonetheless, our study was not without limitations. As a cross-sectional study, our results should be viewed as generating hypotheses rather than proving a causal association. Some items were reported by fewer than 50 reviews, which caused uncertainty in interpreting their risk ratios. Despite intending to include systematic reviews of the effects of health, social, behavioural and educational interventions, the vast majority of reviews evaluated the effects of a health intervention. Therefore, our findings are less generalizable to systematic reviews of the other types of interventions. Lastly, our findings do not necessarily generalise to systematic reviews indexed in databases other than the ones we searched, or to systematic reviews written in languages other than English.

On reporting of systematic reviews

There are several possible reasons why we observed few notable improvements in reporting between 2014 and 2020. Firstly, several 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 [42]. Secondly, some reporting items we examined have only been recommended for reporting recently (e.g. in the PRISMA 2020 statement published in March 2021) [41], such as search strategy for all databases or availability of data or analytic code. As such, authors of reviews in our study using older reporting guidelines might not have felt compelled to report these details in either 2014 or 2020.

Most systematic reviews in 2020 cited a reporting guideline, yet this was not clearly associated with improved reporting for most assessed items. This challenges the assumption that referencing a reporting guideline guarantees adherence to the guideline. In reality, other factors could have affected the authors'

decision not to report certain items. Firstly, authors might assume that reporting of methods used for one process implies that the same approach was used for another process. For example, we observed among our sample a tendency to report the reviewer arrangement only for screening stage, not the subsequent data collection or ROB assessment stages. Besides, authors might incorrectly assume that the meta-analytic methods can always be deduced from knowing the packages and softwares used, or from reading the forest plot. This is not always the case [43], as different meta-analytic softwares have different options and default settings [44]. Secondly, some items are difficult to report if the reviewer had not recorded relevant details during the conduct of the review (e.g. number of records excluded, data conversions performed). In future, we recommend interviews be conducted with review authors to explore their understanding of reporting guidelines and identify challenges in reporting of reviews. Furthermore, interventions should be developed and evaluated to help improve reporting (such as a computer-based tool to break down the PRISMA reporting recommendations into digestible steps for first-time reviewers [45,46]) and aid peer reviewers' ability to detect incomplete reporting.

On data sharing in systematic reviews

The low rate of data and code sharing can be attributed to several factors. Firstly, the issue of data sharing for systematic reviews has received relatively little attention until recently. Data sharing was only recommended in the PRISMA 2020 statement (published in March 2021) while our sample of systematic reviews were published prior to December 2020. Secondly, there has been a rise in percentage of non-Cochrane reviews between 2014-2020. Unlike Cochrane reviews, which are routinely published together with RevMan files containing meta-analysis data, non-Cochrane reviews are not always subjected to data sharing requirement. Third, there are motivational and technical barriers to data sharing that cannot be sufficiently addressed by data sharing policies, such as lack of technical expertise and time, concerns about data ownership, fear of criticism and lack of career incentives [47,48]. Some studies have explored these barriers in general academia, but we are uncertain whether researchers in evidence synthesis face all of these barriers or even unidentified barriers unique to systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Future studies in the REPRISE project will explore systematic reviewers' perspectives in order to address these questions [26].

Lastly, our findings also highlight the important role of supplementary files or public repositories for data sharing in systematic reviews. Web-based supplementary files and public repositories enable authors to share data and materials necessary to validate the review process while keeping the main article concise

and relevant to lay readers [10]. For example, authors can outline in a separate file all database-specific search strategies (e.g. [48]), excluded studies at each stage of screening (e.g. [49]) and complete data for all meta-analyses (e.g. [50]). Data sharing via supplementary files or public repositories is an effective tool to improve reproducibility of systematic reviews and should be made a standard practice. Concerted efforts around data infrastructures, fair use guidelines and a supportive environment are required to make data sharing a standard practice [51–53].

CONCLUSION

Reporting in systematic reviews has improved between 2014-2020 for some reporting items, especially those previously infrequently reported. Frequency of sharing systematic review data files, analytic code and other materials has increased among non-Cochrane reviews, but overall remains low. There was an increase in self-reported use of a reporting guideline; however, citing a reporting guideline was not necessarily associated with better reporting of all items. Data sharing policies could be an effective strategy to promote sharing of systematic review data and materials.

Copyright

The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in BMJ editions and any other BMJPGL products and sublicences such use and exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence.

Acknowledgement: Not applicable

Ethics approval: Not required as this study does not involve human participants or animal subjects

Patient and Public Involvement: As a meta-research study which was aimed at improving research conducts, it was deemed that the expertise of the investigation team and traditional academia publishing channels were appropriate for the conduct and dissemination of the study. Patients or the general public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

Transparency Declaration: The lead authors (PYN and MJP) affirm that the manuscript is an honest, accurate, and transparent account of the study being reported; that no important aspects of the study have been omitted; and that any discrepancies from the study as originally planned (and, if relevant, registered) have been explained.

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

Competing interests: All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form at http://www.icmje.org/disclosure-of-interest/ and declare: some authors had support from research institutions (see Funding); no financial relationships with any organisations that might have an interest in the submitted work in the previous three years; no other relationships or activities that could appear to have influenced the submitted work.

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

Author contributions

The corresponding author attests that all listed authors meet authorship criteria and that no others meeting the criteria have been omitted.

P-YN**:** Data Curation, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – Original Draft Preparation

RK, ZA, SM**:** Investigation, Writing – Review & Editing

JEM**:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Validation, Writing – Review & Editing

SEB, NRH, DGH, SK DM, SN, DN, PT, VAW**:** Writing – Review & Editing

MJP**:** Conceptualization, Funding Acquisition, Methodology, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

Supplemental data

S1 Appendix: Deviations from protocol

S2 Appendix: Eligibility criteria for study inclusion

S3 Appendix: Search strategy

S4 Appendix: Data extraction form

S5 Appendix: List of journals and their policies

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

S7 Appendix: STROBE statement checklist

Figure S1: Sensitivity analysis – Frequency of reporting items between systematic reviews published in 2014 and 2020

Figure S2A: Sensitivity analysis – Relationship between citation of reporting guidelines and reported items

Figure S2B: Sensitivity analysis – Relationship between citation of reporting guidelines and reported items (ctn'd)

Figure S3: Relationship between journal's presence of a data sharing policy and reported items

REFERENCE

1 Hoffmann F, Allers K, Rombey T, *et al.* Nearly 80 systematic reviews were published each day: Observational study on trends in epidemiology and reporting over the years 2000-2019. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2021;**138**:1–11. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.05.022

2 Cullis PS, Gudlaugsdottir K, Andrews J. A systematic review of the quality of conduct and reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in paediatric surgery. PLoS One. 2017;**12**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0175213

3 Peters JPM, Hooft L, Grolman W, *et al.* Reporting quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses of otorhinolaryngologic articles based on the PRISMA statement. *PLoS One* 2015;**10**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0136540

4 Wayant C, Page MJ, Vassar M. Evaluation of Reproducible Research Practices in Oncology Systematic Reviews With Meta-analyses Referenced by National Comprehensive Cancer Network Guidelines. *JAMA Oncol* 2019;**5**:1550–5. doi:10.1001/JAMAONCOL.2019.2564

5 Zhu Y, Fan L, Zhang H, *et al.* Is the best evidence good enough: Quality assessment and factor analysis of meta-analyses on depression. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0157808

6 López-Nicolás R, López-López JA, Rubio-Aparicio M, *et al.* A meta-review of transparency and reproducibility-related reporting practices in published meta-analyses on clinical psychological interventions (2000–2020). *Behav Res Methods* 2022;**54**:334–49. doi:10.3758/s13428-021-01644-z

7 Koffel JB, Rethlefsen ML. Reproducibility of Search Strategies Is Poor in Systematic Reviews Published in High-Impact Pediatrics, Cardiology and Surgery Journals: A Cross-Sectional Study. *PLoS One* 2016;**11**:e0163309. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0163309

8 Polanin JR, Hennessy EA, Tsuji S. Transparency and Reproducibility of Meta-Analyses in Psychology: A Meta-Review. Perspect. Psychol. Sci. 2020;**15**:1026–41. doi:10.1177/1745691620906416

9 Page MJ, Shamseer L, Altman DG, *et al.* Epidemiology and Reporting Characteristics of Systematic Reviews of Biomedical Research: A Cross-Sectional Study. *PLOS Med* 2016;**13**:e1002028. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1002028

10 Page MJ, Altman DG, Shamseer L, *et al.* Reproducible research practices are underused in systematic reviews of biomedical interventions. J. Clin. Epidemiol. 2018;**94**:8–18. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.10.017

11 Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, *et al.* Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *PLOS Med* 2009;**6**:e1000097. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1000097

12 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* Mapping of reporting guidance for systematic reviews and meta-analyses generated a comprehensive item bank for future reporting guidelines. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2020;**118**:60–8. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.11.010

13 Page MJ, Moher D. Evaluations of the uptake and impact of the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement and extensions: a scoping review. *Syst Rev* 2017;**6**. doi:10.1186/S13643-017-0663-8

14 Veroniki AA, Tsokani S, Zevgiti S, *et al.* Do reporting guidelines have an impact? Empirical assessment of changes in reporting before and after the PRISMA extension statement for network meta-analysis. *Syst Rev* 2021;**10**:246. doi:10.1186/s13643-021-01780-9

15 Mayo-Wilson E, Li T, Fusco N, *et al.* Practical guidance for using multiple data sources in systematic reviews and meta-analyses (with examples from the MUDS study). *Res Synth Methods* 2018;**9**:2. doi:10.1002/JRSM.1277

16 Wolfenden L, Grimshaw J, Williams CM, *et al.* Time to consider sharing data extracted from trials included in systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2016;**5**. doi:10.1186/s13643-016-0361-y

17 Lakens D, Hilgard J, Staaks J. On the reproducibility of meta-analyses: six practical recommendations. *BMC Psychol 2016 41* 2016;**4**:1–10. doi:10.1186/S40359-016-0126-3

18 Page MJ, Nguyen P-Y, Hamilton DG, *et al.* Data and code availability statements in systematic reviews of interventions were often missing or inaccurate: a content analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2022;**147**:1–10. doi:10.1016/J.JCLINEPI.2022.03.003

19 Malički M, Jerončić A, Aalbersberg IjJ, *et al.* Systematic review and meta-analyses of studies analysing instructions to authors from 1987 to 2017. *Nat Commun 2021 121* 2021;**12**:1–14. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-26027-y

20 Malički M, Aalbersberg IjJ, Bouter L, *et al.* Journals' instructions to authors: A cross-sectional study across scientific disciplines. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:e0222157. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0222157

21 Moher D, Cobey KD. Ensuring the success of data sharing in Canada. *https://doi.org/101139/facets-2021-0031* 2021;**6**:1534–8. doi:10.1139/FACETS-2021-0031

22 Hardwicke TE, Mathur MB, MacDonald K, *et al.* Data availability, reusability, and analytic reproducibility: evaluating the impact of a mandatory open data policy at the journal Cognition. *R Soc Open Sci* 2018;**5**. doi:10.1098/RSOS.180448

23 Christensen G, Dafoe A, Miguel E, *et al.* A study of the impact of data sharing on article citations using journal policies as a natural experiment. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:e0225883. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0225883

24 Nuijten MB, Borghuis J, Veldkamp CLS, *et al.* Journal Data Sharing Policies and Statistical Reporting Inconsistencies in Psychology. *Collabra Psychol* 2017;**3**. doi:10.1525/COLLABRA.102

25 Federer LM, Belter CW, Joubert DJ, *et al.* Data sharing in PLOS ONE: An analysis of Data Availability Statements. *PLoS One* 2018;**13**:e0194768. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0194768

26 Page MJ, Moher D, Fidler FM, *et al.* The REPRISE project: protocol for an evaluation of REProducibility and Replicability In Syntheses of Evidence. *Syst Rev 2021 101* 2021;**10**:1–13. doi:10.1186/S13643-021-01670-0

27 Veritas Health Innovation. Covidence Systematic Review Software, Melbourne Australia. 2020.www.covidence.org (accessed 22 Jul 2021).

28 Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, *et al.* Research electronic data capture (REDCap)-A metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform* 2009;**42**:377–81. doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2008.08.010

29 Fantini D. easyPubMed: Search and Retrieve Scientific Publication Records from PubMed. 2019.https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/easyPubMed/index.html (accessed 22 Jul 2021).

30 R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013.http://www.r-project.org/

31 Aragon TJ, Fay MP, Wollschlaeger D, *et al.* Package 'epitools'. 2020.http://www. (accessed 1 Jul 2022).

32 Firth D. Bias reduction of maximum likelihood estimates. *Biometrika* 1993;**80**:27–38. doi:10.1093/BIOMET/80.1.27

33 Doerken S, Avalos M, Lagarde E, *et al.* Penalized logistic regression with low prevalence exposures beyond high dimensional settings. *PLoS One* 2019;**14**:e0217057. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0217057

34 Heinze G, Schemper M. A solution to the problem of separation in logistic regression. *Stat Med* 2002;**21**:2409–19. doi:10.1002/SIM.1047

35 Ranganathan P, Aggarwal R, Pramesh CS. Common pitfalls in statistical analysis: Odds versus risk. *Perspect Clin Res* 2015;**6**:222. doi:10.4103/2229-3485.167092

36 Johnston A, Kelly SE, Hsieh SC, *et al.* Systematic reviews of clinical practice guidelines: a methodological guide. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;**108**:64–76. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.11.030

37 Abbott R, Bethel A, Rogers M, *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* 2021;**0**. doi:10.1136/BMJEBM-2021-111710

38 Hensel PG. Reproducibility and replicability crisis: How management compares to psychology and

economics – A systematic review of literature. *Eur Manag J* 2021;**39**:577–94. doi:10.1016/J.EMJ.2021.01.002

39 Alsheikh-Ali AA, Qureshi W, Al-Mallah MH, *et al.* Public Availability of Published Research Data in High-Impact Journals. *PLoS One* 2011;**6**:e24357. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0024357

40 Piwowar HA, Chapman WW. A review of journal policies for sharing research data. *Open Scholarsh Authority, Community, Sustain Age Web 20 - Proc 12th Int Conf Electron Publ ELPUB 2008* 2008;:1–14. doi:10.1038/NPRE.2008.1700.1

41 Page MJ, Moher D, Bossuyt PM, *et al.* PRISMA 2020 explanation and elaboration: Updated guidance and exemplars for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;**372**. doi:10.1136/bmj.n160

42 Cochrane Library. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews: editorial policies. https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/editorial-policies (accessed 8 Jun 2022).

43 Schriger DL, Altman DG, Vetter JA, *et al.* Forest plots in reports of systematic reviews: a cross-sectional study reviewing current practice. *Int J Epidemiol* 2010;**39**:421–9. doi:10.1093/IJE/DYP370

44 Bax L, Yu LM, Ikeda N, *et al.* A systematic comparison of software dedicated to meta-analysis of causal studies. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2007;**7**:40. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-7-40

45 Barnes C, Boutron I, Giraudeau B, *et al.* Impact of an online writing aid tool for writing a randomized trial report: the COBWEB (Consort-based WEB tool) randomized controlled trial. *BMC Med* 2015;**13**. doi:10.1186/S12916-015-0460-Y

46 Blanco D, Altman D, Moher D, *et al.* Scoping review on interventions to improve adherence to reporting guidelines in health research. *BMJ Open* 2019;**9**:e026589. doi:10.1136/BMJOPEN-2018-026589

47 Van Panhuis WG, Paul P, Emerson C, *et al.* A systematic review of barriers to data sharing in public health. *BMC Public Health* 2014;**14**:1–9. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-14-1144

48 Zhu Y. Open-access policy and data-sharing practice in UK academia. *J Inf Sci* 2020;**46**:41–52. doi:10.1177/0165551518823174

49 Bidjan D, Sallmann R, Eliades T, *et al.* Orthopedic Treatment for Class II Malocclusion with Functional Appliances and Its Effect on Upper Airways: A Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis. *J Clin Med* 2020;**9**:1–18. doi:10.3390/JCM9123806

50 Hill J, Hoyt J, van Eijk AM, *et al.* Factors affecting the delivery, access, and use of interventions to prevent malaria in pregnancy in sub-Saharan Africa: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Med* 2013;**10**. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PMED.1001488

51 Wilkinson MD, Dumontier M, Aalbersberg IjJ, *et al.* The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship. *Sci Data 2016 31* 2016;**3**:1–9. doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.18

52 Downs RR. Improving opportunities for new value of open data: Assessing and certifying research data repositories. *Data Sci J* 2021;**20**:1–11. doi:10.5334/DSJ-2021-001/METRICS/

53 Woods HB, Pinfield S, Neylon C, *et al.* Incentivising research data sharing: a scoping review. *Wellcome Open Res 2022 6355* 2022;**6**:355. doi:10.12688/wellcomeopenres.17286.2

Table 1. Items for data collection and data sources (see S4 Appendix for further details)

Source	Data items
Systematic review*	<u>General characteristics of the systematic review</u> Title; journal name; corresponding author's country; source of funding for the review; conflicts of interest of review authors; number of studies included in the review; types of participants and interventions investigated. <u>Reporting characteristics of the systematic review</u> Whether a reporting guideline was cited; whether a protocol or registration record for the review was cited; whether eligibility criteria for participants, interventions, comparators, outcomes and study designs were reported; what details of the search methods were reported (including which databases, the interface used to search them, the years of coverage, date of the search, and whether a full Boolean search logic – using operators such as 'AND', 'OR', 'NOT' – was reported); what method of study selection, data collection and risk of bias assessment authors reported using; what software (and packages) authors reported using; whether the number of records yielded by the searches were reported overall and for each database; whether any full text articles excluded from the review were cited. <u>Reporting characteristics of the index (first reported) meta-analysis</u> Outcome domain investigated; number of included studies; effect measure used; whether methods required to prepare data for meta-analysis were reported; whether the meta-analysis model used was reported; whether the meta-analysis method used was reported; whether the between-study (heterogeneity) variance estimator used was reported; whether summary statistics for each included study were reported; whether effect estimates and measures of precision for each included study were reported. <u>Sharing characteristics of the systematic review</u> Whether a data or code availability statement appeared in the review; which types of files were made publicly accessible either as a supplementary file or uploaded to a repository (e.g. files containing data used in all analyses, analytic code used to generate results, files containing citations of all records that were screened and excluded); whether files shared had a persistent identifier (e.g. DOI) or license (e.g. CC-BY) applied to them
Journal website	Journal name; whether the journal only publishes evidence syntheses (i.e. systematic reviews and their protocols); whether the journal has a data or code sharing policy, or both; whether sharing data and/or issuing a Data Availability Statement is mandatory for systematic reviews published by the journal

*Includes the main report and any supplementary file(s), and the review protocol (if the authors specified that the relevant information was contained therein)

Table 2. Descriptive characteristics of systematic reviews indexed in 2020

Item	Median (IQR) or frequency (%)
Number of databases searched	4 (3-5)
Number of studies included in review	12 (8-21)
Number of studies in index meta-analysis	6 (4-10)
Country of corresponding author	
China	96/300 (32)
USA	31/300 (10)
UK	24/300 (8)
Other	149/300 (50)
Source of funding	
Non-profit	112/300 (37)
For-profit	3/300 (1)
Both for-profit and non-profit	3/300 (1)
No funding	97/300 (32)
Not reported	85/300 (28)
Conflict of interest	
Present	30/300 (10)
Not present	251/300 (84)
Not declared	19/300 (6)
ICD-11 category investigated	
Endocrine, nutritional or metabolic diseases	36/300 (12)
Diseases of the digestive system	36/300 (12)
Diseases of the musculoskeletal system or connective tissue	35/300 (12)
Diseases of the circulatory system	30/300 (10)
Other	198/300 (66)
Type(s) of intervention	
Pharmacological	102/300 (34)
Non-pharmacological	189/300 (63)
Both	9/300 (3)
Area(s) of intervention	
Health	294/300 (98)
Behavioural	28/300 (9)
Educational	4/300 (1)
Social	5/300 (2)
Citing a reporting guideline	245/300 (82)
Reporting of the review process	
Protocol/registration record cited	
Both protocol and registration record cited	1/300 (<0.5)
Only a protocol cited	13/300 (4)
Only a registration record cited	112/300 (37)
Neither	174/300 (58)
Eligibility criteria stated	
Participants	275/300 (92)

Item	Median (IQR) or frequency (%)
Interventions/Exposures	296/300 (99)
Comparators	267/300 (89)
Outcomes	298/300 (99)
Study design	278/300 (93)
Type(s) of eligible study design	
Randomised studies	168/278 (60)
Non-randomised studies	20/278 (7)
Both	90/278 (32)
Search interface reported (e.g. Ovid for MEDLINE)	
For all databases	76/300 (25)
For some databases	36/300 (12)
Not reported	188/300 (63)
Dates of coverage of databases reported	
Both exact start and end dates	136/300 (45)
Both start and end dates but not as exact dates (e.g. "from inception to May 2020")	105/300 (35)
Only start or end date	50/300 (17)
Not reported	9/300 (3)
Exact last date of search reported[#]	72/300 (24)
Search strategy for databases reported	
Boolean logic for all databases	81/300 (27)
Boolean logic for some databases	133/300 (44)
List of MeSH & free text terms only	12/300 (4)
List of MeSH terms only	8/300 (3)
List of free text terms only	59/300 (20)
Not reported	7/300 (2)
Trials register searched	64/300 (21)
Other electronic sources searched	102/300 (34)
Search strategy for trial register/other sources reported	24/140 (17)
Method of screening	
All studies screened by at least 2 authors	196/300 (65)
At least 2 authors were involved in either titles/abstracts or full-text screening, but unclear for the other step	22/300 (7)
Different methods were applied for titles/abstracts and full-text screening	7/300 (2)
All studies screened by 1 author and a subset by another author	4/300 (1)
All studies screened by 1 author with the use of an automation tool	0/300 (0)
All studies screened by 1 author only	4/300 (1)
Not reported	67/300 (22)
Method of data collection	
All data collected by 2 authors	208/300 (69)
All data collected by 1 author with verification by another	16/300 (5)
All data collected by 1 author only	4/300 (1)
Other arrangements	1/300 (<0.5)
Not reported	71/300 (24)

Item	Median (IQR) or frequency (%)
Method of ROB assessment	
All studies assessed by 2 authors	173/300 (58)
All studies assessed by 1 author with verification by another	7/300 (2)
All studies assessed by 1 author only	5/300 (2)
Not reported	115/300 (38)
ROB assessment reported for each study	231/300 (77)
Total records retrieved reported	300/300 (100)
Records retrieved per database reported	126/300 (42)
Software(s) used for meta-analysis	
Review Manager	189/300 (63)
Stata	73/300 (24)
R	33/300 (11)
Comprehensive Meta-Analysis	27/300 (9)
Other	13/300 (4)
SPSS	4/300 (1)
SAS	1/300 (<0.5)
Not reported	3/300 (1)
Software details reported	
Both analysis package and software version reported	28/297 (9)
Only analysis package reported	8/297 (3)
Only software version reported	242/297 (81)
Neither	19/297 (6)
At least 1 excluded article cited	65/300 (22)
Index meta-analysis	
Measure of effect used	
Risk ratio	72/300 (24)
Odds ratio	71/300 (24)
Hazard ratio	13/300 (4)
Risk difference	3/300 (1)
Mean difference	76/300 (25)
Standardised mean difference	63/300 (21)
Other	2/300 (1)
Method of data preparation reported	101/300 (34)
Meta-analysis model reported (e.g. fixed-effects, random-effects)	294/300 (98)
Meta-analysis method reported (e.g. Mantel-Haenszel, inverse variance)	218/300 (73)
Heterogeneity variance estimator reported (e.g. DerSimonian-Laird)	50/235 (21)
Summary statistics reported for each study	215/300 (72)
Effect estimate and measure of precision reported for each study	288/300 (96)
Sharing of data and materials used in analyses	
Data/code availability statement present	93/300 (31)
Types of data shared	
Unprocessed extracted data	9/300 (3)
Data conversions performed	1/300 (<0.5)

Item	Median (IQR) or frequency (%)
Data used in analyses	12/300 (4)
Analytic code	2/300 (1)
Citations of all screened studies	2/300 (1)
Metadata of shared files	1/300 (<0.5)
Any of the above	20/300 (7)
Method(s) of sharing	
Supplementary files	20/20 (100)
Open-access repository	1/20 (5)
Institutional repository	1/20 (5)
DOI cited for shared data	2/2 (100)
License stated for shared data	2/2 (100)
Journal that publishes the review	
Specialised in evidence syntheses (e.g. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews)	14/300 (5)
Data policy stated in guideline for authors	199/300 (66)
Sharing of data and/or analytic code is encouraged, but it is not mandatory for publication in the journal, and a Data Availability Statement is not required.	125/199 (63)
Sharing data and/or analytic code is not mandatory for publication of systematic reviews, but a Data Availability Statement, which contains links to shared data or reasons for not sharing data, must be provided.	55/199 (28)
Sharing data and/or analytic code is a condition of publication of systematic reviews by the journal.	19/199 (10)

*We additionally recorded whether the author confirmed the date of the last search, which, in practice, may or may not be the same as from the end date of the search range.