Current status of methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in medicine and health sciences in Ethiopia: leveraging quantity to improve quality

Tesfa Dejenie Habtewold[1,2*], Nigussie Tadesse Sharew[3,4], Aklilu Endalamaw[5,6], Henok Mulugeta[7,8], Getenet Dessie[9], Nigus G. Asefa[2], Getachew Mulu Kassa[10,11], Wubet Alebachew Bayih[12], Mulugeta Molla Birhanu[13], Balewgize Sileshi Tegegne[2,14], Andreas A. Teferra[15], Abera Kenay Tura[16,17], Sisay Mulugeta Alemu[18]

[1]Department of Quantitative Economics, School of Business and Economics, Maastricht University, Maastricht, the Netherlands
[2]Department of Epidemiology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands
[3]Department of Nursing, College of Health Science, Debre Berhan University, Debre Brehan, Ethiopia
[4]Interdisciplinary Centre Psychopathology and Emotion regulation (ICPE), University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands
[5]Division of Planetary Health and Health Protection, School of Public Health, The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Australia
[6]Department of Nursing, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia
[7]Department of Nursing, College of Health Sciences, Debre Markos University, Debre Markos, Ethiopia
[8]School of Nursing and Midwifery, Faculty of Health, University of Technology Sydney, Sydney, Australia
[9]Department of Nursing, College of Medicine and Health Sciences, Bahir Dar University, Bahir Dar, Ethiopia
[10]HaSET Maternal and Child Health Research Program, Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
[11]Health System and Reproductive Health Research Directorate, Ethiopian Public Health Institute, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia
[12]Department of Nursing, College of Health Sciences, Debre Tabor University, Debre Tabor, Ethiopia
[13]Department of Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia
[14]Center for Statistical Genetics, Columbia University, Columbia, United States of America

[15]Division of Epidemiology, College of Public Health, The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH, United States of America
[16]Department of Midwifery, College of Health and Medical Sciences, Haramaya University, Harar, Ethiopia
[17]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University Medical Centre Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands
[18]Department of Health Sciences, University medical center Groningen, University of Groningen, Groningen, the Netherlands

*Corresponding author

Tesfa Dejenie Habtewold, Ph.D.
Department of Quantitative Economics
School of Business and Economics
Maastricht University
Tongersestraat 53
6211LM, Maastricht, Netherlands
tesfadej2003@gmail.com

Abstract

Introduction: With a rising publication rate of medicine and health sciences systematic reviews (SR) and meta-analyses (MA) in Ethiopia, there is a growing concern over their methodological and reporting quality. The aim of this study was to characterize epidemiological trends and evaluate the methodological and reporting quality of SR and MA Ethiopia.

Methods: A retrospective observational overview study was conducted on medicine and health sciences SR and MA in Ethiopia that accessed through PubMed, PsycInfo, EMBASE databases and additional manual searching. SR and MA based on primary human studies associated with the Ethiopian population irrespective of the place of publication and authors' affiliation and published until March 16, 2021 were included. Title/abstract and full-text screening were conducted in duplicate using EndNote and Covidence semiautometed reference management tools. Data extraction tool was developed by the author using PRISMA and AMSTAR-2 as a guide. We summarized background characteristics, and methodological and reporting qualities using frequencies with percentages and median with range. Two-tailed Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact tests used for catergorical variables and Kruskal-Walis test for quantitative variables at alpha level 0.05 were used to compare the difference in background characterstics between SR and MA as well as across the publication years over time. All the analysis was done using R version 4.0.2 for macOS.

Results: Of the 3,125 total records initially identified, 349 articles (48 (13.75%) SR, and 301 (86.25%) MA) were included in our analyses. We observed a dramatic increase in publications with nearly three-quarters of SR and MA (73.9%) published after 2018. More than nine out of ten (92.8%) SR and MA included only observational studies and infectious disease, was the most researched (20.9%) subject area. Number of authors, number of affiliations, publication year, protocol registration, number of primary

studies, number of references, citation counts and journal quality were significantly different between SR and MA. Both SR and MA had a low methodological and reporting quality Even though there was improvement in registering protocols, searching databases, and transparently reporting search strategy.

Conclusions: The production of SR and MA in Ethiopia has been increased over time, especially during the last three years. There is a promising trend of improvement in methodological and reporting quality even though there is much more to do. This study provide an up-to-date overview of the landscape of SR and MA publication rate and quality leverage in Ethiopia. Authors should prioritize quality over fast track publication.

Keywords: Overview of Systematic Reviews, Umbrella Review, Epidemiological Review, Quality Review, Evidence-based Medicine, Ethiopia

Introduction

Researchers and clinicians are overhelmed by the surging publication rate of primary studies, which takes longer to access up-to-date evidence. Systematic reviews (SR) and meta-analyses (MA) are essential tools to qualitatively and quantitatively synthesize a broad range of evidence for researchers and clinicians that can be accessed within a short time.[1] Thus, they are indispensable for evidence-based medicine and medical decision-making in clinical practice. As a result, SR and MA became increasingly popular to synthesize evidence from primary studies and the number of SR and MA being published has increased steadily over recent years.[2] For example, 28,959 articles were tagged as SR in MEDLINE in 2014, whereas 22,774 SR or MA were indexed in 2017 (i.e., nearly a 50-fold increase compared to 1995.[3] In 2021, 167,029 articles were indexed as SR (search date December 24, 2021).

With the growing publication rate of SR and MA, and the growing concern over their quality, an overview of SR and MA can be helpful to characterize and monitor these publications, summarize the main findings and evaluate methodological and reporting.[2-7] Overview of SRs and MA is a review of previously published SR and/or MA, which represents the highest levels of evidence synthesis currently available especially.[2] An overview studies can be an overview of reviews of interventions and associations, an overview of diagnostic test accuracy, an overview of economic evaluation, and overviews of systematic reviews of qualitative studys.[8]

To date, four overview studies were conducted in Ethiopia. The first overview study examined the trends and methodological quality of 35 systematic reviews and 17 meta-analyses published until 2018.[9] This study showed that three-fourths of the studies had poor scientific methodological quality. The second and third overview studies conducted on SR and MA of child nutrition (nine SR and MA)[10] and birth asphyxia (four SR and MA)[11] respectively. Both studies showed moderate level of quality among the

included SR and MA. Recentely, the fourth overview study was conducted using 422 SR and MA that published until December 31, 2021, and provided a detailed bibliometric information on the publication landscape of SR and MA in Ethiopia, but thier methodological and reporting quality was not assessed.[12]

Given the large body of SR and MA articles being generated in Ethiopia during the last few years and their essential role in decision-making, a detailed analysis of epidemiological trends, and methodological and reporting characteristics would meaningfully inform decision making and priority setting. In addition, detailed assessments of background information, and methodological and reporting quality of SR and MA was not done in previsouly published overviews.[9-12] Thus, this study aimed to assess the epidemiological trends and the methodological and reporting quality of medicine and health sciences SR and MA in Ethiopia. This can be helpful to show the landscape of SR and MA studies and enhance the quality of SR and MA in Ethiopia and other low- and middle-income countries.

Methods and Materials

Protocol and registration

The planned search strategy, inclusion and exclusion criteria, study screening and selelction, and statistical methods for data analyses were decided prior to the study. The full project package and the protocol was registered in the Open Science Framework (OSF) (10.17605/osf.io/vapzx). All the supplementary methods and data are available in the publically open database in OSF (https://osf.io/q5dw2).

Search strategy

A retrospective observational overview study is conducted using SR and MA associated with Ethiopia irrespective of place of publication and authors affiliation. We searched SR and MA indexed in PubMed (NCBI), PsycInfo (EBSCOhost), CINAHL (EBSCOhost) and EMBASE (direct access) databases from inception to March 16, 2021. We searched "Ethiopia" and "Ethiop*" terms combined with "OR' Boolean operator in the title, abstract and keywords of records in PubMed, PsycInfo, EMBASE, and CINAHL. Then, the search was further filtered by article type (i.e., meta-analysis, review, systematic review) and species (i.e., human) in PubMed, methodology (i.e., metasynthesis, meta analysis, systematic review, literature review) in PsycINFO, study type (i.e., systematic review, meta-analysis, human) in EMBASE and publication type (i.e., meta-analysis, meta synthesis, review, systematic review) in CINAHL. Our database search was supplemented by hand searching of tables of content of local journals, such as Ethiopian Medical journal, Ethiopian Journal of Reproductive Health to retrieve potentially relevant missing studies. Grey literature and unpublished/preprint SR and MA databases were not searched given that the quality can be different before and after publication.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria

SRs and MA that fulfilled the following criteria were included. First, the article title must be identified as a SR and MA by the author(s). For articles that did not identify as SR and MA or ambiguous, we inspected relevant information in the methods and results section, and consulted Cochrane [13] and PRISMA[14] guidelines to decide the inclusion of the article. Second, SR and MA must be based on medicine and health sciences primary human studies associated with the Ethiopian population irrespective of the place of publication and authors' affiliation. Original and updated versions, and duplicates (i.e., only the title or topic is similar) of SR and MA were considered as separate publications and were included in our analysis as they have different publication dates, separate number of citations, and include different authors and affiliations. SR and MA protocols, non-systematic reviews (e.g., scoping, historic, literature, or narrative reviews), exact duplicates (i.e., all the title and authors are the same), conference abstracts, grey literature, commentaries and letters to the editors, reviews following case reports, and SR and MA in non-human research subjects were excluded. In addition, SR and MA based on non-medical and -health science topics, and international primary studies were excluded. Furthermore, SR and MA without full text were excluded after contacting corresponding authors, searching in ResearchGate, or searching in free scientific article downloading sites.

Screening, selection, and data extraction

All retrieved records found through database search were imported to EndNote X9 software[15] and then to Covidence web-based reference management tool[16] removing duplicates and to conduct further screening and selection. First, duplicates were automatically removed by Covidence and when not detected, manual removal of duplicates was also done by the authors. Then, double-blinded title and abstract screening was done by two independent reviewers (TD and SM) using Covidence. Next, each SR and MA full-text file was downloaded using EndNote X9 software[15] and imported to Covidence again. Afterward, a double-blinded full-text review was also done by two independent reviewers (TD and NT) based on prior-specified inclusion

and exclusion criteria. The priority of each criterion to exclude articles presented as follows: full-text not accessible, non-systematic reviews, continental or worldwide SR and MA, and non-human study subjects. Disagreements during these steps were resolved by discussion and involvement of a third reviewer when necessary. Background and methodological data were extracted using the Google form created by the review authors (TD, NT, SM, AE, HM, GD, GM, NG, WA). Ten perecent of the extracted data were validated by Details on the list of variables and their description was presented in Supplimentary Table 1. The data extraction form was developed based on PRIMA 2020 reporting guideline[14], AMSTAR-2 tool[17], Cochrane guideline[13], JBI manual[18], previous similar studies[19,20] and authors expertees. The data extraction form was developed and new variables were included whenever the information is relevant. For example, citation count, impact factor without self-citation, number of reference and institutional rank were added while the data collection done. These information were restropectively included in the previously artciles which the data extraction was already completed.

Data analysis

We summarized background characteristics, and methodological and reporting qualities using frequencies with percentages and median with range. Two-tailed Chi-Square and Fisher's Exact tests for catergorical variables and Kruskal-Walis test for quantitative variables at alpha level 0.05 were used to compare the difference in background characterstics between SR and MA as well as across the publication years over time. Kruskal-Walis test wased because of that all the quantitative variables were not normaly distributed. All the analysis was done using R version 4.0.2 for macOS.

Results

Search results

In total, 3,087 records were retrieved through searching PubMed (n = 1,357), PsycInfo (n = 117), EMBASE (n = 1,174) and CINAHL (n = 439). After automatically and manually removing duplicate records (n = 842), 2,245 titles and abstracts were screened. Of these, 1,840 records were excluded due to various reasons, for example, regional or international systematic reviews SR and MA, non-related titles, case reports, primary studies, protocols, non-systematic reviews, and commentaries, corrections, and editorials. As a result, 405 SRs and MA were selected for full-text review. Five SR and MA were excluded because of the inaccessibility of full-texts after several attempts. Additionally, after full-text review, 63 regional or international, 10 non-systematic, and three animal study SR and MA were excluded. Through hand searching of the table of contents of local journals and Google, we found an additional 38 records and 25 of them fulfilled our inclusion criteria. Finally, 349 SR and MA were included in the finaly analysis. The PRISMA flow diagram of the screening and selection process of identified studies shown in Fig. 1.



Fig. 1: PRISMA flow diagram of literature identification, screening, and selection process.

Epidemiology trends and characteristics

In total, 48 (13.75%) SR and 301 (86.25%) MA were published with dramatic increment of annual publication rates. Nearly three-quarters of SR and MA (73.9%) were published since 2018 with the highest number of SR and MA (57.0%) published by authors affiliated to institutions in Amhara Region, Ethiopia. Gondar University (18.9%) is the leading university and Nursing department (24.9%) is the most active department in publishing SR and MA. Infectious Diseases, excluding HIV/AIDS, were the most researched (20.9%) subject area. The median number of authors, primary studies, citation count and references cited was four, 17, six and 54 respectively. The highest number of studies (37.5%) were published in Q2 journals, even though more than a quarter (26.9%) of SR and MA were published in unranked journals. Also, BioMed Central (43.8%) and PLOS ONE (10.3%) were the most active publisher and journal, respectively. Details has been shown below in Table 1.

Compared to SR, MA has been published in recent years ($p < 0.0001$), registered their protocol ($p < 0.0001$), authors are affiliation to multiple institutions ($p = 0.007$), had high median number of authors ($p < 0.0001$), published in high impact journlas ($p = <0.0001$ to 0.009) and high median number of references ($p = 0.01$) (Table 1). On ther other hand, compared to MA, SR had high median number of included studies ($p = 0.003$) and high median number of citation ($p = 0.035$ to 0.048) (Table 1).

Table 1: Background information of SR and MA (N=349)

Characteristics	Article type		Total (N=349)	*W/X² statistic*	p-value
	Systematic reviews (N=48)	Meta-analyses (N=301)			
Number of authors, median (range)	3.00 (12.0)	4.00 (15.0)	4.00 (15.0)	4,530.5	**<0.0001**
Number of affiliations					
Multiple (>1)	11 (22.9%)	29 (9.6%)	40 (11.5%)	7.197	**0.007**
Single	37 (77.1%)	272 (90.4%)	309 (88.5%)		
Top 8 most active universities					
Addis Ababa University	4 (8.3%)	13 (4.3%)	17 (4.9%)		
Bahir Dar University	5 (10.4%)	25 (8.3%)	30 (8.6%)		
Debre Tabor University	2 (4.2%)	12 (4.0%)	14 (4.0%)		
Gondar University	5 (10.4%)	61 (20.3%)	66 (18.9%)		
Haramaya University	3 (6.3%)	15 (5.0%)	18 (5.2%)		
Woldiya University	1 (2.1%)	14 (4.7%)	15 (4.3%)		
Debre Markos University	0 (0%)	51 (16.9%)	51 (14.6%)		
Debre Berhan University	0 (0%)	12 (4.0%)	12 (3.4%)		
Rank of universities, median (range)	5.00 (36.0)	9.00 (38.0)	8.00 (38.0)	4,189.0	0.165
Top 9 most active departements					
Clinical Pharmacy	2 (4.2%)	8 (2.7%)	10 (2.9%)		
Epidemiology and Biostatistics	1 (2.1%)	15 (5.0%)	16 (4.6%)		
Medical Laboratory Science	1 (2.1%)	15 (5.0%)	16 (4.6%)		
Medical Microbiology	3 (6.3%)	7 (2.3%)	10 (2.9%)		
Midwifery	1 (2.1%)	32 (10.6%)	33 (9.5%)		
Nursing (all divisions)	1 (2.1%)	86 (28.6%)	87 (24.9%)		
Public Health	4 (8.3%)	38 (12.6%)	42 (12.0%)		
Biomedical Science	0 (0%)	17 (5.6%)	17 (4.9%)		
Psychiatry	0 (0%)	14 (4.7%)	14 (4.0%)		
Top 5 most active regions					
Addis Ababa	8 (16.7%)	23 (7.6%)	31 (8.9%)		
Amhara	14 (29.2%)	185 (61.5%)	199 (57.0%)		
Oromia	6 (12.5%)	28 (9.3%)	34 (9.7%)		
SNNP	5 (10.4%)	21 (7.0%)	26 (7.4%)		

Tigray	4 (8.3%)	11 (3.7%)	15 (4.3%)		
Country of affiliation					
Ethiopia	40 (83.3%)	286 (95.0%)	326 (93.4%)	0.264	**0.007**
International	8 (16.7%)	15 (5.0%)	23 (6.6%)		
Publication year					
<= 2018	22 (45.8%)	69 (22.9%)	91 (26.1%)	23.994	**<0.0001**
2019	16 (33.3%)	56 (18.6%)	72 (20.6%)		
2020	9 (18.8%)	139 (46.2%)	148 (42.4%)		
2021	1 (2.1%)	37 (12.3%)	38 (10.9%)		
Top 5 most active journals					
BMC Infectious Diseases	1 (2.1%)	25 (8.3%)	26 (7.4%)		
BMC Public Health	1 (2.1%)	16 (5.3%)	17 (4.9%)		
Reproductive Health	1 (2.1%)	10 (3.3%)	11 (3.2%)		
BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth	0 (0%)	12 (4.0%)	12 (3.4%)		
PLOS ONE	0 (0%)	36 (12.0%)	36 (10.3%)		
Top 6 most active publishers					
BioMed Central	11 (22.9%)	142 (47.2%)	153 (43.8%)		
Elsevier	5 (10.4%)	20 (6.6%)	25 (7.2%)		
Hindawi	7 (14.6%)	28 (9.3%)	35 (10.0%)		
Springer	2 (4.2%)	16 (5.3%)	18 (5.2%)		
PLOS	0 (0%)	37 (12.3%)	37 (10.6%)		
SAGE	0 (0%)	11 (3.7%)	11 (3.2%)		
2-IF, median (range)	1.36 (4.89)	2.88 (10.6)	2.69 (10.6)	5,488.5	**0.009**
2-IF without self-citation, median (range)	1.27 (4.65)	2.72 (10.2)	2.52 (10.2)	5,321.0	**0.004**
5-year impact factor, median (range)	1.46 (5.17)	3.40 (10.4)	3.26 (10.4)	5,258.0	**0.003**
Journals rank					
Q1 (>75%)	3 (6.3%)	25 (8.3%)	28 (8.0%)	23.994	**<0.0001**
Q2 (50-75%)	12 (25.0%)	119 (39.5%)	131 (37.5%)		
Q3 (25-50%)	8 (16.7%)	68 (22.6%)	76 (21.8%)		
Q4 (<25%)	4 (8.3%)	13 (4.3%)	17 (4.9%)		
Not ranked	21 (43.8%)	73 (24.3%)	94 (26.9%)		
Protocol registration					
No	46 (95.8%)	203 (67.4%)	249 (71.3%)	16.323	**<0.0001**
Yes	2 (4.2%)	98 (32.6%)	100 (28.7%)		

Number of primary studies, median (range)	22.5 (227.0)	16.0 (227.0)	17.0 (227.0)	8,706.5	**0.003**
Type of studies included					
All type of studies	1 (2.1%)	8 (2.6%)	9 (2.6%)		
Both observational and RCT studies	1 (2.1%)	4 (1.3%)	5 (1.4%)		
Observational studies	39 (81.3%)	285 (94.7%)	324 (92.8%)		
Validation studies	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)		
Not specified	6 (12.8%)	4 (1.3%)	10 (2.9%)		
Number of references, median (range)	46.0 (130.0)	55.0 (128.0)	54.0 (128.0)	5,574.0	**0.011**
Citation count, median (range)	8.50 (193.0)	6.00 (93.0)	6.00 (193)	8,505.5	**0.048**
Citation count without self-citation, median (range)	8.50 (190.0)	5.00 (93.0)	6.00 (190.0)	8,586.0	**0.035**
Citation manager software*					
EndNote	7 (14.6%)	149 (49.5%)	156 (44.7%)		
Mendeley	3 (6.3%)	4 (1.3%)	7 (2.0%)		
RefWorks	1 (2.1%)	4 (1.3%)	5 (1.4%)		
Not reported	37 (77.1%)	144 (47.8%)	181 (51.9%)		
Most researched subject area					
Endocrinology	6 (12.5%)	10 (3.3%)	16 (4.6%)		
HIV/AIDS	1 (2.1%)	17 (5.6%)	18 (5.2%)		
Infectious Diseases (excluding HIV/AIDS)	10 (20.8%)	63 (20.9%)	73 (20.9%)		
Obstetrics and Gynecology	3 (6.3%)	31 (10.3%)	34 (9.7%)		
Pediatrics	1 (2.1%)	30 (10.0%)	31 (8.9%)		
Pharmacology and Therapeutics	8 (16.7%)	8 (2.7%)	16 (4.6%)		
Public and Global Health	5 (10.4%)	12 (4.0%)	17 (4.9%)		
Sexual and Reproductive Health	1 (2.1%)	18 (6.0%)	19 (5.4%)		
Addiction Medicine	0 (0%)	10 (3.3%)	10 (2.9%)		
Nutrition	0 (0%)	33 (11.0%)	33 (9.5%)		
Psychiatry and Clinical Psychology	0 (0%)	22 (7.3%)	22 (6.3%)		

Methodological and reporting quality

Protocol registeration and searching strategy

As shown in Table 2 below, less than one-third of SR and MA (28.7%) had a registered protocol, one in ten (10.3%) did the searching without language or time restriction, about one-fourth (27.5%) did not use PICO or another standard searching framework, and 24.4% did not do manual searching. In addition, 91.7% did not report the search interface, 63.6% did not report the search syntax and 77.9% did not report the date/year of the search coverage (Table 2).

Over time, Table 2, we observed that reporting of last search date ($p = 0.001$), search syntax ($p = 0.002$), and keywords and/or Boolean operators ($p = 0.003$) improved. Also, we found that recent publications had a higher chance of having a registered protocol ($p = 0.002$), reproducible search syntax ($p = 0.001$), completed the search within two years of publication ($p = 0.0005$) and having used PICO or another standard framework for search ($p = 0.005$).

Table 2: Protocol registration and searching strategy over time (N=349)

Characteristics	Publication year				Total (N=349)	X^2 statistic	p-value
	≤ 2018 (N=91)	2019 (N=72)	2020 (N=148)	2021 (N=38)			
Protocol registration							
No	77 (84.6%)	50 (69.4%)	102 (68.9%)	20 (52.6%)	249 (71.3%)	14.902	**0.002**
Yes	14 (15.4%)	22 (30.6%)	46 (31.1%)	18 (47.4%)	100 (28.7%)		
Most searched databases							
African Journals Online							
No	79 (86.8%)	65 (90.3%)	108 (73.0%)	30 (78.9%)	282 (80.8%)	12.22	**0.007**
Yes	12 (13.2%)	7 (9.7%)	40 (27.0%)	8 (21.1%)	67 (19.2%)		
EMBASE							
No	58 (63.7%)	31 (43.1%)	86 (58.1%)	16 (42.1%)	191 (54.7%)	10.066	**0.018**
Yes	33 (36.3%)	41 (56.9%)	62 (41.9%)	22 (57.9%)	158 (45.3%)		
PubMed							
No	11 (12.1%)	10 (13.9%)	6 (4.1%)	2 (5.3%)	29 (8.3%)	-	**0.027**
Yes	80 (87.9%)	62 (86.1%)	142 (95.9%)	36 (94.7%)	320 (91.7%)		
Scopus							
No	80 (87.9%)	51 (70.8%)	89 (60.1%)	26 (68.4%)	246 (70.5%)	20.988	**0.0001**
Yes	11 (12.1%)	21 (29.2%)	59 (39.9%)	12 (31.6%)	103 (29.5%)		
Web of Science							
No	79 (86.8%)	53 (73.6%)	89 (60.1%)	27 (71.1%)	248 (71.1%)	19.799	**0.0002**
Yes	12 (13.2%)	19 (26.4%)	59 (39.9%)	11 (28.9%)	101 (28.9%)		
Search interface reported							
No	84 (92.3%)	64 (88.9%)	137 (92.6%)	35 (92.1%)	320 (91.7%)	-	0.821
Yes	7 (7.7%)	8 (11.1%)	11 (7.4%)	3 (7.9%)	29 (8.3%)		
Keywords and/or Boolean operators reported							
No	24 (26.4%)	12 (16.7%)	18 (12.2%)	1 (2.6%)	55 (15.8%)	14.143	**0.003**
Yes	67 (73.6%)	60 (83.3%)	130 (87.8%)	37 (97.4%)	294 (84.2%)		
Manual search done							
No	20 (22.0%)	18 (25.0%)	35 (23.6%)	12 (31.6%)	85 (24.4%)	1.412	0.703
Yes	71 (78.0%)	54 (75.0%)	113 (76.4%)	26 (68.4%)	264 (75.6%)		
Search syntax reported							
No	73 (80.2%)	43 (59.7%)	85 (57.4%)	21 (55.3%)	222 (63.6%)	14.90	**0.002**

Yes	18 (19.8%)	29 (40.3%)	63 (42.6%)	17 (44.7%)	127 (36.4%)		
Reproducible search syntax							
No	4 (4.4%)	7 (9.7%)	17 (11.5%)	3 (7.9%)	31 (8.9%)	-	**0.001**
Not applicable	73 (80.2%)	39 (54.2%)	76 (51.4%)	17 (44.7%)	205 (58.7%)		
Yes	14 (15.4%)	26 (36.1%)	55 (37.2%)	18 (47.4%)	113 (32.4%)		
Last search date reported							
No	41 (45.1%)	40 (55.6%)	42 (28.4%)	13 (34.2%)	136 (39.0%)	17.087	**0.001**
Yes	50 (54.9%)	32 (44.4%)	106 (71.6%)	25 (65.8%)	213 (61.0%)		
Search within 2 years of publication							
No	12 (13.2%)	6 (8.3%)	3 (2.0%)	2 (5.3%)	23 (6.6%)	-	**0.0005**
Not clear	25 (27.5%)	28 (38.9%)	32 (21.6%)	7 (18.4%)	92 (26.4%)		
Yes	54 (59.3%)	38 (52.8%)	113 (76.4%)	29 (76.3%)	234 (67.0%)		
Date/Year of coverage reported							
No	70 (76.9%)	59 (81.9%)	119 (80.4%)	24 (63.2%)	272 (77.9%)	6.078	0.108
Yes	21 (23.1%)	13 (18.1%)	29 (19.6%)	14 (36.8%)	77 (22.1%)		
Type of studies included							
All type of studies	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.8%)	5 (3.4%)	0 (0%)	9 (2.6%)	-	-
Both observational and RCT studies	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	3 (2.0%)	1 (2.6%)	5 (1.4%)		
Observational studies	84 (92.3%)	64 (88.9%)	139 (93.9%)	37 (97.4%)	324 (92.8%)		
Validation studies	1 (1.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)		
Not specified	3 (3.3%)	6 (8.3%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	10 (2.9%)		
Reason for study selection reported							
No	75 (82.4%)	59 (81.9%)	135 (91.2%)	35 (92.1%)	304 (87.1%)	-	-
Not applicable	5 (5.5%)	6 (8.3%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	13 (3.7%)		
Yes	11 (12.1%)	7 (9.7%)	11 (7.4%)	3 (7.9%)	32 (9.2%)		
PICO or another framework used							
No	77 (84.6%)	55 (76.4%)	98 (66.2%)	23 (60.5%)	253 (72.5%)	12.907	**0.005**
Yes	14 (15.4%)	17 (23.6%)	50 (33.8%)	15 (39.5%)	96 (27.5%)		
Field experts consulted							
No	85 (93.4%)	69 (95.8%)	142 (95.9%)	35 (92.1%)	331 (94.8%)	-	0.619
Yes	6 (6.6%)	3 (4.2%)	6 (4.1%)	3 (7.9%)	18 (5.2%)		
Searching without any restriction							
No	80 (87.9%)	62 (86.1%)	133 (89.9%)	38 (100%)	313 (89.7%)	-	0.073
Yes	11 (12.1%)	10 (13.9%)	15 (10.1%)	0 (0%)	36 (10.3%)		

Screening and data extraction

The majority of SR and MA performed article screening (54.4%), data extraction (70.2%) and quality assessment (66.2%) in duplicate. Also, we observed improvement in performing data extraction ($p < 0.0001$) and quality assessment ($p < 0.0001$) in duplicate over time. NOS (37.0%) was the most commonly used quality assessment tool, followed by JBI (34.7%). Only 13.5% of the SR and MA used a standard (i.e., JBI) data extraction tool. Nearly all SR and MA (92.8%) included only observational studies, 87.1% did not mention the reason for study selection and 78.2% of the studies failed to contact or report contacting the corresponding authors for missing information or full-text. Moreover, 78.8% of the studies provided an adequate description of included studies and 91.7% reported the presence or absence of competing interest and/or funding for the SR or MA. However, most of the SRs and MA we included failed to report the list of excluded studies (86.8%) or funding for included primary studies (94.8%). Details has been presented in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Screening, data extraction and reporting over time (N=349)

Characteristics	Publication year				Total (N=349)	X^2 statistic	p-value
	≤ 2018 (N=91)	2019 (N=72)	2020 (N=148)	2021 (N=38)			
Double screening for study selection							
No	47 (51.6%)	32 (44.4%)	64 (43.2%)	16 (42.1%)	159 (45.6%)	1.899	0.594
Yes	44 (48.4%)	40 (55.6%)	84 (56.8%)	22 (57.9%)	190 (54.4%)		
Double data extraction							
No	46 (50.5%)	24 (33.3%)	25 (16.9%)	9 (23.7%)	104 (29.8%)	31.626	**<0.0001**
Yes	45 (49.5%)	48 (66.7%)	123 (83.1%)	29 (76.3%)	245 (70.2%)		
Data extraction tool							
Author(s) own (pretested)form	49 (53.8%)	40 (55.6%)	100 (67.6%)	28 (73.7%)	217 (62.2%)	-	-
JBI	8 (8.8%)	8 (11.1%)	24 (16.2%)	7 (18.4%)	47 (13.5%)		
PRISMA	0 (0%)	2 (2.8%)	2 (1.4%)	0 (0%)	4 (1.1%)		
Cochrane form	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)		
Not reported	34 (37.4%)	22 (30.6%)	21 (14.2%)	3 (7.9%)	80 (22.9%)		
Contacting corresponding authors							
No	71 (78.0%)	62 (86.1%)	111 (75.0%)	29 (76.3%)	273 (78.2%)	3.616	0.306
Yes	20 (22.0%)	10 (13.9%)	37 (25.0%)	9 (23.7%)	76 (21.8%)		
Double quality assessment							
No	47 (51.6%)	24 (33.3%)	33 (22.3%)	14 (36.8%)	118 (33.8%)	21.868	**<0.0001**
Yes	44 (48.4%)	48 (66.7%)	115 (77.7%)	24 (63.2%)	231 (66.2%)		
Mostly used quality assessment tools							
JBI							
No	47 (51.6%)	33 (45.8%)	79 (53.4%)	21 (55.3%)	180 (51.6%)	2.654	0.448
Yes	22 (24.2%)	23 (31.9%)	60 (40.5%)	16 (42.1%)	121 (34.7%)		
NOS							
No	48 (52.7%)	28 (38.9%)	79 (53.4%)	17 (44.7%)	172 (49.3%)	7.414	0.060
Yes	21 (23.1%)	28 (38.9%)	60 (40.5%)	20 (52.6%)	129 (37.0%)		
List of excluded studies reported							
No	73 (80.2%)	63 (87.5%)	134 (90.5%)	33 (86.8%)	303 (86.8%)	-	0.162
Yes	17 (18.7%)	9 (12.5%)	13 (8.8%)	5 (13.2%)	44 (12.6%)		
Adequate description of included studies							
No	28 (30.8%)	18 (25.0%)	23 (15.5%)	5 (13.2%)	74 (21.2%)	9.918	**0.019**

Yes	63 (69.2%)	54 (75.0%)	125 (84.5%)	33 (86.8%)	275 (78.8%)		
Funding for included studies reported							
No	90 (98.9%)	68 (94.4%)	136 (91.9%)	37 (97.4%)	331 (94.8%)	-	0.090
Yes	1 (1.1%)	4 (5.6%)	12 (8.1%)	1 (2.6%)	18 (5.2%)		
Competing interest and/or funding reported							
No	14 (15.4%)	4 (5.6%)	9 (6.1%)	2 (5.3%)	29 (8.3%)	-	0.068
Yes	77 (84.6%)	68 (94.4%)	139 (93.9%)	36 (94.7%)	320 (91.7%)		

Statistical analyses methods

As shown in Table 4, most MA (78.8%) pooled prevalence estimate followed by odds ratio (47.6%) estimate using random-effects model (78.8%) with DerSimonian-Laird (41.0%) between-study variance estimator and I^2 statistic (84.5%) for heterogeneity assessment. More than 70% of MA used Egger's test (72.8%) to assess publication bias and performed subgroup analysis (71.1%). STATA (66.2%) was the most commonly used statistical software for meta-analyses.

Across the publication years, we observed an increased trend in using Egger's test ($p < 0.0001$) and funnel plot (p-value 0.0002) for assessing publication bias. Similarly, performing subgroup analysis ($p = 0.023$) and sensitivity analysis ($p = 0.009$) was increased over time (Table 4).

Table 4: Statistical analyses methods used by MA (N=301)

Characteristics	Publication year				Total (N=301)	X^2 statistic	p-value
	≤ 2018 (N=69)	2019 (N=56)	2020 (N=139)	2021 (N=37)			
Statistical model							
Random-effects	61 (67.0%)	51 (70.8%)	128 (86.5%)	35 (92.1%)	275 (78.8%)		
Random- and Fixed-effects	3 (3.3%)	2 (2.8%)	7 (4.7%)	2 (5.3%)	14 (4.0%)		
Fixed-effects	1 (1.1%)	1 (1.4%)	4 (2.7%)	0 (0%)	6 (1.7%)		
Not reported	4 (4.4%)	2 (2.8%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	6 (1.7%)		
Between-study variance estimator							
DerSimonian-Laird	37 (40.7%)	23 (31.9%)	70 (47.3%)	13 (34.2%)	143 (41.0%)		
Restricted maximum likelihood	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0%)	1 (0.3%)		
Not reported	32 (35.2%)	33 (45.8%)	68 (45.9%)	24 (63.2%)	157 (45.0%)		
Mostly pooled summary measures							
Prevalence							
No	8 (8.8%)	6 (8.3%)	8 (5.4%)	4 (10.5%)	26 (7.4%)	-	0.352
Yes	61 (67.0%)	50 (69.4%)	131 (88.5%)	33 (86.8%)	275 (78.8%)		
Odds ratio							
No	31 (34.1%)	28 (38.9%)	58 (39.2%)	18 (47.4%)	135 (38.7%)	1.365	0.714
Yes	38 (41.8%)	28 (38.9%)	81 (54.7%)	19 (50.0%)	166 (47.6%)		
Mostly used heterogeneity assessment methods							
I^2 statistic							
No	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.8%)	3 (2.0%)	0 (0%)	6 (1.7%)	-	0.772
Yes	68 (74.7%)	54 (75.0%)	136 (91.9%)	37 (97.4%)	295 (84.5%)		
Cochran's Q test							
No	30 (33.0%)	24 (33.3%)	47 (31.8%)	13 (34.2%)	114 (32.7%)	2.604	0.457
Yes	39 (42.9%)	32 (44.4%)	92 (62.2%)	24 (63.2%)	187 (53.6%)		
Mostly used publication bias assessment methods							
Egger's test							
No	23 (25.3%)	7 (9.7%)	14 (9.5%)	3 (7.9%)	47 (13.5%)	21.676	**<0.0001**
Yes	46 (50.5%)	49 (68.1%)	125 (84.5%)	34 (89.5%)	254 (72.8%)		
Funnel plot							
No	33 (36.3%)	16 (22.2%)	27 (18.2%)	7 (18.4%)	83 (23.8%)	20.209	**0.0002**
Yes	36 (39.6%)	40 (55.6%)	112 (75.7%)	30 (78.9%)	218 (62.5%)		

Begg's test							
No	44 (48.4%)	39 (54.2%)	91 (61.5%)	28 (73.7%)	202 (57.9%)	1.912	0.591
Yes	25 (27.5%)	17 (23.6%)	48 (32.4%)	9 (23.7%)	99 (28.4%)		
Mostly done supportive analyses							
Subgroup analysis							
No	20 (22.0%)	7 (9.7%)	23 (15.5%)	3 (7.9%)	53 (15.2%)	9.573	**0.023**
Yes	49 (53.8%)	49 (68.1%)	116 (78.4%)	34 (89.5%)	248 (71.1%)		
Sensitivity analysis							
No	49 (53.8%)	31 (43.1%)	70 (47.3%)	15 (39.5%)	165 (47.3%)	11.475	**0.009**
Yes	20 (22.0%)	25 (34.7%)	69 (46.6%)	22 (57.9%)	136 (39.0%)		
Meta-regression analysis							
No	50 (54.9%)	34 (47.2%)	80 (54.1%)	23 (60.5%)	187 (53.6%)	4.416	0.220
Yes	19 (20.9%)	22 (30.6%)	59 (39.9%)	14 (36.8%)	114 (32.7%)		
Most used software for data analyses							
STATA							
No	27 (29.7%)	16 (22.2%)	23 (15.5%)	4 (10.5%)	70 (20.1%)	17.346	**0.0006**
Yes	42 (46.2%)	40 (55.6%)	116 (78.4%)	33 (86.8%)	231 (66.2%)		
Comprehensive meta-analysis							
No	58 (63.7%)	47 (65.3%)	127 (85.8%)	36 (94.7%)	268 (76.8%)	-	0.08
Yes	11 (12.1%)	9 (12.5%)	12 (8.1%)	1 (2.6%)	33 (9.5%)		
RStudio							
No	64 (70.3%)	54 (75.0%)	127 (85.8%)	34 (89.5%)	279 (79.9%)	-	0.698
Yes	5 (5.5%)	2 (2.8%)	12 (8.1%)	3 (7.9%)	22 (6.3%)		
Review Manager							
No	62 (68.1%)	53 (73.6%)	132 (89.2%)	35 (92.1%)	282 (80.8%)	-	0.547
Yes	7 (7.7%)	3 (4.2%)	7 (4.7%)	2 (5.3%)	19 (5.4%)		

Discussion

This study described the epidemiological trends and explored the methodological and reporting quality of medicine and health sciences SR and MA in Ethiopia. We found that the publication rate has been increased over time, especially during the last three years. We also observed a promising methodological and reporting quality improvements over time, even though there is a long way to go.

Since 2018, the number of SR and MA publications in Ethiopia has been dramatically increased with 148 SR and MA published in 2020 in various journals. The increase in publication rate in this study was in line with the global trend in several fileds. A recent study found that about 80 SR were globally published per day in 2019, which was more than 20-fold of the publication rate 20 years ago.[3] The study also found SR and MA were getting more diverse in terms of the type of review, journals, and authors affiliation.[3] The increase in the publication of SR and MA in Ethiopia maybe because SR and MA can be completed in short time period compare to primary studies. Also, the development of free citation management and statistical analysis software may have likely contributed to its increase, which saves substantial amount of time. Moreover, the increasing recognition of SR and MA by the academic institutions, scientific community and health care practitioners as a more reliable source of evidence can be a motivating factors for authors.

The implication of increased SR and MA publication is double-edged. On the one hand, it is useful to produce up-to-date knowledge for evidence-based clinical practice and decision-making to improve health and safety, and saving cost. How ever, the proper implementation of methodological standards in low-income countries, such as Ethiopia is poor.[21] Most health care decision-making tools were based on evidence from developed countries without considering the cultural and socioeconomic differences,

and translation into context was limited.[22] Therefore, the increase in publication of high quality SR and MA can be helpful to improve the accuracy of context-specific decision-making. On the other hand, there is also a growing concern that the mass production of SR and MA might lead to unnecessary, misleading, and conflicted evidence instead of promoting evidence-based medicine and health care.[23-26] In addition, a high number of SR might leads to research waste, as the publication of overlapping SR and MA become high.[27,28] For example, in our study, we found 28 duplicates on various topics: two duplicates of SR and MA on mother-to-child transmission of HIV[29,30], two on HIV/AIDS treatment failure[31,32], three on nursing process[33-35], three on antenatal depression[36-38], three on postnatal depression[39-41], three on breastfeeding[42-44], three on immunization coverage[45-47], three on low birth weight[48-50], two on tuberculosis treatment non-adherence[51,52], two on maternal-near miss[53,54] and two on antiepleptive medication non-adherence.[55,56] To minimize research waste, authors must register their protocol, thoroughly search protocol registration cites and communicate each other whenever possible. This can also increase collaboration and save energy and time. Furthermore, some groups have already initiated the idea of 'living' systematic reviews that will be updated as new research becomes available.[57]

Despite the increased trend of SR and MA publication in Ethiopia, according the the international standards most were poorly conducted and reported. The common methodological drawbacks in most SR and MA were not having a registered protocol and not reporting the search interface, search syntax, last search date, and list of excluded studies. This may be related to the quality of publishing journals. In this study, we observed that more than 50% of SR and MA were published in low rank (Q3 and Q4) or unranked journals, which they may not be strict about the quality of SR and MA, and publish all submission to increase their journal impact. Furthermore, authors may publish SR and MA just out of interest without adequate knowledge and skill or

consulting methodologists and statisticians. The result of our study is consistent with the global findings, where inconsistencies in methodological and reporting quality of SR and MA commonly reported.[5] Ensuring methodological and reporting quality is a long-standing challenge for researchers.[6] This implies that authors, supervisors, peer reviewers, journal editors and funding agencies must responsibly work together towards publishing high standard SR and MA. It is advisable for authors to look back and invite co-authors or other friends to read their manuscript instead of rushing to publish low quality SR and MA, and institutions must evaluate the quality of evidence before using these articles for academic promotion. Additionally, journals editors might consider asking authors to include their SR protocol along with the manuscript submission, and check their publications before inviting peer reviewers. Moreover, ensure quality funding agencies would evaluate experience and expertise in SR and MA of grant applicants and proposal reviewers, and may request documentation of SR and MA training or publication.

We observed a promising trend of improvement in some aspects of qualities in methodology and reporting in SR and MA in Ethiopia. Registering protocols, searching more databases and transparently reporting search strategy were improved over time. This is in agreement with previous studies that reported improvement in methodological quality over time.[4,5] This may be due to increase authors knowledge and skills to conduct SR and MA. In our study, we observed that at least four out of ten SR and MA published in Q1 (top 25%) and Q2 (50 - 75%) journals, which we believe their quality is better than SR and MA published in low rank or unranked journals. Furthermore, the improvement in reporting can be attributed to the development of methodological and reporting guidelines, such as the PRISMA statement[58] and the AMSTAR checklist.[17]

Our study's main strength is that we included a large number of SR and MA published to date, which enabling us to observe publication trends and current status of quality. In addition, we gathered detailed background- and quality-related data, which creates authors the opportunity main quality-related setbacks and start prioritizing quality over quantity. Our study also have limitations. First, we did not include unpublished SRs and MA, such as preprints, in our analysis because we believe there is a quality difference between published and unpublished SRs and MA, given the peer reviewers' and editors' feedback during publication would affect the quality of artciles. Second, misclassification for subject categories is possible and there is a huge inconsistency in choosing the subject area by authors in medrxiv platform. In addition, some outcomes may have more than one category, for example, H-pylori infection can be an infectious disease and gastroenterology. Third, only 10% of the data is validated by independent reviewer. Currently, we are working to validate at least 50% of the extracted data.

Conclusions

For the first time, our study provides robust characterization of epidemiological trends and methodological and reporting quality of SR and MA published to date in Ethiopia. We observed that the publication rate has been increased over time, especially during the last three years. However, the quantitative increase not balanced with the increase in methodological and reporting quality of SR and MA. Most SR and MA did not register protocol and not report search interface, search syntax, last search date, and list of excluded studies. Over all, we observed a promising improvement in some aspects of methodological and reporting quality of SR and MA. Shared responsibility between authors, supervisors, peer reviewers, editors, publishing journals and funding agencies is needed to optimize quality.

Funding

This study did not receive any funding.

References

1 Fusar-Poli, P. & Radua, J. Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evid Based Ment Health* **21**, 95-100, doi:10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014 (2018).

2 Hossain, M. M. Umbrella review as an emerging approach of evidence synthesis in health sciences: a bibliometric analysis. *Available at SSRN 3551055* (2020).

3 Hoffmann, F. *et al.* Nearly 80 systematic reviews were published each day: Observational study on trends in epidemiology and reporting over the years 2000-2019. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **138**, 1-11, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.05.022 (2021).

4 Moher, D., Tetzlaff, J., Tricco, A. C., Sampson, M. & Altman, D. G. Epidemiology and reporting characteristics of systematic reviews. *PLoS Med* **4**, e78, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.0040078 (2007).

5 Page, M. J. *et al.* Epidemiology and Reporting Characteristics of Systematic Reviews of Biomedical Research: A Cross-Sectional Study. *PLOS Medicine* **13**, e1002028, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1002028 (2016).

6 Yoshii, A., Plaut, D. A., McGraw, K. A., Anderson, M. J. & Wellik, K. E. Analysis of the reporting of search strategies in Cochrane systematic reviews. *J Med Libr Assoc* **97**, 21-29, doi:10.3163/1536-5050.97.1.004 (2009).

7 Tian, J., Zhang, J., Ge, L., Yang, K. & Song, F. The methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews from China and the USA are similar. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **85**, 50-58, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.12.004 (2017).

8 Bougioukas, K. I. *et al.* Global mapping of overviews of systematic reviews in healthcare published between 2000 and 2020: a bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **137**, 58-72, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.03.019 (2021).

9 Habtewold, T. D. *et al.* Biomedical and public health reviews and meta-analyses in Ethiopia had poor methodological quality: overview of evidence from 1970 to 2018. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* **109**, 90-98, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.01.011 (2019).

10 Mohammed, S. H., Habtewold, T. D., Arero, A. G. & Esmaillzadeh, A. The state of child nutrition in Ethiopia: an umbrella review of systematic review and meta-analysis reports. *BMC Pediatr* **20**, 404, doi:10.1186/s12887-020-02301-8 (2020).

11 Bayih, W. A. *et al.* The state of birth asphyxia in Ethiopia: An umbrella review of systematic review and meta-analysis reports, 2020. *Heliyon* **7**, e08128, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e08128 (2021).

12 Habtewold, T. D. *et al.* Bibliometric study of preclinical, clinical, and public health systematic reviews and meta-analyses in Ethiopia: systematically mapping publication outputs, authors' collaboration networks, trending research topics, and influential articles. *medRxiv*, 2022.2002.2024.22271416, doi:10.1101/2022.02.24.22271416 (2022).

13 Higgins, J. P. *et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. (John Wiley & Sons, 2019).

14 Page, M. J. *et al.* The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol* **134**, 178-189, doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.03.001 (2021).

15 Hupe, M. EndNote X9. *Journal of Electronic Resources in Medical Libraries* **16**, 117-119 (2019).

16 Covidence. Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia.

17 Shea, B. J. *et al.* AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *Bmj* **358**, j4008, doi:10.1136/bmj.j4008 (2017).

18 Aromataris, E. *et al.* Methodology for JBI umbrella reviews. (2014).

19 Faggion, C. M., Jr., Wu, Y. C., Tu, Y. K. & Wasiak, J. Quality of search strategies reported in systematic reviews published in stereotactic radiosurgery. *Br J Radiol* **89**, 20150878, doi:10.1259/bjr.20150878 (2016).

20 Corbyons, K., Han, J., Neuberger, M. M. & Dahm, P. Methodological Quality of Systematic Reviews Published in the Urological Literature from 1998 to 2012. *J Urol* **194**, 1374-1379, doi:10.1016/j.juro.2015.05.085 (2015).

21 Dessie, G. *et al.* Evidence-Based Practice and Associated Factors Among Health Care Providers Working in Public Hospitals in Northwest Ethiopia During 2017. *Current Therapeutic Research* **93**, 100613, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.curtheres.2020.100613 (2020).

22 Pearson, A. & Jordan, Z. Evidence-based healthcare in developing countries. *Int J Evid Based Healthc* **8**, 97-100 (2010).

23 Ioannidis, J. P. The Mass Production of Redundant, Misleading, and Conflicted Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses. *Milbank Q* **94**, 485-514, doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12210 (2016).

24 Page, M. J. & Moher, D. Mass Production of Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses: An Exercise in Mega-silliness? *Milbank Q* **94**, 515-519, doi:10.1111/1468-0009.12211 (2016).

25 Grainger, M. J., Bolam, F. C., Stewart, G. B. & Nilsen, E. B. Evidence synthesis for tackling research waste. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **4**, 495-497, doi:10.1038/s41559-020-1141-6 (2020).

26 Nakagawa, S. *et al.* A new ecosystem for evidence synthesis. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **4**, 498-501, doi:10.1038/s41559-020-1153-2 (2020).

27 Siontis, K. C., Hernandez-Boussard, T. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. Overlapping meta-analyses on the same topic: survey of published studies. *BMJ : British Medical Journal* **347**, f4501, doi:10.1136/bmj.f4501 (2013).

28 Naudet, F., Schuit, E. & Ioannidis, J. P. A. Overlapping network meta-analyses on the same topic: survey of published studies. *Int J Epidemiol* **46**, 1999-2008, doi:10.1093/ije/dyx138 (2017).

29 Kassa, G. M. Mother-to-child transmission of HIV infection and its associated factors in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Infect Dis* **18**, 216, doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3126-5 (2018).

30 Endalamaw, A., Demsie, A., Eshetie, S. & Habtewold, T. D. A systematic review and meta-analysis of vertical transmission route of HIV in Ethiopia. *BMC Infect Dis* **18**, 283, doi:10.1186/s12879-018-3189-3 (2018).

31 Endalamaw, A. *et al.* HIV/AIDS treatment failure and associated factors in Ethiopia: meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* **20**, 82, doi:10.1186/s12889-020-8160-8 (2020).

32 Assemie, M. A., Alene, M., Ketema, D. B. & Mulatu, S. Treatment failure and associated factors among first line patients on highly active antiretroviral therapy in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Glob Health Res Policy* **4**, 32, doi:10.1186/s41256-019-0120-4 (2019).

33 Gebeyehu Yazew, K., Azagew, A. W. & Yohanes, Y. B. Determinants of the nursing process implementation in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis, 2019. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences* **13**, 100219, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2020.100219 (2020).

34 Shiferaw, W. S., Akalu, T. Y., Wubetu, A. D. & Aynalem, Y. A. Implementation of Nursing Process and Its Association with Working Environment and Knowledge in Ethiopia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Nurs Res Pract* **2020**, 6504893, doi:10.1155/2020/6504893 (2020).

35 Bayih, W. A. *et al.* The implementation of nursing process during patient care in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Heliyon* **7**, e06933, doi:10.1016/j.heliyon.2021.e06933 (2021).

36 Zegeye, A. *et al.* Prevalence and determinants of antenatal depression among pregnant women in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth* **18**, 462, doi:10.1186/s12884-018-2101-x (2018).

37 Ayano, G., Tesfaw, G. & Shumet, S. Prevalence and determinants of antenatal depression in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **14**, e0211764, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0211764 (2019).

38 Getinet, W. *et al.* Prevalence and Risk Factors for Antenatal Depression in Ethiopia: Systematic Review. *Depress Res Treat* **2018**, 3649269, doi:10.1155/2018/3649269 (2018).

39 Duko, B., Wolde, D. & Alemayehu, Y. The epidemiology of postnatal depression in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Reprod Health* **17**, 180, doi:10.1186/s12978-020-01035-1 (2020).

40 Desta, M. *et al.* Postpartum depression and its association with intimate partner violence and inadequate social support in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Affect Disord* **279**, 737-748, doi:10.1016/j.jad.2020.11.053 (2021).

41 Necho, M., Abadisharew, M. & Getachew, Y. A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Depression in Postpartum Women in a Low-income Country; Ethiopia, 2020. *The Open Public Health Journal* **13** (2020).

42 Habtewold, T. D. *et al.* Breast and complementary feeding in Ethiopia: new national evidence from systematic review and meta-analyses of studies in the past 10 years. *Eur J Nutr* **58**, 2565-2595, doi:10.1007/s00394-018-1817-8 (2019).

43 Alebel, A., Tesma, C., Temesgen, B., Ferede, A. & Kibret, G. D. Exclusive breastfeeding practice in Ethiopia and its association with antenatal care and institutional delivery: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Breastfeed J* **13**, 31, doi:10.1186/s13006-018-0173-x (2018).

44 Alebel, A. *et al.* Timely initiation of breastfeeding and its association with birth place in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int Breastfeed J* **12**, 44, doi:10.1186/s13006-017-0133-x (2017).

45 Biset, G., Woday, A., Mihret, S. & Tsihay, M. Full immunization coverage and associated factors among children age 12-23 months in Ethiopia: systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* **17**, 2326-2335, doi:10.1080/21645515.2020.1870392 (2021).

46 Eshete, A., Shewasinad, S. & Hailemeskel, S. Immunization coverage and its determinant factors among children aged 12-23 months in Ethiopia: a systematic review, and Meta- analysis of cross-sectional studies. *BMC Pediatr* **20**, 283, doi:10.1186/s12887-020-02163-0 (2020).

47 Nour, T. Y., Farah, A. M., Ali, O. M. & Abate, K. H. Immunization coverage in Ethiopia among 12-23 month old children: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC Public Health* **20**, 1134, doi:10.1186/s12889-020-09118-1 (2020).

48 Endalamaw, A., Engeda, E. H., Ekubagewargies, D. T., Belay, G. M. & Tefera, M. A. Low birth weight and its associated factors in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ital J Pediatr* **44**, 141, doi:10.1186/s13052-018-0586-6 (2018).

49 Dasa, T. T., Kassie, T. W., Roba, A. A. & Kelel, H. U. Prevalence and Determinants of Low Birth Weight in Ethiopia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *African Journal of Health Sciences* **33**, 49-64 (2020).

50 Katiso, N. A., Kassa, G. M., Fekadu, G. A., Kidanemariam Berhe, A. & Muche, A. A. Prevalence and Determinants of Low Birth Weight in Ethiopia: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Advances in Public Health* **2020**, 7589483, doi:10.1155/2020/7589483 (2020).

51 Zegeye, A. *et al.* Prevalence and determinants of anti-tuberculosis treatment non-adherence in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS One* **14**, e0210422, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0210422 (2019).

52 Tola, H. H., Holakouie-Naieni, K., Tesfaye, E., Mansournia, M. A. & Yaseri, M. Prevalence of tuberculosis treatment non-adherence in Ethiopia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Tuberc Lung Dis* **23**, 741-749, doi:10.5588/ijtld.18.0672 (2019).

53 Turi, E. *et al.* The impact of antenatal care on maternal near-miss events in Ethiopia: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences* **13**, 100246, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2020.100246 (2020).

54 Mengist, B., Desta, M., Tura, A. K., Habtewold, T. D. & Abajobir, A. Maternal near miss in Ethiopia: Protective role of antenatal care and disparity in socioeconomic inequities: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Africa Nursing Sciences* **15**, 100332, doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijans.2021.100332 (2021).

55 Amha, H. *et al.* Antiseizure medication nonadherence and its associated factors among Epileptic patients in Ethiopia, a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Seizure* **91**, 462-475, doi:10.1016/j.seizure.2021.07.024 (2021).

56 Belayneh, Z. & Mekuriaw, B. A systematic review and meta-analysis of anti-epileptic medication non-adherence among people with epilepsy in Ethiopia. *Arch Public Health* **78**, 23, doi:10.1186/s13690-020-00405-2 (2020).

57 Elliott, J. H. *et al.* Living Systematic Reviews: An Emerging Opportunity to Narrow the Evidence-Practice Gap. *PLOS Medicine* **11**, e1001603, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1001603 (2014).

58 Moher, D., Liberati, A., Tetzlaff, J. & Altman, D. G. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med* **6**, e1000097, doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097 (2009).

Supplimentary Table 1: List and description of variables extracted from systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

Variables	Description
Article ID	Serial number given to each article.
Title	The title of the article.
Publication type	The type of article as identified by the authors in the title as systematic review and/or meta-analysis. For articles that did not identify in the title, publication type was decided based on their methods.
Author	Last name of first author, e.g. Habtewold et al.
Number of authors	The total number of authors listed in the article.
Number of affiliations	The number of institution(s) that the first author is affiliated with.
Primary affiliation	The first university or any organization and department that the first author is affiliated with.
Rank of organization	The national ranking of university/organization available in ranking web of universities (https://www.webometrics.info/en/Africa/ethiopia) was used. For universities/organizations not in the ranking list or international organization left open.
Year of publication	The year when the article is available online for the first time. Volume and issue given year was not considered.
Journal	The full name of the journal that published the article as written in the journal home page or Web of Science.
Publisher	The full name of published of the journal. For articles that did not include the publisher, journal home page or Google was searched to identify the correct publisher.
Impact factor	The latest (2020) 2-year impact factor of the journal (with and without self-citation) was used in three decimals. Impact factor was extracted from the

	journal webpage and validated using Web of Science Journal Citation report. When the journal has no impact factor, '0' was reported.
5-year impact factor	The latest (2020) 5-year impact factor of the journal was used in three decimals. This impact factor was extracted from the journal webpage and validated using Web of Science Journal Citation report (see Additional metrics section). When the journal has no impact factor, '0' was reported.
Rank	The latest (2020) journal rank based on the 2-year impact factor was used. Web of Science Journal Citation report was used the identify the correct rank of the journal. When the journal has no impact factor, the journal labeled as 'Not ranked". When the journal rank is available for different categories (fields), the category closely related to the article title was used to obtain the rank.
Study population	The study participants of the primary studies included in the article. When more than one study participants are included, all must be listed.
Outcome	The outcome of main topic area of the article. When more than one study outcomes are included, all must be listed.
Subject area	Decide based on the outcome (your answer in Q18) and your own expertise using the medRxiv health science preprint server subjective area classification system (https://www.medrxiv.org). When you are in doubt about the classification, consult Wikipedia (Speciality) and the publishing journal.
ICD-11 classification	Enter the outcome (your answer for Q18) here (https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en) to see the classification (parent). For example the ICD-11 classification/Parent of diabetes mellitus is 'Endocrine diseases'.
Protocol	Registration and/or publication of the protocol in a known international registry (e.g., PROSPERO) and/or journal as explicitly stated in the paper and registration number is included. (AMSTAR-2: Item 2)
Database	The databases searched to access published and unpublished records. Institutional library repositories are not considered as databases. (AMSTAR-

	2: Item 4)
Interface	The platform/tool/" front end" used to search databases (e.g., EBSCO, NCBI, Ovid). It is sufficient if it is reported at least for one database. (Cochrane guideline)
Keywords and/or Boolean operators	These are relevant keywords or/and Boolean operators that used to develop the search strategy. Their clear and explicit presence in article is sufficient. (AMSTAR-2: Item 4)
Additional sources	These are grey literature, systematic reviews, trial/study registries, or cross-references used to search additional records. Reporting in the article is sufficient when it was done. (AMSTAR-2: Item 4)
Search strategy	The search syntax/string used to retrieve records at least for one database or for all databases searched. This information obtained from the main text or supplementary file of the article. (Cochrane guideline)
Reproducibility of search string	The search syntax/string using at least one database specified by the author(s) was used to search articles. Use search syntax/string as exactly used in the article and ignore warnings and notes by the database. Additionally, it is sufficient when at least some amounts of hits are obtained.
Last search date	The final date of the last search date or freezing data. Article inclusion date can be considered last search date. This information can be extracted from the main text of the article or the protocol when it is registered. (Cochrane guideline) This is also important to evaluate whether the search conducted within 24 months of completion of the systematic review and/or meta-analysis. (AMSTAR-2: Item 4)
Date of coverage	The date of coverage for each database searched as clearly and explicitly reported in the article, e.g. PubMed was searched from 1990 to 2020; EMBASE was searched 1950 to 2021, e.t.c. (Cochrane guideline)
Type of studies	The types of the primary studies included in the systematic review and meta-analysis. Justification for the inclusion of certain type of studies or all type of studies must be explicitly explained. (AMSTAR-2: Item 3)

Study framework	Population, Intervention/Exposure, Comparator and Outcome (PI/ECO), Condition, Context, and Population (CoCoPop) or other known framework used. It is also acceptable when the research questions and inclusion criteria reflected the components of PI/ECO, CoCoPop or other frameworks. Timeframe for follow-up studies is optional. (AMSTAR-2: Item 1)
Expert opinion	Experts in particular field of study who were consulted by author(s) about completeness of available primary studies included in their review and/or meta-analysis. (AMSTAR-2: Item 4)
Search restricition	The criteria used to restrict/limit the literature search, e.g. language, time period. When search was restricted based on certain criteria, justification for the restrictions is needed. (AMSTAR-2: Item 4)
Duplicate screening	Screening of titles, abstracts and full texts of articles by two independent reviewers. This also include contacting the authors of primary studies to obtain full-text of the article. (AMSTAR-2: Item 5)
Data-extraction	Data extraction by two independent reviewers using a standard or author(s) own form/tool. This also include contacting the authors of primary studies to obtain missing data or further relevant information. (AMSTAR-2: Item 6)
Quality appraisal	Duplicate assessment of quality or risk of bias of included studies using a standard tool. (AMSTAR-2: Item 9)
Statistical model	The model used to pool results from each study. (AMSTAR-2: Item 11)
Heterogeneity estimator	The method used to estimate the total amount of between-study heterogeneity.
Summary measures	A summary statistic calculated for each study and analyzed together to get pooled results that describe the observed event or association between variables.
Heterogeneity measures	A measure to assess statistical heterogeneity among the included studies.
Publication bias	Methods and tests to examine potential publication bias in the meta-

measures	analysis. (AMSTAR-2: Item 15)
Supportive/Repeat analyses	A repeat of the primary meta-analysis aiming for further investigation of the main result. Conversion or noise adjustment methods can be included here.
Data managment and analysis software	An application used to analyze the data
Number of studies	Total number of studies included in the systematic review and/or meta-analysis.
Excluded studies	The list of excluded studies and reason(s) for exclusion after full-text review. (AMSTAR-2: Item 7)
Study characterstics	The detail characteristics of the included studies, such as study population, study setting, intervention/exposure, comparator, time frame for follow-up study, study design and outcome(s). (AMSTAR-2: Item 8)
Funding	The sources of funding for the individual included studies. This includes funded (funder name), 'not funded', 'not reported' as long as it is reported. (AMSTAR-2: Item 10)
Main findings	Pooled estimates (e.g., prevalence, OR) for meta-analysis or concluding statement for systematic review articles. Results from supportive/repeat analyses, such as subgroup analysis, sensitivity analysis are not required.
Associated factors	Significant and non-significant factors that associated positively or negatively with the outcome of interest when meta-analysis was done. Summary measures are not required.
Disclosure	Declaration of competing interest or funding for conducting the systematic review and/or meta-analysis.
Citation management software	An application used to manage references during screening and selection process.
Number of references	The total number of citation used in the systematic review and/or meta-analysis.

Citation count	The total number that the article cited in other paper(s) with or without self-citation