Title page

Title

The methodological quality of COVID-19 systematic reviews is low, except for Cochrane reviews: a meta-epidemiological study

^{1,2,3,4,5}Yuki Kataoka, MD, MPH, DrPH, ^{3,6}Shiho Oide, MD, ^{3,7}Takashi Arie, MSc, PT, ^{3,7,8}Yasushi Tsujimoto, MD, MPH, ⁹Toshi A. Furukawa, MD, PhDs

Author Affiliations: ¹Hospital Care Research Unit, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center, Higashinaniwa-cho 2-17-77, Amagasaki 660-8550 JAPAN ²Department of Community Medicine in the Graduate School of Medicine, Kyoto University, Yoshida Konoe-cho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, JAPAN ³Systematic Review Workshop Peer Support Group (SRWS-PSG), Japan ⁴Department of Respiratory Medicine, Hyogo Prefectural Amagasaki General Medical Center, Higashinaniwa-cho 2-17-77, Amagasaki 660-8550 JAPAN ⁵Department of Healthcare Epidemiology, Graduate School of Medicine and Public Health, Kyoto University, Yoshida Konoe-cho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, JAPAN ⁶Department of Gynecology, Women's center, Yotsuya Medical Cube, 7-7, Nibancho, Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 102-0084, Japan ⁷Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Sciences at Fukuoka, International University of Health and

Welfare, 137-1 Enokizu, Okawa-shi, Fukuoka 831-8501, Japan ⁸Department of Nephrology and
Dialysis, Kyoritsu Hospital, 16-5 Chuo-cho, Kawanishi, Hyogo 666-0016, Japan ⁹Department of
Health Promotion and Human Behavior, Kyoto University Graduate School of Medicine / School of
Public Health, Yoshida Konoe-cho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan

Corresponding Author:

Toshi A. Furukawa

Department of Health Promotion and Human Behavior, Kyoto University Graduate School of
Medicine / School of Public Health, Yoshida Konoe-cho, Sakyo-ku, Kyoto 606-8501, Japan

Phone: +81-75-753-9491

Fax: +81-75-753-4641

Email: furukawa@kuhp.kyoto-u.ac.jp

ABSTRACT

Objectives: The objective of this study was to investigate the methodological quality of COVID-19 systematic reviews (SRs) indexed in medRxiv and PubMed, compared with Cochrane COVID Reviews.

Study Design and Setting: This is a cross-sectional meta-epidemiological study. We searched medRxiv, PubMed, and Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews for SRs of COVID-19. We evaluated the methodological quality using A MeaSurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews (AMSTAR) checklists. The maximum AMSTAR score is 11, and minimum is 0. Higher score means better quality.

Results: We included 9 Cochrane reviews as well as randomly selected 100 non-Cochrane reviews in medRxiv and PubMed. Compared with Cochrane reviews (mean 9.33, standard deviation 1.32), the mean AMSTAR scores of the articles in medRxiv were lower (mean difference -2.85, 95% confidence intervals (CI): -0.96 to -4.74) and those in PubMed was also lower (mean difference -3.28, 95% CI: -1.40 to -5.15), with no difference between the latter two.

Conclusions: It should be noted that AMSTAR is not a perfect tool of assessing quality SRs other than intervention. Readers should pay attention to the potentially low methodological quality of COVID-19 SRs in both PubMed and medRxiv but less so in Cochrane COVID reviews.

PROTOCOL AND REGISTRATION

We developed the protocol before conducting this study (Kataoka Y, Oide S, Arie T, Tsujimoto Y,

Furukawa TA. Quality of COVID-19 research in preprints: a meta-epidemiological study protocol.

Protocols.io 2020. <https://doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bhm8j49w>).

Keywords: preprints; peer-review; systematic review; methodological quality; meta-epidemiological

study; COVID-19

Running title

The methodological quality of COVID-19 systematic reviews is low

Word count:

Abstract: 194 words, text: 2110 words

What is new?

Key findings

- The methodological quality of COVID-19 systematic reviews (SRs) in medRxiv and PubMed were lower than Cochrane COVID reviews.
- The methodological quality of reviews in medRxiv and PubMed did not differ.

What this study adds to what was known

- Expert opinions and a preliminary review suggested the low quality of COVID-19 SRs but this hypothesis has not been examined empirically.
- We evaluated the methodological quality of COVID-19 SRs using comprehensive search and confirmed that the quality was low except for Cochrane reviews.

What is the implication and what should change now?

Readers should pay attention to the potentially low methodological quality of COVID-19 SRs in both PubMed and medRxiv but less so in Cochrane COVID reviews.

The methodological quality of COVID-19 SRs except for Cochrane COVID reviews needed to be improved.

1. Background

SARS-Cov-2 virus has caused a once-in-a-century pandemic. As of August 2020, there have been over 800,000 coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19) deaths [1]. Recent advances in information and communication technology have led to the publication of many academic articles [2,3]. Until May 2020, more than a thousand COVID-19 trials were registered in ClinicalTrials.gov [4]. Cochrane started Cochrane COVID Reviews to answer the time-sensitive needs of health decision makers as fast as possible. These reviews are intended to simultaneously assure the scientific quality [5].

While the number of studies is growing, questions are being raised about their methodological quality. A meta-epidemiological study that investigated the quality of randomized controlled studies (RCT) of COVID-19 pointed out the poor methodology [6]. A preliminary meta-epidemiological study including 18 COVID-19 systematic reviews (SRs) published until March 2020 also pointed out the poor methodology [7]. Despite the important role of SRs in clinical decision-making [8], the quality of COVID-19 SRs performed for speedy reporting has not been adequately evaluated. In addition, no studies assessed the quality of SRs published in preprint servers without peer review in comparison with other data sources. Hence, we investigated the methodological quality of COVID-19 reviews indexed in medRxiv, PubMed, and the Cochrane Library.

2. Materials and methods

2.1 protocol and study design

This is a cross-sectional meta-epidemiological study. We abode by the reporting guideline of meta-epidemiological study where applicable (S1 Table) [9]. We published the protocol prior to conducting this study [10].

2.2 Types of studies included

We included SRs, indexed in PubMed, medRxiv, and Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR). We included articles of topics related to the COVID-19 practice, irrespective of publication types. We included Cochrane Reviews that dealt with the COVID-19 pandemic. We excluded study protocols.

The definition of SRs was “a scientific investigation that focuses on a specific question and uses explicit, prespecified scientific methods to identify, select, assess, and summarize the findings of similar but separate studies.” [11]

2.3 Search methods

We retrieved abstracts from medRxiv COVID-19 SARS-CoV-2 preprints using search terms:

“review”, “evidence synthesis”, “meta-analysis”, or “metaanalysis” on 15th June 2020. [12] We retrieved abstracts from PubMed using Shokraneh’s filter for COVID-19 [13] and PubMed Systematic Reviews Filter [14] on 15th June 2020. We retrieved abstracts from Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) using search term “COVID-19” on 17th Aug 2020.

2.4 Study selection

Two of three review authors (YK, SO, and TA) selected abstracts from search results independently. Disagreements were solved through discussion. Two of three review authors (YK, SO, and TA) selected full text articles from selected abstracts independently. Disagreements were solved through discussion. Of the articles indexed in medRxiv and PubMed and meeting the eligibility criteria, we randomly selected 100 from each database for inclusion in the present study. We included all Cochrane reviews.

2.5 Data extraction and assessment

2.5.1 Methodological quality of systematic reviews

We defined the methodological quality as “to what extent a study was designed, conducted, analyzed, interpreted, and reported to avoid systematic errors” [15].

For calibration training, three review authors (YK, SO, and TA) independently evaluated the methodological quality using A MeaSurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews (AMSTAR) checklists for five included articles [16]. Disagreements were resolved through discussion. Then one of three review authors (YK, SO, and TA) evaluated other articles. Another author (YK or SO) confirmed the results. We resolved disagreements through discussion.

We initially intended to use AMSTR 2, which is a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomized or non-randomized studies of healthcare interventions [17]. Because there were few intervention reviews, we used AMSTAR due to the latter's applicability [14]. AMSTAR was developed for assessing the methodological quality of systematic reviews. For each of the 11 items in AMSTAR checklist, we calculated the AMSTAR score by counting the number of "Yes". Higher scores indicate higher quality of the systematic review. The possible maximum score was 11. We added some explanations to AMSTAR to reduce disagreements following a previous study after calibration training [18]. The details are shown in S2 Table.

2.5.2 Other variables

The number of included studies was counted at the time of their synthesis of each article. We evaluated types of research questions, the presence of protocol registrations, and the presence of limitation in each abstract. We determined that articles with "rapid" in the title is a "rapid review".

We also evaluated the presence of SPIN in the title or abstract conclusion in intervention systematic reviews whose first outcome was non-significant.[19] SPIN was judged present when there were the manipulation of language to potentially mislead readers from the likely truth of the results. One of three review authors (YK, SO, and TA) evaluated these variables. Another author (YK or SO) confirmed the results. We resolved the disagreements through discussion.

2.5.3 Outcomes

Our primary outcome was the total score of AMSTAR.

2.6 Data analysis

We described summary statistics. We used risk difference (RD) and 95% confidence intervals (CI) to compare binary variables. For quantification of the disagreements of AMSTAR checklists, we calculated kappa statistics between the initial and the final evaluations for the included studies except for the five articles used for calibration. We used ANOVA with Bonferroni correction for the comparison of total AMSTAR score. We conducted sensitivity analysis excluding scoping reviews or qualitative synthesis, because the summary score will be lower in those not intended for meta-analysis or risk-of-bias assessment. We used Stata ver. 16.1 (StataCorp LLC, College Station, Texas, United States of America).

2.7 Ethics

Because this study used only open data, ethics approval was not applicable.

3. Results

3.1 Results of the search

The details of selection process are shown in Figure 1. We searched a total of 641 abstracts from medRxiv and PubMed. We randomly included 49 articles from medRxiv, and 51 articles from PubMed, respectively. We searched a total of 12 abstracts from CDSR, and included 9 articles. Detailed citations are shown in S3 Table. Included articles from PubMed was not indexed in medRxiv, or CDSR.

3.2 Characteristics of included articles

The characteristics of included articles are shown in Table 1. We included 7 rapid reviews from medRxiv, 4 from PubMed, and 4 from Cochrane, respectively. The medians [interquartile range (IQR)] of included studies for qualitative synthesis were 29.5 [17-45.5] in medRxiv, 18.5 [11-39] in PubMed, and 24 [16-36] in Cochrane, respectively. More than a half of articles did not register their protocols.

3.3 Quality of included articles

Table 2 summarizes the characteristics of included articles. The agreement between the initial and the agreed-upon AMSTAR ratings ranged between 0.85 and 1.0. The mean (standard deviation (SD)) scores was 9.33 (1.32) in Cochrane reviews, 6.48 (2.07) of medRxiv, and 6.06 (2.30) of PubMed, respectively. Referring to limitations in each abstract were more often in Cochrane than medRxiv (RD 56%, 95% CI: 32 to 81), and also more often in Cochrane than PubMed (RD 64%, 95%CI: 41 to 88), respectively. Compared with Cochrane reviews, the mean scores of the reviews in medRxiv were lower (mean difference -2.85, 95%confidence intervals (CI): -0.96 to -4.74) and those in PubMed was also lower (mean difference -3.28, 95% CI: -1.40 to -5.15) (Table 3). The difference between medRxiv and PubMed was not statistically significant. The score difference between articles in medRxiv and those in PubMed were not statistically significant (mean difference -0.42, 95% CI: -1.46 to 0.62). Sensitivity analysis after excluding scoping reviews or qualitative synthesis showed similar difference (Cochrane vs. medRxiv: mean difference -2.71, 95%CI 0.70 to 4.72, Cochrane vs. PubMed: mean difference -2.93, 95%CI 0.98 to 4.87).

There were six intervention articles whose first presented outcome was not statistically significant.

No articles expressed SPIN in both titles and conclusions of abstracts.

4. Discussion

This is the first meta-epidemiological study evaluating methodological quality of SRs dealing with the COVID-19 pandemic including preprints, peer-reviewed articles, and Cochrane reviews.

Compared with Cochrane reviews, the mean scores of AMSTAR were lower in articles from medRxiv and PubMed, respectively. The mean scores of medRxiv and PubMed did not differ significantly.

Our findings suggest ordinary peer reviews could not improve the quality of SRs. The mean AMSTAR score difference between medRxiv (6.06) and PubMed (6.48) were not statistically significant. A previous study included SRs published in PubMed from China and US showed their mean AMSTAR score was 6.14 [20]. There's not much difference between our results and regular peer-reviewed SRs. This fact suggests it's not clear whether the quality of COVID-19 SRs will improve in the future with sufficient time of peer-review. At this point, readers should note that the methodological quality of SRs about COVID-19 in both PubMed and medRxiv may be of poor quality, but this is not the case in the Cochrane COVID reviews.

Strict structured reporting like Cochrane reviews would be more useful than time-limited peer reviews or without peer reviews [21]. Referring to limitations in each abstract were more often in Cochrane than in medRxiv or PubMed. The differences of the quality of the articles we found between Cochrane reviews and others included the presentation of protocols, listing included and

excluded studies, considering the quality of included studies at the conclusions, examining publication bias, and presenting the conflict of interests. These domains will be improved by the appropriate use of preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses (PRISMA) statement [22,23]. If the duplicate study selection is difficult due to manpower insufficiency, one solution might be to use crowdsourcing to bring people together through the internet [24].

The proportion of protocol registrations did not differ from those reported in previous studies. Previous studies reported about 20% of SRs registered their protocols [25,26]. Protocol registration is important to prevent duplicate efforts, prevent outcome reporting bias, and to reduce alpha errors in the results of meta-analyses. PROSPERO, the largest SRs protocol registration site, has some problems including not accepting Scoping reviews and taking more than 30 days to register [27]. Some SRs published their protocols in preprint servers [28,29]. For speedy and assuring the scientific quality, protocol registration in preprint servers would be useful.

Our study has several limitations. First, AMSTAR is a reliable and valid measurement tool that has been used widely so far [30]. However, it was originally developed for SRs of randomized trials [31], and there is a criticism for the integrated evaluation of different domains [32]. Future research is needed to determine how to assess the quality of SRs which do not target at interventions. Second, we assessed the quality of the articles while not being masked about the published journal names. While the empirical evidence shows that such a bias is unlikely [33], this information bias could

have led to overestimating the quality of Cochrane COVID reviews. Third, we were not able to incorporate studies that were published before and after peer review in the current study. Further study to compare studies published in peer-reviewed journals after publication in preprint servers is warranted.

5. Conclusions

Readers should pay attention to the potentially low methodological quality of SRs about COVID-19 in both PubMed and medRxiv but less so in Cochrane COVID reviews. The methodological quality of COVID-19 SRs except for Cochrane COVID reviews needed to be improved.

Author Contributions:

Yuki Kataoka had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: All authors.

Acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Yuki Kataoka.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors.

Supervision: Toshi A. Furukawa.

Funding: self-funding

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: Toshi A. Furukawa reports personal fees from Meiji, Mitsubishi-Tanabe, MSD and Pfizer and a grant from Mitsubishi-Tanabe, outside the submitted work; TAF has a patent 2018-177688 pending. Other authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Additional Contributions: We acknowledge Ms. Kyoko Wasai, who assisted retrieving full text articles.

Figure and Table legends

Fig 1. Flowchart for the selection

Table 1. characteristics of included systematic reviews

	medRxiv N=49	PubMed N=51	Cochrane N=9
Number of included articles	29.5 (17-45.5)	18.5 (11-39)	24 (16-36)
Median (IQR)			
Types of research questions			
DTA	1 (2%)	2 (4%)	2 (22%)
Intervention	9 (18%)	14 (28%)	6 (67%)
Meta-epidemiological	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	
Prevalence, incidence	8 (16%)	16 (31%)	
Prognostic factor	11 (22%)	7 (14%)	
Scoping review, qualitative synthesis	19 (39%)	12 (24%)	1 (11%)
Protocol registration			
Present	5 (10%)	9 (18%)	3 (33%)

IQR: interquartile range, DTA: diagnostic test accuracy

Table 2 The quality of included systematic review articles

	medRxiv	PubMed	Cochrane	Risk difference medRxiv vs. Cochrane % [95% CI]	Risk difference PubMed vs. Cochrane	kappa
Referring to limitations in each abstract						1
Yes	16 (33%)	12 (24%)	8 (89%)	56% [32 to 81]	64% [41 to 80]	
No	33 (67%)	37 (73%)	1 (11%)			
Without an abstract	0 (0%)	2 (4%)	0 (0%)			
AMSTAR						
1. Was an 'a priori' design provided?						0.91
Yes	8 (17%)	13 (25%)	8 (89%)	72% [49 to 95]	63% [40 to 88]	
No	4 (8%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)			
Can't answer	36 (75%)	38 (73%)	1 (11%)			
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?						0.96
Yes	41 (85%)	45 (87%)	9 (100%)	15% [5 to 25]	13% [4 to 23]	
No	1 (2%)	3 (6%)	0 (0%)			
Can't answer	6 (13%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)			
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?						1
Yes	46 (96%)	47 (90%)	7 (78%)	-18% [-46 to 10]	-13% [-41 to 16]	
No	2 (4%)	5 (10%)	2 (22%)			
4. Was the status of publication (i.e. grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?						0.85

Yes	21 (44%)	24 (46%)	6 (67%)	23% [-11 to 57]	21% [-13 to 54]	
No	18 (38%)	14 (27%)	3 (33%)			
Can't answer	8 (17%)	14 (27%)	0 (0%)			
Not applicable	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)			
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?						0.96
Yes	5 (10%)	2 (4%)	8 (89%)	78% [56 to 100]	85% [64 to 100]	
No	43 (90%)	50 (96%)	1 (11%)			
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?						0.85
Yes	47 (98%)	47 (90%)	9 (100%)	2% [-2 to 6]	10% [2 to 18]	
No	1 (2%)	5 (10%)	0 (0%)			
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?						0.96
Yes	27 (56%)	22 (42%)	9 (100%)	44% [30 to 58]	58% [44 to 71]	
No	21 (44%)	30 (58%)	0 (0%)			
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?						0.98
Yes	31 (65%)	24 (46%)	9 (100%)	35% [22 to 49]	54% [40 to 67]	
No	17 (35%)	28 (54%)	0 (0%)			
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?						0.89
Yes	24 (50%)	22 (42%)	3 (33%)	-17% [-51 to 17]	-9 [-43 to 25]	
No	4 (8%)	2 (4%)	1 (11%)			

Not applicable	20 (42%)	28 (54%)	5 (56%)			
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?						0.96
Yes	22 (46%)	21 (40%)	7 (78%)	32% [1 to 63]	37% [7 to 68]	
No	25 (52%)	31 (60%)	2 (22%)			
Not applicable	1 (2%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)			
11 . Was the conflict of interest stated?						0.96
Yes	39 (81%)	48 (92%)	9 (100%)	19% [8 to 30]	8% [0 to 15]	
No	9 (19%)	4 (8%)	0 (0%)			

95%CI: 95% confidence intervals

We calculated kappa statistics for the initial evaluation and final evaluation.

Table 3 The difference of AMSTAR score

	Mean (SD)	Mean difference [95%CI]
Cochrane	9.33 (1.32)	Reference
medRxiv	6.48 (2.07)	-2.85 [-0.96 to -4.74]
PubMed	6.06 (2.30)	-3.28 [-1.40 to -5.15]

We used ANOVA with Bonferroni correction.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION CAPTIONS

S1 Table: Items for reporting methodological research, adapted from the PRISMA Checklist

S2 Table Modified AMSTAR checklist

S3 Table retrieved full text articles and decision

References

- [1] WHO Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Dashboard 2020. <https://covid19.who.int/> (accessed August 24, 2020).
- [2] COVID-19: Living systematic map of the evidence n.d.

<http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Projects/DepartmentofHealthandSocialCare/Publishedreviews/COVID-19Livingssystematicmapofthevidence/tabid/3765/Default.aspx> (accessed August 24, 2020).
- [3] WHO | Welcome to the WHO ICTRP n.d. <https://www.who.int/ictrp/en/> (accessed June 11, 2020).
- [4] Waste in covid-19 Research n.d. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1847>.
- [5] Cochrane's work on COVID-19 Related Reviews | Cochrane n.d.

<https://www.cochrane.org/cochranes-work-rapid-reviews-response-covid-19> (accessed August 24, 2020).
- [6] Alexander PE, Debono VB, Mammen MJ, Iorio A, Aryal K, Deng D, et al. COVID-19 coronavirus research has overall low methodological quality thus far: case in point for chloroquine/hydroxychloroquine. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2020:1–7.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.04.016>.
- [7] Borges do Nascimento IJ, O'Mathuna DP, von Groote TC, Abdulazeem HM, Weerasekara I, Marusic A, et al. Coronavirus Disease (COVID-19) Pandemic: An Overview of Systematic

- Reviews. MedRxiv 2020:2020.04.16.20068213. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.16.20068213>.
- [8] Guyatt G, Rennie D, Meade M, Cook D. Users' Guides to the Medical Literature: A Manual for Evidence-Based Clinical Practice. 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill Professional; 2015.
- [9] Murad MH, Wang Z. Guidelines for reporting meta-epidemiological methodology research. Evid Based Med 2017;22:139–42. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebmed-2017-110713>.
- [10] Kataoka Y, Oide S, Arie T, Tsujimoto Y, Furukawa TA. Quality of COVID-19 research in preprints: a meta-epidemiological study protocol. ProtocolsIo 2020. <https://doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.bhm8j49w>.
- [11] Medicine I of. Clinical practice guidelines we can trust. 2011.
- [12] medRxiv COVID-19 SARS-CoV-2 preprints from medRxiv and bioRxiv n.d. <https://connect.medrxiv.org/relate/content/181> (accessed July 3, 2020).
- [13] Shokraneh F. Keeping up with studies on covid-19: systematic search strategies and resources. BMJ 2020:m1601. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.m1601>.
- [14] Systematic Reviews Filter Strategy n.d. https://www.nlm.nih.gov/bsd/pubmed_subsets/sysreviews_strategy.html (accessed August 20, 2020).
- [15] Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.0 (updated July 2019). Cochrane, 2019 n.d.

- [16] Shea BJ, Grimshaw JM, Wells G a, Boers M, Andersson N, Hamel C, et al. Development of AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2007;7:10. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-7-10>.
- [17] Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran 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* 2017;j4008. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.j4008>.
- [18] 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. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;85:50–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.12.004>.
- [19] Boutron I. Reporting and Interpretation of Randomized Controlled Trials With Statistically Nonsignificant Results for Primary Outcomes. *JAMA* 2010;303:2058. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2010.651>.
- [20] 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. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;85:50–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.12.004>.
- [21] MECIR Manual | Cochrane Community n.d. <https://community.cochrane.org/mecir-manual> (accessed October 3, 2019).
- [22] Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, et al. The PRISMA

- statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. PLoS Med 2009;6:e1000100.
- <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100>.
- [23] Jefferson T, Rudin M, Brodney Folse S, Davidoff F. Editorial peer review for improving the quality of reports of biomedical studies. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2007.
- <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.MR000016.pub3>.
- [24] Semler MW, Stover DG, Copland AP, Hong G, Johnson MJ, Kriss MS, et al. Flash Mob Research. Chest 2013;143:1740–4. <https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.12-1837>.
- [25] Tsujimoto Y, Tsujimoto H, Kataoka Y, Kimachi M, Shimizu S, Ikenoue T, et al. Majority of systematic reviews published in high-impact journals neglected to register the protocols: a meta-epidemiological study. J Clin Epidemiol 2017;0.
- <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2017.02.008>.
- [26] Sideri S, Papageorgiou SN, Eliades T. Registration in the international prospective register of systematic reviews (PROSPERO) of systematic review protocols was associated with increased review quality. J Clin Epidemiol 2018;100:103–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.01.003>.
- [27] PROSPERO n.d. <https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prosperto/> (accessed August 24, 2020).
- [28] Piechotta V, Chai KL, Valk SJ, Doree C, Monsef I, Wood EM, et al. Convalescent plasma or hyperimmune immunoglobulin for people with COVID-19: a living systematic review. Cochrane

- Database Syst Rev 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD013600.pub2>.
- [29] Khalili M, Karamouzian M, Nasiri N, Javadi S, Mirzazadeh A, Sharifi H. Epidemiological Characteristics of COVID-19: A Systemic Review and Meta-Analysis. MedRxiv 2020:2020.04.01.20050138. <https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.04.01.20050138>.
- [30] Shea BJ, Hamel C, Wells GA, Bouter LM, Kristjansson E, Grimshaw J, et al. AMSTAR is a reliable and valid measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. J Clin Epidemiol 2009;62:1013–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2008.10.009>.
- [31] Pieper D, Koensgen N, Breuing J, Ge L, Wegewitz U. How is AMSTAR applied by authors – a call for better reporting. BMC Med Res Methodol 2018;18:56. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0520-z>.
- [32] Higgins JPT, Green S E. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0. updated Ma. The Cochrane Collaboration; 2011.
- [33] Berlin JA. Does blinding of readers affect the results of meta-analyses? Lancet 1997;350:185–6. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(05\)62352-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(05)62352-5).