



**EVIDENCE SYNTHESIS**  
IRELAND



**Cochrane**  
Ireland

## **Evidence Synthesis Ireland Fellowship Scheme**

### **Review Identification Form**

#### **Review Centre/Group Mentor**

**Dr. Andrea Tricco and Dr. Areti Angeliki Veroniki**

Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital,  
Unity Health Toronto

#### **Review title**

**Methods scoping reviews**

#### **Other information**

**Updates of 3 previous reviews and 1 new methods review**

#### **Review information**

Part of this work was funded by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) Project Grant (No 190036). This study was drafted using input from evidence synthesis experts and knowledge users, including patient and public partners. Our team involves people from different sectors, such as journal editors, clinicians, policy makers, statisticians, methodologists, patients and the public, and they will be included at all stages of the project (protocol development, review steps, and results dissemination). This research will be of interest to knowledge users, including journal editors, Cochrane, EQUATOR, and patients and the public (e.g., Cochrane Consumer Network). Team members will use their networks to facilitate dissemination through strategies such as knowledge exchange sessions and relevant organisation listservs and newsletters.

#### **Review details**

We are planning to conduct four scoping reviews (ScRs). The first 2 are related to PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses) extensions for network meta-analysis (NMA)<sup>1</sup> and ScRs,<sup>2</sup> which were published in 2015 and 2018, respectively, but since then, advancements in the relevant methodologies have been developed for NMAs and ScRs. To date, there is no complete reporting guideline for rapid review (RRs), which is the third scoping review. Research has shown that PRISMA-NMA<sup>1</sup> is associated with improvement in reporting completeness.<sup>3</sup> However, there are a number of pressing reasons that necessitate a significant

update to these PRISMA extensions. Outdated reporting guidance (or absence thereof in the case of RRs) is likely to result in sub-optimal reporting in published reviews. We will update three previous scoping reviews<sup>4-6</sup> performed by members of the research team in parallel to identify additional, more recent studies pertaining to evaluations of reporting completeness and other key resources to inform the NMA, ScR and RR extensions.

We will also conduct a fourth scoping review of updated systematic reviews (USRs) and living systematic reviews (LSRs), with an aim to determine the optimal methods for conducting a NMA in a LSR. We will descriptively summarize the methods used for meta-analysis (e.g., trial sequential meta-analysis), including assumptions and relevant steps, and will re-analyze available data from the primary outcome of each identified LSR/USR using each method to compare the methods empirically.

We will follow the JBI guidelines for all scoping reviews to guide their methods.<sup>7,8</sup>

Depending on the timing and the Fellows selected, they will be able to assist with at least one of these methods scoping reviews.

#### Review current status

*Protocol development (not yet registered with PROSPERO or EQUATOR)*

#### Any specific/desirable requirements for fellow (e.g. clinical expertise, methodological expertise)

Experience in completing systematic or rapid or scoping reviews (required)

Experience in conducting meta-analysis (an asset)

Clinical experience in any healthcare discipline (an asset)

#### Estimated start and completion dates

**Estimated start date: January 2024**

**Estimated completion date: January 2025**

#### References

1. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, et al. The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. *Ann Intern Med* 2015;162(11):777-84. doi: 10.7326/M14-2385 [published Online First: 2015/06/02]
2. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;169(7):467-73. doi: 10.7326/M18-0850 [published Online First: 2018/09/05]
3. Veroniki AA, Tsokani S, Zevgiti S, et al. Do reporting guidelines have an impact? Empirical assessment of changes in reporting before and after the PRISMA extension statement for network meta-analysis. *Syst Rev* 2021;10(1):246. doi: 10.1186/s13643-021-01780-9 [published Online First: 2021/09/12]

4. Hutton B, Salanti G, Chaimani A, et al. The quality of reporting methods and results in network meta-analyses: an overview of reviews and suggestions for improvement. *PLoS One* 2014;9(3):e92508. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0092508 [published Online First: 2014/03/29]
5. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, et al. A scoping review on the conduct and reporting of scoping reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2016;16:15. doi: 10.1186/s12874-016-0116-4 [published Online First: 2016/02/10]
6. Stevens A. Facilitating rapid dissemination of knowledge: towards the development of a rapid review reporting guideline. University of Split School of Medicine, 2019.
7. Peters MDJ, Marnie C, Tricco AC, et al. Updated methodological guidance for the conduct of scoping reviews. *JBIM Evid Synth* 2020;18(10):2119-26. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-20-00167 [published Online First: 2020/10/11]
8. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, et al. Best practice guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JBIM Evid Synth* 2022;20(4):953-68. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242 [published Online First: 2022/02/02]