

Coding Key for Systematic Review Abstracts – Based on PRISMA abstract guidelines

1. IF abstract is structured **ENTER** – s
IF abstract is unstructured **ENTER** – u
2. IF Title has the words: “Systematic review” (then **ENTER**: sr), “Meta-analysis” (ma), both
IF “meta-regression” then **ENTER** (meta-regression) , (sr, meta-regression)
IF no mention of any of these words in title **ENTER** – no
3. Is an objective given for the research question including components such as **Participants***(see note), **Interventions**, **Comparators**, and **Outcomes** given (also note for the Outcomes, must differentiate between Clinical Outcome (co) and/or Non-Clinical Outcome (nco)? (The objective will be a sentence or two in the first few sentences of an abstract.)
Example of non-clinical outcome: writing clinical practice guidelines
Example of clinical outcome: maternal mortality, accuracy of diagnostic tests
ENTER: “p,i,c,co,nco or no”
(any combination of the p,i,c,co,nco letters can be listed...remember to put comma between components and all letters in lower case)
*(also note, for Participants criteria, code as “p” for examples of BOTH of the following types: “post-menopausal women over 50” and/or “number of eggs implanted using IVF.” So, in the second example the “eggs” are the participant.)
4. Was eligibility criteria of the studies included given? This will be found in the “Methods” section or about halfway through the article. – **ENTER** any combo of below, no
 - a. Participants (ex. Women with hysterectomy) – p
 - b. Interventions (ex. Women taking prenatal vitamins) – i
 - c. Comparative group (ex. Women not taking prenatal vitamins) – c
 - d. Outcome (ex. Birth weight) – o
 - e. Study Design (ex. Only included randomized controlled trials in our analysis) – s
 - f. Language (ex. Restricted to only English) – lang
 - g. Publication status (ex. included only published material and conference abstracts) – pub
5. Were key databases searched listed (i.e. PUBMED, EMBASE, etc.) **ENTER** – yes, no (if not specifically listed)
6. Were search dates given? – **ENTER** yes, no (if general (in last 10 yrs. – code “no” and mention in comments)
7. Was there **specific** mention of words assessing risk of bias (i.e. “methodological quality” or “study quality” and/or “risk of bias”? None (then **ENTER**: 0) “Quality” (1) “Risk of bias” (2) Both (3)
8. Was the number of included studies given? – **ENTER** yes, no
9. Was the number of participants given? – **ENTER** yes, no
10. Were any results for **MAIN** outcomes given (i.e. benefits or harms described)? – **ENTER** yes, no
11. Were **ANY** results listed for **ANY** outcome? (effect size and/or confidence intervals)
(examples of effect size: odds ratios, relative risk, risk ratios, hazard ratios, any type of logarithmic ratios, other outcome measures, r , r^2 , η^2 , ω^2 , f^2 , q , differences between means, d , Δ , g , root-mean-square, w , OR, RR, or h) – **ENTER**:
effect, both, no
12. Was a descriptive word used to describe the results (ex. lower, fewer, reduced, greater, as compared to, associated, significant, no difference, equally, inverse association) **ENTER** yes, no
13. Were descriptive numbers given for the results in familiar units (i.e. percentages, days, kg, 2-fold increase)? – **ENTER** yes, no
14. Was a brief mention of the strengths or limitations of evidence given (e.g. inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, risk of bias, limit in data collection, first international comparison, retrospective studies ...see p. 6 of PRISMA article for examples)? – **ENTER** yes, no
15. Was a general interpretation of the results given? – **ENTER** yes, no
16. Were general implications of the study discussed/included? – **ENTER** yes, no
17. Was a funding source given? (Enter “yes” if the abstract lists funding as “none.”) – **ENTER** yes, no
18. Was a registration number or name given? – **ENTER** yes, no