



# Systematic Review and its Role in Clinical Decision Making

Mohsen Saberi Isfeedvajani<sup>1,2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Medicine, Quran and Hadith Research Center, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

**Corresponding Author:** Mohsen Saberi Isfeedvajani, MD, Associate Professor, Medicine, Quran and Hadith Research Center & Department of Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Baqiyatallah University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran, Tel: +98-2181263617, Email: drsaberihaji@gmail.com

Received October 28, 2016; Accepted November 15, 2016; Online Published December 24, 2016

Systematic reviews as secondary research studies are used as the gold standard to help healthcare professionals and healthcare policy makers in decision making.<sup>1</sup> Clinical decisions need to be based on high quality, up-to-date research evidence. Systematic reviews start with well-defined research questions and explicit and reproducible search strategies in order to critically appraise and integrate results of primary research studies.<sup>2,3</sup>

To perform a systematic review, 6 key steps should be performed successively: (1) clarifying the aims and methods in a protocol, (2) finding relevant research, (3) collecting data, (4) assessing the study's quality, (5) synthesizing the evidence, and (6) interpreting the findings. The systematic review process also includes 4 phases: (1) planning a systematic review, (2) writing and publishing protocol, (3) completing the review, and (4) publishing, disseminating, and updating the review.<sup>2</sup>

For publication, a systematic review or meta-analysis should comply with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) checklist,<sup>1,2,4</sup> which includes 27 items. These items are categorized in 7 sections: title (1 item), abstract (1 item), introduction (2 items), methods (12 items), results (7 items), discussion (3 items), and funding (1 item).<sup>3</sup> An updated version of PRISMA has been developed, i.e. PRISMA-P, that has 17 items to improve the quality of systematic reviews with fewer items.<sup>5,6</sup> A positive correlation has been shown to exist between PRISMA score and average citations per year; in other words, systematic reviews with high PRISMA scores are more likely to be cited by other researchers.<sup>3</sup>

Unfortunately, it has been reported that different methods for systematic review reporting have recently led to a number of publications demonstrating a lack of compliance with PRISMA.<sup>4,5,7,8</sup>

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses play an important

role in evidence-based medicine (EBM),<sup>7,9</sup> and a large increase in systematic review studies has occurred.<sup>1</sup> However, to prevent impaired clinical decision-making, it is highly recommended that the 6 steps of systematic review completion be followed with accuracy, the 4 phases of a systematic review be accomplished rigorously, and finally, a greater adherence to PRISMA standards be maintained.

## Conflict of Interest Disclosures

The author declares that he has no conflicts of interest.

## Ethical Approval

Not applicable.

## References

1. Debray TP, Damen JA, Snell KI, et al. A guide to systematic review and meta-analysis of prediction model performance. *Bmj*. 2017;356:i6460. doi:10.1136/bmj.i6460.
2. Pollock A, Berge E. How to do a systematic review. *Int J Stroke*. 2017;1747493017743796. doi:10.1177/1747493017743796.
3. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4:1. doi:10.1186/2046-4053-4-1.
4. Simons M, Busch K, Avolio A, Kiat H, Davidson A. Improving the quality of the evidence - The necessity to lead by example. *J Clin Neurosci*. 2017;46:165-166. doi:10.1016/j.jocn.2017.09.004.
5. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*. 2015;350:g7647. doi:10.1136/bmj.g7647.
6. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ*. 2009;339:b2535. doi:10.1136/bmj.b2535.
7. Kazerani M, Davoudian A, Zayeri F, Soori H. Assessing abstracts of Iranian systematic reviews and metaanalysis indexed in WOS and Scopus using PRISMA. *Med J Islam Repub Iran*. 2017;31:18. doi:10.18869/mjiri.31.18.
8. Nissen T, Wayant C, Wahlstrom A, et al. Methodological quality,

completeness of reporting and use of systematic reviews as evidence in clinical practice guidelines for paediatric overweight and obesity. *Clin Obes.* 2017;7(1):34-45. doi:[10.1111/cob.12174](https://doi.org/10.1111/cob.12174).

9. Cullis PS, Gudlaugsdottir K, Andrews J. A systematic review of the

quality of conduct and reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in paediatric surgery. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(4):e0175213. doi:[10.1371/journal.pone.0175213](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0175213).

**Citation:** Saberi Isfeedvajani M. Systematic review and its role in clinical decision making. *Int J Med Rev.* 2016;3(4):495-496. doi:[10.15171/ijmr.2016.08](https://doi.org/10.15171/ijmr.2016.08).