

1 **Strategies used to manage overlap of primary study data by exercise-related overviews.**

2 **Protocol for a systematic methodological review.**

3 Ruvistay Gutierrez-Arias<sup>1,2</sup>, Dawid Pieper<sup>3,4</sup>, Carole Lunny<sup>5</sup>, Rodrigo Torres-Castro<sup>6</sup>, Raúl

4 Aguilera-Eguía<sup>7</sup> and Pamela Seron<sup>8</sup>

5

6 **Affiliations:**

7 <sup>1</sup>Servicio de Medicina Física y Rehabilitación, Unidad de Kinesiología, Instituto Nacional

8 del Tórax, Santiago, Chile.

9 <sup>2</sup>Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, School of Physical Therapy, Faculty of

10 Rehabilitation Sciences, Universidad Andres Bello, Santiago, 7591538, Chile.

11 <sup>3</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences Brandenburg, Brandenburg Medical School (Theodor Fontane),

12 Institute for Health Services and Health Systems Research, Rüdersdorf, Germany.

13 <sup>4</sup>Center for Health Services Research, Brandenburg Medical School (Theodor Fontane),

14 Rüdersdorf, Germany.

15 <sup>5</sup>Knowledge Translation Program, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of

16 Toronto, Canada.

17 <sup>6</sup>Department of Physical Therapy, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile.

18 <sup>7</sup>Departamento de Salud Pública, Facultad de Medicina, Carrera de Kinesiología.

19 Universidad Católica de la Santísima Concepción. Concepción, Chile.

20 <sup>8</sup>Departamento de Ciencias de la Rehabilitación & CIGES, Facultad de Medicina,  
21 Universidad de La Frontera, Temuco, Chile.

22 **ORCID.** Ruvistay Gutiérrez-Arias: 0000-0003-1881-9316; Dawid Pieper: 0000-0002-0715-  
23 5182; Carole Lunny: 0000-0002-7825-6765; Rodrigo Torres-Castro: 0000-0001-7974-4333;  
24 Raúl Aguilera-Eguía: 0000-0002-4123-4255; Pamela Seron: 0000-0003-0190-8988.

25

## 26 **Corresponding author**

27 Pamela Seron, Ph.D. Internal Medicine Department & CIGES, Faculty of Medicine,  
28 Universidad de La Frontera, Claro Solar 115, Temuco, Chile. Address all correspondence to:  
29 [pamela.seron@ufrontera.cl](mailto:pamela.seron@ufrontera.cl).

30

## 31 **Abstract**

32 **Introduction:** One of the most conflicting methodological issues when conducting an  
33 overview is the overlap of primary studies included across systematic reviews (SRs). Overlap  
34 in the pooled effect estimates across SRs may lead to overly precise effect estimates in the  
35 overview. SRs that focus on exercise-related interventions are often included in overviews  
36 aimed at grouping and determining the effectiveness of various interventions for the  
37 management of specific health conditions.

38 **Objective:** The aim of this systematic methodological review is to describe the strategies used  
39 by authors of overviews focusing on exercise-related interventions to manage the overlap of  
40 primary studies.

41 **Materials and methods:** A comprehensive search strategy has been developed for different  
42 databases and their platforms. The databases to be consulted will be MEDLINE (Ovid),  
43 Embase (Ovid), The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Cochrane Library), and  
44 Epistemonikos. Two reviewers will independently screen the records identified through the  
45 search strategy and will extract the information from the included overviews. The frequency  
46 and the type of overlap management strategies of the primary studies included in the SRs  
47 will be considered as the main outcome. In addition, the recognition of the lack of use of any  
48 overlap management strategy and the congruence between planning and conducting the  
49 overview focusing on overlap management strategies will be assessed. A sub-group analysis  
50 will be carried out using the impact factor of the journals at the time of publication of the  
51 overviews as the variable.

52 **Discussion:** This methodological review will provide a complete and comprehensive  
53 summary of the frequency of use and types of strategies used for managing the overlap of  
54 primary studies across the SRs included in the overviews focusing on exercise-related  
55 interventions in different health conditions. Future studies should apply different overlap  
56 management strategies to understand their impact on results and conclusions.

57 **Systematic review registration:** INPLASY202250161.

58

## 59 **Introduction**

60 The number of published primary studies covering a similar research question has grown  
61 exponentially (1), limiting the possibility of keeping up to date on a specific topic (2). It is in  
62 this context that systematic reviews (SRs) with and without meta-analyses (MAs) of

63 interventions can offer a solution (3), as in addition to synthesizing the available evidence,  
64 they use reproducible methods to assess the risk of bias in the primary studies included (4).

65 However, the number of published SRs and MAs has increased steadily in recent years  
66 despite the existence of repositories of SRs and MAs protocol registries (5–7) seeking to  
67 reduce duplication or redundancy of SR research (8,9).

68 The growth in research evidence makes it difficult for clinicians to stay current and use  
69 interventions based on the best available evidence (10,11). Overviews, also known as  
70 umbrella reviews, can help clinicians make sense of duplicated SRs on the same topic.  
71 Overviews synthesize information and data from multiple similar SRs to guide health  
72 decision-making (12).

73 Conducting overviews of health interventions is meant to map the available evidence (13),  
74 establishing the effects of different interventions on the same health condition or population  
75 (12), examining the effects of an intervention on different health conditions or populations  
76 (12), and determining the reasons for disagreement among SRs with or without MAs that  
77 answer the same research question (14).

78 Intuitively, one might think that conducting an overview presents the same steps as  
79 conducting an SR with MAs; however, overviews pose challenges stemming from the fact  
80 that the unit of analysis is the SR (15,16). When conducting an overview, one of the most  
81 conflicting methodological issues is the overlap of primary studies included across SRs with  
82 or without MAs (17). When one or more primary studies are included in two or more SRs  
83 with or without MAs, the results and conclusions of the overviews may be biased.  
84 Overlapping data from the same primary studies may include overlapping in risk of bias and

85 certainty of evidence assessments (e.g., Grading of Recommendations, Assessment,  
86 Development and Evaluations (GRADE)), or overlapping in the determination of the effect  
87 of a specific intervention and other MA outcomes such as heterogeneity (e.g.,  $I^2$ ) (18,19).  
88 Overlap in the pooled effect estimates across SRs may lead to overly precise effect estimates  
89 in the overview (20).

90 Methodological studies from different medical fields reported that authors of overviews  
91 rarely assess the overlap of primary studies (16,17). However, these studies have not  
92 conducted an exhaustive search of overviews oriented to a specific health problem, specialty,  
93 or discipline (16,17), as they have only searched an electronic database (16) and included  
94 heterogeneous overviews concerning the research questions addressed (16,17).

95 There are several ways to manage overlap (20). Some will depend heavily on the amount of  
96 overlap and the existing evidence base. Thus, it can be challenging to determine the  
97 methodological approach a priori. Changes to the protocol are likely to occur at this step and  
98 should be clearly reported.

99 SRs that focus on exercise-related interventions are often included in overviews aimed at  
100 grouping and determining the effectiveness of various interventions to manage of specific  
101 health conditions. Assessing the application of overlap management strategies in overviews  
102 focused on exercise-related interventions could contribute to identifying specific or  
103 differentiating aspects. This could be because the concept of exercise is often misunderstood  
104 (21). In addition, the existence of multiple interventions related to exercise due to their  
105 different modalities (e.g., continuous aerobic, intervallic aerobic, resistance exercise) and  
106 dosage (e.g., frequency, intensity, time, and type) could result in a particular need to manage  
107 the overlapping of primary studies data.

108 Therefore, this methodological review aims to find out how often strategies for handling  
109 overlapping data from primary studies are used across the systematic reviews considered by  
110 overviews focused on exercise-related interventions in different health conditions.  
111 Secondly, we describe the overlap strategies used, the authors' acknowledgment of not  
112 using any management strategy as a methodological weakness, and the congruence between  
113 the protocol and the final published overview in terms of overlap management.

## 114 **Materials and methods**

115 The protocol of this methodological review is reported following the Preferred Reporting  
116 Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P) (22) (see checklist  
117 in Supporting Information). In addition, this protocol has been registered in the International  
118 Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) under  
119 number INPLASY202250161.

### 120 *Eligibility criteria*

121 Studies will be eligible if they meet the following inclusion criteria for study design and  
122 population. Given the purpose of this methodological review, the intervention and outcomes  
123 will not determine the inclusion of studies, and the comparator or control intervention will  
124 not be considered as it is not applicable.

### 125 *Study design*

126 We will include overviews that consider SRs with or without MAs, without distinction of the  
127 methodological design of the primary studies included. The definition of SR adopted by the  
128 authors of the overviews (23) will not be considered an eligibility criterion. Overviews that  
129 include primary studies not considered in the selected SRs will not be excluded.

130 For this review, an overview will be understood as any study (24) that:

- 131 1) synthesizes general information, methods, and outcome data from SRs, and
- 132 2) makes explicit the inclusion and exclusion criteria for SRs, and
- 133 3) includes an explicit search strategy for the studies, and
- 134 4) examines the effectiveness of health interventions.

135 Overviews that are conducted using a "rapid review" methodology (25) will be excluded, as  
136 the time frame in which they are conducted to answer urgent questions will likely not  
137 consider the overlap of the primary studies included in the SRs.

### 138 Population

139 Overviews include SRs that have considered primary studies that have studied any exercise-  
140 based intervention, where exercise is understood as a subcategory of physical activity that is  
141 planned, structured, repetitive, and purposefully focused on improving or maintaining one or  
142 more components of physical fitness (21), will be included. These overviews may include  
143 only SRs related to exercise-based interventions, or other non-exercise interventions as well.

144 Overviews that consider exercise training-based interventions that are applied both  
145 preventively and in the recovery phase, and that are delivered either as a stand-alone  
146 intervention, as part of a comprehensive rehabilitation program, or as an adjunct to other  
147 medical interventions in which exercise is the main component, will be included.

148 Furthermore, the inclusion of overviews will not be limited to the context in which the  
149 exercise-based interventions were applied (e.g., primary care, specialized care) or whether  
150 they were delivered face-to-face, remotely, or mixed.

151 Overviews that include SRs that consider physical activity as an intervention, understood as  
152 "any bodily movement produced by skeletal muscles that require energy expenditure"  
153 according to the World Health Organization (26), will be excluded. Therefore, to differentiate  
154 between exercise-based and physical activity-based interventions, it will be considered that  
155 the exercise, together with its structure and dosage (frequency, intensity, time, and type),  
156 must be prescribed or delivered by a professional related to physical training/rehabilitation.

### 157 Intervention

158 Our goal is to identify the strategies used to manage data from overlapping primary studies  
159 selected by SRs included in overviews. Strategies should be specified in the main text of the  
160 overviews and may be in the methods or results section, taking all possible methodological  
161 strategies that address overlap in the primary study data into consideration. Strategies  
162 addressing overlap can address different objectives (20), such as quantifying the overlap  
163 (17,27) (e.g., corrected covered area (CCA)), visually presenting overlap (28) (e.g., matrix,  
164 Venn and Euler diagrams), and avoiding duplicate information by using one or more decision  
165 algorithms (29) (e.g., quality of SRs, comprehensive SRs, up-to-datedness of SRs, statistical  
166 methods).

### 167 Outcomes

168 The presence and the type of overlap management strategies of the primary studies included  
169 in the SRs will be considered as the main outcome.

170 In addition, two aspects will be regarded as secondary outcomes:

- 171 1) Acknowledgement of the limitation in the conducting of the overview: we will assess  
172 whether the overview's authors that did not include any strategy for managing  
173 primary study overlap considered this limitation in their discussion or conclusion.
- 174 2) Congruence between planning and conducting the overview: we will review available  
175 registry entries (e.g., PROSPERO) or published protocols in scientific journals (e.g.,  
176 BMC Systematic Reviews Journal, BMJ Open) of all overviews included in this SR  
177 to determine whether management of primary study overlap had been considered in  
178 the planning phase of the overviews and to determine the congruence between the  
179 methods proposed in the protocols and those ultimately used.

## 180 **Search strategy**

181 A search strategy translated to different databases and their platforms will be developed using  
182 a controlled vocabulary (MeSH and Emtree) and text words. The search strategy will include  
183 a search filter published in 2016 by Lunny et al. (30), which is validated to identify overviews  
184 in MEDLINE-Ovid with 93% sensitivity (95% CI 87 to 96). The search strategy constructed  
185 for this database and platform is shown in Table N°1, which will be used as a basis for  
186 adapting the search strategies of the other databases and search platforms.

187 Table 1. Search strategy for MEDLINE using the Ovid platform

N°	Search term
1	exp Exercise/
2	exp Physical Fitness/
3	exp Physical Exertion/
4	exp Physical Therapy Modalities/
5	exp Exercise Therapy/
6	exp Rehabilitation/
7	(rehabilitat\$ or fitness\$ or exercis\$ or physical\$ or train\$ or physiotherap\$ or kinesiotherap\$).ti,ab.
8	aerobic\$.ti,ab.

---

9	(muscle\$ adj3 resist\$).ti,ab.
10	or/1-9
11	((overview\$ or review or synthesis or summary or cochrane or analysis) and (reviews or meta-analyses or articles or umbrella)).ti. or umbrella review.ab. or (meta-review or metareview).ti,ab.
12	(overview\$ or reviews).mp. and (systematic or cochrane).ti.
13	(reviews adj2 meta).ab.
14	(reviews adj2 (published or quality or included or summar\$)).ab.
15	cochrane reviews.ab.
16	(evidence and (reviews or meta-analyses)).ti.
17	or/11-16
18	and/10,17

---

188

189 The databases to be consulted will be MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Ovid), The Cochrane  
190 Database of Systematic Reviews (Cochrane Library), and Epistemonikos. In addition, we  
191 will search protocol registries of SRs such as the International Platform of Registered  
192 Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocols (INPLASY) (<https://inplasy.com/>),  
193 PROSPERO (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/>), and OSF Registries  
194 (<https://osf.io/registries>), and follow up protocols published in scientific journals (e.g., BMC  
195 Systematic Reviews Journal, BMJ Open).

196 We will also review the references of the studies included in this review to identify overviews  
197 that may not have been identified by our electronic search strategy.

198 We will include all languages in our search and will not be limited by the date of  
199 publication/indexing in databases.

## 200 **Study selection**

201 Two reviewers (RGA and RTC) will independently and blindly screen the records identified  
202 through the search strategy. In the first instance, the titles and abstracts will be evaluated for  
203 inclusion. Then the full texts of the records qualified as potentially eligible, and those that

204 did not present sufficient information to be excluded, will be checked for compliance with  
205 all eligibility criteria. The Rayyan® application (31) will be used for this stage.  
206 Disagreements will be resolved by consensus, or ultimately by a third-party reviewer (RAE  
207 or PS).

## 208 **Data extraction**

209 The extraction of information from the included overviews will also be carried out  
210 independently and blindly by two reviewers (RGA and RTC). For this, a standardized  
211 extraction form will be used which will contain data related to the basic information of the  
212 overviews:

- 213 • Title.
- 214 • Journal name.
- 215 • Year of publication.
- 216 • Name of the authors.
- 217 • Objectives of SRs.
- 218 • Number of SRs included
- 219 • Methodological aspects: databases consulted, date of search, type of synthesis of  
220 results (narrative, MA, or both), and instruments for assessing the risk of  
221 bias/methodological quality of the SRs included.

222 Data will be extracted to respond to the findings of this methodological review:

- 223 • Type of overlap management strategy:
  - 224 a. Quantifying overlap: e.g., CCA.
  - 225 b. Visual presentation of the overlap: e.g., matrix, Venn and Euler diagrams.

226 c. Strategies to avoid duplicate information: e.g., Algorithms based on the quality of  
227 SRs, comprehensive SRs, up-to-datedness of SRs, statistical methods such as  
228 sensitivity analyses, or a combination of two or more criteria.

229 • Step in the conducting of the overview where the strategy has been deployed or used:  
230 e.g., data extraction step, synthesis step.

231 • Level at which the strategies were applied: i.e., whether it was at the level of SR or  
232 reported outcomes (20).

233 In addition, the impact factor (IF) of the journal at the time of publication of the overviews  
234 will be recorded. This will be extracted from the journals' official websites or from Web of  
235 Science (<https://www.webofscience.com/>).

236 If more than one record or publication exists for an overview, the most recent version will be  
237 considered for analysis. Disagreements will be resolved by consensus, or ultimately by a  
238 third-party reviewer (RAE or PS).

### 239 **Risk of bias assessment**

240 This methodological review assesses one aspect that may affect the methodological quality  
241 or risk of bias of the overviews. The assessment of the overall risk of bias of the overviews  
242 is not an objective of this study.

### 243 **Strategy for data synthesis**

244 The results of the study selection will be schematized through a PRISMA-type flow chart  
245 (32). In addition, the characteristics of the overviews included, as well as data related to the  
246 primary and secondary outcomes, will be presented in narrative form, and through tables and  
247 figures.

248 Descriptive statistics will be used to quantify the number of overviews using overlap  
249 strategies, whether the strategies were used at the level of the SRs or the level of each reported  
250 outcome. In addition, these results will be organized by the type of strategy used.

251 We will also assess whether the overlapping strategy successfully resolved overlap at the  
252 following steps: risk of bias assessment, the certainty of the evidence (e.g., GRADE), and  
253 the synthesis step.

#### 254 **Analysis of subgroups**

255 Differences in the percentage of overviews that include overlap management strategies, the  
256 type of strategies used, the recognition of the weakness of not using any strategy, and the  
257 congruence between the protocols and the methodology finally used among journals with  
258 and without IF will be assessed. In addition, this analysis will be repeated for IF journals,  
259 considering the median or quartiles of the IF of the journals at the time of publication of the  
260 overviews to form 2 or 4 groups respectively, depending on the number of overviews  
261 included in this methodological review.

#### 262 **Discussion**

263 This methodological review will provide a comprehensive and exhaustive summary of the  
264 frequency of use of strategies for managing primary study overlap across SRs included in  
265 overviews focused on exercise-related interventions in different health conditions. It will also  
266 provide insight into the strategies used to quantify and visualize overlap, as well as those  
267 used to avoid duplicate data.

268 On the other hand, the findings of this review will tell us whether the authors of the overviews  
269 recognized the failure to include some strategy for handling overlap as a methodological

270 weakness, taking into account that the greater the degree of overlap, the more falsely precise  
271 the estimates of the effects of the interventions (20). In addition, the congruence between the  
272 strategies used by the published overviews and their respective protocols will be revealed.  
273 To our knowledge, the latter two aspects have not been addressed at the overview level by  
274 other studies before.

### 275 *Future research*

276 Different overlapping data management strategies will be applied to all, or a representative  
277 sample, of the overviews identified by this methodological review.

278 In addition, it would be interesting for future studies to assess the association between the  
279 use of different strategies for handling overlapping primary studies and methodological  
280 quality of the overviews or compliance with recommendations in overview reporting, such  
281 as the PRIOR statement (33).

### 282 *Dissemination plans*

283 The findings of this review will be presented at scientific conferences and published as one  
284 or more studies in peer-review scientific journals related to rehabilitation, healthcare, or  
285 methodological aspects associated with evidence synthesis.

286

### 287 **Acknowledgments**

288 None

289

### 290 **References**

- 291 1. Tsay M, Yang Y. Bibliometric analysis of the literature of randomized controlled  
292 trials. *J Med Libr Assoc.* 2005;93(4):450–8.
- 293 2. Heiwe S, Kajermo KN, Tyni-Lenne R, Guidetti S, Samuelsson M, Andersson I-L, et  
294 al. Evidence-based practice: attitudes, knowledge and behaviour among allied health  
295 care professionals. *Int J Qual Heal Care.* 2011 Apr;23(2):198–209.
- 296 3. Mulrow CD. Rationale for systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 1994;309(6954):597–9.
- 297 4. Chandler J, Cumpston M, Thomas J, Higgins J, Deeks J, Clarke M. Chapter I:  
298 Introduction. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ,  
299 Welch VA (editors). *In: Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*  
300 version 62 (updated February 2021). Ccochrane; 2021.
- 301 5. Moher D, Booth A, Stewart L. How to reduce unnecessary duplication: use  
302 PROSPERO. *BJOG An Int J Obstet Gynaecol.* 2014;121(7):784–6.
- 303 6. Booth A, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Moher D, Petticrew M, Stewart L. An international  
304 registry of systematic-review protocols. *Lancet.* 2011;377(9760):108–9.
- 305 7. Pieper D, Rombey T. Where to prospectively register a systematic review. *Syst Rev.*  
306 2022;11(1):8.
- 307 8. Ioannidis JPA. The Mass Production of Redundant, Misleading, and Conflicted  
308 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses. *Milbank Q.* 2016;94(3):485–514.
- 309 9. Riaz I Bin, Khan MS, Riaz H, Goldberg RJ. Disorganized Systematic Reviews and  
310 Meta-analyses: Time to Systematize the Conduct and Publication of These Study  
311 Overviews? *Am J Med.* 2016 Mar;129(3):339.e11-339.e18.

- 312 10. Hoffmann T, Eructi C, Thorning S, Glasziou P. The scatter of research: cross sectional  
313 comparison of randomised trials and systematic reviews across specialties. *BMJ*.  
314 2012;344:e3223.
- 315 11. Seel RT, Dijkers MP, Johnston M V. Developing and using evidence to improve  
316 rehabilitation practice. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2012 Aug;93(8 Suppl):S97-100.
- 317 12. Pollock M, Fernandes R, Becker L, Pieper D, Hartling L. Chapter V: Overviews of  
318 Reviews. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch  
319 VA (editors). In: *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version  
320 62 (updated February 2021). Cochrane; 2021.
- 321 13. Caird J, Sutcliffe K, Kwan I, Dickson K, Thomas J. Mediating policy-relevant  
322 evidence at speed: are systematic reviews of systematic reviews a useful approach?  
323 *Evid Policy A J Res Debate Pract*. 2015;11(1):81–97.
- 324 14. Cooper H, Koenka AC. The overview of reviews: unique challenges and opportunities  
325 when research syntheses are the principal elements of new integrative scholarship. *Am*  
326 *Psychol*. 2012;67(6):446–62.
- 327 15. McKenzie JE, Brennan SE. Overviews of systematic reviews: great promise, greater  
328 challenge. *Syst Rev*. 2017;6(1):185.
- 329 16. Lunny C, Brennan SE, Reid J, McDonald S, McKenzie JE. Overviews of reviews  
330 incompletely report methods for handling overlapping, discordant, and problematic  
331 data. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2020;118:69–85.
- 332 17. Pieper D, Antoine S-L, Mathes T, Neugebauer EAM, Eikermann M. Systematic  
333 review finds overlapping reviews were not mentioned in every other overview. *J Clin*

- 334 Epidemiol. 2014;67(4):368–75.
- 335 18. Hunt H, Pollock A, Campbell P, Estcourt L, Brunton G. An introduction to overviews  
336 of reviews: planning a relevant research question and objective for an overview. *Syst*  
337 *Rev.* 2018 Dec;7(1):39.
- 338 19. Lunny C, Brennan SE, McDonald S, McKenzie JE. Toward a comprehensive evidence  
339 map of overview of systematic review methods: paper 1—purpose, eligibility, search  
340 and data extraction. *Syst Rev.* 2017;6(1):231.
- 341 20. Lunny C, Pieper D, Thabet P, Kanji S. Managing overlap of primary study results  
342 across systematic reviews: practical considerations for authors of overviews of  
343 reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2021;21(1):140.
- 344 21. Dasso NA. How is exercise different from physical activity? A concept analysis. *Nurs*  
345 *Forum.* 2019;54(1):45–52.
- 346 22. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred  
347 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015  
348 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015;4(1):1.
- 349 23. Krnic Martinic M, Pieper D, Glatt A, Puljak L. Definition of a systematic review used  
350 in overviews of systematic reviews, meta-epidemiological studies and textbooks.  
351 *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2019;19(1):203.
- 352 24. Pollock M, Fernandes RM, Becker LA, Featherstone R, Hartling L. What guidance is  
353 available for researchers conducting overviews of reviews of healthcare interventions?  
354 A scoping review and qualitative metasummary. *Syst Rev.* 2016;5(1):190.

- 355 25. Tricco AC, Antony J, Zarin W, Strifler L, Ghassemi M, Ivory J, et al. A scoping review  
356 of rapid review methods. *BMC Med.* 2015;13(1):224.
- 357 26. WHO. Physical activity.
- 358 27. Hennessy EA, Johnson BT. Examining overlap of included studies in meta-reviews:  
359 Guidance for using the corrected covered area index. *Res Synth Methods.*  
360 2020;11(1):134–45.
- 361 28. Bougioukas KI, Vounzoulaki E, Mantsiou CD, Savvides ED, Karakosta C, Diakonidis  
362 T, et al. Methods for depicting overlap in overviews of systematic reviews: An  
363 introduction to static tabular and graphical displays. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2021;132:34–  
364 45.
- 365 29. Hennessy EA, Johnson BT, Keenan C. Best Practice Guidelines and Essential  
366 Methodological Steps to Conduct Rigorous and Systematic Meta-Reviews. *Appl*  
367 *Psychol Heal Well-Being.* 2019;11(3):353–81.
- 368 30. Lunny C, McKenzie JE, McDonald S. Retrieval of overviews of systematic reviews  
369 in MEDLINE was improved by the development of an objectively derived and  
370 validated search strategy. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2016;74:107–18.
- 371 31. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile  
372 app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2016;5(1):210.
- 373 32. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al.  
374 The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews.  
375 *BMJ.* 2021;372:n71.

376 33. Gates M, Gates A, Pieper D, Fernandes RM, Tricco AC, Moher D, et al. Reporting  
377 guideline for overviews of reviews of healthcare interventions: development of the  
378 PRIOR statement. *BMJ*. 2022;e070849.

379