

1 **Redundancy, quality appraisal, and discordance in the results of systematic reviews of**
2 **early mobilization of critically ill adults. A meta-research protocol**

3

4 Ruvistay Gutierrez-Arias^{1,2*}, Dawid Pieper^{3,4}, Peter Nydahl⁵, Felipe González-Seguel⁶,
5 Yorschua Jalil^{7,8}, Maria-Jose Oliveros^{9,10}, Rodrigo Torres-Castro¹¹, Pamela Seron^{9,10}

6

7 ¹Servicio de Medicina Física y Rehabilitación, Unidad de Kinesiología, Instituto Nacional del
8 Tórax, Santiago, Chile.

9 ²Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences Laboratory, Faculty of Rehabilitation Sciences, School
10 of Physical Therapy, Universidad Andres Bello, Santiago 7591538, Chile.

11 ³Faculty of Health Sciences Brandenburg, Brandenburg Medical School (Theodor Fontane),
12 Institute for Health Services and Health Systems Research, Rüdersdorf, Germany.

13 ⁴Center for Health Services Research, Brandenburg Medical School (Theodor Fontane),
14 Rüdersdorf, Germany.

15 ⁵Department of Nursing Research, University Hospital of Schleswig-Holstein, Kiel, Germany.

16 ⁶Servicio de Medicina Física y Rehabilitación and Departamento de Paciente Crítico, Clínica
17 Alemana Universidad del Desarrollo, Santiago, Chile.

18 ⁷Departamento de Medicina Intensiva, Facultad de Medicina, Pontificia Universidad
19 Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile.

20 ⁸Departamento de Ciencias de la Salud, Carrera de Kinesiología, Facultad de Medicina,
21 Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

22 ⁹Departamento de Ciencias de la Rehabilitación, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de La
23 Frontera, Temuco, Chile.

24 ¹⁰Centro de Excelencia CIGES, Universidad de La Frontera, Temuco, Chile.

25 ¹¹Department of Physical Therapy, University of Chile, Santiago, Chile.

26

27 *Corresponding author: Ruvistay Gutierrez-Arias, PT MSc. Servicio de Medicina Física y
28 Rehabilitación, Unidad de Kinesiología, Instituto Nacional del Tórax, Santiago, Chile &
29 Exercise and Rehabilitation Sciences Institute, School of Physical Therapy, Faculty of
30 Rehabilitation Sciences, Universidad Andres Bello, Santiago, 7591538, Chile. Address all
31 correspondence to: ruvistay.gutierrez@gmail.com.

32

33 **ABSTRACT**

34 **Introduction:** In adult patients in intensive care units (ICU), early mobilization is one of the
35 central non-pharmacological interventions studied for recovery from critical illness. Several
36 systematic reviews (SRs) have been conducted to determine the effect of this intervention
37 on ICU-acquired weakness (ICU-AW) with heterogeneous methodology and results.
38 Redundancy in conducting SRs, unclear justification when leading new SRs or updating, and
39 discordant results of SRs on the same research question may be generating research waste

40 that makes it difficult for clinicians to keep up to date with the best available evidence.
41 Therefore, this meta-research aims to assess the redundancy, methodological and reporting
42 quality, and potential reasons for discordance in the results reported by SRs conducted to
43 determine the effectiveness of early mobilization in critically ill adult patients on different
44 clinical outcomes.

45 **Methods:** A meta-research of early mobilization SRs in critically ill adult patients will be
46 conducted. A sensitive search of MEDLINE (Ovid), Embase (Ovid), CINAHL (EBSCOhost),
47 Cochrane Library, Epistemonikos, and other search resources will be conducted. Two
48 independent reviewers will perform study selection, data extraction, and quality appraisal.
49 Discrepancies will be resolved by consensus or a third reviewer. The redundancy of SRs will
50 be assessed by the degree of overlap of primary studies. In addition, the justification for
51 conducting new SRs will be evaluated with the "Evidence-Based Research" framework. The
52 methodological quality of the SRs will be assessed with the AMSTAR 2 tool and the quality
53 of the reports through compliance with the PRISMA statement. To assess the potential
54 reasons for discordance in the results of the SRs, only SRs that an MA has carried out will
55 be analyzed, considering divergence in results and their interpretation.

56 **Expected results:** The analysis of this meta-research will assess the redundancy in the
57 conducting of SR on the mobilization of critically ill adult patients, their methodological
58 quality, and the quality of the reporting of their findings, as well as the causes of possible
59 discrepancies between their results. These findings could guide the development of better
60 and more timely SRs on the effectiveness of early mobilization of adult critically ill patients.

61 The decrease in waste research could facilitate evidence-based decision-making by
62 stakeholders.

63 **Registration number:** osf.io/kxwq9

64

65 **Keywords:** Critical Care; Critical Illness; Early Ambulation; Evaluation Studies as Topic;
66 Exercise Therapy; Overlap; Recovery of Function; Redundancy; Rehabilitation;
67 Rehabilitation Research; Systematic Reviews as Topic; Wasteful Research.

68

69 **INTRODUCTION**

70 Critically ill adult patients may present with various complications from hospitalization in an
71 intensive care unit (ICU) stay [1,2]. Being on mechanical ventilation, sedation,
72 neuromuscular blockade, and the mobility restrictions imposed by the context of critical
73 illness, as well as barriers derived from invasive devices in critically ill patients [3–5], create
74 an environment that can facilitate cognitive [6] and neuromusculoskeletal complications
75 [7], among others.

76 One of the main ones is ICU-acquired weakness (ICU-AW) [8,9]. The prevalence of ICU-AW
77 is variable [10]; however, it is a problem that should be considered a priority in managing
78 critically ill patients. ICU-AW is associated with other structural and functional impairments
79 that may lead to patient activities and participation restrictions. Decreased quality of life,

80 reduced participation in social activities, and low frequency of return-to-work activities in
81 the post-discharge setting have been reported [11–13].

82 This health condition typically appears generalized and symmetrical, affecting limb and
83 respiratory muscles. This weakness may be due to altered nerve stimulus conduction
84 (critical illness polyneuropathy), altered muscle contraction due to myogenic disturbance
85 (critical illness myopathy), or a mixture of both pathophysiological processes (critical illness
86 neuromyopathy) [14,15]. The diagnosis of ICU-AW can be performed in different ways [16].
87 The most used in clinical practice is the manual assessment of muscle strength of the four
88 limbs using the Medical Research Council sum score scale (MRC-SS) [17].

89 Early mobilization is one of the central non-pharmacological interventions studied to
90 prevent or recover from ICU-AW. While the definition of early mobilization is not agreed
91 upon [18], it is expected that this intervention should be applied as early as possible to
92 critically ill patients, starting with passive mobilization of limbs and other body segments,
93 continuing with active mobilization as early as possible, and with functional transitional
94 exercises to higher positions including assisted ambulation. In addition, devices to support
95 passive and active mobilization, such as cycles or cycle ergometers, can be added [19].

96 Positive effects on muscle strength, length of ICU and hospital stay, and duration of
97 mechanical ventilation, among others, have been reported [20–23]. However, the evidence
98 from primary studies on the effectiveness of early mobilization is inconsistent. Therefore,
99 several systematic reviews (SRs) have been conducted to determine the effect of this

100 intervention through different modalities, such as assessment of the quality or risk of bias of
101 the primary studies and pooled data analysis (meta-analysis (MA)).

102 SRs are considered to have the highest level of evidence to establish the effectiveness and
103 safety of any intervention in different health conditions [24]. This type of secondary study
104 is the basis for developing recommendations in clinical practice guidelines [25]. However,
105 the number of SRs published recently has increased exponentially [26], and some SRs seek
106 to answer the same research question, finding limited methodological quality among them.

107 Redundancy in SRs [27], the unclear justification provided when conducting a new SR or
108 updating a previous one [28], and the discordant results of SRs on the same research
109 question may lead to difficulties for clinicians to keep up to date and identify the best
110 available evidence [29–31]. Therefore, this meta-research aims to assess the redundancy,
111 methodological and reporting quality, and potential reasons for discordance in the results
112 reported by SRs conducted to determine the effectiveness of early mobilization in critically
113 ill adult patients on different clinical outcomes. In addition, this meta-research aims to
114 explore the reasons given by the authors of SRs when justifying the conduct of a new SR for
115 the same research question, the use of previous SRs to guide the design of their studies,
116 and whether the findings of their SRs are discussed based on previously published SRs.

117

118 **METHODS**

119 There are no standard guidelines that can be used for meta-research studies. However, in
120 many aspects our work will resemble an overview of SRs of interventions. Thus we will

121 follow the recommendations proposed by the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews
122 of Interventions where appropriate [32]. Furthermore, this protocol was reported according
123 to Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-
124 P) statement, where appropriate, [33] and was registered in Open Science Framework (OSF)
125 under the number osf.io/kxwq9. The findings of this meta-research will be guided by the
126 Preferred Reporting Items for Overviews of Reviews (PRIOR) statement [34].

127 The SRs identified in our overview on the effectiveness of physical rehabilitation
128 interventions on neuromusculoskeletal function in critically ill patients will be considered
129 the basis of this meta-research [35]. However, different eligibility criteria will be applied in
130 terms of the population and intervention studied.

131 **Eligibility criteria**

132 *Type of studies:* Intervention SRs, with or without meta-analysis, that have considered
133 primary studies with a randomized (RCTs) or non-randomized clinical trial (non-RCTs) design
134 will be included. SRs that perform only network meta-analyses without including pairwise
135 comparative analyses of interventions (conventional meta-analyses) will be excluded.

136 Considering that there are different definitions of SRs [36], for this meta-research,
137 intervention SRs will be defined as an evidence synthesis study that aims to answer pre-
138 defined research questions using explicit, reproducible methods to identify, critically
139 appraise and combine results of primary research studies aimed at determining the
140 effectiveness of any intervention on different health conditions [37].

141 *Type of participants:* SRs that consider adult patients, with majority (>50%) being on
142 invasive or non-invasive mechanically ventilation at least once during the stay on ICU, will
143 be included. The illness or health condition that led to the need for critical care shall not
144 limit inclusion.

145 In contrast to the eligibility criteria of our overview of SRs protocol, only the adult
146 population will be considered because it is in this population that most SRs have been
147 conducted.

148 *Type of interventions:* SRs that consider early mobilization as an intervention, as defined by
149 the authors of the SRs, will be included. They may have but are not limited to the passive
150 mobilization of limbs or another body segment [38,39], exercises involving active patient
151 participation [40], and the use of assistive devices such as upper and lower extremity
152 cycling or cycle ergometer [19,38,39].

153 *Type of comparators:* SRs that consider any intervention in the control groups of the primary
154 studies will be included. These interventions may include usual care, placebo, sham,
155 delayed mobilization, or other physical rehabilitation interventions.

156 *Types of outcomes:* SRs that have addressed the effectiveness of early mobilization on at
157 least one of the following outcomes will be included:

- 158 - Mobility: Outcome that can be measured with any generic or specific scale to assess
159 functionality in ICU, such as Functional Status Score for the Intensive Care Unit (FSS-
160 ICU) [41], ICU mobility scale (IMS) [42], The Chelsea Critical Care Physical
161 Assessment Tool (CPAx) [43], or any other measure to assess mobility.

- 162 - Muscle strength: Outcome that can be measured using a manual scale, for example,
163 MRC-SS [44], or using a device that allows the assessment of handgrip strength [45]
164 or the pressures generated by the respiratory muscles [46], among others.
- 165 - Muscle mass: Outcome which can be measured by muscle circumference
166 measurement, ultrasonography, dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry, computed
167 tomography scan [47], among other.
- 168 - Duration of mechanical ventilation: number of days patients remain on invasive
169 ventilatory support.
- 170 - ICU length of stay: days between admission to the ICU and discharge to a less
171 complex unit.
- 172 - Mortality: Due to any cause and which can be reported according to different follow-
173 up points, for example, mortality in ICU, hospital, 90 days, 180 days, 360 days, the
174 number of deaths due to a given cause.
- 175 - Incidence and duration of delirium: Outcome that can be measured with a scale such
176 as the Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive Care Unit (CAM-ICU) [48],
177 among others.
- 178 - Unwanted safety events: Outcome that can be measured as the incidence of any
179 unwanted safety events associated with the delivery of physical rehabilitation
180 interventions reported by SRs.

181

182 **Search strategy**

183 A systematic search with a sensitive approach will be conducted in different electronic
184 databases and other search resources. MEDLINE (through Ovid), Embase (through Ovid),
185 CINAHL (through EBSCOhost), Cochrane Library, and Epistemonikos will be searched using
186 controlled language (i.e., MeSH, Emtree, and CINAHL Subject Headings) and key terms. In
187 addition, the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO),
188 International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-analysis Protocols
189 (INPLASY), and Open Science Framework (OSF) registries will be reviewed.

190 In addition, the references of the SRs included in this overview will be manually searched
191 using the Citationchaser tool [49], and experts in critical patient rehabilitation will be
192 consulted to identify potential SRs that meet the eligibility criteria of this overview.

193 The search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid) (Table 1) was constructed following the Peer Review
194 of Electronic Search Strategies (PRESS) statement [50]. The search strategy for MEDLINE
195 (Ovid) was built following the PRESS statement, which will be adapted for the other
196 electronic databases and search resources. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and
197 Technologies in Health (CADTH) filter was used to identify studies with an SR design [51].

198 **Table 1.** Search strategy for MEDLINE (Ovid).

N°	Search term
1	Exercise/
2	exp Exercise Therapy/
3	exp Rehabilitation/
4	exp Physical Therapy Modalities/
5	Occupational Therapy/
6	"Physical Therapy (Specialty)"/
7	"activities of daily living"/
8	early ambulation/

9	recovery of function/ or movement/ or locomotion/ or walking/ or motor activity/ or exercise movement techniques/
10	exercis\$.tw.
11	(mobilizat\$ or mobilisat\$ or mobility).tw.
12	(therap\$ adj3 (physical or exercise or occupation\$)).tw.
13	((bed or daily living) adj3 activit\$).tw.
14	(training or pregait or pre-gait or walk\$ or adl or physiotherap\$ or ambulation).tw.
15	((cycle or bicycle) adj2 ergomet\$).tw.
16	or/1-15
17	Critical Illness/
18	exp Intensive Care Units/
19	exp Critical Care/
20	(intensive care or intensive-care or critical care or critical-care).tw.
21	(icu or icuaw or icu-aw).tw.
22	(critical\$ adj3 (ill\$ or care\$)).tw.
23	((intubat\$ or ventilat\$) adj5 patient\$).tw.
24	or/34-40
25	16 and 24
26	(systematic review or meta-analysis).pt.
27	meta-analysis/ or systematic review/ or systematic reviews as topic/ or meta-analysis as topic/ or "meta analysis (topic)"/ or "systematic review (topic)"/ or exp technology assessment, biomedical/ or network meta-analysis/
28	((systematic\$ adj3 (review\$ or overview\$)) or (methodologic\$ adj3 (review\$ or overview\$))).ti,ab,kf.
29	((quantitative adj3 (review\$ or overview\$ or synthes\$)) or (research adj3 (integrati\$ or overview\$))).ti,ab,kf.
30	((integrative adj3 (review\$ or overview\$)) or (collaborative adj3 (review\$ or overview\$)) or (pool\$ adj3 analy\$)).ti,ab,kf.
31	(data synthes\$ or data extraction\$ or data abstraction\$).ti,ab,kf.
32	(handsearch\$ or hand search\$).ti,ab,kf.
33	(mantel haenszel or peto or der simonian or dersimonian or fixed effect\$ or latin square\$).ti,ab,kf.
34	(met analy\$ or metanaly\$ or technology assessment\$ or HTA or HTAs or technology overview\$ or technology appraisal\$).ti,ab,kf.
35	(meta regression\$ or metaregression\$).ti,ab,kf.
36	(meta-analy\$ or metaanaly\$ or systematic review\$ or biomedical technology assessment\$ or bio-medical technology assessment\$).mp,hw.
37	(medline or cochrane or pubmed or medlars or embase or cinahl).ti,ab,hw.
38	(cochrane or (health adj2 technology assessment) or evidence report).jw.
39	(comparative adj3 (efficacy or effectiveness)).ti,ab,kf.
40	(outcomes research or relative effectiveness).ti,ab,kf.
41	((indirect or indirect treatment or mixed-treatment or bayesian) adj3 comparison\$).ti,ab,kf.

42	(meta-analysis or systematic review).mp.
43	(multi\$ adj3 treatment adj3 comparison\$).ti,ab,kf.
44	(mixed adj3 treatment adj3 (meta-analy\$ or metaanaly\$)).ti,ab,kf.
45	umbrella review\$.ti,ab,kf.
46	(multi\$ adj2 paramet\$ adj2 evidence adj2 synthesis).ti,ab,kf.
47	(multiparamet\$ adj2 evidence adj2 synthesis).ti,ab,kf.
48	(multi-paramet\$ adj2 evidence adj2 synthesis).ti,ab,kf.
49	or/26-48
50	25 and 49

199

200 **Study selection**

201 Two reviewers will independently check records identified by the search strategy for
202 compliance with the eligibility criteria. Irrelevant documents will be excluded by reading the
203 title and abstract and then determining the inclusion of SRs by reading the full text.
204 Disagreements will be resolved by consensus or by a third reviewer. The Rayyan®
205 application will be used to improve the efficiency of this meta-research stage [52].

206

207 **Data extraction**

208 Two reviewers will independently extract data from the SRs. An extraction form explicitly
209 created for this study will be used, piloted with data extraction from 5 SRs, and then
210 adapted according to the reviewers' feedback in the piloting. This form will seek to extract
211 data to describe the characteristics of the publication, general characteristics of the SRs,
212 reported outcome data, quality or risk of bias of the primary studies included, and certainty
213 of evidence (Table 2). In addition, the methodological and reporting quality of the SRs will

214 be rated in the data extraction form. Disagreements will be resolved by consensus or by the
 215 involvement of a third reviewer.

216 **Table 2.** Data to extract.

Domain	Data to extract
Bibliometric characteristics	a) Title b) Authors c) Countries involved in the SR d) Year of publication e) Journal f) Journal impact factor at the time of publication of the SR g) Protocol registration h) Date of manuscript submission and publication
General characteristics of the SRs	a) Inclusion and exclusion criteria for primary studies according to the acronym PICO b) Population description c) Definition of early mobilization proposed by the SRs' authors d) Electronic databases and other search resources considered by the SR e) Search timeframe f) Study designs included by the SR g) Publication status h) Reasons for exclusion of primary studies reviewed in full text i) Previous early mobilization SRs cited in introduction* j) Previous early mobilization SRs cited in discussion* k) Qualitative or survey-based studies of the preferences or values of the end-users of the SRs cited in the introduction* * Together with the sentences or paragraphs mentioned
Reported outcome data	a) Outcomes initially considered by SRs b) Outcomes reported by SRs c) Scales, questionnaires, or instruments used to assess different outcomes d) Type of synthesis of results (meta-analysis or narrative) e) Results data for each outcome reported
Quality or risk of bias of the primary studies	a) Instrument for assessing the methodological quality or risk of bias of included primary studies b) Results of the assessment of the methodological quality or risk of bias of the included studies

Certainty of evidence	a) Instruments or framework used to assess the certainty of the evidence b) Results of the assessment of the certainty of the evidence
Conclusion	a) Conclusions on the effectiveness of early mobilization b) Recommendations for clinical practice c) Recommendations for research

217

218 The search strategy will not use language, date or publication status restrictions.

219 **Methodological appraisal**

220 Two reviewers will independently assess the methodological quality of the SRs included in
221 this overview using “A Measurement Tool to Assess systematic Reviews 2” (AMSTAR 2) [53].

222 Disagreements will be resolved by consensus or by the involvement of a third reviewer.

223

224 This tool includes 16 items and considers seven as critical:

225 1) Protocol registered before the commencement of the review;

226 2) Adequacy of the literature search;

227 3) Justification for excluding individual studies;

228 4) Risk of bias from individual studies being included in the review;

229 5) Appropriateness of meta-analytical methods;

230 6) Consideration of risk of bias when interpreting the results of the review;

231 7) Assessment of presence and likely impact of publication bias.

232 SRs will be classified according to the overall confidence in their results as High, Moderate,

233 Low, and Critically Low, according to the following criteria:

- 234 - High: No or one non-critical weakness. The SR provides an accurate and
235 comprehensive summary of the results of the available studies that address the
236 question of interest.
- 237 - Moderate: More than one non-critical weakness. The SR has more than one
238 weakness but no critical flaws. It may provide an accurate summary of the results of
239 the available studies that were included in the review.
- 240 - Low: One critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses. The SR has a critical
241 flaw and may not provide an accurate and comprehensive summary of the available
242 studies that address the question of interest.
- 243 - Critically low. More than one critical flaw with or without non-critical weaknesses.
244 The SR has more than one critical flaw and should not be relied on to provide and
245 accurate and comprehensive summary of the available studies.

246

247 **Reporting quality**

248

249 Two reviewers will independently assess SR authors' adherence to the PRISMA statement
250 when reporting their findings. Compliance will be assessed for the updated version [54].
251 Disagreements between the reviewers will be resolved by consensus or by a third reviewer.

252

253 **Data analysis and evidence synthesis**

254 The SR selection process will be reported in narrative form with a PRISMA-type flow chart
255 [54].

256 To assess the redundancy of SRs, a matrix will be created that cross-references the SRs
257 identified by the search strategy with the primary studies included by these SRs. This will be
258 done at the SR and outcome level. In addition, from these matrices, the corrected covered
259 area (CCA) [55] will be calculated without considering any structural missing data and
260 considering the chronological and primary study design structural missing data. The ccaR
261 package (<https://github.com/thdiakon/ccaR>) will be used [56]. The crossover matrix of the
262 SRs and primary studies included will be reported. In addition, heat map graphics will be
263 presented to inform the degree of overlap of primary studies at the SR and outcome level.
264 In addition, the Evidence-Based Research framework will be used to assess whether, as new
265 SRs were published, preceding SRs were cited or used to 1) justify the conduct of a new
266 evidence synthesis study, 2) contribute to the design of new evidence synthesis studies, and
267 3) discuss the findings of new SRs considering preceding evidence synthesis studies [57–59].
268 For this purpose, five questionable research practices will be assessed through content
269 analysis based on what is reported in the SRs' articles (Table 3) [28].

270 **Table 3.** Evaluation of research practices in the Evidence-Based Research framework.

Research practices	Type of response	Section to review	Qualifying conditions
Authors use the results of a systematic and transparent collection of earlier similar studies when justifying a new study.	Dichotomous (Yes/No)	Introduction	If the authors cite at least one previous SR on early mobilization in critically ill adult patients, it will be considered compliant. In addition, if they mention any overview of SRs that consider this research topic, it will also be regarded as compliant.
Authors of a scientific study refer to all earlier similar studies	Dichotomous (Yes/No)	Introduction	If the authors cite all previous SRs (considering as the cut-off point the most current date of

	Quantitative (Proportion)		the conduct of the search strategy) on early mobilization in critically ill adult patients, it will be regarded as compliant. In addition, the citation fraction of each SR will be calculated by dividing all potential cited SRs (considering as the cut-off point the most updated date of the conduct of the search strategy) and the number of cite SRs.
Authors use the results of a systematic and transparent collection of earlier similar studies when designing a new study.	Dichotomous (Yes/No)	Introduction and Methods	If authors discuss and critique the design of previously published SRs in the introduction (based on the definitions of the population, intervention, comparison, outcomes (PICO), and methods of the included studies) and implement improvements in their SR design, they will be considered compliant.
Authors use the results of a systematic and transparent collection of the new research projects' end user's perspectives to inform the justification and design of the new study.	Dichotomous (Yes/No)	Introduction	It will be considered a dichotomous variable. If the authors cite qualitative or survey-based studies on the perspectives or preferences of end-users of SRs (clinicians, decision-makers, patients, etc.), it will be considered compliant.
Authors systematically and transparently place new results in the context of existing evidence.	Dichotomous (Yes/No) Quantitative (Proportion)	Discussion and Conclusion	If the authors cite all previous SR (considering as the cut-off point the most current date of the conduct of the search strategy) on early mobilization in critically ill adult patients, it will be regarded as compliant. In addition, if they cite any overview of SRs that consider this research topic, it will also be

regarded as compliant. In addition, the citation fraction of each SR will be calculated by dividing all potential cited SRs (considering as the cut-off point the most updated date of the conduct of the search strategy) and the number of awarded SRs.

271

272 To assess the potential reasons for discordance in the results of the SRs, only SRs that have
273 been carried out by an MA will be considered as a strategy to synthesize the results. The
274 exploratory analysis will be conducted considering divergence in results or their
275 interpretation:

276 Divergent results:

277 A divergent result is defined as the variation between the SRs of the effect estimators'
278 values and their 95% CIs. The potential causes of variation to be explored will be:

279 a) Search date: the most recent search date reported by the SRs shall be considered.

280 b) Search resources: electronic databases and other search resources used by SRs will be
281 considered.

282 c) Eligibility criteria: The definitions of eligibility criteria according to the PICO framework
283 and the primary study designs included by the SRs will be considered.

284 d) Publication status: Consideration will be given to whether SRs included studies published
285 only as abstracts in conference proceedings.

286 e) Excluded studies: reasons for exclusion of primary studies evaluated in full text will be
287 considered.

288 f) Synthesis of outcome data: statistical methods for conducting meta-analyses (e.g.,
289 random effects vs. fixed effects), and data used to estimate the effect of the intervention
290 (e.g., final scores vs. changes in scores from baseline) will be considered.

291 Divergent interpretations:

292 Divergent interpretation shall be understood as variation in the conclusions in terms of the
293 language used. This analysis will be performed by grouping SRs that determine that the
294 effect estimator calculated using MA is 1) in favor of the intervention, 2) in favor of the
295 comparator, and 3) neither in favor of the intervention nor the comparator. The potential
296 causes of variation to be explored will be:

297 a) Risk of bias: the tool or scale used to assess the risk of bias of the included studies and
298 the rating of the included studies will be considered.

299 b) Certainty of the evidence: consideration will be given to whether any framework was
300 used to assess the certainty of the body of evidence (e.g., GRADE framework) and the
301 grading of the evidence.

302 c) Statistical vs. clinical significance: we will consider whether the interpretation of the
303 effectiveness of the studies was made based on statistical significance or by taking into
304 account the minimally important clinical difference (clinical significance).

305 d) Conclusion: consideration will be given to whether the authors' conclusions were made
306 based on risk of bias or certainty of evidence.

307

308 **DISCUSSION**

309 It is expected that the findings of this meta-research will make it possible to assess the
310 redundancy in the conducting of SR on the mobilization of critically ill adult patients, their
311 methodological quality, and the quality of the reporting of their findings, as well as the
312 causes of possible discrepancies between their results.

313 The need to conduct new SRs that answer the same research question to be evaluated. The
314 review of SR protocol registries [60] and implementation of the "evidence-based research"
315 framework should be mandatory to reduce redundancy and research waste. This could
316 allow for more efficient utilization of financial and human resources and make it easier for
317 clinicians to keep up to date in their field.

318

319 **Ethics and dissemination**

320 As meta-research, this study does not involve the participation of people whose rights may
321 be violated. However, this overview will be developed rigorously and systematically to
322 achieve valid and reliable results.

323 The findings of this meta-research study will be presented at conferences and published in
324 a peer-reviewed journal related to rehabilitation, critical care, or research methodology.

325

326 **REFERENCES**

- 327 1. Eggmann S, Luder G, Verra ML, Irincheeva I, Bastiaenen CHG, Jakob SM. Functional
328 ability and quality of life in critical illness survivors with intensive care unit acquired
329 weakness: A secondary analysis of a randomised controlled trial. PLoS One.
330 2020;15:e0229725–e0229725.
- 331 2. Sidiras G, Patsaki I, Karatzanos E, Dakoutrou M, Kouvarakos A, Mitsiou G, et al. Long
332 term follow-up of quality of life and functional ability in patients with ICU acquired
333 Weakness – A post hoc analysis. J Crit Care. 2019;53:223–30.
- 334 3. Wilches Luna E, Perme C, Gastaldi AC. Relationship between potential barriers to early
335 mobilization in adult patients during intensive care stay using the Perme ICU Mobility
336 score. Can J Respir Ther. 2021;57:148–53.
- 337 4. Babazadeh M, Jahani S, Poursangbor T, Cheraghian B. Perceived barriers to early
338 mobilization of intensive care unit patients by nurses in hospitals affiliated to Jundishapur
339 University of Medical Sciences of Ahvaz in 2019. J Med Life. 2021;14:100–4.
- 340 5. Potter K, Miller S, Newman S. Patient-Level Barriers and Facilitators to Early
341 Mobilization and the Relationship With Physical Disability Post–Intensive Care. Dimens Crit
342 Care Nurs. 2021;40:164–73.
- 343 6. Wilcox ME, Girard TD, Hough CL. Delirium and long term cognition in critically ill
344 patients. BMJ. 2021;n1007–n1007.

- 345 7. Gustafson OD, Williams MA, McKechnie S, Dawes H, Rowland MJ. Musculoskeletal
346 complications following critical illness: A scoping review. *J Crit Care*. 2021;66:60–6.
- 347 8. Griffiths RD, Hall JB. Exploring intensive care unit-acquired weakness. *Crit Care Med*.
348 2009;37:S295–S295.
- 349 9. Stevens RD, Dowdy DW, Michaels RK, Mendez-Tellez PA, Pronovost PJ, Needham DM.
350 Neuromuscular dysfunction acquired in critical illness: a systematic review. *Intensive Care*
351 *Med*. 2007;33:1876–91.
- 352 10. Appleton RTD, Kinsella J, Quasim T. The incidence of intensive care unit-acquired
353 weakness syndromes: A systematic review. *J Intensive Care Soc*. 2015;16:126–36.
- 354 11. Dettling-Ihnenfeldt DS, Wieske L, Horn J, Nollet F, van der Schaaf M. Functional
355 Recovery in Patients With and Without Intensive Care Unit–Acquired Weakness. *Am J Phys*
356 *Med Rehabil*. 2017;96:236–42.
- 357 12. Thomas S, Mehrholz J. Health-related quality of life, participation, and physical and
358 cognitive function of patients with intensive care unit-acquired muscle weakness 1 year
359 after rehabilitation in Germany: the GymNAST cohort study. *BMJ Open*. 2018;8:e020163–
360 e020163.
- 361 13. Kamdar BB, Suri R, Suchyta MR, Digrande KF, Sherwood KD, Colantuoni E, et al. Return
362 to work after critical illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Thorax*. 2020;75:17–
363 27.
- 364 14. Latronico N, Bolton CF. Critical illness polyneuropathy and myopathy: a major cause of

- 365 muscle weakness and paralysis. *Lancet Neurol.* 2011;10:931–41.
- 366 15. Kress JP, Hall JB. ICU-Acquired Weakness and Recovery from Critical Illness. *N Engl J*
367 *Med.* 2014;370:1626–35.
- 368 16. Stevens RD, Marshall SA, Cornblath DR, Hoke A, Needham DM, de Jonghe B, et al. A
369 framework for diagnosing and classifying intensive care unit-acquired weakness. *Crit Care*
370 *Med.* 2009;37:S299–308.
- 371 17. Vanpee G, Hermans G, Segers J, Gosselink R. Assessment of Limb Muscle Strength in
372 Critically Ill Patients. *Crit Care Med.* 2014;42:701–11.
- 373 18. Clarissa C, Salisbury L, Rodgers S, Kean S. Early mobilisation in mechanically ventilated
374 patients: a systematic integrative review of definitions and activities. *J Intensive Care.*
375 2019;7:3.
- 376 19. Needham DM, Truong AD, Fan E. Technology to enhance physical rehabilitation of
377 critically ill patients. *Crit Care Med.* 2009;37:S436–41.
- 378 20. Watanabe S, Liu K, Morita Y, Kanaya T, Naito Y, Suzuki S, et al. Effects of Mobilization
379 among Critically Ill Patients in the Intensive Care Unit: A Single-center Retrospective Study.
380 *Prog Rehabil Med [Internet].* 2022;7:20220013. Available from:
381 https://www.jstage.jst.go.jp/article/prm/7/0/7_20220013/_article
- 382 21. Gatty A, Samuel SR, Alaparathi GK, Prabhu D, Upadya M, Krishnan S, et al. Effectiveness
383 of structured early mobilization protocol on mobility status of patients in medical
384 intensive care unit. *Physiother Theory Pract.* 2022;38:1345–57.

- 385 22. Schweickert WD, Pohlman MC, Pohlman AS, Nigos C, Pawlik AJ, Esbrook CL, et al. Early
386 physical and occupational therapy in mechanically ventilated, critically ill patients: a
387 randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2009;373:1874–82.
- 388 23. Hashem MD, Parker AM, Needham DM. Early Mobilization and Rehabilitation of
389 Patients Who Are Critically Ill. *Chest*. 2016;150:722–31.
- 390 24. Medicine C for E-B. Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine: Levels of Evidence
391 (March 2009) [Internet]. Available from: [https://www.cebm.ox.ac.uk/resources/levels-of-](https://www.cebm.ox.ac.uk/resources/levels-of-evidence/oxford-centre-for-evidence-based-medicine-levels-of-evidence-march-2009)
392 [evidence/oxford-centre-for-evidence-based-medicine-levels-of-evidence-march-2009](https://www.cebm.ox.ac.uk/resources/levels-of-evidence/oxford-centre-for-evidence-based-medicine-levels-of-evidence-march-2009)
- 393 25. Platz T. Methods for the Development of Healthcare Practice Recommendations Using
394 Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses. *Front Neurol*. 2021;12.
- 395 26. Hoffmann F, Allers K, Rombey T, Helbach J, Hoffmann A, Mathes T, et al. Nearly 80
396 systematic reviews were published each day: Observational study on trends in
397 epidemiology and reporting over the years 2000-2019. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2021;138:1–11.
- 398 27. Ioannidis JPA. The Mass Production of Redundant, Misleading, and Conflicted
399 Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses. *Milbank Q*. 2016;94:485–514.
- 400 28. Lund H, Robinson KA, Gjerland A, Nykvist H, Drachen TM, Christensen R, et al. Meta-
401 research evaluating redundancy and use of systematic reviews when planning new studies
402 in health research: a scoping review. *Syst Rev*. 2022;11:241.
- 403 29. Chalmers I, Bracken MB, Djulbegovic B, Garattini S, Grant J, Gülmezoglu AM, et al. How
404 to increase value and reduce waste when research priorities are set. *Lancet*.

- 405 2014;383:156–65.
- 406 30. Ioannidis JPA, Greenland S, Hlatky MA, Khoury MJ, Macleod MR, Moher D, et al.
407 Increasing value and reducing waste in research design, conduct, and analysis. *Lancet*.
408 2014;383:166–75.
- 409 31. Salman RA-S, Beller E, Kagan J, Hemminki E, Phillips RS, Savulescu J, et al. Increasing
410 value and reducing waste in biomedical research regulation and management. *Lancet*.
411 2014;383:176–85.
- 412 32. Pollock M, Fernandes RM, Becker LA, Pieper D, Hartling L. Overviews of Reviews. In:
413 Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors).
414 *Cochrane Handb Syst Rev Interv* version 63 (updated Febr 2022) [Internet]. Cochrane;
415 2022. Available from: <http://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook>.
- 416 33. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
417 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015
418 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4:1.
- 419 34. Gates M, Gates A, Pieper D, Fernandes RM, Tricco AC, Moher D, et al. Reporting
420 guideline for overviews of reviews of healthcare interventions: development of the PRIOR
421 statement. *BMJ*. 2022;e070849–e070849.
- 422 35. Gutierrez-Arias R, Nydahl P, Pieper D, González-Seguel F, Jalil Y, Oliveros M-J, et al.
423 Effectiveness of physical rehabilitation interventions in critically ill patients - A protocol for
424 an overview of systematic reviews. *PLoS One*. 2023;

- 425 36. Krnic Martinic M, Pieper D, Glatt A, Puljak L. Definition of a systematic review used in
426 overviews of systematic reviews, meta-epidemiological studies and textbooks. *BMC Med*
427 *Res Methodol.* 2019;19:203.
- 428 37. Pollock A, Berge E. How to do a systematic review. *Int J Stroke.* 2018;13:138–56.
- 429 38. Machado A dos S, Pires-Neto RC, Carvalho MTX, Soares JC, Cardoso DM, Albuquerque
430 IM de. Effects that passive cycling exercise have on muscle strength, duration of
431 mechanical ventilation, and length of hospital stay in critically ill patients: a randomized
432 clinical trial. *J Bras Pneumol.* 2017;43:134–9.
- 433 39. Camargo Pires-Neto R, Fogaça Kawaguchi YM, Sayuri Hirota A, Fu C, Tanaka C, Caruso
434 P, et al. Very Early Passive Cycling Exercise in Mechanically Ventilated Critically Ill Patients:
435 Physiological and Safety Aspects - A Case Series. *PLoS One.* 2013;8:e74182–e74182.
- 436 40. Mitchell WK, Taivassalo T, Narici M V, Franchi M V. Eccentric Exercise and the Critically
437 Ill Patient. *Front Physiol.* 2017;8.
- 438 41. Huang M, Chan KS, Zanni JM, Parry SM, Neto S-CGB, Neto JAA, et al. Functional Status
439 Score for the ICU: An International Clinimetric Analysis of Validity, Responsiveness, and
440 Minimal Important Difference. *Crit Care Med.* 2016;44:e1155–64.
- 441 42. Hodgson C, Needham D, Haines K, Bailey M, Ward A, Harrold M, et al. Feasibility and
442 inter-rater reliability of the ICU Mobility Scale. *Hear Lung.* 2014;43:19–24.
- 443 43. Corner EJ, Wood H, Englebretsen C, Thomas A, Grant RL, Nikolettou D, et al. The
444 Chelsea Critical Care Physical Assessment Tool (CPAx): validation of an innovative new tool

- 445 to measure physical morbidity in the general adult critical care population; an
446 observational proof-of-concept pilot study. *Physiotherapy*. 2013;99:33–41.
- 447 44. Hermans G, Clerckx B, Vanhullebusch T, Segers J, Vanpee G, Robbeets C, et al.
448 Interobserver agreement of medical research council sum-score and handgrip strength in
449 the intensive care unit. *Muscle Nerve*. 2012;45:18–25.
- 450 45. Ali NA, O’Brien JM, Hoffmann SP, Phillips G, Garland A, Finley JCW, et al. Acquired
451 Weakness, Handgrip Strength, and Mortality in Critically Ill Patients. *Am J Respir Crit Care*
452 *Med*. 2008;178:261–8.
- 453 46. Doorduyn J, van Hees HWH, van der Hoeven JG, Heunks LMA. Monitoring of the
454 Respiratory Muscles in the Critically Ill. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2013;187:20–7.
- 455 47. Lopez-Ruiz A, Kashani K. Assessment of muscle mass in critically ill patients: role of the
456 sarcopenia index and images studies. *Curr Opin Clin Nutr Metab Care*. 2020;23:302–11.
- 457 48. Ely EW, Margolin R, Francis J, May L, Truman B, Dittus R, et al. Evaluation of delirium in
458 critically ill patients: Validation of the Confusion Assessment Method for the Intensive
459 Care Unit (CAM-ICU). *Crit Care Med*. 2001;29:1370–9.
- 460 49. Haddaway NR, Grainger MJ, Gray CT. Citationchaser: A tool for transparent and
461 efficient forward and backward citation chasing in systematic searching. *Res Synth*
462 *Methods*. 2022;13:533–45.
- 463 50. McGowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foerster V, Lefebvre C. PRESS Peer
464 Review of Electronic Search Strategies: 2015 Guideline Statement. *J Clin Epidemiol*.

- 465 2016;75:40–6.
- 466 51. CADTH. SR / MA / HTA / ITC - MEDLINE, Embase, PsycInfo [Internet]. CADTH Search
467 Filters Database. Ottawa. 2022. Available from: <https://searchfilters.cadth.ca/link/33>
- 468 52. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app
469 for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5:210.
- 470 53. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, et al. AMSTAR 2: a critical
471 appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies
472 of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ*. 2017;j4008–j4008.
- 473 54. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
474 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*.
475 2021;n71–n71.
- 476 55. Pieper D, Antoine S-L, Mathes T, Neugebauer EAM, Eikermann M. Systematic review
477 finds overlapping reviews were not mentioned in every other overview. *J Clin Epidemiol*.
478 2014;67:368–75.
- 479 56. Bougioukas KI, Diakonidis T, Mavromanoli AC, Haidich A. <sc>ccaR</sc> : A package
480 for assessing primary study overlap across systematic reviews in overviews. *Res Synth*
481 *Methods*. 2022;
- 482 57. Robinson KA, Brunnhuber K, Ciliska D, Juhl CB, Christensen R, Lund H. Evidence-Based
483 Research Series-Paper 1: What Evidence-Based Research is and why is it important? *J Clin*
484 *Epidemiol*. 2021;129:151–7.

485 58. Lund H, Juhl CB, Nørgaard B, Draborg E, Henriksen M, Andreasen J, et al. Evidence-
486 Based Research Series-Paper 2 : Using an Evidence-Based Research approach before a
487 new study is conducted to ensure value. J Clin Epidemiol. 2021;129:158–66.

488 59. Lund H, Juhl CB, Nørgaard B, Draborg E, Henriksen M, Andreasen J, et al. Evidence-
489 Based Research Series-Paper 3: Using an Evidence-Based Research approach to place your
490 results into context after the study is performed to ensure usefulness of the conclusion. J
491 Clin Epidemiol. 2021;129:167–71.

492 60. Pieper D, Rombey T. Where to prospectively register a systematic review. Syst Rev.
493 2022;11:8.

494