

## **A Scoping Review of Published and Ongoing Prospective Meta-Analyses in Health Research: Study Protocol**

Thomas Love\*, Xiang Li\*, James X. Sotiropoulos, Jonathan G. Williams, Sol Libesman, Kylie E. Hunter, Anna Lene Seidler (\* denotes equal contributions)

### **Abstract:**

#### *Background*

Prospective meta-analysis (PMA) is an emerging evidence synthesis methodology, in which the study selection criteria, hypotheses and analyses are finalised prior to the knowledge of included study results. This has numerous benefits over retrospective meta-analysis, including a reduction in selection bias, selective outcome reporting and publication bias and improved data harmonisation. Yet, common misunderstandings of the PMA methodology remain, leading to inappropriate and/or suboptimal implementation by researchers.

#### *Objectives*

To investigate the landscape of the published and ongoing prospective meta-analyses.

#### *Methods*

We will systematically search the International prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) for PMAs from inception to January 2023 and screen these studies in COVIDENCE. The results of this search will be combined with a search of medical databases (PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews) up to 2018, to capture PMA that started prior to the launch and subsequently increasingly wide implementation of PROSPERO in February 2011. All PMAs conducted in human health research will be eligible for inclusion. All records will be double-screened, and data will be double extracted, with conflicts resolved through consensus.

#### *Dissemination*

Insights from this scoping review will inform adaptations to current PMA guidelines and thus assist researchers in planning future PMAs in their fields.

**NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.**

## **Introduction:**

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses involve the synthesis of data from multiple sources to increase statistical power and improve the generalisability of results [1]. Most meta-analyses are conducted retrospectively, where the planning of analysis, selection of studies and aggregation of data generally occurs following the publication of individual study results [2]. This prior knowledge of results of included studies may introduce bias into both study selection and meta-analysis methods, potentially influencing the meta-analysis hypotheses, inclusion criteria and outcomes [2]. In addition, retrospective meta-analyses are prone to publication bias, whereby studies with positive or statistically significant results are more likely to be published and thus included in meta syntheses [2, 3]. Reviewer selection bias is also prevalent, since reviewers know the results of existing studies and may shape their selection criteria (inadvertently or deliberately) to include studies that confirm their pre-existing beliefs and exclude those that do not [4]. Further, selective outcome reporting frequently occurs in human health research [5-7], involving only a subset of the original recorded variables being selected for inclusion in the final publication based on knowledge of the results. This may lead to bias in subsequent meta-analyses that include these studies, reducing trustworthiness in their findings [6, 8].

Prospective meta-analysis (PMA) is a “next-generation” methodology that addresses many of these limitations of retrospective meta-analysis [9]. PMA is defined as a meta-analysis in which the study selection criteria, hypotheses and analyses are finalised prior to the knowledge of included studies’ results [10-12]. Due to the prospective selection of studies, PMA can reduce the risks of selective outcome reporting and publication bias [13]. Further, specification of study criteria and outcomes prior to knowledge of results allows a reduction in selection bias [14]. PMAs are particularly advantageous to inform decision making for high priority research questions for which limited previous evidence exists and new data are expected to emerge rapidly, for example, during the COVID-19 pandemic [15, 16]. PMAs are usually highly collaborative and are ideally conducted by a

central steering and data analysis committee, as well as representatives from each individual study [10].

PMAAs allow harmonisation of core collected variables, including core outcomes time points and measures between each study, enabling successful synthesis of each study [14]. Harmonisation can increase the statistical power for detecting intervention effects, which is especially beneficial for rare but important outcomes such as mortality [13, 17]. For example, in a meta-analysis case study of early childhood obesity prevention, the proportion of outcome categories that could be meta-analysed due to inclusion in all eligible studies increased from 18% to 91% post-PMA inclusion [13]. Outcome harmonisation can thus reduce research waste [14, 17, 18]. However, some variation across included studies in context (protocol, populations, and interventions) is beneficial to increase the external validity of results [10].

PMAAs can be either conducted with aggregate or individual participant data (IPD), albeit IPD PMAAs are common due to the pre-existing collaborative structure facilitating collection of IPD [19].

Collecting IPD has the important advantage of facilitating subgroup analyses that are less prone to ecological bias [14]. In an IPD PMA this is further enhanced by the ability to prospectively harmonise a collection of subgroup variables across all studies [14].

PMAAs can be planned at any point prior to results being known for the included studies. Thus, the possible timepoints of study inclusion are: during the early planning stages of individual studies, where recruiting/intervention delivery have already initiated, or even following the data collection of each study, however, prior to knowledge of results. Generally, the earlier a PMA is started the greater the ability to harmonise protocols, including core outcomes and subgroups [2, 10].

In some cases, PMA methodology can be combined with retrospective meta-analysis methodology, and this is called a nested PMA [10]. Prospective studies can be harmonised with each other and with the included retrospective studies to optimise data availability and synthesis. The comparison between prospectively included evidence and retrospective evidence in a sensitivity analysis allows for the assessment of publication bias and selective reporting bias [10].

Figure 1. Key advantages of PMA over other research methods

<b>Key advantages of PMA over retrospective meta-analyses</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Prospective selection of studies decreases risk of selective outcome reporting and publication bias [13]</li><li>• Specification of study criteria and outcomes prior to knowledge of results allows a reduction in study selection bias [10]</li><li>• Harmonisation of core outcomes, time points and measures between studies, benefitting data synthesis [14]. This increases statistical power to detect intervention effects and reduces research waste [14]</li><li>• Individual participant data (IPD) can be collected more easily, facilitating harmonisation of studies [19]</li></ul>
<b>Key advantages of PMA over large-scale randomised controlled study</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Variation in study context (protocol, populations, and interventions) between studies can increase external validity of results [10]</li><li>• studies can receive their funding independently, reducing the difficulty in funding a large-scale project</li><li>• The value of already planned and funded research is maximised through the collaboration in PMAs [10]</li></ul>

Yet, there remain common misunderstandings of the methodology, with inappropriate and/or suboptimal implementation by researchers. Therefore, continued refinement of methods guidelines is required to optimise its future implementation and impact on scientific research. To progress this development, it is important to gain an overview of the current prevalence and type of PMAs being conducted. These insights will inform adaptations to the current PMA guidelines and assist researchers in planning PMAs in their fields.

We aim to:

- Describe and characterise the landscape of PMAs (ongoing or completed) within human health research
- Identify the questions that are being addressed by PMA methodology in human health research (including study design, populations and interventions)
- Describe the characteristics of PMAs (e.g. types, levels and forms of collaboration, number of participants and analysis types) that have been or are currently being conducted

### **Methods:**

This protocol is reported in accordance with PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) guidelines (appendix 1) and results will be reported in accordance with PRISMA-scoping review extension [20].

#### *Eligibility criteria*

We are planning to include all PMAs that are conducted in human health research and fulfill PMA criteria as described in the literature [10]:

- Utilise any study design (interventional and observational studies)
- Are conducted in humans (excluding animal studies)
- Either use IPD or aggregate data
- Study an outcome associated with human health

#### Box 1. Definition of a prospective meta-analysis [10]

The key feature of a prospective meta-analysis (PMA) is that the studies or cohorts are identified as eligible for inclusion in the meta-analysis, and hypotheses and analyses are specified, before the results of the studies or cohorts related to the PMA research question are known.

### *Information sources*

An extensive literature search of ongoing and completed records on the International prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) [21] will be conducted to identify PMAs. Additionally, Pubmed, Embase and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews will also be searched.

### *Search strategy*

Firstly, we will search PROSPERO for any ongoing or completed PMAs registered from the establishment of the database (February 2011) to 1<sup>st</sup> January 2023. All studies registered between these dates for which investigators ticked the box ‘prospective meta-analysis’ were exported to Covidence [22]. Further, we will conduct the following free text searches:

- Prospective meta-analysis
- Collaborat\* meta-analysis
- Preplanned and meta-analysis
- Pre-planned and meta-analysis
- Prospectively planned meta-analysis

Secondly, the results of this search will be combined with a more comprehensive literature search conducted in February 2018 [23]. This included a search of PubMed (1950 to February 2018), Embase (1974 to February 2018), Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (all entries up to February 2018) and PROSPERO (inception to February 2018). Additionally, web searches were performed to identify collaborative PMA that may not have been published in traditional journals, and experts in the field (such as the Cochrane PMA methods group) were contacted to name additional planned or conducted PMAs known to them. The search terms and results of the 2018 search are attached in Appendix 2. We expect that most PMAs occurring after the search in February 2018 will appear in the updated PROSPERO search, due to the widespread adoption of PROSPERO registration for evidence synthesis projects. In addition, the references of identified relevant publications will be searched.

### *Data management and selection process*

The identified studies from the updated search will be exported as RIS files and the duplicates will be removed. A pilot screen will be conducted, and the review team will develop and test screening questions using Covidence. The selected PMA registrations will be screened by two authors (TL and XL). Both TL and XL will screen the records independently, with any differences being resolved by consensus and in consultation with JS and/or ALS. Identified studies that contain PMA keywords, however, do not satisfy the essential PMA criteria will be recorded. As the next steps, we will attempt to retrieve publications for all included PMA protocols. SCOPUS will be searched for these publications, beginning with PROSPERO registration number, and then moving on to study title and authors. Where available, we will then screen these full texts in duplicate, resolving conflicts by consensus and consultation.

### *Data collection process, data items and categorisation of studies*

Information on the key PMA elements and characteristics will be recorded in a structured table for each study, as shown in Table 1. This information includes relevant study data (e.g. study design, interventions and eligible populations) and also PMA specific details (e.g. type of PMA, level and structure of collaboration and publication policies). Extractions will occur in duplicate.

The extraction records of the previous 2018 search [23] will be checked by a single reviewer. If any information in Table 1 is not available in the historical extraction record, two reviewers will update the extraction.

Table 1. Data to be extracted and collated from identified PMAs

<b>Category</b>	<b>Data to be extracted</b>
General study information	Title
	Authors
	Registration year on PROSPERO
	Results publication year (if applicable)
	Follow-up results publication year (if applicable)
	PROSPERO registration number
	Most recent publication type
	Journal

	Studied Health Condition (WHO International Classification of Diseases)
	Primary Purpose (Treatment: drugs, other, Prevention, Diagnosis)
	Number of included studies
	Number of participants
	Is the PMA ongoing or are results available?
Review information	Eligible study designs
	Eligible participant populations
	Eligible interventions and comparators?
	Outcome information
	Region of PMA collection
	Region of included studies in PMA
	Funding
PMA-specific information	Type of PMA
	Nested PMA
	If systematic review was conducted prior to PMA
	Included PRISMA checklist
	How were individual studies identified? (What search method was used to identify relevant studies?)
	Individual participant data?
	Subgroup analyses performed?
	Harmonization of outcomes
	Quality of the primary study is assessed by which tools?
Collaboration management	Was there a collaboration?
	Project management structures?
	Procedures for data management?
	Nominated statistical analysis group?
Publication policy	Authorship policy?
	Writing committee?
	Manuscript policy?

### *Data synthesis*

The total number of eligible studies from inception to 1<sup>st</sup> January 2023 that fulfil PMA criteria will be recorded. The PMA details will be analysed both quantitatively (e.g. median sample size, numbers per PMA type), and qualitatively (e.g. describing the varying collaboration structures and common themes across collaborations/interesting case studies). The analysed study characteristics of confirmed and uncertain PMAs will be compared.

### **Acknowledgements:**

Lisa Askie

Saskia Cheyne



**Author contributions:**

Thomas Love and Xiang Li are the co-first authors, contributing most of the work and they will conduct the review. James X. Sotiropoulos, Jonathan G. Williams, Sol Libesman and Kylie E. Hunter provided assistance and guidance in planning this review. Dr Anna Lene Seidler is the project supervisor, overseeing the project.

**Amendments to this protocol:**

This protocol will be uploaded to Open Science Framework. Important protocol amendments will be updated in Open Science Framework and recorded in the final report.

## References:

1. Ahn, E. and H. Kang, *Introduction to systematic review and meta-analysis*. Korean J Anesthesiol, 2018. **71**(2): p. 103-112.
2. Tierney, J.F., et al., *A framework for prospective, adaptive meta-analysis (FAME) of aggregate data from randomised trials*. PLoS Med, 2021. **18**(5): p. e1003629.
3. Roberts, I. and K. Ker, *How systematic reviews cause research waste*. Lancet, 2015. **386**(10003): p. 1536.
4. Ahmed, I., A.J. Sutton, and R.D. Riley, *Assessment of publication bias, selection bias, and unavailable data in meta-analyses using individual participant data: a database survey*. BMJ, 2012. **344**: p. d7762.
5. Vassar, M., et al., *Evaluation of selective outcome reporting and trial registration practices among addiction clinical trials*. Addiction, 2020. **115**(6): p. 1172-1179.
6. Riemer, M., et al., *Trial registration and selective outcome reporting in 585 clinical trials investigating drugs for prevention of postoperative nausea and vomiting*. BMC Anesthesiology, 2021. **21**(1): p. 249.
7. Mathieu, S., et al., *Comparison of registered and published primary outcomes in randomized controlled trials*. Jama, 2009. **302**(9): p. 977-84.
8. Page, M.J., et al., *Bias due to selective inclusion and reporting of outcomes and analyses in systematic reviews of randomised trials of healthcare interventions*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2014. **2014**(10): p. Mr000035.
9. Ioannidis, J., *Next-generation systematic reviews: prospective meta-analysis, individual-level data, networks and umbrella reviews*. British Journal of Sports Medicine, 2017. **51**(20): p. 1456-1458.
10. Seidler, A.L., et al., *A guide to prospective meta-analysis*. BMJ, 2019. **367**: p. l5342.
11. Reade, M.C., et al., *Prospective meta-analysis using individual patient data in intensive care medicine*. Intensive Care Medicine, 2010. **36**(1): p. 11-21.
12. Chalmers, I., *The Cochrane collaboration: preparing, maintaining, and disseminating systematic reviews of the effects of health care*. Ann N Y Acad Sci, 1993. **703**: p. 156-63; discussion 163-5.
13. Seidler, A.L., et al., *Quantifying the advantages of conducting a prospective meta-analysis (PMA): a case study of early childhood obesity prevention*. Trials, 2021. **22**(1): p. 78.
14. Seidler, A.L., et al., *Prospective meta-analyses and Cochrane's role in embracing next-generation methodologies*. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, 2020. **10**(10): p. Ed000145.
15. Naci, H., et al., *Producing and using timely comparative evidence on drugs: lessons from clinical trials for covid-19*. BMJ, 2020. **371**: p. m3869.
16. Sterne, J.A.C., et al., *Association Between Administration of Systemic Corticosteroids and Mortality Among Critically Ill Patients With COVID-19: A Meta-analysis*. Jama, 2020. **324**(13): p. 1330-1341.
17. Efthimiou, O., *Practical guide to the meta-analysis of rare events*. Evid Based Ment Health, 2018. **21**(2): p. 72-76.
18. Jonathan J Deeks, J.P.H., Douglas G Altman; on behalf of the Cochrane Statistical Methods Group. *Chapter 10: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses*. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.3 2019 February 2022; Available from: <https://training.cochrane.org/handbook/current/chapter-10>.

19. Reade, M.C., et al., *Prospective meta-analysis using individual patient data in intensive care medicine*. Intensive Care Med, 2010. **36**(1): p. 11-21.
20. *PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation*. Annals of Internal Medicine, 2018. **169**(7): p. 467-473.
21. (NIHR), N.I.f.H.R., *PROSPERO: International prospective register of systematic reviews*. University of York: York, UK.
22. Cochrane. *Covidence*. Available from: <https://www.covidence.org/>.
23. Seidler, A.L., et al., *A scoping review of prospective meta-analyses in health research*. T.U.o. Sydney, Editor. 2018.

## Appendix 1: PRISMA-P checklist

Selection and topic	Item No	Checklist item	Page number
<b>ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION</b>			
Title			
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	p.1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	Not applicable
Registrations	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	Not applicable
Authors:			
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	p.1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	9
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	9
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	Not applicable
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Not applicable
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	Not applicable
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	p.1-5
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	p.5
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	p.5-8
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	p.6
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned limits, such that it could be repeated	p.6
Study records:			
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	p.7
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility, and inclusion in meta-analysis)	p.7
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	p.7-8
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	p.7-8
Outcomes and prioritisation	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	p.7-8

Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	Not applicable
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	p.5
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's $\tau$ )	p.8
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	p.8
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	p.8
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, selective reporting within studies)	Not applicable
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Not applicable

**\* It is strongly recommended that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and**

**Elaboration (cite when available) for important clarification on the items. Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA-P (including checklist) is held by the PRISMA-P Group and is distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0.**

From: Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group.

Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation.

BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.

## Appendix 2: Previous search strategy

An extensive literature search was conducted to identify PMAs and PMA methodological reports. An incomplete list of known PMAs on the Cochrane PMA Methods Group website was carefully examined (<http://methods.cochrane.org/pma/list-prospective-meta-analysis-studies>) to identify any terminology used to describe PMAs. In addition, the researchers used their experience as convenors and editors of the Cochrane PMA Methods Group and authors of multiple previous PMAs to derive further search terms. The derived search strategy involved various combinations of the following terms, searching in abstracts and titles: prospective, combined, planned, preplanned, pre-planned, pooled, pre-specified, prespecified, collabo\*, individual participant data, individual patient data, meta-analysis, meta analysis, metaanalysis, consortium.

### Previous search results

Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart

