

Title

Publication bias in otorhinolaryngology meta-analyses in 2021

Authors

- Dr. Fatemeh Mohammadian ¹, M.D., fsmohammadian@gmail.com
- Dr. Shahin Bastaninejad ², M.D., dr_shahinbastani@yahoo.com
- Dr. Shirin Irani ², M.D., sh_irani@razi.tums.ac.ir

Affiliations

- 1- Department of Medicine, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran
- 2- Otorhinolaryngology Research Center, Amiralam Hospital, Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding author

Dr. Shirin Irani, Email: sh_irani@razi.tums.ac.ir, Phone: +98-21-64053334

Tehran University of Medical Sciences, Keshavarz Blvd., Tehran, Iran

Conflicts of interest

All authors declare no potential conflicts of interest regarding this study and its outcomes.

Source of funding

This study was not funded.

Contributions

FM: conduct, analysis, and presentation of the research

SB: design and presentation of the research

SI: design, conduct, and presentation

Abstract

Introduction: One concern in meta-analyses is the presence of publication bias (PB) which leads to the dissemination of inflated results. In this study, we assessed how much the meta-analyses in the field of otorhinolaryngology in 2021 evaluated the presence of PB.

Methods: Six of the most influential journals in the field were selected. A search was conducted, and data were extracted from the included studies. In cases where PB was not assessed by the authors, we evaluated the risk of its presence by designing funnel plots and performing statistical tests.

Results: 75 systematic reviews were included. 51% of them used at least one method for assessing the risk of PB, with the visual inspection of a funnel plot being the most frequent method used. 29% of the studies reported a high risk of PB presence. We replicated the results of 11 meta-analyses that did not assess the risk of PB and found that 63.6% were at high risk.

Discussion: Our results indicate that systematic reviews published in some of the most influential journals in the field do not implement enough measures in their search strategies to reduce the risk of PB, nor do they assess the risk of its presence.

1 | Background

1-1 | Rationale

1 The Catalogue of Bias, a collaboration dedicated to describing a wide range of biases
2 and outlining their potential impact on research studies, defines publication bias (PB) as
3 “when the likelihood of a study being published is affected by the findings of the study”
4 ¹. Several factors could lead to PB including selective publication of positive findings,
5 selective publication of statistically significant findings, selective publication of
6 ‘interesting’ findings, and publication according to the quality of the trial or its funding ².
7 A study in 2009 demonstrated that randomized controlled trials with positive findings
8 were 3.9 times more likely to be submitted and published than trials with negative or null
9 findings ³. The OPEN project (Overcome failure to Publish nEgative fiNDings), a project
10 funded by the European Union to investigate the extent and impact of dissemination
11 bias, has encouraged systematic reviewers (SRs) to follow “the best practices” in
12 conducting systematic reviews (SR) (especially practices concerning the assessment of
13 the impact of dissemination bias) and publishing the protocol and results of their SRs
14 publicly. Regarding “the best practices” in conducting SRs, the members of the OPEN
15 project have proposed the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
16 ⁴ and the standards for SRs stated by the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy
17 of Sciences ⁵. The main recommendation in these guidelines for avoiding PB is to
18 search for evidence that includes bibliographic databases and other sources such as
19 grey literature, citation indexes, trial data, and other unpublished reports. On the other

20 hand, selection models and graph-based methods have been suggested to be the main
21 methods for assessing the presence of PB ⁶.

22 Unfortunately, despite the significance of PB, previous studies show that a considerable
23 proportion of systematic reviewers in different fields, such as oncology ⁷, anesthesiology
24 ⁸, dermatology ⁹, cardiology ¹⁰, and gastroenterology ¹¹ did not try to evaluate its
25 possible presence in their SRs and MAs. Also, a substantial proportion of SRs were
26 found not to search resources other than published materials, hence increasing the risk
27 of PB in their results ¹².

28 In this study, we aimed to assess to what extent the recent SRs with MAs in the field of
29 otorhinolaryngology (ENT) have taken measures to reduce the risk of PB in their results
30 or have evaluated the probability of its presence in their research. To our knowledge,
31 this is the first study that has evaluated this subject in this field. Our findings may help to
32 understand how much the issue of PB is addressed in the field.

33

1-2 | Approaches to deal with publication bias

34 There are two approaches for dealing with PB: selection models and graph-based
35 methods ⁶. Selection models use the weighted distribution theory to model the
36 publication process and thus, develop estimation procedures that account for the
37 selection process ¹³. The Hedges model ¹⁴ is the first and most known selection model
38 used for assessing PB. Unfortunately, these models rely on largely untestable
39 assumptions ¹⁵, and thus, are rarely used in practice for assessing PB. Instead, they are

40 used in sensitivity analyses ¹³. On the other hand, graph-based methods are widely
41 used. These methods are based on a funnel plot which usually presents effect sizes
42 plotted against their standard errors (SE) or precision ¹⁶. In the presence of PB, the plot
43 is expected to be asymmetrical. However, a variety of other factors may also lead to
44 asymmetrical funnel plots, such as inflated effects in smaller studies, true heterogeneity,
45 artefactual effects, and chance ¹⁷. Another issue with the visual inspection of funnel
46 plots for detecting PB is the subjectivity of the approach, which in turn leads to errors in
47 interpretation ¹⁸. Thus, statistical tests have also been proposed to detect funnel plot
48 asymmetries, such as Begg's rank test ¹⁹, Egger's regression ¹⁷, Harbord's regression
49 ²⁰, Peters' regression ²¹, and Deeks' regression ²². Trim-and-fill method, a
50 nonparametric rank-based correction method, was proposed to recover symmetry by
51 "trimming" observed studies and subsequently imputing missing studies ²³.

52 It has been proposed that reviewers use various tests and methods to detect PB in their
53 research because different tests make different assumptions on the association
54 between the effect sizes and their precision measures ²⁴. The handbook of Cochrane ²⁵
55 has also made some other recommendations:

- 56 • tests should be used only when there are at least 10 studies included in the
57 meta-analysis;
- 58 • tests should not be used if studies have similar SE of effect estimates;
- 59 • results of tests should be interpreted in the light of visual inspection of the funnel
60 plot; and

- 61 • when there is evidence of plot asymmetry from a test, PB should be considered
62 as only one of several possible explanations.

63

1-3 | Objectives

64 To what extent the MAs in the field of ENT in 2021 have searched for evidence other
65 than bibliographic databases and assessed the risk of PB?

66

2 | Methods

2-1 | Study selection

67 Six of the ten journals with the highest impact factor in the field of ENT (discovered
68 through Google Scholar) were selected following a consensus between a group of four
69 attending ENT surgeons at the Tehran University of Medical Sciences. These included:
70 *Audiology and Neurotology, Ear & Hearing, International Forum of Allergy & Rhinology,*
71 *Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery, Rhinology, and The Laryngoscope.* PubMed
72 was searched for the papers published in these journals in the year 2021. The
73 “Systematic Review” and “Meta-Analysis” filters of PubMed were activated. The results
74 of the search were imported into the Mendeley Reference Manager application, a
75 software designed for the management of citations. Then, using the “Look up metadata
76 by DOI” feature of the application, all the metadata of the records were updated.

77 Two reviewers retrieved the full texts of the records and independently assessed them
78 for eligibility. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Studies that had an MA
79 component were included.

80

2-2 | Data items

81 Two reviewers independently extracted the data from eligible studies. Discrepancies
82 were resolved through discussion. The following data were gathered:

- 83 • study characteristics;
- 84 • reporting guideline;
- 85 • bibliographic databases and citation indexes searched;
- 86 • other sources of data (clinical trials registries, grey literature, citation checking,
87 etc.);
- 88 • whether studies in a language other than English were considered eligible for
89 inclusion;
- 90 • the number of studies included in the SR;
- 91 • if assessed, the method used to assess PB;
- 92 • number of papers that cited the SR; and
- 93 • review type.

94

95 The review type was determined according to the 10 categories proposed by a typology
96 study ²⁶: effectiveness, experiential, costs/economic evaluation, prevalence and/or
8

97 incidence, diagnostic test accuracy (DTA), etiology and/or risk, expert opinion/policy,
98 psychometric, prognostic, and methodology. In cases where one SR fell into more than
99 one category, we considered the main objective of the SR to determine the review type.

100

2-3 | Publication bias assessment

101 We recorded the methods used for assessing PB in each SR. For SRs that did not
102 evaluate the risk of PB, we assessed it by replicating the results of their Mas (using the
103 reported effect measures for each included study), designing funnel plots, using the
104 trim-and-fill method, and performing Begg's rank test and Egger's regression (or Deeks'
105 regression in case of DTA SRs). Only SRs that included at least 10 studies in their MA
106 were assessed to comply with the beforementioned criteria.

107 We used R version 4.2²⁷ "meta" package²⁸ to perform analyses and assess PB in SRs
108 where it was not assessed. The significance level for PB tests was set at $P < 0.10$.

109

3 | Results

3-1 | Study flow

110 The search on PubMed returned 188 records. After updating the metadata, 57 records
111 were removed as they were not published in 2021. After screening the full-text papers,
112 56 reports were also excluded. Finally, 75 SRs were included in this study (check the
113 **Appendix** for the characteristics of the included studies). **Figure 1** shows the flow of
114 study selection.

9

115

3-2 | Basic characteristics of contributing studies

116 The basic characteristics of the included SRs are presented in **Table 1**.

117 The SR types were as follows: 34 effectiveness, 24 etiology and/or risk, 10 prevalence
118 and/or incidence, 5 prognostic, and 2 DTA. Most of the SRs followed PRISMA²⁹ or
119 MOOSE³⁰ reporting guidelines. Only 9 SRs did not report the use of a standard
120 reporting guideline.

121 Included SRs were cited by other papers on a median of 4 citations per SR (interquartile
122 range (IQR): 1–8). The highest number of citations to an SR was 107³¹, while 9 SRs
123 were not cited by any other paper at all.

124

3-3 | Literature search

3-3-1 | Bibliographic databases and citation indexes

125 On average, 3.8 bibliographic databases and citation indexes were searched in the
126 included studies. The data sources searched included APA PsychINFO, CAB Abstracts,
127 CINAHL, CNKI, Cochrane Library, CQVIP, Embase, EmCare, Google Scholar, LILACS,
128 MEDLINE, OTseeker, ProQuest, PubMed, SciELO, ScienceDirect, Scopus, Wanfang
129 Data, and Web of Science. PubMed was the most searched database with 56 SRs
130 (74.7%) searching it, followed by Embase which was searched by 51 SRs (68.0%).
131 **Figure 2** shows how many SRs went through searching each of these databases.

132

3-3-2 | Other sources and languages

133 Backward citation checking was the most prevalent technique used for finding other
134 potentially eligible records (50 SRs, 66.7%). On the other hand, forward citation
135 checking was rarely used (4 SRs, 5.3%). Also, 3 SRs (4.0%) hand-searched the
136 relevant journals or contacted experts in the field. Finally, 1 SR used the “related
137 articles” feature of PubMed to search for other studies.

138 Search for trial registers and trial results registers was also rarely used (10 SRs,
139 13.3%). The registries searched were ClinicalTrials.gov (9 SRs) and ICTRP
140 (International Clinical Trials Registry Platform) (1 SR).

141 The search for unpublished studies and grey literature was also less than satisfactory.
142 One study searched for the abstracts from the related conferences, one study searched
143 for theses (using ProQuest), one study searched the National Rehabilitation Information
144 Center, and one study searched the Chulalongkorn Medical Library.

145 Most of the included SRs also used language restrictions in their search strategy. Only
146 18 SRs (24.0%) searched for studies in languages other than English, while 6 SRs did
147 not report if they utilized any language restrictions in their search.

148

3-3-3 | Included studies

149 On average, 24.8 studies were included in the SRs (median: 16, IQR: 10.5–30.5). The
150 maximum number of studies included in an SR was 98, while the minimum was 3. For
151 MAs, an average number of 21.9 studies were used (median: 13, IQR: 7.5–26.5). The
152 maximum and the minimum number of studies included in an MA was similar to the
153 beforementioned numbers.

154

3-4 | Publication bias

3-4-1 | Assessment for publication bias

155 Almost half of the included SRs used at least one method to assess the potential risk of
156 PB (38/75, 50.7%). **Figure 3** shows the ratio of SRs that assessed PB per journal.

157 Visual inspection of the funnel plot was the most used method for assessing PB across
158 the included SRs (34/38, 89.5%). Among tests used to assess funnel plot asymmetry,
159 Egger's regression was the most widely used (25/38, 65.8%), followed by Begg's rank
160 test (4/38, 10.6%). Two SRs used Harbord's regression and one used Peters'
161 regression. Finally, 4 SRs used the trim-and-fill method to assess the effect of missing
162 studies.

163 Of 38 SRs that assessed PB, 26 (68.4%) used at least two of the mentioned methods,
164 while 6 (15.8%) used at least three methods. Interestingly, 4 SRs did not design a
165 funnel plot but relied solely on statistical tests for funnel plot asymmetry to assess the

166 potential risk of PB. Also, both included DTA SRs used Egger's regression test, instead
167 of Deeks' regression, to assess funnel plot asymmetry.

168

3-4-2 | Presence of publication bias

169 Of the 38 SRs that assessed PB, 11 (28.9%) reported a considerable risk for its
170 presence. We tried to assess the risk of PB in the remaining 37 SRs. In the process, we
171 found that 22 SRs had included less than 10 studies in their MAs for any single
172 outcome, and thus, were ineligible for PB risk assessment. Furthermore, replicating the
173 MA for 4 SRs was impossible mostly due to an incomplete report of the data or
174 statistical methods used. Eventually, we managed to assess the risk of PB in 11
175 additional SRs. Considerably, 7 of these SRs (63.6%) were found to be at a
176 considerable risk of PB. Overall, 49 SRs were assessed for the risk of PB, out of which,
177 18 (36.7%) were found to be at considerable risk.

178

3-4-3 | Possible factors contributing to the risk of publication bias

179 To test for the possible factors that may have affected the risk of PB, a series of
180 Pearson's chi-square tests and t-tests were conducted. However, none of these tests
181 were found to indicate a possible statistically significant correlation. The results of these
182 tests are provided in **Table 2**.

183 As these results indicate, the chances of PB were slightly altered following the inclusion
184 of languages other than English and sources other than bibliographic databases in the
185 search strategy, but none of these correlations were statistically significant. The number
186 of bibliographic databases and citation indexes searched was also not different in a
187 statistically significant manner between the studies with low risk of PB vs. those at high
188 risk of PB.

189

4 | Discussion

4-1 | Interpretation of results

190 In this study, we aimed to evaluate to what extent the SRs and MAs published in some
191 of the most influential journals of ENT use methods to reduce the risk of PB and
192 different techniques to assess the risk of its presence. Our findings revealed that this
193 issue is not addressed optimally in a considerable proportion of the SRs.

194 First, the search strategies used in these SRs were not comprehensive enough to
195 mitigate the risk of PB. Most SRs restricted their search to papers published in English,
196 thus suffering from a great risk of language bias. Although previous studies have shown
197 that the impact of language bias is negligible on the results of an SR in most
198 circumstances³²⁻³⁴, exceptions have also been observed³⁵⁻³⁷. As a result, the Cochrane
199 Initiative recommends that language restrictions should not be used unless in the
200 setting of rapid reviews, and even in that setting, its use should be justified by the
201 reviewers⁴. Also, most of the SRs did not search for other sources of data or grey

202 literature. This issue is of great importance as it has been found that such data can
203 seriously affect the results of an SR^{38, 39}. Specifically, including a grey literature search
204 should be seriously considered when conducting an SR because an association
205 between “statistically significant” results and publication has been documented in
206 previous studies⁴.

207 Another finding of interest was that almost half of the SRs did not assess the risk of PB.
208 This finding becomes bolder knowing that our analyses revealed the risk of PB was
209 considerably higher in the SRs that did not assess the risk of PB. The reason behind
210 this phenomenon is unknown, but some of the potential reasons could be: (a) reviewers
211 trying not to downgrade the confidence in their results; (b) lack of methodological
212 expertise for assessing the risk of PB which also resulted in designing poor search
213 strategies; and (c) solely due to chance. Nevertheless, the journal editors and reviewers
214 should ask the authors to assess the risk of PB in their SRs whenever feasible.

215 More importantly, we saw that in cases where reviewers found a high risk for PB in their
216 SRs, they still did not try to expand their search. This issue should be specifically noted
217 by journal editors, asking the authors to include other sources of data as well when the
218 risk of PB was assessed to be high, in an attempt to avoid publishing inflated results as
219 much as possible.

220 Another finding of interest was the inappropriate use of methods to assess the risk of
221 PB. Although this problem was not frequent across the SRs, some used inappropriate
222 tests to assess funnel plot asymmetry, such as using Egger’s regression test instead of

223 Deeks' regression in the setting of DTA SRs or using statistical tests alone with no
224 visual inspection of the funnel plot beforehand. Both journal editors and reviewers must
225 note that the results of statistical tests for funnel plot asymmetry should be interpreted in
226 light of the visual inspection of the plot, as all these tests are known to have low
227 statistical power²⁵. Other factors should also be considered for using such tests, such
228 as the fact that they are not recommended for cases when there are less than 10
229 studies included in the MA or that they should not be used when studies are of similar
230 size²⁵. Using contour-enhanced funnel plots is also highly desirable as they help with
231 differentiating the reasons for funnel plot asymmetry⁴⁰.

232 Finally, we assessed some possible factors that might have contributed to the risk of PB
233 presence. Surprisingly though, none of those factors (language restriction, a search of
234 sources other than bibliographic databases, and the number of databases searched)
235 had a statistically significant correlation with the presence of PB. This could be due to
236 some possible reasons: first, it might be due to the small sample size of SRs included in
237 the test. Another reason could be that some risk of PB was inevitable even in the
238 absence of language restriction of the search, seeking other sources of data, and
239 searching a large number of databases. Nevertheless, the results of these tests do not
240 exclude the fact that implementing these measures most probably will reduce the risk of
241 PB.

242

4-2 | Implications

243 Our findings indicate the lack of methodological sufficiency for conducting high-quality
244 SRs in the most influential journals of the field, which in turn might have led to the
245 possible dissemination of inflated results. We strongly encourage the editors of the
246 journals to take the issue of PB seriously and demand authors take measures to reduce
247 its risk and use appropriate methods to assess its possible presence.

Bibliography

1. DeVito NJ and Goldacre B. Catalogue of bias: publication bias. *BMJ Evid Based Med* 2019; 24: 53-54. 20181206. DOI: 10.1136/bmjebm-2018-111107.
2. Bassler D, Mueller KF, Briel M, et al. Bias in dissemination of clinical research findings: structured OPEN framework of what, who and why, based on literature review and expert consensus. *BMJ Open* 2016; 6: e010024. 20160121. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010024.
3. Hopewell S, Loudon K, Clarke MJ, et al. Publication bias in clinical trials due to statistical significance or direction of trial results. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009; 2009: MR000006. 20090121. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000006.pub3.
4. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2019.
5. Jill E, Laura L, Alfred B, et al. *Finding What Works in Health Care*. 2011.
6. Marks-Anglin A and Chen Y. A historical review of publication bias. *Res Synth Methods* 2020; 11: 725-742. 20200917. DOI: 10.1002/jrsm.1452.
7. Herrmann D, Sinnott P, Holmes J, et al. Statistical controversies in clinical research: publication bias evaluations are not routinely conducted in clinical oncology systematic reviews. *Ann Oncol* 2017; 28: 931-937. DOI: 10.1093/annonc/mdw691.
8. Hedin RJ, Umberham BA, Detweiler BN, et al. Publication Bias and Nonreporting Found in Majority of Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses in Anesthesiology Journals. *Anesth Analg* 2016; 123: 1018-1025. DOI: 10.1213/ANE.0000000000001452.
9. Atakpo P and Vassar M. Publication bias in dermatology systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *J Dermatol Sci* 2016; 82: 69-74. 20160224. DOI: 10.1016/j.jdermsci.2016.02.005.
10. Palma S and Delgado-Rodriguez M. Assessment of publication bias in meta-analyses of cardiovascular diseases. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2005; 59: 864-869. DOI: 10.1136/jech.2005.033027.

11. Heavener T and Vassar M. A review of publication bias in the gastroenterology literature. *Indian J Gastroenterol* 2018; 37: 58-62. 20180227. DOI: 10.1007/s12664-018-0824-2.
12. Pradhan R, Garnick K, Barkondaj B, et al. Inadequate diversity of information resources searched in US-affiliated systematic reviews and meta-analyses: 2005-2016. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2018; 102: 50-62. 20180604. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.05.024.
13. Lin L and Chu H. Quantifying publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics* 2018; 74: 785-794. 20171115. DOI: 10.1111/biom.12817.
14. Hedges LV. Estimation of Effect Size under Nonrandom Sampling: The Effects of Censoring Studies Yielding Statistically Insignificant Mean Differences. *Journal of Educational Statistics* 2016; 9: 61-85. DOI: 10.3102/10769986009001061.
15. Sutton AJ, Duval SJ, Tweedie RL, et al. Empirical assessment of effect of publication bias on meta-analyses. *BMJ* 2000; 320: 1574-1577. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.320.7249.1574.
16. Richard JL and David BP. Summing Up: The Science of Reviewing Research Harvard University Press: Cambridge, MA, 1984, xiii+ 191 pp. *Educational Researcher* 1986; 15: 16-17, publisher = Sage Publications Sage CA Thousand Oaks, CA.
17. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, et al. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* 1997; 315: 629-634. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.315.7109.629.
18. Lau J, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, et al. The case of the misleading funnel plot. *BMJ* 2006; 333: 597-600. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.333.7568.597.
19. Begg CB and Mazumdar M. Operating Characteristics of a Rank Correlation Test for Publication Bias. *Biometrics* 1994; 50: 1088. DOI: 10.2307/2533446.
20. Harbord RM, Egger M and Sterne JA. A modified test for small-study effects in meta-analyses of controlled trials with binary endpoints. *Stat Med* 2006; 25: 3443-3457. DOI: 10.1002/sim.2380.
21. Peters JL, Sutton AJ, Jones DR, et al. Comparison of two methods to detect publication bias in meta-analysis. *JAMA* 2006; 295: 676-680. DOI: 10.1001/jama.295.6.676.

22. Deeks JJ, Macaskill P and Irwig L. The performance of tests of publication bias and other sample size effects in systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy was assessed. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005; 58: 882-893. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2005.01.016.
23. Duval S and Tweedie R. A Nonparametric “Trim and Fill” Method of Accounting for Publication Bias in Meta-Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 2000; 95: 89-98. DOI: 10.1080/01621459.2000.10473905.
24. Lin L, Chu H, Murad MH, et al. Empirical Comparison of Publication Bias Tests in Meta-Analysis. *J Gen Intern Med* 2018; 33: 1260-1267. 20180416. DOI: 10.1007/s11606-018-4425-7.
25. Page MJ, Higgins JPT and Sterne JAC. Assessing risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 2022.
26. Munn Z, Stern C, Aromataris E, et al. What kind of systematic review should I conduct? A proposed typology and guidance for systematic reviewers in the medical and health sciences. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2018; 18: 5. 20180110. DOI: 10.1186/s12874-017-0468-4.
27. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. 2013.
28. Guido S. meta: An R package for meta-analysis. *R news* 2007; 7: 40-45.
29. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Syst Rev* 2021; 10: 89. 20210329. DOI: 10.1186/s13643-021-01626-4.
30. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000; 283: 2008-2012. DOI: 10.1001/jama.283.15.2008.
31. Saniasiaya J, Islam MA and Abdullah B. Prevalence of Olfactory Dysfunction in Coronavirus Disease 2019 (COVID-19): A Meta-analysis of 27,492 Patients. *Laryngoscope* 2021; 131: 865-878. 20201205. DOI: 10.1002/lary.29286.

32. Hartling L, Featherstone R, Nuspl M, et al. Grey literature in systematic reviews: a cross-sectional study of the contribution of non-English reports, unpublished studies and dissertations to the results of meta-analyses in child-relevant reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2017; 17: 64. 20170419. DOI: 10.1186/s12874-017-0347-z.
33. Morrison A, Polisena J, Husereau D, et al. The effect of English-language restriction on systematic review-based meta-analyses: a systematic review of empirical studies. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2012; 28: 138-144. DOI: 10.1017/S0266462312000086.
34. Nussbaumer-Streit B, Klerings I, Dobrescu AI, et al. Excluding non-English publications from evidence-syntheses did not change conclusions: a meta-epidemiological study. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2020; 118: 42-54. 20191104. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.10.011.
35. Egger M, Juni P, Bartlett C, et al. How important are comprehensive literature searches and the assessment of trial quality in systematic reviews? Empirical study. *Health technology assessment (Winchester, England)* 2003; 7: 1-76 , pmid = 12583822.
36. Moher D, Pham B, Lawson ML, et al. The inclusion of reports of randomised trials published in languages other than English in systematic reviews. *Health Technol Assess* 2003; 7: 1-90. DOI: 10.3310/hta7410.
37. Pham B, Klassen TP, Lawson ML, et al. Language of publication restrictions in systematic reviews gave different results depending on whether the intervention was conventional or complementary. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005; 58: 769-776. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2004.08.021.
38. Halfpenny NJ, Quigley JM, Thompson JC, et al. Value and usability of unpublished data sources for systematic reviews and network meta-analyses. *Evid Based Med* 2016; 21: 208-213. 20160929. DOI: 10.1136/ebmed-2016-110494.
39. Wieseler B, Kerekes MF, Vervoelgyi V, et al. Impact of document type on reporting quality of clinical drug trials: a comparison of registry reports, clinical study reports, and journal publications. *BMJ* 2012; 344: d8141. 20120103. DOI: 10.1136/bmj.d8141.

40. Peters JL, Sutton AJ, Jones DR, et al. Contour-enhanced meta-analysis funnel plots help distinguish publication bias from other causes of asymmetry. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61: 991-996. 20080606. DOI: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2007.11.010.

Figure legends

Figure 1; The flow of study selection.

Figure 2; Number of included systematic reviews (SRs) that searched each bibliographic database and citation index.

Figure 3; Ratio of included systematic reviews (SRs) that assessed publication bias per journal.

Table 1; Basic characteristics of contributing studies. SR: Systematic reviews.

Journal	<i>Audiology and Neurotology</i>	<i>Ear & Hearing</i>	<i>International Forum of Allergy & Rhinology</i>	<i>Otolaryngology-Head and Neck Surgery</i>	<i>Rhinology journal</i>	<i>The Laryngoscope</i>
SR count	1	2	6	22	7	37
Cited by	0	27	15	208	16	394
SR type		Effectiveness	Etiology and/or risk	Prevalence and/or incidence	Prognostic	Diagnostic test accuracy
		34	24	10	5	2
Reporting guideline					Yes	No
					66	9

Table 2; The possible factors which may have contributed to the risk of publication bias. OR: Odds Ratio.

Factor		Risk for publication bias		OR	p-value
		High risk	Low risk		
Language restriction	Only English	12	20	1.35	0.899
	Other languages too	4	9		
Sources other than bibliographic databases (citation searching not included)	Searched	3	6	0.83	0.922
	Not searched	15	25		
Sources other than bibliographic databases (citation searching included)	Searched	13	22	1.06	0.976
	Not searched	5	9		
Number of databases searched	Mean (SD)	3.72 (0.89)	3.84 (1.13)	-	0.692

Study selection flow





