

1 **Characteristics and completeness of reporting of systematic reviews of prevalence**
2 **studies in adult populations: a meta-research study.**

3

4 Diana Buitrago-Garcia ^{a,b}, William Gildardo Robles-Rodriguez ^c, Javier Eslava-Schmalbach ^d,
5 Georgia Salanti ^{a*}, Nicola Low ^{a*†}

6 ^{a.} Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Mittelstrasse 43, 3012
7 Bern, Switzerland.

8 ^{b.} Graduate School of Health Sciences, University of Bern, Mittelstrasse 43, 3012 Bern,
9 Switzerland.

10 ^{c.} Department of Epidemiology, Fundación Universitaria de Ciencias de la Salud-FUCS, Cr
11 49 No 95 – 79, Bogotá, Colombia.

12 ^{d.} School of Medicine, Universidad Nacional de Colombia, Cr 30 No 45-03, Bogotá,
13 Colombia.

14 * GS and NL are joint senior authors

15 † Corresponding author: Nicola Low. Email: nicola.low@unibe.ch. Tel: +41 31 684 3092.

16 Postal address: Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Mittelstrasse
17 43, Bern, CH-3012, Switzerland.

18 **Abstract**

19 **Objective:** The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
20 statement, first published in 2009, has been widely endorsed and compliance is high in
21 systematic reviews of intervention studies. Systematic reviews of prevalence studies are
22 increasing in frequency, but their characteristics and reporting quality have not been examined
23 in large studies. Our objectives were to describe the characteristics of systematic reviews of
24 prevalence studies in adults, evaluate the completeness of reporting and explore study-level
25 characteristics associated with the completeness of reporting.

26 **Study design and setting:** We did a meta-research study. We searched 5 databases from
27 January 2010 to December 2020 to identify systematic reviews of prevalence studies in adult
28 populations. We used the PRISMA 2009 checklist to assess completeness of reporting and
29 recorded additional characteristics. We conducted a descriptive analysis of review
30 characteristics and linear regression to assess the relationship between compliance with
31 PRISMA and publication characteristics.

32 **Results:** We included 1172 systematic reviews of prevalence studies. The number of reviews
33 increased from 25 in 2010 to 273 in 2020. The median PRISMA score for systematic reviews
34 without meta-analysis was 17.5 out of a maximum of 23 and, for systematic reviews with meta-
35 analysis, 22 out of a maximum of 25. Completeness of reporting, particularly for key items in the
36 methods section was suboptimal. Systematic reviews that included a meta-analysis or reported
37 using a reporting or conduct guideline were the factors most strongly associated with increased
38 compliance with PRISMA 2009.

39 **Conclusion:** Reporting of systematic reviews of prevalence was adequate for many PRISMA
40 items. Nonetheless, this study highlights aspects for which special attention is needed.
41 Development of a specific tool to assess the risk of bias in prevalence studies and an extension

42 to the PRISMA statement could improve the conduct and reporting of systematic reviews of
43 prevalence studies.

44 **Plain language summary**

45 A systematic review is a type of research study, which is used to summarise the available
46 information from different studies about a specific topic, such as the prevalence of a disease.
47 Meta-analysis is a statistical method for combining data from individual studies, which can be
48 used to obtain the prevalence of the disease of interest in the populations studied in a
49 systematic review.

50 The PRISMA statement (Preferred Reporting Items in Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses)
51 is a guideline for researchers. It includes a checklist of all information that authors of a
52 systematic review should include in their report. Many scientific journals ask authors to use the
53 PRISMA statement. How well authors use the guideline to report the systematic reviews of
54 prevalence studies is not known.

55 In our paper, we aimed to describe the characteristics of systematic reviews of studies of We
56 included 1,172 systematic reviews of prevalence studies. The number of these reviews grew,
57 from 25 in 2010 to 273 in 2020. Systematic review authors reported the information required for
58 many items in the PRISMA checklist. Other items were reported less well, such as registering a
59 protocol for the systematic review, assessing the risk of biased results in studies included in the
60 review, reporting the methods planned for analysis, discussing limitations and reporting sources
61 of funding. Systematic reviews of prevalence that included a meta-analysis (a statistical method
62 to combine prevalence data) or followed a guideline were better at complying to the PRISMA
63 2009.

64

65 Our study suggests reporting of systematic reviews of prevalence might improve if there were
66 an extension of the PRISMA statement specifically for systematic reviews of prevalence studies
67 and if there were a new tool to assess the risk of bias in prevalence studies.**Keywords:**

68 Systematic reviews; prevalence, adults; reporting; meta-research; risk of bias

69 **Running title:** Systematic reviews of prevalence studies: meta-research study

70 **Word count:** main text, 3154

71 **Abbreviations**

72 IQR Interquartile ranges

73 MOOSE Reporting Guidelines for Meta-analyses of Observational Studies

74 PRISMA Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

75 SR Systematic review

76

77 **What is new?**

- 78 • Systematic reviews of prevalence increased from 25 in 2010 to 2020, to 273 in 2020.
- 79 • Reporting of systematic reviews of prevalence has improved but is still suboptimal.
- 80 • Reporting was better in reviews with a meta-analysis and which followed a guideline.
- 81 • Journals should encourage adherence to PRISMA for systematic reviews of prevalence.
- 82 • A risk of bias tool and a PRISMA extension for systematic reviews of prevalence should be
- 83 developed.

84 **1 Introduction**

85 Prevalence studies quantify the occurrence of a disease and can be used to contribute to
86 estimation of the burden of disease and as a measure to evaluate healthcare interventions [1,
87 2]. Systematic reviews (SRs) of prevalence studies allow the synthesis of evidence about
88 prevalence, which also informs burden of disease estimates and provides a resource for
89 policymakers to help set priorities [1]. The volume of SRs of prevalence studies is increasing,
90 but the methods used to conduct them have been reported to be variable and suboptimal [3, 4].

91 The usefulness of any systematic review depends on the completeness of reporting and the
92 information provided in the included publications. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
93 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement was first published in 2009 to help with
94 transparent and complete reporting of systematic reviews that assess the benefits or harms of
95 interventions [5]. Since then, extensions to the PRISMA statement have covered other study
96 designs, including diagnostic test accuracy [6], protocols [7] and network meta-analysis [8]. An
97 update to the statement, PRISMA 2020, included items that are also applicable to systematic
98 reviews of aetiology, prognosis, and prevalence studies, whilst still being designed primarily for
99 reviews of studies of health interventions [9]. Some studies have shown that the PRISMA
100 statement and extensions have enhanced the reporting of systematic reviews [10-12], although
101 others show that improvement is still needed [11, 13]. The completeness of reporting of SRs of
102 prevalence is, to our knowledge, unknown. The objectives of this study were to describe the
103 characteristics of SRs of prevalence studies in adults, the completeness of reporting, and to
104 explore study level characteristics associated with the quality and completeness of reporting.

105 **2 Methods**

106 We conducted a meta-research study of SRs of prevalence studies, which were identified
107 through a systematic review of SRs. The protocol for the systematic review of SRs was
108 registered in the PROSPERO register (CRD42020151625). Differences between the methods in

109 the protocol and the study reported here are in Appendix A. We report our findings according to
110 the Guidelines for Reporting Meta-Epidemiological Research(Appendix B) [14].

111 *2.1 Search methods*

112 We searched MEDLINE-Ovid, Embase-Ovid, CINAHL and LILACS from January 2010 to
113 December 2020 without language restrictions. We also searched grey literature in
114 opengrey.com [15]. We used terms for “prevalence” and “systematic reviews” as medical
115 subject heading (MeSH) terms, Emtree life science thesaurus terms and free text keywords to
116 identify potential SRs that met our inclusion criteria(Appendix C).

117 *2.2 Eligibility criteria*

118 We included SRs of studies conducted in adults (individuals aged ≥ 18 years) in any setting that
119 assessed the prevalence of a disease, symptom, risk factor or behaviour as their primary aim.
120 We excluded SRs of diagnostic test accuracy and of incidence studies, unless prevalence
121 estimates were also presented separately. We also excluded overviews of SRs, studies that
122 conducted a meta-analysis or pooled prevalence data without conducting a SR and conference
123 abstracts, since it was not possible fully assess the completeness of reporting.

124 *2.3 Study selection and data extraction*

125 One author screened titles, abstracts and reviewed full-text reports for potential eligibility
126 (D.B.G.) and a second author (W.R.) verified 20% of studies, using the online tool Rayyan [16]
127 (96% agreement for title and abstract screening). One reviewer extracted data using a pre-
128 piloted form (D.B.G.) and a second author verified the extraction in 20% of included studies
129 (W.R.). We resolved disagreements through discussion. We extracted the following information:
130 publication year, journal and Journal Impact Factor (Web of Science Journal Citation Reports
131 2022 or, if not available, the impact factor reported on the journal’s website) country of the first
132 author (using the first affiliation, if more than one was listed), number of authors, medical

133 speciality and targeted condition, population, primary objective, design of the included studies,
134 geographic coverage, type of numerical data extracted from the included studies, number of
135 studies included, tool reported to have been used to assess the risk of bias or quality in included
136 studies, statistical methods, and approaches used to assess heterogeneity. In addition, if
137 authors reported the use of guidelines or recommendations for SRs, such as the PRISMA
138 checklist [5], the Reporting Guidelines for Meta-analyses of Observational Studies (MOOSE)
139 [17], or for conduct, such as the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions
140 [18].

141 *2.4 Assessment of the completeness of reporting*

142 The completeness of reporting of each SR was assessed using the PRISMA checklist published
143 in 2009 [5], which was appropriate for the publication dates of the included studies. The
144 PRISMA 2009 checklist has 27 items. We decided to exclude two items related to reporting
145 biases across studies, e.g., publication bias and other biases due to missing studies or missing
146 results within studies (item 15 in the methods and item 22 in the results). The statistical methods
147 used to assess these biases were developed for comparative studies, but their relevance and
148 interpretation in evidence from prevalence studies is less clear and needs to be further
149 investigated [19]. We assigned each of the 25 items one point if the item was adequately
150 reported or no points if the item was not reported. For some items, we awarded half a point if
151 the information was partially reported (Appendix D). The maximum score for SRs with a meta-
152 analysis was 25 points, and 23 points without a meta-analysis (items 14 and 21 were not
153 applicable).

154 *2.5 Data analysis*

155 We summarised the study characteristics (discipline, number of studies etc.) using proportions
156 or medians with interquartile ranges (IQR). The completeness of reporting for each review was

157 calculated as a) the achieved PRISMA reporting score, and b) the scaled reporting score, which
158 was the achieved score divided by the maximum possible value; the scaled reporting score
159 takes values between 0 and 100%. Completeness of reporting was summarised as, a) the
160 median (IQR) PRISMA scores, and b) the proportion of SRs that completely reported, partially
161 reported, or did not report, each PRISMA item. Suboptimal reporting for an item was defined as
162 less than 70%, based on a previous study [10].

163 We conducted univariable and multivariable linear regression analyses to assess the
164 relationship between the scaled reporting score and the year of publication, the Journal Impact
165 Factor, the journal's publishing model (open access or not), the number of co-authors, the
166 number of studies included in the review, the use of a guideline to report or conduct the
167 systematic review, the medical specialty and the type of review (SRs with or without a meta-
168 analysis). All analyses were performed using R version 4.3.1 [20].

169 **3 Results**

170 We screened 9580 references and included 1172 systematic reviews, which fulfilled our
171 inclusion criteria. The main reason for exclusion of potentially eligible reviews was because the
172 primary aim of the review was not to assess prevalence (Figure 1, Appendix E).

173 *Figure 1. PRISMA flowchart of the selection of the inclusion of systematic reviews of prevalence*
174 *studies.*

175 *3.1 Characteristics of the reviews*

176 The number of SRs of prevalence increased from 25 in 2010 to 273 in 2020 (Figure 2). There
177 were 387 SRs without meta-analysis and 785 SRs with a meta-analysis. The median number of
178 studies included in all SRs was 25 (IQR 14, 46). The SRs were published across 645 different
179 journals, with PLOS ONE being the most frequent (n=46), followed by BMC Public Health
180 (n=21), and BMC Infectious Diseases (n=20) (Table 1, Table S1). First authors were affiliated

181 with institutions in 65 countries, amongst whom half were in five countries: the United Kingdom
 182 (n=155), the United States (n=120), Iran (n=107), Brazil (n=105), and China (n=98) (Figure S1,
 183 Table S2). Most SRs evaluated the prevalence of a medical condition or risk factor (n=1,036,
 184 88%) and extracted worldwide prevalence data (765, 65%). About half of the SRs (n=565,
 185 48.2%) were conducted to assess the prevalence of infectious diseases, psychiatric conditions,
 186 cardiology, and neurology (Figure S2, Table S3). Prevalence data were extracted from diverse
 187 populations, most commonly from general adult populations (n=436, 37.2%), adults with a
 188 specific condition (n=382, 32.6%), older populations (n=100, 8.5%), women (n=89, 7.6%) or
 189 workers (n=34, 2.9%) (Table 1, Table S4).

190 **Table 1.** Characteristics of systematic reviews of prevalence studies in adults, published
 191 between 2010-2020

Variable	Systematic reviews without meta-analysis (n=387)	Systematic reviews with meta-analysis (n=785)	Total (n=1172)
Journal Impact Factor			
Median (IQR)	3.6 (2.2, 5.4)	4.1 (2.8, 6.7)	3.9 (2.6, 6.5)
Number of co-authors			
Median (IQR)	4 (3, 6)	6 (4, 7)	5 (4, 7)
Number of studies included in the review			
Median (IQR)	22 (13, 39)	24 (14, 47)	25 (14, 46)
Top five journals, n (%)			
PLOS ONE	11 (2.8)	35 (4.5)	46 (3.9)
BMC Public Health	5 (1.3)	16 (2.0)	21 (1.8)
BMC Infectious Diseases	4 (1.0)	16 (2.0)	20 (1.7)
Journal of Affective Disorders	4 (1.0)	13 (1.7)	17 (1.5)
BMJ Open	1 (0.3)	10 (1.3)	11 (0.9)
Top five country affiliations of first author, n (%)			
United Kingdom	55 (14.0)	100 (12.7)	155 (13.2)
United States	38 (9.8)	82 (10.4)	120 (10.1)
Iran	30 (7.8)	77 (9.8)	107 (9.1)
Brazil	47 (12.0)	58 (7.4)	105 (9.0)
China	26 (6.7)	72 (9.2)	98 (8.4)
Top five study populations, n (%)			
Adults in general	146 (37.7)	290 (36.9)	436 (37.2)

Adults with a specific condition or characteristic	101 (26.1)	281 (35.8)	382 (32.6)
Older adults	47 (12.1)	53 (6.8)	100 (8.5)
Women (including pregnant women)	29 (7.5)	60 (7.6)	89 (7.6)
Workers	16 (4.1)	18 (2.3)	34 (2.9)
Geographic scope, n (%)			
Worldwide	254 (65.6)	511 (65.1)	765 (65.3)
Region	60 (15.5)	87 (11.1)	147 (12.5)
Country	73 (18.9)	187 (23.8)	260 (22.2)
Top five specialties, n (%)			
Infectious diseases	38 (9.8)	168 (21.4)	206 (17.6)
Psychiatry	68 (17.6)	118 (15.0)	186 (15.9)
Cardiology	26 (6.7)	68 (8.7)	94 (8.0)
Neurology	28 (7.2)	51 (6.5)	79 (6.7)
Endocrinology	23 (5.9)	52 (6.6)	75 (6.4)
Aim of the review, n (%)			
Estimate prevalence	353 (91.2)	683 (87.0)	1,036 (88.4)
Estimate prevalence, compare prevalence estimates and/or evaluate associations	34 (8.8)	102 (13.0)	136 (11.6)
Data extracted, n (%)			
Prevalence estimate	273 (70.5)	318 (40.5)	591 (50.4)
Numerator and denominator	89 (23.0)	339 (43.2)	428 (36.5)
Both	25 (6.5)	128 (16.3)	153 (13.1)
Authors reported using the PRISMA statement, n (%)			
Used	163 (42.1)	472 (60.1)	635 (54.2)
Not used	224 (57.9)	313 (39.9)	537 (45.8)
Authors reported using of MOOSE guidelines, n (%)			
Used	22 (5.7)	125 (15.9)	147 (12.5)
Not used	365 (94.3)	660 (84.1)	1,025 (87.5)
Authors reported using other guidelines (e.g., Cochrane Handbook), n (%)			
Used	17 (4.4)	48 (6.1)	65 (5.5)
Not used	370 (95.6)	737 (93.9)	1,107 (94.5)

192 *Abbreviations:* IQR, interquartile range; MOOSE, meta-analysis of observational studies; PRISMA,
 193 preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses

194 In total, 62% (727/1172) of SRs described using one or more reporting or conducting guidelines.
 195 The PRISMA checklist was cited most often, followed by the MOOSE guideline [17]. Most
 196 authors included studies that answered their review questions without restrictions on study
 197 design (n=623, 53%) (Table 1, Table S5-S6). Among SRs with meta-analysis, most (n=703,

198 90%) used a random-effects model (Table S6). Only 21% (n=163) of SRs reported a method
199 used for statistical transformation of prevalence values, such as the Freeman-Tukey double
200 arcsine, log, or logit functions. Heterogeneity between studies was assessed in most SRs,
201 mainly using the I^2 statistic (n=720; 92%).

202 3.2 Completeness of reporting

203 3.2.1 PRISMA scores

204 The median PRISMA score for SRs without meta-analysis was 17.5 (IQR 15.0,19.0) out of a
205 possible 23, and for SRs with meta-analysis, it was 22.0 (IQR 20.5, 23.5) out of a possible 25
206 (Table S7). Figure 2 shows an increasing reporting score over the years. The median scaled
207 reporting score for all included SRs was 84.8% (IQR 76.0, 92.0).

208 *Figure 2. PRISMA score and number of publications (n) by year of publication and type of*
209 *systematic review.*

210 3.2.2 Reporting of selected PRISMA items

211 Over 80% of the included SRs complied with more than 70% of the PRISMA checklist items.
212 Two of 387 SRs without meta-analysis (0.5%) and 66 of 785 SRs with meta-analysis (8%) were
213 entirely compliant with PRISMA 2009. Completeness of reporting was below 70% for reporting
214 the existence of a protocol for the review, the search strategy, additional analyses and
215 assessment of the risk of bias (Figure 3). Findings for these items are reported below.

216 *Protocol:* Only 296/1172 (25%) of all SRs reported the existence of a protocol, which could be
217 accessed, while 62/1172 (6%) mentioned a protocol without information on access details. For
218 SRs without meta-analysis, the number with any protocol was 1/15 in 2010 and 9/47 in 2020; for
219 SRs with meta-analysis, 0/10 reviews in 2010 and 91/226 in 2020 had a protocol (Table S8).

220 *Search strategy:* In 607/1172 (52%) SRs, authors adequately reported information about the
221 search strategy for at least one database. In 498/1172 (42%) reviews, authors only reported the
222 keywords used and 67/1172 (6%) did not provide any information.

223 *Assessment of risk of bias:* In the *methods section*, 798/1172 (68%) review authors reported the
224 use of any tool to assess the risk of bias in included studies (Table S9). For 12 (1%), authors
225 mentioned using a tool but did not report the items assessed or the tool. The most frequently
226 reported tool was the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (153/1172, 13.1%), which is for assessment of
227 the quality of non-randomised studies [21]. In 213/1172 (18%) reviews, authors reported the use
228 of a tool designed explicitly for assessment of quality or risk of bias in prevalence studies. The
229 most frequent was the tool developed by the JBI (formerly Joanna Briggs Institute) [22]. The risk
230 of bias in the included studies was adequately reported in the *results section* in 675/1172 (58%)
231 reviews. Completeness of reporting of the study-level risk of bias assessment in the results was
232 lower than in the methods section (68%). In 56/1172 reviews (5%) authors reported assessing
233 the risk of bias but there was no description of this in the results. In 25/1172 reviews (2%),
234 authors reported using the assessment of the quality of the studies to exclude studies from the
235 review.

236 *Additional analyses:* 526/785 (67%) SRs with meta-analysis reported in the *methods section*
237 additional analyses such as sensitivity, subgroup analysis, or meta-regression. We observed an
238 increase over the years, from 8/10 (80%) reviews in 2010 to 161/226 (71%) in 2020. Additional
239 analysis results were presented adequately in the *results section* in 576/785 SRs with meta-
240 analysis (73%).

241 *Reporting of funding sources:* 764/1172 (65%) SRs reported their source of funding. The
242 reporting of this item improved from 12/25 (48%) in 2010 to 202/273 (74%) in 2020.

243 *Figure 3. Percentage of adequate reporting of PRISMA items in 2009 in 387 systematic reviews*
 244 *without meta-analysis (SR-M) and 785 systematic reviews with meta-analysis (SR+M).*
 245 ^a (M), item in methods section; (R), item in results section.

246 3.3 Factors associated with the completeness of reporting

247 Inclusion of a meta-analysis in the SRs and citing the use of a reporting or methodological
 248 guideline were the factors most strongly associated with a higher scaled reporting score (Table
 249 2). Publishing in an open access journal, the year of publication and the Journal Impact Factor
 250 were also positively associated with higher scaled reporting scores.

251 **Table 2.** Univariable and multivariable linear regression between characteristics of the
 252 published systematic reviews of prevalence studies and scaled reporting score according to the
 253 PRISMA guidelines

Variable	Univariable analysis			Multivariable analysis [*]		
	Coefficient	(95% CI)	P value	Coefficient	(95% CI)	P value
Year	1.20	(0.96, 1.40)	<0.001	0.29	(0.06, 0.52)	<0.001
Journal Impact Factor	0.05	(0.01, 0.10)	0.019	0.06	(0.02, 0.10)	0.003
Open access journal						
No	Reference			Reference		
Yes	1.40	(-0.08, 2.90)	0.063	1.40	(0.13, 2.70)	0.030
Number of authors	0.67	(0.43, 0.91)	<0.001	0.16	(-0.05, 0.37)	0.13
Number of studies included in the review	2.60	(1.00, 4.20)	0.001	0.70	(-0.67, 2.10)	0.30
Report the use of guidelines to report or conduct systematic reviews[†]						
No	Reference			Reference		
Yes	8.90	(7.50, 10.25)	<0.001	5.80	(4.50, 7.04)	<0.001
Systematic review includes a meta-analysis						
No	Reference			Reference		
Yes	13.47	(12.17, 14.76)	<0.001	11.69	(10.36, 13.01)	<0.001
Medical field						
Other	Reference			Reference		
Psychiatry	1.20	(-0.95, 3.30)	>0.9	0.85	(-0.90, 2.6)	0.20
Infectious diseases	0.45	(-1.60, 2.50)		-2.10	(-3.9, -0.42)	
Neurology	0.42	(-2.60, 3.40)		0.27	(-2.20, 2.70)	

Cardiology	0.73	(-2.00, 3.50)	-0.40	(-2.70, 1.90)
Endocrinology	-0.30	(-3.40, 2.70)	-1.20	(-3.70, 1.30)
Surgery	-1.20	(-4.30, 1.90)	-0.27	(-2.80, 2.30)
Lifestyle characteristics	-0.45	(-4.40, 3.50)	0.84	(-2.40, 4.10)

254 *Abbreviations:* CI, confidence intervals

255 * Model includes all variables reported in the table.

256 †Guidelines: PRISMA 2009 statement, Reporting Guidelines for Meta-analyses of Observational Studies
257 (MOOSE), Cochrane Handbook.

258 **4 Discussion**

259 This meta-research study found an 11-fold increase in the number of SRs of prevalence in adult
260 populations published from 25 in 2010 to 273 in 2020. The median PRISMA 2009 score for SRs
261 without meta-analysis was 17.5 (IQR 15.0, 19.0), and for SRs with meta-analysis was 22.0,
262 (IQR 20.5, 23.5). The items with the lowest compliance (<70%) were the availability of a
263 protocol, search methods, assessment of the risk of bias in methods and results, additional
264 analyses, and sources of funding. In multivariable analysis, SRs that included a meta-analysis,
265 reported using a reporting or conduct guideline, and publications in more recent years, in an
266 open access journal, or in journals with a higher Journal Impact Factor were on average more
267 compliant with the PRISMA 2009 checklist.

268 *4.1 Strengths and limitations*

269 Strengths of this study include the detailed assessment of characteristics of SRs of prevalence,
270 including 11 years of publications in 1172 SRs. In addition to recording whether PRISMA
271 checklist items were reported, we extracted additional information for several items and
272 conducted a multivariable regression analysis, which allowed more detailed interpretation of the
273 findings than simple descriptive statistics. Our study also has limitations. First, we did not
274 include SRs of prevalence published before the launch of the PRISMA statement in 2009 [5],
275 which does not allow us to assess if there was improvement after the checklist was published.
276 Second, we did not extend our search after 2020, so the end date of the search means that our
277 findings correspond to the items and scope of the PRISMA 2009 statement [5]. The COVID-19

278 pandemic interrupted work on this study from 2021 and when we returned to it, the PRISMA
279 2020 checklist had been published [9]. Our study therefore provides an initial assessment of the
280 completeness of reporting of SRs of prevalence and a future assessment will help to understand
281 whether the extended scope of PRISMA 2020 is associated with further changes in the
282 completeness of reporting. Third, we did not use PRISMA extensions, such as the PRISMA
283 checklist for abstracts [23] or the extension for reporting literature searches in SRs [24], which
284 might change the results of the items assessed with PRISMA 2009. Fourth, we limited the
285 scope of topics to reviews conducted in adult populations, but we believe that reviews
286 conducted in children would yield similar methodological findings. Fifth, we acknowledge that
287 the PRISMA 2009 checklist was not designed to give a score. This method has been used
288 previously [12] and, for our objectives, provided a pragmatic, if simplified, way to highlight
289 aspects of reporting of SRs that could be improved.

290 *4.2 Interpretation and comparison with other studies*

291 Incomplete reporting of systematic reviews of prevalence should be seen in the context of
292 published guidance for the conduct and reporting of SRs, most of which has been developed for
293 randomised or non-randomised intervention studies. Whilst reported use of a guideline for
294 reporting or conduct of SRs was associated with more complete reporting, the content of some
295 items may indicate a lack of specific methodological guidance for prevalence studies. In
296 particular, 30% of authors did not report the use of a tool for assessment of the risk of bias in
297 individual studies and, amongst those that did, more than 30 different tools were used. In a
298 systematic search, we identified 10 tools for assessing the risk of bias in prevalence studies
299 [25], but only 284 (24%) of reviews in our study used one of these tools. Most of the tools listed
300 were not designed for use with prevalence studies, such as the STROBE checklist for reporting
301 of cross-sectional studies, which does not allow explicit assessment of risk of bias [26].
302 Completeness of reporting of SRs was associated with inclusion of a meta-analysis, publication

303 in open access journals and publication in journals with a higher impact factor. These
304 characteristics could be related to the level of experience and recognition of the methodological
305 requirements of reporting of a systematic review team or with the expectations and
306 requirements of journals.

307 We found two smaller studies, which assessed the characteristics of SRs of prevalence but did
308 not use the PRISMA checklist to quantify completeness of reporting. Borges Migliavaca et al. [3]
309 evaluated 235 SRs of prevalence published in 2017 and 2018 and found substantial differences
310 in terms of conduct, reporting, risk of bias assessment and data synthesis. Whilst we decided
311 not to assess the reporting of publication bias because of doubts about its relevance to
312 prevalence studies, Borges Migliavaca et al. extracted this information. They found that 48/235
313 SRs examined publication bias either graphically or using a statistical test [3]. The authors also
314 found that some reviews used the GRADE approach, despite the absence of GRADE guidance
315 on assessing the quality of the body of evidence in a SR of prevalence. Hoffmann et al. [4]
316 reported on 215 SRs of prevalence and incidence, identified from a random sample of
317 publications up to 2018. The authors did not report on their findings for SRs of prevalence and
318 incidence separately, but concluded that heterogeneity in characteristics, reporting, and
319 methodology of these SRs might be due to the absence of specific guidance.

320 Reporting for some items in SRs of prevalence was consistent with other study designs. Page et
321 al. [10] summarised meta-research studies of adherence to the PRISMA 2009 statement
322 published up to mid-2017. They also found that items such as protocol registration and
323 assessment of the risk of bias of individual studies were likely to be incomplete. Veroniki et al.
324 [12] assessed the reporting in 1144 SRs with network meta-analysis and also found that the
325 items least likely to be adequately reported were publication of a protocol (25%), and of a full
326 search strategy (48%). Wasiak et al. [11] assessed 50 SRs in burn care management and

327 concluded that methodology was the section most in need of improvement. They also found an
328 improvement in the PRISMA score when the systematic review incorporated a meta-analysis.

329 **5 Conclusions and recommendations**

330 Reporting of SRs of prevalence was adequate for many PRISMA items. The completeness of
331 reporting has also improved but there is room for improvement. There are items that authors
332 who conduct any type of SR can improve without further guidance, such as the publication of a
333 protocol. To improve the consistency and utility of SRs of prevalence more specific guidance
334 about reporting of certain methodological features is required. Development of a specific tool to
335 assess the risk of bias in prevalence studies and an extension to the PRISMA statement could
336 improve the conduct and reporting SRs of prevalence studies.

337 **Declarations of interest**

338 None

339 **Declarations of interest of generative AI in scientific writing**

340 The authors declare that no AI was used in the scientific writing of the manuscript.

341 **Acknowledgments**

342 We would like to thank Yuli Baron for designing our graphical abstract.

343 **Author contributions**

344 Study design: DBG, JES, NL, GS.

345 Data collection: DBG, WR.

346 Methodology DBG, JES, NL, GS

347 Writing original draft: DBG

348 **Approval**

349 All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

350 **Funding**

351 This work received support from the Swiss government excellence scholarship (grant number
352 2019.0774), the SSPH+ Global PhD Fellowship Programme in Public Health Sciences of the
353 Swiss School of Public Health.

354 Georgia Salanti acknowledges the Swiss National Science Foundation for funding of her work
355 through the NRP 78 initiative (Project 198418)

356 **Availability of data and materials**

357 Raw data and bibliographic details of the included studies are published on Open Science
358 Framework (<https://osf.io/m5n6s/>)

359 6 REFERENCES

- 360 [1] Harder T. Some notes on critical appraisal of prevalence studies: Comment on: "The
361 development of a critical appraisal tool for use in systematic reviews addressing questions of
362 prevalence". *Int J Health Policy Manag.* 2014;3:289-90
363 <https://doi.org/10.15171%2Fijhpm.2014.99>.
- 364 [2] Denton FT, Spencer BG. Chronic Health Conditions: Changing Prevalence in an Aging
365 Population and Some Implications for the Delivery of Health Care Services. *Can J Aging.*
366 2010;29:11-21 <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0714980809990390>.
- 367 [3] Borges Migliavaca C, Stein C, Colpani V, Barker TH, Munn Z, Falavigna M. How are
368 systematic reviews of prevalence conducted? A methodological study. *BMC Med Res Methodol.*
369 2020;20:96 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-020-00975-3>.
- 370 [4] Hoffmann F, Eggers D, Pieper D, Zeeb H, Allers K. An observational study found large
371 methodological heterogeneity in systematic reviews addressing prevalence and cumulative
372 incidence. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2020;119:92-9 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.12.003>.
- 373 [5] Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, et al. The PRISMA
374 statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate
375 healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ.* 2009;339:b2700
376 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.b2700>.
- 377 [6] McInnes MDF, Moher D, Thombs BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, Group atP-D. Preferred
378 Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy
379 Studies: The PRISMA-DTA Statement. *JAMA.* 2018;319:388-96
380 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2017.19163>.
- 381 [7] Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred reporting
382 items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and
383 explanation. *BMJ.* 2015;349:g7647 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647>.
- 384 [8] Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, et al. The PRISMA
385 Extension Statement for Reporting of Systematic Reviews Incorporating Network Meta-analyses
386 of Health Care Interventions: Checklist and Explanations. *Ann Intern Med.* 2015;162:777-84
387 <https://doi.org/10.7326/m14-2385>.

- 388 [9] Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
389 PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*.
390 2021;372:n71 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>.
- 391 [10] Page MJ, Moher D. Evaluations of the uptake and impact of the Preferred Reporting Items
392 for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Statement and extensions: a scoping
393 review. *Syst Rev*. 2017;6:263 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-017-0663-8>.
- 394 [11] Wasiak J, Tyack Z, Ware R, Goodwin N, Faggion CM, Jr. Poor methodological quality and
395 reporting standards of systematic reviews in burn care management. *Int Wound J*. 2017;14:754-
396 63 <https://doi.org/10.1111%2Fiwj.12692>.
- 397 [12] Veroniki AA, Tsokani S, Zevgiti S, Pagkalidou I, Kontouli KM, Ambarcioglu P, et al. Do
398 reporting guidelines have an impact? Empirical assessment of changes in reporting before and
399 after the PRISMA extension statement for network meta-analysis. *Syst Rev*. 2021;10:246
400 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01780-9>.
- 401 [13] Maticic K, Krnic Martinic M, Puljak L. Assessment of reporting quality of abstracts of
402 systematic reviews with meta-analysis using PRISMA-A and discordance in assessments
403 between raters without prior experience. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2019;19:32
404 <https://doi.org/10.1186%2Fs12874-019-0675-2>.
- 405 [14] Murad MH, Wang Z. Guidelines for reporting meta-epidemiological methodology research.
406 *Evid Based Med*. 2017;22:139-42 <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebmed-2017-110713>.
- 407 [15] OpenGrey. System for Information on Grey Literature in Europe Available:
408 <http://www.opengrey.eu/> [Accessed 28/10/2021].
- 409 [16] Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan—a web and mobile app for
410 systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016;5:210 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4>.
- 411 [17] Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of
412 observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational
413 Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA*. 2000;283:2008-12
414 <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.283.15.2008>.

- 415 [18] Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions: Wiley;
416 2011.
- 417 [19] Page MJ, Sterne JAC, Higgins JPT, Egger M. Investigating and dealing with publication
418 bias and other reporting biases in meta-analyses of health research: A review. Res Synth
419 Methods. 2021;12:248-59 <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1468>.
- 420 [20] R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria
421 2023. Available: <https://www.R-project.org/>
- 422 [21] Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell D, Peterson j, Welch V, Losos M, et al. The Newcastle–Ottawa
423 Scale (NOS) for Assessing the Quality of Non-Randomized Studies in Meta-Analysis. 2000.
424 Available: https://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp
- 425 [22] Joanna Briggs Institute. The Joanna Briggs Institute Critical Appraisal tools for use in JBI
426 Systematic Reviews Checklist for Prevalence Studies. Joanna Briggs Institute; 2017. Available:
427 [https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI_Critical_Appraisal-
428 Checklist_for_Prevalence_Studies2017_0.pdf](https://jbi.global/sites/default/files/2019-05/JBI_Critical_Appraisal-Checklist_for_Prevalence_Studies2017_0.pdf)
- 429 [23] Beller EM, Glasziou PP, Altman DG, Hopewell S, Bastian H, Chalmers I, et al. PRISMA for
430 Abstracts: Reporting Systematic Reviews in Journal and Conference Abstracts. PLoS Med.
431 2013;10:e1001419 <https://doi.org/10.1371%2Fjournal.pmed.1001419>.
- 432 [24] Rethlefsen ML, Kirtley S, Waffenschmidt S, Ayala AP, Moher D, Page MJ, et al. PRISMA-S:
433 an extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic
434 Reviews. Syst Rev. 2021;10:39 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z>.
- 435 [25] Tonia T, Buitrago-Garcia D, Peter NL, Mesa-Vieira C, Li T, Furukawa TA, et al. Tool to
436 assess risk of bias in studies estimating the prevalence of mental health disorders (RoB-
437 PrevMH). BMJ Ment Health. 2023;26 <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.02.01.23285335>.
- 438 [26] von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP.
439 Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement:
440 guidelines for reporting observational studies. BMJ. 2007;335:806-8
441 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.ad>.
- 442