

1 Full Title: Risk factors for renal stone development in adults with primary hyperparathyroidism:  
2 A protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis

3  
4 Short Title: Renal stone risk factors in primary hyperparathyroidism

5  
6 Review team: Mohammad Jay<sup>1</sup>, Sorina Andrei<sup>2</sup>, Peter Hoang<sup>3</sup>, Hussein Samhat<sup>4</sup>, Roland Jones<sup>5</sup>,  
7 Rui Fu<sup>6</sup>, Lorraine Lipscombe<sup>1\*</sup>, Antoine Eskander<sup>7\*†</sup>

8 \* Denotes co-senior authors

9  
10 \*Co-senior authors

11  
12 Affiliations:

- 13 1. Division of Endocrinology, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto,  
14 Ontario, Canada.
- 15 2. Institute of Health Policy, Management and Evaluation, Dalla Lana School of Public  
16 Health, University of Toronto. Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- 17 3. Division of Geriatrics, Department of Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario,  
18 Canada.
- 19 4. Department of Epidemiology, Biostatistics and Occupational Health, McGill University,  
20 Montreal, Quebec, Canada.
- 21 5. Department of Psychiatry, University of Toronto. Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- 22 6. Departments of Community Health Sciences, Surgery & Oncology, Cumming School of  
23 Medicine, University of Calgary. Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
- 24 7. Department of Otolaryngology, Head and Neck Surgery, Department of Surgery,  
25 University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

26  
27 \*Corresponding author: Mohammad Jay. Address: Sunnybrook Health Sciences Centre, 2075  
28 Bayview Avenue, M1-102, Toronto, ON, M4N 3M5. **Phone:** (416) 480-6705. **Fax:** (416)  
29 480-5761. Email: [Mohammad.jay@mail.utoronto.ca](mailto:Mohammad.jay@mail.utoronto.ca)

30  
31 **Funding:** No source of funding was used for this study.

32 **Competing interests:** The authors declare no conflict of interest.

33  
34  
35

36 Abstract word count: 267

37 Manuscript word count: 4516

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 **Abstract**

47 **Background:** Primary hyperparathyroidism (PHPT) is characterized by overactive parathyroid  
48 glands. Renal stones (RS) are a common complication of PHPT and is associated with increased  
49 morbidity. However, the risk factors for RS in PHPT are not well-established and the latest  
50 international PHPT guideline highlights the need for further research into this area.

51 **Objective:** We aim to summarize and meta-analyze the existing evidence on prespecified risk  
52 factors associated with RS in adults with PHPT.

53 **Methods and Analysis:** We will search MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane Central from  
54 inception. Two independent reviewers will screen studies and include prospective/retrospective  
55 cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional designs in adults ( $\geq 18$  years) with PHPT. Randomized  
56 trials, conference abstracts, case reports, and commentaries will be excluded. Two reviewers will  
57 independently extract data on population characteristics, risk factors, RS outcomes, and assess  
58 risk of bias using the Quality in Prognostic Studies tool. A random-effects model will be used to  
59 pool odds ratios. We will separately pool adjusted (primary analyses) and unadjusted odds ratios  
60 (secondary analyses) with their corresponding 95% confidence intervals. Certainty will be  
61 evaluated with the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation  
62 framework. Heterogeneity will be assessed using the  $I^2$  statistic and publication bias will be  
63 evaluated with funnel plots.

64 **Discussion:** Early identification of patients with PHPT at high risk for RS can facilitate the  
65 implementation of preventive strategies and reduce morbidity. Furthermore, recognizing these  
66 risk factors can assist clinicians in prioritizing treatment for those at higher risk, ultimately  
67 improving patient outcomes.

68 **Protocol registration:** The protocol was registered in PROSPERO on November 14, 2024  
69 (registration ID: CRD42024608180).

70 **Funding:** No source of financial funding was used.

71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110

111 **Heading: INTRODUCTION & OBJECTIVES**

112 **Sub-heading: 1. Introduction**

113 Primary hyperparathyroidism (PHPT) is characterized by elevated serum parathyroid hormone  
114 (PTH) levels and consequent disruption of calcium metabolism (1, 2). The resulting  
115 hypercalcemia can lead to several serious complications, including renal stones (RS), renal  
116 failure, and osteoporosis (3). PHPT affects roughly 600,000 Canadians (2, 3). An estimated 40%  
117 of patients with PHPT develop RS, a complication associated with severe pain leading to  
118 frequent emergency department (ED) visits, a 1.4-fold increased mortality risk, and a 2.3-fold  
119 higher risk of renal failure (4, 5). In many countries, the direct costs of RS management and lost  
120 work productivity is estimated to total billions of dollars annually (6, 7).

121 PHPT treatment guidelines recommend reserving curative treatment, parathyroidectomy,  
122 for patients at high risk of complications, such as RS (8-10). Early identification of patients with  
123 PHPT at high risk of developing RS has important implications for optimizing monitoring  
124 schedules, implementing preventative strategies and prioritizing parathyroidectomy (11-15).  
125 Although multiple systematic reviews have examined RS risk factors in the general population,  
126 their applicability to PHPT is uncertain, given that this population experiences disease-specific  
127 changes in calcium metabolism (16-19). For instance, older age, male sex, and hypercalciuria are  
128 commonly recognized risk factors in broader RS literature, but whether these factors have similar  
129 associations in individuals with PHPT is unclear (18). Equally important is whether PHPT-  
130 specific drivers of incident or recurrent RS—such as excessively high serum calcium or PTH—  
131 operate independently or in conjunction with known risk factors from the general population (16,  
132 20, 21). Most evidence to date has focused on the hallmark biochemical features of PHPT (i.e.,  
133 serum calcium and PTH levels) and patient demographic characteristics such as age and sex (16,

134 20, 21). However, findings across studies have been inconsistent (21); while some studies  
135 suggested that RS risk is associated with younger age, higher serum calcium and higher urine  
136 calcium, other studies did not replicated these findings (16, 22-27). Studies which found different  
137 RS risk factors in PHPT compared to the general population suggest that RS risk profile in PHPT  
138 is unique (21, 24, 27).

139 Further complicating our understanding, emerging data suggest that serum vitamin D  
140 levels may also play a role in RS risk among patients with PHPT (28, 29). Vitamin D deficiency  
141 is common in patients with PHPT and maintaining normal vitamin D levels are essential for bone  
142 health (30). Vitamin D has been associated with higher risk of RS.(29) Conversely, as vitamin D  
143 intake increases calcium absorption, it may exacerbate hypercalcemia and hypercalciuria in some  
144 patients, potentially increasing RS risk (28).

145 Recognizing these knowledge gaps, the latest international PHPT guideline highlights  
146 “[renal] stone risk” as a research priority, underscoring the need to establish evidence-based risk  
147 stratification in this population (13). We therefore aim conduct a systematic review and meta-  
148 analysis to consolidate and critically appraise the available evidence on the association of six *a*  
149 *priori* defined risk factors—age, sex, urine calcium, serum calcium, serum PTH and serum  
150 vitamin D—with both incident and recurrent RS in PHPT. Although a narrative review in 2011  
151 summarized the RS risk factors in PHPT, no systematic review or meta-analysis has been  
152 conducted on this topic (21). By integrating data from a broad range of study designs and  
153 settings, we aim to provide a clearer understanding of which patients with PHPT are most  
154 susceptible to RS development, ultimately informing clinical decision-making.

155 **Sub-heading: 2. Objectives**

156 The primary objective of our review is to summarize and meta-analyze the existing evidence on  
157 the association of five risk factors (sex, age, serum calcium, urine calcium, and PTH) with both  
158 incident (new) or recurrent RS development among adults ( $\geq 18$  years old) with PHPT in  
159 outpatient or inpatient settings up to 10 years before or after PHPT diagnosis. For each risk  
160 factor, the comparator will be an alternative category of the risk factor. The secondary objective  
161 will include evaluating the association of these six risk factors with recurrent RS development.

## 162 **Heading: METHODS**

### 163 **Sub-heading: 3. Study Design**

164 Our systematic review will be conducted in accordance with the guidelines outlined in the  
165 Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (31). This protocol was developed  
166 following the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)  
167 2015 checklist (S1. Appendix) (32) and was registered with PROSPERO: an international  
168 prospective register of systematic reviews on November 14, 2024 (registration ID:  
169 CRD42024608180) (33). Data screening has been completed. Data extraction is estimated to be  
170 completed by March-April 2025 and complete results are expected by April-May 2025. The final  
171 systematic review will follow the PRISMA-2020 reporting guidelines (34).

### 172 **Sub-heading: 4. Eligibility Criteria and Outcomes**

#### 173 **Sub-sub-heading Study Type**

174 We will include full-length peer-reviewed prospective cohort, retrospective cohort, case-control,  
175 and cross-sectional studies. For cohort studies, the starting point (time 0) will be the diagnosis of  
176 PHPT, with follow-up measuring the development of RS. We will not restrict the time duration  
177 between PHPT diagnosis and RS development as our primary outcome is RS occurrence  
178 irrespective of the time of PHPT diagnosis. Additionally, we will not apply any language,

179 geographic or time restrictions to the search. Google Translate will be used to translate non-  
180 English studies if necessary (35). Studies will have to report sufficient data to allow for directly  
181 or indirectly estimating odds ratios (OR), relative risks (RR), or hazard ratios (HR) with 95%  
182 confidence intervals (CIs) for at least one of the predefined risk factors.

183 We will exclude studies that only include paediatric patients (<18 years old), case series (i.e.,  
184 those with no quantitative data or fewer than five patients), case reports, commentaries,  
185 editorials, non-human studies, review articles, and conference abstracts. Clinical trials will also  
186 be excluded to avoid the potential for random allocation obscuring the association between the  
187 risk factors and RS (36).

188 **Sub-sub-heading: Participants:** Adults ( $\geq 18$  years old) with symptomatic or asymptotic PHPT  
189 will be included. Studies presenting data for both adults and children will only be included if the  
190 relevant data are presented separately for adults. The diagnostic criteria for PHPT will be based  
191 on internationally recognized standards (13, 37). As most guidelines exclude normocalcemic  
192 PHPT in the formal definition of PHPT, we will exclude these patients (13, 37). Studies  
193 presenting data on both hypercalcemic and normocalcemic PHPT patients will only be included  
194 if the data for these groups are reported separately. We will also exclude data obtained after  
195 parathyroidectomy to avoid its confounding effect on RS risk. Studies that include patients who  
196 have undergone parathyroidectomy will only be considered if they report relevant data collected  
197 before the procedure (12).

198 **Sub-sub-heading: Index prognostic factor:** Studies must include at least one of the following  
199 a-priori risk factors: 1- age, 2- sex, 3- urinary calcium, 4- serum calcium, 5- serum PTH, 6-serum  
200 vitamin D.

201 **Sub-sub-heading: Comparator:** For each risk factor, the comparator will be patients in an  
202 alternative category of the risk factor.

203 **Sub-sub-heading: Outcome: 1) The primary outcome** will be incident and recurrent RS  
204 development during any time frame relative to PHPT diagnosis. This outcome will provide a  
205 comprehensive assessment of RS burden in PHPT, capturing both new and recurrent RS events  
206 to characterize the full spectrum of RS. The lack of established risk factors and systematic  
207 reviews in this area underscores the need for robust data on the overall risk and natural history of  
208 RS in PHPT (15, 38-40). 2) **The secondary outcomes** will be recurrent RS development. Given  
209 that prior RS are a strong predictor of recurrence, clinicians often adopt more intensive  
210 management for these patients, including closer monitoring and higher likelihood of  
211 parathyroidectomy (39, 41). Focusing on recurrent RS will clarify whether a "one-size-fits-all"  
212 approaches to RS risk factors are adequate or if tailored prevention strategies are required for  
213 these higher-risk patients. 3) As an **exploratory outcome**, we will assess the mean difference of  
214 continuous risk factors between RS and no-RS groups to provide a clinically meaningful  
215 interpretation (42, 43). The definition of RS will be based on internationally recognized  
216 standards, primarily based on the presence of symptoms or radiographic findings (7, 44, 45).

217 **Sub-sub-heading: Timing:** We will assess RS occurrence within a 10-year window before or  
218 after PHPT diagnosis as reported in the included studies. This 10-year period is standard in RS  
219 risk studies, effectively balancing the capture of relevant clinical outcomes with the  
220 minimization of confounding factors (25, 46, 47).

221 **Sub-sub-heading: Setting:** *Any* healthcare (e.g., inpatient, outpatient), geographic (e.g., urban,  
222 rural), and study-specific (e.g., single-centre, population based) will be included.

223 **Sub-heading: 5. Information Sources**



224 The following online databases will be searched from their inception: Medline (OVID interface,  
225 1946 onwards), Embase (OVID interface, 1947 onwards), and Cochrane Central Register of  
226 Controlled Trials (Wiley interface, current issue). References of all eligible articles will be  
227 reviewed for additional studies meeting the eligibility criteria (backward citation searching) (48).  
228 Databases containing grey literature will not be searched as our focus is on peer-reviewed  
229 studies.

### 230 **Sub-heading: 6. Search Strategy**

231 Literature search strategies will be developed using a combination of subject headings (MeSH,  
232 Emtree) and keywords. Database searches will be conducted with the aid of an experienced  
233 health information librarian. Two concepts will be included: 1- primary hyperparathyroidism,  
234 and 2- RS. These two concepts will then be combined using the “AND” operator to obtain final  
235 search results. We will limit the search to only studies involving human subjects and will not  
236 apply any language restrictions.

237 A preliminary search strategy is provided in S2. appendix.

### 238 **Sub-heading: 7. Study Records**

#### 239 **Sub-sub-heading: 7.a. Data Management**

240 All citations from the literature search will be imported into Covidence and duplicate studies will  
241 be removed (49). Following the completion of screening, a PRISMA flow diagram will be  
242 generated using Covidence (50).

#### 243 **Sub-sub-heading: 7.b. Selection Process**

244 Two reviewers will independently screen titles and abstracts of studies uploaded in Covidence,  
245 applying prespecified eligibility criteria. The full texts of studies deemed potentially relevant will  
246 then be independently reviewed for inclusion in the final analysis by the same reviewers.

247 Reasons for excluding studies will be recorded. Reviewers will resolve disagreements by  
248 discussion, and a third reviewer will adjudicate the unresolved disagreements. A calibration  
249 exercise involving a small sample of studies (e.g., three) will be conducted before screening  
250 begins to ensure consistency and refine eligibility criteria. Reviewers will not be blinded to  
251 journal titles, study authors or institutions.

### 252 **Sub-sub-heading; 7.c. Data Extraction**

253 For each included study, two reviewers will extract data independently and in duplicates  
254 and record the data in standardized data collection tables in Microsoft Excel. These tables will be  
255 organized in the recommended PICOTS format for prognostic studies (patient, index prognostic  
256 factor, comparator prognostic factor, outcome, time and setting) (51), and will initially be piloted  
257 on three studies to allow necessary adjustments for accuracy and completeness. The tables will  
258 be created using a modified version of the checklist for critical appraisal and data extraction for  
259 systematic reviews of prediction modelling studies for prognostic factors (CHARMS-PF)(52,  
260 53). Reviewers will compare the collected data, resolve disagreements by discussion, and a third  
261 reviewer will adjudicate the unresolved disagreements.

### 262 **Sub-heading: 8. Data Items**

263 We will record the following data from the included studies where available: 1-Basic study  
264 details: first author's last name, publication year, study design, country of origin, sample size,  
265 setting, data sources (e.g., self-report, chart review, administrative data), follow-up duration, and  
266 loss to follow-up, funding sources. 2- Patient Demographics: age and sex. 3- Biochemical Risk  
267 Factors: 24-hour urine calcium, total serum calcium, serum ionized calcium, serum PTH, 25-  
268 hydroxy vitamin D, and 1-25 dihydroxy vitamin D. Units of measurement for all biochemical  
269 variables and the time at which the patient demographics and the biochemical risk factors were

270 assessed in relation to RS development will be recorded. 4- Clinical History: time of PHPT  
271 diagnosis in relation to RS development, and criteria for PHPT diagnosis. 5- Outcome Measures:  
272 Presence of RS (Specify if RS are incident or recurrent), criteria for RS diagnosis. 6- Other  
273 Relevant Clinical Information: osteoporosis and treatment with calcium supplement (S3.  
274 Appendix).

275 Whenever available, we will extract adjusted and unadjusted OR, RR, or HR, and their  
276 measures of variance. If these measures of association are not available, the relevant descriptive  
277 statistics (e.g., mean, median) will be recorded to estimate the unadjusted OR (54, 55). We will  
278 also record the variables used to adjust for each risk factor. We will collect data on all *a priori*  
279 defined risk factors and outcome-compatible information, regardless of RS definition or timing  
280 of RS diagnosis. We will convert data from different studies into consistent units of  
281 measurement to ensure uniformity.

#### 282 **Sub-sub-heading: Missing Data**

283 In cases of missing or unclear data, authors will be contacted up to two times, allowing two  
284 weeks for a response per attempt. If no responses are received regarding essential study  
285 eligibility criteria, the study will be excluded (56). Similarly, if essential data required for  
286 analysis are not obtained, the study will be excluded from the relevant analysis but will  
287 contribute to the descriptive analyses (57).

#### 288 **Sub-heading: 9. Quality Appraisal**

289 Two reviewers will independently assess each risk factor's risk of bias using the Quality in  
290 Prognostic Studies (QUIPS) tool. Reviewers will resolve disagreements through discussion, and  
291 a third reviewer will adjudicate the unresolved disagreements. This tool evaluates six domains:  
292 study participation, study attrition, prognostic factor measurement, outcome measurement, study

293 confounding, and statistical analysis and reporting (58). Each domain will be rated as high,  
294 moderate, or low risk of bias (58). This tool will be initially piloted using three randomly  
295 selected studies to confirm consistency across reviewers. A study will be deemed low risk  
296 overall if all domains are rated as low risk. Conversely, it will be considered high risk if at least  
297 one domain is rated high. Any ratings between these categories will be rated as moderate risk of  
298 bias (59, 60). Traffic-light plots will be generated using R- Version 4.4.1.

### 299 **Sub-heading: 10. Data Synthesis**

300 We will conduct meta-analyses on all prespecified risk factors and outcomes reported by  
301 at least two studies, using the generic inverse variance method within a random-effects model to  
302 account for between-study heterogeneity (61, 62). To ensure robust estimation of uncertainty in  
303 the overall effect size, the Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman adjustment will be applied when at  
304 least four studies are included in the meta-analysis (63). When fewer than four studies are  
305 available, the Wald method will be used instead (64). The restricted maximum likelihood method  
306 will be used to estimate between-study variance (65). Between-study heterogeneity will be  
307 assessed by visually inspecting forest plots for overlapping point estimates and CIs, and formally  
308 evaluated using the chi-square test and  $I^2$  statistic (66). Forest plots, summary effect measures  
309 with 95% confidence intervals (CIs), and prediction intervals will be generated using R Version  
310 4.4.1.

### 311 **Sub-sub-heading: Primary Analysis**

312 We will meta-analyze adjusted risk factors. We will report summary adjusted odds ratios (aORs)  
313 with 95% CIs for the association with RS. We will pool all adjusted risk factors regardless of the  
314 adjustment variables, without requiring a minimum set of adjustment factors (55). We have  
315 chosen this approach for This approach to pooling adjusted effect estimates irrespective of the

316 specific covariates is chosen for two primary reasons: 1) The risk factors and confounders for  
317 renal stones in PHPT are not well-established(67). Consequently, we expect the included studies  
318 to vary widely in the variables they adjust for. Pooling all adjusted estimates allows us to capture  
319 at least the effect of partial confounding control (68, 69). 2) Given the lack of established risk  
320 factors, our priority is establishing the direction of risk factors with adequate precision.  
321 Maximizing the number of studies in the meta-analysis enhances the precision of effect  
322 estimates. Previous systematic reviews on prognostic factors have adopted similar approaches  
323 (21, 55, 70, 71).

#### 324 **Sub-sub-heading: Secondary Analysis**

325 We will examine the unadjusted risk factors. For these, we will estimate summary  
326 unadjusted odds ratios (uORs) with 95% CIs for the association with RS (72), using the  
327 following stepwise approach: 1) **Direct Use of Unadjusted ORs:** If unadjusted ORs are reported  
328 by the study, these will be directly used in the meta-analysis. 2) **Conversion of Relative**  
329 **Measures:** If studies report relative risk (RR) or hazard ratio (HR), HR will equated to RR, and  
330 these measures will be converted to OR.(55, 73) 3) **Calculating ORs from Regression**  
331 **Coefficients:** When regression coefficients are reported without confidence intervals (CI), ORs  
332 and their variances will be calculated using the regression coefficients and p-values from logistic  
333 or linear regression.(74) If regression coefficients and CIs are reported, ORs will be calculated  
334 using the formula:  $OR = e^{\beta}$ , where  $e = 2.718$  and  $\beta$  is the regression coefficient (74, 75). 4)  
335 **Calculating ORs from Cox Regression and Kaplan-Meier Curves:** When direct reporting is  
336 absent, we will use the number of events and the p-values from reported analyses such as log-  
337 rank tests or Cox regressions (54, 76). If only Kaplan-Meier curves are reported with no  
338 available HR, we will reconstruct the raw time-to-event data from Kaplan-Meier curves and use

339 this data to estimate the HR (77). **5) Deriving ORs from 2x2 Tables:** If no measures of  
340 association are described but categories of a risk factor in relation to RS are reported, a 2x2 table  
341 will be constructed to calculate the OR. **6) Tertile Approach for Continuous Variables:** If  
342 neither measures of association nor categorical data are available, continuous variables will be  
343 analyzed by assuming a normal distribution (55, 78). Using the mean and standard deviation  
344 (SD), we will create three groups (tertiles) in R Version 4.4.1 and calculate the OR for the  
345 highest third versus the lowest third of each prognostic factor (55, 70, 79, 80). When only  
346 median and interquartile range (IQR) are reported, these values will be converted to mean and  
347 SD (79). If means and SDs are reported per group, data will be combined using the approach  
348 suggested in the Cochrane Handbook (81). Studies will be excluded if measures of variance are  
349 unavailable (82).

350 To ensure the assumption of normality and avoid unstable tertile conversions, we will  
351 apply the following criteria. A study will be included in the tertile analysis if at least two of the  
352 following three criteria were met: 1) Minimum number of participants in each group >20 (83). 2)  
353 Coefficient of variation (CV) between 0.12 and 0.6 for both groups (84-87). 3) Maximum group  
354 size imbalance: ratio of the larger group to the smaller group <4:1 (88). A study will be excluded  
355 if any of the following criteria are present: 1) Number of participants in the smallest group <5. 2)  
356 CV <0.1 or >0.95, and 3) Ratio of the larger to the smallest group >20:1. These criteria were  
357 derived from the principles outlined in the Cochrane Handbook, relevant methodology papers,  
358 and analogous statistical literature to ensure the robustness of the tertile-based calculations (66,  
359 81, 87, 89).

360           If a study provides both adjusted and unadjusted effect sizes for a risk factor, we will  
361 only use the adjusted effect size in analysis. Additionally, we will report the mean differences  
362 between groups with and without RS for each continuous prognostic factor.

363 **Sub-sub-heading: Studies with Overlapping Populations**

364 All included studies will be described in the patient characteristics table and their data will be  
365 used for descriptive analyses. However, to avoid potential bias and inflation of the statistical  
366 significance due to data duplication, only one study from each set of studies with overlapping  
367 populations will be included in the meta-analysis. Overlapping populations will be identified  
368 based on a careful examination of author information (including affiliations), the time period of  
369 patient recruitment, and, if available, details of the study setting (e.g., specific hospitals or  
370 clinics). When overlapping populations are identified, we will select the study with the largest  
371 sample size, assuming the smaller sample is a subset of the larger study (81, 90, 91).

372 **Sub-sub-heading: Biochemical Risk Factors**

373 Serum total calcium and serum ionized calcium will be included in the same unadjusted odds  
374 ratio meta-analysis using the tertile approach. If a study reports both ionized and total calcium,  
375 only ionized calcium will be used, as it is considered a more accurate measure (92). Similarly,  
376 the uOR for 25-hydroxy vitamin D and 1-25 dihydroxy vitamin D will be meta-analyzed together  
377 and 25-hydroxy vitamin D will be prioritized over 1-25 dihydroxy vitamin D if both are  
378 available in a study, as 25-hydroxy vitamin D represents a more accurate measure of body's  
379 vitamin D stores (93-95).

380           For the analysis of mean differences in biochemical factors between patients with and  
381 without RS, serum total calcium and serum ionized calcium will be analyzed separately.  
382 However, a single certainty of evidence recommendation will be provided for both, as they

383 represent closely related clinical concepts and because this analysis is exploratory (96). The same  
384 analytic approach will be employed for mean differences and certainty of evidence reporting for  
385 25-hydroxy vitamin D and 1-25 dihydroxy vitamin D.

### 386 **Sub-Heading: 11. Subgroup Analyses and Meta-regression**

#### 387 **Sub-sub-heading: Subgroup Analyses:**

388 To assess heterogeneity, we will conduct the following subgroup analyses:

- 389 1. **By Presence of Osteoporosis:** Studies with  $\geq 20\%$  will be compared with those with  
390  $< 20\%$  of participants having osteoporosis (cutoff chosen based on global prevalence)(97).  
391 We expect a stronger association between risk factors and RS in patients with  
392 osteoporosis (98).
- 393 2. **By Study Design:** Cohort and case-control will be compared with cross-sectional  
394 studies. We expect a stronger association in cross-sectional studies as they tend to have  
395 higher bias (99, 100).
- 396 3. **By treatment with thiazide diuretics:** within patients treated with thiazide diuretics, we  
397 expect weaker association between the risk factors and RS as thiazide diuretics lower  
398 urinary calcium and potentially RS risk (101).

#### 399 **Sub-sub-heading: Meta-regression**

- 400 1. **By mean serum calcium in each study:** We hypothesize that the magnitude of the  
401 association between the risk factors and RS will be weaker in studies with higher mean  
402 serum calcium levels. This is because, at higher average serum calcium levels within a  
403 study population, hypercalcemia is likely to be a more dominant factor in stone  
404 formation, potentially overshadowing the influence of other risk factors(102, 103).



405        2. **By proportion of females in each study:** We hypothesize that the magnitude of the  
406            association between other risk factors and RS will be weaker in studies with a smaller  
407            difference in the proportion of females between the RS and no-RS groups. This indirect  
408            assessment is based on the assumption that a smaller difference in the proportion of  
409            females between the groups might reflect a population where sex-related factors play a  
410            less prominent role in modifying the influence of other risk factors on renal stone  
411            formation (104).

#### 412 **Sub-sub-heading: Evaluating the Credibility of Subgroup & Meta-regression Analyses**

413        Two reviewers will independently grade the credibility of each subgroup effect in duplicate  
414        using the Instrument for the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) criteria  
415        (105). Disagreements will be resolved through discussion between the reviewers and the third  
416        reviewer will adjudicate unresolved disagreements. Credibility ratings will be provided assigned  
417        as follows: 1- Very Low: all responses are "definitely no" or "probably no. 2- Low: at least two  
418        responses are "definitely no." 3-Moderate: one "definitely no" or two "probably no" responses. 4-  
419        High: no responses are "definitely no" or "probably no" (106).

#### 420 **Sub-heading: 12. Sensitivity Analyses**

421        To confirm the robustness of our findings, we will conduct the following sensitivity analyses: 1)  
422        To assess the effect of **consistent covariate selection**, we will only include studies that adjust for  
423        at least serum calcium and either age or sex. 2) To examine the influence of **study design**, we  
424        will restrict the analysis to cohort and case-control studies, as these designs allow for stronger  
425        inferences about associations compared to cross-sectional studies (107). 3) To evaluate the  
426        impact of **risk of bias**, we will restrict to studies with low or moderate risk of bias. If a clinically  
427        significant difference is found between the primary or secondary analysis and their

428 corresponding sensitivity analyses, we will present the primary analysis and rate down the  
429 certainty of evidence.

### 430 **Sub-heading: 13. Reporting Bias**

431 For analyses including  $\geq 10$  studies, we will conduct a primary assessment using funnel plots, the  
432 trim-and-fill method, Egger's test for continuous variables, and the Harbord test for dichotomous  
433 variables (108-110). To complement these assessments, a secondary assessment will be  
434 performed using the Doi plot and Luis Furuya-Kanamori (LFK) index, with values within  $\pm 1$   
435 interpreted as indicative of no asymmetry (111, 112). In instances where the primary and  
436 secondary assessments yielded discrepant results, Begg's test will be employed to provide  
437 additional clarification (113, 114). The final determination of publication bias will be based on  
438 the consensus of multiple analyses, prioritizing methods with greater sensitivity and reliability  
439 for the specific context (110, 115-117). For analyses with  $< 10$  studies, formal assessments of  
440 publication bias will not be conducted due to limited statistical power. Instead, publication bias  
441 will be considered "unlikely" if small-study effects are improbable, based on the  
442 comprehensiveness of the search strategy and expert knowledge (109, 110, 118).

### 443 **Sub-heading: 14. Confidence in Cumulative Evidence**

444 Two independent reviewers will assess the overall quality of evidence for each risk factor's  
445 association with the outcomes using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment,  
446 Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) framework (119). The assessment will be adapted to  
447 align with GRADE recommendations for prognostic factor studies (120).

### 448 **Sub-heading: 15. Ethics Approval and Consent to Participate**

449 We plan to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis which will use data from previously  
450 published studies and will not collect new data from participants. Therefore, ethics approval and  
451 consent to participate will not be required.

452 **Heading: DISSEMINATION OF INFORMATION**

453 Findings will be disseminated through presentations at scientific meetings and published through  
454 at least one peer-reviewed manuscript.

455 **Heading: DISCUSSION**

456 To our knowledge, this is the first systematic review and meta-analysis designed to synthesize  
457 and quantify the existing evidence on key risk factors for RS in the setting of PHPT. By  
458 addressing the unique demographic and metabolic factors specific to PHPT, this study aims to  
459 resolve inconsistencies in the literature and identify PHPT-specific risk factors that may differ  
460 from those in the general population. Identifying these risk factors will enable clinicians to more  
461 effectively risk-stratify patients with PHPT, facilitating targeted preventive measures, closer  
462 monitoring, and timely parathyroidectomy for high-risk individuals. Ultimately, this could  
463 reduce the burden of RS, including emergency department visits, renal failure, and associated  
464 healthcare costs (4-7, 11, 12).

465 **Sub-heading: Limitations**

466 We anticipate that many relevant studies will use a cross-sectional design. While combining  
467 cross-sectional, cohort, and case-control studies in the meta-analysis will enhance precision by  
468 increasing the number of included studies (121), the lack of a temporal component in cross-  
469 sectional studies will limit our ability to determine whether these risk factors serve as predictors.  
470 To address this limitation, we will conduct sensitivity analyses restricted to cohort and case-  
471 control studies. Additionally, pooling adjusted estimates that include different covariates will

472 augment the overall sample size but reduce direct comparability of summary estimates between  
473 studies and complicate interpretation of effect size magnitude (54, 122, 123). To address these  
474 limitations, we will conduct sensitivity analyses restricted to studies adjusting for key  
475 confounders.

#### 476 **Heading: AUTHOR CONTRIBUTION**

477 Conceptualization: Mohammad Jay

478 Methodology: Mohammad Jay, Antoine Eskander, Lorraine Lipscombe, Rui Fu

479 Project administration: Mohammad Jay, Sorina Andrei

480 Supervision: Antoine Eskander, Lorraine Lipscombe

481 Validation: Mohammad Jay, Lorraine Lipscombe, Antoine Eskander, Sorina Andrei, Peter

482 Hoang, Roland Jones, Hussein Samhat

483 Writing – original draft: Mohammad Jay

484 Writing – review & editing: Mohammad Jay, Sorina Andrei, Peter Hoang, Hussein Samhat,

485 Roland Jones, Rui Fu, Lorraine Lipscombe, Antoine Eskander

#### 486 **Heading: ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

487 We extend our gratitude to Dr. Neill Adhikari and Dr. Danny Weisz for their contributions to the  
488 methodological development of this project. We also sincerely thank Ms. Genevieve Gore for  
489 her support in developing the draft search strategy.

#### 490 **Heading: REFERENCES**

491 1. Berger C, Almohareb O, Langsetmo L, Hanley DA, Kovacs CS, Josse R, et al.  
492 Characteristics of hyperparathyroid states in the Canadian multicentre osteoporosis study  
493 (CaMos) and relationship to skeletal markers. Clin Endocrinol (Oxf). 2015;82(3):359–68.

- 494 2. Khan AA, Hanley DA, Rizzoli R, Bollerslev J, Young J, Rejnmark L, et al. Primary  
495 hyperparathyroidism: Review and recommendations on evaluation, diagnosis, and  
496 management. A Canadian and international consensus. *Osteoporos Int.* 2017; 28:1–19.
- 497 3. Minisola S, Gianotti L, Bhadada SK, Silverberg SJ. Classical complications of primary  
498 hyperparathyroidism. *Best Pract Res Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2018;32(6):791–803.
- 499 4. Lila AR, Sarathi V, Jagtap V, Bandgar T, Menon PS, Shah NS. Renal manifestations of  
500 primary hyperparathyroidism. *Indian J Endocrinol Metab.* 2012;16(2):258–62.
- 501 5. Dhondup T, Kittanamongkolchai W, Vaughan LE, Mehta RA, Chhina JK, Enders FT, et al.  
502 Risk of ESRD and mortality in kidney and bladder stone formers. *Am J Kidney Dis.*  
503 2018;72(6):790–7.
- 504 6. Raheem OA, Khandwala YS, Sur RL, Ghani KR, Denstedt JD. Burden of urolithiasis: Trends  
505 in prevalence, treatments, and costs. *Eur Urol Focus.* 2017;3(1):18–26.
- 506 7. Bhojani N, Bjazevic J, Wallace B, Lee L, Kaler KS, Dion M, et al. UPDATE–Canadian  
507 Urological Association guideline: Evaluation and medical management of kidney stones. *Can*  
508 *Urol Assoc J.* 2022;16(6):175.
- 509 8. Bilezikian JP, Khan AA, Silverberg SJ, Fuleihan GEH, Marcocci C, Minisola S, et al.  
510 Evaluation and Management of Primary Hyperparathyroidism: Summary Statement and  
511 Guidelines from the Fifth International Workshop. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2022;37(11):2293–  
512 314.
- 513 9. Vescini F, Borretta G, Chiodini I, Boniardi M, Carotti M, Castellano E, et al. Italian  
514 guidelines for the management of sporadic primary hyperparathyroidism. *Endocr Metab*  
515 *Immune Disord Drug Targets.* 2024;24(8):991–1006.

- 516 10. Miller JA, Gundara J, Harper S, Herath M, Ramchand SK, Farrell S, et al. Primary  
517 hyperparathyroidism in adults—(Part II) surgical management and postoperative follow-up:  
518 Position statement of the Endocrine Society of Australia, The Australian & New Zealand  
519 Endocrine Surgeons, and The Australian & New Zealand Bone and Mineral Society. *Clin*  
520 *Endocrinol (Oxf)*. 2024;101(5):516–30.
- 521 11. Assadi F, Moghtaderi M. Preventive kidney stones: Continue medical education. *Int J Prev*  
522 *Med*. 2017;8(1):67.
- 523 12. Wang X, Shi G, Li G, Tang G. Systematic review of the risk of urolithiasis following  
524 parathyroidectomy in patients with primary hyperparathyroidism. *Int Urol Nephrol*.  
525 2024;56(4):1217–25.
- 526 13. Bilezikian JP, Khan AA, Silverberg SJ, Fuleihan GEH, Marcocci C, Minisola S, et al.  
527 Evaluation and management of primary hyperparathyroidism: Summary statement and  
528 guidelines from the fifth international workshop. *J Bone Miner Res*. 2020;37(11):2293–314.
- 529 14. Singh Ospina NM, Rodriguez-Gutierrez R, Maraka S, Espinosa de Ycaza AE, Jasim S,  
530 Castaneda-Guarderas A, et al. Outcomes of parathyroidectomy in patients with primary  
531 hyperparathyroidism: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World J Surg*. 2016;40:2359–  
532 77.
- 533 15. Bilezikian JP, Cusano NE, Khan AA, Liu J-M, Marcocci C, Bandeira F. Primary  
534 hyperparathyroidism. *Nat Rev Dis Primers*. 2016;2(1):1–16. <https://doi.org/10.xxxx>.
- 535 16. Corbetta S, Baccarelli A, Aroldi A, Vicentini L, Fogazzi G, Eller-Vainicher C, et al. Risk  
536 factors associated with kidney stones in primary hyperparathyroidism. *J Endocrinol Invest*.  
537 2005;28:122–8.

- 538 17. Islam AK, Holt S, Reisch J, Nwariaku F, Antonelli J, Maalouf NM. What predicts recurrent  
539 kidney stone after parathyroidectomy in patients with primary hyperparathyroidism? *J Am*  
540 *Coll Surg.* 2020;231(1):74–82.
- 541 18. Wang K, Ge J, Han W, Wang D, Zhao Y, Shen Y, et al. Risk factors for kidney stone disease  
542 recurrence: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *BMC Urol.* 2022;22(1):62.
- 543 19. Ali Z, Rustandi R, Sulchan M, Birowo P, Winarni TI. Comparing the risk factors of  
544 nephrolithiasis in Asian countries population: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arab J*  
545 *Urol.* 2024;22(2):109–14.
- 546 20. Saponaro F, Cetani F, Mazoni L, Apicella M, Di Giulio M, Carlucci F, et al. Hypercalciuria:  
547 its value as a predictive risk factor for nephrolithiasis in asymptomatic primary  
548 hyperparathyroidism? *J Endocrinol Invest.* 2020;43:677–82.
- 549 21. Rejnmark L, Vestergaard P, Mosekilde L. Nephrolithiasis and renal calcifications in primary  
550 hyperparathyroidism. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2011;96(8):2377–85.
- 551 22. Silverberg SJ, Shane E, Jacobs TP, Siris ES, Gartenberg F, Seldin D, et al. Nephrolithiasis  
552 and bone involvement in primary hyperparathyroidism. *Am J Med.* 1990;89(3):327–34.
- 553 23. Mollerup CL, Lindewald H. Renal stones and primary hyperparathyroidism: Natural history  
554 of renal stone disease after successful parathyroidectomy. *World J Surg.* 1999;23(2):173.
- 555 24. Frøkjær VG, Mollerup CL. Primary hyperparathyroidism: Renal calcium excretion in  
556 patients with and without renal stone disease before and after parathyroidectomy. *World J*  
557 *Surg.* 2002; 26:532–5.
- 558 25. Berger AD, Wu W, Eisner BH, Cooperberg MR, Duh Q-Y, Stoller ML. Patients with  
559 primary hyperparathyroidism—why do some form stones? *J Urol.* 2009;181(5):2141–5.

- 560 26. D'Angelo A, Lodetti M, Giannini S, Castrignano R, al Awady M, Malvasi L, et al.  
561 Hyperparathyroidism: Cause or consequence of recurrent calcium nephrolithiasis? *Miner*  
562 *Electrolyte Metab.* 1992;18(6):359–64.
- 563 27. Odvina CV, Sakhaee K, Heller HJ, Peterson RD, Poindexter JR, Padalino PK, et al.  
564 Biochemical characterization of primary hyperparathyroidism with and without kidney  
565 stones. *Urol Res.* 2007; 35:123–8.
- 566 28. Broadus A, Horst R, Lang R, Littledike E, Rasmussen H. The importance of circulating 1,25-  
567 dihydroxyvitamin D in the pathogenesis of hypercalciuria and renal-stone formation in  
568 primary hyperparathyroidism. *N Engl J Med.* 1980;302(8):421–6.
- 569 29. Castellano E, Attanasio R, Latina A, Visconti G, Cassibba S, Borretta G. Nephrolithiasis in  
570 primary hyperparathyroidism: A comparison between silent and symptomatic patients.  
571 *Endocr Pract.* 2017;23(2):157–62.
- 572 30. Walker M, Cong E, Lee J, Kepley A, Zhang C, McMahon D, et al. Vitamin D in primary  
573 hyperparathyroidism: Effects on clinical, biochemical, and densitometric presentation. *J Clin*  
574 *Endocrinol Metab.* 2015;100(9):3443–51.
- 575 31. Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch V. *Cochrane handbook for systematic*  
576 *reviews of interventions.* Hoboken: Wiley; 2019.
- 577 32. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred  
578 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015  
579 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015; 4:1–9.
- 580 33. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, Gherzi D, Moher D, Petticrew M, et al. The nuts and bolts of  
581 PROSPERO: an international prospective register of systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2012;  
582 1:1–9.



- 583 34. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. Updating  
584 guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement. *J*  
585 *Clin Epidemiol.* 2021; 134:103–12.
- 586 35. Jackson JL, Kuriyama A, Anton A, Choi A, Fournier J-P, Geier A-K, et al. The accuracy of  
587 Google Translate for abstracting data from non-English-language trials for systematic  
588 reviews. *Ann Intern Med.* 2019;171(9):677–9.
- 589 36. Valentine JC, Thompson SG. Issues relating to confounding and meta-analysis when  
590 including non-randomized studies in systematic reviews on the effects of interventions. *Res*  
591 *Synth Methods.* 2013;4(1):26–35.
- 592 37. Wilhelm SM, Wang TS, Ruan DT, Lee JA, Asa SL, Duh Q-Y, et al. The American  
593 Association of Endocrine Surgeons guidelines for definitive management of primary  
594 hyperparathyroidism. *JAMA Surg.* 2016;151(10):959–68.
- 595 38. Pallan S, Rahman MO, Khan AA. Diagnosis and management of primary  
596 hyperparathyroidism. *BMJ.* 2012;344.
- 597 39. Charles P-Y, Letavernier E, Périé S, Gauthé M, Daudon M, Haymann J. Effect of  
598 parathyroidectomy on renal stone recurrence. *Urolithiasis.* 2021; 49:327–34.
- 599 40. Sant V, Elnakieb Y, Lehmann C, Rousseau J, Maalouf N. Patient characteristics,  
600 management, and outcomes in a novel cohort of primary hyperparathyroidism. *J Endocr Soc.*  
601 2024;8.
- 602 41. Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch V. *Cochrane handbook for systematic*  
603 *reviews of interventions.* Hoboken: Wiley; 2019.

- 604 42. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Gherzi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred  
605 reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015  
606 statement. *Syst Rev.* 2015; 4:1–9.
- 607 43. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, Gherzi D, Moher D, Petticrew M, et al. The nuts and bolts of  
608 PROSPERO: an international prospective register of systematic reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2012;  
609 1:1–9.
- 610 44. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. Updating  
611 guidance for reporting systematic reviews: development of the PRISMA 2020 statement. *J*  
612 *Clin Epidemiol.* 2021; 134:103–12.
- 613 45. Jackson JL, Kuriyama A, Anton A, Choi A, Fournier J-P, Geier A-K, et al. The accuracy of  
614 Google Translate for abstracting data from non-English-language trials for systematic  
615 reviews. *Ann Intern Med.* 2019;171(9):677–9.
- 616 46. Valentine JC, Thompson SG. Issues relating to confounding and meta-analysis when  
617 including non-randomized studies in systematic reviews on the effects of interventions. *Res*  
618 *Synth Methods.* 2013;4(1):26–35.
- 619 47. Wilhelm SM, Wang TS, Ruan DT, Lee JA, Asa SL, Duh Q-Y, et al. The American  
620 Association of Endocrine Surgeons guidelines for definitive management of primary  
621 hyperparathyroidism. *JAMA Surg.* 2016;151(10):959–68.
- 622 48. Pallan S, Rahman MO, Khan AA. Diagnosis and management of primary  
623 hyperparathyroidism. *BMJ.* 2012;344.
- 624 49. Charles P-Y, Letavernier E, Périé S, Gauthé M, Daudon M, Haymann J. Effect of  
625 parathyroidectomy on renal stone recurrence. *Urolithiasis.* 2021; 49:327–34.

- 626 50. Sant V, Elnakieb Y, Lehmann C, Rousseau J, Maalouf N. Patient characteristics,  
627 management, and outcomes in a novel cohort of primary hyperparathyroidism. *J Endocr Soc.*  
628 2024;8.
- 629 51. Zhou Y, Chu X, Jiang D, Wu X, Xu J, Qi H, et al. Development and validation of a  
630 nomogram for risk prediction of nephrolithiasis recurrence in patients with primary  
631 hyperparathyroidism. *Front Endocrinol.* 2022;13.
- 632 52. Johnston B, Patrick D, Thorlund K, Busse J, Da Costa B, Schünemann H, et al. Patient-  
633 reported outcomes in meta-analyses: Part 2: methods for improving interpretability for  
634 decision-makers. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.* 2013; 11:211.
- 635 53. Takeshima N, Sozu T, Tajika A, Ogawa Y, Hayasaka Y, Furukawa T. Which is more  
636 generalizable, powerful and interpretable in meta-analyses: mean difference or standardized  
637 mean difference? *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2014; 14:30.
- 638 54. Zeng G, Zhao Z, Mazzon G, Pearle M, Choong S, Skolarikos A, et al. European association  
639 of urology section of urolithiasis and international alliance of urolithiasis joint consensus on  
640 retrograde intrarenal surgery for the management of renal stones. *Eur Urol Focus.*  
641 2022;8(5):1461–8.
- 642 55. Taran S, Angeloni N, Pinto R, Lee S, McCredie VA, Schultz MJ, et al. Prognostic factors  
643 associated with extubation failure in acutely brain-injured patients: a systematic review and  
644 meta-analysis. *Crit Care Med.* 2023;51(3):401–12.
- 645 56. Godolphin P, Bath P, Montgomery A. Short email with attachment versus long email without  
646 attachment when contacting authors to request unpublished data for a systematic review: a  
647 nested randomised trial. *BMJ Open.* 2019;9.

- 648 57. Mavridis D, White IR. Dealing with missing outcome data in meta-analysis. *Res Synth*  
649 *Methods*. 2020;11(1):2–13.
- 650 58. Hayden J, Van Der Windt D, Cartwright J, Côté P, Bombardier C. Assessing Bias in Studies  
651 of Prognostic Factors. *Ann Intern Med*. 2013; 158:280–6.
- 652 59. Grooten W, Tseli E, Äng B, Boersma K, Stålnacke B, Gerdle B, et al. Elaborating on the  
653 assessment of the risk of bias in prognostic studies in pain rehabilitation using QUIPS—  
654 aspects of interrater agreement. *Diagn Progn Res*. 2019;3.
- 655 60. Viswanathan M, Patnode C, Berkman N, Bass E, Chang S, Hartling L, et al.  
656 Recommendations for assessing the risk of bias in systematic reviews of health-care  
657 interventions. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017; 97:26–34.
- 658 61. Cheung MWL, Cheung SF. Random-effects models for meta-analytic structural equation  
659 modeling: review, issues, and illustrations. *Res Synth Methods*. 2016;7(2):140–55.
- 660 62. Borenstein M, Hedges L, Rothstein H. Meta-analysis: Fixed effect vs. random effects. *Meta-*  
661 *Analysis Com*. 2007:1–162.
- 662 63. Röver C, Knapp G, Friede T. Hartung-Knapp-Sidik-Jonkman approach and its modification  
663 for random-effects meta-analysis with few studies. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2015; 15:1–7.
- 664 64. Wu J, Jiang G. Confidence intervals of effect size for paired studies. *Biometrical J*. 2007;49.
- 665 65. Veroniki AA, Jackson D, Viechtbauer W, Bender R, Bowden J, Knapp G, et al. Methods to  
666 estimate the between-study variance and its uncertainty in meta-analysis. *Res Synth*  
667 *Methods*. 2016;7(1):55–79.
- 668 66. Deeks JJ, Higgins JP, Altman DG, Group CSM. Analysing data and undertaking  
669 meta-analyses. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2019:241–84.

- 670 67. Rejnmark L, Vestergaard P, Mosekilde L. Nephrolithiasis and renal calcifications in primary  
671 hyperparathyroidism. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab.* 2011;96(8):2377–85.
- 672 68. Yan R, Liu T, Peng Y, Peng X. Can statistical adjustment guided by causal inference  
673 improve the accuracy of effect estimation? A simulation and empirical research based on  
674 meta-analyses of case–control studies. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak.* 2020.
- 675 69. Hamra G, Lesko C, Buckley J, Jensen E, Tancredi D, Lau B, et al. Combining effect  
676 estimates across cohorts and sufficient adjustment sets for collaborative research.  
677 *Epidemiology.* 2021; 32:421–4.
- 678 70. Hemingway H, Philipson P, Chen R, Fitzpatrick NK, Damant J, Shipley M, et al. Evaluating  
679 the quality of research into a single prognostic biomarker: a systematic review and meta-  
680 analysis of 83 studies of C-reactive protein in stable coronary artery disease. *PLoS Med.*  
681 2010;7(6):e1000286.
- 682 71. Riley RD, Elia EG, Malin G, Hemming K, Price MP. Multivariate meta-analysis of  
683 prognostic factor studies with multiple cut-points and/or methods of measurement. *Stat Med.*  
684 2015;34(17):2481–96.
- 685 72. Schroeder K, Jia H, Smaldone A. Which propensity score method best reduces confounder  
686 imbalance? An example from a retrospective evaluation of a childhood obesity intervention.  
687 *Nurs Res.* 2016;65(6):465–74.
- 688 73. Bertic M, Worme M, Foroutan F, Rao V, Ross H, Billia F, et al. Predictors of survival and  
689 favorable neurologic outcome in patients treated with eCPR: a systematic review and meta-  
690 analysis. *J Cardiovasc Transl Res.* 2022;15(2):279–90.
- 691 74. Sroka C, Nagaraja H. Odds ratios from logistic, geometric, Poisson, and negative binomial  
692 regression models. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2018;18.

- 693 75. Bouyer J. [Logistic regression and epidemiology. I]. *Rev Epidemiol Sante Publique*.  
694 1991;39(1):79–87.
- 695 76. Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghersi D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating  
696 summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. *Trials*. 2007; 8:1–16.
- 697 77. Fu R, Sekercioglu N, Mathur MB, Couban R, Coyte PC. Dialysis initiation and all-cause  
698 mortality among incident adult patients with advanced CKD: a meta-analysis with bias  
699 analysis. *Kidney Med*. 2021;3(1):64–75. e1.
- 700 78. Agresti A. Applying  $R^2$ -type measures to ordered categorical data. *Technometrics*. 1986;  
701 28:133–8.
- 702 79. Wan X, Wang W-C, Liu J, Tong T. Estimating the sample mean and standard deviation from  
703 the sample size, median, range and/or interquartile range. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2014;14.
- 704 80. Kulldorff M, Sinha R, Chow W, Rothman N. Comparing odds ratios for nested subsets of  
705 dietary components. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2000;29(6):1060–4.
- 706 81. Higgins JP, Li T, Deeks JJ. Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect.  
707 *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2019:143–76.
- 708 82. Longford N. Unreported standard errors in meta-analysis. *Stat Transit New Ser*. 2021; 22:1–  
709 17.
- 710 83. Lin L. Bias caused by sampling error in meta-analysis with small sample sizes. *PLoS One*.  
711 2018;13(9): e0204056.
- 712 84. Krishnamoorthy K, Lee M. Improved tests for the equality of normal coefficients of  
713 variation. *Comput Stat*. 2014; 29:215–32.

- 714 85. Eldridge SM, Ashby D, Kerry S. Sample size for cluster randomized trials: effect of  
715 coefficient of variation of cluster size and analysis method. *Int J Epidemiol.*  
716 2006;35(5):1292–300.
- 717 86. Viechtbauer W, Nakagawa S. Revisiting and expanding the meta-analysis of variation: The  
718 log coefficient of variation ratio, lnCVR. *bioRxiv.* 2020.
- 719 87. Harwell M. An effect size for variance heterogeneity in meta-analysis. *Commun Stat Simul*  
720 *Comput.* 2019; 50:1955–70.
- 721 88. Alamolhoda M, Ayatollahi SMT, Bagheri Z. A comparative study of the impacts of  
722 unbalanced sample sizes on the four synthesized methods of meta-analytic structural  
723 equation modeling. *BMC Res Notes.* 2017;10(1):446.
- 724 89. Eldridge S, Ashby D, Kerry S. Sample size for cluster randomized trials: effect of coefficient  
725 of variation of cluster size and analysis method. *Int J Epidemiol.* 2006;35(5):1292–300.
- 726 90. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Littlewood A, Marshall C, Metzendorf MI, et al.  
727 Searching for and selecting studies. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*  
728 *Interventions.* 2019:67–107.
- 729 91. Bom PR, Rachinger H. A generalized  $\chi^2$  weights solution to sample overlap in meta-analysis.  
730 *Res Synth Methods.* 2020;11(6):812–32.
- 731 92. Schenck PA, Chew DJ. Calcium: total or ionized? *Vet Clin North Am Small Anim Pract.*  
732 2008;38(3):497–502.
- 733 93. Souberbielle J-C, Body J-J, Lappe JM, Plebani M, Shoenfeld Y, Wang TJ, et al. Vitamin D  
734 and musculoskeletal health, cardiovascular disease, autoimmunity and cancer:  
735 Recommendations for clinical practice. *Autoimmun Rev.* 2010;9(11):709–15.

- 736 94. Bouillon R, Norman AW, Lips P. Vitamin D deficiency. *N Engl J Med*. 2007;357(19):1980–  
737 1.
- 738 95. Hollis BW. Circulating 25-hydroxyvitamin D levels indicative of vitamin D sufficiency:  
739 implications for establishing a new effective dietary intake recommendation for vitamin D. *J*  
740 *Nutr*. 2005;135(2):317–22.
- 741 96. Hultcrantz M, Rind D, Akl E, Treweek S, Mustafa R, Iorio A, et al. The GRADE Working  
742 Group clarifies the construct of certainty of evidence. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017; 87:4–13.
- 743 97. Salari N, Ghasemi H, Mohammadi L, Behzadi Mh, Rabieenia E, Shohaimi S, et al. The  
744 global prevalence of osteoporosis in the world: a comprehensive systematic review and meta-  
745 analysis. *J Orthop Surg Res*. 2021;16(1):609.
- 746 98. Giannini S, Nobile M, Dalle Carbonare L, Lodetti MG, Sella S, Vittadello G, et al.  
747 Hypercalciuria is a common and important finding in postmenopausal women with  
748 osteoporosis. *Eur J Endocrinol*. 2003;149(3):209–13.
- 749 99. Shahar E, Shahar D. Causal diagrams and the cross-sectional study. *Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;  
750 5:57–65.
- 751 100. Desrosiers J, Hebert R, Bravo G, Rochette A. Comparison of cross-sectional and longitudinal  
752 designs in the study of aging of upper extremity performance. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*.  
753 1998;53(5):B362–8.
- 754 101. Cunha TdS, Gomes SA, Heilberg IP. Thiazide and thiazide-like diuretics in nephrolithiasis.  
755 *Braz J Nephrol*. 2020;43(1):103–9.
- 756 102. Goltzman D. Pathophysiology of hypercalcemia. *Endocrinol Metab Clin*. 2021;50(4):591–  
757 607.



- 758 103. Lumachi F, Motta R, Cecchin D, Ave S, Camozzi V, MM Basso S, et al. Calcium  
759 metabolism & hypercalcemia in adults. *Curr Med Chem*. 2011;18(23):3529–36.
- 760 104. Dadon T, Tsvetov G, Levi S, Gorshtein A, Slutzky-Shraga I, Hirsch D. Gender differences in  
761 the presentation, course and outcomes of primary hyperparathyroidism. *Maturitas*. 2021;  
762 145:12–7.
- 763 105. Hayward RA, Gagnier JJ, Borenstein M, VanDerHeijden GJ, Dahabreh IJ, Sun X, et al.  
764 Instrument for the Credibility of Effect Modification Analyses (ICEMAN) in randomized  
765 controlled trials and meta-analyses: manual Version 1.0.
- 766 106. Ademola A, Thabane L, Adekanye J, Okikiolu A, Babatunde S, Almekhlafi MA, et al. The  
767 credibility of subgroup analyses reported in stroke trials is low: A systematic review. *Int J*  
768 *Stroke*. 2023;18(10):1161–8.
- 769 107. Mann C. Observational research methods. *Research design II: cohort, cross-sectional, and*  
770 *case-control studies*. *Emerg Med J*. 2003; 20:54–60.
- 771 108. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, Terrin N, Jones DR, Lau J, et al. Recommendations for  
772 examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled  
773 trials. *BMJ*. 2011;343.
- 774 109. Page MJ, Higgins JP, Sterne JA. Assessing risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis.  
775 *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2019:349–74.
- 776 110. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, Rothstein HR. *Introduction to meta-analysis*.  
777 Hoboken: John Wiley & Sons; 2021.
- 778 111. Furuya-Kanamori L, Barendregt JJ, Doi SA. A new improved graphical and quantitative  
779 method for detecting bias in meta-analysis. *JBIEvid Implement*. 2018;16(4):195–203.

- 780 112. Doi SA. Rendering the Doi plot properly in meta-analysis. *JBI Evid Implement*.  
781 2018;16(4):242–3.
- 782 113. Van Enst WA, Ochodo E, Scholten RJ, Hooft L, Leeflang MM. Investigation of publication  
783 bias in meta-analyses of diagnostic test accuracy: a meta-epidemiological study. *BMC Med*  
784 *Res Methodol*. 2014; 14:1–11.
- 785 114. Michael H. The power functions of Begg's and Egger's tests for publication bias. *Stat Neerl*.  
786 2024.
- 787 115. Mathur M, VanderWeele T. Sensitivity analysis for publication bias in meta-analyses. *J R*  
788 *Stat Soc Ser C Appl Stat*. 2019; 69:1091–119.
- 789 116. Egger M, Smith GD, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple,  
790 graphical test. *BMJ*. 1997;315(7109):629–34.
- 791 117. Fajar J. Approaches for identifying and managing publication bias in meta-analysis. *Deka*  
792 *Med*. 2024.
- 793 118. Guyatt G, Oxman A, Montori V, Vist G, Kunz R, Brozek J, et al. GRADE guidelines: 5.  
794 Rating the quality of evidence--publication bias. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(12):1277–82.
- 795 119. Shao S-C, Kuo L-T, Huang Y-T, Lai P-C, Chi C-C. Using Grading of Recommendations  
796 Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) to rate the certainty of evidence of  
797 study outcomes from systematic reviews: a quick tutorial. *Dermatol Sin*. 2023;41(1):3–7.
- 798 120. Foroutan F, Guyatt G, Zuk V, Vandvik P, Alba A, Mustafa R, et al. Use of GRADE for  
799 assessment of evidence about prognostic factors: rating certainty in identification of groups  
800 of patients with different absolute risks. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2020.
- 801 121. Quintana DS. A guide for calculating study-level statistical power for meta-analyses. *Adv*  
802 *Methods Pract Psychol Sci*. 2023;6(1):25152459221147260.

803 122. Ding Y. Risk adjustment: towards achieving meaningful comparison of health outcomes in  
804 the real world. *Ann Acad Med Singap.* 2009;38(6):552–7.

805 123. Groenwold R, Hak E, Hoes A. Pooling of confounders did not induce residual confounding  
806 in influenza vaccination studies. *Ann Epidemiol.* 2009;19(6):432–6.

807

808

809

810

811

812

813

814

815

816 **Heading: SUPPORTING INFORMATION**

817 **Sub-heading: S1. Appendix: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-**  
818 **Analysis Protocols 2015 checklist**

819

820 **Subheading: S2. Appendix: Draft search strategy**

821

822 **Subheading: S3. Appendix: Variables for Data Extraction**

823