Systematic Reviews

CORRECTION

Correction: Do reporting guidelines have an impact? Empirical assessment of changes in reporting before and after the PRISMA extension statement for network meta-analysis

Areti Angeliki Veroniki[1,2]* , Sofia Tsokani[1], Stella Zevgiti[1], Irene Pagkalidou[3], Katerina-Maria Kontouli[1], Pinar Ambarcioglu[4], Nikos Pandis[5], Carole Lunny[6], Adriani Nikolakopoulou[7,8], Theodoros Papakonstantinou[8], Anna Chaimani[9,10], Sharon E. Straus[2,11], Brian Hutton[12,13], Andrea C. Tricco[2,14], Dimitris Mavridis[1,15] and Georgia Salanti[8]

Correction: Syst Rev 10, 246 (2021)
https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01780-9

Following publication of the original article [1], the authors identified an error in Fig. 3. The correct figure is given below.

Author details
[1]Department of Primary Education, School of Education, University of Ioannina, Ioannina, Greece. [2]Knowledge Translation Program, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto, ON, Canada. [3]Department of Hygiene, Social-Preventive Medicine and Medical Statistics, Medical School, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece. [4]Department of Biostatistics, Faculty of Veterinary Medicine, Mustafa Kemal University, Tayfur Sökmen Kampüsü, 31060 Antakya, Hatay, Turkey. [5]Department of Orthodontics and Dentofacial Orthopedics, Dental School/Medical Faculty, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland. [6]Cochrane Hypertension Review Group and the Therapeutics Initiative, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada. [7]Institute of Medical Biometry and Statistics, Faculty of Medicine and Medical Center, University of Freiburg, Freiburg, Germany. [8]Institute of Social and Preventive Medicine, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland. [9]Université de Paris, Research Center of Epidemiology and Statistics Sorbonne Paris Cité

(CRESS UMR1153), INSERM, INRA, Paris, France. [10]Cochrane France, Paris, France. [11]Department of Geriatric Medicine, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada. [12]Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, ON, Canada. [13]University of Ottawa School of Epidemiology and Public Health, Ottawa, ON, Canada. [14]Epidemiology Division, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON, Canada. [15]Paris Descartes University, Sorbonne Paris CitéFaculté de Médecine, Paris, France.

Reference
1. Veroniki AA, Tsokani S, Zevgiti S, et al. Do reporting guidelines have an impact? Empirical assessment of changes in reporting before and after the PRISMA extension statement for network meta-analysis. Syst Rev. 2021;10:246. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01780-9.

PRISMA-NMA item	Modified PRISMA-NMA score		
	2013-2015 (%)	2016-2018 (%)	Overall (%)
DISCUSSION: Summary of key findings, including strength of evidence	99	97	98
ABSTRACT: main objectives	97	95	96
ABSTRACT: conclusions and implications of findings	96	95	96
INTRODUCTION: Rationale for systematic review and network meta-analysis	96	93	94
RESULTS: Presentation of network meta-analysis results (summary estimates and their confidence/credible intervals, ranking statistics)	96	95	96
METHODS: Description of analysis methods (e.g., network meta-analysis method)	95	93	94
METHODS: Description of information sources with search dates	95	95	95
ABSTRACT: synthesis methods (e.g., network meta-analysis)	94	92	93
METHODS: Description of summary measures to be used (e.g., odds ratio, mean difference)	94	88	90
DISCUSSION: General interpretation of results, comparison to other evidence, and implications for future research	93	92	92
DISCUSSION: Discussion of study limitations	92	94	93
RESULTS: Number of studies screened and included in the review, and reasons for exclusion (e.g., flow diagram)	92	91	91
METHODS: Rationale for eligibility criteria (e.g., PICO criteria, length of follow-up, years considered, language, publication status)	91	93	92
INTRODUCTION: Explicit statement of the questions being addressed (PICO criteria)	88	85	86
RESULTS: Presentation of characteristics per study with citations (e.g., in a table)	88	91	90
ABSTRACT: PICO criteria	85	77	80
ABSTRACT: Structured summary	85	78	80
ABSTRACT: Number of studies and participants	83	83	83
METHODS: Description of the study selection process	82	83	83
TITLE: Network Meta-analysis or related form of meta-analysis	82	89	87
RESULTS: Brief overview of network characteristics (S4)	80	84	83
METHODS: Description of eligible treatments used in the network meta-analysis (with justification for clustering, if any)	78	84	82
FUNDING: Sources of funding for the systematic review	76	68	71
METHODS: Description of methods used to assess study risk of bias	76	80	79
RESULTS: Network plot (S3)	76	88	84
METHODS: Description of collected items	66	77	73
ABSTRACT: Summary estimates and their confidence/credible intervals	65	58	60
RESULTS: Presentation of risk of bias per study	62	64	63
METHODS: Description of the data collection process (method)	61	77	72
METHODS: Description of method used to assess inconsistency (S2)	60	69	66
METHODS: Description of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity analysis)	58	48	52
ABSTRACT: Data sources	57	56	56
RESULTS: Presentation of individual study data	55	39	44
RESULTS: Presentation of results of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity analysis)	53	49	50
RESULTS: Description of results from investigations of inconsistency (S5)	50	60	57
METHODS: A full electronic search strategy available	45	50	48
METHODS: Description of treatment rankings to be used (e.g., surface under the cumulative ranking curve, P-scores)	42	71	61
TITLE: Systematic review	36	38	37
METHODS: Description of methods used to assess bias across studies (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting, small-study effects)	32	37	36
RESULTS: Presentation of results of bias assessment across studies (e.g., funnel plot)	28	34	32
FUNDING: Role of funders for the systematic review	26	15	19
ABSTRACT: Intervention ranking (e.g. surface under the cumulative ranking curve, P-scores)	24	44	37
METHODS: Existence of review protocol	19	28	25
METHODS: Description of methods used to explore network geometry (e.g., network plot, other methods to describe the evidence base) (S1)	16	25	22
ABSTRACT: Limitations	13	10	11
ABSTRACT: Study appraisal (e.g., risk of bias)	13	11	11
METHODS: Protocol can be accessed (e.g., Web address or registration number available)	13	23	20
ABSTRACT: Funding	9	5	6
ABSTRACT: Registration number with registry name (e.g., PROSPERO)	5	10	8

Fig. 3 Plot of the percentage of adequately reporting the 49 modified PRISMA-NMA items overall and according to publication interval 2013–2015 and 2016–2018. PRISMA items are ordered from least to most well reported irrespective publication year. Statistically significant differences are indicated with a bold font. Each cell is coloured according to the reporting using the transformation of three colours: red (0%), yellow (50%), and green (100%)