

WikiJournal review

Strengths

- Generally a clearly written, understandable and informative article that contains most of the relevant information about systematic reviews.

Areas for improvement/consideration

- There is an overall heavy focus on quantitative reviews, generally it would be useful to place a little more emphasis on qualitative reviews and perhaps give some examples of how this type of data can be combined/synthesized.
- The referencing numbers are not in the correct sequence (i.e. number 7 is at end the end of the summary, but then the next number is 17 under the “characteristics” section). This requires correction.
- The following text: *“Systematic reviews often, but not always, use statistical techniques (meta-analysis) to combine results of eligible studies”*. Should be amended to read: *“Systematic reviews of quantitative research often, but not always, use statistical techniques (meta-analysis) to combine results of eligible studies”*.
- An example of how to structure a research review question could be provided within stage 1. i.e. PICOS.
- It should be mentioned in the “searching” section that trial registry databases can be searched for relevant completed, but as yet unpublished, studies.
- Within the analysis text it states: *“A systematic review may be followed by a meta-analysis (which uses complex statistical methods), although this is not always appropriate”* – this could be followed with a few examples of where it would not be appropriate, i.e. in instances of heterogeneity or insufficient data.
- A few other examples of assessing the risk of bias could be provided in stage 4 (i.e. Cochrane ROB tool or ROBINS) and clarification provided that different structured tools/approaches are used for different types of research studies.