INPLASY PROTOCOL

Received: 11 April 2020

Published: 11 April 2020

Corresponding author:
Estefani Brisett Capcha Espinoza

estefani.capcha@gmail.com

Author Affiliation:
Universidad Peruana Cayetano Heredia

Support: None.

Review Stage at time of this submission: Piloting of the study selection process.

Conflicts of interest: None.

Overdentures: an overview of meta-analysis

Capcha EB[1]; Espinoza KI[2]; Di Francesco F[3]; Cafferata EA[4], Alarcón MA[5].

Review question / Objective: What is the quality of systematic reviews with meta-analysis that evaluate implant-supported overdenture treatments?

Condition being studied: Quality of reporting and risk of bias of systematic reviews with meta-analysis that evaluate implant-supported overdenture treatments.

Rationale: Systematic reviews of intervention studies are essential for evidence-based clinical decision-making, the scientific rigor with which they´re made can substantially affect the interpretation of their results. Therefore, minimal bias and optimal quality of reporting of these systematic reviews with meta-analysis is needed in order to propose trustworthy clinical recommendations and reliable application of clinical protocols.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 11 April 2020 and was last updated on 11 April 2020 (registration number INPLASY202040059).

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: What is the quality of systematic reviews with meta-analysis that evaluate implant-supported overdenture treatments?

Rationale: Systematic reviews of intervention studies are essential for evidence-based clinical decision-making, the scientific rigor with which they´re made can substantially affect the interpretation of their results. Therefore, minimal bias and optimal quality of reporting of these systematic reviews with meta-analysis is needed in order to propose trustworthy clinical recommendations and reliable application of clinical protocols.

Condition being studied: Quality of reporting and risk of bias of systematic reviews with meta-analysis that evaluate implant-supported overdenture treatments.

METHODS

Search strategy: (((((((((overdenture* OR conventional denture* OR complete

denture* or removable total denture* OR denture* OR bar attachment OR ball OR locator OR magnetic attachment OR o-ring OR matrix attachment OR telescopic overdenture OR dolder bar OR clip-retained)))) AND ((("Dental Prosthesis, Implant-Supported"[Mesh] OR implant-retained dentures* OR implant supported dentures* OR implant))))) AND systematic review)).

Participant or population: Systematic reviews with meta-analysis that evaluate implant-supported overdenture treatments.

Intervention: Implant-supported overdenture treatments.

Comparator: Treatments different from implant-supported overdentures.

Study designs to be included: Systematic reviews with metanalysis that evaluate randomized clinical trials (RCT) or non-randomized controlled clinical trials (CCT).

Eligibility criteria: Systematic reviews with meta-analysis that evaluate interventions with implant-supported overdentures, published until March 31, 2020 in English. Systematic reviews that evaluated more than one implant-supported type of prosthesis or the combination of tooth- and implant-supported prostheses were excluded.

Information sources: Electronic search: Medline via Pubmed, Embase and Cochrane Oral health. Manual search: Journal of Oral Rehabilitation, Journal of Prosthodontic Research, International Journal of Prosthodontics, Journal of Evidence-Based Dental Practice, Journal of Prosthodontics-Implant Esthetic and Reconstructive, Clinical Implant Dentistry and Related Research, Clinical Oral and Implant Research, European Journal of Oral Implantology, International Journal of Oral & Maxillofacial Implants and Journal of Oral Implantology. Apart from theses journals, the references of the included studies will be searched.

Main outcome(s): Quality of reporting and risk of bias.

Additional outcome(s): None.

Data management: This systematic review will assess the included articles qualitatively.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: The included systematic reviews will be assessed with the AMSTAR-2 checklist by two previously calibrated reviewers, independently.

Strategy of data synthesis: Qualitative synthesis.

Subgroup analysis: None.

Sensibility analysis: None.

Language: English.

Country(ies) involved: Peru.

Keywords: Review, meta-analysis, overdenture, Implant-supported prosthesis.

Dissemination plans: This work will be send to a peer-reviewed journal for its publication.

Contributions of each author:
Author 1 - Independent search, selection and extraction of the articles. Evaluation of the quality of the articles using the AMSTAR-2.
Author 2 - Independent search, selection and extraction of the articles. Evaluation of the quality of the articles using the AMSTAR-2.
Author 3 - Provide critical analysis of the articles for the discussion.
Author 4 - Draft, revise and write the manuscript. Set-up the research study design. Provide critical analysis of the articles for the discussion. Revise extracted data, and risk of bias analysis.
Author 5 - Desing of the research AMSTAR-2 calibration of the two independent reviewers. Draft and revise the manuscript.