

INPLASY PROTOCOL

To cite: Li et al. Methodological and Reporting quality assessment of systematic reviews and meta-analyses on moxibustion: A Cross-Sectional Survey. Inplasy protocol 2022100057. doi: 10.37766/inplasy2022.10.0057

Received: 14 October 2022

Published: 14 October 2022

Corresponding author:

Li Yuxin

1020926547@qq.com

Author Affiliation:

Jiangxi University of Chinese Medicine.

Support: None.

Review Stage at time of this submission: The review has not yet started.

Conflicts of interest:

None declared.

Methodological and Reporting quality assessment of systematic reviews and meta-analyses on moxibustion: A Cross-Sectional Survey

Li, YX¹; Jun, X²; Yingping, K³.

Review question / Objective: To assess the methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in moxibustion.

Condition being studied: Moxibustion is an important part of traditional Chinese medicine. It has been used to prevent and treat diseases for thousands of years, and is widely used in the treatment of various clinical diseases [1]. As an important part of non drug treatment of traditional Chinese medicine, it has unique advantages in the field of disease treatment, prevention and health care [2]. In the evidence system of evidence-based medicine(EBM), systematic review (SR) and meta-analysis(MA) provide EBM evidence for the development of clinical disease treatment and guidelines. In recent years, the number of published studies on systematic evaluation and meta analysis related to moxibustion has increased significantly, but the quality of evidence is uneven. Low quality research is not conducive to the development of clinical treatment and the formulation of guidelines. Therefore, only by improving the methodology of research and the quality of report together can make the systematic review s and meta analyses truly become high-quality evidence that can guide clinical practice.

INPLASY registration number: This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 14 October 2022 and was last updated on 14 October 2022 (registration number INPLASY2022100057).

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective: To assess the methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in moxibustion.

Condition being studied: Moxibustion is an important part of traditional Chinese medicine. It has been used to prevent and treat diseases for thousands of years, and is widely used in the treatment of various clinical diseases [1]. As an important part

of non drug treatment of traditional Chinese medicine, it has unique advantages in the field of disease treatment, prevention and health care [2]. In the evidence system of evidence-based medicine (EBM), systematic review (SR) and meta-analysis (MA) provide EBM evidence for the development of clinical disease treatment and guidelines. In recent years, the number of published studies on systematic evaluation and meta analysis related to moxibustion has increased significantly, but the quality of evidence is uneven. Low quality research is not conducive to the development of clinical treatment and the formulation of guidelines. Therefore, only by improving the methodology of research and the quality of report together can make the systematic review s and meta analyses truly become high-quality evidence that can guide clinical practice.

METHODS

Participant or population: Patients using moxibustion regardless of gender, age, race...

Intervention: Any type of moxibustion alone or combined with any other interventions (such as surgery, western medicine).

Comparator: No treatment, placebo, any other interventions (such as surgery, western medicine), or other types of acupuncture and moxibustion.

Study designs to be included: Published and unpublished systematic review or meta-analysis on moxibustion (included special types of meta analysis, such as dose-response meta analysis and network meta analysis).

Eligibility criteria: Included criteria:- study design and participants: published and unpublished systematic review or meta-analysis on moxibustion (included special types of meta analysis, such as dose-response meta analysis and network meta analysis)- Population: Patients using moxibustion regardless of gender, age, race...- Intervention: any type of

moxibustion alone or combined with any other interventions (such as surgery, western medicine); - Control: no treatment, placebo, any other interventions (such as surgery, western medicine).- Outcome: The methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews and meta-analyses on moxibustion.- language of publication: studies published in Chinese and English. Exclusion criteria:- Reviews or meta-analyses related to animal experiment.- Republished publications.- Narrative review, overview, and protocol.

Information sources: PubMed, Cochrane Library, Embase, CNKI, WangFang database, VIP, CBM will be fully searched from inception to present. In addition, we also screened the references of the retrieved studies.

Main outcome(s): The methodological and reporting quality of included systematic reviews and meta-analyses will be assessed by AMSTAR-2 and PRISMA for Acupuncture (PRISMA - A).

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis: The methodological and reporting quality of included systematic reviews and meta-analysis will be assessed by two independent reviewers using AMSTAR-2 and PRISMA - A.

Strategy of data synthesis: We will analyze the characteristics of included studies as frequencies with percentages or medians with ranges through descriptive statistical methods. The assessment of methodological and reporting quality using the AMSTAR 2 tool and PRISMA - A.

Subgroup analysis: The methodological quality of the included studies will be analyzed based on subgroup analyses (such as year of publication, study type, etc.) if necessarily.

Sensitivity analysis: None.

Country(ies) involved: China.

Keywords: moxibustion, systematic review, meta-analysis.

Contributions of each author:

Author 1 - Li Yuxin.

Email: 1020926547@qq.com

Author 2 - Jun Xiong.

Email: xiongjun196071@163.com

Author 3 - Yingping Kuang.

Email: 1929588533@qq.com