International Conference on
Obesity and Weight Loss

November 6-8, 2017   Barcelona, Spain

What is the Quality of Systematic Reviews/Meta-Analyses Published in the Field of Bariatrics Preliminary Results of Cross Sectional Systematic Survey

Monika Storman[1], Dawid Storman[2], Mateusz J. Świerz[2], Katarzyna Jasinska[2] and **Małgorzata M. Bała[3]**
[1]Systematic-Reviews Unit-Polish Cochrane Branch, Poland
[2]Student's Scientific Group of Systematic Reviews, Systematic Reviews Unit-Polish Cochrane Branch, Faculty of Medicine, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland
[3]Department of Hygiene and Dietetics, Chair of Epidemiology, Systematic Reviews Unit-Polish Cochrane Branch Faculty of Medicine, Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland

Background: Bariatric surgery is the one of the main treatments of morbidly obese patients. Despite an enormous growth in the number of published systematic reviews (SR) and metaanalyses (MA) in the field of bariatrics, no research on the quality of such studies published have been reported so far.

Objectives: To assess the quality of studies published as SR or MA, which were published since the beginning of 2016 and to compare the quality of such studies published in 2016 to 2017.

Methods: We searched for the studies in electronic databases using specially designed search strategy with no language restrictions. Our inclusion criteria for this pilot sub-analysis were SA and MA, which compared current bariatric surgery with any surgical or non-surgical control. Two authors independently reviewed all titles and abstracts and assessed the full text of potentially eligible studies and assessed the quality of included studies. The quality of each SR and MA was scored using the AMSTAR checklist.

Results: Out of 638 identified papers we finally included 23 papers with a control group. Studies published in 2017 scored higher in AMSTAR checklist than in 2016 (mean 4.67 vs 4.0). In 2016 majority of SR and MA were of low quality (<5 points; 71.43%), in 2017 - medium (>=5 points; 55.56%). In 2016-2017 item "formulating conclusions" was most frequently scoring 0 (70.83%). Score 1 was most frequently observed for the items: "study characteristics" (95.83%) and "search strategy" (75.0%). In AMSTAR the item "publication bias" scored 1 in just 45.83% of study.

Conclusions: Although the quality of studies published as SR and MA in 2016 improved as compared to those published in 2017, it is still unsatisfactory. We highly recommend that journal editors and peer reviewers pay more attention to the methodological quality of accepted SR and MA.

Biography:

Monika Storman, a PhD candidate at Department of Internal Medicine and Diabetology, Medical University of Warsaw, graduated from Jagiellonian University Medical College, Krakow, Poland.

Madridge J Food Technol. 2017
MJFT an open access journal

Obesity-2017
November 6-8, 2017

Conference Proceedings

Page 46