

Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA)

❑ Overpromised Simplicity, Underdelivered Rigor

CMA markets itself as a user-friendly, powerful meta-analysis solution, but beneath the polished GUI lies a tool riddled with critical shortcomings.

- The interface, while approachable, **encourages black-box usage**—users often apply complex statistical models without understanding assumptions or limitations.
- Default settings and automated procedures can **mislead novices into inappropriate analyses**.
- It lacks transparency in many calculations, offering limited insight into the underlying algorithms.

❑ Limited Advanced Methodological Features

- CMA supports common meta-analytic models but **lags behind open-source tools in cutting-edge methods** like network meta-analysis, multivariate meta-analysis, or Bayesian approaches.
- It does not support advanced bias modeling or complex meta-regressions adequately.
- The software offers **minimal diagnostic tools** to detect publication bias, heterogeneity, or influential studies beyond standard plots.

❑ No Integration with Modern AI or Data Automation

- CMA is a standalone desktop application with **no integration for automated literature screening, data extraction, or risk of bias assessment**.
- Manual data entry is required, increasing chances of human error and inefficiency.
- Lack of API or cloud support limits collaboration and workflow automation.

❑ Reproducibility and Versioning Concerns

- CMA projects are stored in proprietary file formats, complicating reproducibility.
- Version control is rudimentary or non-existent.
- Reporting templates are rigid, limiting customization of outputs for diverse publication requirements.

⚠ Accessibility and Cost Barriers

- CMA is commercial software with significant licensing costs, limiting access for researchers in low-resource settings.
- Its proprietary nature **locks users into its ecosystem**, hindering data portability.

□ Final Verdict

CMA offers a visually friendly entry point into meta-analysis but **fails to provide the transparency, flexibility, and methodological depth required for rigorous evidence synthesis**. Its closed, manual, and costly nature makes it unsuitable for modern, collaborative, and reproducible research environments.

Recommendation: Use CMA cautiously and always supplement with open, transparent, and flexible tools like R packages or advanced platforms that support automated workflows and collaboration.

Better Alternatives to Comprehensive Meta-Analysis (CMA)

□ R (metafor, meta, netmeta)

- □ Supports wide range of meta-analytic models including network and Bayesian methods
- □ Fully scriptable for reproducibility and customization
- □ Integrates with literate programming tools (R Markdown, Docker)
- □ **Why better than CMA:**

Most flexible, transparent, and extensible platform for meta-analysis

□ JASP / Jamovi

- □ Free, open-source GUI-based statistical software
- □ Supports frequentist and Bayesian meta-analysis methods
- □ Easier learning curve than R with reproducible output
- □ **Why better than CMA:**

Combines ease of use with advanced statistical features

□ AI-Assisted Tools: Elicit + RobotReviewer

- □ Automate literature screening, data extraction, and risk of bias assessment
- □ Reduce manual workload and errors
- □ **Why better than CMA:**

Automate tedious upstream steps, complement statistical analysis

□ Systematic Review Workflow Platforms: Covidence / DistillerSR

- □ Manage entire systematic review lifecycle (screening, extraction, bias assessment)
- □ Support collaboration, version control, and audit trails

- ❑ **Why better than CMA:**

Covers complete review workflow, not just meta-analysis

- ❑ **Summary Table**

Tool	Strengths	Why Better Than CMA
R (metafor, meta, netmeta)	Advanced models, scripting, reproducibility	Maximum flexibility and transparency
JASP / Jamovi	GUI, Bayesian & frequentist methods	User-friendly with rich features
Elicit + RobotReviewer	AI-assisted extraction and bias assessment	Automates and speeds up manual tasks
Covidence / DistillerSR	Full systematic review management	Covers entire SR process with collaboration

- ❑ **Final Recommendation**

- Use **R packages** for comprehensive, advanced, and reproducible meta-analyses.
- Use **JASP or Jamovi** for GUI-based advanced analysis with less coding.
- Use **Elicit and RobotReviewer** to automate evidence extraction and bias assessment.
- Use **Covidence or DistillerSR** to manage the full systematic review process.
- Use **CMA** mainly for simple, standalone GUI needs without cutting-edge features.

From:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/> - **Neurosurgery Wiki**

Permanent link:

<https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=cma>

Last update:

2025/07/01 16:39

