

Systematic Review Protocol

A [systematic review protocol](#) is a predefined plan that outlines the rationale, objectives, and [methods](#) of a planned [systematic review](#).

It serves as a methodological [roadmap](#) and helps ensure [transparency](#), [rigor](#), and [reproducibility](#) in evidence synthesis.

Key Components

- **Research question** (often in [PICO](#) format)
- **Inclusion and [exclusion criteria](#)**
- **Databases and search strategies**
- **[Data extraction](#) and management plans**
- **Risk of [bias assessment tools](#)**
- **Planned analyses** (including meta-analysis, if applicable)
- **Timeline and dissemination plan**

Purpose

- Minimize bias by committing to a methodology before knowing the results
- Facilitate peer review and external input early in the process
- Allow for registration in platforms like [PROSPERO](#)

How to Perform a Systematic Review Protocol

A **systematic review protocol** is a structured plan that outlines how a [systematic review](#) will be conducted. It helps minimize bias and ensures transparency and reproducibility.

This guide follows standard methodology recommended by [PRISMA-P](#) (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis Protocols).

Step-by-Step Process

1. Define the Research Question

Use the [PICO format](#):

- **Population:** Who is being studied?
- **Intervention:** What is being tested?
- **Comparator:** What is the control or alternative?

- **Outcome:** What results are being measured?

2. Register the Protocol

- Recommended: [PROSPERO](#)
- Includes title, background, methods, inclusion/exclusion criteria, and update strategy

3. Develop the Search Strategy

- Choose databases: e.g., PubMed/MEDLINE, Embase, Cochrane Library
- Include grey literature if needed
- Define search terms and Boolean operators

4. Define Eligibility Criteria

- Study design (e.g., RCTs, observational studies)
- Language and date limits
- Population characteristics
- Intervention and outcome specifics

5. Plan the Study Selection Process

- Use two independent reviewers
- Screening titles/abstracts → full texts
- Resolve conflicts through consensus or third reviewer

6. Data Extraction

- Create standardized extraction forms
- Collect data on:
 1. Study characteristics
 2. Participants
 3. Interventions
 4. Outcomes
 5. Results

7. Assess Risk of Bias

Use a [risk of bias tool](#) appropriate for the study design:

- [RoB 2](#) for RCTs
- [ROBINS-I](#) for non-randomized studies
- [AMSTAR 2](#) for other reviews

8. Plan the Data Synthesis

- Qualitative (narrative) synthesis
- Quantitative synthesis (e.g., [meta-analysis](#)) if data are comparable
- Subgroup or sensitivity analysis if applicable

9. Ethics and Dissemination

- Ethical approval not typically required for secondary data
- Plan for publishing in peer-reviewed journals or open-access platforms

Template Registration Fields (Example)

- Title
- Background and rationale
- Objectives
- Eligibility criteria
- Information sources and search strategy
- Data management
- Selection and extraction process
- Bias assessment
- Strategy for data synthesis
- Timeline

From:

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

Permanent link:

https://neurosurgerywiki.com/wiki/doku.php?id=systematic_review_protocol

Last update: **2025/04/10 06:56**

