GUIDELINES FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW / META - ANALYSIS

SCORE GUIDE (To be used by the Referee/Reviewer)

Not Given/Not Relevant	0
Below Standard	1
Average	2
Satisfactory	3
Good	
Excellent	5
Not Applicable	NA

Manuscript Reg. No...... Reviewer's Name......

Part No.	Description of the Part of Manuscript	Score
1.	TITLE 1. Accurate 2. Effective 3. Represents	
2.	ABSTRACT 1. Size of abstract (250)	
3.	A) CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURE B) FUNDING SOURCES ACKNOWLEDGED	
4.	INTRODUCTION 1. If Start Relevant	
5.	AIMS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY Are clearly stated Are addressed in the study	

Part No.	Description of the Part of Manuscript	Score
6.	Material and Methods	
	1. Criteria for considering studies for review mentioned	
	2. Flow diagram of range of studies appropriate	
	3. Criteria for types of participants mentioned	
	4. Justification for types of participants mentioned	
	5. Criteria for types of interventions mentioned	
	6. Criteria for outcome measures mentioned	
	7. Justifications for outcome measures mentioned	
	8. Search strategy mentioned	
	a) initial search	
	b) full search	_
	c) search of reference list	
	d) hand searching	
	e) grey literature searching	
	9. timelines for database search mentioned	
	10. Statement about assessment included	
	11. Assessment of methodological quality	
	12. Data extraction procedure	
	a) Data extraction tool mentioned	
	b) Inclusion/exclusion criteria mentioned	
	, 1	
	a) software mentioned	
7.	b) statistical methods(if applicable)	
/.	Results and analysis of results	
	Presentation of results clear	
	2. Data satisfies objectives of the study	
	3. All subjects/variable in the study accounted for	
	4. Results reported the drop out (if present)	
	5. Results presented in Free	
	6. Results presented with Figures & graphs	
	7. Appropriate statistical tests applied	
	8. Data Analysis correctly interpreted	
	9. Level of significance (preferred less than 0.1%)	
8.	Discussion	
	1. Important findings and results discussed	
	2. New emerging findings discussed	
	3. Results of the study discussed with others in literature	
	4. Questions raised in the study	
	5. Strengths mentioned	
	6. Weakness mentioned	
	7. Take away message	
9.	Conclusions	
	1. Conclusions justified by the results/findings	
	2. Conclusions relevant to the aims and objectives of the	
	study	
	3. Conclusions based on critical argument	

10.	Written English 1. Spellings	
	2. Grammar	
11.	Appendices (if applicable)	
	a) Critical appraisal forms	
	b) Data extraction forms	
	c) Table of included studies	
	d) Table of excluded studies	
	e) Justification of excluded studies	
	Total:	
REPORT (S	State clearly approved-advised revision rejected)	
	, , ,	
- · · ·	- ·	
Reviewer S	Signature Date	