

# ***REPORTING GUIDELINES***

***Presented by  
Professor Nathorn Chaiyakunapruk  
School of Pharmacy  
Monash University Malaysia***

## **Enhancing the QAUAlity and Transpaency Of health Research (EQUATOR)**

- The EQUATOR (Enhancing the QUAality and Transparency Of health Research) Network is an international initiative that seeks to improve the reliability and value of published health research literature by promoting transparent and accurate reporting and wider use of robust reporting guidelines.
- It is the first coordinated attempt to tackle the problems of inadequate reporting systematically and on a global scale; it advances the work done by individual groups over the last 15 years.
- Several Journals have adopted the use of “reporting guidelines” as a requirement of their manuscript submission

# Reporting Guidelines



## Reporting guidelines for main study types

<a href="#">Randomised trials</a>	<a href="#">CONSORT</a>	<a href="#">Extensions</a>	<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Observational studies</a>	<a href="#">STROBE</a>	<a href="#">Extensions</a>	<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Systematic reviews</a>	<a href="#">PRISMA</a>	<a href="#">Extensions</a>	<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Case reports</a>	<a href="#">CARE</a>		<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Qualitative research</a>	<a href="#">SRQR</a>	<a href="#">COREQ</a>	<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Diagnostic / prognostic studies</a>	<a href="#">STARD</a>	<a href="#">TRIPOD</a>	<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Quality improvement studies</a>	<a href="#">SQUIRE</a>		<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Economic evaluations</a>	<a href="#">CHEERS</a>		<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Animal pre-clinical studies</a>	<a href="#">ARRIVE</a>		<a href="#">Other</a>
<a href="#">Study protocols</a>	<a href="#">SPIRIT</a>	<a href="#">PRISMA-P</a>	<a href="#">Other</a>

[See all 322 reporting guidelines](#)

## PRISMA Statement

**Table 1. Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting a Systematic Review or Meta-Analysis**

Section/Topic	Item #	Checklist Item	Reported on Page #
<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Structured summary	2	Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria; participants; and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.	
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	
<b>METHODS</b>			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., year considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of searches), contact with study authors to identify additional studies in the search and data link searches.	
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I <sup>2</sup> ) for each meta-analysis.	
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analysis, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	

# CHEERS Statement

VALUE IN HEALTH 14 (2013) e1-e5



ACADEMIA AND CLINIC

Annals of Internal Medicine

## Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement

David Moher, PhD; Alessandro Liberati, MD, DrPH; Jennifer Tetzlaff, BSc; Douglas G. Altman, DSc; and the PRISMA Group\*

David Moher, PhD<sup>1</sup>, Dan Greenberg, PhD<sup>2,3</sup>, Federico Augustovski, MD, MSc, PhD<sup>10,11</sup>, Andrew H. Briggs, MSc (York), MSc (Oxon), DPhil (Oxon)<sup>12</sup>, Josephine Mauskopf, PhD<sup>13</sup>, Elisabeth Loder, MD, MPH<sup>14</sup>, on behalf of the CHEERS Task Force

<sup>1</sup>Institute of Health Economics, Edmonton, Canada; <sup>2</sup>Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, ON, Canada; <sup>3</sup>University for Health Sciences, Medical Informatics and Technology, Hall in Tiro, Austria; <sup>4</sup>Centre for Health Economics, University of York, Heslington, York, UK; <sup>5</sup>Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK; <sup>6</sup>Pharmacoeconomics, Aulis International, Auckland, New Zealand; <sup>7</sup>Clinical Epidemiology Program, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, ON, Canada; <sup>8</sup>Faculty of Health Sciences, Department of Health Systems Management, Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel; <sup>9</sup>Center for the Evaluation of Value and Risk in Health, Tufts Medical Center, Boston, MA, USA; <sup>10</sup>Health Economic Evaluation and Technology Assessment, Institute for Clinical Effectiveness and Health Policy (IECS), Buenos Aires, Argentina; <sup>11</sup>Universidad de Buenos Aires, Buenos Aires, Argentina; <sup>12</sup>Institute of Health & Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland; <sup>13</sup>RTI Health Solutions, Research Triangle Park, NC, USA; <sup>14</sup>Brigham and Women's/Faulkner Neurology, Faulkner Hospital, Boston, MA, USA

## The Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement

- Published articles on economic evaluations are increasing
- Reporting guidelines are not widely adopted
- CHEERS attempts to **consolidate and update previous health economic evaluation guidelines** into one current, useful reporting guidance
- CHEERS provides **recommendations in a checklist to optimize reporting** of health economic evaluations
- CHEERS checklist consists of 24 items

# CHEERS Checklist

Section/item	Item no.	Recommendation	Reported on page no./line no.
Title and abstract			
Title	1	Identify the study as an economic evaluation, or use more specific terms such as "cost-effectiveness analysis" and describe the interventions compared.	_____
Abstract	2	Provide a structured summary of objectives, perspective, setting, methods (including study design and inputs), results (including base-case and uncertainty analyses), and conclusions.	_____
Introduction			
Background and objectives	3	Provide an explicit statement of the broader context for the study. Present the study question and its relevance for health policy or practice decisions.	_____

<b>Methods</b>		<b>Measurement and valuation of preference-based outcomes</b>	13	<b>Results</b>		<b>Discussion</b>	
Target population and subgroup	4	Estimating resource and costs	13a	Study parameters	18	Study findings, limitations, generalizability, and current knowledge	22
Setting and location	5			Incremental costs and outcomes	19	Other:	
Study perspective	6		13b	Characterizing uncertainty	20a	Source of funding	23
Comparison	7					Conflicts of interest	24
Time horizon	8	Correcting price dates and inflation	14				
Discount rate	9	Choice of model	15				
Choice of health outcomes	10	Assumptions	16	Characterizing heterogeneity	21		
Measurement of effectiveness	11a						
	12b						

## Experiences in reviewing articles

- Manuscripts following PRISMA or CHEERS are generally of higher quality and easy for reviewing process
- It is encouraged that manuscripts submitted to VIH-RI follow the reporting guidelines