

WORLD DEVELOPMENT GROUP
INCORPORATED

Ratified Research Guidelines Directory (RRGD)
First edition (May 2010)

Name: **PRISMA: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses**

First published: 2009

Most recent update: July 2009

Most recent version: Unknown

Organization: PRISMA group

Organization type: Ad-hoc group

Contact: David Moher
Clinical Epidemiology Program
Ottawa Hospital Research Institute
501 Smyth Road, 6th floor of Critical Care Wing
Room W6112
Ottawa, Ontario K1H 8L6
Canada

Tel: +1-613-737-8899 ext 79424

Fax: +1-613-739-6266

E-mail: dmoher@ohri.ca

<http://www.prisma-statement.org/index.htm>

RRG Contact: Name: Mary Ocampo
Title: Contact
Tel: Unknown
Fax: Unknown
E-mail: mocampo@ohri.ca

<http://www.prisma-statement.org/statement.htm>

Purpose: To help authors report a wide array of systematic reviews to assess the benefits and harms of a health care intervention.

Focus: Conduct of secondary research

Governance: Unknown

Finance: Canadian Institutes of Health Research; Università di Modena e Reggio Emilia, Italy; Cancer Research UK;

Methods:	<p>In 2005, at a 3-day meeting in Ottawa (Canada), 29 participants (review authors, methodologists, clinicians, medical editors, and a consumer) revised and expanded the QUOROM checklist and flow diagram, as needed. Prior to the meeting, the executive committee completed a systematic review of studies examining the quality of reporting of systematic reviews, and a comprehensive literature search to identify methodological and other articles that might inform the meeting, especially in relation to modifying checklist items. An international survey of review authors, consumers, and groups commissioning or using systematic reviews and meta-analyses was completed. The survey aimed to ascertain views of QUOROM, including the merits of the existing checklist items. Only items deemed essential were retained or added to the checklist. Shortly after the meeting, a draft of the PRISMA checklist was circulated to the group, including those invited to the meeting but unable to attend. A disposition file was created containing comments and revisions from each respondent, and the checklist was subsequently revised 11 times. The group approved the checklist, flow diagram, and summary paper.</p>
Updates:	Periodically, but no stated frequency
Maintenance:	Unknown
Feedback?	Yes
Feedback use:	To update checklist.
Evaluation?	Yes
Evaluation:	Ongoing. <i>No further information published.</i>
Verification:	Updated by publisher/organization
Date of profile:	6-2-10