Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

Systematic reviews with or without meta-analyses generate evidence by giving a scientific synthesis or summary of primary research results addressing a specific question, using reproducible methodologies and based on pre-specified eligibility criteria. Authors should adhere to PRISMA guidelines and include a completed PRISMA 2020 Checklist as part of their submission.

The manuscript (excluding references) should not exceed **5000 words**. References should not exceed **75** in number. There should be a maximum of **4 figures and tables,** which must be submitted as supplementary files. Manuscripts should be formatted as detailed in the "Original Research Article" section. All systematic reviews and meta-analyses are sent for external peer review.

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses must include the following sections:

Structured Abstract: The abstract should be no more than 250 words and should contain the following sections: background (including the main objective(s) or question(s) addressed); methods (eligibility criteria, information sources, risk of bias, synthesis of results); results (total number of included studies, relevant characteristics of included studies, main findings); and discussion (limitations, interpretation of findings).

Keywords: Please provide 3 to 5 keywords that describe the content of the article. If possible, use medical subject headings (MeSH) of Index Medicus, National Library of Medicine, USA.

Introduction: Clearly state the purpose of the review. Describe the research question(s) and objective(s) being addressed (e.g., population or participants, concepts, context).

Methods: Please include the following: a statement about protocol registration (if applicable), eligibility criteria for sources of evidence (inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review, e.g., population, year and language of publication, publication status), information sources (e.g., databases used, date of most recent search), search strategy for at least one database, methods used to assess the risk of bias in included studies and to synthesize

the results. If a meta-analysis was done, describe the rationale for doing so and details on pooling methods used.

Results: Provide the number of studies screened, assessed, and included in the review, with reasons for and number of exclusions at each stage. Describe the relevant characteristics of included studies (e.g., number of participants) and present data on critical appraisal of these studies. Describe the main findings, including data charted relevant to the review objectives. If a meta-analysis was done, report the pooled estimate accompanied by a confidence interval.

Discussion: Summarize the main results of the review and answer research question(s)/objective(s) identified in the introduction section. Discuss the limitations of the review.

Conclusion: Provide a general interpretation of the results, as well as implications for future research and/or next steps.

Articles Types and Guidelines

Article Type	Article Template	Word Count	Abstract required, word count	Maximum references allowed	Figures/Tables (combined #)	External Peer Review	Description
Systematic Reviews & Meta-analyses (add hyperlink)	Systematic Reviews & Meta-analyses (add hyperlink)	5000	Structured, 250 words	75	4	Yes	Provide a scientific synthesis of primary research addressing a specific question using reproducible methodologies.