



## Description

Systematic reviews and meta-analyses play a crucial role in synthesizing research to guide evidence-based healthcare decisions. However, poor reporting practices can lead to misinterpretations and weaken the impact of these studies. To address this, the *Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses* (PRISMA) guidelines were developed to support [transparent, complete, and consistent reporting](#).

First introduced in 2009 and updated in [2020](#), the PRISMA statement includes a 27-item checklist that outlines key elements to be reported across all sections of a systematic review—ranging from the title and abstract to methods, results, discussion, and disclosures such as funding sources. The [goal is to promote high-quality reporting](#) and help readers critically evaluate the validity and relevance of the findings.

## Why Use the PRISMA Guidelines?

- **Greater Transparency:** The checklist helps authors clearly and thoroughly describe their methodology and results, improving reader comprehension.
- **Stronger Credibility:** Consistent reporting builds confidence in the findings among readers, practitioners, and policymakers.
- **Streamlined [Peer Review](#):** The structured format enables peer reviewers to efficiently assess whether the review meets essential reporting standards.

Researchers aiming to improve the quality of their systematic reviews are encouraged to consult our [PRISMA Checklist](#). This tool guides authors through each component of a systematic review, ensuring that their work aligns with rigorous reporting practices and contributes meaningfully to the scientific community.

For a broader perspective on reporting guidelines, [check out our comparative analysis of STROBE, CONSORT, PRISMA, and ACORD](#), where we break down their key differences and applications in

---

research.

## Category

1. Checklist

## Date Created

2025/05/16

## Author

rebecca