

کارگاه مطالعات مرور نظام مند و متآنالیز در تاریخهای 21-18 آذرماه به صورت حضوری و غیر حضوری برگزار گردید.

The screenshot shows a meeting window with a slide titled "PRISMA 2020 Checklist". The slide contains a table with columns for "Item", "Checklist Item", and "Location Where Item is Reported". The table lists 17 items, categorized into sections: TITLE, ABSTRACT, INTRODUCTION, METHODS, Data items, Reporting bias assessment, and Conclusions. Item 17 is highlighted in red.

Item	Checklist Item	Location Where Item is Reported
1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Abstract
2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	Abstract
3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Introduction
4	Provide an explicit statement of the objectives or questions to be addressed.	Introduction
5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria to be used and how studies were grouped for the synthesis.	Methods
6	Identify all databases, registers, websites, organizations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the search and search terms used to identify studies.	Methods
7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any limits used.	Methods
8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers assessed each record and what report relevant, whether they assessed independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods
9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers extracted data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods
10	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, versions), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	Methods
11	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Methods
12	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tools used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they assessed independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Methods
13	Specify for each outcome the effect measures (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Methods
14	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis item #10).	Methods
15	Describe any methods used to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data transformation.	Methods
16	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and synthesis.	Methods
17	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide estimates for the effects. If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), methods to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Methods
18	Describe any methods used to explore potential sources of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Methods
19	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Methods
20	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (starting from reporting biases).	Methods
21	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	Methods

The screenshot shows a meeting window with a slide titled "The PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses)". The slide contains the following text:

The PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses)

- The PRISMA statement was developed by a group of 29 review authors, methodologists, clinicians, medical editors, and consumers.
- They attended a three day meeting in 2005 and participated in extensive post-meeting electronic correspondence.
- to develop a **27-item checklist** and a **four-phase flow diagram**