

**Author's Reply**

# Reply to: Improving the Quality of the Reporting of Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

Mohammad Zamani, MD<sup>1,2\*</sup>; Reza Alizadeh-Navaei, MD<sup>3</sup>; Yadollah Zahed Pasha, MD<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Student Research Committee, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Cancer Research Center, Health Research Institute, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran

<sup>3</sup>Gastrointestinal Cancer Research Center, Mazandaran University of Medical Sciences, Sari, Iran

<sup>4</sup>Permanent Member of the Academy of Medical Sciences of Islamic Republic of Iran, Babol University of Medical Sciences, Babol, Iran

## Author's Reply

We appreciate the interest and comments by Behzadifar et al on our meta-analysis.<sup>1</sup> They proposed some methodological suggestions to improve quality of the systematic reviews and meta-analyses, mainly by controlling the bias. We of course agree that these measures are helpful to report more accurate results, but they are not necessary for performing such studies. Also there are several meta-analyses which did not consider these elements.<sup>2</sup> In addition, Behzadifar et al's comments seem to be general, and are not specific to our study. For example, CONSORT is related to the randomized controlled trials, not epidemiologic studies. Also, Egger's and Begg's tests are not used for meta-analyses conducting on descriptive studies.<sup>3,4</sup> However, we will try to consider all these suggestions for future systematic reviews and meta-analyses.

## Conflict of Interest Disclosures


None.

## References

1. Zahed Pasha Y, Vahedi A, Zamani M, Alizadeh-Navaei R, Zahed Pasha E. Prevalence of birth defects in iran: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Arch Iran Med. 2017;20(6):376-85. doi: 0172006/aim.0010.
2. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. PLoS Med. 2009;6(7):e1000097. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000097.
3. Begg CB, Mazumdar M. Operating characteristics of a rank correlation test for publication bias. Biometrics. 1994;50(4):1088-101.
4. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. BMJ. 1997;315(7109):629-34.

Received: January 29, 2018, Accepted: February 5, 2018, ePublished: April 1, 2018

**Cite this article as:** Zamani M, Alizadeh-Navaei R, Zahed Pasha Y. Reply to: Improving the quality of the reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Arch Iran Med. 2018;21(4):184.

 © 2018 The Author(s). This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.