

Structured Abstract of a Systematic Review

Structured abstract for submission to a medical journal | Marked-up specimen

<https://www.editfast.com/editing-services/systematic-review-authors>

An abstract checked against the review team's own record and against the twelve items of the PRISMA 2020 abstract checklist.

ORIGINAL, WITH EDITS MARKED

SPECIMEN, PREPARED BY EDITFAST FOR ILLUSTRATION. NOT A REAL RECORD.

Prepared for the Ashcombe Review Group (fictitious), abstract for a systematic review

EXTRACT FROM THE REVIEW TEAM'S RECORD (reproduced unchanged in both panels)

RT-1 Records identified from databases: 2,418. Records after duplicates removed: 1,905.

RT-2 Records screened at title and abstract: 1,905. Reports assessed for eligibility: 74.

RT-3 Studies included in the review: 12. Studies included in the meta-analysis: 9.

RT-4 Registration: PROSPERO, CRD42024000000 (placeholder identifier for this specimen).

RT-5 Eligibility criteria as approved in the protocol: randomized trials in adults, published in any language, comparing the two named interventions.

RT-6 Target journal: The BMJ. Funding statement supplied by the team: none.

ABSTRACT

Objectives This review looked at the two interventions.

Methods We searched several databases up to last year.¹ Two reviewers screened records and extracted data.² We found 1,905 records and included 11 studies.³ Results were pooled.

Results Nine studies were pooled.⁴ The effect favored the first intervention.

Conclusions The first intervention appears better and further research is needed.

WHAT CHANGED, AND WHY

#	Was	Now	Reason
1	Methods We searched several databases up to last year.	Methods Eligible studies were randomized trials in adults, published in any language, comparing the two named interventions. [Query to the review team: item 4 of the abstract checklist asks for the information sources and the date each was last searched. RT-1 gives a record count but not the database names or the search dates. Please supply both.]	Item 3 of the abstract checklist asks for the eligibility criteria, and RT-5 records them as approved in the protocol. The original sentence named neither the criteria nor the sources, and up to last year is not a date. The sources and dates are not in the record, so the line carries a query rather than a guess.
2	Two reviewers screened records and extracted data.	Two reviewers screened records and extracted data. [Query: item 5 asks how risk of bias was assessed. The record does not say, and we have not written a method for you.]	The sentence is unchanged. Item 5 of the abstract checklist has no answer anywhere in the record, so the gap is raised rather than filled.
3	We found 1,905 records and included 11 studies.	(moved to Results, and corrected against RT-1 and RT-3)	The counts belong under Results in the abstract checklist rather than under Methods. RT-3 records 12 studies in the review, and the abstract said 11.
4	Results Nine studies were pooled.	Results 2,418 records were identified and 1,905 remained after duplicates were removed. Reports assessed for eligibility numbered 74. Twelve studies were included in the review and nine in the meta-analysis. [Query: item 7 also asks for the total number of participants and for relevant characteristics of the studies. Neither is in the record.]	Item 7 asks for "the total number of included studies and participants" and for relevant characteristics of the studies. RT-1, RT-2, and RT-3 carry five distinct counts, and the abstract used two of them. The screening counts come from the flow diagram rather than from item 7, and the participant total is raised as a query.
5	(no registration or funding statement)	Funding None. / Registration PROSPERO, CRD42024000000.	Items 11 and 12 of the abstract checklist ask for funding and registration. RT-4 and RT-6 supply both, and neither appeared in the abstract.