Enhancing the QAULity and Transpaency Of health Research (EQUATOR)

- The EQUATOR (Enhancing the QAULity and Transpaency Of health Research) Network is an international initiative that seeks to improve the reliability and value of published health research literature by promoting transparent and accurate reporting and wider use of robust reporting guidelines.
- It is the first coordinated attempt to tackle the problems of inadequate reporting systematically and on a global scale; it advances the work done by individual groups over the last 15 years.
- Several Journals have adopted the use of “reporting guidelines” as a requirement of their manuscript submission.
Reporting Guidelines

Reporting guidelines for main study types

- Randomised trials: CONSORT, Extensions, Other
- Observational studies: STROBE, Extensions, Other
- Systematic reviews: PRISMA, Extensions, Other
- Case reports: CARE, Other
- Qualitative research: SRQR, COREQ, Other
- Diagnostic / prognostic studies: STARD, TRIPOD, Other
- Quality improvement studies: SQUIRE, Other
- Economic evaluations: CHEERS, Other
- Animal pre-clinical studies: ARRIVE, Other
- Study protocols: SPIRIT, PRISMA-P, Other

See all 322 reporting guidelines

PRISMA Statement

Table 1. Checklist of Items to Include When Reporting a Systematic Review or Meta-Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section/Topic</th>
<th>Item #</th>
<th>Checklist Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TITLE</td>
<td></td>
<td>Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABSTRACT</td>
<td></td>
<td>1. Provide a structured summary including, as applicable: background; objectives; data sources; study eligibility criteria, participants, and interventions; study appraisal and synthesis methods; results; limitations; conclusions and implications of key findings; systematic review registration number.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
<td>2. State the process for selecting studies (e.g., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, excluded in the meta-analysis).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METHODS</td>
<td></td>
<td>3. Describe the methods of data extraction from reports (e.g., tabled forms, independently, or duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESULTS</td>
<td></td>
<td>4. Describe how each study was analyzed (e.g., meta-analyzed) and any processes used to assess the quality of included studies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISCUSSION</td>
<td></td>
<td>5. Discuss the limitations of the overall analysis, the clinical implications of the results, and the potential for generalization to other settings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Items 1 and 2 are mandatory for all systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Items 3 and 4 are mandatory for meta-analytic analyses. Items 5 and 6 are mandatory for all systematic reviews and meta-analyses.
CHEERS Statement

The Consolidated Health Economic Evaluation Reporting Standards (CHEERS) statement

- Published articles on economic evaluations are increasing
- Reporting guidelines are not widely adopted
- CHEERS attempts to consolidate and update previous health economic evaluation guidelines into one current, useful reporting guidance
- CHEERS provides recommendations in a checklist to optimize reporting of health economic evaluations
- CHEERS checklist consists of 24 items
Experiences in reviewing articles

- Manuscripts following PRISMA or CHEERS are generally of higher quality and easy for reviewing process
- It is encouraged that manuscripts submitted to VIH-RI follow the reporting guidelines