

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

The prevalence and risk factors of senile pruritus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-051694
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	25-Mar-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Chen, Shi; Sichuan University; Sichuan University chen, shi; Sichuan University, Zhou, Faquan; North Sichuan Medical College [Search North Sichuan Medical College]; General Hospital of Western Theater Command Xiong, Yiquan; Chinese Evidence-based Medicine Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University
Keywords:	Geriatric dermatology < DERMATOLOGY, Dermatological epidemiology < DERMATOLOGY, PERINATOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

The prevalence and risk factors of senile pruritus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Shi Chen^{1, 2*}, Faquan Zhou^{3, 4}, Yiquan Xiong⁵

¹ Institute for Disaster Management and Reconstruction, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

² West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

³ North Sichuan Medical College, Nan Chong, Sichuan, China

⁴ General Surgery Center, General Hospital of Western Theater Command, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

⁵ Chinese Evidence Based Medicine Centre, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

Short Title: The prevalence and risk factors of senile pruritus: meta-analysis

Corresponding author:

Shi Chen, Institute for Disaster Management and Reconstruction, Sichuan University, No. 2

Section 2, Chuanda Road, Shuangliu District, Chengdu, Sichuan 610227, China. 18408270692

[E-mail653645955@qq.com](mailto:653645955@qq.com)

Number of Tables: 3

Supplementary tables: 1

Number of Figures: 1

Word count: 2071 words

Abstract

Objectives: To systematically assess the prevalence and risk factors for SP in the elderly (≥ 60 years of age).

Design: A meta-analysis were used to pool the prevalence and risk factors for SP estimated from individual studies. Four subgroup analyses were conducted to explore the prevalence for SP in different age, sex, research sites and region.

Setting, participants and measures: Senile pruritus (SP) reduces quality of life in the elderly, yet the worldwide prevalence is unclear. Moreover, the risk factors for SP are controversial. Data from cross-sectional studies, case-control studies and cohort studies that reported the prevalence or the risk factors for SP were collected by searching nine electronic databases up to October 2020, including Web of Science, PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, CINAHL, CBM, CNKI, Wanfang and VIP. Two reviewers independently screened studies according to the inclusion and exclusion criteria, extracted data, and assessed methodological quality. Data analysis was performed using Stata 15.1 software.

Results: Seventeen studies involving 28,666 participants were included. The overall pooled prevalence of SP was 21.04% (95% confidence intervals (CI): 11.37%-32.72%). In addition, the results showed that smoking, excessive drinking, and monophagism were possible risk factors for SP, with pooled odds ratios (ORs) of 1.26 (95% CI: 1.14-1.40), 25.03 (95% CI:18.28-34.25), and 1.22 (95% CI:1.12-1.33), respectively.

Conclusions: The overall prevalence of SP was high. Smoking, excessive drinking and monophagism were possible risk factors for SP.

Keywords: senile pruritus; prevalence; risk factors; systematic review; meta-analysis

Registration: PROSPERO registration number(CRD42019143295).

Strengths and limitations

- To our knowledge, this study is the first systematic review and meta-analysis providing comprehensive assessment on the prevalence of senile pruritus in worldwide.
- This study could potentially inform policy and practice to reduce the prevalence of senile pruritus.
- The definitions of SP differed across the included studies.

Introduction

The geriatric population (≥ 60 years of age) has been growing steadily worldwide in recent decades. It is estimated that the geriatric population will account for 20% of the world's population by the middle of this century^[1-3]. Aging results in numerous adverse changes in the structure and function of multiple human organs, including the skin^[4]. Senile pruritus (SP) is defined as generalized pruritus in patients without primary skin lesions^[5-8]. Pruritus is the most common skin disorder in the geriatric population^[9]. It can lead to an unpleasant cutaneous sensation, which provokes the desire to scratch (itchiness) and is accompanied by skin lesions, pain, and infection^[10]. Furthermore, it can lead to adverse consequences for patients' psychological health and quality of life, including anxiety, depression, disruption of normal sleep patterns, and poor daytime concentration^[10, 11]. Therefore, investigating the prevalence of SP is essential for informing policymakers, clinicians, and the general population.

1
2
3
4 The prevalence of SP has been reported around the world, ranging from 41% in Thailand^[12],
5
6 40.6% in America^[13], 18.9% in Italy^[14], and 14.2% in China^[15]. However, these studies were
7
8 limited by sample size and regional differences, and therefore do not represent the
9
10 prevalence of SP worldwide. Furthermore, several studies conducted surveys on inpatients or
11
12 outpatients to report the prevalence of SP ^[1, 11, 16, 17]. Inpatients or outpatients do not represent
13
14 the whole elderly population, making the results less representative of the actual prevalence
15
16 of SP in the community. For these reasons, the precise prevalence and characteristics of the
17
18 population are unknown worldwide. Furthermore, the risk factors for SP have been reported
19
20 extensively, but with controversial conclusions^[18, 19]. For example, Yang *et al.* indicated that
21
22 smoking was associated with SP (odds ratio (OR) = 2.23, 95%CI:1.35-17.40) ^[18]. However, Chen
23
24 *et al.* reported that smoking was not associated with SP (OR = 1.25, 95%CI: 0.99-1.35) ^[19].
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 In this study, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to synthesize the
35
36 prevalence of SP in different ages, sexes, and regions based on the general population and to
37
38 evaluate the risk factors for SP.
39
40

41 **Materials and Methods**

42 **Protocol registration**

43
44
45 This study was conducted in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
46
47 reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines^[20] and has been prospectively registered in
48
49 PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42019143295).
50
51
52

53 **Search strategy**

1
2
3
4 Nine databases were searched in this study, including Web of Science, PubMed, Embase,
5
6
7 Cochrane Library, CINAHL, CBM, CNKI, Wanfang, and VIP. The following strategy was used in
8
9 the searches: (Pruritus OR Itching) AND (Senile OR Aging OR Aged OR Geriatrics) AND
10
11
12 (Incidence OR Epidemiology OR Prevalence OR Risk factors). All of the databases were
13
14
15 searched from their inception dates to the 24th of October 2020. Additional relevant literature
16
17
18 was included following a manual search of the included studies reference lists.
19

20 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

21
22
23 The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) the study design was either cross-sectional, case-
24
25 control or cohort; (2) participants were over 60 years of age; (3) exact diagnostic criteria for
26
27 SP were provided; (4) prevalence or risk factors for SP were reported. The exclusion criteria
28
29 were as follows: the study populations were inpatients and outpatients; the study had
30
31 incomplete data; republished literature; or studies published in a language other than Chinese
32
33
34 or English.
35
36
37

38 **Quality of the studies**

39
40
41 Two independent reviewers assessed the quality of the included studies according to 11
42
43 criteria recommended by the American agency for healthcare research and quality (AHRQ).
44
45
46 The criteria included assessment of selection bias, performance bias, attrition bias, detection
47
48 bias, and publication bias. An item would be scored "1" if it was answered "YES", and if it was
49
50 answered 'NO' or 'UNCLEAR', then the item scored '0' ^[21], providing a maximum score of 11.
51
52
53

54 **Data extraction**

1
2
3
4 Study selection and data extraction were independently conducted by two reviewers. Any
5
6 disagreement was resolved by discussion the two reviewers or a third reviewer. The articles
7
8 were firstly screened by the title and abstract, and then full-text documents were reviewed
9
10 for inclusion if they reported the prevalence and risk factors for SP. By using a standardized
11
12 and pilot-tested form, two reviewers independently extracted data from eligible studies,
13
14 including the title, first author name, publication year, study location, age, sample size,
15
16 diagnostic criteria, prevalence and risk factors for SP.
17
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Data analysis**

24
25 Double arcsine transformation was used to convert the prevalence of SP. The ORs with their
26
27 corresponding 95% CIs were selected to assess the effect size of risk factors for SP.
28
29 Heterogeneity among studies was tested by Cochrane's Q and I^2 statistics. Heterogeneity was
30
31 recognized as significant when $I^2 > 50\%$. A Fixed- effect model (Mantel and Haenszel method)
32
33 was used if $I^2 \leq 50\%$, otherwise a random-effects model (DerSimonian and Laird method) was
34
35 used^[22]. Forest plots were constructed for a visual display of the pooled results if necessary.
36
37 Four subgroup analyses were conducted to explore the prevalence for SP in different age, sex,
38
39 research sites and region. Sensitivity analysis were assessed by excluding single studies.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
Publication bias was assessed by using Begg's and Egger's tests^[23]. Tests of Publication bias
and sensitivity analysis were not conducted in the risk factor analysis section due to the
limited number of studies included. Statistical analyses were conducted using STATA 15.1
(Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX).

Results

Study Description

A total of 8,518 records were identified from the nine databases, of which 647 were duplicates.

After screening titles and abstracts, 7,740 records were excluded. Full-text documents of 131 records were screened, 114 studies were excluded, with the remaining 17 studies included in the meta-analysis (Figure 1).

Characteristics of the included studies

The characteristics of the seventeen studies are summarized in Table 1. Eleven articles were written in Chinese^[18, 19, 24-32], and six were written in English^[33-38]. Thirteen studies were conducted in Asia^[18, 19, 24-32, 34, 36] and four in Europe^[33, 35, 37, 38]. Sample sizes ranged from 45^[38] to 8,252^[35]. Four of the seventeen studies reported the risk factors for SP^[18, 19, 25, 32].

Table 1. Characteristics of included studies.

Authors	Publication Years	Study area	Diagnostic criteria	Sample size	Prevalence(%)	Risk factors
Dalgard et al. ^[33]	2004	Norway	①	3876	6.91	NA
Li et al. ^[24]	2000	China	NA	534	12.36	NA
Xue et al. ^[26]	2008	China	NA	311	19.29	NA
Ni et al. ^[27]	2012	China	④	426	5.63	NA
Zhang et al. ^[28]	2012	China	NA	1283	9.90	NA
Li et al. ^[29]	2014	China	⑤	500	33.40	NA
Wu et al. ^[30]	2014	China	⑤	1286	42.38	NA
Yang et al. ^[31]	2014	China	NA	5000	33.84	NA
Tseng et al. ^[34]	2014	China	NA	313	7.35	NA
Miller et al. ^[35]	2016	Denmark	①	8252	6.31	NA
Kara et al. ^[36]	2017	Turkey	NA	105	19.05	NA
Cowdell et al. ^[37]	2017	Britain	⑥	1116	9.32	NA
Dyhre et al. ^[38]	2019	Denmark	⑦	45	28.89	NA
Ge et al. ^[25]	2006	China	②	1236	66.91	Age; xerosis; Astriktion
Yang et al. ^[18]	2009	China	③	3785	61.98	Less water intake; Bathing with soap; Baths too much; Smoking; Malignant tumor;
Chen et al. ^[19]	2015	China	④	200	10.50	Bathing with soap; Smoking; Chronic illness; Excessive drinking; Monophagism; Insomnia; Contact with animal
Hou et al. ^[32]	2016	China	④	398	18.09	Smoking; Chronic illness; Excessive drinking; Monophagism; Insomnia; Contact with animal

NA: not available. Diagnostic criteria: ① Self-reported skin complaints scale ; ② participants ≥ 60 years, an itch lasting more than 2 weeks, Pruritus of whole body or multiple parts, no primary rash, no other pruritic skin disease, no obvious liver and kidney damage, diabetes and mental disease. ③ Dermatology and Venereology; ④ Clinical Dermatology; ⑤ Dermatovenerolog; ⑥ Self-report skin diseases scale^[37]; ⑦ Self-report skin diseases scale.

Risk of Bias Assessment

Results of the risk of bias assessment are listed in Table S1. Study quality was found to be moderate in 11 studies and high in the other six studies^[39].

Prevalence of SP

1
2
3
4 Seventeen studies, involving 28,666 participants reported the prevalence of SP, ranging from
5
6
7 5.63% to 66.91%. A random-effects model-based meta-analysis showed that the pooled
8
9 prevalence of SP was 21.04% (95% *CI*: 11.37%-32.72%). Subgroup analyses indicated that the
10
11 pooled prevalence of SP for people aged 60-69, 70-79, 80-89, and ≥ 90 years old were 11.98%
12
13 (95% *CI*: 3.91%- 23.62%), 26.79% (95% *CI*: 8.71%- 50.36%), 51.31% (95% *CI*: 47.20%- 96.33%)
14
15 and 57.53% (95% *CI*: 8.18%-98.09%), respectively. The pooled prevalence of SP was 8.26%
16
17 (95% *CI*: 5.88%-11.00%) in females and 18.65% (95% *CI*: 0.83%- 51.61%) in males. The pooled
18
19 prevalence of SP in health examination centers, nursing homes and communities was 43.83%
20
21 (95% *CI*: 19.39%- 69.94%), 16.26% (95% *CI*: (4.55%, 33.29%) and 12.21% (95% *CI*: 3.46%-
22
23 25.34%), respectively. The pooled prevalence of SP in Turkey and China was 24.34% (95% *CI*:
24
25 14.03%- 36.38%). The pooled prevalence of SP in Norway, Denmark and Britain was 8.23% (95%
26
27 *CI*: 6.36%- 10.35%). The results of subgroup analyses of age, sex, research site and region are
28
29 shown in Table 2.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 2. Subgroup analyses by age, sex, research sites and region.

Subgroup	Prevalence (%)	95%CI (%)	Heterogeneity	
			I ² (%)	P value
Age				
60-69	11.98	3.91-23.62	98.1	0.000
70-79	26.79	8.71-50.36	99.7	0.000
80-89	51.31	47.20-96.33	99.6	0.000
≥90	57.53	8.18-98.09	99.0	0.000
Sex				
Females	8.26	5.88-11.00	87.4	0.000
Males	18.65	0.83-51.61	99.9	0.000
Research sites				
Health examination center	43.83	19.39-69.94	99.8	0.000
Nursing homes	16.26	4.55-33.29	93.2	0.000
Community	12.21	3.46-25.34	99.8	0.000
Region				
Turkey, China	24.34%	14.03-36.38%	99.6%	0.000
Norway, Denmark, Britain	8.23%	6.36-10.35%	90.2%	0.000

Risk factors

Four studies, including 5,619 participants, reported the risk factors for SP [18, 19, 25, 32]. There were three studies^[18, 19, 32], including 4,383 participants, that reported the association of smoking and SP. Meta-analyses showed smoking was associated with SP [pooled OR of 1.26 (95% CI : 1.14-1.40), I²=0%]. The results of two studies^[19, 32], involving 598 participants, suggested that excessive drinking increased the occurrence of SP [pooled OR of 25.03 (95% CI:18.28- 34.25), I²=0%]. Two studies^[19, 32] involving 589 participants reported the association of Monophagism and SP [pooled OR of 1.22 (95% CI : 1.12-1.33), I²=0%] (Table 3).

Tab.3 Pooled risk factors of senile pruritus.

No.	Risk factors	OR	95%CI	P	Heterogeneity	
					I ² (%)	P value
1	smoking	1.26	1.14 - 1.40	0.000	0%	0.673
2	excessive drinking	25.03	18.28 - 34.25	0.000	0%	0.980
3	monophagism	1.22	1.12 -1.33	0.000	0%	0.926

Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding a single study and showed that the results of the meta-analysis were stable (18.61%- 22.23%). Sensitivity analysis was not conducted for the risk factor analysis due to the limited number of studies.

Publication Bias

Publication bias was assessed by using Begg's and Egger's tests. Begg's ($Z=0.70$, $P=0.484$) and Egger's test ($t=0.26$, $P=0.796$) results showed that the possibility of publication bias was less in the overall prevalence pooled analysis. Publication bias was not assessed in the risk factor analysis due to the limited number of studies.

Discussion

In this study, 17 studies involving 28,666 participants were included encompassing Norway, China, Denmark, Turkey, and Britain.

Subgroup analyses found that the difference in the prevalence of SP based on epidemiological factors. Subgroup analyses indicated that a steadily increasing prevalence of SP was associated with increasing age. Xerosis is related to aging and is reported as the most common cause of SP^[40-42]. One of the skin's most important functions is to retain water. skin surface

1
2
3
4 lipids and sebum on the skin helps retain water^[43]. As skin ages, there is a decrease in lipids
5
6 and sebum on the skin, leading to suboptimal moisture retention^[41]. In addition,
7
8 immunosenescence occurs with aging and also produces a higher incidence of pruritus^[41].
9
10 Moreover, decreases in androgen, estrogen and glucocorticoid in aged people can contribute
11
12 to SP^[44, 45].
13
14

15
16
17 The results of sub-sex and sub-regional analyses found that individuals who were male or
18
19 living in Turkey and China were associated with a higher prevalence of SP. Sub-research sites
20
21 analyses found that the highest prevalence of SP was found in health examination centers.
22
23 The reasons for these results are unclear based on the current scientific knowledge available
24
25 on SP prevalence. Further studies would be helpful in further exploring these phenomena. In
26
27 conclusion, the prevalence of SP varies among different populations. However, the reasons
28
29 underlying the differences in prevalence observed in the current study remain unclear. It is
30
31 suggested that further studies of the prevalence of SP in different populations be conducted
32
33 in the future.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41
42 Meta-analyses showed that smoking, excessive drinking, and monophagism were possible risk
43
44 factors for SP. It has been shown that smoking can cause nutrient and oxygen deprivation in
45
46 cutaneous tissues, decreases collagen and elastin fibers in the dermis, and increases
47
48 keratinocyte dysplasia^[46]. These changes reduce skin lipids, sebum, and moisture retention,
49
50 leading to dryness and pruritus of skin^[47, 48]. Therefore, smoking is a potential risk factor for
51
52 SP. The present study also identified drinking alcohol as a potential risk factor for SP. Studies
53
54 have demonstrated that alcohol consumption could reduce the concentration of carotenoids
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 in the skin^[49]. Carotenoids can neutralize free radicals, delay premature skin aging and skin
5
6 diseases caused by free radicals^[49-51]. It could be proposed that alcohol consumption may lead
7
8 to skin diseases by affecting the concentration of carotenoids. The human body cannot
9
10 synthesize carotenoids in sufficient amounts without relying on a nutrient rich diet including
11
12 fruit and vegetables. Therefore, monophagism could contribute to reducing the concentration
13
14 of carotenoids and it could be considered a risk factors for skin diseases.
15
16
17
18
19

20 Although the present study indicated smoking, excessive drinking and monophagism were
21
22 associated with an increased risk of SP, all the studies included in the meta-analysis were
23
24 cross-sectional. Consequently, It is not possible to infer on the causality between exposure
25
26 and outcomes. Further studies are needed to confirm these findings. In addition to the three
27
28 risk factors identified through the meta-analyses, the included studies also showed that the
29
30 risk factors for SP also include age, xerosis, astringency, less water intake, bathing with soap,
31
32 bathing too frequently, malignant tumor, chronic illness, excessive drinking, insomnia, and
33
34 contact with animals.
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to provide a systematic review of SP
42
43 prevalence and risk factors. However, several limitations of this study should be noted. First,
44
45 The epidemiological data on SP was only from Norway, China, Denmark, Turkey, Britain, and
46
47 Denmark, which cannot be generalized to the worldwide population. Second, the methods of
48
49 identifying SP varied among the included studies, and no diagnostic assessment was
50
51 performed in some studies, making it difficult to analyze the prevalence of SP using a gold
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4 standard method. Considering these limitations, further studies will be needed to better
5
6 understand the prevalence and risk factors of SP worldwide.
7
8

9 **Conclusion**

10
11 In conclusion, this study found the prevalence of SP was 21.04%. Individuals who were older,
12
13 male, or living in Turkey and China were associated with a higher prevalence of SP.
14
15 Additionally, among health examination centers, nursing homes and communities, the highest
16
17 detection rate of SP was found in the health examination centers. Smoking, excessive drinking
18
19 and monophagism were possible individual risk factors for SP.
20
21
22
23
24

25 **References**

- 26
27 1. Valdes RR, Mollanazar NK, González MJ, et al. Itch Prevalence and
28
29 Characteristics in a Hispanic Geriatric Population: A Comprehensive Study Using
30
31 a Standardized Itch Questionnaire. *Acta Derm Venereol.* 2015;95(4):417-421.
32
33 doi:10.2340/00015555-1968.
- 34
35 2. Hosseinpoor AR, Bergen N, Chatterji S. Socio-demographic determinants of
36
37 caregiving in older adults of low- and middle-income countries. *Age Ageing.*
38
39 2013;42(3):330-338. doi:10.1093/ageing/afs196.
- 40
41 3. Darjani A, Mohtasham AZ, Mohammad AK, et al. Skin Disorders among Elder
42
43 Patients in a Referral Center in Northern Iran. *Dermatol Res Pract.*
44
45 2013;2013:193205. doi:10.1155/2013/193205.
- 46
47 4. Reszke R, Peřka D, Walasek A, et al. Skin disorders in elderly subjects. *Int J*
48
49 *Dermatol.* 2015;54(9):332-338. doi: 10.1111/ijd.12832.
- 50
51 5. Zhang Q, Wang HZ, Gao J, et al. Effect of Traditional Chinese Medicine desire
52
53 adjustment therapy on sleep quality in patients with senile skin pruritus. *Chin J*
54
55 *Nurs.* 2017;52(2):161-165. doi:10.3761/j.issn.0254-1769.2017.02.007.
- 56
57 6. Ständer S, Weisshaar E, Mettang T, et al. Clinical Classification of Itch: a Position
58
59 Paper of the International Forum for the Study of Itch. *Acta Derm Venereol.*
60
2007;87(4):291-4. doi:10.2340/00015555-0305.

- 1
2
3 7. Clerc CJ, Misery L. *Venereologica*, A Literature Review of Senile Pruritus: From
4 Diagnosis to Treatment. *Acta Derm Venereol*. 2017;97(4):433-440.
5 doi:10.2340/00015555-2574.
6
7
- 8
9 8. Reich A, Ständer S, Szepietowski JC. Pruritus in the elderly. *Clin Dermatol*. Jan-
10 Feb 2011;29(1):15-23. doi: 10.1016/j.clindermatol.2010.07.002.
11
- 12
13 9. Cohen KR, Frank J, Salbu RL, et al. Pruritus in the elderly: Clinical approaches to
14 the improvement of quality of life. *P&T*. 2012;37(4): 227-239.
15
- 16
17 10. Zhang Q,Gao J,Shi LH, et al. Effect of Traditional Chinese Medicine desire
18 adjustment therapy on symptom and the quality of life in patients with senile
19 skin pruritu. *Chin J Geront*. 2016. 36(19): 4897-4899. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-
20 9202.2016.19.105.
21
- 22
23 11. Teoh YL, Teo RY, Yeo B, et al. Elderly Hospitalised Patients-The Impact of Itch
24 and its Prevalence. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 2016;45(4):134-137.
25 PMID:27292003.
26
- 27
28 12. Thaipisuttikul Y. Pruritic Skin Diseases in the Elderly. *J Dermatol*.
29 1998 ;25(3):153-157. doi:10.1111/j.1346-8138.1998.tb02371.x.
30
- 31
32 13. Caretti KL, Mehregan DR, Mehregan DA. A survey of self-reported skin disease
33 in the elderly African-American population. *Int J Dermatol*. 2015 ;54(9):1034-8.
34 doi:10.1111/ijd.12520.
35
- 36
37 14. Rubegni P, Poggiali S, Nami N, et al. Skin diseases in geriatric patients: Our
38 experience from a public skin outpatient clinic in Siena. 2012;147(6):631-636.
39 PMID:23149709
40
- 41
42 15. Liao YH, Chen KH, Tseng MP, et al. Pattern of Skin Diseases in a Geriatric Patient
43 Group in Taiwan: A 7-Year Survey from the Outpatient Clinic of a University
44 Medical Center. *Dermat*. 2001;203(4):308-313. doi:10.1159/000051778.
45
- 46
47 16. Reszke R, Pełka D, Walasek A, et al. Skin disorders in elderly subjects. *Int J*
48 *Dermatol*. 2015;54(9):332-338. doi:10.1111/ijd.12832.
49
- 50
51 17. Reszke R, Białyński-Birula R, Lindner K, et al. Itch in Elderly People: A Cross-
52 sectional Study. *Acta Derm Venereol*. 2019 ;99(11):1016-1021.
53 doi:10.2340/00015555-3271.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
 - 2
 - 3
 - 4
 - 5
 - 6
 - 7
 - 8
 - 9
 - 10
 - 11
 - 12
 - 13
 - 14
 - 15
 - 16
 - 17
 - 18
 - 19
 - 20
 - 21
 - 22
 - 23
 - 24
 - 25
 - 26
 - 27
 - 28
 - 29
 - 30
 - 31
 - 32
 - 33
 - 34
 - 35
 - 36
 - 37
 - 38
 - 39
 - 40
 - 41
 - 42
 - 43
 - 44
 - 45
 - 46
 - 47
 - 48
 - 49
 - 50
 - 51
 - 52
 - 53
 - 54
 - 55
 - 56
 - 57
 - 58
 - 59
 - 60
18. Yang J, Zhao H, Zhou Y, et al. A case-control study on risk of 410 male senile pruritus. *Mod Prevent Med*, 2009;36(10):1820-1822.
19. Chen ZH, Mo HX, Xian JF, et al. The study on the morbidity of common senile dermatosis in Junjing community in Guangzhou city. *J Jinan Univ*. 2015;36(1):73-76. doi:10.11778/j.jdx.2015.01.013.
20. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4(1):1. doi: 10.1186/2046-4053-4-1.
21. Zeng XT, Liu H, Chen X, et al. Meta analysis series 4: quality assessment tools for observational studies. *Chin J Evid Based Cardiovasc Med*. 2012;4(04):297-299.
22. Barili F, Parolari A, Kappetein PA, et al. Statistical Primer: heterogeneity, random- or fixed-effects model analyses? *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*. 2018;27(3):317-321. doi: 10.1093/icvts/ivy163.
23. Herrmann D, Sinnet, P, Holmes J, et al. Statistical controversies in clinical research: publication bias evaluations are not routinely conducted in clinical oncology systematic reviews. *Ann Oncol*. 2017 May 1;28(5):931-937. doi: 10.1093/annonc/mdw691.
24. Li XS, He BX, Yang XQ. Investigation of dermatosis in cadres above division level in Changchun. *Shenyang Budui Yiyao*. 2000; 13(1):39.
25. Ge NL, Xie ZH, Zhang CL, et al. A case-control study on risk of 122 simple senile pruritus. *Chin J Epidemiol*. 2006;27(7):627-629.
26. Xue SQ. Survey on Elderly Skin Disorders of Workers in Taigang Factory. *Chin J Dermatovenereol*, 2008;22(7):409-410.
27. Ni HL, Ke XY, Qian MQ, et al. Analysis of Prevalence of Elderly Itch Skin Disease in Two Pension Institutions in Shanghai. *Chin J Dermat Venerol Integ Trad W Med*, 2012;11(3): 157-158.
28. Zhang L. The Dermatopathic Study Of Middle—age and elderly Cadres In TaiYuan. Shanxi Medical University. Taiyuan, Shanxi, China, 2012.
29. Li L, Wang T, Liu XZ. Analysis of risk factors and health guidance for senile pruritus. *J Mili Surg in Southwest Chin*. 2014;(5):591-592. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-7193.2014.05.050.

- 1
2
3
4
5 30. Wu N,Zhang DL. Investigation and etiological analysis of senile pruritus. *Chin J Convalescent Med.* 2014;23(04):368-369. doi:10.13517/j.cnki.ccm.2014.04.051.
6
7
8
9 31. Yang J, Dou N, Ma SH, et al. Influencing factors of senile pruritus in Tangshan city. *Chin J Geront.* 2014;34(18):5205-5207. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-
10 9202.2014.18.087.
11
12
13
14 32. Hou XF, Zhang LJ. Investigation and analysis of 196 influencing factors of elderly dermatosis. *Shaanxi Med.* 2016;45(11):1559-1560.
15 1559-1560.
16 doi:10.11778/j.jdx.2015.01.013.
17
18
19 33. Dalgard F, Svensson A, Holm J, et al. Self-reported skin morbidity in Oslo. Associations with sociodemographic factors among adults in a cross-sectional study. *Br J Dermatol.* 2004 ;151(2):452-457. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
20 2133.2004.06058.x.
21
22
23
24
25
26 34. Tseng HW, Lam HC, Ger LP, et al. A survey of dermatological diseases among older male adults of a Veterans Home in Southern Taiwan. *Aging Clin Exp Res.* 2015;27(2):227-33. doi:10.1007/s40520-014-0260-9.
27
28
29
30
31
32 35. Miller IM, Zarchi K, Ellervik C, et al. Self-reported skin morbidity in Denmark: A population-based cross-sectional study. *Eur J Dermatol.* 2016;26(3):281-6. doi:10.1684/ejd.2016.2766.
33
34
35
36
37 36. Kara PA, Alatas ET, Doğan G, et al. Prevalence of Skin Diseases among Elderly Residing in Nursing Homes in Mugla. *TURK J GERIATR.* 2017;20(1):23-29.
38
39
40
41
42 37. Cowdell F, Dyson J, Long J, et al. Self-reported skin concerns: An epidemiological study of community-dwelling older people. *Int J Older People Nurs.* 2018;13(3):12195. doi: 10.1111/opn.
43
44
45
46 38. Dyhre PN, Gazerani P. Presence and characteristics of senile pruritus among Danish elderly living in nursing homes. *Future Sci OA,* 2019;5(6):Fso399. doi:10.2144/fsoa-2019-0036.
47
48
49
50
51
52 39. Xiong F, Lai YQ, Tu JX, et al. Epidemiological characteristics of sleep disorders in the Chinese elderly: a meta-analysis. *Chin J Evid-Based Med.* 2020;19(4):398-403. doi:10.7507/1672-2531.201808151.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
40. Valdes RR, Stull C, Yosipovitch G. Chronic Pruritus in the Elderly: Pathophysiology, Diagnosis and Management. *Drugs Aging*. 2015;32(3):201-15. doi:10.1007/s40266-015-0246-0.
41. Patel T, Yosipovitch G. The Management of Chronic Pruritus in the Elderly. *Skin Therapy Lett*. 2010;15(8):5-9. 2010. PMID: 20844849.
42. Paul C, Maumus RS, Mazereeuw HJ, et al. Prevalence and Risk Factors for Xerosis in the Elderly: A Cross-Sectional Epidemiological Study in Primary Care. *Dermatol*. 2011;223(3):260-5. doi: 10.1159/000334631.
43. Berger TG, Shive M, Harper GM. Pruritus in the older patient: a clinical review. *JAMA*. 2013;310(22):2443-50. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.282023.
44. Zhang ZJ, Zhu J, Me H, et al. Advances in the pathogenesis of senile pruritus. *Chin J Geront*. 2018;38(18),4598-4600. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2018.18.087.
45. Liu YS. Endocrine system characteristics and diseases of the elderly. *Chin J Geriatr*. 2005;24(8):637-639.
46. Leow YH, Maibach HI. Cigarette smoking, cutaneous vasculature, and tissue oxygen. *Clin Dermatol*. 1998 Sep-Oct;16(5):579-84. doi: 10.1016/s0738-081x(98)00042-x.
47. Farage MA, Miller KW, Elsner P, et al. Intrinsic and extrinsic factors in skin ageing: a review. *Int J Cosmet Sci*. 2008 Apr;30(2):87-95. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2494.2007.00415.x.
48. Friedman O. Changes associated with the aging face. *Facial Plast Surg Clin North Am*. 2005 Aug;13(3):371-80. doi: 10.1016/j.fsc.2005.04.004.
49. Lademann J, Meinke MC, Sterry W, et al. Carotenoids in human skin. *Exp Dermatol*. 2011 May;20(5):377-82. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0625.2010.01189.x. Epub 2011 Mar 1.
50. Berson DS. Natural antioxidants. *J Drugs Dermatol*. 2008 Jul;7(7 Suppl):s7-12.
51. Stahl W, Sies H. Bioactivity and protective effects of natural carotenoids. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2005 May 30;1740(2):101-7. doi:10.1016/j.bbadis.2004.12.006. Epub 2004 Dec 28.

1
2
3 50 Berson DS. Natural antioxidants. J Drugs Dermatol. 2008 Jul;7(7 Suppl):s7-12.
4
5

6 51. Stahl W, Sies H. Bioactivity and protective effects of natural carotenoids.
7 Biochim Biophys Acta. 2005 May 30;1740(2):101-7.
8 doi:10.1016/j.bbadis.2004.12.006. Epub 2004 Dec 28.
9

10 Footnotes

13 Author Statement

14
15 **Contributions:** Shi Chen and Fa-quan Zhou contributed equally to this study. Shi Chen
16 conceived and participated in the design of this review. Shi Chen and Fa-quan Zhou
17 performed the literature searches, study selection, data extraction, and assessed the risk of
18 bias. Shi Chen and Fa-quan Zhou drafted the manuscript. Yi-quan Xiong helped in performing
19 the analysis with constructive discussions. Shi Chen revised the final version. All authors read
20 and approved the final manuscript.
21
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 **Funding:** none
29

30
31 **Conflict of interests:** All of the authors declare that they have no financial or commercial
32 conflicts of interest.
33

34
35 **Ethics approval:** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or
36 animals performed by any of the authors.
37
38
39


40
41 **Patient consent for publication:** Not required.
42

43
44 **Patient and public involvement:** Patients and/or the public were not involved in the
45 design, conduct, reporting or dissemination plans of this research.
46
47

48
49 **Data availability statement:** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or
50 uploaded as supplementary information.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure

Figure 1. Flowchart of the study selection process.



Supplementary table caption

Tab.S1 Risk of bias assessment for studies included.

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total score
Li et al. ^[24]	Y	N	Y	Y	U	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	5
Dalgard et al. ^[33]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8
Ge et al. ^[25]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Xue et al. ^[26]	Y	N	N	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	5
Yang et al. ^[18]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Ni et al. ^[27]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6
Zhang et al. ^[28]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6
Li et al. ^[29]	Y	Y	N	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	5
Wu et al. ^[30]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6
Yang et al. ^[31]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Tseng et al. ^[34]	Y	N	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7
Chen et al. ^[19]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Hou et al. ^[32]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Miller et al. ^[35]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Kara et al. ^[36]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Cowdell et al. ^[37]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Dyhre et al. ^[38]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	8

Y=YES; N= NO; U=Unclear; Score of Item (point): 1. Define the source of information (survey, record review); 2. List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications; 3. Indicate time period used for identifying patients; 4. Indicate whether or not subjects were consecutive if not population-based; 5. Indicate if evaluators of subjective components of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants; 6. Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measurements); 7. Explain any patient exclusions from analysis; 8. Describe how confounding was assessed and/or controlled; 9. If applicable, explain how missing data were handled in the analysis; 10. Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection; 11. Clarify what follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained.



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	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.	1-2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	3-4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	5
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	5
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	5
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	5
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	6
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	6



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 1 of 2

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	6
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	6
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	7
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	7-8
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	8
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	9-11
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	9-11
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	11
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	11
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	11-13
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	13-14
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	14
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	19

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

Page 2 of 2

For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>

BMJ Open

The prevalence and risk factors of senile pruritus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-051694.R1
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	07-Jan-2022
Complete List of Authors:	chen, shi; Sichuan University, Zhou, Faquan; North Sichuan Medical College [Search North Sichuan Medical College]; General Hospital of Western Theater Command Xiong, Yiquan; Chinese Evidence-based Medicine Center, West China Hospital, Sichuan University
Primary Subject Heading:	Dermatology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Geriatric medicine, Public health
Keywords:	Geriatric dermatology < DERMATOLOGY, Dermatological epidemiology < DERMATOLOGY, PERINATOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our [licence](#).

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which [Creative Commons](#) licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

The prevalence and risk factors of senile pruritus: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Shi Chen^{1, 2*}, Faquan Zhou^{3, 4}, Yiquan Xiong⁵

¹ Institute for Disaster Management and Reconstruction, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

² West China School of Public Health, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

³ North Sichuan Medical College, Nan Chong, Sichuan, China

⁴ General Surgery Center, General Hospital of Western Theater Command, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

⁵ Chinese Evidence Based Medicine Centre, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan, China

Short Title: The prevalence and risk factors of senile pruritus: meta-analysis

Corresponding author:

Shi Chen, Institute for Disaster Management and Reconstruction, Sichuan University, No. 2 Section 2, Chuanda Road, Shuangliu District, Chengdu, Sichuan 610227, China. 18408270692

E-mail653645955@qq.com

Number of Tables: 3

Supplementary tables: 2

Number of Figures: 1

Word count: 3173 words

1 **Abstract**

2 **Objectives:** To systematically assess the prevalence and risk factors for Senile pruritus (SP)
3 in the elderly (≥ 60 years of age).

4 **Design:** A meta-analysis were used to pool the prevalence and risk factors for SP estimated
5 from individual studies. Four subgroup analyses were conducted to explore the prevalence
6 for SP in different age, sex, research sites and region.

7 **Setting, participants and measures:** SP reduces quality of life in the elderly, yet the worldwide
8 prevalence is unclear. Moreover, the risk factors for SP are controversial. Data from cross-
9 sectional studies, case-control studies, longitudinal studies and cohort studies that reported
10 the prevalence or the risk factors for SP were collected by searching nine electronic databases
11 up to October 2020, including Web of Science, PubMed, Embase, Cochrane Library, CINAHL,
12 CBM, CNKI, Wanfang and VIP. Two reviewers independently screened studies according to the
13 inclusion and exclusion criteria, extracted data, and assessed methodological quality. Data
14 analysis was performed using Stata 15.1 software.

15 **Results:** Seventeen studies involving 28,666 participants were included. The overall pooled
16 prevalence of SP was 21.04% (95% confidence intervals [CI]: 11.37%-32.72%). In addition, the
17 results showed that smoking, excessive drinking, and monophagism were possible risk factors
18 for SP, with pooled odds ratios (ORs) of 1.26 (95% CI: 1.14-1.40), 25.03 (95% CI:18.28-34.25),
19 and 1.22 (95% CI:1.12-1.33), respectively.

20 **Conclusions:** The overall prevalence of SP was high. Smoking, excessive drinking and
21 monophagism were possible risk factors for SP.

1 **Keywords:** senile pruritus; prevalence; risk factors; systematic review; meta-analysis

2 **Registration:** PROSPERO registration number(CRD42019143295).

3 **Strengths and limitations**

- 4 • To our knowledge, this study is the first systematic review and meta-analysis providing
5 comprehensive assessment on the prevalence of senile pruritus in worldwide.
- 6 • The risk factors of senile pruritus are evaluated.
- 7 • This systematic review and meta-analysis, covering 5 different countries, was composed
8 of 17 studies, with 28,666 participants were included.
- 9 • The definitions of SP differed across the included studies.

1 Introduction

2 The geriatric population (≥ 60 years of age) has been growing steadily worldwide in recent
3 decades. It is estimated that the geriatric population will account for 20% of the world's
4 population by the middle of this century^[1-3]. Aging results in numerous adverse changes in the
5 structure and function of multiple human organs, including the skin^[4]. Senile pruritus (SP) is
6 defined as generalized pruritus in patients without primary skin lesions^[5-8]. Pruritus is the most
7 common skin disorder in the geriatric population^[9]. It can lead to an unpleasant cutaneous
8 sensation, which provokes the desire to scratch (itchiness) and is accompanied by skin lesions,
9 pain, and infection^[10]. Furthermore, it can lead to adverse consequences for patients'
10 psychological health and quality of life, including anxiety, depression, disruption of normal
11 sleep patterns, and poor daytime concentration^[10, 11]. Therefore, investigating the prevalence
12 of SP is essential for informing policymakers, clinicians, and the general population.

13 The prevalence of SP has been reported around the world, ranging from 41% in Thailand^[12],
14 40.6% in America^[13], 18.9% in Italy^[14], and 14.2% in China^[15]. However, these studies were
15 limited by sample size and regional differences, and therefore do not represent the
16 prevalence of SP worldwide. Furthermore, several studies conducted surveys on inpatients or
17 outpatients to report the prevalence of SP^[1, 11, 16, 17]. Inpatients or outpatients do not represent
18 the whole elderly population, making the results less representative of the actual prevalence
19 of SP in the community. For these reasons, the precise prevalence and characteristics of the
20 population are unknown worldwide. Furthermore, the risk factors for SP have been reported
21 extensively, but with controversial conclusions^[18, 19]. For example, Yang *et al.* indicated that

1 smoking was associated with SP (odds ratio (OR) = 2.23, 95%CI:1.35-17.40)^[18]. However, Chen
2 *et al.* reported that smoking was not associated with SP (OR = 1.25, 95%CI: 0.99-1.35)^[19].

3 In this study, we conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis to synthesize the
4 prevalence of SP in different ages, sexes, and regions based on the general population and to
5 evaluate the risk factors for SP.

6 **Materials and Methods**

7 **Protocol registration**

8 This study was reported in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
9 reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines^[20] and has been prospectively registered in
10 PROSPERO (registration number: CRD42019143295).

11 **Search strategy**

12 Nine databases were searched in this study, including Web of Science, PubMed, Embase,
13 Cochrane Library, CINAHL, CBM, CNKI, Wanfang, and VIP. The following strategy was used in
14 the searches: (Pruritus OR Itching) AND (Senile OR Aging OR Aged OR Geriatrics) AND
15 (Incidence OR Epidemiology OR Prevalence OR Risk factors). Complete details of the search
16 strategy are available in supplementary table S1. All of the databases were searched from
17 their inception dates to the 24th of October 2020. Additional relevant literature was included
18 following a manual search of the included studies reference lists.

19 **Inclusion and exclusion criteria**

20 The inclusion criteria were as follows: (1) the study design was either cross-sectional study,
21 case-control study, cohort study or longitudinal study; (2) participants were greater than or

1 equal to 60 years of age; (3) exact diagnostic criteria for SP were provided; (4) prevalence or
2 risk factors for SP were reported. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) the study
3 populations were inpatients and outpatients; (2) the prevalence or risk factor effect value
4 (mainly referred to as OR in this study) of SP wasn't clearly reported in the original study, and
5 the data provided by the original study couldn't calculate the prevalence or risk factor effect
6 value of SP; (3) republished literature; (4) or studies published in a language other than
7 Chinese or English.

8 **Quality of the studies**

9 Two independent reviewers assessed the quality of the included studies according to 11
10 criteria recommended by the American agency for healthcare research and quality (AHRQ).
11 The criteria included assessment of selection bias, performance bias, attrition bias, detection
12 bias, and publication bias. An item would be scored "1" if it was answered "YES", and if it was
13 answered 'NO' or 'UNCLEAR', then the item scored '0' [24], providing a maximum score of 11.

14 **Data extraction**

15 Study selection and data extraction were independently conducted by two reviewers. Any
16 disagreement was resolved by discussion the two reviewers or a third reviewer. The articles
17 were firstly screened by the title and abstract, and then full-text documents were reviewed
18 for inclusion if they reported the prevalence and risk factors for SP. By using a standardized
19 and pilot-tested form, two reviewers independently extracted data from eligible studies,
20 including the title, first author name, publication year, study location, age, sample size,
21 diagnostic criteria, prevalence and risk factors for SP.

1 **Data analysis**

2 Double arcsine transformation was used to convert the prevalence of SP so that the data can
3 follow an approximately normal distribution^[22]. The ORs with their corresponding 95% CIs
4 were selected to assess the effect size of risk factors for SP. Heterogeneity among studies was
5 tested by Cochrane's *Q* and *I*² statistics. Heterogeneity was recognized as significant when
6 *I*² >50%. A Fixed- effect model (Mantel and Haenszel method) was used if *I*² ≤ 50%, otherwise
7 a random-effects model (DerSimonian and Laird method) was used^[23]. Forest plots were
8 constructed for a visual display of the pooled results if necessary. Four subgroup analyses
9 were conducted to explore the prevalence for SP in different age, sex, research sites and
10 region. Sensitivity analysis were assessed by excluding single studies. Publication bias was
11 assessed by using Begg's and Egger's tests^[24]. Tests of Publication bias and sensitivity analysis
12 were not conducted in the risk factor analysis section due to the limited number of studies
13 included. Statistical analyses were conducted using STATA 15.1 (Stata Corp LP, College Station,
14 TX).

15 **Results**

16 **Study Description**

17 A total of 8,518 records were identified from the nine databases, of which 647 were duplicates.
18 After screening titles and abstracts, 7,740 records were excluded with reasons of age,
19 outcome, study design. Full-text documents of 131 records were screened, and 114 studies
20 were excluded with reasons listed as follows: participants were not ≥ 60 years of age (n= 49),
21 outcome was not senile pruritus (n= 44), not cross-sectional, case-control, cohort or

1 longitudinal study (n= 9), non-Chinese and English study (n= 5), duplicate publication (n= 7).

2 In summary, 17 studies were eligible and included in the meta-analysis finally (Figure 1).

3 **Characteristics of the included studies**

4 The characteristics of the seventeen studies are summarized in Table 1. Eleven articles were
 5 written in Chinese^[18, 19, 25-33], and six were written in English ^[34-39]. Thirteen studies were
 6 conducted in Asia^[18, 19, 25-33, 35, 37] and four in Europe ^[34, 36, 38, 39]. Sample sizes ranged from 45^[39]
 7 to 8,252 ^[36]. Four of the seventeen studies reported the risk factors for SP ^[18, 19, 26, 33].

8 Table 1. Characteristics of included studies.

Authors	Publication Years	Study area	Diagnostic criteria	Sample size	Prevalence(%)	Risk factors
Dalgard et al. ^[34]	2004	Norway	①	3876	6.91	NA
Li et al. ^[25]	2000	China	NA	534	12.36	NA
Xue et al. ^[27]	2008	China	NA	311	19.29	NA
Ni et al. ^[28]	2012	China	④	426	5.63	NA
Zhang et al. ^[29]	2012	China	NA	1283	9.90	NA
Li et al. ^[30]	2014	China	⑤	500	33.40	NA
Wu et al. ^[31]	2014	China	⑤	1286	42.38	NA
Yang et al. ^[32]	2014	China	NA	5000	33.84	NA
Tseng et al. ^[35]	2014	China	NA	313	7.35	NA
Miller et al. ^[36]	2016	Denmark	①	8252	6.31	NA
Kara et al. ^[37]	2017	Turkey	NA	105	19.05	NA
Cowdell et al. ^[38]	2017	Britain	⑥	1116	9.32	NA
Dyhre et al. ^[39]	2019	Denmark	⑦	45	28.89	NA
Ge et al. ^[26]	2006	China	②	1236	66.91	Age; xerosis; Astriktion
Yang et al. ^[18]	2009	China	③	3785	61.98	Less water intake; Bathing with soap; Baths too much; Smoking; Malignant tumor;
Chen et al. ^[19]	2015	China	④	200	10.50	Bathing with soap; Smoking; Chronic illness; Excessive drinking; Monophagism;
Hou et al. ^[33]	2016	China	④	398	18.09	Insomnia; Contact with animal Smoking; Chronic illness; Excessive drinking; Monophagism; Insomnia; Contact with animal

1 NA: not available. Diagnostic criteria: ① Self-reported skin complaints scale ; ② participants ≥ 60 years, an itch lasting more than 2 weeks, Pruritus of whole body or multiple parts, no primary rash, no other pruritic skin disease, no obvious liver and kidney damage, diabetes and mental disease. ③ Dermatology and Venereology; ④ Clinical Dermatology; ⑤ Dermatovenerolog; ⑥ Self-report skin diseases scale[38]; ⑦ Self-report skin diseases scale.

5 Risk of Bias Assessment

6 Results of the risk of bias assessment are listed in supplementary table S2. Higher scores
7 indicative of less bias and more quality. Article quality was assessed as follows: 0 to 3 indicates
8 a low quality, 4 to 7 indicates a moderate quality, and 8 to 11 indicates a high quality^[40]. Study
9 quality was found to be moderate in 11 studies and high in the other six studies.

10 Prevalence of SP

11 Seventeen studies, involving 28,666 participants reported the prevalence of SP, ranging from
12 5.63% to 66.91%. A random-effects model-based meta-analysis showed that the pooled
13 prevalence of SP was 21.04% (95% CI: 11.37%-32.72%). Subgroup analyses indicated that the
14 pooled prevalence of SP for people aged 60-69, 70-79, 80-89, and ≥ 90 years old were 11.98%
15 (95% CI :3.91%- 23.62%), 26.79% (95% CI: 8.71%- 50.36%), 51.31% (95% CI: 47.20%- 96.33%)
16 and 57.53% (95% CI: 8.18%-98.09%), respectively. The pooled prevalence of SP was 8.26%
17 (95% CI: 5.88%-11.00%) in females and 18.65% (95% CI: 0.83%- 51.61%) in males. The pooled
18 prevalence of SP in health examination centers, nursing homes and communities was 43.83%
19 (95% CI: 19.39%- 69.94%), 16.26% (95% CI: (4.55%, 33.29%) and 12.21% (95% CI: 3.46%-
20 25.34%), respectively. The pooled prevalence of SP in Turkey and China was 24.34% (95% CI:
21 14.03%- 36.38%). The pooled prevalence of SP in Norway, Denmark and Britain was 8.23% (95%
22 CI: 6.36%- 10.35%). The results of subgroup analyses of age, sex, research site and region are
23 shown in Table 2.

1 Table 2. Subgroup analyses by age, sex, research sites and region.

Subgroup	Prevalence (%)	95%CI (%)	Heterogeneity	
			I ² (%)	P value
Age				
60-69	11.98	3.91-23.62	98.1	0.000
70-79	26.79	8.71-50.36	99.7	0.000
80-89	51.31	47.20-96.33	99.6	0.000
≥90	57.53	8.18-98.09	99.0	0.000
Sex				
Females	8.26	5.88-11.00	87.4	0.000
Males	18.65	0.83-51.61	99.9	0.000
Research sites				
Health examination center	43.83	19.39-69.94	99.8	0.000
Nursing homes	16.26	4.55-33.29	93.2	0.000
Community	12.21	3.46-25.34	99.8	0.000
Region				
Turkey, China	24.34%	14.03-36.38%	99.6%	0.000
Norway, Denmark, Britain	8.23%	6.36-10.35%	90.2%	0.000

2 **Risk factors**

3 Four studies, including 5,619 participants, reported the risk factors for SP [18, 19, 26, 33]. There
4 were three studies^[18, 19, 33], including 4,383 participants, that reported the association of
5 smoking and SP. Meta-analyses showed smoking was associated with SP [pooled OR of 1.26
6 (95% CI: 1.14-1.40), I²=0%]. The results of two studies^[19, 33], involving 598 participants,
7 suggested that excessive drinking increased the occurrence of SP [pooled OR of 25.03 (95%
8 CI:18.28- 34.25), I²=0%]. Two studies^[19, 33] involving 589 participants reported the association
9 of Monophagism and SP [pooled OR of 1.22 (95% CI: 1.12-1.33), I²=0%] (Table 3).

1 **Tab.3** Pooled risk factors of senile pruritus.

2

No.	Risk factors	OR	95%CI	P	Heterogeneity	
					I ² (%)	P value
1	smoking	1.26	1.14 - 1.40	0.000	0%	0.673
2	excessive drinking	25.03	18.28 - 34.25	0.000	0%	0.980
3	monophagism	1.22	1.12 -1.33	0.000	0%	0.926

3 **Sensitivity Analysis**

4 Sensitivity analysis was performed by excluding a single study and showed that the results of
 5 the meta-analysis were stable (18.61%- 22.23%). Sensitivity analysis was not conducted for
 6 the risk factor analysis due to the limited number of studies.

7 **Publication Bias**

8 Publication bias was assessed by using Begg's and Egger's tests. Begg's ($Z=0.70$, $P=0.484$) and
 9 Egger's test ($t=0.26$, $P=0.796$) results showed that the possibility of publication bias was less
 10 in the overall prevalence pooled analysis. Publication bias was not assessed in the risk factor
 11 analysis due to the limited number of studies.

12 **Discussion**

13 In this study, 17 studies involving 28,666 participants were included encompassing Norway,
 14 China, Denmark, Turkey, and Britain. Subgroup analyses found that the difference in the
 15 prevalence of SP based on epidemiological factors. Subgroup analyses indicated that a steadily
 16 increasing prevalence of SP was associated with increasing age. Xerosis is related to aging and
 17 is reported as the most common cause of SP^[41-43]. One of the skin's most important functions
 18 is to retain water. skin surface lipids and sebum on the skin helps retain water^[44]. As skin ages,

1
2
3
4 1 there is a decrease in lipids and sebum on the skin, leading to suboptimal moisture
5
6 2 retention^[42]. It was reported that pruritus can also be secondary to diabetes, kidney disease,
7
8
9 3 liver disease, etc^[44, 45]. Furthermore, pruritus is commonly listed as a medication
10
11 4 complication^[46], including angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors, salicylates, chloro-quine,
12
13
14 5 and calcium channel blockers^[44]. However, elderly people have more basic diseases and
15
16 6 complex medication, which also contributed to the higher incidence of pruritus. Another view
17
18 7 is that SP is probably a subclinical neuropathy, degenerative change in peripheral nerve
19
20 8 endings may be attributable to age. This age alteration can cause pruritus without specific
21
22 9 stimuli^[7]. In addition, immunosenescence occurs with aging and also produces a higher
23
24 10 incidence of pruritus^[42]. Moreover, decreases in androgen, estrogen and glucocorticoid in
25
26 11 aged people can contribute to SP^[47, 48]. All these factors will increase the prevalence of SP with
27
28 12 age.

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36 13 The results of sub-regional analyses found that individuals who were living in Turkey and China
37
38 14 were associated with a higher prevalence of SP. Pruritus is influenced by multiple factors, such
39
40 15 as genetic, biological, psychological, social, environmental and cultural factors^[49]. Different
41
42 16 countries vary in society, culture, and environment, genetic, biological, and psychological
43
44 17 factors also differ among populations in different countries. Therefore, the different
45
46 18 prevalence among countries is related to the above factors.

47
48
49
50
51
52
53 19 The results of sub-sex found that the prevalence of male is higher. Sub-research sites analyses
54
55 20 found that the highest prevalence of SP was found in health examination centers. The reasons
56
57 21 for these results are unclear based on the current scientific knowledge available on SP
58
59
60

1 prevalence. Further studies would be helpful in further exploring these phenomena. In
2 conclusion, the prevalence of SP varies among different populations. However, the reasons
3 underlying the differences in prevalence observed in the current study remain unclear. It is
4 suggested that further studies of the prevalence of SP in different populations be conducted
5 in the future.

6 Meta-analyses showed that smoking, excessive drinking, and monophagism were possible risk
7 factors for SP. It has been shown that smoking can cause nutrient and oxygen deprivation in
8 cutaneous tissues, decreases collagen and elastin fibers in the dermis, and increases
9 keratinocyte dysplasia^[50]. These changes reduce skin lipids, sebum, and moisture retention,
10 leading to dryness and pruritus of skin^[51, 52]. Therefore, smoking is a potential risk factor for
11 SP. The present study also identified drinking alcohol as a potential risk factor for SP. Studies
12 have demonstrated that alcohol consumption could reduce the concentration of carotenoids
13 in the skin^[53]. Carotenoids can neutralize free radicals, delay premature skin aging and skin
14 diseases caused by free radicals^[53-55]. It could be proposed that alcohol consumption may lead
15 to skin diseases by affecting the concentration of carotenoids. The human body cannot
16 synthesize carotenoids in sufficient amounts without relying on a nutrient rich diet including
17 fruit and vegetables. Therefore, monophagism could contribute to reducing the concentration
18 of carotenoids and it could be considered a risk factors for skin diseases. Regrettably, the
19 specific types of monophagism wasn't pointed out in the included study, which prevented
20 further analysis and discussion. We expect that follow-up studies will explore and investigate

1
2
3
4 1 this. In addition, point out the participants' dietary structure and specific types of
5
6
7 2 monophagism.

8
9 3 Although the present study indicated smoking, excessive drinking and monophagism were
10
11
12 4 associated with an increased risk of SP, all the studies included in the meta-analysis were
13
14
15 5 cross-sectional. Consequently, It is not possible to infer on the causality between exposure
16
17
18 6 and outcomes. Further studies are needed to confirm these findings. In addition to the three
19
20
21 7 risk factors identified through the meta-analyses, the included studies also showed that the
22
23
24 8 risk factors for SP also include age, xerosis, astringency, less water intake, bathing with soap,
25
26
27 9 bathing too frequently, malignant tumor, chronic illness, excessive drinking, insomnia, and
28
29
30 10 contact with animals.

31
32
33 11 To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to provide a systematic review of SP
34
35
36 12 prevalence and risk factors. However, several limitations of this study should be noted. First,
37
38
39 13 The epidemiological data on SP was only from Norway, China, Turkey, Britain, and Denmark,
40
41
42 14 which cannot be generalized to the worldwide population. Second, the methods of
43
44
45 15 identifying SP varied among the included studies, the definitions of SP may not be uniform
46
47
48 16 among investigators and researchers in different countries, the study of different countries
49
50
51 17 may not be unified in assessing the prevalence of SP, making it difficult to analyze the
52
53
54 18 prevalence of SP using a gold standard method. These limitations make we less confident that
55
56
57 19 the final estimate is close to a "true" estimate. Considering these limitations, further studies
58
59
60 20 will be needed to better understand the prevalence and risk factors of SP worldwide.

21 **Conclusion**

1
2
3
4 1 In conclusion, this study found the prevalence of SP was 21.04%. Individuals who were older,
5
6
7 2 male, or living in Turkey and China were associated with a higher prevalence of SP.
8
9
10 3 Additionally, among health examination centers, nursing homes and communities, the highest
11
12 4 detection rate of SP was found in the health examination centers. Smoking, excessive drinking
13
14
15 5 and monophagism were possible individual risk factors for SP.
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

References

1. Valdes RR, Mollanazar NK, González MJ, et al. Itch Prevalence and Characteristics in a Hispanic Geriatric Population: A Comprehensive Study Using a Standardized Itch Questionnaire. *Acta Derm Venereol.* 2015;95(4):417-421. doi:10.2340/00015555-1968.
2. Hosseinpoor AR, Bergen N, Chatterji S. Socio-demographic determinants of caregiving in older adults of low- and middle-income countries. *Age Ageing.* 2013;42(3):330-338. doi:10.1093/ageing/afs196.
3. Darjani A, Mohtasham AZ, Mohammad AK, et al. Skin Disorders among Elder Patients in a Referral Center in Northern Iran. *Dermatol Res Pract.* 2013;2013:193205. doi:10.1155/2013/193205.
4. Reszke R, Peřka D, Walasek A, et al. Skin disorders in elderly subjects. *Int J Dermatol.* 2015;54(9):332-338. doi: 10.1111/ijd.12832.
5. Zhang Q, Wang HZ, Gao J, et al. Effect of Traditional Chinese Medicine desire adjustment therapy on sleep quality in patients with senile skin pruritus. *Chin J Nurs.* 2017;52(2):161-165. doi:10.3761/j.issn.0254-1769.2017.02.007.
6. Ständer S, Weisshaar E, Mettang T, et al. Clinical Classification of Itch: a Position Paper of the International Forum for the Study of Itch. *Acta Derm Venereol.* 2007;87(4):291-4. doi:10.2340/00015555-0305.
7. Clerc CJ, Misery L. *Venereologica*, A Literature Review of Senile Pruritus: From Diagnosis to Treatment. *Acta Derm Venereol.* 2017;97(4):433-440. doi:10.2340/00015555-2574.
8. Reich A, Ständer S, Szepietowski JC. Pruritus in the elderly. *Clin Dermatol.* Jan-Feb 2011;29(1):15-23. doi: 10.1016/j.clindermatol.2010.07.002.
9. Cohen KR, Frank J, Salbu RL, et al. Pruritus in the elderly: Clinical approaches to the improvement of quality of life. *P&T.* 2012;37(4): 227-239.
10. Zhang Q, Gao J, Shi LH, et al. Effect of Traditional Chinese Medicine desire adjustment therapy on symptom and the quality of life in patients with senile skin pruritus. *Chin J Geront.* 2016. 36(19): 4897-4899. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2016.19.105.

- 1
2
3 1 11. Teoh YL, Teo RY, Yeo B, et al. Elderly Hospitalised Patients-The Impact of Itch
4 2 and its Prevalence. *Ann Acad Med Singapore*. 2016;45(4):134-137.
5 3 PMID:27292003.
6 4
- 7 5 12. Thaipisuttikul Y. Pruritic Skin Diseases in the Elderly. *J Dermatol*.
8 6 1998 ;25(3):153-157. doi:10.1111/j.1346-8138.1998.tb02371.x.
9 7
- 10 8 13. Caretti KL, Mehregan DR, Mehregan DA. A survey of self-reported skin disease
11 9 in the elderly African-American population. *Int J Dermatol*. 2015 ;54(9):1034-8.
12 10 doi:10.1111/ijd.12520.
13 11
- 14 12 14. Rubegni P, Poggiali S, Nami N, et al. Skin diseases in geriatric patients: Our
15 13 experience from a public skin outpatient clinic in Siena. 2012;147(6):631-636.
16 14 PMID:23149709
17 15
- 18 16 15. Liao YH, Chen KH, Tseng MP, et al. Pattern of Skin Diseases in a Geriatric Patient
19 17 Group in Taiwan: A 7-Year Survey from the Outpatient Clinic of a University
20 18 Medical Center. *Dermat*. 2001;203(4):308-313. doi:10.1159/000051778.
21 19
- 22 20 16. Reszke R, Pełka D, Walasek A, et al. Skin disorders in elderly subjects. *Int J*
23 21 *Dermatol*. 2015;54(9):332-338. doi:10.1111/ijd.12832.
24 22
- 25 23 17. Reszke R, Białynicki-Birula R, Lindner K, et al. Itch in Elderly People: A Cross-
26 24 sectional Study. *Acta Derm Venereol*. 2019 ;99(11):1016-1021.
27 25 doi:10.2340/00015555-3271.
28 26
- 29 27 18. Yang J, Zhao H, Zhou Y, et al. A case-control study on risk of 410 male senile
30 28 pruritus. *Mod Prevent Med*, 2009;36(10):1820-1822.
31 29
- 32 30 19. Chen ZH, Mo HX, Xian JF, et al. The study on the morbidity of common senile
33 31 dermatosis in Junjing community in Guangzhou city. *J Jinan Univ*. 2015;36(1):
34 32 73-76. doi:10.11778/j.jdx.2015.01.013.
35 33
- 36 34 20. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic
37 35 reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4(1):1.doi:
38 36 10.1186/2046-4053-4-1.
39 37
- 40 38 21. Zeng XT,Liu H,Chen X,et al. Meta analysis series 4: quality assessment tools for
41 39 observational studies.*Chin J Evid Based Cardiovasc Med*. 2012;4(04):297-299.
42 40

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 22. Nyaga VN, Arbyn M, Aerts M. Metaprop: a Stata command to perform meta-
2 analysis of binomial data. *Arch Public Health*. 2014 Nov 10;72(1):39. doi:
3 10.1186/2049-3258-72-39.
4
5
6
7
8
9 23. Barili F, Parolari A, Kappetein PA, et al. Statistical Primer: heterogeneity,
10 random- or fixed-effects model analyses? *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg*.
11 2018;27(3):317-321. doi: 10.1093/icvts/ivy163.
12
13
14 24. Herrmann D, Sinnet,P, Holmes J, et al. Statistical controversies in clinical
15 research: publication bias evaluations are not routinely conducted in clinical
16 oncology systematic reviews. *Ann Oncol*. 2017 May 1;28(5):931-937. doi:
17 10.1093/annonc/mdw691.
18
19
20 25. Li XS, He BX, Yang XQ. Investigation of dermatosis in cadres above division level
21 in Changchun. *Shenyang Budui Yiyao*. 2000; 13(1):39.
22
23
24 26. Ge NL, Xie ZH, Zhang CL, et al. A case-control study on risk of 122 simple senile
25 pruritus. *Chin J Epidemiol*. 2006;27(7):627-629.
26
27
28 27. Xue SQ. Survey on Elderly Skin Disorders of Workers in Taigang Factory. *Chin J*
29 *Dermatovenereol*, 2008;22(7):409-410.
30
31
32 28. Ni HL,Ke XY,Qian MQ, et al. Analysis of Prevalence of Elderly Itch Skin Disease in
33 Two Pension Institutions in Shanghai. *Chin J Dermato Venerol Integ Trad W*
34 *Med*, 2012;11(3): 157-158.
35
36
37 29. Zhang L. The Dermatopathic Study Of Middle—age and elderly Cadres In
38 TaiYuan. Shanxi Medical University. Taiyuan, Shanxi, China, 2012.
39
40
41 30. Li L,Wang T,Liu XZ. Analysis of risk factors and health guidance for senile
42 pruritus. *J Mili Surg in Southwest Chin*. 2014;(5):591-592.
43 doi:10.3969/j.issn.1672-7193.2014.05.050.
44
45
46 31. Wu N,Zhang DL. Investigation and etiological analysis of senile pruritus. *Chin J*
47 *Convalescent Med*. 2014;23(04):368-369. doi:10.13517/j.cnki.ccm.2014.04.051.
48
49
50 32. Yang J, Dou N, Ma SH, et al. Influencing factors of senile pruritus in Tangshan
51 city. *Chin J Geront*. 2014;34(18):5205-5207. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-
52 9202.2014.18.087.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1 33. Hou XF, Zhang LJ. Investigation and analysis of 196 influencing factors of elderly
2 dermatosis. *Shaanxi Med*. 2016;45(11):1559-1560.
3 doi:10.11778/j.jdxb.2015.01.013.
- 4
5
6
7
8
9 34. Dalgard F, Svensson A, Holm J, et al. Self-reported skin morbidity in Oslo.
10 Associations with sociodemographic factors among adults in a cross-sectional
11 study. *Br J Dermatol*. 2004 ;151(2):452-457. doi:10.1111/j.1365-
12 2133.2004.06058.x.
- 13
14
15 10 35. Tseng HW, Lam HC, Ger LP, et al. A survey of dermatological diseases among
16 older male adults of a Veterans Home in Southern Taiwan. *Aging Clin Exp Res*.
17 2015;27(2):227-33. doi:10.1007/s40520-014-0260-9.
- 18
19
20 14 36. Miller IM, Zarchi K, Ellervik C, et al. Self-reported skin morbidity in Denmark: A
21 population-based cross-sectional study. *Eur J Dermatol*. 2016;26(3):281-6.
22 doi:10.1684/ejd.2016.2766.
- 23
24
25 18 37. Kara PA, Alatas ET, Doğan G, et al. Prevalence of Skin Diseases among Elderly
26 Residing in Nursing Homes in Mugla. *TURK J GERIATR*. 2017;20(1):23-29.
- 27
28
29 21 38. Cowdell F, Dyson J, Long J, et al. Self-reported skin concerns: An epidemiological
30 study of community-dwelling older people. *Int J Older People Nurs*.
31 2018;13(3):12195. doi: 10.1111/opn.
- 32
33
34 25 39. Dyhre PN, Gazerani P. Presence and characteristics of senile pruritus among
35 Danish elderly living in nursing homes. *Future Sci OA*, 2019;5(6):Fso399.
36 doi:10.2144/fsoa-2019-0036.
- 37
38
39 29 40. Xiong F, Lai YQ, Tu JX, et al. Epidemiological characteristics of sleep disorders in
40 the Chinese elderly: a meta-analysis. *Chin J Evid-Based Med*. 2020;19(4):398-
41 403. doi:10.7507/1672-2531.201808151.
- 42
43
44 33 41. Valdes RR, Stull C, Yosipovitch G. Chronic Pruritus in the Elderly:
45 Pathophysiology, Diagnosis and Management. *Drugs Aging*. 2015;32(3):201-15.
46 doi:10.1007/s40266-015-0246-0.
- 47
48
49 37 42. Patel T, Yosipovitch G. The Management of Chronic Pruritus in the Elderly. *Skin*
50 *Therapy Lett*. 2010;15(8):5-9. 2010. PMID: 20844849.
- 51
52
53 40 43. Paul C, Maumus RS, Mazereeuw HJ, et al. Prevalence and Risk Factors for
54 Xerosis in the Elderly: A Cross-Sectional Epidemiological Study in Primary Care.
55 *Dermatol*. 2011;223(3):260-5. doi: 10.1159/000334631.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
601
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

44. Berger TG, Shive M, Harper GM. Pruritus in the older patient: a clinical review. *JAMA*. 2013;310(22):2443-50. doi:10.1001/jama.2013.282023.
45. Ko MJ, Yang JY, Wu HY, et al. Narrowband ultraviolet B phototherapy for patients with refractory uraemic pruritus: a randomized controlled trial. *Br J Dermatol*. 2011 Sep;165(3):633-9. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2133.2011.10448.x.
46. Reich A, Ständer S, Szepietowski JC. Drug-induced pruritus: a review. *Acta Derm Venereol*. 2009;89(3):236-44. doi: 10.2340/00015555-0650.
47. Zhang ZJ, Zhu J, Me H, et al. Advances in the pathogenesis of senile pruritus. *Chin J Geront*. 2018;38(18):4598-4600. doi:10.3969/j.issn.1005-9202.2018.18.087.
48. Liu YS. Endocrine system characteristics and diseases of the elderly. *Chin J Geriatr*. 2005;24(8):637-639.
49. Tey HL, Yosipovitch G. Itch in ethnic populations. *Acta Derm Venereol*. 2010 May;90(3):227-34. doi: 10.2340/00015555-0867.
50. Leow YH, Maibach HI. Cigarette smoking, cutaneous vasculature, and tissue oxygen. *Clin Dermatol*. 1998 Sep-Oct;16(5):579-84. doi: 10.1016/s0738-081x(98)00042-x.
51. Farage MA, Miller KW, Elsner P, et al. Intrinsic and extrinsic factors in skin ageing: a review. *Int J Cosmet Sci*. 2008 Apr;30(2):87-95. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2494.2007.00415.x.
52. Friedman O. Changes associated with the aging face. *Facial Plast Surg Clin North Am*. 2005 Aug;13(3):371-80. doi: 10.1016/j.fsc.2005.04.004.
53. Lademann J, Meinke MC, Sterry W, et al. Carotenoids in human skin. *Exp Dermatol*. 2011 May;20(5):377-82. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0625.2010.01189.x. Epub 2011 Mar 1.
54. Berson DS. Natural antioxidants. *J Drugs Dermatol*. 2008 Jul;7(7 Suppl):s7-12.
55. Stahl W, Sies H. Bioactivity and protective effects of natural carotenoids. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2005 May 30;1740(2):101-7. doi:10.1016/j.bbadis.2004.12.006. Epub 2004 Dec 28.

Footnotes

1 Author Statement

2 **Contributions:** Shi Chen and Fa-quan Zhou contributed equally to this study. Shi Chen
3 conceived and participated in the design of this review. Shi Chen and Fa-quan Zhou
4 performed the literature searches, study selection, data extraction, and assessed the risk of
5 bias. Shi Chen and Fa-quan Zhou drafted the manuscript. Yi-quan Xiong helped in performing
6 the analysis with constructive discussions. Shi Chen revised the final version. All authors read
7 and approved the final manuscript.

8 **Funding:** none

9 **Conflict of interests:** All of the authors declare that they have no financial or commercial
10 conflicts of interest.

11 **Ethics approval:** This article does not contain any studies with human participants or
12 animals performed by any of the authors.

13 **Patient consent for publication:** Not required.

14 **Patient and public involvement:** Patients and/or the public were not involved in the
15 design, conduct, reporting or dissemination plans of this research.

16 **Data availability statement:** All data relevant to the study are included in the article or
17 uploaded as supplementary information.

18 Figure


19 Fig. 1. Flowchart of the study selection process.

20 Supplementary

21 supplementary table S1. Complete search strategy.

22 supplementary table S2. Risk of bias assessment for the included studies.

Figure 1. Flowchart of the study selection process.



Supplementary table S1.

Tab.S1 Risk of bias assessment for studies included.

Study	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Total score
Li et al. ^[25]	Y	N	Y	Y	U	Y	N	Y	N	N	N	5
Dalgard et al. ^[34]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N	8
Ge et al. ^[26]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Xue et al. ^[27]	Y	N	N	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	5
Yang et al. ^[18]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Ni et al. ^[28]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6
Zhang et al. ^[29]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6
Li et al. ^[30]	Y	Y	N	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	5
Wu et al. ^[31]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	N	N	N	Y	N	6
Yang et al. ^[32]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Tseng et al. ^[35]	Y	N	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	7
Chen et al. ^[19]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Hou et al. ^[33]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Miller et al. ^[36]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	Y	N	Y	N	8
Kara et al. ^[37]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Cowdell et al. ^[38]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	N	Y	N	7
Dyhre et al. ^[39]	Y	Y	Y	Y	U	Y	Y	N	Y	Y	N	8

Y=YES; N= NO; U=Unclear; Score of Item (point): 1. Define the source of information (survey, record review); 2. List inclusion and exclusion criteria for exposed and unexposed subjects (cases and controls) or refer to previous publications; 3. Indicate time period used for identifying patients; 4. Indicate whether or not subjects were consecutive if not population-based; 5. Indicate if evaluators of subjective components of study were masked to other aspects of the status of the participants; 6. Describe any assessments undertaken for quality assurance purposes (e.g., test/retest of primary outcome measurements); 7. Explain any patient exclusions from analysis; 8. Describe how confounding was assessed and/or controlled; 9. If applicable, explain how missing data were handled in the analysis; 10. Summarize patient response rates and completeness of data collection; 11. Clarify what follow-up, if any, was expected and the percentage of patients for which incomplete data or follow-up was obtained.

Pubmed

- 1、 "Aged"[Mesh]
- 2、 "Aging"[Mesh]
- 3、 "geriatrics"[Mesh]
- 4、 (((((((((((Aging[Title/Abstract]) OR aged[Title/Abstract]) OR senior old[Title/Abstract]) OR geriatric[Title/Abstract]) OR elder[Title/Abstract]) OR old age[Title/Abstract]) OR pensioner[Title/Abstract]) OR veteran older adult*[Title/Abstract]) OR older people[Title/Abstract]) OR older person*[Title/Abstract]) OR older patient*[Title/Abstract]) OR older women[Title/Abstract]) OR older men[Title/Abstract]) OR geriatrics[Title/Abstract]) OR senile[Title/Abstract]) OR senility[Title/Abstract]
- 5、 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4
- 6、 "Pruritus"[Mesh]
- 7、 (((((((Pruritus[Title/Abstract]) OR Pruritis[Title/Abstract]) OR skin pruritus[Title/Abstract]) OR Itching[Title/Abstract]) OR Skin disorders[Title/Abstract]) OR Dermatological problems[Title/Abstract]) OR skin diseases[Title/Abstract]) OR Senile Pruritus[Title/Abstract]) OR chronic pruritus[Title/Abstract]
- 8、 #6 or #7
- 9、 "Incidence"[Mesh]
- 10、 "Prevalence"[Mesh]
- 11、 "Epidemiology"[Mesh]
- 12、 (((((((Epidemiology[Title/Abstract]) OR Prevalence[Title/Abstract]) OR Incidence[Title/Abstract]) OR Incidences[Title/Abstract]) OR Incidence Studies[Title/Abstract]) OR Prevalences[Title/Abstract]) OR Prevalence Studies[Title/Abstract]) OR Epidemiologic Studies[Title/Abstract]
- 13、 #9 or #10 or #11 or #12
- 14、 "Risk Factors"[Mesh]
- 15、 "Risk"[Mesh]
- 16、 "Root Cause Analysis"[Mesh]

1
2
3
4 17、 ((Risk Factors[Title/Abstract]) OR Risk[Title/Abstract]) OR Root Cause
5
6 Analysis[Title/Abstract]

7
8 18、 #14 or #15 or #16 or #17
9

10
11 19、 #13 or #18
12

13
14 20、 #5 AND #8 AND #19
15

16 **Web of Science**

17
18 1、 TI=(aged or aging or older adult* or older people or older person* or older
19
20 patient* or older women or older men)

21
22 2、 TI= (geriatric or geriatrics or elder* or senile or senility or senior or old age or old
23
24 or elder or pensioner or veteran).tw.
25

26
27 3、 1 or 2
28

29
30 4、 TS=(Pruritus or Pruritis or skin pruritus or Itching or Skin disorders or
31
32 Dermatological problems or skin diseases or Senile Pruritus or f chronic pruritus)

33
34 5、 TS=(Prevalence Prevalences or Prevalence Studies or Risk Factors or Root Cause
35
36 Analysis)

37
38 6、 3 and 4 and 5
39
40

41 **Embase**

42
43 1、 exp Aged/
44

45
46 2、 exp Aging/
47

48
49 3、 exp Geriatrics/
50

51
52 4、 (aged or aging or older adult* or older people or older person* or older patient*
53
54 or older women or older men).tw.

55
56 5、 (geriatric or geriatrics or elder* or senile or senility or senior or old age or old or
57
58 elder or pensioner or veteran).tw.

59
60 6、 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5

1
2
3
4 7、 exp Pruritus/
5

6
7 8、 (Pruritus or Pruritis or skin pruritus or Itching or Skin disorders or Dermatological
8 problems or skin diseases or Senile Pruritus or f chronic pruritus).tw.
9

10 9、 7 or 8
11

12
13 10、 exp Prevalence/
14

15 11、 exp Risk Factor/
16

17
18 12、 exp Root Cause Analysis/
19

20
21 13、 (Prevalence Prevalences or Prevalence Studies).tw.
22

23 14、 (Risk Factors or Root Cause Analysis).tw.
24

25
26 15、 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14
27

28
29 16、 6 and 9 and 15
30

31 **CINAHL**

32
33 1、 (MH "Aged+") OR (MH "Aging+") OR (MH "geriatrics+")
34

35
36 2、 AB aged or aging or geriatrics or senior or old or geriatric or elder or old age or
37 pensioner or veteran or older adult* or older people or older person* or older patient*
38 or older women or older men or senile or senility
39

40
41 3、 S1 OR S2
42

43
44 4、 (MH "Pruritus+")
45

46
47 5、 AB Pruritus or Pruritis or skin pruritus or Itching or Skin disorders or
48 Dermatological problems or skin diseases or Senile Pruritus or chronic pruritus
49

50
51 6、 S4 OR S5
52

53
54 7、 (MH "Prevalence+") OR (MH "Risk Factors+") OR (MH "Root Cause Analysis+")
55

56
57 8、 AB Prevalence or Prevalences or Prevalence Studies or Risk Factor or Root Cause
58 Analysis
59
60

1
2
3
4 9、 S7 OR S8
5
6

7 10、 S3 AND S6 AND S9
8
9

10
11 **Cochrane Library**
12

- 13 1、 MeSH descriptor: [Aged] in all MeSH products
- 14 2、 MeSH descriptor: [Aging] explode all trees
- 15 3、 MeSH descriptor: [Geriatrics] explode all trees
- 16 4、 (Aging):ti,ab,kw OR (aged):ti,ab,kw OR (Geriatrics):ti,ab,kw OR
17 (senior):ti,ab,kw OR (old):ti,ab,kw
- 18 5、 (geriatric):ti,ab,kw OR (elder):ti,ab,kw OR (old age):ti,ab,kw OR
19 (pensioner):ti,ab,kw OR (veteran):ti,ab,kw
- 20 6、 (older adult*):ti,ab,kw OR (older people):ti,ab,kw OR (older person*):ti,ab,kw
21 OR (older patient*):ti,ab,kw OR (older women):ti,ab,kw
- 22 7、 (older men):ti,ab,kw OR (senile):ti,ab,kw OR (senility):ti,ab,kw
- 23 8、 #1 or #2 #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7
- 24 9、 MeSH descriptor: [Pruritus] explode all trees
- 25 10、 (pruritus):ti,ab,kw OR (pruritis):ti,ab,kw OR (skin pruritus):ti,ab,kw OR
26 (Itching):ti,ab,kw OR (Skin disorders):ti,ab,kw
- 27 11、 (Dermatological problems):ti,ab,kw OR (skin diseases):ti,ab,kw OR (Senile
28 Pruritus):ti,ab,kw OR (chronic pruritus):ti,ab,kw
- 29 12、 #9 or #10 or #11
- 30 13、 MeSH descriptor: [Prevalence] explode all trees
- 31 14、 MeSH descriptor: [Risk Factors] explode all trees
- 32 15、 MeSH descriptor: [Root Cause Analysis] explode all trees
- 33 16、 (Prevalence):ti,ab,kw OR (Prevalences):ti,ab,kw
- 34 17、 (Risk Factors):ti,ab,kw OR (Root Cause Analysis):ti,ab,kw
- 35 18、 #13 or #14 #15 or #16 or #17
- 36 19、 #8 and #12 and #18
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

CNKI

AB = ('老人'+ '老年'+ '老年人') AND AB = ('瘙痒性皮肤病'+ '瘙痒症'+ '老年性皮肤瘙痒'+ '老年性皮肤瘙痒症'+ '搔痒'+ '瘙痒') AND AB = ('发病率'+ '发病率研究'+ '患病率'+ '现患调查'+ '流行病学研究'+ '流行病学'+ '风险关系'+ '危险因素'+ '危险'+ '影响因素'+ '影响因素分析'+ '相关因素'+ '现况调查'+ '相关性研究'+ '相关因素分析'+ '影响')

Wanfang

(老年+老人+老年人) * (瘙痒性皮肤病+瘙痒+瘙痒症+老年性皮肤瘙痒+老年性皮肤瘙痒症+搔痒) * (发病率+发病率研究+患病率+现患调查+流行病学研究+流行病学+风险关系+危险因素+危险+影响因素+相关因素+现况调查+相关性研究+相关因素分析+影响)

VIP

(U=老人 OR U=老年 OR U=老年人) AND (U=瘙痒性皮肤病 OR U=瘙痒 OR U=瘙痒症 OR U=老年性皮肤瘙痒 OR U=老年性皮肤瘙痒症 OR U=搔痒) AND (U=发病率 OR U=发病率研究 OR U=患病率 OR U=现患调查 OR U=流行病学研究 OR U=流行病学 OR U=风险关系 OR U=危险因素 OR U=危险 OR U=影响因素 OR U=影响因素分析 OR U=相关因素 OR U=现况调查 OR U=相关性研究 OR U=相关因素分析 OR U=影响)

CBM

- 1、"老年人"[不加权:扩展]
- 2、"老年人"[常用字段:智能] OR "老人"[常用字段:智能] OR "老年"[常用字段:智能]
- 3、(#1) OR (#2)

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 4、"瘙痒症"[不加权:扩展]
- 5
- 6 5、"瘙痒性皮肤病"[摘要:智能] OR "瘙痒"[摘要:智能] OR "瘙痒症"[摘要:智能] OR
- 7 "老年性皮肤病"[摘要:智能] OR "老年性皮肤瘙痒症"[摘要:智能] OR "搔痒"[摘
- 8 要:智能]
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14 6、(#4) OR (#5)
- 15
- 16
- 17 7、"患病率"[不加权:扩展]
- 18
- 19 8、"横断面研究"[不加权:扩展]
- 20
- 21
- 22 9、"队列研究"[不加权:扩展]
- 23
- 24
- 25 10、"流行病学研究"[不加权:扩展]
- 26
- 27 11、"流行病学"[不加权:扩展]
- 28
- 29
- 30 12、"影响因素分析"[不加权:扩展]
- 31
- 32 13、"危险因素"[不加权:扩展]
- 33
- 34
- 35 14、"危险"[不加权:扩展]
- 36
- 37 15、"发病率"[常用字段:智能] OR "发病率研究"[常用字段:智能] OR "患病率"[常用
- 38 字段:智能] OR "现患调查"[常用字段:智能] OR "流行病学研究"[常用字段:智能] OR
- 39 "流行病学"[常用字段:智能] OR "现况调查"[常用字段:智能] OR "相关性研究"[常
- 40 用字段:智能] OR "相关因素分析"[常用字段:智能]
- 41
- 42
- 43 16、"影响"[常用字段:智能] OR "风险关系"[常用字段:智能] OR "危险因素"[常用字
- 44 段:智能] OR "危险"[常用字段:智能] OR "影响因素"[常用字段:智能] OR "影响因素
- 45 分析"[常用字段:智能] OR "相关因素"[常用字段:智能]
- 46
- 47
- 48
- 49
- 50
- 51
- 52
- 53
- 54
- 55
- 56 17、(#7-16)
- 57
- 58 18、(#3) AND (#6) AND (#17)
- 59
- 60



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	1
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	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.	1-2
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	3-4
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, comparisons, outcomes, and study design (PICOS).	3-4
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	5	Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number.	4
Eligibility criteria	6	Specify study characteristics (e.g., PICOS, length of follow-up) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale.	5
Information sources	7	Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched.	5
Search	8	Present full electronic search strategy for at least one database, including any limits used, such that it could be repeated.	5
Study selection	9	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis).	6
Data collection process	10	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	6
Data items	11	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	6
Risk of bias in individual studies	12	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	5
Summary measures	13	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	6
Synthesis of results	14	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	6



PRISMA 2009 Checklist

Page 1 of 2

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported on page #
Risk of bias across studies	15	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	6
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	6
RESULTS			
Study selection	17	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram.	7
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	7-8
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment (see item 12).	8
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	9-11
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	9-11
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies (see Item 15).	11
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression [see Item 16]).	11
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	11-13
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	13-14
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	14
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	19

From: Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, The PRISMA Group (2009). Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 6(6): e1000097. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed1000097

For more information, visit: www.prisma-statement.org.

Page 2 of 2

For peer review only - <http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml>