



- [Home](#)
- [About Us](#)
- [Publications](#)
- [Checklist](#)
- [FAQs](#)
- [Contact Us](#)

AMSTAR 2 Results

[Printer Friendly Version](#)

Article Name: PHARYNGOCUTANEOUS FISTULA FOLLOWING PRIMARY TOTAL LARY

PHARYNGOCUTANEOUS FISTULA FOLLOWING PRIMARY TOTAL LARYNGECTOMY is a High quality review

- | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO? | Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes |
| 2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? | YesYesYesYes |
| 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? | Yes

Yes |
| 4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? | Yes

Yes
Yes
Yes
Yes |
| 5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? | Yes |
| 6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? | Yes
Yes |
| 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? | Yes

Yes |
| 8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? | Partial Yes
Yes
Yes |

Yes
Yes
Yes

9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review?

RCT

Yes
0

NRSI

Yes
Yes

10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review?

Yes
Yes

11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results?

RCT

Yes

NRSI

Yes

Yes
Yes
Yes

12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis?

Yes
Yes

13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review?

Yes
Yes

14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review?

Yes
Yes

15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review?

Yes
Yes

16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review?

Yes
Yes

To cite this tool: Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, Moher D, Tugwell P, Welch V, Kristjansson E, Henry DA. AMSTAR 2: a critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. *BMJ*. 2017 Sep 21;358:j4008.

[<< Back](#)

Copyright © 2021 AMSTAR All Rights Reserved |

