Auto-reproducability literature review

Andreas Moe

February 22, 2026

1 Abstract

2 Introduction

2.1 Rationale

2.2 Objectives

3 Methods

3.1 Eligibility criteria

3.2 Information sources

3.3 Search strategy

3.4 Selection process

3.5 Data collection process

3.6 Data items

3.7 Study risk of bias assessment

3.8 Effect measures

3.9 Synthesis methods

3.10 Reporting bias assessment

3.11 Certainty assessment

4 Results

4.1 Study selection

Identification

Records identified from*:
Databases ($n = $)
Registers ($n = $)

Records removed before screening:
Duplicate records removed ($n = $)
Records marked as ineligible by automation tools ($n = $)
Records removed for other reasons ($n = $)

Records screened
($n = $)

Records excluded**
($n = $)

Screening

Reports sought for retrieval
($n = $)

Reports not retrieved
($n = $)

Reports assessed for eligibility
($n = $)

Reports excluded:
Reason 1 ($n = $)
Reason 2 ($n = $)
Reason 3 ($n = $)
etc.

Included

Studies included in review
($n = $)
Reports of included studies
($n = $)

Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 flow diagram for new systematic reviews which included searches of databases and registers only. Source: Page MJ, et al. BMJ 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71. Licensed under CC BY 4.0.

*Consider, if feasible to do so, reporting the number of records identified from each database or register searched (rather than the total number across all databases/registers).
**If automation tools were used, indicate how many records were excluded by a human and how many were excluded by automation tools.

Appendix

References