[Link](https://tufts.app.box.com/integrations/officeonline/openOfficeOnline?fileId=1363454454716&sharedAccessCode=) to spreadsheet

Action Items:

* All papers whose column W, “Age reported at baseline” are highlighted indicate that the paper did not provide an age at baseline for all study participants.
  + Ex: only baseline range was reported or only the age at baseline was reported for a subset of the study participants
  + Brooke: there are a few cases where I’ll have to ask Renata how to handle, but otherwise, this is done
* All papers whose column AD, “Years of follow-up – Average or maximum” is highlighted indicates that the following-up phrasing was not clear and needs to be discussed.
  + Brooke: resolved

Section to look at:

* Bechthold\_2019\_pf\_seafood\_IHD
  + Studies highlighted in blue are ones that I did not initially include but included after extracting the forest plot weights. Is MI a type of IHD? I thought they were separate events.
    - Brooke: include (resolved)
  + Studies highlighted in orange are ones that I did include but were not included in the forest weight plots. I was hoping you could explain why some of these weren’t included. Most of these papers have CHD as an outcome, so I am not sure why they aren’t included. Some studies do report HR or OR instead of RR, but then some studies that are included do that as well, so it is not consistent. I highlighted them in orange so that we can just delete them, but it seems strange that they are not included.
    - Brooke: do not include these (resolved)
* Bechthold\_2019\_pf\_seafood\_TSTK
  + Studies highlighted in blue are ones that I did not initially include but included after extracting the forest plot weights.
    - Brooke: include (resolved)
  + Studies highlighted in orange are ones that I did include but were not included in the forest weight plots.
    - Brooke: do not include (resolved)

Specific highlighted cells to flag ones to flag:

* Bechthold\_2019\_pf\_pm\_ISTK
  + Amiano 2016
    - Follow-up typo in meta-analysis. Says 13.6, should say 13.8
      * Brooke: resolved
  + [Larsson, 2011 women’s study](file:///C:\Users\kebat\Box\lasting_aim_3\planning\Summer%202023\Kyra\o%09https:\www-ahajournals-org.ezproxy.library.tufts.edu\doi\10.1161\STROKEAHA.110.596510%3furl_ver=Z39.88-2003&rfr_id=ori:rid:crossref.org&rfr_dat=cr_pub%20%200pubmed)
    - Meta analysis says age range is ~60. But the range in the paper is 49-83 y.o.
      * Brooke: resolved
* Bechthold\_2019\_pf\_seafood\_IHD
  + Buckland, 2009
    - Total n does not match up, meta-analysis and one of the tables in the paper say one thing, the abstract says another. But the baseline characteristics table says the same as the abstract
      * Brooke: resolved
  + Fraser, 1992
    - Only provides minimum age at baseline
      * Brooke: don’t need this anyway
  + Iso, 2006
    - The 196 events are just for the number of fatal coronary heart events. Wasn’t sure if that is important or not, since there are more events that the paper discusses.
      * Brooke: resolved
  + Martinez Gonzalez (might not matter as this is highlighted in orange)
    - Paper doesn’t provide a formal range, but 38 is the mean. There are lower age groups found in table 1, but the metanalysis reports the minimum age as 38.
      * not included
  + Holmberg, 2009 (might not matter as this is highlighted in orange)
    - The n in the paper is different than what is in the meta-analysis. Mean age is based on n in paper. See n in column O and n in column W.
      * not included
* Bechthold\_2019\_pf\_seafood\_TSTK
  + Misirili, 2012
    - Meta-analysis says range is “NA”, study itself does not clearly state range.
      * Brooke: leave as NA (resolved)
  + Myint, 2006
    - The number of participants reported in meta-analysis is wrong. They reported only the number of men but indicate that it is males and females. The number of incidents consider males and females.
      * Brooke: resolved
  + Atkinson, 2011 (might not matter as this is highlighted in orange)
    - From abstract: During a median follow-up of 18 years, 225 strokes (209 ischemic and 19 hemorrhagic) - this adds up to 228, not 225. I assume some participants had both but wanted to flag just in case.
      * not included

**Brooke left to do:**

* ~~All of Kyra’s notes above~~
* ~~Forest plot weight (column U): calculate~~
* ~~Study-weighted average baseline age (column X): Email Renata about subgroup age ranges~~
* ~~Reported years of follow-up (columns AD-AE): review yellow highlights~~
* ~~Calculated years of follow-up (column AG): copy over numbers~~
* ~~Age at event (column AK): calculate~~
* ~~Have Sophia double check sample size (column O)?~~