



Strengthening the Evidence in Exercise Sciences Initiative (SEES Initiative)

Assessment Report for Individual Study

Study title

Impact of prenatal exercise on maternal harms, labour and delivery outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis

PMID

30337349

Journal

Br J Sports Med

Type of Publication and Period of assessment

Systematic Review with Meta-Analysis, SEES Pack 1

| Component | Item | SEES assessment |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|
| Transparency | Registration: Is the review registered in a public database? | Yes - Registered in PROSPERO |
| Transparency | Protocol: Is there referral of a publicly available methodological protocol? (Note: if so, you must also use the protocol to consult information about the review) | No |
| Completeness | Title: Is the study identified as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both? | Yes |
| Completeness | Abstract: Does the abstract list the data sources used in the review? (Note: if more than five databases were used, simplified or partial referral should be considered as "Yes") | No |
| Completeness | Abstract: Does the abstract inform key eligibility criteria for study selection? | Yes |
| Participants | Abstract: Is there a description regarding the population (participants) or main condition(s) addressed in the review? | Yes |
| Intervention / Exposure | Abstract: Is there a description regarding the interventions/exposures (or, broadly, independent variables) addressed in the review? | Yes |
| Completeness | Abstract: Is there a description of the number of included studies? | Yes |
| Outcome | Abstract: Is there a result description for the main outcome of interest? | Yes |
| Completeness | Introduction: Is there a description for the research question (with PICOS elements) or precisely stated objectives (with PICOS) ? | Yes |
| Transparency | Methods: Is there at least one search query fully available? (Note: a full search query should allow complete replication) | Yes |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: Did the search strategy include non-published evidence? ("grey literature") | Yes |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: If the search is restricted for evidence generated after 1980, is there an indirect or direct justification related to the time range? | The searches were carried out from the database inception (earliest date) |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: How many languages were considered for study eligibility? | 3 |
| Completeness | Methods: Is there a detailed explanation of eligibility criteria for PICOS elements? (Note: detailed explanation should allow complete replication) | Yes |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: Was the study selection carried out in duplicate? | Yes |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: Was the data extraction carried out in duplicate? | No |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: Is there a description of the assessment of risk of biases? | Yes |
| Methodological rigor | Methods: Was the assessment of risk of biases carried out in duplicate? | No |
| Outcome | Methods: Is there a description of the statistical combination (meta-analysis) regarding the effect measure (e.g., relative risk or mean difference), statistical method (e.g., inverse variance), and effects approach (fixed or random)? | Yes |
| Outcome | Methods: Is there a description regarding the assessment of statistical heterogeneity? | Yes |
| Completeness | Results: Is there a full description regarding the numbers of references (retrieval, eligibility, synthesis)? | Yes |
| Completeness | Results: Is there a description about the sample sizes of individual studies? | Yes |
| Participants, Intervention / Exposure | Results: Is there a full description of characteristics? (Note: the available PICOS elements should be considered) | Yes |

| | | |
|--------------------|--|---|
| Completeness | Results: Is there a description of study duration (follow-up lengths)? | No |
| Outcome | Results: Is there a minimally recommended description of meta-analytic summary estimates? (Note: binary outcomes as frequencies with and without the event (or as proportions such as 12/45); continuous outcomes as the mean, standard deviation, and sample size for each group) | Yes |
| Outcome | Results: Is there a full description of individual results for studies composing the meta-analysis? (Note: effects size, imprecision measure and percentage weight should be considered) | Yes |
| Critical appraisal | Results: Is there a description of risk of bias within studies? (Note: your assessment should be based on the characteristic of the RoB tool) | Partial Yes (there are individual results without specification of specific criteria/domains) |
| Critical appraisal | Results: Is there a description for non-planned modifications to the synthesis during the course of the review? (e.g.: change in eligibility criteria or RoB tools; please, what was changed and its justification [why] should be considered). | Partial Yes (there are individual results without specification of specific criteria/domains) |
| Critical appraisal | Discussion: Is there a potential spin bias based on a specific reporting strategy to highlight that the experimental treatment (or condition of interest) leads to the hypothesized result? | No |
| Critical appraisal | Discussion: Are the results discussed in light of the risk of biases in individual studies? | No |
| Critical appraisal | Discussion: Are limitations discussed at the study/outcome and/or at the review level? | No |
| Transparency | Is there a statement regarding the data availability (data sharing plan)? | No |
| Completeness | Is there a statement regarding the sources of funding? (Note: funding for the review itself) | Yes |
| Completeness | Did the review authors declare whether they had any conflicts of interest (COI)? | Yes, authors declare non-financial COIs |