Evento: COBRAF
Modalidade: PÔSTER
Tema: C03. Ética, Ensino e Pesquisa em Fisioterapia

Abstracts of low back pain systematic reviews are inaccurate with the full-text: a cross-sectional analysis

DAFNE PORT NASCIMENTO (D P N) - UNIVERSIDADE CIDADE DE SÃO PAULO - dafnepn@yahoo.com.br, Gabrielle Zoldan Gonzalez (G Z G) - Universidade Cidade de São Paulo, Amanda Costa Araujo (A C A) - Universidade Cidade de São Paulo, Anne M Moseley (A M M) - The University of Sydney, Chris G Maher (C G M) - The University of Sydney, Leonardo Oliveira Pena Costa (L O P C) - Universidade Cidade de São Paulo

Background: The accuracy between abstract and full-text in general medicine is very low in systematic reviews. However, the methods used to analyse accuracy of abstracts were only related to numerical data presented in the abstract and the corresponding section in the body of the article. Literature has not shown consistency in the utilization of instruments to analyse systematic reviews abstracts' accuracy.
Objectives: Our main objective was to investigate the accuracy of systematic reviews abstracts in the field of low back pain, by applying two different instruments evaluating reporting quality and overstating of information (spin), to compare with data reported in their full-texts.
Methods: We included fully published systematic reviews in low back pain from PEDro, published from 2015 to 2017. Two independent authors collected data and disagreements were resolved by consensus. The accuracy of abstracts was analysed by comparing information contained in the abstracts with information stated in the full-text. We used two instruments for the analyses: 1) the 12-item checklist from the PRISMA recommendations for abstracts (range 0-12, meaning lower to higher reporting quality), to evaluate the reviews' reporting quality; 2) the 7-item spin list (range 0-7, meaning lower to higher levels of spin), to evaluate the presence of spin of information in the reviews. We then calculated agreement between the ratings for each item for the abstract and full-text. We considered an item to be inaccurate when its level of agreement between the abstract and full-text was lower than 80%. Results were presented descriptively.
Results: 65 systematic reviews were analysed. Accuracy was low with a median level of agreement between abstract and full-text ranging from 56.9% for the PRISMA recommendations for abstracts to 77.0% with the 7-item scale. The mean (SD; range) PRISMA for fully reported items in the abstracts was 4.9 (2.7; 0-12) and 8.6 (2.7; 0-12) in full-texts. The mean (SD; range) 7-item spin score in the abstracts was 2.2 (1.8; 0-7) and 1.1 (1.4; 0-7) in full-texts.
Conclusion: Abstracts of systematic reviews in the low back pain field are inaccurate with the full-text. If an abstract has shown to be of the interest of a reader, he/she should read the full-text of the article to make his/her own interpretations. Readers should not take a clinical decision based on the abstract only.