Letter to the editor regarding recently published systematic integrated review related to the role of preoperative laboratory testing in elective oral and maxillofacial surgeries

Sir,

National Journal of Maxillofacial Surgery recently published a research paper titled "Too much information with little meaning," relevance of preoperative laboratory testing in elective oral and maxillofacial (OMF) surgeries: A systematic integrative review.[1] The objectives of this review were to compile and appraise the available literature for understanding the current perspectives of the surgeons and anesthetists in preparing their patients for the elective OMF surgeries and suggest an algorithm for the selection of relevant preoperative laboratory tests. The authors correctly emphasized the role of preoperative laboratory testing in elective OMF surgeries and the importance of evaluating their efficacy through effective research. Due to their commendable research goals, we read this paper with great interest; however, it appears to have few methodological errors listed below:

1. The guidelines recommended for literature search and data extraction of a systematic review were not followed by authors in this integrated systematic review?[2]
2. There was no mention of an *a priori* registration in a systematic review registry such as PROSPERO[3]
3. PRISMA flowchart regarding the literature search and exclusion of studies at various stages along with their reasons for exclusion, has not been provided in the article[4]
4. The Risk of Bias analysis of the included studies and systematic reviews was not performed. This is another essential feature of any systematic review.[5-7]

A systematic review is a review of a formulated question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, and critically appraise relevant research, and to collect and analyze data from the studies that are included in the review. A systematic search strategy is essential to avoid a bias related to literature search, study selection, and hence their interpretation. PRISMA guidelines should be followed for a transparent reporting of systematic review and meta-analysis. Furthermore, the registration of protocol of a systematic review at PROSPERO or any other registry can help to avoid duplication. The risk of bias tools help to assess the methodological quality of a study/systematic review and to determine the extent to which a study has addressed the possibility of bias in its design, conduct, and analysis.

Therefore, I would like to commend the authors for addressing an important research question but would humbly suggest that in future, they should give considerations to the point raised in this letter to avoid any methodological and reporting errors.

Financial support and sponsorship

Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

Keerthana Gowthaman, Morankar Rahul, Tewari Nitesh

Division of Pedodontics and Preventive Dentistry, Centre for Dental Education and Research, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India

E-mail: captainrahul88@gmail.com

Received: 02 July 2020, **Accepted in Revised Form:** 26 September 2020, **Published:** 16 March 2021

REFERENCES

1. Kaur TS, Chatterjee BP. "Too much informationwith little meaning," relevance of preoperative laboratory testing in electiveoral and maxillofacial surgeries: A systematic integrative review. Natl J Maxillofac Surg 2020;11:3-9.
2. Wormald R, Evans J. What makes systematic reviews systematic and why are they the highest level of evidence? Ophthalmic Epidemiol 2018;25:27-30.
3. Booth A, Clarke M, Dooley G, Ghersi D, Moher D, Petticrew M, *et al*. The nuts and bolts of PROSPERO: An international prospective register of systematic reviews. Syst Rev 2012;1:2.
4. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG, PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA Statement. PLoS Med 2009;6:e1000097.
5. The Joanna Briggs Institute. JBI Critical Appraisal Checklist for Analytical Cross-Sectional Studies; 2016. Available from: http://joannabriggs.org/assets/docs/critical-appraisaltools/JBI CriticalAppraisalChecklistforAnalyticalCrossSectionalStudies2017.

[Last accessed on 2020 Jun 18].
6. Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JP, Caldwell DM, Reeves BC, Shea B, *et al*. ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. J Clin Epidemiol 2016;69:225-34.
7. Shea BJ, Reeves BC, Wells G, Thuku M, Hamel C, Moran J, *et al*. AMSTAR 2: A critical appraisal tool for systematic reviews that include randomised or non-randomised studies of healthcare interventions, or both. BMJ 2017;358:j4008.

Access this article online

Website: www.njms.in

DOI: 10.4103/njms.NJMS_134_20

Quick Response Code

How to cite this article: Gowthaman K, Rahul M, Nitesh T. Letter to the editor regarding recently published systematic integrated review related to the role of preoperative laboratory testing in elective oral and maxillofacial surgeries. Natl J Maxillofac Surg 2021;12:128-9.