

Tutorial Metanálise

Bernardo Diniz Coutinho, Ph.D, PT, Ac



Dez 2018

TUTORIAL METANÁLISE NO REVIEW MANAGER 5.4.1 (REV MAN)

- Para dados contínuos selecionar os dados:
 - Autor, ano
 - Desfecho e instrumento de medida
 - Média, SD, N para intervenção e comparação
- Para dados categóricos selecionar os dados:
 - Autor, ano
 - Desfecho
 - Frequência absoluta de eventos ocorridos, total de eventos

Nos dados categóricos, a interpretação é quantos do total desenvolveram o desfecho.

5 Review Manager 5.4.1				- 0	×
<u>File E</u> dit F <u>o</u> rmat <u>V</u> iew <u>T</u> ools T <u>a</u> ble <u>W</u> indow <u>H</u> elp					
	🐚 🙆 😻 🌮 🏠	$\blacksquare B \dot{\delta} \underline{u} x^2 x_2 \underline{\mathscr{A}} 1$			
e e					
New Review Wizard			X		
New Review Wizard			2		
Welcome					
Welcome to the Ne This wizard helps you create a new If you want to create a Cochrane re	ew Review Wizard v review for other purposes than public view for publication, please contact the	ation in The Cochrane Library. appropriate Review Group.			
To continue, click Next.					
Cancel	< <u>B</u> ack <u>N</u> ext>		<u>F</u> inish		

🗅 🚄 🗏

▼ **B** i u ײ ×₂ 🖉 Ŧ 🗄 🖅 🖅 🐼 🗸

<u>File Edit Format View Tools Table Window Help</u>

Which type of ravia	de veu wentte create?	
Type of Review:	do you want to create?	
 Intervention revie 	v	
 Diagnostic test ad 		
 Methodology revi 	w	
Overview of revie	vs	
Elexible review		
Sub Type: Prognosi		
Sub Type: Trognost	·	



Q N	ew Review Wizard				X
New W	Review Wizard hat is the title of the review?				?
Title:					
۲	[Intervention]	for	[health problem]		
0	[Intervention A]	versus	[intervention B]	for	[health problem]
\circ	[Intervention]	for	[health problem]	in	[participant group/location]
\circ	[Use if title does not fit a	ny of the	formats above]		
<u>C</u>	ancel		< <u>B</u> ack <u>N</u> ext>		<u>F</u> inish



0 N	ew Review Wizard				X
New W	Review Wizard hat is the title of the review?				2
Title:					
0	[Intervention]	for	[health problem]		
۲	Acupuncture Plus Exercise	versus	Sham Acupuncture Plus Exe	for	Chronic musculoskeletal pair
\circ	[Intervention]	for	[health problem]	in	[participant group/location]
0	[Use if title does not fit any o	f the forn	nats above]		
<u>C</u> i	ancel		< <u>B</u> ack <u>N</u> ext >		<u>F</u> inish

5	Review	/ Mana	iger 5	i.4.1																	_		\times
File	Edit	F <u>o</u> rm	nat	View	Tools	T <u>a</u> ble	Wind	ow <u>H</u> e	elp C ^{al}	C D	Ó	OK∕ ⊌BC	1	None	 •	B <i>i</i>	<u>u</u> x ²	×2	2			•	
																				_			

lew Review Wizard		9
Which stage should the review start in	1?	ă
Stage:		
○ <u>T</u> itle only		
<u>P</u> rotocol		
Eull review		
Cancel	< Back Next >	Einieh
callee		<u>F</u> imsn





Clica com a direita em cima da palavra "included" para abrir a caixa

💽 🖻 🖳 🔐 1+2 🏦 🐺 🛷 🕞 🗸	Text of Review		
Intervention review		2 📑	
🖹 Title			
Review information	□ Studies awaiting classification	Ê	
🖏 Main text	□ Ongoing studies		
🗢 🖺 Abstract			
🗢 🖺 Plain language summary	Other references		
🗢 🖺 Background			
 Objectives 	Additional references		
• 🗒 Methods	Other published versions of this review		
• 🗓 Results			
• 🗓 Discussion	Classification pending references		
 ● ● Authors' conclusions 	Data and analyses		
Acknowledgements	Add Comparison		
Contributions of authors	E Figures		
Declarations of interest			
 Differences between protocol and revi Rublished entry 	Sources of sur		
Published notes	D Notes		
Tables M Studies and references	Internal sources Print		
- W References to studies	No sources of support p 2 Help		
 Included studies 			
- Excluded studies			
- Studies awaiting classification	No sources of support provided		
Ongoing studies			
← I Other references			
📲 Data and analyses	Appendices	=	
🗛 Figures 📃	Appendices	-	

Acupuliciture Flus Exercise versus Flacebols					
🗎 🖻 🖪 📄 1+2 🏦 🐺 💣 🖬 🗸 👘	Text of Review 🗙 1.1 Pain				
템 Main text					
• U Abstract		, ,			_
• 🗐 Plain language summary	l∣⊫ Data and analyse	es			
► 🗒 Background					
 B Objectives 	🕒 1 Placebo / Sham 🖤				
► 🗒 Methods	Outrans on Submerry	Otypeliese	Dentisinsent		
🕶 🗓 Results	Outcome or Subgroup	studies	Participants	statistical Method	Effect Estimate
🕶 🗓 Discussion	1 1 Dain	0	0	Mean Difference (IV, Eived, 05%	Not estimable
🕶 🗒 Authors' conclusions	1.1 Falli	U U	0	CI)	Not estimable
 Acknowledgements 					
 	1.1.1 Back Pain	0	0	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95%	Not estimable
 B Declarations of interest 	📑 Add Study Da	ita		CI)	
 B Differences between protocol and revi 	Edit Subgrou	p			
Published notes	🗆 Figures 🗟 Delete Subgr	oup			
Tables =	Rename Sub	aroup			
🕼 Studies and references		group			
- 🕅 References to studies	Cut				
🗣 🛞 Included studies	□ Internal so ^{□□ Copy}				
- 🐼 Excluded studies	No sources Paste				
- 🐼 Studies awaiting classification	A Move Up				
- 🐼 Ongoing studies	🗉 External s 🐺 Move Down				
Other references	No sources Properties				
📲 Data and analyses					
🗛 Figures	E Feedbad				
🐯 Sources of support	Print				
Peedback					
Appendices					-

Lançar os dados de cada estudo

🔁 📝 🗟 📴 1-2 🏦 🐺 💣 🖬 🗸 👔 Text of Review 🔀 1.1 Pain	
Main text Mon Text Comparison: 1 Placebo / Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Pain	* 2 4 2
Abstract Experimental Control Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Plain language summary Study or Subgroup C Mean SD Total Hean SD Total Vegative Vegat	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
• 🗒 Background	
□ B Objectives 3 3 3 25 6 6 25 11.4% -3.00 [-5.63, -0.37]	-
Image: Book of the second	📮
Image: Base of the second	t +
← 🗄 Discussion Subtal (95% Cl) 135 100.0% 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37]	
Heterogenetity: Chi [*] = 7.88, df = 2 (P = 0.02); l [*] = 75%	
B Acknowledgements	
Contributions of authors Total (95% Cl) Total (95% Cl) 135 135 135 100 0% 0 48 (-0.41 1.37)	
B Declarations of interest	
B Differences between protocol and rev Test for overall effect: Z = 1.06 (P = 0.29)	-100 -50 0 50 100
Published notes Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable	[experimental] Favours [contro
Tables	
🕼 Studies and references 🛛 🕹	
References to studies	
← 🚯 Included studies	
- Kan Excluded studies	
- 🐼 Studies awaiting classification	
- R Ongoing studies	
← KØ Other references	
+ Data and analyses	
Figures	
Sources of support	
Feedback	
Appendices	

Image:	Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo	Shan	n for Chronic Low Back Pain									° ⊂ ⊠
Wane det Main det Main det Main det Man bartard. Comparison: 1 Placebo' Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Plan More to More the second of	🔁 📝 🗟 📄 1+2 🏦 🐺 💣 🖬 🗸 🚦	Те	ext of Review X 1.1 Pain									
Abstract Image: Second Biology Control Image: Second Biology Control Image: Second Biology Control Image: Second Biology	Main text	С	omparison: 1 Placebo / Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Pain							MD FE		⊒昌 ? ◄⇒
Image and the interval of the i	🕶 🗐 Abstract			E	periment	al		Control			Chinge to: Random Eff	Mean Difference
Image: Sector our description of authors Image: Sector our description of authors of a	🕶 🗓 Plain language summary 🛛 🗕 🗕		Study or Subgroup \bigtriangledown	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight 1	I', Fixed, 95% Cl	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
B Objectives 3 3 25 6 6 25 11.4% -3.001/5.63.0.37.3 B Methods C proster 2020 4 4 10 4 4 10 6.4% 0.00 (2.51, 3.51) B Authors' conclusions B Attached 2014 4 4 4 10 6.4% 0.00 (3.51, 3.51) B Authors' conclusions B Attached 2014 4 4 4 10 6.4% 0.00 (3.51, 3.51) B Authors' conclusions Testfor overall effect Z = 1.06 (P = 0.29) 135 136 0.00.0% 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] Total (95% CI) 135 135 100.0% 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] 100 -50 0 50 100 B Deferences Total (95% CI) 135 136 136 100.0% 0.48 [-0.41, 1.37] 100 -50 0 50 100 B Deferences between protocol and rev Testfor subgroup differences: Not applicable Image: State and references Image: State and references Image: State and references Image: State and refferences Image: State and references <	🕶 🗓 Background	V	1.1.1 Back Pain									
Image: Second	— 🖹 Objectives	~	Romero 2020	3	3	25	6	6	25	11.4%	-3.00 [-5.63, -0.37]	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •
Image: Seventia	🕶 🗒 Methods	~	Foster 2007	4	4	100	3	3	100	82.2%	1.00 [0.02, 1.98]	
 Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Discussion Acknowledgements Contributions of authors Differences between protocol and reve Differences Differences Studies and feferences Differences Studies awaiing classification Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices 	🕶 🗎 Results	r	Al Rashoud 2014	4	4	10	4	4	10	6.4%	0.00 [-3.51, 3.51]	
Authors' conclusions Authors' conclusions Acknowledgements Controlutions of authors Declarations of interest Declarations Declarating of interest Declaration	🕶 🖺 Discussion		Subtotal (95% CI)			135			135	100.0%	0.48 [-0.41, 1.37]	
Acknowledgements B Acknowledgements Contributions of authors B Declarations of interest B Declarations of interest B Deflemences between protocol and revel B Published notes Tables Studies and references Studies awaiting classification B Cudded studies C Cudded studies B Cudded studies C Cudded studies B Cudded studies C Cudded	🕶 🗐 Authors' conclusions		Heterogeneity: Chi [*] = 7.88, df = 2 (P = 0.02); l [*] = 75%									
 Contributions of authors Declarations of interest Differences between protocol and rev Published notes Studies and references Studies and references Studies and references Studies and inglases Studies and inglases Studies and analyses Studies and analyses Feedback Appendices 	B Acknowledgements		Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.06 (P = 0.29)$									
B Declarations of interest B Differences between protocol and rev B Published notes Tables B Studies and references B References to studies B References to studies B Studies awaiting classification B Studies awaiting classification B Figures S Sources of support Feedback A panelices	 Contributions of authors 		Total (95% CI)			135			135	100.0%	0 /8 [-0 /1 1 37]	
 Differences between protocol and rev Published notes Tables Studies and references Studies awaiting classification Studies awaiting classification Stud	 B Declarations of interest 		Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 7.88 \text{ df} = 2 (P = 0.02); I^2 = 75\%$			100			155	100.070	0.40[-0.41, 1.07]	
B Published notes Tables Studies and references References to studies Studies awaiting classification Studies awaiting classification Sources of support Figures Sources of support Feedback	Differences between protocol and revi		Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.06$ (P = 0.29)									-100 -50 0 50 100
Tables Studies and references References to studies References Studies awaiting classification References Option references Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Feedback	Published notes		Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable									[experimental] Favours [contro
Studies and references References to studies References to studies Excluded studies Studies awaiting classification Ongoing studies Other references Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Peebback Appendices	💷 Tables 📃				I			I				
References to studies Included studies Excluded studies Studies awaiting classification Ongoing studies Other references Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices	Studies and references											
 Included studies Excluded studies Studies awaiting classification Ongoing studies Other references Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices 	P References to studies											
Excluded studies Studies awaiting classification Ongoing studies Other references Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices Footnote:	- Included studies											
Studies awaiting classification Ongoing studies Other references Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices	Excluded studies											
Image: Construction of the second state of the second s	- Studies awaiting classification											
Contraction of the second	Ongoing studies											
 Data and analyses Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices 	• I Other references											
Figures Sources of support Feedback Appendices	T Data and analyses											
Sources of support Feedback Appendices Footnote: Footnote:												
Preedback	Sources of support											
Appendices	D Feedback											
	Annendices	L.	ata ata									
		FOO	bulote:									

Heterogeneidade baixa = fixed effects Heterogeneidade alta = random effects

Quando a Heterogeneidade é baixa tanto faz utilizar efeitos fixos ou aleatórios. O convencional é sempre utilizar efeitos aleatórios.

Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebol	Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain										o C	ĭ 🛛
💽 🖉 🕓 1+2 🏦 🐺 🛷 🖬 🗸	Text of Review X 1.1 Pain											
Main text	Comparison: 1 Placebo / Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Pain						+	MD RE ·	4 🗽 🖥 👯	or 🖬 📑	? •	
🔶 🖺 Abstract		Ev	nerimen	tal		Control			Mean Differenc	Mean	lifference	50
🗣 🗓 Plain language summary 🛛 🗕	Study or Subgroup 🗸	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95%	IV. Rand	om, 95% Cl	
🕶 🗓 Background	✓ 1.1.1 Back Pain											
— 🖹 Objectives	Romero 2020	3	3	25	6	6	25	31.5%	-3.00 [-5.63, -(
🗢 🗎 Methods	Foster 2007	4	4	100	3	3	100	43.2%	1.00 [0.02, 1		•	
🕶 🗒 Results	Al Rashoud 2014	4	4	10	4	4	10	25.3%	0.00 [-3.51, 3		+	
🔶 🖺 Discussion	Subtotal (95% CI)			135			135	100.0%	-0.51 [-3.15, 2		•	
- 🕲 Authors' conclusions	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.93; Chi ² = 7.88, df = 2 (P = 0.02); l ² = 75%											
Acknowledgements	Test for overall effect: Z = 0.38 (P = 0.70)											
 Contributions of authors 	Total (95% CI)			125			125	100.0%	-0.51[-2.15.1			
 Declarations of interest 	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 3.93; Chi ² = 7.88, df = 2 (P = 0.02); l ² = 75%			155			155	100.070	-0.01[-0.10,2			
 B Differences between protocol and revi 	Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.38$ (P = 0.70)									-100 -50	Ó 5Ö 1	00
Published notes	Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable									[experimental]	Favours (con	trc
🎹 Tables 📃					I							
Studies and references												
P References to studies												
Included studies												
Excluded studies												
- Studies awaiting classification												
Ongoing studies												
• 11 Other references												
-1 Data and analyses												
Figures												
Sources of support												
Teedback										•		
Appendices	Footnote:											



Para realizar a análise de sensibilidade deve-se clicar na caixa do estudo e tirar a seleção. Após, olhar o valor da heterogeneidade.

👩 Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo/S	Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain										▫゚⊏៓⊠
🗈 🖻 🗟 📄 1+2 🏦 🏶 🛷 🖬 🗸 👘	Text of Review X 1.1 Pain										
Main text	Comparison: 1 Placebo / Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Pain						+	MD RE -	4 🗽 🔒 🧱	# 🖬 🖴	? ++
Abstract	Otudu az Outbaraun z	Ex	periment	tal		Control		Maight	Mean Differenc {	Mean Dit	fference
🛏 🗓 Plain language summary —	Study or Subgroup 🗸	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	weight	IV, Random, 95%	IV, Randor	n, 95% Cl
🛏 🗓 Background	✓ 1.1.1 Back Pain										
— 🖹 Objectives	Romero 2020	3	3	25	6	6	25	0.0%	-3.00 [-5.63, -0		
🛏 🖺 Methods	Foster 2007	4	4	100	3	3	100	92.8%	1.00 [0.02, 1	-	- - [] []
🛏 🗓 Results	Al Rashoud 2014	4	4	10	4	4	10	7.2%	0.00 [-3.51, 3		
🛏 🗓 Discussion	Subtotal (95% CI)			110			110	100.0%	0.93 [-0.02, 1	l f	
- 🗎 Authors' conclusions	Heterogeneity: 1 au* = 0.00; Chi* = 0.29, dt = 1 (P = 0.59); I* = 0%										
- 🖹 Acknowledgements	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.93 (P = 0.05)										
 	Total (95% CI)			110			110	100.0%	0.931-0.02		
 B Declarations of interest 	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00: Chi ² = 0.29. df = 1 (P = 0.59); l ² = 0%						- 110	100.070	0.00[0.02,		
— 🖹 Differences between protocol and revi	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.93 (P = 0.05)									-2 -1 0	1 Ż
🗉 Published notes	Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable									[experimental]	Favours [contro
🗉 Tables 📃				!							
Studies and references									1000		
- 🐼 References to studies									1000		
- 🕅 Included studies											
Excluded studies											
- 🐼 Studies awaiting classification									0.000		
Ongoing studies											
W Other references											
Data and analyses											
Figures									1000		
Sources of support									1000		
D Feedback		Ш								•	
	Footnote:										
	Loonote.										

<u>File Edit Format View Tools Table Window Help</u> B ἐ ц ײ ×₂ ∠ 升 註 註 導 緯 № № Ω 🔲 V 💱 🍃 🗅 🧉 🗄 5 0

Para ajustar a escala do gráfico clica na escala abaixo

5 Review Manager 5.4.1

đ X

D 6 2 4 + 5 4 21) 🖉 💖 👯	B â <u>u</u> x ²				
🙀 Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo/S	Sham for Chronic L	.ow Back Pain				□ □ □
🗈 🖻 🔍 🖿 1+2 🏦 🐺 🛷 🕞 🗸 🚺	Text of Review	X 1.1 Pain				
Main text	Comparison: 1 P	Placebo / Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Pain			🖻 MC RE 君 🔝 🔡	/ ⊒ 🔒 🔋 🔶
► 🗓 Abstract ► 🖺 Plain language summary —		Study or Subgroup $rac{1}{r}$	Experimental Mean SD Total	Control Mean SD Total	Weight Mea Forest plot	Mean Difference
► Dackground	1 Back Pain				0.00/ 0.00/ 5.00 0.077	
 ■ Objectives ▶ ● Methods 	ter 2007	💐 Forest plot	1 31 31 251	<u>ר וח וח</u>	0.0% -3.001-5.63 -0.371	
▷ III Results Discussion III Authors' conclusions	ashoud 2014 total (95% CI) erogeneity: Tau	Experimental Study or Subgroup Mean SD Tota 1.1.1 Back Pain	Control al Mean SD Total Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	
Acknowledgements Contributions of authors Declarations of interest Contributions of interest Control of the second and real Control of the second and r	al (95% CI) progeneity: Tau	Romero 2020 3 3 25 Foster 2007 4 4 100 Al Rashoud 2014 4 4 100 Subtotal (95% Cl) 1100 100	5 6 6 25 0.0% 0 3 3 100 92.8% 0 4 4 10 7.2% 0 110 100.0%	-3.00 [-5.63, -0.37] 1.00 [0.02, 1.98] 0.00 [-3.51, 3.51] 0.93 [-0.02, 1.87]		
Published notes Tables	t for subgroup (Heterogeneity: 1au* = 0.00; Chi*= 0.29, dt Test for overall effect: Z = 1.93 (P = 0.05) Total (95% CI) 110	r=1 (P=0.59); P=0%	0.93 [-0.02, 1.87]		Favours [control]
Studies and references Studies Studies Studies Studies		Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.29, df Test for overall effect: Z = 1.93 (P = 0.05) Test for subgroup differences: Not applica	if= 1 (P = 0.59); I ^z = 0% able	F	-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [contro	2 01]
Excluded studies We studies awaiting classification Ongoing studies		?			Add as Figure	Cancel
Chher references Data and analyses						
Sources of support	•					
Appendices	Footnote:					

Clicar no Flrorest Plot para gerar o gráfico de metanálise

5 Review Manager 5.4.1

File Edit Format View Tools Table Window Help

đ \times

				·								
Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo/	Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain										□ □ □	X
🖸 📝 🗟 📴 1+2 🏦 🀺 💣 🖬 🗸	Text of Review X 1.1 Pain											
Main text	Comparison: 1 Placebo / Sham, Outcome: 1.1 Pain								RE 📫 🖾 🗐 🚟	1 1 I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	? ♦ →	
- D Abstract						Quatral						1000
 Plain language summary 	Study or Subgroup 🗸	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight C	hange to: Std. Mean Dif IV. Random, 95% CI	ference IV. Rando	m. 95% Cl	-
🕶 🗐 Background	1 Back Pain											100
— 🖹 Objectives	nero 2020	3	3	25	6	6	25	0.0%	-3.00 [-5.63, -0.37]			1000
🕶 🗐 Methods	ter 2007	4	4	100	3	3	100	92.8%	1.00 [0.02, 1.98]			and a
🕶 🗒 Results	ashoud 2014	4	4	10	4	4	10	7.2%	0.00 [-3.51, 3.51]			No.
- 🗒 Discussion	total (95% CI)			110			110	100.0%	0.93 [-0.02, 1.87]		\bullet	100
- 🗎 Authors' conclusions	erogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.29, df = 1 (P = 0.59); l ² = 0%											100
B Acknowledgements	t for overall effect: Z = 1.93 (P = 0.05)											1000
 Contributions of authors				110			440	400.00/	0.001.0.00.4.071			100
 Declarations of interest 	II (95% CI)			110			110	100.0%	0.93 [-0.02, 1.87]			and a
Differences between protocol and revi	For everall effect $7 = 1.02$ ($P = 0.05$)									-2 -1		and a
Published notes	t for subgroup differences: Not applicable									s [experimental]	Favours [control]	1000
Tables		II			I							and a
Studies and references												and a
References to studies												1000
												100
- Evoluded studies												1000
Studies awaiting classification												1000
												100
M Other references												100
T Data and analysis												100
												100
Courses of oursed												1000
Teachack										•		
Preedback												
웹 Appendices	Eootnote:											100
												18

Modificar a estimativa do efeito para SMD quando o desfecho for avaliado por instrumentos de medida diferentes.



Funnel plot: gráfico gerado para quando se tem 10 estudos para medir viés de publicação. Os pontos precisam estar dispersos no funnel plot.

👩 Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo/S	Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain				┍╴┖ 🖂
🗟 🕑 🗟 📴 1+2 🏦 🐺 💣 🖬 🗸	Text of Review X 1.1 Pain				
Main text					
Abstract	Outcome or Submerin	Chudica	Denticinente	Ctetistical Method	
🗝 🗒 Plain language summary	Outcome or subgroup	studies	Participants	statistical Method	Enect Estimate
► 🗒 Background	1 1 Pain	2	220	Std. Mean Difference (IV. Random, 95% CI)	0 26 [-0 01 0 52]
B Objectives					
► 🗒 Methods	1.1.1 Back Pain	2	220	Std. Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	0.26 [-0.01, 0.52]
► 🗒 Results					
Discussion					
Authors' conclusions	Add Figure				
 Acknowledgements 	🖻 Figur 🕲 Paste				
 	1→2 Renumber Figures tal Contro	ol St	d. Mean Difference	e Std. Mean Difference	
 B Declarations of interest 	Study or Total Mean SD	Total Weight	IV, Random, 95% (CI IV, Random, 95% CI	
 Differences between protocol and revi 	1.1.1 Bad 💆 Notes				
Published notes	Romero Print 25 6 6	25 0.0%	-3.00 [-5.63, -0.3	7] 61	
Tables 🗧	Al Rasho ? Help 10 4 4	10 9.2%	0.00 [-0.88, 0.8]	81 +	
Studies and references	Subtotal (95% CI) 110	110 100.0%	0.26 [0.01, 0.52	2]	
References to studies	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.36, df = 1 (P = 0.55	5); I² = 0%			
 Included studies 	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)				
Excluded studies	Total (95% CI) 110	110 100.0%	0.26 [-0.01, 0.52	2]	
Studies awaiting classification	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.36, df = 1 (P = 0.55	5); I² = 0%			
— 🐼 Ongoing studies	Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)			Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	100
Other references	Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable				
Data and analyses	Caption				
🙀 Figures	Forest plot of comparison: 1 Placebo / Sham, ou	tcome: 1 1 Pain			
😴 Sources of support					=
🕄 Feedback	Sources of support				
🖞 Appendices 📃 👻					

Adicionar a figura

5 Review Manager 5.4.1							_	ð X
<u>File Edit Format View Tools Table Window</u>	w <u>H</u> elp							
D 68 🔒 🔶 ÞC D0	1 🙆 🖤 🇊 Table o	cell 🔻 B i 😐	< ×2 🖉 🕂 🗄					
👩 Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo/St	ham for Chronic Low Back Pa	ain						
Image: A state of the state	Text of Review 🗶 1.1 Pa	ain 🛛 🗙 1.2 Disability 🚺	Figure 1 (Analys	sis 1.1)				
🗓 Main text 👘								
🕶 🖺 Abstract	- Data and an	alvaea						
🗣 🖺 Plain language summary 🛛 🗕	Data and ana	alyses						
🕶 🖺 Background	E 1 Placebo / Shar	n 🖑						
— 🖹 Objectives	- TT laceber ena							
🕶 🖺 Methods	Outcome or Subgrou	р	Studies	Participants	Statistical Method		Effect Estimate	
🕶 🗒 Results								
🕶 🖺 Discussion	1.1 Pain		3	490	Std. Mean Difference (IV,	Random, 95% CI)	0.12 [-0.25, 0.49]	
🗢 🖺 Authors' conclusions	1 1 1 Back Pain	+ Add Subgroup		220	Std. Mean Difference (IV	Random 95% CI)	0.26 [-0.01.0.52]	
- Acknowledgements		Edit Outcome		220	old. Medir Difference (IV,		0.20[0.01, 0.02]	
 Contributions of authors	1.1.2 Knee pain	Scheme Selecter Outcome		270	Std. Mean Difference (IV,	Random, 95% CI)	0.09 [-0.53, 0.71]	
 Declarations of interest 	4.0 Dischillity	Rename Outcome		100			0.001.0.50.0.501	
 Differences between protocol and revi 	1.2 Disability	Cut		490	wean Difference (IV, Fixed	1, 95% CI)	0.00 [-0.56, 0.56]	
 Published notes 	1.2.1 Back pain	Copy		270	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed	d, 95% Cl)	0.00 [-0.79, 0.79]	
Tables =	1.0.0 Knoo pain	Paste		220	Moon Difforonce (IV, Eiver		0.001.0.04	
🕼 Studies and references		(in December 2) hereit		220	weat Difference (IV, Fixed	u, 90% CI)	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]	
P		A second subgroups						
🗠 🐼 Included studies	■ Figures	Move Up						
Excluded studies	Eigure 4 (Apolyc	Move Down						
- 🐼 Studies awaiting classification	□ Figure 1 (Analys)	Subgroups						
— 🐼 Ongoing studies	E	Properties	SI	d. Mean Difference	e Std. Mean	Difference		
🕶 🕼 Other references	Study of Subgroup Mea	Notes	otal weight	IV, Random, 95%	CI IV, Rando	om, 95% Cl		
📲 Data and analyses	Romero 2020		25 0.0%	-3.001-5.63-0.3	71			
🙀 Figures	Foster 2007	📑 Print	100 28.9%	0.28 [0.00, 0.5	6]			-
🐯 Sources of support	Al Rashoud 2014	💡 Help	10 11.7%	0.00 [-0.88, 0.8	8]			
😲 Feedback	Subtotal (95% Cl)	TTU Chiže 0.00 dfe 1 /D = 0.55		0.26 [-0.01, 0.5	2]			
🖏 Appendices 📃 👻	The elerogeneity. Tau* = 0.00,	$c_{\rm eff} = 0.50$, $u_{\rm eff} = 1$ (P = 0.55)),1 - 070					_
			~~~~~	~~~~~				

### Para incluir subgrupos dentro de um desfecho

le <u>Edit Format View Tools Table Window Help</u>
Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo'Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain       n° 1° 2°         Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebo'Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain       n° 1° 2°         Main text       Image: Study or Subgroup       Text of Review       X 1.1 Pain       X 1.2 Disability       R Figure 1 (Analysis 1.1)       R Figure 2 (Analysis 1.2)         Image: Study or Subgroup       Image: Study or Subgr
Acupuncture Plus Exercise versus Placebol/Sham for Chronic Low Back Pain
Image: Second Secon
Main text       Image: State of the state
Main text       Image: Control Abstract       Image: Control Abstra       Im
[™] Abstrad [™] Plain language summary [™] Background [™] Chickes [™] Methods [™] Results [™] Discussion [™] Acknowledgements [™] Differences between protocol and review [™] Published notes [™] Differences between protocol and review [™] Studies and references [™] Studies and references [™] Studies and references to studies
Image: Support of the second seco
Image: Sector ound       Std. Mean Difference       Std. Mean Difference       Std. Mean Difference       Std. Mean Difference       N, Random, 95% Cl       N, Random, 95% Cl       N, Random, 95% Cl       Image: Sector ound       Ima
B       Objectives         B       Objectives         B       Methods         B       Methods         B       Results         B       Discussion         B       Authors' conclusions         B       Acknowledgements         B       Control       Study or 3 bg row       Mean SD       Total       Mean SD       Control       N, Random, 95% CI         B       Authors' conclusions       B       Acknowledgements       Study of 3 3 25 6 6 25 0.0%       -3.00 [-5.63, -0.37]         Foster 2007       4       4       10       11.7%       0.00 [-0.88, 0.88]         B       Contributions of authors       B       Differences between protocol and revional (95% CI)       110       110       40.5%       0.28 [0.00, 0.56]         B       Declarations of interest       B       Differences between protocol and revional (95% CI)       110       110       4.4       100 28.9%       -0.28 [0.05, 1.19]         Tables       Tables       Romero 2020       6       6 25 3 3 25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]       Image: Construction (0.5%, 0.00]         B       Studies and references       Studies and references       Studies (2014)       4       10       11.7%       0.0
Wethods       Study or Subgroup       Mean       SD       Total       Mean       SD       SD       SD       <
Image: Study of s
Image: Second
Image: Authors' conclusions       Image: Acknowledgements         Image: Acknowledgements       Image: Acknowledgements         Image: Contributions of authors       Image: Acknowledgements         Image: Contributions of authors       Image: Contributions of authors         Image: Control au
B       Acknowledgements         B       Acknowledgements         Contributions of authors       110       110       40.5%         D       Declarations of interest         D       Differences between protocol and revi         P       Published notes         Tables       Remero 2020       6       6       25       3       3       25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]         Foster 2007       3       3       100       4       4       100       11.7%       0.00 [0.88, 0.88]         Differences       References       Studies and references       References to studies       Subtotal (95% CI)       100       25       3       25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]
B       Contributions of authors       Into       Into       Into       40.5%       0.20 [-0.51, 0.52]         B       Declarations of interest       Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.00; Chi ² = 0.36, df = 1 (P = 0.55); I ² = 0%       Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)         B       Differences between protocol and revi       Into       Into       110       40.5%       0.20 [-0.51, 0.52]         B       Differences between protocol and revi       Into       Into       110       40.5%       0.20 [-0.51, 0.52]         B       Published notes       Romero 2020       6       6       25       3       3       25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]       Into
B Declarations of interest       Test for overall effect Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)         B Differences between protocol and revi       Test for overall effect Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)         B Published notes       Romero 2020       6       6       25       3       25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]         B Studies and references       Romero 2020       6       6       25       3       3       100       4       100       28.9%       -0.28 [-0.56, -0.00]         A Rashoud 2014       4       10       4       10       11.7%       0.00 [-0.88, 0.88]
Differences between protocol and revi       Image: constraint of the second secon
Image: Published notes       Image: 1.1.2 Knee pain         Image: Tables       Romero 2020       6       6       25       3       3       25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]         Image: Tables       Foster 2007       3       3       100       4       4       100       28.9%       -0.28 [-0.66, -0.00]         Image: Tables       Foster 2007       3       3       100       4       4       100       11.7%       0.00 [-0.88, 0.88]         Image: Tables       Subtotal (95% CI)       135       135       59.5%       0.09 [-0.53, 0.71]       Image: Tables
Tables       Foster 2007       3       3       25       18.9%       0.62 [0.05, 1.19]         Studies and references       Foster 2007       3       3       100       4       4       100       28.9%       -0.28 [0.66, -0.00]         Studies and references       Al Rashoud 2014       4       4       10       11.7%       0.00 [-0.88, 0.88]         References to studies       Subtotal (95% CI)       135       59.5%       0.09 [-0.53, 0.71]
Image: State Stat
References to studies Subtotal (95% CI) 135 135 59.5% 0.09 [-0.53, 0.71]
▶ 🐼 Included studies Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.22; Chi ² = 7.88, df = 2 (P = 0.02); I ² = 75%
Excluded studies
Studies awaiting classification Total (95% Cl) 245 245 100.0% 0.12 [-0.25, 0.49]
Ongoing studies Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.10; Chi ² = 12.01, df = 4 (P = 0.02); l ² = 67%
Q Other references     Test for overall effect: Z = 0.63 (P = 0.53)     Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Data and analyses     I est for subgroup differences: Chr ² = 0.23, df = 1 (P = 0.63), P = 0%
Tigures Caption
Sources of support Forest plot of comparison; 1 Placebo / Sham, outcome: 1,1 Pain,
2 Feedback
Appendices Figure 2 (Analysis 1.2) 🖑

ΠX _





M bdc.ufc@gmail.com



© @gaipa_ufc