



# The Open Nursing Journal

Content list available at: <https://opennursingjournal.com>

## Supplementary Material



### Evaluating Health-promoting Lifestyle Profile among Menopausal Women: A Meta-analysis

Zeinab Moshfeghy<sup>1</sup> , Hedyeh Riazi<sup>1,\*</sup> , Sepideh Hajian<sup>1</sup> and Ali Montazeri<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Midwifery and Reproductive Health, School of Nursing and Midwifery, Shahid Beheshti University of Medical Sciences, Tehran, Iran  
<sup>2</sup>Iranian Academic Center for Education, Culture and Research, Population Health Research Group, Health Metrics Research Center, Iranian Institute for Health Sciences Research, ACECR, Tehran, Iran

The following is the search syntax for MedLine (PubMed Interface) It will also be provided as supplementary material: ("HPLP"[Title/Abstract] OR "HPLP-II"[Title/Abstract] OR "health-promoting lifestyle profile"[Title/Abstract] OR "health promo\*"[Title/Abstract] OR "health program"[Title/Abstract] OR "physical activity"[Title/Abstract] OR "health responsibility"[Title/Abstract] OR "nutrition"[Title/Abstract] OR "interpersonal relationships"[Title/Abstract] OR "stress

management"[Title/Abstract] OR "exercise"[Title/Abstract] OR "self-actualization"[Title/Abstract] OR "spiritual growth"[Title/Abstract] OR "wellness"[Title/Abstract])

AND

("menopause\*"[Title/Abstract] OR "postmenopausal\*"[Title/Abstract] OR "postmenopause\*"[Title/Abstract])

**Supplementary Table 1. Quality assessment.**

	Cross-sectional articles					Experimental Studies and Randomized Controlled Trials							
	First Author												
	F. Sehhatie	N. Elahi	A. Moudi	S. Abdolalipour	F. S. Asrami	M. Nazari	D. Y. Kocak	E. Malik	N. Rathnayake	R. S. Mousavi	Z. Jalambadani	N. Rathnayake	
	Year												
	2013	2016	2016	2019	2015	2014	2016	2017	2017	2018	2018	2019	
Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	no	
Was the study population clearly specified and defined?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	no	yes	
Was the participation rate of eligible persons at least 50%?	UC	UC	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	
Were all the subjects selected or recruited from the same or similar populations (including the same time period)? Were inclusion and exclusion criteria for being in the study prespecified and applied uniformly to all participants?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no	

Was a sample size justification, power description, or variance and effect estimates provided?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	no	no	no	no	no	no
For the analyses in this paper, were the exposure(s) of interest measured prior to the outcome(s) being measured?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Was the timeframe sufficient so that one could reasonably expect to see an association between exposure and outcome if it existed?	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	UC	UC	no	yes	yes	UC	yes
For exposures that can vary in amount or level, did the study examine different levels of the exposure as related to the outcome (e.g., categories of exposure, or exposure measured as continuous variable)?	yes	yes	no	no	no	UC	UC	no	yes	no	UC	yes
Were the exposure measures (independent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Was the exposure(s) assessed more than once over time?	yes	yes	no	no	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes
Were the outcome measures (dependent variables) clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants?	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Were the outcome assessors blinded to the exposure status of participants?	no	no	no	no	no	yes	yes	yes	no	yes	yes	yes
Was loss to follow-up after baseline 20% or less?	UC	UC	no	yes	UC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically for their impact on the relationship between exposure(s) and outcome(s)?	yes	no	no	yes	no	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sum/14	11	10	8	11	9	8	7	6	7	9	7	10

## PRISMA 2020 CHECKLIST

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
<b>TITLE</b>			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	yes
<b>ABSTRACT</b>			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	yes
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	yes
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	yes
<b>METHODS</b>			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	yes
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	yes
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	yes
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	yes
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	yes
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide which results to collect.	yes
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	yes
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	yes
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	yes
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	yes
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	yes
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	yes
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	yes
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	yes
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	yes
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	yes
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	yes
<b>RESULTS</b>			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	yes
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	yes
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	yes
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	yes
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	yes

Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	yes
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	yes
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	yes
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	yes
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	yes
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	yes
<b>DISCUSSION</b>			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	yes
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	yes
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	yes
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	yes
<b>OTHER INFORMATION</b>			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	yes
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	yes
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	yes
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	yes
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	yes
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	yes

From: Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

For more information, visit: <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

