

LETTER

Open Access



Publication bias in prevalence studies should not be ignored

Masoud Mohammadi^{1,2*}

Dear Editor,

One of the indicators considered in assessing the comprehensiveness of systematic reviews and meta-analyses is the examination of publication bias. Publication bias indicates the bias of published studies and occurs when certain results of research are published more often because they are positive or interesting, and negative or insignificant results are often not published. This can cause deviations in the research literature [1–3]. Publication bias in meta-analyses leads to inaccurate determination of the association between an exposure and an outcome. Furthermore, the association between exposure and outcome may be over- or under-reported [1–3].

When literature searches in systematic reviews and meta-analyses are based on the type of research (published or unpublished), the results of the sampling of studies can have publication bias. The most important strategy for dealing with missing studies in the literature search process is to identify publication bias, and the simplest and most common method for identifying publication bias is the funnel plot [4, 5].

First, we need to provide an explanation of prevalence studies and the concept of publication bias in these studies, and then explain the funnel plot for examining publication bias. according to the definition of publication

bias, which means not publishing articles that have non-significant results, and in this case, it is said that in prevalence studies, prevalence itself is not related to significance and is always reported because prevalence is a ratio and does not show a relationship, but it should be noted that not all articles have a cross-sectional method and can be descriptive, analytical or observational and report prevalence in the form of examining relationships in the study. In this case, if the results of the study show a non-significant relationship, reporting a prevalence alone will not be very useful, and in this case, the prevalence obtained in these studies will be the victim of obtaining non-significant results in examining relationships and may not be reported.

A funnel plot is a scatterplot that plots the effect size on the horizontal axis and the sample size, variance, standard error, or weight of each study on the vertical axis. In meta-analyses without publication bias, a funnel plot resembles a funnel with the effect size of studies with small sample sizes and high variance at the large end [4, 5]. Also, at the small end of this funnel are the effect sizes of studies with large sample sizes and smaller variance. In the middle of this funnel are studies with medium effect sizes. The symmetry of the left and right sides of the funnel plot indicates the absence of publication bias [4, 5]. Funnel plot asymmetry indicates the presence of publication bias in meta-analysis. If small studies with small sample sizes are neglected and are included in the missing studies, a gap and asymmetry are created in the large part of the funnel [4, 5]. Now, according to the explanations given, a question arises, in studies that report the prevalence of a risk factor or a disease, how can one have a symmetrical funnel plot?

*Correspondence:

Masoud Mohammadi
masoud.mohammadi1989@yahoo.com

¹ Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Health, Isfahan University of Medical Science, Isfahan, Iran

² Research Center for Social Determinants of Health, Jahrom University of Medical Sciences, Jahrom, Iran



© The Author(s) 2025. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License, which permits any non-commercial use, sharing, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if you modified the licensed material. You do not have permission under this licence to share adapted material derived from this article or parts of it. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

Since we know that the range of prevalence is from zero to one, given that it is a proportion, in this case, if the range of the funnel is negative infinity ($-\infty$) to positive infinity ($+\infty$), then all studies should be collected on the right side of the funnel, and of course, this is a logically correct interpretation and has led some researchers to be indifferent to publication bias in prevalence studies with this interpretation.

The answer is that the software uses log to form the funnel and will calculate the log event (prevalence) for the prevalence. In this case, by adding log to the prevalence, its range will change from zero to 1 to negative infinity ($-\infty$) to positive infinity ($+\infty$), and the necessary conditions for examining the propagation bias are provided. Therefore, this explanation makes researchers not indifferent to examining this indicator in prevalence studies.

Acknowledgements

The cooperation and participation of the Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Isfahan University of Medical Sciences, for interpretation and participation in this article is gratefully acknowledged.

Authors' contributions

MM contributed to the design and prepared the manuscript and helped in the interpretation of the study. The author has read and approved the content of the manuscript.

Funding

Not applicable.

Data availability

Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The author declare that they have no competing interests.

Received: 8 February 2025 Accepted: 30 March 2025

Published online: 10 April 2025

References

1. Lin L, Chu H. Quantifying publication bias in meta-analysis. *Biometrics*. 2018;74(3):785–94.
2. DeVito NJ, Goldacre B. Catalogue of bias: publication bias. *BMJ Evid Based Med*. 2019;24(2):53–4.
3. Mohammady M, Shirani F, Sadeghi M. Bias in the clinical trials: a review article. *Nurs Midwifery J*. 2018;16(4):273–85.
4. Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Chandler J, Welch VA, Higgins JP, Thomas J. Updated guidance for trusted systematic reviews: a new edition of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2019;10(10):ED000142
5. Naslund JA, Whiteman KL, McHugo GJ, Aschbrenner KA, Marsch LA, Bartels SJ. Lifestyle interventions for weight loss among overweight and

obese adults with serious mental illness: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Gen Hosp Psychiatry*. 2017;47:83–102.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.