Question regarding the anal fissure systematic review

Rick Nelson¹

Accepted: 8 October 2020 / Published online: 19 October 2020
© Springer-Verlag GmbH Germany, part of Springer Nature 2020

Dear Editor,

I am puzzled by the study below in the most recent edition of the *International Journal of Colorectal Disease* [1].

A total of 9 studies were found to be eligible for inclusion in this systematic review. Three years ago, a similar study was published [2] in which 148 randomized controlled trials were found to be eligible. Several are included in this more recent study (refs. 27–33 of #1). Most of the 2017 included studies were published since 2000. Fourteen were nitrous oxide donors compared with surgery. A scoping search also finds as many as 22 more studies might be eligible for inclusion in [1] since the search date for [2] (18 January, 2017). I cannot imagine what in their eligibility requirements could have lowered this number to only nine. The categories of methodology and healing as criteria listed in [1] need some explanation. The nine included studies do not appear to differ greatly from those included in 2017. How were conclusions reached in this review?

Sincerely,

Rick Nelson, MD, FACS, FASCRS

References

1. Boland PA, Kelly ME, Donlon NE, Bolger JC, Larkin JO, Mehigan BJ, McCormick PH (2020 Oct) Management options for chronic anal fissure: a systematic review of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Colorectal Dis.* 35(10):1807–1815. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00384-020-03699-4>
2. Nelson RL, Manuel D, Gumienny C, Spencer B, Patel K, Schmitt K, Castillo D, Bravo A, Yeboah-Sampong A (2017 Aug) A systematic review and meta-analysis of the treatment of anal fissure. *Tech Coloproctol.* 21(8):605–625. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10151-017-1664-2>

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

✉ Rick Nelson
altohom@uic.edu

¹ Epidemiology and Biostatistics Division, UIC School of Public Health, Chicago, IL, USA