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**Objectives/aims**

To investigate methodological and reporting characteristics of Campbell reviews, as well as to compare the reporting of Campbell reviews published from 2011 Jan to 2014 Sep and 2014 Oct (when new methodological expectations were developed and implemented as mandatory for all reviews) to 2018 Jan.

**Methods**

We included Campbell reviews with full text published between 2011 Jan to 2018 Jan. We developed our abstraction form based on the methodological expectations and other characteristics collected in similar methodological studies of reporting quality. Items to be collected include: 1) descriptive information, such as publication year, number of authors, co-registration information, coordinating group, topic, types of intervention, source of funding etc; 2) methodological characteristics, including protocol availability, data sources, study selection, data collection and analysis, etc; 3) results characteristics, especially those corresponding to methods, such as number of records retrieved and included, analysis results, etc; 4) characteristics of discussion and conclusion, including subheadings, limitations at the study level and review level, implications for practice and research.The AMSTAR 2 will be applied to assess methodology, and reporting data will be summarized as frequencies and percentages.

**Main findings**

We included 97 reviews (51 from 2014 Oct to 2018 Jan, and 46 between 2011 Jan and 2014 Sep) across five coordinating groups, including Crime and Justice (21), Education (26), International Development (28), Social Welfare (37), and Nutrition (1), and 14 reviews were labelled with more than two groups. The mean number of authors is five (range 2-13), and corresponding authors are from 13 countries, where USA (37) ranked the first. Of all reviews, 71 (73%) have title form, 89 (91%) provide protocol, and 64 (65%) have plain language summary. We are still working on abstraction and assessment, and further data will be presented on the conference.

Implications for evidence synthesis: These findings will identify methodological strengths and limitations of Campbell reviews and can be used to inform measures to continuously improve these reviews.