

Overview of Risk of Bias tools used in “Diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of common lower extremity muscle injuries in sport – Grading the evidence: a statement paper commissioned by the Danish Society of Sports Physical Therapy (DSSF)”

QUADAS-2 tool

The tool was originally based on data of the methodological literature on diagnostic test assessment, and a review on the existing quality assessment tools to identify all possible relevant items and their evidence-based. Through a four-round Delphi process, 11 experts agreed on the items to include.[1] The QUADAS was evaluated by asking reviewers a range of questions about its use and performance, and assessed overall agreement.[2] The interrater reliability of QUADAS items was found to be poor, with a study reporting 47-90% agreement (mean 69%) and of -0.28 – 0.58 κ (mean 0.22).[3] The new QUADAS-2 has since been developed with new distinct domains; ‘Patient Selection’, ‘Index Test’, ‘Reference Standard’, and ‘Flow and Timing’,[4] which is recommended in the GRADE handbook.[5]

SIGN (Scottish intercollegiate guideline network) checklist

The SIGN 3 checklist developed by the network consists of 14 items and is closely aligned to procedures in the Cochrane handbook and the GRADE handbook.[6] No studies have investigated the validity or reliability of the checklist.

ROBIS

The ROBIS tool was developed in accordance with evidence-based standards, similar to the approach for the QUADAS-2 tool.[7–9] Properties of reliability of the ROBIS tool are comparable to the AMSTAR quality assessment tool.[10,11]

RoB

The tool to assess risk of bias in RCTs was developed from the Cochrane group, to be used when assessing risk of bias for studies included in systematic reviews.[12] The reliability of the 5 different domains ranges from 0.79 to 0.05 κ . [13]

References

- 1 Whiting P, Rutjes AWS, Reitsma JB, *et al.* The development of QUADAS: a tool for the quality assessment of studies of diagnostic accuracy included in systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2003;**3**:25. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-3-25
- 2 Whiting PF, Weswood ME, Rutjes AWS, *et al.* Evaluation of QUADAS, a tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2006;**6**:9. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-6-9
- 3 Hollingworth W, Medina LS, Lenkinski RE, *et al.* Interrater reliability in assessing quality of diagnostic accuracy studies using the QUADAS tool. A preliminary assessment. *Acad Radiol* 2006;**13**:803–10. doi:10.1016/j.acra.2006.03.008
- 4 Whiting PF, Rutjes AWS, Westwood ME, *et al.* QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med* 2011;**155**:529–36. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009

- 5 Schünemann H, Brożek J, Guyatt G, *et al.* Handbook for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations using the GRADE approach. 2013.
- 6 Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network (SIGN) checklist for cohort studies. <https://www.sign.ac.uk/checklists-and-notes.html> (accessed 24 Apr 2019).
- 7 Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JPT, *et al.* ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016;**69**:225–34. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.06.005
- 8 Moher D, Schulz KF, Simera I, *et al.* Guidance for developers of health research reporting guidelines. *PLoS Med* 2010;**7**:e1000217. doi:10.1371/journal.pmed.1000217
- 9 Banzi R, Cinquini M, Gonzalez-Lorenzo M, *et al.* Quality assessment versus risk of bias in systematic reviews: AMSTAR and ROBIS had similar reliability but differed in their construct and applicability. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2018;**99**:24–32. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.02.024
- 10 Pieper D, Puljak L, González-Lorenzo M, *et al.* Minor differences were found between AMSTAR 2 and ROBIS in the assessment of systematic reviews including both randomized and nonrandomized studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;**108**:26–33. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2018.12.004
- 11 Lorenz RC, Matthias K, Pieper D, *et al.* A psychometric study found AMSTAR 2 to be a valid and moderately reliable appraisal tool. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2019;**114**:133–40. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2019.05.028
- 12 Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, *et al.* The Cochrane Collaboration’s tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011;**343**:d5928. doi:10.1136/bmj.d5928
- 13 Hartling L, Hamm MP, Milne A, *et al.* Testing the risk of bias tool showed low reliability between individual reviewers and across consensus assessments of reviewer pairs. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;**66**:973–81. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2012.07.005