Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2)
TEMPLATE FOR COMPLETION

Edited by Julian PT Higgins, Jelena Savović, Matthew J Page, Jonathan AC Sterne
on behalf of the RoB2 Development Group

Version of 22 August 2019

Study details

Reference	Nielsen PR et al. Costs and quality of life for prehabilitation and early rehabilitation after surgery of the lumbar spine. BMC Health Services Research 2008, 8:209

Study design

X Individually-randomized parallel-group trial

☐ Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial

☐ Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial

For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as

Experimental: | Integrated program including prehabilitation and early rehabilitation   Comparator: | Standard care program

Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias | Index score (15D score)

Specify the numerical result being assessed. In case of multiple alternative analyses being presented, specify the numeric result (e.g. RR = 1.52 (95% CI 0.83 to 2.77) and/or a reference (e.g. to a table, figure or paragraph) that uniquely defines the result being assessed. | Median and range

Is the review team's aim for this result…?

X to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)

☐ to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention* (the 'per-protocol' effect)

If the aim is to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention*, select the deviations from intended intervention that should be addressed (at least one must be checked):

☐ occurrence of non-protocol interventions
☐ failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome
☐ non-adherence to their assigned intervention by trial participants

Which of the following sources were <u>obtained</u> to help inform the risk-of-bias assessment? (tick as many as apply)

X Journal article(s) with results of the trial
X Trial protocol
☐ Statistical analysis plan (SAP)
☐ Non-commercial trial registry record (e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov record)
☐ Company-owned trial registry record (e.g. GSK Clinical Study Register record)
☐ "Grey literature" (e.g. unpublished thesis)
☐ Conference abstract(s) about the trial
☐ Regulatory document (e.g. Clinical Study Report, Drug Approval Package)
☐ Research ethics application
☐ Grant database summary (e.g. NIH RePORTER or Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)
☐ Personal communication with trialist
☐ Personal communication with the sponsor

Risk of bias assessment

Responses underlined in green are potential markers for low risk of bias, and responses in red are potential markers for a risk of bias. Where questions relate only to sign posts to other questions, no formatting is used.

Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	1.1. Y Quote: "After informed consent 28 patients were randomised to an integrated programme and 32 to the standard care programme" (p. 2).	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?	1.2. NI	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	1.3. N Comment: Table 1. The authors do not elaborate on this.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement	Some concerns	Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of assignment to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	2.1. Y 2.1. Y	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?	Comment: It was not possible to blind the patients or the carers from the intervention.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?	2.3. NI	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	2.6. NI Quote: "The scores of the two groups were compared using area under curve and Mann-Whitney test. The level of significance was 0.05" (p. 3). Comment: The description the statistical analysis is too poor for an assessment.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?	2.7 PY Quote: "The number of 60 patients was too small for detailed evaluation regarding types of complications, minor differences in quality of life and costs, which may all, have been overlooked due to a type-2 failure. Furthermore, the quality of life was assessed using the generic questionnaire 15D, which is reliable for comparison the life quality for patients suffering from different illnesses. It may, however, not be sensitive enough to identify differences between the two randomised groups.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement	High	Low / High / Some concerns

Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of adhering to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 3: Missing outcome data

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	3.1 Y Comment: No reported loss to follow-up. Table 1.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N
3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement	Low	Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?	4.1 N AIM Quote: "The aim of the present study was to compare the economic impact and quality of life of surgery for degenerative lumbar spine disease with and without integration of prehabilitation and early rehabilitation" p. 2. METHOD OF MEASURING THE OUTCOME Quote: "Data collection included cost and quality of life for each patient in the preoperative period under hospitalisation and in the postoperative period. The costs originated from three categories; staff resources, equipments and purely bed costs. The bed costs included salary of the nurses and porters, food, clothes, laundry and cleaning" p. 2.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?	4.2. PN Comment: Comparable methods of outcome measurement and time points.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	4.3 Y Quote: "Quality of life was assessed by self-reports. The patients filled in the generic Quality of life survey tool 15D at six different time points (at inclusion, at the day of surgery, at the day of discharge and 1,3 and 6 months postoperatively)" p. 3.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	4.4. PY	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

4.5 **If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?**	Comment: Knowledge of the assignment could influence participant-reported outcomes. 4.5 PN Comment: There is no reason to believe that knowledge of the intervention status could have influenced outcome. Some concerns	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?	5.1 NI Comment: The researchers' pre-specified intentions are not available in sufficient details. A trial protocol is registered at ClinicalTrials.gov. However, there is no analysis plan. Quote: "The study has been registered in the international protocol registration system http://www.ClinicalTrials.gov, ID NCT 00459966" p. 3.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...		
5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	5.2 NI Comment: Analysis intentions are not available.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	5.3 NI Comment: Analysis intentions are not available.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement	Some concerns	Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Overall risk of bias

Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable