

## Item 11: Eligibility Criteria

Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review.

<b>Title</b>	1	Title
<b>Abstract</b>	2	See tip sheets for Abstracts
<b>Summary</b>	3	Plain language summary
<b>Open Science</b>	4	Registration and protocol a. Registration information b. Accession of protocol c. Protocol amendments
	5	Support
	6	Competing interests
	7	Availability of data and other materials
<b>Introduction</b>	8	Rationale
	9	Objectives
<b>Methods</b>	10	Followed guidelines
	<b>11</b>	<b>Eligibility criteria</b>
	12	Information sources
	13	Search strategy
	14	Selection process
	15	Data collection process
	16	Data items
	17	Study risk of bias assessment
	18	Measurement properties
	19	Synthesis methods a. Eligibility processes b. Methods for synthesis c. Causes of inconsistency d. Sensitivity analyses
	20	Certainty assessment
21	Formulating recommendations	
<b>Results</b>	22	Study selection a. Results of search and selection b. Excluded reports with reasons
	23	OMI characteristics a. Characteristics of OMIs b. Interpretability aspects of OMIs c. Feasibility aspects of OMIs
	24	Study characteristics
	25	Risk of bias in studies
	26	Results of individual studies
	27	Results of syntheses a. Results of syntheses conducted b. Results of causes of inconsistency c. Results of sensitivity analyses
	28	Certainty of evidence
	29	Recommendations
<b>Discussion</b>	30	Discussion a. Interpretation of results b. Limitations of evidence c. Limitations of review processes d. Implications

### ✓ Tips for reporting this item:

- ✓ ✓ Specify all study characteristics used to decide whether a study was eligible for inclusion in the review, which can include the outcome domain, population, name/type of OMI, and/or measurement properties of interest, as well as other characteristics, such as eligible study design(s) (e.g., should the study aim be the development or validation of an OMI, or are studies in which an OMI is used also included) and setting(s).
- ✓ ✓ Specify eligibility criteria with regard to report characteristics, such as year of dissemination, language, and report status (for example, whether reports such as unpublished manuscripts and conference abstracts were eligible for inclusion).
- ✓ ✓ Provide rationales for any notable restrictions to study eligibility. For example, authors might explain that the review was restricted to studies published from 2015 onwards because that was the year the OMI was first available.

### Examples:

*“Original studies reporting the development and/or validation of pain scoring instruments in farm animals as well as manuscripts reporting the assessment of one or more measurement properties of these instruments, were included. These studies involved naturally-occurring or experimental acute and chronic painful conditions in bovine (beef and dairy cattle, and buffalo), ovine (sheep and lamb), caprine (goat and kid), camel, porcine (pig and piglets) and poultry (chicken, fowl, ducks, turkeys and geese). These species were chosen since they are the most relevant species used for production of animal protein (meat, dairy products and eggs) according to the Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) of the United Nations, the OECD-FAO Agricultural Outlook 2020–2029.*

*Studies that only reported the use of pain scales as an OMI (e.g. in randomized controlled trials comparing two different treatments), studies in which a pain scale was used in the validation of another instrument, studies reporting only ethogram/list of pain-related behaviors without a scoring system, studies reporting non-ordinal pain assessment variables, or review and systematic reviews were not included. Studies reporting the use of pain scoring instruments to measure constructs other than pain, for example studies assessing animal welfare, in which pain was considered within the overall evaluation, studies assessing nociceptive testing, and studies for which the full text was not available were excluded.”*

Tomacheuski RM et al. Measurement properties of pain scoring instruments in farm animals: A systematic review using the COSMIN checklist. *PLoS One*, 2023;18(1):e0280830. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280830>.

See the [E&E](#) for more examples.

From: Elsmann EB, Mokkink LB, Terwee CB, Beaton D, Gagnier JJ, Tricco AC, et al. Guideline for reporting systematic reviews of outcome measurement instruments (OMIs): PRISMA-COSMIN for OMIs 2024. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 2024, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111422>.

More resources are available at [www.prisma-cosmin.ca](http://www.prisma-cosmin.ca).