

Item 2.12: Limitations of evidence

Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g., study risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision).

Title	2.1	Title
Open Science	2.2	Funding
	2.3	Registration
Background	2.4	Objectives
Methods	2.5	Eligibility criteria
	2.6	Information sources
	2.7	Risk of bias
	2.8	Measurement properties
	2.9	Synthesis methods
Results	2.10	Included studies
	2.11	Synthesis of results
Discussion	2.12	Limitations of evidence
	2.13	Interpretation



Tips for reporting this item:



- Provide a brief summary of the limitations of the evidence included in the review (e.g., study risk of bias, inconsistency, and imprecision).



Examples:



“However, due to the high heterogeneity of the studies available, these results should not be considered conclusive.”



Pizzinato A, Liguoro I, Pusiolo A, Cogo P, Palese A, Vidal E. Detection and assessment of postoperative pain in children with cognitive impairment: A systematic literature review and meta-analysis. *European Journal of Pain*. 2022;26(5):965-979.



“In interpreting the outcomes, one should therefore be aware that not all relevant aspects of physical functioning may be accounted for in the LEFS.”

Ratter J et al. Content validity and measurement properties of the Lower Extremity Functional Scale in patients with fractures of the lower extremities: a systematic review. *Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes*, 2022;6(1):1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41687-022-00417-2>.

“The HAQ, however, was frequently associated with considerable ceiling effects while the SF-36 has limited content coverage.”

Oude Voshaar MA et al. Measurement properties of physical function scales validated for use in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a systematic review of the literature. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes*, 2011;9(1):1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-9-99>.

The quantity and quality of the evidence on the other measurement properties of the included questionnaires varied substantially with insufficient sample sizes and/or poor methodological quality resulting in significant downgrading of evidence quality.”

Kalle J et al. Quality of patient-and proxy-reported outcomes for children with impairment of the upper extremity: a systematic review using the COSMIN methodology. *Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes*, 2022;6(1):1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41687-022-00469-4>.

From: Elsmann EBM, 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.