

Item 13: Search strategy

Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers, and websites, including any filters and limits used.

Title	1	Title	
Abstract	2	See tip sheets for Abstracts	V
Summary	3	Plain language summary	
Open Science	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	
Introduction	8	Rationale	
	9	Objectives	
Methods	10	Followed guidelines	
	11	Eligibility criteria	
	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	
Results	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	5
	26	Results of individual studies	5
	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	
Discussion	30	Discussion a. Interpretation of results b. Limitations of evidence c. Limitations of review processes d. Implications	

Tips for reporting this item:

- Provide the full line by line search strategy as run in each database with a sophisticated interface (such as Ovid), or the sequence of terms that were used to search simpler interfaces, such as search engines or websites.
- Describe any limits applied to the search strategy (such as date or language) and justify these by linking back to the review's eligibility criteria.
- Describe the conceptual structure of the search strategy in relation to the research question. Specify all components (such as the outcome domain, population, name/type of OMI, and measurement properties of interest), how these components were linked, and describe omissions or adaptations to any element.
- See the <u>E&E</u> for specifics on what details should be reported if published approaches, information specialists, natural language processing tools, translation tools, and search validation and review tools were used.

Examples:

"The search consisted of three elements: (1) type 2 diabetes, using a comprehensive set of search terms from a clinical librarian of the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, the Netherlands; (2) PROMs [patient-reported outcome measures], using a PROM filter; and (3) measurement properties, using a modified version of the measurement properties filter. No search terms were used for the construct, as the complete series of reviews intended to find all instruments that have been validated in people with type 2 diabetes. Moreover, for this specific review, we intended to also include physical functioning subscales of PROMs measuring broader constructs, such as quality of life. Adding search terms for physical functioning could have prevented finding these broader instruments as subscales are not always mentioned in the abstract. The complete search strategy can be found in online supplemental appendix 2."

The E&E contains a reproduced version of Appendix 2.

Elsman EBM et al. Systematic review on the measurement properties of diabetes-specific patient-reported outcome measures (PROMs) for measuring physical functioning in people with type 2 diabetes. *BMJ Open Diabetes Res. Care*, 2022;10(3):e002729. https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjdrc-2021-002729.

See the E&E for more examples.

From: Elsman 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.