

## Item 14: Selection process

Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, e.g., including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools/AI used in the process.

<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 <i>a. Registration information</i> <i>b. Accession of protocol</i> <i>c. Protocol amendments</i>
	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
	11	Eligibility criteria
	12	Information sources
	13	Search strategy
	<b>14</b>	<b>Selection process</b>
	15	Data collection process
	16	Data items
	17	Study risk of bias assessment
	18	Measurement properties
	19	Synthesis methods <i>a. Eligibility processes</i> <i>b. Methods for synthesis</i> <i>c. Causes of inconsistency</i> <i>d. Sensitivity analyses</i>
	20	Certainty assessment
21	Formulating recommendations	
<b>Results</b>	22	Study selection <i>a. Results of search and selection</i> <i>b. Excluded reports with reasons</i>
	23	OMI characteristics <i>a. Characteristics of OMIs</i> <i>b. Interpretability aspects of OMIs</i> <i>c. Feasibility aspects of OMIs</i>
	24	Study characteristics
	25	Risk of bias in studies
	26	Results of individual studies
	27	Results of syntheses <i>a. Results of syntheses conducted</i> <i>b. Results of causes of inconsistency</i> <i>c. Results of sensitivity analyses</i>
	28	Certainty of evidence
	29	Recommendations
<b>Discussion</b>	30	Discussion <i>a. Interpretation of results</i> <i>b. Limitations of evidence</i> <i>c. Limitations of review processes</i> <i>d. Implications</i>



### Tips for reporting this item:

- Report how many reviewers screened each record (title/abstract) and each report retrieved, whether multiple reviewers worked independently (that is, were unaware of each other's decisions) at each stage of screening or not (for example, records screened by one reviewer and exclusions verified by another), and any processes used to resolve disagreements between screeners (for example, referral to a third reviewer or by consensus).
- Report any processes used to obtain or confirm relevant information from study investigators.
- If only a subset of abstracts or articles was screened by a second reviewer, report the percentage specific agreement between the two reviewers.
- If abstracts or articles required translation into another language to determine their eligibility, report how these were translated (for example, by asking a native speaker or by using software programs).
- See the [E&E](#) for specifics on what details should be reported if automation tools/AI or crowdsourcing were used.

### Examples:

*“Each abstract or full-text paper was independently reviewed by two reviewers from the review team. If reviewers disagreed, they discussed the abstract or paper until consensus was reached or a third author with experience in systematic reviews of PROMs [patient-reported outcome measures] made the final decision.”*

Terwee CB et al. Content Validity of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Developed for Assessing Health-Related Quality of Life in People with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: a Systematic Review. *Curr. Diab. Rep.*, 2022;22(9):405-421. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11892-022-01482-z>.

*“All titles and abstracts were independently screened by at least two reviewers in Covidence. All full-text papers were independently screened. Disagreements were resolved by discussion, and if needed, a third author was consulted to reach a final decision.”*

Halvorsen MB et al. General measurement tools for assessing mental health problems among children and adolescents with an intellectual disability: a systematic review. *J Autism Dev Disord*, 2023;53(1):132-204. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10803-021-05419-5>.

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

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](http://www.prisma-cosmin.ca).