

Item 19a: Synthesis methods – Eligibility processes

Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis.

Title	1	Title
Abstract	2	See tip sheets for Abstracts
Summary	3	Plain language summary
Open Science	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
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 <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	
Results	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
Discussion	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:

- Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis.

Examples:

“The summary of the overall evidence of measurement properties of the PROMs was determined by the number of studies, the methodological quality of the studies, and consistency of the findings.”

Isa F et al. Patient-reported outcome measures used in patients with primary sclerosing cholangitis: a systematic review. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes*, 2018;16:1-18. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-018-0951-6>.

“Multiple articles were combined if they concerned the same physical capacity task and included samples with comparable characteristics.”

Jakobsson M et al. Level of evidence for reliability, validity, and responsiveness of physical capacity tasks designed to assess functioning in patients with low back pain: a systematic review using the COSMIN standards. *Phys Ther*, 2019;99(4):457-477. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ptj/pzy159>.

“[...] evidence from multiple individual studies on the same PROM or subscale was summarized per measurement property [...]”

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/bmjdr-2021-002729>.

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.