

Item 19d: Synthesis methods – Sensitivity analyses

If applicable, describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.

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> d. Sensitivity analyses
	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 OMI</i> <i>b. Interpretability aspects of OMI</i> <i>c. Feasibility aspects of OMI</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:

- If sensitivity analyses were performed, provide details of each analysis (such as removal of studies at high risk of bias, use of an alternative synthesis method).

Examples:

“Sensitivity analyses were performed for methodological quality and test procedure by restricting the meta-analyses to studies with an RoB [risk of bias] rating of “adequate” or “very good” and specific starting knee angles, respectively. Statistical significance was set at $P < 0.05$.”

Strong A et al. Properties of tests for knee joint threshold to detect passive motion following anterior cruciate ligament injury: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J. Orthop. Surg. Res.*, 2022;17(1):1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13018-022-03033-4>.

“Sensitivity analyses were performed by deleting one study at a time to evaluate the stability of the results.”

Zeng Z et al. Validity and reliability of inertial measurement units on lower extremity kinematics during running: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Sports Med. – Open*, 2022;8(1):86. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40798-022-00477-0>.

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.