Item 20: Certainty assessment

Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence.

Title	1	Title
Abstract	2	See tip sheets for Abstracts
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
	26	Results of individual studies

	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:

- Specify the tool or system (and version) used to assess certainty in the body of evidence.
- Report the factors considered (such as risk of bias, inconsistency of results, imprecision, and indirectness) and the criteria used to assess each factor when assessing certainty in the body of evidence.
- Describe the decision rules used to arrive at an overall judgment of the level of certainty (such as high, moderate, low, very low), together with the intended interpretation (or definition) of each level of certainty.
- If any adaptations to an existing tool or system to assess certainty were made, specify the rationale and adaptations in sufficient detail that the approach is replicable.
- Report how many reviewers assessed the certainty of evidence, whether multiple reviewers worked independently, and any processes used to resolve disagreements between assessors.
- Where a published system is adhered to, it may be sufficient to briefly describe the factors considered and the decision rules for reaching an overall judgment and reference the source guidance for full details of assessment criteria.

Example:

"The quality of evidence was graded using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) approach considering the methodological quality of studies, total sample size, and consistency of results [citation provided]. In case of concerns regarding the trustworthiness of a result, the quality of evidence of the summarized results was downgraded per measurement property per PROM. Downgrading was possible due to risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision, and/or indirectness. The quality of evidence was rated as either high, moderate, low, or very low. We did not grade the quality of evidence if an overall rating was indeterminate or inconsistent."

Piontek K et al. Patient-reported outcome measures for uncomplicated urinary tract infections in women: a systematic review. *Qual Life Res,* 2023;32:2137-2153. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11136-023-03358-5.

See the E&E for more examples.