

Item 21: Formulating recommendations

If appropriate, describe any methods used to formulate recommendations regarding the suitability of OMs for a particular use.

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 OMs</i> <i>b. Interpretability aspects of OMs</i> <i>c. Feasibility aspects of OMs</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 methods were used to formulate recommendations, specify what formed the basis of recommendations.
- Specify which measurement properties were used in formulating recommendations.



Examples:

“To formulate recommendations, we considered the results on the measurement properties in order of importance. According to COSMIN, PROMs [patient-reported outcome measures] that have any level of sufficient content validity, which is the most important measurement property, and at least low-quality evidence for sufficient internal consistency (and as such also at least low-quality evidence for sufficient structural validity) can be recommended for use, except when there is high-quality evidence for any insufficient measurement property [citation provided]. We subsequently took results on reliability into account when formulating recommendations, and considered construct validity and responsiveness as least important. Importantly, we also took into account the limitations of the PROMs arising from the recommendations.”

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>.



“Evidence on each metric property from studies using good or amber methods was extracted and summarized in Summary of Measurement Properties (SOMP) tables. Each measurement property was given a final rating based on the gathered evidence according to OMERACT [Outcome Measures in Rheumatology] guidance. A green rating indicates consistently good performance from multiple studies identified as having good methods; amber indicates a noncritical limitation in the evidence, which merits a research plan. Finally, an overall rating across all the measurement properties for each instrument was proposed by the working group, evaluated by the TAG [technical advisory group] and finally brought to a broader group of the OMERACT community for final approval of our proposed level of endorsement.”

Kroon FP et al. Core outcome measurement instrument selection for physical function in hand osteoarthritis using the OMERACT Filter 2.1 process. *Semin. Arthritis Rheum.*, 2021;1311-1319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.semarthrit.2021.08.014>.

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 OMs 2024. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2024.111422>.

More resources are available at www.prisma-cosmin.ca.