

Item 27c: Results of syntheses – Results of sensitivity analyses

If applicable, present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the 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> <i>d. Sensitivity analyses</i>
	20	Certainty assessment
Results	21	Formulating recommendations
	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	<b>Results of syntheses</b> <i>a. Results of syntheses conducted</i> <i>b. Results of causes of inconsistency</i> <b><i>c. Results of sensitivity analyses</i></b>
	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 conducted, 1) report the results for each sensitivity analysis, and 2) comment on how robust the main analysis was given the results of all corresponding sensitivity analyses.

Examples:

*“Data from three MQ [moderate quality] studies suggested that the validity for flight time measured by IMUs [inertial measurement units] was poor with no statistical significance (ICC [intraclass correlation coefficient] (95% CI) = 0.371 (- 0.110, 0.711), I2 = 95%, p = 0.13). [...] The sensitivity analysis showed that after excluding the study of Deflandre et al., the I2 reduced (I2 = 0%), summary ICC value increased (ICC (95% CI) = 0.774 (0.716, 0.818), p < 0.001). Sensitivity analysis showed that the results were unstable.”*

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