

Item 28: Certainty of evidence

Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each measurement property of an OMI assessed.

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:

- Report the overall level of certainty in the body of evidence (such as high, moderate, low, or very low) for each synthesized result.
- Communicate certainty in the evidence wherever synthesized results are reported (that is, evidence summary tables, results, conclusions). Use a format appropriate for the section of the review.

Examples:

In a review examining the measurement properties of patient-reported outcome measures following knee replacement, the authors presented a table combining the certainty of the evidence with the overall ratings of the measurement property (item #27a). The authors also report the overall rating with the certainty of the evidence in the main text.

“The quality of the evidence for measurement properties of the included PROMs [patient-reported outcome measures] is provided in table 7. [...] The only measurement property to receive a ‘sufficient’ rating was reliability for both the KOOS and the LEAS, supported by ‘low’ and ‘moderate’ quality evidence, respectively.”

The [E&E](#) contains a reproduced version of Table 7.

Sabah SA et al. Patient-reported outcome measures following revision knee replacement: a review of PROM instrument utilisation and measurement properties using the COSMIN checklist. *BMJ Open*, 2021;11(10):e046169. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjopen-2020-046169>.

In a review examining the measurement properties of patient- and proxy-reported outcomes targeted at children with impairment of the upper limb, the authors presented a table combining the certainty of the evidence with the summarized results and the overall ratings of the measurement property (item #27a).

The [E&E](#) contains an abridged version of this table.

Kalle J et al. Quality of patient- and proxy-reported outcomes for children with impairment of the upper extremity: a systematic review using the COSMIN methodology. *Journal of Patient-Reported Outcomes*, 2022;6(1):1-17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s41687-022-00469-4>.

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.