

Item 6: Competing interests

Declare any competing interests of review authors.

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	<b>Competing interests</b>
	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	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
Discussion	29	Recommendations
	29	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:**

- Disclose any of the authors’ relationships or activities that readers could consider pertinent or to have influenced the review, such as being involved in the development, validation or dissemination of one of the reviewed OMIs.
- If any authors had competing interests, report how they were managed for particular review processes, such as not being involved in the assessment of the OMI.

**Examples:**

*“AI and BB declare that they have no competing interests. PW and PK are authors on some of the included articles. They were not involved in assessing the methodological quality of these articles. They have no other competing interests.”*

Abma IL et al. Measurement properties of the Dutch–Flemish patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (PROMIS) physical function item bank and instruments: a systematic review. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes*, 2021;19(1):1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12955-020-01647-y>.

*“Author ZZ was co-author on one of the included PROM development papers [citation provided]. She was not involved in any of the ratings of this paper.”*

Terwee CB et al. Content Validity of Patient-Reported Outcome Measures Developed for Assessing Health-Related Quality of Life in People with Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus: a Systematic Review. *Curr. Diab. Rep.*, 2022;22(9):405-421. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11892-022-01482-z>.

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).