

## Item 2.8: Measurement properties

### Specify the methods used to rate the results of a measurement property.

|                     |            |                               |
|---------------------|------------|-------------------------------|
| <b>Title</b>        | 2.1        | Title                         |
| <b>Open Science</b> | 2.2        | Funding                       |
|                     | 2.3        | Registration                  |
| <b>Background</b>   | 2.4        | Objectives                    |
| <b>Methods</b>      | 2.5        | Eligibility criteria          |
|                     | 2.6        | Information sources           |
|                     | 2.7        | Risk of bias                  |
|                     | <b>2.8</b> | <b>Measurement properties</b> |
| <b>Results</b>      | 2.9        | Synthesis methods             |
|                     | 2.10       | Included studies              |
| <b>Discussion</b>   | 2.11       | Synthesis of results          |
|                     | 2.12       | Limitations of evidence       |
|                     | 2.13       | Interpretation                |



#### Tips for reporting this item:



- Specify the method(s) used to rate the results of a measurement property.
- If the review was conducted following established guidance, methods used to assess risk of bias (item #2.7), rate the results of a measurement property (item #2.8), and synthesize the results (item #2.9) can be summarized into a general statement referring to that guidance (see last example).



#### Examples:

*“The COSMIN criteria for good measurement properties were used to judge the results of the studies [...]”*

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>.

*“The measurement properties were then scored using quality criteria (positive/negative/indeterminate).”*

Everaars B et al. Measurement properties of oral health assessments for non-dental healthcare professionals in older people: a systematic review. *BMC Geriatr.*, 2020;20(1), 4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12877-019-1349-y>.

*“Data extraction and quality assessment (including a risk of bias evaluation) of the included studies was undertaken [...] in accordance with COSMIN guidelines.”*

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>.

See the [E&E](#) for more examples.

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).