

## Item 9: Objectives

Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses and include as applicable the following (in any order): outcome domain of interest, population of interest, name/type of OMI of interest, and measurement properties of interest.

|              |                             |  |
|--------------|-----------------------------|--|
| Title        | 1                           | Title  |
| Abstract     | 2                           | See tip sheets for Abstracts   |
| Summary      | 3                           | Plain language summary   |
| Open Science | 4                           | Registration and protocol<br><i>a. Registration information</i><br><i>b. Accession of protocol</i><br><i>c. Protocol amendments</i>                            |
|              | 5                           | Support  |
|              | 6                           | Competing interests  |
|              | 7                           | Availability of data and other materials   |
| Introduction | 8                           | Rationale  |
|              | 9                           | <b>Objectives</b>  |
| 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<br><i>a. Eligibility processes</i><br><i>b. Methods for synthesis</i><br><i>c. Causes of inconsistency</i><br><i>d. Sensitivity analyses</i> |
|              | 20                          | Certainty assessment   |
| 21           | Formulating recommendations |  |
| Results      | 22                          | Study selection<br><i>a. Results of search and selection</i><br><i>b. Excluded reports with reasons</i>  |
|              | 23                          | OMI characteristics<br><i>a. Characteristics of OMI</i><br><i>b. Interpretability aspects of OMI</i><br><i>c. Feasibility aspects of OMI</i>                   |
|              | 24                          | Study characteristics  |
|              | 25                          | Risk of bias in studies  |
|              | 26                          | Results of individual studies  |
|              | 27                          | Results of syntheses<br><i>a. Results of syntheses conducted</i><br><i>b. Results of causes of inconsistency</i><br><i>c. Results of sensitivity analyses</i>  |
|              | 28                          | Certainty of evidence  |
|              | 29                          | Recommendations  |
| Discussion   | 29                          | Discussion<br><i>a. Interpretation of results</i><br><i>b. Limitations of evidence</i><br><i>c. Limitations of review processes</i><br><i>d. Implications</i>  |



### Tips for reporting this item:

- Provide an explicit statement of all objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.
- Use the four key elements (outcome domain, population, name or type of OMI and the measurement properties of interest) as applicable to formulate the objective(s) or question(s).

### Examples:

*“Therefore, this study aims to systematically assess the measurement properties of diabetes-specific PROMs [patient-reported outcome measure] for measuring physical functioning in adults with type 2 diabetes to make recommendations on the most suitable PROM to use in research or clinical practice.”*

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>.

*“The aim of the present study was to systematically evaluate the content validity of PROMs, which have specifically been developed to measure (aspects of) HRQOL [health-related quality of life] in people with type 2 diabetes.”*

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>.

*“The aim of this study was to systematically review the content validity and measurement properties of all PF [physical function] scales that have been validated for use in patients with RA [rheumatoid arthritis], by linking their content to the ICF [International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health] and to appraise the currently available evidence of the quality of their measurement properties in order to offer recommendations for the use of PF scales for various purposes and settings.”*

Oude Voshaar MA et al. Measurement properties of physical function scales validated for use in patients with rheumatoid arthritis: a systematic review of the literature. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes*, 2011;9(1):1-13. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1477-7525-9-99>.

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

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 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).