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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study details**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Reference** | Zivkovic, Miodrag, et al. "COVID-19 cases prediction by using hybrid machine learning and beetle antennae search approach." *Sustainable Cities and Society* 66 (2021): 102669. |   **Study design**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | X | Individually-randomized parallel-group trial | | □ | Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial | | □ | Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial |   **For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Experimental: | Improve the current time-series prediction (forecasting) algorithms based on hybrids between machine learning and nature-inspired algorithms | Comparator: | No intervention |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias** | Accuracy of COVID pandemics case prediction by hybrid machine learning method based on Bettle Antennae Search (BAS) and adaptive neuro-fuzzy inference system (ANFIS), named Cauchy exploration strategy BAS (CESBAS). |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Specify the numerical result being assessed.** In case of multiple alternative analyses being presented, specify the numeric result (e.g. RR = 1.52 (95% CI 0.83 to 2.77) and/or a reference (e.g. to a table, figure or paragraph) that uniquely defines the result being assessed. | Results are presented in Table 3 and Table 4. Depending on the metaheuristics employed, CESBAS exhibited same performance as other known BAS algorithms. |   **Is the review team’s aim for this result…?**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | X | to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* (the ‘intention-to-treat’ effect) | | □ | to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention* (the ‘per-protocol’ effect) |   **If the aim is to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention***, select the deviations from intended intervention that should be addressed (at least one must be checked):  □ occurrence of non-protocol interventions  □ failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome  X non-adherence to their assigned intervention by trial participants  **Which of the following sources were obtained to help inform the risk-of-bias assessment? (tick as many as apply)**  X Journal article(s) with results of the trial  □ Trial protocol  □ Statistical analysis plan (SAP)  □ Non-commercial trial registry record (e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov record)  □ Company-owned trial registry record (e.g. GSK Clinical Study Register record)  □ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)  □ Conference abstract(s) about the trial  □ Regulatory document (e.g. Clinical Study Report, Drug Approval Package)  □ Research ethics application  □ Grant database summary (e.g. NIH RePORTER or Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)  □ Personal communication with trialist  □ Personal communication with the sponsor |

## Risk of bias assessment

Responses underlined in green are potential markers for low risk of bias, and responses in red are potential markers for a risk of bias. Where questions relate only to sign posts to other questions, no formatting is used.

**Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?** |  | PY |
| **1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?** | Y |
| **1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?** |  | PN |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Low |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process? |  | Favours experimental |

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of assignment to intervention*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?** |  | N |
| **2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?** | N |
| **2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?** |  | N |
| **2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?** |  | N |
| **2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?** |  | PN |
| **2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?** |  | Y |
| **2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?** |  | PN |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Some concerns |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? |  | Favours experimental |

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of adhering to intervention*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?** |  | N |
| **2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?** | N |
| **2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?** |  | PY |
| **2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?** |  | PN |
| **2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants’ outcomes?** |  | PY |
| **2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?** |  | PY |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Some concerns |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? |  | Favours experimental |

Domain 3: Missing outcome data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?** |  | PY |
| **3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?** |  | PY |
| **3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?** |  | N |
| **3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?** | N |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Low |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data? |  | Favours experimental |

Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?** |  | N |
| **4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?** |  | PN |
| **4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?** |  | PN |
| **4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?** |  | N |
| **4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4:** **Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?** | N |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Low |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome? |  | Favours experimental |

Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?** |  | Y |
| **Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...** |  |  |
| **5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?** |  | PY |
| **5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?** |  | PY |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | High |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result? |  | Favours experimental |

Overall risk of bias

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | High |
| Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? |  | Favours experimental / Favours comparator |
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