

Sep 13, 2024

Protocol: Evaluation of the quality of reporting and risk of bias of predictive models widely used in UK perioperative practice

DOI

dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.ewov19bwylr2/v1

Joseph Alderman¹

¹University of Birmingham



Joseph Alderman

University of Birmingham

OPEN  ACCESS



DOI: dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.ewov19bwylr2/v1

External link: <http://www.periopprediction.co.uk>

Protocol Citation: Joseph Alderman 2024. Protocol: Evaluation of the quality of reporting and risk of bias of predictive models widely used in UK perioperative practice. protocols.io <https://dx.doi.org/10.17504/protocols.io.ewov19bwylr2/v1>

License: This is an open access protocol distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited

Protocol status: Working

We use this protocol and it's working

Created: September 13, 2024

Last Modified: September 13, 2024

Protocol Integer ID: 107593

Keywords: Predictive models, prognostic models, healthcare, medicine, surgery, anaesthesia, anesthesiology



Abstract

The aim of this targeted literature review is to critically appraise the reporting and methodological robustness of studies describing the development of predictive models which are most widely used in UK perioperative practice. This is not intended to be a systematic review of the evidence supporting each model - more a review of the state of evidence in general to inform the design of future research studies and develop policy recommendations.

Objectives include:

1. Apply the TRIPOD+AI and PROBAST frameworks to papers describing development of predictive models used frequently in perioperative practice.
2. Summarise the clinical context and population groups represented in any development and validation datasets.
3. Identify the 'intended use' of PMCS being investigated.
4. Identify actionable recommendations for future development/validation studies by comparing limitations across literature sources.

Attachments



PROTOCOL V1

Evaluat...

351KB

