Risk of Bias assessment

form based on JBI rob form for case series

1.	assessor
	Mark only one oval.
	SE
	SK
	SKSE
	MK
	SEMK
	SKMK
2.	study id
3.	author
4.	year
5.	1. Were there clear criteria for inclusion in the case series?
	Scoring instruction: Eligibility criteria should include: a) Duration of pain; b) At least 1 exclusion criterion based on a comorbidity (e.g. dominant psychiatric disorder, recent surgery, etc.).
	Mark only one oval.
	wark only one oval.
	yes
	no
	unclear
	not applicable
5.	2. Was the condition measured in a standard, reliable way for all participants included in the case series? Scoring instruction: Study should include: a) Anatomic region (eligibility or descriptive); b) Minimum duration (eligibility or mean duration); c) Baseline level o
	emotional distress, or functional disability (eligibility or descriptive). (Based on ICD11 definition of Chronic primary pain (Treede 2015).
	Mark only one oval.
	yes
	no
	unclear
	not applicable

	Always "yes" because we only include validated instruments.
	Mark only one oval.
	yes no unclear not applicable
8.	4. Did the case series have consecutive inclusion of participants? "yes" if authors mention 'consecutive inclusion', or explicitly describe that they asked all patients to participate for the complete duration of the trial. Otherwise "no".
	Mark only one oval.
	yes no unclear not applicable
9.	5. Did the case series have complete inclusion of participants? Scoring instruction: YES: if all participants that were contacted agreed to participate (no dropout from initial contact to inclusion).• UNCLEAR: when study provides no information on this part of the study flow. NO if study flow shows a >10% 'drop-out' from initial contact to study inclusion. Mark only one oval.
	yes
	no unclear
	not applicable
10.	6. Was there clear reporting of the demographics of the participants in the study? Study should provide age and gender demographics and at least one of the following items (work status, education level, health literacy, or social economic status).
	Mark only one oval.
	yes
	ono unclear
	not applicable

7. 3. Were valid methods used for identification of the condition for all participants included in the case series?

	Study should include: a) Pain duration (central tendency); b) Outcome measures in at least 2 of the 6 IMMPACT domains (pain, physical function, emotional functioning, GPE, symptoms and adverse events, disposition [adherence to regimen and reasons for premature withdrawal]).
	Mark only one oval.
	yes
	no
	unclear
	ont applicable
12.	8. Were the outcomes or follow up results of cases clearly reported? YESif the results of all outcome measures from protocol and/or method section are reported in the results section. (search for protocol, if mentioned in method section> if mentioned: outcomes of protocol should be reported in results).* NO if not all outcomes are reported
	Mark only one oval.
	γes
	no
	unclear
	not applicable
13.	9. Was there clear reporting of the presenting site(s)/clinic(s) demographic information? "yes" if geographic location of the pain management center is known.
	Mark only one oval.
	yes
	no
	unclear
	onot applicable
1.4	We also shakishing and via account the 2
14.	Was the statistical analysis appropriate? Scoring instruction (two criteria A and B): A) YES for repeated measures ANOVA and MANOVA if there are equal time intervals between measurements; YES for GEE and mixed models; NO for statistical procedures that do not correct for within-subject correlation or do not evaluate the development of the outcome over time (e.g. cross sectional, at each time point); B) YES if dropouts are < 10%, or between 10-20% with a MVA and imputation procedure; NO if dropouts are between 10% and 20%, without a missing value analysis and imputation procedure; NO if dropouts are >20%.
	Mark only one oval.
	yes
	no
	unclear
	not applicable
15.	overall appraisal
	1x "no" or "unclear" risk of bias = high overall appraisal, unless there are good reasons for limited impact that should be specified in the comments below.
	Mark only one oval.
	high
	low

11. 7. Was there clear reporting of clinical information of the participants?

16.	comments
	for clarity, provide all comments/considerations regarded the assessment below. Please specify the question number.

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms