Appendix 1 Current triage tool (10/03/2017)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **ABSTRACT** | **SUMMARY OF FINDINGS TABLE** | **DATA AND ANALYSIS (for Critical and Important outcomes in Main comparison)** |
| **Item**  | **Response**  | **Item**  | **Response** | **Item**  | **Response** |
| Title reflects the review question |  | SoF table presents main outcomes (both benefits and adverse effects) for main comparison*Look at methods section for consistency of SoF table outcomes; Assess methods for using GRADE* |   | Analyses match the plan specified in the methods section (e.g. MDs or SMDs; fixed or random effects meta-analysis)*MDs or SMDs; fixed/random effects, subgroup analysis. Check differences between protocol & review to see what plans changed from protocol.* |   |
| Research question (PICO) is clear and the rationale for the review is well described |  | PICO (including Settings) presented and accurate |  | Data from non-standard designs (cluster, cross-over, etc.) appropriately incorporated where relevant (check ‘Unit of analysis issues’ in methods & footnotes in forest plots)*Check ‘Unit of analysis issues’ in methods/footnotes in forest plots/sensitivity analyses. Study characteristics help to confirm unit of allocation & sample sizes if in doubt.* |  |
| Search date is less than 12 months from publication? |  | Outcomes fully defined (i.e. time of measurement, scale of measurement, range of scores specified) |  | Multiple measurements from multi-arm studies or subgroups handled appropriately (check for double counting of studies in Forest plot and adjustment of sample size in control groups)*Check for double counting of studies in Forest plot & adjustment of events/sample size in control groups* |  |
| Direction, magnitude and confidence intervals of effects clearly described where appropriate |  | Assumed and Corresponding risks presented (where appropriate) |  | Outlying results acknowledged and explored appropriately *Assess plausibility of direction/size of effect* |  |
| Findings for all important outcomes reported for the main comparison(s), including information about harm? (i.e. consistent with the outcomes reported in the SoF table)*Check consistency with first SoF table & others as appropriate*  |  | Clear and accurate summary of narrative results (where appropriate) |  | No unusually high or low mean/SD/count data (look at comparability of SDs for studies using same scale; check that sample sizes for same studies are similar across key outcomes; look at weights of individual studies relative to sample size)*Comparability of SDs for studies using same scale (end of treatment).* *Weights of individual studies relative to sample size**Similar sample sizes across different outcomes for the same study (events not participants)* |   |
| There an estimation of the certainty (or quality) of the body of evidence using GRADE for each outcome reported in the abstract |  | Quality ratings presented for narrative results (where appropriate) |   |
| Absolute effects used to illustrate the relative effects where appropriate |  | GRADE ratings are clearly justified (supported by clear and appropriate quality assessment criteria in Footnotes) |  | Key findings consistent across the summary versions of the review (compare abstract, PLS, SoF table, Effects of interventions and Data tables)  |  |
| Reporting of results avoids emphasizing statistical significance to determine presence or absence of an effect |  |  |
| Conclusions are an accurate reflection of the evidence presented in the GRADE SoF table(s) and do not make direct recommendations |  |  |