Appendix D. Risk-of-Bias Assessment Form for Observational Studies

Author	Year		(PMID) Reviewe	r
Question	Response		Criteria	Justification
QUESTION	Пезропас	Int	ernal Validity	- Custinication
Is the study design prospective, retrospective, or mixed?	Prospective		Outcome has not occurred at the time the study is initiated and information is collected over time to assess relationships with the outcome.	
	Mixed		Studies in which one group is studied prospectively and the other retrospectively.	
O. A.:	Retrospective	<u> </u>	Analyzes data from past records.	
Are inclusion/exclusion criteria clearly stated?	Yes Partially		Some, but not all, criteria stated	
Criteria clearly stated?	No		or some not clearly stated.	
Are baseline characteristics	Yes			
measured using valid and reliable measures	No			
and equivalent in both groups?	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained.	
Is the level of detail describing the	Yes		Intervention described included adequate service details	
intervention adequate?	Partially		Some of the above features.	
	No		None of the above features.	
5. Is the selection of the comparison group appropriate?	Yes		Considering diagnostic assessment, other patient characteristics	
	Partially			
	No			
6. Did researchers isolate the impact from	Yes		Accounted for concurrent informal care.	
a concurrent intervention or an	Partially			
unintended exposure that might bias results?	No			
7. Any attempt to balance the allocation	Yes		(If yes, what was used?)	
between the groups (e.g., stratification,	No			
matching, propensity scores)?	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained.	
8. Were outcomes assessors blinded?	Yes		Who were outcome assessors?	
assessors billided!	No			
9. Are outcomes assessed using valid and reliable measures, implemented	Yes		Measure valid and reliable (i.e., objective measures, well validated scale, provider report); and equivalent across groups.	

Question	Response		Criteria	Justification
consistently across all	Partially		Some of the above features	
study participants?			(partially validated scale)	
	No	Ш	None of the above features (self-	
			report, scales with lower validity,	
			reliability); not equivalent across groups	
	Uncertain	\Box	Could not be ascertained.	
	Oncortain	Ш	Could not be accortained.	
10. Is the length of followup the same for all groups?	Yes			
	No			
	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained.	
11. Did attrition result in a difference in group characteristics between baseline and followup?	Yes		(Measurement period of interest if repeated measures)	
	No			
	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained (i.e. retrospective designs where eligible at baseline could not be determined)	
12. If baseline characteristics are not similar, does the analysis control for	Yes			
	No			
baseline differences	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained (i.e.,	
between groups?			retrospective designs where	
			eligible at baseline could not be	
13. Are confounding	Yes	$\overline{}$	determined)	
and/or effect modifying	165	Ш		
variables assessed	No	П		
using valid and reliable				
measures across all	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained (i.e.,	
study participants?			retrospective designs where	
			eligible at baseline could not be	
	NA	\Box	determined) No confounders or effect	
	INA	Ш	modifiers included in the study.	
14. Were the important	Yes	П		
confounding and effect				
modifying variables	Partially		Some variables taken into	
taken into account in			account or adjustment achieved	
the design and/or analysis (e.g., through	No	\neg	to some extent. Not accounted for or not	
matching, stratification,	INO	Ш	identified.	
interaction terms,	Uncertain	П	Could not be ascertained	
multivariate analysis, or				
other statistical				
adjustment)?			Otatiatia al ta abasianna anna duannat	
15. Are the statistical methods used to	Yes	Ш	Statistical techniques used must be appropriate to the data.	
assess the primary	Partially		be appropriate to the data.	
outcomes appropriate	. artiany			
to the data?	No			
	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained	

Question	Response		Criteria	Justification
16. Are reports of the study free of	Yes			
suggestion of selective	No		Not all prespecified outcomes	
outcome reporting?			reported, subscales not	
			prespecified reported, outcomes reported incompletely.	
	Uncertain		Could not be ascertained.	
17. Funding source identified	No			Industry, government, university, Foundation
	Yes		Who provided funding?	(funded by what money source?)
	Uncertain			
		Over		
18. Overall Risk of Bias assessment	Low		Results are believable taking study limitations into consideration	
	Moderate		Results are probably believable	
			taking study limitations into consideration	
	High		Results are uncertain taking	
			study limitations into	
			consideration	