# The RoB 2.0 tool (individually randomized, parallel group trials)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor name/initials** | JM |
| **Study ID and/or reference(s)** | Rong (2014) |

**Study design**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| 🗹 | Randomized parallel group trial |
| □ | Cluster-randomized trial |
| □ | Randomized cross-over or other matched design |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias** | Seizure frequency |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. | At 8 weeks, decrease from 84.6 SE 14.7 to 48.6 SE 12.0 (active) and 66.43 SE 12.34 to 58.8 SE 12.8 (control). Corresponds to 42.6% and 11.5% decrease, respectively (p < 0.05). |

**Is your aim for this study…?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| □ | to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* |
| 🗹 | to assess the effect of *starting and adhering to intervention* |

**Which of the following sources have you obtained to help inform your risk of bias judgements (tick as many as apply)?**

🗹 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□ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)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, Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)

□ Personal communication with trialist

□ Personal communication with the sponsor

## Risk of bias assessment for a parallel group trial with interest in the effect of starting and adhering to intervention

| **Domain** | **Signalling questions** | **Response options** | **Description/Support for judgement** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bias arising from the randomization process** | 1.1 Was the allocation sequence random? | Y | Specified random  Kept in envelope until physician opened it to distribute electrodes to participants |
| 1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were recruited and assigned to interventions? | Y |
| 1.3 Were there baseline imbalances that suggest a problem with the randomization process? | NI | Male:female ratio was (seemingly intentionally) set to 2:1, not explained why. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low | From algorithm |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process? | Blank |  |
| **Bias due to deviations from intended interventions** | 2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? | PN | Excellent job of blinding done for sham.  Personnel were also blinded well |
| 2.2. Were carers and trial personnel aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? | PN |
| 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important co-interventions balanced across intervention groups? | NA |  |
| 2.4. Was the intervention implemented successfully? | Y | No reported failed interventions |
| 2.5. Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen? | N | Some participants did not return for follow-up. |
| 2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of starting and adhering to the intervention? | PY | Patients that left/didn’t follow intervention were statistically included as ineffective cases |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns | From algorithm |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? | Unpredictable |  |
| **Bias due to missing outcome data** | 3.1 Were outcome data available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized? | Y | No reason to suspect that data was removed |
| 3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Are the proportions of missing outcome data and reasons for missing outcome data similar across intervention groups? | NA |  |
| 3.3 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that results were robust to the presence of missing outcome data? | NA |  |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low | From algorithm |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data? | Blank |  |
| **Bias in measurement of the outcome** | 4.1 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants? | PN | Double blind seems robust and well thought-out |
| 4.2 If Y/PY/NI to 4.1: Was the assessment of the outcome likely to be influenced by knowledge of intervention received? | NA |  |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low | From algorithm |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to measurement of the outcome? | Blank |  |
| **Bias in selection of the reported result** | Are the reported outcome data likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from... |  |  |
| 5.1. ... multiple outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain? | NI | Multiple timepoints were recorded and analyzed, intentions were not specified |
| 5.2 ... multiple analyses of the data? | NI | Multiple comparisons were performed without statement of intentions |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns | From algorithm |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result? | Blank |  |
| **Overall bias** | **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns | good sham. not sure why they had a 2:1 baseline male:female ratio. |
| Optional:  What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? | Unpredictable |  |