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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor name/initials** | NV |
| **Study ID and/or reference(s)** | Salama (2020) |

**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** | All reported outcomes |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. | All reported outcomes since pre-registration was not clearly defined in report. |

**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□ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)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 | Specify block randomised. Concealment not reported. Limitation of paper states “selection bias cannot be excluded completely”. Unclear. |
| 1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were recruited and assigned to interventions? | PY |
| 1.3 Were there baseline imbalances that suggest a problem with the randomization process? | N | Baselines balanced where reported |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low |  |
| 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? | Y | Not blinded. Control is untreated. |
| 2.2. Were carers and trial personnel aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? | Y |
| 2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important co-interventions balanced across intervention groups? | PN | Placebo effect of novel medical device is missing in untreated control group. |
| 2.4. Was the intervention implemented successfully? | Y |  |
| 2.5. Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen? | PY | Not reported otherwise. Considering hospital administration adherence is believable. |
| 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? | N | Cointervention applies to entire group. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | High |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? | Favours experimental |  |
| **Bias due to missing outcome data** | 3.1 Were outcome data available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized? | PY | 100 participants mentioned in report. 130 enrolled is mentioned on pre-registration (NCT03204968) |
| 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 |  |
| 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? | Y | Not blinded |
| 4.2 If Y/PY/NI to 4.1: Was the assessment of the outcome likely to be influenced by knowledge of intervention received? | PY | Measurements of cytokines will not be biased. However, diagnosis of pneumonia, sterile conditions, and duration of hospitalization is controlled by physician. Also, likely provider effects which can bias even objective measures like cytokine levels. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to measurement of the outcome? | Favours experimental |  |
| **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 cytokines measured. Pneumonia, hospitalization duration, and respiratory difficulty not pre-registered but reported. |
| 5.2 ... multiple analyses of the data? | NI | Between and within group analysis used as convenient. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result? | Favours experimental |  |
| **Overall bias** | **Risk of bias judgement** | High |  |
| Optional:  What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? | Favours experimental |  |