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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor name/initials** | NV |
| **Study ID and/or reference(s)** | Stavrakis (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** | AF burden over 2 week monitoring period after 6 months of stimulation. |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. | 85% decrease in AF burden compared to control. |

**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□ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)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 | Block randomised.  Mentioned use of concealed envelopes. |
| 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? | N | Several parameters tested for baseline significance. |
| **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? | PN | Participants were blinded. However, due to 6 months of intervention, participants may have attempted to look up aVNS. Adherence to stimulation protocol was measured and satisfactory.  Investigators were blinded except for the one instructing participants on positioning of ear clips and the statistician. |
| 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? | PY | Adherence to stimulation protocol was measured and satisfactory. |
| 2.5. Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen? | PY | Adherence to stimulation protocol was measured and satisfactory. |
| 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? | NA |  |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low | AF burden increased in sham group from baseline (p = 0.22). May be due to sham having an effect. Tracing studies have shown connection from ear lobe greater auricular nerve to NTS. |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? | Blank |  |
| **Bias due to missing outcome data** | 3.1 Were outcome data available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized? | PY | Several participants did not complete and were well documented. |
| 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? | PN | Outcome assessed by objective means. |
| 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 | Outcome assessed by objective means. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low |  |
| 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... |  | The only point of evaluation during stimulation (if we were to presume a short washout period) is at 3 months. 3 month data was not analysed separately. Several other outcomes measured without pre-registration resulted in NI. |
| 5.1. ... multiple outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain? | NI |  |
| 5.2 ... multiple analyses of the data? | PN | Both comparison to baseline and between active and control were reported. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns | Trial was not pre-registered. |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result? |  |  |
| Blank |
| **Overall bias** | **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns |  |
| Optional:  What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? | Blank |  |