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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor name/initials** | MK |
| **Study ID and/or reference(s)** | Andreas 2019 |

**Study design**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| þ | Randomized parallel group trial |
| £ | Cluster-randomized trial |
| £ | Randomized cross-over or other matched design |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias** | postoperative atrial fibrillation |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. | Patients receiving low level transcutaneous stimulation (LLTS) had a significantly reduced occurrence of POAF (4 of 20) when compared with controls (11 of 20, P=0.022) |

**Is your aim for this study…?**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| £ | to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* |
| þ | 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)?**

þ 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£ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)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? | PY |  |
| 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? | PN | Table 1 shows non-significant differences in demographic and perioperative data. However, the 2 groups were clinically different. |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process? | NA |  |
| **Bias due to deviations from intended interventions** | 2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? | PN | The study was double-blind. The low-level stimulation was not perceptible for the patients. |
| 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? | N | “A higher number of patients in the sham-control group had combined procedures than those with LLTS treatment.” |
| 2.4. Was the intervention implemented successfully? | PY | There are no indicators that the intervention was not implemented successfully. |
| 2.5. Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen? | PY | The participants were in post-surgical hospital care. It is assumed that they were monitored during this time window. |
| 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** | Some concerns | Handbook was overridden. The higher number of patients with combined procedures is a limitation to the study. |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? | NA |  |
| **Bias due to missing outcome data** | 3.1 Were outcome data available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized? | PY | Only 2/42 patients data was not available. |
| 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? | NA |  |
| **Bias in measurement of the outcome** | 4.1 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants? | PN | The study was double blind. Sham devices were set to turn off after 1 cycle and given to the caretakers in enveloppes. |
| 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 |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to measurement of the outcome? | NA |  |
| **Bias in selection of the reported result** | Are the reported outcome data likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from... |  | No, the primary outcome measure was post operative atrial fibrillation or NO post operative fibrillation. |
| 5.1. ... multiple outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain? | PN |  |
| 5.2 ... multiple analyses of the data? | PN |  |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result? | NA |  |
| **Overall bias** | **Risk of bias judgement** | Some concerns |  |
| Optional:  What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? | NA |  |