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

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Assessor name/initials** | MK |
| **Study ID and/or reference(s)** | Straube et. Al 2015 |

**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** | Decrease in headache/28 days |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **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. | **PP analysis:** -7.0 per 28 days in 1Hz group (36.4% reduction) and -3.3 per 28 days in 25 Hz group (17.4% reduction). Here, there is a statistically significantly difference between the two groups (p =0.035). **ITT analysis**: both groups had significant decrease in headaches, but no significant group difference = 0.094 |

**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£ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)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? | Y | The trial was randomized |
| 1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were recruited and assigned to interventions? | Y | Yes, the study was double-blind |
| 1.3 Were there baseline imbalances that suggest a problem with the randomization process? | N | No, there was no statistically significant baselines differences. Reference Table 1 |
| **Risk of bias judgement** | Low |  |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process? | NA | NA |
| **Bias due to deviations from intended interventions** | 2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial? | N | No, they were blinded. Both groups had active stimulation |
| 2.2. Were carers and trial personnel aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial? | N | No, it was double blind. |
| 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? | N | The active control had an unintended effect. It was even more effective the 25Hz stimulation.  Essentially, this means that there was not active control. |
| 2.5. Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen? | PY | “85% compliance” |
| 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** | High | Override: effect of sham was too great and thus this trial has no control. |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? |  |  |
| **Bias due to missing outcome data** | 3.1 Were outcome data available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized? | PY | Data was analysed both as ITT and PP.  40/46 of the people completed the experiment |
| 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 | No, the outcome assessors were the patients through diaries. They were blinded during this experiment.  “Patients kept a paper-and-pencil head- ache diary during the entire period, handing in their diaries and receiving a fresh sheet at each visit. In the diary, pa- tients indicated for every day (1) headache duration in hours, (2) headache intensity (on a 0 to 10 numerical rating scale: 0, no pain; 10, strongest pain imaginable), and (3) intake of acute headache medication (analgesics, triptans).” |
| 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. Primary endpoint measuremnt “Headaches/28 days” is consistent with registration |
| 5.1. ... multiple outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain? | PN |  |
| 5.2 ... multiple analyses of the data? | PN | No. Although multiple analyses of data are presented. Both ITT and PP |
| **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** | High | Override: Since the sham (1Hz) was more effective than the 25hz stim, there was no actual control for this experiment. |
| Optional:  What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? | NA |  |