

Risk of bias assessments for studies included in prevalence tables or meta-analyses

Cross-sectional studies

Based on criteria at:

Risk of Bias in Cross-Sectional Surveys of Attitudes and Practices

<https://www.evidencepartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Risk-of-Bias-Instrument-for-Cross-Sectional-Surveys-of-Attitudes-and-Practices.pdf>

1. Is the source population representative of the population of interest?
2. Is the response rate adequate?
3. Is there little missing data?
4. Is the survey clinically sensible face validity? [Face validity]
5. Is there any evidence for the reliability and validity of the survey instrument?

Risk of bias: High / Low; NR = Not reported

<i>Study</i>	<i>Representative sample</i>	<i>Adequate response rate</i>	<i>Missing data</i>	<i>Face validity</i>	<i>Use of validated scales</i>
C. Liu et al 2020	Low	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
C.S. Chen et al 2005	High	High (NR)	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Chan & Huak 2004	Low	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Chong et al 2004	Low	High	Low	High (NR)	Low
Chung & Yeung, 2020	Low	High	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
J. Z. Huang et al 2020	-	-	-	-	Low
Lai et al 2020	Low	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Lancee et al 2008	High	High	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Lin et al 2007	High	High (NR)	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Matsuishi et al 2012	Low	High	Low	High (NR)	Low
Maunder et al 2006	Low	High	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
McAlonan et al 2005	Low	Low	Low	High (NR)	Low
Poon et al 2004	High	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
S.M. Lee et al 2018	Low	High	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Sim et al 2004	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low

Tham et al 2004	Low	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Wu et al 2008	Low	Low	High (NR)	High (NR)	Low
Z. Liu et al 2020	High	Unclear	Low	High (NR)	Low
Zhu et al 2020	Low	Low	Low	High (NR)	Low

Case-control studies

Criteria at:

Tool to Assess Risk of Bias in Case Control Studies

<https://www.evidencepartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Tool-to-Assess-Risk-of-Bias-in-Case-Control-Studies.pdf>

1. Can we be confident in the assessment of exposure?
2. Can we be confident that cases had developed the outcome of interest and controls had not?
3. Were the cases (those who were exposed and developed the outcome of interest) properly selected?
4. Were the controls (those who were exposed and did not develop the outcome of interest) properly selected?
5. Were cases and controls matched according to important prognostic variables or was statistical adjustment carried out for those variables?

<i>Study</i>	<i>Assessment of exposure</i>	<i>Case / control outcome differentiation</i>	<i>Case selection</i>	<i>Control selection</i>	<i>Matching</i>
C.S. Chen et al 2005	Low	Low	High	High	High
Lin et al 2007	Low	Low	High	High	High
Maunder et al 2006*	High	Low	High	High	High

*High risk subset follow-up only so included here as case-control study

Cohort studies

Tool to Assess Risk of Bias in Cohort Studies

<https://www.evidencepartners.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/Tool-to-Assess-Risk-of-Bias-in-Cohort-Studies.pdf>

1. Was selection of exposed and non-exposed cohorts drawn from the same population?
2. Can we be confident in the assessment of exposure?
3. Can we be confident that the outcome of interest was not present at start of study?
4. Did the study match exposed and unexposed for all variables that are associated with the outcome of interest or did the statistical analysis adjust for these prognostic variables?
5. Can we be confident in the assessment of the presence or absence of prognostic factors?
6. Can we be confident in the assessment of outcome?
7. Was the follow up of cohorts adequate?
8. Were co-interventions similar between groups?

<i>Study</i>	<i>Selection</i>	<i>Exposure assessment</i>	<i>Outcome not present at start</i>	<i>Matching</i>	<i>Assessment prognostic factors</i>	<i>Assessment outcome</i>	<i>Adequate follow-up</i>	<i>Similar co-interventions</i>
Ji et al 2017	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low
Li et al 2015	High	Low	High	High	Low	High	Low	Low
Su et al 2007	Low	Low	High	High	Low	High	High	Low