

Risk of Bias Assessment

Study Number:	Author:	Year:		
REVIEWER:				
Selection Bias	BIASED	NOT	?	
Representativeness of cases (participant recruitment)				
Baseline characteristics of the groups are similar (i.e. there are no systematic differences or participant is own control)				
Comments:				
Detection Bias	BIASED	NOT	?	
Diagnosis made according to recognised criteria (e.g. IASP 1994 – pain greater than 3 months, Budapest criteria for CRPS 2010, American college of Rheumatologist classification of RA 2010) OR a specific a priori criteria.				
Ensured controls were appropriately assessed to fulfil the role of being a ‘control’				
Comments:				
Statistical Methods and Study Size (<i>Reporting bias</i>)	BIASED	NOT	?	
Was the method of determining study size described and appropriate (a priori sample size calculations – power) OR was the sample size for each group in excess of 30 persons?				
Were the confounding variables controlled for? (e.g. by study design, such as matched controls , or statistical analysis)				
Were methods used to examine subgroups and interactions described and appropriate?				
n/a <input type="checkbox"/>				
Comments:				

Missing Data (<i>Reporting bias</i>)	BIASED	NOT	?
Are all outcomes and groups actually reported (e.g. compare aims, methods, and results to make sure)			
Were methods for dealing with missing data described and appropriate? n/a <input type="checkbox"/>			
Comments:			
Methodological bias	BIASED	NOT	?
Were outcome assessors blinded to group status if possible or relevant? Blinded <input type="checkbox"/>			
Valid and reliable measures used for assessment of clinical pain?			
Are the protocols for assessing and processing the reflex reported? (such as sampling rate, amplification, filtering, skin prep, etc)			
Comments:			