Risk of bias assessment: Quantitative study

The Cochranes collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias and Cochranes systematic review "Intervention" was used as inspiration in development of this table (1,2) v. 20.08.19

Study Title/author	**4993 Community Nursing Support for clients with schizophrenia Beebe (2001)**	Authors' comments	Authors Judgement
Selection bias			
-Randomization generation	Description of strategy used to generate random allocation	Pt's were randomly allocated. No description of the randomization process.	unknown
-Allocation concealment	Description of steps taken to conceal the process how to achieve implementation of random allocation	Patient's did not know if they were in intervention or not	High risk
Performance bias			
-blinding	Description of who, if any, and how they were blinded after assignment to intervention (participants, care providers, administers of co-intervention, assessors). If blinding was not possible, description of steps taken to limit bias	No blinding was described. The principal investigator collected data and phoned both intervention and control group.	High risk
-adherence	Description of intervention for the treatment and the comparator groups. Description of how -the intervention was standardized, -protocol adherence of care providers was assessed/enhanced -participants adherence to the intervention was assessed/enhanced (incl. medication adherence)	A protocol for the intervention telephone call is provided for the intervention group members and some guidelines for the telephone call to the control group members. "Problems with medication"? was addressed during the intervention call.	Low risk
-staff educational background	Description of staff education, whether there was a particular training preceding participating in the intervention, and whether there is comparability of staff skills across the groups of the intervention	The principal investigator made all the phone calls and collected all the data.	High risk
Detection bias			
-outcome assessment	Description of primary and secondary outcome for each group.	Community survival time and mean length of stay for intervention and control group was described.	High risk
Attrition bias			
-analysis	Description of the number of participants in each analysis, and whether the analysis included the entire original group. Intention to treat or a description of another method/strategy. Effect size and confidence interval.	The **risk of attrition bias was addressed** due to 9 of the 11 non-completers were from the experimental group. Chi square test of association was performed for differences between completers and non-completers, and intervention group vs. tau group. No significant differences existed. T-test and Kaplan Meier was applied. The reduction in re-hospitalizations (p=.52) and the reduction in "length of stay"(p=.51) were not statistical significant.	Low risk
Reporting bias			
-selective outcome reporting	Describe if the results as presented match the aim and the outcome(s) of the study	The description of the change in rehospitalization and length of stay match the aim. No outcome report on stress.	Unknown
Other sources of bias		The **risk of selection bias** is addressed in terms of "self-selection bias" among possible participants, as the weaker patients may might have declined to participate in the study; as well as bias caused by the inclusion criteria, as only patients who had a home and a telephone could be included in the study, excluding the weaker patients	High Risk of selection bias Only 39% of potential participants were included. 31% denied and 30%? Could not be contacted as they were discharged. This adds up to 120%. This does not, however, change the issue of selection bias.