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# **Minutes**

## **1. Update from last Web Clinic**

Tables design for the Cochrane Library were presented at the last Web Clinic (Dec 2019).

All comments and feedback on these tables are now with the Design team.

## **2. Reporting of RoB2**

We have developed DRAFT guidance for reporting RoB2. The guidance was put together by following discussions with the Bias Methods Group, Kerry Dwan and Tess Moore (Methods Support Unit) and Toby Lasserson (Deputy Editor in Chief). This guidance will be included in the RoB2 Starter pack. The guidance was described by Ella in the call.

Feedback from authors on this guidance is welcomed by the RoB2 Pilot.

## Question 1 Reporting RoB2:

Beth Clark: Should we be using the fixed headings for ‘Domains’ in the ‘Risk of bias in included studies’ section in RevMan Web? As these don’t appear to fit with the RoB2 guidance - which is to not present the domains.

Ella Flemyng: The new reporting guidance encourages authors to link RoB discussions much more closely to the results on the effects, so that they don’t place them in abstract discussions that are disconnected from the results to which they refer. Therefore, domain specific reflections in the ‘Risk of bias in included studies’ section may not be relevant for the reader. This should all be reflected in the new reporting guidance.

Rebecka Hall: I’ll note this and we can change RevMan Web. We will also check which teams using RoB2 in RevMan Web have used these subheadings and provide support to change in light of the new reporting guidance.

## Question 2 (and supplemental questions): Reporting RoB2 for a review that includes both ‘Effect of Adherence’ and ‘Effect of Assignment’.

Beth Clark:

We as an author team discussed our review and decided we wanted to assess both ‘adherence’ and ‘assignment’. There is not space to input information from both into RevMan Web. Following guidance from Toby Lasserson, to input the one that was most important. We have now done this into forest plots and RoB tables. But we are now unsure what to do with the information for the second that we have been unable to include. What should we do with the additional information?

Answer:

In your write up please be transparent and clear about why you have chosen to address both ‘assignment’ and ‘adherence’. As for presenting there are some options for this: As this is one of your research questions it is important to include it in your reporting for the review. You could use RoBviz tool (on the riskofbiasinfo website) to create images to import in to figures. You can use additional tables. It is also possible to add extra information in an appendix. It would also be really helpful to signal clearly to readers from objectives/ research questions through methods to Results that there are different questions being answered using the two variants of RoB2.

Question to Rebecka Hall. Is it possible to add a facility for this in RevMan Web? We are not yet sure if author teams doing both assessments on every outcome, or would it be a rare thing.

Answer (Rebecka Hall): This would seem unlikely. It is not a straightforward thing to change in RevMan Web.

## **3. Screening and data extraction**

## Question 3 What can authors do in the early stages to prepare for data extraction and risk of bias screening?

Kerry Dwan: We as an author team on a review in the pilot are running through a calibration exercise for all authors (both methodological and clinical). We are having conference calls to run through our responses to the signalling questions.

Kerry Dwan: From our experience of the calibration exercise we think it’s a good idea to have all documentation (e.g. trial registry reports, etc) available when you start your RoB2 assessments. As some decisions were changed following the discovery of new documents (Protocols) for some of the studies.

## Question 4: The Excel tool

Craig Williams: We are using the Excel tool. Does the tool link into RevMan Web?

The Excel file cannot be imported into RevMan Web (at this point in time). The RoB 2 team are working on an online tool which should be available in late spring this year. There is discussion about trying to get transferability from the online tool/ excel tool to RevMan Web and we will keep you updated as these discussions progress.

Our advice is that detailed RoB assessments (with consensus responses to the signalling questions) may be presented in supplementary materials via an online repository such as datadryad.org or figshare.com (see the [Editorial Policy here](https://documentation.cochrane.org/display/EPPR/Supplemental%2Bdata%2Band%2Bfiles)). Then authors need to manually copy over the decisions for each domain, the overall risk of bias and the support for judgements into RevMan Web. The domain ratings from all authors assessing risk of bias do not need to be included (only the agreed, consolidated ratings).

## Question 5 (and supplemental questions) Using Covidence and RoB2

Question from Ella Flemyng: Has anyone on this call used Covidence with RoB2 data? Early conversations we had with the Covidence team was that they were going to implement the new study-centric data format before making RoB 2 specific changes.

Covidence does not currently support RoB 2. Covidence are currently redoing their data-extraction module. Once this is done it can be integrated with RevMan Web. This is a large commitment in terms of remodelling of software. As is development of RoB2. We would need to speak to Covidence about timelines.

Craig Williams: We used Covidence. But were unable to put RoB2 into it as the signalling questions did not match up. We would be very interested to know, in future, when Covidence is RoB2 ready.

## Question 6: Using Distiller and RoB2/ RevMan Web

Åse Sjøstrand: May I ask what the situation is with Distiller and RoB2? We are using Distiller SR?

Rebecka Hall: There are currently no conversations between RevMan Web and Distiller SR regarding RoB2 and no ongoing conversations about integrating Distiller SR with RevManWeb at the moment.

Åse Sjøstrand: Does that mean I can screen in Distiller SR?

 Rebecka Hall: Yes - you can screen in Distiller and then import data into RevMan5. From there you can convert to RevMan Web. At that point you can turn on RoB2 in RevMan Web, and at that point back-compatibility with RevMan5 will be broken. However, this way of working would not support updating the review.

## **4. Sensitivity analyses**

## Question 7 Sensitivity analysis and RoB2, Our protocol includes our plans for sensitivity analyses using RoB1 tool. What should we do to change for RoB2 tool?

The guidance for RoB2 states reviewers should use the overall categorisation of bias for RoB2, rather than individual domains as might have been done in RoB1. Authors would need to change their methods to reflect this, and put a note describing the change in ‘Differences between a protocol and the review section. Justification would be that you are changing risk of bias tool.

## **5 General questions in RevMan Web**

## Question 8 RevMan Web and sensitivity analyses

In RevMan5 it is possible to switch off which studies are included in a meta-analysis and then easily switch it back on again. In RevMan Web I cannot see an easy way to do this.

Rebecka Hall: Currently it’s not possible in RevMan Web. But it is one of the items that is high priority list. We expect to have included this facility by the end of Quarter 1 2020.

## Question 9 When might the outcome level summary tables be available in RevMan Web?

Answer: At present the table are still in the design phase with the Cochrane Library. Once we finalise what they will look like in the Cochrane Library, the RevMan team will create similar designs in RevMan Web.

## Question 10 What do authors do if they want to publish their reviews before then?

The plan is to have the table design finished by the time the first review in the pilot is editorial accepted (approximately May 2020). And even though it may not be possible for you to view your tables in RevMan Web it should be possible to publish them as the Cochrane Library team will be able to create the review from the data you have input to RevMan Web to create tables to publish.

## **5 Any other business**

Next clinic is on 27 February 2020 at 9:00-10:00 GMT.

No updates to the RoB 2 starter pack in the last month.

***Request from Ella Flemyng to all pilot review groups to drop us a brief email with the status of your review for our records.***