Revised Cochrane risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2)
TEMPLATE FOR COMPLETION

Edited by Julian PT Higgins, Jelena Savović, Matthew J Page, Jonathan AC Sterne
on behalf of the RoB2 Development Group
Version of 22 August 2019

The development of the RoB 2 tool was supported by the MRC Network of Hubs for Trials Methodology Research (MR/L004933/2- N61), with the support of the host MRC ConDuCT-II Hub (Collaboration and innovation for Difficult and Complex randomised controlled Trials In Invasive procedures - MR/K025643/1), by MRC research grant MR/M025209/1, and by a grant from The Cochrane Collaboration.

Study details

Reference	Delle Karth G, Geppert A, Neunteufl T, Priglinger U, Haumer M, Gschwandtner M, et al. Amiodarone versus diltiazem for rate control in critically ill patients with atrial tachyarrhythmias. Crit Care Med 2001;29:1149-53. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00003246-200106000-00011

Study design

- X Individually-randomized parallel-group trial
- ☐ Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial
- ☐ Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial

For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as

Experimental: Amiodarone | Comparator: Diltiazem

Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias | Rate control

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.

Is the review team's aim for this result…?

X to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)

☐ to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention* (the 'per-protocol' effect)

If the aim is to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention*, select the deviations from intended intervention that should be addressed (at least one must be checked):

☐ occurrence of non-protocol interventions
☐ failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome
☐ non-adherence to their assigned intervention by trial participants

Which of the following sources were <u>obtained</u> to help inform the risk-of-bias assessment? (tick as many as apply)

X 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 or Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)
☐ Personal communication with trialist
☐ Personal communication with the sponsor

Risk of bias assessment

Responses underlined in green are potential markers for low risk of bias, and responses in red are potential markers for a risk of bias. Where questions relate only to sign posts to other questions, no formatting is used.

Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Patients were "randomly assigned" to treatments	NI
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		NI
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?	Important baseline differences in sex and age (though could also be due to the play of chance).	PY
Risk-of-bias judgement		High
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of assignment to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Participants in intensive care. No blinding of interventions given.	PN
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y
2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?		NI
2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA
2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?	Full ITT analysis	Y
2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA
Risk-of-bias judgement		Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of adhering to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 3: Missing outcome data

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?		PY
3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA
3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA
3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		N
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		PN
4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?		PY
4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?	Sustained rate reduction of 30% is an objective outcome	PN
4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		NI
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...		
5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?		NI
5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?		NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Overall risk of bias

Risk-of-bias judgement		High
Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Study details

Reference	Balser JR, Martinez EA, Winters BD, Perdue PW, Clarke AW, Huang W, et al. Beta-adrenergic blockade accelerates conversion of postoperative supraventricular tachyarrhythmias. Anesthesiology 1998;89:1052-9. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/00000542-199811000-00004

Study design

- X Individually-randomized parallel-group trial
- ☐ Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial
- ☐ Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial

For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as

Experimental: Diltiazem Comparator: Esmolol

Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias	Rhythm control
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.	2hr conversion subgroup of AFib patients

Is the review team's aim for this result…?

- X to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* (the 'intention-to-treat' effect)
- ☐ to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention* (the 'per-protocol' effect)

If the aim is to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention*, select the deviations from intended intervention that should be addressed (at least one must be checked):

- ☐ occurrence of non-protocol interventions
- ☐ failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome
- ☐ non-adherence to their assigned intervention by trial participants

Which of the following sources were <u>obtained</u> to help inform the risk-of-bias assessment? (tick as many as apply)

- X 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 or Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)
☐	Personal communication with trialist
☐	Personal communication with the sponsor

Risk of bias assessment

Responses underlined in green are potential markers for low risk of bias, and responses in red are potential markers for a risk of bias. Where questions relate only to sign posts to other questions, no formatting is used.

Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?	Patients "were randomized"	NI
1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?		NI
1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?		PN
Risk-of-bias judgement		Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of assignment to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?	Patients were in an ICU. Abstract says study was "unblinded"	PN
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y
2.3. If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were there deviations from the intended intervention that arose because of the trial context?	Similar proportions of post-randomisation use of digoxin but no reporting on the use of "DC cardioversion implemented at the discretion of physician staff"	NI
2.4 If Y/PY to 2.3: Were these deviations likely to have affected the outcome?		NA
2.5. If Y/PY/NI to 2.4: Were these deviations from intended intervention balanced between groups?		NA
2.6 Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of assignment to intervention?		Y
2.7 If N/PN/NI to 2.6: Was there potential for a substantial impact (on the result) of the failure to analyse participants in the group to which they were randomized?		NA
Risk-of-bias judgement		Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of adhering to intervention*)

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?		Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants' outcomes?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low / High / Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 3: Missing outcome data

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?	Data for all 44 patients with atrial fibrillation were reported	Y
3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?		NA
3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?		NA
3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?		NA
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?		N
4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?		N
4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	Electrocardiograms and rhythm strips reviewed by a cardiologist who was blinded to treatment	N
4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA
4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4: Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?		NA
Risk-of-bias judgement		Low
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result

Signalling questions	Comments	Response options
5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?		NI
Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...		
5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?	Likely that there is only one way in which the outcome can be measured	PN
5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?	Outcome likely to be analysable in only one way	PN
Risk-of-bias judgement		Some concerns
Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable

Overall risk of bias

Risk-of-bias judgement		Some concerns
Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome?		NA / Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null /Away from null / Unpredictable