|  |
| --- |
| Article ID: Reviewer: |
| **Selection bias**  |
|  | Decision  | Justification  |
| Was the sampling/recruitment strategy appropriate to minimise bias? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| Was it clearly and appropriately determined that participants were pain-free? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| [B-G only] Similar baseline demographics among participants (age/sex/medical/psychological state)? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| [Psych manip] Neutral psych status? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| [B-G only] Random allocation[B-site] Random allocation | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of selection bias summary**  | € High (failure to include any of the above probably influenced results FOR THE QUESTION OF THIS REVIEW) € Low (results unlikely to have been influenced)€ Unclear (not enough information) |

**Risk of bias assessment tool**

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance bias**  |
| Blinding | Decision | Justification |
| Were participants blinded to the research question and paradigm and [if relevant] group allocation? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of performance bias summary** | € High  € Low € Unclear  |
| **Detection bias**  |
| Were outcome assessors blinded to the research question and paradigm? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| Were analysing researchers blinded to the group allocation of participants and/or to site allocation? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of detection bias summary** | € High  € Low € Unclear  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Manipulation veracity** |
| [Psych] Did a manipulation check confirm the effectiveness of the manipulation? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of manipulation veracity problem** | € High € Low € Unclear  |  |
| **Attrition bias** |
| Incomplete outcome data  | Decision | Justification |
| Have attrition/exclusions/ withdrawals been reported and appropriately dealt with in analysis? | € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of attrition bias summary** | € High  € Low € Unclear  |
| **Measurement bias** |
|  | Decision | Justification |
| Were valid and reliable outcome measurements used to assess severity & SA of secondary hyperalgesia?  | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| Were identical equipment items used for measurements between groups/sites/time points?  | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| Did the same assessor conduct assessments between groups/sites/time points?  | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of measurement bias summary** | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |
| **Reporting bias** |
| Selective reporting | Decision | Justification |
| Were all outcomes for experimental and control groups reported on?  | € Yes € No  |  |
| Were conflicts of interest and funding sources declared? | € Yes € No  |  |
| **Risk of reporting bias summary** | € High  € Low € Unclear  |
|  **Risk of bias summary**  |
| Risk of bias | Description | Study bias outcome |
| High risk of bias | Plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results. |  |
| Low risk of bias | Plausible bias unlikely to seriously alter or diminish trust in the results. |  |
| Unclear risk of bias | Insufficient information available to make a judgement. |  |

Comments:

|  |
| --- |
| Article ID: Reviewer: |
| **Selection bias**  |
|  | Decision  | Justification  |
| Was the sampling/recruitment strategy appropriate to minimise bias? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: general population or subgroup. Convenience sampling is acceptable as long as eligibility criteria do not restrict to a certain group that could plausibly respond differently to the induction.No: group selected on basis of particular feature (e.g. high catastrophising positive affect / athletes in training) |
| Was it clearly and appropriately determined that participants were pain-free? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: participant self-report of no pain at time of testing AND no history of chronic pain (pain on most days for > 3 mo) in preceding 2 years.No: reports failure to ask BOTH questions.Unclear: does not report asking both questions. |
| [B-G only] Similar baseline demographics among participants (age/sex/medical/psychological state)? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: Psych (trauma Hx, stress status, general affect, sex, age, medication variables accounted for and similar)No: Psychiatric diagnoses or medication use (esp analgesics/anti-inflammatories/SNRI, etc) amongst participants.Unclear: not reported\*Consider design features, e.g. within-subject control or pre-post design |
| [Psych manip] Neutral psych status? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: Psych variables accounted for and normalNo: selected for responses on psych assessment |
| [B-G only] Random allocation[B-site] Random allocation | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: random sequence generation / roll of die / other truly random procedure namedNo: counterbalancing of group size (i.e. pseudo-randomisation)[but consider ROB in context] / sequential allocationUnclear: not reported in enough detail to allow decision |
| **Risk of selection bias summary**  | € High (failure to include any of the above probably influenced results FOR THE QUESTION OF THIS REVIEW)€ Low (results unlikely to have been influenced)€ Unclear (not enough information) |

**Guide to decision-making for risk of bias assessment**

|  |
| --- |
| **Performance bias**  |
| Blinding | Decision | Justification |
| Were participants blinded to the research question and paradigm and [if relevant] group allocation? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: evidence provided - blinding strategy AND blinding check AND results reported AND analysis done accordinglyNo: Blinding reported broken Unclear: not enough information / failure to report) |
| **Risk of performance bias summary** | € High € Low € Unclear | High: Plausible doubt that participant blinding was applied and maintained throughoutLow: Confident that participant blinding was applied and maintained throughoutUnclear: not enough information to make informed judgement (e.g. blinding strategy AND blinding check AND results mentioned BUT not fully reported) |
| **Detection bias**  |
| Were outcome assessors blinded to the research question and paradigm? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: evidence provided - blinding strategy AND blinding check AND results reported AND analysis done accordinglyNo: Blinding reported broken Unclear: not enough information / failure to report) |
| Were analysing researchers blinded to the group allocation of participants and/or to site allocation? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: evidence provided - blinding strategy AND blinding check AND results reported AND analysis done accordinglyNo: Blinding reported broken Unclear: not enough information / failure to report) |
| **Risk of detection bias summary** | € High € Low € Unclear | High: Plausible doubt that participant blinding was applied and maintained throughoutLow: Confident that participant blinding was applied and maintained throughoutUnclear: not enough information to make informed judgement (e.g. blinding strategy AND blinding check AND results mentioned BUT not fully reported) |

|  |
| --- |
| **Risk of manipulation veracity problem** |
| [Psych] Did a manipulation check confirm the effectiveness of the manipulation? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: manip check done and results reported and confirmed effectivenessNo: no manipulation check done OR manip check done but results not reported.Unclear: manip check done and results confirmed ineffectiveness or were inconclusive |
| **Risk of manipulation veracity problem** | € High € Low € Unclear  |  |
| **Attrition bias** |
| Incomplete outcome data  | Decision | Justification |
| Have attrition/exclusions/ withdrawals been reported and appropriately dealt with in analysis? | € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: no attrition/withdrawals OR stats handled withdrawals appropriately AND relevant adverse events reported  |
| **Risk of attrition bias summary** | € High  € Low € Unclear  |
| **Measurement bias** |
|  | Decision | Justification |
| Were valid and reliable outcome measurements used to assess severity & SA of secondary hyperalgesia?  | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear | Yes: Self-report: VAS / NRS / validated scaleSurface area: independently duplicated measurements or validated approachConsider test-retest reliability if relevantNo: single measurement of distance/SA; un-validated self-report scale |
| Were identical equipment items used for measurements between groups/sites/time points?  | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| Did the same assessor conduct assessments between groups/sites/time points?  | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |  |
| **Risk of measurement bias summary** | 2H: € Yes € No € UnclearSA: € Yes € No € Unclear |
| **Reporting bias** |
| Selective reporting | Decision | Justification |
| Were all outcomes for experimental and control groups reported on?  | € Yes € No  | Check each outcome (compare methods vs results) |
| Were conflicts of interest and funding sources declared? | € Yes € No  | Consider relevant conflicts |
| **Risk of reporting bias summary** | € High  € Low € Unclear  |
|  **Risk of bias summary**  |
| Risk of bias | Description | Study bias outcome |
| High risk of bias | Plausible bias that seriously weakens confidence in the results. |  |
| Low risk of bias | Plausible bias unlikely to seriously alter or diminish trust in the results. |  |
| Unclear risk of bias | Insufficient information available to make a judgement. |  |

Comments: