

Search bar with magnifying glass icon

SRDR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW DATA REPOSITORY™

Logged in as evanmw | MySRDR | Feedback | Help & Training | About Us

Navigation links: Contact Us | Citing SRDR | Usage Policies | Log Out and a search bar with a SEARCH button

- Home, MySRDR, Published Projects, Home, My Projects, Edit Project

- PROJECT SETUP, Project Information, Extraction Forms, View Full List, Question 1, Manage Users

Project: Assessing the methodological rigor of systematic reviews on management for refractive error Private Report Incomplete

- PROJECT STUDY DATA, Study List, Complete List (80 Total), Jain S. (8724641), Jain S. (8724641), Rapuano C.J. (11581075), Rapuano C.J. (11581075), Sugar A. (11772601), Sugar A. (11772601), Yang X.J. (13678388), Yang X.J. (13678388), Saw S.M. (11874738), My Studies, My List (40 Total), Jain S. (8724641), Rapuano C.J. (11581075), Sugar A. (11772601), Yang X.J. (13678388), Saw S.M. (11874738), Varley G.A. (15288995), Chang M.A. (15110665), Shortt A.J. (16625626), Virgili G. (16235380), Add New Study

Editing Extraction Form: Quality of systematic reviews on interventions for refractive error -- (Question 1)

- Title and KQs, Publications, Design, Arms, Arm Details, Baseline Data, Outcomes, Outcome Details

- Adverse Events, Quality, Finalize

Create Design Details Form

Please Note: This page allows you to generate extraction form questions for Design Details, each with an optional set of suggested responses.

Responses can be designated as drop down lists, radio buttons or check boxes, or text fields.

Display Options

Would you like to include the Design Details section in your extraction form? Yes

User Instructions

You may add specific instructions for data extractors using the link below.

Add/Edit Instructions

1 Q1. What is the objective of the systematic review?

Record verbatim the objective of the systematic review described in one of the following sections of the article using this order of priority: Abstract; Methods/Background; Other. If not reported, insert NR in the text box.

Text input field for Q1

Copy Question | Edit Question | Delete Question

2 Q2. What is the main conclusion(s) of the systematic review?

Record verbatim the conclusion(s) of the systematic review described in one of the following sections of the article using this order of priority: Abstract; Discussion; Other. If not reported, insert NR in the text box.

Text input field for Q2

Copy Question | Edit Question | Delete Question

3 Q3. In your judgment, did the authors ask at least one clearly-focused research question?

Check "Yes" if at least the population and test intervention are specified in the review

- Yes, No, Can't tell

Copy Question | Edit Question | Delete Question

4 Q4a. Did the author(s) report having eligibility criteria for including/excluding primary studies in the systematic review?

Answer "Yes" for all Cochrane reviews. If "Yes" is selected, answer Q4b. IF "NO" OR "CAN'T TELL" ARE SELECTED, SKIP TO Q5a.

- Yes, No, Can't tell

Copy Question | Edit Question | Delete Question

5 Q4b. Did the author(s) say that the eligibility criteria were pre-specified?

Answer "Yes" for all Cochrane reviews. If a protocol or design paper with eligibility criteria is cited, check "Yes".

- Yes, No, Can't tell

Copy Question | Edit Question | Delete Question

- PROJECT TOOLS, View Summary, Progress Reports, Publish Externally, Data Comparison Tool **, Data Export Tool, File Repository *, Graphical Data View & Stats *, Registries, Data Import Tool, HELP INFORMATION, User Manual and FAQ, Feedback

Note: Coming Soon Experimental Feature Under Development

6 **Q5a. Did the authors report that they planned to include participants of the following ages?**

This question asks about the eligibility criteria rather than the results. Please only choose what is EXPLICITLY stated.

- All participants <12 years
- All participants ≥12 years
- Participants both younger and older than 12 years
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

7 **Q5b. Did the authors report that they planned to include participants with any of the following CONDITIONS?**

This question asks about the eligibility criteria rather than the results. Check "Yes", "No," or "Can't tell" for each category. Please only choose what is EXPLICITLY stated.

	Yes	No	Can't tell
5b1. Astigmatism	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5b2. Hyperopia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5b3. Myopia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
5b4. Presbyopia	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

8 **Q6. Did the authors report that they planned to examine any of the following interventions?**

Select "Yes", "No," or "Can't tell" for each category. Please only choose what is EXPLICITLY stated. If yes, specify the exact type of intervention (e.g., LASIK) and specify if multiple types of the intervention were compared (e.g., soft versus rigid contact lenses).

Types of interventions	If yes, specify
Q6a. Acupuncture	<input type="text"/>
Q6b. Contact lenses	<input type="text"/>
Q6c. Eyeglasses	<input type="text"/>
Q6d. Patching	<input type="text"/>
Q6e. Pharmaceuticals	<input type="text"/>
Q6f. Surgery	<input type="text"/>
Other (please specify):	<input type="text"/>

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

9 **Q7. Did the authors report that they planned to examine any of the following outcomes?**

Look in the METHODS rather than the results section.

	Yes	No	Can't tell
Q7a. Visual acuity: Uncorrected visual acuity (UCVA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7b. Visual acuity: Best corrected visual acuity (BCVA)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7c. Visual acuity: Usual (habitual) corrected visual acuity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7d. Visual acuity: Mean postoperative spherical equivalent	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7e. Visual acuity: Patient acceptance of correction	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7f. Refractive error (e.g., achieving target refraction, proportion of eyes within ±0.50 D of target refraction)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7g. Need for correction (e.g., proportion of	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

patients continue to wear glasses or contact lenses)

Q7h. Contrast sensitivity	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7i. Patient satisfaction (appearance, comfort)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7j. Quality of life / vision-related quality of life	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7k. Functioning (e.g., reading, driving, mobility, activities of daily living)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7l. Adverse events (e.g., corneal ectasia, discomfort, infection, induced astigmatism, subepithelial haze, IOP, dry eye, pain, etc.)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q7m. Cost effectiveness of intervention	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):	<input type="text"/>		

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

10 **Q8. Did the authors report that they planned to include the following types of study design to answer the main research question(s) as defined in the objective?**

Please see question 1 for defined objective

	Yes	No	Unclear
Q8a. Randomized controlled trial (RCT)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q8b. Quasi-randomized controlled trial	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q8c. Observational study (including cohort study, case-control study, cross-sectional study, information from patient registries, case-series, and patient testimonials)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Other (please specify):	<input type="text"/>		

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

11 **Q9a. Did the authors report that they searched any of the following bibliographic databases?**

	Yes	No	Unclear
Q9a1. PubMed or MEDLINE	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q9a2. The Cochrane Library or the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Q9a3. EMBASE	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

- | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Q9a4. LILACS | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| Q9a5. Any other bibliographic database(s) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

12 ▾ **Q9b. What was the total number of bibliographic databases searched?**

Please enter the number of databases explicitly stated in the methods or enter "not reported". BIBLIOGRAPHIC DATABASE is defined as a database which provides descriptive records of items such as book(chapter)s, articles and conference proceedings. Do NOT count clinical trial registers, Science Citation Index, or reference lists as bibliographic databases.

-- Make Your Selection -- ▾

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

13 ▾ **Q9c. What was the latest date of searching any bibliographic databases?**

Please select one option from each drop down menu. If the month, date, or year is not reported, select "not reported" for that item.

	Month	Date	Year
Date	<input type="text" value="Select..."/>	<input type="text" value="Select..."/>	<input type="text" value="Select..."/>

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

14 ▾ **9d-9i. Did the authors report using any of the following methods to identify relevant studies?**

- | | Yes | No | Unclear |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| 9d. Searched for non-English-language studies for at least one of the above bibliographic database(s) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9e. Searched for all relevant years (i.e., all years after which the interventions became available) for at least one of the above bibliographic database | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9f. Searched reference lists, or searched for reports that cited included studies | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9g. Contacted experts in the field and/or contacted study authors | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9h. Searched for unpublished or difficult-to-access studies (e.g., grey literature, FDA data, internal company reports, conference abstracts) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |
| 9i. Searched for ongoing studies (e.g., clinicaltrials.gov, WHO search portal) | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> | <input type="radio"/> |

Other (please specify):

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

15 ▾ **9. Overall, in your judgment, do you think the search for evidence was reasonably comprehensive?**

To answer this question, you are encouraged to consider additional information (e.g., search terms, number of trials identified).

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

16 ▾ 10. Did the authors report that they planned to assess the risk of bias in individual studies?

Many methods exist to assess the risk of bias, including scales, in which various components of quality are scored and combined to give a summary score; or checklists, in which specific questions are asked; or domain-based evaluation, in which critical assessments are made separately for different domain, for example, allocation concealment, masking.

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

17 ▾ 11a1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in assessing each title and/or abstract's eligibility?

If "2 or more" is selected, answer question 11a2

- 1
 2 or more
 Not reported

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

18 ▾ 11a2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in assessing each title and/or abstract's eligibility?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

19 ▾ 11b1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in assessing each full text article's eligibility?

If "2 or more" is selected, answer question 11b2

- 1
 2 or more
 Not reported

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

20 ▾ 11b2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in assessing each full text article's eligibility?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

21 ▾ 11c1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in assessing the risk of bias of each included study?

If "2 or more" is selected, answer question 11c2

- 1
 2 or more
 Not reported

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

22 ▾ 11c2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in assessing the risk of bias of each included study?

- Yes
 No
 Not applicable, risk of bias was not assessed
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

23 ▾ 11d1. Did the authors report how many reviewers were involved in abstracting data from each included study?

If "2 or more" is selected, answer question 11d2

- 1
 2 or more
 Not reported

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

24 ▾ 11d2. Did the authors report that reviewers worked independently in abstracting data from each included study?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

25 ▾ 12. How many primary studies were included in the systematic review?

Enter "Can't tell" if the reporting was unclear and you cannot figure out the number of primary studies included.

-- Make Your Selection -- ▾

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

26 ▾ 13a. How many PARTICIPANTS were included in the systematic review?

Enter "Can't tell" if the reporting was unclear and you cannot figure out how many participants were included.

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

27 ▾ 13b. How many EYES were included in the systematic review?

Enter "Can't tell" if the reporting was unclear and you cannot figure out how many eyes were included.

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

28 ▾ 14. Did the authors describe/present the characteristics of the included studies?

Examples of study characteristics include patient age, race, sex, relevant socioeconomic data; disease status, duration, severity; interventions, outcomes, and risk of bias.

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

29 ▾ 15. What comparisons were made in the systematic review? Please specify

Look in the RESULTS rather than the methods section. Extract the results verbatim (e.g., copy and paste).

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

30 ▾ 16a-16b. How did the authors combine the results?

If "Yes" is selected for 16b, answer 16c-16e.

	Yes	No	Can't tell	Not applicable
16a. Qualitatively (the authors described characteristics and risk of bias in individual studies that may affect the cumulative evidence)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16b. Quantitatively (meta-analysis)	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

31 ▾ 16c-16e. How did the authors combine the results?

	Yes	No	Can't tell
16c. Reported statistical heterogeneity?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16d. Given the clinical and statistical heterogeneity, was it reasonable to combine results in a meta-analysis?	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
16e. Were the methods used to combine results of studies appropriate? (Select "Yes" if correct variance and meta-analysis formula were used, and treatment effects were meta-analyzed at trial level (instead of combining results from the same arm))	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

32 ▾ 17. Did the authors report doing a sensitivity analysis?

- Yes
 No
 Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

33 ▾ 18. Did the authors report doing a subgroup analysis?

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

34 ▾ 19. Did the authors report doing a meta-regression?

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

35 ▾ 20. Did the authors discuss the limitations of the systematic review at the study and outcome level?

E.g., discuss risk of bias in individual studies and heterogeneity across studies

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

36 ▾ 21. Did the authors discuss the limitations of the systematic review at the review level?

E.g., discuss incomplete retrieval of relevant studies, publication bias etc.

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

37 ▾ 22a. Did the authors report the source(s) of monetary or material support for the systematic review?

if "Yes" is selected, answer question 22b.

- Yes
- No

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

38 ▾ 22b. What was the reported source(s) of monetary or material support for the systematic review?

Source(s) of monetary or material support for the systematic review

- 22b1. Government (e.g., National Institutes of Health)
- 22b2. Pharmaceutical industry
- 22b3. Other industry
- 22b4. Foundation
- 22b5. Academic department or institution
- 22b6. No funding
- 22b7. Not reported
- 22b8. Other, specify

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

39 ▾ 23a. Did the authors report explicitly that none of the authors has any financial interests?

- Yes
- No

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

40 ▾ 23b. Did the authors report any type(s) of financial interests?

If "Yes" is selected, answer questions 23c-23p

- Yes
- No

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

41 ▾ 23c-23p: If 23b is yes, please specify type of financial interests.

Specify type of interest

- 23c. Board membership
- 23d. Consultancy

- 23e. Employment
- 23f. Expert testimony
- 23g. Gifts
- 23h. Grants/grants pending
- 23i. Honoraria
- 23j. Payment for manuscript preparation
- 23k. Patents (planned, pending or issued)
- 23l. Royalties
- 23m. Payment for development of educational presentations including service on speakers' bureaus
- 23n. Stock/stock options
- 23o. Travel/accommodations expenses covered or reimbursed
- 23p. Other, specify

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

42 ▾ 24. In your judgment, do you think the conclusions related to main research question of the systematic review are supported by the data?

- Yes
- No
- Can't tell

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

43 ▾ 25a. Overall, in your judgment, do you think the systematic review is reliable?

If "No" is selected, answer 25b to 25g.

- Yes
- No, because...

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

44 ▾ 25b-25g. Why do you think the systematic review is not reliable?

The systematic review is not reliable because

- 25b. Did not define eligibility criteria (see question 4)
- 25c. Did not conduct a comprehensive search (see question 9j)
- 25d. Did not assess risk of bias of included studies (see question 10)
- 25e. Used inappropriate quantitative methods to combine findings of included studies (see question 16)
- 25f. Sources of monetary or material support for the systematic review and/or author(s) placed the review at high risk of bias (see questions 22&23)
- 25g. Other, specify

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

45 ▾ 26. Extractor's name:

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

46 ▾ 27. Date form completed

mm/dd/yyyy

[Copy Question](#) | [Edit Question](#) | [Delete Question](#)

[+ Add a New Design Detail](#)



[Accessibility](#)
[Disclaimers](#)
[EEO](#)
[FOIA](#)
[Inspector General](#)
[HHS Digital Strategy](#)
[Plain Writing Act](#)
[Privacy Policy](#)
[Electronic Policies](#)
[Viewers & Players](#)

Get Social

[About Us](#)
[Careers](#)
[Contact Us](#)
[Sitemap](#)
[FAQ](#)

Health Care Information

[For Patients & Consumers](#)

[For Professionals](#)

[For Policymakers](#)

Research Tools & Data

[Funding & Grants](#)

[Offices, Centers & Programs](#)

[News & Events](#)

[U.S. Department of Health & Human Services](#)
[The White House](#)
[USA.gov: The U.S. Government's Official Web Portal](#)

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

5600 Fishers Lane
 Rockville, MD 20857
Telephone: (301) 427-1364