| H C | isti | ller | SR lisa.wils | son Reviewer1 | Messages Nothing new | | | | |
|---|---|---|-----------------------|-------------------|--|------------------|------------------|---------------|--------------------|
| 0.0 | 11511 | lici | | | Live Suppo | ort Use | er Guide | | |
| Review | Datarama | Reports | References | Forms | Manage Levels | Users | Project | Logout | 9 |
| | Skateboards: A J, Yesupalan R | | erilous? A retrosp | ective study fi | om a district hospit | al. | | | |
| Submit F | orm and go t | o 🔽 or Skip t | to Next | | | | | | |
| (V)-5 | Con | parative Effec | | | herapies for the f | | of Crohn's Di | isease | |
| Reporting | | | Gua | inty i onti ioi c | Diservational Studie | | | | |
| AND A PROPERTY OF THE PARTY OF | main outcome | s to be measu | red clearly describ | oed in the Intro | duction or Methods | s section? | | | |
| | in outcomes a should be ans | | d and defined, ther | the answer is | "YES". If the main o | utcomes are fire | st mentioned in | the Results | section, th |
| O YES | | | | | | | | | |
| ON O | TA DETEC | SEALE OF | | | | | | | |
| Clear Re | BLE TO DETER sponse | (MINE | | | | | | | |
| 2. Are the | characteristic: | s of the patients | s included in the s | study clearly d | escribed? | | | | |
| In cohor should b | | ials, inclusion ar | nd/or exclusion crite | eria should be | given. In case-contr | ol studies, a ca | se-definition ar | nd the source | for contro |
| O YES | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ NO | BLE TO DETER | DMINE | | | | | | | |
| Clear Re | | CIMILINE | | | | | | | |
| 3. Are the | interventions o | of interest clear | y described? | | | | | | |
| Treatme | nts and placeb | o (where releva. | nt) that are to be co | ompared shoul | d be identified and d | lefined. | | | |
| O YES | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ NO | N E TA DETER | NAUNITE : | | | | | | | |
| Clear Re | BLE TO DETER sponse | OMINE | | | | | | | |
| 4. Are the | distributions o | f principal confo | ounders in each g | roup of subjec | ts to be compared | clearly describ | ed? | | |
| (identific | ation) with defi. | | | | ribution in each grou st paragraph of the R | | | | |
| O YES | | | | | | | | | |
| ○ NO | | NAME OF THE OWNER OWNER OF THE OWNER | | | | | | | |
| Clear Re | BLE TO DETER sponse | OMINE | | | | | | | |
| Selection | Bias | | | | | | | | |
| | e patients in c pulation? | lifferent interven | tion groups (coho | rt studies) or | were the cases and | controls (cas | e-control studi | es) recruited | from the |
| exposur | e/case status, | , 3) recruited o | ver the same peri | od of time. | lation, 2) with the s | | | | |
| ror a st determi | | э пос вреспу tr | ге атте ретоа ove | и минси рацеп | ts were recruited, ti | re question sh | oulu be answe | areu as unal | DI U (U |
| O YES | | | | | | | | | |
| O NO | BLE TO DETER | MINE | | | | | | | |
| Clear Re | | SMOTNESS | | | | | | | |

| o. yvere losses of patients to follow-up taken into account? |
|---|
| Methods to account for losses to follow-up include calculating the incidence rate directly or using a survival/life table method. If the numbers of patients lost to follow-up are not reported, the question should be answered as unable to determine. If the proportion los follow-up was less than 20% in each arm at the end of the study, the question should be answered "YES". |
| © YES |
| ○ NO |
| O UNABLE TO DETERMINE |
| Clear Response |
| Confounding |
| 7. Was there adequate adjustment for confounding in the analyses from which the main findings were drawn? |
| If the authors report their results using a fully-adjusted model, multivariate/multivariable model, model resulting from step-wise regression or results stratified by the demonstrated confounders of interest, the answer is "YES". If the effect of the main confounders was not investigated or confounding was demonstrated (different distribution of potential confounders by exposure/case group) but no adjustment was made in the final analyses the question should be answered as "NO". If the study was a matched case-control study and the method of analysis was not conditional logistic regression, the answer is "NO". |
| ◎ YES |
| © NO |
| UNABLE TO DETERMINE Clear Response |
| Overall Quality of Study |
| 8. Please rate the overall quality of the study using the reporting, selection bias and confounding domains: |
| Good indicates all "YES" responses Fair indicates mostly: "YES" for Reporting and all "YES" for Selection Bias and Confounding bias. Poor indicates at least 1 "NO" or "Unable to determine" for selection or confounding bias. |
| © GOOD |
| FAIR |
| O POOR Clear Response |
| Conflict of Interest |
| 9. Did this study receive support (research funds, medications provided, writing services, author or staff was employee) from a company havin |
| financial interest in any of the medications studied? |
| © YES |
| © NO |
| UNABLE TO DETERMINE Clear Response |
| 10. If above question is answered yes: did the company have any involvement in the design, conduct, or reporting of the study? |
| For "NO," the authors are not employees of the company and the authors had complete access to the data, and the company was not involved in the design, conduct, analysis, or reporting of the study. |
| ○ YES |
| ◎ NO |
| O UNABLE TO DETERMINE Clear Response |
| 11. Please add any comments below: |
| |
| |
| |
| Submit Form and go to 🔽 or Skip to Next |
| |