Table 2, Chapter 32. Evidence table: patient’s engagement, risk of bias

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Was the allocation sequence adequately generated?** | **Was the allocation adequately concealed?** | **Were baseline outcome measurements similar?\*** | **Were baseline characteristics similar?** | **Were incomplete outcome data adequately addressed?\*** | **Was knowledge of the allocated interventions adequately prevented during the study? \*** | **Was the study adequately protected against contamination?** | **Was the study free from selective outcome reporting?** |
| Weingart, 2004 1 | Yes | Unclear | Yes | No | Unclear | Yes | No | Yes |
| McGuckin, 2004 2 | No | No | Yes | Yes | No | No | No | No |
| Stone 2007 3 | No | No | Unclear | not applicable | Unclear | No | Yes | Yes |
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