Equator WORKSHOP, Vancouver September 2009

Introduction

Doug Altman

The EQUATOR Network

Centre for Statistics in Medicine, Oxford, UK





Workshop goals

- Understand the importance of transparency and accuracy in reporting health research
- Understand the key concepts of reporting guidelines and their use, especially by editors and peer reviewers
- Learn about selected reporting guidelines:
 - CONSORT (reporting RCTs);
 - PRISMA (reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses)
 - STROBE (reporting epidemiological studies)
- Introduce the EQUATOR Network internet-based resource centre and training programme
- Discuss implementation of reporting guidelines in health research journals



The purpose of a research article

- Scientific manuscripts should present sufficient data so that the reader can fully evaluate the information and reach his or her own conclusions about results
 - Assess reliability and relevance





We need research we can rely on

 Assessment of reliability of published articles is a necessary condition for the scientific process

[Ziman. Reliable Knowledge, 1978]

- Good reporting is an essential part of good research
- Authors (and journals) have an obligation to ensure that research is reported adequately
 - i.e. transparently and completely





Council of Science Editors White Paper (2006): "Promoting Integrity in Scientific Journal Publications"

Editors' responsibilities to readers:

"... evaluating all manuscripts considered for publication to make certain that each manuscript provides the evidence readers need to evaluate the authors' conclusions and that authors' conclusions reflect the evidence provided in the manuscript."





What should be reported?

Methods

 "Describe statistical methods with enough detail to enable a knowledgeable reader with access to the original data to verify the reported results."

[International Committee of Medical Journal Editors]

- Same principle should extend to all study aspects
- Allow repetition (in principle) if desired

Results

- Main findings (corresponding to pre-specified plan)
- Should not be misleading



What do we mean by poor reporting?

Mainly

- Key information is missing, incomplete or ambiguous
 - Methods
 - Results

Also

- Selective reporting
- Misleading interpretation
- etc





Why is clear and transparent reporting important?

- "If reporting is inadequate—namely, information is missing, incomplete, or ambiguous—assumptions have to be made, and, as a result, important findings could be missed and not acted upon.
- Alternatively, false outcomes might be identified and used in practice."

[Needleman et al , J Dent Res 2008]





Evidence of poor reporting

- There is considerable evidence that many published articles omit vital information
 - Hundreds of reviews of methodology of published research articles
 - Systematic reviews
- We often cannot tell exactly how the research was done





519 Randomised trials published in December 2000

Reporting of report key aspects of trial conduct:

```
27% Sample size calculation
```

45% Defined primary outcome(s)

40% Whether blinded

21% Method of random sequence generation

18% Method of allocation concealment

[Chan & Altman Lancet 2005]

Clear improvement by 2006 but majority of articles still omit this key information

[Presentation at PRC by Sally Hopewell]



Impact of poor reporting

Cumulative published evidence is misleading

- Biased results
- Methodological weaknesses may not be apparent

Adverse effects on

- Other researchers
- Clinicians
- Patients





Reporting vs conduct: study methods

METHODS – each aspect of the methods

	Done well	Done poorly	Not done
Fully reported (=reproducible)			
Ambiguously or incompletely reported			
Not reported			





Reporting vs conduct: results

RESULTS – for each analysis

	Exactly as pre- specified	Explicitly not pre- specified	Post hoc but not declared as such
Fully reported (= can be included in meta-analysis)			
Ambiguously or incompletely reported			
Not reported			



