Article:
Mierzynska, J, Piccinin, C, Pe, M et al. (10 more authors) (2019) Prognostic value of patient-reported outcomes from international randomised clinical trials on cancer: a systematic review. The Lancet Oncology, 20 (12). e685-e698. ISSN 1470-2045

https://doi.org/10.1016/S1470-2045(19)30656-4

Table 4: Results from the methodological evaluation

		Criteria fulfilled in the present review (2019)	Criteria fulfilled in review by Mauer et al. (2008)
Criteria	Subcriteria	Yes N (%)	Yes N (%)
Sample size	Sample size of patient who reported baseline PROs	41 (93)	NR
Missing data	Reasons for missing PROs assessments at baseline reported	5 (11)	5 (10)
	Information given on baseline characteristics for patients with PROs	29 (66)	27 (55)
	Information given on survival for patients with PROs	13 (29)	9 (18)
	Information given on the exact number of available data for each PROs score separately	15 (34)	14 (29)
A priori selection of PROs predictor	A priori selection of potential prognostic PROs guided by subject matter knowledge (literature review, clinical expertise, etc.)	24 (54)	22 (45)
Interaction	Absence of interaction(s) in the final model	38 (86)	46 (94)
Type of variables	PROs scores dichotomized at a cut-off point (median included)	14 (32)	27 (55)
	A priori selection of the cut-off point (median included)	9 (20)	NR
	Continuous summary statistics on PROs scores	37 (84)	27 (55)
Model building strategy	Cox proportional hazards model used for the multivariate analysis	42 (95)	43 (88)
	Univariate screening used to preselect PROs scores and/or clinical factors for consideration in the final multivariate model	31 (70)	16 (33)
	Forced inclusion of preselected clinical factors to enter the multivariate model	12 (27)	21 (43)
Hypothesis	Specification of an a priori hypothesis	5 (11)	NR
Verification of model assumptions	Check of the use of the PH assumption in a Cox proportional hazards model, by using methods such as Schoenfeld residuals or log-log survival	9 (20)	16 (33)
Quantifying predictive accuracy	Measures of the predictive accuracy in univariate or multivariate analysis by using methods such as he Harrell's C discrimination index, Schemper statistics, Nagelkerke R^2, Likelihood test, PLS regression	14 (32)	7 (14)

	Assessment of the improvement of predictive accuracy due to the addition of the PROs factors as potential prognostic factors in the model	11 (25)	NR
Model validation	Performance of an internal model validation such as bootstrap resampling	16 (36)	9 (18)
	Performance of an external model validation	1 (2)	NR
	Performance of a model validation via an external study	1 (2)	NR

N represents the number of RCTs included and evaluated in the review which have (yes) or have not (not) fulfilled the criteria assessed.
NR = not reported