APPENDIX 3

Cochrane Collaborations Risk of Bias Tool

Leighl et al, 2011		
Domain	**Support for judgement**	**Authors' judgement**
Selection bias		
Random sequence generation	"Eligible consenting patients with advanced colorectal cancer who were seeing a medical oncologist for an initial consultation regarding first line chemotherapy were randomly assigned…" "randomization lists stratified by the consulting oncologist were computer generated…" Comment: No statistically significant differences in the intervention and control group except English as first language in intervention arm (see table 2)	**Low**
Allocation concealment	"randomization lists…were computer generated and the code was concealed in a sealed envelope until the time of random assignment" "…oncologists and patients were actively informed of the randomization arm only when patients received the DA."	**Low**
Performance bias		
Blinding of participants and personnel	"Although not blinded, oncologists and patients were actively informed of the randomization arm only when patients received the DA." "Those receiving the DA were counselled not to share it with others in the waiting room to avoid contamination of the standard arm." "…five consultations were audiotaped before study commencement as a baseline for comparison with consultations in the standard arm. Oncologists were to be provided with feedback in the event of marked deviation during the course of the trial, but no deviation occurred" "Oncologists were trained to use the DA during the consultation…"	**Moderate**
Detection bias		
Blinding of outcome assessment	Comment: The study does not specify whether or not the outcomes assessment was done in a blinded fashion	**Low**
Attrition bias		
Incomplete outcome data	Comment: 18 patients declined to participate initially and a total of 32 patients were lost to follow up in control, and 33 were lost to follow up in intervention with similar amounts between groups at similar intervals Comment: All patients who participated in at least one survey were included in the analysis Comment: All the outcome assessments are linked together with the surveys, no significant difference in data collection for outcomes	**Low**
Reporting bias		
Selective reporting	Comment: All outcome measures appear to be addressed within the results and discussion Comment: the researchers did not mention how many of the patients were from Canada or Australia but do mention some statistically significant differences in readiness to make a treatment decision and consultation satisfaction scores	**Low/ Moderate**
Other bias		
Other sources of bias	Comment: Insufficient information to judge	**Unclear**