

Search methods for prognostic factor systematic reviews: a methodologic investigation

Leah Boulos; Rachel Ogilvie; Jill A. Hayden

APPENDIX C

Data used in meta-analyses of association of expectations with outcomes

Source: Secondary analysis of data from Hayden et al. [28]

Supplemental Table 3 Data used in meta-analyses of association of expectations with outcomes with all included studies

| MA name, study ID | Effect estimate | SE | Confidence interval (CI) start | CI end |
|--|-----------------|------|--------------------------------|--------|
| Return to work (RTW) outcome, dichotomous measure of expectations, ALL STUDIES | | | | |
| Unadjusted results | 4.11 | | 3.46 | 4.89 |
| Carriere 2015 | 13.60 | 0.79 | 2.89 | 63.97 |
| Du Bois 2008 | 5.21 | 0.39 | 2.42 | 11.18 |
| Hagen 2005 | 2.29 | 0.25 | 1.40 | 3.74 |
| Jensen 2013 | 3.25 | 0.38 | 1.55 | 6.85 |
| Lindell 2010 | 6.42 | 0.61 | 1.94 | 21.23 |
| Magnussen 2007 | 6.89 | 0.66 | 1.89 | 25.12 |
| Opsahl 2016a (women)* | 4.81 | 0.34 | 2.47 | 9.36 |
| Opsahl 2016b (men)* | 5.37 | 0.33 | 2.81 | 10.24 |
| Reiso 2003 | 3.97 | 0.56 | 1.33 | 11.91 |
| Steenstra 2005 | 4.06 | 0.14 | 3.08 | 5.34 |
| Turner 2008 | 4.31 | 0.16 | 3.15 | 5.89 |
| Adjusted results | 2.43 | | 1.64 | 3.62 |
| Butler 2007 | 1.15 | 0.41 | 0.52 | 2.57 |
| Carriere 2015 | 1.04 | 0.01 | 1.02 | 1.06 |
| Du Bois 2008 | 4.62 | 0.41 | 2.07 | 10.31 |
| Hagen 2005 | 1.80 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 3.25 |
| Jensen 2013 | 2.94 | 0.33 | 1.54 | 5.62 |
| Lindell 2010 | 5.21 | 0.62 | 1.54 | 17.55 |
| Opsahl 2016a (women)* | 4.18 | 0.40 | 1.91 | 9.15 |
| Opsahl 2016b (men)* | 3.35 | 0.38 | 1.59 | 7.06 |
| Petersen 2007 | 6.49 | 0.78 | 1.41 | 29.93 |
| Reiso 2003 | 3.22 | 0.29 | 1.83 | 5.69 |
| Reme 2009 | 1.90 | 0.38 | 0.90 | 3.99 |
| Steenstra 2005 | 2.83 | 0.17 | 2.03 | 3.95 |
| Turner 2008 | 1.30 | 0.21 | 0.86 | 1.96 |

| MA name, study ID | Effect estimate | SE | Confidence interval (CI) start | CI end |
|--|-----------------|------|--------------------------------|--------|
| Important recovery outcome, dichotomous measure of expectations, ALL STUDIES | | | | |
| Unadjusted results | 2.40 | | 1.32 | 4.37 |
| Niemistö 2004 | 1.75 | 0.34 | 0.90 | 3.41 |
| Rasmussen-Barr 2012 | 1.60 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 4.80 |
| Shaw 2009 | 3.86 | 0.29 | 2.18 | 6.81 |
| Adjusted results | 1.89 | | 1.49 | 2.41 |
| Enthoven 2006 | 1.19 | 0.54 | 0.41 | 3.42 |
| Foster 2008 | 1.84 | 0.15 | 1.37 | 2.47 |
| Niemistö 2004 | 2.12 | 0.44 | 0.89 | 5.01 |
| Petersen 2007 | 1.80 | 0.43 | 0.78 | 4.19 |
| Shaw 2009 | 2.69 | 0.37 | 1.30 | 5.56 |

* Opsahl 2016 presented data for women (n=286) and men (n=283) separately.

Supplemental Table 4 Data used in meta-analyses of association of expectations with outcomes with studies excluded that were not identified in the focused search (“Partial MA”)

| MA name, study ID | Effect estimate | SE | CI start | CI end |
|---|-----------------|------|----------|--------|
| RTW outcome, dichotomous measure of expectations, partial MA: excluding studies not identified in focused search | | | | |
| Unadjusted results | 4.38 | | 2.48 | 7.74 |
| Jensen 2013 | 3.25 | 0.38 | 1.55 | 6.85 |
| Lindell 2010 | 6.42 | 0.61 | 1.94 | 21.23 |
| Magnussen 2007 | 6.89 | 0.66 | 1.89 | 25.12 |
| Adjusted results | 2.94 | | 1.86 | 4.64 |
| Jensen 2013 | 2.94 | 0.33 | 1.54 | 5.62 |
| Lindell 2010 | 5.21 | 0.62 | 1.54 | 17.55 |
| Petersen 2007 | 6.49 | 0.78 | 1.41 | 29.93 |
| Reme 2009 | 1.90 | 0.38 | 0.90 | 3.99 |
| Important recovery outcome, dichotomous measure of expectations, partial MA: excluding studies not identified in focused search | | | | |
| Unadjusted results | 2.83 | | 1.24 | 6.45 |
| Rasmussen-Barr 2012 | 1.60 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 4.80 |
| Shaw 2009 | 3.86 | 0.29 | 2.18 | 6.81 |
| Adjusted results | 1.88 | | 1.46 | 2.41 |
| Enthoven 2006 | 1.19 | 0.54 | 0.41 | 3.42 |
| Foster 2008 | 1.84 | 0.15 | 1.37 | 2.47 |
| Petersen 2007 | 1.80 | 0.43 | 0.78 | 4.19 |
| Shaw 2009 | 2.69 | 0.37 | 1.30 | 5.56 |

Supplemental Table 5 Data used in meta-analyses of association of expectations with outcomes with studies excluded that were not identified in the broad search (“Broad MA”)

| MA name, study ID | Effect estimate | SE | CI start | CI end |
|---|-----------------|------|----------|--------|
| RTW outcome, dichotomous measure of expectations, Broad MA: excluding studies not identified in broad search | | | | |
| Unadjusted results | 4.05 | | 3.44 | 4.76 |
| Du Bois 2008 | 5.21 | 0.39 | 2.42 | 11.18 |
| Hagen 2005 | 2.29 | 0.25 | 1.40 | 3.74 |
| Jensen 2013 | 3.25 | 0.38 | 1.55 | 6.85 |
| Lindell 2010 | 6.42 | 0.61 | 1.94 | 21.23 |
| Magnussen 2007 | 6.89 | 0.66 | 1.89 | 25.12 |
| Opsahl 2016a (women)* | 4.81 | 0.34 | 2.47 | 9.36 |
| Opsahl 2016b (men)* | 5.37 | 0.33 | 2.81 | 10.24 |
| Reiso 2003 | 3.97 | 0.56 | 1.33 | 11.91 |
| Steenstra 2005 | 4.06 | 0.14 | 3.08 | 5.34 |
| Turner 2008 | 4.31 | 0.16 | 3.15 | 5.89 |
| Adjusted results | 2.72 | | 2.05 | 3.60 |
| Du Bois 2008 | 4.62 | 0.41 | 2.07 | 10.31 |
| Hagen 2005 | 1.80 | 0.30 | 1.00 | 3.25 |
| Jensen 2013 | 2.94 | 0.33 | 1.54 | 5.62 |
| Lindell 2010 | 5.21 | 0.62 | 1.54 | 17.55 |
| Opsahl 2016a (women)* | 4.18 | 0.40 | 1.91 | 9.15 |
| Opsahl 2016b (men)* | 3.35 | 0.38 | 1.59 | 7.06 |
| Petersen 2007 | 6.49 | 0.78 | 1.41 | 29.93 |
| Reiso 2003 | 3.22 | 0.29 | 1.83 | 5.69 |
| Reme 2009 | 1.90 | 0.38 | 0.90 | 3.99 |
| Steenstra 2005 | 2.83 | 0.17 | 2.03 | 3.95 |
| Turner 2008 | 1.30 | 0.21 | 0.86 | 1.96 |
| Important recovery outcome, dichotomous measure of expectations, Broad MA: excluding studies not identified in broad search | | | | |
| Unadjusted results | 2.40 | | 1.32 | 4.37 |
| Niemistö 2004 | 1.75 | 0.34 | 0.90 | 3.41 |
| Rasmussen-Barr 2012 | 1.60 | 0.56 | 0.53 | 4.80 |
| Shaw 2009 | 3.86 | 0.29 | 2.18 | 6.81 |
| Adjusted results | 1.89 | | 1.49 | 2.41 |
| Enthoven 2006 | 1.19 | 0.54 | 0.41 | 3.42 |
| Foster 2008 | 1.84 | 0.15 | 1.37 | 2.47 |
| Niemistö 2004 | 2.12 | 0.44 | 0.89 | 5.01 |
| Petersen 2007 | 1.80 | 0.43 | 0.78 | 4.19 |
| Shaw 2009 | 2.69 | 0.37 | 1.30 | 5.56 |

* Opsahl 2016 presented data for women (n=286) and men (n=283) separately.