A centralization and directional preference : a systematic review

MAY, Stephen and AINA, A

Table 3. Method score for centralization and prognosis

Reference	A	B	C	D	E	F	Total
Brotz et al. 2003	0	0	1	1	0	0	2
Christiansen et al 2010	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Donelson et al 1990	1	0	0	0	1	0	2
George et al 2005	0	1	0	0	1	1	3
Karas et al 1997	0	0	0	0.5	1	1	2.5
Kilpikoski et al 2010	1	0	1	0	0	1	3
Long 1995	0.5	1	1	0.5	1	1	5
Long et al 2009	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
May et al 2008	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Murphy et al 2009b	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
Niemisto et al 2004	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
Schmidt et al 2008	1	0	1	0	1	1	4
Skikic & Suad 2003	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Skytte et al 2005	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Sufka et al 1998	0.5	0	0	0.5	0	0.5	1.5
Tuttle 2005	1	0	0	1	1	1	4
Werneke et al 1999	1	1	0	0.5	1	0	3.5
Werneke & Hart 2001	1	1	1	0.5	1	1	5.5
Werneke et al 2011	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
Total	**15**	**5**	**10**	**7.5**	**13**	**13.5**	
Mean							**3.4**

A. Was the sample representative of the underlying population? B. Were they at a well-defined point in the natural history? C. Was the follow-up of sufficient length—1 year? D. Was there follow-up of > 85% of the sample? E. Was there blinded assessment of outcome? F. Were other prognostic factors equal or accounted for in analysis?