Analysis of the graphic report of results of randomized clinical trials in manual therapy: a methodological review.

Núñez-Cortés R, Pérez-Bracchiglione J, Álvarez G, Urrútia G

Objectives

To assess the quantity and quality of graphs in RCTs of MT.

Methods

- ✓ Search strategy: PubMed and CENTRAL.
- ✓ Eligibility criteria: RCT design, MT intervention, English language.
- ✓ Published between the year 2000 and 2015.
- ✓ We took a random sample of 100 trials.
- ✓ We identified figures and graphs presenting data related to the primary outcome.

Graph Characteristic (n=48)	% [CI 95%]
Completeness	
Number of subjects is discernable for each element	8.3% [2.3 to 20.0]
Title	14.6% [6.0 to 2.7]
x and y axis titles	85.4% [72.2 to 93.9]
x and y axis labels	87.5% [74.7 to 95.3]
Error bar meaning defined	33% [20.4 to 48.4]
All data elements defined (is self-explanatory)	18.8% [8.9 to 32.6]
Visual clarity (absence of the following)	
Numeric distortion (scale problems)	91.7% [80.0 to 97.7]
Chart junk (dark/thick/unnecessary grid lines or cross-hatching patterns)	70.1% [55.9 to 83.0]
Readability (superimposition of data elements or numeric/textual redundancy)	56.3% [41.2 to 70.1]
Other (problems with labels or improperly connected points)	89.6% [77.3 to 96.5]

Conclusions

Despite graphs being able efficiently to convey study findings, less than half of the RCTs in MT use them. In addition, there is a important deficit in the quality of graphic reports. Improvements in graphic reporting are necessary to generate advances in physiotherapy practice.



Analysis of the graphic report of results of randomized clinical trials in manual therapy: a methodological

Triemortés R, Pérez-Bracchiglione J, Álvarez G, Urrútia G



Introduction:

The number of randomized controlled trials (RCTs) in manual therapy (MT) has increased exponentially, and graphs are a usual way of summarizing the results. However, the quality of this kind of report has not been assessed yet.

Methodological quality:

PEDro Item (n=100)	%
Elegibility Criteria and Source	97%
Random Allocation	99%
Concealed Allocation	51%
Baseline Comparability	88%
Subject Blinding	32%
Therapist Blinding	3%
Assessor Blinding	57%
>85% Follow-up	84%
Intetion-to-treat Analysis	73%
Between-group Comparisions	96%
Point Measures and Variability	92%





