

**APPENDIX 2 – CRITICAL APPRAISAL TOOL FOR PREVALENCE STUDIES USED BY HOY ET AL. (2012):**

Name of author(s): Year of publication: Study title:			
Risk of bias items	Risk of bias levels	Points scored	
1	Was the study's target population a close representation of the national population in relation to relevant variables, e.g. age, sex, occupation?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> The study's target population was a close representation of the national population.	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> The study's target population was clearly NOT representative of the national population.	<b>1</b>
2	Was the sampling frame a true or close representation of the target population?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> The sampling frame was a true or close representation of the target population.	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> The sampling frame was NOT a true or close representation of the target population.	<b>1</b>
3	Was some form of random selection used to select the sample, OR, was a census undertaken?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> A census was undertaken, OR, some form of random selection was used to select the sample (e.g. simple random sampling, stratified random sampling, cluster sampling, systematic sampling).	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> A census was NOT undertaken, AND some form of random selection was NOT used to select the sample.	<b>1</b>
4	Was the likelihood of non-response bias minimal?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> The response rate for the study was $\geq 75\%$ , OR, an analysis was performed that showed no significant difference in relevant demographic characteristics between responders and non-responders	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> The response rate was $< 75\%$ , and if any analysis comparing responders and non-responders was done, it showed a significant difference in relevant demographic characteristics between responders and non-responders.	<b>1</b>
5	Were data collected directly from the subjects (as opposed to a proxy)?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> All data were collected directly from the subjects.	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> In some instances, data were collected from a proxy.	<b>1</b>
6	Was an acceptable case definition used in the study?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> An acceptable case definition was used.	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> An acceptable case definition was NOT used.	<b>1</b>
7	Was the study instrument that measured the parameter of interest (e.g. prevalence of low back pain) shown to have reliability and validity (if necessary)?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> The study instrument had been shown to have reliability and validity (if this was necessary), e.g. test-re-test, piloting, validation in a previous study, etc.	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> The study instrument had NOT been shown to have reliability or validity (if this was necessary).	<b>1</b>
8	Was the same mode of data collection used for all subjects?	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> The same mode of data collection was used for all subjects.	<b>0</b>
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> The same mode of data collection was NOT used for all subjects.	<b>1</b>
9	Were the numerator(s) and denominator(s) for the parameter of interest	<b>Yes (LOW RISK):</b> The paper presented appropriate numerator(s) AND denominator(s) for the parameter of interest (e.g. the prevalence of low	<b>0</b>

	appropriate	back pain).	
		<b>No (HIGH RISK):</b> The paper did present numerator(s) AND denominator(s) for the parameter of interest but one or more of these were inappropriate.	<b>1</b>
10	Summary on the overall risk of study bias	<b>LOW RISK</b>	<b>0-3</b>
		<b>MODERATE RISK</b>	<b>4-6</b>
		<b>HIGH RISK</b>	<b>7-9</b>