

# Study Eligibility & Data Collection Form

## General Information

<b>Study ID</b> (e.g. author name, year)	Bopche, 2009
<b>Form completed by</b>	Ritzzaleena Rosli Mohd Rosli
<b>Study author contact details</b>	ritzz.rosli@student.usm.my
<b>Publication type</b> (e.g. full report, abstract, letter)	Full report
<b>List of included publications</b>	-
<b>References of similar trial*</b>	-

\*This is when the authors published the same study in several reports. All these references to a similar trial should be linked under one *Study ID* in RevMan.

## Study eligibility

	Yes	No	Unclear	Further details
<b>RCT/Quasi/CCT</b>	/			RCT
<b>Relevant participants</b>	/			
<b>Relevant interventions</b>	/			
<b>Relevant outcomes*</b>	/			

\*Include only if the presence of outcomes form the inclusion criterion

If the above answers are 'YES', proceed to Section 1.

If any of the above answers are 'NO\*', record below the information for 'Excluded studies'

Reason(s) for exclusion
-

## Section 1. Characteristics of included studies

This section is to be completed by only one reviewer. State initials: RRMR

<b>METHODS</b>	<b>Descriptions as stated in paper</b>
<b>Aim of study</b> (e.g. efficacy, equivalence, pragmatic)	To determine the therapeutic efficacy of two different oral iron preparations: iron polymaltose complex (IPC) and ferrous sulfate (FS).
<b>Design</b> (e.g. parallel, crossover, cluster)	Parallel study comparing Iron Polymaltose and Ferrous Sulphate
<b>Unit of allocation</b> (by individuals, cluster/ groups or body parts)	individuals
<b>Start &amp; end dates</b>	October 2004 – September 2005
<b>Total study duration</b>	1 year
<b>Sources of funding</b> (including role of funders)	None
<b>Possible conflicts of interest</b> (for study authors)	Not stated

<b>PARTICIPANTS</b>	<b>Description</b> (include information for each intervention or comparison group)
<b>Population description</b> (Company/companies; occupation)	Children with Iron deficiency anaemia
<b>Setting</b> (including location (city, state, country) and single centre / multicenter)	Teaching institution with a tertiary level paediatric centre in central India.
<b>Inclusion criteria</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Age ranging from 1-6 years</li> <li>IDA confirmed by serum iron chemistry</li> </ol>
<b>Exclusion criteria</b>	Not mentioned
<b>Method of recruitment of participants</b> (e.g. phone, mail, clinic patients, voluntary)	Patients attending outpatient department
<b>Total no. randomised</b>	118
<b>Clusters</b> (if applicable, no., type, no. people per cluster)	No

<b>No. randomised per group</b> <i>(specify whether no. people or clusters)</i>	Intervention: 59 Control: 59
<b>No. missing</b> <i>(if overall, e.g. exclusions &amp; withdrawals, whether or not missing from analysis)</i>	Intervention: 6 Control:6
<b>Reasons missing</b>	Lost to follow up
<b>Baseline imbalances</b>	No
<b>Age</b>	1-6 years old
<b>Sex (proportion)</b>	Not mentioned
<b>Race/Ethnicity</b>	Indian
<b>Other relevant sociodemographic</b>	-
<b>Subgroups measured</b> <i>(e.g. split by age or sex)</i>	-
<b>Subgroups reported</b>	-

## Section 2. Risk of bias assessment

We recommend you refer to and use the method described in the Cochrane Handbook.

This section is completed by two reviewers. State initials: (i) RRMR (ii) NMN

Domain	Risk of bias			Support for judgement (include direct quotes where available with explanatory comments)	Location in text or source (page, table)
	Low	High	Unclear		
<b>Random sequence generation</b> (selection bias)	Low			"Randomization was achieved by simple randomization"	Page 2
<b>Allocation concealment</b> (selection bias)	Low			"and allocation was concealed by sealed envelope technique."	Page 2
<b>Blinding of participants and personnel</b> (performance bias)	Unclear			Not mentioned in full text	-
<b>Blinding of outcome assessment</b> (detection bias)	Low			Outcome is base on laboratory results from blood sample.  Comment: Objective / continuous outcome	Page 2
<b>Incomplete outcome data</b> (attrition bias)	Low			Number of missing participants are equal in each group and both for similar reason.	Figure 1: study flow chart, page 2
<b>Selective outcome reporting</b> (reporting bias)	Low			Study protocol not available  All pre-specified and expected outcomes of interest are reported	-
<b>Other bias</b>	Low			No other bias identified	-

Random sequence generation = Process used to assign people into intervention and control groups

Allocation concealment = Process used to prevent foreknowledge of group assignment in a RCT

Blinding of participants and personnel = Presence or absence of blinding for participants and health personnel

Blinding of outcome assessment = presence or absence of blinding for assessment of outcome

Incomplete outcome data = application of intention-to-treat analysis is one in which all the participants in a trial are analysed according to the intervention to which they were allocated

Selective outcome reporting = Selection of a subset of the original variables recorded

### Section 3. Intervention groups

This section is completed by two reviewers. State initials: (i) RRMR (ii) NMN

Outcomes relevant to your review <i>(Copy and paste from 'Types of outcome measures')</i>	Reported in paper <i>(Yes / No)</i>	Outcome definition <i>(with diagnostic criteria if relevant)</i>	Unit of measurement & tool <i>(if relevant)</i>	Reanalysis required? <i>(specify)</i>
1. Haemoglobin (Hb)	Yes	level at end of treatment	(g/dL)	No
2. Serum Ferritin	No	-	-	No
3. Serum iron	No	-	-	No
4. Serum mean corpuscular volume (MCV)	No	-	-	No
5. Serum mean corpuscular haemoglobin (MCH)	No	-	-	No
6. Gastrointestinal disturbances as side effects	Yes	Described as gastrointestinal side effects.	-	No

### Section 4. Data and analysis

DICHOTOMOUS OUTCOME	Intervention group		Control group	
	Number of events	Number of participants	Number of events	Number of participants
Gastrointestinal disturbances as side effects	4	53	9	53

State details if outcomes were only described in text or figures.

CONTINUOUS OUTCOME	Unit of measurement	Intervention group		Control group	
		n	Mean (SD)	n	Mean (SD)
Mean change of haemoglobin (Hb)	(g/dL)	53	8.565 (0.3809)	53	8.985 (1.6507)
Haemoglobin (Hb)	(g/dL)	53	8.67 (0.73)	53	9.44 (0.67)

State details if outcomes were only described in text or figures.

## Section 5. Other information

	Description as stated in paper
<b>Key conclusions of study authors</b>	Ferrous sulfate has a better clinical response as compared to Iron polymaltose complex for treating iron deficiency anemia in children.
<b>Results that you calculated using a formula</b>	-
<b>References to other relevant studies</b> <i>(Did this report include any references to unpublished data from potentially eligible trials not already identified for this review? If yes, give list contact name and details)</i>	-
<b>Correspondence required for further study information</b> <i>(from whom, what and when)</i>	-

### Sources:

Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from [www.cochrane-handbook.org](http://www.cochrane-handbook.org).