
JOURNAL OF CLINICAL EPIDEMIOLOGY

VOLUME 110, JUNE 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Editorial

- v Inadequate comparators produce misleading results – the importance of good comparison practice
J. André Knottnerus, and Peter Tugwell

Commentary

- 90 The ecosystem of evidence cannot thrive without efficiency of knowledge generation, synthesis, and translation
Antonino Cartabellotta, and Julie K. Tilson

Reviews

- 12 A systematic review shows no performance benefit of machine learning over logistic regression for clinical prediction models
Evangelia Christodoulou, Jie Ma, Gary S. Collins, Ewout W. Steyerberg, Jan Y. Verbakel, and Ben Van Calster
- 74 The selection of comparators for randomized controlled trials of health-related behavioral interventions: recommendations of an NIH expert panel
Kenneth E. Freedland, Abby C. King, Walter T. Ambrosius, Evan Mayo-Wilson, David C. Mohr, Susan M. Czajkowski, Lehana Thabane, Linda M. Collins, George W. Rebok, Shaun P. Treweek, Thomas D. Cook, Jack D. Edinger, Catherine M. Stoney, Rebecca A. Campo, Deborah Young-Hyman, and William T. Riley, for the National Institutes of Health Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research Expert Panel on Comparator Selection in Behavioral and Social Science Clinical Trials

Original Articles

- 1 A scoping review provided a framework for new ways of doing research through mobilizing collective intelligence
Van Thu Nguyen, Mehdi Benchoufi, Bridget Young, Lina Ghosn, Philippe Ravaud, and Isabelle Boutron
- 23 Structured decision-making drives guidelines panels' recommendations "for" but not "against" health interventions
Benjamin Djulbegovic, Tea Reljic, Shira Elqayam, Adam Cuker, Iztok Hozo, Qi Zhou, Shelly-Anne Li, Paul Alexander, Robby Nieuwlaat, Wojtek Wiercioch, Holger Schünemann, and Gordon Guyatt
- 34 Comparison of non-Cochrane systematic reviews and their published protocols: differences occurred frequently but were seldom explained
Nadja Koensgen, Tanja Rombey, Katharina Allers, Tim Mathes, Falk Hoffmann, and Dawid Pieper
- 42 The risk of conclusion change in systematic review updates can be estimated by learning from a database of published examples
Rabia Bashir, Didi Surian, and Adam G. Dunn

Continued on following page



0895-4356(201906)110:C;1-A

JOURNAL OF CLINICAL EPIDEMIOLOGY

VOLUME 110, JUNE 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS *continued*

- 50 Rounding, but not randomization method, non-normality, or correlation, affected baseline *P*-value distributions in randomized trials
Mark J. Bolland, Greg D. Gamble, Alison Avenell, and Andrew Grey
- 63 The proportion of missing data should not be used to guide decisions on multiple imputation
Paul Madley-Dowd, Rachael Hughes, Kate Tilling, and Jon Heron
- 82 Most noninferiority trials were not designed to preserve active comparator treatment effects
Michael Tsui, Sunita Rehal, Vipul Jairath, and Brennan C. Kaban

Letters to the Editor

- 96 Should a systematic review be tested for reproducibility before its publication?
Clovis Mariano Faggion, Jr.
- 97 Decision making about healthcare-related tests and diagnostic test strategies: what “The death of Ivan Ilyich” teaches us
Paulo Schiavom Duarte
- 98 Methodological studies evaluating evidence are not systematic reviews
Livia Puljak
- 99 Priority setting for Cochrane Review Groups
Chris Del Mar, on behalf of the Acute Respiratory Infections Cochrane Review Group