



4 M's to make sense of evidence – Avoiding the propagation of mistakes, misinterpretation, misrepresentation and misinformation

Jerry Draper-Rodi ^{a,b,*}, Paul Vaucher ^{c,d}, David Hohenschurz-Schmidt ^e, Chantal Morin ^{c,f},
Oliver P. Thomson ^{a,c}

^a University College of Osteopathy, 275 Borough High St, London, SE1 1JE, UK

^b National Council for Osteopathic Research, University College of Osteopathy, 275 Borough High St, London, SE1 1JE, UK

^c Foundation COME Collaboration, Pescara, Italy

^d HES-SO University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland, School of Health Sciences Fribourg, Rue des Arsenaux 16a, CH-1700, Fribourg, Switzerland

^e Imperial College London, Dept. Surgery & Cancer, Chelsea & Westminster Hospital, 369 Fulham Road, London, SE10 9NH, UK

^f School of Rehabilitation, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Université de Sherbrooke, Canada

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Research appraisal
Evidence-based practice
Methods
Case reports
Clinical trials
Qualitative research
Reviews

ABSTRACT

Osteopaths are expected to keep up to date with research evidence relevant to their clinical practice and to integrate this knowledge with their own experience and their patients' values and preferences. One of the potential challenges when engaging with research is to make sense of it, to decide if it is trustworthy, and if it is applicable to the complex and context-sensitive nature of clinical practice and the care of individual people. Clinicians are increasingly exposed to (deliberate and undeliberate) misinformation and overstatements which propagate easily, including via social media. This masterclass aims to facilitate critical thinking and engagement in research for clinicians to make better-informed decisions with their patients. It was developed to support osteopaths facing these questions with the aim of empowering them to judge research themselves, detect common fallacies in the conduct and reporting of different research designs, and to increase researchers' accountability. Ultimately, we hope that by reading and considering the guidance and examples in this paper, clinicians will be better equipped to optimise the use of their (and their patients') time when facing potential sources of evidence.

Mistakes, misinterpretation, misrepresentation and misinformation are discussed for each of these methods/methodologies: case reports, clinical trials, qualitative research, and reviews.

1. Introduction

Osteopaths are expected to keep up-to-date with research evidence relevant to their clinical practice (e.g. for UK osteopaths see the General Osteopathic Council's Osteopathic Practice Standards [1] and for Swiss osteopaths see [2]) and to integrate this knowledge with their own experience and their patients' values and preferences [3]. There are a number of benefits in adopting evidence-informed practice (EIP). However, several theoretical and practical challenges have also been identified [4–8]. One of the potential challenges when engaging with research is to make sense of it, to decide if it is trustworthy, and if it is applicable to the complex and context-sensitive nature of clinical practice and the care of individual people [9]. Tools to support critical

analysis are not only required when reading research, but whenever osteopaths encounter information that could impact on the care or information they provide to their patients. Clinicians are increasingly exposed to (deliberate and undeliberate) misinformation and overstatements which propagate easily, including via social media. At the same time, they are naturally vulnerable to misinformation and need to be aware of their cognitive biases. This is not a problem specific to osteopathy and there are various reasons why this occurs (e.g., confirmation bias or anchorage bias [10,11]). The challenge posed by EIP concerns all healthcare professions, and many (if not all) professions have had to incorporate EIP in some form or another. The translation of evidence into practice can be seen in the development of guidelines that inform healthcare pathways. Clinicians' use of guidelines varies and

* Corresponding author. 275 Borough High Street, London SE1 1JE

E-mail addresses: Jerry.Draper-Rodi@uco.ac.uk (J. Draper-Rodi), paul.vaucher@hes-so.ch (P. Vaucher), d.hohenschurz-schmidt19@imperial.ac.uk (D. Hohenschurz-Schmidt), Chantal.Morin@USherbrooke.ca (C. Morin), Oliver.Thomson@uco.ac.uk (O.P. Thomson).

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijosm.2022.04.007>

Received 20 September 2021; Received in revised form 20 March 2022; Accepted 8 April 2022

Available online 14 April 2022

1746-0689/© 2022 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ltd. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).

their decision-making seems to be based on hybrid sources of information [12]. It is important to state that forty years after its inception, EIP, as a theory of practice, is not settled. Debates continue about all elements of EIP including the nature of evidence [13], the role of patients' values and preferences [3,14], and the role of the practitioners' judgement [15,16]. Osteopathy has not escaped the debate, and there have been calls for osteopaths to incorporate evidence into their decision-making for more than 20 years [17,18]. Recent research of osteopaths' attitudes and skills is encouraging [19,20], and there are signs that, globally, osteopaths have broadly positive views towards utilising evidence in their clinical practice, but feel less confident in their skills to integrate evidence into their clinical decision-making [19].

This masterclass aims to facilitate critical thinking and engagement in research for clinicians to make better-informed decisions with their patients. It was developed to support osteopaths facing these questions with the aim of empowering them to judge research themselves, detect common fallacies in the conduct and reporting of different research designs, and to increase researchers' accountability. Ultimately, we hope that by reading and considering the guidance and examples in this paper, clinicians will be better equipped to optimise the use of their (and their patients') time when facing potential sources of evidence. We hope that their autonomy and agency will be enhanced to decide if and how to apply evidence in practice, developing their expertise.

Building a house (knowledge) with strong foundations (research)

Knowledge and evidence can be seen as a house where all designs help to build different rooms that are equally important but have different functions [22,23].

Researchers frequently confront ethical, methodological and practical constraints or challenges. Compromises have to be made during the publication process (e.g., due to word count limitations) and at times 'mistakes' are unavoidable. In fact, they are part and parcel of the research process that sometimes only become apparent towards the end of a study. It is also part of the development and maturation of any profession to be critically self-reflective of the methods and epistemology (i.e., the nature of knowledge and how to go about 'knowing it' [24]) which inform its practice.

Beyond discussing common study designs, we would like to define our interpretation of the concepts that are used in this masterclass. **Mistakes** refer mostly to the methods employed, what was "done" in the study, and could be defined as avoidable errors that may often be unrecognised by the authors. They would also include methods or techniques that are not accepted as adequate research practice. **Misinterpretation** refers to the analysis used in the study and how the data were interpreted. **Misrepresentation** relates to how the information is portrayed in the title, abstract, discussion, and conclusion. There is a fourth "M" that we would like to mention here, relating to the readership: **Misinformation**. It is the product of the first three M's with consequences for clinical practice and patient care. Misinformation occurs when inappropriate research designs or evidence quality are used to inform (erroneous) reasoning; when absence of evidence informs (poor) practice; and when inaccurate advice is propagated to peers or patients. Broadly, we address the question of when, as a reader, should I propagate information or not.

Whilst we have presented the 4 M's as distinct, and this is a somewhat crude separation to define our position, in reality there is overlap. One will influence the other or not sit clearly under 1 'M'.

The following sections will provide details about such fallacies found in case reports, randomised controlled trials (RCTs), qualitative research, and reviews, as these are designs that readers will frequently encounter in the literature.

To develop this masterclass, four osteopaths took part in a review and feedback process. They had had no formal training in research methods beyond their initial undergraduate training. They were each sent the manuscript with an osteopathic article (case report, RCT, qualitative study or review) and a pilot form. They were asked to read

the masterclass and the article in their preferred order, and to send the pilot form back. They provided scores (0-10) and reasons for their score on: the general style of the article, the usability of the content, and the help the masterclass provided to assess the quality of the paper. There was a free-text box for further comments. The feedback was overall positive and the changes they proposed were made, apart from two. One was on how to interpret statistics: whilst it is outside the scope of this masterclass, it is very relevant and related to the 4 M's; we would like to draw the readers' attention to these references [25–27]. Another comment was on using user experience design to help the readability, for which we do not have expertise in.

2. Case reports & case series

Case reports and case series usually describe an interesting, rare or an unusual evolution of a disease of one individual or few individuals. They are used to generate an in-depth investigation and understanding of a single patient in their real-world context [28,29]. This research design is a suitable strategy to investigate "how" and "why"- questions about a contemporary intervention and complex issues [30]. Even if the case report is traditionally perceived to be a lower-value form of evidence, this type of observational and descriptive research design has its rightful place to document and understand complex interventions in a more naturalistic way [31]. There are several types of case reports, including retrospective and prospective ones (of which the latter are considered more rigorous because of the ability to pre-specify the methodology), multiple or single cases. Further, case reports can be assessment reports, management reports or educational reports. Case reports resemble other research designs such as single case experimental designs (including n-of-1 designs) that introduce deliberate experimentation, or cohort studies that voluntarily observe exposed and non-exposed participants [32].

The value of the case report is well recognised in many fields. Indeed, it can be used to generate hypotheses to be subsequently tested by other types of research design such as cohort studies or control randomized trials [33,34], to detect novelties [34], to warn a profession of potential complications of an intervention [35]. These reports can also promote the sharing of clinical expertise, help clinicians to solve difficult clinical problems and provide valuable teaching opportunities [29,34,35]. Finally, case report can give the patient the opportunity to share their perspective.

The popularity of case reports has led to the need to develop tools that promote high-quality and well-written case reports [36]. The most widely used reporting guideline is the CARE (CAse REport) guidelines [37]) to improve transparency and completeness of case reports. A successful clinical case report must be well structured, be brief and convey a clear message [35]. It includes elements of the patient case history, examination, accurate descriptions of the interventions, objective, reliable and valid measures and ongoing management with the aim of informing clinical practice. Several professions have documented how to use the CARE checklist in the context of their own discipline, including osteopathy [29]. Osteopathy is no exception to the trend of writing case reports; about one third of all osteopathic publications between 1980 and 2018 about the effect of OMT are case reports [38]. Although it may seem easy for a clinician to write, read or improve clinical decisions with a case report, several pitfalls are possible and should be identified by the reader. The most common problems with case reports are outlined in Table 1.

The main limitations of case reports include low possibility of generalization, cause-effect relationships cannot be inferred, and there is a danger of over-interpretation and distraction of the reader from common problems by focusing only on the unusual aspect of the cases [34].

Table 1
3 M's in case reports.

| Warning signs | Types | Examples |
|--|--|---|
| Mistakes | | |
| Unclear research question or no indication of the scope of the case | Case selection | Presentation of a case without any specific question or rationale |
| Absence of systematic measures before/during/after | Recall bias (in retrospective case studies) | Writing a case based on few clinical notes in the chart |
| No indication of the types of measurements, time period or no validated tools used | Lack of rigour | Non objectives, poor-quality data (anecdotic), absence of triangulation of data |
| Extensive literature review and very few information about the case | Combining a case and literature review | Long review that does not narrow down to the need for the case report |
| Presentation of only one aspect of the case with no alternative hypothesis discussed | Data collection and selection | Not presenting enough contextual information to understand clinical decision through the conclusions |
| No explanation about why this case is worthy or unique or what does it add to current knowledge | Absence of original contribution from the case | Many similar cases or RCT already published on the topic |
| Misinterpretation | | |
| Difficulty in extracting the evolution of the case | Volume of non-relevant data | Too much information and data presented |
| Absence of tables with before and after outcomes/timeline | Inadequate/confusing presentation of data | Long descriptive text without any synthesis |
| Absence of information about potential confounders, natural evolution, or other possible reasons for the observation | Cause-effect relationship | Affirmation that an intervention helps for a condition without specifying the context and confounders |
| Emotional appeal on readers, impression that the intervention is fantastic | Overinterpretation [34] | Exaggerated conclusions from the results of a single case |
| No disclaimer that the case results cannot necessarily be generalized to all potential patient with this condition | Generalization | Letting people believe that the conclusion applies to many without taking into account the context |
| Misrepresentation | | |
| Absence of the word case report in the title | Title | Title that let suppose interventional research |
| No mentioned that other types of design are required to validate hypothesis generated by the case | Claims and general statements | Conclusion that the approach or technique is effective based only on the case results |
| A case report should describe and not prove anything | Prove causation | Sentences such as: "this case proves that ..." |
| No highlights of the differences found between the case and what is already known in the literature | Discussion is inconsequential | Typical and non-typical aspects of the case not clearly stated |
| No sentence summarizing what was learned from this case | Take away message | No clear suggestions or recommendations are made for clinicians or researchers |

3. Clinical trials

Randomised clinical trials (RCTs) are comparisons between two or more groups of patients, receiving distinct interventions in order to evaluate the effects of one in comparison to the other [22]. Even though highly regarded, it is important to remember that each RCT is an experiment designed to give specific answers to clearly defined research questions. These effects can be about clinical outcomes, costs, safety concerns, or specific physiological responses. RCTs are important to inform clinical decision-making but require keeping in mind that the observed results are limited to the circumstances in which measures were taken. Furthermore, most RCTs tell us very little about other important factors, such as patient and practitioner experiences, preferences, and social context.

RCTs make use of randomisation to ensure that patients in all study groups are similar across known and unknown factors that may influence treatment outcomes. The choice of the comparator group for the test treatment is determined by the underlying study question. For example, comparing a treatment to a no-treatment control (similarly, 'waitlist' and 'time controls') can account for the natural history of the disease. It cannot, however, elucidate to which degree any observed effect is due to any specific components of the provided care. Placebo (also 'sham' and 'attention') controls are designed to isolate these specific effects. In doing so, well-designed placebo-controlled trials provide information on the potential true benefit of a specific targeted underlying mechanism. However, clinical trials may also use existing treatment as control (i.e., equivalence or comparative effectiveness trials). Table 2 gives the main fallacies or errors that are useful to identify when assessing whether the results from a trial are applicable to specific clinical situations.

4. Qualitative research

The previous sections on quantitative methods are conducted with the view that there is a single truth and knowledge (epistemology) to be found 'out there' (ontology), and this is consistent with the assumptions which underpin the positivist and post-positivist paradigms [21,39]. For example whether or not a treatment *is* or *is not* effective (statistically significantly) or whether or not a clinical assessment *is* or *is not* reliable or valid (e.g. by way of a Kappa score or an intraclass correlation coefficient). Research which adopts quantitative methods and methodologies tends to view knowledge as facts which can be discovered from direct observation and measurement to enable predetermined hypotheses to be accepted or rejected [40]. Quantitative researchers generally hold the view that there is a Truth to be found in relation to these research questions and that the knowledge of them is independent of the knower (i.e. objective), meaning that treatments are either effective (or not) and this knowledge is true, regardless of the personality, beliefs and values of the researchers [40].

On the other hand, qualitative research takes a different view to truth, knowledge and reality, which, while the different qualitative theoretical methodologies might vary, the general difference is that in the social world, truth is multiple, local to the individual and socially constructed [41]. These assumptions are aligned with a constructivist or interpretivist research paradigms [21]. As a result, qualitative researchers may reject the view held by quantitative researchers that social reality can be accessed ('observed') by methods that are independent of their interests and values. The subjective position of qualitative research can make it a challenge to implement strict 'objective' criteria and standards for conducting and reporting qualitative research [42]. As such, for many qualitative researchers, research is a process of interpretation. The researchers themselves with all their values, knowledge and experiences are the instrument of that interpretation (e.g., during data collection and data analysis) [40].

Table 2

Table 2: 3 M's in RCTs, see below.

| Warning signs | Types | | Examples |
|--|---|------------------------|---|
| Mistakes | | | |
| Unclear explanation of underlying mechanisms or theoretical models that justify the intervention under scrutiny. | Poor choice of intervention or control. | Rational | Providing general description of care without details such as “osteopathic manipulative treatment”. |
| Use of a control that is unlikely to be perceived as a credible treatment. | | Blinding | Having participants lay down and wait alone in the control group. |
| Different management between groups other than for the component of interest. | | Performance bias | Let practitioners talk to participants in the treatment group and not in the control. |
| Lack of power to identify minimal clinical important difference. | Lack of rigour in methods | Random error | Not plan a sample size large enough to detect the minimal clinical important difference. |
| Not using standardised and validated measuring instruments to evaluate outcomes. | | Detection bias | Using a self-made questionnaire combining questions from different questionnaires to assess severity of symptoms. |
| Not blinding operator to group allocation. | | Observation bias | Measuring pain threshold by the same person that is delivering the intervention. |
| Lack of measures put into place to assure data quality and avoid protocol deviations. | | Quality control | Absence of protocol or ethical approval. |
| Not clearly distinguishing primary from secondary outcomes. | Lack of transparency in reporting | Random error | Choosing as an outcome multiple dimensions of a questionnaire. |
| Not comparing baseline characteristics between groups. | | Selection bias | Avoiding providing baseline values for each group. |
| Not reporting reasons for drop-out. | | Attrition bias | Not reporting outcomes for patients with severe side-effects who have stopped the treatment. |
| Not reporting what groups participants believed they were in (blinding success). | | Performance bias | Simply reporting blinding to have worked. |
| Not reporting all results. | | Reporting bias | Focusing on significant results only. |
| Misinterpretations | | | |
| Concluding on benefits when the primary outcome does not show significant differences between groups. | Shifting the goalpost | Reporting bias | Focusing on quality of life when the primary outcome was pain intensity. |
| Relying on multiple testing without statistical correction and then focusing on results that are significant. | Relying on multiple testing | Random error | Ignoring negative results when interpreting overall results. |
| Ignoring missing data without relying on multiple imputation or sensitivity analysis. | Not accounting for missing data | Attrition bias | Not reporting any missing data. |
| Exaggerating effects between groups by modifying the scale or by focusing uselessly on within group difference. | Graphical distortion | Reporting bias | Assuming effects occur because significant effects within the group occurred over time. |
| Misrepresentation | | | |
| Use of specific reporting strategies to distract the reader from statistically non-significant results. | Spin reporting | Integrity | Even if non-significant, reporting results to be meaningful. |
| Inappropriate identification and recognition of potential biases and/or limitations. | Bias denial | Internal validity | Not reporting blinding issues in a trial where operators are not blinded. |
| Going beyond the trial's specific research question in interpretation or discussion. Making claims not supported by the data or that do not recognise the risk of false results inherent in this particular study. | Extrapolation | Poor contextualisation | Assuming that if an intervention modulates heart rate, it also increases resistance to stress. |
| Generalising to broad populations outside the trial or not outlining the limits of the supposed generalisability. | Exaggerated generalisability | External validity | Extrapolating results to other populations or conditions. |

The value of qualitative research is that it offers insights, depth and context formed from a range of perspectives on a particular psychological, social process or phenomenon, which may have transferability to the readers' own personal setting and circumstances. While there is growing recognition that the evidence generated from qualitative studies offers significant value for evidence-based person-centred care [7,43], it is traditionally believed that the findings offer limited or insufficient evidence for causal relationships, such as the effectiveness of treatment interventions. With that said, recently philosophers of healthcare and science and clinicians have begun to articulate the important role of qualitative research in obtaining a rich and contextual understanding of the complex and unique ‘causal story’ of individual patients using the theoretical framework of dispositionalism [7]. Furthermore, strong arguments have been made for the inclusion of qualitative research into evidence-based practice, policy and decision-making on the grounds that quantitative research alone is unable to provide a sufficient understanding of the complex relationship between the healthcare system and the outside world (e.g., socio-political and economic context) in which care the care of people, communities and populations takes place; qualitative research possesses a rich and diverse range of methods, methodologies and theories which can generate a detailed and holistic understanding of healthcare practice [44].

There is a growing recognition of the complexity of clinical healthcare practice, such as how clinicians conceptualise common conditions like low back pain (see Refs. [45,46]), the nature of clinician-therapist interaction [47], the crucial role of contextual factors in clinical outcomes [48] and even the nature of causation itself in respect to the development of pain/illness and how different people may (or not) respond to therapeutic interventions [49]. Therefore, real-world clinical practice (and the ultimate success of therapy) is highly subjective, individualised to the person/patient, influenced by a multitude of interacting factors in a context-sensitive environment.

The different underpinning theories and philosophies of qualitative research enables researchers to embrace complexity, rather than control for it. As such, the findings of qualitative studies offer insights and knowledge of the idiosyncrasy of individual patients, including their lived-experiences, psycho-social processes and social contexts and provide a valuable form of evidence to inform person-centred practice. The most common problems with qualitative research are outlined in Table 3.[49–53]

5. Reviews

Secondary research involves the collation and synthesis of existing research. Reviews are often conducted when enough data is published

on a topic, but with an unclear overall answer or conflicting results. Reviews aim at providing an up-to-date summary of what is currently known. There are currently four main ways to review the literature in medicine, allied health and rehabilitation: narrative literature reviews, systematic literature reviews, meta-analyses [54], and scoping reviews [55]. Their methods should clearly be described to allow readers to assess their quality and trustworthiness.

Narrative reviews can be appropriate educational tools in the classroom but are no longer accepted for publication by many journals [56] due to the lack of clear selection criteria for articles [57]. There are numerous examples in the osteopathic literature of recent narrative reviews on attractive topics, e.g., the fascial system or the five diaphragms, but readers should be mindful of the low quality of this type of review when reading them.

There are more reliable methods to combine and merge information from individual studies. Some will include mostly quantitative data (such as systematic reviews, with or without meta-analysis), qualitative data (qualitative meta-synthesis [58]), or a variety of study designs (such as systematic reviews with critical interpretive synthesis [59]). These reviews have different epistemological positions (e.g., meta-analyses are more aligned with post-positivism and qualitative meta-synthesis with constructivism). Systematic reviews of quantitative data focus on a specific clinical problem; therapeutic, diagnostic or prognostic [60] and include different steps that are explicitly and clearly stated to allow independent reproduction by other researchers [60–63]. They are effective at pinpointing weaknesses and fallacies in apparently sound primary studies [60]. Systematic reviews of qualitative data hold different theoretical frameworks and researchers' position than systematic reviews of quantitative data; reality and knowledge are not perceived as objective, absolute and stable, but subjective, co-constructed and contextual. Whilst they tend to be more flexible and diverse in their methods, they should also be transparent in how they are

conducted. As such, they follow explicit steps to allow readers to assess how results and conclusions were made, seeking to develop and refine theories and creating broader narratives of psychosocial phenomena, processes and experiences [58].

Another form of review are scoping reviews that are exploratory in nature; their broad research questions differentiate them from systematic reviews (Colquhoun, Levac et al., 2014). They are mostly used in healthcare [55] and follow a distinct methodological framework [64]. They can be conducted to examine the extent, range and nature of research activity; to determine the value of undertaking a full systematic review; to identify research gaps in the existing literature; and to summarise and disseminate research findings to policy makers, practitioners and consumers who might otherwise lack time or resources to undertake such work themselves [64].

The limitations of reviews include the quality of the studies included: if only few or low-quality studies are retrieved, conducting a systematic review may mislead readers about the strength of the evidence. Another limitation is the lack of their external validity to a clinical setting, i.e., knowing if results from systematic literature reviews can be applied to a single individual. The most common problems with reviews are outlined in Table 4.

6. Conclusion

Four potential problems with evidence from four frequent clinical research designs were discussed: Mistakes, Misinterpretation, Misrepresentation and Misinformation, described in the context of case reports, clinical trials, qualitative research, and literature reviews. The first three fallacies were described as being related to errors, limitations or lack of information within the study publication. The fourth one can be prevented by osteopaths themselves by identifying when information is unreliable and should not be transmitted to patients and colleagues,

Table 3
3 M's in qualitative research.

| Warning signs | Type | Example |
|--|---|---|
| Mistakes | | |
| Too much/lack of diversity in participants [49] | Inappropriate sampling [50] | All participants samples from the same work/clinic location or setting. |
| Authors claiming to adopt an interpretivist position but conducting an inter-rater reliability analysis on the coding to ascertain the single object 'truth'. | Theoretical position vague, ambiguous or not stated. | Mixing and matching epistemological or ontological positions which are either not congruent with the research question stated or are incompatible with the chosen methods or inconsistent with each other. |
| Moving between and stating different methods and methodologies without transparent reporting of how these were utilised. | Methodological slurring (Baker, Wuest et al., 1992) | Using content analysis (Cho and Lee 2014) combined with grounded theory without a clear description about how the different methods. |
| Superficial descriptions of the study design e.g. 'an interview study' or 'a qualitative study' without details about of the methodology and methods. | Lack of transparency in reporting methods | A lack of detail in reporting or guideline not used to structure the methods. (e.g., COREQ [51], SRQR [52]). |
| Mundane or seeming obvious unimaginative results reported, Absence of how the findings relate to broader social theories [53]. | Testing existing theory Lack of theoretical grounding or integration | A finding that 'chronic back pain negatively affects a person quality of life'. A focus <i>only</i> on methods and little integration of broader extant social theories |
| Misinterpretation | | |
| Not all participants quoted in results. Problematic especially in methodologies where power and marginalisation are the focus of the study (e.g., critical theory) | Selection of participants' quotations | Only quotes presented from a small number of participants. |
| Inconsistency between the researchers aims and the potential focus and goals of the chosen qualitative methodology. | Mist-match between research aims and qualitative methodology | Using phenomenology (methodological aim: to describe the lived experience of a phenomenon) to develop an understanding of the social processes (which would be better suited to a grounded theory approach) (Starks and Brown Trinidad 2007). |
| Ambiguity or a lack of detail about the researchers, who conducted the analysis, their relationship to the participants. | Lack of researcher reflexivity | Absence of declaration of the position, assumptions, background and views of the researcher. |
| Misrepresentation | | |
| Broad and sweeping statements by the researchers in the discussion section. | Over generalising qualitative findings | "The attitudes and experiences of the participants in this study indicate that it is likely that <i>all</i> other similar people will feel and think in this way" |
| Causal claims should be carefully considered only in the context of individual patients rather than broad populations [7]. | Making generalisable causative claims | Using the subjective reports of participants (e.g. their condition improved) to 'prove' the effectiveness of an intervention. |
| Absence of coherent and transparent theoretical position of the researchers which is consistent with paradigms of qualitative enquiry [21]. | Incorrect or misleading descriptions of the 'qualitative' study design | 'Qualitative' studies using quantitative surveys or questionnaires to collect data on subjected phenomena and processes. |

Table 4
3 M's in reviews.

| Warning signs | Type | Example |
|--|---|--|
| Mistakes | | |
| Lack of balanced and nuanced discussion | Evidence cherry-picking (aka p-hacking) | Article which starts with a short introduction, followed by a long discussion on a topic with no clear description of the methods followed and reporting of the results |
| Not reported following the PRISMA statement | | |
| Absence of registered protocol or unaccounted differences with protocol | Poor databases search | Review on osteopathy only searching PubMed where osteopathic literature is very limited. |
| No methods section | | |
| Only one database searched | | |
| Absence of definition of the study topic (using PICOS: Participants, Interventions, Comparisons, Outcomes, and Study design) | Biases introduced by researchers | Search based on simple search terms with absence of use of MeSH terms, Boolean operators (OR, AND, NOT), or truncation (usually represented with an asterisk) |
| Limited number of search terms (synonyms and Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)) | | |
| Absence of duplicate and independent processes | | |
| Misinterpretation | | |
| Comparing articles that use different outcome measures or populations with no acknowledgment | Data mishandling | Review with an exploratory research question leading to inclusion of articles with varied designs: authors synthesising all results together regardless of major differences in levels and types of evidence |
| Making effectiveness claims based on preclinical data | Correlation error | Review including clinical trials regardless of their power (i.e., including pilot studies and well-powered studies) and giving them equal weight in the final conclusions |
| Amalgamating well-powered and underpowered (e.g., pilot) studies | | |
| Studies not reporting causation (e.g., cohort studies) but review misreporting results/conclusions | Poor clinical replicability | Using Patient Reported Outcome Measures (PROMs) to assess effectiveness of osteopathy |
| Using data that was not drawn from clinical encounters to hypothesise or justify clinical effectiveness | | |
| Misrepresentation | | |
| Prioritising positive over negative findings not based on strength/quality of evidence in abstract/conclusion | Spinning | Suggesting that a therapy is effective or may be effective when results strongly suggest the opposite |
| Conclusion not aligned with research question | Misleading conclusion | Research question regarding effectiveness but conclusions based on adverse events |

including via social media. As clinicians it is important to remember that the further away the evidence is from what clinical practice looks like, the more care needs to be taken in the interpretation and extrapolation to clinical decision-making. This masterclass aimed at equipping clinicians in how to assess information and evidence related to clinical practice - a challenge as an ever-growing amount of evidence is shared and available. One of the limitations of this masterclass is the lack of specific tools for clinicians to use. Instead, we would like to draw the readers' attention to free resources that were specially developed for clinicians to assess research publication quality [65]. Assessing the strength of evidence, however, provides little indications on what to do as a clinician in the absence of evidence. We may need to use less reliable knowledge, requiring even more careful interpretation. We would recommend readers to read [5] on this topic. As clinicians, our knowledge, values and beliefs influence our patient management. Being able to decide whether to trust what we read is essential to the profession and to patients.

Conflict of Interest

Paul Vaucher is an independent clinician providing osteopathic care and research services in osteopathic science. He also is a board of trustees member of COME collaboration, a Foundation promoting science in osteopathic medicine, and holds a position as Full Professor at the University of Applied Sciences and Arts Western Switzerland to provide support and assistance in osteopathic research and teaching in methodology and ethics. He is an editor at Mains Libres, a reviewer for IJOM and other medical indexed journals, and is scientific advisor for the Swiss Osteopathic Science Foundation.

Oliver P Thomson is an Associate Editor for IJOM but had no role in the reviewing process and decisions regarding this paper and is the curator and host of The Words Matter Podcast referenced in this masterclass.

Jerry Draper-Rodi, David Hohenschurz-Schmidt and Chantal Morin declare that they have no conflict of interest to report.

Funding Sources

No funding was awarded to support the development of this manuscript.

Ethical Approval

Ethical approval was not required for the development or writing of this manuscript.

References

- [1] General Osteopathic Council. Standard B3 1.2.3. Osteopath Pract Stand 2021. Retrieved 18/06/2021, from, <https://standards.osteopathy.org.uk/themes/knowledge-skills-and-performance/>.
- [2] Conseil fédéral suisse. Ordonnance relative aux compétences professionnelles spécifiques aux professions de la santé selon la LPSan Conseil fédéral suisse. Switzerland811. Conseil fédéral suisse; 2019. p. 1–8. 212.
- [3] Greenhalgh T, et al. Evidence based medicine: a movement in crisis? *BMJ* 2014; 348(g3725).
- [4] Miles A, Loughlin M. Models in the balance: evidence-based medicine versus evidence-informed individualized care. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2011;17(4):531–6.
- [5] Leboeuf-Yde C, et al. How to proceed when evidence-based practice is required but very little evidence available? *Chiropr Man Ther* 2013;21(24).
- [6] Tyreman S. Evidence, alternative facts and narrative: a personal reflection on person-centred care and the role of stories in healthcare. *Int J Osteopath Med* 2018; 28:1–3.
- [7] Anjum RL, et al. Rethinking causality, complexity and evidence for the unique patient: a CauseHealth Resource for healthcare professionals and the clinical encounter. Springer Nature; 2020.
- [8] Kamper SJ. Generalizability: linking evidence to practice. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2020;50(1):45–6.
- [9] Kerry R. Expanding our perspectives on research in musculoskeletal science and practice. *Musculoskel Sci Pract* 2017;32:114–9.
- [10] Gigerenzer G, Brighton H. Homo heuristicus: why biased minds make better inferences. *Top Cognit Sci* 2009;1(1):107–43.
- [11] Saposnik G, et al. Cognitive biases associated with medical decisions: a systematic review. *BMC Med Inf Decis Making* 2016;16(1):138.
- [12] Wieringa S, Greenhalgh T. 10 years of mindlines: a systematic review and commentary. *Implement Sci* 2015;10(45) [Online] Available at: <http://implementationscience.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13012-13015-10229-x>.
- [13] Loughlin M. Reason, reality and objectivity—shared dogmas and distortions in the way both 'scientific' and 'postmodern' commentators frame the EBM debate. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2008;14(5):665–71.

- [14] Louw J, et al. Patient- or person-centred practice in medicine? - a review of concepts. *Afr J Prim Health Care Fam Med* 2017;9(1):e1–7.
- [15] Loughlin M. The basis of medical knowledge: judgement, objectivity and the history of ideas. *J Eval Clin Pract* 2009;15(6):935–40.
- [16] Woodbury G, Kuhnke J. Evidence-based practice vs. Evidence-informed practice: what's the difference? *Wound Care Canada* 2014;12(1):26–9.
- [17] Vogel S. Research - the future? Why bother? *Br Orthop J* 1994;XIV:6–10.
- [18] Green J. Evidence-based medicine or evidence-informed osteopathy? *Osteopathy Today* 2000;April(21–22).
- [19] Sundberg T, et al. Attitudes, skills and use of evidence-based practice among UK osteopaths: a national cross-sectional survey. *BMC Musculoskel Disord* 2018;19(1).
- [20] Alvarez G, et al. A national cross-sectional survey of the attitudes, skills and use of evidence-based practice amongst Spanish osteopaths. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2021; 21(1):1–13.
- [21] Guba EG, Lincoln YS. Competing paradigms in qualitative research. *Handb Qual Res* 1994;2(105):163–94.
- [22] Jonas WB. Building an evidence house: challenges and solutions to research in complementary and alternative medicine. *Forsch Komplementarmed Klass Naturheilkd* 2005;12:159–67.
- [23] Walach H, et al. Circular instead of hierarchical: methodological principles for the evaluation of complex interventions. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2006;6(29) [Online] Available at: <http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/1476/1429>.
- [24] Richardson B, et al. Recognising practice epistemology in the health professions. *Developing practice knowledge for health professionals*. Edinburgh: Butterworth Heinemann; 2004. p. 1e14. R. B. Higgs J, Dahlgren MA.
- [25] Kamper SJ. Interpreting outcomes 1—change and difference: linking evidence to practice. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2019;49(5):357–8.
- [26] Kamper SJ. Interpreting outcomes 2—statistical significance and clinical meaningfulness: linking evidence to practice. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2019;49 (7):559–60.
- [27] Kamper SJ. Interpreting outcomes 3—clinical meaningfulness: linking evidence to practice. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2019;49(9):677–8.
- [28] Yin R. *Case study research and applications, design and methods*. London: Sage Publications Ltd; 2018.
- [29] Vaughan B, Fleischmann M. A guide to writing a case report of an osteopathic patient. *Int J Osteopath Med* 2020;37:34–9.
- [30] Yin R. *Case study research, design and method*. London: Sage Publications Ltd; 2009.
- [31] Crowe S, et al. The case study approach. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2011;11(1):1–9.
- [32] Mathes T, Pieper D. Clarifying the distinction between case series and cohort studies in systematic reviews of comparative studies: potential impact on body of evidence and workload. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2017;17(1):107.
- [33] Sun GH, et al. Open-access electronic case report journals: the rationale for case report guidelines. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2013;66(10):1065–70.
- [34] Nissen T, Wynn R. The clinical case report: a review of its merits and limitations. *BMC Res Notes* 2014;7(1):1–7.
- [35] Green BN, Johnson CD. How to write a case report for publication. *J chiropractic Med* 2006;5(2):72–82.
- [36] Riley DS, et al. CARE guidelines for case reports: explanation and elaboration document. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2017;89:218–35.
- [37] Gagnier J, et al. The CARE guidelines: consensus-based clinical case reporting guideline development. *Dtsch Arztebl Int* 2013;110(37):603–8.
- [38] Morin C, Gaboury I. Osteopathic empirical research: a bibliometric analysis from 1966 to 2018. *BMC Complement Med Ther* 2021;21(1):1–9.
- [39] Olson K, et al. *Handbook of qualitative health research for evidence-based practice*. 2016.
- [40] Petty NJ, et al. Ready for a paradigm shift? Part 1: introducing the philosophy of qualitative research. *Man Ther* 2012;17(4):267–74.
- [41] Guba EG. Relativism. *Curric Inq* 1992;22(1):17–23.
- [42] Sandelowski M. A matter of taste: evaluating the quality of qualitative research. *Nurs Inq* 2015;22(2):86–94.
- [43] Thomson O. Rethinking causality, complexity and evidence for the unique patient - the CauseHealth Podcast series. *Words matter*. London: O. Thomson; 2020.
- [44] Greenhalgh T, et al. An open letter to the BMJ editors on qualitative research. *BMJ* 2016;352.
- [45] Eriksen TE, et al. At the borders of medical reasoning: aetiological and ontological challenges of medically unexplained symptoms. *Philos Ethics Humanit Med PEHM* 2013;8(1):11.
- [46] O'Sullivan P, et al. Unraveling the complexity of low back pain. *J Orthop Sports Phys Ther* 2016;46(11):932–7.
- [47] O'Keefe M, et al. What influences patient-therapist interactions in musculoskeletal physical therapy? Qualitative systematic review and meta-synthesis. *Phys Ther* 2016;96(5):609–22.
- [48] Rossetini G, et al. Context matters: the psychoneurobiological determinants of placebo, nocebo and context-related effects in physiotherapy. *Arch Physiother* 2020;10(1):1–12.
- [49] Anjum RL. Dispositions and the unique patient. *Rethinking causality, complexity and evidence for the unique patient*. Springer; 2020. p. 13–36.
- [50] Pietkiewicz I, Smith JA. A practical guide to using interpretative phenomenological analysis in qualitative research psychology. *Psychol J* 2014;20(1):7–14.
- [51] Tong A, et al. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups. *Int J Qual Health Care* 2007;19 (6):349–57.
- [52] O'Brien BC, et al. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. *Acad Med* 2014;89(9):1245–51.
- [53] Jackson AY, M LA. *Thinking with theory in qualitative research: viewing data across multiple perspectives*. London, UK: Routledge; 2012.
- [54] Rumrill PD, et al. Using scoping literature reviews as a means of understanding and interpreting existing literature. *Work* 2010;35(3):399–404.
- [55] Pham MT, et al. A scoping review of scoping reviews: advancing the approach and enhancing the consistency. *Res Synth Methods* 2014;5(4):371–85.
- [56] Green BN, et al. Writing narrative literature reviews for peer-reviewed journals: secrets of the trade. *J Chiropr Med* 2006;5(3):101–17.
- [57] Cronin P, et al. Undertaking a literature review: a step-by-step approach. *Br J Nurs* 2008;17(1):38–43.
- [58] Finlayson KW, Dixon A. Qualitative meta-synthesis: a guide for the novice. *Nurse Res* 2008;15(2).
- [59] Dixon-Woods MCD, Agarwal S, Annandale E, Arthur A, Harvey J, Hsu R, Katbamna S, Olsen R, Smith L, Riley R. Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2006;6(1):1–13.
- [60] Biondi-Zoccai G, et al. The rough guide to systematic reviews and meta-analyses. *HSR Proc Intensive Care Cardiovasc Anesth* 2011;3(3):161–73.
- [61] Wright RW, et al. How to write a systematic review. *Clin Orthop Relat Res* 2007; 455:23–9.
- [62] Furlan A, et al. 2009 updated method guidelines for systematic reviews in the Cochrane Back Review Group. *Spine* 2009;34(18):1929–41.
- [63] Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*; 2011 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, Available from, Version 5.1.0. www.cochrane-handbook.org.
- [64] Arksey H, O'Malley L. Scoping studies: towards a methodological framework. *Int J Soc Res Methodol* 2005;8(1):19–32.
- [65] **Critical Appraisals Skills Programme. checklists.** <https://casp-uk.net/casp-tools-ch-ecklists/>. [Accessed 18 June 2021].
- [66] Coyne IT. Sampling in qualitative research. Purposeful and theoretical sampling; merging or clear boundaries? *J Adv Nurs* 1997;26(3):623–30.