



#### Supplement of

# The scientific publication score – a new tool for summarizing evidence and data quality criteria of biomedical publications

Dieter Bettin et al.

*Correspondence to:* Dieter Bettin (dieter.bettin@ewetel.net)

The copyright of individual parts of the supplement might differ from the article licence.

## Scientific Publication Score

### **Open Statement Diagnose**

#### Open Statement: Joint aspiration culture-51



Subgroup: other 🕙 Posted by Thomas Maurer						Vote button			
	Title	Author	Journal	Year	Pape level (mea		Readers vote (mean)	Number of Voters	-
1	Is there a role for tissue biopsy in the diagnosis of periprosthetic infection?	Meermans, Geert; Haddad, Fares S;	Clinical orthopaedics and related research	2010	4.00	2	4.00	1	R 🗾 🗙 🗵
2	Prospective analysis of preoperative and intraoperative investigations for the diagnosis of infection at the sites of two hundred and two revision total hip	Spangehl, M J; Masri, B A; O'Connell, J X; Duncan, C P;	The Journal of bone and joint surgery. American volume	1999	4.00	\$	3.00	1	
3	arthroplasties. Culture and PCR analysis of joint fluid in the diagnosis of prosthetic joint infection.	Gallo, Jiri; Kolar, Milan; Dendis, Milos; Loveckova, Yvona; Sauer, Pavel; Zapletalova, Jana; Koukalova, Dagmar;	The new microbiologica	2008	4.00	\$	<b>Open</b>		ed
4	Evaluation of the painful prosthetic joint. Relative value of bone scan, sedimentation rate, and joint aspiration.	Levitsky, K A; Hozack, W J; Balderston, R A; Rothman, R H; Gluckman, S J; Maslack, M M; Booth. B F:	The Journal of arthroplasty	1991	4.00	6	3.00	1	<u> </u>

- Demonstration of the ranked publications for the specific subject: diagnose methods
- Joint aspiration culture was chosen as an open statement /question in this specific subject
- New publication could be downloaded from PubMed by the blue magnifiying glass.
- Experts were able to corrected errors by further editing (orange) and deleting (red).
- All publications were listed by title, author, journal, year and number of voters.
- Mean study level (evidence level) and mean data level (initially named readers vote) summarized all votings for each publication.
- The Final SPS summarized and avaraged all publication votes by calculation. It was demonstrated in the upper right corner (minimum 1, maximum 5)
- The vote button (light) opened the voting procedure for each publication.

### Scientific Publication Score

Voting Procedure

Voting Time 10 min.							Note paper results			
pen Statement: .	Joint aspirat	ion culture-	51				S NCBI Resources 🛛 H	How To 🕑		
ubgroup: other	6			Publiced gov US National Ubrary of Medicine National Institutes of Health	PubMed Is there a role for tissue biopsy in the RSS Save search Limits Advi					
Publication-Title:	Is there a role for tissue biopsy in the diagnosis of periprosthetic infection?						Display Settings: () Abstract	Send to: (V)		
Author:	Meermans, Geert; Haddad, Fares S; Clinical orthopaedics and related research						See 1 article found using an alternative search:			
lournal:										
reart	2010						Cin Orthon Relat Res. 2010 May;468(5):1410-7. Epub 2010 Feb 4.			
Paper level vote:	© Pro Statement O Indifferent opinion O Against Statement						Is there a role for tissue biopsy in the diagnosis of periprosthetic infection?			
	One big study	randomised do	ouble blind 🛛 💆				Meermans Q, Haddad FS. University College London Hospital	I, London, UK. geertneemans@hotnail.com		
Readers vote:	recommended						Abstract BACKGROUND: Successful treatment of an infected joint arthropiasty depends on correctly identifying the responsible pathogens. The value of a preoperative biopsy remains controversial.			
	n	Follow up	Survival rate; Recurrance rate	Sensitivity	Spezifity	p		1) compared the sensitivity and specificity of both tests and (2) asked whether the mbination of tissue biopsy and astic yield in the evaluation of the providence of the sensitivity of the sensitity of t		
lighly recommended	> 500	> 15 years	> 0.95; < 0.05	> 0.95	> 0.05	< 0.001; Power 0.8	infections.			
lecommended	> 100	> 10 years	> 0.90; < 0.10	> 0.85	1	< 0.01; Power 0.8		prospectively followed and the swith suspected infection with THAs and 56 with TKAs. All patients had aspiration with		
nteresting	100	> 5 years	> 0.90; < 0.10	> 0.75	> 0.75	< 0.05; Power 0.8		83% for aspiration, 79% for biopsy, and 90% for the		
eutral	< 50	< 5 years	< 0.90; > 0.10	165	> 0.65	0.05; Power 0.8	combination of both techniques. The specificity was 100% for aspiration and biopsy combination. The overall accuracy was 84%, 81%, and 90%, respectively.			
ot recommended	< 10	<5 years	< 0.80; > 0.20	< 0.65	< 0.65	> 0.05; Power<0.8	aspiration. However, the combi	pest tissue biopsy alone offers no clear advantage over joint ination of both techniques provides improved sensitivity and use of tissue biopsy as an adjunct to joint aspiration in the		
Expert-vote should su	mmerize all faci s chose the me	tors: Chose the	n. Additional selection	e highest numbe in relation to eco	v of fitting crite nomics, releva	ria. In case of criteria in nce and practicability. In	diagnosis of total joint infection LEVEL OF EVIDENCE: Level II, o complete description of levels	diagnostic study. See the Guidelines for Authors for a		

• The voting procedure for each publication was done in a side by side presentation on the computer dash board.

abstract (PubMed)/full paper original	on the right side			
quality assessment documentation	on the left side			
<ul> <li>Expert noted whether the study was</li> <li>pro</li> <li>against</li> <li>or indifferent in respect to the proposed question</li> </ul>	/statement			
<ul> <li>Study level (big study, prospective)</li> </ul>	4 points, recommended			
<ul> <li>Data level (initially named readers vote)</li> <li>patient number (&gt;100)</li> <li>+sensitivity (&gt;75%)</li> <li>+specifity (&gt;95%)</li> <li>summarize to one result</li> </ul>	4 points, recommended			
	<ul> <li>quality assessment documentation</li> <li>Expert noted whether the study was <ul> <li>pro</li> <li>against</li> <li>or indifferent <ul> <li>in respect to the proposed question</li> </ul> </li> <li>Study level (big study, prospective)</li> <li>Data level (initially named readers vote) <ul> <li>patient number (&gt;100)</li> <li>+sensitivity (&gt;75%)</li> <li>+specifity (&gt;95%)</li> </ul> </li> </ul></li></ul>			

• The experts honestly confirmed, that they had read the full paper respecting all quality assessment criteria to the best of their knowledge.