Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS)

(Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 64 (2011) 96e106)

Table 1
Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS).

TITLE AND ABSTRACT	1.	Identify in title or abstract that interrater/intrarater reliability or agreement was investigated.
INTRODUCTION	2.	Name and describe the diagnostic or measurement device of interest explicitly.
	3.	Specify the subject population of interest.
	4.	Specify the rater population of interest (if applicable).
	5.	Describe what is already known about reliability and agreement and provide a rationale for the study (if applicable).
METHODS	6.	Explain how the sample size was chosen. State the determined number of raters, subjects/objects, and replicate observations.
	7.	Describe the sampling method.
	8.	Describe the measurement/rating process (e.g. time interval between repeated measurements, availability of clinical information, blinding).
	9.	State whether measurements/ratings were conducted independently.
	10.	Describe the statistical analysis.
RESULTS	11.	State the actual number of raters and subjects/objects which were included and the number of replicate observations which were conducted.
	12.	Describe the sample characteristics of raters and subjects (e.g. training, experience).
	13.	Report estimates of reliability and agreement including measures of statistical uncertainty.
DISCUSSION	14.	Discuss the practical relevance of results.
AUXILIARY MATERIAL	15.	Provide detailed results if possible (e.g. online)

“Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS) were proposed.

Jan Kottner et al. 2011

Guidelines for Reporting Reliability and Agreement Studies (GRRAS).

TITLE AND ABSTRACT

INTRODUCTION

1. Identify in title or abstract that interrater/intrarater reliability or agreement was investigated.

Authors response: That is included in the abstract. The terms interrater/intrarater reliability and agreement are also added to the keywords

2. Name and describe the diagnostic or measurement device of interest explicitly.

Authors response: Our method is described in detail in lines 116-137.

3. Specify the subject population of interest.

Authors response: The subject population of interest and the sample investigated in this study is described in lines 85-94.

4.Specify the rater population of interest (if applicable).

Authors response: The rater population is now described in more details in lines 140-143.

5. Describe what is already known about reliability and agreement and provide a rationale for the study (if applicable).

Authors response: This is now described in more details in in the introduction section lines 62-65. Rationale in lines 65-75.

METHODS

6. Explain how the sample size was chosen. State the determined number of raters, subjects/objects, and replicate observations.

Authors response: The sample size and the number of raters was chosen according to the recommendations of Koo et al (Ref. 13): at least 30 heterogeneous samples and involve at least 3 raters (lines 140-146). No replicate observations were done.

7. Describe the sampling method.

Authors response: Line 144.

8. Describe the measurement/rating process (e.g. time interval between repeated measurements, availability of clinical information, blinding).

Authors response: No repeated measurements. Blinding line 143.

9. State whether measurements/ratings were conducted independently.

Authors response: Line 142.

10. Describe the statistical analysis.

Authors response: Lines 169-186.

RESULTS

11. State the actual number of raters and subjects/objects which were included and the number of replicate observations which were conducted.

Authors response: Lines 140-144. No replicate observations were conducted.

12. Describe the sample characteristics of raters and subjects (e.g. training , experience).

Authors response: Lines 140-145.

13. Report estimates of reliability and agreement including measures of statistical uncertainty.

Authors response: Table 2 and the results section.

DISCUSSION

14. Discuss the practical relevance of results.

Authors response: Discussion section

AUXILIARY MATERIAL

15. Provide detailed results if possible (e.g. online).

Authors response: Our data was entered and stored in an MS office Access database and copied to SPSS for statistical calculations. We are certainly willing to share all or parts of the data on request.