

## **UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)**

Brain training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: A multicenter randomized controlled trial of a computer-based cognitive flexibility training

van de Ven, R.M.; Buitenweg, J.I.V.; Schmand, B.A.; Veltman, D.J.; Aaronson, J.A.; Nijboer, T.C.W.; Kruiper-Doesborgh, S.J.C.; van Bennekom, C.A.M.; Rasquin, S.M.C.; Ridderinkhof, K.R.; Murre, J.M.J.

Published in: PLoS ONE

10.1371/journal.pone.0172993

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA): van de Ven, R. M., Buitenweg, J. I. V., Schmand, B., Veltman, D. J., Aaronson, J. A., Nijboer, T. C. W., ... Murre, J. M. J. (2017). Brain training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: A multiple of training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: A multiple of training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: A multiple of training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: A multiple of training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: A multiple of training improves recovery after stroke but waiting list improves equally: randomized controlled trial of a computer-based cognitive flexibility training. PLoS ONE, 12, [e0172993]. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0172993

**General rights** 

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations
If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: http://uba.uva.nl/en/contact, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (http://dare.uva.nl)

Download date: 21 May 2019



## CONSORT 2010 checklist of information to include when reporting a randomised trial\*

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	0
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	2
Introduction			1 E
Background and	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	4-5
objectives	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	5
Methods			7
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	7
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	6
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	8
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	9-10
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	7-11
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	11
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	7
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	
Randomisation:			7
Sequence	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	′
generation	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	7
Allocation	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers),	
concealment mechanism		describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	7
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	7
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those	7-8

CONSORT 2010 checklist

		assessing outcomes) and how	
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	9
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	14-16
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses	14-16
Results			
Participant flow (a	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and	8
diagram is strongly		were analysed for the primary outcome	
recommended)	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	8
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	6
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	7
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	18
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was	
		by original assigned groups	22
Outcomes and	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its	22
estimation		precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing	0.4
		pre-specified from exploratory	21
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	28-29
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	28-30
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	30
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	8
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	6
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	<del></del> 31

<sup>\*</sup>We strongly recommend reading this statement in conjunction with the CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration for important clarifications on all the items. If relevant, we also recommend reading CONSORT extensions for cluster randomised trials, non-inferiority and equivalence trials, non-pharmacological treatments, herbal interventions, and pragmatic trials. Additional extensions are forthcoming: for those and for up to date references relevant to this checklist, see <a href="https://www.consort-statement.org">www.consort-statement.org</a>.

CONSORT 2010 checklist Page 2