

Bilag

Bilag 1 - Søgning i PubMed d. 13/02-2026 kl. 11:44

P+I	O	S
<p>Joint laxity[MeSH Terms]</p> <p>Joint instability[MeSH Terms]</p> <p>“Generalized joint hypermobility”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Glenohumeral joint instability”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Joint laxity”[Title/Abstract].</p> <p>“Joint instability”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Shoulder hypermobility”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Shoulder instability”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Hypermobility spectrum disorder”[Title/Abstract]</p>	<p>Shoulder dislocation[MeSH Terms]</p> <p>“Shoulder dislocation”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Anterior shoulder dislocation”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Shoulder luxation”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Shoulder injur*”[Title/Abstract]</p>	<p>Cohort study [MeSH Terms]</p> <p>Systematic Review [Publication Type]</p> <p>“Cohort stud*”[Title/Abstract]</p> <p>“Systematic review”[Title/Abstract]</p>
Hits: 30.519	Hits: 13.954	Hits: 706.832
Hits: 2.791		
Hits: 1412 / 813 (seneste 10 år)		

Bilag 2 - Søgning i Cochrane d. 13/02-2026 kl. kl.11:10

P+I	O	S
MeSH Joint instability	MeSH shoulder dislocation	MeSH systematic review
Generalized NEXT joint NEXT hypermobility:ti,ab	Anterior NEXTshoulder NEXT dislocation:ti,ab	MeSH Cohort studies
Glenohumeral NEXT joint NEXT instability:ti,ab	Shoulder NEXT dislocation:ti,ab	Systematic NEXT review:ti,ab
Hypermobility NEXT spectrum NEXT disorder:ti,ab	Shoulder NEXT luxation:ti,ab	Cohort NEXT stud*:ti,ab
Joint NEXT instability:ti,ab	Shoulder NEXT <u>injur</u> *:ti,ab	
Shoulder NEXT hypermobility:ti,ab		
Shoulder NEXT instability:ti,ab		
Joint NEXTlaxity:ti,ab		
Hits: 1497	Hits: 600	Hits: 28.388
Hits: 108		
Hits: 1		

Bilag 3 – Risk Of Bias Assesement (ROBIS)

Kritisk vurdering vha. ROBIS – risk of bias assessment in systematic reviews.

Phase 2: Identifying concerns with the review process

DOMAIN 1: STUDY ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA	
Describe the study eligibility criteria, any restrictions on eligibility and whether there was evidence that objectives and eligibility criteria were pre-specified:	
1.1 Did the review adhere to pre-defined objectives and eligibility criteria?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
1.2 Were the eligibility criteria appropriate for the review question?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
1.3 Were eligibility criteria unambiguous?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
1.4 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on study characteristics appropriate (e.g. date, sample size, study quality, outcomes measured)?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
1.5 Were any restrictions in eligibility criteria based on sources of information appropriate (e.g. publication status or format, language, availability of data)?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
Concerns regarding specification of study eligibility criteria	LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR
Rationale for concern: The study presents welldefined in- and exclusion criteria and comply with those presented in the protocol. Due to lack of consensus for GJH a broad exposure definition was accepted	

DOMAIN 2: IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF STUDIES	
Describe methods of study identification and selection (e.g. number of reviewers involved):	
2.1 Did the search include an appropriate range of databases/electronic sources for published and unpublished reports?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
2.2 Were methods additional to database searching used to identify relevant reports?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
2.3 Were the terms and structure of the search strategy likely to retrieve as many eligible studies as possible?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
2.4 Were restrictions based on date, publication format, or language appropriate?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
2.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in selection of studies?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
Concerns regarding methods used to identify and/or select studies	LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR
Rationale for concern: The study searched four relevant databases. Study selection was performed by two independent reviewers with a third resolving disagreements. The methods used to identify and select studies are unlikely to introduce bias	

DOMAIN 3: DATA COLLECTION AND STUDY APPRAISAL	
Describe methods of data collection, what data were extracted from studies or collected through other means, how risk of bias was assessed (e.g. number of reviewers involved) and the tool used to assess risk of bias:	
3.1 Were efforts made to minimise error in data collection?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
3.2 Were sufficient study characteristics available for both review authors and readers to be able to interpret the results?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
3.3 Were all relevant study results collected for use in the synthesis?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
3.4 Was risk of bias (or methodological quality) formally assessed using appropriate criteria?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
3.5 Were efforts made to minimise error in risk of bias assessment?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
Concerns regarding methods used to collect data and appraise studies	LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR
Rationale for concern: Appropriate tools were used to assess risk of bias for observational studies. Data extraction and risk of bias assessment were conducted independently by two reviewers with consensus procedures and a third reviewer if needed	

DOMAIN 4: SYNTHESIS AND FINDINGS	
Describe synthesis methods:	
4.1 Did the synthesis include all studies that it should?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
4.2 Were all pre-defined analyses reported or departures explained?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
4.3 Was the synthesis appropriate given the nature and similarity in the research questions, study designs and outcomes across included studies?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
4.4 Was between-study variation (heterogeneity) minimal or addressed in the synthesis?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
4.5 Were the findings robust, e.g. as demonstrated through funnel plot or sensitivity analyses?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
4.6 Were biases in primary studies minimal or addressed in the synthesis?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
Concerns regarding the synthesis and findings	LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR
Rationale for concern: The study used a random-effects meta-analysis and explored heterogeneity through subgroup and sensitivity analyses. Risk of bias in the included studies was assessed and taken into account in the interpretation of the results.	
Y=YES, PY=PROBABLY YES, PN=PROBABLY NO, N=NO, NI=NO INFORMATION	

Phase 3: Judging risk of bias

Summarize the concerns identified during the Phase 2 assessment:

Domain	Concern	Rationale for concern
1. Concerns regarding specification of study eligibility criteria	Low	Well-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria that comply with the pre-specified protocol
2. Concerns regarding methods used to identify and/or select studies	Low	Four relevant databases were searched and study selection was performed by independent reviewers.
3. Concerns regarding methods used to collect data and appraise studies	Low	Appropriate tools were used to assess risk of bias for observational studies.
4. Concerns regarding the synthesis and findings	Low	Random-effects meta-analysis was performed and heterogeneity was explored through subgroup and sensitivity analyses

RISK OF BIAS IN THE REVIEW	
Describe whether conclusions were supported by the evidence:	
A. Did the interpretation of findings address all of the concerns identified in Domains 1 to 4?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
B. Was the relevance of identified studies to the review's research question appropriately considered?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
C. Did the reviewers avoid emphasizing results on the basis of their statistical significance?	Y/PY/PN/N/NI
Risk of bias in the review	RISK: LOW/HIGH/UNCLEAR
Rationale for risk: The authors acknowledge heterogeneity and low evidence quality and interpret the findings cautiously	
Y=YES, PY=PROBABLY YES, PN=PROBABLY NO, N=NO, NI=NO INFORMATION	