Abstract

Introduction: Our team reported the development of a scale for assessing methodological quality in prognostic papers (scale MinCir Pr). The aim of this paper is to report the process of validation of scale MinCir Pr. Material and Methods: We reviewed 121 papers about prognosis. Score was performed according to the scale MinCir Pr and level of evidence. In addition we recorded the number of publications of the author. For the construct validity of the measurement was made through the technique known extreme groups, which claims that the evaluations differ regarding the critical attribute. To this end, we used the level of evidence items 2 and 4, waiting for a difference in scale scores of articles published at the ends of the score. Results: For validation of extreme groups we compare the performance of the scale in relation to the level of evidence 2 and 4, since in these groups had more papers (55 and 48 respectively). The average score of the scale in papers with level of evidence 2 was 82.21 ± 13.79 compared with the score in papers with level of evidence 4 which was 64.97 ± 17.10 (p = 0.000). Conclusion: We performed the validity of the scale builder MinCir Pr using the technique known extreme groups.
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