ANCHOR EVIDENCE RECORD

Is this anchor doing its job?

One page, eight items. Tick what you have, note where it is, and say what it means. Use it for your own anchor, or to appraise someone else's.

I AM
- [x] Documenting my own anchor
- [ ] Appraising someone else's

WORKED EXAMPLE · SIMULATED DATA

STUDY / DATA SOURCE	ANCHOR (AND TYPE)	TARGET COA	GROUPINGS ANALYSED
Hypothetical trial, N = 600	PGI-S (repeated rating)	Symptom COA	−1, 0, +1, +2, +3 PGI-S points

COMPLETED BY	DATE	THIS ANCHOR'S ROLE
ISOQOL 2026 worked example	October 2026	[x] Primary [ ] Supportive

PURPOSE An anchor sorts patients into distinct, interpretable change groups. Each row tests one part of that job.

ITEM	SHOWN	PARTLY	GAP	N/A	EVIDENCE AND WHERE IT IS	WHAT IT MEANS
1 CONSTRUCT LINKAGE *Does it measure the same thing as the COA?*						
1.1 **Conceptual alignment** Same domain, respondent, recall period and attributes? This is the gate.	☐	☐	☐	☑	Not part of the simulated example.	In a real study, complete this row first.
1.2 **Cross-sectional association** Anchor against COA at one time point: correlation and scatter plot.	☑	☐	☐	☐	Baseline r = 0.74, with scatter plot.	Same construct at one time point.
1.3 **Longitudinal association** Change correlation and scatter plot. Necessary, not sufficient.	☑	☐	☐	☐	Change r = 0.61, with scatter plot.	Supports linkage. Not enough alone: see 3.2.
2 MEANINGFULNESS *Do its steps mean something to patients?*						
2.1 **Category interpretability** Debriefing and clinical input: options understood and distinct. PLAN IN PROTOCOL	☐	☐	☑	☐	No debriefing data.	Plan it into the next protocol.
2.2 **Transition meaningfulness** Is each one-step move meaningful, across the scale and over time? PLAN IN PROTOCOL	☐	☐	☑	☐	No transition data.	Plan it into the next protocol.
2.3 **Within-group coherence** Share saying "my change was meaningful" in each group. Look for the step. PLAN IN PROTOCOL	☑	☐	☐	☐	"Meaningful": 20% at 0, 48% at +1, 89% at +2, 96% at +3.	The step is at +2, not +1.
3 DISCRIMINATION *Does it separate neighbouring groups?*						
3.1 **Response option discrimination** AUC for neighbouring options at one time point.	☑	☐	☐	☐	AUC 0.80 to 0.86 for neighbouring options at baseline.	Options separate at one time point.
3.2 **Grouping discrimination** AUC for neighbouring groups on change scores, with 95% CIs.	☑	☐	☐	☐	0 vs +1: AUC 0.59 (0.53 to 0.65). +1 vs +2: 0.75 (0.69 to 0.80).	+1 is not distinct from no change.

The verdict

No cutoffs, by design. Set out the evidence; the reader judges it.

Groupings the evidence supports	2-point improvement or more
Groupings it does not support	1-point improvement
The one gap to close first	Qualitative evidence, items 2.1 and 2.2

Confidence in the groupings
☐ High ☑ Moderate ☐ Low

Fit for this purpose?
☐ Yes ☑ With caveats ☐ No

SeeingTheta

Fromy P, O'Neill D, Anatchkova M, Clarke N, Williams A, Cocks K, Lauer A, Kitchen H, Bushnell DM, Terluin B. An evidential framework for evaluating anchor measures in meaningful change research. *Adv Patient Rep Outcomes* 2026;2:100354. doi:10.1016/j.apro.2026.100354

PAPER AND TOOLS
seeingtheta.com/anchor-evidence