medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Quantitative bias analysis for mismeasured variables in health research: a review of software tools

Corresponding author Codie J.C. Wood[1,2,3]

Email: codie.wood@bristol.ac.uk, Telephone: +447513034353

Contributing authors Kate M. Tilling[2,3], Jonathan W.Bartlett[4], Rachael A. Hughes[2,3]

Affiliations

1. Institute of Statistical Sciences, School of Mathematics, University of Bristol, Fry Building, Woodland Road, Bristol, UK, BS8 1UG
2. MRC Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Oakfield House, Oakfield Road, Bristol, UK, BS8 2BN
3. Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Whately Road, Bristol, UK, BS8 2PS
4. Department of Medical Statistics, London School of Hygiene & Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, UK, WC1E 7HT

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background: Mismeasurement (measurement error or misclassification) can cause bias or loss of power. However, sensitivity analyses (e.g. using quantitative bias analysis, QBA) are rarely used.

Methods: We reviewed software tools for QBA for mismeasurement in health research identified by searching Web of Science, the CRAN archive, and the IDEAS/RePEc software components database. Tools were included if they were purpose-built, had documentation and were applicable to epidemiological research.

Results: 16 freely available software tools for QBA were identified, accessible via R and online web tools. The tools handle various types of mismeasurement, including classical measurement error and binary misclassification. Only one software tool handles misclassification of categorical variables, and few tackle non-classical measurement error.

Conclusions: Efforts should be made to create tools that can assess multiple mismeasurement scenarios simultaneously, to increase the clarity of documentation for existing tools, and provide tutorials for their usage.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Background

Epidemiological studies often aim to estimate the causal effect of an exposure on an outcome (referred to as the exposure effect).[1] Most methods of estimating an exposure effect assume that exposure, outcome and all confounders have been measured without error.

Mismeasurement (referred to as measurement error in continuous variables, or misclassification in categorical variables) can occur for various reasons, including imprecise measurement instruments, variations in measurement conditions, or errors in data entry.[2] Mismeasurement can lead to bias or loss of power.[3,4] Despite this, the sensitivity of results to mismeasurement is rarely discussed.[5]

Suppose we have a variable that has been measured with error. Let A denote the true value of the variable, and A^* the observed (mismeasured) variable. We specify the relationship between A and A^* using a statistical model (the mismeasurement model).[3,4] See eAppendix 1 for details on selected examples of such models. The impact of the mismeasurement on the estimated exposure effect will depend on the mismeasurement model and the analysis model.

We say there is non-differential error in the variable A with respect to another variable, Z, when the observed variable A^* is conditionally independent of Z given the true value of A, i.e. $A^* \perp\!\!\!\perp Z \mid A$. Otherwise, the measurement error is differential with respect to Z.[3] When A is the exposure or a confounder, the term non-differential error is typically used to refer to error which is non-differential with respect to the outcome variable. When A is the outcome, the term non-differential error often then refers to error which is non-differential with respect to the exposure.

Methods that correct for mismeasurement typically require validation data (either internal or external), or replication data.[2,6,7] Where such data are not available, the impact of mismeasurement on conclusions can be evaluated using

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

sensitivity analyses, such as a quantitative bias analysis (QBA).

QBA methods for mismeasurement use a bias model, which models the relationship between the bias source and the study data, to quantify the uncertainty arising from mismeasurement.[8] Typically the bias model will be characterised by one or more parameters, referred to as "bias" or "sensitivity" parameters, which cannot be estimated using the observed data.

Information about these bias parameters may be obtained from multiple sources, including external validation studies, published literature, data constraints or expert opinion.[9] Where there is limited knowledge about plausible values for the bias parameters, tipping point analysis can explore which combinations of values of the parameters would overturn study conclusions.

QBA methods can broadly be classified into two categories; deterministic and probabilistic [8, Chapter 2]. A deterministic QBA approach specifies, for each of the bias parameters, either a single value (simple bias analysis) or a set of potential values (multidimensional bias analysis). In a probabilistic QBA the analyst specifies prior probability distributions for the bias parameters to be drawn from. This prior acts as a way to model the analyst's beliefs about which values and combinations of the bias parameters are most likely to occur, as well as the uncertainty around these values.

Currently, QBA methods are not employed as a standard practice, which is partly attributed to the lack of available software for implementing these analyses, as well as limited awareness about such tools.[1,10]

We aim to identify and review the publicly available software tools that implement a QBA for mismeasurement in epidemiological studies.[8]

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Methods

Publication search

We searched Web of Science for papers published between 1st January 2014 and 1st May 2024 (inclusive) that mentioned all of the terms "measurement error", "bias analysis" and "software" (or synonyms, see eFigure 1[11]) in the title, abstract or as keywords. We excluded meeting abstracts, clinical trials or patents, and articles from journals outside the fields of statistics, medicine, population health or epidemiology (see eFigure 2).

Software repository search

We searched The Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN), R's central software repository;[12] IDEAS, Boston College's Statistical Software Components archive;[13] and the Stata manuals. We considered tools which had been made available or had relevant updates (i.e. changes made specifically to the functions implementing QBA) between 1st January 2014 and 1st May 2024 (inclusive). R packages that had been removed from CRAN were excluded.

We searched CRAN and the Stata manuals for packages/commands that mentioned both of the terms "measurement error" and "bias analysis" (or synonyms) in their title or description (Further details of the process are given in eAppendix 2, with R and Stata code available in eAppendix 3 and 4). We searched IDEAS for software components that had both "measurement error" and "bias analysis" (or synonyms, see eFigure 3) in any of their title, abstract, or key words.

Eligibility criteria

Eligibility of identified abstracts and tools was assessed independently by two reviewers, with any disagreements resolved by consensus. Studies and tools

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

were eligible for data extraction if:

1. the abstract mentioned purpose-built software
2. the software implemented a QBA for mismeasurement
3. the software was accompanied by documentation
4. the software was functioning as intended (e.g. did not contain errors)

Results

After removal of duplicates, our Web of Science search returned 254 results, of which 81 met our inclusion criteria (Figure 1a). The screening process for the 81 selected abstracts is illustrated in Figure 1b. We found references to 24 unique software tools in the full texts of the 25 eligible articles. The IDEAS search and search of the Stata manual returned no eligible tools, while our CRAN search returned 7 additional tools (Figure 1c). Of the total 31 unique tools identified across all searches, 16 met our eligibility criteria.

Table 1 summarises the key features of the 15 total software programs we found that were applicable to studies aiming to quantify bias in an effect estimate, in order of most recent update by year. One tool, *APScalculator*,[14] did not quantify bias in an effect estimate, but rather assessed the impacts of classical measurement error on the categorisation of a continuous variable. Since this tool has potential application for health research we did not exclude it, but it is not included in Table 1.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



(a) Flowchart of the publication search step of the review.



(b) Flowchart of the abstract screening step of the review.



(c) Flowchart of the software tool search process.

Figure 1: Overview of the publication search, article screening process and software search process.

Table 1: Software programs implementing a quantitative bias analysis for measurement error (ME) and misclassification (MC) reported in epidemiology articles or contributed to CRAN between January 2014 and May 2024.

		Output		Mismeasurement			Bias analysis	
Software name (Year)	Environment	Table	Plot	Type	Differential	Multiple mismeasured variables	Type	Multi dimensional
sensiPhy (2018, upd. 2020)[15,16]	R package	✓	✓	ME	ND	✓	Det	-
SAMBA-EHR (2020)[17]	Web tool	-	✓	MC	ND	-	Det	✓
Outcome Misclassification (2020)[18]	Web tool	✓	✓	MC	D, ND	-	Det	✓
SensitivityAnalysis (2020)[19]	Web tool	-	✓	MC	ND	-	Prob	-
miCoPTCM (2016, upd. 2020)[20]	R package	✓	-	ME	ND	✓	Prob	-
MediationSensitivityAnalysis (2021)[21]	Web tool	✓	✓	ME	ND	✓	Det	✓
BayesSenMC (2021)[22]	R package	✓	✓	MC	D, ND	-	Prob	-
EValue (2017, upd. 2021)[23]	R package	✓	-	MC	D	✓	Det	-
ConMed (2023)[24]	R package: non-CRAN	-	✓	ME	ND	✓	Det	-
episensr (2015, upd. 2023)[25]	R package	✓	✓	MC	D, ND	✓	Det, Prob	✓
apisensr (2021, upd. 2023)[26,27]	Web tool	✓	✓	MC	D, ND	-	Det, Prob	✓
mgee2 (2020, upd. 2023)[28,29]	R package	✓	✓	MC	ND	✓	Det	-
multibias web tool (2023)[30,31]	Web tool	✓	✓	MC	D, ND	-	Det, Prob	-
multibias (2023, upd. 2024)[31,32]	R package	✓	-	MC	D, ND	✓	Det, Prob	-
rcme (2023, upd. 2024)[33]	R package: non-CRAN	✓	✓	ME	D, ND	-	Det	-

Continued on next page...

Abbreviations used (in alphabetical order): D; Differential, Det; Deterministic, dev.; Developed, MC; Misclassification, ME; Measurement error, ND; Non-differential, Prob; Probabilistic, upd.; Updated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 1: *Continued from previous page*

Software name (Year)	Analysis				
	Data type	Analysis of interest	Outcome	Exposure	Other covariates
sensiPhy (2018, upd. 2020)[15,16]	Individual	Regression (phylogenetic)	**cts**, bin	**cts**	-
SAMBA-EHR (2020)[17]	Summary	Regression	**bin**	cts, cat	-
Outcome Misclassification (2020)[18]	Summary	Contingency table	**bin**	bin	-
SensitivityAnalysis (2020)[19]	Summary	Regression	cts	bin	**bin**
miCoPTCM (2016, upd. 2020)[20]	Summary	Mediation analysis	**cts**	bin	**Mediator (cts)**, **other (cts)**
BayesSenMC (2021)[22]	Aggregate	Contingency table	bin	**bin**	-
EValue (2017, upd. 2021)[23]	Summary	Regression	**bin**	**bin**	-
ConMed (2023)[24]	Summary	Mediation analysis	**cts**	cts	**Mediator (cts)**, other (bin, cat, cts)
episensr (2015, upd. 2023)[25]	Aggregate	Contingency table	**bin**, TTE	**bin**	**bin**
apisensr (2021, upd. 2023)[27]	Aggregate	Contingency table	**bin**	**bin**	**bin**
mgee2 (2020, upd. 2023)[28,29]	Individual	Regression (longitudinal analysis)	**cat (ordinal)**	**cat (ordinal)**, bin, cts	**cat (ordinal)**, bin, cat, cts
multibias web tool (2023)[30,31]	Individual	Regression	bin	**bin**	bin, cat, cts
multibias (2023, upd. 2024)[31,32]	Individual	Regression	**bin**	**bin**	bin, cat, cts
rcme (2023, upd. 2024)[33]	Individual	Regression	**cts**	**cts**	**cts**

Bolded text in the "Outcome", "Exposure" and "Other covariates" columns indicate the variable is able to be considered mismeasured by the tool. "Aggregate" data here means any non-individual level data e.g. count data. "Summary" data here means statistics calculated from data, e.g. regression coefficients or standard deviations.
Abbreviations used (in alphabetical order): bin; Binary, cat; Categorical, cts; Continuous, dev.; Developed, TTE; Time-to-event, upd.; Updated.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Six tools implement a QBA for measurement error in a continuous variable (*sensiPhy*, *MediationSensitivityAnalysis*, *miCoPTCM*, *ConMed*, *APScalculator* and *rcme*). Of these, all assume a classical measurement error model except *rcme*, which allows for multiplicative measurement error. Of the ten tools implementing QBA for misclassification, only *mgee2* implements a QBA to misclassification of a discrete variable with more than two categories.

Two tools are applicable for mediation analysis, *MediationSensitivityAnalysis* and *ConMed*. *MediationSensitivityAnalysis* performs bias analysis for measurement error in any of the outcome, mediator, effect modifiers or confounders, assuming a binary error-free exposure. *ConMed* is applicable specifically when there may be unmeasured confounders as well as measurement error, but only considers measurement error in the mediator or outcome variables.

The tools *sensiPhy*, *multibias*, *ConMed*, *EValue*, *episensr* and *MediationSensitivityAnalysis* are able to perform multiple bias analysis, i.e. they also analyse bias from different sources, such as unmeasured confounding and selection bias, occurring alongside bias from mismeasurement.

Discussion

There have been 16 new software implementations of QBA for mismeasurement between January 2014 and May 2024; all available either in the software environment R, or as an online web tool. These tools include programs applicable when the analysis of interest is a mediation analysis or survival analysis, as well as more standard regression or contingency table analysis. Nine of the programs, over half of all of those found, conducted a QBA for misclassification of a binary variable.

Whilst previous authors have argued that software to implement QBA for mismeasurement is available,[9] this review demonstrates that there are large gaps in the range of existing software. Further work is needed to provide tools

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

that conduct a QBA for misclassification of a categorical variable. Similarly, there is a lack of tools to apply QBA for measurement error in a continuous variable outside of the context of a mediation analysis or survival analysis, or with a non-classical error model.

Our eligibility criteria required that all tools had some documentation. However, in most cases documentation required a high degree of statistical literacy to be understood. This could be a barrier to use by applied researchers, even if existence of the tools were more widely known. Further work could expand this review to include tutorials and examples of the implementation of these tools with simulated or real data.

We focused on software described in the published literature between January 1st 2014 and May 1st 2024, or made available via CRAN or IDEAS in this time frame. Software programs which would not be found by this search could include tools that have not been mentioned in published journal articles and have not been uploaded to software archives, such as web tools,[34] or which were created prior to 2014 and have not been significantly updated since.[8,35,36] By limiting our search of publications to statistical and health-related journals we may have missed relevant software implementations from other fields.

Conclusions

The wide array of QBA methods, and lack of accessibly written documentation, present challenges in the widespread uptake of QBA methods. Development of tools which can handle a multitude of different mismeasurement scenarios simultaneously may also increase uptake of QBA techniques.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

References

1. Shaw PA, Deffner V, Keogh RH, *et al.* Epidemiologic Analyses with Error-Prone Exposures: Review of Current Practice and Recommendations. *Annals of Epidemiology.* 2018;28(11):821–828.

2. Keogh RH, Shaw PA, Gustafson P, *et al.* STRATOS Guidance Document on Measurement Error and Misclassification of Variables in Observational Epidemiology: Part 1—Basic Theory and Simple Methods of Adjustment. *Statistics in Medicine.* 2020;39(16):2197–2231.

3. Gustafson P. *Measurement Error and Misclassification in Statistics and Epidemiology: Impacts and Bayesian Adjustments.* Interdisciplinary Statistics SeriesBoca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC 2004.

4. Carroll RJ, Ruppert D, Stefanski LA, Crainiceanu CM. *Measurement Error in Nonlinear Models: A Modern Perspective, Second Edition.* New York: Chapman and Hall/CRC2 ed. 2006.

5. Jurek AM, Maldonado G, Greenland S, Church TR. Exposure-Measurement Error Is Frequently Ignored When Interpreting Epidemiologic Study Results. *European Journal of Epidemiology.* 2006;21(12):871–876.

6. Shaw PA, Gustafson P, Carroll RJ, *et al.* STRATOS Guidance Document on Measurement Error and Misclassification of Variables in Observational Epidemiology: Part 2—More Complex Methods of Adjustment and Advanced Topics. *Statistics in Medicine.* 2020;39(16):2232–2263.

7. Innes GK, Bhondoekhan F, Lau B, Gross AL, Ng DK, Abraham AG. The Measurement Error Elephant in the Room: Challenges and Solutions to Measurement Error in Epidemiology. *Epidemiologic Reviews.* 2021;43(1):94–105.

8. Fox MP, MacLehose RF, Lash TL. *Applying Quantitative Bias Analysis to Epidemiologic Data.* Statistics for Biology and HealthCham: Springer International Publishing 2021.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

9. Lash TL, Fox MP, MacLehose RF, Maldonado G, McCandless LC, Greenland S. Good Practices for Quantitative Bias Analysis. *International Journal of Epidemiology.* 2014;43(6):1969–1985.

10. Fox MP. Creating a Demand for Bias Analysis in Epidemiological Research. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health.* 2009;63(2):91–91.

11. Wood C, Hughes R, Tilling K, Bartlett J. Software Tools for Quantitative Bias Analysis on Measurement Error or Misclassification (Web of Science Core Collection). *searchRxiv.* 2023. DOI: 10.1079/searchRxiv.2023.00202.

12. The Comprehensive R Archive Network. https://cran.r-project.org/.

13. Economics and Finance Research | IDEAS/RePEc. https://ideas.repec.org/. Accessed 8 May 2024.

14. Çubukçu HC, Vanstapel F, Thelen M, *et al.* APS Calculator: A Data-Driven Tool for Setting Outcome-Based Analytical Performance Specifications for Measurement Uncertainty Using Specific Clinical Requirements and Population Data. *Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM).* 2024;62(4):597–607.

15. Paterno GB, Penone C, Werner GDA. sensiPhy: An r-Package for Sensitivity Analysis in Phylogenetic Comparative Methods. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution.* 2018;9(6):1461–1467.

16. Paterno G, Werner G, Penone C, Martinez P. sensiPhy: Sensitivity Analysis for Comparative Methods. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/sensiPhy/index.html 2020. Accessed 8 May 2024.

17. Beesley LJ, Fritsche LG, Mukherjee B. An Analytic Framework for Exploring Sampling and Observation Process Biases in Genome and Phenome-Wide Association Studies Using Electronic Health Records. *Statistics in Medicine.* 2020;39(14):1965–1979.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

18. Hall GC, Lanes S, Bollaerts K, Zhou X, Ferreira G, Gini R. Outcome Misclassification: Impact, Usual Practice in Pharmacoepidemiology Database Studies and an Online Aid to Correct Biased Estimates of Risk Ratio or Cumulative Incidence. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety.* 2020;29(11):1450–1455.

19. Nab L, Groenwold RHH, van Smeden M, Keogh RH. Quantitative Bias Analysis for a Misclassified Confounder: A Comparison Between Marginal Structural Models and Conditional Models for Point Treatments. *Epidemiology.* 2020;31(6):796.

20. Bertrand A, Legrand C, Léonard D, Van Keilegom I. Robustness of Estimation Methods in a Survival Cure Model with Mismeasured Covariates. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis.* 2017;113:3–18.

21. Liu X, Wang L. The Impact of Measurement Error and Omitting Confounders on Statistical Inference of Mediation Effects and Tools for Sensitivity Analysis.. *Psychological Methods.* 2021;26(3):327–342.

22. Yang J, Lin L, Chu H. BayesSenMC: An R Package for Bayesian Sensitivity Analysis of Misclassification. *The R Journal.* 2021;13(2):228–238.

23. Smith LH, Mathur MB, VanderWeele TJ. Multiple-Bias Sensitivity Analysis Using Bounds. *Epidemiology.* 2021;32(5):625.

24. Lin Q, Nuttall AK, Zhang Q, Frank KA. How Do Unobserved Confounding Mediators and Measurement Error Impact Estimated Mediation Effects and Corresponding Statistical Inferences? Introducing the R Package ConMed for Sensitivity Analysis.. *Psychological Methods.* 2023;28(2):339–358.

25. Haine D. Episensr: Basic Sensitivity Analysis of Epidemiological Results. https://dhaine.github.io/episensr/, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4554553 2021. Accessed 10 May 2024.

26. Haine D. The Apisensr Shiny App Package: Interface to Episensr for Sensitivity Analysis of Epidemiological Results. https://cran.r-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

project.org/web/packages/apisensr/index.html, DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.4579968 2023. Accessed 12 May 2024.

27. Banack HR, Smith SN, Bodnar LM. Application of a Web-based Tool for Quantitative Bias Analysis: The Example of Misclassification Due to Self-reported Body Mass Index. *Epidemiology (Cambridge, Mass.).* 2024;35(3):359–367.

28. Xu Y, Liu S, Yi GY. Mgee2: An R Package for Marginal Analysis of Longitudinal Ordinal Data with Misclassified Responses and Covariates. *The R Journal.* 2021;13(2):471–484.

29. Xu Y, Chen Z, Liu SS, Yi G. Mgee2: Marginal Analysis of Misclassified Longitudinal Ordinal Data. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/mgee2/index.html 2023. Accessed 12 May 2024.

30. Brendel P. Simultaneous Multi-bias Analysis. https://pcbrendel.shinyapps.io/multibias/. Accessed 8 May 2024.

31. Brendel P, Torres A, Arah OA. Simultaneous Adjustment of Uncontrolled Confounding, Selection Bias and Misclassification in Multiple-Bias Modelling. *International Journal of Epidemiology.* 2023;52(4):1220–1230.

32. Brendel P. Multibias: Simultaneous Multi-Bias Adjustment. https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/multibias/index.html 2024. Accessed 22 May 2024.

33. Pina-Sánchez J, Brunton-Smith I, Buil-Gil D, Cernat A. Exploring the Impact of Measurement Error in Police Recorded Crime Rates through Sensitivity Analysis. *Crime Science.* 2023;12(1):14.

34. Jiang T, Fox MP. Quantitative Bias Analysis. https://jiangtammy.shinyapps.io/quantitative_bias_analysis/ 2021. Accessed 23 March 2024.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.12.12.24318922; this version posted December 12, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

35. Fox MP, Lash TL, Greenland S. A Method to Automate Probabilistic Sensitivity Analyses of Misclassified Binary Variables. *International Journal of Epidemiology.* 2005;34(6):1370–1376.

36. Orsini N, Bellocco R, Bottai M, Wolk A, Greenland S. A Tool for Deterministic and Probabilistic Sensitivity Analysis of Epidemiologic Studies. *The Stata Journal: Promoting communications on statistics and Stata.* 2008;8(1):29–48.

Supplemental Digital Content.

Web Appendix (this includes eFigure 1, eFigure 2, eFigure 3, eAppendix 1 and eAppendix 2)

eAppendix 3: R code for CRAN search

eAppendix 4: Stata code for manual search