

Ensuring Validity in Health Research: The Critical Role of Methodological Reporting in Minimizing Bias

Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho¹

¹Department of Health, Poltekkes Kemenkes Surabaya, Surabaya, Indonesia

Correspondence: **Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho**: Jl. Pucang Jajar Tengah 56, Surabaya, Indonesia; heruswn@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The validity of health research is shaped not only by the appropriateness of its design, but also by how carefully potential sources of bias are identified, minimized, and transparently reported. Bias; defined as a systematic error that distorts the estimation of relationships or effects can emerge at any stage of the research process, including sampling, measurement, and data analysis. When the efforts to control bias are insufficiently described, readers are left with uncertainty regarding the credibility and reliability of the findings. This perspective emphasizes the importance of writing research methods that clearly and convincingly demonstrate strategies to minimize bias. A method can be considered methodologically sound when it not only applies appropriate techniques but also explicitly communicates how potential biases were anticipated and addressed. This paper discusses the main types of bias that commonly affect health research, explains why minimizing bias is essential for scientific validity and evidence-based decision-making, and outlines practical strategies for presenting bias-control efforts in a structured and transparent manner. Authors are encouraged to adopt a deliberate and systematic approach when reporting their methods, ensuring that readers can critically appraise the extent to which bias has been minimized. Ultimately, transparent reporting of bias-reduction strategies enhances the trustworthiness, interpretability, and overall impact of research evidence in healthcare.

Keywords: bias minimization; health research methodology; internal validity; methodological transparency; scientific rigor; reporting quality

INTRODUCTION

In health research, producing credible and reliable evidence requires far more than simply selecting an appropriate study design. It also demands a deliberate, systematic, and transparent effort to anticipate, identify, and minimize potential sources of bias that may compromise the validity of the findings. Bias, as a form of systematic error, can infiltrate a study at any stage; from participant selection and data collection to analysis and interpretation and may influence results in ways that are not immediately visible to readers or even to the researchers themselves. Yet these subtle distortions can significantly alter the conclusions drawn from a study, ultimately weakening the scientific value of the evidence produced [1].

Within this context, the methods section becomes a central pillar of scientific communication. It is not merely a procedural narrative describing what researchers did; rather, it is the primary space where they demonstrate the rigor of their approach and their commitment to safeguarding the study against threats to validity. A well-constructed methods section provides readers with the information necessary to evaluate whether the research process was conducted with sufficient care, transparency, and methodological discipline. When bias is inadequately controlled; or when efforts to control it are insufficiently reported the credibility of the study becomes questionable, regardless of how compelling the results may appear [1–6].

The growing emphasis on evidence-based practice further amplifies the importance of minimizing bias. Healthcare professionals, policymakers, and researchers increasingly rely on published findings to inform clinical decisions, develop guidelines, allocate resources, and shape public health strategies. These decisions have direct consequences for patient outcomes, population health, and the effectiveness of interventions implemented in real-world settings. If the evidence base is influenced by unaddressed or poorly reported bias, the implications can be far-reaching: ineffective interventions may be adopted, beneficial practices may be overlooked, and policies may be built on foundations that are scientifically unstable. In such cases, the harm extends beyond academic discourse and enters the realm of clinical and public health practice, where the stakes are considerably higher [7].

Despite this critical importance, many published studies continue to provide only limited explanations of how bias was anticipated and managed. Key methodological details; such as strategies for reducing selection bias, controlling confounding variables, ensuring measurement consistency, or maintaining blinding are often presented too briefly or omitted entirely. As a result, readers are left to infer the rigor of the research process, which undermines transparency and weakens confidence in the findings. This lack of clarity is particularly problematic in studies involving complex designs, vulnerable populations, or outcomes that are highly sensitive to measurement error.

This perspective seeks to address this persistent gap by emphasizing the importance of writing methods sections that clearly and comprehensively demonstrate efforts to minimize bias. By encouraging researchers to articulate their methodological decisions with greater precision and transparency, we aim to strengthen the validity, interpretability, and overall usefulness of health research. Ultimately, improving the reporting of bias-control strategies is not merely a matter of academic completeness; it is a fundamental requirement for advancing trustworthy science and supporting evidence-based decision-making in healthcare.

ENSURING MINIMAL BIAS IN HEALTH RESEARCH METHODS

What types of bias must be minimized?

Bias can arise at different stages of a study [8–11], and understanding its various forms is essential not only for conducting rigorous research but also for reporting it transparently. Each type of bias threatens the validity of findings in distinct ways, and failure to recognize or address these threats can undermine the scientific value of an otherwise well-designed study. One of the most prominent types is selection bias, which occurs when the participants included in a study do not adequately represent the target population [12]. This problem may emerge when sampling methods are non-random, recruitment processes favor certain groups, or inclusion and exclusion criteria are applied inconsistently or without clear justification. In such cases, the resulting sample may differ systematically from the population of interest, thereby limiting the generalizability of the findings and potentially producing misleading conclusions about the phenomenon under investigation.

Another major concern is information bias, also referred to as measurement bias [13]. This type of bias arises when systematic errors occur in the way data are collected, recorded, or classified [14]. These errors may stem from poorly calibrated instruments, inconsistent measurement procedures across observers or study sites, or subjective assessments that vary depending on the evaluator's expectations or experience. Even

small inaccuracies in measurement can accumulate and distort the results, particularly in studies relying on self-reported data, clinical assessments, or laboratory procedures requiring high precision. Information bias is especially problematic because it can affect both exposure and outcome variables, thereby complicating the interpretation of associations.

Confounding bias is particularly important in observational studies, where researchers do not control exposure assignment. Confounding occurs when an external variable influences both the exposure and the outcome, creating a spurious or misleading association [15]. Without proper control; through strategies such as stratification, matching, multivariable adjustment, or the use of directed acyclic graphs (DAGs) confounding factors can lead to incorrect interpretations of cause-and-effect relationships. In many fields of health research, confounding is pervasive because exposures and outcomes are often influenced by complex social, behavioral, and biological factors. Thus, careful identification and management of confounders is essential for producing valid and interpretable results.

In experimental settings, additional forms of bias may arise, including observer bias and performance bias. Observer bias occurs when researchers' expectations or prior knowledge influence how they record or interpret data, potentially skewing results in favor of the hypothesized effect [16]. Performance bias, on the other hand, occurs when participants modify their behavior because they are aware of the intervention they receive or because they perceive themselves as being observed more closely [17–18]. These biases highlight the importance of blinding; both of participants and researchers whenever feasible. Blinding helps ensure that differences in outcomes are attributable to the intervention itself rather than to psychological or behavioral responses triggered by awareness of group assignment.

Finally, analysis bias can occur during data processing, statistical analysis, and interpretation. This includes the use of inappropriate statistical techniques, selective reporting of results, failure to account for missing data, or post-hoc modifications to the analysis plan that are not transparently disclosed. Analytical decisions; such as how to handle outliers, which covariates to include in models, or how to define outcome variables can substantially influence the results. When these decisions are not justified or clearly reported, readers may question the reliability of the findings and the integrity of the research process.

A well-written methods section should not only acknowledge these potential sources of bias but also clearly explain how each one was anticipated, minimized, or controlled within the study. This includes detailing sampling procedures, measurement protocols, blinding strategies, confounder management, and analytical decisions. Transparent reporting allows readers to assess the rigor of the study and provides confidence that the findings are grounded in sound scientific practice. Ultimately, addressing bias is not merely a technical requirement; it is a fundamental component of producing trustworthy evidence that can meaningfully inform clinical practice, policy development, and future research.

Why must these biases be minimized?

Minimizing bias is essential for ensuring the internal validity of a study, that is, the extent to which the findings accurately reflect the true relationship between variables rather than distortions introduced by methodological weaknesses. Internal validity forms the foundation upon which all scientific inferences are built; without it, even the most sophisticated analyses or compelling results lose their meaning. When bias is present, the results may systematically deviate from reality, producing estimates that are either exaggerated, understated, or entirely misleading. Such distortions can obscure true associations, create false impressions of causality, or mask important effects that would otherwise be detectable under more rigorous conditions.

From a scientific perspective, biased findings are inherently difficult to interpret. They complicate efforts to compare results across studies, synthesize evidence, or identify consistent patterns within a field. When different studies are affected by different types or degrees of bias, their findings may appear contradictory even when the underlying phenomena are similar. This inconsistency limits the contribution of individual studies to the cumulative body of knowledge and reduces their value in systematic reviews and meta-analyses, which depend heavily on the availability of high-quality, unbiased evidence. Over time, the presence of bias in individual studies can weaken the overall evidence base in a given field, creating uncertainty about what is truly known and hindering scientific progress [19].

From a practical standpoint, the implications are even more significant. Health research often informs clinical guidelines, treatment decisions, and public health policies. These decisions directly affect patient care, resource allocation, and population-level interventions. If such decisions are based on biased evidence, they may lead to ineffective, inefficient, or even harmful outcomes. For example, a biased study might overestimate the effectiveness of a treatment, leading clinicians to adopt an intervention that provides little real benefit. Conversely, bias might obscure the value of a beneficial therapy, causing it to be overlooked or underutilized. In public health contexts, biased evidence can misguide policy decisions, resulting in programs that fail to address the most pressing needs or that inadvertently exacerbate health disparities. In this sense, minimizing bias becomes not only a methodological priority but also an ethical obligation, as researchers have a responsibility to produce evidence that supports safe, effective, and equitable decision-making [20].

In addition, transparent reporting of bias-minimization efforts enhances trust in the research process. When readers can clearly see how potential sources of bias were anticipated, monitored, and managed, they are more likely to have confidence in the study's findings and to consider them in clinical or policy decision-making. Transparent reporting also allows other researchers to replicate the study, evaluate its rigor, and build upon its findings. Conversely, when methods for minimizing bias are poorly described or omitted, readers may question the reliability of the results, regardless of how strong the conclusions appear. In an era where evidence-based practice is central to healthcare, such transparency is indispensable for maintaining scientific credibility and ensuring that research findings contribute meaningfully to improving health outcomes.

How to write methods that demonstrate minimal bias

To effectively communicate that a study has minimized bias, the methods section must be written with clarity, depth, and logical coherence [21]. First, authors should begin by clearly describing the study design, including the rationale for its selection. The choice of design should be linked to its ability to reduce bias. For instance, randomized controlled trials are often used to minimize selection and confounding bias, while cohort studies may be appropriate for studying temporal relationships. Second, the process of participant selection should be explained in detail. This includes how participants were identified, recruited, and enrolled, as well as the criteria used to include or exclude them. Authors should also describe any steps taken to ensure representativeness and reduce the risk of selection bias. Third, data collection methods should be presented comprehensively. Authors should specify the instruments used, provide evidence of their validity and reliability, and describe how data collectors were trained. Standardization procedures and blinding techniques, if applied, should be clearly outlined to reduce information and observer bias. Fourth, strategies to control confounding variables must be explicitly described. This may involve design-based approaches such as matching or restriction, as well as statistical techniques such as regression analysis or stratification. The rationale for choosing these methods should also be explained. Fifth, the analytical approach should be reported in a transparent and detailed manner. Authors should specify the statistical tests used,

the software employed, and the criteria for significance. They should also describe how missing data were handled and how they avoided selective reporting of results.

Finally, authors should openly acknowledge limitations and residual bias [22]. No study is entirely free from bias, and recognizing this reality demonstrates scientific honesty. By discussing potential weaknesses, authors provide readers with the context needed to interpret the findings appropriately.

MESSAGE TO AUTHORS

Minimizing bias should be understood as a core scientific responsibility rather than a procedural formality. It is a foundational requirement for producing research that is both trustworthy and capable of contributing meaningfully to the broader evidence base. For this reason, the methods section of a manuscript must function as a detailed and transparent account of how potential sources of bias were anticipated, identified, and addressed throughout the study. Rather than relying on brief or generalized descriptions of procedures, authors benefit from providing clear, concrete, and context-specific explanations that allow readers to understand precisely how the research was conducted and how threats to validity were managed. Each stage of the research process; study design, sampling strategy, data collection, measurement procedures, and analytical decision-making should incorporate explicit strategies aimed at reducing bias and strengthening internal validity.

A sequential and well-structured presentation of methods further enhances clarity. When the narrative reflects the actual flow of the study, readers can follow the logic of the research process and observe how bias-minimization efforts were integrated at each step. This chronological coherence not only improves readability but also reinforces the transparency of the methodological approach. It allows readers to trace the progression from conceptualization to execution, making it easier to evaluate whether the procedures were appropriate, consistent, and sufficiently rigorous.

Equally important is the willingness to openly acknowledge limitations. No study is entirely free from bias, and recognizing this reality is a hallmark of scientific integrity. Reporting potential sources of residual bias; whether related to sampling constraints, measurement challenges, or analytical decisions helps readers critically appraise the findings and understand the context in which they should be interpreted. Transparency about deviations from the original study plan, unexpected obstacles encountered during data collection, or methodological compromises made due to practical constraints further strengthens the credibility of the manuscript. Such openness signals that the authors have engaged thoughtfully with the complexities of the research process and are committed to presenting an honest and balanced account of their work.

Ultimately, careful and transparent reporting of bias-minimization efforts contributes to stronger, more reliable evidence. When readers can clearly see how methodological rigor was upheld, they are more likely to trust the findings and consider them relevant for clinical practice, policy development, or future research. Approaching the methods section with diligence, precision, and attention to detail ensures that the study's validity is communicated effectively and that its contributions to the scientific community are both credible and impactful.

CONCLUSION

Minimizing bias is a cornerstone of high-quality health research. A well-written methods section should clearly and systematically demonstrate how potential sources of bias were addressed throughout the study. By presenting methods in a transparent, detailed, and logically organized manner, authors enable readers to critically evaluate the validity of their findings. Strengthening the reporting of bias-minimization strategies ultimately enhances the credibility, applicability, and impact of scientific evidence, supporting better decision-making in healthcare and public health.

REFERENCES

1. Gerhard T. Bias: considerations for research practice. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 2008 Nov 15;65(22):2159-68.
2. Schmidt FL. Beyond questionable research methods: The role of omitted relevant research in the credibility of research. *Archives of Scientific Psychology*. 2017 Sep 25;5(1):32.
3. Vaidyanathan AK. Controlling bias in research. *The Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society*. 2022 Oct 1;22(4):312-3.
4. Krauss A. Why all randomised controlled trials produce biased results. *Annals of Medicine*. 2018 May 19;50(4):312-22.
5. Suter WN. Questionable research practices: How to recognize and avoid them. *Home Health Care Management & Practice*. 2020 Nov;32(4):183-90.
6. Cypress BS. Rigor or reliability and validity in qualitative research: Perspectives, strategies, reconceptualization, and recommendations. *Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing*. 2017 Jul 1;36(4):253-63.
7. Littell JH. Evidence-based or biased? The quality of published reviews of evidence-based practices. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2008 Nov 1;30(11):1299-317.
8. Vaidyanathan AK. Controlling bias in research. *The Journal of Indian Prosthodontic Society*. 2022 Oct 1;22(4):312-3.
9. Jabarov J. Bias in scientific research: How to identify and eliminate it. *Journal of Science and Innovative Technologies*. 2023;25:80-96.
10. Arias FD, Navarro M, Elfanagely Y, Elfanagely O. Biases in research studies. In *Translational surgery 2023* Jan 1 (pp. 191-194). Academic Press.
11. Jager KJ, Tripepi G, Chesnaye NC, Dekker FW, Zoccali C, Stel VS. Where to look for the most frequent biases?. *Nephrology*. 2020 Jun;25(6):435-41.
12. Enzenbach C, Wicklein B, Wirkner K, Loeffler M. Evaluating selection bias in a population-based cohort study with low baseline participation: the LIFE-Adult-Study. *BMC medical research methodology*. 2019 Jul 1;19(1):135.
13. Althubaiti A. Information bias in health research: definition, pitfalls, and adjustment methods. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Healthcare*. 2016 May 4:211-7.
14. Bell A, Ward P, Tamal ME, Killilea M. Assessing recall bias and measurement error in high-frequency social data collection for human-environment research. *Population and Environment*. 2019 Mar 15;40(3):325-45.
15. Youngmann B, Cafarella M, Moskovitch Y, Salimi B. On explaining confounding bias. In *2023 IEEE 39th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE) 2023* Apr 3 (pp. 1846-1859). IEEE.
16. Keaney TA, Jones TM, Mulder RA. An undergraduate classroom experiment illustrates an effect of observer bias on data collection in animal behaviour. *Animal Behaviour*. 2024 Jun 1;212:175-82.

17. Pinto C. Experimenters' assumptions and animals' perceptions: observer bias in temporal-discrimination tasks. *Animal Behaviour*. 2026 Mar 1;233:123466.
18. Kornell N, Hausman H. Performance bias: Why judgments of learning are not affected by learning. *Memory & Cognition*. 2017 Nov;45(8):1270-80.
19. Popovic A, Huecker MR. Study bias. InStatpearls [internet] 2023 Jun 20. StatPearls Publishing.
20. Srivastava S, Sinha K. From bias to fairness: a review of ethical considerations and mitigation strategies in artificial intelligence. *Int J Res Appl Sci Eng Technol*. 2023 Mar;11:2247-51.
21. Simon D, Read SJ. Toward a general framework of biased reasoning: Coherence-based reasoning. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*. 2025 May;20(3):421-59.
22. Brown JP, Hunnicutt JN, Ali MS, Bhaskaran K, Cole A, Langan SM, Nitsch D, Rentsch CT, Galwey NW, Wing K, Douglas IJ. Quantifying possible bias in clinical and epidemiological studies with quantitative bias analysis: common approaches and limitations. *BMJ*. 2024 Apr 2;385.