Health Notions
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.33846/hn100301
EDITORIAL
ISSN 2580-4936
Volume 10 Number 3, March 2026

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

Heru Santoso Wahito Nugroho[1]
[1]Department 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 editorial 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 more than selecting an appropriate study design. Equally important is the ability of researchers to anticipate and minimize potential sources of bias that may compromise the validity of their findings. Bias, as a form of systematic error, can subtly influence results in ways that are not immediately apparent, yet significantly alter the conclusions drawn from a study [1].

The methods section serves as the primary space where researchers demonstrate how they have addressed these risks. It is not merely a procedural description, but a critical component of scientific communication that allows readers to evaluate the integrity of the research process. When bias is not adequately controlled—or when efforts to control it are not clearly reported—the credibility of the study becomes questionable [1-6].

The increasing reliance on evidence-based practice further highlights the importance of minimizing bias [7]. Healthcare professionals, policymakers, and researchers depend on published findings to guide decisions that directly affect patient outcomes and public health strategies. If these findings are influenced by unaddressed bias, the consequences can be far-reaching, leading to ineffective interventions or misguided policies.

Despite this, many studies still provide only limited explanations of how bias was handled. Key methodological details are often presented too briefly, leaving readers to make assumptions about the rigor of the research. This editorial seeks to address this gap by emphasizing the importance of writing methods that clearly demonstrate efforts to minimize bias, thereby strengthening the validity and usefulness of health research.

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 for both conducting and reporting research. 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 can happen when sampling methods are not random, recruitment processes are uneven, or inclusion and exclusion criteria are not carefully defined. As a result, the findings may not be generalizable.

Another key concern is information bias, also referred to as measurement bias [13]. This type of bias emerges when there are systematic errors in the way data are collected [14]. For example, poorly calibrated instruments, inconsistent measurement procedures, or subjective assessments by observers can introduce inaccuracies that affect the results.

Confounding bias is particularly important in observational studies. It occurs when an external variable influences both the exposure and the outcome, creating a misleading association [15]. Without proper control, confounding factors can lead to incorrect interpretations of cause-and-effect relationships.

In experimental settings, observer bias and performance bias may occur. Observer bias arises when researchers' expectations influence how they record or interpret data, while performance bias occurs when participants alter their behavior because they are aware of the intervention they receive [16-18].

Finally, analysis bias can occur during data processing and interpretation. This includes the use of inappropriate statistical techniques, selective reporting of results, or failure to account for missing data. A well-written methods section should not only acknowledge these potential sources of bias but also clearly explain how each one was addressed within the study.

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. When bias is present, the results may systematically deviate from reality, leading to conclusions that are either exaggerated or understated. From a scientific perspective, biased findings are difficult to interpret and compare with those from other studies. This limits their contribution to the cumulative body of knowledge and reduces their value in systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Over time, the presence of bias in individual studies can weaken the overall evidence base in a given field [19].

From a practical standpoint, the implications are even more significant. Health research often informs clinical guidelines, treatment decisions, and public health policies. If these decisions are based on biased evidence, they may lead to ineffective or even harmful outcomes. In this context,

minimizing bias becomes not only a methodological priority but also an ethical obligation [20]. In addition, transparent reporting of bias-minimization efforts enhances trust. When readers can clearly see how potential sources of bias were managed, they are more likely to have confidence in the study's findings and to consider them in decision-making processes.

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

As editors, we strongly encourage authors to recognize that minimizing bias is not only a technical requirement but a fundamental aspect of producing trustworthy research. The methods section should clearly communicate how potential sources of bias were identified, addressed, and, where necessary, acknowledged. Authors should avoid overly brief or generalized descriptions of their procedures. Instead, they should provide detailed and concrete explanations that allow readers to understand exactly how the study was conducted. Each stage of the research process—design, sampling, data collection, and analysis—should include explicit strategies to reduce bias.

A well-structured and sequential presentation of methods is also essential. The narrative should reflect the actual flow of the study, guiding readers through each step and showing how bias was minimized along the way. This not only improves clarity but also enhances the transparency of the research. Equally important is the willingness to be transparent about limitations. Reporting potential sources of residual bias, as well as any deviations from the original study plan, strengthens the credibility of the manuscript. Such openness allows readers to critically appraise the findings and understand their context.

Ultimately, careful and transparent reporting of bias-minimization efforts contributes to stronger, more reliable evidence. Authors should therefore approach the methods section with diligence and attention, recognizing its central role in ensuring the validity and impact of their work.

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. InTranslational 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. In2023 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.