

NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE COHORT STUDIES

Note: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability

Selection

- 1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort
 - a) truly representative of the average _____ (describe) in the community ✱
 - b) somewhat representative of the average _____ in the community ✱
 - c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
 - d) no description of the derivation of the cohort
- 2) Selection of the non exposed cohort
 - a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort ✱
 - b) drawn from a different source
 - c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort
- 3) Ascertainment of exposure
 - a) secure record (eg surgical records) ✱
 - b) structured interview ✱
 - c) written self report
 - d) no description
- 4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study
 - a) yes ✱
 - b) no

Comparability

- 1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis
 - a) study controls for _____ (select the most important factor) ✱
 - b) study controls for any additional factor ✱ (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)

Outcome

- 1) Assessment of outcome
 - a) independent blind assessment ✱
 - b) record linkage ✱
 - c) self report
 - d) no description
- 2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur
 - a) yes (select an adequate follow up period for outcome of interest) ✱
 - b) no
- 3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
 - a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for ✱
 - b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost - > ____ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost) ✱
 - c) follow up rate < ____% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost
 - d) no statement

Table S2- Summary of Data quality

Author	Selection				Comparability	Outcome			Total score
	Representativeness	Selection	Ascertainment	Demonstration	Comparability	Assessment	Follow up	Adequacy	
Mamede ³⁰	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	5
Msaouel ³¹	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	5
Stiegler ⁴⁵	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Meyer ⁵⁵	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Gupta ⁴⁶	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	6
Crowley ⁴⁷	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Dibonaventura ⁴³	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	4
Redelmeier ⁴²	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Ross ³²	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	6
Sorum ⁴¹	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4
Bytzer ⁴⁰	1	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
Graber ³⁹	1	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	4
Yee ³⁸	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	1	7
Reyna ³⁷	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	1	5
Baldwin ³⁶	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	5
Mamade ⁶⁰	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	3
Friedman ³³	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4
Ogdie ³⁴	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
Perneger ³⁵	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	4
Saposnik ⁴⁴	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	5

Each number represents a positive point if that attribute was fulfilled according to the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS).²