Appendix D. Tools Used To Assess the Quality of the Literature

Reviewer:_____

Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Form for Cohort Studies

Note: A study can be given 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) b) c) d)	Truly representative <i>(one star)</i> Somewhat representative <i>(one star)</i> Selected group No description of the derivation of the cohort
2)	Selection of the non-exposed cohort	
	a) b) c)	Drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort <i>(one star)</i> Drawn from a different source No description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort
3)	Ascertainment of exposure	
	a) b) c) d) e)	Secure record (e.g., surgical record) (one star) Structured interview (one star) Written self report No description Other
4)	Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	
	a) b)	Yes <i>(one star)</i> No
Comparability		
1)	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis controlled for confounders	
	a) b) c)	The study controls for age <i>(one star)</i> Study controls for other factors (list)
Outcome		
1)	Assessment of outcome	
	a) b) c) d) e)	Independent blind assessment (one star) Record linkage (one star) Self report No description Other
2)	Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	
Indi	a) Yes <i>(one star)</i> b) No dicate the median duration of follow-up and a brief rationale for the assessment above:	

3) Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts

- a) Complete follow up- all subject accounted for (one star)
 b) Subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias- number lost less than or equal to 20% or description of those lost suggested no different from those followed. (one star)
 c) Follow up rate greater than 80% and no description of those lost
 d) No statement