

## Cohort Studies

### NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE COHORT STUDIES

#### Selection

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- a) Truly representative of the average patient with a RCT in the community \*
- b) Somewhat representative of the average patient with a RCT in the community \*
- c) Selected group of users (e.g., WCB, overhead workers / athletes, massive, irreparable tears, etc)
- 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

#### Comparability

1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) Study controls for age OR tear size \*
- b) Study controls for any additional factor \*
- c) None

#### Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome

- a) Independent blind assessment \*
- b) Record linkage \*
- c) Self report
- d) No description
- e) Described as unblinded

2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur

- a) Yes – follow-up for at least 12 months \*
- 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 -  $\geq 90\%$  follow up, or description provided of those lost \*
- c) Follow up rate  $\leq 90\%$  (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost
- d) No statement

TOTAL: \_\_\_\_\_ \*

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.