

---

**Table 1 Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale. Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (Case control study)**

---

Selection

---

1) Is the case definition adequate?

- a) yes, with independent validation<sup>1</sup>
- b) yes, eg record linkage or based on self-reports
- c) no description

2) Representativeness of the cases

- a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases<sup>1</sup>
- b) potential for selection biases or not stated

3) Selection of Controls

- a) community controls<sup>1</sup>
- b) hospital controls
- c) no description

4) Definition of Controls

- a) no history of disease (endpoint)<sup>1</sup>
  - b) no description of source
- 

Comparability

---

1) Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis

- a) study controls for "age, sex, Body Mass Index" (Select the most important factor.)<sup>1</sup>
  - b) study controls for any additional factor (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific control for a second important factor.)<sup>1</sup>
- 

Exposure

---

1) Ascertainment of exposure

- a) secure record (eg surgical records)<sup>1</sup>
  - b) structured interview where blind to case/control status<sup>1</sup>
  - c) interview not blinded to case/control status
  - d) written self-report or medical record only
  - e) no description
-

---

2) Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls

a) yes<sup>1</sup>

b) no

3) Non-Response rate

a) same rate for both groups<sup>1</sup>

b) non respondents described

c) rate different and no designation

---

<sup>1</sup>A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.

---

Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale (Cohort study)

---

Selection

---

1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- a) truly representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_ (describe) in the community<sup>1</sup>
- b) somewhat representative of the average \_\_\_\_\_ in the community<sup>1</sup>
- 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<sup>1</sup>
- 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)<sup>1</sup>
- b) structured interview<sup>1</sup>
- c) written self-report
- d) no description

4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study

- a) yes<sup>1</sup>
- b) no

---

Comparability

---

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

- a) study controls for \_\_\_\_\_ (select the most important factor)<sup>1</sup>
- b) study controls for any additional factor (This criteria could be modified to indicate specific \_\_\_\_\_ control for a second important factor.)<sup>1</sup>

---

Outcomes

---

1) Assessment of outcome

- a) independent blind assessment<sup>1</sup>
-

---

b) record linkage<sup>1</sup>

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)<sup>1</sup>

b) no

3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts

a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for<sup>1</sup>

b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost

- > \_\_\_\_ % (select an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of those lost)<sup>1</sup>

c) follow up rate < \_\_\_\_% (select an adequate %) and no description of those lost

d) no statement

---

<sup>1</sup>A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Exposure categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability.