

## 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

## NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE CASE CONTROL STUDIES

**Note:** 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.

### **Selection**

- 1) Is the case definition adequate?
  - a) yes, with independent validation
  - 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
  - b) potential for selection biases or not stated
- 3) Selection of Controls
  - a) community controls
  - b) hospital controls
  - c) no description
- 4) Definition of Controls
  - a) no history of disease (endpoint)
  - b) no description of source

### **Comparability**

- 1) Comparability of cases and controls 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.)

### **Exposure**

- 1) Ascertainment of exposure
  - a) secure record (eg surgical records)
  - b) structured interview where blind to case/control status
  - 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
  - b) no
- 3) Non-Response rate
  - a) same rate for both groups
  - b) non respondents described
  - c) rate different and no designation