NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE COHORT STUDIES

<u>Note:</u> 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	
	_(describe) in the community*
b) somewhat representative of the average	
c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers	·
d) no description of the derivation of the cohort	
2) <u>Selection of the non exposed cohort</u>	
a) drawn from the same community as the exposed coh	ort*
b) drawn from a different source	
c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed of	cohort
3) Ascertainment of exposure	
a) secure record (e.g, surgical records)*	
b) structured interview*	
c) written self report	
d) no description	
4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present	t at start of study
a) yes	
b) no	
Comparability	
1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or a	<u>analysis</u>
a) study controls for (select the most i	
b) study controls for any additional factor* (This criter	ia 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	e 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	•
an adequate %) follow up, or description provided of	,
c) follow up rate <% (select an adequate %) and to	no description of those lost
d) no statement	
Wells, G. A, Shea, B., O'Connel, D. et al. The Newcastle-Ottawa scale (NOS	5) for assessing the quailty of nonrandomised studies

in meta-analyses. http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.htm 2009 Feb 1