Study	Riley ¹	Noakes ¹	Neviackas ¹⁶	Irving ¹⁶	Kraemer ¹³	Irving ¹⁶	Nelson ¹⁶	Borkowski ²	Irving ²	Irving ²²	Irving ²²	Holtzhausen ²	Kratz ²	Neumayr ²	Reid ²⁷	Neumayr ²⁶	Wharam ²	Page ³	Dumke	Lippi ³	Mingels 32	McCullough	Mohseni ³	Mydlik ³	Lippi ³⁶	Hoffman ³	Lipman ³	Christensen ³	Hou ⁴⁰	Hewing ⁴
Year	1975	1976	1981	1986	1986	1989	1989	1990	1990b	1990a	1991	1994	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2007	2008	2009	2011	2011	2012	2012	2013	2014	2014	2015	2015
Selection																														
1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort																														
a) truly representative of the average in the community *	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	1
b) somewhat representative of the average in the community *	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0
c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
d) no description of the derivation of the cohort	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2) <u>Selection of the</u> non exposed cohort																														
a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort *	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
 b) drawn from a different source 	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3) <u>Ascertainment of</u> exposure																														
a) secure record (eg surgical records) #	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b) structured interview #	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
c) written self report	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d) no description	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4) <u>Demonstration</u> that outcome of interest was not present at start of study																														
a) yes 🗮	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1
b) no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Comparability																														
1) <u>Comparability of</u> <u>cohorts on the basis</u> <u>of the design or</u> <u>analysis</u>																														
a) study controls for pre-race SCr ¥	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1
b) study controls for any additional factor ★	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
Outcome																														
1) <u>Assessment of</u> outcome																														
a) independent blind assessment *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
b) record linkage 🟶	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	1
c) self report	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
d) no description	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2) <u>Was follow-up</u> long enough for outcomes to occur	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
a) yes (adequate follow up - at least one post race repeat) ₩	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
b) no	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3) <u>Adequacy of</u> follow up of cohorts																														
a) complete follow up - all subjects accounted for #	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	
b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias - small number lost ->80% follow up, or description provided of those lost *	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1
Follow-up rate (%)	1 0 0	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	57	30	100	86	100	100	94	86	100	100	100	68	100	100	48	85	100	93	84
c) follow up rate < 80% and no description of those lost																														
d) no statement	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Stars	7	7	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	5	5	7	8	7	8	7	6	7	8	8	8	7	7	8	6	8	8	8	

Newcastle-Ottawa Risk of bias for Cohort studies for the 30 endurance event studies included.