

MODIFIED 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 adult with sepsis in the community ✱
- b) somewhat representative of the average adult with sepsis in the community ✱
- c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
- d) no description of the derivation of the cohort

2) Ascertainment of exposure – HIV status

- a) reproducible description of valid testing procedures (e.g. following national guidelines) ✱
- b) self reported status
- c) no description

3) Ascertainment of exposure - aetiology

- a) Reproducible description of testing procedures using reference tests ✱
- b) Reproducible description of testing using non-reference tests (e.g Widal test for enteric fever)
- d) no or nonreproducible description of testing

Comparability

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

- a) study reports +/- controls for lactate ✱
- b) study reports +/- controls for any additional physiologic parameters (BP, HR etc) ✱

Outcome

1) Assessment of outcome

a) independent blind assessment *

b) record linkage *

c) self report

d) no description

2) 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 - > 90% follow up rate, or description provided of those lost) *

c) follow up rate < 90% and no description of those lost

d) no statement