

S2 Table. Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for quality assessment in meta-analysis.

Selection

(1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort

- (a) Truly representative of the cancer patients in the community (1 star)
- (b) Somewhat representative of the cancer patients in the community (1 star)
- (c) Selected group of users (e.g., 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 (1 star)
- (b) Drawn from a different source
- (c) No description of the derivation of the non-exposed cohort

(3) Ascertainment of exposure (proof of cancer and LKB1 measurement)

- (a) Secure record (e.g., surgical records or pathological diagnosis) (1 star)
- (b) Structured interview (1 star)
- (c) Written self-report
- (d) No description

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

- (a) Yes (1 star)
- (b) No

Comparability

(1) Comparability of cohorts based on the design or analysis

- (a) The age between exposed cohort and non-exposed cohort had no significant difference (1 star)
- (b) The sex (or grade, stage, etc.) between exposed cohort and non-exposed cohort had no significant difference (1 star)

Outcome

(1) Assessment of outcome (death or recurrence)

- (a) Independent blind assessment (1 star)
- (b) Record linkage (1 star)
- (c) Self-report
- (d) No description

(2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur? (death or recurrence)

- (a) Yes (at least 3 years) (1 star)
- (b) No

(3) Adequacy of follow-up of cohorts

- (a) Complete follow-up—all subjects accounted for (1 star)
- (b) Subjects lost to follow-up unlikely to introduce bias—small number lost (less than 25%) or description provided of those lost (1 star)
- (c) Follow-up rate less than 75% and no description of those lost
- (d) No statement

Note: a maximum of one “star” for each item within the “Selection” and “Outcome” categories, maximum of two “stars” for “Comparability”.