Supplementary table 3
NEWCASTLE - OTTAWA QUALITY ASSESSMENT SCALE CASE CONTROL STUDIES

Study		Monica Verdoia 2014	Monica Verdoia 2015	Serdar Keç¸eogˇlu 2013
Selection	Is the case definition adequate	☆	☆	☆
	Representativeness of the cases	☆	☆	☆
	Selection of Controls	—	—	—
	Definition of Controls	—	—	☆
Comparability	Comparability of cases and controls on the basis of the design or analysis	☆☆	☆☆	☆☆
Exposure	Ascertainment of exposure	☆☆	☆☆	☆
	Same method of ascertainment for cases and controls	☆	☆	☆☆
	Non-Response rate	—	—	—
Score		7	7	8

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 criterion 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