

The RECORD statement – checklist of items, extended from the STROBE statement, that should be reported in observational studies using routinely collected health data.

	Item No.	STROBE items	Location in manuscript where items are reported	RECORD items	Location in manuscript where items are reported
Title and abstract					
	1	(a) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found		<p>RECORD 1.1: The type of data used should be specified in the title or abstract. When possible, the name of the databases used should be included.</p> <p>RECORD 1.2: If applicable, the geographic region and timeframe within which the study took place should be reported in the title or abstract.</p> <p>RECORD 1.3: If linkage between databases was conducted for the study, this should be clearly stated in the title or abstract.</p>	<p>Abstract.</p> <p>Abstract. Cross-section as of 2019. Data availability from 2002 to define variables evaluated as of March 31, 2019. Now reported in abstract as 2002-2019.</p> <p>Abstract. “linked administrative data”.</p>
Introduction					
Background rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported			Background.
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses			Revised research questions located in background on page 2.
Methods					
Study Design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper			First sentence of methods.

Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection			First sentence of methods.
Participants	6	<p><i>(a) Cohort study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls</p> <p><i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants</p> <p><i>(b) Cohort study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case</p>		<p>RECORD 6.1: The methods of study population selection (such as codes or algorithms used to identify subjects) should be listed in detail. If this is not possible, an explanation should be provided.</p> <p>RECORD 6.2: Any validation studies of the codes or algorithms used to select the population should be referenced. If validation was conducted for this study and not published elsewhere, detailed methods and results should be provided.</p> <p>RECORD 6.3: If the study involved linkage of databases, consider use of a flow diagram or other graphical display to demonstrate the data linkage process, including the number of individuals with linked data at each stage.</p>	<p>Base cohort identified on page 4 with references to administrative data case definition for diabetes.</p> <p>Supplement now contains details on specific codes with references.</p> <p>Figure 1.</p>
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable.		RECORD 7.1: A complete list of codes and algorithms used to classify exposures, outcomes, confounders, and effect modifiers should be provided. If these cannot be reported, an explanation should be provided.	Supplemental Table S2.
Data sources/ measurement	8	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement).			Source databases listed in Supplement.

		Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group			
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias			Methods – Analysis.
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at			All available adults in Alberta meeting the case definitions.
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen, and why			See analysis. All groupings were considered clinically meaningful groups by the authors. Only income <i>quintiles</i> were data-driven, but this is the standard definition for this variable.
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) <i>Cohort study</i> - If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed <i>Case-control study</i> - If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed			See Methods – analysis. No subgroups / interactions. Analysis revised so that the CKD subgroups is now the main analysis. Administrative data – minimal loss to follow-up.

		<i>Cross-sectional study</i> - If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses			
Data access and cleaning methods		..		RECORD 12.1: Authors should describe the extent to which the investigators had access to the database population used to create the study population. RECORD 12.2: Authors should provide information on the data cleaning methods used in the study.	No direct access to the included adults. Analysis performed in Stata 17 – Methods / analysis. Minimal cleaning required outside of linkage and application of definitions.
Linkage		..		RECORD 12.3: State whether the study included person-level, institutional-level, or other data linkage across two or more databases. The methods of linkage and methods of linkage quality evaluation should be provided.	Individual level via PIN – Supplement.
Results					
Participants	13	(a) Report the numbers of individuals at each stage of the study (<i>e.g.</i> , numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed) (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage. (c) Consider use of a flow diagram		RECORD 13.1: Describe in detail the selection of the persons included in the study (<i>i.e.</i> , study population selection) including filtering based on data quality, data availability and linkage. The selection of included persons can be described in the text and/or by means of the study flow diagram.	Figure 1.

Descriptive data	14	<p>(a) Give characteristics of study participants (<i>e.g.</i>, demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders</p> <p>(b) Indicate the number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest</p> <p>(c) <i>Cohort study</i> - summarise follow-up time (<i>e.g.</i>, average and total amount)</p>			<p>Table 3.</p> <p>Main text, results. < 3% missingness except 12000 adults with missing HbA1c.</p>
Outcome data	15	<p><i>Cohort study</i> - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time</p> <p><i>Case-control study</i> - Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure</p> <p><i>Cross-sectional study</i> - Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures</p>			<p>Table 3.</p>
Main results	16	<p>(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (<i>e.g.</i>, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included</p> <p>(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized</p> <p>(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period</p>			<p>Table 3, and Supplemental Table S3 – the latter for crude odds ratios and their confidence intervals.</p> <p>Table 3.</p>
Other analyses	17	<p>Report other analyses done—<i>e.g.</i>, analyses of subgroups and</p>			<p>Results, page 8 – referring to the same analysis</p>

		interactions, and sensitivity analyses			performed in the base population of adults with diabetes regardless of CKD status. Reported as well in Supplement Table S4.
Discussion					
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives			Discussion, page 8.
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias		RECORD 19.1: Discuss the implications of using data that were not created or collected to answer the specific research question(s). Include discussion of misclassification bias, unmeasured confounding, missing data, and changing eligibility over time, as they pertain to the study being reported.	Primary limitation is missing lab data in a cohort where such data was not primarily collected – Limitations, page 10.
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence			Limitations, page 10.
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results			Limitations, page 10. A strength here is the use of Alberta administrative data.
Other Information					
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable,			Funding / disclosures.

		for the original study on which the present article is based			
Accessibility of protocol, raw data, and programming code		..		RECORD 22.1: Authors should provide information on how to access any supplemental information such as the study protocol, raw data, or programming code.	The raw data is not accessible as we are bound by disclosure agreements with Alberta Health. Other desired information can be discussed with the authors on request.

*Reference: Benchimol EI, Smeeth L, Guttman A, Harron K, Moher D, Petersen I, Sørensen HT, von Elm E, Langan SM, the RECORD Working Committee. The REporting of studies Conducted using Observational Routinely-collected health Data (RECORD) Statement. *PLoS Medicine* 2015; in press.

*Checklist is protected under Creative Commons Attribution ([CC BY](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)) license.