

Supplemental Table 3 – Newcastle-Ottawa Cohort Studies | Appraisal Results.

Study	Selection				Comparability (can have up to 2 stars)	Outcome			Rating
	Representativeness of exposed cohort (*)	Selection of non-exposed cohort (*)	Ascertainment of exposure (*)	Demonstration that outcome of interest not present at start of study	Comparability of cohorts (**)	Assessment of outcome (*)	Long enough follow up (*)	Adequacy of follow up (*)	
Boudreau 2019 [66]	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	-	Good
Schauer 2019 [35]	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	Poor
Winstanley 2019 [24]	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	Poor
Bozzay 2018 [45]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Cornelius 2018 [65]	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	Poor
Duignan 2018 [34]	*	-	*	*	-	-	*	-	Poor
Hardy 2018 [38]	-	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	Poor
Heschl 2018[59]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Kauvar 2018 [26]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	Good
Lesperance 2018 [43]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Maddy 2018 [44]	*	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	Poor
Schauer 2018 [30]	-	*	*	*	-	*	*	-	Poor
Shavit 2018 [39]	*	*	*	*	**	*	-	-	Poor
Vitalis 2018 [55]	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	Poor
Holcomb 2017 [54]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
O'Dochartaigh 2017 [77]	*	-	*	-	*	*	-	*	Fair
Schauer 2017 [69]	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	Poor

Schauer 2017 [32]	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	Poor
Shackelford 2017 [61]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	Poor
Yates 2017 [78]	*	*	*	-	-	*	-	-	Poor
Dunn 2016 [21]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Miller 2016 [63]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Savell 2016 [70]	*	*	*	-	**	*	*	-	Good
Weichenthal 2016 [49]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	*	Poor
Auten 2015 [60]	*	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Blenkinsop 2015 [51]	-	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	Poor
Kragh 2015 [29]	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	Poor
Meizoso 2015 [74]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Ode 2015 [28]	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	Poor
Barnard 2014[41]	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	Poor
Jansen 2014 [68]	*	*	*	*	**	*	-	-	Poor
Lockey 2014 [36]	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	-	Poor
Nadler 2014 [67]	*	*	*	*		*	*		Poor
Bonner 2011 [62]	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	Poor
Perkins 2011 [57]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Pozza 2011 [31]	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Poor
Struck 2011 [40]	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	-	Poor
Ball 2010 [47]	*	-	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Blaivas 2010 [50]	*	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	Poor

Borut 2010 [64]	*	*	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Pollak 2010 [33]	*	-	*	-	-	-	-	-	Poor
Clasper 2009 [25]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	Poor
Cobas 2009 [37]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Cox 2009 [18]	*	-	*	*	-	-	-	-	Poor
Matsumoto 2009 [27]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Aylwin 2008 [42]	*	-	*	*	-	*	*	*	Poor
Beekley 2008 [20]	*	*	*	*	-	*	*	*	Poor
Cancio 2008 [73]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Warner 2008 [52]	*	-	*	-	-	*	-	-	Poor
Brodie 2007 [23]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor
Davis 2005 [53]	*	*	*	*	*	*	-	-	Poor
Spanjersberg 2005 [46]	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	Good
Lakstein 2002 [22]	*	-	*	*	-	*	-	-	Poor

Thresholds for converting the Newcastle-Ottawa scales to AHRQ standards (good, fair, and poor):

Good quality: 3 or 4 stars in Selection domain **AND** 1 or 2 stars in Comparability domain **AND** 2 or 3 stars in Outcome domain

Fair quality: 2 stars in Selection domain **AND** 1 or 2 stars in Comparability domain **AND** 2 or 3 stars in Outcome domain

Poor quality: 0 or 1 star in Selection domain **OR** 0 stars in Comparability domain **OR** 0 or 1 stars in Outcome domain