Table Supplemental Digital Content 4: NHLBI Quality Assessment of Case-Control Studies

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Carroccio et al. 1998** |
| 1. Was the research question or objective in this paper clearly stated and appropriate? | Y |
| 2. Was the study population clearly specified and defined? | Y |
| 3. Did the authors include a sample size justification? | N |
| 4. Were controls selected or recruited from the same or similar population that gave rise to the cases (including the same timeframe)? | Y |
| 5. Were the definitions, inclusion and exclusion criteria, algorithms or processes used to identify or select cases and controls valid, reliable, and implemented consistently across all study participants? | Y |
| 6. Were the cases clearly defined and differentiated from controls? | Y |
| 7. If less than 100 percent of eligible cases and/or controls were selected for the study, were the cases and/or controls randomly selected from those eligible? | NR |
| 8. Was there use of concurrent controls? | NR |
| 9. Were the investigators able to confirm that the exposure/risk occurred prior to the development of the condition or event that defined a participant as a case? | CD |
| 10. Were the measures of exposure/risk clearly defined, valid, reliable, and implemented consistently (including the same time period) across all study participants? | Y |
| 11. Were the assessors of exposure/risk blinded to the case or control status of participants? | N |
| 12. Were key potential confounding variables measured and adjusted statistically in the analyses? If matching was used, did the investigators account for matching during study analysis? | Y |
| **Rating** | **Fair** |

CD, cannot determine; N, no; NA, not applicable; NR, not reported; Y, yes.