# c. Newcastle-Ottawa Quality Assessment Scale (Cohort Studies)

### **Selection**

- 1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort (i.e., glucose intolerant or GDM patients)
  - a) truly representative of the average patient with glucose intolerance in the community \*
  - b) somewhat representative of the average glucose intolerance in the community \*
  - c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers
  - d) no description of the derivation of the cohort
- 2) Selection of the non-exposed cohort (i.e., normal or minimal glucose intolerant patients)
  - a) drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort \*
  - b) drawn from a different source
  - c) no description of the derivation of the non exposed cohort
- 3) Ascertainment of exposure
  - a) secure record (eg surgical records) \*
  - b) structured interview \*
  - c) written self report
  - d) no description
- 4) Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study
  - a) yes \*
  - b) no

# **Comparability**

- 1) Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis
  - a) study controls for age, race/ethnicity, weight/BMI, previous GDM, or family history of diabetes \*\*
  - b) study controls for any additional factor \*

## Outcome

- 1) Assessment of outcome
  - a) independent blind assessment \*
  - b) record linkage \*
  - c) self report
  - d) no description
- 2) Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur
  - a) yes (follows patients at least until birth) \*
  - b) no
- 3) Adequacy of follow up of cohorts
  - a) complete follow up all subjects accounted for \*
  - b) subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias: small number lost (>90% follow up), or description provided of those lost \*
  - c) follow up rate <75% and no description of those lost
  - d) no statement

### **TOTAL STARS (0-9)**

<u>Note</u>: A study can be awarded a maximum of one star for each numbered item within the Selection and Outcome categories. A maximum of two stars can be given for Comparability