# A/ Are the results of the study valid?

### **Screening Questions**

1 Did the study address a clearly focused issue?  HINT: A question can be focused in terms of: - the population studied - the risk factors studied - the outcomes considered - is it clear whether the study tried to detect a beneficial or harmful effect?	Yes	Can't tell	No
2 Did the authors use an appropriate method to answer their question?  HINT: Consider - Is a cohort study a good way of answering the question under the circumstances? -Did it address the study question?	Yes	Can't tell □	No

## Is it worth continuing?

### **Detailed Questions**

3 Was the cohort recruited in an	Yes	Can't tell	No
acceptable			
way?		_	_
HINT: We are looking for selection bias which might compromise the generalisability of the findings:  - Was the cohort representative of a defined population?  - Was there something special about the cohort?			
- Was everybody included who should			
have been included?			

4. Was the exposure accurately	Yes	Can't tell	No
measured to minimise bias?			
HINT: We are looking for measurement			
or classification bias:			
- Did they use subjective or objective			
measurements?			
- Do the measures truly reflect what you			
want them to (have they been validated)?			
- Were all the subjects classified into			
exposure groups using the same			
procedure?			
5. Was the outcome accurately	Yes	Can't tell	No
measured			
to minimise bias?			
HINT: We are looking for measurement			
or			
classification bias:			
- Did they use subjective or objective measurements?			
- Do the measures truly reflect what you			
want them to (have they been validated)?			
- Has a reliable system been established			
for detecting all the cases (for measuring			
disease occurrence)?			
- Were the measurement methods similar			
in the different groups?			
- Were the subjects and/or the outcome			
assessor blinded to exposure			
(does this matter)?			
6. A. Have the authors identified all	Yes	Can't tell	No
important confounding factors?			
List the ones you think might be		_	_
important, that the authors missed.			
	Yes	Can't tell	No
B. Have they taken account of the			
confounding factors in the design			
and/or			
analysis?	List:		
HINT:			
- Look for restriction in design, and			
techniques eg modelling, stratified-,			
regression-, or sensitivity analysis to			
correct, control or adjust for			
confounding factors			

7. A. Was the follow up of subjects complete enough?	Yes	Can't tell	No
B. Was the follow up of subjects long enough?	Yes	Can't tell □	No
HINT:  - The good or bad effects should have had long enough to reveal themselves  -The persons that are lost to follow-up may have different outcomes than those available for assessment  - In an open or dynamic cohort, was there anything special about the outcome of the people leaving, or the exposure of the people entering the cohort?			
B/ What are the results?			
8. What are the results of this study?	9. How precise are the results?		
HINT: - What are the bottom line results? - Have they reported the rate or the proportion between the exposed/unexposed, the ratio/the rate difference? - How strong is the association between exposure and outcome (RR,)? - What is the absolute risk reduction (ARR)?	risk?  HINT:	ise is the estimate of the confidence intervals	he

#### Is it worth continuing?

#### C/ Will the results help me locally?

11. Can the results be applied to the	Yes	Can't tell	No
local population?  HINT: Consider whether  - The subjects covered in the study could be sufficiently different from your population to cause concern.  - Your local setting is likely to differ much from that of the study  - Can you quantify the local benefits and harms?			
12. Do the results of this study fit with other available evidence?	Yes	Can't tell	No

One observational study rarely provides sufficiently robust evidence to recommend changes to clinical practice or within health policy decision making. However, for certain questions observational studies provide the only evidence. Recommendations from observational studies are always stronger when supported by other evidence.