Methodological Evaluation of Observational Research (MEVORECH)—Observational Studies of Risk Factors of Chronic Diseases

Instructions:	
Please review the checklist and mark quality items that not reported and	flaws in external or internal validity if
present. Descriptive	
·	
Journal of publication Year of publication	
Funding of study	
Role of funding organization in data analysis and interpretations of the re	esults
Conflict of interest	
Ethical approval of the study	
,, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
Aim of the study	
Aim was not stated	Poor reporting
Included association with risk factors	Minor flaw
without clear definition of the target	
population	
Objectives	
Not clear statement	Poor reporting
Estimation of the association with	
prevalence of chronic conditions	
Estimation of the association with	
incidence of chronic conditions	
Design	
Not clear statement about the study	Poor reporting
design	
External Validity	
Sampling of the subjects by investigators	
General population based	
Not reported	Poor reporting
Nongeneral population based sampling method	
Not reported	Poor reporting
Convenient	Minor flaw
Self selection	☐ Minor flaw

Nongeneral population-based sampling frame

Not reported		
Medical records		Major flaw
Insurance claims		Major flaw
Work place		Major flaw
Health care based (clinics, hospitals)		Major flaw
For case-control studies		
Sampling of controls are not clearly		Poor reporting
reported		1 con reperting
Sampling of controls from different	П	Major flaw
population as cases		ajoa.v
Sampling of controls from health care	П	Minor flaw
related sources (out-clinic or in-		
clinics, health care claims)		
Access bins		
Assess bias		
Assessment of sampling bias (failure t	to ensure that all members of the refer	ence population have a known
chance of selection in the sample)		
No information about sampling bias		Poor reporting
The authors did not assess sampling		Minor flaw
bias		
Response rate in total sample (cut off	of accentable response rate depend or	n the target nonulation)
Not reported		Poor reporting
<40 (or less than cut off specific for		Major flaw
the target population) %		wajor naw
the target population, 75		
Response rate in race subgroups (if ap	oplicable)	B
Not reported	Ц	Poor reporting
<40 (or less than cut off specific for		Major flaw
the target population) %		
Response rate in other subgroups (if a	applicable)	
Not reported		Poor reporting
<40 (or less than cut off specific for	<u> </u>	Major flaw
the target population) %		major nav
are target population, 70		
Freshed an acts from the analysis		
Exclusion rate from the analysis		Poor reporting
Not reported		
>10%	Ц	Major flaw
Exclusion rate in subgroups (if applica	able)	
Not reported		Poor reporting
>10%		Major flaw
	П	
Subject flow (the acceptable ranges ca	an be specific for the area of research)	
Not applicable for study design		
Number screened not reported		Poor reporting
Number eligible not reported		Poor reporting
Number enrolled not reported		Poor reporting
Exclusion rate from the analysis in exp	posed and not exposed	
Exclusion from the analyses was not		Poor reporting
reported separately for exposed		
and nonexposed		
Reasons to exclude from the		Major flaw
analyses differ for exposed and not		
exposed		

Address Bias	More one boot (*) and all applications	able reconcused
Not reported	alysis. (Mark one best (*) and all applica	Poor reporting
Not addressed in analysis		Minor flaw
Internal Validity		
Source to measure dependent variable Not reported	es (target, outcomes)	Poor reporting
Proxy reported (collected for the		Minor flaw
study)		William Haw
Obtained from medical records (mining of data collected for health care purposes)		Minor flaw
Obtained from administrative database (mining of data collected for health care purposes)		Minor flaw
Dependent variable		
Reference period, time of occurrence	of the disease	Minerflow
Reference period may be relevant but not included in definition of the outcome (define relevance specific for research question)		Minor flaw
Reference period different from	П	Minor flaw
recommended and not justified		THIRD HATT
Severity, degree of the symptoms of t Severity is not relevant for the outcome Severity can be relevant but not assessed in the study	he chronic condition	Major flaw
	mportance of frequency per day, week,	or month specific for the nature
of the outcomes) Frequency is not relevant for the outcome		
Frequency can be relevant but not		Minor flaw
assessed in the study		
Validation of outcomes measurement	6	
No information about validation	5	Poor reporting
The authors reported inter-methods		Minor flaw
validation (one method vs. another)		minor nam
The authors did not validate the	П	Major flaw
methods to measure dependent		-,-
variables (nonvalid methods were		
obtained)		
Deliability of the active to		
Reliability of the estimates Not reported		Poor reporting
Intra-observer variability is reported		Minor flaw
with subjective judgment of reliability		minor new
Inter-observer variability is reported	П	Minor flaw
with subjective judgment of reliability	_	
Source to measure exposure (can be	completed for more than one risk facto	
Not reported	П	Poor reporting

Proxy reported (collected for the		Minor flaw	
study) Obtained from medical records		Minorflow	
(mining of data collected for health		Minor flaw	
care purposes)			
Obtained from administrative		Minor flaw	
database (mining of data collected	_		
for health care purposes)			
Definition of the exposure (risk factors	s, independent variables)		
Reference period/length of exposure)			
Reference period/length of exposure not relevant for the nature of			
exposure			
Reference period/length of exposure	П	Minor flaw	
may be relevant but not included in			
definition of the exposure (define			
relevance specific for research			
question)		NAME OF FLOOR	
Reference period/length of exposure different from recommended and		Minor flaw	
not justified			
not justinou			
Interestuda e e			
Intensity/dose Intensity/dose is not relevant for			
exposure			
Intensity/dose can be relevant but not		Minor flaw	
assessed in the study	_		
Measure exposure			
Measure exposure			
Measurements of the exposure (can b	e completed for more than		
	e completed for more than	one risk factor) Poor reporting	
Measurements of the exposure (can b Not reported The authors reported inter-methods	e completed for more than		
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another)	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the	e completed for more than	Poor reporting	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk)	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk)	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables)	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors,	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors,	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variable) in cases and	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors,	e completed for more than	Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls		Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw Major flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls Confounding factors or factors that call the same method of the same methods are different methods.		Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw Major flaw Major flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls Confounding factors or factors that cannot be not controls Confounding factors or factors that cannot be not controls		Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw Major flaw Metween risk factor and disease Poor reporting	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls Confounding factors or factors that can Not reported Major confounding factors/effect		Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw Major flaw Major flaw	
Measurements of the exposure (can be Not reported) The authors reported inter-methods validation (one method vs. another) The authors did not validate the methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variables) Reliability of exposure estimates Not reported Intra-observer variability is reported with subjective judgment of reliability For case-control studies The authors did not state that the same methods were used to measure exposure risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls The authors used different methods to measure exposure (risk factors, independent variable) in cases and controls Confounding factors or factors that cannot be not controls Confounding factors or factors that cannot be not controls		Poor reporting Minor flaw Major flaw Poor reporting Minor flaw Minor flaw Major flaw Metween risk factor and disease Poor reporting	

Measure of confounding factors		
Not reported		Poor reporting
Unknown validity to measure confounding factors		Minor flaw
Non valid methods to measure		Major flaw
confounding factors		Wajor naw
companing factors		
Followup	tt -ff hifi- f	unation)
Loss of followup (acceptable importan Not reported	Cut on can be specific for research qu	Poor reporting
Not applicable (no followup in the		1 doi reporting
study)		
Loss of followup is larger than		
acceptable		
For case-control studies		
Not reported		Poor reporting
% of nonresponse differed among		Minor flaw
cases and controls		
% of nonresponse reported for cases		Minor flaw
only		
Masking of exposure status for investi	gators who measured dependent varia	
Not reported		Poor reporting
Was possible but not obtained		Minor flaw
Statistical analysis		
Not reported	П	Poor reporting
The authors did not obtain methods	П	Major flaw
to reduce bias		major nav
Towns and its (for only out of saling)		
Temporality (for cohort studies) Assessment of temporality		
Not reported	П	Poor reporting
Not reported		1 doi reporting
Appropriateness of statistical model to	roduce receptoh specific bios	
Strategies to reduce research specific	Teduce research specific bias	Poor reporting
bias not reported		1 doi reporting
Authors did not use statistical models	П	Minor flaw
that may be the most appropriate		
according to the published literature		
(examples may include population		
stratification bias in case-control		
studies of genetic association, odds		
ratio in cohort studies of common		
diseases, missing data, large loss of followup)		
Authors did not justify choice of		Minor flaw
statistical models to reduce	П	IVIII OI II AVV
research specific bias		
Authors attempted to reduce bias in	П	Minor flaw
post hoc statistical adjustment		
Dose response with exposure		
Not relevant for research question		
May be relevant but not reported		Poor reporting
- may be relevant but not reported		1 con reporting

Reporting of tested hypothesis

Unclear reporting of the estimates (unclear model, reference level, set of confounding factors)		Poor reporting
Crude estimates		Major flaw
Incomplete selective reporting of the tested hypotheses (compared to aim and objectives)		Minor flaw
Precision of the estimates Numeric value of estimates not reported (p value only, significance or non significance only)		Minor flaw
Mean only reported without p value or variance		Poor reporting
Sample size justification Not reported		Poor reporting
Justification by authors is incomplete or inaccurate		Minor flaw
Post-hoc analyses		Minor flaw
	•	v Validity Report erated based on responses above)
Manuscript:	•	
Manuscript:	•	erated based on responses above) Decision
Manuscript: Reviewer: External Validity	•	erated based on responses above)
Manuscript: Reviewer: External Validity Not reported	•	erated based on responses above) Decision
Manuscript: Reviewer: External Validity Not reported Major flaws	•	Require reporting 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced
Manuscript:	•	Prated based on responses above) Decision Require reporting 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced 2. Reject manuscript 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced
Manuscript:	•	Prated based on responses above) Decision Require reporting 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced 2. Reject manuscript 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced
	•	Prated based on responses above) Decision Require reporting 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced 2. Reject manuscript 1. Require justification that flaws could not be avoided or bias cannot be reduced 2. Reject manuscript 2. Reject manuscript