Outcomes of quality appraisal, using Newcastle – Ottawa Scale for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analysis

(http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.asp)

Studies could receive between zero and four stars. Bolding indicates which criteria was met.

Borschmann	Cohort
et al. (2017)	***
Selection	1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) truly representative of the average prison population in Qld in the community * b) somewhat representative of the average 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
	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
Duncan et	Cohort
al. (2019)	**
Selection	1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) truly representative of the average population of individuals who are attended by ambulance due to mental health crisis in the community * b) somewhat representative of the average in the community c) selected group of users eg nurses, volunteers d) no description of the derivation of the cohort
	2) <u>Selection of the non exposed cohort</u> 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

Case-control

Selection
1) <u>Is the case definition adequate</u> ?
a) yes, with independent validation $oldsymbol{*}$
b) yes, eg record linkage or based on self reports
c) no description
2) <u>Representativeness of the cases</u>
a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases ★
b) potential for selection biases or not stated
3) <u>Selection of Controls</u>
a) community controls *
b) hospital controls
c) no description
4) <u>Definition of Controls</u>
a) no history of disease (endpoint) *
b) no description of source
Case-control

Selection
1) <u>Is the case definition adequate?</u>
a) yes, with independent validation *
b) yes, eg record linkage or based on self reports
c) no description
2) <u>Representativeness of the cases</u>
a) consecutive or obviously representative series of cases *
b) potential for selection biases or not stated
3) <u>Selection of Controls</u>
$oldsymbol{\cdot}$
a) community controls ☀
b) hospital controls
b) hospital controls
b) hospital controls c) no description

*** 1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) truly representative of the average
a) truly representative of the average
2) Selection of the non exposed cohort 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 *
• •
Cohort
**
a) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) truly representative of the average (describe) in the community * b) somewhat representative of the average individual who experiences police contact due to mental health issue 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 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
a) 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 ★
1 c c

Walter et al.	Cohort
(2019)	***
Selection	1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) truly representative of the average individual who has been a psychiatric inpatient in the community * b) somewhat representative of the average 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 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
	Cohort
Warren et	***
al. (2008)	
Selection	1) Representativeness of the exposed cohort a) truly representative of the average (describe) in the community * b) somewhat representative of the average individual who makes a threat to kill 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 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) <u>Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study</u> a) yes ** b) no