

CASP: QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF COHORT & CASE-CONTROL STUDIES

Adapted from <http://www.casp-uk.net/wp-content/> Yes No, Can't tell

ED attendance

Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate?	Is the population studied appropriate?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled and understandable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-information provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?
Baker ⁷ 2011	YES	YES	YES	YES But only Leicestershire & Rutland	YES Response rate varied median practice response was 47%	YES	Only univariate analysis	YES	YES	NO	YES
Basu ³⁸ 2002	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Begley ³³ 2006	YES	YES	YES	Data from very specific source (safety net hospitals in Houston)	YES Discussion around data source	YES	YES?	YES	YES	YES	YES
Brousseau ²⁷ 2009	YES	YES	YES	YES Children only in Wisconsin area	YES Poor response rate (40%)	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

Brousseau ²⁸ 2007	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES 96% response rate	YES	YES Univariate analysis	YES	YES	NO	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate ?	Is the population studied appropriate ?	Is confoundin g and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequate ly labelled and understa ndable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost- informati on provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?
Burge ²⁹ 2003	YES	YES	YES	YES	Don't know	YES	Yes But univariate analysis only	YES	YES	NO	YES
Christakis ¹⁶ 2001	YES	YES	YES	YES Children only	YES in analysis & discussion	YES	Yes but univariate analysis only	YES	YES	NO	YES
Cheung ^{18,19} 2011 & 2012	YES	YES	YES	YES but US only comparing insurance status	YES	NO No graphs	YES	YES to US	YES	NO But was about insurance status	NO
Cowling ³⁹ 2013	YES	YES	YES	YES	Yes in analysis & discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO
De la Fuente ⁵⁰ 2007	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES Time- series co- integration analysis	YES	YES	NO	YES
Gill ⁵⁴ 2000	YES	YES	YES	YES but only Medicaid population	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

Harris ⁴⁰ 2011	YES	YES	YES	YES but just one inner- London primary care trust	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Hull ⁵⁸ 2000	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO Selective data reported	YES	YES	YES But not all reported	NO	YES
Ionescu ³⁵ 2007	YES	YES	YES	YES But only 65yrs plus patients	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Kronman ⁵⁹ 2008	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate ?	Is the population studied appropriate ?	Is confoundin g and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequate ly labelled and understa ndable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost- informati on provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?
Lowe ⁴³ 2005	YES	YES	YES	YES but only Medicaid enrollees	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Lowe ⁴⁷ 2009	YES	YES	YES	YES but only Medicaid enrollees	YES Described in analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

Ludwick ⁵³ 2009	YES	YES	YES	YES but only pediatric Medicaid enrollees	YES In analysis & discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
McCusker ⁵¹ 2010	YES	YES	YES	YES but only adults with chronic conditions	YES A overall response rate of 76.4% Bias described in analysis & discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
McCusker ⁵² 2012	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES in analysis & discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate ?	Is the population studied appropriate ?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled and understandable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-informati on provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?
Periera ²⁴ 2003	YES	YES	YES	YES for both cases & controls but only adult patients	YES In analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Stern ²⁶ 2009	YES	YES	YES	YES for both cases & controls but only diabetes patients	YES Response rate was 54% In analysis & discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

Sturm ⁴⁴ 2010	YES	YES	YES	Yes but only pediatrics	YES in analysis & discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Thomas ³⁰ 2008	YES	YES	YES	YES but comparing Aboriginal & Torres Strait Islanders with other Australians	YES Briefly in discussion	YES	YES but only univariate	YES	YES	NO	YES
Thompson ³¹ 2010	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES in the discussion	YES	YES Only univariate	YES	YES	NO	YES
Van uden ⁴⁸ 2004	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES in the discussion	YES	YES B&A	YES	YES	NO	YES
Vedsted ⁴⁹ 2001	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES in the discussion	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES

Emergency hospital admissions

Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate?	Is the population studied appropriate?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled and understandable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-information provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?
Bankart ¹⁷ 2011	YES	YES	YES	YES	Response rate was only 44% & there was response rate variation between practices. Test of validity using model on previous yr data	YES	YES	USE	YES	NO	YES
Bottle ²⁵ 2008	YES	YES	YES	YES	No pilot study or validation described	YES Although some data presented as graphs	YES But only univariate analysis	YES	YES but only diabetes	NO	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate?	Is the population studied appropriate?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled and understandable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-information provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?

Carlsen ³⁴ 2007	YES	YES	YES	YES	The patient response rate varied between counties from 52-70% data was lacking from 4/435 municipalities	YES	YES	YES	YES But no physician data	YES	YES
Christakis ¹⁶ 2001	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES Used validated scores for CoC & PCDS	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Downing ⁴² 2007	YES	YES	YES	YES But only 2 PCTs were involved both in the west Midlands, UK	YES In the form of discussion around confounding factors	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Dusheiko ²⁰ 2011	YES	YES	YES	YES	Yes But analysis is at practice level not patient level	YES	YES	YES	YES But only diabetes	YES	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate?	Is the population studied appropriate?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled and understandable?	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of statistical methods, if employed?	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-information provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?

Duffy ³⁶ 2012	YES	YES	YES	YES But study performed in Dundee, Scotland only	YES In the form of discussion around confounding factors	YES	YES	YES (most data involved just one hospital)	YES	NO	YES
Guliford ³⁷ 2002	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES As part of analysis & discussion	YES But only final analysis data given	YES	YES	Selective criteria	NO	YES
Hossain ³⁵ 2009	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES Yes as part of analysis & discussion	YES	spatial structural equation modelling on cross sectional data	YES	YES	NO	YES
Magan ⁴⁵ 2011	YES	YES	YES	YES	Data provided was often incomplete & imprecise It was not possible to distinguish admissions from readmissions	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate?	Is the population studied appropriate?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-information provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?

						and understandable?	statistical methods, if employed?				
Majeed ⁴¹ 2000	YES	YES	YES	YES But study performed in London area only	YES Within multivariate analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Menec ²³ 2006	YES	YES	YES	YES but >67yrs only	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Nolan ⁵⁶ 2011	YES	YES	YES	YES But a very specific population in special situation	YES unique patient identifier not available so could not identify repeat admissions. Used hospital discharge.	YES	YES	YES	NO? Admission related data could also have been correlated e.g. length of stay	NO	YES
Purdy ²¹ 2011a	YES	YES	YES	YES But only asthma & COPD	YES a priori confounders in analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Purdy ²² 2011b	YES	YES	YES	YES But only CHD	YES a priori confounders in analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Ricketts ⁴⁶ 2001	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES As part of analysis	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES
Author year	Is the study relevant to the needs of the project?	Does the paper address a clearly focussed issue?	Is the choice of study method appropriate?	Is the population studied appropriate?	Is confounding and bias considered?	Are tables/ graphs adequately labelled	Are you confident with the authors' choice and use of	Can the results be applied to the local situation?	Were all important outcomes/ results considered?	Is any cost-information provided?	Accept for further use as Type IV evidence?

						and understandable?	statistical methods, if employed?				
Rizza ³⁷ 2007	YES	YES	YES	YES But is a select population	'A random sample of 520 medical records of patients' but 94.6%, response rate. Questionnaire was pretested to improve validity of responses.	YES	YES	YES, but only one hospital	YES	NO	YES
Saxena ⁸ 2006	YES	YES	YES	YES but only London data	YES Analysis at primary care trusts level Some patient registered in one PCT, lives in another Data quality was not validated	YES	YES	YES, but London area only	YES	NO	YES
Solberg ³² 2004	YES	YES	YES	YES USA data	Don't know	YES	YES	YES To the US population	YES But admission related data could also have been	YES	YES

									correlated e.g. length of stay		
									Only diabetes, CHD & depression		