## Checklist for evaluation of epidemiological articles

1. What was the aim of the study?
2. Which study design was used? Do you agree with the study design? Is this the most appropriate study design to answer the aim of the study? If not, which study design would you suggest?
3. What's the study population, source population and can it be generalized to a bigger population?
4. How was the study population followed during the study period (if cohort study)?
5. What was the main outcome of the study? How was the outcome defined and measured? How were the following identified or selected:
6. Those having the outcome (“cases” if case-control study)
7. Those not having the outcome (“controls” if case-control study)
8. Which sources of bias might be present regarding the identification of those with the outcome (cases) or without the outcome (controls)? Do the outcome-free accurately reflect the exposure distribution in the study base?
9. How large is the non-participation? Do you have any information about the non-participants? Did the authors provide a flowchart?
10. How can these sources of bias affect the study results (what magnitude and in which direction)?
11. What was the main exposures? How was the exposure measured or estimated?
12. Which sources of bias might be present regarding exposure assessment (differential or non-differential exposure misclassification)?
13. How can these sources of bias affect the study results (what magnitude and in which direction)? Try to assess how common the exposure is in the study base, and whether it is the sensitivity or specificity of the exposure assessment method that is the most important, and what the sensitivity and specificity might be for the exposure assessment method used.
14. Which statistical methods were used? Did the authors mention how missing data was handled? If yes, how?
15. Which method or methods did the authors used to assess potential confounding or effect modification?
16. Which confounders were adjusted for? How were they selected? How were they measured? Would you suspect residual confounding?
17. Are there other potential confounding factors that should have been included? In what direction and in what magnitude would they have affected the results?
18. Did the authors categorize the exposure, confounding or outcome variables? If so, how did they choose the cut points? Do you believe that the choice of cut points might have affected the results?
19. How are the results presented? Is the text, tables and figures clear and easy to interpret? Have they done any selection of what results they are reporting?
20. What were the main findings? Do you agree with the authors' interpretation of the results? What is (if you could find it) the main problem of the study? What would you do differently?