<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Representativeness of the exposed cohort</th>
<th>Selection of the non exposed cohort</th>
<th>Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study</th>
<th>Ascertainment of exposure</th>
<th>Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis</th>
<th>Assessment of outcome</th>
<th>Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur (1 year)</th>
<th>Adequacy of follow up of cohorts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dyrbye / 2010 / 1016</td>
<td>drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort</td>
<td>written self report</td>
<td>study controls for gender / multivariate analysis</td>
<td>follow up rate &lt; 50% and no description of those lost</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kjeldstadli / 2006 / 48</td>
<td>drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort</td>
<td>written self report</td>
<td>study controls for gender / age</td>
<td>subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias (small number lost, &gt; 50% follow up, or description provided of those lost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kötter / 2016 / 646</td>
<td>drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort</td>
<td>written self report</td>
<td>study controls for gender / multivariate analysis</td>
<td>subjects lost to follow up unlikely to introduce bias (small number lost, &gt; 50% follow up, or description provided of those lost)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michalec / 2013 / 89</td>
<td>drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort</td>
<td>written self report</td>
<td>study controls for gender / skin colour, age</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volmer / 2012 / 840</td>
<td>drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort</td>
<td>written self report</td>
<td>study controls for gender / age</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yusoff / 2013 / 39</td>
<td>drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort</td>
<td>written self report</td>
<td>unclear</td>
<td>no</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Representativeness of the exposed cohort**
  - Dyrbey / 2010 / 1016: no description of the derivation of the cohort
  - Kjeldstadli / 2006 / 48: truly representative of the average medical student in the community
  - Kötter / 2016 / 646: somewhat representative of the average medical student in the community
  - Michalec / 2013 / 89: somewhat representative of the average medical student in the community
  - Volmer / 2012 / 840: somewhat representative of the average medical student in the community
  - Yusoff / 2013 / 39: unclear

- **Selection of the non exposed cohort**
  - drawn from the same community as the exposed cohort
  - written self report

- **Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study**
  - no
  - yes

- **Ascertainment of exposure**
  - written self report

- **Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis**
  - study controls for gender / multivariate analysis
  - study controls for gender / age
  - study controls for gender / skin colour, age

- **Assessment of outcome**
  - self report
  - no

- **Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur (1 year)**
  - yes
  - no

- **Adequacy of follow up of cohorts**
  - follow up rate < 50% and no description of those lost
  - complete follow up - all subjects accounted for
  - follow up rate <50% and no description of those lost

- **Follow-up rate <50% and no description of those lost**
  - unlikely to introduce bias (small number lost, > 50% follow up, or description provided of those lost)
  - complete follow up - all subjects accounted for