|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Author, Year  Study Name | Were harms pre-  specified and defined? | Were ascertainment techniques for harms adequately described? | Were ascertainment techniques (outcome measures) for harms equal, valid, and reliable? | Was the duration of followup adequate to assess the outcome? | Does the analysis control for baseline differences between groups? | Does the analysis control for potential confounders? | Was an appropriate method used to handle missing data? | Did the study use appropriate statistical methods? | Quality Rating | Comments |
| Polesky, 1996156 Retrospective cohort  87 | No | No | NR, Unclear | Yes | No; and they had limited information available to determine similarity of groups at baseline | No | NR; for harms information, it is unclear how much missing data there were | Yes | Poor | Retrospective study designed aiming to assess benefits; methods for ascertaining harms not adequately described; high risk of selection bias and confounding  Frequency of harms in no-treatment group was not reported for comparison; some differences in followup for those in the TB clinic |

**Abbreviations:** NR=not reported; TB=tuberculosis.