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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Quality score criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td><strong>Case ascertainment</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2 | • Nationwide survey/register/database (not for a specific population)  
    • Multiple institutions/centers |
| 1 | • Regional  
    • Case/death registers  
    • One treatment institution/hospital etc. |
| 0 | • Not specified |
| 2 | **Measurement instrument** |
| 3 | • Interview/self-reported drug use (comment about reporting type, eg. self-report or standardised interview)  
    • In treatment for drug dependence |
| 2 | • Systematic case note/database/reports review  
    • Blood and/or urine toxicology screen |
| 1 | • Chart diagnosis |
| 0 | • Not specified |
| 3 | **Diagnostic criteria** |
| 1 | • Any diagnostic system reported for drug dependence or abuse (not use) eg., DSM, ICD, RDC (comment, eg. DSM)  
    • Dependence inferred from type of sample population (comment, eg. treatment centre) |
| 0 | • Drug use  
    • Own system  
    • Symptoms described  
    • No system  
    • Not specified |
| 4 | **Estimate** |
| 1 | • Yes (comment on what type of estimate, eg. relative risk, SMR, prevalence, incidence) |
| 0 | • No |
5. **Numerator and denominator presented?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. **Numerator and denominator based on identical epochs and identical catchment areas?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. **Completeness of follow-up in cohort studies and response for cross-section studies**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>High response rate/inclusion of defined sample population (&gt;80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1 | Moderate response rate (60% - 79%)
|   | Exclusions made |
| 0 | Poor response rate (<60%) |

8. **Representative of the catchment area?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2 | Well represented
|   | National registers
|   | Multiple institutions across states |
| 1 | Small area
|   | Not representative of nation
|   | One treatment centre
|   | Registers of specific populations, eg. pilots |
| 0 | Convenient sampling
|   | Other (comment) |

9. **Age/sex specific values presented?**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Some (eg. sex and 2 broad age ranges only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. **Quality of methods of reporting**

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Text</td>
<td>Eg. translation of tools, interviewer’s quality, quality control monitoring, limitations of data, high quality methods used etc</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Duration of follow-up

- Eg. Number of years at follow-up – small sample size over a number of years etc.