**S1 Checklist. STROBE guidelines, for reporting cohort studies.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  **Title and abstract** | 1 | (*a*) Indicate the study’s design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract**Yes: *“Psychosocial and socioeconomic determinants of cardiovascular mortality in Eastern Europe: a multicentre prospective cohort study”*** |
| (*b*) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found **Yes** |
| Introduction |
| Background/rationale | 2 | Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported**Yes: *“One weakness is that most evidence comes from the Western world, making it unclear to what extent these findings are generalizable.”*** |
| Objectives | 3 | State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses**1) to investigate the extent to which socioeconomic and psychosocial factors associate with CVD mortality in four Eastern European populations. More specifically:****a) whether these two sets of risk factors are independently associated with CVD;****b) whether psychosocial factors accounted for socioeconomic differences in CVD mortality; and** **c) whether socioeconomic and psychosocial factors help to explain the high rates of CVD mortality in in Russia when compared to populations with lower rates.** |
| Methods |
| Study design | 4 | Present key elements of study design early in the paper **Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| Setting | 5 | Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection **Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| Participants | 6 | (*a*) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up **Yes under “Methods - Participants”**  |
| (*b*)For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed **n/a** |
| Variables | 7 | Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable**Yes under “Methods - Socioeconomic factors” and “Methods - Psychosocial factors”**  |
| Data sources/ measurement | 8\* | For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group**Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| Bias | 9 | Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias. **Yes under “Methods - Statistical analysis” and under Results:** **“*Sensitivity analyses gave similar results when limiting follow-up time to 8 years in all three countries; excluding those participants with less than 2 years of follow-up; excluding imputed data; when using all-cause mortality as the outcome; or when increasing the number of psychosocial/socioeconomic covariates (in model 3) from 6 to all 14 factors (S9-S12 Tables)”*.** |
| Study size | 10 | Explain how the study size was arrived at **Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| Quantitative variables | 11 | Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why **Yes under “Methods”** |
| Statistical methods | 12 | (*a*) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding **yes** |
| (*b*) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions **yes** |
| (*c*) Explain how missing data were addressed ***“Between 0-24% of the data was missing for each variable. This was imputed from 10 multiple imputation models that included vital status, follow-up time and all covariates.”* Sensitivity analyses excluded imputed data.** |
| (*d*) If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed. **Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| (*e*) Describe any sensitivity analyses **yes** |
| Results |
| Participants | 13\* | (a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed **Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage **Yes under “Methods - Participants”** |
| (c) Consider use of a flow diagram **Not done, (as flow is quite simple),** |
| Descriptive data | 14\* | (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders **Yes, table 1** |
| (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest **Yes, table 1** |
| (c) Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount), **yes Table 1 for averages. Totals are given in methods:** ***“Follow up of 8, 9, 7, and 11 years respectively [in the four cohorts analysed]”*.** |
| Outcome data | 15\* | Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time **Yes in abstract:*****“676 participants died from CVD”*** |
| Main results | 16 | (*a*) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included **Yes Figures 3 and 5** |
| (*b*) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized **Yes, boundaries are given in the Methods section.** |
| (*c*) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period.**Deemed to be less relevant, given the large number of estimates presented. Absolute risk estimates are likely to be large.**  |
| Other analyses | 17 | Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses **Yes, S9-S12 Tables.** |
| Discussion |
| Key results | 18 | Summarise key results with reference to study objectives **Yes 1st paragraph of discussion.** |
| Limitations | 19 | Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias **Yes under “Discussion - Strengths and limitations”.** |
| Interpretation | 20 | Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence **Yes under “Discussion - Conclusion”.** |
| Generalisability | 21 | Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results **Not that applicable, since we are testing generalizability in unusual settings. Discussed “Discussion - Comparison with research in Western settings”.**  |
| Other information |
| Funding | 22 | Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based **Yes** |

\*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.