

Table S1. Raters' distribution of outcomes when using two different causality assessment methods.

	Definite	Probable	Possible	Unlikely	Unassessable	Total
Rater 1 – WHO-UMC	3 (14%)	2 (10%)	4 (19%)	8 (38%)	4 (19%)	21
Rater 2 – WHO-UMC	2 (7.7%)	6 (23%)	8 (31%)	7 (27%)	3 (12%)	26
Rater 3 – WHO-UMC	3 (12%)	1 (3.9%)	11 (42%)	8 (31%)	3 (12%)	26
Rater 4 – WHO-UMC	0	2 (8.7%)	7 (30%)	11 (48%)	3 (13%)	23
Subtotal: WHO-UMC	8 (8.3%)	11 (11%)	30 (31%)	34 (35%)	13 (14%)	96
Rater 1 – LCAT	1 (3.7%)	8 (30%)	7 (26%)	9 (33%)	2 (7.4%)	27
Rater 2 – LCAT	0	12 (55%)	2 (9.1%)	8 (36%)	0	22
Rater 3 – LCAT	1 (4.6%)	2 (9.1%)	11 (50%)	4 (18%)	4 (18%)	22
Rater 4 – LCAT	1 (4.0%)	7 (28%)	5 (20%)	11 (44%)	1 (4.0%)	25
Subtotal: LCAT	3 (3.1%)	29 (30%)	25 (26%)	32 (33%)	7 (7.3%)	96
Combined total: WHO-UMC and LCAT methods	11 (5.7%)	40 (21%)	55 (29%)	66 (34%)	20 (10%)	192