Methodology Checklist Critical appraisal modified by Methodological Evaluation of Observational Research\(^2\) (MORE, Shamliyan TA, 2013) and the Scottish Intercollegiate Guidelines Network\(^3\) (SIGN, http://www.sign.ac.uk/methodology/checklists.html)

**Project:** Incidence of lower-limb amputations in the diabetic compared to the non-diabetic population: A Systematic Review

**Study** (author, title, year of publication, journal title, pages)

**Section 1: Internal validity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Does this study do it?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes □ No □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Population**

1. The incidence of amputations is a main question of the study
   - Yes □ No □

2. Precise description of the method of estimating the population at risk (diabetic population)?
   - Yes □ No □

3. Precise description of the source of data (survey, diabetes registry, insurance data…)
   - Yes □ No □

4. Was incident diabetes taken into account? (only for diab./non-diab. population)
   - Yes □ No □

5. Precise description of the method of diagnosis of diabetes among patients with amputations?
   - Yes □ No □

6. Precise description of the source diagnosis of diabetes (self-reported, physician DS (ICD), insurance data)
   - Yes □ No □

**Outcome LEAs**

7. Appropriate clinical definition of LEA e.g. re-amputations not appropriate, only tumor or trauma indication clearly excluded…)
   - Yes □ No □

8. Clear description of the definition of anatomical level (minor/major/total amputation)
   - Yes □ No □

   - Yes □ No □

10. Were the estimates for all parameters (IR, RR) with 95% confidence interval reported?
    - Yes □ No □

11. Precise description of calculation of incidence rates concerning study and reference population (reference population/denominator)?
    - Yes □ No □

12. Time trend reporting
    - Yes □ No □

13. Time trends reported using appropriate multivariate regression model
    - Yes □ No □

14. Absolute numbers of cases reported
    - Yes □ No □

15. No. of amputations is not below 10
    - Yes □ No □

16. The potential sources of limitations and bias were mentioned
    - Yes □ No □

**Section 2: OVERALL ASSESSMENT OF THE STUDY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Overall assessment of the methodological quality of this study</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High quality (+++) □ Acceptable (+) □ Low quality (-) □</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

High quality (+++): Majority (13 points or more) of criteria met. Little or no risk of bias. Acceptable (+): Most (8 points or more) of criteria met. Some flaws in the study with an associated risk of bias. Low quality (-): Either most criteria not met, or significant flaws relating to key aspects of study design.