Assessment of risk of bias

Each study was assessed (by two independent raters) on the following 13 items.

1. The source population is adequately described for key characteristics (choose one of the following possibilities)
   1. A selected sample from the general population
   2. Patients with heart disease
   3. Patients with cancer
   4. Patients with another somatic disorder
   5. Other clearly defined sample
   6. The source population is not clearly described

2. The sampling frame and recruitment are adequately described:
   2(a) The participants are recruited through
      1. the general population (with a clear description of the method)
      2. a medical setting, number of hospitals/institutes
      3. another clearly described method
      4. a method not clearly described
   2(b) The period of inclusion is clearly defined (at least the years are indicated)
      1. True
      2. Not true
   2(c) The geographical location of recruitment is clearly indicated (e.g. the name and city of the hospital, the name of the area)
      1. True
      2. Not true

3. Inclusion and exclusion criteria are clearly described
   1. True
   2. Not true

4. Is the study sample an adequate representation of the target population?
   1. Yes
   2. No

5. The baseline study sample (individuals entering the study) is adequately described for key characteristics
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. Mortality data at follow-up are available for at least 90% of the baseline sample
   1. True
   2. Not true
   3. Unclear

7. Attempts to collect information on participants who dropped out of the study are described
   1. Yes
   2. No drop-out
   3. No
   4. Unclear

8. Reasons for drop-out from baseline to follow-up are provided
   1. Yes
   2. No drop-out
   3. No
   4. Unclear

9. Participants who dropped out are adequately described in terms of key characteristics (including at least the number with depression)
   1. Yes
   2. No drop-out
   3. No
   4. Unclear

10. Mortality
    10(a) It is clearly reported what was done to establish the mortality status of participants
        1. True
        2. Not true
    10(b) The follow-up period for which mortality is measured is clearly described
        1. True
        2. Not true

11. Have the following confounders been measured?
    11(a) Demographic variables
       1. Yes
       2. No
    11(b) One or more lifestyle variables (smoking, body mass index, exercise)
       1. Yes
       2. No
    11(c) One or more illness-related variables (severity of the illness, somatic comorbidity, characteristics of the illness, etc.)
       1. Yes
       2. No

12. Have analyses been conducted to examine the influence of the confounders described in item 11 on the association between depression and mortality (usually through multivariable analyses)?
    1. Yes, all three groups of relevant confounders have been examined in multivariable analyses
    2. One or two groups of confounders have been examined in multivariable analyses
    3. No confounder was included in the analyses
    4. No confounder was reported in question 11

13. The analyses have been conducted adequately. There are two possibilities:
    This is a prospective study in a population. In these studies survival analyses are conducted.
    This is a case–control study. In these studies logistic regression analyses have been conducted.
    Have these analyses been conducted?
    1. Yes
    2. No

Scoring

After the rating the studies were scored on the main five main areas using the following rules.

Study participation (items 1–5)
Does the study sample represent the population of interest on key characteristics, sufficient to limit potential bias to the results?
Yes (5 items are positive)
Partly (3 or 4 items are positive)
No (0–2 items are positive)
Item 1 is positive if one of the answers 1–5 is given (6 is negative)
Item 2 is positive if 2(a) to 2(c) are all positive
Item 3 is positive when 1 is chosen
Item 4 is positive when 1 is chosen
Item 5 is positive when 1 is chosen

Study attrition (items 6–9)
Loss to follow-up (from sample to study population) is not associated with key characteristics (i.e. the study data adequately represent the sample), sufficient to limit potential bias
Yes (4 items are positive)
Partly (2 or 3 items are positive)
No (0 or 1 item is positive)
Item 6 is positive when 1 is chosen
Item 7 is positive when 1 or 2 is chosen
Item 8 is positive when 1 or 2 is chosen
Item 9 is positive when 1 or 2 is chosen

Outcome measurement (item 10)
The outcome of interest is adequately measured in study participants to sufficiently limit potential bias
Yes (2 sub-items are positive)
Partly (1 sub-item is positive)
No (0 sub-item is positive)
Item 10(a) is positive when 1 is chosen
Item 10(b) is positive when 1 is chosen
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Confounding measurement and account (items 11 and 12)
Important potential confounders are appropriately accounted for, limiting potential bias with respect to the prognostic factor of interest
Yes (all three groups of confounders have been measured and accounted for; items 11(a)–(c) are positive and 1 is selected for item 12)
Partly (one or two groups of confounders have been measured and accounted for; at least one of items 11(a)–(c) is positive and 2 is selected for item 12)
No (all other ratings)
Item 11(a) is positive when 1 is chosen
Item 11(b) is positive when 1 is chosen
Item 11(c) is positive when 1 is chosen

Analysis (item 13)
The statistical analysis is appropriate for the design of the study, limiting potential for presentation of invalid results
Yes (adequate analyses)
No
Unsure
Item 13 is positive when 1 is chosen

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study participation</th>
<th>Study attrition</th>
<th>Outcome measurement</th>
<th>Confounding measurement</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>Total quality score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush, 2001</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frasure-Smith, 1995</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fredman, 1989</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallo, 1999</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janzing, 1999</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang, 2001</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorm, 1991</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCusker, 2006</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, 1993a</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, 1993b</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakaya, 2006</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakh, 2008</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penninx, 1999</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pnato, 2005</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovner, 1991</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, 2008</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schiefer, 1999</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, 1998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, 2003</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Ammon, 2001</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tik, 1998</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkley, 2007</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Key: +, positive (score 1); -, negative (score 0); , partly positive (score 0.5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient group</th>
<th>Recruitment</th>
<th>Women %</th>
<th>Depressive disorder</th>
<th>Subthreshold depression</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Follow-up period (years)</th>
<th>Country</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bush, 2001[46]</td>
<td>Myocardial infarction patients</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>MDD (SCID, DSM-III-R)</td>
<td>BDI &gt; 10</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frasure-Smith, 1995[37]</td>
<td>Hospitalised MI patients</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>MDD (DIS)</td>
<td>BDI &gt; 10</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friedman, 1999[38]</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>MDD (DIS, DSM-III)</td>
<td>Minor depression (DIS)</td>
<td>1606</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallo, 1997[39]</td>
<td>Adults (&gt;50 years)</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>MDD (DIS, DSM-III)</td>
<td>Depression with sadness</td>
<td>1612</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janzing, 1999[40]</td>
<td>Dementia patients</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>Depressive disorder (GMS/AGECAT)</td>
<td>Subthreshold depression (GMS/AGECAT)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jiang, 2001[41]</td>
<td>Congestive heart failure patients</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>MDD (DIS)</td>
<td>BDI &gt; 10</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jorm, 1991[42]</td>
<td>Older adults (&gt;70 years)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>MDD (GMS/DSM-III)</td>
<td>Dystrophic mood (GMS)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCusker, 2006[43]</td>
<td>Older medical in-patients (&gt;65 years)</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>MDD (DIS, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>Minor depression (DIS, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, 1993[44]</td>
<td>Stroke patients</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>MDD (PSE/DSM-III)</td>
<td>Minor depression (PSE, DSM-III)</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris, 1993[45]</td>
<td>Stroke patients</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>MDD (CIDI, DSM-III)</td>
<td>Minor depression (CIDI, DSM-III)</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nakaya, 2006[46]</td>
<td>Lung cancer patients</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>MDD (DSM-III, SCID)</td>
<td>POMS-d &gt;7</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>Japan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parakh, 2008[47]</td>
<td>Hospitalised MI patients</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>MDD and dysthymia (SCID, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>BDI &gt; 10</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penninx, 1999[48]</td>
<td>Older adults (55-85 years)</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>MDD (DIS, DSM-III)</td>
<td>CES-D &gt;16</td>
<td>3056</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prieto, 2008[49]</td>
<td>Haematological cancer patients</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>MDD and minor depression (clinical interview, modified DSM-IV)</td>
<td>Minor depression (clinical interview)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rovner, 1991[50]</td>
<td>Nursing home residents</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>Depressive disorder (MAPSE, DSM-III)</td>
<td>Depressive symptoms (MAPSE)</td>
<td>454</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan, 2008[51]</td>
<td>Older adults (&gt;65 years)</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>MDD (DSM-IV, MINI)</td>
<td>CES-D &gt;16</td>
<td>7363</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>France</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlesier, 1989[52]</td>
<td>Patients with MI</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>MDD (RDC criteria)</td>
<td>Minor depression (RDC)</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharma, 1998[53]</td>
<td>Patients with depression compared with subthreshold and people without depression</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>Depressive disorder (GMS/AGECAT)</td>
<td>Subthreshold depression (GMS/AGECAT)</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sullivan, 2003[54]</td>
<td>Patients with stable coronary disease</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>MDD (DIS, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>Minor depression (DIS, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilvis, 1998[55]</td>
<td>Older adults (65, 75, 80, 85 years)</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Depression disorder (interview according to DSM-III)</td>
<td>SDS &gt; 40</td>
<td>1330</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Finland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Von Ammon Cavanaugh, 2001[56]</td>
<td>Medical in-patients</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>MDD (SADS/DSM-IV)</td>
<td>Minor depression (SADS/DSM-IV)</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>NR</td>
<td>Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winkley, 2007[57]</td>
<td>Patients with first diabetic foot ulcer</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>MDD (SCAN, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>Minor depression (SCAN, DSM-IV)</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>UK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AGECAT, Automated Geriatric Examination for Computer Assisted Taxonomy; BDI, Beck Depression Inventory; CES-D, Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression scale; CIDI, Composite International Diagnostic Interview; DIS, Diagnostic Interview Schedule; ECA, Epidemiologic Catchment Area; GMS, Geriatric Mental State; HMO, health maintenance organisation; LASA, Longitudinal Aging Study Amsterdam; MAPSE, Modified Present State Examination; MDD, major depressive disorder; MI, myocardial infarction; MINI, Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview; NR, not reported; POMS-d, Profile of Mood States Depression scale; PSE, Present State Examination; RDC, Research Diagnostic Criteria; SADS, Schedule for Affective Disorders and Schizophrenia; SCAN, Schedules for Clinical Assessment in Neuropsychiatry; SCID, Structured Clinical Interview for DSM; SDS, Self-rating Depression Scale.