www.nrronline.org

Differences in brain-derived neurotrophic factor gene polymorphisms between acute ischemic stroke patients and healthy controls in the Han population of southwest China

Jie Zhou^{*}, **Meng-Meng Ma^{*}**, **Jing-Huan Fang, Lei Zhao, Mu-Ke Zhou, Jian Guo^{*}**, **Li He^{*}** Department of Neurology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, Chengdu, Sichuan Province, China

Funding: This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 81472162 (to MKZ).

Graphical Abstract



Abstract

Single-nucleotide polymorphisms in the brain-derived neurotrophic factor gene may affect the secretion and function of brain-derived neurotrophic factor, thereby affecting the occurrence, severity and prognosis of ischemic stroke. This case-control study included 778 patients (475 males and 303 females, mean age of 64.0 ± 12.6 years) in the acute phase of ischemic stroke and 865 control subjects (438 males and 427 females, mean age of 51.7 ± 14.7 years) from the Department of Neurology, West China Hospital, Sichuan University, China between September 2011 and December 2014. The patients' severities of neurological deficits in the acute phase were assessed using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale immediately after admission to hospital. The ischemic stroke patients were divided into different subtypes according to the Trial of Org 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment classification. Early prognosis was evaluated using the Modified Rankin Scale when the patients were discharged. Genomic DNA was extracted from peripheral blood of participants. Genotyping of rs7124442 and rs6265 was performed using Kompetitive Allele Specific polymerase chain reaction genotyping technology. Our results demonstrated that patients who carried the C allele of the rs7124442 locus had a lower risk of poor prognosis than the T allele carriers (odds ratio [OR] = 0.67; 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.45–1.00; P = 0.048). The patients with the CC or TC genotype also exhibited lower risk than TT carriers (OR = 0.65; 95% CI: 0.42–1.00; P = 0.049). The AA genotype at the rs6265 locus was associated with the occurrence of ischemic stroke in patients with large-artery atherosclerosis (OR = 0.58; 95% CI: 0.37-0.90; P = 0.015). We found that the C allele (CC and TC genotypes) at the rs7124442 locus may be protective for the prognosis of ischemic stroke. The AA genotype at the rs6265 locus is likely a protective factor against the occurrence of ischemic stroke in patients with large-artery atherosclerosis. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of West China Hospital of Sichuan University, China (approval ID number 2008[4]) on July 25, 2008.

Key Words: nerve regeneration; ischemic stroke; brain-derived neurotrophic factor; single-nucleotide polymorphism; risk; stroke severity; prognosis; rs6265; rs7124442; neural regeneration

Chinese Library Classification No. R446; R741

Introduction

Stroke is a common, frequently occurring disease that seriously harms human health. The results from an epidemiological survey on cerebrovascular diseases in China showed that the age-corrected prevalence, annual incidence and mortality rates of stroke were 1114.8/100,000, 246.8/100,000, and 114.8/100,000, respectively (Wang et al., 2017). Ischemic stroke is the most common type of stroke, accounting for 69.6–77.8% of all stroke cases (Wang et al., 2017). Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) is one of the members of the neurotrophic factor family. Mature BDNF is an alkaline protein with 119 amino acid residues and a relative molecular weight of 14 kDa (Mowla et al., 2001). It is mainly synthesized and secreted by neurons and glial cells in the central nervous system (Mowla et al., 2001; Wurzelmann et al., 2017). There are two secretory modes of BDNF: constitutive release and activity-dependent release (Poo, 2001). In recent years, studies have suggested that BDNF plays important roles in neuroprotection, neuroplasticity and neuroregeneration (Lee et al., 2003; Machaliński et al., 2012; Zhao et al., 2017).

The secretion and functions of BDNF depend on the expression of the BDNF gene. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms are one of the most common types of human genetic variation. Single-nucleotide polymorphisms in the BDNF gene may affect BDNF secretion and/or function, thereby affecting the incidence, severity and prognosis of ischemic stroke (Egan et al., 2003; Orefice et al., 2013; Kotlega et al., 2017). A large number of single-nucleotide polymorphisms in the BDNF gene are known. It has been reported that the mutation at the rs7124442 (C/T) locus in the 3'-untranslated region (3'UTR) of the BDNF gene is associated with the recovery of cognitive functions after traumatic brain injury (Rostami et al., 2011), but few studies on this topic have been published. No studies have reported on the correlation between nucleotide variations at this locus and susceptibility to ischemic stroke, neurological deficits during the acute phase of ischemic stroke and ischemic stroke prognosis. Additionally, rs6265 (A/G) is one of the most studied and most clinically significant single-nucleotide polymorphism loci of the BDNF gene (Kotlega et al., 2017). Rs6265 is a missense mutation located in the exon of the BDNF gene and is present in approximately 30-50% of the population (Shimizu et al., 2004). This mutation of G to A changes the amino acid at position 66 of the BDNF precursor protein (pro-BDNF) from valine to methionine (Val66Met). Although this missense mutation does not affect the function and basic secretion of BDNF, it causes a 25% reduction in the activity-dependent secretion of BDNF (Egan et al., 2003). However, the results from existing clinical studies on the correlations of polymorphism at the rs6265 locus with ischemic stroke susceptibility and prognosis are not entirely consistent (Cramer et al., 2012; Kim et al., 2012, 2013; Zhao et al., 2013; Stanne et al., 2014; Keshavarz et al., 2016). Animal studies have found a decrease in BDNF levels in the central nervous systems of knock-in mice with a BDNF (Met/Met) mutation; this reduction was associated with the severity of motor defects (Qin et al., 2011). However, the rs6265 polymorphism has not been found to be associated with the severity of neurological deficits during the acute phase of ischemic stroke in clinical studies (Zhao et al., 2013; Stanne et al., 2014).

This study investigated the correlations of *BDNF* polymorphism at the rs7124442 locus with the occurrence, severity and prognosis during the acute phase in ischemic stroke patients in the Han population of southwest China. The rs6265 locus was also examined for the presence of the these correlations in ischemic stroke patients.

Participants and Methods Participants

This was a case-control study. Ischemic stroke patients treated and registered at the Department of Neurology in West China Hospital, Sichuan University, China, from September 2011 to December 2014 were recruited. The 2010 China Guidelines for Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute Ischemic Stroke was used as the reference for the diagnostic criteria adopted in this study (Acute Ischemic Stroke Diagnosis and Treatment Writing Group of Cerebrovascular Disease in Neurology Branch of Chinese Medical Association, 2010). Assessments were made by more than two neurologists. These neurologists took part in the study, and were blind to the participants' genotypes. The specific inclusion criteria were as follows: patients aged ≥ 18 years in the Han ethnic population of southwest China; patients who met the ischemic stroke diagnostic criteria and were admitted to hospital within 7 days of disease onset; patients who had ischemic stroke lesions confirmed by computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging; and patients who had new-onset acute ischemic stroke or who had a history of stroke but with no residual dysfunction (score ≤ 1 point on a modified Rankin scale) (Cheng et al., 2014). The exclusion criteria were as follows: subjects with transient cerebral ischemia or hemorrhagic stroke (but not excluding hemorrhagic transformation after ischemic stroke); and subjects with complications of primary subarachnoid hemorrhage, subdural hematoma, cerebrovascular malformations, intracranial venous thrombosis or intracranial tumors. The subjects in the control group were recruited from the Department of Neurology of West China Hospital over the same period. They showed no history of stroke during clinical examination and cerebral infarction lesions in cranial imaging (computed tomography or magnetic resonance imaging). The exclusion criteria of the control group were the same as those of the ischemic stroke group.

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants or their next-of-kin, when participants were unable to communicate or write. The study protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of West China Hospital, Sichuan University, China (approval ID number 2008[4]) on July 25, 2008 (Additional file 1) and conducted in accordance with the ethical guidelines of the 1975 *Declaration of Helsinki*. The study flow chart is shown in Figure 1. This study follows the Standard Protocol Items: STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) guidance for study (Additional file 2).

Collection of clinical information

General clinical information, such as age and sex, along with the assessment of risk factors, including history of hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, atrial fibrillation, smoking and drinking, were collected by neurologists. Ischemic stroke was divided into the following five types according to the Trial of Org 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment (TOAST) classification: large-artery atherosclerosis, cardioembolism, small-artery occlusion, stroke of other determined etiologies and stroke of undetermined etiology (Adams et al., 1993). Meanwhile, the severity of their neurological deficits in the acute phase immediately after admission to the hospital was assessed using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale (NIHSS) (Lyden, 2017). A stroke with an NIHSS score ≤ 6 was considered mild, while a stroke with an NIHSS score \geq 7 was considered severe. Early prognosis was evaluated using Modified Rankin Scale (mRS) scores (Cheng et al., 2014) from ischemic stroke patients when they were discharged. Patients with mRS scores \leq 1 were considered as having good prognoses, while those with mRS scores ≥ 2 were considered as having poor prognoses. The above criteria were employed to remain consistent



Figure 1 Study flow chart.

with the criteria adopted in existing relevant studies on the correlation between *BDNF* single-nucleotide polymorphisms and ischemic stroke to facilitate the comparison of findings from different populations (Zhao et al., 2013; Stanne et al., 2014).

Blood sample collection

Fasting peripheral venous blood samples (5 mL) were collected from superficial veins of the upper extremity at the elbow of each participant in the morning, with ethylenediamine tetraacetic acid as the anticoagulant. The samples were then stored at -20° C for extraction of genomic DNA from whole blood.

Genotyping

Genomic DNA was extracted from peripheral blood using an AxyPrep Blood Genomic DNA Maxiprep Kit (Axygen, Union City, CA, USA). Genotyping of rs7124442 and rs6265 was performed using Kompetitive Allele Specific polymerase chain reaction genotyping technology (LGC Genomics, formerly KBioscience, http://www.lgcgenomics.com/).

Statistical analysis

To compare differences in the clinical backgrounds of the participants, SPSS for Windows (Version 21.0, IBM, Armonk, NY, USA) was employed for chi-square or independent samples t-test analyses. The Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium test was performed using the SHEsis software (Shi and He, 2015). Three common genetic analysis methods (allele frequency, dominance model and recessive model) were used to analyze the correlations between polymorphism of the selected locus and the risk, severity of neurological deficits and early prognosis of ischemic stroke. If "A" represents wild type and "a" represents mutant type, the methods of allele mean participants with the a alleles versus those with the A allele, while the dominance model means aa + Aa versus AA; the recessive model means aa versus Aa + AA. Chi-square testing was employed to analyze the distribution of allele frequencies between the ischemic stroke and control groups. Logistic regression analysis was used in the dominant and recessive models to correct for the relevant risk factors (sex, age, smoking history, history of alcohol consumption, hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia and atrial fibrillation). The three types of analyses described above were performed using PLINK v1.07 (http://pngu.mgh.harvard.edu/purcell/plink/) (Purcell et al., 2007). Values of P < 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

Baseline characteristics of ischemic stroke cases and controls A total of 778 ischemic stroke patients and 865 control participants were included in this study. The comparison of general clinical information between the two groups is shown in **Table 1**. The differences in age and sex were statistically significant between the two groups (P < 0.001). Among the common risk factors for ischemic stroke, the proportions of participants with hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia, atrial fibrillation and history of smoking were significantly higher in the ischemic stroke group than those in the control group (P < 0.001). No significant differences were found in alcohol consumption between the ischemic stroke and control groups (P = 0.132).

The results from the TOAST classification are shown in Table 1. The ischemic stroke group included 281 cases with large-artery atherosclerosis. Statistically significant differences were found in age and sex between the large-artery atherosclerosis group and the control group (P < 0.001). Rates of hypertension, diabetes and history of smoking or drinking were higher in the large-artery atherosclerosis group than in the control group (all P < 0.05). There were 160 cases of cardioembolism in the ischemic stroke group, with a significant difference in age when compared with the control group (P < 0.001). The rates of hypertension, diabetes and atrial fibrillation were all higher in the cardioembolism group than those of the control group (P < 0.001). A total of 210 cases of small-artery occlusion were included in the ischemic stroke group. Significant differences in age (P = 0.002) and sex (P < 0.002) 0.001) were detectable between the ischemic stroke group and the control group (P < 0.01). The rates of hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia and history of smoking were significantly higher in the small-artery occlusion group than in the control group (all *P* < 0.05).

As shown in the analysis of the subtypes of the ischemic stroke group in Table 2, 477 mild stroke patients (61.3%) (NIHSS score \leq 6) and 301 (38.7%) severe stroke patients (NIHSS score \geq 7) were included. No significant differences were observed in sex, age, or rates of hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia or history of drinking or smoking between the two groups (P > 0.05). However, the rate of atrial fibrillation was lower in the mild stroke group than that of the severe stroke group (P < 0.001). There were 189 patients (24.3%) with good prognosis (mRS score ≤ 1 ; good prognosis group) and 589 patients (75.7%) with poor prognosis (mRS score \geq 2; poor prognosis group). These two groups exhibited no significant differences in sex, age, rate of diabetes or hyperlipidemia or history of drinking or smoking (P > 0.05). However, the rate of atrial fibrillation in the good prognosis group was lower than that in the poor prognosis group (P = 0.045). The rate of hypertension was higher in the good prognosis group than in the poor prognosis group (P = 0.022).

	Control	Ischemic stroke								
Characteristic	(n = 865)	Total (<i>n</i> = 778)	Р	LAA $(n = 281) P$		Cardioembolism ($n = 160$) P		SAO (<i>n</i> = 210)	Р	
Age (year)	51.7±14.7	64.0±12.6	< 0.001*	65.1±11.9	< 0.001*	65.2±13.4	< 0.001*	62.4±11.8	0.002^{*}	
Sex (male)	438(50.6)	475(61.1)	< 0.001*	191(68.0)	< 0.001*	76(47.5)	0.466	135(64.3)	$< 0.001^{*}$	
Hypertension	165(19.1)	519(66.7)	< 0.001*	196(69.8)	$< 0.001^{*}$	81(50.6)	$< 0.001^{*}$	167(79.5)	$< 0.001^{*}$	
Diabetes	58(6.7)	248(31.9)	< 0.001*	93(33.1)	< 0.001*	39(24.4)	< 0.001*	81(38.6)	$< 0.001^{*}$	
Hyperlipidemia	89(10.3)	132(17.0)	< 0.001*	46(16.4)	0.06	14(8.8)	0.552	55(26.2)	< 0.001*	
Atrial fibrillation	5(0.5)	141(18.1)	< 0.001*	2(0.7)	0.803	127(79.4)	< 0.001*	2(1.0)	0.545	
Smoking	221(25.5)	268(34.4)	< 0.001*	122(43.4)	< 0.001*	33(20.6)	0.185	77(36.7)	0.001^{*}	
Drinking	160(18.5)	167(21.5)	0.132	69(24.6)	0.027^*	28(17.5)	0.765	47(22.4)	0.200	

Table 1 Baseline characteristics of ischemic stroke cases and controls

LAA: Large-artery atherosclerosis; SAO: small-artery occlusion. Data are expressed as n (percent) with the exception of age. The data for age are expressed as the mean \pm SD. *P < 0.05, vs. control group (chi-square or independent samples *t*-test).

Table 2 Baseline characteristics of ischemic stroke subtypes

	Stroke severity at admission		Acute functional outcome				
Characteristic	$Mild (NIHSS \le 6) (n = 477)$	Severe (NIHSS \geq 7) ($n = 301$)	Р	Good (mRS \le 1) (<i>n</i> = 189)	Р		
Age (year)	63.8±12.3	64.3±12.9	0.569	64.5±12.4	63.9±12.6	0.566	
Sex (male)	297(62.3)	178(59.1)	0.384	118(62.4)	357(60.6)	0.655	
Hypertension	321(67.3)	198(65.8)	0.662	139(73.5)	380(64.5)	0.022^{*}	
Diabetes	163(34.2)	85(28.2)	0.084	59(31.2)	189(32.1)	0.823	
Hyperlipidemia	89(18.7)	43(14.3)	0.114	35(18.5)	97(16.5)	0.514	
Atrial fibrillation	67(14.0)	74(24.6)	< 0.001*	25(13.2)	116(19.7)	0.045^{*}	
Smoking	163(34.2)	105(34.9)	0.839	58(30.7)	210(35.7)	0.211	
Drinking	105(22.0)	62(20.6)	0.64	37(19.6)	130(22.1)	0.467	

Data are expressed as *n* (percent), except age. The data for age are expressed as the mean \pm SD. *P < 0.05 (chi-square or independent samples *t*-test). NIHSS: National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; mRS: Modified Rankin Scale.

Genotype and allele frequency distributions of single-nucleotide polymorphisms in ischemic stroke cases and controls

As shown in **Tables 3** and **4**, in the comparative analysis between the control group and the subtype groups based on TOAST classification in ischemic stroke patients, we performed logistic regression analysis for the rs7124442 locus to correct for potential confounding factors (sex, age, smoking, drinking, hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia and atrial fibrillation), and no correlations were found between the rs7124442 polymorphism and the ischemic stroke subtypes (P > 0.05). However, after logistic regression analysis was performed for the rs6265 locus with the correction of potential confounding factors (sex, age, smoking, drinking, hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia and atrial fibrillation), a negative correlation was found between the AA genotype (recessive model) and the occurrence of ischemic stroke in patients with large-artery atherosclerosis (odds ratio, OR = 0.58; 95% confidence interval, 95% CI: 0.37-0.90; P = 0.015). Polymorphisms at the rs6265 locus were found not to correlate with the risk of ischemic stroke or the incidence of cardioembolism or small-artery occlusion (P > 0.05).

rs7124442 and rs6265 genotypes/allele frequencies

distribution and association with stroke severity at admission The allele and genotype distribution frequencies in the mild and severe stroke groups are shown in **Table 5**. No significant differences were found in allele frequencies at the rs7124442 and rs6265 loci in the intergroup comparison (P > 0.05). Logistic regression analysis revealed that the dominant and recessive models of the rs7124442 and rs6265 loci had no correlation with the severity of the neurological deficits during the acute phase (P > 0.05). Because the distribution frequency of the CC genotype at the rs7124442 locus was zero in the severe stroke group, recessive model analysis was not performed.

rs7124442 and rs6265 genotypes, allele frequency distributions and association with stroke acute functional outcome

The allele and genotype distribution frequencies in the good prognosis group (mRS score ≤ 1) and the poor prognosis group (mRS score ≥ 2) during the acute phase are shown in **Table 6**. In the intergroup comparison between the patients with good prognosis and those with poor prognosis, the risk of poor prognosis was lower in patients who carried a C allele at the rs7124442 locus than in T allele carriers (OR = 0.67; 95% *CI*: 0.45–1.00; P = 0.048). After logistic regression analysis was performed to correct for potential confounding factors (sex, age, smoking, drinking, hypertension, diabetes, hyperlipidemia and atrial fibrillation), the risk was lower in patients with the CC or TC genotype than TT carriers (OR = 0.65; 95% *CI*: 0.42–1.00; P = 0.049).

The allele frequency of rs6265 was not significantly different between the two groups (P > 0.05), and the dominant and recessive models exhibited no correlation with prognosis (P > 0.05).

Zhou J, Ma MM, Fang JH, Zhao L, Zhou MK, Guo J, He L (2019) Differences in brain-derived neurotrophic factor gene polymorphisms between acute ischemic stroke patients and healthy controls in the Han population of southwest China. Neural Regen Res 14(8):1404-1411. doi:10.4103/1673-5374.253525

SNP	Allele/genotype	Ischemic stroke	Control	Chi ² /STAT	OR (95% CI)	Р	
rs6265	A	682(47.4)	709(44.8)	_	_	_	
	G	758(52.6)	873(55.2)	1.96	1.11(0.96-1.28)	^a 0.162	
	AA	153(21.2)	172(21.7)	-	-	-	
	AG	376(52.2)	365(46.1)	_	_	_	
	GG	191(26.5)	254(32.1)	_	_	_	
	Dominant ^b	_	_	0.73	1.11(0.83-1.48)	0.467	
	Model						
	AA+GA						
	GG						
	Recessive ^b	-	_	-1.735	0.75(0.55-1.04)	0.083	
	Model						
	AA						
	GA+GG						
rs7124442	С	126(8.7)	133(8.6)	_	-	-	
	Т	1326(91.3)	1415(91.4)	0.01	1.01(0.78-1.31)	0.924	
	CC	3(0.4)	6(0.8)	-	-	-	
	TC	120(16.5)	121(15.6)	-	-	-	
	TT	603(83.1)	647(83.6)	_	-	-	
	Dominant	-	_	-0.14	0.98(0.69-1.39)	0.89	
	Model						
	CC+TC						
	TT						
	Recessive	_	_	-0.33	0.75(0.14-3.94)	0.739	
	Model						
	CC						
	TC+TT						

Table 3 Genotypes and allele frequencies between ischemic stroke cases and controls

SNP: Single-nucleotide polymorphism; STAT: logistic coefficient t statistic; CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio. ^aChi-square test; ^blogistic regression analyses adjusted on the basis of risk factors such as age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, smoking and drinking.

Table 4 Genotypes and allele frequencies between TOAST subtype and controls

	Allele/ genotype	Control [<i>n</i> (%)]	LAA (<i>n</i> = 281)				Cardioembolism $(n = 160)$				SAO (<i>n</i> = 210)				
SNP			n(%)	Model	Chi²/ STAT	OR (95% CI)	$P^{\rm d}$	n(%)	Chi²/ STAT	OR (95% CI)	P^{d}	n(%)	Chi²/ STAT	OR (95% CI)	P^{d}
rs6265	A	709(44.8)	243(45.8)					149(51.0)				175(46.1)			
	G	873(55.2)	287(54.2)	Allelic ^a	0.17	1.04	0.679	143(49)	3.83	1.28	0.05	205(53.9)	0.19	1.05	0.664
						(0.86–1.27)				(1.00–1.65)				(0.84–1.32)	
	AA	172(21.7)	53(20)	-	-	-	-	31(21.2)	-	-	-	43(22.6)	-	-	-
	AG	365(46.1)	137(51.7)	$\operatorname{Dominant}^{\flat}$	0.12	1.02	0.908	87(59.6)	1.64	2.06	0.102	89(46.8)	-0.08	0.98	0.937
						(0.70-1.50)				(0.87-4.90)				(0.63-1.53)	
	GG	254(32.1)	75(28.3)	Recessive ^b	-2.44	0.58	0.015 ^c	28(19.2)	-0.43	0.83	0.666	58(30.5)	-0.21	0.95	0.833
						(0.37-0.90)				(0.35-1.97)				(0.59–1.53)	
rs7124442	С	133(8.6)	47(8.9)					22(7.5)				35(8.8)			
	Т	1415(91.4)	479(91.1)	Allelica	0.06	1.04	0.808	270(92.5)	0.36	0.87	0.551	363(91.2)	0.02	1.03	0.898
						(0.74-1.48)				(0.54-1.39)				(0.69–1.52)	
	CC	6(0.8)	0	-	-	-	-	0	-	-	-	3(1.5)	-	-	-
	ТС	121(15.6)	47(17.9)	Dominant ^b	0 34	1.08	0.732	22(15.1)	-0.4	0.82	0 691	29(14.6)	-0.37	0.9	0.713
	10	121(15.0)	17(17.5)	Dominant	0.51	(0.69, 1.71)	0.752	22(13.1)	0.1	(0.3, 2, 22)	0.071	29(11.0)	0.57	(0.53, 1.55)	0.715
	TT	(17(02.6)	21((02.1)	D b	NTA	(0.09-1.71)	NTA	124(04.0)	NTA	(0.5-2.22)	NTA	1(7(92.0)	1.20	(0.55-1.55)	0.200
	11	047(83.6)	210(82.1)	Recessive	INA	INA	INA	124(84.9)	INA	INA	INA	107(83.9)	1.26	5.15 (0.53–18.55)	0.209

SNP: Single-nucleotide polymorphism; LAA: large-artery atherosclerosis; SAO: small artery occlusion; STAT: logistic coefficient *t* statistic. ^aChisquare test; ^bLogistic regression analyses adjusted on the basis of risk factors such as age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, smoking, and drinking; ^cindicates significant differences at P < 0.05; ^dStroke TOAST subtype cases *vs.* control group. Data of control group are the same as in **Table 3**.

SNP	Allele/genotype	Mild (NIHSS ≤ 6) ($n = 477$)	Severe (NIHSS \geq 7) (n = 301)	Chi ² /STAT	OR (95% CI)	Р
rs6265	А	419(47.3)	263(47.5)	_	_	_
	G	467(52.7)	291(52.5)	0.005	1.01(0.81-1.25)	0.946 ^a
	AA	98(22.1)	55(19.9)	_	-	_
	AG	223(50.3)	153(55.2)	_	_	_
	GG	122(27.5)	69(24.9)	_	_	_
	Dominant ^b	_	_	0.45	1.08(0.76-1.54)	0.652
	Model					
	AA+GA					
	GG					
	Recessive ^b	_	_	-0.79	0.86(0.59-1.25)	0.431
	Model					
	AA					
	GA+GG					
rs7124442	С	77(8.6)	49(8.8)	_	-	-
	Т	819(91.4)	507(91.2)	0.02	1.03(0.71-1.50)	0.885
	CC	3(0.7)	0(0.00)	_	-	-
	TC	71(15.8)	49(17.6)	_	-	_
	TT	374(83.5)	229(82.4)	_	_	_
	Dominant	_	_	0.43	1.09(0.73-1.64)	0.665
	Model					
	CC+TC					
	TT					
	Recessive	_	_	NA	NA	NA
	Model					
	CC					
	TC+TT					

SNP: Single-nucleotide polymorphism; NIHSS: National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale; STAT: logistic coefficient t statistic; CI: confidence interval; OR: odds ratio. ^aChi-square test; ^blogistic regression analyses adjusted on the basis of risk factors such as age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, smoking and drinking.

Table 6 Genotype and allele frequency distributions and association with acute functional outcom	e
--	---

SNP	Allele/genotype	Good (mRS ≤ 1) ($n = 189$)	Poor (mRS \ge 7) ($n = 589$)	Chi ² /STAT	OR (95% CI)	Р
rs6265	А	158(44.9)	524(48.2)	_	_	_
	G	194(55.1)	564(51.8)	1.14	1.14(0.90-1.45)	0.285 ^a
	AA	35(19.9)	118(21.7)	_	-	_
	AG	88(50.0)	288(52.9)	_	-	_
	GG	53(30.1)	138(25.4)	_	-	_
	Dominant ^b	-	-	1.26	1.28(0.87–1.88)	0.209
	Model AA+GA GG					
	Recessive ^b Model A A	_	-	0.64	1.15(0.75–1.76)	0.525
	GA+GG					
rs7124442	С	40(11.2)	86(7.8)	_	_	-
	Т	316(88.8)	1010(92.2)	3.9	0.67(0.45-1.00)	0.048°
	CC	1(00.6)	2(0.4)	_	-	_
	TC	38(21.3)	82(15.0)	_	-	_
	TT	139(78.1)	464(84.7)	-	-	_
	Dominant CC+TC	-	-	-1.97	0.65(0.42-1.00)	0.049 ^c
	Recessive CC TC+TT	_	-	-0.32	0.67(0.06–7.68)	0.746

SNP: Single-nucleotide polymorphism; mRS: Modified Rankin Scale; STAT: logistic coefficient *t* statistic; *CI*: confidence interval; *OR*: odds ratio. ^aChi-square test; ^blogistic regression analyses adjusted on the basis of risk factors such as age, sex, hypertension, hyperlipidemia, diabetes, atrial fibrillation, smoking and drinking; ^cIndicates significant differences at P < 0.05.

Discussion

In this study, for the first time, we studied the correlations between polymorphism at the *BDNF* rs7124442 (C/T) locus and acute ischemic stroke. We discovered that patients carrying a C allele at the rs7124442 locus showed a lower risk for poor prognosis than T allele carriers (OR = 0.67; 95% *CI*: 0.45–1.00; P = 0.048). Additionally, the risk of poor prognosis in carriers of the CC or TC genotype (dominant model) was significantly lower than that in the carriers of the TT genotype (OR = 0.65; 95% *CI*: 0.42–1.00; P = 0.049). We also found a correlation between the AA genotype (recessive model) at the rs6265 locus of the *BDNF* gene and the incidence of ischemic stroke in patiants with large-artery atherosclerosis (OR = 0.58; 95% *CI*: 0.37–0.90; P = 0.015).

The rs7124442 (C/T) locus is in the long 3'UTR of the *BDNF* gene. This untranslated sequence is immediately adjacent to the coding sequence in the mRNA and plays important roles in the post-transcriptional regulation of genes, such as involvement in mRNA transport and translation efficiency (Mignone et al., 2002). A study has shown that variations of polymorphisms at the rs7124442 (C/T) locus are associated with cognitive recovery after traumatic brain injury (Rostami et al., 2011), but there are still relatively few studies on this topic. No studies have reported on the correlation between polymorphisms at this locus with ischemic stroke susceptibility, neurological deficits during the acute phase and prognosis.

We are the first to study the correlation between polymorphism at the rs7124442 locus and acute ischemic stroke. The 3'UTR plays important regulatory roles in the transcription and translation of genes. Two studies found no significant associations between the rs7124442 (C/T) locus and BDNF levels (Hohenadel et al., 2014; Failla et al., 2016). However, one study found that rs7124442 in the long 3'UTR inhibited dendritic localization of *BDNF* mRNA (Orefice et al., 2013). Further mechanistic studies are needed to clarify how rs7124442 (C/T) locus polymorphism can influence the prognosis of stroke. No correlation was found between rs7124442 and ischemic stroke susceptibility and the severity of neurological deficits during the acute phase.

In this study, only the AA genotype (recessive model) at the rs6265 locus of the *BDNF* gene was negatively correlated with the occurrence of ischemic stroke in patients with large-artery atherosclerosis (OR = 0.58; 95% CI: 0.37-0.90; P = 0.015). This finding is not consistent with the results of previous studies. Zhao et al. (2013) found a correlation between the AA genotype of the rs6265 locus and the incidence of ischemic stroke, but no such correlation in subtype analyses. Additionally, in an Iranian population, Keshavarz et al. (2016) found that the GA or GG genotypes at the rs6265 locus are associated with the incidence of ischemic stroke. This discrepancy is likely due to different the populations included in these studies. This study only included the Han population in southwest China, while the population studied by Zhao et al. (2013) was mainly from the Shanghai area.

Other research has shown that BDNF may be associated with neurological deficits in the central nervous system. For example, Qin et al. (2011) found that knock-in mice with a *BDNF* mutation (Met/Met) had reduced *BDNF* levels in the central nervous system when compared with wild-type mice (Val/Val); this reduction was associated with motor function

1410

impairment severity. However, no correlations were found between the rs6265 polymorphism and the severity of neurological deficits during the acute phase of ischemic stroke in our study. In fact, this finding is consistent with the results from previous clinical studies in China and other countries (Zhao et al., 2013; Stanne et al., 2014). However, this finding is not consistent with the results of animal studies by Qin et al. (2011), though the reasons for this inconsistency require further investigation. One possible reason is that the factors affecting the severity of neurological deficits in the human body are more diverse than those in an animal ischemic stroke model and that the interactions between these factors are more complex.

When ischemic stroke prognosis was assessed using mRS scores, the current findings on the rs6265 polymorphism and prognosis were not consistent. In this study, the rs6265 polymorphism was not found to be associated with early ischemic stroke prognosis. Furthermore, no correlations were found between the rs6265 polymorphism and the prognosis of ischemic stroke patients in populations from Europe and the US (Cramer et al., 2012; Stanne et al., 2014). However, a study in the Korean population showed that the rs6265 polymorphism was not associated with prognosis at 30 days after ischemic stroke, but was associated with prognosis at 90 days after ischemic stroke (Kim et al., 2013). In another study of the Korean population, rs6265 polymorphism was found to be associated with poor prognosis at 14 days and 1 year after ischemic stroke (Kim et al., 2012). In the Chinese population, Zhao et al. (2013) found that the AA genotype was associated with poor prognosis at 90 days after ischemic stroke. The differences in these findings suggest that the rs6265 polymorphism exhibits differences in different races. Therefore, our results require further confirmation in different races with large samples.

There are some limitations in this study. First, this study is a single-center study with a small sample size. The patients showed significant differences in age and sex when compared with the control group. Our results need further confirmation through multi-center studies of larger sample sizes matched in sex and age, because ischemic stroke is a complex disease that has a high incidence and is influenced by multiple gene interactions, the environment, and lifestyle. Second, this study only included the Han population in southwestern China, and its findings need to be further verified in different ethnic populations in different regions. Third, only two hotspot single-nucleotide polymorphisms of the BDNF gene were selected in this study, and the correlations between ischemic stroke and other BDNF single-nucleotide polymorphisms should be elucidated in subsequent studies to further clarify the relationship between the BDNF gene and ischemic stroke. Finally, this study included patients with ischemic stroke within 7 days of onset; the NIHSS score was assessed on the day of admission to assess the severity of neurological deficits, and the mRS score was evaluated on the day of discharge for early prognosis. Therefore, the two assessments of the patients may not be on the same timeline. Additionally, the observation period for ischemic stroke prognosis was short. The correlations between BDNF gene polymorphisms and long-term ischemic stroke prognosis should be further observed in follow-up studies.

For the first time, we discovered that the C allele (CC or TC genotypes) at the rs7124442 locus is likely a protective factor

for ischemic stroke prognosis. We also found that the AA genotype of rs6265 is possibly a protective factor for the occurrence of ischemic stroke in patients with large-artery atherosclerosis. The mechanisms underlying the above observations should be further verified in subsequent studies.

Author contributions: *Study design, data analysis and interpretation, experimental implementation, and manuscript writing: JZ and MMM; experimental implementation and statistically analysis: JHF; data collection and experimental implementation: LZ; data collection: MKZ; study design and manuscript revision critically for important intellectual content: JG and LH. All authors approved the final version of the paper.*

Conflicts of interest: The authors declare that there is no conflict of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Financial support: The study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China, No. 81472162 (to MKZ). The funding body played no role in the study design, in the collection, analysis and interpretation of data, in the writing of the paper, or in the decision to submit the paper for publication.

Institutional review board statement: This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of West China Hospital, Sichuan University, China (approval No. 2008(4)) on July 25, 2008. The study was performed in accordance with the relevant laws and regulations of the Declaration of Helsinki, and the hospital's relevant ethical principles.

Declaration of patient consent: The authors certify that they obtained patients' or their guardians' consent forms. In the forms, patients or their guardians have given their consent for the patients' images and other clinical information to be reported in the journal. The patients or their guardians understand that the patients' names and initials will not be published and due efforts will be made to conceal their identity.

Reporting statement: This study followed the STrengthening the Reporting of OBservational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement.

Biostatistics statement: The statistical methods of this study were reviewed by the biostatistician of West China Hospital of Sichuan University, China.

Copyright license agreement: The Copyright License Agreement has been signed by all authors before publication.

Data sharing statement: Individual participant data that underlie the results reported in this article, after deidentification (text, tables, figures, and appendices) will be in particular shared. Study protocol and informed consent form will be promulgated within 6 months after the completion of the trial. Anonymized trial data will be available indefinitely at www.figshare.com. Plagiarism check: Checked twice by iThenticate.

Peer review: Externally peer reviewed.

Open access statement: This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

Open peer reviewer: Clarissa Cavarsan, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Brazil.

Additional files:

Additional file 1: Ethics committee approval (Chinese). Additional file 2: STROBE checklist.

References

- Acute Ischemic Stroke Diagnosis and Treatment Writing Group of Cerebrovascular Disease in Neurology Branch of Chinese Medical Association (2010) The 2010 China Guidelines for Diagnosis and Treatment of Acute Ischemic Stroke. Zhonghua Shenjing Ke Zazhi 43:146-153.
- Adams HP Jr, Bendixen BH, Kappelle LJ, Biller J, Love BB, Gordon DL, Marsh EE 3rd (1993) Classification of subtype of acute ischemic stroke. Definitions for use in a multicenter clinical trial. TOAST. Trial of Org 10172 in Acute Stroke Treatment. Stroke 24:35-41.
- Cheng B, Forkert ND, Zavaglia M, Hilgetag CC, Golsari A, Siemonsen S, Fiehler J, Pedraza S, Puig J, Cho TH, Alawneh J, Baron JC, Ostergaard L, Gerloff C, Thomalla G (2014) Influence of stroke infarct location on functional outcome measured by the modified rankin scale. Stroke 45:1695-1702.
- Cramer SC, Procaccio V, GAIN Americas, GAIN International Study Investigators (2012) Correlation between genetic polymorphisms and stroke recovery: analysis of the GAIN Americas and GAIN International Studies. Eur J Neurol 19:718-724.
- Egan MF, Kojima M, Callicott JH, Goldberg TE, Kolachana BS, Bertolino A, Zaitsev E, Gold B, Goldman D, Dean M, Lu B, Weinberger DR (2003) The BDNF val66met polymorphism affects activity-dependent secretion of BDNF and human memory and hippocampal function. Cell 112:257-269.

- Failla MD, Conley YP, Wagner AK (2016) Brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) in traumatic brain injury-related mortality: interrelationships between genetics and acute systemic and central nervous system BDNF profiles. Neurorehabil Neural Repair 30:83-93.
- Hohenadel MG, Thearle MS, Grice BA, Huang H, Dai MH, Tao YX, Hunter LA, Palaguachi GI, Mou Z, Kim RC, Tsang MM, Haack K, Voruganti VS, Cole SA, Butte NF, Comuzzie AG, Muller YL, Baier LJ, Krakoff J, Knowler WC, et al. (2014) Brain-derived neurotrophic factor in human subjects with function-altering melanocortin-4 receptor variants. Int J Obes (Lond) 38:1068-1074.
- Keshavarz P, Saberi A, Sharafshah A, Asgari K, Rezaei S (2016) Association of BDNF G196A gene polymorphism with ischemic stroke occurrence and its 6-month outcome in an Iranian population. Top Stroke Rehabil 23:254-260.
- Kim JM, Stewart R, Park MS, Kang HJ, Kim SW, Shin IS, Kim HR, Shin MG, Cho KH, Yoon JS (2012) Associations of BDNF genotype and promoter methylation with acute and long-term stroke outcomes in an East Asian cohort. PLoS One 7:e51280.
- Kim WS, Lim JY, Shin JH, Park HK, Tan SA, Park KU, Paik NJ (2013) Effect of the presence of brain-derived neurotrophic factor val(66)met polymorphism on the recovery in patients with acute subcortical stroke. Ann Rehabil Med 37:311-319.
- Kotlęga D, Peda B, Zembroń-Łacny A, Golab-Janowska M, Nowacki P (2017) The role of brain-derived neurotrophic factor and its single nucleotide polymorphisms in stroke patients. Neurol Neurochir Pol 51:240-246.
- Lee SH, Han JH, Choi JH, Huh EY, Kwon YK, Kaang BK (2003) The effect of brain-derived neurotrophic factor on neuritogenesis and synaptic plasticity in Aplysia neurons and the hippocampal cell line HiB5. Mol Cells 15:233-239.
- Lyden P (2017) Using the National Institutes of Health Stroke Scale: a cautionary tale. Stroke 48:513-519.
- Machaliński B, Lażewski-Banaszak P, Dąbkowska E, Paczkowska E, Gołąb-Janowska M, Nowacki P (2012) The role of neurotrophic factors in regeneration of the nervous system. Neurol Neurochir Pol 46:579-590.
- Mignone F, Gissi C, Liuni S, Pesole G (2002) Untranslated regions of mRNAs. Genome Biol 3:REVIEWS0004.
- Mowla SJ, Farhadi HF, Pareek S, Atwal JK, Morris SJ, Seidah NG, Murphy RA (2001) Biosynthesis and post-translational processing of the precursor to brain-derived neurotrophic factor. J Biol Chem 276:12660-12666.

Orefice LL, Waterhouse EG, Partridge JG, Lalchandani RR, Vicini S, Xu B (2013) Distinct roles for somatically and dendritically synthesized brain-derived neurotrophic factor in morphogenesis of dendritic spines. J Neurosci 33:11618-11632.

- Poo MM (2001) Neurotrophins as synaptic modulators. Nat Rev Neurosci 2:24-32. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MA, Bender D, Maller J, Sklar P, de Bakker PI, Daly MJ, Sham PC (2007) PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-based linkage analyses. Am J Hum Genet 81:559-575.
- Qin L, Kim E, Ratan R, Lee FS, Cho S (2011) Genetic variant of BDNF (Val66Met) polymorphism attenuates stroke-induced angiogenic responses by enhancing anti-angiogenic mediator CD36 expression. J Neurosci 31:775-783.
- Rostami E, Krueger F, Zoubak S, Dal Monte O, Raymont V, Pardini M, Hodgkinson CA, Goldman D, Risling M, Grafman J (2011) BDNF polymorphism predicts general intelligence after penetrating traumatic brain injury. PLoS One 6:e27389.
- Shi YY, He L (2005) SHEsis, a powerful software platform for analyses of linkage disequilibrium, haplotype construction, and genetic association at polymorphism loci. Cell Res 15:97-98.
- Shimizu E, Hashimoto K, Iyo M (2004) Ethnic difference of the BDNF 196G/A (val66met) polymorphism frequencies: the possibility to explain ethnic mental traits. Am J Med Genet B Neuropsychiatr Genet 126B:122-123.
- Stanne TM, Tjarnlund-Wolf A, Olsson S, Jood K, Blomstrand C, Jern C (2014) Genetic variation at the BDNF locus: evidence for association with long-term outcome after ischemic stroke. PLoS One 9:e114156.
- Wang W, Jiang B, Sun H, Ru X, Sun D, Wang L, Wang L, Jiang Y, Li Y, Wang Y, Chen Z, Wu S, Zhang Y, Wang D, Wang Y, Feigin VL (2017) Prevalence, incidence, and mortality of stroke in China: results from a nationwide population-based survey of 480 687 adults. Circulation 135:759-771.
- Wurzelmann M, Romeika J, Sun D (2017) Therapeutic potential of brain-derived neurotrophic factor (BDNF) and a small molecular mimics of BDNF for traumatic brain injury. Neural Regen Res 12:7-12.
- Zhao H, Alam A, San CY, Eguchi S, Chen Q, Lian Q, Ma D (2017) Molecular mechanisms of brain-derived neurotrophic factor in neuro-protection: Recent developments. Brain Res 1665:1-21.
- Zhao J, Wu H, Zheng L, Weng Y, Mo Y (2013) Brain-derived neurotrophic factor G196A polymorphism predicts 90-day outcome of ischemic stroke in Chinese: a novel finding. Brain Res 1537:312-318.

P-Reviewer: Cavarsan C; C-Editor: Zhao M; S-Editors: Yu J, Li CH; L-Editors: Brooks W, Qiu Y, Song LP; T-Editor: Liu XL

STROBE Statement-checklist of items that should be included in reports of observational studies

Please fill out the page numbers on this form and upload the file as a supplemental file when you submit your revision

Manuscript 1

Indicate page number ↓ (Or n/a if not applicable)

International probability of a second seco		Item	Decommon detion	
number of the second state is not been streng of the second state is an end of the second state is a second streng of the second state is a second streng of the second state is a second streng of the second streng of	Title and obstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the shotmat	1
Implementation of the structure of a number of status and number of status and status a	The and abstract	1	(a) indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title of the abstract	
Introduction 2 Epidain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported (mathef{intermative}) Objectives 3 State specific objectives, including any perspecified hypothesis (mathef{intermative}) (mathef{intermative}) Study during 4 Possel we glements of indup during narby in the paper (mathef{intermative}) (mathef{intermative}) Study during 4 Possel we glements of indup during narby in the paper (mathef{intermative}) (mathef{intermative}) Study during 6 (<i>ioCobort stud</i>)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of sclection of participants. Describe (mathef{intermative}) Participants 6 (<i>ioCobort stud</i>)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of cale as certainment and control (mathef{intermative}) Participants Crear sociand mathefficienticity, reportering, and the sources and methods of cale as certainment and control (mathef{intermative}) Variable 7 Clearly during of timese, reporters, posterior, posteri			(b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found	
Biological probability of the section of static text framework the investigation being reported. Image: Constraint text framework t	Introduction			
Objectives Total specific objectives, including any properiability objectses Image: Control objectives, including any properiability of the paper Standy design 4 Pescent key clanates of study design only in the paper Image: Control objectives, including periods of recentiment, exposure, failtweeup, and data collaction Standy design 6 (i) Cohort study—Circe the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up. Participants 6 (i) Cohort study—Circe the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Participants 7 Clanaty description, Circe the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Participants 7 Clanaty description, Circe the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Participants 7 Cleanty define all noticonces, seporates, predictive, potential confiscutes, and eliter mediters. Give diagnostic enterint, if applicable Variables 7 Cleanty define all noticonces, seporates, predictive, potential confiscutes, and eliter mediters. Give diagnostic enterint, if applicable eliteristic in the dots in the objective of this Statistical methods 9 Pescription flow quantitative variables were khannel group Bas 9 Descheche all matterios predin stow sost of four-objeca	Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported	
Method: Formal source Instance Sudy decign 4 Person key cleance of sudy design early in the paper Image: Super Sup	Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses	
Study decision 4.4 Precisc key elements of study decign early in the paper (1) Setting 2 Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection (2) Paricipants 4 (2) Colour study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up. (2) Paricipants 4 (2) Colour study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe methods of follow-up. (2) Variables Conv control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and he number of controls per cose criteria, if applicable (2) Variables 7 Clearly define all studenes, exposures, predictions, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable (2) Data sources/ 8 7 Clearly define all studenes, potential control on group (2) Study size 10 Explain how quantitary variables of interest, give sources of has (2) Statistical methods 11 Explain how quantitary variables of follow-up, and and selestical or control for contronding (2) Statistical methods 11 Explain how quantatrice variables of follow-up was addreseed	Methods			
Setting 5 Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recritiment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection Participants 6 (a) Color andyGive the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe in methods of follow-up. Participants (a) Color andyGive the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Participants (b) Color andyGive the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Participants (c) Color andyGive the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Variables (c) Color andyGive the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Variables 7 (c) Color andyGive matched studies, give matching criteria and he number of cornots per case. Variables 7 (c) Color andyGive matched studies, give matching criteria and number of cornots. Statistical methods 7 (c) Color andy-Give the adjustication of participants. Maria 7 (c) Color andy-Give the adjustication controls on cornot files. Give diagonstic. Statistical methods 7 (c) Color andy-Give the adjustication controls on cornot files. Give the adjustication controls on cornot files. Statis icical relations in adjustical methods in the an	Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper	
Image: Probability of a section of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe and the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe and the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe and the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Construction of the clightly criteria and number of exposed and unexposed. Construction of the clightly criteria and number of exposed and unexposed. Construction of the clightly	Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data	
Parkipuns 6 (a Color and)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of electricity of parkiepans. Describe include of the decisity distribution of parkiepans. Describe include of the decisity distribution of parkiepans. Parkiepans Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Consecutor stand) Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Consecutor stand) Variables Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Variables Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Variables Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Variables Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Variables Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Variables Consecutor stand)—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of parkiepans. Variables Consecutor stand) Consecutor stand) Variables Consecutor stand stand selection of thene so			collection	
Image: Section Construction of the section of the sectin the sectin section of the section of the section of the secti	Participants	6	(a) Cohort study-Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants. Describe	
Reserver and study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of sease scrutulment and control Selection, Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls Consome study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participans Go (born study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participans Go (born study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of costools per case Case-coartel study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of contools per case Case-coartel study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of contools per case Case-coartel study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of contools per case Case-coartel study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of contools per case Case-coartel study—for study cases sneer theologi of the size sneer thom one group Case-coartel study size sources of thiss Case-coartel study size sources of thiss Spatis for quantifier to stady size sources of thiss Case-coartel study—for study size sources of thiss Case-coartel study—for spatistical methods, including those used to coarter for conformating Case-coartel study—for applicable, explain how matching of cases and counsils and affersed Case-coartel study—for applicable, explain how matching of cases and counsils and affersed Case-coartel study—for applicable, explain how matching of cases and counsils and affersed Case-coartel study completing follow-up, and analysed Case-coartel			methods of follow-up	
Results selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls Constructional study—Give the alightify criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (a) Color study—Give the alightify criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (a) (b) Color study—Give the alightify criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants (a) Variables 7 Clarty define al outcomes, exposures, proteintia conformader, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic (a) Nation correction 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe (a) Station correction 9* Describe any efforts to address optiential sources of bis (a) Statis correction 10 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen (a) Statis correction 10 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe handle groupings were chosen (a) Statis correction 10 (a) Color study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed (a) (a) Color study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed (a) (a) (b) Color study—If applicable			Case-control study-Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of case ascertainment and control	
Process sectional study—Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants ()) (b) Colour study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case ()) Variables () Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential conformed, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic erriteria, if applicable ()) Data sources/ () () Constrability of assessment methods if there is more than one group ()) Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias ()) ()) Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at ()) ()) Quantitive variable () ()) ()) ()) ()) Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at ()) ()) ()) Quantitive variable () ()) ()) ()) ()) ()) Statistical methods 12 ()) ()) ()) ()) ()) Quantitive variable ()) ()) ()) ()) ()) ()) Statistical methods			selection. Give the rationale for the choice of cases and controls	
initial section independence of the static section is and provide section is and provide static section is and provide second provide second static section is and provide second static se			Cross-sectional study-Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants	
Image: Section of andy—Formatched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case Image: Section of andy define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic Variables Pro For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe Data sources/ Pro For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe Bias 9 For each variable of interest, give sources of bias Image: Source of the source of bias Study size 10 Explain how the study size was revied at Image: Source of the source of bias Quantitative variable 11 Explain how the study size was revied at Image: Source of the source of bias Study size 10 Explain how the study size was revied at Image: Source of the source of bias Study size 10 Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: Source of the source of source of the source of source of the source of source			(b) Cohort study-For matched studies, give matching criteria and number of exposed and unexposed	
Variables 2 Clardy define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic citieria, if applicable Data sources/ 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 Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 9.0 Excitine any efforts to address potential sources of bias Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Quantitative variables Explain how the study size was arrived at Image: Comparability of assessment methods, including those used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods, including those used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods, including those used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods, including those used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods and the analytical methods king account of assessment methods and the analytical methods taking account of sub addressed Image: Comparability of assessment methods and the analytical methods king account of sub addressed Image: Comparability of analytical methods king account of sub addressed Image: Comparability of analytical methods king account one sub addressed Image: Comparabili			Case-control study—For matched studies, give matching criteria and the number of controls per case	
Image: second state Image: second state Image: second state Image: second state Data sources/ 8* For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe measurement) Image: second state Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Image: second state Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at Image: second state Quantituitive variables 1 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses, If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Study size 10 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses, If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Study size 10 Scond study-ut analyses was arrived at Autostical methods 1 1 Autostical mow missing data were addressed 1 (2) Explain how missing data were addressed 1 (3) Cohort study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed 1 (3) Cohort study-If applicable, explain how matching account of sampling strategy 1 (4) Cohort study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed 1 (5) Conscient us of a flow diagram 1 Participants 1 1 (6) Conorater user of individuals at each stage of study-eq numb	Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic	
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 Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 90 Explain how the study size was arrived at Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Quantitative variables 11 Explain how the study size was arrived at Image: Comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Statistical methods 11 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment methods used to control for confounding Image: Comparability of assessment metholes use			criteria, if applicable	
measurement image: comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group image: comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Image: comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group Image: comparability of assessment methods in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Image: comparability of assessment methods including those used to control for confounding Image: comparability of assessment methods including those used to control for confounding Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment methods used to examine subgroups and interactions Image: comparability of assessment and comparability analyses Image: comparability of assessment andinteractions of assessment	Data sources/	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe	
Bias 9 Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias Study size 10 Explain how the study size was arrived at Quantitative variables 11 Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why Statistical methods 12 (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed (c) Describe any sensitivity analyses Results (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 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram (d) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) Outcome data 11* (a) Give characteristics of study participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Summaris follow-up time	measurement		comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group	
Study size10Explain how the study size was arrived at11Quantitative variables11Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and whyStatistical methods12(a) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions12(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions12(c) Explain how missing data were addressed12(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed12(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Cross-sectional study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Cross-sectional study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed (c) Describe any sensitivity analysesResults13*(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 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram14*Descriptive data14* (c) Indicate number of outcipants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcipants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcine events or summary measures of exposure (c) Consider use of a participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures o	Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias	
Conception Concept	Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at	
Quantitative variances 11 Column trave variances well variance variances well in and and yes. In applicable, velocities within groupings were closen and why Statistical methods 12 (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Statistical methods 12 (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (c) (c) (c) (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (c) (c) (c) (d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how bols to follow-up was addressed (c) (c) (c) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) (c) (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses (c) (c) (c) Results (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 (c) (c) Poscriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) (b) Indicate number of partricipants with mi	Quantitative variables	11	Explain how are study size was arrived at	
Statistical methods12 (a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding11 (b)Statistical methods(a) Describe and methods, including those used to control for confounding11 (b)(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions11 (c)(c) Explain how missing data were addressed11 (c)(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed11 (c)(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed11 (c)(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses11 (c)Results(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 analysed11 (c)Participants13* (c) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage11 (c) Consider use of a flow diagram11 (c) Consider use of a flow diagramDescriptive data14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders11 (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)11Outcome data15* (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures (c) consert in study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures11Outcome data15* (c) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and heir preci	Quantitative variables	11	and why	
Statistical methods12(d) Describe any statistical methods, including mose used to control for confounding(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions(d)(c) Explain how missing data were addressed(d)(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed(d)(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed(d)Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed(d)(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses(e)Results(f) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed(d)(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage(d)(d)(c) Consider use of a flow diagram(d)(d)Descriptive data14*(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders(d)(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest(d)(d)(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)(d)(d)Outcome data15*Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure(d)(d) Give unadiusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95%)(d)	Statistical mode	10		
Image: bit is the problem of the p	Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding	
Image: Constraint of the section of the sectin the section of the section of th			(b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions	
Image: Addition of the study of the stu			(c) Explain how missing data were addressed	
Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy Image: Case-control study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy Results (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses Image: Case-control study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Image: Case-control study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed 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 Image: Case-control study-If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders Image: Case-control study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) Image: Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Image: Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Image: Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Image: Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Image: Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Image: Case-control study=Re			(d) Cohort study—If applicable, explain how loss to follow-up was addressed	
Image: constraint of the study of the st			Case-control study—If applicable, explain how matching of cases and controls was addressed	
(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses Results (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 (b) 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 (b) Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) (c) Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time (c) Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (ee, 95%) (a)			Cross-sectional study—If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy	
Results Image: state			(e) Describe any sensitivity analyses	
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 (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram (c) Consider use of a flow diagram Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%)	Results	1		
Main results 16 confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed Image: Confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up included eligible, confounders Image: Confirmed eligible, included eligible, confounder, adjusted estimates and their precision (ee, 95%)	Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study-eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility,	
(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95%)			confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed	
Image: Consider use of a flow diagram Image: Consider use of a flow diagram Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Image: Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95%)			(b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage	
Descriptive data 14* (a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures (c) Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95%)			(c) Consider use of a flow diagram	
Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%)	Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and	
(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest (c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount) (c) Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures (c) Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95%)			potential confounders	
Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures of exposure Case-control study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%)			(b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest	
Outcome data 15* Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time Case-control study—Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure Construction Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%)			(c) Cohort study—Summarise follow-up time (eg, average and total amount)	
Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%)	Outcome data	15*	Cohort study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures over time	
Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%)			Case-control study-Report numbers in each exposure category, or summary measures of exposure	
Main results 16 (a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg. 95%			Cross-sectional study—Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures	
the maximum of the second s	Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (e.g. 95%)	

			confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included						
			(b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized						
			(c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period						
Other analyses		17	Report other analyses done-eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses						
Discussion									
Key results	18	Summa	immarise key results with reference to study objectives						
Limitations	19	Discus	ass limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and						
		magnit	de of any potential bias						
Interpretation	20	Give a	a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar						
		studies	and other relevant evidence						
Generalisability	21	Discus	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results						
Other informatio	n								
Funding	22	Give th	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 pres	sent article is based						

*Give information separately for cases and controls in case-control studies and, if applicable, for exposed and unexposed groups in cohort and cross-sectional studies.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at http://www.plosmedicine.org/, Annals of Internal Medicine at http://www.annals.org/, and Epidemiology at http://www.epidem.com/). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.