

10.1071/AH21131

Australian Health Review

Predictors of mortality in older patients with isolated severe head injury: a data linkage study from New South Wales, Australia

*Sally Bath*¹ MBBS, ED Registrar

Michael M. Dinh^{2,3} MBBS, MPH, PhD, FACEM, Clinical Director

*Stacey Casley*⁴ BHlthScN, MNSc, Rural Trauma Clinical Nurse Consultant

Pooria Sarrami^{2,5,6} MD, PhD, Research Fellow

¹Royal Prince Alfred Hospital, 50 Missenden Road, Camperdown, NSW 2050, Australia. Email: sbat2975@gmail.com

²New South Wales Institute of Trauma and Injury Management, 1 Reserve Road, St Leonards, NSW 2065, Australia.

³Sydney Medical School, Anderson Stuart Building, The University of Sydney, Camperdown, NSW 2050, Australia. Email: michael.dinh@health.nsw.gov.au

⁴Wagga Wagga Base Hospital, Docker Street, Wagga Wagga, NSW 2650, Australia. Email: Stacey.Casley@health.nsw.gov.au

⁵South Western Sydney Clinical School, University of New South Wales (UNSW Sydney), Liverpool Hospital, Liverpool, NSW 2170, Australia.

⁶Corresponding author. Email: pooria.sarrami@health.nsw.gov.au

Supplementary Material S1: The following reporting guideline for data linkage was followed [1, P 488].

DOMAIN 1: The existing data sources to be linked (complete for each dataset to be linked in the study)			
	Admitted Patient Data Collection	NSW Trauma Registry	NSW Registry of Birth, Deaths and Marriages
1. Purpose of the dataset was given	Yes	Yes	Yes
2. Description of the type of dataset (administrative/ clinical registry/ research study) was specified	Yes	Yes	Yes
3. Any standardised coding system/data dictionary used should was stated	Cited*	Cited*	Cited*
4. % population coverage	Cited*	Yes	Cited*
5. Data collection methods were described	Cited*	Cited*	Cited*
6. Data quality assurance process described, including the frequency of checks	Cited*	Cited*	Cited*
DOMAIN 2: Researcher-selected variables and data preparation			
7. Were the participant inclusion criteria specified?			Yes
8. Were the variables used for linkage stated (including rates of missing data)?			Cited*
9. Were changes to the coding systems reported (including changes over time or revisions to disease/risk factor definitions revised during the study period)?			Cited*
10. Were potential sources of bias adequately described?			Yes
DOMAIN 3: Technology/linkage process			
11. Was the intended precision of the linkage stated?			Yes
12. Was a description of the linkage method given (e.g. deterministic, probabilistic methods including use of blocking and phonetic coding, if used) and a justification for the use of this type of linkage provided?			Cited*
13. Was a measure of the quality of the linked data-sets provided (e.g. % linked records, false positive/false negative rates)?			Yes
DOMAIN 4: Ethics, privacy, data protection and access arrangements			
14. Did the study receive approval from a human research ethics committee?			Yes

*Cited: Information was not directly given in the paper, but appropriate links were cited to enable readers to access the information.

[1] Bohensky MA, Jolley D, Sundararajan V, Evans S, Ibrahim J, Brand C. Development and validation of reporting guidelines for studies involving data linkage. Aust N Z J Public Health. 2011;35:486-9.