Potential bias	Items to be considered for potential bias	Cameron (2014)	Kraaijvanger	Lucke	Noel	Zlotnik
Participant selection	*Low risk of bias if:*					
	In- and exclusion criteria were adequately described	X	X	X	X	X
	Patient characteristics were adequately described		X	X	X	
	Study dates were noted	X	X	X	X	X
	Moderate risk of bias if:					
	Participant selection was described but not satisfying					
	High risk of bias if:					
	No adequate description of recruitment of study sample was given					
Predictor assessment	*Low risk of bias if:*					
	Predictor definitions were the same for all patients	x	x	x	x	x
	All predictors were available at the time of the model is intended to be used	x	x	x	x	x
	Predictors were measured with valid and reproducible methods such that misclassification was limited	x	x	x		x
	Handling of predictors in the modelling was described (e.g. continuous, categorized)	x	x	x	x	x
	Moderate risk of bias if:					
	One of the criteria was not satisfied				x	
	High risk of bias if:					
	Predictor assessment was not adequately described					
Outcome assessment	*Low risk of bias if:*					
	Definition of outcome was described adequately	x	x	x	x	x
	There was no loss of follow-up or <20%	x	x	x	x	x
	Moderate risk of bias if:					

	Loss of follow up was not described					
	High risk of bias if:					
	Measurement of outcome was unclear					
Model development	*Low risk of bias if:*					
	Number of outcomes in relation to number of candidate predictors (events per variable, EPV) was described and satisfying	x	x	x	x	x
	Number of participants with missing data was described				x	
	Compensation for missing data was performed	x		x		
	Methods used to select predictors for inclusion in multivariable analysis were described	x	x	x	x	x
	Selection of predictors during multivariable modelling was described	x	x	x		x
	Shrinkage methods were used to account for overfitting					
	Moderate risk of bias if:					
	The EPV was less than ten					
	Continuous predictors were categorized prior to inclusion in multivariable analysis	x (age)	x (age)	x	x (age)	x(age), number ED visits
	The methods for predictor selection were not described accurately					
	Participants with missing data were excluded				x	
	High risk of bias if:					
	Description of number of outcomes, missing data and predictor selection was lacking					
Analysis	*Low risk of bias if:*					
	Calibration was assessed and described	x	x	x	x	x
	Discrimination was determined	x	x	x	x	x
	No cut-off points were used	x	x	x	x	x
	External validation was performed, or internal validation accounted for optimism and shrinkage		x	x		

	Moderate risk of bias if:					
	Internal validation was performed without optimism correction	x				x
	External validation was performed in a population identical to the derivation cohort					
	Cut-off points were used					
	High risk of bias if:					
	No data about discrimination and calibration was described					
	No validation was performed				x	