

Table 5: Performance of the one-dimensional temporal scan statistic on cluster detection, with the true risk region $R_3 = \{43 \leq T_1 \leq 84\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	Sensitivity		Specificity		p_G
		Median	Robust se	Median	Robust se	
25	0,1	0	0.106	0.937	0.059	0.62
25	0.69,2	0.143	0.318	0.96	0.071	0.695
25	1.10,3	0.31	0.424	0.984	0.059	0.655
25	1.61,5	0.524	0.424	1	0.047	0.553
25	2.30,10	0.786	0.3	1	0.035	0.415
50	0,1	0	0.071	0.96	0.041	0.546
50	0.69,2	0.167	0.335	0.976	0.041	0.619
50	1.10,3	0.405	0.477	0.992	0.041	0.602
50	1.61,5	0.786	0.371	1	0.035	0.458
50	2.30,10	0.905	0.141	1	0.024	0.289
100	0,1	0	0.071	0.976	0.035	0.481
100	0.69,2	0.214	0.477	0.992	0.029	0.59
100	1.10,3	0.69	0.477	1	0.035	0.509
100	1.61,5	0.929	0.159	0.992	0.029	0.299
100	2.30,10	0.976	0.071	1	0.018	0.18
200	0,1	0	0.053	0.984	0.029	0.445
200	0.69,2	0.548	0.591	0.992	0.029	0.553
200	1.10,3	0.905	0.221	0.992	0.029	0.343
200	1.61,5	0.976	0.071	0.992	0.018	0.174
200	2.30,10	1	0.035	1	0.012	0.089
500	0,1	0	0.035	0.984	0.035	0.44
500	0.69,2	0.905	0.229	0.992	0.029	0.362
500	1.10,3	0.976	0.071	0.992	0.018	0.174
500	1.61,5	1	0.035	1	0.006	0.083
500	2.30,10	1	0.018	1	0.006	0.03

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 6. Performance of the one-dimensional temporal scan statistic on effect estimation, with the true risk region $R_3 = \{43 \leq T_1 \leq 84\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	#sim with valid effect estimates	Bias of $\hat{\theta}$			95% CI	
			Median	Median/ θ^*	Robust se	Coverage probability	Median width
25	0,1	1432	0	.	0.715	0.995	3.578
25	0.69,2	1450	-0.693	-1	0.814	0.932	3.395
25	1.10,3	1514	-0.588	-0.535	0.814	0.892	3.395
25	1.61,5	1585	-0.511	-0.317	0.893	0.844	3.201
25	2.30,10	1478	-0.613	-0.266	0.814	0.852	3.201
50	0,1	1616	0	.	0.649	0.989	3.201
50	0.69,2	1695	-0.431	-0.621	0.649	0.919	2.994
50	1.10,3	1837	-0.405	-0.369	0.649	0.874	2.479
50	1.61,5	1891	-0.288	-0.179	0.617	0.864	2.263
50	2.30,10	1866	-0.266	-0.115	0.62	0.896	2.435
100	0,1	1767	0	.	0.601	0.975	2.772
100	0.69,2	1875	-0.266	-0.383	0.578	0.898	2.087
100	1.10,3	1939	-0.216	-0.197	0.459	0.87	1.532
100	1.61,5	1995	-0.143	-0.089	0.418	0.886	1.532
100	2.30,10	1991	-0.128	-0.056	0.485	0.923	1.837
200	0,1	1845	0	.	0.573	0.975	2.457
200	0.69,2	1970	-0.182	-0.263	0.375	0.869	1.097
200	1.10,3	1998	-0.143	-0.13	0.293	0.884	1.003
200	1.61,5	2000	-0.086	-0.053	0.294	0.927	1.079
200	2.30,10	2000	-0.056	-0.024	0.348	0.941	1.303
500	0,1	1912	0	.	0.412	0.965	1.762
500	0.69,2	1999	-0.078	-0.112	0.181	0.889	0.618
500	1.10,3	2000	-0.057	-0.052	0.17	0.917	0.628
500	1.61,5	2000	-0.034	-0.021	0.191	0.937	0.686
500	2.30,10	2000	-0.02	-0.009	0.206	0.947	0.825

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 7. Performance of the one-dimensional temporal scan statistic on cluster detection, with the true risk region $R_4 = \{1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	Sensitivity		Specificity		p_G
		Median	Robust se	Median	Robust se	
25	0,1	0	0.159	0.95	0.085	0.536
25	0.69,2	0.25	0.344	1	0.053	0.396
25	1.10,3	0.393	0.45	1	0.026	0.255
25	1.61,5	0.75	0.424	1	0.016	0.16
25	2.30,10	0.893	0.212	1	0.005	0.118
50	0,1	0	0.106	0.964	0.058	0.472
50	0.69,2	0.179	0.397	1	0.032	0.331
50	1.10,3	0.679	0.53	1	0.016	0.195
50	1.61,5	0.893	0.185	1	0.005	0.126
50	2.30,10	0.964	0.079	1	0.005	0.063
100	0,1	0	0.053	0.971	0.04	0.433
100	0.69,2	0.393	0.556	1	0.016	0.263
100	1.10,3	0.893	0.265	1	0.011	0.142
100	1.61,5	0.964	0.079	1	0.005	0.063
100	2.30,10	1	0.026	1	0.005	0.023
200	0,1	0	0.026	0.979	0.032	0.391
200	0.69,2	0.821	0.424	1	0.011	0.183
200	1.10,3	0.964	0.079	1	0.005	0.077
200	1.61,5	1	0.026	1	0.005	0.022
200	2.30,10	1	0	1	0	0.011
500	0,1	0	0.026	0.986	0.032	0.397
500	0.69,2	0.964	0.079	1	0.005	0.08
500	1.10,3	1	0.026	1	0	0.02
500	1.61,5	1	0	1	0	0.006
500	2.30,10	1	0	1	0	0.003

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 8. Performance of the one-dimensional temporal scan statistic on effect estimation, with the true risk region $R_4 = \{1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	#sim with valid effect estimates	Bias of $\hat{\theta}$			95% CI	
			Median	Median/ θ^*	Robust se	Coverage probability	Median width
25	0,1	1437	0	.	0.794	0.993	3.578
25	0.69,2	1529	-0.405	-0.585	0.679	0.944	3.28
25	1.10,3	1625	-0.405	-0.369	0.814	0.903	3.143
25	1.61,5	1726	-0.431	-0.268	0.75	0.879	3.013
25	2.30,10	1623	-0.511	-0.222	0.814	0.863	3.013
50	0,1	1658	0	.	0.679	0.991	3.201
50	0.69,2	1739	-0.288	-0.415	0.628	0.931	2.705
50	1.10,3	1880	-0.288	-0.262	0.592	0.894	2.024
50	1.61,5	1955	-0.223	-0.139	0.565	0.889	1.994
50	2.30,10	1910	-0.143	-0.062	0.626	0.914	2.381
100	0,1	1795	0	.	0.601	0.986	2.863
100	0.69,2	1908	-0.223	-0.322	0.467	0.923	1.561
100	1.10,3	1986	-0.15	-0.136	0.368	0.903	1.315
100	1.61,5	1999	-0.118	-0.073	0.374	0.912	1.376
100	2.30,10	1994	-0.069	-0.03	0.471	0.935	1.683
200	0,1	1862	0	.	0.573	0.97	2.4
200	0.69,2	1979	-0.111	-0.16	0.282	0.907	0.894
200	1.10,3	1999	-0.084	-0.076	0.238	0.919	0.89
200	1.61,5	2000	-0.048	-0.03	0.256	0.94	0.98
200	2.30,10	2000	-0.033	-0.014	0.307	0.95	1.193
500	0,1	1930	0	.	0.381	0.968	1.762
500	0.69,2	2000	-0.048	-0.07	0.149	0.911	0.539
500	1.10,3	2000	-0.026	-0.023	0.149	0.934	0.561
500	1.61,5	2000	-0.013	-0.008	0.171	0.95	0.623
500	2.30,10	2000	0	0	0.196	0.953	0.765

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 9. Performance of the two-dimensional time-time scan statistic on cluster detection, with the true risk region $R_5 = \{-28 \leq T_1 \leq 35 \text{ \& } 1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	T_1		T_2		Sensitivity		Specificity		p_G
		Sens	Spec	Sens	Spec	Median	Robust se	Median	Robust se	
25	0,1	0.238	1	0	0.814	0	0.089	0.948	0.039	0.53
25	0.69,2	0.222	1	0.214	0.843	0	0.232	0.951	0.04	0.518
25	1.10,3	0.222	0.981	0.357	0.871	0.197	0.329	0.957	0.038	0.453
25	1.61,5	0.238	0.971	0.5	0.9	0.352	0.365	0.963	0.041	0.322
25	2.30,10	0.254	0.971	0.607	0.929	0.512	0.318	0.968	0.044	0.184
50	0,1	0.206	1	0	0.85	0	0.022	0.962	0.028	0.552
50	0.69,2	0.206	1	0.214	0.871	0	0.219	0.965	0.03	0.497
50	1.10,3	0.206	0.99	0.357	0.886	0.192	0.325	0.967	0.032	0.436
50	1.61,5	0.238	0.981	0.5	0.943	0.389	0.31	0.973	0.035	0.262
50	2.30,10	0.27	0.981	0.643	0.975	0.612	0.299	0.98	0.038	0.106
100	0,1	0.159	1	0	0.879	0	0	0.975	0.019	0.638
100	0.69,2	0.175	0.99	0.214	0.907	0	0.183	0.976	0.022	0.507
100	1.10,3	0.206	1	0.357	0.929	0.192	0.305	0.98	0.023	0.407
100	1.61,5	0.238	1	0.536	0.971	0.414	0.345	0.985	0.031	0.207
100	2.30,10	0.302	1	0.75	0.993	0.744	0.239	0.99	0.031	0.063
200	0,1	0.127	1	0	0.907	0	0	0.984	0.014	0.811
200	0.69,2	0.159	1	0.179	0.929	0	0.168	0.986	0.016	0.572
200	1.10,3	0.19	1	0.393	0.975	0.219	0.372	0.988	0.019	0.365
200	1.61,5	0.286	1	0.679	0.993	0.645	0.332	0.995	0.018	0.106
200	2.30,10	0.349	1	0.857	1	0.842	0.124	0.998	0.011	0.031
500	0,1	0.079	1	0	0.936	0	0	0.992	0.008	0.737
500	0.69,2	0.159	1	0.25	0.971	0.099	0.278	0.992	0.012	0.493
500	1.10,3	0.286	1	0.679	0.993	0.666	0.356	0.996	0.013	0.155
500	1.61,5	0.365	1	0.857	1	0.889	0.121	0.998	0.005	0.031
500	2.30,10	0.397	1	0.964	1	0.963	0.055	1	0.002	0.007

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 10. Performance of the two-dimensional time-time scan statistic on effect estimation , with the true risk region $R_5 = \{-28 \leq T_1 \leq 35 \ \& \ 1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	#sim with valid effect estimates	Bias of $\hat{\theta}$			95% CI	
			Median	Median/ θ^*	Robust se	Coverage probability	Median width
25	0,1	1451	0	.	1.028	0.998	3.92
25	0.69,2	1437	-0.693	-1	0.893	0.96	3.92
25	1.10,3	1493	-1.1	-1	0.814	0.849	3.92
25	1.61,5	1489	-1.2	-0.748	0.679	0.708	3.578
25	2.30,10	1498	-1.49	-0.648	0.862	0.598	3.578
50	0,1	1770	0	.	0.794	0.992	3.201
50	0.69,2	1742	-0.693	-1	0.814	0.909	3.201
50	1.10,3	1729	-0.847	-0.771	0.679	0.761	2.994
50	1.61,5	1792	-0.916	-0.569	0.814	0.642	2.863
50	2.30,10	1786	-1.1	-0.477	0.75	0.587	2.654
100	0,1	1853	0	.	0.636	0.979	2.772
100	0.69,2	1889	-0.588	-0.848	0.66	0.854	2.705
100	1.10,3	1880	-0.762	-0.694	0.641	0.718	2.53
100	1.61,5	1927	-0.836	-0.52	0.645	0.59	2.235
100	2.30,10	1953	-0.815	-0.354	0.685	0.572	1.975
200	0,1	1950	0	.	0.601	0.971	2.4
200	0.69,2	1953	-0.575	-0.83	0.592	0.799	2.295
200	1.10,3	1964	-0.657	-0.598	0.628	0.665	2.029
200	1.61,5	1993	-0.545	-0.338	0.544	0.619	1.518
200	2.30,10	1999	-0.464	-0.202	0.532	0.659	1.504
500	0,1	1978	0	.	0.514	0.972	2.181
500	0.69,2	1992	-0.431	-0.621	0.414	0.737	1.761
500	1.10,3	1998	-0.329	-0.299	0.378	0.659	0.953
500	1.61,5	2000	-0.233	-0.145	0.299	0.746	0.915
500	2.30,10	2000	-0.159	-0.069	0.306	0.839	1.017

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 11. Performance of the two-dimensional time-time scan statistic on cluster detection, with the true risk region $R_6 = \{15 \leq T_1 \leq 49 \text{ \& } 1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	T_1		T_2		Sensitivity		Specificity		p_G
		Sens	Spec	Sens	Spec	Median	Robust se	Median	Robust se	
25	0,1	0.229	0.895	0	0.829	0	0.143	0.952	0.039	0.523
25	0.69,2	0.371	0.917	0.393	0.871	0.173	0.299	0.96	0.039	0.453
25	1.10,3	0.457	0.94	0.5	0.914	0.281	0.302	0.967	0.04	0.338
25	1.61,5	0.543	0.977	0.643	0.964	0.39	0.287	0.975	0.042	0.188
25	2.30,10	0.686	0.992	0.786	0.986	0.594	0.31	0.978	0.047	0.103
50	0,1	0.2	0.91	0	0.85	0	0.096	0.963	0.029	0.508
50	0.69,2	0.343	0.94	0.393	0.9	0.177	0.258	0.972	0.034	0.418
50	1.10,3	0.486	0.955	0.536	0.95	0.281	0.268	0.975	0.034	0.28
50	1.61,5	0.629	0.985	0.714	0.986	0.463	0.339	0.982	0.039	0.131
50	2.30,10	0.8	0.992	0.893	1	0.786	0.252	0.982	0.046	0.062
100	0,1	0.143	0.925	0	0.879	0	0.051	0.975	0.021	0.576
100	0.69,2	0.343	0.962	0.357	0.943	0.152	0.22	0.981	0.027	0.39
100	1.10,3	0.514	0.985	0.607	0.986	0.287	0.352	0.987	0.029	0.209
100	1.61,5	0.771	0.985	0.857	0.993	0.723	0.368	0.986	0.036	0.094
100	2.30,10	0.886	0.992	0.964	1	0.899	0.114	0.987	0.039	0.038
200	0,1	0.086	0.94	0	0.907	0	0.027	0.984	0.014	0.721
200	0.69,2	0.357	0.977	0.357	0.979	0.132	0.245	0.989	0.021	0.363
200	1.10,3	0.686	0.992	0.786	0.993	0.581	0.474	0.99	0.028	0.145
200	1.61,5	0.886	0.992	0.964	1	0.881	0.139	0.989	0.031	0.057
200	2.30,10	0.943	1	1	1	0.955	0.066	0.996	0.014	0.012
500	0,1	0.057	0.955	0	0.936	0	0	0.991	0.01	0.741
500	0.69,2	0.6	0.992	0.679	0.993	0.4	0.53	0.993	0.019	0.233
500	1.10,3	0.886	0.992	0.964	1	0.881	0.139	0.993	0.02	0.057
500	1.61,5	0.971	1	1	1	0.96	0.056	0.998	0.006	0.011
500	2.30,10	1	1	1	1	0.99	0.022	1	0.002	0.003

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 12. Performance of the two-dimensional time-time scan statistic on OR estimation, with the true risk region $R_6 = \{15 \leq T_1 \leq 49 \& 1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	#sim with valid effect estimates	Bias of $\hat{\theta}$			95% CI	
			Median	Median/ θ^*	Robust se	Coverage probability	Median width
25	0,1	1424	0	.	0.679	0.998	3.92
25	0.69,2	1485	-0.693	-1	0.814	0.949	3.578
25	1.10,3	1488	-0.762	-0.694	0.845	0.876	3.578
25	1.61,5	1550	-0.916	-0.569	0.814	0.785	3.395
25	2.30,10	1522	-1.05	-0.456	0.814	0.73	3.28
50	0,1	1745	0	.	0.757	0.989	3.28
50	0.69,2	1768	-0.511	-0.737	0.727	0.907	2.994
50	1.10,3	1805	-0.693	-0.631	0.679	0.824	2.772
50	1.61,5	1845	-0.654	-0.406	0.649	0.763	2.53
50	2.30,10	1889	-0.734	-0.319	0.679	0.711	2.435
100	0,1	1891	0	.	0.641	0.979	2.772
100	0.69,2	1922	-0.47	-0.678	0.679	0.856	2.479
100	1.10,3	1939	-0.511	-0.465	0.592	0.775	2.147
100	1.61,5	1973	-0.511	-0.317	0.514	0.715	1.676
100	2.30,10	1992	-0.487	-0.212	0.526	0.722	1.722
200	0,1	1950	0	.	0.601	0.978	2.4
200	0.69,2	1950	-0.405	-0.585	0.459	0.826	2.095
200	1.10,3	1990	-0.405	-0.369	0.416	0.722	1.233
200	1.61,5	2000	-0.364	-0.226	0.365	0.686	1.123
200	2.30,10	2000	-0.274	-0.119	0.424	0.759	1.309
500	0,1	1978	0	.	0.514	0.967	2.18
500	0.69,2	1994	-0.269	-0.388	0.319	0.745	0.884
500	1.10,3	2000	-0.22	-0.2	0.255	0.675	0.7
500	1.61,5	2000	-0.126	-0.079	0.241	0.805	0.746
500	2.30,10	2000	-0.074	-0.032	0.25	0.898	0.879

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 13. Performance of the two-dimensional time-time scan statistic on cluster detection, with the true risk region $R_7 = \{43 \leq T_1 \leq 84 \text{ \& } 1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	T_1		T_2		Sensitivity		Specificity		p_G
		Sens	Spec	Sens	Spec	Median	Robust se	Median	Robust se	
25	0,1	0	0.865	0	0.829	0	0.096	0.951	0.04	0.534
25	0.69,2	0.286	0.897	0.393	0.907	0.143	0.265	0.964	0.04	0.462
25	1.10,3	0.452	0.929	0.571	0.971	0.255	0.344	0.974	0.039	0.365
25	1.61,5	0.619	0.976	0.679	1	0.372	0.292	0.987	0.032	0.2
25	2.30,10	0.81	0.992	0.821	1	0.571	0.318	0.993	0.025	0.096
50	0,1	0	0.881	0	0.85	0	0.048	0.962	0.028	0.518
50	0.69,2	0.31	0.921	0.429	0.929	0.162	0.252	0.974	0.03	0.4
50	1.10,3	0.5	0.968	0.589	1	0.276	0.261	0.985	0.028	0.277
50	1.61,5	0.762	0.984	0.786	1	0.476	0.365	0.99	0.027	0.116
50	2.30,10	0.905	0.984	0.929	1	0.767	0.279	0.99	0.029	0.063
100	0,1	0	0.897	0	0.879	0	0.038	0.975	0.019	0.578
100	0.69,2	0.357	0.944	0.393	0.979	0.155	0.228	0.984	0.022	0.354
100	1.10,3	0.667	0.976	0.679	1	0.327	0.385	0.989	0.025	0.164
100	1.61,5	0.929	0.976	0.929	1	0.786	0.318	0.985	0.034	0.075
100	2.30,10	0.976	0.984	0.964	1	0.918	0.141	0.987	0.03	0.034
200	0,1	0	0.921	0	0.907	0	0.022	0.984	0.013	0.744
200	0.69,2	0.405	0.968	0.464	1	0.155	0.269	0.991	0.018	0.29
200	1.10,3	0.881	0.976	0.857	1	0.702	0.402	0.988	0.03	0.1
200	1.61,5	0.976	0.976	0.964	1	0.929	0.141	0.987	0.031	0.047
200	2.30,10	1	0.992	1	1	0.964	0.069	0.992	0.021	0.012
500	0,1	0	0.944	0	0.943	0	0.009	0.992	0.008	0.716
500	0.69,2	0.833	0.976	0.821	1	0.582	0.541	0.991	0.03	0.149
500	1.10,3	0.976	0.976	0.964	1	0.929	0.111	0.987	0.03	0.035
500	1.61,5	1	0.992	1	1	0.976	0.053	0.993	0.014	0.009
500	2.30,10	1	0.992	1	1	1	0.026	0.996	0.008	0.003

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

Table 14. Performance of the two-dimensional time-time scan statistic on effect estimation, with the true risk region $R_7 = \{43 \leq T_1 \leq 84 \text{ \& } 1 \leq T_2 \leq 28\}$

N	$\theta^*, \exp(\theta^*)$	#sim with valid effect estimates	Bias of $\hat{\theta}$			95% CI	
			Median	Median/ θ^*	Robust se	Coverage probability	Median width
25	0,1	1471	0	.	0.893	0.999	3.92
25	0.69,2	1438	-0.693	-1	0.814	0.949	3.92
25	1.10,3	1444	-0.693	-0.631	0.814	0.885	3.92
25	1.61,5	1459	-0.916	-0.569	1.028	0.833	3.578
25	2.30,10	1349	-0.799	-0.347	0.679	0.835	3.92
50	0,1	1734	0	.	0.757	0.99	3.201
50	0.69,2	1751	-0.511	-0.737	0.763	0.922	3.201
50	1.10,3	1768	-0.405	-0.369	0.814	0.868	2.977
50	1.61,5	1836	-0.511	-0.317	0.679	0.835	2.553
50	2.30,10	1829	-0.405	-0.176	0.645	0.861	2.466
100	0,1	1893	0	.	0.649	0.984	2.772
100	0.69,2	1909	-0.388	-0.559	0.613	0.894	2.553
100	1.10,3	1934	-0.351	-0.32	0.55	0.852	2.063
100	1.61,5	1979	-0.28	-0.174	0.446	0.872	1.636
100	2.30,10	1996	-0.203	-0.088	0.499	0.88	1.846
200	0,1	1947	0	.	0.601	0.976	2.479
200	0.69,2	1969	-0.288	-0.415	0.534	0.858	2.024
200	1.10,3	1994	-0.216	-0.197	0.353	0.845	1.141
200	1.61,5	2000	-0.184	-0.114	0.308	0.862	1.109
200	2.30,10	2000	-0.147	-0.064	0.366	0.875	1.3
500	0,1	1971	0	.	0.527	0.966	2.181
500	0.69,2	1997	-0.158	-0.227	0.249	0.857	0.748
500	1.10,3	2000	-0.115	-0.105	0.194	0.855	0.663
500	1.61,5	2000	-0.082	-0.051	0.193	0.881	0.707
500	2.30,10	2000	-0.059	-0.026	0.223	0.915	0.839

- N: number of matched pairs in each of the two datasets for cluster detection and effect estimation respectively
- Robust se: robust standard error which is defined as inter-quartile range (IQR)/1.345

VIII. REFERENCES

1. Naus JI. The distribution of the size of the maximum cluster of points on a line. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 1965;60:532-8.
2. Kulldorff M. A spatial scan statistic. *Communications in Statistics-Theory and methods* 1997;26:1481-96.
3. Kulldorff M. Prospective time periodic geographical disease surveillance using a scan statistic. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)* 2001;164:61-72.
4. Huang L, Kulldorff M, Gregorio D. A spatial scan statistic for survival data. *Biometrics* 2007;63:109-18.
5. Jung I, Kulldorff M, Klassen AC. A spatial scan statistic for ordinal data. *Stat Med* 2007;26:1594-607.
6. Jung I, Kulldorff M, Richard OJ. A spatial scan statistic for multinomial data. *Stat Med* 2010;29:1910-8.
7. Kulldorff M, Huang L, Pickle L, Duczmal L. An elliptic spatial scan statistic. *Stat Med* 2006;25:3929-43.
8. Kulldorff M. SaTScan User Guide version9.4. http://www.satscan.org/cgi-bin/satscan/register.pl/SaTScan_Users_Guide.pdf?todo=process_userguide_download.
9. Kulldorff M. Temporal Scan Statistics for Pharmacoepidemiology. Unpublished paper. 2016.
10. Irving SA, Kieke BA, Donahue JG, et al. Trivalent inactivated influenza vaccine and spontaneous abortion. *Obstet Gynecol* 2013;121:159-65.
11. Baril L, Rosillon D, Willame C, et al. Risk of spontaneous abortion and other pregnancy outcomes in 15-25 year old women exposed to human papillomavirus-16/18 AS04-adjuvanted vaccine in the United Kingdom. *Vaccine* 2015;33:6884-91.
12. Suissa S. The case-time-control design. *Epidemiology* 1995;6:248-53.
13. Suissa S. The case-time-control design: further assumptions and conditions. *Epidemiology* 1998:441-5.
14. Maclure M. The case-crossover design: a method for studying transient effects on the risk of acute events. *American journal of epidemiology* 1991;133:144-53.
15. Li DK, Odouli R, Wi S, et al. A population-based prospective cohort study of personal exposure to magnetic fields during pregnancy and the risk of miscarriage. *Epidemiology* 2002;13:9-20.
16. Kawai AT, Li L, Kulldorff M, et al. Mini-sentinel CBER/PRISM surveillance protocol - influenza vaccines and pregnancy outcomes. http://www.mini-sentinel.org/work_products/PRISM/Mini-Sentinel_PRISM_Influenza-Vaccines-and-Pregnancy-Outcomes-Protocol.pdf.
17. Casella G, Berger RL. *Statistical Inference*: Duxbury Pacific Grove, CA; 2002.

IX. APPENDIX

eTable 1. Weekly SAB rates per 1000 woman-week

Week	Days post LMP	Weekly rate (per 1000 woman-weeks)*
6	36-42	21.05
7	43-49	28.59
8	50-56	34.62
9	57-63	28.55
10	64-70	21.88
11	71-77	23.96
12	78-84	21.76
13	85-91	11.55
14	92-98	8.15
15	99-105	7.05
16	105-112	1.18
17	113-119	1.18
18	120-126	1.18
19	127-133	2.38
20	132-140	1.2