

MOOSE (Meta-analyses of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) Checklist

Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
Reporting of Background			
1	Problem definition	Page 3/Line 72-73	Introduction/Paragraph 1
2	Hypothesis statement	Page 3/Line 100-102	Introduction/Paragraph 3
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page 3-4/Line 102-105	Introduction/Paragraph 3
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page 4/Line 127-129	Methods/Paragraph 2
5	Type of study design used	Page 4/Line 127-129	Methods/Paragraph 2
6	Study population	Page 4/Line 127-129	Methods/Paragraph 2
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page 5/Line 151	Methods/Paragraph 4
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page 4/Line 111-124	Methods/Paragraph 1
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page 5/Line 155-159	Methods/Paragraph 4
10	Databases and registries searched	Page 4/Line 111-124	Methods/Paragraph 1
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Page 4/Line 111-124	Methods/Paragraph 1
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	NA	NA
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page 4-5/Line 127-139	Methods/Paragraph 2
14	Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	NA	NA
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Page 5/Line 137-139	Methods/Paragraph 2
16	Description of any contact with authors	Page 5/Line 155-159	Methods/Paragraph 4

Reporting of Methods			
17	Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Page 4/Line 127-134	Methods/Paragraph 2
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page 5/Line 143-147	Methods/Paragraph 3
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page 5/Line 151-154	Methods/Paragraph 4
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page 5/Line 155-159	Methods/Paragraph 4
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page 5/Line 163-170	Methods/Paragraph 5
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page 6/Line 174-184	Methods/Paragraph 6
23	Description of statistical methods (eg, complete description of fixed or random effects models, justification of whether the chosen models account for predictors of study results, dose-response models, or cumulative meta-analysis) in sufficient detail to be replicated	Page 6/Line 174-184	Methods/Paragraph 6
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page 6/Line 174-184	Methods/Paragraph 6
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page 7/Line 211-215	Results/Paragraph 1
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page 7/Line 211-215	Results/Paragraph 1
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page 10/Line 333-336	Results/Paragraph 15
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	NA	NA
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page 7/Line 219-224	Results/Paragraph 2
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Page 6-7/Line 200-207	Results/Paragraph 1
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page 7/Line 219-224	Results/Paragraph 2
Reporting of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page 12/Line 376-378	Conclusions/Paragraph 1
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page 12/Line 378-380	Conclusions/Paragraph 1
34	Guidelines for future research	Page 12/Line 380-386	Conclusions/Paragraph 1
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page 12/Line 389	Acknowledgments

From: Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, *et al.*, for the Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) Group. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology. A Proposal for Reporting. JAMA. 2000;283(15):2008-2012. doi: 10.1001/jama.283.15.2008.

Article information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/apm-22-437>

*As the checklist was provided upon initial submission, the page number/line number reported may be changed due to copyediting and may not be referable in the published version. In this case, the section/paragraph may be used as an alternative reference.