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

Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph		
Report	Reporting of Background				
1	Problem definition	Page 2, Line 1	Abstract, Paragraph 1		
2	Hypothesis statement	N/A	N/A		
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page 2, Line 5	Abstract, Paragraph 1		
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page 2, Line 7	Abstract, Paragraph 1		
5	Type of study design used	Page 2, Line 9	Abstract, Paragraph 2		
6	Study population	N/A	N/A		
Report	Reporting of Search Strategy				
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page 4, Line 16	Method, Paragraph 1		
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page 4, Line 19	Method, Paragraph 1		
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	N/A	N/A		
10	Databases and registries searched	N/A	N/A		
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	N/A	N/A		
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Page 4, Line 22	Method, Paragraph 1		
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page 4, Line 31	Method, Paragraph 2		
14	Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	N/A	N/A		
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	N/A	N/A		
16	Description of any contact with authors	N/A	N/A		

Report	Reporting of Methods					
17	Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	N/A	N/A			
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	N/A	N/A			
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page 5, Line 5	Method, Paragraph 3			
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	N/A	N/A			
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page 5 Line 14	Method, Paragraph 4			
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page 5, Line 24	Method, Paragraph 5			
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 5, Line 26	Method, Paragraph 5			
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	N/A	N/A			
Reporting of Results						
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page 6, Line 33	Results, Paragraph 1-2			
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page 20, Line 1	Table 1			
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page 8, Line 11	Results, Paragraph 7			
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	N/A	N/A			
Reporting of Discussion						
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page 7, Line 8	Results, Paragraph 3			
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	N/A	N/A			
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page 20, Line 1	Table 1			
Report	Reporting of Conclusions					
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page 8, Line 21	Discussion, Paragraph 1			
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page 8, Line 21	Discussion, Paragraph 1			
34	Guidelines for future research	N/A	N/A			
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page 11, Line 17	Funding			

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/jgo-22-682

\*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.