

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

Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
<b>Reporting of Background</b>			
1	Problem definition	Page 2/ Line 16–34	Introduction/Paragraph 1
2	Hypothesis statement	Page 3/ Line 1–5	Introduction/Paragraph 1
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page 3/ Line 25–27	Methods/Paragraph 2
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page 3/ Line 23–24	Methods/Paragraph 2
5	Type of study design used	Page 3/ Line 22	Methods/Paragraph 2
6	Study population	Page 3/ Line 22–23	Methods/Paragraph 2
<b>Reporting of Search Strategy</b>			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page 3/ Line 16	Methods/Paragraph 1
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page 3/ Line 17–18	Methods/Paragraph 1
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page 4/ Line 6–7	Methods/Paragraph 4
10	Databases and registries searched	Page 3/ Line 16	Methods/Paragraph 1
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Page 3/ Line 16	Methods/Paragraph 1
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Page 4/ Line 3–4	Methods/Paragraph 4
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Table 1	Table 1
14	Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Page 3/ Line 18	Methods/Paragraph 1
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Page 3/ Line 18	Methods/Paragraph 1
16	Description of any contact with authors	Page 4/ Line 7	Methods/Paragraph 4

<b>Reporting of Methods</b>			
17	Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Page 2/ Li ne 21–25	Met hods/Par agr aph 3
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page 2/ Li ne 25–27	Met hods/Par agr aph 3
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page 4/ Li ne 3–4	Met hods/Par agr aph 4
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page 4/ Li ne 28	Met hods/Par agr aph 7
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page 4/ Li ne 28–32	Met hods/Par agr aph 7
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page 5/ Li ne 13–16	Met hods/Par agr aph 9
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/ Li ne 2–4	Met hods/Par agr aph 8
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page 5/ Li ne 11	Met hods/Par agr aph 8
<b>Reporting of Results</b>			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Fi g 2–5	Fig 2-5
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Tabl e 1–2	Table 1-2
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page 7/ Li ne 6–7	Resul ts/Par agr aph 8
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Page 6/ Li ne 4–8	Resul ts/Par agr aph 4
<b>Reporting of Discussion</b>			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page 7/ Li ne 10–13	Resul ts/Par agr aph 9
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Page 5/ Li ne 20–21	Resul ts/Par agr aph 1
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page 5/ Li ne 26–28	Resul ts/Par agr aph 2
<b>Reporting of Conclusions</b>			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page 7/ Li ne 16–29	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 1
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page 7/ Li ne 31–34	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 2
34	Guidelines for future research	Page 8/ Li ne 7–11	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 4
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page 8/ Li ne 11–16	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 4

*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/jtd-21-1893>

\*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.