

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	Page3/Line7-29 Page4/Line1-6	Introduction/Paragraph1
2	Hypothesis statement	Page4/Line6-914	Introduction/Paragraph1
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page5/Line28-33	Methods/Paragraph4
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page5/Line13-14 Page6/Line1-6	Methods/Paragraph3 Methods/Paragraph4
5	Type of study design used	Page5/Line10 Page7/Line1-2	Methods/Paragraph3 Methods/Paragraph6
6	Study population	Page5/Line17-20 Page8/Line17-18 Page8/Line24-26	Methods/Paragraph3 Results/Paragraph2
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page5/Line3-4 Page1/Line8-10	Methods/Paragraph2 Inform Author
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page4/Line24-31 Page5/Line1-6	Methods/Paragraph2
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page4/Line24-27 Page5/Line2-3	Methods/Paragraph2
10	Databases and registries searched	Page4/Line24-27	Methods/Paragraph2
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Page4/Line24-27 Page6/Line6-8	Methods/Paragraph2 Methods/Paragraph3
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Page5/Line2-4	Methods/Paragraph2
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page8/Line1-13	Results/Paragraph1
14	Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Page5/Line3-4	Methods/Paragraph2
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Page5/Line23-24	Methods/Paragraph3
16	Description of any contact with authors	Page6/Line30-31	Methods/Paragraph5

Reporting of Methods			
17	Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Page5/Line10-24	Methods/Paragraph3
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page6/Line15-30	Methods/Paragraph5
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page5/Line3-6 Page6/Line8-12 Page6/Line28-30	Methods/Paragraph2 Methods/Paragraph4 Methods/Paragraph5
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page7/Line8-9 Page7/Line13-16	Methods/Paragraph6
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page6/Line25-31	Methods/Paragraph5
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page7/Line9-12	Methods/Paragraph6
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	Page7/Line1-26	Methods/Paragraph6
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page7/Line32 Page8/Line26 Page9/Line12 Page9/Line8 Page9/Line20	Figure1-4 Table1-3
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page7/Line32 Page9/Line12 Page9/Line8	Figure1-4
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page8/Line26	Table1-2
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page8/Line30-34 Page9/Line1-18	Results/Paragraph3-4
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Page9/Line20-27	Results/Paragraph4
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page8/Line30-34 Page9/Line1-20	Results/Paragraph3-5
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Page7/Line30-34 Page8/Line1-13	Results/Paragraph1
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page8/Line22-26	Results/Paragraph2
Reporting of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page12/21-22 Page13/3-4 Page13/19-23 Page13/29-31	Discussion/Paragraph5 Discussion/Paragraph6 Discussion/Paragraph8 Discussion/Paragraph9

33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page14/Line15-22	Conclusion/Paragraph1
34	Guidelines for future research	Page14/Line9-11	Discussion/Paragraph10
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page15/Line3-8	Interest Conflicts

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-22-48>

*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.