

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 | | |
| 2 | Hypothesis statement | | |
| 3 | Description of Study Outcome(s) | | |
| 4 | Type of exposure or intervention used | | |
| 5 | Type of study design used | | |
| 6 | Study population | | |
| Reporting of Search Strategy | | | |
| 7 | Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | | |
| 8 | Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords | | |
| 9 | Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors | | |
| 10 | Databases and registries searched | | |
| 11 | Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion) | | |
| 12 | Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) | | |
| 13 | List of citations located and those excluded, including justification | | |
| 14 | Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English | | |
| 15 | Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies | | |
| 16 | Description of any contact with authors | | |

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

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.

