

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 2 / Line 1–8	Introduction/Paragraph 1
2	Hypothesis statement	Page 2 / Line 8–22	Introduction/Paragraph 1
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page 3 / Line 3–9	Methods/Paragraph 1
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page 3 / Line 1–3	Methods/Paragraph 1
5	Type of study design used	Page 2 / Line 26–29	Methods/Paragraph 1
6	Study population	Page 2 / Line 29–30	Methods/Paragraph 1
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page 3 / Line 12	Methods/Paragraph 2
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page 3 / Line 13	Methods/Paragraph 2
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page 3 / Line 25	Methods/Paragraph 3
10	Databases and registries searched	Page 3 / Line 12	Methods/Paragraph 2
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Page 3 / Line 12	Methods/Paragraph 2
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Page 3 / Line 12	Methods/Paragraph 2
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 14	Methods/Paragraph 2
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Page 3 / Line 17–18	Methods/Paragraph 3
16	Description of any contact with authors	Page 3 / Line 25	Methods/Paragraph 3

Reporting of Methods			
17	Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Page 3 / Li ne 22–23	Met hods/Par agr aph 3
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page 3 / Li ne 20–21	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 1–4	Met hods/Par agr aph 4
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page 4 / Li ne 7	Met hods/Par agr aph 4
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page 4 / Li ne 7–10	Met hods/Par agr aph 5
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page 4 / Li ne 16–17	Met hods/Par agr aph 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 4 / Li ne 13–16	Met hods/Par agr aph 6
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page 4 / Li ne 19	Met hods/Par agr aph 6
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Fi g 2–6	Resul t s/Par agr aph 3
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Tabl e 1	Resul t s/Par agr aph 3
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page 10 / Li ne 5–7	Resul t s/Par agr aph 3
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Page 10 / Li ne 10–11	Resul t s/Par agr aph 3
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page 13 / Li ne 3–4	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 8
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Page 13 / Li ne 1	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 8
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page 13 / Li ne 2–3	Di scussi on/Par agr aph 8
Reporting of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page 13 / Li ne 7–8	Sunmar y/Par agr aph 1
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page 13 / Li ne 8–9	Sunmar y/Par agr aph 1
34	Guidelines for future research	Page 13 / Li ne 9–10	Sunmar y/Par agr aph 1
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page 10 / Li ne 28	Sunmar y/Par agr aph 1

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/tcr-22-344>

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