

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 2-3/Line 60-86	Introduction/Paragraph 1-3
2	Hypothesis statement	Page 3/Line 87-95	Introduction/Paragraph 4
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page 3/Line 87-95	Introduction/Paragraph 4
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page 3/Line 76-86	Introduction/Paragraph 3
5	Type of study design used	N/A	N/A
6	Study population	Page 3/Line 96-98	Introduction/Paragraph 5
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	N/A	N/A
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page 4/Line 104-111	Publication search/ Paragraph 1
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page 4/Line 114-122	Studies selection/ Paragraph 1
10	Databases and registries searched	Page 4/Line 104-111	Publication search/ Paragraph 1
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 104-111	Publication search/ Paragraph 1
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page 4/Line 114-122	Studies selection/ Paragraph 1
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15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	N/A	N/A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

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)	Page 4/Line 125-132	Data extraction and quality assessment/Paragraph 1
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page 4-5/Line 133-142	Data extraction and quality assessment/Paragraph 2
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page 4-5/Line 133-142	Data extraction and quality assessment/Paragraph 2
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page 4-5/Line 133-142	Data extraction and quality assessment/Paragraph 2
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page 4-5/Line 133-142	Data extraction and quality assessment/Paragraph 2
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 145-155	Statistical analysis/Paragraph 1
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page 5/Line 145-155	Statistical analysis/Paragraph 1
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page 5/Line 158-166	Results/Paragraph 1
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page 5/Line 158-166	Results/Paragraph 1
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page 8/Line 248-252	Results/Paragraph 17
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Page 8/Line 254-258	Results/Paragraph 18
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page 8/Line 261-270	Discussion/Paragraph 1
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non–English-language citations)	NO	NO
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page 8/Line 261-270	Discussion/Paragraph 1
Reporting of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page 10/Line 312-318	Conclusions/Paragraph 1
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page 10/Line 312-318	Conclusions/Paragraph 1
34	Guidelines for future research	Page 10/Line 312-318	Conclusions/Paragraph 1
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page 10/Line 312-318	Conclusions/Paragraph 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-22-627>

*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.