

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	Page2-3/Line53-80	Introduction/Paragraph1-2
2	Hypothesis statement	Page2-3/Line53-80	Introduction/Paragraph1-2
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page2-3/Line53-80	Introduction/Paragraph1-2
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page2-3/Line53-80	Introduction/Paragraph1-2
5	Type of study design used	Page2-3/Line53-80	Introduction/Paragraph1-2
6	Study population	Page3/Line66-80	Introduction/Paragraph2
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page4/Line103-112	Methods/Paragraph4
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page3-4/Line84-102	Methods/Paragraph1-3
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page3-4/Line84-102	Methods/Paragraph1-3
10	Databases and registries searched	Page3/Line84-90	Methods/Paragraph1
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Page4-5/Line114-126	Methods/Paragraph5
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Page4/Line103-112	Methods/Paragraph1-3
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page4/Line103-112	Methods/Paragraph1-3
14	Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Page3/Line84-90	Methods/Paragraph1
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Page4/Line103-112	Methods/Paragraph1-3
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	Page4-5/Line103-126	Methods/Paragraph4-5
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page4-5/Line103-126	Methods/Paragraph4-5
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page4-5/Line103-126	Methods/Paragraph4-5
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page4-5/Line103-126	Methods/Paragraph4-5
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page4-5/Line103-126	Methods/Paragraph4-5
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page4-5/Line103-126	Methods/Paragraph4-5
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	Page4-5/Line114-126	Methods/Paragraph5
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	N/A	N/A
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page5/Line129-139	Results/Paragraph1
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page5/Line129-139	Results/Paragraph1
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page5-7/Line140-191	Results/Paragraph2-7
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Page5-7/Line140-191	Results/Paragraph2-7
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page7-9/Line194-248	Discussion/Paragraph1-5
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Page7-9/Line194-248	Discussion/Paragraph1-5
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page8-9/Line233-244	Discussion/Paragraph4
Reporting of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page9/Line245-248	Discussion/Paragraph5
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page9/Line245-248	Discussion/Paragraph5
34	Guidelines for future research	Page9/Line245-248	Discussion/Paragraph5
35	Disclosure of funding source	N/A	N/A

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-23-892>

*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.