MOOSE (Meta-analyses of Observational Studies in Epidemiology) Checklist

Item No	Recommendation	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph		
Report	Reporting of Background				
1	Problem definition	Page2-3/Line58-82	Introduction/Paragraph1		
2	Hypothesis statement	Page2-3/Line58-82	Introduction/Paragraph1		
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page2-3/Line58-82	Introduction/Paragraph1		
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page2-3/Line58-82	Introduction/Paragraph1		
5	Type of study design used	Page2-3/Line58-82	Introduction/Paragraph1		
6	Study population	Page2-3/Line58-82	Introduction/Paragraph1		
Report	Reporting of Search Strategy				
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page3/Line86-100	Methods/Paragraph1		
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page3/Line86-100	Methods/Paragraph1		
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page3/Line86-100	Methods/Paragraph1		
10	Databases and registries searched	Page3/Line86-100	Methods/Paragraph1		
11	Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Page3/Line86-100	Methods/Paragraph1		
12	Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Page3/Line86-100	Methods/Paragraph1		
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page4/Line103-115	Methods/Paragraph2		
14	Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Page4/Line103-115	Methods/Paragraph2		
15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Page4/Line103-115	Methods/Paragraph2		
16	Description of any contact with authors	N/A	N/A		

Report	ing of Methods			
17	Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Page4/Line118-129	Methods/Paragraph3	
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page4/Line118-129	Methods/Paragraph3	
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page4/Line118-129	Methods/Paragraph3	
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page4/Line118-129	Methods/Paragraph3	
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page4/Line118-129	Methods/Paragraph3	
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page4/Line118-129	Methods/Paragraph3	
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/Line132-145	Methods/Paragraph4	
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page4-5/Line132-145	Methods/Paragraph4	
Report	ing of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page5/Line150-165	Results/Paragraph1-2	
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page5-6/Line168-204	Results/Paragraph3-7	
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Page7/Line207-211	Results/Paragraph8	
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Page7/Line214-220	Results/Paragraph9	
Reporting of Discussion				
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page7-9/Line223-288	Discussion/Paragraph1-4	
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Page9-10/Line290-305	Discussion/Paragraph5	
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Page7-10/Line223-305	Discussion/Paragraph1-5	
Report	ing of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Page10/Line308-315	Conclusion/Paragraph1	
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page10/Line308-315	Conclusion/Paragraph1	
34	Guidelines for future research	Page10/Line308-315	Conclusion/Paragraph1	
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-23-1157

^{*}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.