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 6/Line 103-105	Introduction/Paragraph 2
2	Hypothesis statement	Page 6/Line 106-109	Introduction/Paragraph 3
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	Page 7/Line 136-142	Methods/Data extraction/Paragraph 2
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	Page 6/Line 106-108	Introduction/Paragraph 3
5	Type of study design used	Page 6/Line 106-108	Introduction/Paragraph 3
6	Study population	Page 9/Line 170-175	Results/Study characteristics/Paragraph 2
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Page 7/Line 131-133	Methods/Data extraction/Paragraph 1
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Page 6/Line 114-117	Methods/Search strategy/Paragraph 1
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Page 6/Line 114-117	Methods/Search strategy/Paragraph 1
10	Databases and registries searched	Page 6/Line 114-117	Methods/Search strategy/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)	N/A	N/A
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Page 8 /Line 165-169	Results/Study characteristics/Paragraph 1, figure 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15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	N/A	N/A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	Page 6/Line 114-117	Methods/Search strategy
18	Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Page 6-7/Line 120-128	Methods/Study selection
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Page 7/Line 131-135	Methods/Data extraction/Paragraph 1
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Page 7/Line 131-135	Methods/Data extraction/Paragraph 1
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Page 8/Line 146-153	Methods/Quality assessment
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	Page 8/Line 158-161	Methods/Statistical analysis/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 8/Line 156-161	Methods/Statistical analysis
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Page 16/Line 372-380	Figure1-5, Table 1
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Page 9-10/Line 184-198	Results/BR and mastectomy comparative analysis/Figure 2-4
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Page 9/Line 170-181	Results//Study characteristics/Table 1
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	N/A	N/A
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	N/A	N/A
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Page 12/Line 259-260	Discussion/Paragraph 5
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non–English-language citations)	Page 12/Line 260-264	Discussion/Paragraph 5
31	Assessment of quality of included studies	Table 1	Table 1
Reporting of Conclusions			
32	Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	N/A	N/A
33	Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Page 13/Line 274-275	Conclusions
34	Guidelines for future research	N/A	N/A
35	Disclosure of funding source	Page 13/Line 281-282	Funding

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-23-706

*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.