

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	P3 Line4-8	Introduction Paragraph1
2	Hypothesis statement	P3 Line20, P4 Line1-2	Introduction Paragraph2
3	Description of Study Outcome(s)	P4 Line3-5	Introduction Paragraph2
4	Type of exposure or intervention used	P4 Line22-28, P5 Line 1-7	Inclusion criteria
5	Type of study design used	P4 Line22-28, P5 Line 1-7	Inclusion criteria
6	Study population	P4 Line22-28, P5 Line 1-7	Inclusion criteria
Reporting of Search Strategy			
7	Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	P5 Line 12-15	Data extraction
8	Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	P4 Line 12-20	Search strategy
9	Effort to include all available studies, including contact with author	N/A	N/A

10	Databases and registries searche	P4 Line 9-10, 12-13	Method and Search strategy
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)	P6 Line 6-7	Result
13	List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	N/A	N/A
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15	Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	N/A	N/A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 author	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)	P5 Line 22-28, P6 Line 1-3	Statistical analysis
19	Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	N/A	N/A
20	Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	N/A	N/A
21	Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	P5 Line 17-20	Quality assessment
22	Assessment of heterogeneity	P6 Line 13,17,25-26, P7 Line 8-	Results Paragraph 2-8

		9,16,24-25, P8 Line 1	
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	P5 Line 27-28, P6 Line 1	Statistical analysis
24	Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Supplementary Material	Supplementary Material
Reporting of Results			
25	Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	Supplementary Material	Supplementary Material
26	Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Supplementary Material Table1	Supplementary Material Table1
27	Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	P6 Line 14-15,22- 23, P7 Line 1-2,10- 11,18-20,25-26, P8 Line 6-7	Results Paragraph 2-8
28	Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	N/A	N/A
Reporting of Discussion			
29	Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	P9 Line 9-28, P10 Line 1-30, P11 Line 1-13	Discussion
30	Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	N/A	N/A

31	Assessment of quality of included studie	P9 Line 9-15	Discussion Paragraph4
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)	P11 Line 23-26	Conclusions
34	Guidelines for future research	N/A	N/A
35	Disclosure of funding source	P11 Line 29-30	Acknowledgments

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/tgh-23-58>

*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.