

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

A reporting checklist for Authors, Editors, and Reviewers of Meta-analyses of Observational Studies. You must report the page number in your manuscript where you consider each of the items listed in this checklist. If you have not included this information, either revise your manuscript accordingly before submitting or note N/A.

Reporting Criteria	Reported (Yes/No)	Reported on Page No.
Reporting of Background		
Problem definition	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	4
Hypothesis statement	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	4
Description of Study Outcome(s)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	5
Type of exposure or intervention used	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	5
Type of study design used	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	6
Study population	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	6
Reporting of Search Strategy		
Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	6
Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	6
Databases and registries searched	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	6
Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	7
Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Description of any contact with authors	No <input type="checkbox"/>	N/A
Reporting of Methods		
Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7
Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	7

Reporting Criteria	Reported (Yes/No)	Reported on Page No.
Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	Yes	7
Assessment of heterogeneity	Yes	10
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	Yes	10
Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Yes	10
Reporting of Results		
Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Yes	11
Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Yes	11
Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Yes	11
Reporting of Discussion		
Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	No	N/A
Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non–English-language citations)	No	N/A
Assessment of quality of included studies	Yes	7
Reporting of Conclusions		
Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Yes	15
Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Yes	15
Guidelines for future research	Yes	15
Disclosure of funding source	Yes	15

Once you have completed this checklist, please save a copy and upload it as part of your submission. DO NOT include this checklist as part of the main manuscript document. It must be uploaded as a separate file.