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	3-4
Hypothesis statement	Yes	3-4
Description of Study Outcome(s)	Yes	5-7
Type of exposure or intervention used	Yes	5-7
Type of study design used	Yes	5-7
Study population	Yes	5
Reporting of Search Strategy	1.00	
Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians	Ves	4
and investigators)	Yes	4
Search strategy, including time period	T.	4.5
included in the synthesis and keywords	Yes	4-5
Effort to include all available studies,		4.5
including contact with authors	Yes	4-5
Databases and registries searched	Yes	4-5
Search software used, name and		
version, including special features used	Yes	4-5
(eg, explosion)		
Use of hand searching (eg, reference	T _V	4-5
lists of obtained articles)	Yes	4-5
List of citations located and those	Ves	6-7
excluded, including justification	Yes	0-7
Method for addressing articles		
published in languages other than	Yes	4-5
English		
Method of handling abstracts and	Yes	4-5
unpublished studies	103	7 3
Description of any contact with authors	Yes	4-5
Reporting of Methods		
Description of relevance or		
appropriateness of studies assembled for	Yes	4-6
assessing the hypothesis to be tested		
Rationale for the selection and coding of		
data (eg, sound clinical principles or	Yes	4-6
convenience)		
Documentation of how data were		
classified and coded (eg, multiple raters,	Yes	4-6
blinding, and interrater reliability)		
Assessment of confounding (eg,		
comparability of cases and controls in	Yes	6-7
studies where appropriate		

Reporting Criteria	Reported (Yes/No)	Reported on Page No.
Assessment of study quality, including		
blinding of quality assessors;	Yes	<u> </u>
stratification or regression on possible	162	5-7
predictors of study results		
Assessment of heterogeneity	Yes	6-7
Description of statistical methods (eg,		
complete description of fixed or random		
effects models, justification of whether		
the chosen models account for predictors	Yes	5-7
of study results, dose-response models,		
or cumulative meta-analysis) in sufficient		
detail to be replicated		
Provision of appropriate tables and	V	Figure 1
graphics	Yes	Figure 1
Reporting of Results		
Table giving descriptive information for	Yes	Supplementary
each study included	103	Supplementary
Results of sensitivity testing (eg,	Yes	6-7
subgroup analysis)	163	0-7
Indication of statistical uncertainty of		7
findings	Yes	6-7
Reporting of Discussion		
Quantitative assessment of bias (eg,	Yes	6-7
publication bias)	163	0-7
Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion	Van	NA
of non–English-language citations)	Yes	IVA
Assessment of quality of included studies	Yes	5-7
Reporting of Conclusions		
Consideration of alternative explanations	Yes	7-9
for observed results	163	1-7
Generalization of the conclusions (ie,		
appropriate for the data presented and	Yes	7-9
within the domain of the literature review)		
Guidelines for future research	Yes	7-9
Disclosure of funding source	Yes	Title

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.