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	Intro para 3
Hypothesis statement	No	NA
Description of Study Outcome(s)	Yes	Intro para 3
Type of exposure or intervention used	Yes	Methods 2.3 para 1
Type of study design used	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 1
Study population	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 1
Reporting of Search Strategy		
Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 2
Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Yes	Methods 2.1
Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 2
Databases and registries searched	Yes	Methods 2.1
Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Yes	Methods 2.1
Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Yes	Methods 2.1
List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Yes	Supplementary S6
Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 1
Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 1
Description of any contact with authors	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 2
Reporting of Methods		
Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Yes	Results 3.1 para 1
Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 2
Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 2
Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate	No	NA

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	Methods 2.2 para 2
Assessment of heterogeneity	Yes	Methods 2.3 para 1
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	Methods 2.3
Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Yes	Tables and figures seperate
Reporting of Results		
Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Yes	Tables 1,2,3
Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Yes	Results 3.2
Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Yes	Results 3.2
Reporting of Discussion		
Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Yes	Results 3.2
Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non–English-language citations)	Yes	Methods 2.2 para 1
Assessment of quality of included studies	Yes	Results 3.2
Reporting of Conclusions		
Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Yes	Discussion para 1
Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Yes	Discussion para 1
Guidelines for future research	Yes	Discussion 4.2
Disclosure of funding source	Yes	Title page

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.