**MOOSE Checklist**

From: Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al (2000) Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: A proposal for reporting. JAMA 283:2008–2012. doi:10.1001/jama.283.15.2008.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Reported on page | Comments |
| **Reporting of background should include** | | |
| Problem definition |  |  |
| Hypothesis statement |  |  |
| Description of study outcome(s) |  |  |
| Type of exposure or intervention used |  |  |
| Type of study designs used |  |  |
| Study population |  |  |
| **Reporting of search strategy should include** | | |
| Qualifications of searchers (e.g. librarians and investigators) |  |  |
| Search strategy, including time period used in the synthesis and key words |  |  |
| Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors |  |  |
| Databases and registries searched |  |  |
| Search software used, name and version, including special features used (e.g. explosion) |  |  |
| Use of hand searching (e.g. reference lists of obtained articles) |  |  |
| List of citations located and those excluded, including justification |  |  |
| Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English |  |  |
| Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies |  |  |
| Description of any contact with authors |  |  |
| **Reporting of methods should include** | | |
| Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested |  |  |
| Rationale for the selection and coding of data (e.g. sound clinical principles or convenience) |  |  |
| Documentation of how data were classified and coded (e.g. multiple raters, blinding and interrater reliability) |  |  |
| Assessment of confounding (e.g. comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate) |  |  |
| Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors, stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results |  |  |
| Assessment of heterogeneity |  |  |
| Description of statistical methods (e.g. 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 |  |  |
| Provision of appropriate tables and graphics |  |  |
| **Reporting of results should include** | | |
| Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate |  |  |
| Table giving descriptive information for each study included |  |  |
| Results of sensitivity testing (e.g. subgroup analysis) |  |  |
| Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings |  |  |
| **Reporting of discussion should include** | | |
| Quantitative assessment of bias (e.g. publication bias) |  |  |
| Justification for exclusion (e.g. exclusion of non-English language citations) |  |  |
| Assessment of quality of included studies |  |  |
| **Reporting of conclusions should include** | | |
| Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results |  |  |
| Generalization of the conclusions (i.e. appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review) |  |  |
| Guidelines for future research |  |  |
| Disclosure of funding source |  |  |