

Appendix 3: MOOSE Checklist

Items in the Proposed Reporting Checklist for Authors, Editors, and Reviewers of Meta-analyses of Observational Studies (MOOSE checklist)

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 (eg, librarians and investigators) <i>Margaret Burke has an MSc Information & Library Management and 7 years experience of designing search strategies for systematic reviews</i>	✓
Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	✓
Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	✓
Databases and registries searched	✓
Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	✓
Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	✓
List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	✓
Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English <i>Non-English language articles were translated by epidemiologists fluent in the relevant language</i>	✓
Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies <i>We included abstract only publications and assessed them for eligibility. If insufficient data were available we wrote to authors for more details. We attempted to find unpublished studies by writing to experts in the topic area and to people we thought might have cohorts with exposure and outcome measures appropriate to this topic.</i>	✓
Description of any contact with authors <i>This is available on request. We wrote to authors for details of studies not present in written reports. We asked for their knowledge of other potential papers of interest.</i>	✓

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 (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	✓
Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	✓
Assessment of confounding (eg, 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 (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	✓
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 (eg, subgroup analysis) <i>Done where applicable</i>	✓
Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	✓

Reporting of discussion should include

Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	✓
Justification for exclusion (eg, 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	✓
Guidelines for future research	✓
Disclosure of funding source	✓