**Appendix A: MOOSE Statement - Reporting Checklist for Authors of Meta-analyses of Observational Studies**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reporting Criteria | Reported (Yes/No) | Reported on Page |
| Reporting of Background | Yes | 5 |
|  Problem definition | Yes | 5 |
|  Hypothesis statement | Yes | 5 |
|  Description of Study Outcome(s) | Yes | 5 |
|  Type of exposure or intervention used | Yes | 5 |
|  Type of study design used | Yes | 5 |
|  Study population | Yes | 5 |
| Reporting of Search Strategy | Yes | Supplement 2 |
|  Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | Yes | 6 |
|  Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords | Yes | 6 and Supplement 2 |
|  Effort to include all available studies,  including contact with authors | Yes | 6 and 7 |
|  Databases and registries searched | Yes | 6 |
|  Search software used, name and  version, including special features used  (eg, explosion) | Not applicable | - |
|  Use of hand searching (eg, reference  lists of obtained articles) | Yes | 6 |
|  List of citations located and those  excluded | Yes | Table 1 and Figure 1 |
|  Method for addressing articles  published in languages other than  English | Not applicable | - |
|  Method of handling unpublished studies | Not applicable | - |
|  Description of any contact with authors | Yes | 6 |
| Reporting of Methods | Yes | 6, 7 and 8 |
|  Description of relevance or  appropriateness of studies assembled for  assessing the hypothesis to be tested | Yes | 6 and 7 |
|  Rationale for the selection and coding of  data  | Yes | 7 |
|  Documentation of how data were  classified and coded  | Yes | 7 |
|  Assessment of confounding  | Yes | Table 1 |
|  Assessment of study quality, including  blinding of quality assessors;  stratification or regression on possible  predictors of study results  | Yes | 7. and Supplement 3 |
|  Assessment of heterogeneity | Yes | 7 |
|  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 | 7 |
|  Provision of appropriate tables and  graphics | Yes | Table 1. Figures 2 and 3 |
| Reporting of Results | Yes | 8,9,10 and 11 |
|  Table giving descriptive information for  each study included | Yes | Table 1 |
|  Results of sensitivity testing  | Yes | 10 |
|  Indication of statistical uncertainty of  findings | Yes | 10 |
| Reporting of Discussion | Yes | 11, 12, 13 and 14 |
|  Quantitative assessment of bias (eg,  publication bias) | Yes | 10 |
|  Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion  of non–English-language citations) | Yes | 6 |
|  Assessment of quality of included studies | Yes | Supplement 3 |
| Reporting of Conclusions | Yes | 12, 13 and 14 |
|  Consideration of alternative explanations  for observed results | Yes | 12 |
|  Generalization of the conclusions (ie,  appropriate for the data presented and  within the domain of the literature review) | Yes | 13 |
|  Guidelines for future research | Yes | 14 |
|  Disclosure of funding source | Yes | 14 |