Supplementary Table 4. MOOSE statement: reporting checklist for authors, editors, and reviewers of meta-analyses of observational studies

Reporting criteria	Reported	Reported on page
Reporting of background		
Problem definition	Yes	5
Hypothesis statement	Yes	6
Description of study outcome(s)	Yes	6
Type of exposure or intervention used	Yes	6
Type of study design used	Yes	6
Study population	Yes	6
Reporting of search strategy		
Qualifications of searchers (e.g., librarians and investigators)	Yes	6
Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Yes	6
Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	No	
Databases and registries searched	Yes	6
Search software used, name and version, including special features used (e.g., explosion)	No	
Use of hand searching (e.g., reference lists of obtained articles)	No	
List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Yes	6
Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	No	
Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	No	
Description of any contact with authors	No	
Reporting of methods		
Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Yes	7
Rationale for the selection and coding of data (e.g., sound clinical principles or convenience)	Yes	6-7
Documentation of how data were classified and coded (e.g., multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Yes	7
Assessment of confounding (e.g., comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Yes	7
Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results YES 5	Yes	7
Assessment of heterogeneity	Yes	8
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	Yes	8
Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Yes	
Reporting of results		
Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Yes	Supplementary Table 2
Results of sensitivity testing (e.g., subgroup analysis)	Yes	Supplementary Figures 2-11
Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Yes	8
Reporting of discussion		
Quantitative assessment of bias (e.g., publication bias)	Yes	11
Justification for exclusion (e.g., exclusion of non–English-language citations)	No	
Assessment of quality of included studies	Yes	11
Reporting of conclusions		
Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	No	
Generalization of the conclusions (i.e., appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Yes	15
Guidelines for future research	No	
Disclosure of funding source	Yes	15

MOOSE, Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology.