

# MOOSE CHECKLIST

## DISCLAIMER :

This checklist is meant only for academic reference purpose only.  
We acknowledge the author and the publisher



pubrica.com



(UK) +44 161 394 0786  
(IN) +91 98843 50006  
(USA) +1-972-502-9262



sales@pubrica.com

## 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.
<b>Reporting of Background</b>		
Problem definition	Yes	
Hypothesis statement	Yes	
Description of Study Outcome(s)	Yes	
Type of exposure or intervention used	Yes	
Type of study design used	Yes	
Study population	Yes	
<b>Reporting of Search Strategy</b>		
Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators)	Yes	
Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords	Yes	
Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	Yes	
Databases and registries searched	Yes	
Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion)	Yes	
Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)	Yes	
List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	Yes	
Method for addressing articles published in languages other than English	Yes	
Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies	Yes	
Description of any contact with authors	Yes	
<b>Reporting of Methods</b>		
Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	Yes	
Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)	Yes	
Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)	Yes	
Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	Yes	

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	
Assessment of heterogeneity	Yes	
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	
Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Yes	
<b>Reporting of Results</b>		
Table giving descriptive information for each study included	Yes	
Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)	Yes	
Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Yes	
<b>Reporting of Discussion</b>		
Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)	Yes	
Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)	Yes	
Assessment of quality of included studies	Yes	
<b>Reporting of Conclusions</b>		
Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Yes	
Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Yes	
Guidelines for future research	Yes	
Disclosure of funding source	Yes	

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.