MOOSE Guide (Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology)
- A checklist for authors, editors, and reviewers of meta-analyses of observational studies

Reporting of the background should include:
- problem definition;
- hypothesis statement;
- description of study outcome(s);
- type of exposure or intervention used;
- type of study designs used; and
- study population.

Reporting of the search strategy should include:
- qualifications of searchers (e.g., librarians and investigators);
- 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 (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- method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies; and
- 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 inter-rater 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; and
- provision of appropriate tables and graphics.
Reporting of results should include:
- graphical summary of individual study estimates and the overall estimate of effect;
- a table giving descriptive information for each study included;
- results of sensitivity testing (e.g., subgroup analysis); and
- 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; and
- the discussion should also include discussion of issues related to bias, including publication bias, confounding, and quality.

Reporting of conclusions should include:
- consideration of alternative explanations for observed results;
- generalizability of the conclusions (i.e., appropriate to the data presented);
- guidelines for future research;
- disclosure of funding source.
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