Supplement 1: MOOSE Statement - Reporting Checklist for Authors of Meta-analyses of Observational Studies

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Reporting Criteria | Reported (Yes/No) | Reported on Page |
| Reporting of Background | Yes | 4-5 |
| Problem definition | Yes | 4-5 |
| Hypothesis statement | Yes | 5 |
| Description of Study Outcome(s) | Yes | 5 |
| Type of exposure or intervention used | NA | 5 |
| Type of study design used | Yes | 5 |
| Study population | NA | 5 |
| Reporting of Search Strategy | Yes | 6 |
| Qualifications of searchers (eg, 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 | Yes | 6 |
| Databases and registries searched | Yes | 6 |
| Search software used, name and  version, including special features used  (eg, explosion) | Yes | 6 |
| Use of hand searching (eg, reference  lists of obtained articles) | Yes | 6 |
| List of citations located and those  excluded | Yes | Figure 1 |
| Method for addressing articles  published in languages other than  English | NA | NA |
| Method of handling unpublished studies | NA | NA |
| Description of any contact with authors | Yes | 6 |
| Reporting of Methods | Yes | 5-8 |
| Description of relevance or  appropriateness of studies assembled for  assessing the hypothesis to be tested | Yes | 6 |
| Rationale for the selection and coding of  data | Yes | 6 |
| Documentation of how data were  classified and coded | Yes | Table 1 and 2 |
| Assessment of confounding | Yes | 6 |
| Assessment of study quality, including  blinding of quality assessors;  stratification or regression on possible  predictors of study results | Yes | Supplement 2 |
| 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 | Figure 2, tables 1 and 2. Supplement 3 and 4 |
| Reporting of Results | Yes | 8-10 |
| Table giving descriptive information for  each study included | Yes | Table 1 and 2 |
| Results of sensitivity testing | Yes | Supplement 3 |
| Indication of statistical uncertainty of  findings | Yes | 9, Supplement 3 |
| Reporting of Discussion | Yes | 10-13 |
| Quantitative assessment of bias (eg,  publication bias) | No | 8 |
| Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion  of non–English-language citations) | NA | -- |
| Assessment of quality of included studies | Yes | Supplement 2 |
| Reporting of Conclusions | Yes | 13 |
| Consideration of alternative explanations  for observed results | Yes | 11-14 |
| 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 | 13 |
| Disclosure of funding source | Yes | 3 |