

## From: **Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology: A Proposal for Reporting**

JAMA. 2000;283(15):2008-2012. doi:10.1001/jama.283.15.2008 [31]

**Table.** A Proposed Reporting Checklist for Authors, Editors, and Reviewers of Meta-analyses of Observational Studies

---

Reporting of background should include

- \* Problem definition
- \* Hypothesis statement
- \* Description of study outcome(s)
- \* Type of exposure or intervention used
- \* Type of study designs used
- \* Study population

Reporting of search strategy should include

- \* Qualifications of searchers (eg, 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 (eg, explosion)
- \* Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles)
- \* List of citations located and those excluded, including justification

N/A Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English

- \* Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies
- \* 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 (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience)
- \* Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability)
- \* Assessment of confounding (eg, 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 (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
- \* Provision of appropriate tables and graphics

Reporting of results should include

- \* Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate
- \* Table giving descriptive information for each study included

N/A Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis)

- \* Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings

Reporting of discussion should include

- \* Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias)
- \* Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations)
- \* Assessment of quality of included studies

Reporting of conclusions should include

- \* Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results
- \* Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)
- \* Guidelines for future research
- \* Disclosure of funding source

---

### Figure Legend:

**x** : Reporting check point included in current review

N/A: Point not applicable to current review