Moose checklist

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Reporting of background should include |  |
| Problem definition | Background (Paragraph 3) |
| Hypothesis statement | Background (Paragraph 3) |
| Description of study outcome(s) | OS, DFS stage(Paragraph 12) |
| Type of exposure or intervention used | Various cancer (Paragraph 11) |
| Type of study designs used | Meta-analysis (Paragraph 3) |
| Study populationReporting of search strategy should include | Asian (Paragraph 11&Table 1) |
| Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | Investigators (Paragraph 7) |
| Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords | Literature search and selection criteria (Paragraph 5-6) |
| Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors | We contact authors and searched reference lists and citations (Paragraph 10) |
| Databases and registries searched | Methods (Paragraph 10) |
| Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion) | Methods (Paragraph 5) |
| Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) | Literature search and selection criteria (Paragraph 5-6) |
| List of citations located and those excluded, including justification | Flow diagram in Figure 1 |
| Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English | Literature search and selection criteria (Paragraph 5-6) |
| Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies | Method (Paragraph 6) |
| Description of any contact with authors Reporting of methods should include | Method (Paragraph 6) |
| Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested | Method (Paragraph 6) |
| Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience) | Methods (Paragraph 7-8) |
| Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, and interrater reliability) | Methods (Paragraph 7-8) |
| Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors | Methods (Paragraph 8) |
| Stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results | Stratified analysis (Paragraph 13) |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Assessment of heterogeneity | Heterogeneity & sensitivity analysis (Paragraph 14) |
| 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 | Methods (Page 4-6) |
| Provision of appropriate tables and graphics Reporting of results should include | Results (Page 6-8) |
| Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate | Figure 2, 3, 4, 5and 6 |
| Table giving descriptive information for each study included | Table 1 |
| Information description table for subgroup study | Table 2 and 3 |
| Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis) | Heterogeneity & sensitivity analysis (Paragraph 14) |
| Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings Reporting of discussion should include | Discussion (Paragraph 19) |
| Quantitative assessment of bias (eg, publication bias) | Publication bias (Paragraph 15) |
| Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non-English-language citations) | Eligible researches (Paragraph 10) |
| Assessment of quality of included studies Reporting of conclusions should include | Quality Assessment (Paragraph 8) |
| Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results | Discussion (Paragraph 19-20) |
| Generalisation of the conclusions (eg, appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review) | Discussion (Paragraph 19-20) |
| Guidelines for future research | Conclusions (Paragraph 21) |
| Disclosure of funding source | Funding (Page 13) |