**Additional file 1: MOOSE Guidelines for Meta-Analyses and Systematic Reviews of Observational Studies**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Section/topic** | **Guideline item** | **Reported on page #** |
| **1** | ***Title*** | Identify the study as a meta-analysis (or systematic review) | Title |
| **Health-related quality of life in Iranian diabetic patients assessed by Short-Form-36 questionnaire: a systematic review and meta-analysis** |
| **2** | ***Abstract*** | Use the journal’s structured format | Abstract |
| **3** | ***Introduction*** | The clinical problem | Background |
| The hypothesis | Background |
| A statement of objectives that includes the study population, the condition of interest, the exposure or intervention, and the outcome(s) considered | Background |
| **4** | ***Sources*** | Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | Methods  |
| Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and keywords | Methods |
| Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors | Methods |
| Databases and registries searched | Methods |
| Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion) | Methods |
| Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) | Methods |
| List of citations located and those excluded, including justification | Methods |
| Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English | Methods |
| Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies | Methods |
| Description of any contact with authors | Methods |
| **5** | ***Study Selection*** | Types of study designs considered | Methods |
| Relevance or appropriateness of studies gathered for assessing the hypothesis to be tested | Methods |
| Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience) | Methods |
| Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding, andinterrater reliability) | Methods |
| Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies whereappropriate) | Methods |
| Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors; stratification orregression on possible predictors of study results | Methods |
| Assessment of heterogeneity | Methods |
| Statistical methods (eg, complete description of fixed or random effects models, justificationof whether the chosen models account for predictors of study results, dose-response models,or cumulative meta-analysis) in sufficient detail to be replicated | Methods |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Section/topic** | **Guideline item** | **Reported on page #** |
| **6** | ***Results*** | A graph summarizing individual study estimates and the overall estimate | Results  |
| A table giving descriptive information for each included study | Results |
| Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis) | Results |
| Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings | Results |
| **7** | ***Discussion*** | Strengths and weaknesses | Discussion  |
| Potential biases in the review process (eg, publication bias) | Discussion |
| Justification for exclusion (eg, exclusion of non–English-language citations) | Discussion |
| Assessment of quality of included studies | Discussion |
| Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results | Discussion |
| Generalization of the conclusions (ie, appropriate for the data presented and within the domainof the literature review) | Discussion |
| Guidelines for future research | Discussion |
| Disclosure of funding source | Discussion |

**Reference:** Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. JAMA. 2000;283(15):2008-12.