**Additional file 2. MOOSE Checklist.**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Item No** | **Recommendation** | **Reported on Page No.** |
| Reporting of background should include |
| 1 | Problem definition | 5-6 |
| 2 | Hypothesis statement | 5-6 |
| 3 | Description of study outcome(s) | 5-6 |
| 4 | Type of exposure or intervention used | 5-6 |
| 5 | Type of study designs used | 5-6 |
| 6 | Study population | 5-6 |
| Reporting of search strategy should include |
| 7 | Qualifications of searchers (eg, librarians and investigators) | 6 |
| 8 | Search strategy, including time period included in the synthesis and key words | 6 |
| 9 | Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors | 7-8 |
| 10 | Databases and registries searched | 6 |
| 11 | Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg, explosion) | NoteExpress |
| 12 | Use of hand searching (eg, reference lists of obtained articles) | 10 |
| 13 | List of citations located and those excluded, including justification | Supplemental Digital Content 5 |
| 14 | Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English | included all languages |
| 15 | Method of handling abstracts and unpublished studies | 10 |
| 16 | Description of any contact with authors | 7-8 |
| Reporting of methods should include |
| 17 | Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested | 6-7 |
| 18 | Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg, sound clinical principles or convenience) | 7-8 |
| 19 | Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg, multiple raters, blinding and interrater reliability) | 8 |
| 20 | Assessment of confounding (eg, comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate) | 7-8 |
| 21 | Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors, stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results | 8 |
| 22 | Assessment of heterogeneity | 9 |
| 23 | 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 | 8-9, Supplemental Digital Content 4 |
| 24 | Provision of appropriate tables and graphics | Figures 1-3, Table 1, Supplemental Digital Content |
| Reporting of results should include |
| 25 | Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate | Figures 1-3 |
| 26 | Table giving descriptive information for each study included | Table 1 |
| 27 | Results of sensitivity testing (eg, subgroup analysis) | 12-13, Supplemental Digital Content 6 |
| 28 | Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings | 17-18 |
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