Sex bias in infectious disease epidemiology: patterns and processes

Felipe Guerra-Silveira and Fernando Abad-Franch

MOOSE Checklist

Note: Since our appraisal of the literature was only one aspect of our hypothesis-testing exercise (which mainly relies on official incidence records), we did not perform a systematic review. Our meta-analyses are based on a selection of published papers reporting results for males and females separately; we only excluded papers with incomplete data – i.e., when a 2x2 table with positive and negative results for each sex could not be built. No report with these characteristics was excluded after assessment of its results

	Reported on page	Comments	
Reporting of background should include			
Problem definition	1,3		
Hypothesis statement	1,4-5	See also Table 1	
Description of study outcomes	4-7		
Type of exposure or intervention used	4-7	Age-stratified sex differences	
Type of study designs used	7		
Study population	4-7		
Qualifications of searchers (eg librarians and investigators)		FA-F: MD, MSc, DLSHTM, PhD; FG-S: medical student	
Search strategy, including time period used in the synthesis and key words	7	NOTE: non-systematic searches	
Effort to include all available studies, including contact with authors	NA	See p. 7	
Databases and registries searched	7		
Search software used, name and version, including special features used (eg explosion)	NA	Used standard Internet searches	
Use of hand searching (eg reference lists of obtained articles)	7	All references used are presented	
List of citations located and those excluded, including justification	NA	Only included papers were cited	
Method of addressing articles published in languages other than English	NA	Authors fluent in English, Spanish, Portuguese	
Method of handling abstracts and unpublished	NA	Not used	

studies				
Description of any contact with authors	NA	Not done		
Reporting of methods should include				
Description of relevance or appropriateness of studies assembled for assessing the hypothesis to be tested	7			
Rationale for the selection and coding of data (eg sound clinical principles or convenience)	7			
Documentation of how data were classified and coded (eg multiple raters, blinding and interrater reliability)	7	We used the data exactly as reported		
Assessment of confounding (eg comparability of cases and controls in studies where appropriate)	NA	Only sex-stratified prevalence data were of interest		
Assessment of study quality, including blinding of quality assessors, stratification or regression on possible predictors of study results	7	We were interested in sex-stratified data		
Assessment of heterogeneity	7-8	Random-effects models used		
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	7-8			
Provision of appropriate tables and graphics	Fig. 4			
Reporting of results should include				
Graphic summarizing individual study estimates and overall estimate	NA	Only the summary OR for each disease is reported		
Table giving descriptive information for each study included	NA			
Results of sensitivity testing (eg subgroup analysis)	Fig. 4			
Indication of statistical uncertainty of findings	Throughout	95%CIs provided		
Reporting of discussion should include				
Quantitative assessment of bias (eg publication bias)	NA	Not a systematic review; see also Fig. 4 caption		
Justification for exclusion (eg exclusion of non-English language citations)	7	We only excluded papers with incomplete data		
Assessment of quality of included studies	NA	We did not make a formal assessment		
Reporting of conclusions should include				

Consideration of alternative explanations for observed results	Throughout	We compare two main hypotheses, and discuss other possibilities
Generalization of the conclusions (eg appropriate for the data presented and within the domain of the literature review)	Discussion	
Guidelines for future research	Discussion	
Disclosure of funding source	'Funding' section in the submission system	