

	CHAMP	SATIRE checklist [10] / SUN 2010 [19]	Pincus [12]
<i>Aim of tool</i>	to assess individual studies or body of evidence on moderator or predictor findings	to assess subgroup quality as part of a systematic review	to assess moderator findings for inclusion in systematic reviews
<i>Aimed at (M)oderators or (P)redictors</i>	M and P	M and P (referred to as 'subgroup effects')	M only
<i>Development method</i>	new checklist	extension of existing set of 7 criteria by Oxman and Guyatt [23]	new checklist
<i>Source of criteria</i>	literature & Delphi panel	existing checklist & expert opinion	literature & Delphi panel
<i>Target study types</i>	Quantitative or quantitative studies	randomized trials (for inclusion in systematic reviews)	randomized trials (for inclusion in systematic reviews)
<i>Type of questions</i>	closed (polar)	open (polar)	open (polar)
<i>Remarks</i>	contains two lists: 1 for rating individual studies 1 for body of evidence	SATIRE checklist: Not presented as standalone checklist; developed for their review specifically. Sun 2010: similar to SATIRE checklist but presented as checklist	contains two lists: 1 for exploratory meta-analyses 1 for confirmatory meta-analyses
<i>Primary output</i>	overall verdict and answers to individual items	unspecified; answers to individual questions	unspecified; answers to individual questions
<i>Background information on item usage</i>	included	included for n=4 new items (Sun 2010 only). Remainder only through references	Included in publication, backup up by references but limited in usability as a standalone document
<i>Total number of items</i>	13 (individual studies) 15 (body of evidence)	11	3 (exploratory) 5 (confirmatory)
<i>Prespecification of hypothesis</i>	yes	yes (also directional)	yes (only in confirmatory list)
<i>Prespecification of analysis</i>	yes	no	yes (only in confirmatory list)
<i>Interaction test usage</i>	yes	yes	yes
<i>Credibility of findings</i>	(indirect through biol. Rationale and effect size)	(indirect through biol. rationale)	yes (only in confirmatory list, theory or evidence-based plausibility)
<i>Consistency (within and between studies)</i>	yes (between studies only in body-of-evidence list)	yes	no
<i>Transferability of findings</i>	yes	no	no
<i>Was factor measured at</i>	yes	yes (only refers to randomisation)	yes (only refers to randomisation)

<i>baseline or before randomisation</i>			
<i>Biological rationale</i>	yes	yes ('indirect evidence')	yes (only in confirmatory list)
<i>Independence other effects</i>	no	yes	no
<i>Effect within versus between studies</i>	no	yes	no
<i>Limited to a small number of tests</i>	yes	yes	no
<i>Effect size</i>	yes (clinical importance)	yes	no
<i>Measurement quality</i>	yes	no	yes
<i>Sample size</i>	yes	no	no
<i>Completeness of tests reported</i>	yes	no	no
<i>Statistical reporting</i>	yes	no	no

Table 1: comparison of CHAMP checklist (this study) with two checklists by Sun et al.[10, 19](both are similar, hence compared simultaneously) and a moderator checklist by Pincus et al. [12].