

**Exercise 1b: Effect Size Estimates and Moderator Values (BCG Vaccine Meta-Analysis)**

Study	Vaccinated		Not Vaccinated		RR	log(RR)	v	Absolute Latitude	Group Allocation
	TB+	TB-	TB+	TB-					
1	4	119	11	128	0.41	-0.89	0.326	44	random
<b>2</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>300</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>274</b>	<b>0.20</b>	<b>-1.59</b>	<b>0.195</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>random</b>
3	3	228	11	209	0.26	-1.35	0.415	42	random
4	62	13536	248	12619	0.24	-1.44	0.020	52	random
5	33	5036	47	5761	0.80	-0.22	0.051	13	alternate
6	180	1361	372	1079	0.46	-0.79	0.007	44	alternate
7	8	2537	10	619	0.20	-1.62	0.223	19	random
8	505	87886	499	87892	1.01	0.01	0.004	13	random
9	29	7470	45	7232	0.63	-0.47	0.056	27	random
10	17	1699	65	1600	0.25	-1.37	0.073	42	systematic
11	186	50448	141	27197	0.71	-0.34	0.012	18	systematic
12	5	2493	3	2338	1.56	0.45	0.533	33	systematic
<b>13</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>16886</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>17825</b>	<b>0.98</b>	<b>-0.02</b>	<b>0.071</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>systematic</b>

Notes: The absolute latitude of the study locations has to be looked up (not reported in the studies). For study 2, the numbers of TB+ and TB- cases were taken from Table I (p. 7). For study 13, the numbers were based on what is reported in the text (“17,854 were controls, 16,913 were vaccinees”) and Table I (both on p. 277). Note that only “confirmed tuberculosis” cases were considered to be TB+ (this is what Colditz et al. did in their meta-analysis). One could also consider counting “presumptive tuberculosis” cases as TB+. This is a decision that needs to be made by the meta-analyst.