

PRISMA-DTA Checklist

| Section/topic | # | PRISMA-DTA Checklist Item | Reported on Page Number/Line Number | Reported on Section/Paragraph |
|---------------------------------|----|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| TITLE/ABSTRACT | | | | |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review (+/- meta-analysis) of diagnostic test accuracy (DTA) studies. | Page1/Line1-3 | Title/Paragraph 1 |
| Abstract | 2 | Abstract: See PRISMA-DTA for abstracts (Table 2). | Page1/Line 15 | Abstract/Paragraph 2 |
| INTRODUCTION | | | | |
| Rationale | 3 | Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known. | Page 2/Line 39 | Introduction/Paragraph 5 |
| Clinical role of index test | D1 | State the scientific and clinical background, including the intended use and clinical role of the index test, and if applicable, the rationale for minimally acceptable test accuracy (or minimum difference in accuracy for comparative design). | Page 2/Line1-3 | Introduction/Paragraph 1 |
| Objectives | 4 | Provide an explicit statement of question(s) being addressed in terms of participants, index test(s), and target condition(s). | Page 3/Line 1-24 | Introduction/Paragraph 1 |
| METHODS | | | | |
| Protocol and registration | 5 | Indicate if a review protocol exists, if and where it can be accessed (e.g., Web address), and, if available, provide registration information including registration number. | Page3/Line 26 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Eligibility criteria | 6 | Specify study characteristics (participants, setting, index test(s), reference standard(s), target condition(s), and study design) and report characteristics (e.g., years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility, giving rationale. | Page 4/Line 12-20 | Methods/Paragraph 3 |
| Information sources | 7 | Describe all information sources (e.g., databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors to identify additional studies) in the search and date last searched. | Page 5/Line 7-14 | Methods/Paragraph 2 |
| Search | 8 | Present full search strategies for all electronic databases and other sources searched, including any limits used, such that they could be repeated. | Page 3/Line 27-29 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Study selection | 9 | State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility, included in systematic review, and, if applicable, included in the meta-analysis). | Page 3/Line 27-29 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Data collection process | 10 | Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators. | Page 3/Line 27-29 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Definitions for data extraction | 11 | Provide definitions used in data extraction and classifications of target condition(s), index test(s), reference standard(s) and other characteristics (e.g. study design, clinical setting). | Page 5/Line 1-5 | Methods/Paragraph 1 |

| | | | | |
|--------------------------------|----|--|--------------------|------------------------|
| Risk of bias and applicability | 12 | Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias in individual studies and concerns regarding the applicability to the review question. | Page 5/Line 16 | Methods/Paragraph 2 |
| Diagnostic accuracy measures | 13 | State the principal diagnostic accuracy measure(s) reported (e.g. sensitivity, specificity) and state the unit of assessment (e.g. per-patient, per-lesion). | NA | NA |
| Synthesis of results | 14 | Describe methods of handling data, combining results of studies and describing variability between studies. This could include, but is not limited to: a) handling of multiple definitions of target condition. b) handling of multiple thresholds of test positivity, c) handling multiple index test readers, d) handling of indeterminate test results, e) grouping and comparing tests, f) handling of different reference standards | Page 7/Line 6 | Methods/Paragraph 1 |
| Meta-analysis | D2 | Report the statistical methods used for meta-analyses, if performed. | Page 7/Line 7-16 | Methods/Paragraph 2 |
| Additional analyses | 16 | Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified. | NA | NA |
| RESULTS | | | | |
| Study selection | 17 | Provide numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, included in the review (and included in meta-analysis, if applicable) with reasons for exclusions at each stage, ideally with a flow diagram. | Page 7/Line 6 | Result/Paragraph 1 |
| Study characteristics | 18 | For each included study provide citations and present key characteristics including: a) participant characteristics (presentation, prior testing), b) clinical setting, c) study design, d) target condition definition, e) index test, f) reference standard, g) sample size, h) funding sources | Page 7/Line 7 | Result/Paragraph 1 |
| Risk of bias and applicability | 19 | Present evaluation of risk of bias and concerns regarding applicability for each study. | Page 5/Line 16-23 | Result/Paragraph 2 |
| Results of individual studies | 20 | For each analysis in each study (e.g. unique combination of index test, reference standard, and positivity threshold) report 2x2 data (TP, FP, FN, TN) with estimates of diagnostic accuracy and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest or receiver operator characteristic (ROC) plot. | Page 7/Line 5-15 | Result/Paragraph 2 |
| Synthesis of results | 21 | Describe test accuracy, including variability; if meta-analysis was done, include results and confidence intervals. | Page 7/Line 5-15 | Result/Paragraph 2 |
| Additional analysis | 23 | Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression; analysis of index test: failure rates, proportion of inconclusive results, adverse events). | NA | NA |
| DISCUSSION | | | | |
| Summary of evidence | 24 | Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence. | Page 13/Line 2-29 | Discussion/Paragraph 2 |
| Limitations | 25 | Discuss limitations from included studies (e.g. risk of bias and concerns regarding applicability) and from the review process (e.g. incomplete retrieval of identified research). | Page 14/Line 17-30 | Discussion/Paragraph 4 |

| | | | | |
|----------------|----|---|-----------------|------------------------|
| Conclusions | 26 | Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence. Discuss implications for future research and clinical practice (e.g. the intended use and clinical role of the index test). | Page 15/Line 13 | Discussion/Paragraph 1 |
| FUNDING | | | | |
| Funding | 27 | For the systematic review, describe the sources of funding and other support and the role of the funders. | NA | NA |

Adapted From: McInnes MDF, Moher D, Thoms BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, The PRISMA-DTA Group (2018). Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies: The PRISMA-DTA Statement. JAMA. 2018 Jan 23;319(4):388-396. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.19163.

Table 2 PRISMA-DTA for Abstracts Checklist

| Section/topic | # | PRISMA-DTA Checklist Item | Reported on Page Number/Line Number | Reported on Section/Paragraph |
|------------------------------|----|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| TITLE and PURPOSE | | | | |
| Title | 1 | Identify the report as a systematic review (+/- meta-analysis) of diagnostic test accuracy (DTA) studies. | Page1/Line1-3 | Title/Paragraph 1 |
| Objectives | 2 | Indicate the research question, including components such as participants, index test, and target conditions. | Page1/Line 15 | Abstract/Paragraph 2 |
| METHODS | | | | |
| Eligibility criteria | 3 | Include study characteristics used as criteria for eligibility. | Page 1/Line 19-25 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Information sources | 4 | List the key databases searched and the search dates. | Page 1/Line 19-20 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Risk of bias & applicability | 5 | Indicate the methods of assessing risk of bias and applicability. | Page 1/Line 19-25 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| Synthesis of results | A1 | Indicate the methods for the data synthesis. | Page 1/Line 25 | Methods/Paragraph 4 |
| RESULTS | | | | |
| Included studies | 6 | Indicate the number and type of included studies and the participants and relevant characteristics of the studies (including the reference standard). | Page 1/Line 26-29 | Result/Paragraph 5 |
| Synthesis of results | 7 | Include the results for the analysis of diagnostic accuracy, preferably indicating the number of studies and participants. Describe test accuracy including variability; if meta-analysis was done, include summary results and confidence intervals. | Page 2/Line 1-4 | Result/Paragraph 1 |

| DISCUSSION | | | | |
|---------------------------|----|---|-----------------|--------------------|
| Strengths and limitations | 9 | Provide a brief summary of the strengths and limitations of the evidence | Page 2/Line 5-7 | Result/Paragraph 1 |
| Interpretation | 10 | Provide a general interpretation of the results and the important implications. | Page 2/Line 5 | Result/Paragraph 1 |
| OTHER | | | | |
| Funding | 11 | Indicate the primary source of funding for the review. | NA | NA |
| Registration | 12 | Provide the registration number and the registry name | NA | NA |

Adapted From: McInnes MDF, Moher D, Thombs BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, The PRISMA-DTA Group (2018). Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies: The PRISMA-DTA Statement. JAMA. 2018 Jan 23;319(4):388-396. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.19163.