

## PRISMA-DTA Checklist

Section/topic	#	PRISMA-DTA Checklist Item	Reported on Page Number/Line Number	Reported on Section/Paragraph
<b>TITLE/ABSTRACT</b>				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review (+/- meta-analysis) of diagnostic test accuracy (DTA) studies.	Page 1/Line 1-2	Title/Paragraph 1
Abstract	2	Abstract: See PRISMA-DTA for abstracts (Table 2).	Page 1/Line 16	Abstract/Paragraph 1-4
<b>INTRODUCTION</b>				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	Page 1/Line 1-2	Introduction/Paragraph 1
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 1/Line 36	Introduction/Paragraph 5
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of question(s) being addressed in terms of participants, index test(s), and target condition(s).	Page 1/Line 36	Introduction/Paragraph 5
<b>METHODS</b>				
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.	NA	NA
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 3/Line 3-7	Methods/Paragraph 1
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 2/Line 31-39	Methods/Paragraph 5
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 2/Line 30	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 2/Line 32-36	Methods/Paragraph 5
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 19-25	Methods/Paragraph 3
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 3/Line 19-25	Methods/Paragraph 3

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 3/Line 19-25	Methods/Paragraph 3
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).	Page 3/Line 33	Methods/Paragraph 6
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 4/Line 8	Methods/Paragraph 1
Meta-analysis	D2	Report the statistical methods used for meta-analyses, if performed.	Page 4/Line 8	Methods/Paragraph 1
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
<b>RESULTS</b>				
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 4/Line 8	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 4/Line 10-14	Result/Paragraph 2
Risk of bias and applicability	19	Present evaluation of risk of bias and concerns regarding applicability for each study.	Page 3/Line 27-30	Result/Paragraph 4
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 4/Line 10-14	Result/Paragraph 2
Synthesis of results	21	Describe test accuracy, including variability; if meta-analysis was done, include results and confidence intervals.	Page 4/Line 8	Result/Paragraph 1
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
<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence.	Page 8/Line 28	Discussion/Paragraph 4
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 9/Line 12-20	Discussion/Paragraph 3

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 9/Line 40-43	Discussion/Paragraph 6
<b>FUNDING</b>				
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
<b>TITLE and PURPOSE</b>				
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review (+/- meta-analysis) of diagnostic test accuracy (DTA) studies.	Page 1/Line 1-2	Title/Paragraph 1
Objectives	2	Indicate the research question, including components such as participants, index test, and target conditions.	Page 1/Line 17	Abstract/Paragraph 1
<b>METHODS</b>				
Eligibility criteria	3	Include study characteristics used as criteria for eligibility.	Page 1/Line 18-22	Abstract/Paragraph 2
Information sources	4	List the key databases searched and the search dates.	Page 1/Line 18	Abstract/Paragraph 2
Risk of bias & applicability	5	Indicate the methods of assessing risk of bias and applicability.	Page 1/Line 18-22	Abstract/Paragraph 2
Synthesis of results	A1	Indicate the methods for the data synthesis.	Page 1/Line 22	Abstract/Paragraph 2
<b>RESULTS</b>				
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 23-28	Abstract/Paragraph 3
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 1/Line 23-28	Abstract/Paragraph 3

<b>DISCUSSION</b>				
Strengths and limitations	9	Provide a brief summary of the strengths and limitations of the evidence	Page 1/Line 29	Abstract/Paragraph4
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and the important implications.	Page 1/Line 29-30	Abstract/Paragraph4
<b>OTHER</b>				
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.

Article Information: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tcr-22-864>

\*As the checklist was provided upon initial submission, the page number/line number reported may be changed due to copyediting and may not be referable in the published version. In this case, the section/paragraph may be used as an alternative reference.