ui refid extractor	***************************************	
first.author		
title		
journal		
pub.year	####	
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * *	***********
[Eligibility criteria [1. Meta-analysis of [2. Was based on syst criteria)] [3. Has an imaging, 6 [4. Exclude comparis [NB the above exclude	a:] diagnosti tematic re clinical, on of cont e reviews	c or prognostic accuracy ] view methodology (key question; search; elgibility genetic test - (not risk instruments like APACHE)] inuous measurements ] of clinical outcomes after Dx test application]
[1 = yes; 0 = no]		
eligible excl.reason	#	[Is this study eligible? ]
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * *	**********
/* This is for the p	erformed a	nalyses */
n.studies	###	[Total articles in paper - e.g. number at the end of the flowchart, N of papers in metanalysis]
n.tests	##	[Number of different index tests included in any meta- analysis: e.g., CT or MRI or PET vs. a gold standard]
n.ref.stand	##	[Number of different reference tests included in any meta- analysis: e.g., outcomes - breast Ca, lung Ca etc ]
[Another way to look analyses in the pape:	at it: (n r]	.tests) $x$ (n.ref.stand) is giving us the number of meta-
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * *	******************
[Try to classify the field cvd	test that #	is being studied (medical field)]
field.obgvn	#	[obstetrics-gynecology]
field.gi	#	[gastrointestinal]
field.id	#	[infectious diseases]
field.onc	#	[hematology-oncology]
field.kidn	#	[nephrology - urology]
field.rheu	#	[rheumatology]
tield.pulm	#	[pulmonary medicine]
field.orth	#	[ortnopedics]
field opt	# #	[psychiatry] [Far - Nego - Threat]
field neuro	#	[Lai - Nose - Infoat]
field.peds	#	[Pediatrics]
field other		
[if it does not fit	to the abo	ve list, free text]
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * *	******************
[write 1-Y or 0-N to	the follo	wing questions]
binary.test	#	[is this a binary test? - based on the handling of studies in the meta-analysis ]
* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *	* * * * * * * * * *	************
[Try to categorise t]	he type of	test that the paper studies]
histology.cytology clinical.exam	# #	[e.g., biopsy, pap smear] [e.g., signs (mcburney's, boas), murmurs, blood pressure measurement]

imaging [e.g., CT scan, V-Q scan, MRI, chest X-ray] biomarker # [e.g., PSA, BNP, PTH] clinical.test [e.g., this can be a challenge test such as using levodopa for idiopathic Parkinson's diagnosis, or doing a treadmill test (stress test) or doing a tilt test] [e.g., measuring electric impendance, EKG, EEG, doppler physiologic.test # measurement of blood flow (not image, but Qa), sleep apnea testing, spirometry] [e.g., gastroscopy, colonoscopy] endoscopy.exams # [If there are no obvious candidates for the above, please describe in 80 chars] describe.test \*\*\*\*\*\* [Describe the search - again 1 = yes; 0 = no] [If the above is 0 then do they report the following] [they list or enumerate search terms without boolean search.terms # operandsl [they state that the exact search is available upon request, search.on.demand # available on a website, or in a previous paper] yr.searched # [search years mentioned] qual.exc ± [in the inclusion criteria do they describe excluding studies based on study quality We do count exclusions based on - risk of verification bias - timing between index and reference test administration - blinding etc. We do not count study design characteristics - i.e., exclusion of retrospective or Xsectional studies ] min.n [in the inclusion criteria do they describe excluding studies based on min sample size?] ##### [if yes above, fill in cutoff sample size] min.no.sub Which languages were included? [1] English only --- [2] English + specific other -- [3] no restrictions or all --- [4] not stated language # Which of the following databases were searched? [MEDLINE - ANY VENDOR, Pubmed or OVID] Medline # Embase # [EMBASE] [conference proceedings] Conference # biblio [reference lists] # [review papers] [Science citation index] review # # sci [current contents] [Contact experts in the field] CC # experts # [were manufacturers specifically asked for info on studies] manufacturers # specific.db # [Other specific database] manual # [handsearching] [Cochrane CENTRAL or Cochrane database of systematic reviews] cochrane # CINAHL [CINAHL] # unpublished.data # [Did they search for unpublished data] Which funder? [0] No funder [1] Non-industry only --- [2] Any industry funding --- [3] not mentioned funding # \*\*\*\*\* [Did the meta-analysis abstract for each individual study the following characteristics?] [NB -Answer yes if they describe abstracting this information even if they do not report it in a table, or even if they do not perform or report analyses by these characteristics -- answer 0 [no] if they do not explicitly state that they assessed the characteristic. Only note characteristics that were explicitly mentioned. ] [did they do any quality assessment - scores or items both anv.gual # count] [setting of study -- e.g., tertiary care, rural] settings # consecutive # [whether participants were recruited consecutively or not] [whether participants were recruited prospectively or not] prospective # refstd # [the exact definition of the reference standard per study] [whether the test reader/assessor in each study was #

reader

experienced or not] [blinding of index test assessor to reference standard blinding.index # or to clinical information ] blinding.refst # [blinding of reference test assessor to index test results] blinding.unspecif # [they mention blinding but not distinguish in the above] [describe age distribution in studies e.g., mean, sd] Aqe # Gender [male/female] Location [geographic location e.g. US/Europe] # [representativeness of spectrum of patients studied or Spectrum bias # description of severity] [what criteria were used to select patients for study] Selection bias # Time # [adequacy of the time interval between the index test and reference standard] Test Independence # [was the reference standard independent of the index test? i.e. the index test did not form part of the reference standard] [were uninterpretable/intermediate test results reported?] Indeterminant results# [were withdrawals from the study explained?] [verification bias - whether the decision to apply the reference Withdrawals # verbias # test is influenced by the results of the index test] [If they used QUADAS to rate studies indicate 1 below. If not, indicate 0. ] Ouadas # Stard ± IMPORTANT NOTE for HANDLING QUALITY EXTRACTIONS: When the authors claim to have used QUADAS or STARD First, check the corresponding checklist (QUADAS or STARD) above. Then, If they report the specific items they used (which may be a subset of the checklist) then check ONLY the items they used. - If they do not report any specific items from that checklist check ALL those that correspond to checklist items. ] \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* \* With respect to the index test classification as (+) or (-) did the analysis examine only a single threshold or did it examine multiple thresholds (analysed in any way?) Indicate 1= single threshold 2= multiple, analysed in separate meta-analyses 3= multiple, analysed in a single model (ordinal) n.thresholds # [based on the handling of the test in the meta-analysis] Does the paper provide data to repeat analyses? [Yes, if they report counts for the 2x2 tables, i.e., TP, FN, has.counts # FP, TN] can.calculate.counts # [If the above is no, do they provide sufficient statistics to calculate counts e.g., sensitivity and N diseased, with specificity and N nondiseased OR sensitivity, specificity, prevalence and overall sample size OR sensitivity, specificity and their CI's ] ANALYSES - GENERAL [Yes if they used any random effects model in their analyses] [Yes if they used any bayesian approach in their analyses rem.used # bayes.used # using just Bayes rule does not count as a Bayesian analysis] ANALYSES - METRICS Which of the following metrics were reported or anyhow analysed/calculated? Please check only the metrics that were used in a synthesis or to interpret a synthesis. For example: A meta-analysis using the bivariate method synthesizes Sensitivity and Specificity (should be checked). If it then takes the summary Sensitivity and Specificity and calculates summary LR+ and LR- to aid in interpretation, then we should check LR also. [ diagnostic OR ] or sens # sensitivity ] specificity spec # [ # [ likelihood ratios ] LR [ accuracy ] Acc # # [ predictive values ]
# [ Synthesis of Q\* - i.e. analysis based on Q\* from primary pv 0.star

studies] [ Synthesis of individual ROC AUC's - i.e. # auc analysis based on AUCs from primary studies] \*\*\*\*\*\* ANALYSES - GRAPHICS # [ Do they show any graphs plots for synthesis ] plot.shown Specify the type of graphs that are shown forest.plot [ Forest plot ] # [ Plot in the ROC space - sensitivity vs (1-) specificity ] roc.space.plot # Other plot(s) related to Dx test analyses plot.describe \*\*\*\*\* ANALYSES - HETEROGENEITY Testing for heterogeneity [ Did they do any test for heterogeneity or for differential hetero test # model fit between fixed and random effects models? ] Exploring heterogeneity 0 = no exploration of heterogeneity, (or no heterogeneity to explore) 1 = subgroup analyses - excluding a single study 2 = exploration of heterogeneity with regression models hetero.explore [ for studies that do both meta-regression and subgroup # analyses enter "2" ] ANALYSES - MODELS Do they perform univariate analyses? E.g., separate analyses of sensitivity, specificity, analysis of ORs, AUCs, LRs and so on. Note that SROC analyses should not be logged here - they should be logged under SROC/HSROC analyses univariate # [ analyses done one outcome-at-a-time ] naive.univariate # [ Do they do naive "pooling"? Examples are summing up numerator for sensitivity and specificity, or weighting by size or getting an unweighted mean ] Do they perform advanced multivariate analyses? E.g., bivariate model (joint analysis of sensitivity and specificity) or the HSROC model (joint analysis of alpha and theta). Note that we do not record meta-regressions with multiple predictors here. 0 = no advanced analyses 1 = bivariate model 2 = HSROC model3 = bivariate and HSROC models (e.g., if they show the summary point and the line) 4 = other (e.g. multiple thresholds, or a custom model that is complex) - free text advanced other.advanced If they perform SROC/HSROC analyses, what method do they use? 1 = Moses and Littenberg 2 = Rutter and Gatsonis 3 = other (e.g., random intercept variation of Moses, or major axis regression) - free text sroc.model # sroc.other ANALYSES - COMPARATIVE Do they perform formal comparative analyses between 2 or more index tests, based on statistical procedures? Qualitative comparisons (eyeball, or based on overlap of CIs), in the absence of a formal statistical test DO NSOT COUNT as comparative. comparative If yes, where the comparisons direct or indirect? Direct: (1) Both index tests were given to the same patients in each study and were assessed against the same reference standard (2) This design was taken into account in a hierarchical model

Indirect: All that do not fall under the above

direct.comparisons #

What statistical tests were used for comparing the performance characteristics of index tests? z.score # [ comparisons of summary estimates ] meta.regression # [ test is a covariate in the HSROC or bivariate or other model ] State something about the comparison method: compare.method

\*\*\*\*\*\*