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/Line3-4	Abstract/Paragraph1
Abstract	2	Abstract: See PRISMA-DTA for abstracts (Table 2).	Page2/Line1-22	AbstractParagraph1-5
INTRODUCTION				
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	Page2/Line27-34	Introduction/Paragraph1
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).	Page2/Line36-37 Page3/Line1-5	Introduction/Paragraph2
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of question(s) being addressed in terms of participants, index test(s), and target condition(s).	Page3/Line5-8	Introduction/Paragraph2
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.	N/A	N/A
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.	Page3/Line23-34	Methods/Paragraph2
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.	Page3/Line13-15	Methods/Paragraph1
Search	8	Present full search strategies for all electronic databases and other sources searched, including any limits used, such that they could be repeated.	Page3/Line15-21	Methods/Paragraph1
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).	Page3/Line36-37	Methods/Paragraph3
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.	Page3/Line13-15	Methods/Paragraph2
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).	Page4/Line1-5	Methods/Paragraph3

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.	Page4/Line7-12	Methods/Paragraph4
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).	Page4/Line22-25	Methods/Paragraph5
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	Page4/Line15-20	Methods/Paragraph5
Meta-analysis	D2	Report the statistical methods used for meta-analyses, if performed.	Page4/Line21-27	Methods/Paragraph5
Additional analyses	16	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	Page7/Line27-29	Methods/Paragraph5
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.	Page4/Line31-35	Results/Paragraph1
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	Page4/Line35-37 Page5/Line1-9	Results/Paragraph1
Risk of bias and applicability	19	Present evaluation of risk of bias and concerns regarding applicability for each study.	Page3/Line13-18	Results/Paragraph2
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.	Page3/Line22-24	Results/Paragraph3
Synthesis of results	21	Describe test accuracy, including variability; if meta-analysis was done, include results and confidence intervals.	Page5/Line24-25	Methods/Paragraph3
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).	Page5/Line27-37	Methods/Paragraph3
DISCUSSION				
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence.	Page6/Line17-20	Discussion/Paragraph2
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).	Page7/Line14-26	Discussion/Paragraph4

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).	Page7/Line27-33	Discussion/Paragraph5
FUNDING				
Funding	27	For the systematic review, describe the sources of funding and other support and the role of the funders.	Page8/Line2-5	Funding/Paragraph1

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.

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/Line3-4	Title/Paragraph1
Objectives	2	Indicate the research question, including components such as participants, index test, and target conditions.	Page2/Line3-5	Background/Paragraph1
METHODS				
Eligibility criteria	3	Include study characteristics used as criteria for eligibility.	N/A, for word limitation	N/A, for word limitation
Information sources	4	List the key databases searched and the search dates.	Page2/Line6-7	Methods/Paragraph1
Risk of bias & applicability	5	Indicate the methods of assessing risk of bias and applicability.	Page2/Line11-12	Methods/Paragraph1
Synthesis of results	A1	Indicate the methods for the data synthesis.	Page2/Line8-11	Methods/Paragraph1
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).	Page2/Line13	Results/Paragraph1
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.	Page2/Line13-16	Results/Paragraph1

DISCUSSION				
Strengths and limitations	9	Provide a brief summary of the strengths and limitations of the evidence	Page2/Line18-19	Conclusion/Paragraph1
Interpretation	10	Provide a general interpretation of the results and the important implications.	Page2/Line17-19	Conclusion/Paragraph1
OTHER				
Funding	11	Indicate the primary source of funding for the review.	Page8/Line3-6	Funding/Paragraph1
Registration	12	Provide the registration number and the registry name	N/A	N/A

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: http://dx.doi.org/10.21037/atm-21-1051
*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.