QUADAS-2 [18] results and CEBM 2011 Levels of Evidence [19]

Study	RISK OF BIAS				APPLICABILITY CONCERNS			Level of Evidence
	PATIENT SELECTION	INDEX TEST	REFERENCE STANDARD	FLOW AND TIMING	PATIENT SELECTION	INDEX TEST	REFERENCE STANDARD	
Jeong et. al. [27]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Lisowska et. al. [44]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Roque et. al. [39]	🙂	?	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Li et. al. [3]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Schwede et. al. [47]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Verhaak et. al. [48]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Obermayr et. al. [32]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	☹	🙂	2
Han et. al. [49]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Hsu et. al. [50]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Lui et. al. [51]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Kang et. al. [42]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Gillet et. al. [52]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Ferriss et. al. [28]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Brun et. al. [45]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Skirnisdottir and Seidal [38]	🙂	?	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Brenne et. al. [53]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Sabatier et. al. [54]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Gillet et. al. [24]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Chao et. al. [55]	☹	🙂	☹	🙂	🙂	🙂	☹	3
Schlumbrecht et. al. [40]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Glaysher et. al. [20]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Yan et. al. [56]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Yoshihara et. al. [22]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Williams et. al. [29]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Denkert et. al. [41]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Matsumara et. al. [30]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Crijns et. al. [23]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Mendiola et. al. [57]	?	?	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Gevaert et. al. [34]	?	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Bachvarov et. al. [58]	☹	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	3
Netinatsunthorn et. al. [59]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
De Smet et. al. [60]	☹	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	3
Helleman et. al. [33]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Spentzos et. al. [61]	🙂	🙂	🙂	☹	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Jazaeri et. al. [62]	☹	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	3
Raspollini et. al. [37]	?	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	3
Hartmann et. al. [21]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Spentzos et. al. [36]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Selvanayagam et. al. [35]	?	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	3
Iba et. al. [63]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Kamazawa et. al. [31]	🙂	☹	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2
Vogt et. al. [26]	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	🙂	2

🙂 Low Risk   ☹ High Risk   ? Unclear Risk

Table modified from http://www.bris.ac.uk/quadas/resources/