

Additional file 2. The QUADAS questionnaire for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies

Item (<i>characteristic tested</i>)	Higham [29]	Deeny [30]	Janssen [31]	Barr [32]	Reid [33]	Wyatt [34]	Zakherah [37]	Larsen [36]	Magnay [5]
1. Representative spectrum of <i>patients (spectrum composition)</i>	X	√	√	X	X	√	√	√	√
2. Clear selection criteria described (<i>selection criteria</i>)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
3. Correct diagnostic classification by reference test (<i>reference standard</i>)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
4. Short enough interval between index & reference test (<i>disease progression bias</i>)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
5. Verification of diagnosis using reference test (<i>partial verification</i>)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
6. Same reference test used for all patients (<i>differential verification</i>)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
7. Independent index & reference tests (<i>incorporation bias</i>)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√
8. Sufficient description of index test (<i>index test execution</i>)	√	√	√	X	√	√	√	√	√
9. Sufficient description of reference test (<i>reference standard execution</i>)	√	√	√	√	X	√	X	X	√
10. Index test results without knowledge of reference results (<i>test review bias</i>)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	√
11. Reference test results without knowledge of index test results (<i>reference review bias</i>)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	√
12. Same clinical data available before interpretation of both index and reference tests (<i>clinical review bias</i>)	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	U	√
13. Uninterpretable or intermediate test results reported (<i>uninterpretable test results</i>)	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	√	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

14. Withdrawals from study explained (<i>withdrawals</i>)	√	N/A	√	√	N/A	√	√	N/A	√
---	---	-----	---	---	-----	---	---	-----	---

Questionnaire adapted from Whiting et al (2006). A tick (√) indicates “yes”, X indicates “no”, “U” indicates “unclear” and N/A indicates “not applicable to study”. Whiting PF, Weswood ME, Rutjes AW, Reitsma JB, Bossuyt PN, Kleijnen J. Evaluation of QUADAS, a tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. BMC Medical Research Methodology 2006;6:9