Study, year	Sensitivity (95% CI)		Specificity (95% CI)	
Askim et al [17], 2017	0.32 (0.24 - 0.42)	-#-	0.98 (0.97 - 0.99)	
Dorsett al [21], 2017	0.28 (0.15 - 0.44)		0.93 (0.86 - 0.97)	
Dorsett al [21], 2017	0.67 (0.51 - 0.81)		0.86 (0.78 - 0.92)	
Forward et al [23], 2017	0.90 (0.82 - 0.95)	-	0.87 (0.77 - 0.94)	
Hwang et al [28], 2017	0.26 (0.23 - 0.28)	•	0.83 (0.74 - 0.91)	
Kim et al [29], 2017	0.14 (0.08 - 0.22)	-	0.98 (0.96 - 0.99)	
Mellhammar et al [31], 2017	0.42 (0.33 - 0.52)		0.89 (0.85 - 0.93)	
Park et al [32], 2017	0.35 (0.31 - 0.39)		0.99 (0.97 - 1.00)	
Peake et al [33], 2017	0.90 (0.88 - 0.91)	•	0.72 (0.68 - 0.76)	
Williams et al [37], 2017	0.30 (0.28 - 0.32)	•	0.96 (0.96 - 0.97)	
Combined	0.47 (0.28 - 0.66) Q = 1466.08, df = 9.00, P < 0.001 I <sup>2</sup> = 99.39 (99.26 - 99.51)	0.1 SENSITIVITY 1.0	$\begin{array}{c} 0.93 \; (0.88 - 0.97) \\ Q = 881.66, \\ df = 9.00, \\ P < 0.001 \\ I^2 = 98.88 \; (98.74 - 99.22) \end{array}$	0.7 SPECIFICITY 1.0

Additional File 5. Paired forest plots of sensitivity and specificity of positive qSOFA score in identifying organ dysfunction in infected patients outside the intensive care unit