

## S2 Appendix. Original and Adapted PRISMA for Abstract Tools

Item	Description	Adjusted for DTA	No	Yes	Items
<b>Item 1</b>	Title: Identify the report as a systematic review, meta-analyses or both.	-----	The title does not include words "systematic review" or "meta-analysis".	The title includes words "systematic review" or "meta-analysis".	
<b>Item 2</b>	Objectives: The research question including components such as participants, interventions, comparators and outcomes.	Objectives: The research question including components such as participants, index test, reference standard and outcomes.	There is no explicit statement of the questions being addressed or there is an objective statement, but it does not include a reference to each of the following (PIRO): participants, index test, reference standards and outcomes.	There is an explicit statement of the questions being addressed or an objectives statement with reference to each of the following (PIRO): participants, index test, reference standards, and outcomes.	A statement that refers to all PIRO components must be found in the objectives or research statement section of the abstract to be coded as "yes". Review questions may be narrowly focused or broad.
<b>Item 3a*</b>	Eligibility criteria: study characteristics used as criteria for inclusion.	-----	One or more eligibility criteria are omitted and there is no statement that eligibility criteria had no restrictions.	Study eligibility criteria are stated for all PIRO study characteristics or there is a statement that there were no restrictions for eligibility criteria.	This item considers characteristics of the primary study itself. All PIRO components must be specified. If a study had no restrictions and includes any participants who completed a screening measure and assessment, this must be stated.
<b>Item 3b*</b>	Eligibility criteria: report characteristics used as criteria for inclusion.	-----	Report characteristics considered for eligibility are not stated or there is a statement, but it does not address language of	Report characteristics considered for eligibility are clearly stated, including, at least, language of publication and publication status.	This item considers characteristics of the report of the primary study.

			publication and publication status.		
<b>Item 4a†</b>	Information sources: Key databases searched.	-----	Does not list all databases searched.	Lists all databases searched (or at least 3 if more than 3 searched).	
<b>Item 4b†</b>	Information sources: Key search dates.	-----	Does not state the dates of coverage of the search, including year and month of end date.	The dates of coverage of the search are provided, including year and month of end date.	
<b>Item 5</b>	Risk of bias: Methods of assessing risk of bias.	-----	There is no statement about how risk of bias was assessed, including the name of the tool for assessing risk of bias is listed. Alternatively, if risk of bias was not assessed, this is not stated.	There is a statement about how risk of bias was assessed, including the name of the tool used to assess bias is listed, or there is a statement that risk of bias was not assessed.	Assessments of study "quality" are coded as assessing risk of bias. All elements must be included to be coded "Yes".
<b>Item 6</b>	Included studies: Number and type of included studies and participants and relevant characteristics of studies.	-----	The number of primary studies, total number of participants and cutoffs included in the analyses are not provided.	The number of primary studies, total number of participants and cutoffs assessed are provided.	All elements must be included to be coded "Yes".
<b>Item 7</b>	Synthesis of results: Results for main outcomes (benefits and harms), preferably indicating the number of studies and participants for each. If meta-analysis was done, include summary measures and confidence	Results of the principle summary measures (e.g., sensitivity and specificity, diagnostic odds ratio).	Results of the principle summary measures are not provided (e.g., sensitivity and specificity, diagnostic odds ratio).	Results of the principle summary measures are provided (e.g., sensitivity and specificity, diagnostic odds ratio).	If sensitivity and specificity are the primary outcome measures, both must be reported to code "Yes".

---

intervals.

---

<b>Item 8</b>	Description of effect: direction of the effect and size of the effect in terms meaningful to clinicians and patients.	Description of outcomes: summary of accuracy outcomes in terms meaningful to clinicians and patients.	Results do not summarize the principle results in words and numbers, including the most accurate cutoff to use and how the screening tools would perform in practice, in terms meaningful to clinicians and patients (e.g. positive and negative predictive values or true and false positive rates).	Results summarize the principle results in words and numbers, including the most accurate cutoff to use and how the screening tools would perform in practice, in terms meaningful to clinicians and patients (e.g. positive and negative predictive values or true and false positive rates).	
<b>Item 9</b>	Strengths and Limitations of evidence: Brief summary of strengths and limitations of evidence (e.g., inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, or risk of bias, other supporting or conflicting evidence).	-----	Relevant limitations of the diagnostic accuracy evidence are not noted (e.g., inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, risk of bias, other supporting or conflicting evidence).	Relevant limitations of the diagnostic accuracy evidence are noted (e.g., inconsistency, imprecision, indirectness, risk of bias, other supporting or conflicting evidence).	
<b>Item 10</b>	Interpretation: General interpretation of the results and important implications.	-----	Authors do not provide a statement about clinical implications of results or need for more research if results suggest uncertainty.	Authors provide a statement about clinical implications of results or need for more research if results suggest uncertainty.	
<b>Item 11</b>	Funding: Primary source of funding for the review.	-----	Authors do not provide the sources of funding for the review or a statement that it was not funded.	Authors provide the source of funding for the review or a statement that it was not funded.	For a “yes”, funding information must be listed in the abstract that is available for viewing on an online database such as PubMed.

---

<b>Item</b> <b>12</b>	Registration: Registration number and registry name.	-----	A registration number and/or registry name are not provided.	A registration number and registry name are provided.	Cochrane reviews are an exception to this requirement, as they are preceded by a peer reviewed protocol that is published in the Cochrane Library and can be downloaded from there. For a “yes”, registration number and/or name must be listed in the abstract that is available for viewing on an online database such as PubMed.
--------------------------	---	-------	--	--	--

\* = if either item 3a or 3b is coded as “no”, the original item 3 would also be coded as “no”.

† = if either item 4a or 4b is coded as “no”, the original item 4 would also be coded as “no”.