

ESM Table 1 Methodological quality assessment using the QUADOMICS Tool [18]

| | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | 13 | 14 | 15 | 16 | |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|----|----|----|----|--------------|
| Metzger et al, 1980, [20] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Butte et al, 1999, [21] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Seghieri et al, 2003, [28] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Tarim et al, 2004, [22] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Cetin et al, 2005, [23] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Güven et al, 2006, [29] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Pappa et al, 2007, [24] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Idzior-Waluś et al, 2008, [30] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Telejko et al, 2009, [25] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Akturk et al, 2010, [27] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Chen et al, 2010, [35] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | 12/16; HQ |
| Graça et al, | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | ? | N | N | ? | N | Y | 11/16; |

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|--|--------------|
| 2010, [19] | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | LQ |
| Sertkaya et al, 2011, [26] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | | 12/16; HQ |
| Diaz et al, 2011, [34] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | ? | N | N | ? | N | Y | | 11/16; LQ |
| Graça et al, 2012, [33] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | ? | N | N | ? | N | Y | | 10/16; LQ |
| Sachse et al, 2012, [31] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | N | N | ? | N | Y | | 12/16; HQ |
| Diaz et al, 2013, [32] | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | Y | ? | N | N | ? | N | Y | | 11/16; LQ |

Index: 1=description of selection criteria, 2=the spectrum of patients used in each study is representative of the patients who will receive the test in practice, 3=full description of the sample size, 4=adequate description of the procedure and timing of the collection of biological sample with respect to clinical factors, 5=adequate description of handling and pre-analytical procedures—were these the same for the whole sample?, 6=the period between the reference standard and the index test is short enough to reasonably guarantee that the target condition did not change between the two tests, 7=the reference standard is likely to correctly classify the target condition, 8=the whole sample or a random selection of the sample received verification using a reference standard of diagnosis, 9=the patients received the same reference standard regardless of the result of the index test, 10=the execution of the index test is sufficiently described to permit replication, 11=the execution of the reference standard is sufficient described to permit replication, 12=the index test results are interpreted without knowledge of the reference standard, 13=the reference standard results are interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test, 14=the same clinical data is available when test results are interpreted as it would be when the test is used in practice, 15=any uninterpretable/intermediate test results are reported, 16=the presence of overfitting was most likely avoided. Y=criteria achieved, N=criteria not achieved, ?=ambiguous or not stated, HQ=high quality, LQ=low quality, N/A=not applicable.