

Supplementary Figure 1 ROC plots for reviews causing extreme underestimation of DOR with ML models (using unadjusted data)

## Supplementary Table 1 Review details

Review details					Review characteristics			
Author Year	Target disorder	Test	Covariates investigated (no. studies)	No. studies	Median sample size (SD)	Range in 'S' <sup>*</sup>	Zero cells (%) <sup>†</sup>	
			Hospitalised patients (14) vs Emergency					
Balk 2001[1]	acute cardiac ischemia	presentation myoglobin	Department patients (18)	32	101 (355)	7.9	3%	
Bricker 2000[2]	pregnancy	ultrasound	Tertiary (4) vs Primary/Secondary care (7) Second trimester (6) vs Any trimester (5) Low risk (4) vs Unselected (7)	11	7,575 (9,324)	5.0	2%	
	dangerous severe		Prison release (8) vs Community/hospital discharge (13)					
Buchanan 2001[3]	personality disorder	clinical assessment	Time at risk <=20 months (10) vs >20 months (8)	21	293 (880)	8.0	0%	
Chapell 2002[4]	carpal tunnel syndrome	distal motor latency: symptoms/presented patient groups	Possible age bias (4) vs no bias or not reported (9) Possible bias to easy cases (5) vs no bias (8) <sup>‡</sup> Symptomatic/presented (8) vs unspecified diagnosis (5)	13	85 (115)	3.9	15%	
Delgado 2003[5]	detection of primary tumours in patients with metastasis	F18-FDG PET	Any unknown primary tumour (8) vs unknown primary tumour with cervical adenopathies or intra-/extra-cranial metastases (7)	15	20 (12)	6.4	18%	
Dijkhuizen 2000[6]	endometrial carcinoma	endometrial sampling	Pre- and post-menopausal women (22) vs post- menopausal women only (7) Asymptomatic only (20) or symptomatic women included (13)	33	120 (174)	7.8	34%	
Eden 2001[7]	thyroid cancer screening	palpation	Environmental exposure (3) vs medical exposure or unexposed (4)	7	102 (781)	3.5	11%	
Flemons 2003[8]	sleep apnoea	sleep monitors	Home setting (13) vs sleep laboratory setting (36) <sup>‡</sup> <75% male (10) vs 75-100% male (29) mean Apnea Hypopnea Index <=30 (15) vs >30 (17)	49	71 (129)	10.1	7%	
Flobbe 2002[9]	breast cancer	mammography	mean body mass index <=30 (9) vs >30 (25)	22	213 (478)	5.8	0%	
Gifford 2000[10]	potentially reversible causes of dementia	clinical assessment	age <=70 (3) years >70 (8) dementia/memory clinic setting (5) vs other (6) <sup>‡</sup> diagnostic criteria met (6) vs referrals (5)	11	202 (108)	6.5	9%	
	primony bladder concer-	eutology	<30% Grade 1 tumours (14) vs $>30%$ (6) <30% Grade 2 tumours (6) vs $>30%$ (14) <30% Grade 3 tumours (8) vs $>30%$ (12) <sup>  </sup> 100% Urological controls (4) vs nonurological patients and/or healthy controls (6) [case-control studios apl/d	26	107 (70)	77	- 00/	
Gias 2003[11]	primary bladder cancer	cytology	studies only $\sim$ 70% men (14) vs < 70% men (14)	20	107 (76)	1.1	9%	
Gould 2001[12]	lung cancer	FDG-PET	<60 years old (7) versus >=60 years (17)	35	46 (27)	7.6	15%	
Gould 2003[13]	mediastinal staging of non small cell lung cancer	PET	>=70% men (12) vs <70% men (10) <60 years old (4) versus >=60 years (21)	33	49 (44)	4.5	8%	

Review details					Review characteristics			
Author Year	Target disorder	Test	Covariates investigated (no. studies)	No. studies	Median sample size (SD)	Range in 'S' <sup>*</sup>	Zero cells (%) <sup>†</sup>	
	Ŭ	toludine blue dye in visual	Clinical suspicion/lesions (10) vs cancer history		. ,			
Gray 2000[14]	oral cancer	screening	(4)	14	85 (301)	6.5	9%	
			Symptoms suggestive of acute cardiac ischaemia (4) vs chest pain (6) Age <65 years (3) vs >=65 (4)					
Ioannidis[15]	acute mvocardial infarction	out-of-hospital ECG	<65% men (3) vs >=65% men (4) §	10	295 (439)	10.8	5%	
Kittler 2002[16]	melanoma	dermoscopy	Non-melanocytic lesions excluded (4) versus Included (9)	13	172 (890)	7.6	2%	
Koelemay 2001[17]	peripheral arterial disease - aortoiliac tract	MRA	Age <65 years (9) vs >=65 (7) <70% men (7) vs >=70% (11) <sup>∥</sup> <65% intermittent claudication (5) vs >=65% (10)	19	96 (71)	7.2	13%	
MSAC 2002[18]	fragile X syndrome	cytogenetic tests	<50% male (6) vs >=50% male (6) Fragile X pedigree/families (8) vs definite/suspected/prenatal (4)	12	77 (176)	13.8	21%	
Nallamothu 2001[19]	coronary artery disease	electron beam computed tomography	Age <55 years (5) vs >=55 years (9) <sup>‡</sup> <65%male (7) vs >=65% male (7)	14	104 (63)	5.1	0%	
Patwardhan 2004[20]	Alzheimer disease dementia	PET	Age <70 (11) vs >=70 years (5) Healthy controls (13) vs diseased controls (6)	19	43 (31)	8.0	5%	
Romagnuolo 2003[21]	bilary disease - detection of stones	MRI cholangiopancreatography	Range possible diagnoses (11) vs stones or cancer diagnoses (35)	46	63 (53)	6.4	15%	
Sauerland 2004[22]	pelvic fractures	clinical examination	Adults (10) vs children (3)	13	219 (577)	7.9	8%	
Sotiriadis 2003[23]	Down syndrome	intracardiac echogenic foci	Age <=30 years (4) vs >30 (8) High risk (7) vs low risk/routine (5)	12	4,308 (4,642)	7.9	0%	
Varonen 2000[24]	acute maxillary sinusitis	ultrasound	ENT clinic setting (3) vs general clinic (4)	7	156 (74)	4.5	0%	
Visser 2000[25]	peripheral arterial disease	Duplex ultrasound	<=60% men (8) vs >60% (8) Age <=65 years (8) vs >65 (8) <sup>  </sup> N America (14) vs other location (7)	21	404 (739)	6.8	4%	
Whitsel 2000[26]	autonomic failure in diabetes	Bazett's heart rate- corrected QT interval (QTc)	Age <=40 years (8) vs >40 years (8) <=50% men (5) vs >50% men (11) $^{\parallel}$ <=50% type 1 diabetes (5) vs >50% (10) Mean duration <=10 years (10) vs >10 years (4)	17	58 (772)	6.7	4%	

\* range in 'S' is based on values for 'S' from ML model, where S = logit(sensitivity) + logit(1 - specificity). 1 - range 3 to <6; range 6 to <8; range 8+ <sup>†</sup> number of zero false positive and false negative cells as a percentage of the total number of cells per analysis. 1 - <5%; 2 - 5 to 10%; 3 - >10% <sup>‡</sup> model would not converge for HSROC model either with parallel curves or non-parallel curves <sup>§</sup> model would not converge for HSROC model either with parallel curves <sup>II</sup> model would not converge for HSROC model either with non-parallel curves