

On-line Table 1: Subgroup analysis for factors associated diagnostic accuracy

Study Outcomes	Diagnostic Accuracy	False-Positive and False-Negative Results	P Value
Nodule size (mm)			
<10 mm	432 (94.9%)	23 (5.1%)	.012
≥10 mm	728 (97.7%)	17 (2.3%)	
Composition (No.) (%)			
Solid	1026 (96.2%)	40 (3.8%)	.265
Predominantly solid	75 (100.0%)	0	
Predominantly cystic	58 (100.0%)	0	
Cystic	1 (100.0%)	0	
Location			
Upper/lower	633 (96.9%)	20 (3.1%)	.568
Mid	527 (96.3%)	20 (3.7%)	

On-line Table 2: Histologic diagnosis at core needle biopsy and subsequent operation in 572 nodules

Diagnosis at CNB (No. of Nodes)	Surgical Diagnosis (No. of Nodes)
Nondiagnostic (14)	Adenomatous hyperplasia (5) Follicular adenoma (1) Papillary carcinoma (7) FVPTC (1)
Benign (147)	Adenomatous hyperplasia (113) Follicular adenoma (12) Papillary carcinoma (8) Thyroiditis (12) Hurthle cell adenoma (2)
AUS or FLUS (48)	Adenomatous hyperplasia (13) Follicular adenoma (16) Papillary carcinoma (13) Follicular carcinoma (1) Hurthle cell adenoma (3) FVPTC (2)
FN or SFN (24)	Adenomatous hyperplasia (2) Follicular adenoma (11) Papillary carcinoma (4) Follicular carcinoma (4) Hurthle cell adenoma (3)
Suspicious for malignancy (21)	Papillary carcinoma (18) FVPTC (3)
Malignancy (318)	Diffuse large B-cell lymphoma (2) Anaplastic carcinoma (1) Medullary carcinoma (2) Papillary carcinoma (309) FVPTC (4)

Note:—FVPTC indicates follicular variant of papillary carcinoma; FN, follicular neoplasm; SFN, suspicious for a follicular neoplasm.

On-line Table 3: Summary of diagnostic performances of CNB for the diagnosis of malignancy in published studies

Author, Year	Sensitivity	PPV	Specificity	NPV	Diagnostic Accuracy	Conclusive	Inconclusive	ND	Major/Minor Complication
Present study	89.7% (347/387)	100% (347/347)	100% (813/813)	95.3% (813/853)	96.7% (1160/1200)	88.1% (2093/2376)	11.9% (283/2376)	4.9% (117/2376)	0/0.5% (12/2376)
Sung et al ¹⁵ , 2012	86.8% (276/318)	99.3% (276/278)	99.2% (235/237)	84.8% (235/277)	92.1% (511/555)	87.2% (484/555)	12.8% (71/555)	1.4% (8/555)	0/3.3% (18/555)
Yeon et al ¹⁴ , 2013	94.6% (35/37)	100% (35/35)	100% (79/79)	97.5% (79/81)	98.3% (114/116)	87.1% (135/155)	12.9% (20/155)	1.3% (2/155)	0/1.9% (3/155)
Ha et al ²⁵ , 2014	89.5% (94/105)	100% (94/94)	100% (101/101)	90.2% (101/112)	94.7% (195/206)	90.1% (245/272)	9.9% (27/272)	0.7% (2/272)	0/1.1% (3/272)
Trimboli et al ¹⁷ , 2014	100% (24/24)	100% (24/24)	—	—	96.8% (30/31)	96.8% (30/31)	3.2% (1/31)	3.2% (1/31)	0
Suh et al ¹⁹ , 2016	90% (190/211)	100% (190/190)	100% (253/253)	92.3% (253/274)	97.6% (414/424)	94.2% (595/632)	5.9% (37/632)	1.3% (8/632)	0/0.2% (1/632)
Paja et al ¹⁸ , 2016	80.1% (145/181)	98.0% (145/148)	99.4% (492/495)	93.2% (492/528)	94.2% (637/676)	—	—	5.8% (204/3517)	0.0% (1/3517)/1.6% (56/3517)

Note:—ND indicates nondiagnostic.