

Appendix 1

Positive likelihood ratio (LR+) was defined as (sensitivity)/(1-specificity) and negative likelihood ratio was defined as (1-sensitivity)/(Specificity) [1]. In addition to point estimates, MetaDTA was used to generate forest plots and summary receiver operating characteristics (sROC) curves to visualize the results graphically [2 3]. In cases where the bivariate binomial model could not be fitted for meta-analysis, a random effects univariate model was fitted [4]. Heterogeneity was assessed by examining the distribution of sensitivity and specificity in forest plots as well as the sROC curves. In analyses where sufficient data was available, heterogeneity was assessed formally by adding covariates in the bivariate binomial model to perform meta-regression. Each covariate was tested one-by-one using likelihood ratio test with the R package *lme4* [1]. No assumption of equal variance between the two test types was made when a dichotomous covariate was added to the models. The covariates are dichotomous and were defined a priori in the protocol as follows: mydriasis (mydriatic versus non-mydriatic imaging), imaging device (Hand-held versus table-top device), use of ancillary imaging (optical coherence tomography versus no optical coherence tomography). If multiple diagnostic test accuracy data was available for each grader separately, data from grader one was taken in all cases.

References

1. Macaskill P, Gatsonis C, Deeks J, Harbord R, Takwoingi Y. Chapter 10: analysing and presenting results. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy* version 2010;1(0)
2. Freeman SC, Kerby CR, Patel A, Cooper NJ, Quinn T, Sutton AJ. Development of an interactive web-based tool to conduct and interrogate meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies: MetaDTA. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2019;19(1):81 doi: 10.1186/s12874-019-0724-x.
3. Patel A, Cooper N, Freeman S, Sutton A. Graphical enhancements to summary receiver operating characteristic plots to facilitate the analysis and reporting of meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy data. *Research Synthesis Methods* 2020;n/a(n/a) doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.1439>.

4. Takwoingi Y, Guo B, Riley RD, Deeks JJ. Performance of methods for meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy with few studies or sparse data. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2017;**26**(4):1896-911 doi: 10.1177/0962280215592269.