**Figure 1:** Flow diagram of the search and inclusion process in the study
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**Figure 2.** Risk of Bias and Applicability Judgments in QUADAS-2

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **RISK OF BIAS** |  | **APPLICABILITY CONCERNS** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | **PATIENTSELECTION** | **INDEX TEST** | **REFERENCESTANDARD** | **FLOW ANDTIMING** |  | **PATIENTSELECTION** | **INDEX TEST** | **REFERENCESTANDARD** |
| Sevgi et al. | **■** | **?** | **▲** | **■** |  | **▲** | **▲** | **■** |
| Biswas | **■** | **?** | **■** | **■** |  | **■** | **■** | **■** |
| Agarwal et al. | **■** | **▲** | **▲** | **■** |  | **■** | **■** | **■** |
| Ayub et al. | **■** | **■** | **▲** | **■** |  | **■** | **■** | **■** |
| Cheung et.al | **■** | **■** | **▲** | **■** |  | **■** | **■** | **■** |
| Totlis et al. | **▲** | **▲** | **▲** | **■** |  | **■** | **■** | **▲** |
| Han et al. | **▲** | **▲** | **▲** | **?** |  | **▲** | **■** | **■** |
| Klang et al. | **■** | **■** | **■** | **▲** |  | **■** | **■** | **■** |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Low Risk | **■** |
| High Risk | **▲** |
| Unclear Risk | **?** |