Individual classification considering the quality assessment of studies of diagnostic performance included in systematic reviews (QUADAS-2) tool for accuracy studies (a and b) and a modified Newcastle-Ottawa tool for cohort studies (c)

a) Severity assessment

Study	RISK OF BIAS				APPLICABILITY CONCERNS		
	PATIENT SELECTION	INDEX TEST	REFERENCE STANDARD	FLOW AND TIMING	PATIENT SELECTION	INDEX TEST	REFERENCE STANDARD
Laboratory studies							
Achilleos et al., 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Braga et al., 2009a	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☹
Braga et al., 2009b	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Bussanelli et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Chawla et al., 2012	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Diniz et al., 2011	☹	☺	☹	☹	☹	☺	☹
Diniz et al., 2009	☹	☺	☹	☹	☹	☺	☹
Ekstrand et al., 2007	☹	☺	?	☹	☹	☺	?
Ekstrand et al., 2011	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Gomez et al., 2013	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹
Graye et al., 2012	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹
Holtzman et al, 2014	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Jablonski-Momeni et al., 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Jablonski-Momeni et al., 2008	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹
Jablonski-Momeni et al., 2012	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺

Jallad et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Ko et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Markowitz et al., 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Mitropoulos et al., 2010	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Neuhaus et al., 2011	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Neuhaus et al.2014	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Neuhaus et al., 2015	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Novaes et al., 2012	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
Ozkan et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Ozturk et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Parviainen et al, 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Patel et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	☺	?
Piovesan et al, 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Rodrigues et al, 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Rodrigues et al., 2008	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Shoaib et al., 2009	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹	☺	☹
Souza et al., 2013	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Soviero et al., 2012	☹	☺	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹
Zandona et al., 2009	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺

Clinical studies							
Braga et al., 2010	☹	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺
Castilho et al., 2016	☹	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☹
Cotta et al., 2015	☹	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺

Diniz et al., 2012	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Freitas et al., 2016	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺
Luz et al., 2015	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
Matos et al., 2011	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺	☹
Melo et al., 2015	☹	☺	?	☺	☹	?	☺
Novaes et al., 2009	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
Novaes et al., 2010	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺	☺
Teo et al, 2014	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹

b) Activity assessment (accuracy)

Study	RISK OF BIAS				APPLICABILITY CONCERNS		
	PATIENT SELECTION	INDEX TEST	REFERENCE STANDARD	FLOW AND TIMING	PATIENT SELECTION	INDEX TEST	REFERENCE STANDARD
Braga et al., 2010	☹	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺
Cotta et al., 2015	☹	☺	☺	☹	☹	☺	☺
Ekstrand et al.,2007	☺	☺	?	☹	☺	?	☹
Freitas et al., 2016	☹	☺	☺	☺	☹	☺	☺

c) Activity assessment (longitudinal studies)†

Study	NEW-CASTLE OTTAWA DOMAINS			RISK OF BIAS INTERPRETATION		
	SELECTION	COMPARABILITY	EXPOSURE	SELECTION	COMPARABILITY	EXPOSURE
Guedes et al., 2015	****	**	***	☺	☺	☺
Ferreira Zandoná et al., 2012	****	**	***	☺	☺	☺

† Instead of using the final classification by points, we determined the risk of bias according to each domain. This system identifies the low risk of bias using stars. If the most part of the stars had been awarded for the domain (selection=4*, comparability=2*, exposure=3*), the study was classified as having low risk of bias considering this aspect.