

|   |  |
|---|--|
| Internal validity   | Chan et al, 2012   |
| The study addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question   | <b>yes</b>   |
| A description of the methodology used is included   | <b>yes</b>   |
| The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies                       | <b>unclear:</b> no search question is provided   |
| Study quality is assessed   | <b>unclear:</b> no quality checklist is given, but according to the Appendix it seems that quality assessment has been done. |
| The method of data extraction is clearly described  | <b>yes</b>   |
| The most important characteristics from the original research are described                               | <b>yes</b>   |
| There are enough similarities between the selected studies to make combining them reasonable              | <b>no:</b> a priory expectation of heterogeneity   |
| Statistical pooling is correctly performed  | <b>not applicable</b>  |
| Statistical heterogeneity is adequately taken into account  | <b>not applicable</b>  |
| Study quality is taken into account   | <b>unclear,</b> but probably yes, because the authors followed the method of Facey et al.                                    |
| <b>Overall assessment of the study</b>  |  |
| Are the results of the systematic review valid?   | <b>no:</b> The poor quality of the studies means that the validity of these estimates is threatened by several biases.       |
| Are the results of the systematic review applicable to the patient group targeted in the search question? | <b>yes</b>   |

|                 |   |
|-----------------|---|
| <b>Comments</b> | The search strategies used are available upon request from the corresponding author of this review. |
|-----------------|---|

| Patel et al, 2011   | Brush et al, 2011   |
|---|---|
| yes   | yes   |
| yes   | yes   |
| yes   | yes   |
| yes   | yes   |
| yes   | yes   |
| yes   | yes   |
| no: planned pooled analyses were not calculated given the heterogeneity in the studies                          | no  |
| not applicable  | unclear, no methodology described.  |
| not applicable  | unclear, no methodology described.  |
| yes   | yes   |
|   |   |
| no: The poor quality of the studies means that the validity of these estimates is threatened by several biases. | no: The poor quality of the studies means that the validity of these estimates is threatened by several biases. |
| yes   | yes   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <p>a qualitative summary of results is presented</p> | <p>Because of methodological problems, particularly those caused by the difficulty of estimating within-study variance when patients contribute more than one data point, and when the individual patient data are not available, it was the authors' intention that the 2 × 2 tables should report the lesion-level data, but that the analyses be restricted to patient-level data.</p> |
|--|---|

|  |
|--|
| Niekel et al, 2010   |
| yes  |
| yes  |
| yes, 15 690 hits.  |
| yes  |
| yes  |
| yes  |
| <b>unknown:</b> Because of the limited number of FDG PET/CT studies, no check for heterogeneity was performed.         |
| <b>not applicable</b>  |
| <b>not applicable</b>  |
| yes  |
|  |
| <b>no:</b> The poor quality of the studies means that the validity of these estimates is threatened by several biases. |
| yes  |

