**SUPPORTING INFORMATION 7. Quality Assessment of Studies** **of Diagnostic Accuracy (QUADAS-2)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **QUADAS-2 Domains\*** |
|  | **Risk of Bias** |  | **Applicability Concerns** |
| **First Author,****Year,****Country** | **Patient Selection** | **Index Test** | **Reference Standard** | **Flow and Timing** |  | **Patient Selection** | **Index Test** | **Reference Standard** |
| Bunevicius, 2012,Lithuania [17] | Low | High | Low | Low |  | Low | Low | Low |
| Cruz, 2010,Brazil [8] | Unclear | Low | Low | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| Dickens,2004,United Kingdom [18] | Low | High | Unclear | Unclear |  | High | Low | Low |
| Frasure-Smith,1995,Canada [19] | Low | Low | Unclear | Low |  | Unclear | Low | Unclear |
| Frasure-Smith,2008,Canada [9] | High | Low | Low | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| Freedland,2003,United States [20] | High | Low | Unclear | Low |  | Unclear | Low | Low |
| Gutierrez,1999,Canada [21] | High | Unclear | Low | Low |  | Unclear | Low | Low |
| **Heart and Soul** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| McManus,2005,United States [22] | High | Low | Low† | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| Thombs,2008,United States [11] | High | High | Low | Low |  | High‡ | Low | Low |
| Elderon,2011,United States [10] | High§ | Low | Low† | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| **Huffman** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Huffman,2006,United States [23] | Low | High | High | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| Huffman, 2010,United States [12] | Low | High | High | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| Jacq,2009,France [13] | Low | Low | Unclear | Unclear |  | High | Low | Low |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Low,2007,Canada [24] | Unclear | High | Low | Low |  | High | Low | Low |
| Pinho,2010,Brazil [14] | Unclear | High | Low | High |  | High | Low | Low |
| Stafford,2007,Australia [25] | High | High | Low | Low |  | Unclear | Low | Low |
| Swardfager,2011,Canada [16] | High | Low | Unclear | Unclear |  | High | Low | Low |
| Tiringer,2008,Hungary [15] | Unclear | High | Low | Unclear |  | High | Low | Low |

\* See Appendix 5 for QUADAS-2 risk of bias and applicability judgments. Items are rated “low”, “high” and “unclear” based on the QUADAS-2 guidelines and reflect the risk of bias or the degree of concern about applicability. Quality ratings were based only on published information. QUADAS-2 coding notes are available from the corresponding author. † The blinding of interviewers to the results of the screening instrument was reported for this cohort in Thombs, 2008 [11]. ‡ The number of included patients already treated for depression in this cohort was reported in McManus, 2005 [22] and Elderon, 2011 [10]. § Information on the rate of recruitment for this cohort was reported in McManus, 2005 [22] and Thombs, 2008 [11].