

	Performance	
	Derivation	Validation
Chandra et al. (2012)	0.93 (95% CI: 0.92, 0.95)	0.95 (95% CI: 0.93, 0.96)
Cooper et al. (2013)	0.93 (95% CI: 0.93, 0.93)	0.91 (95% CI: 0.90, 0.91)
Davis et al. (2018)	0.75 (95% CI: NR)	0.77 (95% CI: NR)
Garey et al. (2008)	0.73 (95% CI: NR)	0.68 (95% CI: NR)
Hornbuckle et al. (1998)	0.78 (95% CI: NR)	0.7 (95% CI: NR)
Tabak et al. (2015)	0.79 (95% CI: 0.76, 0.81)	0.79 (95% CI: 0.76, 0.81)
Oh et al. (2018)^a		
MGH		0.75 (95% CI: 0.73, 0.78)
UM		0.82 (95% CI: 0.8, 0.84)
Tilton et al.^b		
Index model (2019)		0.7 (95% CI: NR)
Validation model (2021)		0.74 (95% CI: NR)
Voicu et al. (2021)		
Model 1		0.84 (95% CI: 0.76, 0.92)
Model 2		0.82 (95% CI: 0.75, 0.90)

Note:

Performance was reported as by area under the ROC for all studies.

Values rounded to two decimal places.

NR = Not reported

Bolded studies included multiple models

^a Created institution specific models.

^b Validated prior model on external population.