

Magnetocardiography for the diagnosis of coronary artery disease and comparison with electrocardiography: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Supplementary Materials

Table of Contents

Table of Contents.....	1
Section 1 List of acronyms and abbreviations.....	2
Table S1 List of acronyms and abbreviations.....	2
Section 2 PRISMA checklist.....	4
Section 3 Search strategy.....	8
Table S2 Search strategy for PubMed.....	8
Table S3 Search strategy for Embase.....	8
Table S4 Search strategy for Web of Science.....	8
Table S5 Search strategy for Cochrane Library.....	9
Table S6 Search strategy for ClinicalTrials.gov.....	9
Table S7 Search strategy for Scopus.....	9
Table S8 Search strategy for CNKI.....	10
Table S9 Search strategy for Wanfang.....	10
Section 4 Selection criteria.....	11
Table S10 Eliminated studies during the screening.....	11
Table S11 Eliminated studies during the full-text reading.....	14
Section 5 Data extraction.....	16
Table S12 Diagnostic 2×2 table.....	16
Table S13 Extracted data used for MCG analysis in our study.....	16
Section 6 Meta-analysis.....	17
Section 7 Sensitivity analysis.....	18
Figure S1 Funnel plot for meta-analysis of MCG.....	18
Section 8 Quality evaluation.....	19

Section 1 List of acronyms and abbreviations

Table S1 List of acronyms and abbreviations		
No.	Abbreviation	Full name
1	ACS	acute coronary syndromes
2	AF	atrial fibrillation
3	AFL	atrial flutter
4	AMI	acute myocardial infarction
5	AP	angina pectoris
6	AR	arrhythmias
7	AUC	the area under the curve
8	AVB	atrioventricular block
9	BBB	bundle branch block
10	CABG	coronary artery bypass surgery
11	CAG	coronary angiography
12	CBBB	complete bundle branch block
13	CDV	current density vector
14	CHD	coronary heart disease
15	CI	confidence interval
16	CK-MB	creatin kinase-MB isoenzyme
17	CM	cardiomyopathy
18	CNKI	China National Knowledge Infrastructure
19	CTCO	chronic total coronary occlusion
20	CVEI	complex ventricular excitation index
21	DCM	dilated cardiomyopathy
22	DM	diabetes mellitus
23	ECD	epicardial current density
24	ECG	electrocardiography
25	ECHO	echocardiography
26	ED	exertional dyspnea
27	EI	electrolyte imbalance
28	ESRF	end stage renal failure
29	FAPB	frequent atrial premature beats
30	FTW	flat T wave
31	HAP	hospital-admitted patient
32	HF	heart failure
33	HNOCM	hypertrophic nonobstructive cardiomyopathy
34	HOCM	hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy
35	HTN	hypertension
36	HUP	hemodynamically unstable patient
37	IC	integral change
38	IHD	ischemic heart disease
39	ITW	inverted T wave
40	IVB	intraventricular block
41	LV	left ventricular
42	LVD	left ventricular dysfunction

43	LVEF	left ventricular ejection fraction
44	MA	malignant arrhythmias
45	MCG	magnetocardiography
46	MD	magnetic dipole
47	MFM	magnetic field map
48	MI	myocardial infarction
49	MP	metallic prosthesis
50	MPI	myocardial perfusion imaging
51	MT	malignant tumor
52	OPM	optically pumped magnetometer
53	PA	pre-peak repolarization angle
54	PAD	pre-peak repolarization angular deviation
55	PCI	percutaneous coronary intervention
56	PI	pacemaker implantation
57	PoA	post-peak repolarization angle
58	PoAD	post-peak repolarization angular deviation
59	PoT	post-peak repolarization trajectory
60	PPAC	pre-post angle change
61	PT	pre-peak repolarization trajectory
62	PTP	pre-test probability
63	ROC curve	receiver operating characteristic curve
63	SAP	stable angina pectoris
64	SHD	structural heart disease
65	SI-QTc	smooth index QTc
66	SQUID	superconducting quantum interference device
67	SR	sinus rhythm
68	SROC	summary receiver operating characteristic
69	STE	ST-segment elevation
70	UAP	unstable angina pectoris
71	VAP	variant angina pectoris
72	VD	valve disease
73	VH	ventricular hypertrophy
74	VHD	valvular heart disease
75	VPB	ventricular premature beats
76	yo.	years old

Section 2 PRISMA checklist

This research complies with the [PRISMA 2020 guidelines](#). Details are reported at the list below.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identify the report as a systematic review.	Paper title
ABSTRACT			
Abstract	2	See the PRISMA 2020 for Abstracts checklist.	
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of existing knowledge.	Main text introduction, paragraph 1-2.
Objectives	4	Provide an explicit statement of the objective(s) or question(s) the review addresses.	Main text introduction, paragraph 2.
METHODS			
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify the inclusion and exclusion criteria for the review and how studies were grouped for the syntheses.	Main text methods, "Search strategy and selection criteria" section.
Information sources	6	Specify all databases, registers, websites, organisations, reference lists and other sources searched or consulted to identify studies. Specify the date when each source was last searched or consulted.	Main text methods, "Search strategy and selection criteria" section.
Search strategy	7	Present the full search strategies for all databases, registers and websites, including any filters and limits used.	Supplementary material, "Search Strategy" section.
Selection process	8	Specify the methods used to decide whether a study met the inclusion criteria of the review, including how many reviewers screened each record and each report retrieved, whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Main text methods, "Data extraction" section.
Data collection process	9	Specify the methods used to collect data from reports, including how many reviewers collected data from each report, whether they worked independently, any processes for obtaining or confirming data from study investigators, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Main text methods, "Data extraction" section.
Data items	10a	List and define all outcomes for which data were sought. Specify whether all results that were compatible with each outcome domain in each study were sought (e.g. for all measures, time points, analyses), and if not, the methods used to decide	Main text methods, "Data extraction" section. Supplementary material "Data extraction" section.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
		which results to collect.	
	10b	List and define all other variables for which data were sought (e.g. participant and intervention characteristics, funding sources). Describe any assumptions made about any missing or unclear information.	Main text methods, “Data extraction” section.
Study risk of bias assessment	11	Specify the methods used to assess risk of bias in the included studies, including details of the tool(s) used, how many reviewers assessed each study and whether they worked independently, and if applicable, details of automation tools used in the process.	Main text, “Quality evaluation” section. Supplementary material, “Quality evaluation” section.
Effect measures	12	Specify for each outcome the effect measure(s) (e.g. risk ratio, mean difference) used in the synthesis or presentation of results.	Main text methods, “Data analysis” section.
Synthesis methods	13a	Describe the processes used to decide which studies were eligible for each synthesis (e.g. tabulating the study intervention characteristics and comparing against the planned groups for each synthesis (item #5)).	Main text methods, “Search strategy and selection criteria” section.
	13b	Describe any methods required to prepare the data for presentation or synthesis, such as handling of missing summary statistics, or data conversions.	Main text methods, “Data extraction”. Main text methods, “Data analysis”.
	13c	Describe any methods used to tabulate or visually display results of individual studies and syntheses.	Main text methods, “Data analysis”.
	13d	Describe any methods used to synthesize results and provide a rationale for the choice(s). If meta-analysis was performed, describe the model(s), method(s) to identify the presence and extent of statistical heterogeneity, and software package(s) used.	Main text methods, “Data analysis”.
	13e	Describe any methods used to explore possible causes of heterogeneity among study results (e.g. subgroup analysis, meta-regression).	Main text methods, “Data analysis”.
	13f	Describe any sensitivity analyses conducted to assess robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary materials, “sensitivity analysis” section.
Reporting bias assessment	14	Describe any methods used to assess risk of bias due to missing results in a synthesis (arising from reporting biases).	/
Certainty assessment	15	Describe any methods used to assess certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for an outcome.	/

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
RESULTS			
Study selection	16a	Describe the results of the search and selection process, from the number of records identified in the search to the number of studies included in the review, ideally using a flow diagram.	Main text results, paragraph 1-2.
	16b	Cite studies that might appear to meet the inclusion criteria, but which were excluded, and explain why they were excluded.	Supplementary materials, "Selection criteria" section.
Study characteristics	17	Cite each included study and present its characteristics.	Main text, table 1.
Risk of bias in studies	18	Present assessments of risk of bias for each included study.	Main text results, paragraph 3.
Results of individual studies	19	For all outcomes, present, for each study: (a) summary statistics for each group (where appropriate) and (b) an effect estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval), ideally using structured tables or plots.	Main text, figure 2.
Results of syntheses	20a	For each synthesis, briefly summarise the characteristics and risk of bias among contributing studies.	Main text results, paragraph 3.
	20b	Present results of all statistical syntheses conducted. If meta-analysis was done, present for each the summary estimate and its precision (e.g. confidence/credible interval) and measures of statistical heterogeneity. If comparing groups, describe the direction of the effect.	Main texts results, paragraph 3.
	20c	Present results of all investigations of possible causes of heterogeneity among study results.	Main texts results, paragraph 4.
	20d	Present results of all sensitivity analyses conducted to assess the robustness of the synthesized results.	Supplementary materials, "Sensitivity analysis" section.
Reporting biases	21	Present assessments of risk of bias due to missing results (arising from reporting biases) for each synthesis assessed.	/
Certainty of evidence	22	Present assessments of certainty (or confidence) in the body of evidence for each outcome assessed.	For all mean estimates: 95% confidence intervals (CIs).
DISCUSSION			
Discussion	23a	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence.	Main texts discussion, paragraph 1.
	23b	Discuss any limitations of the evidence included in the review.	Main texts discussion, paragraph 2.

Section and Topic	Item #	Checklist item	Location where item is reported
	23c	Discuss any limitations of the review processes used.	Main texts discussion, paragraph 2.
	23d	Discuss implications of the results for practice, policy, and future research.	Main texts discussion, paragraph 4-5.
OTHER INFORMATION			
Registration and protocol	24a	Provide registration information for the review, including register name and registration number, or state that the review was not registered.	Abstract methods.
	24b	Indicate where the review protocol can be accessed, or state that a protocol was not prepared.	Main texts, data sharing.
	24c	Describe and explain any amendments to information provided at registration or in the protocol.	/
Support	25	Describe sources of financial or non-financial support for the review, and the role of the funders or sponsors in the review.	Main texts methods, Role of the funding source.
Competing interests	26	Declare any competing interests of review authors.	Main texts, Declaration of interests.
Availability of data, code and other materials	27	Report which of the following are publicly available and where they can be found: template data collection forms; data extracted from included studies; data used for all analyses; analytic code; any other materials used in the review.	Main texts, data sharing.

Section 3 Search strategy

PubMed

Table S2 Search strategy for PubMed	
No.	Query
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4
#4	((predictive[Title/Abstract] AND (value[Title/Abstract])) OR ((sensitiv*[Title/Abstract] OR (sensitivity and specificity[MeSH Terms])))
#3	angiogra*[Title/Abstract]
#2	((((((((((Coronary Artery Disease[Title/Abstract] OR (Arteriosclerosis, Coronary[Title/Abstract]) OR (Coronary Atherosclerosis[Title/Abstract])) OR (Coronary Atheroscleroses[Title/Abstract]) OR (Atheroscleroses, Coronary[Title/Abstract]) OR (Atherosclerosis, Coronary[Title/Abstract]) OR (Coronary Arterioscleroses[Title/Abstract]) OR (Arterioscleroses, Coronary[Title/Abstract]) OR (Coronary Arteriosclerosis[Title/Abstract]) OR (Left Main Coronary Disease[Title/Abstract]) OR (Left Main Diseases[Title/Abstract]) OR (Left Main Disease[Title/Abstract]) OR (Left Main Coronary Artery Disease[Title/Abstract]) OR (Coronary Artery Diseases[Title/Abstract]) OR (Artery Diseases, Coronary[Title/Abstract]) OR (Artery Disease, Coronary[Title/Abstract])
#1	(Magnetocardiography[Title/Abstract] OR (magnetocardiogra*[Title/Abstract])
Number of studies: 17	

Embase

Table S3 Search strategy for Embase	
No.	Query
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4
#4	'angiography*':ab,ti
#3	'sensitiv':ab,ti OR 'diagnostic accuracy':ab,ti OR 'diagnostic':ab,ti
#2	'magnetocardiogra*':ab,ti OR 'magnetocardiography'/exp
#1	'arteriosclerosis, coronary':ab,ti OR 'coronary atherosclerosis':ab,ti OR 'coronary atheroscleroses':ab,ti OR 'atheroscleroses, coronary':ab,ti OR 'atherosclerosis, coronary':ab,ti OR 'coronary arterioscleroses':ab,ti OR 'arterioscleroses, coronary':ab,ti OR 'coronary arteriosclerosis':ab,ti OR 'left main coronary disease':ab,ti OR 'left main diseases':ab,ti OR 'left main disease':ab,ti OR 'left main coronary artery disease':ab,ti OR 'coronary artery diseases':ab,ti OR 'artery diseases, coronary':ab,ti OR 'artery disease, coronary':ab,ti OR 'coronary artery disease'/exp
Number of studies: 13	

Web of Science

Table S4 Search strategy for Web of Science	
No.	Query
1	TS=(Coronary Artery disease OR Artery Disease OR Coronary Left Main Diseases OR Atherosclerosis, Coronary OR Artery Diseases, Coronary OR Left Main Coronary Disease OR Atheroscleroses, Coronary OR Coronary Artery Diseases OR Coronary Arteriosclerosis OR Coronary Atheroscleroses OR Left Main Coronary Artery Disease OR Arterioscleroses, Coronary OR Coronary Atherosclerosis OR Left Main Disease OR Coronary Arterioscleroses OR Arteriosclerosis, Coronary)
2	TS=(magnetocardiography OR magnetocardiogra*)
3	TS=(sensitiv* OR sensitivity and specificity OR (predictive AND value) OR predictive value of tests OR accuracy*)

4	TS=angiogra*
5	#4 AND #3 AND #2 AND #1
Number of studies: 26	

Cochrane Library

Table S5 Search strategy for Cochrane Library	
No.	Query
#1	MeSH descriptor: [Coronary Artery Disease] explode all trees
#2	(Left Main Diseases):ti,ab,kw OR (Left Main Coronary Disease):ti,ab,kw OR (Coronary Arteriosclerosis):ti,ab,kw OR (Arterioscleroses, Coronary):ti,ab,kw OR (Coronary Arterioscleroses):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)
#3	(Artery Disease, Coronary):ti,ab,kw OR (Artery Diseases, Coronary):ti,ab,kw OR (Coronary Artery Diseases):ti,ab,kw OR (Left Main Coronary Artery Disease):ti,ab,kw OR (Left Main Disease):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)
#4	(Atherosclerosis, Coronary):ti,ab,kw OR (Atheroscleroses, Coronary):ti,ab,kw OR (Coronary Atheroscleroses):ti,ab,kw OR (Coronary Atherosclerosis):ti,ab,kw OR (Arteriosclerosis, Coronary):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)
#5	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4
#6	MeSH descriptor: [Magnetocardiography] explode all trees
#7	(magnetocardiogra*):ti,ab,kw (Word variations have been searched)
#8	#6 OR #7
#9	#5 AND #8
Number of studies: 4	

ClinicalTrials.gov

Table S6 Search strategy for ClinicalTrials.gov	
Intervention/treatment	Magnetocardiography OR magnetocardiogram
Condition or disease	Coronary artery disease
Number of studies: 12 (44 articles mentioned)	

Scopus

Table S7 Search strategy for Scopus	
No.	Query
#1	TITLE-ABS-KEY (magnetocardiography) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (magnetocardiogra*)
#2	TITLE-ABS-KEY (angiogra*)
#3	TITLE-ABS-KEY (sensitiv*) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (sensitivity AND specificity) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (predictive AND value) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (predictive AND value AND of AND tests) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (accuracy*)
#4	TITLE-ABS-KEY (artery AND disease, AND coronary) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (artery AND diseases, AND coronary) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (coronary AND artery AND diseases) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (left AND main AND coronary AND artery AND disease) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (left AND main AND disease) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (left AND main AND diseases) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (left AND main AND coronary AND disease) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (coronary AND arteriosclerosis) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (arterioscleroses, AND coronary) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (coronary AND arterioscleroses) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (atherosclerosis, AND coronary) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (atheroscleroses, AND coronary) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (coronary AND atheroscleroses) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (coronary AND atherosclerosis) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (arteriosclerosis, AND coronary) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY (coronary AND artery AND disease)
#5	#1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Number of studies: 33

CNKI

Table S8 Search strategy for CNKI	
No.	Topic words
1	冠心病
2	冠状动脉
3	心肌缺血
4	缺血性心脏病
5	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4
6	心磁
7	诊断
8	冠状动脉造影
9	冠脉造影
10	8 OR 9
11	5 AND 6 AND 7 AND 10
Number of studies: 10	

Wanfang

Table S9 Search strategy for Wanfang	
#	Topic words
1	冠心病
2	冠状动脉
3	心肌缺血
4	缺血性心脏病
5	1 OR 2 OR 3 OR 4
6	心磁
7	诊断
8	冠状动脉造影
9	冠脉造影
10	8 OR 9
11	5 AND 6 AND 7 AND 10
Number of studies: 27	

Section 4 Selection criteria

Table S10 Eliminated studies during the screening				
No.	Research	Author	Year	Reasons for elimination
1	MCG-Net: End-to-End Fine-Grained Delineation and Diagnostic Classification of Cardiac Events from Magnetocardiographs	Tao R, Zhang S, Wang Y, Mi X, Ma J, Shen C, et al.	2022	Different diseases; machine learning.
2	Magnetocardiography as a noninvasive diagnostic strategy for suspected coronary microvascular dysfunction	Quesada O, Pico M, Palmer C, Yildiz M, Miranda R, Malhotra R, et al.	2022	Immature machine learning
3	Detection of coronary artery disease in patients with chest pain: A machine learning model based on magnetocardiography parameters	Huang X, Chen P, Tang F, and Hua N	2021	Immature machine learning
4	Value of magnetocardiography in chronic coronary disease detection: results of multicenter trial	Chaikovsky I, Li T, Zhang W, Kazmirchyk A, Mjasnikov G, Lutay M, et al.	2021	Unsatisfactory subjects
5	JCS 2018 guideline on diagnosis of chronic coronary heart diseases	Yamagishi M, Tamaki N, Akasaka T, Ikeda T, Ueshima K, Uemura S, et al.	2021	Not a DT
6	Safety and efficacy of the European Society of Cardiology 0/1-hour algorithm for diagnosis of myocardial infarction: systematic review and meta-analysis.	Chiang CH, Chiang CH, Lee GH, et al.	2020	Not a DT
7	High-sensitivity-cardiac troponin for accelerated diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction: A systematic review and meta-analysis	Lee CC, Huang SS, Yeo YH, et al.	2020	Not a DT
8	Cardiac troponin had limited diagnostic value for acute myocardial infarction in renal insufficiency: a meta-analysis	Yang G, Yao Y, Du Y, and Huang J	2020	Not a DT
9	Effectiveness of magnetocardiography to identify patients in need of coronary artery revascularization: a cross-sectional study	Huang X, Hua N, Tang F, and Zhang S	2020	Different disease
10	A 90-second magnetocardiogram using a novel analysis system to assess for coronary artery stenosis in Emergency department observation unit chest pain patients	Pena ME, Pearson CL, Goulet MP, Kazan VM, DeRita AL, Szpunar SM, et al.	2020	Different disease
11	Magnetocardiography for identification of coronary ischemia in patients with chest pain and normal resting 12-lead electrocardiogram	Ramesh R, enthilnathan S, Satheesh S, Swain PP, Patel R, Ananthakrishna Pillai A, et al.	2020	Unsatisfactory reference standard
12	Emergency Department Observation Unit Utilization Among Older Patients With Chest Pain	Madsen T, Perkins R, Holt B, et al.	2019	Not a DT
13	Magnetocardiography-Based Ischemic Heart Disease Detection and Localization Using Machine Learning Methods	Tao R, Zhang S, Huang X, Tao M, Ma J, Ma S, et al.	2019	Immature machine learning
14	Heart Disease and Stroke Statistics-2017 Update: A Report From the American Heart Association.	Benjamin EJ, Blaha MJ, Chiuve SE, et al.	2017	Not a DT
15	Coronary computed tomographic angiography for patients with low-to-intermediate risk chest pain: A systematic review and meta-analysis	Chen Y, Fan Y, Yin Z, et al.	2017	Not a DT
16	Machine learning for prediction of all-cause mortality in patients with suspected coronary artery disease: a 5-year multicentre prospective registry analysis	Motwani M, Dey D, Berman DS, et al.	2017	Not a DT
17	四通道无屏蔽心磁图仪对冠心病的诊断研究 (Study on the Diagnosis of Coronary Heart Disease with Four Channel Non-shielded Magnetocardiography)	Dai Z	2017	Unsatisfactory reference standard.
18	Repolarization Heterogeneity of Magnetocardiography Predicts Long-Term Prognosis in Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction	Bang WD, Kim K, Lee YH, et al.	2016	Not a DT; different disease

19	Repolarization Heterogeneity of Magnetocardiography Predicts Long-Term Prognosis in Patients with Acute Myocardial Infarction	Her AY and Park JW	2016	Not a DT
20	Diagnostic outcomes of magnetocardiography in patients with coronary artery disease	Li Y, Che Z, Quan W, et al.	2015	Unsatisfactory subjects
21	Significance of an Indeterminate Troponin I in Patients Evaluated for Chest Pain in an Emergency Department Observation Unit	Madsen TE, Stewart M, Smyres C, Beal A, Hamilton D, Vlastic K, and Oates A.	2015	Not MCG
22	Validation of magnetocardiography versus fractional flow reserve for detection of coronary artery disease	Park JW, Shin ES, Ann SH, Goedde M, Park LSI, Brachmann J, et al.	2015	Unsatisfactory reference standard
23	Noninvasively diagnosing coronary artery disease with 61 channel MCG data	Chen T, Zhao C, Jiang S, Van Leeuwen P, and Grönemeyer D	2014	Unsatisfactory subjects
24	高温超导心磁图仪在糖尿病患者冠脉介入治疗中的应用 (Value of High Temperature Superconductor Magnetocardiography in Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Patients with Type II Diabetes)	Di C, Hua N, Xie J, Tao Y, Wang B, and Tang F	2014	Different disease
25	Diagnostic value of magnetocardiography in coronary artery disease and cardiac arrhythmias: a review of clinical data	Kwong JS, Leithauser B, Park JW, and Yu CM	2013	Not a DT
26	心磁图在心血管疾病的临床应用研究 (The clinical application of magnetocardiography in cardiovascular disease)	Tao Y, Tang F, and Wang L	2013	Not a DT
27	高温超导心磁图仪在冠心病中的应用初探 (The value of high temperature superconductor magnetocardiography in coronary artery disease)	Di C, Hua N, Lin L, Tang F, Ma P, and Yang T	2013	Not a DT
28	Magnetocardiography for the diagnosis of coronary artery disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis	Agarwal R, Saini , Alyousef T, and Umscheid CA	2012	Not a DT
29	Contrast between magnetocardiography and electrocardiography for the early diagnosis of coronary artery disease in patients with acute chest pain	Lin LJ, Tang FK, Hua N, and Lu H	2011	Different disease
30	Testing of low-risk patients presenting to the emergency department with chest pain: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association	Amsterdam EA, Kirk JD, Bluemke DA, et al.	2010	Not a DT
31	Non-invasive magnetocardiography for the early diagnosis of coronary artery disease in patients presenting with acute chest pain	Kwon H, Kim K, Lee YH, et al.	2010	Different disease
32	Magnetocardiography based spatiotemporal correlation analysis is superior to conventional ECG analysis for identifying myocardial injury	Goernig M, Liehr M, Tute C, et al.	2009	Different disease
33	Usefulness of magnetocardiogram to detect unstable angina pectoris and non-ST elevation myocardial infarction	Lim HK, Kwon H, Chung N, et al.	2009	Different disease
34	Strain-Encoded Cardiac MR During High-Dose Dobutamine Stress Testing: Comparison to Cine Imaging and to Myocardial Tagging	Korosoglou G, Futterer S, Humpert PM, Riedle N, Lossnitzer D, Hoerig B, et al.	2009	Lack of MCG
35	冠心病患者的心磁图应用 (Clinical application value of magnetocardiography to the patients with coronary heart disease)	Li Y, Jin H, Quan W, Che Z, Yuan R, Shen Y, et al.	2008	Not a DT
36	Reproducibility of quantitative estimate of magnetocardiographic ventricular depolarization and repolarization parameters in healthy subjects and patients with coronary artery disease	Lim HK, Chung N, Kim K, et al.	2007	Not a DT
37	老年冠心病患者介入治疗前后的心磁图变化 (Magnetocardiogram changes after PTCA in old patients with coronary artery diseases)	Du X, Li F, Li Y, Cao J, Li Y, Quan W, et al.	2007	Not a DT
38	Sensitivity and specificity of magnetocardiography, using computerized classification of current density vectors maps, in ischemic patients with normal ECG	Fainzilberg L, Chaikovsky I, Auth-Eisernitz S, Awolin B,	2007	Unsatisfactory subjects

	and echocardiogram	Ivaschenko D, and Hailer, B		
39	Predictive value of rest magnetocardiography in patients with stable angina	Fenici R and Brisinda D	2007	Unsatisfactory reference standard
40	Integral value of JT interval in magnetocardiography is sensitive to coronary stenosis and improves soon after coronary revascularization	On Kei, Watanabe Shigeyuki, Yamada Satsuki, Takeyasu Norlyuki, Nakagawa Yoshitsugu, Nishina Hidetaka, et al.	2007	Not a DT
41	Application of the TIMI risk score for unstable angina and non-ST elevation acute coronary syndrome to an unselected emergency department chest pain population	Pollack CV Jr, Sites FD, Shofer FS, Sease KL, and Hollander JE	2006	Not MCG
42	冠心病辅助检查的临床应用进展 (The advancement of clinical applications for auxiliary examination of coronary heart disease)	Niu J	2006	Not a DT
43	心磁图:临床优势明显,技术仍需完善 (Magnetocardiography: clear clinical advantages, technology still needs improvement)	/	2006	Not a DT
44	心磁图检查原理及其临床应用 (Principle and Clinical Application of Magnetocardiography)	Wang C, Li W, Zhang J. and Fang P	2006	Not a DT
45	Identification of patients with coronary artery disease using magnetocardiographic signal analysis	Van Leeuwen P, Hailer B, Lange S, and Grönemeyer DH	2006	Not a DT of CHD
46	ACCF/ASNC appropriateness criteria for single-photon emission computed tomography myocardial perfusion imaging (SPECT MPI): a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation Quality Strategic Directions Committee Appropriateness Criteria Working Group and the American Society of Nuclear Cardiology endorsed by the American Heart Association	Brindis RG, Douglas PS, Hendel RC, et al.	2005	Not MCG
47	心磁图测量心脏复极时间对冠心病患者心功能预后的评估 (Evaluative role of magnetocardiography on prognosis of cardiac function in patients with coronary heart disease by measuring the time of heart repolarization)	Chen L, Wang Y, Van Leeuwen P, Lange S, and Klein A.	2005	Not a DT
48	The value of magnetocardiography in patients with and without relevant stenoses of the coronary arteries using an unshielded system	Hailer B, Chaikovskiy I, Auth-Eisemitz S, Schäfer H, and Van Leeuwen P	2005	Unsatisfactory subjects
49	Myocardial viability evaluation using magnetocardiography in patients with coronary artery disease	Morguet AJ, Behrens S, Kosch O, et al.	2004	Not a DT
50	Qualitative and quantitative description of myocardial ischemia by means of magnetocardiography	Park JW, and Jung F	2004	Unsatisfactory reference standard
51	冠心病患者的心磁图分析及应用 (Clinical application of magnetocardiography in patients with coronary heart disease)	Li Y, Lu G, Quan W, Shen Y, Yuan R, Du X, et al.	2004	Lack of data of diagnostic performance
52	心磁图对冠心病患者的诊断价值 (The diagnostic value of magnetocardiography to the patients with coronary heart disease)	Li Y, Lu G, Quan W, Du X, Li F, Yuan R, et al.	2004	Unsatisfactory subjects
53	Detection of coronary artery disease with MCG	Hailer B and Van Leeuwen P	2004	Not a DT
54	Evaluation of magnetocardiography indices in patients with cardiac diseases	Budnyk MM, Kozlovskiy VI, Stadnyuk LA, Zahrabova OM, Ryzhenko TM, and Getman TV	2004	Not a DT
55	Age and sex dependent variations in the normal magnetocardiogram compared with changes associated with ischemia	Chen J, Thomson PD, Nolan V, and Clarke J	2004	Not a DT
56	Effects of filtering on computer-aided analysis for detection of chronic ischemic heart disease with unshielded rest magnetocardiography mapping	Fenici R, Brisinda D, and Meloni AM	2004	Not a DT
57	Understanding multimodal fusion imaging	Hoppenrath M	2004	Review

58	Myocardial viability evaluation using magnetocardiography in patients with coronary artery disease	Morguet AJ, Behrens S, Kosch O, Lange C, Zabel M, Selbig D, et al.	2004	Not a DT
59	冠心病无创性检查——心磁图 (Magnetocardiography: non-invasive examination for coronary heart disease)	Li W	2003	Not a DT
60	心磁图在缺血性心脏病的诊断价值探讨 (Preliminary evaluation of the effect of magnetocardiography on diagnosis of ischemic heart disease)	Wang C	2003	Unsatisfactory subjects
61	心磁图对静态心电图正常的冠心病患者的诊断价值 (Diagnostic value of magnetocardiography in coronary heart disease patients with normal resting electrocardiogram)	Li Y, Lu G, Quan W, Shen Y, and Yuan R	2003	Not a DT
62	First 36-channel magnetocardiographic study of CAD patients in an unshielded laboratory for interventional and intensive cardiac care	Brisinda D, Meloni AM, and Fenici R	2003	Unsatisfactory subjects
63	Coronary artery imaging with real-time navigator three-dimensional turbo-field-echo MR coronary angiography: Initial experience	Bogaert J, Kuzo R, Dymarkowski S, Beckers R, Piessens J, and Rademakers FE	2003	Lack of MCG
64	Comparison of magnetocardiograms acquired in unshielded clinical environment at rest, during and after exercise and in conjunction with myocardial perfusion imaging	Brazdeikis A, Taylor AA, Mahmarian JJ, Xue Y, and Chu CW.	2002	Lack of fulltext; not a DT
65	Computerized classification of patients with coronary artery disease but normal or unspecifically changed ECG and healthy volunteers	Chaikovsky I, Primin M, Nedayvoda I, Vassilyev V, Sosnitsky V, and Steinberg F	2002	Lack of fulltext
66	Evaluation of myocardial ischemia in Kawasaki disease using an isointegral map on magnetocardiogram	Shiono J, Horigome H, Matsui A, Terada Y, Watanabe S, Miyashita T, et al.	2002	Different disease
67	Features of ST segment and T-wave in exercise-induced myocardial ischemia evaluated with multichannel magnetocardiography	Hänninen H, Takala P, Korhonen P, Oikarinen L, Mäkjärvi M, Nenonen J, et al.	2002	Not a DT
68	The continuing search to identify the very-low-risk chest pain patient	Hollander JE	1999	Not a DT
69	Normal and abnormal components in magnetocardiographic maps of a subject with myocardial infarction	Troink G, MacAuley C, Montague TJ, and Horacek BM	1985	Not a DT, different disease
70	Analysis of current source of the heart using isomagnetic and vector arrow maps	Nakaya Y, Sumi M, Saito K, Fujino K, Murakami M, and Mori H	1984	Not a DT; different disease
71	Magnetocardiograms taken inside a shielded room with a superconducting point-contact magnetometer	Cohen D, Edelsack EA, and Zimmerman JE	1970	Not a DT
DT: diagnostic tests; CHD: coronary artery disease; MCG: magnetocardiography				

Table S11 Eliminated studies during the full-text reading				
No.	Research	Author	Year	Reasons for elimination
1	心磁图参数在心电图无特异性改变冠心病患者中应用 (The application of related parameters of MCG in patients of coronary artery disease with normal and unspecialized changed electrocardiogram)	Xu W	2015	Overlapping samples with included studies
2	高温超导 SQUID 技术在不稳定型心绞痛诊断中的初步研究 (The preliminary investigation of the effectiveness and possibilities of high temperature superconducting quantum interference device in the diagnosis of unstable angina pectoris)	Wang B	2014	Overlapping samples with included studies

3	高温超导量子干涉器在不稳定型心绞痛诊断中的初步研究 (The preliminary investigation of the effectiveness and possibilities of high temperature superconducting quantum interference device in the diagnosis of unstable angina pectoris)	Wang B, Tang F, Hua N, Di C, Lin L, and Tao Y	2014	Overlapping samples with included studies
4	四通道高温超导心磁图诊断冠心病的临床初步研究 (A preliminary clinical study on the diagnosis of coronary heart disease with four channel high temperature superconductor MCG)	Yang J	2013	Overlapping samples with included studies
5	Preliminary approach of value of the high-temperature superconducting magnetocardiography in diagnosis of coronary heart disease	Yang J, Tang F, Di C, Zhang C, and Hua N	2013	Overlapping samples with included studies
6	心磁图对冠心病心肌缺血与高血压心室肥厚的诊断价值 (Effect of magnetocardiography on diagnosis of ischemia in patient with coronary heart disease and left ventricular hypertrophy)	Chen Y	2010	Lack of data of diagnostic performance
7	心磁图对不稳定型心绞痛的诊断价值 (Diagnostic value of MCG to unstable angina)	Bu L, Tang F, Hua N, Qi Z, Zhang C, and Tang X	2009	Unsatisfactory reference standard
8	心磁图对冠心病诊断和冠状动脉支架内再狭窄的预测价值 (The predictive value of magnetocardiography for diagnosing coronary heart disease and predicting in-stent restenosis)	Quan W	2006	Overlapping samples with included studies
9	静息心电图正常的冠心病患者的心磁图分析	Quan W, Lu G, Li Y, Shen Y, Yuan R, and Qi W	2006	Overlapping samples with included studies
10	Non-invasive resting magnetocardiographic imaging for the rapid detection of ischemia in subjects presenting with chest pain	Tolstrup K, Madsen BE, Ruiz JA, et al.	2006	Unsatisfactory reference standard
11	冠心病患者 QTd 变异的心磁图研究 (The study of QT dispersion variability in patients with coronary artery disease using magnetocardiography)	Chen L, Van leeuwen P, Lange S, and Klein A	2004	Unsatisfactory subjects
12	心磁图对常规心电图正常冠心病的诊断价值的初步探讨 (Preliminary approach of diagnostic value of magnetocardiography for coronary artery disease in patients with normal electrocardiogram at rest)	Wang C, Gao R, Hu F, Wei B, Yang Y, You S, et al.	2004	Duplicated studies

Section 5 Data extraction

Table S12 Diagnostic 2×2 table		
	CAG positive	CAG negative
MCG positive	True positives a	False positives b
MCG negative	False negatives c	True negatives d

The main indices include sensitivity = $\frac{a}{a+c} \times 100\%$ and specificity = $\frac{d}{b+d} \times 100\%$. The Youden index, calculated as $\frac{a}{a+c} + \frac{d}{b+d} - 1$, evaluates the overall accuracy of the diagnostic test. Other commonly used indices include the false positive rate = $\frac{b}{b+d}$ and false negative rate = $\frac{c}{a+c}$.

Table S13 Extracted data used for MCG analysis in our study									
Name	Author	Year	TP	FP	FN	TN	Rest_ecg	Stress_test	Stand_ref
Huang 2019	Huang	2019	129	43	3	38	0	0	0
Shin 2017	Shin	2017	39	6	7	44	0	1	1
Wu 2013	Wu	2013	44	7	7	17	0	0	1
Zhao 2010	Zhao	2010	216	10	167	100	0	0	0
Zhang 2009	Zhang	2009	61	4	8	37	1	0	0
Du 2006	Du	2006	39	17	7	27	0	0	1
Park 2005	Park	2005	136	3	7	39	0	0	0
Shin 2019	Shin	2019	54	6	25	117	0	1	1
Kanzaki 2003	Kanzaki	2003	14	2	3	11	1	1	1
Lin 2015	Lin	2015	169	26	21	71	0	0	1
Steinberg 2005	Steinberg	2005	16	6	3	4	0	0	0
Wu 2014	Wu	2014	31	6	5	13	0	0	1
Chaikovsky 2014	Chaikovsky	2014	50	4	4	21	1	0	1
Chaikovsky 2017	Chaikovsky	2017	76	6	6	48	0	0	0
Park 2008	Park	2008	41	19	1	39	0	1	1
Quan 2006	Quan	2006	91	26	49	56	1	0	1
Coriasso 2021	Coriasso	2021	15	3	12	35	0	0	
Zhao 2019	Zhao	2019	26	29	6	43	0	0	0

Rest_ecg: The patient's resting electrocardiogram (ECG) status, where '1' signifies a normal resting ECG and '0' signifies no specific demand. Stress_test: It indicates whether the patient's MCG was measured under stress, where '1' denotes stress MCG and '0' signifies resting MCG. Stand_ref: It represents the threshold value of the standard reference, where '1' indicating a threshold value of 70% and '0' indicating a threshold value of 50%.

Section 6 Meta-analysis

Code for STATA

```
ssc install midas
```

```
ssc install mylabels
```

```
midas tp fp fn tn, res(sum)
```

```
midas tp fp fn tn, id(author year) ms(0.75) ford fors bfor(dss)
```

```
midas tp fp fn tn, plot sroc(both)
```

```
midas tp fp fn tn, reg(rest_ecg stress_test stand_ref)
```

```
midas tp fp fn tn, pubbias
```

Section 7 Sensitivity analysis

Funnel Plot




Figure S1 Funnel plot for meta-analysis of MCG. It indicates the absence of significant publication bias

Section 8 Quality evaluation

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION

Risk of bias: Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Question 1: Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled?

YES: 'all patients', or 'consecutive patients'.

Question 2: Was a case-control design avoided?

Question 3: Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions?

Exclusion considered inappropriate: patients who are difficult to diagnose based on their clinical presentation.

Exclusion considered appropriate: patients who refused entry into the registry, with poor data, with other serious disease, or other unsuitable situations.

Risk of bias LOW: If enrolled consecutive or random sample of patients, avoided case-control design, and avoided inappropriate exclusions. Risk of bias Unclear: uncleared exclusions or uncleared recruitment procedures. Risk of bias HIGH: If existed case-control design, discontinuous subjects, or existed inappropriate exclusion.

Applicability Concerns: Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

Match the review question: Suspected patients with CHD, using magnetocardiography. High concern: restrictive clinical criteria used at inclusion, leading to a population at higher risk of CHD, or easier to diagnose.

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TEST

Risk of Bias: Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Question 1: Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard?

Question 2: If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified?

Risk of bias LOW: If pre-specified threshold, blinded to the results of coronary angiography. Risk of bias UNCLEAR: If unmentioned blinded design, or unmentioned specified threshold. Risk of bias HIGH: If post-specified threshold or without blinded design.

Applicability: Are there concerns that the index test, its conduct, or interpretation differ from the review question?

Low concern: same technology, execution, and interpretation. High concern: Existed variation in test technology, execution, or interpretation.

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

Risk of Bias: Could the reference standard, its conduct, or its interpretation have introduced bias?

Question 1: Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition?

Question 2: Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test?

Risk of bias LOW: Blinded, with more than 2 independent readers, or at least same experienced reader, with pre-specified criteria. UNCLEAR: unmentioned procedure including unclear readers and unclear blinded design. HIGH: unblinded, without standardized criteria.

Applicability: Are there concerns that the target condition as defined by the reference standard does not match the question?

Low concern: stenosis more than 50% or 70%.

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

Risk of Bias: Could the patient flow have introduced bias?

Question 1: Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard?

Appropriate interval: Within 48h or other time stated appropriately.

Question 2: Did all patients receive the same reference standard?

Question 3: Were all patients included in the analysis?

Risk of Bias LOW: If appropriate interval, same reference standard, and all patients included. Risk of Bias UNCLEAR:

Unmentioned interval between index test or unmentioned design of reference standard. HIGH: existed exclusion of patients, or inappropriate interval between index test and reference standard.

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Patients with chest symptoms, who were scheduled for CAG, and healthy volunteers. Recruitment procedure unclear.

- Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? Unclear
- Was a case-control design avoided? No
- Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? Unclear

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): Patients with chest symptoms and healthy volunteers. All subjects had normal ECG at rest, normal echocardiograms, and no medical devices made of metallic or magnetic material. Aged 38 ± 19 and 61 ± 7 years for control group and CHD patients, respectively. The proportion of male are 85% and 94% for control group and CHD patients, respectively.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: performed with a 64-channel SQUID MCG system installed in a magnetically shielded room. The detectors were positioned just above the anterior chest wall of the subject, who was kept in the supine position. If the maximal QRS integral change during 40 ms ≥ 0.44 , the subject was defined as CHD patient.

- Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? Unclear
- If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? No

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Positivity criteria: $> 70\%$ diameter narrowing of one or more major coronary arteries.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question? CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with pains in the retrosternal area and ECG changes indicative of acute ischemic heart disease, without persistent ST-segment elevation, but rather with temporary ST-segment elevation or flat or inverted T waves or even with nonspecific changes at all. Exclusion criteria: Patients with acute myocardial infarction, who were unambiguously diagnosed with a 12-lead surface ECG, hemodynamically unstable patients, and patients who refused entry into the registry.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): Aged 67.0 ± 10.7 years. 72 females and 113 males in total.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: 2 independent readers evaluated visually the MCG without prior knowledge of the results of the laboratory results, the 12-lead ECG, the echocardiographic, or the CAG examinations. The detailed procedure and positive criteria not reported.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Yes |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least one coronary artery branch of first or secondary order revealed a 50% or greater degree of stenosis.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Yes

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Low

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question? CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): 264 patients were consecutively recruited and only 185 subjects were evaluated. 8 patients were excluded due to intrinsic signal interference (1 with implanted defibrillator, 2 with metal clips after two bypass operations, 3 with a pacemaker, and 2 had excessive metal after permanent teeth replacement). Another 8 patients were excluded because they became symptom-free after on and no longer needed CAG examination. 63 patients were excluded due to the poor signal to noise ratio of the raw data.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Within 36 hours.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? No

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: High

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with suspected CHD, who are scheduled for diagnostic coronary artery catheterization. Exclusion criteria: implantable devices, sternal wires, dental artifacts, or otherwise poor data.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Unclear |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): 21 males and 8 females in total, aged from 45 to 83 years.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 9-channel MCG system positioned 3–5 cm above the chest. The subject lies on the examination table. The table can be moved to four different positions, and the MCG is recorded in each of these positions. In each location, the recording is performed for 90 seconds for improvement of the signal/noise ratio. “Common” ECG cycle is used to average each of the 36 MCG tracings over time, then the data are interpolated using first a bivariate surface fitting algorithm to obtain a 2-D color map. Two observers who were blinded to the results of the other tests read the results of MCG. Ischemia on MCG was defined by an algorithm based on three characteristics within the analysis window: the number of poles, the positions and movements of the poles, and the overall stability of the map. The algorithm was preprogrammed into the proprietary analysis software, provided by the manufacturer, and has been submitted for patent. The score of this algorithm ranged from 0 to 100; and greater than 49 was deemed abnormal.

- | | |
|---|-----|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Yes |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Yes |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Yes

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: 2

Criteria for interpretation: At least one coronary artery stenosis of 50% was present.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation

of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Within 24 hours.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Low

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with chest pain. Exclusion criteria: patients with heart failure, electrolyte imbalance, atrial fibrillation, bundle branch block, and left ventricular hypertrophy confirmed by echocardiography, age < 26 years old.

- Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? Yes
- Was a case-control design avoided? Yes
- Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? Unclear

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): 90 subjects in total, with 61 males and 29 females.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Sensors were placed 1-2 cm above the chest and its recording cover an area of 20 × 20 cm. The subject lied on the examination bed with all magnetic, electronic and metallic objects removed. The patients are diagnosed according to the ratio of abnormal maps RAM in the S-T interval. The cut-off value decided by ROC curve not reported.

- Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? Unclear
- If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? Unclear

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG
Readers: Unclear
Criteria for interpretation: At least one coronary artery stenosis of 70% was present.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question? CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with chest pain who exhibit normal findings in echocardiography, chest X-rays, and resting electrocardiogram (ECG) recordings. Exclusion criteria: Patients with heart failure, bundle branch block, atrial fibrillation. Patients with cardiomyopathy, valvular heart disease, ventricular hypertrophy, and left ventricular dysfunction confirmed by Doppler ultrasound.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): Inclusion and exclusion criteria see above. Aged from 37 to 85 years and from 43 to 78 years for CHD group and non-CHD group, respectively.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: MCG is recorded in an unshielded room at a 5 × 5 rectangular grid and separated from each other by 4 cm. MCG of all the measuring points during ST segment is utilized to reconstruct a current density figure. The patient with the value of complex ventricular excitation index (CVEI) between -100 to 0 is diagnosed as CHD.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | YES |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG
Readers: Unclear
Criteria for interpretation: At least one main coronary artery stenosis of $\geq 70\%$.

- | | |
|--|-----|
| ➤ Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? | Yes |
|--|-----|

- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Low

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with stable angina pectoris or exertional dyspnea and an intermediate pre-test probability (10–90%) for CHD, who were referred to Hoyerswerda Hospital for the first CAG. Exclusion criteria included: 1. Age <18 years 2. Acute coronary syndromes 3. Low (<10%) or high (>90%) pre-test; probability for CHD 4. History of percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) 5. History of coronary bypass surgery 6. Hypertrophic obstructive cardiomyopathy (HOCM) 7. Hypertrophic nonobstructive cardiomyopathy (HNOCM) 8. Dilated cardiomyopathy (DCM) 9. Aortic valve stenosis >2 10. Mitral valve stenosis >2 11. Complete bundle branch block Glaucoma 12. Hypovolemia 13. History of contrast agent allergy 14. Creatinine >135 mmol/l 15. Pregnancy

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Unclear |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): Inclusion and exclusion criteria see above. There are 49 males and 51 females, with a mean age of 65.1 ± 10.1 years old. Mean value of height and body weight are 168 ± 9.7 cm and 81.8 ± 15.5 kg, respectively.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 55 channel MCG system (intersensor spacing 3.2 cm covering a circular area of about 23 cm) in a magnetically shielded room. The patients were examined at rest and during the dobutamine–atropine stress until age-adjusted submaximal heart rate was reached. The epicardial current distribution was calculated and reconstructed from the magnetic field data and superposed on a virtual heart model (Software: AtB, Pescara, Italy and Biomagnetik, Cologne, Germany). A head-to-head visual comparison is used for diagnosing CHD. Patients with a significant reduction of epicardial current density and current strength at the timepoint of maximal strength of QRS-complex (QRSmax) during stress is diagnosed as CHD.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Yes |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: 1

Criteria for interpretation: Lesions with a diameter reduction of $\geq 70\%$.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation

of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Within 24 hours.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Low

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with chest pain or chest discomfort. Inclusion criteria included: 1. Routine 12-lead resting ECG shows normal findings or exhibits non-specific changes. 2. Creatine kinase-MB isoenzyme (CK-MB) is less than 2 times the normal range. 3. Troponin I ≤ 0.16 ng/L 4. aged from 50 - 70 years old. Exclusion criteria included: 1. Acute and old myocardial infarction. 2. Primary and secondary hypertension. 3. Clinically significant valve disease. 4. Diabetes mellitus 5. Atrioventricular block, bundle branch block, intraventricular block, and post-pacemaker implantation. 6. LVEF $\leq 50\%$. 7. Other situations that the researchers deemed unsuitable for inclusion.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): See above. No details in the patients' characteristics reported.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 9-channel MCG system in an unshielded room. All magnetic, electronic and metallic objects were removed. The sensors were placed at 1-2 cm above the chest and recorded 36 points in total. The MCG signals were sent to the computer and then analyzed. Patients were diagnosed as CHD if at least 3 out of the following 7 indicators were found to be abnormal: (1) Magnetic dipole standard integral, (2) Magnetic dipole quantitative integral, (3) Magnetic dipole standard scoring, (4) Magnetic dipole angle range, (5) Magnetic dipole angle change, (6) Magnetic dipole distance change, (7) Positive and negative extreme value change ratio. The threshold of these parameters not reported.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least one major coronary artery or its major branch has $\geq 50\%$ diameter stenosis.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation

of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Within 24 hours.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Low

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with suspected CHD exhibiting chest pain. Exclusion criteria included: 1. Severe hypertension ($> 180/110$ mmHg) 2. Complex arrhythmias such as frequent atrial premature beats, ventricular premature beats, and complete bundle branch block. 3. patients with severe lung disease, chest deformity, or those who have undergone surgery. 4. Patients with acute myocardial infarction of less than 3 months. 5. Patients with ventricular hypertrophy or dilated cardiomyopathy confirmed by echocardiography.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): The CHD group consists of 383 subjects, including 253 males and 130 females. The mean value of the age is 59.56 ± 9.60 years. The non-CHD group consists of 110 subjects, including 58 males and 52 females. The mean value of the age is 51.15 ± 8.60 years.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using 9-channel MCG system, and all sensors are aligned as a rectangle of 3×3 , with the distance of 4 cm between neighboring sensors. All magnetic, electronic and metallic objects were removed. The system is placed at 4 positions to record MCG at 36 points in total. In each location, the recording is performed for 90 seconds. Patients were diagnosed as CHD if at least 3 out of the following 7 indicators were found to be abnormal: 1. pre-peak repolarization angle < -120 or > -25 . 2. pre-peak repolarization trajectory ≥ 4.3 . 3. pre-peak repolarization angular deviation ≥ 0.5 . 4. post-peak repolarization angle < -110 or > -22 . 5. post-peak repolarization trajectory ≥ 3.7 . 6. post-peak repolarization angular deviation ≥ 0.45 . 7. prepost angle change < -35 or > -12 .

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least one major branch of coronary artery stenosis $\geq 50\%$.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2x2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with suspected CHD. Exclusion criteria: significant arrhythmias, known MI history or Q wave on surface 12-lead ECG, unstable angina pectoris, significant valvular heart disease, metallic prosthesis (including pacemaker and implantable cardioverter defibrillator).

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): The mean age of the patients is 64 ± 10 years old. 67 males and 8 females in total.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 64-channel SQUID system in a magnetically shielded room. The MCG signals were digitally recorded for 100s at a sampling rate of 500Hz, with the patient in the supine position and the SQUID's 2-D arrayed sensors positioned close to, but not in contact with, the left chest wall. After baseline correction, data were averaged using R-peaks to obtain a time-averaged 1-period MCG signal. MCG signals during the QT interval was used for the construction of the QT contour map. QTc dispersion and SI-QTc are derived from the QT contour map to represent the myocardial repolarization heterogeneity. Patients with the QTc dispersion ≥ 79 ms or SI-QTc ≥ 9 ms are diagnosed as CHD.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | No |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: /

Criteria for interpretation: Angiographic maximum lesions $\geq 50\%$ luminal stenosis in the left main (LM), or $\geq 70\%$ in at least one of the primary coronary arteries and their major branches.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: within 1 month.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Low

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Patients with chest pain. Exclusion. Exclusion criteria: Patients with previous myocardial infarction, atrial fibrillation and flutter, pacemaker, heart failure, hypertensive disease of stage III, renal and hepatic failure, obstructive respiratory diseases, febrile states, or oncological diseases were excluded. Further exclusion criteria were abnormalities in 12-lead ECG at rest (abnormal Q-waves, ST depression/elevation, negative T-waves in more than two leads, complete bundle branch block, signs of the left ventricular hypertrophy) as well as abnormalities in rest echocardiogram (segmental and global disturbances of contractility, enlargement of hear chamber, valvular heart disease). No details on patient recruitment.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Unclear |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): The CHD group consists of 54 subjects, including 48 males and 6 females. The mean value of the age is 56 ± 10 years. The non-CHD group consists of 25 subjects, including 20 males and 5 females. The mean value of the age is 54 ± 12 years.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: MCG was conducted using a 7-channel stationary MCG system in an unshielded room. Patients were positioned on a movable platform, and sensors were placed at nine locations over the precordial region. The magnetic field registration lasted for 30 seconds to 1 minute at each location, while simultaneously recording a two-lead ECG. Trained nurses performed the MCG registration, and the data were filtered and processed. Averaged MCG curves were obtained and analyzed, with reference points marked based on the QRS complex and ST-T interval. The signal-to-noise ratio was suitable for analysis, and the PQRST reference points were well differentiated. Written informed consent was obtained from all patients. Patient is diagnosed as CHD if the complex index $CI \geq 10$.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | No |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: 2

Criteria for interpretation: Detected stenosis of 70% or more in at least one of the main coronary arteries.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation

of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: 24 – 48 hours.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with suspected or known stable CAD referred for stress MPI and CAG. Inclusion criteria included: 1. typical/atypical chest pain or ischemic equivalents (eg. dyspnea). 2. an interpretable baseline electrocardiography (ECG) and in sinus rhythm. 3. at least intermediate pretest CHD likelihood. 4. preserved left ventricular (LV) ejection fraction (EF) ($\geq 50\%$ by 2D echocardiography) and wall motion. Exclusion criteria: significant arrhythmias, recent (< 6 weeks) myocardial infarction, unstable angina pectoris, Q-wave on 12-lead ECG, and metallic prosthesis (including pacemaker and implantable cardioverter-defibrillator).

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): For CHD group and non-CHD group, the mean values of age are 64 ± 10 and 65 ± 9 years old, respectively. There is no significant difference in age, gender within these 2 groups.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 64-channel SQUID system in a magnetically shielded room. The MCG signals were digitally recorded for 100s at a sampling rate of 500Hz, with the patient in the supine position and the SQUID's 2-D arrayed sensors positioned close to, but not in contact with, the left chest wall. After baseline correction, data were averaged using R-peaks to obtain a time-averaged 1-period MCG signal. MCG signals during the QT interval was used for the construction of the QT contour map. QTc dispersion and SI-QTc are derived from the QT contour map to represent the myocardial repolarization heterogeneity. Patients with the QTc dispersion ≥ 79 ms or SI-QTc ≥ 9 ms are diagnosed as CHD.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | No |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: /

Criteria for interpretation: Angiographic maximum lesions $\geq 50\%$ luminal stenosis in the left main (LM), or $\geq 70\%$ in at least one of the primary coronary arteries and their major branches.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2x2 table (refer to flow diagram): Patient with suspected CHD

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Within 3 months.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Low

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with chest pain or chest discomfort. Exclusion criteria: 1. patients with suspected variant angina, persistent ST segment elevation, bundle branch block, arrhythmias. 2. patients with left ventricular hypertrophy confirmed by echocardiography.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): See above. No details in the patients' characteristics reported.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 9-channel MCG system in the magnetically shielded room. Then the MCG signals were used to calculate seven parameters. Patients were diagnosed as CHD if at least 3 out of the following 7 indicators were found to be abnormal: 1. pre-peak repolarization angle < -120 or > -25 . 2. pre-peak repolarization trajectory ≥ 4.3 . 3. pre-peak repolarization angular deviation ≥ 0.5 . 4. post-peak repolarization angle < -110 or > -22 . 5. post-peak repolarization trajectory ≥ 3.7 . 6. post-peak repolarization angular deviation ≥ 0.45 . 7. prepost angle change < -35 or > -12 .

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least 1 stenosis $\geq 70\%$ in the three main coronary arteries and their branches.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question? CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Patients, who exhibiting symptoms of chest pain, without a history of myocardial infarction. Exclusion criteria and recruitment procedure undetailed.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Unclear |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): 82 and 54 subjects for CHD group and non-CHD group, respectively. No details in patients' characteristics reported.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: The magnetocardiography recordings were obtained from 36 positions during rest, and CDV maps were generated during the ST-T interval. Each CDV map element was characterized by brightness, representing the current density, and the angle of the current density vector at that point. This resulted in the calculation of 32 features for each map. A binary k-NN classifier employing different distance metrics (Cityblock, Mahalanobis, Chebyshev, Euclidean) was utilized to classify the patient into the relevant categories.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least 50% stenosis in at least one of the main coronary arteries.

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? | Yes |
| ➤ Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question? CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Patients with an indication for CAG due to chest pain or suspected CHD who were older than 18 years and suited for stress testing with MCG. Exclusion criteria: acute coronary syndromes or recent (b3 months) acute myocardial infarction, coronary artery bypass grafting, chronic total coronary occlusion, significant valvular heart disease, end stage renal failure, or refusal to enter the registry.

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Unclear |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): 96 subjects in total, including 75 males and 21 females. The subjects aged from 34 to 82 years, with a mean value of 65.0 ± 10.8 years.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 64-channel gradiometer system in a magnetically shielded room. The subject were in the supine position to record the rest MCG. Stress recordings were obtained by bicycle exercise test. Each signal is recorded for 100 s at a sampling rate of 500 Hz. An independent investigator performed quality evaluation and analysis of ECG and MCG. Patients with non-dipole phenomenon, which means the number of existed poles was either 1 or > 2 , were diagnosed as CHD. For the inter-observer agreement of ischemic analysis by MCG (for ST-segment fluctuation score as well as non-dipole phenomenon analysis), kappa statistic was used.

- | | |
|---|-----|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Yes |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | No |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least 70% stenosis in at least one proximal epicardial coronary artery and objective evidence of myocardial ischemia (substantial changes in ST-segment depression or T-wave inversion on the resting electrocardiogram or inducible ischemia with either exercise) or at least one coronary stenosis of at least 80% and classic angina without provocative testing.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Within 24 hours.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Yes
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Low

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Patients who are pathologically diagnosed with MCG, radionuclide myocardial perfusion imaging (MPI), and CAG. Exclusion criteria: serious hypertension (blood pressure > 180/110 mmHg) OR complex arrhythmias (frequent ventricular premature contraction, ventricular tachycardia and complete bundle branch block) OR serious pulmonary disease and chest malformation or surgery OR < 3 months post-AMI OR ventricular hypertrophy or dilated cardiomyopathy confirmed by Echo OR valvular heart disease OR congenital cardiovascular disease OR post pacemaker OR heart failure NYHA > class III OR dysfunction of liver and kidney as well as abnormal electrolyte. All the patients signed written informed consent and are willing to cooperate with researchers.

- | | |
|--|-----|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Yes |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Low

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): 71 males and 33 females in total. Aged 58.56 ± 8.13 and 54.74 ± 8.58 years for CHD group and non-CHD group, respectively. No significant difference between groups for height and weight.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 9-channel mapping system in an unshielded room. The 9 sensors are arranged in a 3×3 rectangular grid and separated from each other by 4 cm. All magnetic, electronic and metallic objects were removed. MCG were recorded at four pre-defined positions for a total imaging time of 6 min. Surface ECG was recorded simultaneously as a reference signal for MCG signal averaging. The MCG data were analyzed in scalar form within T waves. System automatically drew an iso-magnetic map from 36 points of magnetic field component. With this map, 7 quantitative parameters were then calculated. The patients is diagnosed as CHD if at least 2 out of the following 7 indicators were found to be abnormal: 1) Pre-peak repolarization angle (PA) < -120 or > -25 2) Pre-peak repolarization trajectory (PT) ≥ 4.3 3) Pre-peak repolarization angular deviation (PAD) ≥ 0.5 4) Post-peak repolarization angle (PoA) < -110 or > -22 5) Post-peak repolarization trajectory (PoT) ≥ 3.7 6) Post-peak repolarization angular deviation (PoAD) ≥ 0.45 7) Pre-Post angle change (PPAC) < -35 or > -12

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | Unclear |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD

A. Risk of Bias

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: Narrowing of the coronary arteries $\geq 50\%$ in one or more vessels.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients older than 18 years and suited for stress testing with MCG, who were admitted to the hospital with an indication for CAG due to chest pain or suspected CHD. Exclusion criteria: acute coronary syndromes, recent (<3 months) acute myocardial infarction, coronary artery bypass grafting, chronic total coronary occlusion, significant valvular heart disease, end stage renal failure, or refusal to enter the registry.

- Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? Yes
- Was a case-control design avoided? Yes
- Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? Unclear

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): See above. 129 males and 73 females in total, with a mean age of 64.6 years.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using a 64-channel gradiometer system in a magnetically shielded room. The rest MCG were recorded for 100 seconds at a sampling rate of 500 Hz, with the patient in the supine position and the SQUID's 2-D arrayed sensors positioned close to, but not in contact with the left chest wall. Stress recordings were acquired by bicycle exercise test. One independent investigator performed quality evaluation and analysis of ECG and MCG. The patients with the percent change of ST-segment fluctuation score $\geq -40.0\%$ is diagnosed as CHD.

- Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? Unclear
- If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? No

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: $\geq 70\%$ luminal obstruction.

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Consecutive patients with suspected CHD exhibiting chest pain or chest discomfort. Exclusion criteria included: 1. Malignant tumor. 2. Structural heart disease 3. Valvular heart disease 4. Cardiomyopathy. 5. Malignant arrhythmias (atrial fibrillation, atrial flutter, and ventricular arrhythmias).

- | | |
|--|---------|
| ➤ Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? | Yes |
| ➤ Was a case-control design avoided? | Yes |
| ➤ Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? | Unclear |

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): For CHD group, the mean value of age is 59.7 ± 11.3 years. There are 102 males in the total of 132 CHD patients. For non-CHD group, the mean value of age is 59.5 ± 9.2 years. There are 38 males in the total of 81 non-CHD patients.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Performed using 4-channel MCG system in an unshielded room. All magnetic, electronic and metallic objects were removed. The sensors were placed at 1-2 cm above the chest and recorded 36 points covering a rectangle area of 25×25 cm. These signals were then sent to the computer and analyzed. The patient is diagnosed as CHD if at least 1 out of the following 4 indicators were found to be abnormal: the angle of T peak magnetic field > 12.205 , the change of the angle of TT current > 62.625 , the change of the angle of TT > 43.215 , the minimum of the angle of TT current < -27.725 .

- | | |
|---|---------|
| ➤ Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? | Unclear |
| ➤ If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? | No |

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: High

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: At least one coronary artery stenosis $\geq 50\%$ in the three main coronary arteries and their branches.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias? Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2 × 2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

DOMAIN 1: PATIENT SELECTION**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe methods of patient selection: Patients with suspected CHD. Exclusion criteria and recruitment procedure unclear.

- Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled? Unclear
- Was a case-control design avoided? Yes
- Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions? Unclear

Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Describe included patients (prior testing, presentation, intended use of index test and setting): 62% male. Mean age of 60.9 years old. Inclusion criteria see above.

Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 2: INDEX TESTS**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the index test and how it was conducted and interpreted: Patients whose MCG displays the presence of “RT angle”, “multipolar”, or “island” is diagnosed as CHD. Procedure for clinical examination and data collection not reported.

- Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard? Yes
- If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified? Unclear

Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or interpretation of the Index test do not match the review question?

CONCERN: Low

DOMAIN 3: REFERENCE STANDARD**A. Risk of Bias**

Describe the reference standard and how it was conducted and interpreted: CAG

Readers: Unclear

Criteria for interpretation: Unclear.

- Is the reference standard likely to correctly classify the target condition? Yes
- Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test? Unclear

Could the conduct or the interpretation of the reference standard have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear

B. Applicability concerns

Are there concerns that the conduct or the interpretation

DOMAIN 4: FLOW AND TIMING

A. Risk of Bias

Describe any patients who did not receive the index test and/or reference standard or who were excluded from the 2×2 table (refer to flow diagram): None.

Describe the time interval and any interventions between index test and reference standard: Unclear.

- Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard? Unclear
- Did all patients receive the same reference standard? Yes
- Were all patients included in the analysis? Yes

Could the flow and timing have introduced bias?

Risk: Unclear