

**Table S1.** Results of the Per-Patient analysis for MDCT (TP: true-positive; FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value; MPR: multiplanar reformation).

Diagnostic values of MDCT on a Per-Patient Basis									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b>									
<i>axial CT + MPR-arterial phase, infracolic omentum, observer 2</i>	7	0	0	10	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b>									
<i>left 'high risk upper abdomen'</i>	8	6	0	8	57	100	100	57	72
<b>Kim et al [64]</b>									
	23	3	7	13	88.5	65	76.7	81.3	78.3
<b>Mazzei et al [65]</b>									
	38	0	3	2	100	40	93	100	93
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b>									
<i>porta hepatis</i>	4	3	1	147	57	99	80	98	97.4
<b>Rodolfino et al [69]</b>									
<i>experienced readers, portal + delayed phase</i>	27	2	3	8	93.1	72.7	90	80	87.5
<b>Tawakol et al [70]</b>									
	52	23	9	52	69	85	85.2	69.3	76
<b>Cerci et al [71]</b>									
<i>peritoneal carcinomatosis</i>	35	26	4	47	57.4	92.2	89.7	64.4	73.2
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b>									
<i>diffuse peritoneal thickening</i>	17	0	0	19	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Michielsen et al [73]</b>									
<i>duodenum, stomach, celiac trunk carcinomatosis</i>	11	5	1	77	68.8	98.7	91.7	93.9	93.6
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b>									
<i>left upper</i>	1	0	1	38	100	97.4	50	100	97.5
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b>									
<i>major omentum</i>	35	11	3	44	76.1	93.6	92.1	80	85
<b>An et al [27]</b>									
	47	4	3	4	92.16	57.14	94	50	87.93
<b>Mikkelsen et al [30]</b>									
<i>liver/duodenum/pancreas/gastric ventricle</i>	3	4	0	43	43	100	100	92	92
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b>									
	41	2	10	14	95	58	80	88	82

**Table S2.** Results of the Per-Patient analysis for MRI (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value; PMs: peritoneal metastases).

Diagnostic values of MRI on a Per-Patient Basis									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
Tempany et al [51]									
	39	2	27	107	95	80	59.1	98.2	83.4
Ricke et al [53]									
<i>greater omentum</i>	8	13	2	34	38.1	94.4	80	72.3	73.7
Sanli et al [61]									
<i>PMs: 2-3 cm</i>	15	1	0	31	93.3	100	100	96.9	97.8
Espada et al [62]									
<i>omental extension: spleen parenchyma, splenic hilum, stomach, lesser sac</i>	11	0	0	23	100	100	100	100	100
Michielsen et al [73]									
<i>duodenum, stomach, celiac trunk</i>	15	1	1	77	93.8	98.7	93.8	98.7	97.9
Mikkelsen et al [30]									
<i>celiac trunk/superior mesenteric artery/bowel mesentery root</i>	6	8	0	33	40	100	100	79	83
Fischerova et al [78]									
	40	3	5	19	93	79	89	86	88

**Table S3.** Results of the Per-Patient analysis for FDG PET/CT (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value).

Diagnostic values of FDG PET/CT on a Per-Patient Basis									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
Pannu et al [54]									
	8	3	3	2	72.7	40	72.7	40	62.5
Sanli et al [61]									
<i>PMs: 2-3 cm</i>	15	0	0	32	100	100	100	100	100
Hynninen et al [63]									
<i>omentum</i>	31	3	1	6	91	86	97	67	90
Kim et al [64]									
	25	1	2	18	96.2	90	92.6	94.7	93.5
Tawakol et al [70]									
	72	3	0	61	96	100	100	95.3	98
Tsoi et al [77]									
	25	2	4	18	92.6	81.8	86.2	90	87.8
Mikkelsen et al [30]									
<i>liver/duodenum/pancreas/gastric ventricle</i>	6	1	1	42	85	98	86	98	96

Mallet et al [44]									
AR-0 (central)	69	4	6	5	94.5	45.5	92	55.5	88.1

**Table S4.** Results of the Per-Region analysis for MDCT (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value).

Diagnostic values of MDCT on a Per-Region Basis									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
Kitajima et al [56]									
	27	18	4	83	60	95.4	87.1	82.2	83.3
Kitajima et al [57]									
<i>liver surface</i>	2	0	0	38	100	100	100	100	100
Choi et al [58]									
	114	137	135	355	45	72	46	72	63.3
Metser et al [59]									
	336	78	27	1404	81.2	98.1	92.6	94.7	94.3
Hynninen et al [63]									
	196	288	20	216	41	92	90.7	42.8	57
Mazzei et al [65]									
	141	54	73	291	72	80	66	84	77
Michielsen et al [66]									
	136	72	47	220	65	82	74	75	75
Schmidt et al [67]									
	71	3	5	56	96	92	95	94	95
Lopez-Lopez et al [68]									
	79	199	9	480	35	98	90	72	73
Rodolfino et al [69]									
<i>experienced readers, portal + delayed phase</i>	171	11	21	304	94	93.5	89.1	96.5	93.7
Abdalla Ahmed et al [76]									
	925	50	20	130	94.9	86.7	97.9	72.2	93.8
An et al [27]									
	184	108	39	108	63.01	73.47	82.51	50	66.51

**Table S5.** Results of the Per-Region analysis for MRI (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value).

Diagnostic values of MRI on a Per-Region Basis									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
Kim et al [55]									
	12	2	0	22	86	100	100	92	94
Michielsen et al [66]									
	189	19	24	243	91	91	89	93	91
Schmidt et al [67]									
	73	1	10	51	98	84	91	96	93

**Table S6.** Results of the Per-Region analysis for FDG PET/CT (TP: true-positive; FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value).

Diagnostic values of FDG PET/CT on a Per-Region Basis									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
<b>Pannu et al [54]</b>									
	7	24	3	16	22.5	84.2	70	40	46
<b>Kim et al [55]</b>									
	6	8	1	21	43	96	86	72	75
<b>Kitajima et al [56]</b>									
CECT	36	9	2	85	80	97.7	94.7	90.4	91.7
<b>Kitajima et al [57]</b>									
<i>liver surface</i>	2	0	0	38	100	100	100	100	100
<b>De Iaco et al [60]</b>									
	243	65	12	26	78.9	68.4	95.3	28.5	77.7
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b>									
	237	226	25	205	51	89	90.4	47.5	64
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b>									
	108	100	39	228	52	85	73	70	71
<b>Schmidt et al [67]</b>									
	70	4	2	59	95	96	98	92	96
<b>Lopez-Lopez et al [68]</b>									
	69	209	34	455	24	93	66	68	68
<b>Tsoi et al [77]</b>									
	44	14	4	673	75.9	99.4	91.7	98	97.6
<b>Feng et al [42]</b>									
	208	78	41	231	72.7	84.9	83.5	74.8	78.5

**Table S7.** Results of the Per-Patient analysis for MDCT in different abdominopelvic regions (TP: true-positive; FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value; ARs: abdominopelvic regions; MPR: multiplanar reformation).

Diagnostic values of MDCT on a Per-Patient Basis in different ARs									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
<b>AR0</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b> <i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, infracolic omentum, observer 2</i>	7	0	0	10	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>omentum</i>	27	7	2	5	79	71	93	42	78
<b>Cerci et al [71]</b> <i>omentum</i>	36	17	3	55	67.9	94.8	92.3	76.4	82
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>omentum</i>	34	1	0	1	97.1	100	100	50	97.2
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b>	14	10	2	14	58.3	87.5	87.5	58.3	70

<i>central</i>									
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b> <i>major omentum</i>	35	11	3	44	76.1	93.6	92.1	80	85
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>greater omentum</i>	40	2	9	16	95	64	82	89	84
<b>AR1</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b> <i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, porta hepatis/gallbladder, observer 2</i>	2	2	0	13	50	100	100	86.6	88.2
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>right 'high risk upper abdomen'</i>	17	14	0	5	55	100	100	26	61
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b> <i>porta hepatis</i>	4	3	1	147	57	99	80	98	97.4
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>right subdiaphragm</i>	32	3	0	1	91.4	100	100	25	91.6
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>right upper</i>	1	3	5	31	25	86.1	16.6	91.1	80
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b> <i>hepatic hilum</i>	2	8	0	83	20	100	100	91.2	91.4
<b>Mikkelsen et al [30]</b> <i>porta hepatis/ hepatoduodenal ligament</i>	6	11	1	32	35	97	86	74	76
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>right diaphragm</i>	26	10	3	28	72	90	90	74	81
<b>AR2</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b> <i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, lesser sac, observer 2</i>	2	1	3	11	66.6	78.5	40	91.6	76.4
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>lesser sac</i>	8	7	0	21	53.3	100	100	75	80.5
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>epigastrium</i>	3	3	3	31	50	91.1	50	91.1	85
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>lesser omentum</i>	4	4	3	53	50	95	57	93	89
<b>AR3</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b>	2	0	1	14	100	93.3	66.6	100	94.1

<i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, spleen, observer 2</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>left 'high risk upper abdomen'</i>	8	6	0	8	57	100	100	57	72
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b> <i>spleen</i>	5	14	2	134	26	99	71	91	90
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>left subdiaphragm</i>	22	5	0	9	81.4	100	100	35.7	81.6
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>left upper</i>	1	0	1	38	100	97.4	50	100	97.5
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b> <i>spleen</i>	2	3	0	88	40	100	100	96.7	97
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>left diaphragm</i>	15	6	3	42	71	93	83	88	86
<b>AR4</b>									
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>left paracolic region</i>	19	8	0	9	70.3	100	100	53.7	77.7
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>left flank</i>	7	0	3	30	100	90.9	70	100	92.5
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>left paracolic gutter</i>	20	9	8	30	69	79	71	77	75
<b>AR5-7</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b> <i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, pelvis, observer 1</i>	8	4	0	5	66.6	100	100	55.5	76.4
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>sigmoid serosa</i>	5	20	0	9	20	100	100	31	41
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b> <i>rectum</i>	15	24	1	115	39	99	94	83	84
<b>Cerci et al [71]</b> <i>perivesical-perirectal fat</i>	23	31	2	53	42.6	96.4	92	63.1	62.7
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>uterus and ovary</i>	34	0	0	2	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>pelvis</i>	34	2	1	3	94.4	75	97.1	60	92.5
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b> <i>pelvic peritoneum</i>	35	24	3	31	59.3	91.2	92.1	56.4	71
<b>Fischerova et al [78] pelvis</b>	42	5	5	14	89	74	89	74	85
<b>AR6</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b>	4	1	0	12	80	100	100	92.3	94.1

<i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, ovarian mass, observer 2</i>									
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b> <i>rectum</i>	15	24	1	115	39	99	94	83	84
<b>Cerci et al [71]</b> <i>perivesical-perirectal fat</i>	23	31	2	53	42.6	96.4	92	63.1	62.7
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>uterus and ovary</i>	34	0	0	2	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>pelvis</i>	34	2	1	3	94.4	75	97.1	60	92.5
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b> <i>rectosigmoid</i>	9	18	7	59	33.3	89.4	56.2	76.6	73
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>rectosigmoid</i>	34	2	8	21	94	72	81	91	85
<b>AR8</b>									
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>right paracolic region</i>	22	11	0	3	68.5	100	100	23	71.4
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>right flank</i>	7	1	1	31	87.5	96.8	87.5	96.8	95
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>right paracolic gutter</i>	20	8	8	31	71	79	71	79	76
<b>diaphragm</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b> <i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, observer 2</i>	5	6	0	6	45.5	100	100	50	64.7
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b>	16	18	0	6	47	100	100	25	55
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b>	19	42	1	93	32	99	95	70	72.3
<b>Cerci et al [71]</b>	0	20	1	80	0	98.8	0	80	79.2
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>right subdiaphragm</i>	32	3	0	1	91.4	100	100	25	91.6
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>right, left diaphragm</i>	26	10	3	28	72	90	90	74	81
<b>small bowel</b>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>small bowel serosa</i>	2	12	2	25	14	93	50	68	66
<b>Mazzei et al [65]</b>	7	5	4	27	58	87	64	84	79

<b>Nasser et al [26]</b>	7	10	1	137	44	99	88	94	92.9
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>small bowel serosa</i>	8	12	1	15	35	93.7	87.5	53.5	61.1
<b>Rajan et al [74]</b> <i>lower ileum</i>	3	2	0	35	60	100	100	94.5	95
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b>	7	5	7	74	58.3	91.4	50	93.7	87.1
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>small bowel serosa</i>	11	8	4	42	58	91	73	84	82
<i>colon</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>large bowel serosa</i>	13	53	2	40	20	95	87	37	49
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b> <i>large bowel</i>	17	20	2	116	46	98	89	85	86
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>large bowel serosa</i>	12	17	0	7	41.3	100	100	29.1	52.7
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>large bowel serosa</i>	4	15	5	43	21	90	44	74	70
<i>mesentery</i>									
<b>Pannu et al [52]</b> <i>axial CT + MPR- arterial phase, mesenteric root, observer 1</i>	1	2	0	14	33.3	100	100	87.5	88.2
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>small bowel mesentery</i>	7	19	0	13	27	100	100	41	51
<b>Nasser et al [26]</b>	12	28	1	114	31	99	92	81	81.3
<b>Cerci et al [71]</b>	12	37	4	48	24.5	92.3	75	56.5	59.4
<b>Bagul et al [72]</b> <i>small bowel mesentery</i>	11	10	0	15	52.3	100	100	60	72.2
<b>Michielsen et al [73]</b> <i>superior mesenteric artery, mesenteric root</i>	3	5	0	86	37.5	100	100	94.5	94.7
<b>Alcazar et al [75]</b>	1	3	7	82	25	92.1	14.3	95.3	89.2
<b>Mikkelsen et al [30]</b> <i>celiac trunk/superior mesenteric artery/bowel mesentery root</i>	2	12	0	33	14	100	100	73	74.5



<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>small and large bowel mesentery</i>	17	13	2	35	57	95	89	73	78
--	----	----	---	----	----	----	----	----	----

**Table S8.** Results of the Per-Patient analysis for MRI in different abdominopelvic regions (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value).

Diagnostic values of MRI on a Per-Patient Basis in different ARs									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
<i>AR0</i>									
<b>Tempany et al [51]</b> <i>omentum</i>	40	30	82	128	57.1	61	32.8	81	60
<b>Ricke et al [53]</b> <i>greater omentum</i>	8	13	2	34	38.1	94.4	80	72.3	73.7
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>greater omentum</i>	38	4	5	20	90	80	88	83	87
<i>diaphragm</i>									
<b>Tempany et al [51]</b> <i>subdiaphragmatic spaces</i>	27	18	106	129	60	55	20.3	87.8	55.7
<b>Ricke et al [53]</b>	11	4	5	37	73.3	88.1	68.8	90.2	84.2
<b>Espada et al [62]</b>	4	1	1	28	80	96.6	80	96.6	94
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>right, left diaphragm</i>	26	10	1	30	72	97	96	75	84
<i>mesentery</i>									
<b>Tempany et al [51]</b>	20	18	94	148	52.6	61.1	17.5	89.2	60
<b>Espada et al [62]</b> <i>small and/or large bowel mesentery</i>	8	0	4	22	100	84.6	66.6	100	88.2
<b>Michielsen et al [73]</b> <i>superior mesenteric artery, mesenteric root</i>	8	0	1	85	100	98.8	88.9	100	98.9
<b>Mikkelsen et al [30]</b> <i>celiac trunk/superior mesenteric artery/bowel mesentery root</i>	6	8	0	33	40	100	100	79	83
<b>Fischerova et al [78]</b> <i>small and large bowel mesentery</i>	16	14	4	33	53	89	80	70	73

**Table S9.** Results of the Per-Patient analysis for FDG PET/CT in different abdominopelvic regions (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value).

Diagnostic values of FDG PET/CT on a Per-Patient Basis in different ARs									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
<i>AR0</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>omentum</i>	31	3	1	6	91	86	97	67	90
<b>Tsoi et al [77]</b> <i>omentum</i>	5	1	2	41	83.3	95.3	71.4	97.6	93.9
<b>Mallet et al [44]</b> <i>central</i>	69	4	6	5	94.5	45.5	92	55.5	88.1
<i>AR1</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>right ‘high risk upper abdomen’</i>	20	11	0	5	65	100	100	31	70
<b>Tsoi et al [77]</b> <i>right subhepatic space</i>	2	0	0	47	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Mikkelsen et al [30]</b> <i>porta hepatis/ hepatoduodenal ligament</i>	11	6	3	30	65	91	79	83	82
<b>Mallet et al [44]</b> <i>right upper</i>	53	14	5	11	79.1	68.8	91.4	44	77.1
<i>AR3</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>left ‘high risk upper abdomen’</i>	3	11	2	6	21	75	60	35	41
<b>Tsoi et al [77]</b> <i>gastric serosa</i>	1	0	0	48	100	100	100	100	100
<b>Mallet et al [44]</b> <i>left upper</i>	46	10	9	19	82.1	67.9	83.6	65.5	77.4
<i>AR5-7</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>sigmoid</i>	19	7	2	8	73	80	91	53	75
<b>Tsoi et al [77]</b> <i>pelvis</i>	14	0	1	34	100	97.1	93.3	100	98
<b>Mallet et al [44]</b> <i>pelvis</i>	75	3	3	0	96.2	0	96.2	0	92.6
<i>mesentery</i>									
<b>Hynninen et al [63]</b> <i>small bowel mesentery</i>	16	9	1	12	64	92	94	57	74

<b>Tsoi et al [77]</b>	2	3	0	44	40	100	100	93.6	93.9
<b>Mikkelsen et al [30] celiac trunk/superior mesenteric artery/bowel mesentery root</b>	2	12	0	33	14	100	100	73	74.5

**Table S10.** Results of the Per-Region analysis for MDCT in different abdominopelvic regions (TP: true-positive, FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value; ARs: abdominopelvic regions).

Diagnostic values of MDCT on a Per-Region Basis in different ARs									
Study	TP	FN	FP	TN	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accuracy (%)
<i>AR0</i>									
<b>Kitajima et al [57] omentum</b>	3	6	1	30	33	97	75	83.3	83
<b>Choi et al [58] omentum</b>	6	14	15	22	30	59	29	61	49.1
<b>Michielsen et al [66] omentum</b>	18	5	3	5	78	63	86	50	74
<b>An et al [27] omentum</b>	27	10	1	10	72.97	90.91	96.43	50	77.08
<i>AR5-7</i>									
<b>Kitajima et al [57] cul de sac</b>	2	6	1	31	25	97	66.6	83.8	75
<b>Choi et al [58] bladder dome area</b>	0	16	2	39	0	95	0	70	68.4
<b>Michielsen et al [66] left pelvic</b>	17	4	3	7	81	70	85	64	77
<b>An et al [27] pelvic peritoneum</b>	22	21	7	25	51.16	78.12	75.86	54.35	62.67
<i>AR6</i>									
<b>Kitajima et al [57] cul de sac</b>	2	6	1	31	25	97	66.6	83.8	75
<b>Choi et al [58] bladder dome area</b>	0	16	2	39	0	95	0	70	68.4
<b>Michielsen et al [66] bladder surface</b>	8	9	0	11	47	100	100	55	68
<i>diaphragm</i>									
<b>Kitajima et al [57]</b>	0	1	0	39	0	100	-	97.5	98
<b>Choi et al [58] left subdiaphragmatic area</b>	16	18	2	21	47	91	89	54	65
<b>Michielsen et al [66] left diaphragm</b>	7	2	4	15	78	79	64	88	79
<b>An et al [27]</b>	1	15	1	7	6.25	87.50	50	31.82	33.33

<i>subdiaphragmatic space</i>									
<b>mesentery</b>									
<b>Kitajima et al [57]</b>	2	5	1	32	29	97	66.7	86.4	85
<b>Choi et al [58]</b>									
<i>small bowel mesentery</i>	3	11	3	40	21	93	50	78	75.4
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b>									
<i>small bowel mesentery</i>	8	4	1	16	67	94	89	80	83
<b>An et al [27]</b>	10	10	5	10	50	66.67	66.67	50	57.14

**Table S11.** Results of the Per-Region analysis for FDG PET-CT in different abdominopelvic regions (TP: true-positive; FN: false-negative; FP: false-positive; TN: true-negative; PPV: positive-predictive value; NPV: negative-predictive value; ARs: abdominopelvic regions).

<b>Diagnostic values of FDG PET/CT on a Per-Region Basis in different ARs</b>									
<b>Study</b>	<b>TP</b>	<b>FN</b>	<b>FP</b>	<b>TN</b>	<b>Sensitivity (%)</b>	<b>Specificity (%)</b>	<b>PPV (%)</b>	<b>NPV (%)</b>	<b>Accuracy (%)</b>
<b>AR0</b>									
<b>Kitajima et al [57]</b>									
<i>omentum</i>	5	4	1	30	56	97	83.3	88.2	88
<b>De Iaco et al [60]</b>									
<i>mesogastrium</i>	35	2	2	1	94.6	33.3	94.6	33.3	90
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b>									
<i>omentum</i>	18	5	1	7	78	88	95	58	81
<b>Feng et al [42]</b>									
<i>central</i>	24	5	2	12	82.8	85.7	92.3	70.6	83.7
<b>AR1</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [54]</b>									
<i>right upper quadrant</i>	0	1	0	3	0	100	-	75	75
<b>De Iaco et al [60]</b>									
<i>right upper</i>	21	13	0	2	61.7	100	100	13.3	64
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b>									
<i>subhepatic/ Morrison's space</i>	5	5	9	32	50	78	36	86	73
<b>Feng et al [42]</b>									
<i>right upper</i>	24	7	1	11	77.4	91.7	96	61.1	81.4
<b>AR3</b>									
<b>Pannu et al [54]</b>									
<i>left upper quadrant</i>	1	1	1	1	50	50	50	50	50
<b>De Iaco et al [60]</b>									
<i>left upper</i>	18	10	1	6	64.3	85.7	94.7	37.5	68.6
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b>									
<i>splenic surface</i>	1	0	3	18	100	86	25	100	86
<b>Feng et al [42]</b>									
<i>left upper</i>	15	1	5	22	93.8	81.5	75	95.7	86

AR4									
<b>De laco et al [60]</b> <i>left flank</i>	29	6	2	2	82.8	50	93.5	25	79.5
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b> <i>left lateroconal</i>	11	5	2	11	69	85	85	69	76
<b>Feng et al [42]</b> <i>left flank</i>	13	6	4	20	68.4	83.3	76.5	76.9	76.7
AR5-7									
<b>Pannu et al [54]</b>	4	13	0	4	23.5	100	100	23.5	38.1
<b>Kitajima et al [57]</b> <i>cul de sac</i>	4	4	1	31	50	97	80	88.6	80
<b>De laco et al [60]</b> <i>left lower</i>	26	10	2	2	72.2	50	92.8	16.6	70
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b> <i>Douglas pouch</i>	9	10	0	10	47	100	100	50	66
<b>Feng et al [42]</b> <i>left lower</i>	21	11	2	9	65.6	81.8	91.3	45	69.8
AR8									
<b>De laco et al [60]</b> <i>right flank</i>	29	5	1	4	85.3	80	96.6	44.4	84.6
<b>Michielsen et al [66]</b> <i>right lateroconal</i>	11	4	3	10	73	77	79	71	75
<b>Feng et al [42]</b> <i>right flank</i>	14	7	3	19	66.7	86.4	82.4	73.1	76.7