

Characteristics of excluded studies

Au 2022

Reason for exclusion

Oral presentation – 29 patients in total; retrospective cohort study . T1–T3 tumors evaluated by 2 experienced head and neck neuroradiologists and 2 pathologists. Results: Eight out of the 11 patients (73%) with infiltrative TS had resection margin <5 mm; 1 at 4.5 mm, 2 at 4 mm, 4 at 3 mm, and 1 at <1 mm. Tumors with ill-defined TB on US were 8.7 times (95% CI, 1.40–53.8) more likely to not have perineural invasion, when compared with those with sharp TB.

Clayburgh 2016

Reason for exclusion

outcomes evaluated were not in line with the main question of the systematic review – *ie IOUS-assessment of cancer of the oropharynx (image-guided surgery)*

De Konig2020

Reason for exclusion

outcomes evaluated were not in line with the main question of the systematic review– *difference between ioIOUS measurement of DOI and TT compared to histology. Surgical margins were NOT evaluated*

Green 2020

Reason for exclusion

outcomes evaluated were not in line with the main question of the systematic review – *ie IOUS-assessment of surgical margins in cancer of the oropharynx (among which also retropharyngeal lymph nodes)*

Lee Dong 2022

Reason for exclusion

the measured outcome was not in line with the question formulated in the review – *ie evaluating the impact of resection margins on long-term prognosis, regardless on imaging guidance*

McMahon 2020

Reason for exclusion

the object of the study was not in line with the question formulated in the review– *ie evaluating the impact of imaging on surgical margins on OTSCC– where imaging was only preoperative and also including CT*

Noorlag 2020

Reason for exclusion

the characteristics of the paper do not meet the inclusion criteria set in the systematic review– both intraoral US and MRI were undertaken before (10 days on average) surgery

Noorlag 2022

Reason for exclusion

the paper is a narrative review

wang 2020

Reason for exclusion

the measured outcome was not in line with the question formulated in the review – *ie evaluating the difference between ex-vivo MR DOI measurement and pathological DOI. also DOI >5 and 10 mm were evaluated but no mention to the surgical margins.*

Wu-Chia 2018

Reason for exclusion

the paper is a narrative review