

Study and publication year	Local staging (Yes/No)	LN staging (Yes/No)	Imaging modality	Tot n° studies	Outcomes (pooled sensitivity [specificity]%)	Weakness of the study
<i>Choi et al., 2010[84]</i>	No	Yes	Conventional MRI, CT, PET/PET-CT	41	Assessing lymph node metastasis (patient-based): PET/PET-CT 82 [81] MRI 56 [71] CT 50 [92] Assessing lymph node metastasis (region/node-based): PET/PET-CT 54 [97] CT 52 [92] MRI 38 [97]	Articles selected from 1981 Does not categorize early vs LACC Nodal regions subgroup analysis not performed
<i>Kang et al., 2010[86]</i>	No	Yes	PET/CT	10	Assessing lymph node metastasis: 34 [97]	Does not categorize early vs LACC Large heterogeneity of studies
<i>Shen et al., 2015[78]</i>	No	Yes	DWI	15	Assessing lymph node metastasis: 86 [84]	Paraortic LN only Most of study designs not documented Reference standard not always met (histopathology) Pelvic LN only
<i>Liu et al., 2017[92]</i>	No	Yes	Conventional MRI, DWI, CT, PET/PET-CT	67	Assessing lymph node metastasis: DWI 87 [83] PET/PET-CT 66 [97] CT 57 [91] MRI 54 [93] Paraortic LN: PET/PET-CT 81[98] CT 68[90] MRI 54[94] DWI NA Pelvic LN: PET/PET-CT 55[97] CT 48[91] MRI 62[93] DWI NA	Study selection from 1981 Technological features insufficiently detailed
<i>Gong et al. 2017[96]</i>	No	Yes	Pelvic conventional MRI, DWI, CT, PET, PET-CT, US	80	Assessing lymph node metastasis: DWI 84 [95] US 71 [99] PET-CT 68 [97] PET 56 [97] MRI 50 [95] CT 47 [93]	Article selected from 1981 Different gynaecological cancers considered, not cervical exclusive Majority of studies being retrospective

<i>Woo et al.,2018[95]</i>	Yes	No	Pelvic conventional MRI, DWI	14	Assessing parametrial involvement: DWI 82 [94] MRI 72[91]	Majority of studies focusing only on pelvic LN
						Nodal regions subgroup analysis not performed
<i>Luo et al.,2018[108]</i>	No	Yes	Pelvic conventional MRI, DWI, CT, PET	16	Assessing lymph node metastasis MRI 54[92] PET 50 [96] CT 44 [93] DWI NA*	Reference standard not always met (histopathology)
						Does not categorize early vs LACC
<i>Ruan et al., 2018[93]</i>	No	Yes	PET/CT	27	Assessing lymph node metastasis: 72 [96] Paraaortic LN: 76 [96] Pelvic LN: 85 [76]	Different MRI technology (1T;1,5T; 3T)
						Majority of studies being retrospective
<i>Yu et al., 2019[97]</i>	No	Yes	PET/CT	14	Assessing lymph node metastasis: 71 [97]	Does not categorize early vs LACC
						Nodal regions subgroup analysis not performed
						Technological features insufficiently detailed
						*DWI results expressed only in LHR
						Inconsistencies in criteria of interpretation of PET/CT
						Large heterogeneity of studies
						Majority of studies being retrospective
						Paraaortic LN only
						Technological features insufficiently detailed

<i>Woo et al.,2020[66]</i>	Yes	Yes	Pelvic conventional MRI, CT, PET, US	115	<p>Assessing local disease extent: PET 73 [91] MRI 71 [91] US 67 [94] CT 43 [71]</p> <p>Assessing lymph node metastasis: PET 57 [95] MRI 57 [93] CT 51 [87] US 43 [96]</p> <p>Paraaortic LN: PET 59 [96] MRI 40 [91] CT 29 [91] US NA</p> <p>Pelvic LN: PET 60 [93] MRI 61 [88] CT NA US NA</p>	<p>Does not categorize early vs LACC</p> <p>Majority of studies being retrospective</p> <p>Technological features insufficiently detailed</p>
<i>Alcázar et al., 2020[73]</i>	Yes	No	Pelvic conventional MRI, US	9	<p>Assessing parametrial involvement: US 78 [96] MRI 68 [91]</p>	<p>Articles selected from 1990</p> <p>Different MRI technologies (0,5 T; 1,5T; 3T; NA)</p> <p>Large heterogeneity of studies</p>
<i>Xiao et al., 2020 [65]</i>	Yes	Yes	Conventional MRI	39	<p>Assessing the internal os involvement: 86 [97]</p> <p>Assessing the stromal invasion: 87 [91]</p> <p>Assessing lymph node metastasis: 51 [90]</p>	<p>Articles selected from 1995</p> <p>Different MRI technologies (0,5 T; 1,5T; 3T; NA)</p> <p>Mostly based on early-stages</p> <p>Nodal regions subgroup analysis not performed</p>
<i>Tian et al., 2022 [85]</i>	Yes	Yes	US	11	<p>Assessing parametrial involvement: 62 [91]</p> <p>Assessing stromal invasion: 84 [80]</p> <p>Assessing lymph node metastasis: 52 [95]</p>	<p>Does not categorize early vs LACC</p> <p>Large heterogeneity of studies</p> <p>Nodal regions subgroup analysis not performed</p>
<i>He et al., 2022[98]</i>	No	Yes	Conventional MRI, PET-CT	11	<p>Assessing lymph node metastasis: PET-CT 65 [93] MRI 58 [91]</p>	Does not categorize early vs LACC

	Majority of studies being retrospective
	Nodal regions subgroup analysis not performed
	Technological features insufficiently detailed

Supplementary Table S3: Overview of meta-analyses on radiological local and nodal staging in cervical cancer