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With great interest, we have read the recently published meta-analysis by Song and Lee [1] on the diagnostic properties of sialography and salivary ultrasonography in patients with Sjögren’s Syndrome (SS). A systematic review and meta-analysis on this topic has been lacking so far from the literature, and, thus, eagerly expected. We would like to express some concerns regarding Table 1 of their study in relation to the study outcomes. There seems to be a discrepancy between the data shown in the meta-analysis and the data presented by the source studies [2-7].

Additionally, summing the numbers of true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives in Table 1 of Song and Lee’s paper does not add up to the same numbers. It is possible that the data set was not complete for every participant in the source studies. See, e.g., the study of Yoshiura et al. 1997, in which data of 2 control groups were used with different numbers for sialography and ultrasonography [7]. Furthermore, some source studies do not report the number of true positives, true negatives, false positives, and false negatives. If Song and Lee calculated these numbers, it is essential to know the correct number of participants with SS and the number of controls in the studies where the studies were conducted. Finally, Song and Lee report that discrepancies between reviewers were resolved by consensus or a third reviewer [1]. However, they fail to present who the third reviewer was. It might be that there was no need for a third reviewer and that the reviewers did not reach consensus.

We were wondering which numbers were entered in the statistical program to perform the meta-analyses, since the authors could not confirm on the above raised issues. We would appreciate if the authors could comment on the above raised issues.
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