## PRISMA Flow Diagram
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Appendix Figure 1. Flow chart showing literature search and study selection.
Appendix Figure 2. Node-splitting plot showing the sensitivity of the seven imaging methods for the diagnostic values of ischemic stroke. $(\mathrm{A}=$ traditional computed tomography; B = computed tomography angiography; C = computed tomography perfusion; $\mathrm{D}=$ diffusion-weighted imaging; $\mathrm{E}=$ magnetic resonance angiography; $\mathrm{F}=$ traditional magnetic resonance imaging; $\mathrm{G}=$ transcranial Doppler ultrasound)

Appendix Figure 3. The node-splitting plot showing the specificity of the seven imaging methods for the diagnostic values of ischemic stroke. ( $\mathrm{A}=$ traditional computed tomography; B = computed tomography angiography; C = computed tomography perfusion; $\mathrm{D}=$ diffusion-weighted imaging; $\mathrm{E}=$ magnetic resonance angiography; $\mathrm{F}=$ traditional magnetic resonance imaging; $\mathrm{G}=$ transcranial Doppler ultrasound)

Appendix Figure 4. Node-splitting plot of PPV of the seven imaging methods for the diagnostic values of ischemic stroke. $(\mathrm{A}=$ traditional computed tomography; $\mathrm{B}=$ computed tomography angiography; $\mathrm{C}=$ computed tomography perfusion; $\mathrm{D}=$ diffusionweighted imaging; $\mathrm{E}=$ magnetic resonance angiography; $\mathrm{F}=$ traditional magnetic resonance imaging; G = transcranial Doppler ultrasound; PPV = positive predictive value)

Appendix Figure 5. Node-splitting plot of NPV of the seven imaging methods for the diagnostic values of ischemic stroke. $(\mathrm{A}=$ traditional computed tomography; $\mathrm{B}=$ computed tomography angiography; $\mathrm{C}=$ computed tomography perfusion; $\mathrm{D}=$ diffusionweighted imaging; $\mathrm{E}=$ magnetic resonance angiography; $\mathrm{F}=$ traditional magnetic resonance imaging; $\mathrm{G}=$ transcranial Doppler ultrasound; NPV = negative predictive value)

Appendix Figure 6. The node-splitting plot highlighting the accuracy of the seven imaging methods for the diagnostic values of ischemic stroke. ( $\mathrm{A}=$ traditional computed tomography; $\mathrm{B}=$ computed tomography angiography; $\mathrm{C}=$ computed tomography perfusion; $\mathrm{D}=$ diffusion-weighted imaging; $\mathrm{E}=$ magnetic resonance angiography; $\mathrm{F}=$ traditional magnetic resonance imaging; $\mathrm{G}=$ transcranial Doppler ultrasound)

