P.2.1.77 MMSE (<24)

Studies	Design	Tot al N	Sens (95%CI)	Spec (95%CI)	Meas ure	Summary of findings (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Quality
PRIMARY CARE	Prospecti ve	360	0.99 (0.91, 1.00)	0.46 (0.40, 0.52)	LR+	1.84 (1.65	Seriou	n/a	Not	Serious		LOW
1 study (Carnero-Pardo 2013)					LIV.	2.05)	S	TI/A	serious		-	
					LR-	0.08 (0.01, 1.32)	Seriou s	n/a	Not serious	Not serious		MODE RATE
SECONDARY CARE												
11 studies (Bastide 2012; Callahan 2002; Goncalves 2011; Flicker 1997; Hancock 2011; Knaefelc 2003; Kukull 1994;	11 × prospecti ve	2,9 75	0.73 (0.63, 0.81)	0.91 (0.83, 0.96)	LR+	8.43 (4.47, 14.80)	Seriou s	Serious	Not serious	Not serious		LOW
Mathuranath 2000; Nielsen 2013; Postel-Vinay 2014; Sager 2006)					LR-	0.31 (0.23, 0.40)	Seriou s	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	-	LOW
ALL EVIDENCE POOLED												
12 studies (Bastide 2012; Callahan 2002; Carnero-Pardo 2013; Flicker 1997; Goncalves 2011; Hancock 2011; Knaefelc 2003;		3,3 5	0.75 (0.65, 0.84)	0.88 (0.78, 0.94)	LR+	6.65 (3.70, 11.00)	Seriou s	Serious	Not serious	Not serious		LOW
Kukull 1994; Mathuranath 2000; Nielsen 2013; Postel-Vinay 2014; Sager 2006)					LR-	0.29 (0.20, 0.38)	Seriou s	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	-	LOW

[©] NICE 2018. All rights reserved. See Notice of rights.

Dementia

Appendix P: Diagnosis evidence tables & GRADE

		Tot al	Sens	Spec	Meas	Summary of findings	sk of bias	consistency	directness	precision	her nsiderations	
Studies	Design	N	(95%CI)	(95%CI)	ure	(95%CI)	Risk	lıc	밀	Ξ	₹ Ö Qual	ity

Notes on risk of bias

Kukull 1994: It is unclear whether the index test results were interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard; multiple pre-specified cut offs were used to determine the optimal cut off; the index test result was known during the reference standard diagnosis.

Flicker 1997: Due to non-pre-specification of test thresholds; large number of patients excluded from study; lack of clarity about patient groups included in the analysis and whether the reference standard results were interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test.

Callahan 2002: It was unclear whether a consecutive or random sample of patients was enrolled in the study; whether the index and reference tests were independent of each other and the test threshold was not pre-specified.

Knaefelc 2003: Unclear whether all patients were included in the analysis; unclear interval between index and reference tests; lack of a pre-specified threshold.

Goncalves 2011: The reference diagnosis was not independent of the index tests; optimised test thresholds were used.

Goncalves 2011: The reference diagnosis was not independent of the index tests; optimised test thresholds were used.

Hancock 2011: Optimised test threshold.

Bastide 2012: Optimised test cut-offs used.

Carnero-Pardo 2013: Multiple test thresholds were used

Nielsen 2013: The study selected some participants on the basis of immigrant background and excluded non-immigrants during this time period; the people with immigrant backgrounds were significantly younger than Danish-born participants; the test threshold was not pre-specified.

Postel-Vinay 2014: Optimised cut-off was used; the study was not downgraded for exclusions as <10% population was excluded

[©] NICE 2018. All rights reserved. See Notice of rights.