## P.2.8.8 FDG-PET

		Total	Sens	Spec		Summary of findings	Risk of bias	consistency	directness	Imprecision	Other considerations	
Studies	Design	N	(95%CI)	(95%CI)	Measure	(95%CI)	ä	Ĕ	Ĕ	<u>=</u>	5 S	Quality
SECONDARY CARE												
6 studies (Arslan 2015; Frisoni 2009; Hoffman 2000; Jagust 2007; Ossenkoppele 2013; Yakushev 2010)	4 × prospective; 2 × retrospectiv e	300	0.71 (0.60, 0.80)	0.66 (0.57, 0.74)	LR+	2.07 (1.52, 2.78)	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious		LOW
					LR-	0.46 (0.30, 0.64)	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	-	VERY LOW

## Notes on risk of bias

Frisoni 2009: Subgroup analysis with >10% population excluded; patients whose cognitive deficit reverted (regarded as primarily depressed with secondary cognitive impairment) were excluded from the study; unclear whether reference test was interpreted without knowledge of index test and unclear whether results of index test interpreted without knowledge of reference test. Yakushev 2010: Subgroup analysis with >10% population excluded

Ossenkoppele 2013: It is unclear whether a consecutive or random sample of patients was enrolled and whether inappropriate exclusions were avoided; the index test was interpreted with knowledge of the reference diagnosis; a subgroup analysis was used where >10% study population was excluded.

Arslan 2015: Unclear whether: a consecutive or random sample of eligible patients was enrolled and inappropriate exclusions were avoided; the index test was interpreted without knowledge of the reference standard and if the imaging patterns were pre-specified; the reference standard results were interpreted independently of the index test results.

## Notes on indirectness

Ossenkoppele 2013: It is unclear whether the LeARN cohort consisted of people with suspected cognitive impairment.