P.2.20 FTD versus AD

P.2.20.1 99mTc-HMPAO SPECT

Studies SINGLE CAMERA	Design	Tota I N	Sens (95%CI)	Spec (95%CI)	Measu re	Summary of findings (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Quality
SINGLE CAMERA	3 ×					12 11 (6 12	V.	Not	Not	Not		
	prospective ; 1 × retrospecti	291	0.51 (0.35, 0.67)	0.96 (0.92, 0.98)	LR+	13.11 (6.13, 28.05)	v. serious	serious	serious	serious		LOW
4 studies (Launes 1991; Read 1995; Talbot 1998; Velakoulis 1997)					LR-	0.55 (0.45, 0.66)	V. serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	-	VERY LOW
MULTIPLE CAMERA												
	1 × prospective		0.73 (0.52, 0.87)	0.96 (0.82, 0.99)	LR+	18.12 (3.71, 88.60)	V. serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious		LOW
2 studies (Boutoleau-Bretonniere 2012; Rollin-Sillaire 2012)	; 1 × retrospecti ve	64			LR-	0.28 (0.15, 0.54)	V. serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	-	VERY LOW
ALL EVIDENCE POOLED												
6 studies (Boutoleau-Bretonniere 2012;	4 × prospective ; 2 × retrospecti ve		0.58 (0.44, 0.72)	0.96 (0.92, 0.98)	LR+	13.50 (6.77, 24.20)	V. serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious		LOW
Launes 1991; Read 1995; Rollin-Sillaire 2012; Talbot 1998; Velakoulis 1997)		355			LR-	0.44 (0.30, 0.59)	V. serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	-	VERY LOW

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

Dementia

Appendix P: Diagnosis evidence tables & GRADE

Studies Design N (95%Cl) (95%Cl) re (95%Cl) 🔁 🚊 🚊 🖺 🦰 🥱 Quality		Studies	Design	Tota I N	Sens (95%CI)	Spec (95%CI)	Measu re	Summary of findings (95%CI)	Risk of bias	nconsistency	ndirectness	mprecision	Other considerations	Quality
---	--	---------	--------	----------------	-----------------	-----------------	-------------	-----------------------------------	--------------	--------------	-------------	------------	-------------------------	---------

Notes on risk of bias

Launes 1991: Subgroup analysis used with >10% study population excluded.

Read 1995: Subgroup analysis used with >10% study population excluded; unclear whether random or consecutive patient enrolment was used; unclear if inappropriate exclusions avoided. Velakoulis 1997: Subgroup analysis where >10% study population excluded and it was unclear whether: the index test results were interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard; the index test threshold was pre-specified or the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test.

Talbot 1998: Unclear if avoided inappropriate exclusions; unclear whether the reference standard results were interpreted without knowledge of the index test and whether the index test was carried out without knowledge of reference test result; no pre-specified index test threshold; subgroup analysis used with >10% study population excluded.

Boutoleau-Bretonniere 2012: Loss to follow up of 6/69 patients; unclear about consecutive versus random enrolment of patients; reference diagnosis made at 24 month follow up with index tests carried out at baseline and again at 24 months in some cases; subgroup analysis used with >10% study population discarded.

Rollin-Sillaire 2012: Subgroup analysis where >10% study population excluded