

### H.7.3 Monitoring strategies and tools for people with late age-related macular degeneration (wet active)

RQ23b: What strategies and tools are useful for monitoring for people with late AMD (wet active)?

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	LRs	Effect size (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
<b>Neovascularisation (fluid)</b>											
<b>SD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
2 studies (Giani, Khurana,)	Retrospective	152 eyes (149 people)	92.3% (83.9, 96.5%)	35.8% (25.3, 47.8%)	LR+	1.37 (1.15, 1.63)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
					LR-	0.22 (0.10, 0.50)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
3 studies (Eter, Khurana, van velthoven)	2 x Retrospective 1 x Prospective (van velthoven)	149 eyes (146 people)	69.6% (59.7, 78.0%)	63.1% (48.2, 75.9%)	LR+	1.58 (1.04, 2.39)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.48 (0.33, 0.70)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA (analysis unit: sets of OCT and FA)</b>											
2 (Henschel, Salinas-Alaman)	Prospective	237 sets of OCT and FA (66 people), up to 12 months follow-up	95.9% (91.1, 98.1%)	51.8% (41.4, 62.1%)	LR+	1.85 (1.51, 2.28)	Serious <sup>3</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.08 (0.03, 0.17)	Serious <sup>3</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>OCT-A vs multimodal imaging (FA, ICG, OCT)</b>											
1 (Coscas)	Retrospective	80 eyes (73 people)	96.6% (90.6, 99.6%)	86.4% (69.6, 97.0%)	LR+	7.08 (2.47, 20.29)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE

Macular Degeneration

Appendix H: Grade tables and meta-analysis results

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	LRs	Effect size (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
					LR-	0.04 (0.01, 0.16)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>Neovascular AMD activities (PED)</b>											
<b>SD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (Giani)	Retrospective	93 eyes (93 people))	38.5% (25.8, 51.9%)	68.3% (53.5, 81.4%)	LR+	1.21 (0.69, 2.14)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.90 (0.67, 1.22)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (Van de Moere))	Retrospective	121 eyes (121 people)	6.3% (2.0, 13.0%)	99.0% (95.2, 100.0%)	LR+	6.59 (0.36, 119.77)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Very serious <sup>4</sup>	VERY LOW
					LR-	0.95 (0.89, 1.01)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>Neovascular AMD activities (intraretinal fluid)</b>											
<b>SD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 ((Khurana)	Retrospective	59 eyes (56 people)	65.5% (47.6, 81.4%)	63.3% (45.7, 79.3%)	LR+	1.79 (1.04, 3.06)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.54 (0.31, 0.96)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
2 Khurana, van de moere)	Retrospective	180 eyes (177 people)	67.6% (56.3, 77.1%)	59.9% (48.6, 70.2%)	LR+	+ 1.71 (1.28, 2.27)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.65 (0.48, 0.88)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA (analysis unit: sets of OCT and FA)</b>											

Macular Degeneration

Appendix H: Grade tables and meta-analysis results

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	LRs	Effect size (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
1 (Henschel)	Prospective	14 people (61 pairs of OCT and FA during 12 weeks after PDT treatment)	90.3% (77.9, 97.9%)	40.0% (23.5, 57.7%)	LR+	1.51 (1.10, 2.06)	Serious <sup>3</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.24 (0.08, 0.77)	Serious <sup>3</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>Neovascular AMD activities (subretinal fluid)</b>											
<b>SD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (Khurana)	Retrospective	59 eyes (56 people)	69.0% (51.3, 84.1%)	76.7% (60.3, 89.7%)	LR+	2.96 (1.48, 5.91)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.41 (0.23, 0.72)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
2 (Khurana, van de moere)	Retrospective	180 eyes (177 people)	47.5% (37.9, 57.3%)	83.9% (74.3, 90.4%)	LR+	2.96 (1.73, 5.09)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.63 (0.51, 0.77)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA (analysis unit: sets of OCT and FA)</b>											
1 study (Henschel)	Prospective	14 people (61 pairs of OCT and FA during 12 weeks after PDT treatment)	71.0% (54.1, 85.3%)	73.3% (56.5, 87.3%)	LR+	2.66 (1.41, 5.02)	Serious <sup>3</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.40 (0.22, 0.72)	Serious <sup>3</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>Neovascular AMD activities (retinal cystoid abnormalities)</b>											
<b>SD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											

Macular Degeneration

Appendix H: Grade tables and meta-analysis results

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	LRs	Effect size (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
1 (Khurana)	Retrospective	59 eyes (56 people)	58.6% (40.6, 75.5%)	56.7% (38.9, 73.6%)	LR+	1.35 (0.81, 2.26)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.73 (0.43, 1.25)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (Khurana)	Retrospective	59 eyes (56 people)	73.3% (56.5, 87.3%)	55.6% (32.9, 77.0%)	LR+	1.29 (0.60, 2.81)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.89 (0.64, 1.26)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERTE
<b>Neovascular AMD activities (cystoid macular oedema)</b>											
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (van de moere)	Retrospective	121 eyes (121 people)	22.9% (13.9, 33.3%)	98.0% (92.9, 99.9%)	LR+	11.66 (1.60, 85.1)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.79 (0.69, 0.90)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>Neovascular AMD activities (cystoid spaces)</b>											
<b>TD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (Eter)	Retrospective	60 eyes (60 people)	80% (66.7, 88.9%)	80% (45.9, 95.0%)	LR+	4.00 (1.15 to 13.92)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Serious <sup>2</sup>	LOW
					LR-	0.25 (0.13 to 0.47)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
<b>SD-Optical coherence tomography vs FA</b>											
1 (Giani)	Retrospective	93 eyes (93 people)	51.9% (38.5, 65.0%)	43.9% (29.7, 59.2%)	LR+	0.93 (0.64 to 1.35)	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE
					LR-	1.09	Serious <sup>1</sup>	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	MODERATE

Macular Degeneration

Appendix H: Grade tables and meta-analysis results

No. of studies	Study design	Sample size	Sensitivity (95%CI)	Specificity (95%CI)	LRs	Effect size (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Quality
						(0.70 to 1.71)					
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Downgraded for study design (retrospective study)</li> <li>2. Downgraded for imprecision because 95%CI of the positive likelihood ratio crossing 1 line of defined minimal importance difference</li> <li>3. Downgraded for overall results of diagnostic accuracy based on sets of OCT and FA with no individual time point result</li> <li>4. Downgraded for imprecision because 95%CI of the positive likelihood ratio crossing 2 lines of defined minimal importance difference</li> </ol>											