

P.2.7.8 Amyloid Beta 1-42

Studies	Design	Total N	Sens (95%CI)	Spec (95%CI)	Measure	Summary of findings (95%CI)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Quality
ALL EVIDENCE POOLED												
10 studies (Andreasen 2001; Brandt 2008; Duits 2014; Dumurgier 2015 (Lille); Dumurgier 2015 (Paris); Dumurgier 2015 (Montpellier); Gabelle 2012 (Lille and Paris); Gabelle 2012 (Montpellier); Knapskogog 2016; Mulder 2010)	8 × prospective; 2 × retrospective	3,685	0.76 (0.67, 0.83)	0.74 (0.68, 0.79)	LR+	2.88 (2.23, 3.67)	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	-	LOW
					LR-	0.34 (0.23, 0.46)	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious		LOW
Notes on risk of bias												
Mulder 2010: It is unclear whether participants were consecutively or randomly recruited; the test cut offs were not pre-specified but selected to obtain 85% sensitivity; the timing between the reference and index tests is unclear and it is unclear whether the index test was interpreted independently of the reference test results												
Gabelle 2012: Test thresholds were not pre-specified, but optimised based on the data; it was unclear whether the study enrolled random or consecutive people or avoided inappropriate exclusions. A subgroup analysis was carried out but as < 10% population was excluded the study was not downgraded for this.												
Dumurgier 2015: The reference standard diagnosis included consideration of the CSF results; the test cut offs were not pre-specified; patients with unknown clinical diagnoses or MCI were excluded from the study and the timing of the reference and index tests is unclear.												
Additional notes: the Dumurgier study had 3 independent data sets from 3 different clinics; the Gabelle study had 2 independent data sets from 2 clinics.												