

P.2.17.4 123I-MIBG cardiac scintigraphy

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
SECONDARY CARE												
5 studies (Estorch 2008; Manabe 2017; Sakamoto 2014; Sakamoto 2017, Slaets 2015)	4 × prospective; 1 × retrospective	607	0.89 (0.81, 0.93)	0.91 (0.82, 0.96)	LR+	10.80 (4.89, 21.50)	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	-	LOW
					LR-	0.13 (0.07, 0.21)	V. serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious		LOW
<p>Notes on risk of bias</p> <p>Estorch 2008: Significant proportion of people not given a final reference standard diagnosis</p> <p>Sakamoto 2014: It was unclear whether the study avoided inappropriate exclusions or whether the reference standard results were interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test.</p> <p>Slaets 2015: The diagnosing physicians were not blind to the index test results.</p> <p>Manabe 2017: Optimised test cut-offs were calculated and it was unclear whether the reference standard was interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test or the index test was interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference test.</p> <p>Sakamoto 2017: Selective reporting of sensitivity and specificity of outcome variables and it was unclear whether the index test results were interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard; whether the reference standard results were interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index test or whether the test cut-off was pre-specified.</p>												