

POSTER PRESENTATION

Open Access

Difficulties with defining diagnostic accuracy study outcomes

Katie Banister^{1*}, Craig Ramsay¹, Jonathan Cook², Charles Boachie³, Augusto Azuara-Blanco⁴, GATE study group¹

From 3rd International Clinical Trials Methodology Conference
Glasgow, UK. 16-17 November 2015

Introduction

Evaluation of diagnostic tests raises unique methodological challenges. Outcomes include measures of test performance compared to a reference standard. When reporting diagnostic test accuracy, other factors to consider include the rate of indeterminate results and missing data [1]. However, there is little guidance on how this should be considered and represented within a diagnostic study.

Methods

We conducted a paired study of the diagnostic accuracy of four imaging techniques for glaucoma. Participants were new referrals in UK secondary care. The reference standard was a clinical diagnosis of glaucoma by an experienced ophthalmologist.

Tests gave a glaucoma classification (outside normal limits, borderline, within normal limits) or were classed as indeterminate or missing. Analyses explored the causes of indeterminate results, alternative diagnostic scenarios including indeterminate results and alternative thresholds for the tests and reference standard.

Results

943 participants were included in the analysis. Between 4 and 8% of imaging outputs were classed as indeterminate and this varied amongst imaging techniques. Indeterminate results were further classified into low quality result; no automated classification generated; imaging artefact; patient unable to undertake test.

Conclusion

We used a generalisable systematic approach to considering categorisation and reporting of abnormal, indeterminate and missing test results. The handling of

indeterminate results needs careful consideration during study conduct in order to inform decision making.

Funding

NIHR HTA programme 09/22/111

Authors' details

¹Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK.

²Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. ³Robertson Centre for Biostatistics, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK. ⁴Centre for Experimental Medicine, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK.

Published: 16 November 2015

Reference

1. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, *et al*: Towards complete and accurate reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: the STARD initiative. *Fam Pract* 2004, **21**:4-10.

doi:10.1186/1745-6215-16-S2-P49

Cite this article as: Banister *et al*: Difficulties with defining diagnostic accuracy study outcomes. *Trials* 2015 **16**(Suppl 2):P49.

Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central
and take full advantage of:

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

Submit your manuscript at
www.biomedcentral.com/submit



¹Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, UK
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article