CENTER FOR KLINISKE RETNINGSLINJER

BILAG 5

Øre vs. rektal

Sensitivity	0.58 to 0.85
Specificity	0.72 to 0.94

Prevalences	0.5%	0.2%	0.05%

	Nº of	studies Study (№ of design		Factors that may decrease quality of evidence				Effect per 1000 patients/year				
Outcome (Nº of			Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Publication bias	pre-test probability of 0.5%	pre-test probability of 0.2%	pre-test probability of 0.05%	Test accuracy QoE	Importance
True positives (patients with Feber)	5 studies 236 patients	cross- sectional (cohort type accuracy	very serious ¹	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	3 to 4	1 to 2	0 to 0	⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE ¹	Critical
False negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having Feber)		study)					1 to 2	0 to 1	1 to 1	⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE ¹	Critical	
True negatives (patients without Feber)	5 studies 571 patients	cross- sectional (cohort type accuracy study)	serious 1	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	716 to 935	719 to 938	720 to 940	⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE ¹	Critical
False positives (patients incorrectly classified as having Feber)								60 to 279	60 to 279	60 to 280	⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE ¹	Critical

1. No blinding and selection bias







CENTER FOR KLINISKE RETNINGSLINJER

BILAG 5

- CLEARINGHOUSE

Temporal vs. PA

Sensitivity	0.26 (95% CI: 0.20 to 0.30)
Specificity	0.99 (95% CI: 0.98 to 1.00)

Prevalences	0.5%	0.2%	0.05%

Outcome stud	Nº of		Factors that may decrease quality of evidence				Effect per 1000 patients/year			Test		
	(№ of patients)	Study design	Risk of bias	Indirectness	Inconsistency	Imprecision	Publication bias	pre-test probability of 0.5%	pre-test probability of 0.2%	pre-test probability of 0.05%	accuracy QoE	Importance
True positives (patients with Feber)	1 studies 736 patients	cross- sectional (cohort type accuracy study)	very serious ¹	not serious	not serious	serious ²	none	1 (1 to 2)	1 (0 to 1)	0 (0 to 0)	⊕ VERY LOW 12	CRITICAL
False negatives (patients incorrectly classified as not having Feber)		Study						4 (3 to 4)	1 (1 to 2)	1 (1 to 1)	⊕ VERY LOW 12	CRITICAL
True negatives (patients without Feber)	1 studies 48 patients	cross- sectional (cohort type accuracy study)	very serious ¹	not serious	not serious	serious ²	none	985 (975 to 995)	988 (978 to 998)	990 (980 to 1000)	⊕ VERY LOW 12	CRITICAL
False positives (patients incorrectly classified as having Feber)		olddy)						10 (0 to 20)	10 (0 to 20)	10 (-1 to 20)	⊕ VERY LOW 12	CRITICAL

- 1. No blinding and possible selection bias
- 2. Only one s





