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Thread 1: Information Retrieval
PICO: A Tool to Structure the Foreground Question

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Therapy</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P Patient Pop</td>
<td>Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I Intervention</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Comparison</td>
<td>Gold Standard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O Outcome</td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Using the PICO model, jot down 1 foreground question with your partner that will help you care for this patient:

A 42 year old woman comes to her primary care practitioner’s office for follow up of her diabetes. She is currently on glyburide 10 mg twice daily. However, her blood sugars still stay elevated. After you see this patient, your attending asks whether you think she should add metformin to her regimen.

Patient - Intervention - Comparison - Outcome
Foreground Questions - Therapy

• In type II diabetics, is metformin and glyburide better than glyburide alone at lowering blood sugar?

• Among women with type II diabetes, are there more instances of low blood sugar events in patients on both metformin and glyburide, compared to glyburide alone?
Sources for Foreground Questions

• MEDLINE
• Practice Guidelines
• Evidence Based-Databases
  – Cochrane Library
  – ACP Journal Club
Thread 3: Diagnostic Reasoning
Initial Diagnostic Reasoning
The Odyssey Reloaded

The Mechanic

- Failure to entertain all possibilities
- Failure to pay attention to all symptoms
- Failure to inform customer
- Failure to perform diagnostic tests

The Clinician

- Entertain all important possibilities
- Elicit and pay attention to description of all symptoms
- Inform and involve patients
- Perform effective diagnostic tests
The Odyssey: Conclusion

Initial Possibilities
#1: Trunk latch defect (recall pending)
#2: Ajar sensing defect on side door
#3: Side door not closing properly
The Odyssey: Conclusion

**Initialization Possibilities**

1. Trunk latch defect (recall pending)
2. Ajar sensing defect on side door
3. Side door not closing properly

**The Answer**

2. Ajar sensing defect on side door
Learning Objectives

By the end of this lecture, you will…

• demonstrate diagnostic question formulation
• define and calculate sensitivity, specificity, and predictive values for diagnostic tests
• explain how risk factors drive prior probabilities, and how this concept relates to prevalence
• modify probabilities from test results through 2x2 table calculations, Bayesian reasoning, and Likelihood Ratios
Case: Diagnostic Reasoning

• The case: A 60 year old man without heart disease presents with sudden onset of shortness of breath.

• Description of the problem: Yesterday, after flying in from California the day before, the patient awoke at 3AM with sudden shortness of breath. His breathing is not worsened while lying down.
Q: “What other symptoms were you feeling at the time?”
A: He has had no chest pain, no leg pain, no swelling. He just returned yesterday from a long plane ride. He has no history of this problem before. He takes an aspirin every day. He smokes a pack of cigarettes a day.
Diagnostic Reasoning: First Steps

The *differential diagnosis*

**Basic Tasks:**

- Assign likelihoods to each possibility
  - E.g. $P(X) =$ probability that “$X$” is the cause of the patient’s symptoms
- Place the possibilities in descending order of likelihood
- State why (rationale)
My list

My differential diagnosis

– Pulmonary embolism
– Congestive heart failure
– Emphysema exacerbation
– Asthma exacerbation
Probabilities

(1) PE \hspace{1cm} P(PE) = 40\%
(2) CHF \hspace{1cm} P(CHF) = 30\%
(3) Emphysema \hspace{1cm} P(\text{emphysema}) = 20\%
(4) Asthma \hspace{1cm} P(\text{asthma}) = 10\%

• What is the probability that the shortness of breath is due to either PE or CHF? \hspace{1cm} 70\%* 

*provided that both do not happen simultaneously (i.e., they are “mutually exclusive”). If there is a 10\% chance that 2 events may happen, then this number is 60\% (make sure you understand why).
Prior Probabilities

• Based on many factors:
  – Clinician experience
  – Patient demographics
  – Characteristics of the patient presentations (history and physical exam)
  – Previous testing
  – Basic science knowledge

• Quite variable but can be standardized
  – Clinical Prediction Rules
    – [http://medcalc3000.com/PulmonaryEmbRiskPisa.htm](http://medcalc3000.com/PulmonaryEmbRiskPisa.htm)
More information

- Family history: he has had a DVT in the past (age 40)
- Physical Exam:
  - His blood oxygen saturation is normal on room air
  - His respiratory rate is 16, but his pulse rate is 105 beats per minute
  - Examination of his lungs reveals some crackles and wheezes, but no pleural rub or evidence of consolidation.
  - Swollen right leg, with firm vein below the knee
- CXR: normal
- EKG: sinus tachycardia

http://medcalc3000.com/PulmonaryEmbRiskPisa.htm
Diagnostic Reasoning: Testing

• If a Test existed that could “rule in” PE as the diagnosis with 100% certainty:
  then P(PE | Test+) = 100%

• Two questions:
  – What is this test called?  
    Gold Standard
  – Does P(CHF | Test+) = 0%?  
    No
Diagnostic Testing

• Facilitates the modification of probabilities.
• Can include any/all of the following:
  – Further history taking
  – Physical Examination maneuver
  – Simple testing (laboratory analysis, radiographs)
  – Complex technology (stress testing, angiography, CT/MRI, nuclear scans)
PICO: The Anatomy of a Diagnostic Foreground Question

- **Patient**: define the clinical condition or disease clearly.
- **Intervention**: define the diagnostic test clearly.
- **Comparison group**: define the accepted gold standard diagnostic test to compare the results against.
- **Outcomes of interest**: the outcomes of interest are the properties of the test itself (e.g., performance and others we’ll discuss).
Case: A 60 year old man without heart disease presents with sudden onset of shortness of breath. Considering PE.

Diagnostic Test to consider: Ventilation / Perfusion Scanning

Gold standard: Pulmonary angiography

Need: Diagnostic performance
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Case: A 60 year old man without heart disease presents with sudden onset of shortness of breath. Considering PE.

Diagnostic Test to consider: Ventilation / Perfusion Scanning

Gold standard: Pulmonary angiography

Need: Diagnostic performance
Can the test be used?
Step 1 - Accuracy and Precision

- **Accuracy** - The result of the test corresponds consistently with the true result.
  - The test yields the **correct value**

- **Precision** - The measure of the test’s reproducibility when repeated on the same sample.
  - The test yields the **same value**
Accuracy vs. Precision

High Accuracy
High Precision

High Precision
Low Accuracy

High Accuracy
Low Precision
Accuracy vs. Precision

- High Accuracy, High Precision
- High Precision, Low Accuracy
- High Accuracy, Low Precision

Proceed to Step 2
Accuracy vs. Precision

High Accuracy
High Precision

High Precision
Low Accuracy

High Accuracy
Low Precision

Proceed to Step 2
Calibrate Equipment
Accuracy vs. Precision

- High Accuracy, High Precision
- High Precision, Low Accuracy
- High Accuracy, Low Precision

Proceed to Step 2
Calibrate Equipment
Start Over
Can the test be used?  
Step 2 - Diagnostic Performance  

1. A well-defined group of people being evaluated for a condition undergo:  
   - an experimental test, and  
   - the gold standard test.  

2. Comparison is made between the result of the new test and that of the gold standard.
Diagnostic Performance: Statistical Significance

- **Statistical significance**: strength of the association between...
  - Diagnostic study results (for the diagnosis of a particular disease)
  - Gold standard results (for the diagnosis of the same disease, in the same population)

- **Strength** = degree of correlation
Diagnostic Performance: Clinical Significance

- **Clinical significance**: how likely is the diagnostic test going to affect patient care?
  - Magnitude of the association between test results and the accepted gold standard
  - Other literature (including those of the gold standard)
  - Cost of the test, reproducibility of test
  - Disease characteristics (will the test result affect management of the disease?)
Diagnostic performance is an association between test result and diagnosis of a condition (as assessed by the gold standard).

### What are the results - Diagnosis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Disease +</th>
<th>Disease -</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test +</strong></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TP</td>
<td>FP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Test -</strong></td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FN</td>
<td>TN</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**BONUS**

What type of variable is disease state?
Which test characteristics?

• There are prevalence-dependent and prevalence-independent measures in diagnostic tests.
• Prevalence-independent: sensitivity and specificity.
• Prevalence-dependent: positive and negative predictive values.
Test Characteristics: SeNsitivity

Sensitivity:

- The probability that the test will be positive when the disease is present.  
  \[ P(\text{Test + | Disease +}) \]
- Of all the people WITH the disease, the percentage that will test positive.
- A sensitive test is one that will detect most of the patients who have the disease (low false-Negative rate).
Specificity:

• The probability that the test will be negative when the disease is absent.
  \[ P(\text{Test} - | \text{Disease} -) \]

• Of all the people WITHOUT the disease, the percentage that will test negative.

• A specific test is one that will rarely be positive in patients who don’t have the disease (low false-positive rate).
Test Characteristics: Predictive Values

• **Positive predictive value**: the probability that a patient has a disease, given a positive result on a test.
  \[ P \text{ (Disease} + \mid \text{Test} + \text{)} \]

• **Negative predictive value**: the probability that a patient does not have a disease, given a negative result on a test.
  \[ P \text{ (Disease} - \mid \text{Test} - \text{)} \]
## Diagnostic Test Characteristics

- Sens = $\frac{A}{A+C}$
- Spec = $\frac{D}{B+D}$
- PPV = $\frac{A}{A+B}$
- NPV = $\frac{D}{C+D}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T-</th>
<th>T+</th>
<th>Dx+</th>
<th>Dx-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A + C  B + D
To reflect upon...

Why?

Sensitivity and Specificity
Prevalence-Independent characteristics

Positive and Negative Predictive Values
Prevalence-Dependent characteristics
Case: To determine the diagnostic performance of V/Q scans for detecting pulmonary embolism, a study was conducted where 300 patients underwent both a V/Q and pulmonary angiogram. 150 patients were found to have a PE by PA gram. Of those, 75 patients had a high probability VQ scan. Of the 150 patients without a PE, 125 had a non-high probability VQ scan.
Case: To determine the diagnostic performance of V/Q scans for detecting pulmonary embolism, a study was conducted where 300 patients underwent both a V/Q and pulmonary angiogram. 150 patients were found to have a PE by PA gram. Of those, 75 patients had a high probability VQ scan. Of the 150 patients without a PE, 125 did not have a high probability VQ scan (VQ other).
Let’s try it out

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PE+</th>
<th>PE-</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VQ hi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ other</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>150</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sens = \( \frac{75}{75+75} \) = 50%
- Spec = \( \frac{125}{125+25} \) = 83%
- PPV = \( \frac{75}{75+25} \) = 75%
- NPV = \( \frac{125}{125+75} \) = 63%
Modification of Probability

Pretest Probability $P(\text{Disease})$ → Test Result

Test result changes the probability of disease $P(\text{Disease} | \text{Test Result})$
Test Characteristics and Prevalence

- Sens = \( \frac{A}{A+C} \)
- Spec = \( \frac{D}{B+D} \)
- PPV = \( \frac{A}{A+B} \)
- NPV = \( \frac{D}{C+D} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dx+</th>
<th>Dx-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Disease Prevalence}: A+C + B+D \]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PE+</th>
<th>PE-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VQ hi</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VQ other</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Sens = 50%
- Spec = 83%
- PPV = 75%
- NPV = 63%
- Prevalence = **50%**
Populations and Patients

Population view
• Prevalence reflects the number of people with the disease at a given moment

Patient view
• Same concept implies how likely an individual patient has the disease
• P (Disease)
Modification of Probability

Pretest Probability $P(Disease)$ → Test Result → Test result changes the probability of disease $P(Disease|Test\ Result)$

Disease Prevalence
An Important Question and Assumption

Question: Are certain test characteristics fixed?

Answer: Generally, yes.

Sensitivity and specificity are constants, regardless of the prevalence of the disease in the studied population (prevalence-INdependent)*

*Exceptions and caveats to this assumption are real, but are beyond the scope of this course
Modification of Probability

Pretest Probability $P_{\text{Disease}}$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test result changes the probability of disease $P_{\text{Disease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Patients
- Populations

Disease Prevalence

- sensitivity
- specificity
Importance of Pre-Test Probability

- Hi-prob V/Q: Sens = 50%, Spec = 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-TP/Prev</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How do our predictive values relate to our probability after the test result is obtained (our post-test probabilities)?
Importance of Pre-Test Probability

- Hi-prob V/Q: Sens = 50%, Spec = 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-TP/Prev</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If our Pre-test Probability was 50%, and we obtain a hi-prob V/Q scan on this patient, what is our Post-test probability? 75%
### Importance of Pre-Test Probability

- **Hi-prob V/Q:** Sens = 50%, Spec = 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-TP/Prev</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If our Pre-test Probability was 50%, and we obtain a V/Q-other scan on this patient, what is our Post-test probability? 37% (tricky: 1-63%)
What did we just do?

- 50% = \( P(PE|T+) \)
- 75% = \( P(PE|T+) \)
- 37% = \( P(PE|T-) \)

Graph showing:
- VQ hi
- VQ other

P (PE) vs. P (PE | Test)
Modification of Probability

Pretest Probability $P(Disease)$ → Test Result → Test result changes the probability of disease $P(Disease|Test\ Result)$

- Disease Prevalence
- Predictive Values (Positive and Negative)
- sensitivity
- specificity
Sensitivity and specificity are constants, regardless of the prevalence of the disease in the studied population (prevalence-INdependent)*

Positive and Negative Predictive Values are dependent on the prevalence of the disease in the studied population (prevalence-DEpendent)

*with exceptions
Now, what do we do?

*clickers

75% = P(PE|T+)

Q1: Choices:
   a) Treat as if patient has PE
   b) Decide to get another test
   c) Decide that patient does not have a PE

What factors do you consider when making the next decision?
Now, what do we do?

*clickers

Q2: Choices:

a) Treat as if patient has PE
b) Decide to get another test
c) Decide that patient does not have a PE

37% = P(PE|T-)

What factors do you consider when making the next decision?
Now, what do we do?

75% = $P(PE|T^+)$

37% = $P(PE|T^-)$

**Choices:**
- Treat as if patient has PE
- Decide to get another test
- Decide that patient does not have a PE

What factors do you consider when making the next decision?
What if we change our pretest probability?

• In essence, we are simultaneously changing the prevalence:
  – Original pre-TP = P(PE) = 50%  HIGH RISK
  – New pre-TP = P(PE) = 25%  MED RISK

• Assuming that sensitivity and specificity are fixed…then we must recalculate our predictive values to determine our new post-test probabilities.
Importance of Pre-Test Probability

- Hi-prob V/Q: Sens = 50%, Spec = 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-TP/Prev</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hi risk</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med risk</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Post-TP:

- Our Pre-test Probability was 25%, we obtain a V/Q-other scan on this patient, our Post-test probability is now…17%
Decision time
*clickers

Q3: Choices:
- a) Treat as if patient has PE
- b) Decide to get another test
- c) Decide that patient does not have a PE

50% = P(PE|T+)
**Decision time**

*clickers*

Q4: **Choices**:
- a) Treat as if patient has PE
- b) Decide to get another test
- c) Decide that patient does not have a PE

17% = \( P(PE|T-) \)
Decision time

$\text{Choices:}$
- Treat as if patient has PE
- **Decide to get another test**
- Decide that patient does not have a PE

$50\% = P(\text{PE}|T+)$

$17\% = P(\text{PE}|T-)$

$\text{Choices:}$
- Treat as if patient has PE
- **Decide to get another test**
- Decide that patient does not have a PE
Let’s change it again…

• Again, we are changing the prevalence:
  – Young woman, no risk factors, some dyspnea, no history, normal exam
  – If we consult our clinical prediction rule:
    • New pre-TP = P(PE) = 5%: LOW RISK
Importance of Pre-Test Probability

- Hi-prob V/Q: Sens = 50%, Spec = 83%

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre-TP/Prev</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hi risk</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lo risk</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8/(8+47) \[238/(238+7)\]
What did we just do?

Observation
As prevalence (pre-test probability) decreases, positive tests are more likely to be false-positives.
Question: If you get a high probability V/Q scan for the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism, is it more likely to represent a false positive test if the patient presented with…

(a) many clinical features of PE (shortness of breath, chest pain, long plane ride), or

(b) no clinical features of PE (no shortness of breath, no chest pain, no leg swelling, no long plane ride)?
Alternative Vocabulary - Rates

- True Positive Rate = sensitivity
- False Positive Rate = 1 - specificity
- False Negative Rate = 1 - sensitivity
- True Negative Rate = specificity
Combining Rates - Methods

- Likelihood Ratios
- ROC Curves
Combining Rates - Method 1
Likelihood Ratios (LR)

• Concept - LRs depict the relationship between true and false rates
  – TPR/FPR = LR for a positive test result
  – FNR/TNR = LR for a negative test result

\[
\text{TPR \over FPR} = \text{LR} = \frac{\text{sens}}{1 - \text{spec}}
\]

Typically >1, excellent >10

\[
\text{FNR \over TNR} = \text{LR} = \frac{1 - \text{sens}}{\text{spec}}
\]

Typically <1, excellent <0.1
Application
Likelihood Ratios (LR)

Key Concept: LRs can be combined with pre-test odds to get post-test odds

Remember our scenario:
High risk pt - 50% (PreTP)

0.50

LR (VQ hi) = __________ = 2.94
1-0.83

50% 1.0 2.94 2.94 75%

*converting odds to probability and vice and versa - many references online
Combining Rates - Method 2

ROC Curves

Visual depiction of LR

- Tests with continuous values only
- Sensitivity-specificity tradeoff at different cutoffs
- TPR plotted against FPR
Application

ROC Curves

- Area under the curve determines overall utility of the test
- Inflection point reflects optimal threshold
- More in Small Group Exercise
  - Assignment 3
Take Home Points

• Research studies of diagnostic tests give you test characteristics, not predictive values.
• Relationships between sensitivity and specificity can be captured in ROC curves (for tests with thresholds) and Likelihood Ratios (LRs)
• Appropriate use of tests stem from large differences between pre-test and post-test probabilities, resulting from LRs that strongly deviate from 1.
• If your pre-test probability is very low (<10%) or very high (>90%), it is rare that a single test can help.
Diagnostic Reasoning
The Odyssey Returns

The Mechanic
- Failure to entertain all possibilities
- Failure to pay attention to all symptoms
- Failure to inform customer
- Failure to perform diagnostic tests

The Clinician
- Entertain all important possibilities
- Elicit and pay attention to description of all symptoms
- Inform and involve patients
- Perform effective diagnostic tests
The MDM Cycle

- Ask
- Acquire
- Appraise
- Apply
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