**Appendix Table F32. Association between intermediate and clinical outcomes-diagnostic value of the tests**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, year****Study characteristics** | **Index method** | **Reference method** | **Outcome** | **Sensitivity** | **Specificity** | **Positive likelihood ratio** | **Negative likelihood ratio** | **Diagnostic odds ratio** |
| Bieleman, 2009367Country: The NetherlandsAge: >45Sample: 92 | SF-36:physical function: cut-off point<60 | Functional Capacity Evaluation  | Work limitations | 33.0 | 97.0 | **11.0** | 0.69 | 15.9 |
| Bieleman, 2009367Country: The NetherlandsAge: >45Sample: 92 | WOMAC: function: cut-off point>-21 | Functional Capacity Evaluation | Work limitations | 51.0 | 88.0 | 4.3 | 0.56 | 7.6.8 |
| Salaffi, 2004336Country: ItalyAge: >18Sample: 233 | Baseline NRS score <=4 and much better on PGIC scale | Patients' Global Impression of Change (PGIC) | Percent change in NumericalRating Scale score | 96.1 | 91.2 | **10.9** | 0.04 | 255.4 |
| Salaffi, 2004336Country: ItalyAge: >18Sample: 233 | Baseline NRS score >4 to <=7 and much better on PGIC scale | PGIC | Percent change in NRS score | 92.5 | 82.9 | 5.4 | 0.09 | 59.8 |
| Salaffi, 2004336Country: ItalyAge: >18Sample: 233 | Baseline NRS score >7 to 10 and much better on PGIC scale | PGIC | Percent change in NRS score | 91.4 | 90.1 | 9.2 | 0.10 | 96.7 |
| Salaffi, 2004336Country: ItalyAge: >18Sample: 233 | Much better on PGIC scale | PGIC | Percent change in NRS score | 83.9 | 92.6 | **11.3** | 0.17 | 65.2 |

Bold- large positive predictive likelihood ratios suggesting conclusive increase in the likelihood of outcome