

**UCC Library and UCC researchers have made this item openly available.  
Please [let us know](#) how this has helped you. Thanks!**

<b>Title</b>	Accuracy of diagnostic testing in primary ciliary dyskinesia
<b>Author(s)</b>	Jackson, Claire L.; Behan, Laura; Collins, Samuel A.; Goggin, Patricia M.; Adam, Elizabeth C.; Coles, Janice L.; Evans, Hazel J.; Harris, Amanda; Lackie, Peter; Packham, Samantha; Page, Anton; Thompson, James; Walker, Woolf T.; Kuehni, Claudia; Lucas, Jane S.
<b>Publication date</b>	2016-02-29
<b>Original citation</b>	Jackson, C. L., Behan, L., Collins, S. A., Goggin, P. M., Adam, E. C., Coles, J. L., Evans, H. J., Harris, A., Lackie, P., Packham, S., Page, A., Thompson, J., Walker, W. T., Kuehni, C. and Lucas, J. S. (2016) 'Accuracy of diagnostic testing in primary ciliary dyskinesia', European Respiratory Journal, 47(3), pp. 837-848. doi: 10.1183/13993003.00749-2015
<b>Type of publication</b>	Article (peer-reviewed)
<b>Link to publisher's version</b>	<a href="http://dx.doi.org/10.1183/13993003.00749-2015">http://dx.doi.org/10.1183/13993003.00749-2015</a> Access to the full text of the published version may require a subscription.
<b>Rights</b>	© 2016, ERS. ERJ Open articles are open access and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial Licence 4.0. <a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/</a>
<b>Item downloaded from</b>	<a href="http://hdl.handle.net/10468/9259">http://hdl.handle.net/10468/9259</a>

Downloaded on 2023-03-26T15:03:18Z

**Table S1:** The diagnostic accuracy of nasal nitric oxide (nNO), high-speed video microscopy analysis (HSVMA) and transmission electron microscopy (TEM) including those with an inconclusive outcome. Analyses are grouped by (A) valid-inconclusive (VI) diagnostic outcome assumed to all be PCD-positive, and (B) VI diagnostic outcome assumed to all be negative.

	nNO (≤30 nL/min)	HSVMA	TEM
<b><u>A) Assuming VI group are all positive</u></b>			
Total n (%) /654	309 (47.2%)	638 (97.5%)	378 (57.7%)
Positive patients undergoing each test n (%) /88	42 (47.7%)	73 (82.9%)	81 (92.0%)
Negative patients undergoing each test n (%) /566	267 (47.1%)	565 (99.8%)	297 (52.4%)
True positive (n)	33	71	58
True negative (n)	257	526	297
False positive (n)	10	39	0
False negative (n)	9	2	23
Sensitivity	0.78	0.97	0.72
(95% CI)	(0.62-0.89)	(0.90-1.00)	(0.61-0.87)
Specificity	0.96	0.93	1.00
(95% CI)	(0.93-0.98)	(0.91-0.95)	(0.99-1.00)
Positive Predictive Value	0.77	0.65	1.00
(95% CI)	(0.61-0.88)	(0.55-0.73)	(0.94-1.00)
Negative Predictive Value	0.97	1.00	0.93
(95% CI)	(0.94-0.98)	(0.99-1.00)	(0.89-0.95)
<b><u>B) Assuming VI group are all negative</u></b>			
Total n (%) /654	309 (47.2%)	638 (97.5%)	378 (57.7%)
Positive patients undergoing each test n (%) /75	34 (45.3%)	60 (80%)	71 (94.6%)
Negative patients undergoing each test n (%) /579	275 (47.4%)	578 (99.8%)	307 (53%)
True positive (n)	31	60	56
True negative (n)	263	528	305
False positive (n)	12	50	2
False negative (n)	3	0	15
Sensitivity	0.91	1.00	0.79
(95% CI)	(0.76-0.98)	(0.94-1.00)	(0.68-0.88)
Specificity	0.96	0.91	0.99
(95% CI)	(0.93-0.98)	(0.89-0.94)	(0.98-1.00)
Positive Predictive Value	0.72	0.55	0.97
(95% CI)	(0.56-0.85)	(0.45-0.64)	(0.88-0.99)
Negative Predictive Value	0.99	1.00	0.95
(95% CI)	(0.97-1.00)	(0.99-1.00)	(0.92-0.97)