Single-field Non-mydriatic Fundus Photography for Diabetic Retinopathy Screening: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Running head: Effectiveness of single filed NMFP in DR screening

Jiying Hu[1], Ruiting Chen[1], Ying Lu[1], Baikang Ye[2], Xiaoyan Dou[2], Zhiming Cai[1], Zuhui Pu[1]*, Lisha Mou[1]*

[1] Evidence Based Medicine Center, Institute of Translational Medicine, Shenzhen University Health Science Center, Shenzhen University School of Medicine, First Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University, Shenzhen Second People's Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518035, China

[2] Department of Ophthalmology, Shenzhen University School of Medicine, First Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University, Shenzhen Second People's Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518035, China

*Corresponding Author

Full name: Zuhui Pu and Lisha Mou

Institute: Evidence Based Medicine Center, Institute of Translational Medicine

Department: Shenzhen University School of Medicine

University/Hospital: Shenzhen Second People's Hospital, First Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University

Street Name & Number: NO.3002 Sungang Road, Futian district, Shenzhen, China
City, State, Postal code, Country: Shenzhen, Guangdong, 518035, China

Tel: (086) 0755-83366388-3230

Fax: (086) 0755-83366388-3230

E-mail: pupeter190@163.com (Z. P.), lishamou@gmail.com (L. M.)

Key words: Non-mydriatic fundus photography, diabetic retinopathy, diagnostic effectiveness.

Figure legend

eFigure 1. Assessment of methodological quality based on the QUADAS-2 method (patient selection, index test, reference standard, and timing flow) for each study (upper) and all the combining studies (bottom). Risk of bias summary and applicability concerns assessments: green, low risk; red, high risk; and yellow, unclear risk.

eFigure 2. Forest plots of pooled sensitivity specificity for single-field NMFP in DR detection with 95% CIs.

eFigure 3. Publication bias of the included studies.


Risk of Bias
Applicability Concerns
Patient Selection
Index Test
Reference Standard
Flow and Timing
Patient Selection
Index Test
Reference Standard
Aptel 2008
Baeza 2009
Herbert 2003
Lawrence 2004
Lee 2011
Lin 2002
Phiri 2006
Pugh 1993
Taylor 1999
Vujosevic 2009
High
Unclear
Low


Patient Selection
Index Test
Reference Standard
Flow and Timing
0%
25%
50%
75%
100%
Risk of Bias
Applicability Concerns
High
Unclear
Low


Studyld
SENSITIVITY (95% CI)
Vujosevic/2006
0.71 [0.60 - 0.81]
Taylor/1999
0.75 [0.65 - 0.82]
Pugh/1993
0.61 [0.49 - 0.72]
Phiri/2006
0.86 [0.80 - 0.91]
Lin/2002
0.78 [0.66 - 0.87]
Lee/2011
0.48 [0.26 - 0.70]
Lawrence/2004
0.66 [0.54 - 0.77]
Herbert/2003
0.38 [0.27 - 0.51]
Baeza/2009
0.68 [0.55 - 0.79]
Aptel/2008
0.77 [0.62 - 0.89]
COMBINED
0.68[0.59 - 0.76]
Q = 69.11, df = 9.00, p = 0.00
I2 = 86.98 [80.16 - 93.79]
0.2 0.4 0.6 0.8 1.0
Sensitivity
Studyld
SPECIFICITY (95% CI)
Vujosevic/2006
0.96 [0.80 - 1.00]
Taylor/1999
0.96 [0.90 - 0.99]
Pugh/1993
0.85 [0.80 - 0.89]
Phiri/2006
0.71 [0.63 - 0.78]
Lin/2002
0.86 [0.78 - 0.91]
Lee/2011
0.98 [0.96 - 0.99]
Lawrence/2004
0.86 [0.68 - 0.96]
Herbert/2003
0.95 [0.92 - 0.98]
Baeza/2009
0.98 [0.96 - 0.99]
Aptel/2008
0.99 [0.95 - 1.00]
COMBINED
0.94[0.89 - 0.97]
Q =179.96, df = 9.00, p = 0.00
I2 = 95.00 [93.02 - 96.98]
0.6 0.8 1.0
Specificity


Deeks' Funnel Plot Asymmetry Test
pvalue = 0.39
.06
.08
.1
.12
1/root(ESS)
1
10
100
1000
Diagnostic Odds Ratio
Study
Regression Line
7
8
3
9
2
6
1
4
5
10