



How to clarify the Baveno VI criteria for ruling out varices needing treatment by noninvasive tests.

Submitted by Beatrice Guillaumat on Tue, 02/05/2019 - 16:09

Titre	How to clarify the Baveno VI criteria for ruling out varices needing treatment by noninvasive tests.
Type de publication	Article de revue
Auteur	Calès, Paul [1], Buisson, François [2], Ravaioli, Federico [3], Berger, Arthur [4], Carboni, Carlotta [5], Marasco, Giovanni [6], Festi, Davide [7]
Editeur	Wiley
Type	Article scientifique dans une revue à comité de lecture
Année	2019
Langue	Anglais
Date	2019 Jan
Pagination	49-53
Volume	39
Titre de la revue	Liver Int
ISSN	1478-3231

Résumé en anglais

BACKGROUND & AIMS: Baveno VI criteria enabled the screening of varices needing treatment (VNT) without endoscopy but created confusion by not stating the method used to calculate the 5% missed VNT limit, resulting in different calculations across validation studies. We analysed those calculations to clarify their diagnostic meaning.

METHODS: (a) Literature review and recalculation of the missed VNT rates according to the three definitions encountered. (b) Contingency table comparison of these latter to determine their diagnostic meanings. (c) Real case analysis. 4/Simulation of variations in the three main statistical descriptors (VNT, missed VNT or spared endoscopies).

RESULTS: Missed VNT rates in the three definitions varied five- to 10-fold across 7 papers. The contingency table showed that the definitions based on VNT prevalence and spared endoscopy as reference corresponded, respectively, to sensitivity and negative predictive value (NPV). The whole population-based definition corresponded to diagnostic accuracy (not pertinent in that setting). Real case analysis showed that concerning liver stiffness, the 95% sensitivity and NPV cut-offs for VNT were, respectively, 14.1 and 26.5 kPa. The VNT-based definition offered a more statistically powerful paired comparison between diagnostic tests, whereas the definition based on spared endoscopies was hampered by an unpaired comparison. Case simulation showed that the VNT-based definition was the most sensitive to descriptor variations.

CONCLUSION: The definitions of missed VNT rate placing VNT or spared endoscopy as the denominator are appropriate, providing, respectively, sensitivity and NPV for VNT. We privilege the first since it corresponds to the true proportion of missed VNT.

URL de la notice

<http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications/ua18780> [8]

DOI 10.1111/liv.13945 [9]
Autre titre Liver Int.
Identifiant (ID) 30129700 [10]
PubMed

Liens

- [1] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/p.cales/publications>
- [2] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=33608>
- [3] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=33604>
- [4] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=30386>
- [5] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=33609>
- [6] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=33606>
- [7] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications?f%5Bauthor%5D=33427>
- [8] <http://okina.univ-angers.fr/publications/ua18780>
- [9] <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/liv.13945>
- [10] <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/30129700?dopt=Abstract>

Publié sur *Okina* (<http://okina.univ-angers.fr>)