MJA
The Medical Journal of Australia

Supporting Information

Supplementary tables

This appendix was part of the submitted manuscript and has been peer reviewed.
It is posted as supplied by the authors.

Appendix to: An YK, Prince D, Gardiner F, et al. Faecal calprotectin testing for identifying patients with organic gastrointestinal disease: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Med J Aust* 2019; doi: 10.5694/mja2.50384.

Table 1. Studies reporting faecal calprotectin testing for distinguishing between organic disease and functional gastrointestinal disorders

Study	Faecal calprotectin cut-off (μg/g)	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Disease prevalence
Included in statistical analysis										
Limburg 2000	100	24	14	5	67	83%	83%	63%	93%	26.4% (18.4–35.6%)
Carrocio 2003	50 (adults)	19	8	11	32	63%	80%	70%	74%	42.9% (31.1–55.2%)
Carrocio 2003	50 (children)	25	1	10	14	71%	93%	96%	58%	70.0% (55.4–82.1%)
D'Inca 2007	50	13	2	11	41	54%	95%	87%	79%	35.8% (24.5–48.5%)
Otten 2008	50	22	12	1	79	96%	87%	65%	99%	20.2% (13.2–28.7%)
El-Badry 2010	50	19	4	0	26	100%	87%	83%	100%	38.8% (25.2–53.8%)
Kok 2012	50	52	152	10	168	84%	48%	24%	94%	16.2% (12.7–20.3%)
Burri 2012	50	112	13	31	249	78%	95%	90%	89%	35.3% (30.6–40.2%)
Pavlidis 2013	50	77	200	17	668	82%	77%	28%	98%	9.8% (8.0–11.8%)
Angulo 2015	50	123	80	9	32	93%	29%	61%	78%	54.1% (47.6–60.5%)
Banerjee 2015	50	19	39	2	59	90%	60%	33%	97%	17.6% (11.3–25.7%)
Turvill 2016	100	23	44	3	192	88%	81%	34%	98%	9.9% (6.6–14.2%)
Högberg 2017	50	20	89	6	258	77%	74%	18%	98%	7.0% (4.6–10.0%)
Conroy 2018	50	21	127	6	256	78%	67%	14%	98%	6.6% (4.4–9.4%)
Walker 2018	100	64	69	36	620	64%	90%	49%	95%	12.7% (10.4–15.2%)
Turvill 2018	100	73	29	5	803	94%	92%	51%	99%	8.2% (6.5–10.1%)
Not included in statistical analysis*										
Carrocio 2003	100 (adults)	13	3	17	37	43%	93%	81%	69%	42.9% (31.1–55.2%)
Carrocio 2003	100 (children)	18	1	17	14	51%	93%	95%	45%	70.0% (55.4–82.1%)
El-Badry 2010	100	15	0	4	30	79%	100%	100%	88%	38.8% (25.2–53.8%)
Pavlidis 2013	100	73	78	21	790	78%	91%	48%	97%	9.8% (8.0–11.8%)
Angulo 2015	100	100	53	32	59	76%	53%	65%	65%	54.1% (47.6–60.5%)
Banerjee 2015	100	14	18	7	80	67%	82%	44%	92%	17.6% (11.3–25.7%)
Högberg 2017	100	12	46	14	301	46%	87%	21%	96%	7.0% (4.6-10.0%)

TP = true positive; FP = false positive; TN = true negative; FN = false negative; PPV = positive predictive value; NPV = negative predictive value.

* When studies used both 50 and 100 μg/g cut-off values for the same patient, we only used the 50 μg/g value for our analysis.

Table 2. Studies reporting faecal calprotectin testing for distinguishing between inflammatory bowel disease and functional gastrointestinal disorders

Study	Faecal calprotectin cut-off (µg/g)	TP	FP	FN	TN	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Disease prevalence
Included in statistical analysis										
Limburg 2000	100	15	23	1	71	94%	76%	39%	99%	14.6% (8.6–22.5%)
D'Inca 2007	50	2	13	0	52	100%	80%	13%	100%	3.0% (0.36–10.4%)
Damms 2008	50	18	47	0	75	100%	61%	28%	100%	12.9% (7.8–19.6%)
Schoepfer 2008	50	53	0	11	30	83%	100%	100%	73%	68.1% (57.7–77.3%)
Angulo 2015	50	68	80	0	32	100%	29%	46%	100%	37.8% (30.7–45.3%)
Dhaliwal 2015	50	115	18	33	126	78%	88%	87%	79%	50.7% (44.8–56.6%)
Banerjee 2015	50	12	39	0	59	100%	60%	24%	100%	10.9% (5.8–18.3%)
Högberg 2017	50	4	105	0	264	100%	72%	4%	100%	1.1% (0.29–2.7%)
Conroy 2018	50	4	144	3	259	57%	64%	3%	99%	1.7% (0.69–3.5%)
Walker 2018	100	43	89	7	650	86%	88%	33%	99%	6.3% (4.7–8.3%)
Not included in statistical analysis*										
Angulo 2015	100	60	49	8	63	88%	56%	55%	89%	37.8% (30.7–45.3%)
Dhaliwal 2015	100	113	4	35	140	76%	97%	97%	80%	50.7% (44.8–56.6%)
Banerjee 2015	100	11	18	1	80	92%	82%	38%	99%	10.9% (5.8–18.3%)
Högberg 2017	100	3	55	1	314	75%	85%	5%	100%	1.1% (0.29–2.7%)

TP = true positive; FP = false positive; TN = true negative; FN = false negative; PPV = positive predictive value; NPV = negative predictive value.

* When studies used both 50 and 100 µg/g cut-off values for the same patient, we only used the 50 µg/g value for our analysis.