MJA
The Medical Journal of Australia

Supporting Information

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

Appendix to: Bell KJL, Macaskill P, Loy C. Test accuracy and potential sources of bias in diagnostic test evaluation. *Med J Aust* 2019; doi: 10.5694/mja2.50449.

Supplementary Table: Magnetic resonance imaging angiography (MRA) and digital subtraction angiography (DSA) results in 31 patients*

MRA measurement (mm)	Aneurysm or not according to DSA
1.21	NO
1.45	NO
1.96	NO
2.26	NO
2.51	NO
2.77	YES
2.97	NO
2.98	YES
3.24	YES
3.49	NO
3.52	YES
3.75	YES
3.91	YES
4.02	YES
4.27	YES
4.92	YES
4.94	NO
4.97	YES
4.99	YES
5.47	YES
5.95	YES
5.98	YES
6.45	YES
6.98	YES
8.37	YES
8.40	YES
8.41	YES
9.43	YES
9.97	YES
13.50	YES
15.40	YES

* DSA threshold of 3.0 mm used to define presence or absence of aneurysm. We extracted data for MRA and DSA from Figure 4B, Mallouhi et al[4] using Plot Digitizer. We used the following formulae to calculate MRA measurement and DSA measurement for the 31 individuals from the Figure (Bland–Atman limits-of-agreement plot of differences between test values against their means for each of the 31 people):

$$\text{MRA (mm)} = \text{mean} + \left(\frac{\text{difference}}{2}\right)$$

$$\text{DSA (mm)} = \text{mean} - \left(\frac{\text{difference}}{2}\right)$$