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Overview of this Session

• Background information
• Reporting of diagnostic accuracy in test manuals
• Influences on diagnostic accuracy
• Practice determining accuracy of selected tests
• Wrap up
What is Diagnostic Accuracy?

Diagnostic accuracy refers to the accuracy with which scores obtained on a test classify children as having language impairment (LI) or having typically developing language (TLD).
Why is Diagnostic Accuracy Important?

Clinicians use test results as part of the diagnostic process
• We want our diagnoses to be accurate

Clinicians use tests to determine eligibility for service
• We want to provide services to children with LI
• We do not want to provide services to children with TLD
Diagnostic Accuracy as Reported in Test Manuals

- **Impaired diagnosed as Impaired**
  - *Sensitivity*-proportion of LI children correctly diagnosed as LI by the test

- **Normal diagnosed as Normal**
  - *Specificity*-proportion of TLD children correctly diagnosed as TLD
Two Influences on Sensitivity and Specificity

1. The **distribution (mean and sd)** of
   a. the **children with LI**
   b. the **children with TLD**
Two Influences on Sensitivity and Specificity

2. The cut score
Refresher: The Normal Distribution

Test scores for the normative sample create a distribution.

(normal distribution = normal curve = bell curve)

Assumption: We are referring to tests with standard scores having a mean of 100 (with a standard deviation of 15).
Refresher: Relationships among scores based on the normal distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Standard Score (SD 15)</th>
<th>% rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ 3</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>&gt; 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 2</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ 1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 1.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 2</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- 3</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>&lt; 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In a nutshell, the lower the standard score, the fewer the children who received a score at or below that score.
Refresher: The Normal Distribution

Not all distributions are normal.

Distributions with a small SD are narrower.
Distributions with a large SD are wider.
Three Distributions Important in Determining Diagnostic Accuracy

Normative Sample:
Results used to develop a test’s conversion table

Children with LI

Children with TLD
Three Distributions Important in Determining Diagnostic Accuracy

Normative Sample

Children with LI

Children with TLD
Influence on Sensitivity and Specificity # 1

• The relationship between the distributions of the children with LI and the children with TLD.
When the distributions overlap, any standard scores that are achieved by both groups of children (by children with LI as well as by children with TLD) are problematic.
The Relationship between the Two Distributions

The relationship between the distributions is affected by
a. the amount of variation in each distribution
b. the distance between the means of the two groups
Variation in the Distributions

Distributions with less variation
(\(SD < 15\))

Distributions with more variation
(\(SD > 15\))
Distance between Group Means

Large distance between means

Small distance between means
Relationship between the Distributions

Overlapping distributions are problematic.
If a child receives a standard score of 80 -
Does the child have language impairment?
Or
Does the child have typically developing language?
Overlapping distributions are problematic. If a child receives a standard score of 80 - Does the child have language impairment? Or Does the child have typically developing language?
The cut score

• The location of the cut score impacts the child’s diagnosis.
Influence # 2: The cut score

Example 1:
Cut score = 87

A child who receives a standard score of 87 or less will be identified as having LI.
Influence # 2: The cut score

Example 2:
Cut score = 70

A child with LI who receives a standard score of 70 or lower will be identified as having LI.
Reporting of Information Related to Diagnostic Accuracy in Test Manuals
Information Provided in Test Manuals

1. The diagnostic accuracy table
2. Sensitivity/Specificity
Four Tests that Include Sensitivity and Specificity

- **PLS-4** (Preschool Language Scale – 4)
- **CELF-4** (Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – 4)
- **CELF-P2** (Clinical Evaluation of Language Fundamentals – Preschool)
- **DELV-NR** (Diagnostic Evaluation of Language Variation – Norm Referenced)
Diagnostic Accuracy in the PLS-4

*Image removed due to copyright restrictions*
## Diagnostic Accuracy Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Language Impairment (LI)</td>
<td>Typically Developing Language (TLD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Impairment (LI)</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typically Developing Language (TLD)</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Example: Diagnostic Accuracy of the **PLS-4**

*(Zimmerman, Steiner, and Pond, 2002)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>TLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Children ages 3:0 to 5:11
(Table 7.13, p. 214)

Cut Score of 85 (found on page 212 in the PLS-4 manual).
Example: Diagnostic Accuracy of the **PLS-4**

*(Zimmerman, Steiner, and Pond, 2002)*

Children ages 3:0 to 5:11

(Table 7.13, p. 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLS-4 (total test score)</th>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI 60</td>
<td>TLD 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD 15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculating Sensitivity
Example: Diagnostic Accuracy of the PLS-4
(Zimmerman, Steiner, and Pond, 2002)

Children ages 3:0 to 5:11
(Table 7.13, p. 214)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLS-4</strong> (total test score)</td>
<td><strong>LI</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LI</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TLD</strong></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Calculating Sensitivity
**Calculating Sensitivity:** Determine the percentage of children with an existing diagnosis of LI who also received a diagnosis of LI on the test under investigation.  

**Sensitivity = A/(A+C)**
### PLS-4 Sensitivity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLS-4 Total Test</th>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Total Test Sensitivity**  \(0.80\) \([60/(60 + 15)]\)

80% of the children with an existing diagnosis of LI were also identified as having LI using the **PLS-4**.

Cut Score of 85 (found on page 212 in the **PLS-4** manual).
**Example: Diagnostic Accuracy of the PLS-4**

*(Zimmerman, Steiner, and Pond, 2002)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Children ages 3:0 to 5:11</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>TLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing Diagnosis</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS-4 (total test score)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculating Specificity**
Example: Diagnostic Accuracy of the **PLS-4**  
*(Zimmerman, Steiner, and Pond, 2002)*

Children ages 3:0 to 5:11  
*(Table 7.13, p. 214)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLS-4 (total test score)</th>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| LI                      | 60                 | 9  
| TLD                     | 15                 | 66  

Calculating Specificity
**Calculating Specificity:** Determine the percentage of children with an existing diagnosis of TLD who also received a diagnosis of TLD on the test under investigation.

**Specificity** = \( \frac{D}{D+B} \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>Existing Diagnosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**PLS-4 Specificity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Test</th>
<th>LI</th>
<th>TLD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LI</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TLD</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Existing Diagnosis**

- **LI**: 60
- **TLD**: 66

- **Total Test Specificity** \(0.88 \quad [66/ (66 + 9)]\)

88% of the children with an existing diagnosis of TLD were also identified as having TLD using the **PLS-4**.

Cut Score of 85 (found on page 212 in the test manual).
Deciding what Level of Diagnostic Accuracy is Acceptable

• **Clinical importance of test’s ability to discriminate**

• Are the **social values and social consequences of mis-identification serious?**
  - TLD misdiagnosed as LI
  - LI misdiagnosed as TLD

• Accurate discrimination should have relatively stringent guidelines
Recommended levels of Sensitivity and Specificity  (Plante & Vance, 2004)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSITIVITY &amp; SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION OF DIAGNOSTIC ACCURACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥90%</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-89%</td>
<td>FAIR (ACCEPTABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td>UNACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results for the **PLS-4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSITIVITY &amp; SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION OF DIAGNOSTIC ACCURACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥90%</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-89%</td>
<td>FAIR (ACCEPTABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td>UNACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use the **PLS-4**

• Find the sensitivity and specificity for children ages **4:0 to 4:11**.

• How does it compare to the results for all ages collapsed (3:0 to 5:11)?
PLS-4 page 213  Image removed due to copyright restrictions
• Consistent -1.0SD cut-off

• Different sensitivity and specificity based on age of child (3.0-3.11; 4.0-4.11; 5.0-5.11)

• Different sensitivity and specificity based on whether you are interested in
  » Total Language Score
  » Auditory Comprehension Score
  » Expressive Communication Score
Changes in the Cut Score Impact Sensitivity and Specificity
The children with LI have mean of 72.7 with an SD of 9.9.

The children with TLD have a mean of 100.1 with an SD of 12.4.
Influence of the distributions

**DELV-NR**

The children with LI have **mean of 72.7** with an **SD of 9.9**.

The children with TLD have a **mean of 100.1** with an **SD of 12.4**.

Cut Score = - 1 SD
Influence of the distributions

**DELV-NR**

The children with LI have **mean of 72.7** with an **SD of 9.9**.

The children with TLD have a **mean of 100.1** with an **SD of 12.4**.

Cut score = - 1.5 SD
Influence of the distributions

**DELV-NR**

The children with LI have **mean of 72.7** with an **SD of 9.9**.

The children with TLD have a **mean of 100.1** with an **SD of 12.4**.

Cut score = - 2 SD
Influence of the Distributions Combined with Changes in the Cut Score: DELV-NR

What happened to diagnostic accuracy as the cut score moved farther from the mean?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>- 1 SD</th>
<th>- 1.5 SD</th>
<th>- 2 SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitivity decreased</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specificity increased</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Table 7.11, p. 140)
PRACTICE: The influence of the cut score

• Use the CELF-4

• Find the classification table (Table 8.18)

• As the cut score moves farther from the mean
  – what happens to the sensitivity?
  – what happens to the specificity?
The influence of the Cut Score: CELF-4

• Cut score of –1 SD
The influence of the Cut Score: **CELF-4**

- Cut score of $-1.5$ SD

![Diagram showing standard deviation, standard score, and percentile rank distributions with a cut score at $-1.5$ SD marked.]
The influence of the Cut Score: **CELF-4**
Page 272 CELF-4 image removed due to copyright restrictions
Results for the **CELF-4**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SENSITIVITY &amp; SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>INTERPRETATION OF DIAGNOSTIC ACCURACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>≥90%</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80%-89%</td>
<td>FAIR (ACCEPTABLE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;80%</td>
<td>UNACCEPTABLE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**CELF-4 Review**

- Provides sensitivity and specificity info for all ages combined
- Provides sensitivity and specificity info for different cut-off scores (-1.0SD, -1.5SD, -2.0SD)
- Sensitivity decreases as the cut score moves farther from the mean
What should you do if sensitivity and specificity are not provided in the test manual?

• **Best approach: Read research** that provides diagnostic accuracy information
## Found in Research:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>SENSITIVITY</th>
<th>SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>CUT-OFF</th>
<th>CUT-OFF SD</th>
<th>AUTHORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPELT-II</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>-3.25 SD</td>
<td>Plante &amp; Vance, 1994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELT-III</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>-.33 SD</td>
<td>Perona, Plante &amp; Vance, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELT-P</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>-1.40 SD</td>
<td>Plante &amp; Vance, 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPELT-P2</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>-.87 SD</td>
<td>Greenslade, Plante, &amp; Vance, 2009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Found in Research (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>SENSITIVITY</th>
<th>SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>CUT-OFF</th>
<th>CUT-OFF SD</th>
<th>STUDY AUTHORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPVT-III</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>+.23 SD</td>
<td>Gray, Plante, Vance, &amp; Henrichsen, 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWPVT</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-.20 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOWPVT-R</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>-.27 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>-.20 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Found in Research (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>SENSITIVITY</th>
<th>SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>CUT-OFF</th>
<th>CUT-OFF SD</th>
<th>STUDY AUTHORS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>THE RENFREW BUS STORY</strong></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>Info Score: 87</td>
<td>Info Score: -.87 SD</td>
<td>Pankratz, Plante, Vance &amp; Insalaco, 2007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length Score: 99</td>
<td>Length Score: -.10 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TEEM PEST</strong></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>-1.69 SD</td>
<td>Merrell &amp; Plante, 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-2.67 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Review: Sensitivity & Specificity Summary
(Spaulding, Plante, & Farinella, 2006)

Do the test manuals report information on sensitivity and specificity?

- Only 9 of the 43 tests reported

The cut-off scores that they reported ranged from -1.0SD to -2.0SD
Sensitivity & Specificity of Tests

(Spaulding, Farinella, & Plante, 2006)
Sensitivity & Specificity of Tests
Cut-off Scores
(Spaulding, Farinella, & Plante, 2006)

Child Language Test

-2.0 SD
-1.0 SD
by age
Update: Sensitivity/Specificity In Manuals...2009
Three years later

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>SENSITIVITY</th>
<th>SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>CUT-OFF</th>
<th>CUT-OFF SD</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bracken-Expressive</strong>*</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.0 SD</td>
<td>Language Impaired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptive</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.0 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DELV-NR</strong>**</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.0 SD</td>
<td>Language Disordered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CELF-P2</strong>*</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.0 SD</td>
<td>Not Specified</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* **Fair** level of diagnostic accuracy (criterion: Plante & Vance, 1994)
** **Good** level of diagnostic accuracy (criterion: Plante & Vance, 1994)
Update: Sensitivity/Specificity In Manuals...2009
Three years later (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>SENSITIVITY</th>
<th>SPECIFICITY</th>
<th>CUT-OFF</th>
<th>CUT-OFF SD</th>
<th>POPULATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAVA**</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>-1.0 SD</td>
<td>Special Ed with Vocab Deficits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.0 SD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TWFD**</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>97.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>PT 1 SCORE OF 31%</td>
<td>Word Finding Disordered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Fair level of diagnostic accuracy* (criterion: Plante & Vance, 1994)

**Good level of diagnostic accuracy** (criterion: Plante & Vance, 1994)
What should you do if sensitivity and specificity are not provided in the test manual?

• What if there isn’t any research?

• You might be tempted to use a cut score that seems reasonable.
Using + 1 SD above the mean for children with LI as the Cut Score

• A cut score of + 1 SD above the mean for children with LI will have sensitivity of approximately .84 (correctly identifying approximately 84% of children with LI).
Examples of Standard Score Means for Children with LI

• Tests in which the mean standard score is directly stated in the manual

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TEST</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>+ 1 SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPVT-4 (ages 8 – 12 yrs)</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>102.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REEL-3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOWPVT-3</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>16.52</td>
<td>100.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOLD-I:4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EVT-2 (ages 3 – 7 yrs)</td>
<td>88.1</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>100.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• Using a cut score of 100 to 103 would be hard to justify! (specificity may be too high!)
What does this mean for you, as an SLP?

• You will need to read the test manuals!

• You will need to teach others about appropriate cut scores for tests of language development and why the cut scores are not the same across tests!

• You will need to advocate for change!
What this Means......

• If we are using standardized tests for diagnostic purposes, we should be using *test specific cut-off scores* to assist in the diagnosis.

• We should be choosing tests with high levels of sensitivity and specificity.

• This is possible---so let’s demand that from test developers.
References


Tests

• This HOME GUIDE will help you to:

1) Determine the diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) of standardized tests

2) To determine if the sensitivity and specificity rates are acceptable.

3) To determine the standard deviation cut-off score that is appropriate to use for the test in order to increase the chances of making an accurate diagnosis.
1) Is there a **Validity** section in the Table of Contents?
   • If **NO**, you will be hand searching through this entire manual. Start your search and skip to question 4.
   • If **YES**, go to question 2.

2) Is there a section under **Validity** that either says *Clinical Validity*, *Discriminant Analysis*, or indicates *Special Populations*?
   • If **YES**, turn to this section in the manual, and skip to question 4.
   • If **NO**, go to question 3.

3) Is there a section under **Validity** that says *Construct Validity*?
   • If **YES**, turn to this section and go to question 4.
   • If **No**, turn to the Validity section of the manual and go to question 4.
TAKE HOME GUIDE (continued)

4) Is sensitivity and specificity information available in the manual and calculated for you?
   • If YES, indicate sensitivity and specificity rates and skip to question 6.
     Sensitivity: ___________________ Specificity:___________________
   • If NO, go to question 5.

5) Is sensitivity and specificity information able to be calculated from information provided in the test manual?
   • If YES, calculate the sensitivity and specificity rates using the formula and go to question 6.
     Sensitivity: ___________________ Specificity:___________________
   • If NO, you are done. You don’t know the diagnostic accuracy of this test.
6) What is the standard deviation (or standard score) cut-off score to obtain that level of sensitivity and specificity? _______

• If there IS one, go to question 8.
• If there IS NOT one, this test is not useful for diagnosing language impairment because you don’t know what cut-off to use.

7) Is the level of sensitivity and specificity .80 (80%) or better?

• If YES, this is an acceptable level of diagnostic accuracy. Use the cut-off they provide.
• If NO, this is not an acceptable level of diagnostic accuracy to use the test for this purpose.
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