



# Screening

**Dr. Akhilesh Bhargava**

MD, DHA, PGDHRM

Prof. Community Medicine

&

Director-SIHFV, Jaipur

# Screening



**“ application of a medical procedure  
or a test,  
*rapidly*,  
to people who as yet have *not*  
developed *symptoms* of disease  
for the purpose of  
determining their *likelihood of*  
*developing* of disease” .**

# Why screen



**Purpose:**

**To reduce morbidity/mortality  
by *detection at an early stage*  
where treatment is more successful,  
and cost effective**

*Assumption- “Favorable prognosis”  
as treatment will start before clinical  
manifestation and arrest the  
process*



# Screening criteria

**a disease need to satisfy:**

- Life threatening, irreversible, serious
- Treatment at early stage to be more effective than one given after.
- High prevalence of detectable pre-clinical stage

# Qualities of screening test

- ✓ **Low cost**
- ✓ **Easy to administer**
  - **skills**
  - **technique**
  - **minimal discomfort**
- ✓ ***Valid***
- ✓ **Reliable**
- ✓ **Reproducible**

# Validity

“ability of a test to do what it is intended to do”

expressed as sum of-

***Sensitivity+***

***Specificity+***

***Reliability***(reproducibility)

***Yield***

# Sensitivity

“ A test’s ability to designate an individual with a disease as positive”, expressed as  $a/(a+c)$

Highly ***sensitive***

- ***a few false negatives***
- ***fewer cases of disease missed***

| Test | Disease |     |     |
|------|---------|-----|-----|
|      | +ve     | -ve |     |
| +ve  | a       | b   | a+b |
| -ve  | c       | d   | c+d |
|      | a+c     | b+d |     |

Results depend on criteria of positivity

# Specificity

“ability of a test to designate an individual who **does not** have a disease as **negative**, expressed as  $d / b+d$  .”

a highly specific test:

- a few false positives
- a fewer cases without disease are included

| Test | Disease |     |     |
|------|---------|-----|-----|
|      | +ve     | -ve |     |
| +ve  | a       | b   | a+b |
| -ve  | c       | d   | c+d |
|      | a+c     | b+d |     |



# Changes in specificity/sensitivity...

? Ideal:

**Sensitivity 100%**

**Specificity 100%** (Increase in one at cost on other and depend on positivity criterion)



Less stringent- sensitivity increases

(more of actually diseased test +ve,  
no. without disease also increase)

More strict - specificity increases

(large no. test -ve, more no. of true cases  
will be missed)

# Conditions that ask for increase---

## **Increase Sensitivity-**

- serious diseases
- a definite treatment exists
- subsequent diagnostic tests cost less

## **Increase Specificity-**

- subsequent diagnosis costly, risky



# Reliability

**“ ability to reproduce same results with consistency ”**

## **Factors:**

Biological variations

Variation in method of testing

Intra-observer variation

Inter- observer variation

# Evaluation of a screening test/program

Disease's appropriateness determined  
Valid test available



Can a screening test be introduced ?

***Feasibility ?***  
***Effectiveness ?***

# Feasibility

- Acceptability
  - Quick
  - Easy to administer-Less discomfort
- Cost-effectiveness
  - Total cost
  - Unit cost
  - Follow-up cost
- Subsequent diagnosis & treatment of +ve
- Yield (no. detected)

Measure- ***Predictive value***

# Predictive value of a test

*“ a measure to ascertain whether or not a person tested positive, has the disease ”*

| Test  | Disease        |                  |                           |
|-------|----------------|------------------|---------------------------|
|       | Present        | Absent           |                           |
| +ve   | 900(a)<br>(TP) | 4950(b)<br>(FP)  | PV+ve<br>(TP/TP+FP)=91%   |
| -ve   | 100(c)<br>(FN) | 94050(d)<br>(TN) | PV-ve<br>(TN/FN+TN)=99.9% |
| Total | 1000           | 99000            |                           |

Sensitivity-TP/TP+F=

Specificity-TN/FP+TN=

# Predictive value - interpretations

Influencers- **Validity**-increasing specificity,  
increases PV+ve test

**Prevalence** of pre-clinical disease

900 4950 5850  
100 94050 94150

900 1980 2880  
100 97020 97120

sens.- $a/a+c=90\%$

90%

speci.- $d/b+d=95\%$

98%

PV+ve- $a/a+b=15.4\%$

31.3%

PV-ve-  $d/c+d=99.9\%$

99.9%

# PV- interpretations...

| Change in -prevalence | PV+ve | Sensitivity | Specificity |
|-----------------------|-------|-------------|-------------|
| 0.1                   | 1.8   | 90          | 95          |
| 1.0                   | 15.4  | 90          | 95          |
| 5.0                   | 48.6  | 90          | 95          |
| 50.0                  | 94.7  | 90          | 95          |

*PV+ve can be increased by*  
*-increasing specificity*  
*-increasing prevalence*





# Effectiveness

Screening objective- To reduce morbidity/mortality through early detection & offering treatment in pre-clinical stage

To be effective-

- groups need to be comparable
- scrutinized for ascertainment of outcome
- bias reduced

# Bias in screening

- Self-selection
- Lead time bias (identification during screening ----- diagnosis after symptoms)  
Time
- Length bias- over representation of those with long pre-clinical phase, amongst screened  
(heterogeneous nature of disease, prevalence dependent on duration)