Supplementary Table 6．Impact of prevalence of ≥F2, ≥F3 and F4 on PPV and NPV of LSM, and for the cutoff for Se=0.90, cutoff for Youden index and cutoff for Sp=0.90

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Prevalence | Justification | Cutoff  for  Se=0.90 | Cutoff for Youden index | Cutoff for Sp=0.90 |
| Diagnostic of ≥F2 |  |  | Cutoff=  5.3kPa | Cutoff=  9.4kPa | Cutoff=  13.3kPa | |
|  | 0.61 | Actual prevalence in our cohort | PPV=64%  NPV=71% | PPV=83%  NPV=56% | PPV=85%  NPV=47% | |
|  | 0.40 | Estimated prevalence in diabetic clinic [21] | PPV=44%  NPV=80% | PPV=68%  NPV=74% | PPV=71%  NPV=67% | |
|  | 0.07 | Estimated prevalence in general population [23] | PPV=8%  NPV=97% | PPV=19%  NPV=96% | PPV=22%  NPV=95% | |
| Diagnostic of ≥F3 |  |  | Cutoff=  6.1kPa | Cutoff=  9.4 kPa | Cutoff=  15kPa | |
|  | 0.36 | Actual prevalence in our cohort | PPV=40%  NPV=80% | PPV=58% NPV=80% | PPV=69%  NPV=73% | |
|  | 0.18 | Estimated prevalence in diabetic clinic [21] | PPV=21%  NPV=91% | PPV=35%  NPV=91% | PPV=47%  NPV=87% | |
|  | 0.02 | Estimated prevalence in general population [24] | PPV=2%  NPV=99% | PPV=5%  NPV=99% | PPV=8%  NPV=99% | |
| Diagnostic of F4 |  |  | Cutoff=  11kPa | Cutoff=  11kPa | Cutoff=  21.4kPa | |
|  | 0.04 | Actual prevalence in our cohort | PPV=9%  NPV=99% | PPV=9%  NPV=99% | PPV=13%  NPV=98% | |
|  | 0.03 | Estimated prevalence in patients at risk of liver disease [25] | PPV=8%  NPV=99% | PPV=8%  NPV=99% | PPV=11%  NPV=98% | |
|  | 0.01 | Estimated prevalence in general population [25] | PPV=3%  NPV=99.7% | PPV=3%  NPV=99.7% | PPV=4%  NPV=99.3% | |