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Abstract

Peripheral arterial disease (PAD) is associated with cerebral and coronary artery disease. Symptomatic PAD affects about 5% of people over 55 years; many more have asymptomatic PAD. Early detection enables modification of arterial disease risk factors. Diagnostically, assessment of symptoms or signs can be unreliable; ankle brachial pressure index (ABPI) testing is time-consuming and few healthcare professionals are properly trained. This study assessed the diagnostic accuracy of multi-site photoplethysmography (MPPG), an alternative non-invasive test for PAD, in primary care.

PAD patients identified from general practice registers were age- and sex-matched with controls. Participants were assessed using MPPG, ABPI and duplex ultrasound (DUS). Outcome measures were sensitivity and specificity of MPPG and ABPI (relative to DUS) and concordance.

MPPG test results were available in 249 of 298 eligible participants from 16 practices between May 2015 and November 2016. DUS detected PAD in 101/249 (40.6%). MPPG sensitivity was 79.8% (95% confidence interval [CI] 69.9-87.6%), with specificity 71.9% (95% CI 63.7-79.2%). ABPI sensitivity was 80.2% (95% CI 70.8-87.6%), with specificity 88.6% (95% CI 82-93.5%).

With comparable sensitivity to ABPI, MPPG is quick, automated and simpler to do than ABPI; it offers the potential for rapid and accessible PAD assessments in primary care.
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Introduction

Peripheral arterial disease (PAD) is common in middle-aged and older patients. It is symptomatic in approximately 5% of those aged between 55 and 75 years but many times more have asymptomatic PAD. It carries a poor prognosis once well established, via its association with cerebral and coronary artery disease. Its major risk factors are smoking, diabetes, hypertension and hyperlipidaemia. Classic symptoms include intermittent claudication (predictable, repeatable ischemic calf pain on exertion due to reduced tissue perfusion, relieved by rest). As it progresses patients may present with pain at rest, tissue gangrene or ulceration (critical limb ischemia) which has only a 50-60% 5-year survival. Claudication symptoms are highly specific but have a low sensitivity as PAD is often asymptomatic, even in patients with hemodynamically significant large vessel disease. There is also evidence that those with PAD are offered fewer risk reduction strategies in the United Kingdom National Health Service (NHS) than other groups of vascular patients. Since 2011, General Practitioner (GP) practices have been incentivized to create PAD registers to address risk factors in these patients. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance recommends less invasive treatments, focusing on need for diagnostics in primary care and commissioning encourages adopting innovative diagnostic devices, especially if cost saving.

Detecting PAD early gives the opportunity to control its vascular risk factors and reduce adverse cardiovascular events. NICE Guidelines recommend diagnosis through symptoms and signs (S&S) and measurement of the ankle brachial pressure index (ABPI) in the first instance. However, S&S alone can have a poor diagnostic accuracy. Additionally, the ABPI test is time-consuming, requires an experienced operator, does not allow measurement of transient state and may produce false negatives in people with falsely elevated ankle pressure due to stiff arteries (e.g. in diabetic, renal and elderly patients). Furthermore, the amount of training healthcare professionals receive in ABPI measurement varies; this is a barrier to its widespread adoption. Consequently, diagnosis of PAD in primary care is often made via S&S alone, or by referral to secondary care if suspected. The Edinburgh Claudication
Questionnaire (ECQ) is based on S&S, is known to have limitations in sensitivity and specificity\textsuperscript{17}, and evidence of its uptake in is lacking. There is a need for an accurate test for primary care use.\textsuperscript{18}

We have introduced multi-site photoplethysmography (MPPG) which uses low-level near-infrared light non-invasively to detect the tissue blood volume pulse\textsuperscript{19} at multiple body sites, and have quantified the levels of agreement between MPPG and ABI in a hospital setting for both sensitivity and specificity.\textsuperscript{19–22}

We have now developed a portable device with novel probes, rapid operation and automated pulse analysis, with potential to be less time consuming and require less training than ABPI in primary care. The aim of this study was to assess prospectively the diagnostic test accuracy, relative to duplex ultrasound (DUS), of MPPG in a primary care setting with respect to the accuracy of ABPI, ECQ and PAD registers.

**Methods**

**Study design**

A prospective diagnostic accuracy study in a primary care setting (ISRCTN13301188\textsuperscript{23}). The index test was the novel prototype MPPG device; the comparator test was ABPI; the reference test, to confirm the presence or absence of PAD, was DUS.\textsuperscript{11} This study compares the diagnostic performance of MPPG and ABPI with DUS and measures the concordance of MPPG and ABPI. Diagnostic performances of ECQ\textsuperscript{24} and GP PAD registers\textsuperscript{25} for the same participants compared with DUS have already been reported.

**Participants**

Participants were recruited from 16 practices in North East England between May 2015 and November 2016. PAD patients were identified from GP registers, and matched with controls by sex and age (within 5 years). The study protocol\textsuperscript{23,26} was approved by Newcastle & North Tyneside 1 Research Ethics Committee (14/NE/1238); all participants provided written informed consent.
Participants were required to be ≥45 years and excluded if: they were receiving renal support therapy; had significant limb tremor; had damaged skin at a PPG measurement site (great toe or index finger); were unable to tolerate ABPI; had toe or limb amputation.

Participants made two visits within 1 month. Visit 1 was for screening and enrolment by a Vascular Research Nurse who recorded sex, height, weight, demographics, past medical history (diabetes, hypertension, ischemic heart disease, stroke, transient ischemic attack and atrial fibrillation), smoking status and medications, and administered an ECQ. Visit 2 was for measurements by a Practice Nurse of MPPG, ABPI, heart rate and blood pressures (systolic, diastolic, mean arterial and pulse), and DUS of both legs by a Vascular Scientist. Practice Nurses were trained and assessed in MPPG and ABPI by a Vascular Research Nurse prior to the study.

The estimated sample size was 250 participants (80% power, 5% significance level and equal numbers with and without PAD). A pre-test probability of .5 was representative of the target population: Bendermacher et al reported PAD prevalence of 48.3% in patients visiting their GP with symptoms suggestive of intermittent claudication.

PAD assessments

Measurements were made in examination rooms (mean ambient temperature 22.9±1.4°C). Subjects lay supine for 10 min prior to ABPI and MPPG measurements with 5 min rest between. The order of these measurements was alternated and DUS was performed last with the Vascular Scientist blinded to earlier results. Practice nurses and Vascular Scientist were blinded to the referral details, but blinding to PAD status was impractical since PAD can result in observable changes to extremities. Besides any ongoing medication on and between visits there were no additional clinical interventions between the index and reference tests.
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Reference test

A duplex ultrasonography system (M-Turbo, Fujifilm Sonosite Inc., Bothell, WA, USA) was used on both lower limbs to detect the presence of disease in the arterial lumen from groin to ankle, from images and blood velocity waveforms. The Vascular Scientist used a 7-feature grading system, derived from Thrush and Hartshorne, to classify patients as PAD+ (significant disease detected in either leg) or PAD- (significant disease in neither).

Index test

Bilateral pulses were measured with MPPG from the right and left great toe pads while the subject lay comfortably supine and still. Prior to recording, the practice nurse checked signal quality and PPG gain for each toe (Figure 1).

Digitized signals were recorded at 500 Hz for 60 s. Individual pulses were extracted using R-wave gating from the single-lead ECG, measured at the finger probes. Each pulse was normalized in time and amplitude, checked for validity and clustered with other pulses of similar shape. The median pulse used to calculate the Shape Index (SI) was based on the largest cluster; PPG signals with insufficient pulses (≤15) in the largest cluster were considered inconclusive.

The prospective cut-off threshold for SI was 0.71. If exceeded in either leg it was classed as test positive for hemodynamically significant PAD (PAD+) and PAD- otherwise. If neither leg could be measured, or if one leg was normal and the other could not be measured, the MPPG was recorded as “inconclusive”.

Comparator test

ABPI was measured using a hand-held 8 MHz Doppler ultrasound probe, blood pressure cuffs of appropriate size and a manual sphygmomanometer (Huntleigh Dopplex ABPI Kit, Huntleigh Healthcare Ltd, Cardiff, UK). The cuff pressure was raised at least 30 mmHg supra-systolic until the pulse could no longer be heard and then reduced, noting the pressure at pulse re-appearance. Right and left brachial artery pressures, and both right and left foot pressures were measured. If a foot artery was incompressible and the pulse still audible then a not recordable pressure was noted. Where measurements were available,
the highest value from the foot was divided by the highest brachial pressure. A ratio of <0.9 for either leg was considered as PAD+, consistent with guidelines\textsuperscript{11} and our previous work.\textsuperscript{21} If neither leg could be measured, or if one leg was normal and the other could not be measured, or both arms could not be measured, then ABPI was recorded as “Inconclusive”. Measurements in either leg of >1.3 were suggestive of the presence of calcification or incompressible arteries and these patients were assigned ABPI “Inconclusive”.

Data analysis

Summary statistics

Height and BMI were described as mean and standard deviation. Number (and %) were used for previous medical history. Matching of the groups was checked with Chi-squared test of proportions for sex, smoking status and previous medical history; Student’s t-test for age and BMI.

Diagnostic test accuracy

Diagnostic performances were per-participant rather than per-leg as diagnostically it is the patient who would have PAD. 3x3 contingency tables were formed from the binary PAD+ and PAD- outcomes plus inconclusive tests. The proportion of test failures was summarized for the index and comparator tests. Sensitivity (Se), specificity (Sp), positive (LR+) and negative (LR-) likelihood ratios and diagnostic odds ratios (DOR) were calculated from conclusive tests. Differences between sensitivity and specificity for MPPG vs ABPI were tested using a two sample test for equality of proportions with continuity correction.\textsuperscript{33} McNemar’s test was used for concordance of MPPG and ABPI. The significance level was <0.05.

Analytical methods

Information from each clinical history sheet, ABPI report, duplex report and ECQ was collated in a spreadsheet controlled by the Clinical Trial Manager. SIs were calculated from MPPG signals by JW using Python.\textsuperscript{34} Statistical analyses were by AJS using R\textsuperscript{35} (v4.1.1) and package “mada”.\textsuperscript{36} Analytical code was incorporated into the manuscript using markdown.\textsuperscript{37} Results were independently checked by IG.
and TAWB. Study reporting followed the STAndards for Reporting Diagnostic accuracy (STARD) statement.\textsuperscript{38}

## Results

### Participants

A sample of 125 PAD and 125 non-PAD patients were recruited as per protocol. Due to a protocol breach where one of the sites reported ABPI measurements consistently in a non-standard fashion, and did not adequately rest patients before performing the MPPG, these subjects were excluded and recruitment was extended to include a further 48. In total 306 patients consented to recruitment; 8 withdrew after consent and before DUS, leaving 298 eligible (149 PAD patients and 149 controls); 49 had no valid index test (48 at the excluded site and 1 with missing PPG data), leaving 249 available for analysis (125 PAD patients and 124 controls), Figure 2. The baseline characteristics of participants are summarized in Table 1. There is overall sex-matching of DUS PAD+ and PAD- groups, and age-matching to within 5 years.

### Diagnostic accuracy

The reference test was successful in all 249 participants, with 101 (40.6\%) positive for PAD. The prevalence was lower than the 50\% intended because the GP PAD registers, on which allocation to PAD or normal was based, were found to have sensitivity and specificity of <1 (Table 3).\textsuperscript{25}

Systolic pressure was recorded in both arms in 248 patients; in 6 patients, pressure could not be measured in the dorsalis pedis nor the posterior tibial artery in one or both feet. The left or right leg ABPI exceeded 1.3 in 17 patients and was inconclusive in 8.4\%, Table 2a. There was evidence of terminal digit preference (rounding of recorded values to the nearest 10): of 497 valid brachial artery pressure measurements, 185 (37.2\%) were zero; of 961 valid foot artery pressure measurements, 368 (38.3\%) were zero.
MPPG was successful in 228 patients (Table 2b). The MPPG failure rate was 8.4%, due mainly to missetting of the manual gain controls and signal quality of the ECG sensor used on the trial device. There were no adverse events from performing the index, comparator or reference tests.

There was significant non-concordance between index and comparator tests (p<0.001), Table 2c. The diagnostic performance of both tests compared with DUS is shown in Figure 3 and Table 3, with diagnostic accuracy of PAD registers and ECQ provided for reference. There was no difference in sensitivity between MPPG and ABPI (79.8 vs 80.2%; p=1), but there was a significant difference in specificity (71.9 vs 88.6%; p=0.001).

Discussion
PAD carries a poor prognosis once established, owing to its association with cerebral and coronary artery disease. However, if accurately identified, “at risk” patients can have optimal early risk factor treatment to reduce risk of disease progression, adverse cardiovascular events and mortality. Ideally a test for PAD would be appropriate for use in primary care as in the majority of cases it can be managed without referral to secondary care, if a reliable diagnosis can be made.

Measurement of ABPI, for confirmation of the presence of PAD, is currently recommended by guidelines worldwide. It usually takes 20 to 30 minutes, including a 10 minute period of supine rest and is suitable for use in primary care but has known disadvantages. Arterial calcification resulting in incompressible arteries, especially in diabetics, renal and older patients, can render the ABPI non-diagnostic. Additionally, resting ABPI may be less sensitive in milder PAD, either because an arterial stenosis is not hemodynamically significant or because collateral vessels are present. Most reports would consider a stenosis of ≥50% as diagnostically positive for PAD, but such a stenosis would usually not be hemodynamically significant at rest. Diagnostic performance of ABPI may be improved by post-exercise testing, but this adds significant complexity, time and expense. In one study nearly half the patients referred for suspected arterial disease had normal resting ABPI. These factors may be particularly
important in some asymptomatic or minimally symptomatic PAD patients, and ABPI would fail to identify them. Protocol variations,\textsuperscript{41} and inter-observer variability may also reduce its accuracy. Additionally, it may be less accurate when used by less skilled or occasional operators.\textsuperscript{42} In a recent retrospective study compared with DUS, ABPI was only moderately predictive, with sensitivity of 72.3\% and specificity of 69.3\%.\textsuperscript{43} Especially in diabetics another approach has been to use toe pressure measurements, part of the widely used Wound, Ischemia and foot Infection (WIfI) scoring system\textsuperscript{44}, but their use is less suitable for use in primary care. However, measurement at the toe, as with toe pressures and the MPPG technique, may improve diagnostic accuracy by detecting more distal disease.\textsuperscript{45}

ABPI testing is not universally used for PAD diagnosis and anecdotally the majority of patients referred to secondary care vascular units have not had an ABPI. Automated oscillometric ABPI devices, such as the MESI device (MESI Ltd., Ljubljana, Slovenia), are diagnostically equivalent to conventional ABPI but may be quicker to use, and are in principle less prone to operator variability.\textsuperscript{14} However there does not appear to be validation of their use against a reference standard.

We have previously reported poor GP PAD Register accuracy\textsuperscript{25} (sensitivity 86.1\%, specificity 74.5\%). It is highly likely that due to poor diagnostic accuracy in primary care, PAD patients are being missed, leading to lost opportunities for vital early management. We have also highlighted issues with using just symptoms for diagnosis such as the ECQ\textsuperscript{24} (sensitivity 52.5\%; specificity 87.1\%).

At least 50\% of individuals with diagnostic ABPI in population surveys have no claudication symptoms and current guidelines are mainly focused on the management of symptomatic PAD. Furthermore, the QRISK2 score\textsuperscript{47} was not improved by the addition of PAD but it is possible that MPPG offers predictive value in cardiovascular risk assessment, as a diagnosis of PAD in itself identifies high cardiovascular risk.

We have previously reported a qualitative study which demonstrates that users perceived MPPG to be quicker and easier to use than ABPI,\textsuperscript{48} and like ABPI it is safe. An updated version of the MPPG device
includes automatic gain control, ECG with conventional electrodes and real-time pulse analysis; we expect these will reduce its test failure rate.

Our study had limitations. Although a case-control approach was suitable for optimizing trial efficiency by artificially adjusting prevalence, there is a risk of the approach leading to spectrum bias by favoring the inclusion of those with established PAD, and who appear on a register, over those who have early stage or mild PAD. Secondly, although we excluded one site due to observed failure of measurement protocol, we cannot rule out the possibility of unobserved measurement protocol breaches at other sites. Thirdly, time constraints in the project required us to measure MPPG with a prototype device while designing a more ergonomic version in parallel, which limited our opportunity to compare aspects of human factors with ABPI.

This was a prospective controlled trial to assess MPPG in a representative population. It had equivalent sensitivity to ABPI; specificities differed, but we found that ABPI was not always performed correctly, even in a trial setting. We have previously shown that healthcare professionals prefer MPPG to ABPI.48. We plan further developments to the MPPG technology, making it fully portable and plan further studies to investigate its economic case and its utility in subgroups, e.g. diabetes and AF. MPPG offers promise the potential for rapid and accessible PAD assessments in primary care.
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### Tables

**Table 1:**
Patient demographics, risk factors and comorbidities. PAD as assessed by DUS. Age and BMI (body mass index) are shown as mean (SD); smoking status and previous medical history of diabetes, ischemic heart disease (IHD), stroke transient ischemic attack (TIA) and atrial fibrillation (AF) are shown as number (%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All</th>
<th>PAD+</th>
<th>PAD-</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (y)</td>
<td>71.9 (8.6)</td>
<td>73.3 (8.2)</td>
<td>70.8 (8.8)</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (M:F)</td>
<td>155:94</td>
<td>66:35</td>
<td>89:59</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMI (kg m^−2)</td>
<td>27.3 (4.6)</td>
<td>27.2 (5)</td>
<td>27.4 (4.4)</td>
<td>0.703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- never</td>
<td>70 (28.1)</td>
<td>13 (12.9)</td>
<td>57 (38.5)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- ex</td>
<td>127 (51)</td>
<td>61 (60.4)</td>
<td>66 (44.6)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- current</td>
<td>52 (20.9)</td>
<td>27 (26.7)</td>
<td>25 (16.9)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>59 (23.7)</td>
<td>28 (27.7)</td>
<td>31 (20.9)</td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>147 (59)</td>
<td>69 (68.3)</td>
<td>78 (52.7)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IHD</td>
<td>59 (23.7)</td>
<td>40 (39.6)</td>
<td>19 (12.8)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>18 (7.2)</td>
<td>9 (8.9)</td>
<td>9 (6.1)</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIA</td>
<td>23 (9.2)</td>
<td>16 (15.8)</td>
<td>7 (4.7)</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AF</td>
<td>20 (8)</td>
<td>7 (6.9)</td>
<td>13 (8.8)</td>
<td>0.771</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2:
Diagnostic cross-tabulations (numbers of participants) of ankle-brachial pressure index (ABPI), Table 2a, and multi-site photoplethysmography (MPPG), Table 2b, relative to duplex ultrasound (DUS). Pairwise comparison of MPPG and ABPI, Table 2c.

**Table 2a**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DUS PAD+</th>
<th>DUS PAD-</th>
<th>DUS PAD Inconclusive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABPI PAD+</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI PAD-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI PAD Inconclusive</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2b**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DUS PAD+</th>
<th>DUS PAD-</th>
<th>DUS PAD Inconclusive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPG PAD+</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td>39</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPG PAD-</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>100</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPG PAD Inconclusive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>101</strong></td>
<td><strong>148</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 2c**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ABPI PAD+</th>
<th>ABPI PAD-</th>
<th>ABPI PAD Inconclusive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MPPG PAD+</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPG PAD-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPG PAD Inconclusive</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>136</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>249</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3:
Diagnostic accuracy for peripheral arterial disease (PAD) of primary care PAD registers\textsuperscript{25}, ECQ\textsuperscript{24}, ankle-brachial pressure index (ABPI) and multi-site photoplethysmography (MPPG) vs duplex ultrasound reference test. n: number of pairwise comparisons with conclusive index test and reference test; LR+: positive likelihood ratio; LR-: negative likelihood ratio; DOR: diagnostic odds ratio. Ranges in brackets are 95% confidence intervals.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Sensitivity (%)</th>
<th>Specificity (%)</th>
<th>LR+</th>
<th>LR-</th>
<th>DOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registers</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>86.1 (77.8-92.2)</td>
<td>74.5 (66.7-81.3)</td>
<td>3.4 (2.5-4.5)</td>
<td>0.19 (0.11-0.31)</td>
<td>18.2 (9.3-35.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECQ</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>52.5 (42.3-62.5)</td>
<td>87.1 (80.6-92)</td>
<td>4.1 (2.6-6.4)</td>
<td>0.55 (0.44-0.68)</td>
<td>7.4 (4.0-13.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABPI</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>80.2 (70.8-87.6)</td>
<td>88.6 (82-93.5)</td>
<td>7.1 (4.3-11.5)</td>
<td>0.22 (0.15-0.34)</td>
<td>31.6 (15.1-66.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MPPG</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>79.8 (69.9-87.6)</td>
<td>71.9 (63.7-79.2)</td>
<td>2.8 (2.1-3.8)</td>
<td>0.28 (0.18-0.43)</td>
<td>10.1 (5.4-19.1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure legends

Figure 1. The multi site photoplethysmography (MPPG) device used in the study: (a) schematic diagram of signals and data flow; (b) signal processing unit and data collection computer; (c) finger probe capable of measuring photoplethysmogram (PPG) and electrocardiogram (ECG); (d) toe probe used for measuring PPG. In this study, PPG signals were measured at the toes and ECG from the finger probes.

Figure 2. Flow of participants through the study. DNA: did not attend; PPG: photoplethysmography.

Figure 3. Diagnostic prospective performances of multi-site photoplethysmography (MPPG) and ankle-brachial pressure index (ABPI) in primary care with respect to the duplex ultrasound (DUS) reference test for peripheral arterial disease (PAD) detection. An ideal diagnostic test would be placed in the top left corner with sensitivity (Se; true positive rate) of 1, and a false positive rate (1 - Sp) of 0. The Se and (1 - Sp) show the comparable accuracy between PPG and ABPI. Also shown are the previously published diagnostic performance of the Edinburgh Claudication Questionnaire (ECQ) and GP PAD registers relative to DUS, also from the NOTEPAD trial.
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