Wellcome Trust Lecture 1 Questions
http://dcnapp1.dcn.ed.ac.uk/neurotube/player/player.asp?vidID=aop82134

Lecturer: Dr R Al Shahi Salman
Copies of the original papers being described are in the delegate packs if you would like to read them, they're very interesting.

Q: Do you have any evidence of how often these findings have actually led to intervention, was there any evidence of that in the papers you reviewed?
A: No that was not described in those papers, No.

Q: I've seen papers sighting the incidence as much higher, at about 10%, perhaps that was because of the other non-incidental findings?
A: It depends how you define incidental findings, and I have been careful to exclude these markers of cerebrovascular disease which at the moment have unknown therapeutic implications, or even diagnostic implications. I think you see the play of chance there, many of these studies are quite small themselves, so I think that's why meta-analysis can give you a more precise answer overall, but you may see in some of these findings that are reporting higher prevalence's that they are perhaps using the higher resolution sequences, that we have shown in sub-group analysis, tend to detect more incidental findings or they may have older patients, again which we have found influences things. So those are the 3 reasons I think that might influence that.

Q: In the studies you included in your meta-analysis do you know how many of them had Radiologists or other brain image analysis experts looking at the studies?
A: Yes, by no means were all of them examined by Neuro-Radiologists. It was certainly less than 100% of them. A neurologist was involved in some of them or a neuro-radiologist, and in some of them there was an untrained clinician interpreting the images, which has limitations.

Q: So that might account for that discrepancy?
A: Yes it was difficult to explore that. We did not find a systematic difference between those studies where the neuroradiologist reported the prevalence of incidental findings and a non-radiologist reported them, but with all the various confounding variables at play, I think it is hard to pick up, even with this number of patients, all those various influences.