

Table 1.

	<b>Reviewer 1</b>	<b>Reviewer 2</b>	<b>Reviewer 3</b>	<b>Overall</b>
<b>Accuracy</b>	89.1%	89.4%	88.9%	89.1%
<b>Sensitivity (95% CI)</b>	90.6% (73.8-97.5%)	100% (87.1-100%)	93.5% (77.2-98.9%)	94.8% (87.7-98.1%)
<b>Specificity (95% CI)</b>	85.7% (56.2-97.5%)	64.3% (35.6-86.0%)	78.6% (48.9-94.3%)	76.2% (60.2-87.4%)
<b>PPV (95% CI)</b>	93.5% (77.2-98.9%)	86.8% (71.1-95.0%)	90.6% (73.8-97.5%)	90.1% (82.1-94.9%)
<b>NPV (95% CI)</b>	80.0% (51.4-94.7%)	100% (62.9-100%)	84.6% (53.7-97.3%)	86.5% (70.4-94.9%)

Accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV) for each of three reviewers and aggregated across the entire sample comparing smartphone video ratings with v-EEG diagnoses of epileptic seizures (ES) and psychogenic non-epileptic seizures (PNES).