Contents

Chapter 1

Introduction to Method Comparison Studies

1.1 Introduction

The problem of assessing the agreement between two or more methods of measurement is ubiquitous in scientific research, and is commonly referred to as a 'method comparison study'. Published examples of method comparison studies can be found in disciplines as diverse as pharmacology (**?**), anaesthesia (**?**), and cardiac imaging methods (**?**).

To illustrate the characteristics of a typical method comparison study consider the data in Table I (**?**). In each of twelve experimental trials, a single round of ammunition was fired from a 155mm gun and its velocity was measured simultaneously (and independently) by three chronographs devices, identified here by the labels 'Fotobalk', 'Counter' and 'Terma'.

Round	Fotobalk [F]	Counter [C]	Terma [T]
1	793.8	794.6	793.2
2	793.1	793.9	793.3
3	792.4	793.2	792.6
4	794.0	794.0	793.8
5	791.4	792.2	791.6
6	792.4	793.1	791.6
7	791.7	792.4	791.6
8	792.3	792.8	792.4
9	789.6	790.2	788.5
10	794.4	795.0	794.7
11	790.9	791.6	791.3
12	793.5	793.8	793.5

Table 1.1: Velocity measurement from the three chronographs (Grubbs 1973).

An important aspect of the these data is that all three methods of measurement are assumed to have an attended measurement error, and the velocities reported in Table 1.1 can not be assumed to be 'true values' in any absolute sense.

A method of measurement should ideally be both accurate and precise. **?** describes agreement as being a broader term that contains both of those qualities. An accurate measurement method will give results close to the unknown 'true value'. The precision of a method is indicated by how tightly measurements obtained under identical conditions are distributed around their mean measurement value. A precise and accurate method will yield results consistently close to the true value. Of course a method may be accurate, but not precise, if the average of its measurements is close to the true value, but those measurements are highly dispersed. Conversely a method that is not accurate may be quite precise, as it consistently indicates the same level of inaccuracy. The tendency of a method of measurement to consistently give results above or below the true value is a source of systematic bias. The smaller the systematic bias, the greater the accuracy of the method.

In the context of the agreement of two methods, there is also a tendency of one measurement method to consistently give results above or below the other method. Lack of agreement is a consequence of the existence of 'inter-method bias'. For two methods to be considered in good agreement, the inter-method bias should be in the region of zero. A simple estimation of the inter-method bias can be calculated using the differences of the paired measurements. The data in Table 1.2 are a good example of possible inter-method bias; the 'Fotobalk' consistently recording smaller velocities than the 'Counter' method. Consequently one would conclude that there is lack of agreement between the two methods.

The absence of inter-method bias by itself is not sufficient to establish whether two measurement methods agree. The two methods must also have

equivalent levels of precision. Should one method yield results considerably more variable than those of the other, they can not be considered to be in agreement. With this in mind a methodology is required that allows an analyst to estimate the inter-method bias, and to compare the precision of both methods of measurement.

1.2   Grubbs' FCT Data