

# 1 A computational way station for reporting 2 network meta-analyses

3 Charles T. Gray, Gavin Stewart, Matthew Grainger

4 January 31, 2021

## 5 **1 Network meta-analysis reporting according** 6 **to Cochrane protocols**

### 7 **1.1 Network meta-analysis**

8 Pairwise analyses between treatment and control, exposed and unexposed,  
9 intervention and no intervention, are conventionally undertaken with meta-  
10 analysis in fields such as ecology, medicine, and the social sciences [1]. Net-  
11 work meta-analysis provides a means of comparing three or more treatments  
12 or interventions, including control or placebo [6]. The question answered by  
13 a network meta-analysis is not *if* a treatment works, but *which* treatments  
14 perform better, comparatively [4]. A particularly useful aspect of network  
15 meta-analysis is combining the results of more than one pairwise analysis and




Figure 1: This network shows the direct evidence provided by pairwise comparisons in seven studies on treatments for Parkinson’s disease [14]. Each node represents a treatment, including one placebo, represented by the fourth node. Where there is an edge connecting two treatment nodes, there exists a pairwise comparison in the literature between these two treatments. Where there is no edge connecting the nodes of the network, there is no direct evidence.

constructing indirect comparisons, where pairwise evidence is unavailable, from a network of direct comparisons. An example of direct comparisons provided by existing evidence is shown in Figure 1. Network meta-analysis converts the network to a complete graph, where all treatments are compared with all other treatments, that is, every node connects to every other node via direct or indirect comparison.

Software to implement network meta-analyses are relatively new and do not provide complete toolchains for specific protocols, such as reporting results according to Cochrane’s handbook [6]. For example, the handbook recommends reporting the network of direct evidence, for which the R pack-

age `multinma::` includes a tool [14], an example of which is shown in Figure 1. However, the handbook also recommends reporting a **contribution matrix** of the percentage of each study’s contribution to the estimated overall effect, and this is not provided as a visualisation tool with `multinma::`.

Furthermore, open source scientific software is shifting from all-purpose packages for an entire analysis, such as `metafor::`, to smaller task-specific software packages. One method of aggregation of tools is a **metapackage**, such as `tidyverse::` [19], for data engineering, which comprises a number of packages that each pertain to different problems, such as `ggplot2::` for data visualisation, and `dplyr::` for Boolean data manipulation. Here we explore another way of aggregating resources, for the specific purpose of network meta-analysis reporting: a computational **way station**, a temporary resting place between two points of travel, of toolchains and tool development. Since protocols and tools are still being developed, this is a way station between a single person’s analysis, and a resource that is definitive for all practitioners to follow.

## 1.2 Reporting protocols

The Methodological Expectations of Cochrane Intervention Reviews (MECIR) manual [5] provides a collection of recommendations for reporting Cochrane reviews in compliance with the Preferred Reporting Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-analysis [8] (PRISMA). The Cochrane Handbook [6] further recommends that extended PRISMA guidelines [7] are fol-

48 lowed for reporting network meta-analyses, as PRISMA guidelines apply to  
49 pairwise comparisons, whereas network meta-analyses compare multiple in-  
50 terventions.

51 These guidelines are necessarily prescriptive, in order to facilitate evidence  
52 synthesis; for example, the title must include "network meta-analysis" [7].  
53 As we are considering the computational implementation of network meta-  
54 analysis in this manuscript, we will focus on the statistical reporting elements  
55 of these protocols.

### 56 1.3 A snapshot of a living resource

57 In this manuscript, we next describe the gaps in the toolchain for implement-  
58 ing network meta-analysis via R according to Cochrane's reporting standards.  
59 Standards for network meta-analysis are not, however, fixed, but in devel-  
60 opment, and Cochrane's reporting standards may not be appropriate for,  
61 say, ecological network meta-analyses. Thus, instead of aiming to provide  
62 a complete toolchain for network meta-analysis, we instead propose a com-  
63 putational way station as a meeting place for stakeholders with different  
64 priorities to provide perspective and collaborate. This way station is a **liv-**  
65 **ing resource**, in anticipation of future updates following stakeholder input  
66 and computational development, comprising multiple points of access:

67 **website** A website with vignettes of toolchains. Currently the existing solu-  
68 tions for Cochrane's reporting standards are provided, however there is

69 scope for future vignettes for network meta-analyses according to other  
70 discipline or organisational protocols.

71 **open source code repository** Source code is provided for toolchains and  
72 software extensions.

73 **contributing** Detailed instructions for different stakeholders with varying  
74 levels of mathematical and computational training to contribute.

75 **issues** In addition to the source code, the issues associated with the code  
76 repository provide a public record for discussions.

77 Living resources provide a solution to the problem of overabundance of  
78 systematic reviews, flooding literature to the point that decision makers are  
79 unsure of where to look [3, 10, 11, 16]. Consider Covid-19, where in the first  
80 88 days after naming the disease, there already existed 88 systematic reviews,  
81 one for every day since the disease was named [13]. Cochrane’s COVID-NMA  
82 initiative (<https://covid-nma.com/>) is a living synthesis solution to this prob-  
83 lem, via network meta-analysis of regularly updated Covid-19 research [2].

84 **nmareporting::** is also a living resource, but to solve a different problem.  
85 How to bring people together for open scientific collaboration when not all  
86 the solutions exist. As a package it is not ready for CRAN, and may never be  
87 intended for CRAN. In some ways similar to the **rethinking::** package the  
88 accompanies the canonical<sup>1</sup> text, *Statistical Rethinking*, the intention of this

---

<sup>1</sup>At the time of writing *Statistical Rethinking* has 1243 citations.

89 software is not to ship a polished piece of software to CRAN, or a publish a  
90 manuscript with a definitive toolchain [9]. Rather, this manuscript provides a  
91 snapshot of a living resource for open collaboration on network meta-analysis  
92 reporting.

## 93 2 Toolchain gaps in Cochrane reporting stan- 94 dards

95 There exist several software packages for conduction network meta-analysis in  
96 R; for example, `gemtc::` [18], `multinma::` [14], and `netmeta::` [17]. Different  
97 tools will no doubt have unique advantages and disadvantages, however, there  
98 is no one tool for all reporting standards for a Cochrane network meta-  
99 analysis. Furthermore, visualisations and reporting for meta-analysis are  
100 still being developed.

### 101 2.1 Missing tables and improved visualisations

102 Cochrane recommends reporting the percentage each study contributes to  
103 the overall estimated effect via a **contribution matrix**, shown in Figure 2.

104 The `netmeta::` package has tools for contribution matrices, but if one  
105 is performing the analysis with, say, `multinma::`, it is unclear how to piece  
106 together the tools to produce a complete set of Cochrane reporting.

107 Visualisations, too, are still in development. A recent improvement on

**Figure 11.6.b** Contribution matrix for the network on interventions for heavy menstrual bleeding presented in Figure 11.4.a. Four direct comparisons in the network are presented in the columns, and their contributions to the combined treatment effect are presented in the rows. The entries of the matrix are the percentage weights attributed to each direct comparison. The intervention labels are: A, first generation hysteroscopic techniques; B, hysterectomy; C, second generation non-hysteroscopic techniques; D, Mirena

		Direct comparisons in the network (% contribution)			
		A-B	A-C	A-D	C-D
Network meta-analysis estimates	Mixed estimates				
	A-B	100.0			
	A-C		97.8	1.1	1.1
	A-D		34.5	34.1	34.5
	C-D		14.4	14.4	71.2
	Indirect estimates				
	B-C	49.6	48.9	0.7	0.7
	B-D	38.5	28.0	15.5	28.0
Entire network		34.4	36.4	10.5	21.7
Included studies		5	11	1	3

Figure 2: A contribution matrix shows what percentage each study contributes to the overall estimated effect in a network meta-analysis. This is the example given in the Cochrane Handbook [6].

standard forest plots are orchard plots which contain not only credible intervals, but prediction intervals, and group studies categorically, particularly useful for large meta-analyses [12]. `nmareporting::` is a place where implementation of orchard plots for network meta-analysis can be developed.

## 2.2 Sensitivity

Sensitivity in network meta-analysis measures how much the studies agree in results. A standard approach to measuring this is a ‘leave one out analysis’ [1], shown in Figure 3, where a study is randomly selected to be omitted, and the meta-analysis is rerun to see if the results differ. We randomly<sup>2</sup>

<sup>2</sup>This manuscript is fully reproducible, with all analyses and code embedded in the document. The source for this manuscript can be found here:




Figure 3: On the left is a forest plot of all analyses. On the right is a forest plot of the analysis with a randomly selected study omitted.

117 select

```
## [1] "study_1"
```

118 to remove from the analysis.

119 In this case, there is little disagreement between the studies. However, it  
 120 does raise the question of what the analysis would report if another study  
 121 were omitted, and, indeed, what if more than one study were omitted? In  
 122 Figure 4, we provide aggregation of rankings of network meta-analyses run  
 123 on all subsets, of size three or greater, of the studies.

124 Unsurprisingly, the ranking are in agreement when including all seven  
 125 studies, with treatment 2 predicted to have the greatest reduction in the  
 126 measure of interest, the mean off-time reduction in patients given dopamine

<https://github.com/softcloud/nmareporting/blob/master/manuscript/draft/nmarep-ms.Rnw>.






Figure 4: Rankings for leave  $m$  out analyses, where  $m = 0, \dots, 4$  studies omitted from the total 7 studies available.

127 agonists as adjunct therapy in Parkinson’s disease [14]. And as treatment  
128 2 dominates in all subgroups, we surmise that there is confidence in the  
129 meta-analytic recommendation of treatment 2.

130 However, other possible inferences do exist in these rankings, supposing  
131 we did not have all seven studies, and it is easy to see how a different conclu-  
132 sion might be drawn. Furthermore, another drawback is that whilst leave  $m$   
133 studies (for  $m \leq k$  studies) works for seven studies, this analysis is not prac-  
134 tical for meta-analyses that aggregate a larger number of studies. Indeed,  
135 the number of network meta-analyses performed in this analysis is

```
## [1] 99
```

136 from seven studies. Clearly this type of analysis would become computa-  
137 tionally intractable for larger meta-analyses.

138 A more robust approach would be threshold analysis, where an **invariant**  
139 **interval** is provided for each study, showing the interval in which the study’s  
140 results will not change the ranking [15]. However, this solution is challenging,  
141 involving mathematics and **stan** syntax, so providing toolchains, guides, and  
142 support for practitioners will surely be helpful.

### 143 **3 Computational way station for open and** 144 **inclusive scientific method development**

145 Stakeholders engage with meta-analyses in multiple ways. A lead researcher  
146 may not be interested in interacting with code repositories, but may well have  
147 thoughts about how to improve reporting for inference. A computational  
148 collaborator may wish to contribute tools for related analyses, even if not  
149 directly involved in the project.

150 In this section, we consider developing a toolchain for reporting a Cochrane  
151 network meta-analysis, considering how different researchers may wish to  
152 provide feedback on the implemented protocol. With increasing levels of  
153 computational complexity, we step through how researchers in various roles  
154 might contribute.

#### 155 **3.1 Domain-specific principal investigator**

156 Consider a study where the principal investigator (PI) is a psychologist who  
157 delegates statistical analysis to other members of the team: a lead statis-  
158 tician, and a postdoctoral scholar under their supervision. The PI will in-  
159 terpret the meta-analytic findings, but will not wish to interact with code  
160 repositories. In this case, an email address of the primary maintainer (the  
161 postdoctoral scholar) of the living resource is provided for comments that can  
162 then be converted to issues by the maintainer on the repository for discussion  
163 amongst the community.

## 164 **3.2 Lead statistician**

165 The lead statistician will be comfortable with code, but will be time poor in  
166 comparison to the maintainer of the living resource, the postdoctoral scholar  
167 under their supervision. Whilst they may not have time to contribute they  
168 will likely have comments for the maintainer. They will likely have a GitHub  
169 account, and thus can contribute to the discussion via issues, where not  
170 only the maintainer, but any interested party can consider and add to the  
171 suggestions.

## 172 **3.3 Computational collaborators**

173 Now consider a computational ecologist, interested in developing tools and  
174 protocols for their own network meta-analyses. In this case, they may wish  
175 to contribute new vignettes to the website, with new toolchains, as well as  
176 develop new tools to fill the toolchain gaps.

177 The R package `usethis::` includes a workflow for contributing to some-  
178 one else's package<sup>3</sup> [20].

179 In Figure 5 is a sketch of the workflow for contributing to `nmareporting::`,  
180 the underlying code base of the site and development. Let us suppose  
181 the ecologist is contributing an ecology-specific vignette for network meta-  
182 analysis.

---

<sup>3</sup>Workflow documentation available here: <https://usethis.r-lib.org/articles/articles/pr-functions.html>

```

library(usethis)
# create a fork and clone
create_from_github("softloud/nmareporting")
# create a branch for the specific contribution
pr_init("ecovignette")
#
# ecologist then writes vignette
#
# contribute the vignette to the code repository
pr_push()
#
# waits for maintainer to merge
#
# once the maintainer has merged
pr_finish()

```

Figure 5: A workflow for contributing to the `nmareporting::` computational way station.

## 183 4 Conclusion

184 In the era of big data and rapid-fire advances in statistical software, research  
 185 is still adapting to what, in fact, constitutes a useful research artifact. Math-  
 186 ematical algorithms are conventionally implemented via software. Computa-  
 187 tional way stations provide a meeting point, between a scholar's inception of  
 188 an analysis technique, and it's formalisation in scientific protocol.

## References

- [1] Michael Borenstein, Larry V. Hedges, Julian P. T. Higgins, and Hannah R. Rothstein. *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons. Google-Books-ID: JQg9jdrq26wC.
- [2] Isabelle Boutron, Anna Chaimani, Joerg J. Meerpohl, Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, Declan Devane, Gabriel Rada, David Tovey, Giacomo Grasselli, and Philippe Ravaud. The COVID-NMA project: Building an evidence ecosystem for the COVID-19 pandemic. 173(12):1015–1017.
- [3] S. Gopalakrishnan and P. Ganeshkumar. Systematic reviews and meta-analysis: Understanding the best evidence in primary healthcare. 2(1):9–14.
- [4] Mathias Harrer, Prof Dr Pim Cuijpers<sup>2</sup>, Prof Dr Toshi A. Furukawa<sup>3</sup>, and Assoc Prof Dr David D. Ebert<sup>2</sup>. *Doing Meta-Analysis in R*.
- [5] JPT Higgins, T Lasserson, J Chandler, D Tovey, R Churchill, and others. Methodological expectations of cochrane intervention reviews. 5.
- [6] Julian PT Higgins, James Thomas, Jacqueline Chandler, Miranda Cumpston, Tianjing Li, Matthew J Page, and Vivian A Welch. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [7] Brian Hutton, Georgia Salanti, Deborah M. Caldwell, Anna Chaimani, Christopher H. Schmid, Chris Cameron, John P.A. Ioannidis, Sharon

- 209 Straus, Kristian Thorlund, Jeroen P. Jansen, Cynthia Mulrow, Ferrán  
210 Catalá-López, Peter C. Gøtzsche, Kay Dickersin, Isabelle Boutron, Dou-  
211 glas G. Altman, and David Moher. The PRISMA extension statement  
212 for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses  
213 of health care interventions: Checklist and explanations. 162(11):777–  
214 784. Publisher: American College of Physicians.
- 215 [8] Alessandro Liberati, Douglas G. Altman, Jennifer Tetzlaff, Cynthia Mul-  
216 row, Peter C. Gøtzsche, John P.A. Ioannidis, Mike Clarke, P. J. Dev-  
217 ereaux, Jos Kleijnen, and David Moher. The PRISMA statement for  
218 reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate  
219 health care interventions: Explanation and elaboration. 151(4):W–65.  
220 Num Pages: W-94 Publisher: American College of Physicians.
- 221 [9] Richard McElreath. *Statistical rethinking: A bayesian course with ex-*  
222 *amples in R and stan.* CRC Press.
- 223 [10] David Moher. The problem of duplicate systematic reviews. 347:f5040.  
224 Publisher: British Medical Journal Publishing Group Section: Editorial.
- 225 [11] Morten Hylander Møller, John P. A. Ioannidis, and Michael Darmon.  
226 Are systematic reviews and meta-analyses still useful research? we are  
227 not sure. 44(4):518–520.
- 228 [12] Shinichi Nakagawa, Malgorzata Lagisz, Rose E. O’Dea, Joanna  
229 Rutkowska, Yefeng Yang, Daniel W. A. Noble, and Alistair M.

- 230 Senior. The orchard plot: Cultivating a forest plot for  
 231 use in ecology, evolution, and beyond. 12(1):4–12. \_eprint:  
 232 <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/jrsm.1424>.
- 233 [13] David Naumann. Too many systematic reviews for a disease that has  
 234 existed for a few months.
- 235 [14] David M. Phillippo. `multinma`: Network meta-analysis of individual and  
 236 aggregate data in `stan`.
- 237 [15] David M. Phillippo, Sofia Dias, A. E. Ades, Vanessa Didelez,  
 238 and Nicky J. Welton. Sensitivity of treatment recommenda-  
 239 tions to bias in network meta-analysis. 181(3):843–867. \_eprint:  
 240 <https://rss.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/rssa.12341>.
- 241 [16] Derek Richards. Too many reviews too few trials. 19(1):2–2. Number:  
 242 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- 243 [17] Gerta Rücker, Ulrike Krahn, Jochem König, Orestis Efthimiou, and  
 244 Guido Schwarzer. `netmeta`: Network meta-analysis using frequentist  
 245 methods.
- 246 [18] Gert van Valkenhoef and Joel Kuiper. `gemtc`: Network meta-analysis  
 247 using bayesian methods.
- 248 [19] Hadley Wickham. `tidyverse`: Easily install and load the 'tidyverse'.



249 [20] Hadley Wickham and Jennifer Bryan. usethis: Automate package and  
250 project setup.