

Measures of Association

Solymosi Norbert


Quantitative veterinary epidemiology

Department of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases


University of Veterinary Medicine Budapest

- descriptive epidemiology (until now)
- analytic epidemiology
 - analysing the association between the suspected causal factor and the disease in the population
 - express the effect size of exposure on the health by absolute and relative association measures
- types
 - clinical trials
 - observational studies
 - cross-sectional the animals are sampled without considering health and exposure status beforehand
 - case-control the animals are included in the sample based on their health status
 - cohort the animals are included in the sample based on their exposure
 - prospective or retrospective


Case reports and case series




Cross-sectional study




Case-control study



Cohors study



Randomized Controlled Trial (RCT)



Association?

- Lyme borreliosis
 - whether the risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes is associated by antibiotic treatment?(Lakos and Solymosi, 2010)
 - what are the association and its strongness between the age of foresters and seropositivity?(Lakos et al., 2012)
- Dirofilaria
 - have the warmer areas higher risk of *D. immitis* or *D. repens* occurrence?(Farkas et al., 2020)
- Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography
 - what is the relationship between the chance of post ERCP pancreatitis and the rectal administrated indomethacin?(Patai et al., 2015)
- Stillbirth
 - is the risk higher in heifer?(Szenci et al., 2018)
- COVID-19
 - whether obesity affects the recovery of COVID-19 patients?(Nakeshbandi et al., 2020)

Exposure

- Lyme borreliosis
 - whether the risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes is associated by **antibiotic treatment**?
 - what are the association and its strongness between the **age** of foresters and seropositivity?
- Dirofilaria
 - have the **warmer** areas higher risk of D. immitis or D. repens occurrence?
- Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography
 - what is the relationship between the chance of post ERCP pancreatitis and the rectal administrated **indomethacin**?
- Stillbirth
 - is the risk higher in **heifer**?
- COVID-19
 - whether **obesity** affects the recovery of COVID-19 patients?

Outcome

- Lyme borreliosis
 - whether the risk of **adverse pregnancy outcomes** is associated by antibiotic treatment?
 - what are the association and its strongness between the age of foresters and **seropositivity**?
- Dirofilaria
 - have the warmer areas higher **risk of D. immitis or D. repens** occurrence?
- Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography
 - what is the relationship between the chance of **post ERCP pancreatitis** and the rectal administrated indomethacin?
- Stillbirth
 - is the **risk** higher in heifer?
- COVID-19
 - whether obesity affects the **recovery** of COVID-19 patients?

- Lyme borreliosis
 - whether the risk of adverse pregnancy outcomes is affected by antibiotic treatment?
 - what are the association and its strongness between the age of foresters and seropositivity?
- Dirofilaria
 - have the warmer areas higher risk of *D. immitis* or *D. repens* occurrence?
- Endoscopic retrograde cholangiopancreatography
 - what is the relationship between the chance of post ERCP pancreatitis and the rectal administrated indomethacin?
- Stillbirth
 - is the risk higher in heifer?
- COVID-19
 - whether obesity affects the recovery of COVID-19 patients?
- if we can identify factors that can be related to the outcome, it can be a base of controlling the disease (even if we don't know the exact causal chain)

The well known 2×2 table

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

dichotomous situation

The well known 2×2 table

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

The risk of the disease in the exposed group:

$$R_{E+} = \frac{a}{a + b}$$

The well known 2×2 table

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

The risk of the disease in the unexposed group:

$$R_{E-} = \frac{c}{c + d}$$

The well known 2×2 table

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

The risk of the disease in the whole population:

$$R_T = \frac{a + c}{a + b + c + d}$$

The well known 2×2 table

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

- Based on the R_{E+} , R_{E-} and R_T values, various association measures can be calculated.
- Main types:
 - measures of effect
 - measures of total effect
 - measures of therapeutic effect
 - measures of strength

Nakeshbandi et al. (2020) studied the effect of obesity on the recovery of COVID-19 patients (cohors design).

- 51 died of the 139 normal-weight patients
- 81 died of the 150 overweighted patients
- is there an association between death risk and obesity?
- if there is, how strong is it?

Nakeshbandi et al. (2020) studied the effect of obesity on the recovery of COVID-19 patients (cohors design).

- 51 died of the 139 normal-weight patients
- 81 died of the 150 overweighted patients
- is there an association between death risk and obesity?
- if there is, how strong is it?

| | Death+ | Death− | Σ | |
|------------|--------|--------|----------|--|
| Overweight | 81 | 69 | 150 | $R_{E+} = \frac{81}{150} = 540 \text{ cases/1000}$ $R_{E-} = \frac{51}{139} = 367 \text{ cases/1000}$ $R_T = \frac{132}{289} = 457 \text{ cases/1000}$ |
| Normal | 51 | 88 | 139 | |
| Σ | 132 | 157 | 289 | |

Nakeshbandi et al. (2020) studied the effect of obesity on the recovery of COVID-19 patients (cohors design).

- 51 died of the 139 normal-weight patients
- the incidence risk among the normal-weight patients
 $R_{E-} = 51/139 = 367 \text{ cases}/1000$
- 81 died of the 150 overweighted patients
- the incidence risk among the overweight patients
 $R_{E+} = 81/150 = 540 \text{ cases}/1000$
- the incidence risk in the whole population $R_T = 132/289 = 457 \text{ cases}/1000$
- is there an association between death risk and obesity?
- if there is, how strong is it?

Attributable risk (AR): the incidence risk of disease in the exposed that is attributable to exposure

$$AR = R_{E+} - R_{E-}$$

| | Death+ | Death- | Σ | |
|------------|--------|--------|----------|--|
| Overweight | 81 | 69 | 150 | $R_{E+} = \frac{81}{150} = 540 \text{ cases/1000}$ |
| Normal | 51 | 88 | 139 | |
| Σ | 132 | 157 | 289 | $R_{E-} = \frac{51}{139} = 367 \text{ cases/1000}$ |

$$AR = 540 - 367 = 173 \text{ cases/1000}$$

- describes the absolute frequency of disease associated with the exposure
- the incidence risk of death in overweight COVID-19 patients attributed to overweight is 173 cases/1000

Attributable fraction (AF): the proportion of disease in the exposed that is due to exposure

$$AF = \frac{R_{E+} - R_{E-}}{R_{E+}}$$

| | Death+ | Death- | Σ | |
|------------|--------|--------|----------|--|
| Overweight | 81 | 69 | 150 | $R_{E+} = \frac{81}{150} = 540 \text{ cases/1000}$ |
| Normal | 51 | 88 | 139 | |
| Σ | 132 | 157 | 289 | $R_{E-} = \frac{51}{139} = 367 \text{ cases/1000}$ |

$$AF = \frac{540 - 367}{540} = 0.32$$

- the proportion of disease in the exposed that is due to exposure
- 32% of death in overweight COVID-19 patients is attributable to overweight (AF=0.32)

Population attributable risk (PAR): the incidence risk of disease in the population attributable to exposure

$$PAR = R_T - R_{E-}$$

| | Death+ | Death- | Σ | |
|------------|--------|--------|----------|--|
| Overweight | 81 | 69 | 150 | $R_{E-} = \frac{51}{139} = 367 \text{ cases/1000}$ |
| Normal | 51 | 88 | 139 | |
| Σ | 132 | 157 | 289 | $R_T = \frac{132}{289} = 457 \text{ cases/1000}$ |

$$PAR = 457 - 367 = 90 \text{ cases/1000}$$

- the risk of death in COVID-19 patients that may be attributed to overweight is 90 cases/1000 (PAR=0.09)

Population attributable fraction (PAF): the proportion of disease in the population that is due to exposure

$$PAF = \frac{R_T - R_{E-}}{R_T}$$

| | Death+ | Death- | Σ | |
|------------|--------|--------|----------|--|
| Overweight | 81 | 69 | 150 | $R_{E-} = \frac{51}{139} = 367 \text{ cases/1000}$ |
| Normal | 51 | 88 | 139 | |
| Σ | 132 | 157 | 289 | $R_T = \frac{132}{289} = 457 \text{ cases/1000}$ |

$$PAF = \frac{457 - 367}{457} = 0.20$$

- 20% of death in COVID-19 patients is attributable to overweight (PAF = 0.20)

How would you describe the effect of the new drug?

Event rate the number of individual experiencing an event as a proportion of the number of individuals in the population


Absolute risk reduction, ARR the absolute difference between the untreated and treated group event rates

Absolute risk increase, ARI the absolute difference between the treated and untreated group event rates

Relative risk reduction, RRR the difference in event rates between 2 groups, expressed as a proportion of the event rate in the untreated group

Number needed to treat, NNT the number of patients who would have to receive the treatment for 1 of them to benefit
($NNT = 1/ARR$)

Number needed to harm, NNH the number of patients who would have to receive the treatment for 1 of them to experience an adverse effect ($NNH = 1/ARI$)

Group ■ untreated ■ treated


Suppose we study the effect of a new drug on COVID-19 patients with **high-risk** (e.g. older men).

Absolute risk reduction:

$$0.4 - 0.3 = 0.1$$

Relative risk reduction:

$$\frac{0.4 - 0.3}{0.4} = \frac{0.1}{0.4} = 0.25$$

Group ■ untreated ■ treated


*The same medicine was used in a **lower risk** group (e.g. young women)*

Absolute risk reduction:

$$0.1 - 0.075 = 0.025$$

Relative risk reduction:

$$\frac{0.1 - 0.075}{0.1} = \frac{0.025}{0.1} = 0.25$$

Group ■ untreated ■ treated

Absolute risk reduction:

High risk: $0.4 - 0.3 = 0.1$

Low risk: $0.1 - 0.075 = 0.025$

Relative risk reduction:

High risk: $\frac{0.4 - 0.3}{0.4} = 0.25$

Low risk: $\frac{0.1 - 0.075}{0.1} = 0.25$


The **absolute** risk reduction becomes smaller when event rates are low, whereas the **relative** risk reduction, or “efficacy” of the treatment, often remains constant

Number needed to treat (NNT)

High risk:
$$\text{NNT} = \frac{1}{0.4 - 0.3} = \frac{1}{0.1} = 10$$

Low risk:
$$\text{NNT} = \frac{1}{0.1 - 0.075} = \frac{1}{0.025} = 40$$

- if the NNT for treatment is 10:
 - the practitioner would have to give the treatment to 10 patients to prevent 1 patient from having the adverse outcome
 - each patient who received the treatment would have a 1 in 10 chance of being a beneficiary
- if the absolute risk reduction is large, you need to treat only a small number of patients to observe a benefit in at least some of them
- if the absolute risk reduction is small, you must treat many people to observe a benefit in just a few




Relative risk (RR): the incidence risk of disease in the exposed divided by the incidence risk of disease in the unexposed

$$RR = \frac{R_{E+}}{R_{E-}} = \frac{0.54}{0.367} = 1.47 = 1.47$$

Interpretation: the incidence risk of death in overweight COVID-19 patients is 1.47 times higher than the incidence risk of death in normal-weight COVID-19 patients

Reporting form: $RR=1.47$ (95% CI: 1.13 - 1.92).



When the time at risk is available, the incidence rate (IR) ratio is the **incidence rate** of disease in the exposed divided by the **incidence rate** of disease in the unexposed.

Incidence risk (or rate) ratio:

- provides an estimate of how many times more likely exposed individuals are diseased compared with non-exposed individuals
- if $RR = 1$:
 - then the risk of disease in the exposed and non-exposed groups are equal
- if $RR > 1$:
 - then exposure increases the risk of disease with greater departures from 1 indicative of a stronger effect
- if $RR < 1$:
 - then exposure (e.g. treatment) decreases the risk of disease
- can't be estimated in case-control studies, because we can't calculate incidence using case control data → OR



Risk $\frac{3}{10} = 0.30$

Odds $\frac{3}{7} = 0.43$

Odds ratio (OR): cohort studies

- the odds of disease in the exposed divided by the odds of disease in the unexposed

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

Odds in exposed group:

$$O_{E+} = \frac{a}{b}$$

Odds ratio (OR): cohort studies

- the odds of disease in the exposed divided by the odds of disease in the unexposed

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

Odds in unexposed group:

$$O_{E-} = \frac{c}{d}$$

Odds ratio (OR): cohort studies

- the odds of disease in the exposed divided by the odds of disease in the unexposed

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

Odds in whole population:

$$O_T = \frac{a + c}{b + d}$$

Odds ratio (OR): cohort studies

- the odds of disease in the exposed divided by the odds of disease in the unexposed

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

$$OR = \frac{O_{E+}}{O_{E-}}$$

$$O_{E+} = \frac{a}{b}, O_{E-} = \frac{c}{d}$$

Odds ratio (OR): cohort studies

- the odds of disease in the exposed divided by the odds of disease in the unexposed


| | Death+ | Death- | Σ |
|------------|--------|--------|----------|
| Overweight | 81 | 69 | 150 |
| Normal | 51 | 88 | 139 |
| Σ | 132 | 157 | 289 |

$$O_{E+} = \frac{81}{69} = 1.17$$

$$O_{E-} = \frac{51}{88} = 0.58$$

$$OR = \frac{1.17}{0.58} = 2.017 \text{ (95\% CI: 1.26 - 3.24)}$$

- the odds of adverse outcome, given exposure
- interpretation like RR



Odds ratio (OR): case-control studies

- the odds of exposure in the diseased divided by the odds of exposure in the undiseased

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | <i>a</i> | <i>b</i> | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | <i>c</i> | <i>d</i> | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

Odds in diseased group:

$$O_{D+} = \frac{a}{c}$$

Odds ratio (OR): case-control studies

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

Odds in disease free group:

$$O_{D-} = \frac{b}{d}$$

Odds ratio (OR): case-control studies

| | Disease+ | Disease− | Σ |
|-----------|----------|----------|-----------------|
| Exposure+ | a | b | $a + b$ |
| Exposure− | c | d | $c + d$ |
| Σ | $a + c$ | $b + d$ | $a + b + c + d$ |

$$OR = \frac{O_{D+}}{O_{D-}}$$

$$O_{D+} = \frac{a}{c}, O_{D-} = \frac{b}{d}$$

| Cohort study | Case-control study |
|--|--|
| <i>Sequence</i> | |
| 1. Define exposure status | 1. Define disease status |
| 2. Define disease status | 2. Define exposure status |
| <i>Measure of strength</i> | |
| RR or OR | OR |
| <i>Interpretation of odds ratio</i> | |
| Odds of disease in exposed, compared with odds of disease in unexposed | Odds of exposure in diseased, compared with odds of exposure in undiseased |

/home/sn/docs_archiv/PhD/Debrecen/dolgozat2/picts/forest.pdf

Final logistic
multiple-regression
models of risk factors
(within indicated radii)
for seropositivity of
swine units for
Aujeszky's disease in a
county of Hungary,
1998–2000. (Uninf.
LSC: Uninfected
large-scale swine unit).

Nodal status

Positive
Negative

Tumour size


≤ 2 cm
> 2 cm

Receptor status

Positive
Negative
Unknown

Previous chemotherapy

Yes
No

All patients

- Confidence intervals in subgroups are always wider than those for the main effect because of smaller numbers.
- If the interval for a subgroup crosses the **no effect point**, this is widely misinterpreted as a lack of effect in the subgroup even where the overall effect is significant.
- Interpretation of subgroup effects would be helped if this line was deemphasised or omitted and replaced by a bold vertical line at the **overall treatment effect** level, making it easier to see if a subgroup confidence interval differed significantly from the overall effect.

Cuzick (2005)

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | − | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

- outcome \sim exposure

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- outcome \sim exposure
- the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- outcome \sim exposure
- the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes
- the per os AB and non-treated groups do NOT have the same odds of adverse outcomes

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- outcome \sim exposure
- the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes
- the per os AB and non-treated groups do NOT have the same odds of adverse outcomes
- OR: 3.11

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- outcome \sim exposure
- the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes
- the per os AB and non-treated groups do NOT have the same odds of adverse outcomes
- OR: 3.11
- how sure can I be about that?

Lakos and Solymosi (2010)

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | − | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- hypothesis testing

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- hypothesis testing
- NULL hypothesis (H_0): the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes, $OR = 1$

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- hypothesis testing
- NULL hypothesis (H_0): the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes, $OR = 1$
- ALTERNATIVE hypothesis (H_a): the per os AB and non-treated groups do NOT have the same odds of adverse outcomes, $OR \neq 1$

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- hypothesis testing
- NULL hypothesis (H_0): the per os AB and non-treated group have the same odds of adverse outcomes, $OR = 1$
- ALTERNATIVE hypothesis (H_a): the per os AB and non-treated groups do NOT have the same odds of adverse outcomes, $OR \neq 1$
- OR: 3.11, $p = 0.2359$

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- the p-value expresses the probability that the value of OR is at least 3.11 if the true odds ratio is equal to 1

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- the p-value expresses the probability that the value of OR is at least 3.11 if the true odds ratio is equal to 1
- OR: 3.11, 95% CI: 0.51 - 21.60, $p = 0.2359$

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- the p-value expresses the probability that the value of OR is at least 3.11 if the true odds ratio is equal to 1
- OR: 3.11, 95% CI: 0.51 - 21.60, $p = 0.2359$
- if $p > 0.05$ and/or 95%CI contains the value 1.0, the result is STATISTICALLY not significant

| | Adverse outcome | | |
|--------------|-----------------|----|----------|
| | + | - | Σ |
| No treatment | 6 | 4 | 10 |
| Per os AB | 6 | 13 | 19 |
| Σ | 12 | 17 | 29 |

Adverse outcome:

cavernous hemangioma, cerebral bleeding, dysplasia coxae, hypospadias, muscular hypotonicity, neonatal jaundice requiring exchange transfusion, papulovesicular eruption at birth, premature birth pyloric stenosis, skeletal anomaly, small for dates, spontaneous abortion, stillbirth

- the p-value expresses the probability that the value of OR is at least 3.11 if the true odds ratio is equal to 1
- OR: 3.11, 95% CI: 0.51 - 21.60, $p = 0.2359$
- if $p > 0.05$ and/or 95%CI contains the value 1.0, the result is STATISTICALLY not significant
- p-value is not the probability of H_0 is true (false); it expresses only the extremity of observed values assuming H_0

m

| | Treatment | | |
|---------|-----------|-----|----|
| Outcome | no | per | os |
| + | 6 | 6 | |
| - | 4 | 13 | |

```
fisher.test(m)
```

Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data

```
data: m
```

```
p-value = 0.2359
```

```
alternative hypothesis: true odds ratio is not equal to 1
```

```
95 percent confidence interval:
```

```
0.5125188 21.6033358
```

```
sample estimates:
```

```
odds ratio
```

```
3.111034
```

```
(double_m = m*2)
```

```
Treatment
```

```
Outcome  no  per os
```

```
+   12      12
```

```
-    8      26
```

```
fisher.test(double_m)
```

```
Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data
```

```
data:  double_m
```

```
p-value = 0.05108
```

```
alternative hypothesis: true odds ratio is not equal to 1
```

```
95 percent confidence interval:
```

```
0.9190679 11.6961091
```

```
sample estimates:
```

```
odds ratio
```

```
3.179755
```

- a negligible difference of p values may have a significant consequence (0.051, 0.049)

```
(triple_m = m*3)
```

```
Treatment
```

```
Outcome  no  per os
```

```
+   18      18
```

```
-   12      39
```

```
fisher.test(triple_m)
```

```
Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data
```

```
data:  triple_m
```

```
p-value = 0.01285
```

```
alternative hypothesis: true odds ratio is not equal to 1
```

```
95 percent confidence interval:
```

```
1.17897 9.04624
```

```
sample estimates:
```

```
odds ratio
```

```
3.202991
```


Four hypothetical studies

- patients are given treatments A and B and asked which they prefer
- p-values are equal

| Number of patients receiving <i>A</i> or <i>B</i> | Numbers preferring <i>A</i> : <i>B</i> | % preferring <i>A</i> | two-sided p-value |
|--|---|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 20 | 15 : 5 | 75.00 | 0.04 |
| 200 | 115 : 86 | 57.00 | 0.04 |
| 2 000 | 1046 : 954 | 52.30 | 0.04 |
| 2 000 000 | 1 001 445 : 998 555 | 50.07 | 0.04 |


BEWARE FALSE CONCLUSIONS

Studies currently dubbed 'statistically significant' and 'statistically non-significant' need not be contradictory, and such designations might cause genuine effects to be dismissed.



WRONG INTERPRETATIONS

An analysis of 791 articles across 5 journals* found that around half mistakenly assume non-significance means no effect.



*Data taken from: P. Schatz *et al. Arch. Clin. Neuropsychol.* **20**, 1053–1059 (2005); F. Fidler *et al. Conserv. Biol.* **20**, 1539–1544 (2006); R. Hoeksma *et al. Psychon. Bull. Rev.* **13**, 1033–1037 (2006); F. Bernardi *et al. Eur. Sociol. Rev.* **33**, 1–15 (2017).

Observed case numbers

| Arverse outcome | <i>Treatment</i> | | | Σ |
|--------------------|------------------|----|-----|----------|
| | NO | PO | PAR | |
| yes | 6 | 6 | 8 | 20 |
| no | 4 | 13 | 58 | 75 |
| Σ | 10 | 19 | 66 | 95 |

Observed case numbers

| Arverse outcome | <i>Treatment</i> | | | Σ |
|--------------------|------------------|----|-----|----------|
| | NO | PO | PAR | |
| yes | 6 | 6 | 8 | 20 |
| no | 4 | 13 | 58 | 75 |
| Σ | 10 | 19 | 66 | 95 |

Expected case numbers

| Arverse outcome | <i>Treatment</i> | | | Σ |
|--------------------|------------------|----|-------|----------|
| | NO | PO | PAR | |
| yes | 2.11 | 4 | 13.89 | 20 |
| no | 7.89 | 15 | 52.11 | 75 |
| Σ | 10 | 19 | 66 | 95 |

Observed case numbers

| Arverse outcome | <i>Treatment</i> | | | Σ |
|--------------------|------------------|----|-----|----------|
| | NO | PO | PAR | |
| yes | 6 | 6 | 8 | 20 |
| no | 4 | 13 | 58 | 75 |
| Σ | 10 | 19 | 66 | 95 |


Expected case numbers

| Arverse outcome | <i>Treatment</i> | | | Σ |
|--------------------|------------------|----|-------|----------|
| | NO | PO | PAR | |
| yes | 2.11 | 4 | 13.89 | 20 |
| no | 7.89 | 15 | 52.11 | 75 |
| Σ | 10 | 19 | 66 | 95 |

Pearsons's residuals


| Arverse outcome | <i>Treatment</i> | | |
|--------------------|------------------|-------|-------|
| | NO | PO | PAR |
| yes | 2.68 | 1.00 | -1.58 |
| no | -1.38 | -0.52 | 0.82 |

$$r_{ij} = \frac{o_{ij} - e_{ij}}{\sqrt{e_{ij}}}$$



Lakos and Solymosi (2010)

Temperature measured in parallel inside and outside the stable



What is the relationship between outside and inside temperature?

- correlation: $R = 0.9938484$

How depends the inside temperature on outside temperature?

- linear regression

Coefficients:

| | Estimate | Std. Error | t value | Pr(> t) |
|-------------|----------|------------|---------|------------|
| (Intercept) | 3.261357 | 0.177733 | 18.35 | <2e-16 *** |
| T.o | 0.806852 | 0.007796 | 103.49 | <2e-16 *** |

Signif. codes: 0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Residual standard error: 0.4621 on 133 degrees of freedom

Multiple R-squared: 0.9877, Adjusted R-squared: 0.9876

F-statistic: 1.071e+04 on 1 and 133 DF, p-value: < 2.2e-16

- $\beta = 0.806852$, means the inner temperature increases with $\sim 0.81^\circ\text{C}$ by 1°C increase of outer temperature

```
dat = rbind(
  tibble(adverse.out=c(rep(1,6), rep(0,4)), AB='no'),
  tibble(adverse.out=c(rep(1,6), rep(0,13)), AB='po')
) %>% mutate(AB=relevel(factor(AB), 'po'))
```


```
fit = glm(adverse.out ~ AB, family=binomial(link='logit'),
data=dat)
summary(fit)
```

Coefficients:

| | Estimate | Std. Error | z value | Pr(> z) |
|-------------|----------|------------|---------|----------|
| (Intercept) | -0.7732 | 0.4935 | -1.567 | 0.117 |
| ABno | 1.1787 | 0.8126 | 1.451 | 0.147 |

```
round(exp(cbind(OR=coef(fit), confint(fit))),2)
```

| | OR | 2.5 % | 97.5 % |
|-------------|------|-------|--------|
| (Intercept) | 0.46 | 0.16 | 1.17 |
| ABno | 3.25 | 0.68 | 17.35 |



Lakos et al. (2012)

| | seropos | age |
|---|---------|-----|
| 1 | 0 | 33 |
| 2 | 1 | 41 |
| 3 | 1 | 50 |
| 4 | 1 | 50 |
| 5 | 0 | 55 |

```
fit = glm(seropos ~ age, family = binomial(link="logit"),
data=dat)
```

```
summary(fit)
```

Coefficients:

| | Estimate | Std. Error | z value | Pr(> z) |
|-------------|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|
| (Intercept) | -1.497757 | 0.215261 | -6.958 | 3.45e-12 *** |
| age | 0.023765 | 0.005055 | 4.701 | 2.59e-06 *** |

```
round(exp(cbind(OR=coef(fit), confint(fit))),2)
```


| | OR | 2.5 % | 97.5 % |
|-------------|------|-------|--------|
| (Intercept) | 0.22 | 0.15 | 0.34 |
| age | 1.02 | 1.01 | 1.03 |

| Reference | Level | β | OR | CI | <i>p</i> |
|------------|-------------|---------|-------|-------------|----------|
| Male | Female | 0.11 | 1.116 | 1.1–1.132 | 0.0000 |
| Non-white | White | −0.011 | 0.989 | 0.971–1.008 | 0.2643 |
| 45–65 | <45 | 0.376 | 1.456 | 1.404–1.509 | 0.0000 |
| | 65–80 | −0.208 | 0.813 | 0.799–0.827 | 0.0000 |
| | >80 | −0.272 | 0.762 | 0.746–0.777 | 0.0000 |
| 1998–2003 | 2004–2009 | 0.835 | 2.304 | 2.27–2.338 | 0.0000 |
| Poverty Q1 | Q2 | −0.042 | 0.959 | 0.94–0.978 | 0.0000 |
| | Q3 | −0.178 | 0.837 | 0.822–0.852 | 0.0000 |
| | Q4 | −0.254 | 0.775 | 0.758–0.793 | 0.0000 |
| Colon | Esophagus | −1.015 | 0.362 | 0.349–0.377 | 0.0000 |
| | Pancreas | −1.175 | 0.309 | 0.297–0.322 | 0.0000 |
| | Rectum | −0.563 | 0.569 | 0.557–0.582 | 0.0000 |
| | Small bowel | −1.466 | 0.231 | 0.219–0.244 | 0.0000 |
| | Stomach | −0.928 | 0.395 | 0.383–0.409 | 0.0000 |

Lymph node retrieval during surgery for GI cancer remains inadequate in a large proportion of patients in the USA, although the median number of resected nodes increased over the last 10 years. Gender and socioeconomic disparities in receiving adequate lymphadenectomy were observed.


Dubecz et al. (2013)


- vaccination trial in livestock production
- there were two groups (vaccinated and placebo) of about 115 animals
- the event was the diagnosis of clinical respiratory tract problems



Noordhuizen et al. (2001)

Test of difference by log-rank test, $p = 0.038$






The hazard function $h(t)^*$ gives the probability that the event will occur in the next period of time, given that the individual has not yet shown the event

$$h(t) = \lim_{\Delta t \rightarrow 0} \frac{P(t \leq T < t + \Delta t)}{\Delta t}$$


conditional probability:


- let's say the probability of dying in the 80th year of life is 1% at birth%
- the same probability when someone is in the 79th year of life is higher, let's say 5%


*hazard function



Since the hazard function shows significant variation per time unit, it is not used for plotting, but rather the cumulative hazard







- The hazard ratio (HR) is an expression of the hazard or chance of events occurring in the treatment arm as a ratio of the hazard of the events occurring in the control arm.


$$HR = \frac{h_{treat}(t)}{h_{control}(t)}$$

- hazard ratio of 2 means that a treated patient who has not yet event by a certain time has twice the chance of having event at the next point in time compared with someone in the control group

HR=1 the factor has no effect

HR>1 the factor is positively associated to the event

HR<1 the factor is negatively associated to the event



- Amrhein, V., S. Greenland, and B. McShane (2019). Scientists rise up against statistical significance. *Nature* 567(7748), 305–307.
- Barratt, A., P. C. Wyer, R. Hatala, T. McGinn, A. L. Dans, S. Keitz, V. Moyer, et al. (2004). Tips for learners of evidence-based medicine: 1. relative risk reduction, absolute risk reduction and number needed to treat. *Canadian Medical Association Journal* 171(4), 353–358.
- Cuzick, J. (2005). Forest plots and the interpretation of subgroups. *The Lancet* 365(9467), 1308.
- Dubecz, A., N. Solymosi, M. Schweigert, R. J. Stadlhuber, J. H. Peters, D. Oefner, and H. J. Stein (2013). Time-Trends and Disparities in Lymphadenectomy for Gastrointestinal Cancer in the United States: A Population-Based Analysis of 342,792 Patients. *Journal of Gastrointestinal Surgery* 17(4), 611–619.
- Farkas, R., V. Mag, M. Gyurkovszky, N. Takács, K. Vörös, and N. Solymosi (2020). The current situation of canine dirofilariosis in Hungary. *Parasitology research* 119(1), 129–135.
- Lakos, A., Z. Igari, and N. Solymosi (2012). Recent lesson from a clinical and seroepidemiological survey: low positive predictive value of borrelia burgdorferi antibody testing in a high risk population. *Advances in medical sciences* 57(2), 356–363.
- Lakos, A. and N. Solymosi (2010). Maternal lyme borreliosis and pregnancy outcome. *International Journal of Infectious Diseases* 14(6), e494–e498.
- Nakeshbandi, M., R. Maini, P. Daniel, S. Rosengarten, P. Parmar, C. Wilson, J. M. Kim, A. Oommen, M. Mecklenburg, J. Salvani, et al. (2020). The impact of obesity on COVID-19 complications: a retrospective cohort study. *International Journal of Obesity* 44(9), 1832–1837.
- Noordhuizen, J. P. T. M., K. Frankena, M. Thrusfield, and E. A. M. Graat (2001). *Application of Quantitative Methods in Veterinary Epidemiology*. Wageningen, The Netherlands: Wageningen Pers.
- Patai, Á., N. Solymosi, and Á. V. Patai (2015). Effect of rectal indomethacin for preventing post-ercp pancreatitis depends on difficulties of cannulation. *Journal of clinical gastroenterology* 49(5), 429–437.
- Solymosi, N., J. Reiczig, O. Berke, A. Harnos, S. Szigeti, L. Fodor, G. Szigeti, and K. Bódis (2004). Spatial risk assessment of herd sero-status of Aujeszky's disease in a county in Hungary. *Preventive veterinary medicine* 65(1-2), 9–16.
- Spiegelhalter, D. J., K. R. Abrams, and J. P. Myles (2004). *Bayesian approaches to clinical trials and health-care evaluation*, Volume 13. John Wiley & Sons.
- Stevenson, M. (2012). An introduction to veterinary epidemiology. EpiCentre, IVABS, Massey University, Palmerston North, New Zealand.
- Stevenson, M. (2019). *epiR: Tools for the Analysis of Epidemiological Data*. R package version 1.0-4.
- Szenci, O., M. K. Abdelmegeid, N. Solymosi, E. Brydl, C. Á. Bajcsy, I. Biksi, and M. Kulcsár (2018). Prediction of stillbirth in holstein-friesian dairy cattle by measuring metabolic and endocrine parameters during the periparturient period. *Reproduction in Domestic Animals* 53(6), 1434–1441.
- Thrusfield, M., R. Christley, H. Brown, P. J. Diggle, N. French, K. Howe, L. Kelly, A. O'Connor, J. Sargeant, and H. Wood (2018). *Veterinary Epidemiology* (4th ed.). Oxford, UK: Wiley.