



Shayan Mostafaei Assistant Professor of Biostatistics

Contents

- 1. What is heterogeneity?
- 2. Types of heterogeneity
- 3. What is Clinical, methodological and statistical heterogeneity?
- 4. Identifying and testing of heterogeneity
- 5. What can we do with heterogeneity?
 - 5.1. Check the data
 - 5.2. Change effect measure
 - 5.3 <u>Random effects modeling</u>
 - 5.4. Sensitivity analysis
 - 5.5. Subgroup analysis based on the categorical variable
 - 5.6. Subgroup analysis based on clustering analysis results
 - 5.7. Bayesian modeling
 - 5.8. <u>Multivariate meta analysis due to related multiple outcomes</u>
 - 5.9. SEM meta analysis due to related multiple outcomes
- 5.10. <u>non-normally random effects modeling for asymmetry</u> assumption due to heterogeneity.
 - 5.11. sign test
 - 5.12. exclude the studies
 - 513. Do no meta analysis

What is a meta-analysis?

 A statistical analysis of the results from <u>independent studies</u>, which generally aims to produce a single estimate of the treatment effect Egger et al, 2001



انواع واریانسها در مطالعات متاانالیز

 واریانس درون مطالعات Within studies variation
 این واریانس حاصل از تفاوت بین دادههای هر مطالعه اولیه براساس پارامتر مورد بررسی در بین آنها است. این واریانس به دلیل ماهیت تصادفی بودن نمونههای در هر مطالعه اولیه است.

واریانس بین مطالعات Between studies variation
 این وارایانس حاصل از تفاوت بین نتایج مطالعات اولیه براساس پارامتر مورد
 بررسی در بین آنها است. این واریانس ممکن است در اثر منشا بالینی و یا
 متدولوژیک باشد.

Types of heterogeneity

- Clinical:
- 1. Heterogeneity between Participants
- Heterogeneity between interventions (Intensity / dose / duration)
- Methodological:
- 1. Design
- 2. Conduct (Allocation concealment/blinding/analysis methods)
- 3. Multiple outcomes measurement tools
- Statistical: Statistical heterogeneity is the observed variation in effect sizes that cannot be explained by chance or random error alone.

Identifying and testing of heterogeneity

- Visual:
- 1. Forest plot
- 2. Funnel plot (bias or systematic heterogeneity)
- 3. Baujat plot (to detect studies overly contributing to the heterogeneity of a meta-analysis)
- Statistics:
- 1. **I**^2
- 2. Tau^2
- Testing:
- 1. <u>Q test based on the chi-square test</u>

Forest plot



Funnel plot



Baujat plot



Contribution to overall heterogeneity

Heterogeneity test and statistics

$$Q = \sum w_i \big(\hat{y}_i - \hat{\theta} \big)^2$$

$$I^2 = \frac{Q - k + 1}{Q} * 100\%$$

$$\tau^{2} = \frac{Q - (k - 1)}{\sum w_{i} - \frac{\sum w_{i}^{2}}{\sum w_{i}}}$$

Interpretation of I-square statistic

- 0% to 40%: might not be important;
- 30% to 60%: may represent moderate heterogeneity*;
- 50% to 90%: may represent substantial heterogeneity*;
- 75% to 100%: considerable heterogeneity*.

*The importance of the observed value of *I*² depends on (1) magnitude and direction of effects, and (2) strength of evidence for heterogeneity (e.g. P value from the Chi² test, or a confidence interval for *I*²: uncertainty in the value of *I*² is substantial when the number of studies is small).

Fixed effect vs. random effects models

The fixed effect assumption



Fixed effect vs. random effects models

The random effects assumption



Fixed effect vs. random effects models

- Fixed effect model is often unrealistic when heterogeneity is considerable and unexplained. But C.I is narrow compare with random effects.
- Random effects model analysis is suitable for unexplained heterogeneity. But it is difficult to interpret.

Sensitivity Analysis

- Sensitivity analysis is perform to evaluate the consistency or robustness of our results.
- sensitivity analysis was done by successively removing a particular study or group of studies (if any) that had the highest impact on the heterogeneity of pooled effect size.
- Sensitivity analyses are sometimes confused with subgroup analysis. Although some sensitivity analyses involve restricting the analysis to a subset of the totality of studies, the two methods differ in two ways.

Sensitivity Analysis



Meta regression

- The statistical purpose of meta-regression is to see to what extent covariates can explain the betweentrial component of the variance.
- <u>Covariates in meta regression should be</u> <u>independent</u>.
- In meta-regression based on the linear regression equations, <u>linear effects</u> of the covariates were assessed on the between studies variance component.

Meta regression & Subgroup analysis

- if you know which characteristics of studies may be associated with the size of effect. You can use subgroup analyses for qualitative characteristics for assessing between-trial component of the variance.
- Subgroup analysis involve splitting all of the studies into heterologous groups, often in order to make comparisons between them.

Subgroup analysis

	Vitamir	ie K	Contr	ol	Odds Ratio		Odds Ratio		
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI		
1.1.1 Over 50s									
Bayes	48	183	54	183	12.7%	0.85 [0.54, 1.34]			
Cochrane	125	624	152	631	23.3%	0.79 [0.60, 1.03]	-		
Fisher	132	259	172	253	17.3%	0.49 [0.34, 0.70]			
Gosset	3	10	5	10	1.1%	0.43 [0.07, 2.68]			
Jeffreys	47	91	48	92	9.0%	0.98 [0.55, 1.75]	-+		
Markov	86	311	93	302	17.9%	0.86 [0.61, 1.22]			
Pearson	3	18	9	17	1.5%	0.18 [0.04, 0.85]			
Subtotal (95% CI)		1496		1488	82.9%	0.72 [0.57, 0.92]	•		
Total events	444		533				-		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.04; Chi	$^{2} = 10.7$	<u>'8, df</u> = 6	(P = 0.1)	10); I ^z = 4	4%			
Test for overall effect: .	Z= 2.58 (P = 0.0	10)						
1.1.2 Under 50s									
Hill	41	83	49	85	8.3%	0.72 [0.39, 1.32]			
Wilks	5	11	9	12	1.2%	0.28 [0.05, 1.62]			
Yates	24	94	27	97	7.6%	<u>_ N 89 [N 47, 1 69]</u>			
Subtotal (95% CI)		188		194	17.1%	0.75 [0.49, 1.15]	•		
Total events	70		85				-		
<u>Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.00; Chi² = 1.51, df =</u> 2 (P = 0.47); I ² = 0%									
Test for overall effect: .	Z=1.34 (P = 0.1	8)						
Total (95% CI)		1684		1682	100.0%	0.73 [0.60, 0.89]	•		
Total events	514		618						
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0.02; Chi ² = 12.29, df = 9 (P = 0.20); l ² = 27%								
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3.16 (P = 0.002)$									
Test for subgroup diffe	erences:	Chi ^z = 0).02, df =	1 (P = (0.90) I ² =	0%	ravours treatment ravours control		

Caution in Meta-regression



Cluster analysis & Subgroup analysis

- if you don't know which characteristics of studies may be associated with the size of effect. You can use cluster analysis based on the <u>all of related and</u> <u>independent characteristics of studies</u> in order to identify heterogeneous clusters.
- Finally, you can use subgroup analysis based one clustering running. <u>Cluster analysis make</u> <u>comparisons between clusters automatically</u>.
- <u>Comparisons between clusters are expected to</u> <u>significantly differ in subgroup analysis</u>.

Partitioning clustering algorithm

- K-means is simplest partitioning algorithm (MacQueen, 1967).
- This algorithm is the most commonly used unsupervised machine learning algorithm for partitioning a given data set into a set of k groups (i.e. k clusters), where k represents the number of groups pre-specified by the analyst.

Partitioning vs. Fuzzy clustering

- Unlike partitioning clustering methods (e.g. kmeans), in fuzzy clustering methods (e.g. c-means) each observation has a set of membership coefficients or membership probabilities.
- The fuzzy clustering is considered as soft clustering and partitioning clustering is considered as hard or non-fuzzy clustering.
- Fuzzy clustering has many advantages compare with hard clustering such as <u>flexibility and clustering</u> <u>noisy data</u> samples. <u>Very sensitive to good</u> <u>initialization</u> can be considered as a main <u>disadvantage of fuzzy clustering</u>.

ID	Study	Location	Year	Number of case	Number of control	Type of control	Case positive	Case negative	Control positive	Control negative	Sample	HPV detection method
	McNicol 1 et al.	Canada	1990	4	5	Healthy	4	0	1	4	Tissue	PCR
	Ibrahim 2 et al.	USA	1992	48	16	Healthy	6	42	2	14	Tissue	PCR
	Anwar et 3 al.	Japan	1992	68	10	Healthy	28	40	0	10	Tissue	PCR
	4 Tu et al.	USA	1994	60	1	Healthy	3	57	0	1	Tissue	PCR
	Wideroff 5 et al.	USA	1996	56	42	Healthy	7	49	4	38	Tissue	PCR
	suzuki et 6 al.	Japan	1996	51	51	Healthy	8	43	0	51	Tissue	PCR
	Terris et 7 al.	USA	1997	73	37	Healthy	18	55	6	31	Tissue	PCR
	Dillner et 8 al.	Finland	1998	165	290	Healthy	40	125	60	230	Serum	PCR
	Hisada et 9 al.	USA	2000	48	63	Healthy	20	28	19	44	Serum	Elisa
1	Hayes et 0 al.	USA	2000	276	295	Healthy	19	257	15	280	Serum	Elisa

For example: R code for k-means algorithm

- install.packages("cluster")
- install.packages("factoextra")
- library(cluster)
- library(factoextra)
- data<-read.table("clipboard",h=TRUE,sep="\t")</pre>
- data<-na.omit(data)</p>
- data<-scale(data)</p>
- fviz_nbclust(data, kmeans, method ="gap_stat")
- km.res <- kmeans(data, 6, nstart = 25)</pre>
- print(km.res)



- \checkmark K-means clustering with 6 clusters of sizes 5, 2, 1, 3, 5, 8
- ✓ Clustering vector:
 - ✓ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24
 - ✓ 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 1 6 1 4 1 2 4 1 3 2 1 4 5 5 5 5 5
 - ✓ Within cluster sum of squares by cluster:
 - ✓ [1] 4.5460675 6.9232220 0.0000000 3.3145160 0.8259981
 2.5880018
 - ✓ (between_SS / total_SS = 90.1 %) ????? <u>I-square statistics</u>



Subgroup analysis after clustering

Test(s) of heterogeneity:						
1	Heterogener	ty degre	ees of			
	statistic	freedom	I P	I-squared	** lau-squared	
6	10.23	7	0.176	31.6%	0.2915	
1	0.45	3	0.929	0.0%	0.0000	
4	0.96	2	0.619	0.0%	0.0000	
2	4.42	1	0.035	77.4%	0.0448	
3	0.00	0		.% 0.0	0448	
5	1.41	4	0.842	0.0%	0.0000	
Overall	56.74	22	0.00	0 61.29	6 0.1104	
** I-squared: the variation in OR attributable to heterogeneity)						

Note: between group heterogeneity not calculated; only valid with inverse variance method

Significance test(s) of OR=1

6	z= 1.88	p = 0.060
1	z= 1.90	p = 0.057
4	z= 0.05	p = 0.957
2	z= 1.31	p = 0.190
3	z= 2.51	p = 0.012
5	z= 4.09	p = 0.000
Overall	z= 2.23	p = 0.026

Subgroup analysis after clustering

Study	OR (95% CI)	%
	OR (50% CI)	wagir
6		
McNicol et al. (1990)	27.00 (0.85, 856.53)	0.38
Ibrahim et al. (1992)	1.00 (0.18, 5.53)	1.42
Anwar et al. (1992)	14.78 (0.83, 262.53)	0.55
Tu et al. (1994)	0.18 (0.01, 5.35)	0.40
Wideroff et al. (1996)	1.36 (0.37, 4.98)	2.25
suzuki et al. (1996)	20.13 (1.13, 358.75)	0.55
Terris et al. (1997)	1.69 (0.61, 4.71)	3.23
Hisada et al. (2000)	1.65 (0.75, 3.63)	4.56
Subtotal (I-squared = 31.6%, p = 0.176)	1.97 (0.97, 3.99)	13.35
1		
Dillner et al. (1998)	1.23 (0.78, 1.93)	7.53
Hayes et al. (2000)	1.38 (0.69, 2.77)	5.22
Adami et al. (2003)	1.38 (0.90, 2.11)	7.65
Demis et al. (2009)	1.14 (U./3, 1.//)	7.00
Bergh et al. (2007)	(EXCLUDED)	0.00
Subiolal (Fisquared = 0.0%, p = 0.929)	1.20 (0.99, 1.00)	20.27
e Beneddell et el (2002)	1 14 /0 01 1 070	0.70
S delifie et al. (2003)	0.01 (0.68, 1.22)	0.72
Sidelifie et al. (2007)	1.05 (0.58, 1.00)	6.11
School (Leagend = 0.0% p = 0.619)	1.01 (0.82, 1.30)	24.16
	1.01 (0.02, 1.24)	24.10
2		
Korofi et al. (2005)	0.95/0.75.1.20)	9.96
Huston et al. (2008)	0.68 (0.55, 0.84)	10.11
Subtatal (I-squared = 77.4%, p = 0.035)	0.80 (0.57, 1.12)	20.07
3		
Sitas et al. (2007) -	1.53 (1.10, 2.13)	8.92
Subtotal (I-squared = .%, p = .)	1.53 (1.10, 2.13)	8.92
5		
Fierro et al. (2010)	4.44 (1.33, 14.80)	2.54
Whitaker et al. (2013)	21.00 (1.78, 248.10)	0.73
Michopoulou et al. (2014)	5.52 (0.66, 46.58)	0.96
Hassanein et al. (2016)	10.98 (0.63, 191.21)	0.55
Smelov et al. (2016)	5.87 (0.25, 135.15)	0.46
Subtotal (I-squared = 0.0%, p = 0.842)	6.24 (2.59, 15.02)	5.24
Overall (I-squared = 61.2%, p = 0.000)	1,28 (1.03, 1.59)	100.00
NOTE: Weighte are from cardion efforte analysis		
Horse Hughs and Horse diagram		
.00117 1	857	

Applications of Bayesian Modeling in meta analysis

- \checkmark For violation of the symmetry assumption by a skewed dis.
- \checkmark For small number of individual studies by a prior dis.
- \checkmark For dealing with considerable heterogeneity by a random dis.
- ✓ For using prior knowledge about true effect size
- \checkmark For dealing with skewed data a skewed dis.
- \checkmark For dealing with outlier data by a Laplace dis.
- ✓ For controlling false positive results by a wider 95% (Cr.I)

Why Bayesian Modeling?

 Because Bayesian approach takes into account all sources of variation and reflects these variations in the pooled effect size.

For example: R code for Bayesian Modeling

- install.packages("bayesmeta")
- library(bayesmeta)
- OR <- escalc(measure="OR",ai=tpos, bi=tneg, ci=cpos, di=cneg, data=data)
- bm01 <- bayesmeta(y=OR,sigma=SE,labels =`First author`,mu.prior.mean=mu, mu.prior.sd=10.0,tau.prior=function(x){ dinvgamma(x, 2+(1/10000),1.38*(1+(1/10000)))})</p>
- print(bm01)
- > plot(bm01,which=1)
- > plot(bm01,which=2)
- > plot(bm01,which=3)
- > plot(bm01,which=4)
- > forestplot(bm01)

Example for Bayesian Modeling

- marginal posterior summary:
- tau mu
- mode 0.9757218 1.4906700
- median 1.0843731 1.5117491
- mean 1.1457243 1.5213724
- sd 0.3986335 0.4304754
- 95% lower 0.4723850 0.6793157
- 95% upper 1.9420972 2.3922495



Multivariate meta analysis

- ✓ In a meta-analysis clinical interest does not always concern only one specific outcome measure.
- ✓ Sometimes the focus is on the combination of several related outcome measures that are presented in the individual studies, for instance when there are more outcome variables. Related multiple outcome in the studies is one of the reasons of methodological heterogeneity. For dealing with related multiple related outcome, multivariate meta analysis can useful rather than univariate meta analysis.
- ✓ Unlike of multivariate meta analysis, network meta-analysis combines direct and indirect estimates across a network of interventions in a single analysis in order to comparison between interventions/or outcomes.

Multivariate meta analysis

- ✓ In a multivariate analysis all outcome measures are analyzed jointly, therefore also revealing information about the correlations between the multiple outcome variables.
- ✓ In multivariate meta analysis I_R^2 and multivariate H^2 statistic are as the heterogeneity indices.
- "mvmeta" r package is available package to perform fixed and random-effects multivariate meta analysis (<u>https://cran.r-</u> <u>project.org/web/packages/mvmeta/mvmeta.pdf</u>).

For example: R code for multivariate meta analysis

- install.packages("mvmeta")
- library(mvmeta)
- model<-</p>

mvmeta(cbind(Y1,Y2)~year,S=S,data=data,method="fixed")

- print(summary(model))
- summary(model)\$coef
- coef(model,format="matrix")
- > forestplot(model)

Application of structural equation modeling in meta-analysis

- ✓ On one hand, related multiple outcome in the studies is one of reasons of methodological heterogeneity. In other hand, related outcomes can play a variety of roles in multiple regression equations. For this situation, structural equation modeling can useful.
- ✓ Please refer to "metaSEM" as a r package for meta-analysis using Structural Equation Modeling (<u>https://cran.r-</u> <u>project.org/web/packages/metaSEM/vignettes/metaSEM.pdf</u>)

meta-analysis modeling for skewed data

- ✓ As you know that all of traditional models in meta analysis are only correct asymptotically, while assume that the true effects are normally distributed.
- ✓ In practice, meta analysis models are frequently applied when study numbers are small and the normality of the effect distribution unknown or unlikely.
- ✓ If meta-analyses involve outcomes with skewed distributions, you can use skewed normal random effect model. However, log-transformed distribution can be useful.

meta-analysis modeling for skewed data

- ✓ "altmeta" R package provides alternative statistical methods for meta-analysis, including new heterogeneity tests and measures that are robust to <u>outliers or skewed data</u>; measures, tests, and visualization tools for publication bias; meta-analysis methods for synthesizing proportions; models for multivariate meta analysis, etc
- ✓ (<u>https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/altmeta/altmeta.pdf</u>).

Some of the important functions in altmeta r package

- metaoutliers(y, s2, model) ## Calculates the standardized residual for each study
- mvma.Bayesian () ## Bayesian Random-Effects Multivariate Meta-Analysis
- mvma.hybrid () ## Performs a multivariate meta-analysis using the hybrid random-effects model when the within-study correlations are unknown
- mvma.hybrid.Bayesian() ## Bayesian Hybrid Model for Random-Effects Multivariate Meta Analysis

References

- Patsopoulos NA, Evangelou E, Ioannidis JP. Sensitivity of between-study heterogeneity in meta-analysis: proposed metrics and empirical evaluation. International journal of epidemiology. 2008 Oct 1;37(5):1148-57.
- Schroll JB, Moustgaard R, Gøtzsche PC. Dealing with substantial heterogeneity in Cochrane reviews. Cross-sectional study. BMC medical research methodology. 2011 Dec;11(1):22.
- Higgins JP, White IR, Anzures-Cabrera J. Meta-analysis of skewed data: combining results reported on log-transformed or raw scales. Statistics in medicine. 2008 Dec 20;27(29):6072-92.
- Kriston L. Dealing with clinical heterogeneity in meta-analysis. Assumptions, methods, interpretation. International journal of methods in psychiatric research. 2013 Mar;22(1):1-5.
- Arends L. Multivariate meta-analysis: modelling the heterogeneity mixing apples and oranges; dangerous or delicious?. 2006 Jun 28.

References

- Cheung MW. metaSEM: An R package for meta-analysis using structural equation modeling. Frontiers in Psychology. 2015 Jan 5;5:1521.
- Gasparrini A, Gasparrini MA. Package 'mvmeta'.
- Roever C, Friede T, Roever MC. Package 'bayesmeta'.
- Mohammadi FS, Aslani S, Mostafaei S, Jamshidi A, Riahi P, Mahmoudi M. Are genetic variations in IL-21–IL-23R–IL-17A cytokine axis involved in a pathogenic pathway of rheumatoid arthritis? Bayesian hierarchical meta-analysis. Journal of cellular physiology. 2019 Oct;234(10):17159–71.
- Mostafaei S, Keshavarz M, Nahand JS, Hassankiadeh RF, Moradinazar M, Nouri M, Babaei F, Ahadi M, Payandeh M, Esker AS, Hajighadimi S. Viral infections and risk of thyroid cancer: A systematic review and empirical bayesian meta-analysis. Pathology-Research and Practice. 2020 Feb 13:152855.