

Before lecture exercise

- Select 10 red tiles and 10 blue tiles at random from baskets.
- These represent 10 patients allocated to two different treatments.
- You need to decide which treatment is most successful and by how much
- Count number of red and blue happy faces.
- Which treatment is more successful?
- · How sure are you of the result?
- · Look up the p-value on the handout.

Barts and The London

A Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Aims of the lecture

- To distinguish a systematic review from other studies
- To formulate a question using the PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparator, Outcome) principle
- · To explain sources of bias in systematic reviews
- Explain what is meant by external validity of randomised trial

Arts and The London





A review of the evidence on a clearly formulated question that uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select and critically appraise relevant primary research, and to extract and analyse data from the studies that included in the review. Statistical methods (meta analysis) may or may not be used"

NHS Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/pdf/crdreport4_complete.pdf

👾 Barts and The London











· Health system

Barts and The London



















- · Use PICO to define search terms
- · Balance wide v narrow search
- · Use more than one database
- Grey literature
- Trials registers
- · References, citations and expert advice

A Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Systematic and explicit methods to select studies

After obtaining references from each search

- Identify unique set of articles
- Check titles and abstracts
- Read papers
- Define eligible studies; clear inclusion criteria
- Inclusion decision ideally made by more than one assessor

A Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Assessment of study quality

- · Record key quality criteria e.g. blind assessment
- · Scoring system may be used
- · Poor quality studies may be excluded
- Sensitivity analysis investigating effect of study quality

Barts and The London





Data extraction and analysis

- Independent extraction
- Summarise descriptions of each study and key findings
- Ideally combine quantitatively Meta analysis Forest plots Statistical assessment of publication bias

Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Meta analysis

- Subset of systematic reviews will provide data suitable for meta analysis
- · Need to have same outcomes
- Increases precision of any estimate of effect
- Identifies whether variability observed is between studies is greater than expected from natural variation

Barts and The London





Meta analysis outcome: >=1 infection			
Study or subgroup	Experimental n/N	Control n/N	Odds Ratio IV,Random,95% CI
1 Number of participants w Berggren 2010 (1)	ho experienced URTI 76/159	episodes: at least 91/159	1 event
Hojsak 2010a (2)	58/139	95/142	-
Hojsak 2010b	8/376	20/366	
Kekkonen 2007 (3)	32/70	26/71	
Rautava 2009 (4)	7/38	20/43	
Sanz 2006 (5)	21/158	18/115	
Subtotal (95% CI)	940	896	•
Total events: 202 (Experim Heterogeneity: Tau' = 0.2: Test for overall effect: Z = 3	ental), 270 (Control) ; Chi² = 16.15, df = 5 2.28 (P = 0.022)	5 (P = 0.01); l ² = 69	1%
Barts and The Lon School of Medicine and Directiony	don		www.smd.qmul.ac.uk







Meta analysis

Overall effect Odds ratio 0.58 (0.36 to 092) P=0.022

Taking a probiotic reduces the odds of getting a cold by $0.58\,$

Arts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk





Tendency for studies to be different Qualitative assessment

- Are outcomes/interventions similar enough Quantitative assessment
- Do study result vary more than would be expected just through random sampling
- Are there patterns which indicate publication bias

Barts and The London









Variability between study results

- · Different populations
- · Different interventions
- · Study quality
- Difference in measuring outcomes
- · Random variability

Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Publication (reporting) bias

The tendency for negative/uninteresting findings to be

- Unpublished
 - study
 - outcome
- · Published in obscure journals
- · Have their publication delayed

A Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Detecting publication bias

- · Funnel plot
 - Plots effect size against measure of study size
 - Look out for large studies with smaller effect than overall effect
- Sensitivity methods

 Trim and fill; use funnel plot to estimate what studies would be needed to make it symmetrical and then see what effect adding these studies would have on the estimate

Barts and The London





Difference between proportions Does tamiflu (oseltamivir) prevent respiratory tract infections requiring antibiotics in children with confirmed influenza 28% in those given placebo 17% in those given tamiflu Difference 11 (4 to 19) Barts and The London





Number needed to treat

Number of people you need to treat to avoid one adverse event NNT = 1/Risk difference

For tamiflu Risk difference =0.11 Number needed to treat = 1/0.11=9 95% confidence interval (5 to 29)

A Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Continuous outcomes

Mean duration of symptoms One study by Vrese Control mean(SD) = 8.9 (1.0) days Probiotics mean(SD) = 7.0 (0.5) days

Difference = 1.9 95% confidence interval 1.75 to 2.05; *P* <0.05

A Barts and The London

www.smd.qmul.ac.uk

Continuous outcomes

Simple comparison of two groups Use a t-test Gives confidence interval for difference

Adjusting for confounders Use regression model Present results as "adjusted difference"

Barts and The London

Summary

- Systematic reviews require a clear precise protocol for selecting, extracting and analysing data
- Meta analysis is the pooling of quantifiable results
- Less risk of bias when
 - Large number of studies
 - No evidence of heterogeneity
 - No evidence of publication bias

Barts and The London