

Contents

| | |
|-------------------------------|---------|
| List of Tables | xv |
| List of Figures | xix |
| Acknowledgements | xxv |
| Preface | xxvii |
| Preface to the Second Edition | xxxv |
| Website | xxxviii |

PART 1: INTRODUCTION

| | |
|--------------------------------------|----------|
| 1 HOW A META-ANALYSIS WORKS | 3 |
| Introduction | 3 |
| Individual studies | 3 |
| The summary effect | 5 |
| Heterogeneity of effect sizes | 6 |
| Summary points | 7 |
| 2 WHY PERFORM A META-ANALYSIS | 9 |
| Introduction | 9 |
| The streptokinase meta-analysis | 10 |
| Statistical significance | 11 |
| Clinical importance of the effect | 11 |
| Consistency of effects | 12 |
| Summary points | 13 |

PART 2: EFFECT SIZE AND PRECISION

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 3 OVERVIEW | 17 |
| Treatment effects and effect sizes | 17 |
| Parameters and estimates | 18 |
| Outline of effect size computations | 19 |
| 4 EFFECT SIZES BASED ON MEANS | 21 |
| Introduction | 21 |
| Raw (unstandardized) mean difference D | 21 |
| Standardized mean difference, d and g | 25 |
| Response ratios | 30 |
| Summary points | 31 |

| | | |
|--|---|-----------|
| 5 | EFFECT SIZES BASED ON BINARY DATA (2×2 TABLES) | 33 |
| | Introduction | 33 |
| | Risk ratio | 33 |
| | Odds ratio | 35 |
| | Risk difference | 37 |
| | Choosing an effect size index | 38 |
| | Summary points | 38 |
| 6 | EFFECT SIZES BASED ON CORRELATIONS | 39 |
| | Introduction | 39 |
| | Computing r | 39 |
| | Other approaches | 40 |
| | Summary points | 41 |
| 7 | CONVERTING AMONG EFFECT SIZES | 43 |
| | Introduction | 43 |
| | Converting from the log odds ratio to d | 44 |
| | Converting from d to the log odds ratio | 45 |
| | Converting from r to d | 45 |
| | Converting from d to r | 46 |
| | Summary points | 47 |
| 8 | FACTORS THAT AFFECT PRECISION | 49 |
| | Introduction | 49 |
| | Factors that affect precision | 50 |
| | Sample size | 50 |
| | Study design | 51 |
| | Summary points | 53 |
| 9 | CONCLUDING REMARKS | 55 |
| PART 3: FIXED-EFFECT VERSUS RANDOM-EFFECTS MODELS | | |
| 10 | OVERVIEW | 59 |
| | Introduction | 59 |
| | Nomenclature | 60 |
| 11 | FIXED-EFFECT MODEL | 61 |
| | Introduction | 61 |
| | The true effect size | 61 |
| | Impact of sampling error | 61 |
| | Performing a fixed-effect meta-analysis | 63 |
| | Summary points | 64 |

12 RANDOM-EFFECTS MODEL

- Introduction
- The true effect sizes
- Impact of sampling error
- Performing a random-effects meta-analysis
- Summary points

13 FIXED-EFFECT VERSUS RANDOM-EFFECTS MODELS

- Introduction
- Definition of a summary effect
- Estimating the summary effect
- Extreme effect size in a large study or a small study
- Confidence interval
- The null hypothesis
- Which model should we use?
- Model should not be based on the test for heterogeneity
- Concluding remarks
- Summary points

14 WORKED EXAMPLES (PART 1)

- Introduction
- Worked example for continuous data (Part 1)
- Worked example for binary data (Part 1)
- Worked example for correlational data (Part 1)
- Summary points

PART 4: HETEROGENEITY**15 OVERVIEW**

- Introduction
- Nomenclature
- Worked examples

16 IDENTIFYING AND QUANTIFYING HETEROGENEITY

- Introduction
- Isolating the variation in true effects
- Computing Q
- Estimating τ^2
- The I^2 statistic
- Comparing the measures of heterogeneity
- Confidence intervals for τ^2
- Confidence intervals (or uncertainty intervals) for I^2
- Summary points

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 17 | PREDICTION INTERVALS | 119 |
| | Introduction | 119 |
| | Prediction intervals in primary studies | 119 |
| | Prediction intervals in meta-analysis | 121 |
| | Confidence intervals and prediction intervals | 123 |
| | Comparing the confidence interval with the prediction interval | 123 |
| | Summary points | 125 |
| 18 | WORKED EXAMPLES (PART 2) | 127 |
| | Introduction | 127 |
| | Worked example for continuous data (Part 2) | 127 |
| | Worked example for binary data (Part 2) | 131 |
| | Worked example for correlational data (Part 2) | 134 |
| | Summary points | 138 |
| 19 | AN INTUITIVE LOOK AT HETEROGENEITY | 139 |
| | Introduction | 139 |
| | Motivating example | 140 |
| | The Q -value and the p -value do not tell us how much the effect size varies | 141 |
| | The confidence interval does not tell us how much the effect size varies | 142 |
| | The I^2 statistic does not tell us how much the effect size varies | 142 |
| | What I^2 tells us | 142 |
| | The I^2 index vs. the prediction interval | 145 |
| | The prediction interval | 145 |
| | Prediction interval is clear, concise, and relevant | 147 |
| | Computing the prediction interval | 147 |
| | How to use I^2 | 149 |
| | How to explain heterogeneity | 149 |
| | How much does the effect size vary across studies? | 150 |
| | Caveats | 150 |
| | Conclusion | 150 |
| | Further reading | 151 |
| | Summary points | 151 |
| | The meaning of I^2 in Figure 19.2 | 151 |
| 20 | CLASSIFYING HETEROGENEITY AS LOW, MODERATE, OR HIGH | 155 |
| | Introduction | 155 |
| | Interest should generally focus on an index of absolute heterogeneity | 155 |
| | The classifications lead themselves to mistakes of interpretation | 158 |
| | Classifications focus attention in the wrong direction | 158 |
| | Summary points | 158 |

PART 5: EXPLAINING HETEROGENEITY

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 21 | SUBGROUP ANALYSES | 161 |
| | Introduction | 161 |
| | Fixed-effect model within subgroups | 163 |
| | Computational models | 172 |
| | Random effects with separate estimates of τ^2 | 174 |
| | Random effects with pooled estimate of τ^2 | 181 |
| | The proportion of variance explained | 189 |
| | Mixed-effects model | 192 |
| | Obtaining an overall effect in the presence of subgroups | 193 |
| | Summary points | 195 |
| 22 | META-REGRESSION | 197 |
| | Introduction | 197 |
| | Fixed-effect model | 198 |
| | Fixed or random effects for unexplained heterogeneity | 203 |
| | Random-effects model | 206 |
| | Summary points | 212 |
| 23 | NOTES ON SUBGROUP ANALYSES AND META-REGRESSION | 213 |
| | Introduction | 213 |
| | Computational model | 213 |
| | Multiple comparisons | 216 |
| | Software | 216 |
| | Analyses of subgroups and regression analyses are observational | 217 |
| | Statistical power for subgroup analyses and meta-regression | 218 |
| | Summary points | 219 |

PART 6: PUTTING IT ALL IN CONTEXT

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 24 | LOOKING AT THE WHOLE PICTURE | 223 |
| | Introduction | 223 |
| | Methylphenidate for adults with ADHD | 226 |
| | Impact of GLP-1 mimetics on blood pressure | 228 |
| | Augmenting clozapine with a second antipsychotic | 228 |
| | Conclusions | 231 |
| | Caveats | 231 |
| | Summary points | 232 |
| 25 | LIMITATIONS OF THE RANDOM-EFFECTS MODEL | 233 |
| | Introduction | 233 |
| | Assumptions of the random-effects model | 234 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| A textbook case | 234 |
| When studies are pulled from the literature | 235 |
| A useful fiction | 237 |
| Transparency | 238 |
| A narrowly defined universe | 238 |
| Two important caveats | 239 |
| In context | 239 |
| Extreme cases | 240 |
| Summary points | 241 |
| 26 KNAPP–HARTUNG ADJUSTMENT | 243 |
| Introduction | 243 |
| Adjustment is rarely employed in simple analyses | 243 |
| Adjusting the standard error | 244 |
| The Knapp–Hartung adjustment for other effect size indices | 246 |
| <i>t</i> distribution vs. <i>Z</i> distribution | 247 |
| Limitations of the Knapp–Hartung adjustment | 248 |
| Summary points | 249 |
| PART 7: COMPLEX DATA STRUCTURES | |
| 27 OVERVIEW | 253 |
| 28 INDEPENDENT SUBGROUPS WITHIN A STUDY | 255 |
| Introduction | 255 |
| Combining across subgroups | 255 |
| Comparing subgroups | 260 |
| Summary points | 260 |
| 29 MULTIPLE OUTCOMES OR TIME-POINTS WITHIN A STUDY | 263 |
| Introduction | 263 |
| Combining across outcomes or time-points | 264 |
| Comparing outcomes or time-points within a study | 270 |
| Summary points | 275 |
| 30 MULTIPLE COMPARISONS WITHIN A STUDY | 277 |
| Introduction | 277 |
| Combining across multiple comparisons within a study | 277 |
| Differences between treatments | 278 |
| Summary points | 279 |
| 31 NOTES ON COMPLEX DATA STRUCTURES | 281 |
| Introduction | 281 |
| Summary effect | 281 |
| Differences in effect | 282 |

PART 8: OTHER ISSUES

| | | |
|-----------|--|------------|
| 32 | OVERVIEW | 287 |
| 33 | VOTE COUNTING – A NEW NAME FOR AN OLD PROBLEM | 289 |
| | Introduction | 289 |
| | Why vote counting is wrong | 290 |
| | Vote counting is a pervasive problem | 291 |
| | Summary points | 293 |
| 34 | POWER ANALYSIS FOR META-ANALYSIS | 295 |
| | Introduction | 295 |
| | A conceptual approach | 295 |
| | In context | 299 |
| | When to use power analysis | 300 |
| | Planning for precision rather than for power | 301 |
| | Power analysis in primary studies | 301 |
| | Power analysis for meta-analysis | 304 |
| | Power analysis for a test of homogeneity | 309 |
| | Summary points | 312 |
| 35 | PUBLICATION BIAS | 313 |
| | Introduction | 313 |
| | The problem of missing studies | 314 |
| | Methods for addressing bias | 316 |
| | Illustrative example | 317 |
| | The model | 317 |
| | Getting a sense of the data | 318 |
| | Is there evidence of any bias? | 320 |
| | How much of an impact might the bias have? | 320 |
| | Summary of the findings for the illustrative example | 324 |
| | Conflating bias with the small-study effect | 325 |
| | Using logic to disentangle bias from small-study effects | 326 |
| | These methods do not give us the 'correct' effect size | 327 |
| | Some important caveats | 327 |
| | Procedures do not apply to studies of prevalence | 328 |
| | The model for publication bias is simplistic | 328 |
| | Concluding remarks | 329 |
| | Putting it all together | 330 |
| | Summary points | 330 |

PART 9: ISSUES RELATED TO EFFECT SIZE

| | | |
|-----------|-----------------|------------|
| 36 | OVERVIEW | 335 |
|-----------|-----------------|------------|

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|------------|
| 37 | EFFECT SIZES RATHER THAN p-VALUES | 337 |
| | Introduction | 337 |
| | Relationship between p -values and effect sizes | 337 |
| | The distinction is important | 339 |
| | The p -value is often misinterpreted | 340 |
| | Narrative reviews vs. meta-analyses | 341 |
| | Summary points | 342 |
| 38 | SIMPSON'S PARADOX | 343 |
| | Introduction | 343 |
| | Circumcision and risk of HIV infection | 343 |
| | An example of the paradox | 345 |
| | Summary points | 348 |
| 39 | GENERALITY OF THE BASIC INVERSE-VARIANCE METHOD | 349 |
| | Introduction | 349 |
| | Other effect sizes | 350 |
| | Other methods for estimating effect sizes | 353 |
| | Individual participant data meta-analyses | 354 |
| | Bayesian approaches | 355 |
| | Summary points | 357 |
| PART 10: FURTHER METHODS | | |
| 40 | OVERVIEW | 361 |
| 41 | META-ANALYSIS METHODS BASED ON DIRECTION AND p-VALUES | 363 |
| | Introduction | 363 |
| | Vote counting | 363 |
| | The sign test | 363 |
| | Combining p -values | 364 |
| | Summary points | 368 |
| 42 | FURTHER METHODS FOR DICHOTOMOUS DATA | 369 |
| | Introduction | 369 |
| | Mantel-Haenszel method | 369 |
| | One-step (Peto) formula for odds ratio | 373 |
| | Summary points | 376 |
| 43 | PSYCHOMETRIC META-ANALYSIS | 377 |
| | Introduction | 377 |
| | The attenuating effects of artifacts | 378 |
| | Meta-analysis methods | 380 |
| | Example of psychometric meta-analysis | 381 |
| | Comparison of artifact correction with meta-regression | 384 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Sources of information about artifact values | 384 |
| How heterogeneity is assessed | 385 |
| Reporting in psychometric meta-analysis | 386 |
| Concluding remarks | 386 |
| Summary points | 387 |
| | |
| PART 11: META-ANALYSIS IN CONTEXT | |
| 44 OVERVIEW | 391 |
| 45 WHEN DOES IT MAKE SENSE TO PERFORM A META-ANALYSIS? | 393 |
| Introduction | 393 |
| Are the studies similar enough to combine? | 394 |
| Can I combine studies with different designs? | 395 |
| How many studies are enough to carry out a meta-analysis? | 399 |
| Summary points | 400 |
| 46 REPORTING THE RESULTS OF A META-ANALYSIS | 401 |
| Introduction | 401 |
| The computational model | 402 |
| Forest plots | 402 |
| Sensitivity analysis | 404 |
| Summary points | 405 |
| 47 CUMULATIVE META-ANALYSIS | 407 |
| Introduction | 407 |
| Why perform a cumulative meta-analysis? | 409 |
| Summary points | 412 |
| 48 CRITICISMS OF META-ANALYSIS | 413 |
| Introduction | 413 |
| One number cannot summarize a research field | 414 |
| The file drawer problem invalidates meta-analysis | 414 |
| Mixing apples and oranges | 415 |
| Garbage in, garbage out | 416 |
| Important studies are ignored | 417 |
| Meta-analysis can disagree with randomized trials | 417 |
| Meta-analyses are performed poorly | 420 |
| Is a narrative review better? | 420 |
| Concluding remarks | 422 |
| Summary points | 422 |
| 49 COMPREHENSIVE META-ANALYSIS SOFTWARE | 425 |
| Introduction | 425 |
| Features in CMA | 426 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Teaching elements | 427 |
| Documentation | 427 |
| Availability | 427 |
| Acknowledgments | 427 |
| Motivating example | 428 |
| Data entry | 428 |
| Basic analysis | 429 |
| What is the <i>average</i> effect size? | 430 |
| How much does the effect size vary? | 430 |
| Plot showing distribution of effects | 431 |
| High-resolution plot | 432 |
| Subgroup analysis | 433 |
| Meta-regression | 435 |
| Publication bias | 438 |
| Explaining results | 439 |
| 50 HOW TO EXPLAIN THE RESULTS OF AN ANALYSIS | 443 |
| Introduction | 443 |
| The overview | 444 |
| The mean effect size | 444 |
| Variation in effect size | 444 |
| Notations | 444 |
| Impact of resistance exercise on pain | 445 |
| Correlation between letter knowledge and word recognition | 450 |
| Statins for prevention of cardiovascular events | 455 |
| Bupropion for smoking cessation | 460 |
| Mortality following mitral-valve procedures in elderly patients | 465 |
| PART 12: RESOURCES | |
| 51 SOFTWARE FOR META-ANALYSIS | 471 |
| Comprehensive meta-analysis | 471 |
| Metafor | 471 |
| Stata | 472 |
| Revman | 472 |
| 52 WEB SITES, SOCIETIES, JOURNALS, AND BOOKS | 473 |
| Web sites | 473 |
| Professional societies | 476 |
| Journals | 476 |
| Special issues dedicated to meta-analysis | 477 |
| Books on systematic review methods and meta-analysis | 477 |
| REFERENCES | 479 |
| INDEX | 491 |