

Critical appraisal of evidence



Mahasti Alizadeh MD,MPH
Associate professor of community
medicine
Tabriz University of Medical Sciences
M.Alizadeh


مراحل عملی تصمیم گیری مبتنی بر شواهد

۱. تهیه یک سوال قابل جستجو و قابل پاسخ
۲. جستجوی منابع بر اساس سوال طراحی شده
۳. نقد و بررسی مقالات بدست آمده از جستجو از نظر اعتبار و قابلیت بکار گیری نتایج آن
۴. بکار گیری نتایج در عملکرد حرفه ای



M.Alizadeh


2



تا چه حد مطالعه درست انجام شده است؟

- تا چه اندازه نتایج مطالعه تحت تاثیر سوگرایی و عوامل مخدوش کننده قرار می گیرند؟
- سوگرایی چیست؟
- تفاوت سوگرایی با خطای تصادفی چیست؟

M.Alizadeh 4




Confounding factor

عامل مخدوش کننده

- هر عاملی بجز عامل مورد سنجش که بر نتایج و پیامد مورد نظر تاثیر گذارد

M.Alizadeh

6






How well was the study done?

- انتخاب افراد و ورود آنها به مطالعه تا چه حد درست بوده است؟ (P)
- آیا افراد تحت مطالعه بدرستی در دو یا چند گروه قرار گرفته اند؟ (I and C)
- تا چه حد افراد گروههای تحت مطالعه بدرستی بررسی و پیگیری شده اند؟ (I and C)
- پیامد یا Outcome تا چه حد درست اندازه گیری شده است؟ (O)

M.Alizadeh

8








	E = HRT	C = placebo
CHD	a = 71	b = 58
No CHD	c	d

Outcomes (O)—the HERS example (fatal CHD).

M.Alizadeh





Recruitment Representative

- افرادی که وارد مطالعه می شوند نماینده جمعیت مورد نظر باشند.
- انتخاب تصادفی از کل جامعه آماری
- در مقاله جمعیت مرجع بطور شفاف توضیح داده شود
- انتخاب تعداد مناسب و کافی نمونه (حجم نمونه کافی)
- بررسی مطالعه نمونه!!!!




RECRUITMENT

In cooperation with the university administration, we drew a random sample of 13 000 full-time undergraduates aged 17 to 24 years in March 2007 using survey recruitment procedures described in detail elsewhere.^{21,22} In summary, 4 weeks after the start of the first semester, all students were sent a letter by mail, followed by an e-mail containing a hyperlink to a Web questionnaire. Students were informed that the study concerned “the experiences of tertiary students with alcohol, and their views about certain aspects of drinking.” Up to 3 reminder e-mails were sent in the following weeks. Students were offered the opportunity to win 1 of 40 A\$100 gift vouchers for participating.

M.Alizadeh

17



Allocation

- گروهها از هر نظر بجز مداخله مورد نظر با هم همسان باشند
- اگر چنین نباشد هر تفاوتی در نتیجه می تواند ناشی از غیر همسانی متغیرهای مخدوش کننده باشد نه مداخله
- با تخصیص تصادفی به گروهها تا حدی می توان به این همسانی نزدیک شد



M.Alizadeh

19

Is allocation concealed?



M.Alizadeh

20

Methods: A randomized controlled trial was conducted at an Australian university in 2007. Invitations were sent to 13 000 undergraduates (age range, 17-24 years) to complete a Web-based Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. Of 7237 students who responded, 2435 scored in the hazardous/harmful range (≥ 8) and were randomized, and 2050

M.Alizadeh

21

RANDOMIZATION AND INTERVENTIONS

Respondents who scored 8 or more on the AUDIT and had exceeded the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council's guideline for acute risk (binge drinking: 4 standard drinks for women, 6 for men) in the last 4 weeks were considered to have screened positive for unhealthy alcohol use. They were randomly assigned by the Web server software to the control group (screening only) or to the intervention group.

M.Alizadeh

22

Adjustment

- Characteristics of the study groups
- Sample paper!!!!



M.Alizadeh

23

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics and Alcohol Use of the Study Groups at Baseline

	Control (n=1184)	Intervention (n=1251)
Women, %	45.5	45.1
Age, mean (SD), y	19.7 (1.8)	19.7 (1.8)
Living arrangement, %		
With a parent or guardian	64.3	66.4
Shared house/student housing	29.7	27.2
Other	5.9	6.3
AUDIT score, mean (SD)	14.3 (5.1)	14.2 (5.1)
Drinking summary data ^c		
Drinks alcohol 2 or more times per week, %	62.2	59.3
No. of standard drinks per typical drinking occasion, mean (SD)	8.5 (4.6)	8.5 (5.2)
Alcohol dependence subscale score, mean (SD) ^b	1.8 (1.8)	1.8 (1.8)


Abbreviation: AUDIT, Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test.

^aAUDIT items 1 and 2.

^bSum of scores for AUDIT items 4 through 6.

M.Alizadeh

24



Maintenance


- آیا شرایط قابل مقایسه دو گروه تا آخر مطالعه حفظ شده است؟
- آیا یک گروه درمان یا مداخله اضافی دیگری دریافت نکرده است؟

Adequate follow-up •

- تعداد افراد تا پایان مطالعه
- قرار گرفتن در همان گروه
- مدت پیگیری (تا بروز پیامد مورد نظر)

Intention to treat analysis 28





27



Intention to treat analysis

- افراد در همان گروهی مورد تجزیه و تحلیل قرار می گیرند که از همان ابتدا در آن گروه بودند.



M.Alizadeh

28




STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

The primary outcomes and the AREAS scores were analyzed with negative binomial regression for panel data using the Stata 10.1 xtnbreg procedure (StataCorp, College Station, Texas).²⁸ The APS scores were analyzed with linear regression after log transformation using xtmixed (StataCorp). For the proportions of students exceeding the Australian National Health and Medical Research Council's drinking guidelines, we used generalized linear mixed models with the xtlogit procedure (StataCorp).^{29,30} All models included a random intercept to account for clustering within participant²⁹ as well as fixed effects for group, follow-up assessment, and their interaction.³¹ The interaction term allowed differences in the intervention effect between follow-up assessments. The results are presented as rate ratios, difference in regression coefficients, and odds ratios, respectively, along with overall tests of intervention with 2 *df*.

Participants were analyzed in the group to which they were randomized (intention to treat), and all participants were followed up regardless of their compliance with the intervention. We describe patterns of missing values and compare those observed and those missing in terms of baseline characteristics. In this study, some participants were missing at the 1 month follow-up assessment, others at 6 months, and some at both time points (no postrandomization data available). We compared baseline AUDIT scores, age, sex, and treatment ob-

M.Alizadeh

31



Measurement (Blinding, Objective)

- Double blind
- Objective outcomes
- Sample paper!!!!



M.Alizadeh

33

Were patients, clinicians, and study personnel kept blind to treatment?



M.Alizadeh

34



Fig. 3 A double-blind placebo-controlled clinical trial for CAM therapies.

35

baseline, a form of booster intervention.

Participants were blind to the true nature of the study, which was presented as a series of surveys, in accordance with ethical approval, provided by the research ethics committee of Curtin University, Perth, Australia. Researchers were blind to participants' group allocation.

OUTCOMES AND FOLLOW-UP


M.Alizadeh


36

Methods: A randomized controlled trial was conducted at an Australian university in 2007. Invitations were sent to 13 000 undergraduates (age range, 17-24 years) to complete a Web-based Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test. Of 7237 students who responded, 2435 scored in the hazardous/harmful range (≥ 8) and were randomized, and 2050 (84%) completed at least 1 follow-up assessment. Intervention was 10 minutes of Web-based motivational assessment and personalized feedback. Controls received only screening. Follow-up assessments were conducted at 1 and 6 months with observers and participants blinded to allocation. Outcome measures were drinking frequency, typical occasion quantity, overall volume, number of personal problems, an academic problems score, prevalence of binge drinking, and prevalence of heavy drinking.

M.Alizadeh

37






$$\text{OCCURRENCE} = \frac{\text{Outcomes}}{\text{Population} / \text{Time}}$$
$$\text{Numerator/Denominator/Time}$$

M.Alizadeh

40



Relative Risk(RR)

- خطر نسبی
- احتمال بروز یک پیامد یا نتیجه در گروه مداخله چند برابر گروه مقایسه است؟
- $RR=1$ تفاوتی بین دو گروه وجود ندارد
- $RR<1$ درمان احتمال بروز پیامد را کم می کند
- $RR>1$ درمان احتمال بروز پیامد را بیشتر می کند

$$RR = \frac{\text{ریسک بروز پیامد در گروه مداخله}}{\text{ریسک بروز پیامد در گروه مقایسه}}$$

M.Alizadeh

42

Variable	Treatment Effects	
	RR ^a (95% CI) Intervention/Control	
	Without Multiple Imputation for Missing Values	With Multiple Imputation for Missing Values ^b
Primary outcomes		
Frequency of drinking		
1 mo	0.89 (0.83 to 0.94)	0.90 (0.85 to 0.96)
6 mo	0.91 (0.85 to 0.97)	0.91 (0.85 to 0.96)
Typical occasion quantity		
1 mo	0.93 (0.88 to 0.98)	0.93 (0.88 to 0.99)
6 mo	0.96 (0.91 to 1.02)	0.94 (0.89 to 0.99)
Volume consumed		
1 mo	0.83 (0.78 to 0.90)	0.85 (0.79 to 0.92)
6 mo	0.89 (0.82 to 0.96)	0.86 (0.81 to 0.92)

M.Alizadeh 43

Absolute Risk Reduction (ARR) Absolute Risk difference

- تفاوت خطر
- $ARR=0$ تفاوتی بین دو گروه از نظر تاثیر درمان وجود ندارد
- ARR مثبت: درمان مفید است
- ARR منفی: درمان مضر است
- ریسک پیامد در گروه مقایسه منهای ریسک پیامد در گروه مداخله
- $0.15 - 0.10 = 0.05 (5\%)$ درصد کاهش در میزان مرگ ناشی از درمان

M.Alizadeh

44

- If the experimental treatment increased the risk of a good event, we can use this same equation to calculate the absolute benefit increase (ABI).
- Or, if the experimental treatment increases the risk of an adverse event, we can use the equation to calculate the absolute risk increase (ARI)

M.Alizadeh

45

Relative Risk reduction(RRR)

- کاهش میزان بروز پیامد در گروه مواجهه نسبت به گروه مقایسه
- $1 - RR$
- $ARR / \text{risk of event in control group}$
- $0.05 / 0.15 = 0.33 (33\%)$
- **بروز عوارض یا مرگ در گروه مداخله ۳۳٪ کمتر از گروه مقایسه است**

M.Alizadeh

46

- If the experimental treatment increases the risk of a good event, we can use this same equation to calculate the relative benefit increase (RBI).
- Similarly, if the experimental treatment increases the risk of an adverse event we can use the equation to calculate the relative risk increase (RRI).

M.Alizadeh

47

Number needed to treat(NNT)

- $1/ARR$
- $1/0.05=20$
- **تعداد بیمارانیکه باید درمان شوند تا از یک مورد مرگ یا عوارض پیشگیری شود**
- **۲۰ بیمار به مدتسال باید درمان شوند تا از یک مورد مرگ جلوگیری شود**

M.Alizadeh

48

- In a randomised controlled trial (Stroke 1997; 28:1861-6) looking into the long-term outcome for stroke patients treated in stroke units (SU) compared with patients treated in general wards (GW),
- the mortality rate 5 years after the onset of stroke was 59.1% in the patients treated in SU and 70.9% in those treated in the GW. How many patients need to be treated in stroke units to prevent one additional death?
- NNT = _____

M.Alizadeh

49

- $ARR = |CER - EER| = |0.709 - 0.591| = 0.118$

$$NNT = 1/ARR = 1/0.118 = 9$$

- Nine patients would need to be treated in stroke units to prevent one additional death.

M.Alizadeh

50

- When the treatment increases the risk of adverse events, we can calculate the number of patients that we'd need to treat with this therapy to cause one additional bad event and this term is called the number needed to harm (NNH). The NNH is calculated as $1/ARI$.

M.Alizadeh

51

Important example



Event: stroke


Mean follow-up: 5 years

Control rate	Experimental rate	RRR CER-EEE/CER	ARR CER-EER	NNT 1/ARR
5.7%	4.3%	$(5.7\% - 4.3\%) / 5.7\% = 25\%$	$5.7\% - 4.3\% = 0.014$	$1 / 1.4\% = 72$

M.Alizadeh

52

Important example



Event: stroke
Mean follow-up: 5 years


Control rate	Experimental rate	RRR CER-EEE/CER	ARR CER-EER	NNT 1/ARR
5.7%	4.3%	$(5.7\% - 4.3\%) / 5.7\% = 25\%$	$5.7\% - 4.3\% = 0.014$	$1 / 0.014 = 72$
0.000057%	0.000043%	$(0.000057\% - 0.000043\%) / 0.000057\% = 25\%$	$0.000057\% - 0.000043\% = 0.000014\%$	$1 / 0.000014\% = 714285$

M.Alizadeh 53

P value

چقدر احتمال دارد که نتایج بدست آمده بخاطر شانس باشد؟ (شانسی باشد)


what does p=0.5 mean?
what does p=0.05 mean?
what does p=0.1 mean?



0 1

Impossible *Absolutely certain*


M.Alizadeh 54



Number in treatment arm	5	
Responders in treatment arm	4	
Proportion responding in treatment arm	0.8	
Number in control arm	5	
Responders in control arm	2	
Proportion responding in control arm	0.4	
p-value	0.29	M.Alizadeh 55

Number in treatment arm	5	10
Responders in treatment arm	4	8
Proportion responding in treatment arm	0.8	0.8
Number in control arm	5	10
Responders in control arm	2	4
Proportion responding in control arm	0.4	0.4
p-value	0.29	0.09
		eh 56

Number in treatment arm	5	10	15	20	100
Responders in treatment arm	4	8	12	16	80
Proportion responding in treatment arm	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8	0.8
Number in control arm	5	10	15	20	100
Responders in control arm	2	4	6	8	40
Proportion responding in control arm	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.4
p-value	0.29	0.09	0.03	0.01	<0.0001






Confidence Interval


- An estimate of the range of values that are likely to include a real value.

M.Alizadeh

59







- a randomized placebo-controlled trial of acellular pertussis vaccine:
- 72/1670 (4.3%) infants developed pertussis among those receiving the vaccine
- 240/1665 (14.4%) did so among the control group.
- absolute risk reduction, is 10.1%.
- The SE of this difference is 0.99%,
- so that the 95% CI is $10.1\% \pm 1.96 \times 0.99\%$, and therefore runs from 8.2 to 12.0.

M.Alizadeh

64

- *In a randomized trial to compare suturing and stapling for large-bowel anastomosis,*
- *wound infection occurred in 10.9% and 13.5% of cases respectively ($P = 0.30$).*
- *The 95% CI for this difference of 2.6% is -2 to $+8$.*
- *Sung et al carried out a randomized trial to compare octreotide infusion and emergency sclerotherapy for acute variceal hemorrhage in 100 patients.*
- *The observed rates of controlled bleeding were 84% in the octreotide group and 90% in the sclerotherapy group,*
- *$P = 0.56$.*
- *In this case, however, the 95% CI for the treatment difference of 6% is -7 to $+19$.*
- *It is clear that the study cannot rule out a large difference in effectiveness, so that the authors' conclusion that "octreotide infusion and sclerotherapy are equally effective in controlling variceal haemorrhage" is certainly not valid.*

M.Alizadeh

65

