

An interactive web application to aid diagnostic test accuracy meta-analysis

Suzanne Freeman^{1,2}, Clareece Kerby¹, Nicola Cooper^{1,2}, Alex Sutton^{1,2}

Cochrane Colloquium, 18th September 2018

suzanne.freeman@leicester.ac.uk

¹ Biostatistics Research Group, Department of Health Sciences, University of Leicester, UK, ² NIHR Complex Reviews Support Unit

NIHR CRSU

Complex Reviews Support Unit

Conflicts of Interest

I have no actual or potential conflicts of interest in relation to this presentation.

Acknowledgements

The Complex Reviews Support Unit (CRSU) is funded by the National Institute for Health Research (project number 14/178/29)

Department of Health Disclaimer:


The views and opinions expressed herein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health

Background

- Diagnostic tests generally split individuals into healthy or diseased
- Routinely used to guide treatment decisions
- Some studies aim to identify a new diagnostic test that is still as acceptably accurate as the “gold standard” but less costly or invasive
- Accuracy of a diagnostic test often assessed by comparing to the “gold standard” in terms of sensitivity and specificity

Meta-Analysis of DTA studies

- Meta-analysis of DTA studies synthesises sensitivity and specificity
 - Important to take correlation into account
- Often performed using bivariate or hierarchical summary receiver operating curve (HSROC) models
- Results often presented as a summary receiver operating curve (SROC)
- Current software:
 - Stata (metandi)
 - R (mada, lme4, bamdit)
 - SAS (MetaDAS)
 - All require some form of expert knowledge



What about RevMan?

- From the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of DTA:

“The Moses-Littenberg model is used in RevMan to provide reviewers with the facility to undertake purely exploratory analyses based on SROC curves without needing to export data out of RevMan. **Because of the limitations of the Moses-Littenberg method, RevMan does not provide parameter estimates or standard errors from this model** as inferences should be based on hierarchical models that take separate account of within study sampling error and additional unexplained heterogeneity between studies.”

- To fit bivariate or HSROC models need to import model parameters from other software such as Stata, SAS or R

Aim

To develop a freely available web-based “point and click” interactive online application which allows users to input their own data and conduct meta-analyses of DTA studies including sensitivity analyses

App Development

- R and the packages Shiny and lme4
 - Shiny used to create the online application
 - lme4 used for the statistical analysis (bivariate binomial model of Chu & Cole)
- Application hosted on the shinyapps server available at:
https://crsu.shinyapps.io/dta_ma/
- Available to all users with an internet browser
 - No specialist software required

Example

- Fourteen studies assessing the use of the AUDIT-C (Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption) questionnaire for identifying patients with an unhealthy alcohol use problem

author	year	TP	FN	FP	TN
Aalto	2006	47	9	101	738
Aertgeerts01	2001	126	51	272	1543
Aertgeerts02	2002	19	10	12	192
Bradley03	2003	36	3	78	276
Bradley07	2007	130	19	211	959
Bush	1998	84	2	68	89

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis

Home Load Data Meta-Analysis Sensitivity Analysis

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-Analysis

Suzanne Freeman, Clareece Kerby, Nicola Cooper, Alex Sutton

For feedback/questions about this app please contact suzanne.freeman@leicester.ac.uk

App powered by Rshiny with statistical analyses performed using the package lme4:
<https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=lme4>

Note: Prior to 3rd September 2018 statistical analyses were performed using the package mada

An interactive primer on diagnostic test accuracy can be found at:
<https://crsu.shinyapps.io/diagprimer/>

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis | Home | Load Data | Meta-Analysis | Sensitivity Analysis

Please select a file

Select No file selected

Default maximum file size is 5MB

File options

First row as column headings

File Delimiter

Comma
 Semicolon
 Tab
 Space

File Upload | **Data for Analysis**

Please select a file to upload

The file should contain six columns. Labelling of columns is case sensitive.

The **first** column should be labelled **author** and contain the name of the study author. The author name must be unique for each study.

The **second** column should be labelled **year** and contain the year of publication.

The **third** column should be labelled **TP** and contain the number of patients with a true positive test result.

The **fourth** column should be labelled **FN** and contain the number of patients with a false negative test result.

The **fifth** column should be labelled **FP** and contain the number of patients with a false positive test result.

The **sixth** column should be labelled **TN** and contain the number of patients with a true negative test result.

An example of this structure can be seen in the 'Data for Analysis' tab.

The default dataset is a subset of data from a study on unhealthy alcohol use and alcohol use disorders (Kriston et al. Ann Intern Med. 2008; 149: 879). The dataset consists of fourteen studies assessing the use of the AUDIT-C (Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test-Consumption) questionnaire for identifying patients with an unhealthy alcohol use problem.

Note: The default dataset, pre-loaded on the 'Data for Analysis' tab will be used for analysis if no file is selected. The 'Data for Analysis' tab will automatically update once a file is successfully loaded.

Excel files should be saved in csv format and the separator option 'comma' selected for upload.

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis Home Load Data Meta-Analysis Sensitivity Analysis

Please select a file

Select No file selected

Default maximum file size is 5MB

File options

First row as column headings

File Delimiter

Comma

Semicolon

Tab

Space

File Upload Data for Analysis

author	year	TP	FN	FP	TN
Aalto	2006	47	9	101	738
Aertgeerts01	2001	126	51	272	1543
Aertgeerts02	2002	19	10	12	192
Bradley03	2003	36	3	78	276
Bradley07	2007	130	19	211	959
Bush	1998	84	2	68	89
Gomez	2006	68	0	112	423
Gordon	2001	752	0	3226	2977
Gual	2002	59	5	55	136
Rumpf	2002	142	50	571	2788
Seale	2006	137	24	107	358
Selin	2006	57	3	103	437
Tsai	2005	34	1	21	56
Tuunanen	2007	152	51	88	254

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis Home Load Data Meta-Analysis Sensitivity Analysis

Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies

Options for ROC Curve tab

- Data Points
- SROC curve
- Extrapolate SROC curve

Bivariate model options

- Summary point
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Study-level Outcomes ROC Curve Statistics

Show 30 entries Search:

	Author	Year	TP	FN	FP	TN	N	Sensitivity	Specificity	FPR
1	Aalto	2006	47	9	101	738	895	0.839	0.880	0.120
2	Aertgeerts01	2001	126	51	272	1543	1992	0.712	0.850	0.150
3	Aertgeerts02	2002	19	10	12	192	233	0.655	0.941	0.059
4	Bradley03	2003	36	3	78	276	393	0.923	0.780	0.220
5	Bradley07	2007	130	19	211	959	1319	0.872	0.820	0.180
6	Bush	1998	84	2	68	89	243	0.977	0.567	0.433
7	Gomez	2006	68	0	112	423	603	1.000	0.791	0.209
8	Gordon	2001	752	0	3226	2977	6955	1.000	0.480	0.520
9	Gual	2002	59	5	55	136	255	0.922	0.712	0.288
10	Rumpf	2002	142	50	571	2788	3551	0.740	0.830	0.170
11	Seale	2006	137	24	107	358	626	0.851	0.770	0.230
12	Selin	2006	57	3	103	437	600	0.950	0.809	0.191
13	Tsai	2005	34	1	21	56	112	0.971	0.727	0.273
14	Tuunanen	2007	152	51	88	254	545	0.749	0.743	0.257

Showing 1 to 14 of 14 entries Previous 1 Next

[Download Table](#)

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis Home Load Data Meta-Analysis Sensitivity Analysis

Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies

Study-level Outcomes ROC Curve Statistics

Note: At least one box under 'Options for ROC Curve tab' must be selected to avoid an error message

Plot title
Random Effects Meta-Analysis

Options for ROC Curve tab

- Data Points
- SROC curve
- Extrapolate SROC curve

Bivariate model options

- Summary point
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Random Effects Meta-Analysis

Legend:

- HSROC curve
- Summary estimate
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region
- Data

Hover over plot for individual study summaries

Select plot format

Options for ROC Curve tab

- Data Points
- SROC curve
- Extrapolate SROC curve

Bivariate model options

- Summary point
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Study-level Outcomes


ROC Curve

S

Note: At least one box under 'Options for ROC Curve' must be checked.

Plot title

Random Effects Meta-Analysis



Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis | Home | Load Data | **Meta-Analysis** | Sensitivity Analysis

Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies

Options for ROC Curve tab

- Data Points
- SROC curve
- Extrapolate SROC curve

Bivariate model options

- Summary point
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Study-level Outcomes | **ROC Curve** | Statistics

Parameter	Estimate	2.5%	97.5%
Sensitivity	0.925	0.834	0.968
Specificity	0.781	0.719	0.833
False Positive Rate	0.219	0.167	0.281
Correlation	-0.746		
θ	-0.250		
λ	3.612		
β	-0.958		
σ_{θ}	0.904		
σ_{α}	0.378		
Diagnostic Odds Ratio	44.050	13.706	74.394
Log Likelihood Ratio +ve	4.231	3.327	5.135
Log Likelihood Ratio -ve	0.096	0.021	0.171

Download Table

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analyses

crsu.shinyapps.io/dta_ma/

Sensitivity Analysis

Options for ROC Curve tab

- Data points
- SROC curve
- Extrapolate SROC curve

Bivariate model options

- Summary point
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Select studies to include:

- Aalto
- Aertgeerts01
- Aertgeerts02
- Bradley03
- Bradley07
- Bush
- Gomez
- Gordon
- Gual
- Rumpf
- Seale
- Selin

ROC Curve Statistics

Note: At least two studies must be selected for inclusion to avoid an error message

Plot title

Random Effects Meta-Analysis

Random Effects Meta-Analysis

Sensitivity

False Positive Rate

Legend:

- HSROC curve
- Summary estimate
- - - 95% Confidence region
- ⋯ 95% Predictive region
- △ Data


Hover over plot for individual study summaries

Select plot format

Select studies to include:

- Aalto
- Aertgeerts01
- Aertgeerts02
- Bradley03
- Bradley07
- Bush
- Gomez
- Gordon
- Gual
- Rumpf
- Seale
- Selin
- Tsai
- Tuunanen

Random Effects Meta-Analysis



Diagnostic Test Accuracy Meta-analysis Home Load Data Meta-Analysis Sensitivity Analysis

Sensitivity Analysis

Options for ROC Curve tab

- Data points
- SROC curve
- Extrapolate SROC curve

Bivariate model options

- Summary point
- 95% Confidence region
- 95% Predictive region

Options for Statistics tab

- Sensitivity
- Specificity
- False Positive Rate
- Correlation
- HSROC parameters
- Diagnostic Odds Ratio
- Likelihood Ratios

Select studies to include:

- Aalto
- Aertgeerts01
- Aertgeerts02
- Bradley03
- Bradley07
- Bush
- Gomez
- Gordon
- Gual
- Dumf

ROC Curve Statistics

All studies

Parameter	Estimate	2.5%	97.5%
Sensitivity	0.925	0.834	0.968
Specificity	0.781	0.719	0.833
False Positive Rate	0.219	0.167	0.281

Selected studies only

Parameter	Estimate	2.5%	97.5%
Sensitivity	0.786	0.645	0.881
Specificity	0.869	0.802	0.916
False Positive Rate	0.131	0.084	0.198

Download Table

ROC Curve

Statistics

All studies

Parameter	Estimate	2.5%	97.5%
Sensitivity	0.925	0.834	0.968
Specificity	0.781	0.719	0.833
False Positive Rate	0.219	0.167	0.281

Selected studies only

Parameter	Estimate	2.5%	97.5%
Sensitivity	0.786	0.645	0.881
Specificity	0.869	0.802	0.916
False Positive Rate	0.131	0.084	0.198

 Download Table

Conclusions

- We developed a freely available interactive online application which meta-analyses DTA studies, produces the SROC plot and allows sensitivity analyses to be conducted
- All tables and plots can be downloaded
- We think we achieved our initial aim however...To do list:
 - Subgroup analysis/covariates
 - Move list of included studies to separate panel (sensitivity analysis page)
 - Test how much data the app can handle & different internet browsers
 - Compatibility with RevMan

References

Chu H, Cole SR. Bivariate meta-analysis for sensitivity and specificity with sparse data: a generalized linear mixed model approach (letter to the Editor). *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2006;59:1331-1331.

Kriston et al. Meta-analysis: Are 3 questions enough to detect unhealthy alcohol use? *Ann Intern Med*. 2008; 149: 879

Littenberg B, Moses L. Estimating diagnostic accuracy from multiple conflicting reports: A new meta-analytic method. *Medical Decision Making*. 1993;13:313-21

Macaskill P, Gatsonis C, Deeks JJ, Harbord RM, Takwoingi Y. Chapter 10: Analysing and Presenting Results. In: Deeks JJ, Bossuyt PM, Gatsonis C (editors), *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Diagnostic Test Accuracy* Version 1.0. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2010. Available from: <http://srdta.cochrane.org/>.

Moses L, Shapiro D, Littenberg B. Combining independent studies of a diagnostic test into a summary ROC curve: data-analytic approaches and some additional considerations. *Stat Med*. 1993;12:1293-316

Partlett C, Takwoingi Y. Meta-analysis of test accuracy studies in R: a summary of user-written programs and step-by-step guide to using glmer. Version 1.0. August 2016. Available from: <http://methods.cochrane.org/sdt/>

Reitsma JB, Glas AS, Rutjes AW, Scholten RJ, Bossuyt PM, Zwinderman AH. Bivariate analysis of sensitivity and specificity produces informative summary measures in diagnostic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2005;58(10):982-90

Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014

Rutter CM, Gatsonis CA. A hierarchical regression approach to meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy evaluations. *Stat Med*. 2001;20(19):2865-84