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| Disclosure |
| :--- |
| - Dr. Gettig has no conflicts of interest to |
| disclose. |
|  |
|  |
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Learning Objectives

- At the end of this session, the learner will be
able to:
- Define and interpret the following: nominal data,
ordinal data, continuous data, Type I error, Type II
error, alpha, beta, power, p-values and confidence
intervals.
- Describe the factors that affect statistical power.
- Compare, contrast and calculate absolute risk,
absolute risk reduction/increase, relative risk, relative
risk reduction/increase, odds ratio and number
needed to treat/harm
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ ordinal data, continuous data, Type I error, Type II error, alpha, beta, power, p-values and confidence rals. $\qquad$
- Describe the factors that affect statistical power.

Compare, contrast and calculate absolute risk, absolute risk reduction/increase, relative risk, relative risk reduction/increase, odds ratio and number needed to treat/harm

## Learning Objectives (cont.)

Train

- At the end of this session, the learner will be able to:
- Select the appropriate parametric or nonparametric statistical test given a set of variables and a hypothesis
- Explain how statistical results in clinical studies can be used to make clinical decisions.
How confident are you with regard
to your ability to interpret statistics?
A. Very confident
B. Moderately confident
C. Somewhat confident
D. Not at all confident
E. This session is about statistics? Where's
the door?!
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Basic Terms/Concepts |  |
| :---: | :--- |
|  |  |
| Types of data <br> - Nominal <br> - Ordinal <br> - Continuous <br> • Interval <br> • ratio | significance terms |
|  | - Alpha |
|  | - Beta |
|  | - Type I II |
|  | - Power |
|  | - P-value |
|  | - Confidence interval |
|  |  |


$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| General Rule about Types of Data |
| :--- |
| - Higher level data can be transformed into |
| lower level data, but not the converse. |
| - Example: |
| - 4 patients |
| - SBPs: $119 \mathrm{mmHg}, 127 \mathrm{mmHg}, 117 \mathrm{mmHg}, 136 \mathrm{mmHg}$ |
| • Assume $\leq 120 \mathrm{mmHg}$ is "at goal" |
| • How many patients are at goal? |
| • If we started with how many patients were at goal, |
| would you be able to determine their individual |
| SBPs? |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$ lower level data, but not the converse.

- Example:
- SBPs: $119 \mathrm{mmHg}, 127 \mathrm{mmHg}, 117 \mathrm{mmHg}, 136 \mathrm{mmHg}$ $\qquad$
- How many patients are at goal? $\qquad$
med with how many patients were at would you be able to determine their individual SBPs?

| Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of the Participants |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Characteristic | Sustained-Release Bupropion $(\mathrm{n}=300)$ | Placebo ( $\mathrm{n}=300$ ) |
| Age, mean (SD). y | 44.0 (10.9) | 44.4 (11.3) |
| Women, No. (\%) | 212 (70.7) | 208 (69.3) |
| Married or living with a partner, No. (\%) | 117 (39.0) | 113 (37.7) |
| Monthly family income <\$1800, No. (\%) | 158 (52.6) | 164 (54.6) |
| SHigh school graduate, No. (\%) | 151 (50.3) | 149 (49.7) |
| No. of cigarettes smoked per day, mean (SD) | 16.1 (7.5) | 17.1 (8.5) |
| Smoke mentholated cigarettes, No. (\%) | 235 (78.3) | 236 (78.7) |
| Fagerström score, mean (SD)* | 4.6 (2.1) | 4.7 (1.9) |
| No. of previous serious attempts to quit, mean (SD) | 2.1 (4.7) | 2.2 (4.2) |
| Salivary cotinine, mean (SD), ng/mL | 287.2 (138.8) | 296.5 (147.0) |
| Exhaled carbon monoxide, mean (SD), ppm | 22.1 (13.2) | 23.3 (15.2) |
| $\frac{\text { Previous use of sus }}{\text { Other smokers in th }} \mathbf{A}=$ Nominal |  | 24 (8.0) |
|  |  | 96 (32.0) |
| Weight, mean (SD). |  | 81.6 (20.1) |
| Body mass index, $n$ B = Ordinal |  | 28.7 (6.3) |
| CES-D, mean (SD) + |  | 11.9 (8.7) |
| $\frac{\text { Possible clinical deg }}{\text { The Fagestrom lest }}$ C= Continuous |  | 84 (28.0) |
|  |  | te greater levels |
| of nicotine dependence. <br> $\dagger$ Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) scores can range from 0 to 60 . Scores of 16 or higher indicate the likelihood of dinical depression because it represented the 80th percentile in a representative population. ${ }^{18}$ |  |  |
| Adapted from Ahluwalia JS, Harris KJ, Catley D, Okuyemi K, Mayo M. Sustained-ReleaseBupropion for Smoking Cessation in African Americans. JAMA 2002 Jul; 288(4):468-474. |  |  |

## Hypotheses

- Null hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{0}\right)$
- Assumes no difference between therapies
$\qquad$
- Goal of studies is usually to reject $\mathrm{H}_{\text {o }}$
- Research/alternate hypothesis $\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}\right)$
- Assumes a difference between therapies
- Goal of studies is usually to accept $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}$
Type I Error
- Also called "alpha" error
- Null hypothesis is incorrectly rejected
- A difference is inferred; however, there is no true
difference $\rightarrow$ false positive
- alpha $\leq 0.05$ is generally accepted
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

What does the ' $p$ ' value mean?
- Every inferential statistical test has a 'test
statistic' ( $t, F, \chi^{2}$ ) and a probability of that result
( $p$ )
- ' $p$ ' is the probability that there is no difference,
$\frac{\text { no effect, or no relationship between the }}{\text { groups in the entire population of interest }}$
- Probability that the null hypothesis is true
- How likely is the observed difference, effect, or
relationship due to random chance?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Every inferential statistical test has a 'test statistic' ( $\mathrm{t}, \mathrm{F}, \chi^{2}$ ) and a probability of that result
' $p$ ' is the probability that there is no difference,
$\qquad$ no effect, or no relationship between the
$\qquad$ groups in the entire population of interes
- Probability that the null hypothesis is true $\qquad$
How likely is the observed difference, effect, or relationship due to random chance? $\qquad$
$\qquad$

What does the ' $p$ ' value mean?
$\qquad$

- The $p$ value is used in determining whether or not the null hypothesis should be accepted or rejected $\qquad$
- If ' $p$ ' is less than or equal to alpha, the null $\qquad$ hypothesis must be rejected
- What about the research hypothesis?
- If ' $p$ ' is greater than alpha, the null hypothesis must be accepted (or not rejected)
- What about the research hypothesis?

| Please complete question |
| :---: |
| $\# 1$ on worksheet. |
|  |
|  |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Confidence Intervals

- Estimates the range of values likely to contain the true value for a population
- Most population values (mean, \%) are practically impossible to obtain
- The width of a confidence interval depends on $\qquad$
- The amount of variability in the sample data
- The degree of confidence the researchers wish to have that their interval contains the true value

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Type II Error
- Also called "beta" error
- Null hypothesis is incorrectly accepted
(or not rejected)
- No difference is detected; however, there is a true
difference $\rightarrow$ false negative
- beta $\leq 0.20$ is generally accepted
- Chance for Type II error generally decreases as sample
size increases

Can Type I and Type II error occur simultaneously for the same endpoint in a study? $\qquad$
A. Yes
B. No

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

-Sample size and power are directly related.
-Effect size and power are directly related. $\qquad$
-Alpha and power are directly related.
-Standard deviation and power are inversely related.

A researcher seeks to determine whether there is a significant difference in weight loss $\qquad$ between patients who take Drug A and patients who take Drug B $\qquad$

- Null hypothesis: There is no difference in weight loss between groups.
- The researcher wants to detect a difference of $10 \%$ weight loss in the 2 groups.
- Upon review of previous literature, the researcher estimates the standard deviation at 8 pounds.
- Alpha is set at 0.05
- Sample size to achieve $80 \%$ power is 250 patients per group.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

A = power increases, $B=$ power decreases,

$$
C=\text { no effect on power }
$$

- What if...
- The researcher changed his mind and wanted to wants to detect a difference of $3 \%$ weight loss between groups?
- The researcher underestimated the std. dev? It is actually 15 lbs .
- The researcher wants to set a more conservative alpha at 0.01 ?
- The researcher could only recruit 100 patients per group?

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Caveats to Measures of Risk

valip

Always keep results in perspective

- Are you referring to patients who received a medication or did not receive a medication?
- Are you referring to a positive (desired) outcome or a negative (adverse) outcome?
- In the case of head-to-head (comparative trials), which medication is the comparator and which is the intervention?
- By appropriately orienting yourself to the results, you will avoid misinterpretation of them.

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| Representing Risk |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Outcome |  |  |
|  |  | Y | N |  |
| Exposure | Y | A | B | M1 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | C | D | M2 |
|  | N |  |  |  |
|  |  | N1 | N2 | N |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| $A=$ \# of exposed persons with outcome <br> $B=$ \# of exposed persons without outcome <br> $C=$ \# of non-exposed persons with outcome <br> $D=$ \# of non-exposed persons without outcome |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| M1 $=$ total study sample exposed <br> M2 = total study sample not exposed <br> N1 = total study sample with outcome <br> N2 = total study sample without outcome <br> $\mathrm{N}=$ total study sample |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |



## What is Absolute Risk?

- Absolute risk is the risk or rate of an event in a defined period of time.
- Sometimes called incidence or incidence rate
- Helps readers make sense of the true risks and benefits of treatment
- Relative risk \& odds ratio do not help the reader consider how common an outcome is to start with.
- Using the previous 2 slides as examples: $\qquad$
- The AR for the outcome would be $A / M_{1}$ for those exposed (intervention group)
- The AR for stroke in the aspirin group would be $221 / 19,934=0.011=1.1 \%$



## What is ARI?

- Absolute Risk Increase (ARI)
- Difference in absolute risks of an outcome
$\qquad$ likely to result in harm to a patient
- Related to Number Needed to Harm (NNH)
- Calculated the same way as ARR
- Keep ARs in perspective to determine whether result is an ARR or ARI

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
What is NNT?
- For the previous example:
$-1 /$ ARR $=1 / 0.002=500$
- If you do not want to go back and forth between
decimal and percent, you can divide 100 by ARR
in its percent form (i.e., NNT $=10000.2=500)$ - Therefore, for every 500 patients that $\quad$ receive ASA instead of placebo (i.e., no


## What is NNT/NNH?

- In clinical practice, NNTs and NNHs can be compared to weigh risks versus benefits.
- Should take into account how severe the outcomes are in question. $\qquad$
- What's a more clinically important beneficial outcome?
- Getting to goal BP or preventing stroke?
- What's a more clinically important adverse outcome?
- Experiencing a headache or an embolism?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Odds ratios VS. Relative RiSkS
- 4 marbles: 1 is red; 3 are blue
odds of choosing a red marble are 3 to 1 against choosing
a red marble $=0.33=1 / 3$
probability of choosing a red marble is 0.25 or

1 in 4 $\quad$\begin{tabular}{l}
Odds ratios (ORs) are often used in case-control <br>
studies and in regression models. <br>

- $\quad$| Relative risks (RRs) are calculated in other study |
| :--- |
| designs. | <br>
- Hazard ratios (HRs) can be interpreted similar to <br>
RRs.
\end{tabular}

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ Hazard ratios (HRs) can be interpreted similar to
RRs.
$\qquad$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

## Types of Effects

- By convention, assuming the intervention is the $\qquad$ numerator and the comparator (which is often placebo) is the denominator: $\qquad$
- ORs/RRs/HRs $<1 \rightarrow$ protective/beneficial effect
- OR(stroke $)_{\text {ASA }}=(221 / 19713) /(266 / 19676)=0.829$ $\qquad$
- RR (stroke) $)_{\text {ASA }}=(221 / 19934) /(266 / 19942)=0.831$
- ORs/RRs/HRs $=1 \rightarrow$ NO effect
- Ors/RRs/HRs > $1 \rightarrow$ harmful/adverse effect
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Ors/RRs/HRs and Cls

## Use of confidence intervals

- Researchers often report a confidence interval around the relative risk rather than a $p$ value.
- Finding is considered statistically significant based on whether or not the Cl contains 1.
- RR(CVevent) ASA $=0.91,95 \% \mathrm{CI}=0.80$ to 1.03
- $\operatorname{RR}(\text { stroke })_{\mathrm{ASA}}=0.83,95 \% \mathrm{Cl}=0.69$ to 0.99
- $\operatorname{RR}(\text { hemstroke })_{\text {ASA }}=1.24,95 \% \mathrm{CI}=0.82$ to 1.87
- If the Cl contains 1 , the relative risk is not statistically significant!
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

| What is RRR? |
| :---: |
| - Relative risk reduction (RRR) |
| $-\quad 1-\mathrm{RR}$ |
| - RRR (stroke $)_{\text {ASA }}$ |
| $-\quad 1-R R=1-0.83=0.17$ or $17 \%$ |

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
What is RRI?

- Relative risk increase (RRI)
$-|(1-R R)|$
- calculated similarly to RRR
- Again, perspective is important
- Is the event beneficial or harmful?
- Which is the intervention? Which is the
comparator?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Is the event beneficial or harmful?
Which is the intervention? Which is the



## Relative vs. Absolute Risk Reduction/Increase

- RRRs and RRIs will almost always be larger than their corresponding ARRs and ARIs.
- Watch for these in drug ads!
- RRRs may be used for efficacy outcomes
- ARIs may be used for safety outcomes
- Why is this?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Promotional Material: Risk

$\qquad$

- Relative risk (RR) vs. absolute risk (AR) $\qquad$ vs. number needed to treat (NNT)
- RR will always be higher than AR
- CURE study example
- 20\% RRR CV events (2.1\% ARR)
$-1 \%$ ARI in serious bleeds (38\% RRI)
The CURE Trial Investigators. Effects of clopidogrel in addition to aspirin in patients with acute coronary syndromes without ST-segment elevation. N Engl J Med 2001; 345:494-502.



## Important Point

- RRs do not tell you anything about the overall incidence of the disease/outcome.
- For example:
- Treatment X reduced mortality from $40 \%$ (with placebo) to $20 \%$ (with tx)
- Treatment Y reduced mortality from $4 \%$ (with placebo) to $2 \%$ (with tx)
- Relative risk of death with tx is $\underline{0.5}$ for both treatments.
- Treatment X's NNT is $1 /$ ARR $=1 / 0.20=\underline{\mathbf{5}}$
- Treatment Y's NNT is $1 /$ ARR $=1 / 0.02=\underline{\mathbf{5 0}}$

$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Statistical Analysis

- Statistical tests to be performed should always be determined before (a priori) the study takes place and should be described in the Methods section
- Your job
- If reading a trial: Determine if the proper tests were performed. Interpret and evaluate the results.
- If performing a study: Select and perform the appropriate test. Interpret and evaluate the results.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$



## One-tailed vs. Two-tailed Tests

## One-tailed Test

- Research hypothesis states that one group will be higher/lower than another (directional)


## Two-tailed Test

- Research hypothesis states that one group will be different than another (non-directional)
- Two-tailed tests are more common
- Easier to reject null hypothesis


## Two-tailed Tests

- Researchers often "cheat" when interpreting two-tailed tests
- Assign a direction to the difference in the population based on the direction of the difference in the sample.
- This can result in "Type III" error
- There is a statistically significant difference, but the direction of the difference stated by the researchers based on their sample data is incorrect.
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Types of Groups

## Independent Groups

- The subjects being compared in each group are different - mutually exclusive
- Also known as between-group comparisons
- Examples
- RCT (parallel designs) - Drug A vs. Drug B, Drug vs. Placebo
- Males vs. Females
- P-1 vs. P-2 vs. P-3 vs. P-4
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Types of Groups

$\qquad$

## Dependent Groups

$\qquad$

- The subjects being compared in each group are the same
- Also known as within-group comparisons
- Examples
- Pretest - Posttest
- Before - After
- Crossover designs

A researcher designs a study in which 3 HMGCoA
Reductase Inhibitors are compared in 3 separate groups of
100 subjects (total 300). The primary outcome measure is
LDL at 8 weeks, and the null hypothesis is that there is no
difference in the treatments with respect to LDL.
Which statistical test should be used to analyze the data?
A - t-test
B - paired t-test
C - ANOVA
D - Mann Whitney U
E - Chi-square
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$


## Putting It All Together

- How can all this information used?
- Better conceptualize risk and benefit in clinical trials and pharmaceutical advertisements
- Better apply the results of studies to patient care
- Considering the worksheet:
- What if your patient was at very high risk for stroke or MI?
- What if your patient was at very high risk for bleeding?
- How would this affect your choice whether clopidogrel should be added to ASA?
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$ sould e added $\qquad$



## Guide to Inferential Statistical Tests of Difference

David P. Zgarrick, Ph.D.


## Important

Independent Groups - Different subjects in each group (mutually exclusive)
Dependent Groups - Same subjects in each group (paired/matched/repeated measures)

## Statistics in Clinical Practice <br> ICHP Annual Meeting 2009 Jacob Gettig, PharmD, MPH, BCPS

In groups of 2 to 4 , please answer the following questions.

| End Point | Clopidogrel plus Aspirin $(\mathrm{N}=7802)$ | Placebo plus Aspirin ( $\mathrm{N}=7801$ ) | Relative Risk (95\% CI)* | P Value |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | no. (\%) |  |  |  |
| Efficacy end points |  |  |  |  |
| Primary efficacy end point | 534 (6.8) | 573 (7.3) | 0.93 (0.83-1.05) | 0.22 |
| Death from any cause | 371 (4.8) | 374 (4.8) | 0.99 (0.86-1.14) | 0.90 |
| Death from cardiovascular causes | 238 (3.1) | 229 (2.9) | 1.04 (0.87-1.25) | 0.68 |
| Myocardial infarction (nonfatal) | 146 (1.9) | 155 (2.0) | 0.94 (0.75-1.18) | 0.59 |
| Ischemic stroke (nonfatal) | 132 (1.7) | 163 (2.1) | 0.81 (0.64-1.02) | 0.07 |
| Stroke (nonfatal) | 150 (1.9) | 189 (2.4) | 0.79 (0.64-0.98) | 0.03 |
| Secondary efficacy end point $\dagger$ | 1301 (16.7) | 1395 (17.9) | 0.92 (0.86-0.995) | 0.04 |
| Hospitalization for unstable angina, transient ischemic attack, or revascularization | 866 (11.1) | 957 (12.3) | 0.90 (0.82-0.98) | 0.02 |
| Safety end points |  |  |  |  |
| Severe bleeding | 130 (1.7) | 104 (1.3) | 1.25 (0.97-1.61) | 0.09 |
| Fatal bleeding | 26 (0.3) | 17 (0.2) | 1.53 (0.83-2.82) | 0.17 |
| Primary intracranial hemorrhage | 26 (0.3) | 27 (0.3) | 0.96 (0.56-1.65) | 0.89 |
| Moderate bleeding | 164 (2.1) | 101 (1.3) | 1.62 (1.27-2.08) | <0.001 |

* Cl denotes confidence interval.
$\dagger$ The secondary efficacy end point was the first occurrence of myocardial infarction, stroke, death from cardiovascular causes, or hospitalization for unstable angina, a transient ischemic attack, or a revascularization procedure (coronary, cerebral, or peripheral).

Adapted from: Bhatt DL et al. N Engl J Med. 2006; 354(16): 1706-17.

1. Assuming alpha was set at 0.05 , which efficacy and safety end points were statistically significant? How do you know?
2. For the secondary efficacy endpoint, identify/calculate the following:
a. $\mathrm{AR}_{\text {clopidogrel }+\mathrm{ASA}}$
b. $\mathrm{AR}_{\text {placebo }+ \text { ASA }}$
c. ARR
d. NNT
e. RRR
f. 95\% CI for the RRR
3. For the safety endpoint of moderate bleeding, identify/calculate the following:
a. $\mathrm{AR}_{\text {clopidogrel }+\mathrm{ASA}}$
b. $\mathrm{AR}_{\text {placebo } 0 \text { +ASA }}$
c. ARI
d. NNH
e. RRI
f. $95 \%$ CI for the RRI
4. Make a statement regarding the risk/benefit trade-off using the NNT and NNH for the above efficacy and safety endpoints.
