

Meta-analysis for diagnostic accuracy studies: A new statistical model using beta-binomial distributions and bivariate copulas

Oliver Kuß, Annika Hoyer, Alexander Solms

**Institute of Medical Epidemiology, Biostatistics, and Informatics,
Martin-Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale)**

Overview

- Introduction
- Current standard approach
- Our Model
- Copulas
- Two Examples: A simple one and a tricky one
- Future plans

Introduction: Definitons

- “Meta-analysis is a quantitative, systematic summary of a collection of separate studies for the purpose of obtaining information that cannot be derived from any of the studies alone “(Boissel et al., 1988)
- “There is an increasing interest in systematic reviews and meta-analyses of data from diagnostic accuracy studies” (Harbord, 2007)

Introduction:

Intervention studies with binary outcome

Study	Treatment	Control
1	0/17	3/18
2	245/1780	317/1802
3	47/590	63/595
...

Introduction: Intervention studies with binary outcome

Study	Treatment	Control	Effect size
1	0/17	3/18	$RR_1 = (0/17)/(3/18)$
2	245/1780	317/1802	$RR_2 = \dots$
3	47/590	63/595	$RR_3 = \dots$
...

$RR_{MA} = \dots$

Introduction: Diagnostic studies

Study	„Sick“ (Sensitivity)	„Healthy“ (Specificity)
1	0/17	3/18
2	245/1780	317/1802
3	47/590	63/595
...

Introduction: Diagnostic studies

Study	„Sick“ (Sensitivity)	„Healthy“ (Specificity)
1	0/17	3/18
2	245/1780	317/1802
3	47/590	63/595
...

In general, there is no interest in merging sensitivity and specificity per study.

Introduction: Diagnostic studies

Study	„Sick“ (Sensitivity)	„Healthy“ (Specificity)	Generally, there is no interest in merging sensitivity and specificity per study.
1	0/17	3/18	
2	245/1780	317/1802	
3	47/590	63/595	
...	

$$Se_{MA} = \dots$$

$$Sp_{MA} = \dots$$

Introduction: Diagnostic studies

Study	„Sick“ (Sensitivity)	„Healthy“ (Specificity)	Generally, there is no interest in merging sensitivity and specificity per study.
1	0/17	3/18	
2	245/1780	317/1802	
3	47/590	63/595	
...	

$$Se_{MA} = \dots$$

$$Sp_{MA} = \dots$$

... taking into account that each study reports two values that are
(generally negatively) correlated

Current standard approach

Bivariate logistic regression model with random effects:

$$\text{Sensitivity } Se = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad \text{and specificity } Sp = \frac{TN}{TN + FP}$$

(TP, FN, TN, FP represent the number of true positives, false negatives, true negatives and false positives, respectively)

$$TP_i | Se_i \sim \text{Binomial}(TP_i + FN_i, Se_i), \quad \text{logit}(Se_i) = \mu + \mathbf{U}_i \alpha + \phi_i$$

$$TN_i | Sp_i \sim \text{Binomial}(TN_i + FP_i, Sp_i), \quad \text{logit}(Sp_i) = \nu + \mathbf{V}_i \beta + \psi_i$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \psi_i \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{\phi_i}^2 & \rho_{\phi_i \psi_i} \\ \rho_{\phi_i \psi_i} & \sigma_{\psi_i}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right]$$

$\text{logit}(p) = \log(p/(1-p))$, μ , ν intercepts for $\text{logit}(Se_i)$, $\text{logit}(Sp_i)$, U_i , V_i vectors of possibly available covariates

Current standard approach

Advantages:

- Bivariate modeling of sensitivity and specificity
 - allows correlation within studies
- Sensitivity and specificity can vary between the studies (random effects)
- Accesses individual patient data
- Meta-Regression is possible
- Empty Cells (Se, Sp = 100%) are possible
- Standard software is available (SAS PROCs NLMIXED, GLIMMIX)

Problems:

- Sensitivity and specificity are modeled on logit scale
(interpretation of variance, correlation, ...)
- Likelihood has no closed form (product of N integrals → approximative methods/ numerical or stochastic integration needed)
- Only one possible dependence structure

Our model

Analogous:

TP_i and TN_i are binomially distributed

$$TP_i | Se_i \sim \text{Binomial}(TP_i + FN_i, Se_i),$$

$$TN_i | Sp_i \sim \text{Binomial}(TN_i + FP_i, Sp_i),$$

But:

Se_i and Sp_i are beta distributed

(=> Se_i and Sp_i are random effects)

~~$$\text{logit}(Se_i) = \mu + \mathbf{U}_i \alpha + \phi_i$$~~

~~$$\text{logit}(Sp_i) = \nu + \mathbf{V}_i \beta + \psi_i$$~~

~~$$\begin{pmatrix} \phi_i \\ \psi_i \end{pmatrix} \sim \mathcal{N} \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{\phi_i}^2 & \rho_{\phi_i \psi_i} \\ \rho_{\phi_i \psi_i} & \sigma_{\psi_i}^2 \end{pmatrix} \right]$$~~


Advantage:

TP_i and TN_i are beta-binomially distributed

Last step:

Modeling the dependence between Se_i and Sp_i by using copulas

Our model



Copulas

Definition:

Every function $C : [0, 1] \times [0, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ that satisfies

$$(i) \quad C(u, 0) = 0 = C(0, v), \quad \forall u, v \in [0, 1]$$

$$(ii) \quad C(u, 1) = u, \quad C(1, v) = v, \quad \forall u, v \in [0, 1]$$

$$(iii) \quad \forall u_1, u_2, v_1, v_2 \in [0, 1] \text{ with } u_1 \leq u_2, v_1 \leq v_2:$$


$$\Delta := C(u_2, v_2) - C(u_2, v_1) - C(u_1, v_2) + C(u_1, v_1) \geq 0$$

is a copula.

Important:

- A bivariate copula is a bivariate distribution on $[0, 1] \times [0, 1]$ with uniform margins
 - Most copulas have an explicit density
- Likelihood of the our model is a product of the likelihoods of the copula and of the margins

Copulas




Sens $\sim F$




Spec $\sim G$

+




Copula C

Gaussian copula
($\rho = -0.5$)




A copula describes the functional relationship between the marginal distributions and the related joint distribution.


Copulas




t-Copula



Clayton-Copula



Frank-Copula



AMH-Copula

Back to our model

Advantages:

- Modelling sensitivity and specificity on the original scale
- Closed Likelihood
 - Numerical stability
 - No need for numerical or stochastic integration
 - „Exact“ LR-test theory is applicable [MCMC: length of chain?, GQ: number of quadrature points?, effective degrees of freedom for random effects)
- Different copulas enable different dependence structures
 - optimisation via goodness of fit criteria
- Same number of parameters as compared to the standard model

Disadvantage:

- Standard model with bivariate normal distribution of the logits of sensitivity and specificity is slightly more flexible (Johnson, 1987)

Our Model: SAS PROC NLMIXED

```
proc nlmixed data=scheidler . . . ;  
    ...  
    pi_sens = exp(b_sens)/(1 + exp(b_sens));  
    pi_spec = exp(b_spec)/(1 + exp(b_spec));  
  
    alpha_sens1 = pi_sens*(1-rho_sens)/rho_sens ; alpha_sens2 = (1- pi_sens)*(1-rho_sens)/rho_sens ;  
    alpha_spec1 = pi_spec*(1-rho_spec)/rho_spec ; alpha_spec2 = (1- pi_spec)*(1-rho_spec)/rho_spec ;  
  
    do i=0 to TP;  
        f_senspdf = exp(lgamma(K+1)+lgamma(TP+alpha_sens1)+lgamma(K-i+alpha_sens2)+lgamma(alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2)  
            -lgamma(i+1)-lgamma(K-i+1)-lgamma(K+alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2) -lgamma(alpha_sens1)-lgamma(alpha_sens2));  
        F_sens = F_sens + f_senspdf;  
    end;  
  
    do i=0 to TN;  
        f_specpdf = exp(lgamma(G+1)+lgamma(i+alpha_spec1)+lgamma(G-i+alpha_spec2)+lgamma(alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2)  
            -lgamma(i+1)-lgamma(G-i+1)-lgamma(G+alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2) -lgamma(alpha_spec1)-lgamma(alpha_spec2));  
        F_spec = F_spec + f_specpdf;  
    end;  
    u = quantile('Gauss',F_sens); v = quantile('Gauss',F_spec);  
  
    ll_sens= lgamma(K+1)+lgamma(TP+alpha_sens1)+lgamma(K-TP+alpha_sens2)+lgamma(alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2)  
        -lgamma(TP+1)-lgamma(K-TP+1)-lgamma(K+alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2) -lgamma(alpha_sens1)-lgamma(alpha_sens2);  
    ll_spec= lgamma(G+1)+lgamma(TN+alpha_spec1)+lgamma(G-TN+alpha_spec2)+lgamma(alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2)  
        -lgamma(TN+1)-lgamma(G-TN+1)-lgamma(G+alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2) -lgamma(alpha_spec1)-lgamma(alpha_spec2);  
  
    ll_Gaussian= -log(sqrt(2*3.141*(1-normalcorr**2))) -(u**2 + v**2- 2*normalcorr*u*v)*normalcorr/(2*(1-normalcorr**2))  
        -logpdf('Gauss',u) -logpdf('Gauss',v);  
  
    ll = ll_sens + ll_spec + ll_Gaussian;  
  
    model dummy ~ general(ll);  
  
    estimate "Sensitivity" exp(b_sens)/(1 + exp(b_sens)) ;  
    estimate "Specificity" exp(b_spec)/(1 + exp(b_spec)) ;  
run;
```

Our Model: SAS PROC NL MIXED

```
proc nlmixed data=scheidler . . .;
    ...
    pi_sens = exp(b_sens)/(1 + exp(b_sens));
    pi_spec = exp(b_spec)/(1 + exp(b_spec));

    alpha_sens1 = pi_sens*(1-rho_sens)/rho_sens ; alpha_sens2 = (1- pi_sens)*(1-rho_sens)/rho_sens ;
    alpha_spec1 = pi_spec*(1-rho_spec)/rho_spec ; alpha_spec2 = (1- pi_spec)*(1-rho_spec)/rho_spec ;

do i=0 to TP;
    f_senspdf = exp(lgamma(K+1)+lgamma(TP+alpha_sens1)+lgamma(K-i+alpha_sens2)+lgamma(alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2)
        -lgamma(i+1)-lgamma(K-i+1)-lgamma(K+alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2) -lgamma(alpha_sens1)-lgamma(alpha_sens2));
    F_sens = F_sens + f_senspdf;
end;

do i=0 to TN;
    f_specpdf = exp(lgamma(G+1)+lgamma(TN+alpha_spec1)+lgamma(G-i+alpha_spec2)+lgamma(alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2)
        -lgamma(i+1)-lgamma(G-i+1)-lgamma(G+alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2) -lgamma(alpha_spec1)-lgamma(alpha_spec2));
    F_spec = F_spec + f_specpdf;
end;
u = quantile('Gauss',F_sens);

ll_sens= lgamma(K+1)+lgamma(TP+alpha_sens1)+lgamma(K-TP+alpha_sens2)+lgamma(alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2)
    -lgamma(TP+1)-lgamma(K-TP+1)-lgamma(K+alpha_sens1+alpha_sens2) -lgamma(alpha_sens1)-lgamma(alpha_sens2);
ll_spec= lgamma(G+1)+lgamma(TN+alpha_spec1)+lgamma(G-TN+alpha_spec2)+lgamma(alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2)
    -lgamma(TN+1)-lgamma(G-TN+1)-lgamma(G+alpha_spec1+alpha_spec2) -lgamma(alpha_spec1)-lgamma(alpha_spec2);

ll_Gaussian= -log(sqrt(2*3.141*(1-normalcorr**2))) -(u**2 + v**2- 2*normalcorr*u*v)*normalcorr/(2*(1-normalcorr**2))
    -logpdf('Gauss',u) -logpdf('Gauss',v);

ll = ll_sens + ll_spec + ll_Gaussian;

model dummy ~ general(ll);

estimate "Sensitivity" exp(b_sens)/(1 + exp(b_sens)) ;
estimate "Specificity" exp(b_spec)/(1 + exp(b_spec)) ;
run;
```

**But: No random statement needed,
we are only using the NL*-part of
PROC NL MIXED!**

```
spec1+alpha_spec2)
    -lgamma(alpha_spec1)-lgamma(alpha_spec2));
```

Standard Model: SAS PROC NLMIXED

```
proc nlmixed data=scheidler . . . ;  
    ...  
    p_sens= exp(b_sens + u_sens)/(1+(exp(b_sens + u_sens)));  
    p_spec= exp(b_spec + u_spec)/(1+(exp(b_spec + u_spec)));  
  
    ll_sens = TP*log(p_sens) + (K-TP)*log(1-p_sens);  
    ll_spec = TN*log(p_spec) + (G-TN)*log(1-p_spec);  
  
    ll=ll_sens +ll_spec;  
  
    model dummy ~ general(ll);  
  
    estimate "Sensitivity" exp(b_sens)/(1+(exp(b_sens)));  
    estimate "Specificity" exp(b_spec)/(1+(exp(b_spec)));  
  
    random u_sens u_spec ~ normal([0,0],[sd_sens,cov_sens_spec,sd_spec]) subject=study;  
run;
```

The simple example


From: Scheidler et al. Radiological evaluation of lymph node metastases in patients with cervical cancer. A meta-analysis.

Aim: Validation of lymphangiography for diagnosing lymph node metastases in patients with cervical cancer

Gold standard: Histological/cytological specimen taken from surgery or biopsy of lymph nodes

Source, y	N*	Sensitivity, No. (%)	Specificity, No. (%)
Kindermann et al, ²⁹ 1970	111	19/29 (66)	81/82 (99)
Lecart and Lenfant, ³² 1971	32	8/10 (80)	13/22 (59)
Piver et al, ⁴² 1971	103	41/53 (77)	49/50 (98)
Piver and Barlow, ⁴³ 1973	26	5/7 (71)	18/19 (95)
Kolbenstvedt, ³¹ 1975	300	45/77 (58)	165/223 (74)
Leman et al, ¹⁹ 1975	48	8/10 (80)	32/38 (84)
Brown et al, ⁴¹ 1979	21	5/6 (83)	7/15 (47)
Lagasse et al, ⁴⁸ 1979	95	15/26 (58)	52/69 (75)
Kjorstad et al, ³⁰ 1980	59	16/24 (67)	24/35 (69)
Ashraf et al, ²⁸ 1982	39	4/6 (67)	25/33 (76)
De Muylder et al, ³⁶ 1984	100	8/18 (44)	70/82 (85)
Smales et al, ³³ 1986	73	10/14 (71)	55/59 (93)
Feigen et al, ¹⁰ 1987	36	2/8 (25)	23/28 (82)
Swart et al, ³⁵ 1989	54	7/14 (50)	30/40 (75)
Heller et al, ¹¹ 1990	241	44/56 (79)	135/185 (73)
La Fianza et al, ¹² 1990	49	8/9 (89)	37/40 (93)
Stellato et al, ³⁴ 1992	21	4/4 (100)	14/17 (82)

The simple example



Datensatz: Scheidler, Copula: GAUSS, Constrain: NO


The simple example

	Sensitivity [95%-CI]	Specificity [95%-CI]	-2LogL
Gauss-Copula (Independence)	67.1% [60.0% - 74.1%]	80.7% [73.7% - 87.7%]	150.40
Gauss-Copula	67.0% [60.0% - 74.0%]	80.4% [73.1% - 87.7%]	150.30
Clayton-Copula	66.4% [58.0%, 74.7%]	80.9% [74.5%, 87.2%]	
Plackett-Copula	67.0% [60.0%, 73.9%]	80.6% [73.5%, 87.6%]	
Nelsen 4.2.16- Copula	65.2% [57.3%, 73.1%]	78.4% [69.9%, 86.9%]	
Standard Model	67.4% [59.8% - 74.2%]	83.7% [75.1% - 89.8%]	

The simple example


	Marg. Var. Se [95%- CI]	Marg. Var. Sp [95%-CI]	Association [95%-CI]
Gauss-Copula (Independence)	0.012 [-0.013, 0.037]	0.062 [0.011, 0.113]	0
Gauss-Copula	0.012 [-0.013, 0.037]	0.061 [0.011, 0.112]	$\rho_p=0.049$ [-0.271, 0.369]
Clayton-Copula	0.023 [-0.040, 0.087]	0.050 [-0.002, 0.102]	$\tau=-0.279$ [-0.520,-0.037]
Plackett-Copula	0.012 [-0.013, 0.037]	0.061 [0.011, 0.112]	$\tau=0.081$ [-0.316, 0.478]
Nelsen 4.2.16- Copula	0.021 [-0.013, 0.056]	0.082 [0.021, 0.143]	$\tau=0.212$ [-0.060, 0.485]

The simple example





Datensatz: Scheidler, Copula: GAUSS, Constrains: NO

The simple example



Datensatz: Scheidler, Copula: GAUSS, Constrain: NO



The tricky example


From: Glas et al. Tumor markers in the diagnosis of primary bladder cancer. A systematic review.

Aim: Validation of telomerase (urinary tumor marker) for primary bladder cancer

Gold standard: Cytoscopy and/or histopathology

	% True Pos.	% False Pos.	% False Neg.	% True Neg.
Telomerase:				
Ito et al ¹⁰	1	8	25	76
Rahat et al ¹¹	3	4	11	81
Kavaler et al ¹²	16	16	31	85
Yoshida et al ¹³	3	10	80	62
Ramakumar et al ²⁴	1	17	137	70
Landman et al ²⁵	6	9	24	81
Kinoshita et al ²⁹	0	19	12	55
Gelmini et al ²⁸	2	6	18	82
Cheng et al ⁴⁹	3	3	29	82
Cassel et al ⁴⁹	22	7	7	84

The tricky example



Datensatz: Telomerase, Copula: GAUSS, Constrain: NO


The tricky example

	Sensitivity [95%-CI]	Specificity [95%-CI]	-2LogL
Gauss-Copula (Independence)	75.8% [68.9%, 82.7%]	81.0% [67.0%, 95.1%]	92.30
Gauss-Copula	79.4% [75.1%, 83.7%]	81.9% [69.0%, 94.7%]	79.09
Clayton-Copula	--	--	
Plackett-Copula	77.6% [72.6%, 82.6%]	86.5% [74.7%, 98.3%]	
Nelsen 4.2.16-Copula	75.7% [71.3%, 80.2%]	87.7% [79.2%, 96.2%]	
Standard model (PROC NL MIXED)	--	--	
Standard model (MCMC, Paul et al.)	76.7% [69.8%, 82.6%]	90.9% [73.7%, 97.8%]	
Original analysis (Glas et al.)	75% [71%, 79%]	86% [71%, 94%]	

The tricky example

	Marg. Var. Se [95%- CI]	Marg. Var. Sp [95%-CI]	Association [95%-CI]
Gauss-Copula (Independence)	0.015 [-0.011, 0.041]	0.157 [0.036, 0.277]	0
Gauss-Copula	0.0001 [-0.0074, 0.0076]	0.147 [0.048, 0.245]	$\rho_P = -0.711$ [-0.954, -0.469]
Clayton-Copula	--	--	--
Plackett-Copula	0.009 [-0.005, 0.025]	0.200 [0.073, 0.326]	$\tau = -0.854$ [-1.027, -0.681]
Nelsen 4.2.16- Copula	0.016 [-0.0006, 0.033]	0.235 [0.130, 0.339]	$\tau = -0.720$ [-0.926, -0.514]
Standard-Modell (MCMC, Paul et al.)			$\rho_{P(\text{logits})} = -0.88$ [-0.99, -0.18]
Original analysis (Glas et al.)			$\rho_{P(\text{logits})} = -0.73$

The tricky example



Datensatz: Telomerase, Copula: GAUSS, Constrain: NO

Future plans

- Comparison of our model and the standard model by simulation
- What is a good measure for goodness-of-fit?
- Is the mean actual the best estimator of sensitivity and specificity (mode, median, ...)?
- Confidence ellipsoids of sensitivity and specificity
- Meta regression
- Apply beta-binomial/copula methodology on other situations (e.g. intervention studies)
- Check statistical theory

References

- Boissel JP, Sacks HS, Leizorovicz A, Blanchard J, Panak E, Peyrieux JC. Meta-analysis of clinical trials: summary of an international conference. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol*. 1988;34(6):535-8.
- Harbord RM, Deeks JJ, Egger M, Whiting P, Sterne JA. A unification of models for meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Biostatistics*. 2007 Apr;8(2):239-51.
- Johnson, Mark E. Multivariate statistical simulation. New York, NY [et.al.]: Wiley, 1987.
- Scheidler J, Hricak H, Yu KK, Subak L, Segal MR. Radiological evaluation of lymph node metastases in patients with cervical cancer. A meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 1997 Oct 1;278(13):1096-101.
- Glas AS, Roos D, Deutekom M, Zwinderman AH, Bossuyt PM, Kurth KH. Tumor markers in the diagnosis of primary bladder cancer. A systematic review. *J Urol*. 2003 Jun;169(6):1975-82.