

MVPBT: R package for publication bias tests in meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy studies

Hisashi Noma, PhD*

Department of Data Science, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan

ORCID: <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2520-9949>

*Corresponding author: Hisashi Noma

Department of Data Science, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics

10-3 Midori-cho, Tachikawa, Tokyo 190-8562, Japan

TEL: +81-50-5533-8440

e-mail: noma@ism.ac.jp

Meta-analysis for diagnostic test accuracy (DTA) has been one of standard research methods for evidence synthesis of diagnostic studies (Deeks, 2001; Leeftang et al., 2008). In these studies, bivariate meta-analysis methods are widely applied to adequately incorporate correlation information between the outcome variables (Reitsma et al., 2005). Summary information of the diagnostic accuracy can also be expressed by the summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curve (Harbord et al., 2007; Rutter and Gatsonis, 2001).

Publication bias is an important source of bias in these evidence synthesis studies (Higgins and Thomas, 2019). In conventional univariate meta-analysis methodology, various statistical tests have been developed to detect publication bias such as the Egger test (Egger et al., 1997), but there were no certain methods for DTA meta-analysis. However, several studies have discussed these methods recently, and generalized Egger tests have been developed for multivariate meta-analysis (Hong et al., 2020; Noma, 2020). A R package MVPBT (<https://github.com/nomahi/MVPBT>) is developed to implement the generalized Egger tests developed by Noma (2020) for DTA meta-analysis. Noma's publication bias tests effectively incorporate the correlation information between multiple outcomes and are expected to improve the statistical powers. This paper provides a non-technical introduction for the publication bias tests of DTA meta-analysis using MVPBT.

Installation and preparation for MVPBT

MVPBT is available at the GitHub page (<https://github.com/nomahi/MVPBT>). Also, the installation file MVPBT_1.1-1.tar.gz can be downloaded from [https://github.com/nomahi/MVPBT/raw/main/MVPBT_1.1-1.tar.gz]. If the installation file is obtained, the package can be installed by R menu: "packages" -> "Install package(s) from local files...". The help manual is also available at

[\[https://github.com/nomahi/MVPBT/raw/main/MVPBT_1.1-1.pdf\]](https://github.com/nomahi/MVPBT/raw/main/MVPBT_1.1-1.pdf).

MVPBT: Generalized Egger tests for DTA meta-analysis

The Egger test (Egger et al., 1997) is known as a statistical test to detect asymmetry of a funnel plot. A generalized version of this test for multivariate meta-analysis was firstly developed by Hong et al. (2020) as an overall test for the global null hypothesis “all of the univariate funnel plots for multiple outcomes are symmetric.” This overall test incorporates multiple outcome information, and the statistical power is generally improved compared with the conventional univariate publication bias test (Hong et al., 2020). The Hong’s test (called as MSSET) circumvents to incorporate the correlation information among the multiple outcomes that are sometimes unavailable under some situations of multivariate meta-analysis. However, for DTA meta-analysis, all of the correlation information is available in the Reitsma’s bivariate meta-analysis model (Reitsma et al., 2005), and the statistical power of MSSET is possibly inefficient because it does not use the correlation information. Noma (2020) developed alternative efficient generalized Egger tests for the same global null hypothesis that effectively incorporate the correlation information (called as MSSET2 and MSSET3). The Noma’s tests are expected to improve the statistical powers compared with the MSSET in applications to DTA meta-analysis, because of the uses of correlation information.

As an illustrative example, we present the SROC curve for a DTA meta-analysis that assessed the diagnostic accuracy of lymphangiography based on the presence of nodal-filling defects for the diagnosis of lymph node metastasis in women with cervical cancer (Scheidler et al., 1997; $N = 17$) in Figure 1 (a). We also provided funnel plots for the two outcome variables in the Reitsma-type bivariate meta-analysis model, i.e., logit-




Figure 1. Summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curve plot and funnel plots for marginal distributions of logit-transformed sensitivity and FPR of the two DTA meta-analyses.

transformed sensitivity and false positive rate (FPR) in Figure 1 (b)(c). The global null hypothesis of the Noma (2020)'s publication bias tests is “both of the two univariate funnel plots are symmetric.” Thus, these tests are interpreted as statistical tests to assess asymmetries of the two funnel plots jointly.

These figures are created by the following R code using mada package [<https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/mada/>].

```
require(metafor)
require(mada)

data(cervical)

LAG <- cervical[cervical$method==2,]

fit1 <- reitsma(LAG)
summary(fit1)      # results of the bivariate meta-analysis

Call: reitsma.default(data = LAG)

Bivariate diagnostic random-effects meta-analysis
Estimation method: REML

Fixed-effects coefficients

```

	Estimate	Std. Error	z	Pr(> z)	95%ci.lb	95%ci.ub	
tsens.(Intercept)	0.653	0.147	4.443	0.000	0.365	0.941	***
tfpr.(Intercept)	-1.448	0.208	-6.951	0.000	-1.857	-1.040	***
sensitivity	0.658	-	-	-	0.590	0.719	
false pos. rate	0.190	-	-	-	0.135	0.261	

```
---
Signif. codes:  0 '***' 0.001 '**' 0.01 '*' 0.05 '.' 0.1 ' ' 1

Variance components: between-studies Std. Dev and correlation matrix

```

	Std. Dev	tsens	tfpr
tsens	0.320	1.000	.
tfpr	0.724	-0.218	1.000

```

logLik    AIC    BIC

```

22.453 -34.906 -27.274

AUC: 0.755

Partial AUC (restricted to observed FPRs and normalized): 0.669

I2 estimates

Zhou and Dendukuri approach: 10.2 %

Holling sample size unadjusted approaches: 41.9 - 63.7 %

Holling sample size adjusted approaches: 5 - 5.5 %

###

attach(LAG)

```
dta1 <- sum.dta(TP, FN, TN, FP)
```

```
par(mfrow=c(1,3))
```

```
plot(fit1, predict=TRUE, cex=1.5, pch=19, sroclty=1, sroclwd=1.5, lty=2,
```

```
  main="(a) SROC plot", xlim=c(0,1), ylim=c(0,1))
```

```
points(dta1$Fp,dta1$Se,pch=20,col="blue")
```

```
#legend(0.4,0.1,legend=c("95% confidence region","95% prediction  
region"),lty=c(2,3))
```

```
attach(dta1)
```

```
res1 <- rma(y[,1], S[,1])
```

```
funnel(res1,main="(b) Funnel plot for logit(Se)")
```

```
regtest(res1, model="lm")      # univariate Egger's test
```

Regression Test for Funnel Plot Asymmetry

Model: weighted regression with multiplicative dispersion

Predictor: standard error

Test for Funnel Plot Asymmetry: t = 0.6102, df = 15, p = 0.5509

Limit Estimate (as sei -> 0): b = 0.4622 (CI: -0.2316, 1.1560)

```
res2 <- rma(y[,2], S[,3])
```

```
funnel(res2,main="(c) Funnel plot for logit(FPR)")
```

```
regtest(res2, model="lm")      # univariate Egger's test
```

Regression Test for Funnel Plot Asymmetry

Model: weighted regression with multiplicative dispersion
Predictor: standard error

Test for Funnel Plot Asymmetry: $t = -2.4233$, $df = 15$, $p = 0.0285$
Limit Estimate (as $se_i \rightarrow 0$): $b = -0.6302$ (CI: -1.1836 , -0.0767)

The P-values of univariate Egger tests were 0.551 and 0.028, and asymmetry of the funnel plot was indicated for FPR.

Then, there are two options for the publication bias tests for the global null hypothesis of asymmetries for the two funnel plots in MVPBT package. We provide brief non-technical explanations here, and the theoretical details are presented in Noma (2020).

MVPBT2: An efficient score test for the global null hypothesis of asymmetries for the two funnel plots that incorporates the correlation information between the two outcomes. This test does not consider the uncertainty of the heterogeneity variance-covariance parameter estimates, so might be inaccurate under small N (the number of studies) settings; called as MSSET2 in Noma (2020).

MVPBT3: To address the uncertainty problem of the heterogeneity variance-covariance parameter estimates, a parametric bootstrap test for the efficient score test above (MSSET2) is proposed in Noma (2020), i.e., the bootstrap distribution of the score statistic is used instead of the ordinary χ^2 -distribution; called as MSSET3 in Noma (2020).

Both of these tests can be interpreted as generalized versions of the Egger test. In the MVPBT package, these tests are implementable by MVPBT2 and MVPBT3, respectively.

The former test (MSSET2) can be implemented by the following command.

```
MVPBT2(y,S) # Generalized Egger test (MSSET2)
```

```
$T
```

```
    [,1]
```

```
[1,] 9.581602
```

```
$P
```

```
    [,1]
```

```
[1,] 0.008305801
```

```
$b0
```

```
[1] 0.6527201 -1.4483726
```

The P-value of the MSSET2 was 0.008. However, it might be inaccurate because the uncertainty of the heterogeneity variance-covariance parameters was not considered.

The latter test (MSSET3) is more recommended in practice, and is implementable by the following command.

```
MVPBT3(y,S) # Generalized Egger test (MSSET3)
```

```
$T.b
```

```
    [1] 3.728571970 0.143517438 0.648951676 2.418124253 0.659743986  
1.280331731 1.215632849 0.479688613 0.395274721 2.343870993  
1.917282832 3.404983696 0.667862531 3.146952026 .....
```

```
$T
```

```
    [,1]
```

```
[1,] 9.581602
```

```
$P
```

```
[1] 0.002998501
```


The P-value of the MSSET3 was 0.004. Both of the generalized Egger tests indicated asymmetries of the funnel plots in this example. These P-values can be used for practices in DTA meta-analysis as like the ordinary Egger test in univariate meta-analysis.

An R file that involves the example code provided in this paper is available at [<https://www.ism.ac.jp/~noma/MVPBT.r>].

References

- Deeks, J. J. (2001). Systematic reviews in health care: Systematic reviews of evaluations of diagnostic and screening tests. *BMJ* **323**, 157-162.
- Egger, M., Davey Smith, G., Schneider, M., and Minder, C. (1997). Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *BMJ* **315**, 629-634.
- Harbord, R. M., Deeks, J. J., Egger, M., Whiting, P., and Sterne, J. A. (2007). A unification of models for meta-analysis of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Biostatistics* **8**, 239-251.
- Higgins, J. P. T., and Thomas, J. (2019). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, 2nd edition. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Hong, C., Salanti, G., Morton, S., *et al.* (2020). Testing small study effects in multivariate meta-analysis. *Biometrics* **76**, 1240-1250.
- Leeflang, M. M., Deeks, J. J., Gatsonis, C., Bossuyt, P. M., and Cochrane Diagnostic Test Accuracy Working, G. (2008). Systematic reviews of diagnostic test accuracy. *Ann Intern Med* **149**, 889-897.
- Noma, H. (2020). Discussion on "Testing small study effects in multivariate meta-analysis" by Chuan Hong, Georgia Salanti, Sally Morton, Richard Riley, Haitao Chu, Stephen E. Kimmel, and Yong Chen. *Biometrics* **76**, 1255-1259.
- Reitsma, J. B., Glas, A. S., Rutjes, A. W., Scholten, R. J., Bossuyt, P. M., and Zwinderman, A. H. (2005). Bivariate analysis of sensitivity and specificity produces informative

summary measures in diagnostic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol* **58**, 982-990.

Rutter, C. M., and Gatsonis, C. A. (2001). A hierarchical regression approach to meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy evaluations. *Stat Med* **20**, 2865-2884.

Scheidler, J., Hricak, H., Yu, K. K., Subak, L., and Segal, M. R. (1997). Radiological evaluation of lymph node metastases in patients with cervical cancer. A meta-analysis. *JAMA* **278**, 1096-1101.