

Comparing basic statistical concepts with diagnostic probabilities based on directly observed proportions to help understand the replication crisis.

Huw Llewelyn MD FRCP

Department of Mathematics

Aberystwyth University

Penglais

Aberystwyth

SY23 3BZ

Tel 01970622802

Fax: 01970622826

hul2@aber.ac.uk

Keywords: Posterior probability. Gaussian distribution. Likelihood distribution. Replication. diagnosis. Statistical concepts.

Abstract

Instead of regarding an observed proportion as a sample from a population with an unknown parameter, diagnosticians intuitively use the observed proportion as a direct estimate of the 'posterior' probability of a diagnosis. Therefore, a diagnostician might also regard a continuous Gaussian probability distribution of an outcome conditional on the information in the study's methods section to represent posterior probabilities. Fitting a distribution to its mean and standard deviation (SD) can be regarded as pooling data from an infinite number of imaginary or theoretical studies with an identical mean and SD but randomly different numerical values. For a distribution of possible means based on a SEM (e.g. of $10/\sqrt{100} = 1$), the 'posterior' probability 'Q' of any theoretically 'true' mean falling into a specified tail would be equal to the tail's area as a proportion of the whole. If the 'reverse' likelihood distribution of possible study means conditional on the same hypothetical tail threshold is assumed to be the same as the posterior probability distribution of means (as is customary), then by Bayes rule the P value equals Q. Replication involves doing two independent studies, thus doubling the variance for the combined 'posterior' probability distribution. Thus, if the original effect size was 1.96, the number of observations was 100, the SEM was 1 and the original P value was 0.025, the theoretical probability of a replicating study getting a P value of ≤ 0.025 again is only 0.283. By applying the double variance to power calculations, the required number of observations is doubled compared to conventional approaches. If these theoretical probabilities of replication are consistent with empirical replication study results, this might explain the replication crisis and make the concepts of statistics easier to understand by diagnosticians and others.

1. Introduction

The P value and its related confidence interval are difficult concepts. An eminent Bayesian statistician suggested recently that these concepts have mystified generations of students [1]. He went on to admit on behalf of the statistical community that learning from data is a bit of a mess [2]. This may reflect a persistent difference of opinion between Frequentist and Bayesian statisticians about how scientific data should be interpreted. A high-profile statement by the ASA has tried to clarify the position from a Frequentist point of view [3, 4]. Nevertheless, it is still unclear how a P value is related to the probability of scientific replication as reflected by the ongoing replication crisis [5]. In the Open Science Collaboration study, the average two-sided P value in 97 studies was 0.028 but only 36.1% (95% CI 26.6% to 46.2%) showed a two-sided P value of 0.05 or lower when each of the 97 studies was repeated [6].

The estimation of probabilities and their replication is important for individual observations during medical diagnosis as well as for studies on groups of individuals that are used to test scientific hypotheses. Examining the concept of replication for an individual observation that is a familiar daily experience for diagnosticians might provide an insight into the nature of replication in scientific studies and improve understanding between diagnosticians, scientists, and statisticians and help students to understand the concepts of statistics.

Probability of an outcome in a cross over RCT

If 100 patients had been in a double-blind cross over randomized controlled trial and that 58 out of those 100 individuals had a BP 2mm Hg higher on control than on treatment, then knowing only that an individual was one of those in the study, a diagnostician's probability conditional on the entry criterion of that individual patient having a BP difference greater than zero as a chosen range of interest (ROI) would be $58/100 = 0.58$. In Bayesian terms this would be a 'posterior' probability that is estimated directly without involving Bayes rule. If this had been an N of 1 study that had been repeated in the same person 100 times, then 0.58 would be the probability of getting a BP difference greater than zero for an individual observation.

Probabilities based on numerical results.

If in a study on many subjects, the average BP difference between a pair of observations on treatment and control was 2mmHg and the standard deviation of the differences was 10 mmHg, then in Figure 1, the area under the bell-shaped Gaussian distribution above 0 mmHg to the right of the arrow (i.e. 0.2 standard deviations below the mean of 2mmHg) would contain 58% of the total area. From this again we see a posterior probability of any randomly selected study individual will have a probability of 0.58 of being greater than zero. Fitting a Gaussian distribution to the data by calculating the standard deviation, models the result of pooling the results of an infinitely large number of identically designed studies with randomly different numerical results but the same standard deviation and mean. This infinite number of results creates a distribution of continuous values as in Figure 1.

The distribution of the means of different studies

As the standard deviation of the distribution was 10mm Hg and the number of observations was 100, then the standard error of all the possible means in other identical studies is assumed to

be modelled by the expression $10/\sqrt{100} = 1$. Therefore, 95% of the area under the tall narrow curve in the centre of Figure 1 with a mean of 2mm Hg and SEM of 1mmHg would fall between 0.04mm Hg to 3.96mm Hg. Because the Gaussian distribution is continuous, it models the pooling of an infinite number of studies with the same mean and SD. A distribution of means based on an infinite number of studies might be assumed to be a theoretical distribution of 'true' means. This implies that there is a theoretical 'posterior' probability of 0.95 that true mean lies between 0.04mm Hg to 3.96mm Hg. The one-sided probability would be 0.975 that the true mean is above 0.04mmHg. However, a scientist and diagnostician might wish to know the probability of a result being above 0mmHg as their range of interest (ROI) for making clinical, research or policy decisions. This would be a probability that the true mean was 2 SEMs below 2mmHg after an infinite number of observations. This would be estimated from the Gaussian distribution as a theoretical probability of 0.9772. If their ROI was a BP difference above 2mmHg then the probability would be 0.5.




Figure 1: The distributions of blood pressure differences in a cross-over RCT

Proportions

The lower 1.96 SD of Figure 1 was a BP of minus 19.6 mmHg, which equates to a proportion of 97.5% of results being above this value. The position of this tail if the mean had instead been 1.96 SEM lower would be minus 19.6 - 1.96 = minus 21.65mmHg, which equates to a Z score of minus 2.165 and a proportion of 98.4%. However, the position of the tail if the mean had instead been 1.96 SEM higher would be -19.6 - 1.96 = minus 17.64mmHg, which equates to a Z score of -1.764 and proportion of 96.1%. This shows that any proportion of 97.5% can have a lower 95% theoretical true limit (TTL) of 96.1% and an upper 95% TTL of 98.4%. Note that these are not symmetrical, the upper 95% TL being 0.9% away from the mean and the lower 95% TTL being 1.4% away. By contrast, the simplified binomial approximation gives $0.975 \pm 1.96\sqrt{(0.975 \times 0.025/100)} = 0.94\%$ to 100.5% . Note that the latter CLs are symmetrical, and the upper CL inappropriately exceeds 1. Exact confidence intervals based on the binomial theorem can only be made for natural frequencies and not continuous values such as the above.

The null hypothesis

If we now assume a 'null hypothesis' that the true difference between the average BPs on treatment and control was zero, then this invites yet another assumption. It is that the likelihood distribution of the BP differences conditional on the null hypothesis is the same as the posterior probability distribution of the BP differences in the above study. The latter had a standard deviation of 10mm Hg and a standard error of the possible means of 1mmHg. Based on these assumptions, we can assume further that the likelihood of getting the observed mean difference of 2 mmHg or something more extreme (i.e. over 2mm Hg) is 0.0228. As the distribution of posterior probabilities (from which the likelihood distribution was derived) is the same, then the posterior probability of the difference being of zero or lower is also 0.0228, and above zero it is 0.9772. According to Bayes rule, it follows from the above assumptions that the prior probability of seeing any observed result Y_i above a hypothetical threshold value H (i.e. $p(Y_i > \{Y=H\})$) is the same as the prior probability of any hypothetical result X_i above a value H (i.e. $p(X_i > \{X=H\})$ for same i). This symmetry and uniformity apply to all the prior probabilities of all hypothetical results and all observed results. Furthermore, the same applies for any $T+\Delta$ (when $\Delta=1/\infty$) so that $p(X_i) = p(Y_i)$.

The distribution of means can therefore represent 3 different situations

- A. The distribution of the posterior probabilities of all possible true means conditional on the observed mean and a standard error of the mean (SEM) of measurement results
- B. The likelihood distribution of possible observed means conditional on any single hypothetical mean (e.g. the null hypothesis) assuming that the SEM is the same as in A
- C. The likelihood distribution of the unique observed mean conditional on each of the possible hypothetical means, assuming that the SEM is the same as in A

It is assumed in this example that distribution A is Gaussian with a mean equal to the observed mean. It is also assumed that distribution B is a Gaussian distribution as in (A) and has the same SEM conditional on any hypothetical single mean (e.g. the null hypothesis). The posterior probability distribution A and the likelihood distribution C are assumed to be the same - with the same mean and SEM. Therefore, when X_i is any particular possible true mean and Y = the single actually observed mean, then $p(X_i|Y) = p(Y|X_i)$ and so by Bayes rule, $p(X_i) = p(Y)$ for any X_i and therefore $p(X_i) = p(X_{i+1}) = p(Y)$. In other words, the latter are all the same so that the prior probability distributions of X_i are uniform and equal to $p(Y)$. This guarantees that the prior probability of seeing any observed result above a value X is the same as the prior probability of any true result above a value X . It also guarantees that for any null hypothesis X_{null} that $p(\leq X_{null}|Y) = p(>Y|X_{null})$ and that $p(>X_{null}|Y) = p(\leq Y|X_{null})$.

Why the assumption of uniform priors on which P values are based seems reasonable

The assumption made historically to calculate P values is that the likelihood of selecting patients at random from a population of an assumed true value (e.g. when the null hypothesis is zero) is equal to the directly estimated 'posterior' probability distribution arising from the study. This also assumes that scales used for the true and observed values are the same. The scale of continuous values used for the study are a subset of the universal set of all numbers, so it could

also be assumed that the prior probability of each possible value conditional on that universal set is the same or uniform for each of these true and observed values. This uniformity will apply to all studies using continuous numerical values and before the study design is even considered. Another rationale is that if the observed frequency distribution has been drawn from possible populations with a range of true means and each of these possible populations contained the same infinite number of elements or members, then each of those possible populations will have the same prior probability [7].

Why Bayesian prior probabilities are not uniform

The Bayesian prior probability is different to the above assumed uniform prior probability conditional on the universal set of all numbers. The Bayesian prior will be estimated not before but after designing the study and doing a thought experiment to estimate what the distribution of possible results will be in an actual study conditional on background knowledge. This prior distribution can be regarded as a posterior distribution formed by combining a uniform prior distribution conditional on the universal set of all numbers with an estimated likelihood distribution of the thought study result or pilot study result conditional on all possible true values. Each of those latter likelihoods is then multiplied by the likelihood of observing the actual study result conditional on all possible true results. These products are then normalized to give the Bayesian posterior probability of each possible true result conditional on the combined evidence of the result of the Bayesian thought experiment and the actual study result.

The baffled student

We might now explain to a student that a one-sided P value of 0.0228 is the same as the probability of the true study mean not falling into a range beyond the null hypothesis. This also implies that there is a probability of 0.9772 that the true mean does fall into a range the same side as the null hypothesis. In some cases, the ROI might be an interval between two thresholds (e.g. a BP difference of between 0 mmHg and 3.96 mmHg or 1mmHg and 3mmHg). This happens when the investigator wishes to test the hypothesis that there is little difference between the outcome of treatment and control. In this case there would be a probability of $1 - 0.0228 - 0.0228 = 0.9544$ that the true result mean would fall within the ROI of 0mmHg to 3.96mmHg or a probability of 0.683 that true result mean will fall within the ROI of 1mmHg and 3mmHg or a probability of 0.5 that it will fall with the ROI over 2mmHg.

Replication

When trying to estimate the probability of a true result, the investigator chooses a ROI that is a fixed range of true results. However, in contrast to this, the result of the study used to estimate the probability of a true result being within the ROI is subject to random or stochastic variation. The latter is like a fixed target on land being shot at by an archer on a bobbing boat. However, if both the archer and the target are on bobbing boats, then the probability of the target being hit will be lower. The probability of also hitting the bull's eye will be lower still. The same considerations apply when the result of one scientific study subject to variation is being used to predict the result of another scientific study that attempts to replicate the first, which is also subject to variation.

The combined variance of two independent studies

To simplify matters, we will now use a slightly different example where the observed mean difference is 1.96mmHg instead of 2mmHg but the SD is still 10 and the SEM is still 1. However, if we postulate a distribution of differences for the result of the second study also with a SEM of 1 conditional on each point on the distribution of true values of the first study, then the overall distribution of the second conditional on the information in the first study's methods section will have a variance of $1 + 1 = 2$ and the SEM will be $\sqrt{2} = 1.414$ mmHg (see Figure 2). The latter shows the indirect likelihood distribution conditional on the null hypothesis and the direct probability distribution conditional on the information in the first study's methods section (this new observed difference is used here to get the probability of a P value of 0.025 again when the original P value was also 0.025 as opposed to 0.0228 as in the initial example).

To get a combined result that provides a P value of 0.025 again, the next study's mean result needs to be 2.77mmHg that corresponds to the arrow in Figure 2. This is because the SEM of the distributions is 1.414mmHg and the result must be 1.96 SEM away from the null hypothesis of zero. Therefore, the repeat result must be at least $1.414 \text{mmHg} \times 1.96 = 2.77 \text{mmHg}$ away from zero, which is $2.77 - 1.96 = 0.81 \text{mmHg}$ away from an observed mean of 1.96mmHg. This corresponds to a Z score of $\text{minus } (0.81/1.414) = -0.573$. The area of the distribution in Figure 2 to the right of the arrow is therefore 28.3% of the total area. In other words, when a one-sided P value for a study with a standard deviation of 10mmHg and 100 observations is 0.025, then the probability of getting a P-value of 0.025 or less when the study is repeated with the same numbers is 0.283. The result of the calculation in a spreadsheet would be as follows:

$$=\text{NORMSDIST}(-\text{NORMSINV}(0.025))/(((10/100^{0.5})^2)^{0.5}+\text{NORMSINV}(0.025)) = 0.283. \text{ (Eqn 1)}$$




Figure 2: The distribution of blood pressure differences when the results of one study are followed by the results of an identical study.

General considerations

The above example is a special case of course, where the standard deviation is 10mmHg, the number of observations 100 and there is a requirement for the P value resulting from the repeat experiment with the same number of measurements is ≤ 0.025 . However, if the P value for result of the first experiment had been 0.0025 instead of 0.025 then the probability of getting a P-value of 0.025 or less when the study is repeated with the same numbers is 0.510:

$$= \text{NORMSDIST}(-\text{NORMSINV}(0.0025)/(((10/100^{0.5})^2)^2)^{0.5} + \text{NORMSINV}(0.025)) = 0.510 \text{ (Eqn 2)}$$

However, if the P value in the original study had been 0.0025 and the study was based on 200 observations then the probability of replication with a P value of 0.025 again would be:

$$= \text{NORMSDIST}(-\text{NORMSINV}(0.0025)/(((10/200^{0.5})^2)^2)^{0.5} + \text{NORMSINV}(0.025)) = 0.801 \text{ (Eqn 3)}$$

The Open Science Collaboration study

In the Open Science Collaboration study, the average P value from the original 97 articles was 0.028 two sided but only 36.1% (95% CI 26.6% to 46.2%) showed a two-sided P value of 0.05 or lower when repeated [6]. According to the above reasoning, if we assume that the average SEM was 1 (e.g. based on an average SD of 10 and 100 observations, the one-sided P value was $0.028/2 = 0.014$ as reported, then the expected proportion showing a one-sided P value of 0.025 (or a two-sided P value of 0.05) in a repeat study is

$$= \text{NORMSDIST}(-\text{NORMSINV}(0.014)/(((10/100^{0.5})^2)^2)^{0.5} + \text{NORMSINV}(0.025)) = 34.2\% \text{ (Eqn 4)}$$

Based on these assumptions leading to an SEM of 1, this calculated estimate is consistent with the above observed result of the Open Science Collaboration study. However, the most appropriate way of testing this would be to calculate the probability of replication for each of the 97 Open Science Collaboration studies based on their individual number of observations, P values and SEMs and then finding the average of these individual predicted replication rates to see to what extent this corresponded the average observed replication rate of 36.1%.

Power calculation based on the above rationale

It follows from the argument so far that if the required power of a study had been 28.3%, the estimated effect size was 1.96mmHg, the estimated standard deviation of BP differences was 10mmHg, and there was a requirement for a repeat P value of up to 0.025, then the number of observations required would be 100 to satisfy these conditions. The calculation in a spreadsheet would be as follows:

$$= (10 / (((1.96 / (\text{NORMSINV}(0.283) - \text{NORMSINV}(0.025)))^2) / 2)^{0.5})^2 = 100 \text{ (Eqn 5)}$$

However, if the required power was 80% instead of 28.3%, then by substituting 0.8 for 0.283 in the above expression 4, we get a required number of observations to be

$$= (10 / (((1.96 / (\text{NORMSINV}(0.8) - \text{NORMSINV}(0.025)))^2) / 2)^{0.5})^2 = 408 \text{ (Eqn 6)}$$

This required number of observations is twice the number required when the power calculation is made in the traditional way. This is because the conventional calculation is based only on

one estimated variance by assuming that the estimated effect size is exactly 1.96mmHg (i.e. with a variance and standard deviation of zero). In other words, instead of '1/2' representing two variances in Equation 6, the equation for the conventional calculation contains '1/1' representing one variance giving a required number of observations of 204:

$$=(10/(((1.96/(NORMSINV(0.8)-NORMSINV(0.025)))^2)/1)^{0.5})^2 = 204 \text{ (Eqn 7)}$$

If the required number of observations from Equation 7 is used to estimate the power of our study, then according to Equation 8 where we replace 100 by 204, the probability of replication with a P value of 0.025 again is only 0.507, which is disappointingly lower than the desired 0.8:

$$=NORMSDIST(-NORMSINV(0.025)/(((10/204^{0.5})^2)^{0.5}+NORMSINV(0.025))) = 0.507 \text{ (Eqn 8)}$$

However, if we use the required number of 408 based on two identical variances in Equation 9 instead of 204 based on one variance in Equation 8, the probability of replication is what we should expect:

$$=NORMSDIST(-NORMSINV(0.025)/(((10/408^{0.5})^2)^{0.5}+NORMSINV(0.025))) = 0.799 \text{ (Eqn 9)}$$

It would be interesting to know from pre-registration data what the frequency of P values of 0.05 two sided (or 0.025 one sided) when the subsequent study results became known in the light of the conventional power calculations. If they were disappointingly near to 50% then this would again provide empirical evidence in support of the assumptions made here including the assumption that the probability of a true result falling within the ROI.

If studies such as the Open Science Collaboration study turn out to have average replication rates that match those predicted by these expressions 1 to 9, then that would suggest that all their assumptions, designs, and executions are appropriate. One of these assumptions would be that the theoretical probability of a true result falling within a ROI is realistic. However, to make those inferences and decisions reliably, we need to assume that P values and the probabilities of true means falling within ROIs are not due to bias or other factors.

Estimating that the probability of the true result being within the ROI is not due to bias etc.

The probability of 0.975 of the true result being within a ROI only suggests that the result of the study is worthy of consideration. However, this worthy result might not be due to the phenomenon of interest (e.g. the treatment being more effective than placebo). It could be due to a poor choice of mathematical models or bias or dishonesty or cherry picking or data dredging etc. We therefore need other evidence that is frequently associated with the phenomenon of interest and rarely or never in association with each of the invalid possibilities. This other evidence might be a clear account of sound randomization, which would often be associated with treatment effectiveness but rarely with the study result being due to bias. By finding similar items of evidence to show that the other invalid possibilities are highly improbable, we can conclude that the cause of the study result is the probable phenomenon of interest. Mayo calls this process severe testing [8]. To be on the safe side, we could assume that the probability of the result being within the ROI to be up to 0.975 (i.e. from 0 to 0.975).

Estimating the probability of the true result being within the ROI due to bias etc

There is an expression derived from the extended version of Bayes rule with a dependence assumption that allows this probability of the true result falling within the ROI during the above reasoning process to be calculated [9]. This expression was formulated to model the analogous process of assessing diagnostic tests. Another concern would be if the result was contrary to the results of previous studies. The Bayesian approach to this would be to combine such information in the form of an estimated prior probability distribution of the expected results of the forthcoming study with the actual results of the study as explained above.

Testing scientific hypotheses

Up to this point, we have only estimated the probability of the true result being due to a legitimate case (and not error or bias et.). We may choose to use the ROI as a reliable fact and sufficient criterion to assume or decide to reject an alternative hypothesis (e.g. that there is no effectiveness). We cannot regard 0.975 as the probability of the hypothesis of effectiveness being true as there may be some other explanation for the ROI that we have not considered. This means again that we can only assume that there is a probability of up to 0.975 that our hypothesis is true (e.g. that the treatment is more effective than placebo). Moreover, the risk reduction for a patient might be very low for a ROI based on a BP difference of barely more than zero, especially when taking adverse effects into account. Therefore, the risk reduction may need to be considered for other ROIs by considering other ranges of severity of the condition (e.g. higher blood pressures) where the absolute risk reduction might be greater. In this situation another ROI might be chosen (e.g. the range of differences above 2mmHg).

Testing multiple scientific hypotheses

We might not only be interested in the effectiveness of a treatment (e.g. of an angiotensin receptor blocker or 'ARB') but also theories about the underlying mechanisms. If we had already demonstrated the efficacy of an ARB in preventing nephropathy, we might also wish to do another study to compare its efficacy with a treatment that does not theoretically block the angiotensin receptor. If the ARB was shown to be probably more effective than a non-ARB, then although this would allow the alternative hypothesis of no added advantage from an ARB to be rejected, it would not confirm the hypothesis that this was due to receptor blockade because there might be another explanation that had not been considered that is also compatible with the findings. Karl Popper famously indicated this by asserting that hypotheses cannot be proven (or shown to be probable) but only refuted (or at least shown to be less probable).

The probability theory for investigating rival scientific hypotheses can be modelled with an application of Bayes rule with a dependence assumption. This was formulated to allow the use of posterior probabilities based on directly observed frequencies to model the differential diagnostic process [9]. This approach uses ratios of posterior probabilities (or likelihood ratios) between pairs of rival diagnoses or rival scientific hypotheses in an analogous manner to Bayes factors. However, it would provide a probability not of a scientific hypothesis being true, but the probability of that hypothesis or some other explanation not yet considered to be true.

Conclusion

The principle of using posterior probabilities to be estimated directly from observed frequencies during differential diagnostic reasoning provides some insight into the relationship between probability of replication and P values. This might also be helpful in teaching and understanding statistics.

References

1. Spiegelhalter D. The art of statistics. Learning from data. Penguin Random House, 2019. p. 241
2. Ibid p 305
3. Wasserstein RL, Lazar NA. The ASA's Statement on p-Values: Context, Process, and Purpose. *The American Statistician*, Volume 70, 2016 - Issue 2, p 129 – 133.
4. Greenland S, Senn SJ, Rothman KJ, Carlin JB, Poole C, Goodman SN, Altman DG. Statistical Tests, P-values, Confidence Intervals, and Power: A Guide to Misinterpretations. Online Supplement to the ASA Statement on Statistical Significance and P-values. *The American Statistician*, Volume 70, 2016 - Issue 2, p 129 – 133.
5. Benjamin, D. J., Berger, J. O., Johannesson, M., Nosek, B. A., Wagenmakers, E. J., Berk, R., ... Johnson, V. E. Redefine statistical significance. *Nature Human Behaviour*, 2018. 2(1), 6-10. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-017-0189-z>
6. Open Science Collaboration. Estimating the reproducibility of psychological science. *Science*. 2015; 349 (6251):aac4716.0
7. Llewelyn H. Replacing P-values with frequentist posterior probabilities of replication—When possible parameter values must have uniform marginal prior probabilities. *PLoS ONE* (2019) 14(2): e0212302.
8. Mayo D. *Statistical Inference as Severe Testing: How to Get Beyond the Statistics Wars*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2018.
9. Llewelyn H, Ang AH, Lewis K, Abdullah A. *The Oxford Handbook of Clinical Diagnosis*, 3rd edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford. 2014 p638 - 642.