Network meta-analysis combining survival and count outcome data: A simple frequentist approach

Hisashi Noma, PhD*
Department of Interdisciplinary Statistical Mathematics, The Institute of Statistical Mathematics, Tokyo, Japan
The Graduate Institute for Advanced Studies, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI), Tokyo, Japan
ORCID: http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2520-9949

Kazushi Maruo, PhD
Department of Biostatistics, Institute of Medicine, University of Tsukuba, Tsukuba, Japan

*Corresponding author: Hisashi Noma
Department of Interdisciplinary Statistical Mathematics
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

Abstract

Network meta-analysis for survival outcome data often involves several studies only reported dichotomized outcomes (i.e., the numbers of events and sample sizes of individual arms). To avoid the reporting biases via eliminating these studies in the syntesis analyses, Woods et al. (2010; *BMC Med Res Methodol* 10:54) proposed a Bayesian approach to combine the survival and dichotomized outcome data using hierarchical models. However, the Bayesian methods require complicated computations involving the Markov Chain Monte Carlo and the technical aspects are generally difficult to handle by non-statisticians (e.g., the convergence diagnostics). Besides, frequentist approaches have been alternative standard methods for statistical analyses of network meta-analysis. The methodology has been well established, and several effective software packages have been developed (e.g., `netmeta` package in R). In this article, we propose a simple method to synthesis the survival and dichotomized outcome data within the frequentist framework using the contrast-based models. We also provide a R package `survNMA` (https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.survNMA) to calculate hazard ratio statistics from the dichotomized outcome data that can be directly used for implementing general analyses of network meta-analysis using `netmeta` package of R.

Key words: network meta-analysis; survival outcome, hazard ratio; contrast-based approach, frequentist method.

1. Introduction

Network meta-analysis for survival outcome data often involves several studies only reported dichotomized outcomes (i.e., the numbers of events and sample sizes of individual arms). To avoid the reporting biases via eliminating these studies in the synthesis analyses, Woods et al. [1] proposed a Bayesian approach to combine the survival and dichotomized outcome data using hierarchical models. However, the Bayesian methods require complicated computations involving the Markov Chain Monte Carlo [2,3] and the technical aspects are generally difficult to handle by non-statisticians (e.g., the convergence diagnostics). Besides, frequentist approaches have been alternative standard methods for statistical analyses of network meta-analysis [4-6]. The methodology has been well established, and several effective software packages have been developed (e.g., `network` [7] in Stata, `netmeta` [8] and `NMA` [9] packages in R). In this article, we propose a simple method to synthesis the survival and dichotomized outcome data within the frequentist framework of network meta-analysis using the contrast-based models. We also provide a R package `survNMA` (https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.survNMA) to calculate hazard ratio statistics that can be directly used for implementing general analyses of network meta-analysis using `netmeta` package [8] of R.

2. Methods

In meta-analyses of survival outcome data, hazard ratio has been widely adopted as the effect measure [10], which can be estimated the commonly used Cox regression model [11]. Woods et al. [1] proposed Bayesian hierarchical modelling methods to model the hazard ratio estimates and the dichotomous outcome data simultaneously. Besides, the contrast-based approach of frequentist framework for network meta-analysis requires summary statistics of contrast measures (e.g., hazard ratio, risk ratio) for the pooling analysis [12,13].

In this case, the log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates are required for all eligible trials. If valid log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates are calculated from the dichotomized outcome data, the pooling analyses can be simply conducted using existing standard methods. Salika et al. [14] investigated comparative effectiveness of several methods for computing the log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates from dichotomized data through a large dataset by the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, and concluded the estimating method using the complementary log-log link was favorable among the candidate methods.

Suppose d_1, d_0 represent the numbers of events, and n_1, n_0 represent the sample sizes of the corresponding two groups that the log hazard ratio should be estimated. Also, denote $\hat{P}_1 = d_1/n_1$ and $\hat{P}_0 = d_0/n_0$ as the cumulative event proportions of the two groups. Then, the log hazard ratio estimator [14] is provided as

$$\log \widehat{HR} = \log\{-\log(1-\hat{P}_1)\} - \log\{-\log(1-\hat{P}_0)\}$$

and the corresponding variance estimator [14] is

$$V[\log \widehat{HR}] = \left(\frac{1}{(\hat{P}_1 - 1)\log(1-\hat{P}_1)}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{P}_1(1-\hat{P}_1)}{n_1}\right) + \left(\frac{1}{(\hat{P}_0 - 1)\log(1-\hat{P}_0)}\right)^2 \left(\frac{\hat{P}_0(1-\hat{P}_0)}{n_0}\right)$$

The log hazard ratio estimator is provided via the use of the complementary log-log link for a link function in the discrete-time hazards models [15,16], and the asymptotic normality is fulfilled for the summary statistic. Thus, the resultant summary statistics can simply be added to the remaining data that are obtained from the other studies that reported hazard ratio estimates. The contrast-based network meta-analysis methods [4] can be simply applied to the combined dataset, and then, valid pooling analyses can be conducted. The advantage of this approach is that all of the standard analysis tools for network meta-

analysis can be directly applied to the combined dataset, e.g., pooling analyses, graphical tools, and heterogeneity and inconsistency assessments. As shown in the following section, all of the generic functions of `netmeta` package [8] in R can be applied to the combined dataset straightforwardly.

3. Implementation of the proposed method using "survNMA" package

3.1 Installation of "survNMA" package

The `survNMA` package can be installed from CRAN by the following command:

```
> install.packages("survNMA")
```

3.2 Loading the package

After the installation, users can load the package via the following command.

```
> library("survNMA")
```

3.3 Preparing a summary survival outcome data

As like ordinary meta-analysis of survival outcome data, the log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates are needed in the analyses using contrast-based models. If these statistics can be directly extracted from literatures or back-calculations from related statistics (e.g., confidence intervals or P-values; see Parmar et al. [17] for the details), they can be straightforwardly used for the synthesis analyses. However, in multi-arm trials, these statistics are possibly not reported for several contrasts of comparative groups. In Table 1, we present summary hazard ratio statistics of two clinical trials in the network meta-analysis of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) provided in Woods et al. [1]. For the second study, the hazard ratio estimate and the standard error estimate were not reported for the comparison Salmeterol vs. Fluticasone. However, the other treatment

Table 1. Example summary hazard ratio dataset for network meta-analysis of COPD (cited from Woods et al. [1]) †.

Study	Treatment 1	Treatment 2	N1	N2	$\log \widehat{HR}$	$\sqrt{V[\log \widehat{HR}]}$
Burge et al. (2000)	Fluticasone	Placebo	376	375	−0.276	0.203
Calverly et al. (2007)	SFC	Placebo	1533	1524	−0.209	0.098
	Salmeterol	Placebo	1521	1524	−0.154	0.096
	Fluticasone	Placebo	1534	1524	0.055	0.092
	SFC	Salmeterol	1533	1521	−0.056	0.100
	SFC	Fluticasone	1533	1534	−0.264	0.096

† The log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates of Salmeterol vs. Fluticasone for Calverly et al. (2007) were not reported.

pairs, these summary statistics are available. In these cases, Woods et al. [1] provided an approximation method for calculating these summary statistics from the available data.

Without loss of generality, we suppose there are three groups A, B and C for comparison, and the summary hazard ratio statistics are available for the contrasts B vs. A and C vs. A; however, those for the contrast B vs. C are not available. In such cases, the log hazard ratio estimate $\log \widehat{HR}_{Bvs.C}$ is calculable by

$$\log \widehat{HR}_{Bvs.C} = \log \widehat{HR}_{Bvs.A} - \log \widehat{HR}_{Cvs.A}$$

and the variance of $\log \widehat{HR}_{Bvs.C}$ is estimated by

$$V\left[\log \widehat{HR}_{Bvs.C}\right] = \frac{(n_B^{-1} + n_C^{-1})\left(V\left[\log \widehat{HR}_{Bvs.A}\right] + V\left[\log \widehat{HR}_{Cvs.A}\right]\right)}{(2n_A^{-1} + n_B^{-1} + n_C^{-1})}$$

where n_A, n_B and n_C are the sample sizes of the groups A, B and C. The standard error estimate can be easily calculated using the `calcse` function:

```
> calcse(0.096,0.092,1521,1534,1524)
[1] 0.09396776
```

Using these outputs, users can make a summary dataset on R or other data editing

software (e.g., Microsoft Excel); these datasets can be combined with the summary dataset created from dichotomized dataset as described in Section 3.5.

3.4 Calculation of the log hazard ratio estimates from dichotomized dataset

The log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates can be calculated by the `pairwiseHR` function from dichotomized dataset. The `pairwiseHR` function simply requires the numbers of events `d` and the sample sizes `n` for all arms involved in the corresponding studies; the ID of studies `studlab` and treatment variable `treat` are also needed. We present an example dataset in Table 2; 3 clinical trials data that only reported dichotomized outcome data in the network meta-analysis of COPD [1] is presented.

```
> data(woods2)
> woods2
  study      treat d   n
1     1  Salmeterol 1 229
2     1     Placebo 1 227
3     2 Fluticasone 4 374
4     2  Salmeterol 3 372
5     2        SFC 2 358
6     2     Placebo 7 361
7     3  Salmeterol 1 554
8     3     Placebo 2 270
```

We can calculate the log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates of these studies simultaneously by a simple command,

Table 2. Example dichotomized dataset for network meta-analysis of COPD (cited from Woods et al. [1])[†].

Study	Treatment	d (death)	n	$\log \widehat{HR}$ (vs. Placebo)	$\sqrt{V[\log \widehat{HR}]}$
Boyd et al. (1997)	Salmeterol	1	229	−0.009	1.414
	Placebo	1	227	—	—
TRISTAN (2003)	Fluticasone	4	374	−0.599	0.627
	Salmeterol	3	372	−0.883	0.690
	SFC	2	358	−1.251	0.802
	Placebo	7	361	—	—
Celli et al. (2003)	Salmeterol	1	554	−1.415	1.225
	Placebo	2	270	—	—

[†] The log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates were calculated using the `pairwiseHR` function.

```
> woods3 <- pairwiseHR(treat, studlab=study, event=d, n, data=woods2)
> woods3
  studlab      treat1     treat2          TE      seTE  n1  n2
1       1  Salmeterol    Placebo -0.008791294 1.4142147 229 227
2       2 Fluticasone    Placebo -0.599396596 0.6267887 374 361
3       2  Salmeterol    Placebo -0.883042430 0.6900702 372 361
4       2         SFC    Placebo -1.251392723 0.8017874 358 361
5       2 Fluticasone        SFC  0.651996128 0.8660275 374 358
6       2  Salmeterol        SFC  0.368350293 0.9128726 372 358
7       2 Fluticasone Salmeterol  0.283645834 0.7637654 374 372
8       3  Salmeterol    Placebo -1.414701888 1.2247459 554 270
```

Using the output object, users can make a summary dataset that can be directly used for the network meta-analysis using the `netmeta` package.

3.5 Combining the dataset objects

The two dataset objects created by the survival and dichotomized outcome data (described in Sections 3.3 and 3.4) can be combined by `combine2` function.

```
> data(woods1)
> woods1
  studlab      treat1      treat2     TE       seTE   n1   n2
1       1 Fluticasone     Placebo -0.276 0.20300000  376  375
2       2         SFC     Placebo -0.209 0.09800000 1533 1524
3       2  Salmeterol     Placebo -0.154 0.09600000 1521 1524
4       2 Fluticasone     Placebo  0.055 0.09200000 1534 1524
5       2         SFC  Salmeterol -0.056 0.10000000 1533 1521
6       2         SFC Fluticasone -0.264 0.09600000 1533 1534
7       2  Salmeterol Fluticasone -0.209 0.09396776 1521 1534
> woods4 <- combine2(woods1,woods3)
> woods4
   studlab      treat1      treat2          TE       seTE
1        1 Fluticasone     Placebo -0.276000000 0.20300000
2        2         SFC     Placebo -0.209000000 0.09800000
3        2  Salmeterol     Placebo -0.154000000 0.09600000
4        2 Fluticasone     Placebo  0.055000000 0.09200000
5        2         SFC  Salmeterol -0.056000000 0.10000000
6        2         SFC Fluticasone -0.264000000 0.09600000
7        2  Salmeterol Fluticasone -0.209000000 0.09396776
8        3  Salmeterol     Placebo -0.008791294 1.41421470
```

```
9        4 Fluticasone     Placebo -0.599396596 0.62678873
10       4  Salmeterol     Placebo -0.883042430 0.69007019
11       4         SFC     Placebo -1.251392723 0.80178739
12       4 Fluticasone         SFC  0.651996128 0.86602755
13       4  Salmeterol         SFC  0.368350293 0.91287264
14       4 Fluticasone  Salmeterol  0.283645834 0.76376539
15       5  Salmeterol     Placebo -1.414701888 1.22474592
```

The output object can directly be used for general analyses of network meta-analysis using `netmeta` package.

3.6 Network meta-analysis for the combined dataset

The network meta-analysis can be conducted by simply applying existing packages for network meta-analysis to the combined dataset. For example, the pooling analysis can be simply performed by `netmeta` function in `netmeta` package [8],

```
> library("netmeta")
> net1 <- netmeta(TE=TE, seTE=seTE, treat1=treat1, treat2=treat2,
studlab=studlab, data=woods4, common=FALSE, ref="Placebo", sm="HR")
> net1                # network meta-analysis; synthesis analysis
Number of studies: k = 5
Number of pairwise comparisons: m = 15
Number of treatments: n = 4
Number of designs: d = 3

Random effects model
```

```
Treatment estimate (sm = 'HR', comparison: other treatments vs
'Placebo'):
               HR          95%-CI     z p-value
Fluticasone 0.9834 [0.8359; 1.1570] -0.20  0.8405
Placebo         .               .     .       .
Salmeterol  0.8151 [0.6798; 0.9772] -2.21  0.0272
SFC        0.7721 [0.6407; 0.9303] -2.72  0.0065

Quantifying heterogeneity / inconsistency:
tau^2 = 0; tau = 0; I^2 = 0% [0.0%; 70.8%]

Tests of heterogeneity (within designs) and inconsistency (between
designs):
                 Q d.f. p-value
Total          5.46    6  0.4865
Within designs  3.02    4  0.5537
Between designs 2.43    2  0.2963
```

The pooling results are compared with those by the Bayesian approach of Woods et al. [1] in Table 3. Since the τ estimate of the REML method was 0, only the pooling results of the fixed-effect models are presented. We can confirm that the results are very similar between the two fixed-effect models; although the random-effects models often provide quite different results because of the differences of the principles of statistical inferences. Actually, the τ estimate reported by the Bayesian approach of Woods et al. [1] was 0.36;

Table 3. Results of the network meta-analyses of COPD by the proposed frequentist approach and the Bayesian approach (the latter data was cited from Woods et al. [1])[†].

	The proposed frequentist approach	The Bayesian approach
	HR estimate (95%CI)	HR estimate (95%CI)
Fluticasone	0.98 (0.84, 1.16)	0.99 (0.84, 1.16)
Salmeterol	0.82 (0.68, 0.98)	0.82 (0.68, 0.98)
SFC	0.77 (0.64, 0.93)	0.78 (0.64, 0.93)
(reference: Placebo)		

[†] Only the results of the fixed-effect models are presented, because the τ estimate of the random-effects model by the proposed frequentist approach was 0.

however, these differences are simply explained by the principles of the two different methodologies [18,19]. The frequentist validities of the REML-based inference methods are shown in many previous reports [12,20].

Example R code

Example R code is available at https://www.ism.ac.jp/~noma/example_survNMA.r

Acknowledgements

This study was supported by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research from the Japan Society for the Promotion of Science (grant numbers: JP23K11931, JP22H03554, and JP24K21306).

References

1. Woods BS, Hawkins N, Scott DA. Network meta-analysis on the log-hazard scale, combining count and hazard ratio statistics accounting for multi-arm trials: a tutorial. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2010;10:54.

2. Gelman A, Carlin JB, Stern HS, Dunson DB, Vehtari A, Rubin DB. *Bayesian Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. Boca Raton: Chapman and Hall/CRC; 2013.
3. Carlin BP, Louis TA. *Bayesian Methods for Data Analysis*. 3rd ed. New York: Chapman & Hall; 2009.
4. Nikolakopoulou A, White IR, Salanti G. Network meta-analysis. In: Schmid CH, Stijnen T, White IR, eds. *Handbook of Meta-Analysis*. CRC Press; 2021: pp. 187-217.
5. Higgins JP, Jackson D, Barrett JK, Lu G, Ades AE, White IR. Consistency and inconsistency in network meta-analysis: concepts and models for multi-arm studies. *Research Synthesis Methods*. 2012;3(2):98-110.
6. White IR, Barrett JK, Jackson D, Higgins JP. Consistency and inconsistency in network meta-analysis: model estimation using multivariate meta-regression. *Research Synthesis Methods*. 2012;3(2):111-125.
7. White IR. Network meta-analysis. *The Stata Journal*. 2015;15(4):951-985.
8. Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Nikolakopoulou A, et al. netmeta: An R Package for network meta-analysis using frequentist methods. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2023;106:1-40.
9. Noma H, Maruo K, Tanaka S, Furukawa TA. NMA: Network Meta-Analysis Based on Multivariate Meta-Analysis Models. R package ver. 1.4-3. 2024. https://doi.org/10.32614/CRAN.package.NMA
10. Higgins JPT, Thomas J. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell; 2019.
11. Cox DR. Regression models and life tables (with discussion). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B*. 1972;34(2):187-220.
12. Noma H, Hamura Y, Gosho M, Furukawa TA. Kenward-Roger-type corrections for inference methods of network meta-analysis and meta-regression. *Research Synthesis*

Methods. 2023;14(5):731-741.

13. Noma H, Hamura Y, Sugasawa S, Furukawa TA. Improved methods to construct prediction intervals for network meta-analysis. *Research Synthesis Methods*. 2023;14(6):794-806.
14. Salika T, Turner RM, Fisher D, Tierney JF, White IR. Implications of analysing time-to-event outcomes as binary in meta-analysis: empirical evidence from the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2022;22(1):73.
15. Hedeker D, Siddiqui O, Hu FB. Random-effects regression analysis of correlated grouped-time survival data. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*. 2000;9(2):161-79.
16. Singer JD, Willett JB. *Applied Longitudinal Data Analysis: Modeling Change and Event Occurrence*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2003.
17. Parmar MK, Torri V, Stewart L. Extracting summary statistics to perform meta-analyses of the published literature for survival endpoints. *Statistics in Medicine*. 1998;17(24):2815-2834.
18. Hamaguchi Y, Noma H, Nagashima K, Yamada T, Furukawa TA. Frequentist performances of Bayesian prediction intervals for random-effects meta-analysis. *Biometrical Journal*. 2021;63(2):394-405.
19. Noma H. Bayesian estimation and prediction for network meta-analysis with contrast-based approach *International Journal of Biostatistics*. 2024;20(2):661-676.
20. Noma H, Nagashima K, Maruo K, Gosho M, Furukawa TA. Bartlett-type corrections and bootstrap adjustments of likelihood-based inference methods for network meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2018;37(7):1178-1190.