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 pooling analyses, Woods et al. (2010; *BMC Med Res Methodol* 10:54) proposed a Bayesian approach to combine these different 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 count outcome data within the frequentist framework using the contrast-based models. We also provide a R package `survNMA` (https://github.com/nomahi/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 pooling analyses, Woods et al. [1] proposed a Bayesian approach to combine these different 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 count outcome data within the frequentist framework of network meta-analysis using the contrast-based models. We also provide a R package `survNMA` (https://github.com/nomahi/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, odds 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 GitHub by the following procedure:

1. Download the R package file from the following URL:
   https://github.com/nomahi/survNMA/raw/main/survNMA_1.1-1.tar.gz
2. Then, install the package (tar.gz format) by R menu: "packages" -> "Install package(s) from local files...".

3.2 Loading the package

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

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

3.3 Calculation of the log hazard ratio estimates

The log hazard ratio estimates and their standard error estimates can be calculated by the `calcHR` function. The `calcHR` function simply requires the numbers of events (`d1`, `d0`) and the sample sizes (`n1`, `n0`) for the corresponding two groups that the log hazard ratio should be estimated. We present an example dataset in Table 1 that reported 3 trials that only reported dichotomized outcome data in the network meta-analysis of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD) provided in Woods et al. [1] For example, we can calculate the log hazard ratio estimate and its standard error estimate of the 1st study by

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

Study	Treatment	d (death)	n (participants)
Boyd et al. (1997)	Salmeterol	1	229
	Placebo	1	227
TRISTAN (2003)	Fluticasone	4	374
	Salmeterol	3	372
	SFC	2	358
	Placebo	7	361
Celli et al. (2003)	Salmeterol	1	554
	Placebo	2	270

the following simple command:

```
> calcHR(1,229,1,227)
$TE
[1] -0.008791294
$seTE
[1] 1.414215
```

where the former statistic is the log hazard ratio estimate and the latter statistic is the standard error estimate. These statistics can be directly incorporated into the dataset for the synthesis analyses.

In the dataset object `woods`, the summary statistics are calculated by this method for the 3 trials only reported dichotomized outcome data, and they are combined with the remaining data for the studies that reported hazard ratio estimates. Users can make such combined datasets on R or other data editing software (e.g., Microsoft Excel); these datasets can be directly used for the analyses of existing software packages of network meta-analysis.

```
> data(woods)
```

```
> woods
   id        study      treat1      treat2 outcome        logHR   se_logHR
1   1   Buerge2000 Fluticasone     Placebo      HR -0.276000000 0.20300000
2   2 Calverly2007        SFC     Placebo      HR -0.209000000 0.09800000
3   2 Calverly2007  Salmeterol     Placebo      HR -0.154000000 0.09600000
4   2 Calverly2007 Fluticasone     Placebo      HR  0.055000000 0.09200000
5   2 Calverly2007        SFC  Salmeterol      HR -0.056000000 0.10000000
6   2 Calverly2007        SFC Fluticasone      HR -0.264000000 0.09600000
7   2 Calverly2007  Salmeterol Fluticasone      HR -0.209000000 0.09417537
8   3     Boyd1997  Salmeterol     Placebo   count -0.008791294 1.41421500
9   4 Calverly2003 Fluticasone     Placebo   count -0.599396600 0.62678870
10  4 Calverly2003  Salmeterol     Placebo   count -0.883042400 0.69007020
11  4 Calverly2003        SFC     Placebo   count -1.251393000 0.80178740
12  4 Calverly2003 Fluticasone         SFC   count  0.651996100 0.86602750
13  4 Calverly2003  Salmeterol         SFC   count  0.368350300 0.91287260
14  4 Calverly2003 Fluticasone  Salmeterol   count  0.283645800 0.76376540
15  5    Celli2003  Salmeterol     Placebo   count -1.414702000 1.22474600
```

3.4 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")
> netmeta(TE=logHR, seTE=se_logHR, treat1=treat1, treat2=treat2,
studlab=study, data=woods, common=FALSE, ref="Placebo", sm="HR")
```

Table 2. 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.

```
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 0.9835 [0.8359; 1.1571] -0.20  0.8407

Placebo         .               .     .       .

Salmeterol  0.8152 [0.6799; 0.9774] -2.21  0.0273

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  0.2962
```

The pooling results are compared with those by the Bayesian approach of Woods et al. [1] in Table 2. 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; however, these differences are simply explained by the principles of the two different methodologies [17,18]. The frequentist validities of the REML-based inference methods are shown in many previous reports [12,19].

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. 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.
18. Noma H. Bayesian estimation and prediction for network meta-analysis with contrast-based approach *International Journal of Biostatistics*. 2024;20(2):661-676.
19. 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.