Evidence based healthcare special lecture I Final mini-test (Please see opposite side of the paper)

Department Registration No. Name

1. Please specify the wrong points in explanation and/or method to analyze and suggest how to improve it (if no wrong point, answer so) for each issues underlined below.

(1) In R island with population size of about 4,000 in a developing country. When we see there with Google Earth, almost equal-sized 40 villages are scattered. Recently the people with high fish and whale intake are reported to suffer from neural damage symptoms. Due to the possibility of mercury poisoning, (A) 4 villages were randomly selected from 40 villages, **and in those 4 villages**, all 400 residents were recruited to join the survey. They were interviewed about the frequency of fish/whale intake, such as [1] none or rarely, [2] monthly, [3] weekly, [4] daily, and the hair mercury concentrations of them were measured. The results (of which raw data are available from http://minato.sip21c.org/fish-Hg-2018.txt; variables are PID as personal ID number, HairHg as hair mercury concentration, HighHairHg is 1 if HairHg>=5, otherwise 0, and FishIL is one of 4 categories shown above) were summarized below.

| Eating fish or whale | Ν | Median | $Mean \pm SD$ | High Hg | |
|----------------------|---------|--------------------|------------------|---------------|--|
| frequency | | (Hg µg/g hair) | (Hg µg/g hair) | ≥5 µg/g hair | Histogram of subset(dat, Fishintake == "None")\$HairHg |
| 1. None | 80 | 3.44 | 3.55 ± 2.02 | 27 | |
| 2. Monthly | 90 | 4.34 | 4.72 ± 2.89 | 36 | المن المن المن المن المن المن المن المن |
| 3. Weekly | 120 | 5.45 | 5.36 ± 2.30 | 69 | |
| 4. Daily | 110 | 5.97 | 6.20 ± 2.37 | 72 | |
| There are two approa | aches t | to analyze the rel | lationships betv | veen fish/wha | le |

There are two approaches to analyze the relationships between fish/whale intake and mercury exposure. First, the independence between High Hg and eating fish/whale frequency can be analyzed. (B) Fisher's exact test resulted in $p = 1.34 \times 10^{-5}$ and the null hypothesis was rejected, so that the relationship between the two variables is statistically significant. Second, the effect of fish/whale intake on hair mercury concentration can be analyzed. Welch's one-way ANOVA resulted in F-value of 24.273, first d.f. of 3, second d.f. of 210.39, and p<0.001. (C) Then pairwise comparisons of hair Hg levels between all pairs among 4 fish/whale intake frequencies can be conducted by repeated use of Welch's t-test.



(A)

(B)

(C)

(2) Based on the result of large scale cohort study, brown rice intake is proved to significantly reduce the body weight and white rice intake is proved to significantly increase the body weight. Then 5 obese patients changed their stable food from white rice to brown rice. The changes of body weight (kg) between the 2 timings (before intervention and after 6 months) were $70\rightarrow65$, $140\rightarrow135$, $95\rightarrow85$, $95\rightarrow90$, $85\rightarrow80$. The result of paired t-test was p=0.0008, so that brown rice intake can be judged to have a significant weight reduction effect as the result the intervention study.

(3) The gold standard method A can measure the concentration of biochemical marker for disease X, where the concentration exceeds a specific threshold value. A cheaper and more rapid new method B was developed. Validity of B can be confirmed by showing <u>the fact that the Pearson's correlation coefficient</u> between the measurements by A and B for the sufficient number of X patients and healthy volunteers is more than 0.8 and that is statistically significant.

(4) The 44 chronic hepatitis patients were randomly divided into 2 groups. Treatment group was treated by prednisolone, the other (control group) was just observed. At the end of the study, 11 patients lived in treatment group, 6 lived in control group, but the result of Fisher's exact test was not significant (p=0.215). The months until death or censoring (lived at the end of the study) were recorded in <u>http://minato.sip21c.org/hepatitis-2018.txt</u> as **time**, with **flag** (1 if died, 0 if still lived) and **group** (1 for treatment group, 2 for control group). For all patients (ignoring alive/dead), the mean survival months (109.5 months in treatment group and 64.7 months in control group) were compared by Welch's t-test, then p=0.013, so that prednisolone has a significant effect of lengthen survival for chronic hepatitis patients.

- 2. Please explain the incidence rate of a disease. What type of study design is needed has to be included.
- 3. Sir Wright developed typhus vaccine and it was used in 6 studies conducted around 1900. In 1904, Karl Pearson summarized the results by simply taking average of tetrachoric correlation coefficients of 6 studies. The result was 0.193, which is judged as not enough strong to recommend as vaccine by Karl

Pearson. However, if we consider the death as outcome, and conduct the meta-analysis of odds ratios, integrated odds ratio is 0.57 (95%CI, 0.48-0.67), which means the vaccine having the significant effect to reduce mortality. Please explain why Pearson made a wrong judge. Why we must not take simple averages of correlation coefficients?

| Study | Experin Events | | - | ontrol Total | Odds Ratio │ | OR | 95%-CI | Weight (fixed) | Weight (random) |
|--|-------------------|----------------|-----|-----------------|-----------------|------|------------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| HospitalSA | 2 | 32 | 12 | 75 | | 0.35 | [0.07; 1.66] | 1.5% | 2.1% |
| GarrisonLadysmith | 8 | 35 | 329 | 1489 | +++ | 1.04 | [0.47; 2.32] | 2.7% | 7.4% |
| SpecialRegimenSA | 9 | 72 | 21 | 82 | | 0.41 | [0.18; 0.98] | 3.9% | 6.5% |
| SpecialHospitalSA | 86 | 1174 | 538 | 4991 | | 0.65 | [0.52; 0.83] | 43.4% | 39.1% |
| MilitaryHospitalSA | 63 | 764 | 510 | 3374 | | 0.50 | [0.38; 0.66] | 39.5% | 34.3% |
| IndianArmy | 11 | 84 | 423 | 1475 | | 0.37 | [0.20; 0.71] | 9.0% | 10.7% |
| Fixed effect model Random effects model Heterogeneity: $I^2 = 27\%$, τ^2 | | 2161 | | 11486 | | | [0.48; 0.67] [0.44; 0.70] | 100.0% | 100.0% |
| Heterogeneity. $T = 27\%$, t | - 0.0204 | , <i>ρ</i> = 0 | .23 | | 0.1 0.5 1 2 10 | | | | |

4. Whether the ability of flash memory is improved by glucose candy or not was investigated for 10 healthy volunteers. The result is shown below. Please test whether glucose candy improves flash memory or not. P-value is needed. You can use computer software or calculator, but manual calculation is possible if you use 97.5% point of t-distribution with d.f. 9 is 2.262 and either of $\sqrt{2}$ =1.414, $\sqrt{3}$ =1.732, or $\sqrt{5}$ =2.236.

| Scores before glucose candy | 8 | 6 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 6 |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Scores after glucose candy | 9 | 7 | 5 | 8 | 7 | 9 | 6 | 9 | 8 | 7 |

5. The RCT (Randomized Controlled Trial) to test new stretch method to improve body flexibility is to be conducted. Outcome measure is the change of standing-posture body anteflexion in centimeter. Based on previous studies, the conventional stretch method increased 3 cm (standard deviation 2 cm) of standing posture body anteflexion measurement. If the new stretch method can increase more than 4cm (as the difference from the conventional method, more than 1 cm) of standing posture body anteflexion, it can be judged as clinically valuable. Please calculate needed sample size for this RCT for 2-tailed t-test with 5% significance level and 80% power, and assuming the same size of 2 groups.

^{*} Please evaluate this lecture by URI-BOH-Net.