

# Latent class models for individual participant data meta-analyses of diagnostic test accuracy studies with imperfect reference standards

**Zelalem Negeri, Ph.D.**

**Postdoctoral Fellow**

**Department of Epidemiology Biostatistics and Occupational Health**

**McGill University**

**Joint work with:**

**Brooke Levis, Yin Wu, Nandini Dendukuri, Brett Thombs and Andrea Benedetti**



**A day with ... SMG**

**May 11, 2021**



# 1. Background – Overview

- The Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) is a nine-item questionnaire widely used to screening for major depression
- The PHQ-9 has been evaluated against various reference standards:
  - Semi-structured interviews (e.g., SCID)
  - Fully structured interviews (e.g., CIDI, MINI)
- The PHQ-9 database:
  - Accrued by the DEPRESsion Screening Data Project ([www.depressd.ca](http://www.depressd.ca))
  - More than 100 studies comprising of about 44,000 participants and over 4,500 major depression cases

# 1. Background – The Problem

- The PHQ-9 database:
  - Multiple reference standards (e.g., SCID, CIDI MINI) with different depression diagnosing capabilities
  - A single reference standard per participant
- Wu *et al.* (2020):
  - Synthesized three individual participant data meta-analyses (IPDMAs) – that included 69,405 participants from 212 studies
  - The MINI categorized major depression more frequently relative to the SCID
- This could influence estimates of PHQ-9 sensitivity, specificity, and depression prevalence

## 2. Objectives

- We aimed to **propose and validate LCMs** for the IPDMA of the PHQ-9 to accurately estimate:
  - PHQ-9 sensitivity and specificity
  - Reference standards' sensitivity and specificity
  - Depression prevalence

### 3. Methods – Frequentist LCMs

- We propose and validate both Frequentist- and Bayesian-based LCMs by assuming the true depression status as unknown
- Our Frequentist LCM assumes a common sensitivity and specificity across studies but study-specific prevalence
  - We additionally assume conditional dependence between PHQ-9 and reference standards (i.e., FCDLCM)
  - We use the expectation-maximization (EM) algorithm to estimate model parameters

### 3. Methods – Bayesian LCMs

- We also propose a **Bayesian conditional dependence LCM (BCDLCM)** by introducing covariance parameters as in the FCDLCM
- The BCDLCM **assumes the multinomial distribution** to model the observed cell frequencies (TPs, FPs, FNs and TNs) given the unobserved disease status and model parameters
  - We use the **Gaussian distribution** as priors for the logit-transformed pooled **sens**, **spec**, depression **prevalence**, and **random effects**; and the **Uniform distribution** as hyper-priors for the **precision parameters**
  - We use **Markov Chain Monte Carlo (MCMC)** as implemented in the R package **rjags** to sample from the marginal posterior distribution of each model parameter

## 4. Results – Simulations

**Table 1:** Results when true PHQ-9 sens=spec = 0.7,  $\tau_1^2 = 1.2$ ,  $\tau_2^2 = 0.6$ ,  $\rho = -0.6$ ,  $k = 30$ ,  $n = 134$ ,  $\pi = 10\%$  when data were generated assuming conditional dependence and MINI as imperfect

Model	Bias				RMSE			
	PHQ Sens	PHQ Spec	MINI Sens	MINI Spec	PHQ Sens	PHQ Spec	MINI Sens	MINI Spec
BREM	-0.22	-0.02	NA	NA	0.05	0.00	NA	NA
FCDLCM	-0.07	0.01	0.02	-0.05	0.03	0.00	0.01	0.01
BCDLCM	0.02	0.10	-0.36	-0.01	0.02	0.02	0.15	0.00

BREM=Bivariate Random-Effects Model; FCDLCM=Frequentist Conditional Dependence Latent Class Model; BCDLCM=Bayesian Conditional Dependence Latent Class Model

## 4. Results – Real Data

**Table 2:** Estimates of PHQ-9 and MINI sensitivity and specificity in % when PHQ-9 was compared against the MINI interview at the PHQ-9 standard cut-off of  $\geq 10$

Model	PHQ Sens (95% CI)	PHQ Spec (95% CI)	MINI Sens (95% CI)	MINI Spec (95% CI)
BREM	74 (67, 79)	89 (86, 91)	NA	NA
FCDLCM	83 (73, 90)	94 (87, 96)	91 (87, 96)	99 (99, 100)
BCDLCM	82 (73, 92)	92 (87, 95)	68 (58, 82)	97 (94, 99)

BREM=Bivariate Random-Effects Model; FCDLCM=Frequentist Conditional Dependence Latent Class Model; BCDLCM=Bayesian Conditional Dependence Latent Class Model



# 5. Conclusions

- We proposed robust models that can handle multiple imperfect reference standards
- As expected, the BREM performed well when diagnostic interviews were assumed perfect, otherwise underestimated PHQ-9 sensitivity
- LCMs were shown to be alternative approaches for IPDMA to account for differences in reference standard accuracy