Open Access



Using the properties of the odds ratio to improve precision in meta-analysis: an update on the benefits of targeted deployment of physician-led interprofessional pre-hospital teams on the care of critically ill and injured patients

Ryan D. McHenry^{1*}

The recent systematic review and meta-analysis titled "the benefits of targeted deployment of physician-led interprofessional pre-hospital teams on the care of critically III and injured patients" by Lavery and colleagues provides a useful review of the literature in an important research question [1]. The study also provides opportunity to refine its methods, and improve precision of the estimate of effect sizes, by utilising the symmetrical properties of the odds ratio. Given that the odds ratio for an outcome is the inverse of the odds ratio for other, mutually exclusive, outcomes [2], a simple inversion of mortality outcome effects will produce survival outcome effects, and allow pooling of all the outcomes reported in these studies.

This analysis was undertaken using the same random-effects pooling methodology as the original work with the meta package in R (R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria) [3] and produces similar effect sizes with the benefits of increased precision, and potentially the improved interpretability of a single result (Fig. 1). The opportunity was also taken to construct a funnel plot, which has some utility in the assessment of publication bias [4], which demonstrated visual symmetry, providing some reassurance that significant publication bias is unlikely (Fig. 2).

While this re-analysis does not mitigate the limitations of the initial study in terms of significant heterogeneity of study characteristics and outcome, it does provide a more efficient use of the available data. Improved understanding of the properties of commonly used statistical techniques is likely to result in more reliable results and greater interpretability of the available evidence.

*Correspondence: Ryan D. McHenry ryan.mchenry2@nhs.scot ¹Scottish Ambulance Service, Paisley, UK



© The Author(s) 2025. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

Source	OR (95% CI)		
Subgroup = Trauma			
De Jongh et al. 2012	1.00 [0.60; 1.67]		+ ÷
Endo et al. 2020	1.15 [1.03; 1.29]		
Endo et al. 2021	1.14 [1.01; 1.28]		
Garner at al. 2015	0.95 [0.60; 1.51]		
Hepple et al. 2019	0.88 [0.42; 1.85]		
Lyons et al. 2021	1.59 [1.03; 2.44]		
Maddock et al. 2020	1.79 [1.15; 2.78]		
Pakkanen et al. 2019	1.89 [1.21; 2.95]		
Yeguiayan et al. 2011	1.82 [1.06; 3.13]		
Hartog et al. 2015	1.50 [1.13; 2.00]		
Hessefeldt et al. 2013	4.90 [1.30; 18.47]		
Moors et al. 2019	1.21 [0.47; 3.12]		
Tsuboi et al. 2024	1.23 [1.06; 1.42]		
Total	1.31 [1.13; 1.52]		\diamond
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2_{12} = 21.07$ ($P = .05), I^2 = 43\%$		
Subgroup = OHCA			
Bujak et al. 2022	1.43 [0.80; 2.56]		- + •
Fukuda et al. 2018	1.94 [1.15; 3.28]		
Goto et al. 2019	1.67 [1.59; 1.76]		
Hagihara et al. 2014	1.29 [1.04; 1.60]		
Hamilton et al. 2016	1.18 [1.04; 1.34]		
Hatakeyama et al. 2021	1.67 [1.33; 2.09]		
Hatakeyama et al. 2023a	1.64 [1.02; 2.64]		
Hatakeyama et al. 2023b	1.12 [0.78; 1.61]		- B ÷
Kato et al. 2019	2.57 [1.32; 5.00]		
Obara et al. 2023	1.49 [0.97; 2.29]		
Sato et al. 2019	2.60 [1.41; 4.79]		
Total	1.51 [1.32; 1.73]		\diamond
Heterogeneity: $\chi^2_{10} = 37.45$ ($(P < .001), I^2 = 73\%$		
Total	1.41 [1.27; 1.56]		
		1	
		0.1	0.5 1 2
-			OR (95% CI)

Heterogeneity: χ^2_{23} = 102.44 (*P* < .001), *I*² = 78% Test for subgroup differences: χ^2_1 = 1.83 (*P* = .18)

Fig. 1 A forest plot showing the survival outcomes in patients receiving physician-based care compared to standard care



Fig. 2 A funnel plot for studies assessing outcomes in patients receiving physician-based care compared to standard care

Acknowledgements

The author is grateful for the encouragement of this submission by the senior author of the original work described.

Author contributions

RM is the sole author.

Funding

Unfunded.

Data availability

No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

1.

References Lavery MD, Aulakh A, Christian MD. Benefits of targeted deployment of

Published online: 03 March 2025

Received: 7 February 2025 / Accepted: 11 February 2025

- physician-led interprofessional pre-hospital teams on the care of critically ill and injured patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Scand J Trauma Resusc Emerg Med. 2025;33(1):1.
- Cummings P. The relative merits of risk ratios and odds ratios. Arch Pediatr 2 Adolesc Med. 2009;163(5):438-45.
- Balduzzi S, Rücker G, Schwarzer G. How to perform a meta-analysis with R: a 3 practical tutorial. Evid Based Ment Health. 2019. pp. 153-60.
- 4. Lau J, Ioannidis JPA, Terrin N, Schmid CH, Olkin I. The case of the misleading funnel plot. BMJ. 2006;333(7568):597-600.

Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.