

COMBINING ROBUST VARIANCE ESTIMATION WITH MODELS FOR DEPENDENT EFFECT SIZES

James E. Pustejovsky, UT Austin
Beth Tipton, Columbia University
Ariel Aloe, University of Iowa

SRSM, Bristol, UK



July 18, 2018

pusto@austin.utexas.edu

THESIS

- Many methods available for meta-analyzing dependent effect size estimates.
 - ad hoc methods (Hammering the screws)
 - model-based methods
 - robust variance estimation (RVE)
- Useful to combine RVE with model-based approaches.
 - Addresses limitations of model-based approaches.
 - Addresses limitations of default RVE implementation.

Model-based
meta-analysis
methods




Robust
variance
estimation


better together

DEPENDENT EFFECT SIZES ARE VERY COMMON


Multiple outcomes measured on common set of participants




Outcome measured at multiple follow-up times



Multiple treatment conditions compared to a common control



Multiple correlations from a common sample



FRIESE, FRANKENBACH, JOB, & LOSCHELDER (2017). DOES SELF-CONTROL TRAINING IMPROVE SELF- CONTROL: A META-ANALYSIS.


33 experimental studies, 166 effect size estimates
(standardized mean differences)

- ✓ Multiple outcomes (1-13 outcomes per study, median = 2)
- ✓ Multiple follow-up times (immediate post-test and/or later follow-up)
- ✓ Multiple treatment conditions (1-4 treatment conditions per study)
- ✓ Multiple control conditions (active and/or passive control)
- ✓ 1-52 effect size estimates per study (median = 2)

COVARIANCES BETWEEN ES ESTIMATES ARE OFTEN NOT AVAILABLE

- Multiple treatments compared to common control
 - known formulas (Gleser & Olkin, 2009), easy enough to calculate
- Multiple outcomes/multiple follow-ups
 - known formulas (Gleser & Olkin, 2009)
 - require knowing correlations among outcomes/repeated measures, which are not often reported
- Multiple correlations from common sample
 - known, icky formulas (Olkin & Siotani, 1976)
 - need to know correlations between ALL variables involved

BECKER (2000) DESCRIBED FOUR BROAD STRATEGIES FOR HANDLING DEPENDENCE:



COMPARISON

Method	Requires making assumptions about ES covariances
Aggregated effects	✓
Sub-grouping	✓
Shifting unit-of-analysis	✓
Multivariate meta-analysis	✓
Multi-level meta-analysis	✓
Meta-SEM	✓
Robust variance estimation	✓ (Working model)

ROBUST VARIANCE ESTIMATION

(Hedges, Tipton, & Johnson, 2010)

- Meta-analysis/meta-regression method using “sandwich” variance estimators, which are robust to mis-specified assumptions about variance-covariance structure.
- Sandwich methods work with very general classes of models, including any of the other methods for handling dependent effects.
 - Proof: See Hedges et al. (2010, Appendix A).

COMPARISON

Method	Requires making assumptions about ES covariances	Robustness to assumptions about ES covariances
Aggregated effects	✓	Robust*
Sub-grouping	✓	Robust*
Shifting unit-of-analysis	✓	Robust*
Multivariate meta-analysis	✓	Robust*
Multi-level meta-analysis	✓	Robust*
Meta-SEM	✓	Robust*
Robust variance estimation	✓ (Working model)	Robust

* When combined with robust (sandwich) variance estimation

DEFAULT RVE IMPLEMENTATION HAS LIMITATIONS

(Hedges, Tipton, & Johnson, 2010)

- Implementation in **robumeta** packages for R and Stata.
- Limited to two “working models”: correlated effects or hierarchical effects.
- Uses semi-efficient diagonal weights:

$$w_{ij} = \frac{1}{n_j(\bar{s}_j^2 + \hat{\tau}^2)}, \quad \text{where } \bar{s}_j^2 = \frac{1}{n_j} \sum_{i=1}^{n_j} s_{ij}^2$$

- Studies contributing more effects get less weight in meta-regressions that have within-study predictors.
 - Similar to meta-regression after aggregating to the study level.

RE-ANALYSIS OF SELF-CONTROL TRAINING STUDIES

	(1) Aggregated effects	(2) Shifting unit- of-analysis	(3) Multivariate meta-analysis	(4) Multi-level meta-analysis	(5) Robust variance estimation
Overall Average ES (k = 33, N = 166)	0.281*** [0.059]		0.261*** [0.052]	0.263*** [0.054]	0.289*** [0.060]
Between-study SD	0.207		0.202	0.254	0.289
Within-study SD			0.143	0.027	
Moderator analysis by type of outcome					
Stamina (k = 16, N = 31)	0.579*** [0.157]	0.413** [0.093]	0.359*** [0.077]	0.351*** [0.071]	0.579*** [0.123]
Strength (k = 28, N = 135)	0.199** [0.071]	0.171** [0.064]	0.236*** [0.054]	0.238*** [0.055]	0.203** [0.065]
Difference	-0.380* [0.185]	-0.243* [0.113]	-0.123 [0.072]	-0.112 [0.059]	-0.376* [0.136]

DISCUSSION

- Robust “sandwich” variance estimation can be used with **any** of the available methods for handling dependence.
 - Hong, Chen, & Riley (2018) propose this for bivariate meta-analysis.
- Default RVE should not be used for meta-regression with predictors that vary within study.
- More attention to within- versus between-study variation in moderators.
- Improve software to make multivariate meta-analysis easier to implement.

THANKS

James E. Pustejovsky
pusto@austin.utexas.edu
<https://jepusto.com>



REFERENCES

- Becker, B. J. (2000). Multivariate Meta-analysis. In S. D. Brown & H. E. A. Tinsley (Eds.), *Handbook of Applied Multivariate Statistics and Mathematical Modeling* (pp. 499–525). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., & Rothstein, H. R. (2009). *Introduction to Meta-Analysis*. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
- Cheung, M. W. L. (2014). Modeling dependent effect sizes with three-level meta-analyses: A structural equation modeling approach. *Psychological Methods, 19*(2), 211–229. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0032968>
- Cooper, H. M. (1998). *Synthesizing Research: A Guide for Literature Reviews* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Friese, M., Frankenbach, J., Job, V., & Loschelder, D. D. (2017). Does Self-Control Training Improve Self-Control? A Meta-Analysis. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(6), 1077–1099. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1745691617697076>
- Gleser, L. J., & Olkin, I. (2009). Stochastically dependent effect sizes. In H. Cooper, L. V. Hedges, & J. C. Valentine (Eds.), *The Handbook of Research Synthesis and Meta-Analysis* (2nd ed., pp. 357–376). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Hedges, L. V., Tipton, E., & Johnson, M. C. (2010). Robust variance estimation in meta-regression with dependent effect size estimates. *Research Synthesis Methods, 1*(1), 39–65. <http://doi.org/10.1002/jrsm.5>
- Hong, C., D. Riley, R., & Chen, Y. (2018). An improved method for bivariate meta-analysis when within-study correlations are unknown. *Research synthesis methods, 9*(1), 73-88.

MORE REFERENCES

- Kalaian, H. a., & Raudenbush, S. W. (1996). A multivariate mixed linear model for meta-analysis. *Psychological Methods*, 1(3), 227–235. <http://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.1.3.227>
- Olkin, I., & Siotani, M. (1976). Asymptotic distribution of functions of a correlation matrix. In S. Ikeda (Ed.), *Essays in Probability and Statistics*. Tokyo, Japan: Shinko Tsusho Co., Ltd., p. 235-251.
- Raudenbush, S. W., Becker, B. J., & Kalaian, H. a. (1988). Modeling multivariate effect sizes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103(1), 111–120. <http://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.103.1.111>
- Riley, R. D. (2009). Multivariate meta-analysis: the effect of ignoring within-study correlation. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 172(4), 789-811.
- Van den Noortgate, W., López-López, J. A., Marín-Martínez, F., & Sánchez-Meca, J. (2013). Three-level meta-analysis of dependent effect sizes. *Behavior Research Methods*, 45(2), 576–594. <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-012-0261-6>
- Van den Noortgate, W., López-López, J. A., Marín-Martínez, F., & Sánchez-Meca, J. (2015). Meta-analysis of multiple outcomes: a multilevel approach. *Behavior Research Methods*, 47(4), 1274–1294. <http://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-014-0527-2>