

I'm not a robot





































odds ratios are tricky. It isn't actually all that hard to come up with some decent ways to analyze them. The tricky part is interpreting the results in a way that makes sense to average readers. How do you put the phrase odds ratio into a clear and easily interpreted sentence? The Kansas Department of Health and Environment partnered with us to discuss such a problem. They had important data on the odds that people with histories of sexual violence will also have other health conditions. We went back and forth in our discussions about how to frame the results of their analysis. They wanted to say things like 5.8 greater odds, which doesn't have practical meaning to most of us. We had to work hard to balance out what is digestible to the public and most precise to the scientists responsible for data collection and analysis. We discussed (and I still ultimately favored) the option of framing it in terms of likelihood, as in Men who have experienced sexual violence are 5.8 times more likely to feel depressed, which I think is a more familiar concept the average readers. Ultimately, my clients felt the best balance was struck by using wording around greater odds. So ultimately, we decided to visualize the odds ratios as a simple bar graph, which textbooks that interpret the top bar of data.I get a handful of questions about how to visualize odds ratios every year and I usually tell those people what I just told you. Researchers Leon Gilman and Gerald Davis from University of Wisconsin Milwaukee were behind one of those emails. They were trying to graph odds ratios related to race and disciplinary suspensions within a school district but said that help from the school district found odds ratio to be too abstract and that they particularly had trouble interpreting odds ratios that were below 1. They ran with the idea of likelihood and produced this visualization; they took it even further by completely rephrasing the discussion in terms of equality-and, wow, is that a pretty powerful statement! We staff folks sort out these issues on their own projects, propelling them to data literacy. Lets take a study we covered on 10/19 to discuss this concept. Survival was lower in pediatric patients intubated during arrest compared with those not intubated 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%). If not intubated: 411/1135 = .361 (36%), if intubated: 460/1135 = .407 (41%). Odds ratio = 0.89. This means survival was affected by a factor of 0.89 for pediatric arrest patients who were intubated during arrest vs. not. This has a very intuitive meaning: risk of failure with SF was three times more likely than HP. The OR is a way to present the strength of association between risk factors/exposures and outcomes. If the OR is 1 means the odds are increased for a given outcome. Lets look at the examples again and consider odds. For pediatric arrest, the risk of survival if intubated during arrest was 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%) if not intubated. Lets convert to odds and calculate an OR. Intubated: 411/1135-411 = 411/724 = 0.57 odds. Non-intubated: 460/1135-460 = 667/75 = 0.88 odds. So, the OR is 0.57/0.88 = 0.83.Note, this is very close to the OR (0.89) but is a slight overestimate of the effect on the outcome. This is always the case with the OR compared to the RR it overestimates the effect.Take the example of supination-flexion vs hyperpronation for nursesmaids. The risk of failure for SF was 96/351 vs. 32/350 with HP. Lets convert this to odds. SF: 96/351-96 = 0.376 odds HP: 32/350-32 = 0.10 odds The OR is 0.376/0.10 = 3.76Note, the OR overestimates the RR, which was 3. Although one could say the risk of failure using SF is 3 times greater than HP, one could not say, based on the OR, the risk was 3.74 times greater. The OR and RR are not the same. What could be said is that the odds of failure is 3.74 times greater.Whereas RR can be interpreted in a straightforward way, OR can not. A RR of 3 means the risk of an outcome is increased threefold. A RR of 0.5 means the risk is cut in half. But an OR of 3 doesnt mean the risk is threefold; rather the odds is threefold greater. Interpretation of an OR must be in terms of odds, not probability. Again, the OR will always be an overestimate compared to the RR. However, the RR and OR will be similar for rare outcomes, 1 means greater odds of association with the exposure and outcome. OR < 1 means there is no association between exposure and outcome. OR > 1 means there is a lower odds of association between exposure and outcome. If the 95% confidence interval for the OR includes 1, the results are not statistically significant. Lets take a study we covered on 10/19 to discuss this concept. Survival was lower in pediatric patients intubated during arrest compared with those not intubated 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%). If not intubated: 411/1135 = .361 (36%), if intubated: 460/1135 = .407 (41%). Odds ratio = 0.89. This means survival was affected by a factor of 0.89 for pediatric arrest patients who were intubated during arrest vs. not. This has a very intuitive meaning: risk of failure with SF was three times more likely than HP. The OR is a way to present the strength of association between risk factors/exposures and outcomes. If the OR is 1 means the odds are increased for a given outcome. Lets look at the examples again and consider odds. For pediatric arrest, the risk of survival if intubated during arrest was 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%) if not intubated. Lets convert to odds and calculate an OR. Intubated: 411/1135-411 = 411/724 = 0.57 odds. Non-intubated: 460/1135-460 = 667/75 = 0.88 odds. So, the OR is 0.57/0.88 = 0.83.Note, this is very close to the OR (0.89) but is a slight overestimate of the effect on the outcome. This is always the case with the OR compared to the RR it overestimates the effect.Take the example of supination-flexion vs hyperpronation for nursesmaids. The risk of failure for SF was 96/351 vs. 32/350 with HP. Lets convert this to odds. SF: 96/351-96 = 0.376 odds HP: 32/350-32 = 0.10 odds The OR is 0.376/0.10 = 3.76Note, the OR overestimates the RR, which was 3. Although one could say the risk of failure using SF is 3 times greater than HP, one could not say, based on the OR, the risk was 3.74 times greater. The OR and RR are not the same. What could be said is that the odds of failure is 3.74 times greater.Whereas RR can be interpreted in a straightforward way, OR can not. A RR of 3 means the risk of an outcome is increased threefold. A RR of 0.5 means the risk is cut in half. But an OR of 3 doesnt mean the risk is threefold; rather the odds is threefold greater. Interpretation of an OR must be in terms of odds, not probability. Again, the OR will always be an overestimate compared to the RR. However, the RR and OR will be similar for rare outcomes, 1 means greater odds of association with the exposure and outcome. OR < 1 means there is no association between exposure and outcome. OR > 1 means there is a lower odds of association between exposure and outcome. If the 95% confidence interval for the OR includes 1, the results are not statistically significant. Lets take a study we covered on 10/19 to discuss this concept. Survival was lower in pediatric patients intubated during arrest compared with those not intubated 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%). If not intubated: 411/1135 = .361 (36%), if intubated: 460/1135 = .407 (41%). Odds ratio = 0.89. This means survival was affected by a factor of 0.89 for pediatric arrest patients who were intubated during arrest vs. not. This has a very intuitive meaning: risk of failure with SF was three times more likely than HP. The OR is a way to present the strength of association between risk factors/exposures and outcomes. If the OR is 1 means the odds are increased for a given outcome. Lets look at the examples again and consider odds. For pediatric arrest, the risk of survival if intubated during arrest was 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%) if not intubated. Lets convert to odds and calculate an OR. Intubated: 411/1135-411 = 411/724 = 0.57 odds. Non-intubated: 460/1135-460 = 667/75 = 0.88 odds. So, the OR is 0.57/0.88 = 0.83.Note, this is very close to the OR (0.89) but is a slight overestimate of the effect on the outcome. This is always the case with the OR compared to the RR it overestimates the effect.Take the example of supination-flexion vs hyperpronation for nursesmaids. The risk of failure for SF was 96/351 vs. 32/350 with HP. Lets convert this to odds. SF: 96/351-96 = 0.376 odds HP: 32/350-32 = 0.10 odds The OR is 0.376/0.10 = 3.76Note, the OR overestimates the RR, which was 3. Although one could say the risk of failure using SF is 3 times greater than HP, one could not say, based on the OR, the risk was 3.74 times greater. The OR and RR are not the same. What could be said is that the odds of failure is 3.74 times greater.Whereas RR can be interpreted in a straightforward way, OR can not. A RR of 3 means the risk of an outcome is increased threefold. A RR of 0.5 means the risk is cut in half. But an OR of 3 doesnt mean the risk is threefold; rather the odds is threefold greater. Interpretation of an OR must be in terms of odds, not probability. Again, the OR will always be an overestimate compared to the RR. However, the RR and OR will be similar for rare outcomes, 1 means greater odds of association with the exposure and outcome. OR < 1 means there is no association between exposure and outcome. OR > 1 means there is a lower odds of association between exposure and outcome. If the 95% confidence interval for the OR includes 1, the results are not statistically significant. Lets take a study we covered on 10/19 to discuss this concept. Survival was lower in pediatric patients intubated during arrest compared with those not intubated 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%). If not intubated: 411/1135 = .361 (36%), if intubated: 460/1135 = .407 (41%). Odds ratio = 0.89. This means survival was affected by a factor of 0.89 for pediatric arrest patients who were intubated during arrest vs. not. This has a very intuitive meaning: risk of failure with SF was three times more likely than HP. The OR is a way to present the strength of association between risk factors/exposures and outcomes. If the OR is 1 means the odds are increased for a given outcome. Lets look at the examples again and consider odds. For pediatric arrest, the risk of survival if intubated during arrest was 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%) if not intubated. Lets convert to odds and calculate an OR. Intubated: 411/1135-411 = 411/724 = 0.57 odds. Non-intubated: 460/1135-460 = 667/75 = 0.88 odds. So, the OR is 0.57/0.88 = 0.83.Note, this is very close to the OR (0.89) but is a slight overestimate of the effect on the outcome. This is always the case with the OR compared to the RR it overestimates the effect.Take the example of supination-flexion vs hyperpronation for nursesmaids. The risk of failure for SF was 96/351 vs. 32/350 with HP. Lets convert this to odds. SF: 96/351-96 = 0.376 odds HP: 32/350-32 = 0.10 odds The OR is 0.376/0.10 = 3.76Note, the OR overestimates the RR, which was 3. Although one could say the risk of failure using SF is 3 times greater than HP, one could not say, based on the OR, the risk was 3.74 times greater. The OR and RR are not the same. What could be said is that the odds of failure is 3.74 times greater.Whereas RR can be interpreted in a straightforward way, OR can not. A RR of 3 means the risk of an outcome is increased threefold. A RR of 0.5 means the risk is cut in half. But an OR of 3 doesnt mean the risk is threefold; rather the odds is threefold greater. Interpretation of an OR must be in terms of odds, not probability. Again, the OR will always be an overestimate compared to the RR. However, the RR and OR will be similar for rare outcomes, 1 means greater odds of association with the exposure and outcome. OR < 1 means there is no association between exposure and outcome. OR > 1 means there is a lower odds of association between exposure and outcome. If the 95% confidence interval for the OR includes 1, the results are not statistically significant. Lets take a study we covered on 10/19 to discuss this concept. Survival was lower in pediatric patients intubated during arrest compared with those not intubated 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%). If not intubated: 411/1135 = .361 (36%), if intubated: 460/1135 = .407 (41%). Odds ratio = 0.89. This means survival was affected by a factor of 0.89 for pediatric arrest patients who were intubated during arrest vs. not. This has a very intuitive meaning: risk of failure with SF was three times more likely than HP. The OR is a way to present the strength of association between risk factors/exposures and outcomes. If the OR is 1 means the odds are increased for a given outcome. Lets look at the examples again and consider odds. For pediatric arrest, the risk of survival if intubated during arrest was 411/1135 (36%) vs 460/1135 (41%) if not intubated. Lets convert to odds and calculate an OR. Intubated: 411/1135-411 = 411/724 = 0.57 odds. Non-intubated: 460/1135-460 = 667/75 = 0.88 odds. So, the OR is 0.57/0.88 = 0.83.Note, this is very close to the OR (0.89) but is a slight overestimate of the effect on the outcome. This is always the case with the OR compared to the RR it overestimates the effect.Take the example of supination-flexion vs hyperpronation for nursesmaids. The risk of failure for SF was 96/351 vs. 32/350 with HP. Lets convert this to odds. SF: 96/351-96 = 0.376 odds HP: 32/350-32 = 0.10 odds The OR is 0.376/0.10 = 3.76Note, the OR overestimates the RR, which was 3. Although one could say the risk of failure using SF is 3 times greater than HP, one could not say, based on the OR, the risk was 3.74 times greater. The OR and RR are not the same. What could be said is that the odds of failure

How to put odds ratio into words. How to odds work in betting. How do you interpret an odds ratio of 0.75. How to interpret odds ratio example. How to interpret odds ratio. How to interpret odds ratio more than 1. How to explain odds ratio in words.