



DOA: A New Paradigm of the Level of Proof or a Simple Complementary Tool?

Jean-Baptiste Ricco, Farid Guetarni

► To cite this version:

Jean-Baptiste Ricco, Farid Guetarni. DOA: A New Paradigm of the Level of Proof or a Simple Complementary Tool?. European Journal of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery, 2019, 57, pp.275 -. <10.1016/j.ejvs.2018.10.002>. <hal-03486237>

HAL Id: hal-03486237

<https://hal.science/hal-03486237v1>

Submitted on 20 Dec 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



Distributed under a Creative Commons CC BY-NC 4.0 - Attribution - Non-commercial use - International License

DOA. A new paradigm of the level of proof or a simple complementary tool?

Ricco JB, MD, PhD*, Guetarni F, PhD **

* Professor of vascular surgery. Department of clinical research and innovation (DRCI),
University Hospital of Poitiers, 86021, Poitiers CEDEX, France

** Professor of information systems engineering, CNAM, Paris and Department of clinical
research and innovation (DRCI), University Hospital of Poitiers, 86021, Poitiers CEDEX,
France

Corresponding author : Professor Jean-Baptiste Ricco, MD, PhD, Direction de la Recherche
Clinique et de l'Innovation, CHU de Poitiers, 86021, Cedex.

Mobile : +33607155726

Email : jean.baptiste.ricco@univ-poitiers.fr

DOA: A new paradigm of the level of proof or a simple complementary tool?

At present, the methodologies applied in clinical research are based on therapeutic trials carried out for diagnostic, therapeutic or prognostic purposes. Indeed, randomized trials and meta-analyses of randomized trials are the foundation of Evidence-Based Medicine.

However, in a given population, observations in everyday practice may differ, and most of the time RCTs ignore subgroups that are rarely identified or poorly represented (elderly, pregnant women). Moreover, in RCTs, statistical significance is not always predictive of a practice and a holistic patient-centered approach has been gaining increased acceptance, thereby avoiding marginalization of a specific effect, especially as concerns polyopathologies and comorbidities.

The discord outcome analysis (DOA) described by Kalodiki et al ¹ in this issue of the Journal is a benchmarking technique, primarily a Venn diagram,² that can complement standard statistics. In this respect, the idea of conditional probabilities is of undeniable interest.

For the record, the set-theoretic representation attributed to John Venn ² was inspired by Euler's work well before him. It provides a visual proposition for abstract data structures. This method is based on visual representation of sets and their intersections. One set characterizes one variable and their intersections the overlapping variables of another set. This technique has some limitations insofar as it is appropriate for only 2 or 3 sets. Furthermore, in the context of clinical research it gives no information on set size or cardinality.

The authors have reported 24% of discord outcomes in the EVLA group and 41% in the UGFS group. In other words, improvement in one domain is countered by deterioration in another.

Strictly speaking, DOA is not a method in its own right but rather, as stated in the article, “a reporting standard for comparative analyses”. a count. Considering the way it is applied by the authors, the reader will find it interesting to note that the DOA determines patterns and trends of improvement or deterioration by comparing the change in post-treatment score with regard to the pre-treatment score on the basis of defined criteria (AVVQ, VCSS, VFI).

Although the paper published by Kalodiki et al. ¹ presents some reading difficulties for a vascular surgeon, implementation of this new technique may improve decision-making

processes and contribute to a rethinking of our paradigm for randomized studies.³ The informational input of Venn diagrams should consequently be considered as a complementary tool to be interpreted with caution and within a clearly identified statistical methodology. At present, whether DOA will lead to a better understanding of RCTs remains uncertain, as does role it will ultimately assume as a reporting standard for comparative analyses.

References

1. Kalodiki E, Azzam M, Schnatterbeck P, Geroulakos P, Lattimer CR. The discord outcome analysis (DOA) as a reporting standard at 3 months and 5 years in randomized varicose vein treatment trials. *Eur J Vasc Endovasc Surg*, 2018, *in print*.
2. Venn, John (July 1880) On the diagrammatic and mechanical representation of propositions and reasonings, *Philosophical Magazine Series 5*, 10:59, 1-18, DOI: 10.1080/14786448008626877
3. Maisonneuve H, Babany G. Real-world data and clinical research: The complement data from randomized trials, *La Presse Médicale*, 2015; 44: 586-589.