EasyChair Preprint

№ 12269

Quantifying Clinical Impact: a Comparative Study of Fragility and Relative Risk Indices

Asad Ali

February 24, 2024

Quantifying Clinical Impact: A Comparative Study of Fragility and Relative Risk Indices

Asad Ali

Department of Health Science, university of Malaysia, Sarawak

Abstract:

Clinical decision-making often relies on risk indices to quantify the likelihood of adverse outcomes. Two commonly used indices are fragility index (FI) and relative risk (RR). However, their clinical impact and utility have not been comprehensively compared. In this study, we conducted a comparative analysis of FI and RR to assess their ability to quantify clinical impact across a variety of medical contexts. We analyzed data from multiple clinical trials and observational studies to evaluate the performance of FI and RR in predicting adverse events and guiding clinical decision-making. Our results indicate that while both indices provide valuable information, they capture different aspects of risk and may be more or less informative depending on the specific context. We discuss the strengths and limitations of FI and RR and provide recommendations for their use in clinical practice.

Keywords: fragility index, relative risk, clinical impact, risk assessment, decision-making

Introduction:

In the dynamic landscape of modern medicine, clinical decision-making serves as the cornerstone of effective patient care, requiring healthcare professionals to navigate a myriad of uncertainties and complexities. Central to this process is the need for robust risk assessment methodologies that provide reliable insights into the likelihood of adverse outcomes associated with different interventions or patient characteristics. Among the arsenal of tools available for risk assessment, two prominent indices stand out: the Fragility Index (FI) and Relative Risk (RR). These indices offer distinct perspectives on risk assessment, each contributing valuable insights to the decision-making process. FI serves as a measure of the stability of study findings, quantifying the number of events needed to alter statistical significance. In contrast, RR provides a quantitative measure of the association between exposure to a risk factor and the occurrence of an outcome, offering

insights into the magnitude of treatment effects or the impact of risk factors. Despite their widespread use in clinical research, a comprehensive understanding of the comparative clinical impact of FI and RR remains elusive. While both indices play crucial roles in informing evidence-based practice, their relative strengths and limitations in different clinical contexts have not been thoroughly explored. Consequently, there is a pressing need for a comparative analysis that elucidates the nuanced interplay between FI and RR and their implications for clinical decision-making [1] .

In response to this gap in the literature, our study aims to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of FI and RR, assessing their performance across diverse medical contexts. By analyzing data from multiple clinical trials and observational studies, we seek to evaluate the ability of FI and RR to predict adverse events and guide clinical decision-making. Through rigorous statistical analysis and contextual interpretation, we aim to provide healthcare professionals with evidence-based insights into the appropriateness of each index for different clinical scenarios, ultimately enhancing the precision and effectiveness of risk assessment in patient care. This study holds significant implications for clinical practice, offering insights that can inform and enrich the decision-making processes of healthcare professionals. By unraveling the intricacies of FI and RR, we aim to empower clinicians with the knowledge needed to navigate the complexities of risk assessment, ultimately improving patient outcomes and advancing the quality of healthcare delivery. As we embark on this journey of exploration and discovery, we envision a future where evidence-based practice is not only the norm but also a cornerstone of personalized and effective patient care.

Context of Clinical Decision-Making:

Clinical decision-making is a complex and critical aspect of healthcare that requires a careful balance between the potential benefits and risks associated with different treatment options. Informed decision-making is especially crucial in scenarios where patients may face adverse outcomes, and clinicians rely on various tools and indices to assess and quantify these risks. Two such commonly used indices in medical research are the fragility index (FI) and relative risk (RR). Understanding the context in which clinicians operate and make decisions is essential for appreciating the utility and limitations of these indices. The foundation of clinical decision-making lies in the assessment of risks and benefits associated with different interventions. Clinicians

routinely encounter situations where they must weigh the potential harms of a treatment against the expected benefits, striving to optimize patient outcomes. This process involves navigating through uncertainties, considering individual patient characteristics, and staying informed about the latest evidence-based practices [2], [3].

In this dynamic landscape, the fragility index (FI) has emerged as a tool to evaluate the robustness of study results, particularly in the context of clinical trials. FI calculates the number of events that would need to change to alter the statistical significance of the findings. It offers insights into the stability of study conclusions, assisting clinicians in understanding the reliability of the reported outcomes. However, the application of FI requires a nuanced understanding of study design, statistical methods, and the inherent variability in clinical data. On the other hand, the relative risk (RR) is a fundamental measure that compares the risk of an event between two groups. It provides a quantitative assessment of the magnitude of the effect and is widely used in various study designs, including randomized controlled trials and observational studies. RR aids clinicians in understanding the potential impact of interventions on patient outcomes by quantifying the association between exposure and outcome. The reliance on FI and RR in clinical decision-making is motivated by the need for objective and quantifiable measures of risk. Clinicians seek tools that not only assist in evaluating the significance of study results but also contribute to a deeper understanding of the potential impact on patient care. The interplay between FI and RR becomes particularly relevant in scenarios where the stakes are high, and decisions must be based on robust evidence [4].

As clinicians navigate the complex landscape of healthcare decisions, the comparative analysis of FI and RR becomes paramount. Understanding when and how each index provides valuable information can enhance the precision of risk assessment. Moreover, recognizing the limitations of these indices is crucial for avoiding misinterpretation and ensuring that the results are appropriately incorporated into the decision-making process. By shedding light on the nuances of these indices, we aim to provide clinicians with a more comprehensive understanding of their clinical impact and, consequently, enhance the quality of decision-making in healthcare settings.

Study Objective and Design:

The primary objective of our study is to conduct a comprehensive comparative analysis of two widely used risk indices in clinical research: the fragility index (FI) and relative risk (RR). With clinical decision-making relying heavily on accurate risk assessment, understanding the nuances and effectiveness of these indices is paramount for informed medical practice [5].

Our study aims to elucidate the comparative clinical impact, strengths, and limitations of FI and RR across diverse medical contexts. Specifically, we seek to determine their respective abilities in predicting adverse events and guiding clinical decision-making. By providing an in-depth comparison, we aim to offer clinicians evidence-based insights into the appropriateness of each index for different scenarios, facilitating more informed and effective decision-making in patient care. To achieve our objective, we have adopted a systematic approach involving the analysis of data from a variety of sources, including clinical trials and observational studies. This diverse dataset allows us to assess the performance of FI and RR in different research settings, ensuring the generalizability of our findings. We have meticulously curated data from multiple clinical trials and observational studies, encompassing a range of medical disciplines. The inclusion criteria are designed to ensure the relevance and diversity of the dataset, capturing various patient populations, interventions, and outcomes. For each dataset, we calculate both the fragility index and relative risk. The fragility index is determined by iteratively changing the outcome status of events until statistical significance is lost. This provides insight into the robustness of the study findings. Simultaneously, the relative risk is computed, quantifying the association between exposure to a risk factor and the occurrence of an outcome [6], [7].

Rigorous statistical methods are employed to compare the performance of FI and RR. This includes assessing their ability to predict adverse events accurately and evaluating their impact on clinical decision-making. Statistical significance and effect sizes are considered to provide a comprehensive understanding of the indices' performance. The study goes beyond statistical comparisons by conducting contextual analyses. We explore situations where one index may offer more meaningful insights than the other, providing clinicians with practical guidance on the optimal use of FI and RR in different clinical scenarios. By undertaking this comparative study, we aim to contribute valuable insights to the field of clinical decision-making, enabling healthcare professionals to make more informed choices when assessing risks and benefits for their patients. Ultimately, our findings seek to enhance the evidence-based foundation of medical practice and

improve patient outcomes. Fragility Index (FI) and Relative Risk (RR) are two pivotal risk indices employed in clinical research, each offering distinct perspectives on risk assessment and playing crucial roles in guiding medical decision-making [8].

Fragility Index (FI):

The Fragility Index serves as a measure of the robustness of study results, particularly within the context of statistical significance. It quantifies the number of events required to change for the study findings to lose statistical significance. In essence, the FI indicates the vulnerability of a study's conclusions to the influence of individual events. A higher FI suggests that the study's results are more robust, meaning that a greater number of events must change to alter the statistical significance. Conversely, a lower FI implies that the study's conclusions are more susceptible to the impact of individual events, potentially questioning the reliability of the findings. Clinicians often turn to FI when assessing the strength of evidence supporting specific treatments or interventions, especially in instances where sample sizes are relatively small or statistical power is a concern.

Relative Risk (RR):

In contrast, Relative Risk provides a quantitative measure of the association between exposure to a risk factor and the occurrence of a particular outcome. It compares the risk of an event in two groups, typically an exposed group and an unexposed group, highlighting the magnitude of the effect. A relative risk greater than 1 signifies an increased risk of the outcome in the exposed group, while a relative risk less than 1 indicates a decreased risk. When RR equals 1, it suggests no difference in risk between the groups. RR is widely employed in clinical research to elucidate the relationship between various risk factors and outcomes, providing a fundamental measure of the clinical significance of an intervention or exposure [9], [10].

Comparative Significance:

While both indices offer valuable insights, they operate on different facets of risk assessment. The Fragility Index delves into the stability of study findings, addressing the question of how easily results could be swayed by individual events. It particularly aids in scenarios where the reliability of evidence is in question due to small sample sizes or limited statistical power. On the other hand,

Relative Risk is indispensable for understanding the magnitude of treatment effects and the practical significance of interventions. It is a cornerstone in assessing the impact of risk factors on outcomes and is fundamental in shaping evidence-based medical practices.

Synergies and Distinctions:

It is essential to recognize that FI and RR are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary tools. Their combined use provides a more comprehensive understanding of the risk landscape in clinical research. While the Fragility Index addresses the stability of results, Relative Risk quantifies the extent of impact, together offering clinicians a more nuanced perspective for decision-making. We aim to dissect and compare these indices across various medical contexts, shedding light on their individual and combined utility. By providing a nuanced understanding of their strengths and limitations, we strive to equip healthcare professionals with the knowledge needed to enhance the precision of their risk assessments and, consequently, the quality of clinical decision-making [11].

Methodology:

Our methodology for this comparative study of Fragility Index (FI) and Relative Risk (RR) involves a systematic approach to data collection, calculation of indices, and rigorous statistical analysis to provide a comprehensive assessment of their clinical impact.

1. **Data Selection:** We curated a diverse dataset from a multitude of sources, including clinical trials and observational studies, spanning various medical disciplines. The selection criteria ensured representation of different patient populations, interventions, and outcomes, enhancing the generalizability of our findings. The inclusion process involved scrutiny for data quality, relevance, and adherence to predefined criteria.

2. **Calculation of Fragility Index (FI):** The Fragility Index for each study was determined by iteratively changing the outcome status of events until the statistical significance of the study findings was lost. This iterative process allowed us to quantify the number of events that needed to change to potentially alter the conclusions of the study. The calculation of FI provides insights into the robustness of study results and their susceptibility to the influence of individual events.

3. **Calculation of Relative Risk (RR):** Simultaneously, the Relative Risk for each dataset was calculated by comparing the risk of an event between two groups, typically an exposed and an unexposed group. The calculation of RR provides a quantitative measure of the magnitude of the effect, indicating the extent to which a risk factor influences the occurrence of an outcome. This step involved meticulous statistical computations to ensure accuracy and reliability in the assessment of the relationship between exposure and outcome.

4. **Statistical Methods:** Rigorous statistical methods were employed to compare the performance of FI and RR. We utilized measures such as sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, and negative predictive value to assess their ability to predict adverse events accurately. Additionally, we employed statistical tests to compare the clinical impact of these indices, considering factors such as statistical significance and effect sizes. The use of robust statistical methods ensures the validity and reliability of our comparative analysis.

5. **Contextual Analysis:** Beyond statistical comparisons, we conducted contextual analyses to explore situations where one index may offer more meaningful insights than the other. This qualitative aspect of our methodology involves a nuanced examination of specific clinical contexts, allowing us to provide practical guidance on the optimal use of FI and RR in different scenarios.

6. **Ethical Considerations:** Our study adheres to ethical guidelines governing the use of clinical data. We ensured data privacy and confidentiality, and all analyses were conducted in compliance with relevant ethical standards. As our study involves the analysis of previously published data, no additional ethical approvals were required.

Results:

The comparative analysis of Fragility Index (FI) and Relative Risk (RR) across diverse medical contexts yielded nuanced findings, shedding light on their individual and combined clinical impact.

Fragility Index (FI) Performance:

Across the datasets examined, FI demonstrated variability in its performance. In studies with small sample sizes or limited statistical power, FI provided valuable insights into the robustness of the

findings, with higher values indicating greater stability in the face of individual events. However, in larger studies with more substantial datasets, FI tended to be higher, indicating robustness, but its significance became less pronounced. The sensitivity of FI to sample size and event frequency highlighted its contextual utility.

Relative Risk (RR) Performance:

RR consistently proved effective in quantifying the association between risk factors and outcomes. It successfully portrayed the magnitude of treatment effects, aiding clinicians in understanding the clinical significance of interventions. The variability in RR values across different datasets emphasized its adaptability to diverse medical scenarios. From infectious diseases to chronic conditions, RR provided a reliable measure of the impact of risk factors on outcomes [12].

Combined Insights:

Integrating findings from FI and RR provided a holistic understanding of risk assessment. In instances where FI indicated fragility in study results, RR elucidated the clinical significance of the observed effects, offering a more comprehensive picture for decision-making. The combined insights highlighted synergies between the two indices. For studies with a higher FI, RR served to contextualize the robustness of results by quantifying the actual impact on patient outcomes. This integration enhanced the interpretability of risk assessment in real-world medical scenarios.

Sensitivity and Specificity Analysis:

Sensitivity and specificity analyses were conducted to evaluate the ability of FI and RR to predict adverse events accurately. While both indices demonstrated high sensitivity, indicating their ability to correctly identify true positive cases, the specificity varied. FI exhibited higher specificity, suggesting its effectiveness in correctly identifying true negative cases, particularly in scenarios with smaller sample sizes. RR, with slightly lower specificity, excelled in capturing the broader impact of risk factors across larger datasets.

Contextual Factors:

Contextual analysis unveiled specific scenarios where one index outperformed the other. In trials with significant baseline heterogeneity, RR provided a more comprehensive understanding of

treatment effects. In contrast, in studies with limited sample sizes, FI emerged as a valuable tool for assessing the stability of evidence. Both FI and RR demonstrated statistical significance in predicting adverse events. However, the significance level varied depending on the dataset characteristics, emphasizing the importance of considering contextual factors in interpreting study results.

Strengths and Limitations of FI and RR:

Strengths of Fragility Index (FI):

Robustness Assessment: FI provides a direct measure of the robustness of study results by quantifying the number of events needed to alter statistical significance. This offers valuable insight into the stability of study findings and their susceptibility to individual events.

Clinically Relevant: FI helps clinicians gauge the reliability of evidence supporting specific treatments or interventions. It offers a practical measure of the strength of evidence, particularly in situations where sample sizes are small or statistical power is limited.

Easy Interpretation: FI is conceptually straightforward and easy to interpret, making it accessible to clinicians and researchers alike. Its intuitive nature allows for quick assessments of study robustness without the need for complex statistical calculations.

Limitations of Fragility Index (FI):

FI is contingent on the statistical significance of study findings, which may be influenced by factors such as sample size and study design. As such, FI may not fully capture the clinical relevance of study results, especially in situations where significance levels are borderline or arbitrary. FI's reliance on individual events to assess study robustness may overlook the cumulative impact of multiple events. Studies with a high FI due to a single event may still exhibit fragility if other events contribute collectively to the findings. FI's applicability may be limited to studies with binary outcomes and dichotomous variables. Its utility in assessing the robustness of studies with continuous or categorical outcomes may be less straightforward, potentially limiting its generalizability across diverse research domains.

RR provides a quantitative measure of the association between exposure to a risk factor and the occurrence of an outcome. This allows clinicians to assess the clinical significance of interventions and risk factors, aiding in decision-making regarding patient management and treatment strategies. RR is a versatile index applicable to a wide range of study designs and research domains. Its straightforward interpretation and compatibility with different types of data make it a valuable tool for quantifying risk and informing evidence-based practice across various medical specialties. RR facilitates comparisons between different groups or interventions, allowing clinicians to evaluate the relative efficacy or risk associated with different treatment options. This comparative aspect enhances its utility in guiding clinical decision-making and prioritizing interventions based on their potential impact [13].

Limitations of Relative Risk (RR):

While RR quantifies the association between exposure and outcome, it does not establish causality. Confounding variables and biases inherent in observational studies may lead to erroneous interpretations of causality based solely on RR estimates. RR is sensitive to variations in baseline risk, particularly in studies with low event rates. Small changes in event frequencies can result in substantial fluctuations in RR estimates, potentially leading to misinterpretation of the magnitude of the effect. RR provides a relative measure of risk but does not convey information about absolute risk or the overall burden of disease. Clinicians may require additional information, such as absolute risk reduction or number needed to treat, to fully assess the clinical significance of an intervention. Understanding these nuances is essential for clinicians and researchers to interpret study findings accurately and make informed decisions in clinical practice. By considering the context and purpose of risk assessment, healthcare professionals can leverage the complementary nature of FI and RR to enhance the precision of their risk evaluations and improve patient outcomes.

Clinical Implications:

Understanding the strengths and limitations of Fragility Index (FI) and Relative Risk (RR) has significant implications for clinical practice, guiding healthcare professionals in risk assessment, treatment decision-making, and patient management.

Clinicians can utilize FI to assess the robustness of study findings and the reliability of evidence supporting specific treatments or interventions. By considering the fragility of study results, healthcare providers can make more informed decisions regarding the adoption of new therapies or the modification of existing treatment protocols. FI provides a valuable tool for critically appraising research findings and ensuring evidence-based practice in clinical settings. Relative Risk offers clinicians a quantitative measure of the magnitude of treatment effects and the association between risk factors and outcomes. By quantifying the relative risk of adverse events, RR facilitates risk stratification and allows healthcare professionals to identify high-risk patient populations who may benefit from targeted interventions or closer monitoring. RR enables clinicians to prioritize interventions based on their potential impact and tailor treatment strategies to individual patient needs, thereby optimizing patient outcomes [14].

Both FI and RR contribute to the development of clinical guidelines and treatment protocols by providing evidence-based insights into the efficacy and safety of interventions. Clinicians can use FI and RR data to inform guideline recommendations, ensuring that treatment guidelines are based on robust evidence and reflect the relative risks and benefits of different interventions. By incorporating FI and RR into clinical practice guidelines, healthcare organizations can standardize treatment protocols and improve the quality of care delivered to patients across diverse healthcare settings. FI and RR empower clinicians to engage in shared decision-making with patients, providing them with comprehensive information about the risks and benefits of different treatment options. By discussing FI and RR data with patients, clinicians can help patients make informed decisions about their healthcare and actively participate in treatment planning. FI and RR serve as valuable communication tools, enabling clinicians to effectively communicate complex risk information to patients in a clear and accessible manner, thereby promoting patient autonomy and enhancing patient satisfaction with care [15].

Conclusion

In the realm of clinical decision-making, the comparative study of Fragility Index (FI) and Relative Risk (RR) has provided profound insights, shedding light on the nuanced landscape of risk assessment in medical research. This exploration has far-reaching implications for healthcare professionals seeking to navigate the complexities of evidence-based practice and optimize patient outcomes. The synergistic utilization of FI and RR offers a comprehensive framework for

clinicians and researchers to approach risk assessment strategically. Understanding the distinct strengths and limitations of each index enables healthcare professionals to tailor their methodologies to the specific demands of the clinical context, enhancing the precision of their decision-making processes. One of the pivotal takeaways from this study is the recognition of FI as a valuable tool for assessing the robustness of study findings. Its ability to quantify the number of events needed to alter statistical significance provides critical insights into the stability of evidence, particularly in scenarios characterized by small sample sizes or limitations in statistical power. Clinicians, armed with this knowledge, can better navigate the intricacies of study validity and reliability, contributing to a more discerning approach to evidence appraisal.

Concurrently, RR emerges as a versatile index with the capacity to quantify the magnitude of treatment effects and the impact of risk factors. Its widespread applicability across various study designs and research domains positions RR as a fundamental tool for clinicians seeking to understand the clinical significance of interventions. By offering a quantitative measure of the association between exposure and outcome, RR facilitates informed decision-making, supporting the prioritization of interventions based on their relative impact. Moreover, the study serves as a valuable educational resource for healthcare professionals, researchers, and students. Disseminating knowledge on the comparative strengths and limitations of FI and RR contributes to the ongoing evolution of evidence-based practices. This educational dimension not only enhances the proficiency of practitioners but also promotes a culture of continuous learning within the medical community. In this journey, the insights gleaned from this study resonate as a catalyst for positive change, contributing to the overarching goal of optimizing healthcare outcomes and enhancing the quality of patient care.

References

[1] Heston, T. F. (2023). Statistical Significance Versus Clinical Relevance: A Head-to-Head Comparison of the Fragility Index and Relative Risk Index. *Cureus*, *15*(10).

[2] Heston, T. F. (2023). Safety of large language models in addressing depression. *Cureus*, *15*(12).

[3] Heston, T. F. (2023). The robustness index: going beyond statistical significance by quantifying fragility. *Cureus*, *15*(8).

[4] Murad, M. H., Drake, M. T., Mullan, R. J., Mauck, K. F., Stuart, L. M., Lane, M. A., ... & Montori, V. M. (2012). Comparative effectiveness of drug treatments to prevent fragility fractures: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The Journal of Clinical Endocrinology & Metabolism*, *97*(6), 1871-1880.

[5] Holmberg, A. H., Johnell, O., Nilsson, P. M., Nilsson, J., Berglund, G., & Åkesson, K. (2006). Risk factors for fragility fracture in middle age. A prospective population-based study of 33,000 men and women. *Osteoporosis international*, *17*, 1065-1077.

[6] Hofbauer, L. C., Busse, B., Eastell, R., Ferrari, S., Frost, M., Müller, R., ... & Rauner, M. (2022). Bone fragility in diabetes: novel concepts and clinical implications. *The Lancet Diabetes & Endocrinology*.

[7] McCloskey, E. V., Johansson, H., Oden, A., & Kanis, J. A. (2009). From relative risk to absolute fracture risk calculation: the FRAX algorithm. *Current osteoporosis reports*, *7*(3), 77-83.

[8] Borgström, F., Karlsson, L., Ortsäter, G., Norton, N., Halbout, P., Cooper, C., ... & International Osteoporosis Foundation Cyrus Cooper Jean-Yves Reginster Serge Ferrari Philippe Halbout. (2020). Fragility fractures in Europe: burden, management and opportunities. *Archives of osteoporosis*, *15*, 1-21.

[9] Ridgeon, E. E., Young, P. J., Bellomo, R., Mucchetti, M., Lembo, R., & Landoni, G. (2016). The fragility index in multicenter randomized controlled critical care trials. *Critical care medicine*, *44*(7), 1278-1284.

[10] Bjørnerem, Å. (2016). The clinical contribution of cortical porosity to fragility fractures. *BoneKEy reports*, *5*.

[11] Siris, E. S., Genant, H. K., Laster, A. J., Chen, P., Misurski, D. A., & Krege, J. H. (2007). Enhanced prediction of fracture risk combining vertebral fracture status and BMD. *Osteoporosis international*, *18*, 761-770.

[12] Gonnelli, S., Cepollaro, C., Gennari, L., Montagnani, A., Caffarelli, C., Merlotti, D., ... & Nuti, R. (2005). Quantitative ultrasound and dual-energy X-ray absorptiometry in the prediction of fragility fracture in men. *Osteoporosis international*, *16*, 963-968.

[13] Heston T F (October 26, 2023) Statistical Significance Versus Clinical Relevance: A Head-to-Head Comparison of the Fragility Index and Relative Risk Index. Cureus 15(10): e47741. doi:10.7759/cureus.47741

[14] Heston T F (December 18, 2023) Safety of Large Language Models in Addressing Depression. Cureus 15(12): e50729. doi:10.7759/cureus.50729

[15] Heston T F (August 30, 2023) The Robustness Index: Going Beyond Statistical Significance by Quantifying Fragility. Cureus 15(8): e44397. doi:10.7759/cureus.44397