

## References

1. Comparison of invasive and conservative strategies after treatment with intravenous tissue plasminogen activator in acute myocardial infarction. Results of the thrombolysis in myocardial infarction (TIMI) phase II trial. The TIMI Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1989;320(10):618-27.
2. An international randomized trial comparing four thrombolytic strategies for acute myocardial infarction. The GUSTO investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329(10):673-82.
3. A predictive model for aggressive non-Hodgkin's lymphoma. The International Non-Hodgkin's Lymphoma Prognostic Factors Project. *N Engl J Med* 1993;329(14):987-94.
4. A comparison of reteplase with alteplase for acute myocardial infarction. The Global Use of Strategies to Open Occluded Coronary Arteries (GUSTO III) Investigators. *N Engl J Med* 1997;337(16):1118-23.
5. International germ cell consensus classification: a prognostic factor-based staging system for metastatic germ cell cancers. International Germ Cell Cancer Collaborative Group. *J Clin Oncol* 1997;15:594-603.
6. Surgery for colorectal cancer in elderly patients: a systematic review. Colorectal Cancer Collaborative Group. *Lancet* 2000;356(9234):968-74.
7. Addala S, Grines CL, Dixon SR, Stone GW, Boura JA, Ochoa AB, *et al.* Predicting mortality in patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction treated with primary percutaneous coronary intervention (PAMI risk score). *Am J Cardiol* 2004;93(5):629-32.
8. Altman DG. *Practical statistics for medical research*. 1st ed. London; New York: Chapman and Hall, 1991.
9. Altman DG. ROC curves and confidence intervals: getting them right. *Heart* 2000;83(2):236.
10. Altman DG, Andersen PK. Bootstrap investigation of the stability of a Cox regression model. *Stat Med* 1989;8(7):771-83.
11. Altman DG, Bland JM. Absence of evidence is not evidence of absence. *Bmj* 1995;311(7003):485.
12. Altman DG, Lausen B, Sauerbrei W, Schumacher M. Dangers of using "optimal" cutpoints in the evaluation of prognostic factors. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1994;86(11):829-35.
13. Altman DG, Royston P. What do we mean by validating a prognostic model? *Stat Med* 2000;19(4):453-73.
14. Ambler G, Brady AR, Royston P. Simplifying a prognostic model: a simulation study based on clinical data. *Stat Med* 2002;21(24):3803-22.
15. Ambler G, Royston P. Fractional polynomial model selection procedures: investigation of type I error rate. *J Stat Comput Simul* 2001;69:89-108.
16. Ammar KA, Kors JA, Yawn BP, Rodeheffer RJ. Defining unrecognized myocardial infarction: a call for standardized electrocardiographic diagnostic criteria. *Am Heart J* 2004;148(2):277-84.
17. Assmann G, Schulte H. The Prospective Cardiovascular Munster (PROCAM) study: prevalence of hyperlipidemia in persons with hypertension and/or diabetes mellitus and the relationship to coronary heart disease. *Am Heart J* 1988; 116:1713-24.
18. Assmann SF, Pocock SJ, Enos LE, Kasten LE. Subgroup analysis and other (mis)uses of baseline data in clinical trials. *Lancet* 2000;355(9209):1064-9.

19. Austin PC. Using the bootstrap to improve estimation and confidence intervals for regression coefficients selected using backwards variable elimination. *Stat Med* 2008;27:3286-3300.
20. Austin PC, Tu JV. Automated variable selection methods for logistic regression produced unstable models for predicting acute myocardial infarction mortality. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57(11):1138-46.
21. Austin PC, Tu JV. Bootstrap methods for developing predictive models in cardiovascular research. *Am Stat* 2004;58:131-137.
22. Aylin P, Alves B, Best N, Cook A, Elliott P, Evans SJ, *et al.* Comparison of UK paediatric cardiac surgical performance by analysis of routinely collected data 1984-96: was Bristol an outlier? *Lancet* 2001;358(9277):181-7.
23. Babyak MA. What you see may not be what you get: a brief, nontechnical introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosom Med* 2004;66(3):411-21.
24. Bach PB, Guadagnoli E, Schrag D, Schussler N, Warren JL. Patient demographic and socioeconomic characteristics in the SEER-Medicare database applications and limitations. *Med Care* 2002;40(8 Suppl):IV-19-25.
25. Balmana J, Stockwell DH, Steyerberg EW, Stoffel EM, Deffenbaugh AM, Reid JE, *et al.* Prediction of MLH1 and MSH2 mutations in Lynch syndrome. *Jama* 2006;296(12):1469-78.
26. Bancroft TA, Han CP. Inference based on conditional specification: a note and a bibliography. *Int Statist Rev* 1977;45:117-127.
27. Bao Y. Predicting the use of outpatient mental health services: do modeling approaches make a difference? *Inquiry* 2002;39(2):168-83.
28. Barnetson RA, Tenesa A, Farrington SM, Nicholl ID, Cetnarskyj R, Porteous ME, *et al.* Identification and survival of carriers of mutations in DNA mismatch-repair genes in colon cancer. *N Engl J Med* 2006;354(26):2751-63.
29. Begg CB, Gray R. Calculation of polychotomous logistic regression parameters using individualized regressions. *Biometrika* 1984;71(1):11-8.
30. Begg CB, Greenes RA. Assessment of diagnostic tests when disease verification is subject to selection bias. *Biometrics* 1983;39(1):207-15.
31. Begg CB, Satagopan JM, Berwick M. A new strategy for evaluating the impact of epidemiologic risk factors for cancer with application to melanoma. *JASA* 1998;93:415-26.
32. Bellacosa A, Genuardi M, Anti M, Viel A, Ponz de Leon M. Hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer: review of clinical, molecular genetics, and counseling aspects. *Am J Med Genet* 1996;62(4):353-64.
33. Benichou J, Gail MH, Mulvihill JJ. Graphs to estimate an individualized risk of breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1996;14(1):103-10.
34. Biesheuvel CJ, Grobbee DE, Moons KG. Distraction from randomization in diagnostic research. *Ann Epidemiol* 2006;16(7):540-4.
35. Biesheuvel CJ, Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Grobbee DE, Moons KG. Polytomous logistic regression analysis could be applied more often in diagnostic research. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(2):125-34.
36. Birim O, Kappetein AP, Waleboer M, Puvimanasinghe JP, Eijkemans MJ, Steyerberg EW, *et al.* Long-term survival after non-small cell lung cancer surgery: development and validation of a prognostic model with a preoperative and postoperative mode. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2006;132(3):491-8.
37. Birkmeyer JD, Marrin CA, O'Connor GT. Should patients with Bjork-Shiley valves undergo prophylactic replacement? *Lancet* 1992;340(8818):520-3.
38. Blattenberger G, Lad F. Separating the Brier score into calibration and refinement components: a graphical exposition. *Am Stat* 1985;39(1):26-32.
39. Bleeker S, Derksen-Lubsen G, Grobbee D, Donders A, Moons K, Moll H. Validating and updating a prediction rule for serious bacterial infection in patients with fever without source. *Acta Paediatr* 2007;96(1):100-4.
40. Bleeker SE, Moll HA, Steyerberg EW, Donders AR, Derksen-Lubsen G, Grobbee DE, *et al.* External validation is necessary in prediction research: a clinical example. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56(9):826-32.

41. Bleeker SE, Moons KG, Derksen-Lubsen G, Grobbee DE, Moll HA. Predicting serious bacterial infection in young children with fever without apparent source. *Acta Paediatr* 2001;90(11):1226-32.
42. Blot WJ, Omar RZ, Kallewaard M, Morton LS, Fryzek JP, Ibrahim MA, *et al.* Risks of fracture of Bjork-Shiley 60 degree convexo-concave prosthetic heart valves: long-term cohort follow up in the UK, Netherlands and USA. *J Heart Valve Dis* 2001;10(2):202-9.
43. Boersma E, Pieper KS, Steyerberg EW, Wilcox RG, Chang WC, Lee KL, *et al.* Predictors of outcome in patients with acute coronary syndromes without persistent ST-segment elevation. Results from an international trial of 9461 patients. The PURSUIT Investigators. *Circulation* 2000;101(22):2557-67.
44. Boersma E, Steyerberg EW, van der Vlugt MJ, Simoons ML. Reperfusion therapy for acute myocardial infarction. Which strategy for which patient? *Drugs* 1998;56(1):31-48.
45. Boissel JP, Gueyffier F, Chucherat M, Bricca G. Pharmacogenetics and responders to a therapy: theoretical background and practical problems. *Clin Chem Lab Med* 2003;41(4):564-72.
46. Bos JM, Rietveld E, Moll HA, Steyerberg EW, Luytjes W, Wilschut JC, *et al.* The use of health economics to guide drug development decisions: determining optimal values for an RSV-vaccine in a model-based scenario-analytic approach. *Vaccine* 2007;25(39-40):6922-9.
47. Boscarino JA, Adams RE. Public perceptions of quality care and provider profiling in New York: implications for improving quality care and public health. *J Public Health Manag Pract* 2004;10(3):241-50.
48. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, *et al.* Towards complete and accurate reporting of studies of diagnostic accuracy: the STARD initiative. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;138(1):40-4.
49. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, Gatsonis CA, Glasziou PP, Irwig LM, *et al.* The STARD statement for reporting studies of diagnostic accuracy: explanation and elaboration. *Ann Intern Med* 2003;138(1):W1-12.
50. Bower M, Gazzard B, Mandalia S, Newsom-Davis T, Thirlwell C, Dhillon T, *et al.* A prognostic index for systemic AIDS-related non-Hodgkin lymphoma treated in the era of highly active antiretroviral therapy. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;143(4):265-73.
51. Box GEP. Robustness in the strategy of scientific model building. In: Launer RL, Wilkinson GN, editors. *Robustness in statistics: proceedings of a workshop*. New York: Academic Press, 1979:xvi, 296p.
52. Box GEP, Tidwell PW. Transformation of the independent variables. *Technometrics* 1962;4:531-550.
53. Boyd CR, Tolson MA, Copes WS. Evaluating trauma care: the TRISS method. Trauma Score and the Injury Severity Score. *J Trauma* 1987;27(4):370-8.
54. Brady AR, Fowkes FG, Greenhalgh RM, Powell JT, Ruckley CV, Thompson SG. Risk factors for postoperative death following elective surgical repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm: results from the UK Small Aneurysm Trial. On behalf of the UK Small Aneurysm Trial participants. *Br J Surg* 2000;87(6):742-9.
55. Braitman LE, Rosenbaum PR. Rare outcomes, common treatments: analytic strategies using propensity scores. *Ann Intern Med* 2002;137(8):693-5.
56. Brehaut JC, Stiell IG, Visentin L, Graham ID. Clinical decision rule "in the real world": how a widely disseminated rule is used in everyday practice. *Acad Emerg Med* 2005;12(10):948-56.
57. Breiman L. *Classification and regression trees*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth International Group, 1984.
58. Breiman L. Better subset regression using the nonnegative Garrote. *Technometrics* 1995;37:373-384.
59. Breiman L. Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning* 1996;24:123-140.
60. Brookhart MA, Schneeweiss S, Rothman KJ, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Sturmer T. Variable selection for propensity score models. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006;163(12):1149-56.
61. Burton A, Altman DG. Missing covariate data within cancer prognostic studies: a review of current reporting and proposed guidelines. *Br J Cancer* 2004;91(1):4-8.

62. Butcher I, McHugh GS, Lu J, Steyerberg EW, Hernandez AV, Mushkudiani N, *et al.* Prognostic value of cause of injury in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):281-6.
63. Califf RM, Woodlief LH, Harrell FE, Jr., Lee KL, White HD, Guerci A, *et al.* Selection of thrombolytic therapy for individual patients: development of a clinical model. GUSTO-I Investigators. *Am Heart J* 1997;133(6):630-9.
64. Campbell MJ. *Statistics at square two: understanding modern statistical applications in medicine.* 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.
65. Carroll KJ. On the use and utility of the Weibull model in the analysis of survival data. *Control Clin Trials* 2003;24(6):682-701.
66. Cepeda MS, Boston R, Farrar JT, Strom BL. Comparison of logistic regression versus propensity score when the number of events is low and there are multiple confounders. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003;158(3):280-7.
67. Chan SF, Deeks JJ, Macaskill P, Irwig L. Three methods to construct predictive models using logistic regression and likelihood ratios to facilitate adjustment for pretest probability give similar results. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(1):52-63.
68. Charlson ME, Pompei P, Ales KL, MacKenzie CR. A new method of classifying prognostic comorbidity in longitudinal studies: development and validation. *J Chronic Dis* 1987;40(5):373-83.
69. Chatfield C. Model uncertainty, data mining and statistical inference. *J R Stat Soc Ser A* 1995;158(3):419-66.
70. Chen CH, George SL. The bootstrap and identification of prognostic factors via Cox's proportional hazards regression model. *Stat Med* 1985;4(1):39-46.
71. Chen S, Wang W, Lee S, Nafa K, Lee J, Romans K, *et al.* Prediction of germline mutations and cancer risk in the Lynch syndrome. *Jama* 2006;296(12):1479-87.
72. Chun FK, Karakiewicz PI, Briganti A, Gallina A, Kattan MW, Montorsi F, *et al.* Prostate cancer nomograms: an update. *Eur Urol* 2006;50(5):914-26; discussion 926.
73. Clark TG, Altman DG. Developing a prognostic model in the presence of missing data: an ovarian cancer case study. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56(1):28-37.
74. Claus EB, Risch N, Thompson WD. Autosomal dominant inheritance of early-onset breast cancer. Implications for risk prediction. *Cancer* 1994;73(3):643-51.
75. Cleveland WS, Devlin SJ. Locally weighted regression: an approach to regression analysis by local fitting. *JASA* 1988;83:596-610.
76. Collins JA, Burrows EA, Wilan AR. The prognosis for live birth among untreated infertile couples. *Fertil Steril* 1995;64(1):22-8.
77. Collins LM, Schafer JL, Kam CM. A comparison of inclusive and restrictive strategies in modern missing data procedures. *Psychol Methods* 2001;6(4):330-51.
78. Cook NR. Use and misuse of the receiver operating characteristic curve in risk prediction. *Circulation* 2007;115(7):928-35.
79. Cook NR, Buring JE, Ridker PM. The effect of including C-reactive protein in cardiovascular risk prediction models for women. *Ann Intern Med* 2006;145(1):21-9.
80. Cooper GS, Virnig B, Klabunde CN, Schussler N, Freeman J, Warren JL. Use of SEER-Medicare data for measuring cancer surgery. *Med Care* 2002;40(8 Suppl):IV-43-8.
81. Copas JB. Regression, prediction and shrinkage. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1983;45(3):311-354.
82. Copas JB, Long T. Estimating the residual variance in orthogonal regression with variable selection. *Statistician* 1991;40:51-59.
83. Costantino JP, Gail MH, Pee D, Anderson S, Redmond CK, Benichou J, *et al.* Validation studies for models projecting the risk of invasive and total breast cancer incidence. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1999;91(18):1541-8.
84. Coulter A. Partnerships with patients: the pros and cons of shared clinical decision-making. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 1997;2(2):112-21.
85. Cox D. Regression models and life-tables (with discussion). *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1972;34:187-220.

86. Cox DR. Two further applications of a model for binary regression. *Biometrika* 1958;45:562-5.
87. Croft RP, Nicholls PG, Steyerberg EW, Richardus JH, Cairns W, Smith S. A clinical prediction rule for nerve-function impairment in leprosy patients. *Lancet* 2000;355(9215):1603-6.
88. Cucciare MA, O'Donohue W. Predicting future healthcare costs: how well does risk-adjustment work? *J Health Organ Manag* 2006;20(2-3):150-62.
89. D'Agostino RB, Jr. Propensity score methods for bias reduction in the comparison of a treatment to a non-randomized control group. *Stat Med* 1998;17(19):2265-81.
90. D'Agostino RB, Sr., Grundy S, Sullivan LM, Wilson P. Validation of the Framingham coronary heart disease prediction scores: results of a multiple ethnic groups investigation. *Jama* 2001;286(2):180-7.
91. De Coster C, Quan H, Finlayson A, Gao M, Halfon P, Humphries KH, *et al.* Identifying priorities in methodological research using ICD-9-CM and ICD-10 administrative data: report from an international consortium. *BMC Health Serv Res* 2006;6:77.
92. De Dombal FT. *Diagnosis of acute abdominal pain.* Edinburgh: Churchill Livingstone, 1980.
93. De Ridder MA, Stijnen T, Hokken-Koelega AC. Validation and calibration of the Kabi Pharmacia International Growth Study prediction model for children with idiopathic growth hormone deficiency. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab* 2003;88(3):1223-7.
94. Decarli A, Calza S, Masala G, Specchia C, Palli D, Gail MH. Gail model for prediction of absolute risk of invasive breast cancer: independent evaluation in the Florence-European Prospective Investigation into Cancer and Nutrition cohort. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98(23):1686-93.
95. DeLong ER, Peterson ED, DeLong DM, Muhlbaier LH, Hackett S, Mark DB. Comparing risk-adjustment methods for provider profiling. *Stat Med* 1997;16(23):2645-64.
96. Derksen S, Keselman H. Backward, forward and stepwise automated subset selection algorithms: frequency of obtaining authentic and noise variables. *Br J Math Stat Psychol* 1992;45:265-82.
97. DerSimonian R, Kacker R. Random-effects model for meta-analysis of clinical trials: an update. *Contemp Clin Trials* 2007;28(2):105-14.
98. Dijk JM, van der Graaf Y, Bots ML, Grobbee DE, Algra A. Carotid intima-media thickness and the risk of new vascular events in patients with manifest atherosclerotic disease: the SMART study. *Eur Heart J* 2006;27(16):1971-8.
99. Donabedian A. *The definition of quality and approaches to its assessment.* Ann Arbor, MI: Health Administration Press, 1980.
100. Donders AR, van der Heijden GJ, Stijnen T, Moons KG. Review: a gentle introduction to imputation of missing values. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(10):1087-91.
101. Draper D. Assessment and propagation of model uncertainty. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1995;57:45-97.
102. Draper NR, Smith H. *Applied regression analysis.* 3rd ed. New York: Wiley, 1998.
103. Dresser GK, Bailey DG. A basic conceptual and practical overview of interactions with highly prescribed drugs. *Can J Clin Pharmacol* 2002;9(4):191-8.
104. Dubois C, Pierard LA, Albert A, Smeets JP, Demoulin JC, Boland J, *et al.* Short-term risk stratification at admission based on simple clinical data in acute myocardial infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 1988;61(4):216-9.
105. Earle CC, Nattinger AB, Potosky AL, Lang K, Mallick R, Berger M, *et al.* Identifying cancer relapse using SEER-Medicare data. *Med Care* 2002;40(8 Suppl):IV-75-81.
106. Efron B, Hastie T, Johnstone I, Tibshirani R. Least angle regression. *Ann Stat* 2004;32:407-99.
107. Efron B, Morris C. Stein's paradox in statistics. *Scientific American* 1977;236(5):119-127.
108. Efron B, Tibshirani R. *An introduction to the bootstrap.* New York: Chapman & Hall, 1993.
109. Efron B, Tibshirani R. Improvements on cross-validation: the .632+ bootstrap method. *JASA* 1997;92:548-60.

110. Egger M, Davey Smith G, Schneider M, Minder C. Bias in meta-analysis detected by a simple, graphical test. *Bmj* 1997;315(7109):629-34.
111. Eimers JM, te Velde ER, Gerritse R, Vogelzang ET, Looman CW, Habbema JD. The prediction of the chance to conceive in subfertile couples. *Fertil Steril* 1994;61(1):44-52.
112. Elmore JG, Fletcher SW. The risk of cancer risk prediction: "What is my risk of getting breast cancer?". *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98(23):1673-5.
113. Empana JP, Ducimetiere P, Arveiler D, Ferrieres J, Evans A, Ruidavets JB, *et al.* Are the Framingham and PROCAM coronary heart disease risk functions applicable to different European populations? The PRIME Study. *Eur Heart J* 2003;24(21):1903-11.
114. Enders CK. A primer on the use of modern missing-data methods in psychosomatic medicine research. *Psychosom Med* 2006;68(3):427-36.
115. Ennis M, Hinton G, Naylor D, Revow M, Tibshirani R. A comparison of statistical learning methods on the GUSTO database. *Stat Med* 1998;17(21):2501-8.
116. Euhus DM, Smith KC, Robinson L, Stucky A, Olopade OI, Cummings S, *et al.* Pretest prediction of BRCA1 or BRCA2 mutation by risk counselors and the computer model BRCAPRO. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2002;94(11):844-51.
117. Ewald B. Post hoc choice of cut points introduced bias to diagnostic research. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(8):798-801.
118. Fanning J, Gangestad A, Andrews SJ. National Cancer Data Base/Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results: potential insensitive-measure bias. *Gynecol Oncol* 2000;77(3):450-3.
119. Faraway JJ. On the cost of data analysis. *J Comp Graph Stat* 1992;1(3):213-29.
120. Farley JF, Harley CR, Devine JW. A comparison of comorbidity measurements to predict healthcare expenditures. *Am J Manag Care* 2006;12(2):110-9.
121. Felker GM, Leimberger JD, Califf RM, Cuffe MS, Massie BM, Adams KF, Jr., *et al.* Risk stratification after hospitalization for decompensated heart failure. *J Card Fail* 2004;10(6):460-6.
122. Figueiras A, Domenech-Massons JM, Cadarso C. Regression models: calculating the confidence interval of effects in the presence of interactions. *Stat Med* 1998;17(18):2099-105.
123. Fine AM, Nigrovic LE, Reis BY, Cook EF, Mandl KD. Linking surveillance to action: incorporation of realtime regional data into a medical decision rule. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2007;14(2):206-11.
124. Fine JP, Gray RJ. A proportional hazards model for the subdistribution of a competing risk. *JASA* 1999;94:496-509.
125. Finlayson EV, Birkmeyer JD. Operative mortality with elective surgery in older adults. *Eff Clin Pract* 2001;4(4):172-7.
126. Fortin M, Hudon C, Dubois MF, Almirall J, Lapointe L, Soubhi H. Comparative assessment of three different indices of multimorbidity for studies on health-related quality of life. *Health Qual Life Outcomes* 2005;3:74.
127. Frank TS, Deffenbaugh AM, Reid JE, Hulick M, Ward BE, Lingenfelter B, *et al.* Clinical characteristics of individuals with germline mutations in BRCA1 and BRCA2: analysis of 10,000 individuals. *J Clin Oncol* 2002;20(6):1480-90.
128. Friedenson B. Assessing and managing breast cancer risk: clinical tools for advising patients. *MedGenMed* 2004;6(1):8.
129. Friedman JH. Multivariate adaptive regression splines. *Ann Stat* 1991;19:1-141.
130. Gail MH. The estimation and use of absolute risk for weighing the risks and benefits of selective estrogen receptor modulators for preventing breast cancer. *Ann N Y Acad Sci* 2001;949:286-91.
131. Gail MH, Brinton LA, Byar DP, Corle DK, Green SB, Schairer C, *et al.* Projecting individualized probabilities of developing breast cancer for white females who are being examined annually. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1989;81(24):1879-86.
132. Gail MH, Pfeiffer RM. On criteria for evaluating models of absolute risk. *Biostatistics* 2005;6(2):227-39.
133. Gail MH, Wieand S, Piantadosi S. Biased estimates of treatment effect in randomized experiments with non-linear regressions and omitted variables. *Biometrika* 1984;71:431-44.

134. Gelfand AE, Smith AFM. Sampling-based approaches to calculating marginal densities. *JASA* 1990;85:398-409.
135. Gigerenzer G, Edwards A. Simple tools for understanding risks: from innumeracy to insight. *Bmj* 2003;327(7417):741-4.
136. Glance LG, Dick A, Osler TM, Li Y, Mukamel DB. Impact of changing the statistical methodology on hospital and surgeon ranking: the case of the New York State cardiac surgery report card. *Med Care* 2006;44(4):311-9.
137. Glantz SA, Slinker BK. *Primer of applied regression & analysis of variance*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill, Medical Pub. Division, 2001.
138. Glasziou PP, Irwig LM. An evidence based approach to individualising treatment. *Bmj* 1995;311(7016):1356-9.
139. Gloeckler Ries LA, Reichman ME, Lewis DR, Hankey BF, Edwards BK. Cancer survival and incidence from the Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program. *Oncologist* 2003;8(6):541-52.
140. Glynn RJ, Rosner B. Methods to evaluate risks for composite end points and their individual components. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57(2):113-22.
141. Goeman JJ, le Cessie S. A goodness-of-fit test for multinomial logistic regression. *Biometrics* 2006;62(4):980-5.
142. Goldman L, Weinberg M, Weisberg M, Olshen R, Cook EF, Sargent RK, *et al*. A computer-derived protocol to aid in the diagnosis of emergency room patients with acute chest pain. *N Engl J Med* 1982;307(10):588-96.
143. Goldstein H, Spiegelhalter DJ. League tables and their limitations: statistical issues in comparisons of institutional performance. *J R Stat Soc Ser A* 1996;159:385-443.
144. Goodacre S, Sutton AJ, Sampson FC. Meta-analysis: the value of clinical assessment in the diagnosis of deep venous thrombosis. *Ann Intern Med* 2005;143(2):129-39.
145. Gotz HM, van Bergen JE, Veldhuijzen IK, Broer J, Hoebe CJ, Steyerberg EW, *et al*. A prediction rule for selective screening of *Chlamydia trachomatis* infection. *Sex Transm Infect* 2005;81(1):24-30.
146. Graf E, Schmoor C, Sauerbrei W, Schumacher M. Assessment and comparison of prognostic classification schemes for survival data. *Stat Med* 1999;18(17-18):2529-45.
147. Graham ID, Stiell IG, Laupacis A, O'Connor AM, Wells GA. Emergency physicians' attitudes toward and use of clinical decision rules for radiography. *Acad Emerg Med* 1998;5(2):134-40.
148. Grambsch PM, O'Brien PC. The effects of transformations and preliminary tests for non-linearity in regression. *Stat Med* 1991;10(5):697-709.
149. Gray RJ. Flexible methods for analysing survival data using splines, with applications to breast cancer prognosis. *JASA* 1992;87:942-51.
150. Green J, Wintfeld N. Report cards on cardiac surgeons: assessing New York State's approach. *N Engl J Med* 1995;332(18):1229-32.
151. Greenland S. Quantitative methods in the review of epidemiologic literature. *Epidemiol Rev* 1987;9:1-30.
152. Greenland S. Methods for epidemiologic analyses of multiple exposures: a review and comparative study of maximum-likelihood, preliminary-testing, and empirical-Bayes regression. *Stat Med* 1993;12(8):717-36.
153. Greenland S. Bayesian perspectives for epidemiological research. II. Regression analysis. *Int J Epidemiol* 2007;36:195-202.
154. Greenland S. Invited commentary: variable selection versus shrinkage in the control of multiple confounders. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008;167(5):523-9; discussion 530-1.
155. Greenland S, Finkel WD. A critical look at methods for handling missing covariates in epidemiologic regression analyses. *Am J Epidemiol* 1995;142(12):1255-64.
156. Grigg OA, Farewell VT, Spiegelhalter DJ. Use of risk-adjusted CUSUM and RSPRT charts for monitoring in medical contexts. *Stat Methods Med Res* 2003;12(2):147-70.
157. Grundy SM, Cleeman JI, Merz CN, Brewer HB, Jr., Clark LT, Hunninghake DB, *et al*. Implications of recent clinical trials for the National Cholesterol Education Program Adult Treatment Panel III guidelines. *Circulation* 2004;110(2):227-39.

158. Grunkemeier GL, Anderson RP, Miller DC, Starr A. Time-related analysis of nonfatal heart valve complications: cumulative incidence (actual) versus Kaplan-Meier (actuarial). *Circulation* 1997;96(9 Suppl):II-70-4; discussion II-74-5.
159. Grunkemeier GL, Jin R, Eijkemans MJ, Takkenberg JJ. Actual and actuarial probabilities of competing risks: apples and lemons. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2007;83(5):1586-92.
160. Guyatt GH, Haynes RB, Jaeschke RZ, Cook DJ, Green L, Naylor CD, *et al.* Users' Guides to the Medical Literature: XXV. Evidence-based medicine: principles for applying the Users' Guides to patient care. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *Jama* 2000;284(10):1290-6.
161. Habbema JD, Hilden J. The measurement of performance in probabilistic diagnosis. IV. Utility considerations in therapeutics and prognostics. *Methods Inf Med* 1981;20(2):80-96.
162. Habbema JD, Hilden J, Bjerregaard B. The measurement of performance in probabilistic diagnosis. I. The problem, descriptive tools, and measures based on classification matrices. *Methods Inf Med* 1978;17(4):217-26.
163. Habbema JD, Hilden J, Bjerregaard B. The measurement of performance in probabilistic diagnosis. V. General recommendations. *Methods Inf Med* 1981;20(2):97-100.
164. Hahn GJ, Raghunathan TE. Combining information from various sources: a prediction problem and other industrial applications. *Technometrics* 1988;30(1):41-52.
165. Hajer GR, van der Graaf Y, Olijhoek JK, Verhaar MC, Visseren FL. Levels of homocysteine are increased in metabolic syndrome patients but are not associated with an increased cardiovascular risk, in contrast to patients without the metabolic syndrome. *Heart* 2007;93(2):216-20.
166. Hakulinen T. On long-term relative survival rates. *J Chronic Dis* 1977;30(7):431-43.
167. Hakulinen T, Abeywickrama KH. A computer program package for relative survival analysis. *Comput Programs Biomed* 1985;19(2-3):197-207.
168. Halkin A, Singh M, Nikolsky E, Grines CL, Tchong JE, Garcia E, *et al.* Prediction of mortality after primary percutaneous coronary intervention for acute myocardial infarction: the CADILLAC risk score. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2005;45(9):1397-405.
169. Hall WH, Jani AB, Ryu JK, Narayan S, Vijayakumar S. The impact of age and comorbidity on survival outcomes and treatment patterns in prostate cancer. *Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis* 2005;8(1):22-30.
170. Hand DJ. Statistical methods in diagnosis. *Stat Methods Med Res* 1992;1(1):49-67.
171. Hand DJ. Classifier technology and the illusion of progress. *Statist Sci* 2006;21(1):1-14.
172. Hanley JA, McNeil BJ. The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. *Radiology* 1982;143(1):29-36.
173. Hannan EL, Racz MJ, Jollis JG, Peterson ED. Using Medicare claims data to assess provider quality for CABG surgery: does it work well enough? *Health Serv Res* 1997;31(6):659-78.
174. Harrell FE. Regression modeling strategies: with applications to linear models, logistic regression, and survival analysis. New York: Springer, 2001.
175. Harrell FE, Jr., Lee KL, Califf RM, Pryor DB, Rosati RA. Regression modelling strategies for improved prognostic prediction. *Stat Med* 1984;3(2):143-52.
176. Harrell FE, Jr., Lee KL, Mark DB. Multivariable prognostic models: issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors. *Stat Med* 1996;15(4):361-87.
177. Harrell FE, Jr., Lee KL, Pollock BG. Regression models in clinical studies: determining relationships between predictors and response. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1988;80(15):1198-202.
178. Harrell FE, Jr., Margolis PA, Gove S, Mason KE, Mulholland EK, Lehmann D, *et al.* Development of a clinical prediction model for an ordinal outcome: the World Health Organization Multicentre Study of Clinical Signs and Etiological agents of Pneumonia, Sepsis and Meningitis in Young Infants. WHO/ARI Young Infant Multicentre Study Group. *Stat Med* 1998;17(8):909-44.
179. Harrison RF, Kennedy RL. Automatic covariate selection in logistic models for chest pain diagnosis: a new approach. *Comput Methods Programs Biomed* 2008;89(3):301-12.



180. Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Generalized additive models. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1999.
181. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman JH. The elements of statistical learning: data mining, inference, and prediction. New York: Springer, 2001.
182. Hauck WW, Anderson S, Marcus SM. Should we adjust for covariates in nonlinear regression analyses of randomized trials?. *Control Clin Trials* 1998;19(3):249-56.
183. Heagerty PJ, Zheng Y. Survival model predictive accuracy and ROC curves. *Biometrics* 2005;61:92-105.
184. Hemingway H. Prognosis research: why is Dr. Lydgate still waiting? *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(12):1229-38.
185. Henry NL, Hayes DF. Uses and abuses of tumor markers in the diagnosis, monitoring, and treatment of primary and metastatic breast cancer. *Oncologist* 2006;11(6):541-52.
186. Hermanek P, Hutter RV, Sobin LH. Prognostic grouping: the next step in tumor classification. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol* 1990;116(5):513-6.
187. Hermans J, Krol AD, van Groningen K, Kluin PM, Kluin-Nelemans JC, Kramer MH, *et al.* International Prognostic Index for aggressive non-Hodgkin's lymphoma is valid for all malignancy grades. *Blood* 1995;86(4):1460-3.
188. Hernandez AV, Eijkemans MJ, Steyerberg EW. Randomized controlled trials with time-to-event outcomes: how much does prespecified covariate adjustment increase power?. *Ann Epidemiol* 2006;16(1):41-8.
189. Hernandez AV, Steyerberg EW, Butcher I, Mushkudiani N, Taylor GS, Murray GD, *et al.* Adjustment for strong predictors of outcome in traumatic brain injury trials: 25% reduction in sample size requirements in the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2006;23(9):1295-303.
190. Hernandez AV, Steyerberg EW, Habbema JD. Covariate adjustment in randomized controlled trials with dichotomous outcomes increases statistical power and reduces sample size requirements. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57(5):454-60.
191. Hilden J, Habbema JD, Bjerregaard B. The measurement of performance in probabilistic diagnosis. II. Trustworthiness of the exact values of the diagnostic probabilities. *Methods Inf Med* 1978;17(4):227-37.
192. Hilden J, Habbema JD, Bjerregaard B. The measurement of performance in probabilistic diagnosis. III. Methods based on continuous functions of the diagnostic probabilities. *Methods Inf Med* 1978;17(4):238-46.
193. Hoaglin DC, Mosteller F, Tukey JW. Understanding robust and exploratory data analysis. Wiley classics library ed. New York: Wiley, 2000.
194. Hoeting J, Madigan D, Raftery A, Volinsky C. Bayesian model averaging: a tutorial. *Statist Sci* 1999;14:382-401.
195. Hokken RB, Steyerberg EW, Verbaan N, van Herwerden LA, van Domburg R, Bos E. 25 years of aortic valve replacement using mechanical valves. Risk factors for early and late mortality. *Eur Heart J* 1997;18(7):1157-65.
196. Hollander N, Augustin NH, Sauerbrei W. Investigation on the improvement of prediction by bootstrap model averaging. *Methods Inf Med* 2006;45(1):44-50.
197. Homs MY, Steyerberg EW, Eijkenboom WM, Tilanus HW, Stalpers LJ, Bartelsman JF, *et al.* Single-dose brachytherapy versus metal stent placement for the palliation of dysphagia from oesophageal cancer: multicentre randomised trial. *Lancet* 2004;364(9444):1497-504.
198. Hosmer DW, Hosmer T, Le Cessie S, Lemeshow S. A comparison of goodness-of-fit tests for the logistic regression model. *Stat Med* 1997;16(9):965-80.
199. Hosmer DW, Lemeshow S. Applied logistic regression. 2nd ed. New York: Wiley, 2000.
200. Hu G, Root MM. Building prediction models for coronary heart disease by synthesizing multiple longitudinal research findings. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2005;12(5):459-64.
201. Hudon C, Fortin M, Vanasse A. Cumulative Illness Rating Scale was a reliable and valid index in a family practice context. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58(6):603-8.
202. Hukkelhoven CW, Rampen AJ, Maas AI, Farace E, Habbema JD, Marmarou A, *et al.* Some prognostic models for traumatic brain injury were not valid. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(2):132-43.

203. Hukkelhoven CW, Steyerberg EW, Habbema JD, Farace E, Marmarou A, Murray GD, *et al.* Predicting outcome after traumatic brain injury: development and validation of a prognostic score based on admission characteristics. *J Neurotrauma* 2005;22(10):1025-39.
204. Hukkelhoven CW, Steyerberg EW, Rampen AJ, Farace E, Habbema JD, Marshall LF, *et al.* Patient age and outcome following severe traumatic brain injury: an analysis of 5600 patients. *J Neurosurg* 2003;99(4):666-73.
205. Hunault CC, Habbema JD, Eijkemans MJ, Collins JA, Evers JL, te Velde ER. Two new prediction rules for spontaneous pregnancy leading to live birth among subfertile couples, based on the synthesis of three previous models. *Hum Reprod* 2004;19(9):2019-26.
206. Hunault CC, te Velde ER, Weima SM, Macklon NS, Eijkemans MJ, Klinkert ER, *et al.* A case study of the applicability of a prediction model for the selection of patients undergoing in vitro fertilization for single embryo transfer in another centre. *Fertil Steril* 2007;87(6):1314-21.
207. Hurria A, Leung D, Trainor K, Borgen P, Norton L, Hudis C. Factors influencing treatment patterns of breast cancer patients age 75 and older. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol* 2003;46(2):121-6.
208. Iezzoni LI. Risk adjustment for measuring health care outcomes. 3rd ed. Chicago: Health Administration Press, 2003.
209. Imani B, Eijkemans MJ, Faessen GH, Bouchard P, Giudice LC, Fauser BC. Prediction of the individual follicle-stimulating hormone threshold for gonadotropin induction of ovulation in normogonadotropic anovulatory infertility: an approach to increase safety and efficiency. *Fertil Steril* 2002;77(1):83-90.
210. Ioannidis JP. Why most published research findings are false. *PLoS Med* 2005;2(8):e124.
211. Ioannidis JP, Trikalinos TA, Khoury MJ. Implications of small effect sizes of individual genetic variants on the design and interpretation of genetic association studies of complex diseases. *Am J Epidemiol* 2006;164(7):609-14.
212. Ivanov J, Tu JV, Naylor CD. Ready-made, recalibrated, or remodeled? Issues in the use of risk indexes for assessing mortality after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *Circulation* 1999;99(16):2098-104.
213. Jamieson GG, Mathew G, Ludemann R, Wayman J, Myers JC, Devitt PG. Postoperative mortality following oesophagectomy and problems in reporting its rate. *Br J Surg* 2004;91(8):943-7.
214. Janssen-Heijnen ML, Houterman S, Lemmens VE, Brenner H, Steyerberg EW, Coebergh JW. Prognosis for long-term survivors of cancer. *Ann Oncol* 2007;18(8):1408-13.
215. Janssen KJ, Moons KG, Kalkman CJ, Grobbee DE, Vergouwe Y. Updating methods improved the performance of a clinical prediction model in new patients. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(1):76-86.
216. Janssens AC, Aulchenko YS, Elefante S, Borsboom GJ, Steyerberg EW, van Duijn CM. Predictive testing for complex diseases using multiple genes: fact or fiction? *Genet Med* 2006;8(7):395-400.
217. Janssens AC, Deng Y, Borsboom GJ, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD, Steyerberg EW. A new logistic regression approach for the evaluation of diagnostic test results. *Med Decis Making* 2005;25(2):168-77.
218. Jennett B, Snoek J, Bond MR, Brooks N. Disability after severe head injury: observations on the use of the Glasgow Outcome Scale. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 1981;44(4):285-93.
219. Jennings BM, Staggers N, Brosch LR. A classification scheme for outcome indicators. *Image J Nurs Sch* 1999;31(4):381-8.
220. Jiang W, Simon R. A comparison of bootstrap methods and an adjusted bootstrap approach for estimating the prediction error in microarray classification. *Stat Med* 2007;26(29):5320-34.
221. Jiang W, Varma S, Simon R. Calculating confidence intervals for prediction error in microarray classification using resampling. *Stat Appl Genet Mol Biol* 2008;7:Article8.
222. Justice AC, Covinsky KE, Berlin JA. Assessing the generalizability of prognostic information. *Ann Intern Med* 1999;130(6):515-24.

223. Kallewaard M, Algra A, Defauw J, Grobbee D, van der Graaf Y. Long-term survival after valve replacement with Bjork-Shiley CC valves. Bjork-Shiley Study Group. *Am J Cardiol* 2000;85(5):598-603.
224. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric estimation from incomplete observations. *JASA* 1958;53:457-81.
225. Kattan MW. Judging new markers by their ability to improve predictive accuracy. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2003;95(9):634-5.
226. Kattan MW, Eastham JA, Stapleton AM, Wheeler TM, Scardino PT. A preoperative nomogram for disease recurrence following radical prostatectomy for prostate cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1998;90(10):766-71.
227. Kattan MW, Eastham JA, Wheeler TM, Maru N, Scardino PT, Erbersdobler A, *et al.* Counseling men with prostate cancer: a nomogram for predicting the presence of small, moderately differentiated, confined tumors. *J Urol* 2003;170(5): 1792-7.
228. Kattan MW, Heller G, Brennan MF. A competing-risks nomogram for sarcoma-specific death following local recurrence. *Stat Med* 2003;22(22):3515-25.
229. Kent DM, Hayward RA. Limitations of applying summary results of clinical trials to individual patients: the need for risk stratification. *Jama* 2007;298(10): 1209-12.
230. Kerkhof M, van Dekken H, Steyerberg EW, Meijer GA, Mulder AH, de Bruine A, *et al.* Grading of dysplasia in Barrett's oesophagus: substantial interobserver variation between general and gastrointestinal pathologists. *Histopathology* 2007;50(7):920-7.
231. Kertai MD, Steyerberg EW, Boersma E, Bax JJ, Vergouwe Y, van Urk H, *et al.* Validation of two risk models for perioperative mortality in patients undergoing elective abdominal aortic aneurysm surgery. *Vasc Endovascular Surg* 2003;37(1):13-21.
232. Kirkwood BR, Sterne JAC. *Essential medical statistics*. 2nd ed. Malden, MA: Blackwell Science, 2003.
233. Klabunde CN, Warren JL, Legler JM. Assessing comorbidity using claims data: an overview. *Med Care* 2002;40(8 Suppl):IV-26-35.
234. Kleinbaum DG, Kupper LL, Morgenstern H. *Epidemiologic research: principles and quantitative methods*. Belmont, CA: Lifetime Learning Publications, 1982.
235. Klungel OH, Martens EP, Psaty BM, Grobbee DE, Sullivan SD, Stricker BH, *et al.* Methods to assess intended effects of drug treatment in observational studies are reviewed. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57(12):1223-31.
236. Knaus WA, Harrell FE, Jr., Lynn J, Goldman L, Phillips RS, Connors AF, Jr., *et al.* The SUPPORT prognostic model Objective estimates of survival for seriously ill hospitalized adults. Study to understand prognoses and preferences for outcomes and risks of treatments. *Ann Intern Med* 1995;122(3):191-203.
237. Knol MJ, van der Tweel I, Grobbee DE, Numans ME, Geerlings MI. Estimating interaction on an additive scale between continuous determinants in a logistic regression model. *Int J Epidemiol* 2007;36(5):1111-8.
238. Knottnerus JA. *Evidence base of clinical diagnosis*. Oxford: Blackwell BMJ Books, 2002.
239. Kollmannsberger C, Nichols C, Meisner C, Mayer F, Kanz L, Bokemeyer C. Identification of prognostic subgroups among patients with metastatic 'IGCCCG poor-prognosis' germ-cell cancer: an explorative analysis using cart modeling. *Ann Oncol* 2000; 11(9):1115-20.
240. Konig IR, Malley JD, Weimar C, Diener HC, Ziegler A. Practical experiences on the necessity of external validation. *Stat Med* 2007;26(30):5499-511.
241. Krijnen P, van Jaarsveld BC, Deinum J, Steyerberg EW, Habbema JD. Which patients with hypertension and atherosclerotic renal artery stenosis benefit from immediate intervention? *J Hum Hypertens* 2004;18(2):91-6.
242. Krijnen P, van Jaarsveld BC, Hunink MG, Habbema JD. The effect of treatment on health-related quality of life in patients with hypertension and renal artery stenosis. *J Hum Hypertens* 2005;19(6):467-70.
243. Krijnen P, van Jaarsveld BC, Steyerberg EW, Man in 't Veld AJ, Schalekamp MA, Habbema JD. A clinical prediction rule for renal artery stenosis. *Ann Intern Med* 1998;129(9): 705-11.

244. Krumholz HM, Brindis RG, Brush JE, Cohen DJ, Epstein AJ, Furie K, *et al.* Standards for statistical models used for public reporting of health outcomes: an American Heart Association Scientific Statement from the Quality of Care and Outcomes Research Interdisciplinary Writing Group: cosponsored by the Council on Epidemiology and Prevention and the Stroke Council. Endorsed by the American College of Cardiology Foundation. *Circulation* 2006;113(3):456-62.
245. Krumholz HM, Wang Y, Mattera JA, Han LF, Ingber MJ, Roman S, *et al.* An administrative claims model suitable for profiling hospital performance based on 30-day mortality rates among patients with an acute myocardial infarction. *Circulation* 2006;113(13):1683-92.
246. Kwakkel G, Wagenaar RC, Kollen BJ, Lankhorst GJ. Predicting disability in stroke—a critical review of the literature. *Age Ageing* 1996;25(6):479-89.
247. Kyrgidis A, Kountouras J, Zavos C, Chatzopoulos D. New molecular concepts of Barrett's esophagus: clinical implications and biomarkers. *J Surg Res* 2005;125(2):189-212.
248. Landis JR, Koch GG. The measurement of observer agreement for categorical data. *Biometrics* 1977;33(1):159-74.
249. Laupacis A, Wells G, Richardson WS, Tugwell P. Users' guides to the medical literature. V. How to use an article about prognosis. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *Jama* 1994;272(3):234-7.
250. le Cessie S, van Houwelingen HC. Testing the fit of a regression model via score tests in random effects models. *Biometrics* 1995;51(2):600-14.
251. Le CT, Lindgren BL. Computational implementation of the conditional logistic regression model in the analysis of epidemiologic matched studies. *Comput Biomed Res* 1988;21(1):48-52.
252. Lecleire S, Di Fiore F, Antonietti M, Ben Soussan E, Hellot MF, Grigioni S, *et al.* Undernutrition is predictive of early mortality after palliative self-expanding metal stent insertion in patients with inoperable or recurrent esophageal cancer. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2006;64(4):479-484.
253. Lee KI, Koval JJ. Determinants of the best significance level in forward stepwise logistic regression. *Comm Stat Sim Comp* 1997;26(2):559-75.
254. Lee KL. Predictors of 30-day mortality in the era of reperfusion for acute myocardial infarction: <http://circ.ahajournals.org/cgi/content/full/91/6/1659>, 2006.
255. Lee KL, Woodlief LH, Topol EJ, Weaver WD, Betriu A, Col J, *et al.* Predictors of 30-day mortality in the era of reperfusion for acute myocardial infarction. Results from an international trial of 41,021 patients. GUSTO-I Investigators. *Circulation* 1995;91(6):1659-68.
256. Lesaffre E, Bogaerts K, Li X, Bluhmki E. On the variability of covariate adjustment: experience with Koch's method for evaluating the absolute difference in proportions in randomized clinical trials. *Control Clin Trials* 2002;23(2):127-42.
257. Lewington S, Clarke R, Qizilbash N, Peto R, Collins R. Age-specific relevance of usual blood pressure to vascular mortality: a meta-analysis of individual data for one million adults in 61 prospective studies. *Lancet* 2002;360(9349):1903-13.
258. Liao JG, Chin KV. Logistic regression for disease classification using microarray data: model selection in a large p and small n case. *Bioinformatics* 2007;23(15):1945-51.
259. Lijmer JG, Mol BW, Heisterkamp S, Bossel GJ, Prins MH, van der Meulen JH, *et al.* Empirical evidence of design-related bias in studies of diagnostic tests. *Jama* 1999;282(11):1061-6.
260. Lilford R, Mohammed MA, Spiegelhalter D, Thomson R. Use and misuse of process and outcome data in managing performance of acute medical care: avoiding institutional stigma. *Lancet* 2004;363(9415):1147-54.
261. Lingsma HF, Dippel DW, Hoeks S, Steyerberg EW, Franke CL, van Oostenbrugge RJ, *et al.* Variation between hospitals in patient outcome after stroke is only partly explained by differences in quality of care: data from the Netherlands Stroke Survey. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry* 2008.
262. Lipton LR, Johnson V, Cummings C, Fisher S, Risby P, Eftekhari Sadat AT, *et al.* Refining the Amsterdam Criteria and Bethesda Guidelines: testing algorithms for the prediction of

- mismatch repair mutation status in the familial cancer clinic. *J Clin Oncol* 2004;22(24):4934-43.
263. Little RJA, Rubin DB. *Statistical analysis with missing data*. 2nd ed. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2002.
264. Liu J, Hong Y, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Wu Z, Wang W, Sun J, *et al.* Predictive value for the Chinese population of the Framingham CHD risk assessment tool compared with the Chinese Multi-Provincial cohort study. *Jama* 2004;291(21):2591-9.
265. Loeb M, Walter SD, McGeer A, Simor AE, McArthur MA, Norman G. A comparison of model-building strategies for lower respiratory tract infection in long-term care. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1999;52(12):1239-48.
266. Lord SJ, Irwig L, Simes RJ. When is measuring sensitivity and specificity sufficient to evaluate a diagnostic test, and when do we need randomized trials? *Ann Intern Med* 2006;144(11):850-5.
267. Lorenz MO. Methods of measuring the concentration of wealth. *JASA* 1905;9:209-19.
268. Lubien E, DeMaria A, Krishnaswamy P, Clopton P, Koon J, Kazanegra R, *et al.* Utility of B-natriuretic peptide in detecting diastolic dysfunction: comparison with Doppler velocity recordings. *Circulation* 2002;105(5):595-601.
269. Lubsen J, Pool J, van der Does E. A practical device for the application of a diagnostic or prognostic function. *Methods Inf Med* 1978;17(2):127-9.
270. Lynch HT, de la Chapelle A. Genetic susceptibility to non-polyposis colorectal cancer. *J Med Genet* 1999;36(11):801-18.
271. Maas AI, Marmarou A, Murray GD, Teasdale SG, Steyerberg EW. Prognosis and clinical trial design in traumatic brain injury: the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):232-8.
272. Maas AI, Steyerberg EW, Butcher I, Dammers R, Lu J, Marmarou A, *et al.* Prognostic value of computerized tomography scan characteristics in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):303-14.
273. Maas AI, Steyerberg EW, Murray GD, Bullock R, Baethmann A, Marshall LF, *et al.* Why have recent trials of neuroprotective agents in head injury failed to show convincing efficacy? A pragmatic analysis and theoretical considerations. *Neurosurgery* 1999;44(6):1286-98.
274. Maggioni AP, Maseri A, Fresco C, Franzosi MG, Mauri F, Santoro E, *et al.* Age-related increase in mortality among patients with first myocardial infarctions treated with thrombolysis. The Investigators of the Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell'Infarto Miocardico (GISSI-2). *N Engl J Med* 1993;329(20):1442-8.
275. Malek MH, Berger DE, Coburn JW. On the inappropriateness of stepwise regression analysis for model building and testing. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 2007;101(2):263-4; author reply 265-6.
276. Marmarou A, Lu J, Butcher I, McHugh GS, Murray GD, Steyerberg EW, *et al.* Prognostic value of the Glasgow Coma Scale and pupil reactivity in traumatic brain injury assessed pre-hospital and on enrollment: an IMPACT analysis. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):270-80.
277. Marmarou A, Lu J, Butcher I, McHugh GS, Mushkudiani NA, Murray GD, *et al.* IMPACT database of traumatic brain injury: design and description. *J Neurotrauma* 2007; 24(2):239-50.
278. Marquand A, Hanon O, Fauvel JP, Mounier-Vehier C, Equine O, Girerd X. [Validity of the clinical prediction rule for the diagnosis of renal arterial stenosis in hypertensive patients resistant to treatment]. *Arch Mal Coeur Vaiss* 2000;93(8):1041-5.
279. Marshall EC, Spiegelhalter DJ. Reliability of league tables of in vitro fertilisation clinics: retrospective analysis of live birth rates. *Bmj* 1998;316(7146):1701-4; discussion 1705.
280. Marshall LF, Marshall SB, Klauber MR, Van Berkum Clark M, Eisenberg H, Jane JA, *et al.* The diagnosis of head injury requires a classification based on computed axial tomography. *J Neurotrauma* 1992;9 (Suppl 1):S287-92.
281. Matthews DE, Farewell VT. *Using and understanding medical statistics*. 4th, completely rev. and enl. ed. Basel: Karger, 2007.
282. McGinn TG, Guyatt GH, Wyer PC, Naylor CD, Stiell IG, Richardson WS. Users' guides to the medical literature: XXII: how to use articles about clinical decision rules. Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *Jama* 2000;284(1):79-84.

283. McHugh GS, Butcher I, Steyerberg EW, Lu J, Mushkudiani N, Marmarou A, *et al.* Statistical approaches to the univariate prognostic analysis of the IMPACT database on traumatic brain injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):251-8.
284. McHugh GS, Engel DC, Butcher I, Steyerberg EW, Lu J, Mushkudiani N, *et al.* Prognostic value of secondary insults in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):287-93.
285. McShane LM, Altman DG, Sauerbrei W, Taube SE, Gion M, Clark GM. Reporting recommendations for tumor marker prognostic studies (REMARK). *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005;97(16):1180-4.
286. Michel P, Domecq S, Salmi LR, Roques F, Nashef SAM. Confidence intervals for the prediction of mortality in the logistic EuroSCORE. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2005;27(6):1129-32.
287. Michel P, Roques F, Nashef SA. Logistic or additive EuroSCORE for high-risk patients? *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2003;23(5):684-7.
288. Michie D, Spiegelhalter DJ, Taylor CC. Machine learning, neural and statistical classification. New York: Ellis Horwood, 1994.
289. Miller AJ. Subset selection in regression. 2nd ed. Boca Raton: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2002.
290. Miller ME, Hui SL, Tierney WM. Validation techniques for logistic regression models. *Stat Med* 1991;10(8):1213-26.
291. Miller ME, Langefeld CD, Tierney WM, Hui SL, McDonald CJ. Validation of probabilistic predictions. *Med Decis Making* 1993;13(1):49-58.
292. Molinaro AM, Simon R, Pfeiffer RM. Prediction error estimation: a comparison of resampling methods. *Bioinformatics* 2005;21(15):3301-7.
293. Moons KG, Donders AR, Steyerberg EW, Harrell FE. Penalized maximum likelihood estimation to directly adjust diagnostic and prognostic prediction models for overoptimism: a clinical example. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57(12):1262-70.
294. Moons KG, Donders RA, Stijnen T, Harrell FE, Jr. Using the outcome for imputation of missing predictor values was preferred. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(10):1092-101.
295. Moons KG, Grobbee DE. Diagnostic studies as multivariable, prediction research. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2002;56(5):337-8.
296. Moons KG, Grobbee DE. When should we remain blind and when should our eyes remain open in diagnostic studies? *J Clin Epidemiol* 2002;55(7):633-6.
297. Moons KG, Harrell FE, Steyerberg EW. Should scoring rules be based on odds ratios or regression coefficients? *J Clin Epidemiol* 2002;55(10):1054-5.
298. Morgan TM, Elashoff RM. Effect of categorizing a continuous covariate on the comparison of survival time. *JASA* 1986;81:917-21.
299. Morise AP, Diamond GA, Detrano R, Bobbio M, Gunel E. The effect of disease-prevalence adjustments on the accuracy of a logistic prediction model. *Med Decis Making* 1996;16(2):133-42.
300. Morris CN. Parametric Empirical Bayes inference: theory and applications. *JASA* 1983;78:47-55.
301. Morton V, Torgerson DJ. Effect of regression to the mean on decision making in health care. *Bmj* 2003;326(7398):1083-4.
302. Mueller HS, Cohen LS, Braunwald E, Forman S, Feit F, Ross A, *et al.* Predictors of early morbidity and mortality after thrombolytic therapy of acute myocardial infarction. Analyses of patient subgroups in the Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) trial, phase II. *Circulation* 1992;85(4):1254-64.
303. Murphy AH. A new vector partition of the probability score. *J Appl Meteor* 1973;12(4):595-600.
304. Murray GD, Barer D, Choi S, Fernandes H, Gregson B, Lees KR, *et al.* Design and analysis of phase III trials with ordered outcome scales: the concept of the sliding dichotomy. *J Neurotrauma* 2005;22(5):511-7.
305. Murray GD, Butcher I, McHugh GS, Lu J, Mushkudiani NA, Maas AI, *et al.* Multivariable prognostic analysis in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):329-37.

306. Mushkudiani NA, Engel DC, Steyerberg EW, Butcher I, Lu J, Marmarou A, *et al.* Prognostic value of demographic characteristics in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):259-69.
307. Mushkudiani NA, Hukkelhoven CW, Hernandez AV, Murray GD, Choi SC, Maas AI, *et al.* A systematic review finds methodological improvements necessary for prognostic models in determining traumatic brain injury outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(4):331-43.
308. Nab HW, Hop WC, Crommelin MA, Kluck HM, van der Heijden LH, Coebergh JW. Changes in long term prognosis for breast cancer in a Dutch cancer registry. *Bmj* 1994;309(6947):83-6.
309. Nagelkerke NJ. A note on a general definition of the coefficient of determination. *Biometrika* 1991(78):691-2.
310. Narayan RK, Michel ME, Ansell B, Baethmann A, Biegon A, Bracken MB, *et al.* Clinical trials in head injury. *J Neurotrauma* 2002;19(5):503-57.
311. Normand SL, Wolf RE, Ayanian JZ, McNeil BJ. Assessing the accuracy of hospital clinical performance measures. *Med Decis Making* 2007;27(1):9-20.
312. Odell PM, Anderson KM, Kannel WB. New models for predicting cardiovascular events. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1994;47(6):583-92.
313. Oostenbrink R, Moons KG, Bleeker SE, Moll HA, Grobbee DE. Diagnostic research on routine care data: prospects and problems. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56(6):501-6.
314. Ormsby AH, Petras RE, Henricks WH, Rice TW, Rybicki LA, Richter JE, *et al.* Observer variation in the diagnosis of superficial oesophageal adenocarcinoma. *Gut* 2002;51(5):671-6.
315. Osborne JW, Overbay A. The power of outliers (and why researchers should always check for them). *Pract Assess Res Eval* 2004;9(6).
316. Ott K, Weber W, Siewert JR. The importance of PET in the diagnosis and response evaluation of esophageal cancer. *Dis Esophagus* 2006;19(6):433-42.
317. Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine. Glossary of terms in Evidence-Based Medicine. <http://www.cebm.net/glossary.asp>. Accessed Jan 2, 2007.
318. Palatini P. Reliability of ambulatory blood pressure monitoring. *Blood Press Monit* 2001;6(6):291-5.
319. Papworth DG, Lloyd RA. Cancer survival in the USA, 1973-1990: a statistical analysis. *Br J Cancer* 1998;78(11):1514-5.
320. Park MY, Hastie T. L1-regularization path algorithm for generalized linear models. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 2007;69(4):659-77.
321. Park MY, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Averaged gene expressions for regression. *Biostatistics* 2007;8(2):212-27.
322. Park T. A comparison of the generalized estimating equation approach with the maximum likelihood approach for repeated measurements. *Stat Med* 1993;12(18):1723-32.
323. Parmigiani G, Berry D, Aguilar O. Determining carrier probabilities for breast cancer-susceptibility genes BRCA1 and BRCA2. *Am J Hum Genet* 1998;62(1):145-58.
324. Parry GJ, Gould CR, McCabe CJ, Tarnow-Mordi WO. Annual league tables of mortality in neonatal intensive care units: longitudinal study. International Neonatal Network and the Scottish Neonatal Consultants and Nurses Collaborative Study Group. *Bmj* 1998;316(7149):1931-5.
325. Pauker SG, Kassirer JP. The threshold approach to clinical decision making. *N Engl J Med* 1980;302(20):1109-17.
326. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Feinstein AR, Holford TR. Importance of events per independent variable in proportional hazards regression analysis. II. Accuracy and precision of regression estimates. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1995;48(12):1503-10.
327. Peduzzi P, Concato J, Kemper E, Holford TR, Feinstein AR. A simulation study of the number of events per variable in logistic regression analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1996;49(12):1373-9.
328. Peirce CS. The numerical measure of success of predictions. *Science* 1884;4:453-4.
329. Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., D'Agostino RB, Jr., Vasan RS. Comments on "Integrated discrimination and net reclassification improvements-Practical advice." *Stat Med* 2008;27(2):207-12.

330. Pencina MJ, D'Agostino RB, Sr., D'Agostino RB, Jr., Vasan RS. Evaluating the added predictive ability of a new marker: from area under the ROC curve to reclassification and beyond. *Stat Med* 2008;27(2): 157-72; discussion 207-12.
331. Pepe MS. The statistical evaluation of medical tests for classification and prediction. Oxford: Oxford: University Press, 2003.
332. Pepe MS. Evaluating technologies for classification and prediction in medicine. *Stat Med* 2005;24(24):3687-96.
333. Perel P, Edwards P, Wentz R, Roberts I. Systematic review of prognostic models in traumatic brain injury. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2006;6:38.
334. Perry JJ, Stiell IG. Impact of clinical decision rules on clinical care of traumatic injuries to the foot and ankle, knee, cervical spine, and head. *Injury* 2006;37(12):1157-65.
335. Petrina M, Goodman SG, Eagle KA. The 12-lead electrocardiogram as a predictive tool of mortality after acute myocardial infarction: current status in an era of revascularization and reperfusion. *Am Heart J* 2006;152(1): 11-8.
336. Picard RR, Cook RD. Cross-validation of regression models. *JASA* 1984;79:575-83.
337. Piccirillo JF, Tierney RM, Costas I, Grove L, Spitznagel EL, Jr. Prognostic importance of comorbidity in a hospital-based cancer registry. *Jama* 2004;291(20):2441-7.
338. Pocock SJ. Clinical trials: a practical approach. Chichester [West Sussex]: Wiley, 1983.
339. Pocock SJ, Assmann SE, Enos LE, Kasten LE. Subgroup analysis, covariate adjustment and baseline comparisons in clinical trial reporting: current practice and problems. *Stat Med* 2002;21(19):2917-30.
340. Poldermans D, Bax JJ, Kertai MD, Krenning B, Westerhout CM, Schinkel AF, *et al.* Statins are associated with a reduced incidence of perioperative mortality in patients undergoing major noncardiac vascular surgery. *Circulation* 2003; 107(14): 1848-51.
341. Powers CA, Meyer CM, Roebuck MC, Vaziri B. Predictive modeling of total healthcare costs using pharmacy claims data: a comparison of alternative econometric cost modeling techniques. *Med Care* 2005;43(11): 1065-72.
342. Raftery AE, Madigan D, Hoeting J. Bayesian model averaging for linear regression models. *JASA* 1997;92:179-91.
343. Ransohoff DF, Feinstein AR. Problems of spectrum and bias in evaluating the efficacy of diagnostic tests. *N Engl J Med* 1978;299(17):926-30.
344. Reilly BM, Evans AT. Translating clinical research into clinical practice: impact of using prediction rules to make decisions. *Ann Intern Med* 2006; 144(3):201-9.
345. Rietveld E, De Jonge HC, Polder JJ, Vergouwe Y, Veeze HJ, Moll HA, *et al.* Anticipated costs of hospitalization for respiratory syncytial virus infection in young children at risk. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2004;23(6):523-9.
346. Rietveld E, Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Huysman MW, de Groot R, Moll HA. Hospitalization for respiratory syncytial virus infection in young children: development of a clinical prediction rule. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2006;25(3):201-7.
347. Rigatelli G. Assessing the appropriateness and increasing the yield of renal angiography in patients undergoing coronary angiography: a scoring system. *Int J Cardiovasc Imaging* 2006;22(2): 135-9.
348. Robinson LD, Jewell NP. Some surprising results about covariate adjustment in logistic regression models. *Int Stat Review* 1991;59(2):227-40.
349. Rodriguez-Bigas MA, Boland CR, Hamilton SR, Henson DE, Jass JR, Khan PM, *et al.* A National Cancer Institute Workshop on Hereditary Nonpolyposis Colorectal Cancer Syndrome: meeting highlights and Bethesda guidelines. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 1997;89(23):1758-62.
350. Rosamond WD, Chambless LE, Folsom AR, Cooper LS, Conwill DE, Clegg L, *et al.* Trends in the incidence of myocardial infarction and in mortality due to coronary heart disease, 1987 to 1994. *N Engl J Med* 1998;339(13):861-7.
351. Ross PL, Scardino PT, Kattan MW. A catalog of prostate cancer nomograms. *J Urol* 2001; 165(5): 1562-8.
352. Roukema J, van Loenhout RB, Steyerberg EW, Moons KG, Bleeker SE, Moll HA. Polytomous regression did not outperform dichotomous logistic regression in diagnosing serious bacterial infections in febrile children. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008;61(2):135-41.



353. Royston P. A strategy for modelling the effect of a continuous covariate in medicine and epidemiology. *Stat Med* 2000;19(14):1831-47.
354. Royston P, Altman DG. Regression using fractional polynomials of continuous covariates: parsimonious parametric modelling. *Appl Stat* 1994;43(3):429-67.
355. Royston P, Altman DG, Sauerbrei W. Dichotomizing continuous predictors in multiple regression: a bad idea. *Stat Med* 2006;25(1):127-41.
356. Royston P, Sauerbrei W. Improving the robustness of fractional polynomial models by preliminary covariate transformation: a pragmatic approach. *Computational Stat Data Anal* 2007;51(9):4240-53.
357. Rubin DB. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika* 1976;63:581-92.
358. Rubin DB. Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys. New York: Wiley, 1987.
359. Rubin DB. Estimating causal effects from large data sets using propensity scores. *Ann Intern Med* 1997; 127(8 Pt 2):757-63.
360. Rutjes AW, Reitsma JB, Coomarasamy A, Khan KS, Bossuyt PM. Evaluation of diagnostic tests when there is no gold standard. A review of methods. *Health Technol Assess* 2007; 11(50):iii, ix-51.
361. Rutjes AW, Reitsma JB, Di Nisio M, Smidt N, van Rijn JC, Bossuyt PM. Evidence of bias and variation in diagnostic accuracy studies *CMAJ* 2006;174(4):469-76.
362. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM. On the need for evidence-based medicine. *J Public Health Med* 1995;17(3):330-4.
363. Sanada H, Sugama J, Kitagawa A, Thigpen B, Kinoshita S, Murayama S. Risk factors in the development of pressure ulcers in an intensive care unit in Pontianak, Indonesia. *Int Wound J* 2007;4(3):208-15.
364. Sargent DJ, Conley BA, Allegra C, Collette L. Clinical trial designs for predictive marker validation in cancer treatment trials. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23(9):2020-7.
365. Sauerbrei W. The use of resampling methods to simplify regression models in medical statistics. *J R Stat Soc Ser C* 1999;48(3):313-29.
366. Sauerbrei W, Meier-Hirmer C, Benner A, Royston P. Multivariable regression model building by using fractional polynomials: description of SAS, STATA and R programs. *Computational Stat Data Anal* 2006;50(12):3464-85.
367. Sauerbrei W, Royston P. Building multivariable prognostic and diagnostic models: transformation of the predictors by using fractional polynomials. *J R Stat Soc Ser A* 1999; 162(1):71-94.
368. Sauerbrei W, Schumacher M. A bootstrap resampling procedure for model building: application to the Cox regression model. *Stat Med* 1992;11(16):2093-109.
369. Scarvelis D, Wells PS. Diagnosis and treatment of deep-vein thrombosis. *CMAJ* 2006;175(9):1087-92.
370. Schafer JL. Analysis of incomplete multivariate data. London: Chapman & Hall, 1997.
371. Schapire RE. The strength of weak learnability. *Machine Learning* 1990;5(2): 197-227.
372. Schemper M. Predictive accuracy and explained variation. *Stat Med* 2003;22(14):2299-308.
373. Scholte op Reimer WJ, Dippel DW, Franke CL, van Oostenbrugge RJ, de Jong G, Hoeks S, *et al.* Quality of hospital and outpatient care after stroke or transient ischemic attack: insights from a stroke survey in the Netherlands. *Stroke* 2006;37(7):1844-9.
374. Schumacher M, Binder H, Gerds T. Assessment of survival prediction models based on microarray data. *Bioinformatics* 2007; 23:1768-74.
375. Schumacher M, Graf E, Gerds T. How to assess prognostic models for survival data: a case study in oncology. *Methods Inf Med* 2003;42(5):564-71.
376. Schwarzer G, Schumacher M. Artificial neural networks for diagnosis and prognosis in prostate cancer. *Semin Urol Oncol* 2002;20(2):89-95.
377. Schwarzer G, Vach W, Schumacher M. On the misuses of artificial neural networks for prognostic and diagnostic classification in oncology. *Stat Med* 2000;19(4):541-61.
378. Seeger JD, Walker AM, Williams PL, Saperia GM, Sacks FM. A propensity score-matched cohort study of the effect of statins, mainly fluvastatin, on the occurrence of acute myocardial infarction. *Am J Cardiol* 2003;92(12): 1447-51.

379. Segaar RW, Wilson JH, Habbema JD, Malchow-Moller A, Hilden J, van der Maas PJ. Transferring a diagnostic decision aid for jaundice. *Neth J Med* 1988;33(1-2):5-15.
380. Senn S. Testing for baseline balance in clinical trials. *Stat Med* 1994;13(17):1715-26.
381. Shah BR, Laupacis A, Hux JE, Austin PC. Propensity score methods gave similar results to traditional regression modeling in observational studies: a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58(6):550-9.
382. Shahian DM, Normand SL, Torchiana DF, Lewis SM, Pastore JO, Kuntz RE, *et al.* Cardiac surgery report cards: comprehensive review and statistical critique. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2001;72(6):2155-68.
383. Shahian DM, Silverstein T, Lovett AF, Wolf RE, Normand SL. Comparison of clinical and administrative data sources for hospital coronary artery bypass graft surgery report cards. *Circulation* 2007;115(12): 1518-27.
384. Shahian DM, Torchiana DF, Shemin RJ, Rawn JD, Normand SL. Massachusetts cardiac surgery report card: implications of statistical methodology. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2005;80(6):2106-13.
385. Shen W, Louis TA. Triple-goal estimates in two-stage hierarchical models. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1998;60:455-71.
386. Simon R, Altman DG. Statistical aspects of prognostic factor studies in oncology. *Br J Cancer* 1994;69(6):979-85.
387. Simon R, Korn E, McShane L, Radmacher M, Wright G, Zhao Y. Design and analysis of DNA microarray investigations. New York: Springer, 2003.
388. Simons PC, Algra A, van de Laak MF, Grobbee DE, van der Graaf Y. Second manifestations of ARTERial disease (SMART) study: rationale and design. *Eur J Epidemiol* 1999;15(9):773-81.
389. Skacel M, Petras RE, Gramlich TL, Sigel JE, Richter JE, Goldblum JR. The diagnosis of low-grade dysplasia in Barrett's esophagus and its implications for disease progression. *Am J Gastroenterol* 2000;95(12):3383-7.
390. Smits JM, De Meester J, Deng MC, Scheld HH, Hummel M, Schoendube F, *et al.* Mortality rates after heart transplantation: how to compare centre-specific outcome data? *Transplantation* 2003;75(1):90-6.
391. Smits M, Dippel DW, Steyerberg EW, de Haan GG, Dekker HM, Vos PE, *et al.* Predicting intracranial traumatic findings on computed tomography in patients with minor head injury: the CHIP prediction rule. *Ann Intern Med* 2007; 146(6):397-405.
392. Snee RD. Validation of regression models: methods and examples. *Technometrics* 1977; 19:415-28.
393. Snick HK, Snick TS, Evers JL, Collins JA. The spontaneous pregnancy prognosis in untreated subfertile couples: the Walcheren primary care study. *Hum Reprod* 1997; 12(7):1582-8.
394. Solomon DH, Chibnik LB, Losina E, Huang J, Fossel AH, Husni E, *et al.* Development of a preliminary index that predicts adverse events after total knee replacement. *Arthritis Rheum* 2006;54(5): 1536-42.
395. Spiegelhalter DJ. Probabilistic prediction in patient management and clinical trials. *Stat Med* 1986;5(5):421-33.
396. Spiegelhalter DJ. Funnel plots for comparing institutional performance. *Stat Med* 2005;24(8):1185-202.
397. Spiegelhalter DJ, Crean GP, Holden R, Knill-Jones RP. Taking a calculated risk: predictive scoring systems in dyspepsia. *Scand J Gastroenterol Suppl* 1987;128:152-60.
398. Stein CM. Estimation of the mean of a multivariate normal distribution. *Ann Stat* 1981;9(6):1135-51.
399. Stephenson AJ, Smith A, Kattan MW, Satagopan J, Reuter VE, Scardino PT, *et al.* Integration of gene expression profiling and clinical variables to predict prostate carcinoma recurrence after radical prostatectomy. *Cancer* 2005;104(2):290-8.
400. Steyerberg EW, Balmana J, Stockwell DH, Syngal S. Data reduction for prediction: robust coding of age and family history for the risk of having a genetic mutation. *Stat Med* 2007; 26(30): 5545-56.

401. Steyerberg EW, Bleeker SE, Moll HA, Grobbee DE, Moons KG. Internal and external validation of predictive models: a simulation study of bias and precision in small samples. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56(5):441-7.
402. Steyerberg EW, Borsboom GJ, van Houwelingen HC, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD. Validation and updating of predictive logistic regression models: a study on sample size and shrinkage. *Stat Med* 2004;23(16):2567-86.
403. Steyerberg EW, Bossuyt PM, Lee KL. Clinical trials in acute myocardial infarction: should we adjust for baseline characteristics? *Am Heart J* 2000;139(5):745-51.
404. Steyerberg EW, Earle CC, Neville BA, Weeks JC. Racial differences in surgical evaluation, treatment, and outcome of locoregional esophageal cancer: a population-based analysis of elderly patients. *J Clin Oncol* 2005;23(3):510-7.
405. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Boersma E, Habbema JD. Applicability of clinical prediction models in acute myocardial infarction: a comparison of traditional and empirical Bayes adjustment methods. *Am Heart J* 2005;150(5):920.
406. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Boersma E, Habbema JD. Equally valid models gave divergent predictions for mortality in acute myocardial infarction patients in a comparison of logistic regression models. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58(4):383-90.
407. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD. Stepwise selection in small data sets: a simulation study of bias in logistic regression analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1999;52(10):935-42.
408. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD. Application of shrinkage techniques in logistic regression analysis: a case study. *Stat Neerl* 2001;55:76-88.
409. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Harrell FE, Jr., Habbema JD. Prognostic modelling with logistic regression analysis: a comparison of selection and estimation methods in small data sets. *Stat Med* 2000;19(8):1059-79.
410. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Harrell FE, Jr., Habbema JD. Prognostic modeling with logistic regression analysis: in search of a sensible strategy in small data sets. *Med Decis Making* 2001;21(1):45-56.
411. Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, van Houwelingen JC, Lee KL, Habbema JD. Prognostic models based on literature and individual patient data in logistic regression analysis. *Stat Med* 2000;19(2):141-60.
412. Steyerberg EW, Gerl A, Fossa SD, Sleijfer DT, de Wit R, Kirkels WJ, *et al.* Validity of predictions of residual retroperitoneal mass histology in nonseminomatous testicular cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1998;16(1):269-74.
413. Steyerberg EW, Harrell FE, Jr., Borsboom GJ, Eijkemans MJ, Vergouwe Y, Habbema JD. Internal validation of predictive models: efficiency of some procedures for logistic regression analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2001;54(8):774-81.
414. Steyerberg EW, Homs MY, Stokvis A, Essink-Bot ML, Siersema PD. Stent placement or brachytherapy for palliation of dysphagia from esophageal cancer: a prognostic model to guide treatment selection. *Gastrointest Endosc* 2005;62(3):333-40.
415. Steyerberg EW, Kallewaard M, van der Graaf Y, van Herwerden LA, Habbema JD. Decision analyses for prophylactic replacement of the Bjork-Shiley convexo-concave heart valve: an evaluation of assumptions and estimates. *Med Decis Making* 2000;20(1):20-32.
416. Steyerberg EW, Keizer HJ, Fossa SD, Sleijfer DT, Bajorin DF, Donohue JP, *et al.* Resection of residual retroperitoneal masses in testicular cancer: evaluation and improvement of selection criteria. The ReHiT study group. Re-analysis of histology in testicular cancer. *Br J Cancer* 1996;74(9):1492-8.
417. Steyerberg EW, Keizer HJ, Fossa SD, Sleijfer DT, Toner GC, Schraffordt Koops H, *et al.* Prediction of residual retroperitoneal mass histology after chemotherapy for metastatic non-seminomatous germ cell tumor: multivariate analysis of individual patient data from six study groups. *J Clin Oncol* 1995;13(5):1177-87.
418. Steyerberg EW, Keizer HJ, Habbema JD. Prediction models for the histology of residual masses after chemotherapy for metastatic testicular cancer. ReHiT study group. *Int J Cancer* 1999;83(6):856-9.

419. Steyerberg EW, Keizer HJ, Sleijfer DT, Fossa SD, Bajorin DF, Gerl A, *et al.* Retroperitoneal metastases in testicular cancer: role of CT measurements of residual masses in decision making for resection after chemotherapy. *Radiology* 2000;215(2):437-44.
420. Steyerberg EW, Keizer HJ, Stoter G, Habbema JD. Predictors of residual mass histology following chemotherapy for metastatic non-seminomatous testicular cancer: a quantitative overview of 996 resections. *Eur J Cancer* 1994;30A(9):1231-9.
421. Steyerberg EW, Kievit J, de Mol Van Otterloo JC, van Bockel JH, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD. Perioperative mortality of elective abdominal aortic aneurysm surgery. A clinical prediction rule based on literature and individual patient data. *Arch Intern Med* 1995;155(18):1998-2004.
422. Steyerberg EW, Marshall PB, Keizer HJ, Habbema JD. Resection of small, residual retroperitoneal masses after chemotherapy for nonseminomatous testicular cancer: a decision analysis. *Cancer* 1999;85(6):1331-41.
423. Steyerberg EW, Neville BA, Koppert LB, Lemmens VE, Tilanus HW, Coebergh JW, *et al.* Surgical mortality in patients with esophageal cancer: development and validation of a simple risk score. *J Clin Oncol* 2006;24(26):4277-84.
424. Steyerberg EW, Roobol MJ, Kattan MW, van der Kwast TH, de Koning HJ, Schroder FH. Prediction of indolent prostate cancer: validation and updating of a prognostic nomogram. *J Urol* 2007;177(1):107-12.
425. Steyerberg EW, Vergouwe Y, Keizer HJ, Habbema JD. Residual mass histology in testicular cancer: development and validation of a clinical prediction rule. *Stat Med* 2001;20(24):3847-59.
426. Steyerberg EW, Vickers AJ. Decision curve analysis: a discussion. *Med Decis Making* 2008;28(1):146-9.
427. Stiell I, Wells G, Laupacis A, Brison R, Verbeek R, Vandemheen K, *et al.* Multicentre trial to introduce the Ottawa ankle rules for use of radiography in acute ankle injuries. Multicentre Ankle Rule Study Group. *Bmj* 1995;311(7005):594-7.
428. Strandberg TE, Pitkala K. What is the most important component of blood pressure: systolic, diastolic or pulse pressure? *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 2003;12(3):293-7.
429. Sturmer T, Joshi M, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Rothman KJ, Schneeweiss S. A review of the application of propensity score methods yielded increasing use, advantages in specific settings, but not substantially different estimates compared with conventional multivariable methods. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(5):437-47.
430. Teasdale G, Jennett B. Assessment and prognosis of coma after head injury. *Acta Neurochir (Wien)* 1976;34(1-4):45-55.
431. Terrin N, Schmid CH, Griffith JL, D'Agostino RB, Selker HP. External validity of predictive models: a comparison of logistic regression, classification trees, and neural networks. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56(8):721-9.
432. Thomas N, Longford NT, Rolph JE. Empirical Bayes methods for estimating hospital-specific mortality rates. *Stat Med* 1994;13(9):889-903.
433. Thompson KM. Risk in perspective: insight and humor in the age of risk management. Newton Centre, MA: AORM, 2004.
434. Tibshirani R. Regression and shrinkage via the Lasso. *J R Stat Soc Ser B* 1996;58:267-88.
435. Tibshirani R. The lasso method for variable selection in the Cox model. *Stat Med* 1997;16(4):385-95.
436. Tu JV. Advantages and disadvantages of using artificial neural networks versus logistic regression for predicting medical outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1996;49(11):1225-31.
437. Tu JV, Austin PC, Walld R, Roos L, Agram J, McDonald KM. Development and validation of the Ontario acute myocardial infarction mortality prediction rules. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2001;37(4):992-7.
438. Tu JV, Weinstein MC, McNeil BJ, Naylor CD. Predicting mortality after coronary artery bypass surgery: what do artificial neural networks learn? The Steering Committee of the Cardiac Care Network of Ontario. *Med Decis Making* 1998;18(2):229-35.

439. Tuma RS. Trial and error: prognostic gene signature study design altered. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2005;97(5):331-3.
440. Twisk J, de Vente W. Attrition in longitudinal studies. How to deal with missing data. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2002;55(4):329-37.
441. Ulmer H, Kollerits B, Kelleher C, Diem G, Concin H. Predictive accuracy of the SCORE risk function for cardiovascular disease in clinical practice: a prospective evaluation of 44 649 Austrian men and women. *Eur J Cardiovasc Prev Rehabil* 2005;12(5):433-41.
442. Umar A, Boland CR, Terdiman JP, Syngal S, de la Chapelle A, Ruschoff J, *et al.* Revised Bethesda guidelines for hereditary nonpolyposis colorectal cancer (Lynch syndrome) and microsatellite instability. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2004;96(4):261-8.
443. Vach K, Sauerbrei W, Schumacher M. Variable selection and shrinkage: comparison of some approaches. *Stat Neerl* 2001;55:53-75.
444. Vach W, Blettner M. Biased estimation of the odds ratio in case-control studies due to the use of ad hoc methods of correcting for missing values for confounding variables. *Am J Epidemiol* 1991;134(8):895-907.
445. Vach W, Blettner M. Missing data in epidemiologic studies. *Encyclopedia of Biostatistics*. New York: Wiley, 1998:2641-54.
446. van Beek JG, Mushkudiani NA, Steyerberg EW, Butcher I, McHugh GS, Lu J, *et al.* Prognostic value of admission laboratory parameters in traumatic brain injury: results from the IMPACT study. *J Neurotrauma* 2007;24(2):315-28.
447. van Buuren S, Boshuizen HC, Knook DL. Multiple imputation of missing blood pressure covariates in survival analysis. *Stat Med* 1999;18(6):681-94.
448. van der Graaf Y, de Waard F, van Herwerden LA, Defauw J. Risk of strut fracture of Bjork-Shiley valves. *Lancet* 1992;339(8788):257-61.
449. van der Meulen JH, Steyerberg EW, van der Graaf Y, van Herwerden LA, Verbaan CJ, Defauw JJ, *et al.* Age thresholds for prophylactic replacement of Bjork-Shiley convexo-concave heart valves. A clinical and economic evaluation. *Circulation* 1993;88(1):156-64.
450. van der Vaart AW, Dudoit S, van der Laan MJ. Oracle inequalities for multi-fold cross-validation. *Stat Decis* 2006;24:351-71.
451. van Dijk MR, Steyerberg EW, Habbema JD. A decision-analytic approach to define poor prognosis patients: a case study for non-seminomatous germ cell cancer patients. *BMC Med Inform Decis Mak* 2008;8:1.
452. van Dijk MR, Steyerberg EW, Stenning SP, Habbema JD. Identifying subgroups among poor prognosis patients with nonseminomatous germ cell cancer by tree modelling: a validation study. *Ann Oncol* 2004;15(9):1400-5.
453. van Dijk MR, Steyerberg EW, Stenning SP, Habbema JD. Survival estimates of a prognostic classification depended more on year of treatment than on imputation of missing values. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006;59(3):246-53.
454. van Gorp MJ, Steyerberg EW, Kallewaard M, van der Graaf Y. Clinical prediction rule for 30-day mortality in Bjork-Shiley convexo-concave valve replacement. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003;56(10):1006-12.
455. van Gorp MJ, Steyerberg EW, van der Graaf Y. Decision guidelines for prophylactic replacement of Bjork-Shiley convexo-concave heart valves: impact on clinical practice. *Circulation* 2004;109(17):2092-6.
456. van Houwelingen HC. Validation, calibration, revision and combination of prognostic survival models. *Stat Med* 2000;19(24):3401-15.
457. van Houwelingen HC, Brand R, Louis TA. Empirical Bayes methods for monitoring health care quality. *Technical Report* 2006.
458. van Houwelingen HC, Thorogood J. Construction, validation and updating of a prognostic model for kidney graft survival. *Stat Med* 1995;14(18):1999-2008.
459. van Houwelingen JC, Le Cessie S. Predictive value of statistical models. *Stat Med* 1990;9(11):1303-25.
460. van Jaarsveld BC, Krijnen P, Pieterman H, Derkx FH, Deinum J, Postma CT, *et al.* The effect of balloon angioplasty on hypertension in atherosclerotic renal-artery stenosis. *Dutch Renal*

- Artery Stenosis Intervention Cooperative Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 2000; 342(14):1007-14.
461. van Koningsveld R, Steyerberg EW, Hughes RA, Swan AV, van Doorn PA, Jacobs BC. A clinical prognostic scoring system for Guillain-Barre syndrome. *Lancet Neurol* 2007;6(7):589-94.
  462. van Westreenen HL, Westerterp M, Sloof GW, Groen H, Bossuyt PM, Jager PL, *et al.* Limited additional value of positron emission tomography in staging oesophageal cancer. *Br J Surg* 2007;94(12):1515-20.
  463. Vandenbroucke JP. Prospective or retrospective: what's in a name? *Bmj* 1991;302(6771): 249-50.
  464. Vapnik VN. *The nature of statistical learning theory.* New York: Springer, 1995.
  465. Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Eijkemans MJ, Habbema JD. Substantial effective sample sizes were required for external validation studies of predictive logistic regression models. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58(5):475-83.
  466. Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Foster RS, Habbema JD, Donohue JP. Validation of a prediction model and its predictors for the histology of residual masses in nonseminomatous testicular cancer. *J Urol* 2001;165(1):84-8.
  467. Vergouwe Y, Steyerberg EW, Foster RS, Sleijfer DT, Fossa SD, Gerl A, *et al.* Predicting retroperitoneal histology in postchemotherapy testicular germ cell cancer: a model update and multicentre validation with more than 1000 patients. *Eur Urol* 2007;51(2):424-32.
  468. Verweij PJ, van Houwelingen HC. Penalized likelihood in Cox regression. *Stat Med* 1994;13(23-24):2427-36.
  469. Vickers AJ, Elkin EB. Decision curve analysis: a novel method for evaluating prediction models. *Med Decis Making* 2006;26(6):565-74.
  470. Vickers AJ, Kramer BS, Baker SG. Selecting patients for randomized trials: a systematic approach based on risk group. *Trials* 2006;7:30.
  471. Virnig BA, Warren JL, Cooper GS, Klabunde CN, Schussler N, Freeman J. Studying radiation therapy using SEER-Medicare-linked data. *Med Care* 2002;40(8 Suppl):IV-49-54.
  472. Vittinghoff E. *Regression methods in biostatistics: linear, logistic, survival, and repeated measures models.* New York: Springer, 2005.
  473. Vittinghoff E, McCulloch CE. Relaxing the rule of ten events per variable in logistic and Cox regression. *Am J Epidemiol* 2007;165(6):710-8.
  474. Volinsky CT, Raftery AE. Bayesian information criterion for censored survival models. *Biometrics* 2000;56(1):256-62.
  475. Wang D, Lertsithichai P, Nanchahal K, Yousufuddin M. Risk factors of coronary heart disease: a Bayesian model averaging approach. *J Appl Stat* 2003;30:813-26.
  476. Wang OJ, Wang Y, Lichtman JH, Bradley EH, Normand SL, Krumholz HM. "America's Best Hospitals" in the treatment of acute myocardial infarction. *Arch Intern Med* 2007;167(13):1345-51.
  477. Wang R, Lagakos SW, Ware JH, Hunter DJ, Drazen JM. Statistics in medicine—reporting of subgroup analyses in clinical trials. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357(21):2189-94.
  478. Warren JL, Harlan LC, Fahey A, Virnig BA, Freeman JL, Klabunde CN, *et al.* Utility of the SEER-Medicare data to identify chemotherapy use. *Med Care* 2002;40(8 Suppl):IV-55-61.
  479. Wehberg S, Schumacher M. A comparison of nonparametric error rate estimation methods in classification problems. *Biometrical J* 2004;46(1):35-47.
  480. Weimar C, Ziegler A, König IR, Diener HC. Predicting functional outcome and survival after acute ischemic stroke. *J Neurol* 2002;249(7):888-95.
  481. Wells PS, Anderson DR, Bormanis J, Guy F, Mitchell M, Gray L, *et al.* Value of assessment of pretest probability of deep-vein thrombosis in clinical management. *Lancet* 1997;350(9094):1795-8.
  482. Wells PS, Hirsh J, Anderson DR, Lensing AW, Foster G, Kearon C, *et al.* Accuracy of clinical assessment of deep-vein thrombosis. *Lancet* 1995;345(8961):1326-30.
  483. Whitworth A. NCI launches an innovative design for a breast cancer clinical trial. *J Natl Cancer Inst* 2006;98(17):1178-9.

484. Wijesinha A, Begg CB, Funkenstein HH, McNeil BJ. Methodology for the differential diagnosis of a complex data set. A case study using data from routine CT scan examinations. *Med Decis Making* 1983;3(2):133-54.
485. Wijnen JT, Vasen HF, Khan PM, Zwinderman AH, van der Klift H, Mulder A, *et al.* Clinical findings with implications for genetic testing in families with clustering of colorectal cancer. *N Engl J Med* 1998;339(8):511-8.
486. Wikipedia contributors. Bootstrapping. <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Bootstrapping&oldid=95537267> 2006:Accessed Dec 27, 2006.
487. Wilson PW, D'Agostino RB, Levy D, Belanger AM, Silbershatz H, Kannel WB. Prediction of coronary heart disease using risk factor categories. *Circulation* 1998;97(18):1837-47.
488. Wood AM, White IR, Royston P. How should variable selection be performed with multiply imputed data? *Stat Med* 2008;27:3227-46.
489. Wood AM, White IR, Thompson SG. Are missing outcome data adequately handled? A review of published randomized controlled trials in major medical journals. *Clin Trials* 2004;1(4):368-76.
490. Wood SN. Generalized additive models: an introduction with R. Boca Raton, FL: Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2006.
491. Wright J. The Glasgow Outcome Scale. The Centre for Outcome Measurement in Brain Injury. <http://www.tbims.org/combi/gos> (accessed September 30, 2006).
492. Wynne R. Variable definitions: implications for the prediction of pulmonary complications after adult cardiac surgery. *Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs* 2004;3(1):43-52.
493. Yang Y. Consistency of cross validation for comparing regression procedures. *Ann Stat* 2007;35(6):2450-73.
494. Ye J. On measuring and correcting the effects of data mining and model selection. *JASA* 1998;93:120-31.
495. Yuan S, Yu Y, Chao KS, Fu Z, Yin Y, Liu T, *et al.* Additional value of PET/CT over PET in assessment of locoregional lymph nodes in thoracic esophageal squamous cell cancer. *J Nucl Med* 2006;47(8):1255-9.
496. Zelen M. The randomization and stratification of patients to clinical trials. *J Chronic Dis* 1974;27(7-8):365-75.
497. Zhou XH. Effect of verification bias on positive and negative predictive values. *Stat Med* 1994;13(17):1737-45.

# Index

## A

- Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA), 430, 440, 459–461
- Accelerated failure time (AFT) models, 78
- Acute appendicitis diagnosis, 39
- Acute myocardial infarction (AMI) mortality
  - recursive partitioning, 67
  - treatment cost-effectiveness, 18
- Acute myocardial infarction (MI) and GUSTO-I study
  - 30-day mortality in
    - prediction models development
      - checklist, 416–417
      - prognostic modelling, 414–417
      - risk and prognostic factors, 413–414
      - tPA and streptokinase (SK), 414
    - covariate adjustment and tPA vs. SK advantages, 427
    - analysis, adjusted and unadjusted, 426–427
  - model development
    - outcome and predictors, 418–419
    - research question and intended application, 417–418
    - study design and analysis, 419
  - modelling steps in
    - coding of predictors and model specification, 420
    - discrimination and calibration, 421
    - estimation methods, 420–421
    - odds ratios (OR), 422
    - presentation, 422–423
    - prognostic factor effects, 418–419
    - validation, 421–422
  - thrombolytic therapy
    - prediction-based selection, 425–426
    - score chart for, 424–425
  - validity, internal and external, 423
- Adaptation methods, multivariable regression
  - coefficients
    - clinical results, 250–251
    - description, 244
    - estimation, 245
    - improving calibration, 247–248
    - predictive performance, 247
    - simulation results, 245
- Additivity and interaction terms
  - model specifications, 213–214
  - potential interactions, 214–216
  - time and survival, 216
- Akaike information criterion (AIC), 195
- Aneurysm mortality, 309, 310
- ANOVA table, 422
- Aortic aneurysms study, Bayesian analysis, 252
- Apparent validation, 300–301

## B

- Bacterial meningitis, prediction models, 282
- Barrett's oesophagus, 42
- Bayes rule
  - and logistic regression, 65
  - Naïve Bayes estimation, 63–65
  - prior probability of disease, 61–62
- Bayes' theorem, 13
- Bayesian information criterion (BIC), 195
- Bayesian methods
  - aneurysm study, 252
  - predicting neonatal death, 252
  - regression modelling, 251–252
- Bayesian model averaging (BMA), 208–210
- Björk–Shiley convexo–concave (BScc) valves
  - Poisson regression model, 80–81
  - risk of fracture, 21–23



- Bootstrap resampling
  - applications of, 93
  - definition, 92
  - optimism-corrected performance, 94–96
  - regression coefficients, 93–94
  - stepwise selection, 96–97
- Bootstrap validation, 98, 303–304
- Boxplot, 265–266. *See also* Concordance statistic
- Breast cancer susceptibility gene (BRCA), 13
- Breast cancer, prediction models, 294
- Brier score, 257
  
- C**
- C-reactive protein (CRP), 39
- Candidate predictors, prediction model
  - averaging effects, 180–181
    - Chlamydia trachomatis* infection risk, 180
    - heart valve replacement patients, 180–181
  - comorbidity coding, 177–178
  - distribution, 177
  - equal weights assumption assessment, 178–179
  - in testicular cancer, 176–177
  - logical weighting, 179
  - meta-analysis for, 176
  - principal component analysis, 180
- Categorical predictors, GUSTO-I study
  - coding impact, 159–160
  - in acute myocardial infarction, 160–161
- Classification and regression tree (CART)
  - methods
    - advantages, 67–68
    - binary tree construction, 67
    - disadvantages, 68–69
    - logistic regression model, 69–70
- Claus model, 13
- Clinical practice, prediction models
  - delaying treatment, 19
  - diagnostic algorithm, 16–17
  - gold standard test, 13–14
  - heart valve replacement
    - BSc valves, 21
    - decision analysis, 22–23
    - risk of fracture, 22
    - short-term vs. long-term risk, 21–22
  - renal artery stenosis, 14–15
  - spontaneous pregnancy
    - in vitro fertilization, 21
    - prognostic index score, 19–20
    - surgical decision-making, 21
    - treatment cost-effectiveness, 18–19
    - treatment intensity
      - benefit and harm, 16–18
      - risks and side effects, 16
    - treatment threshold, 15–16
- Clinical prediction models
  - confidence intervals, 316–317
  - interaction terms
    - estimation, 217–218
    - GUSTO-I interactions, 217
  - nomograms, 317–319
  - score charts, 319
  - specific formats, 321
  - tabular presentation, 320–321
- Cohort study. *See* Prognostic cohort study
- Collinear models, 192
- Colorectal cancers (CRC)
  - adenoma polyps, 184–185
  - age effect and diagnosis, 185–186
  - clinical background and patient data, 181–184
  - prediction model, 186–187
- Comorbidity definition, 40
- Complete case (CC) analysis, missing data
  - inefficiency of, 116
  - multiple predictors, 127–128
  - regression coefficients
    - MAR and MNAR, 117–118
    - MCAR, 117
  - simulation of, 124
- Concordance statistic, discriminative ability
  - box plots and discrimination slope, 264
  - Lorenz curve, 264–267
  - receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, 260–262
  - sensitivity and specificity, 260
  - survival data, discrimination, 267–268
  - testicular cancer discrimination, 268–269
  - verification bias and discriminative ability, 269
  - vs. explained variation ( $R^2$ ), 262–264
- Confidence intervals, regression models, 316–318, 320
- Continuation ratio model, 77
- Continuous predictors
  - categorization, 327, 329
  - prediction models and decision rules, 314
  - regression formula, 315
  - score chart, 319, 324, 325
  - table format, 320
- Continuous predictors, GUSTO-I study
  - categorization, 162–163
  - coding impact, 161–162

- non-linear functions for
    - fractional polynomials (FPs), 164
    - polynomials, 164
    - spline function, 165–166
  - outliers and extreme values of, 167–168
  - predictor effect interpretation, 170
- Covariate adjustment in GUSTO-I
  - advantages, 427
  - analysis, adjusted and unadjusted, 426–427
- Cox proportional hazards regression, 77–78
- Cox regression analysis, 439, 442–443
- Creatinine transformations, coding of predictors, 440
- Cross-validation
  - classical, 301, 302
  - jack-knife procedure, 301–303
  - vs. split-sample validation, 302
- D**
- Data sets, 454
  - abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA), 460–461
  - GUSTO-I prediction models
    - data description of, 456
    - modelling strategies in, 455
    - modern learning methods, 455
    - simulation design for, 457
  - SMART case study, 457, 458
  - testicular cancer case study, 457–459
  - traumatic brain injury (TBI), 461
- Decision curves, prediction models, 284–285, 295
  - testicular cancer, 287–288
  - treat all strategy, 285–286
- Decision rules
  - meta-model, 329–330
  - score chart rule, 328–329
  - survival analyses, 329
  - vs. prediction model, 313–314
- Decision threshold, prediction models, 281, 295
  - classifications, false-negative and false-positive, 282–283
  - decision curve, 284
  - definition, 283
  - net benefit, 286
  - validation setting, 288
- Deep venous thrombosis (DVT), 16–17
- Diagnostic study design
  - case–control studies, 39
  - cross-sectional study, 38
  - renal artery stenosis, 38–39
- E**
- Empirical Bayes (EB) estimation, 395, 396, 404
- Epidural haematoma (EDH), IMPACT study
  - imputed values, 150
  - missingness patterns, 144–146
  - predictor missingness quantification, 143–144
  - rank correlations, 148
- European study on prostate cancer (ERSPC), 308
- EuroSCORE, 323, 327
- Expected rank (ER), 402, 406, 407
- Explained variation ( $R^2$ ), 255–256
- External validation, prediction models, 304
  - calibration, discrimination, and clinical usefulness
    - calibration slope and calibration-in-the-large, 342–345, 347–349, 354–358
    - invalidity patterns, 336–337
    - performance measures, 339–340
    - simulation designs, 338–339
  - case–control design outcomes, 344–345
  - determinants of
    - case-mix, 335–336
    - regression coefficients, 336–337
  - differences between populations, 336
  - fully independent validation, 308–309
  - geographic validation, 307–308
  - invalidity patterns, 348–349
  - missed predictors
    - heterogeneous case-mix, 344
    - more–or less-severe case-mix, 342–344
  - model performance reference values
    - calculation, 349–350
    - model refitting, 350–351
    - R code, 350
    - testicular cancer and TBI, 351–352
  - observed predictors  $X$ 
    - heterogeneous case-mix, 341–342
    - more–or less-severe case-mix, 340–341
  - performance estimation
    - standard errors, 354–355
    - testicular cancer and TBI, 351–352
    - validation uncertainty, 352–354
  - power calculations, 356
  - regression coefficients
    - calibration, 348
    - clinical usefulness, 349
    - linear predictor, 345–346
    - R code, 346–347
  - sample size requirement, 356–357

**F**

- Fixed-effect approach
  - centre-specific estimates, 395
  - GUSTO-I and TIMI-II, 396
  - outcome differences, 393
  - predictors effects, 398
- Fractional polynomials (FP), 221–222.
  - See also* Testicular cancer
- Framingham risk functions, 12

**G**

- GAM. *See* Generalized additive model
- Generalizability, prediction model. *See* Prediction models, external validity patterns
- Generalized additive logistic regression model (GAM), 108–109
- Generalized additive model (GAM)
  - binary outcomes, 65–66
  - continuous outcomes, 55–57
- Generalized additive models (GAM), 220
- Generalized degrees of freedom (GDF), 98
- Genetic mutation, prediction modelling
  - colorectal cancers (CRC)
    - adenoma polyps, 184–185
    - age effect and diagnosis, 185–186
    - clinical background and patient data, 181–184
    - prediction model, 186–187
- Geographic validation, 307–308
- Gini index, 266
- Glasgow coma scale, 328
- Glasgow outcome scale, 74–75
  - imputation model, 147, 149
  - imputed values distribution, 149
  - missing values, 142
  - missingness patterns, 144–146
  - patient selection, 140
  - predictors
    - coding and time dependency, 141–142
    - missingness quantification, 143–144
    - selection, 140–141
- Goodness-of-fit tests
  - Goeman-Le Cessie test, 276
  - Hosmer-Lemeshow (H-L) test, 274–275
- GUSTO-I data
  - acute myocardial infarction, 103
  - modelling
    - GAM and MARS, 109
    - logistic regression and classification tree, 108
    - predictive performance, 109–110
  - GUSTO-I interactions, 217
  - GUSTO-I prediction models, data sets

- description of, 456
- modern learning methods, 455
- simulation design for, 457

**H**

- Hazard ratios (HRs), SMART study, 441
- Heterogeneity testing, TIMI-II model, 398–399
- High-dose chemotherapy (HD-CT), 18
- Homocysteine (HOMOC), SMART study, 434–435
- Hosmer-Lemeshow test, 278. *See also* Goodness-of-fit tests

**I**

- Imputation
  - auxiliary variables, 124–125
  - imputation, single and multiple methods, 122–123
  - missing outcomes
    - analysis, univariate and adjusted, 131–132
    - missing indicator, 130
    - predictor effect, 131
    - prognostic study guidelines, 133–134
    - stochastic SI, 132–133
  - multiple imputation, 123–124
  - multiple predictor simulations, 127–128
  - principle, 121–122
  - variables transformations, 125
- Indolent prostate cancer. *See* Prostate cancer, prediction models
- Internal validation, prediction models
  - validation techniques
    - apparent, 300–301
    - bootstrap, 303–304
    - cross-validation, 301–303
    - vs. external validation, 299–300
- International Germ Cell Classification (IGCC), 294
- International Mission on Prognosis and Analysis of Clinical Trials (IMPACT), TBI
  - missing values, predictors
    - adjusted effects estimation, 149–155
    - imputation model, 147, 149
    - missingness patterns, 144–146
    - missingness quantification, 141–142
    - multivariable effects, 155
    - outcome, 142
    - rank correlations, 147
  - predictor selection, 140–141
- Intima media thickness (IMT), SMART study, 437

**J**

Jack-knife cross-validation, 301–303

**K**

Kaplan–Meier analysis, 79

**L**

Lasso model

estimation, 238

GUSTO sample4 analyses, 239

model performance after shrinkage, 240

predictions after shrinkage, 239

Linear regression model, 53–54

generalized additive model, 55–57

optimism-corrected performance, 92

outcome transformation, 54–55

variance estimation, 55

Linear regression models

Lasso model

estimation, 238

GUSTO sample4 analyses, 239

model performance after shrinkage, 240

predictions after shrinkage, 239

neural networks, 231–232

penalized maximum likelihood (PML)

estimation, 234–235

GUSTO sample4 analyses, 235–237

shrinkage and selection methods, 238

shrinkage

characteristics, 232

uniform shrinkage, 233

Literature-adapted model, 247

Logistic regression analysis

and Bayes rule, 65

linear discriminant analysis, 60–61

log likelihood scale

maximum likelihood techniques, 58

$R^2$  definition, 60

neural network, hidden layer, 66

vs. tree characteristics, 69–70

Logistic regression model

age-related mortality

acute myocardial infarction, 103

GUSTO-I data set, 104

data differences between centres, 404–405

fixed-effect approach, 393–394

GUSTO-I modelling

GAM and MARS, 109

logistic regression and classification

tree, 108

predictive performance, 109–110

operative mortality

and age effect, 104–105

definition, 104

logistic regression models, 106

random effects, 394–396

Logistic regression model, external

validation, 337

calibration slope and calibration-in-the-large, 338

discrimination and calibration estimation, 352–354

power calculations, 356

standard error estimation, 354–355

stratification, 338

Lorenz curve, discriminative ability

advantages and disadvantages, 267

cumulative distribution of population, 264–265

Gini index in, 266

Lynch syndrome prediction model,

305, 306, 310

**M**

Medical research, prediction models

cardiac outcome ranking, 29–30

covariate adjustment

gain in power, 26–27

in RCT, 25–26

GUSTO-III trial analysis, 27

observational studies, 27–28

propensity scores, 28

provider profiling, 29

statin treatment effects, 28–29

stratification, RCT, 23–24

TBI trial selection, 24

Meta-analysis. *See* Univariate logistic regression coefficients

Meta-model, decision rules, 314, 329–330

Missing at random (MAR)

data mechanism, 117–118

imputation

missing outcomes, 130

model, 124–125

multiple predictors, 127–128

simulations of, 126

R code, 119–120

Missing completely at random (MCAR), SMART study, 434

Missing data outcomes

missing indicator, 130

predictor effect, 131

prognostic studies guidelines, 133–134

stochastic SI, 132–133

univariate and adjusted analysis, 131–132

- Missing not at random (MNAR )
  - data mechanisms, 117–118
  - imputation
    - missing outcomes, 130
    - multiple predictors, 128
    - simulations of, 126
  - regression coefficients, 119–120
- Missing completely at random (MCAR)
  - data mechanisms, 117
  - imputation
    - missing outcomes, 130
    - model, 125
    - multiple predictors, 128
    - simulations of, 126
  - regression coefficients, 119
- Missing values, TBI
  - outcomes, 142
  - predictors
    - adjusted effects estimation, 149–155
    - imputation model, 147, 149
    - imputed values distribution, 149
    - missingness patterns, 144–146
    - missingness quantification, 143–144
    - multivariable effects, 155
    - rank correlations, 147
- Modern selection methods
  - bagging and boosting, 208
  - Bayesian model averaging (BMA), 208–210
  - bootstrapping, 208
  - regression coefficients shrinkage, 210
- Multivariable analysis, non-linearity
  - fractional polynomials (FP), 221–222
  - generalized additive models (GAM), 220
  - restricted cubic splines (RCS), 220–221
  - splines in GAM, 222
- Multivariable diagnostic univariate log, 65
- Multivariable logistic regression coefficients, 249–250
- Multivariable regression coefficients
  - adaptation methods
    - clinical results, 250–251
    - description, 244
    - estimation, 245
    - improving calibration, 247–248
    - predictive performance, 247
    - simulation results, 245
  - Bayesian methods
    - aneurysm study, 252
    - predicting neonatal death, 252
    - regression modelling, 251–252
- Multivariate additive regression splines (MARS), 110–111
- Myocardial infarction
  - age-related mortality, 103
- N**
- Naïve Bayes estimation
  - calibration, 65
  - prediction, 63–64
- Nerve-function impairment (NFI), 79–80
- Net benefit (NB), prediction models
  - definition, 284
  - discrimination and calibration, 289–290
  - formula and interpretation, 285
  - in decision curves, 285–286
  - testicular cancer
    - decision curves, 287–288
    - model development and validation, 286–287
- Noise variables, 205
- Nomogram presentation, SMART study, 444–445
- Nomograms, prediction models, 314
  - benign histology, 317, 318
  - testicular cancer, 324, 328
- Non-linear prediction models
  - multivariable analysis
    - fractional polynomials (FP), 221–222
    - generalized additive models (GAM), 220
    - restricted cubic splines (RCS), 220–221
    - splines in GAM, 222
  - testicular cancer case study
    - analysis, univariate and multivariable, 224–226
    - fractional polynomials, multivariable, 224
    - LDH effect, 222–223
    - predictive performance, 226–227
- Non-significant variables, 193
- O**
- Odds ratios (OR), 422
- Odds threshold, prediction models, 283–285
- Oesophageal cancer
  - early mortality, 35
  - long-term mortality, 36
  - surgical mortality, 37
- Oesophagectomy, surgical mortality, 84
- Outcome and predictors
  - acute MI and GUSTO-I study, 416–417
  - SMART study, 429, 431
- Outcome, prediction models
  - cancer registry, 45–46
  - composite end points, 46
  - diagnostic end points, 47

- survival endpoints, 45
- types of, 46–47
- Overfitting and optimism, prediction models
  - bootstrap resampling
    - applications of, 95
    - definition, 94
    - optimism-corrected performance, 96–98
    - regression coefficients, 95–96
    - stepwise selection, 98–99
  - data analysis cost
    - outcome prediction, 99
    - tree model and practical implications, 98
  - definition, 83–84
  - mortality variability
    - noise vs. true heterogeneity, 85–87
    - within single centre, 84–85
  - regression models
    - model performance, 90–91
    - model uncertainty, 87–88
    - optimal cut-point bias, 89
    - optimism-corrected performance, 91
    - parameter uncertainty, 90
    - testimation bias, 88–89
  - shrinkage
    - mortality prediction, 87
    - parameter uncertainty, 90
- P**
- Parsimony, 193
- Penalized coefficients, regression models
  - formula, 323
  - LDH values, 325
  - post-chemotherapy histology, 322, 324
- Penalized maximum likelihood (PML)
  - estimation
    - Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC), 234–235
    - effective degrees of freedom, 235
    - shrinkage and selection methods, 238
- Percentile expected rank (PCER), 406, 407
- Performance measures, prediction model
  - Brier score, 257
  - calibration
    - calibration-in-the-large model, 271
    - discrimination and, 278
    - estimation, 274–275
    - goodness-of-fit tests, 274–276
    - Hosmer–Lemeshow test, 276
    - in testicular cancer, 276–277
    - Kaplan–Meier method, 271
    - outcomes and probabilities, 273–274
    - regression coefficients, 272
    - smoothing techniques, 270–271
    - statistical tests, 274
    - survival predictions, 276
  - concordance statistic
    - box plots and discrimination slope, 264
    - Lorenz curve, 264–267
    - R code, 269–270
    - receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, 260–262
    - sensitivity and specificity, 260
    - survival data discrimination, 267–268
    - testicular cancer discrimination, 268–269
    - verification bias and discriminative ability, 269
    - vs. explained variation ( $R^2$ ), 262–264
    - discrimination and calibration, 259
    - explained variation, 255–256
    - for testicular cancer, 257–258
    - survival outcomes, 258–259
- Poisson regression model, 80–81, 216
- Polytomous logistic regression analysis
  - residual masses histology, 72–73
  - vs. multivariable dichotomous logistic models, 73–75
- Positron-emission tomography (PET)
  - scans, 47
- Predicted probabilities, regression models, 316
  - benign histology, 319
  - formula, 323
  - necrosis, 319–320
  - pre- and post-chemotherapy mass size, 321–322
- Prediction intervals, regression models, 316–317
- Predictive biomarkers, 47–48
- Predictor selection
  - collinearity, 192
  - non-significant variables, 193
  - parsimony, 193
  - reduction modelling, 191–192
- Predictors, prediction models
  - categories, 40
  - choice of, 44
  - costs, 40–41
  - determinants, 41
  - prognosis in oncology, 41–42
  - reliability
    - biological variability, 43
    - observer variability, 42
    - regression dilution bias, 43–44
  - strength, 39–40

- Presentation formats
  - decision rules
    - meta-model, 329–330
    - score chart rule, 328–329
    - survival analyses, 329
  - prediction models
    - confidence intervals, 316–317
    - nomograms, 317–319
    - score charts, 319
    - specific formats, 321
    - tabular presentation, 320–321
- Prognosis
  - medicine, 1
  - oncology, 41–42
- Prognostic cohort study
  - nested case-control studies, 37–38
  - prospective designs, 35–38
  - registry data, 36–37
  - retrospective designs, 35
  - types, 33–35
- Prognostic factors, acute MI, 413–414, 419–420
- Proportional odds logistic regression
  - advantages of, 75–76
  - GOS dichotomous categorizations, 75
- Prostate cancer
  - fully independent external validation, 308, 309
  - prediction models, 284, 295
- Provider profiling, prediction models
  - case-mix adjustment, 400
  - centres' ranking, 401–402, 406–407
  - data differences between centres
    - analyses, adjusted and EB, 405–406
    - estimation of, 404–405
    - fixed effects and EB estimates for, 404
    - testing of, 403–404
  - ER and PCER in, 402, 407
  - guidelines for, 408
  - in stroke, 403
  - standard error (SE), 401
  - W statistic for, 400–401
- Public health, prediction models
  - breast cancer incidence, 12–13
  - preventive interventions, 12
- R**
- Random effects model
  - EB estimation, 306, 401
  - heterogeneity in, 402
  - predictor effects in, 398
- Randomized controlled trial (RCT)
  - different case-mix, 336
  - inclusion and exclusion criteria, 341–342
  - reference values, 351
  - vs. surveys, 348
- Randomized controlled trials (RCTs)
  - covariate adjustment
    - linear regression analysis, 25–26
    - logistic regression, 25
  - inclusion and stratification, 23–24
  - prospective study, 36
  - traumatic brain injury, 24
  - treatment benefits and harms, 16–18
- Receiver operating characteristic (ROC)
  - curve, 282
  - and consecutive cutoffs, 260–261
  - confidence intervals, 262
  - probability outcomes, 261
- Recursive partitioning. *See* Classification and regression tree (CART) methods
- Reduction models, 191–192
- Reference values
  - performance with refitting, 350–351
  - R code, 350
  - testicular cancer and TBI, 351–352
- Regression models. *See also* Logistic regression model, external validation
  - confidence intervals, 316–318, 320
  - missed predictors *Z*
    - heterogeneous case-mix, 344
    - more-or less-severe case-mix, 342–344
  - observed predictors *X*
    - heterogeneous case-mix, 341–342
    - more-or less-severe case-mix, 340–341
  - penalized coefficients
    - formula, 323
    - LDH values, 325
    - post-chemotherapy histology, 322, 324
  - predicted probabilities
    - benign histology, 319
    - formula, 323
    - necrosis, 319–320
    - pre-and post-chemotherapy mass size, 321–322
  - regression coefficients
    - adjusted and unadjusted, 337–339, 343
    - calibration, 348
    - clinical usefulness, 349
    - defining risk factors, 328–329
    - linear predictor, 345–346
    - post-chemotherapy histology, 322
    - rescaled predictor, 326
    - testicular cancer, 324
    - variance of, 323
- regression formula, 314

heuristic shrinkage and uses, 316  
 logistic model, 321–323  
 prediction steps involved, 315–316  
 shrunk coefficients, 323  
 Regression models, additivity and interaction terms  
   model specifications, 213–214  
   potential interactions, 214–216  
   time and survival, 216  
 Renal artery stenosis, 14–15  
 Respiratory syncytial virus (RSV), 54  
 Restricted cubic spline (RCS), prediction models  
   extrapolation and robustness, 166–167  
   spline functions, 165–166  
   vs. fractional polynomials, 164–165  
 Restricted cubic splines (RCS), 220–221

## S

Second manifestations of arterial disease (SMART) study  
   bootstrap procedure and model validation, 444–446  
   case study, 457, 458  
   coding of predictors  
     combining similar effects predictors, 439–440  
     Cox regression models for, 439  
     creatinine transformations in, 440  
     transforming continuous predictors, 438–439  
     truncated extreme values for IMT, 437  
   diastolic and systolic measurements, 434–435  
   discrimination of, 444  
   fatal and non-fatal vascular events in, 430–431  
   model estimation  
     Cox regression coefficients, 442–443  
     Lasso model shrunk coefficients, 443  
   model specification  
     and hazard ratios (HRs), 441  
     predictor selection, 442  
   nomogram presentation, 446–447  
   outcome and predictors, 431, 432  
   prediction model development checklist, 432  
   preliminary modeling steps  
     cluster analysis, missing data, 436  
     missing completely at random (MCAR) situation, 434  
     missing data patterns in, 434–435  
     multiple imputation techniques, 435–436

    prognosis in, 429–431  
     research question and intended applications, 431  
     study design and analysis, 432  
 Shrinkage of regression coefficients  
   characteristics, 232  
   Lasso model, 239–240  
   PML model, 238  
   uniform shrinkage, 233  
 Shrunk coefficients, regression models, 323  
 Socio-economic status (SES), 37, 40  
 Split-sample validation  
   drawbacks of, 301–302  
   vs. cross-validation, 302  
 Statistical model prediction  
   age-related mortality  
     acute myocardial infarction, 105  
     GUSTO-I data set, 106  
   GUSTO-I modelling  
     GAM and MARS, 111  
     logistic regression and classification tree, 110  
     predictive performance, 111–112  
   model type, 104–105  
   operative mortality  
     and age effect, 106–107  
     definition, 106  
     logistic regression models, 108  
   StatLog project, 109–110  
   testing, 104  
 Statistical modelling  
   estimation problem and hypothesis testing, 2–3  
   model uncertainty, 3  
   sample size, 4–5  
 Statistical prediction models  
   binary outcomes  
     Bayes rule, 61–62  
     classification and regression tree methods, 67–70  
     generalized additive model, 65–66  
     likelihood ratio calculations, 62–63  
     log likelihood scale,  $R^2$  calculation, 58–60  
     logistic regression analysis, 57–58  
     MARS and SVM, 70–71  
     multivariable diagnostic univariate log, 65  
     Naïve Bayes estimation, 63–65  
   categorical outcomes  
     differential diagnoses, 71  
     multivariable dichotomous logistic models, 73–75  
     polytomous logistic regression, 72



- Statistical prediction models (*cont.*)
    - residual masses histology, 72–73
    - continuous outcomes
      - cost prediction, 54
      - generalized additive model, 55–57
      - linear regression model, 53–54
      - transformation, 54–55
      - variance estimation, 55
    - economic outcomes, 54
    - estimation problem and hypothesis testing, 2–3
    - model uncertainty, 3
    - ordinal outcomes
      - continuation ratio model, 77
      - Glasgow outcome scale, 74–75
      - proportional odds logistic regression model, 75–77
    - sample size, 4–5
    - survival outcomes
      - Cox proportional hazards regression model, 77–78
      - Kaplan–Meier analysis, 79
      - nerve-function impairment, 79–80
      - parametric models, 80
      - proportionality assumption, 78–79
      - risky heart valves replacement, 80–81
  - Stein’s paradox, 90
  - Stepwise selection, prediction models
    - advantages of, 196
    - disadvantages of
      - biased coefficients, 199
      - event variable bias, 199–201
      - p*-values exaggeration, 204
      - selection instability, 197–199
      - variability misspecification, 201–204
    - stopping rules, 195–196
    - variants, 194–195
  - Streptokinase (SK), 414
  - Stroke, provider profiling, 403
  - Support vector machine (SVM), 70–71
- T**
- Traumatic brain injury (TBI) trials, 24
  - Temporal validation, 305–307
  - Testicular cancer
    - candidate predictors, 176–177
    - non-linearity case study
      - analysis, univariate and multivariable, 224–226
      - fractional polynomials, multivariable, 224
      - LDH effect, 222–223
      - predictive performance, 226–227
    - prediction model
      - Brier score, 257
      - calibration method, 276–277
      - discriminative ability, 260
      - receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, 260–262
  - Testicular cancer case study, 457–459
  - Testicular cancer, prediction models, 307–308
    - clinical usefulness, 286–287
    - decision curves, 287–288
    - decision rule, 330
    - more–or less-severe patients, 349
    - nomogram, 324
    - performance, 289–290
    - pre–and post-chemotherapy mass size, 321–322, 326–327
    - predictor categorization, 327
    - presentation formats, 330
    - reference values, 351–352
    - regression formula, 321–323
    - score chart, 319, 324–325
    - tabular presentation, 320–321
    - validity interpretation, 341
  - Thrombolytic therapy, acute MI
    - predictions for selection of, 423–424
    - score chart for, 422–423
  - TIMI-II models and GUSTO-I trial
    - outcome differences in
      - centre-specific estimates, 395
      - intercepts updating, 397
      - logistic regression models, 394
      - R code for random effect analyses, 399
      - random effect models, 394, 395
      - standard error (SE), 396
    - predictor effects in
      - heterogeneity in calibration slope, 398–399
      - testing and updating, 398
  - Tissue plasminogen activator (tPA), 414
  - Transforming continuous predictors, 438–439
  - Transportability. *See* Prediction model, generalizability
  - Traumatic brain injury (TBI)
    - adjusted effects estimation
      - complete predictors, 151–154
      - incomplete predictors, 154–155
      - logistic regression coefficients, 151
    - age and outcome, 108–109
    - continuous predictors
      - coding impact, 161
      - effects of, 171
    - Glasgow outcome scale (GOS)
      - imputation model, 147, 149
      - imputed values distribution, 149

- missing values, 142
- missingness patterns, 144–146
- patient selection, 140
- predictor coding and time dependency, 141–142
- predictors missingness quantification, 143–144
- predictors selection, 140–141
- glucose values and outcome, 168–169
- haematocrit (ht) and haemoglobin (Hb) correlation, 122
- multivariable analyses, 155
- Traumatic brain injury (TBI) data set, 461

**U**

- Univariate analyses, model specification
  - advantages of, 207
  - multivariable modelling, 206
  - screening of, 207
- Univariate logistic regression coefficients, 248–249
- Updating prediction model
  - centre-specific estimates and EB estimation, 395
  - in GUSTO-I, 396–398
  - intercept updating, 397
  - predictor effects in

- heterogeneity in calibration slope, 398–399
- testing and updating of, 398

**V**

- Validation. *See also* Prediction models, external validity patterns
  - case-mix, 337–338
  - missed predictors *Z*
    - heterogeneous case-mix, 344
    - more–or less-severe case-mix, 342–344
  - observed predictors *X*
    - heterogeneous case-mix, 341–342
    - more–or less-severe case-mix, 340–341
  - performance measures, 339
  - power calculations, 356
  - regression coefficients, 336–337, 341
- Validation, internal and external prediction models, 450–451
- Variance inflation factors (VIF). *See* Collinear models

**W**

- W* statistic, differences between centres, 400–401