

1

1 **EVALUATION OF STATISTICAL ILLITERACY IN LATIN AMERICAN**
2 **CLINICIANS AND OF THE EFFICACY OF A 10-HOUR COURSE**

3 **Authors:**

4 Adrian Soto-Mota MD, DPhil. Assistant Professor at the Metabolic Diseases Research Unit at
5 The National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán.

6 Eduardo Carrillo Maravilla MD, MSc. Internal Medicine consultant at The National Institute
7 of Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán

8 Jose Luis Cárdenas Fragoso, MD. Chief resident at The National Institute of Medical
9 Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán

10 Óscar Arturo Lozano Cruz, MD. Chief resident at The National Institute of Medical Sciences
11 and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán

12 Alfonso Gulías Herrero, MD, PhD. Director of the Internal Medicine residency program at
13 The National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán.

14 Sergio Ponce De Leon Rosales MD, PhD. Academic Director at The National Institute of
15 Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán

16 **Corresponding author:**

17 Luis Adrian Soto-Mota MD, DPhil.

18 Assistant Professor at the Metabolic Diseases Research Unit of The National Institute of
19 Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán. Mexico City, Postal code: 14080.

20 Tel: +52 5487 0900 ext.: 6321. Email: adrian.sotom@incmnsz.mx

21 Number of pages: 13

22 Word count: 1224

23 **ABSTRACT**

24 **Introduction**

25 All medics require statistical interpretation skills to keep up to date with the scientific
26 advances and evidence-based recommendations of their specific field. However, statistical
27 illiteracy among clinicians is a highly prevalent problem with far-reaching consequences. The
28 few available studies that report statistical literacy improvements after educational
29 interventions do not report for how long these benefits last. We measured for the first-time
30 statistical proficiency among Latin-American clinicians with different levels of training and
31 evaluated the efficacy of a 10-hour course at multiple timepoints.

32 **Methods**

33 Using an online questionnaire, we evaluated self-perceived statistical proficiency, scientific
34 literature reading habits and statistical literacy (using an adaptation of the Quick Risk Test)
35 across multiple levels of medical training. Separately, we evaluated statistical proficiency
36 among Internal Medicine residents at a tertiary centre in Mexico City immediately before,
37 immediately after and one and two months after a 10-hour statistics course using the same
38 adaptation (allowing for “I don’t know” answers) of the Quick Risk Test. Scores across
39 multiple time points were compared using Friedman’s Test.

40 **Results**

41 Data from 392 clinicians from 9 Latin American countries were analyzed. Most clinicians
42 (85%) failed our adaptation of the Quick Risk Test (mean score = 2.6/10, IQR:1.4). The 10-
43 hour course significantly improved the scores of the Internal Medicine Residents (n=16) from
44 3.8/10, IQR:1.8 to 8.3/10, IQR:1.4 (p<0.01). However, scores dropped after one and two
45 months to 7.7/10, IQR:1.6 and 6.1 / 10, IQR:2.2, respectively.

3

46 **Conclusions**

47 Statistical Illiteracy is highly prevalent among Latin American clinicians. Short-term
48 educational interventions are effective but, their benefits quickly fade away if they are not
49 periodically reinforced. Medical boards and Medical schools need to periodically teach and
50 evaluate statistical proficiency to ameliorate these issues.

51

52 **Keywords:** Statistical Literacy, Quick Risk Test, Evidence-Based Medicine.

53

54 INTRODUCTION

55 Most medical schools and Medical board recognise the importance of Statistical Skills for
56 practising clinicians¹. However, evidence shows that even experienced clinicians struggle
57 with assimilating the differences and implications of fundamental statistical concepts such as
58 odds ratio versus absolute risk and sensitivity versus positive post-test probability².
59 Moreover, essential concepts such as absolute risk changes, number needed to treat/screen,
60 intention-to-treat analysis and Bayesian probability are often overlooked when making
61 clinical decisions and when explaining the implications of tests and treatments to patients^{3,4}.

62

63 The implications of Statistical Illiteracy among clinicians are frequent and range from
64 generating individual ethical problems⁵⁻⁷ to health-policy misinformed decisions⁸. Moreover,
65 improving health statistics among medical doctors has been put forward as one of the seven
66 goals for improving health during this century⁹.

67

68 Importantly, evidence also suggests that cheap, easy-to-implement and short-term
69 interventions can improve statistical skills among clinicians¹⁰. In their 2018 study, Jenny,
70 Keller and Gigerenzer¹¹ demonstrated that a 90-minute training session in medical statistical
71 literacy improved the performance (from 50% to 90%) in 82% of the participants using a
72 multiple-choice Statistics test. However, it was not evaluated how quickly these
73 improvements fade away after the educational intervention.

74

75 In this study, we estimated Statistical Literacy among Latin American clinicians and
76 evaluated the efficacy of a 10-hour Statistics course across multiple timepoints.

77 **METHODS**

78 This study and its methods were reviewed and approved by y the Ethics Committee of the
79 National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition Salvador Zubirán on September 29th,
80 2020 (Reg. No. SEN-3516-20-21-1). Data were anonymized, and its collection followed
81 Good Clinical Practice Standards.

82

83 **Online survey and Statistics Test**

84 The survey collected information about medical training, medical school and graduation year,
85 self-perceived understanding of the methods section of scientific papers (as a percentage),
86 and the number of scientific papers read per week, and extracurricular statistical training.
87 Email restrictions were placed to ensure respondents were only capable of answering once.

88

89 The test was based on the Quick Risk Test¹¹ but, to avoid granting points by guessing, was
90 modified to incorporate an “I don’t know” option in all questions. Additionally, it avoided
91 word by word translations and evaluating concepts by directly asking their definitions.

92 Hypothetical cases and examples were used instead. The evaluated concepts were:

93 Sensitivity, Specificity, Positive and Negative Predictive Values, Statistical Power, Sample
94 Size, Statistical Significance, Statistical correlation, Absolute and Relative Risk, Bayesian
95 clinical reasoning and Dependent and Independent probabilities.

96

97 Respondents did not receive feedback after answering each question to avoid their early
98 performance influenced their final answers. The survey and questionnaire can be reviewed
99 here at <https://forms.gle/fCep4atAhcoG5BKW6>

100 **Characteristics and design of the educational intervention**

101 A 10-hour course was divided into ten one-hour weekly sessions to review each one of the
102 concepts evaluated by the test. All sessions were recorded and available for review during the
103 10 weeks the course lasted.

104

105 This course was summarized into a 3-hour long 10 session videos now freely available at:
106 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdEX8AdEU6Y&list=PLoieIsf7siGMTkICPbkvgD1hyZ>
107 [pbVwd0H](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cdEX8AdEU6Y&list=PLoieIsf7siGMTkICPbkvgD1hyZ)

108

109 **Evaluation of the efficacy of the course**

110 Internal Medicine residents answered the aforementioned survey and test before the course,
111 immediately after the last session, one month after the course and two months after the
112 course. Lecture recordings were unavailable after the course ended to avoid biasing the
113 follow-up evaluations.

114

115 The same questions were used for all evaluations except for the very last one in which,
116 different cases evaluated the same Statistical concepts.

117

118 **Statistical Analysis**

119 Since scores were not normally distributed, we compared them using Friedman's Test using
120 the R function "friedman.test" from the R package "stats" version 3.6.2. Normality was
121 evaluated using Shapiro-Wilk tests using the function "shapiro.test" in the same R package.

122 **RESULTS**

123 **Survey responses and Statistical Literacy results among Latin American clinicians.**

124 A total of 403 responses were collected, however, 11 were discarded due to having
125 incomplete data. In total 392 from 9 different countries and 53 different medical schools were
126 included in the analysis. Most respondents (82%) were Mexican. Scores were not
127 significantly different across different levels of medical training. Table 1 summarizes their
128 answers in the survey and the overall performance in the test. Table 2 summarizes the
129 percentage of correct answers in every statistical concept we evaluated.

130

131 **Evaluation of the efficacy of the course**

132 Internal Medicine residents at the National Institute of Medical Sciences and Nutrition
133 Salvador Zubirán voluntarily attended or listened to the recorded lectures at their own pace
134 and answered the Statistics tests at the already mentioned time points. Tests were self-paced,
135 unsupervised and were open for 5 days during each time point. Email restrictions were placed
136 to allow no more than one answer per resident.

137

138 Only those who answered all tests (n=16 out of 42) were included in the analysis. Figure 1
139 shows the scores results and their distributions across the evaluated time points. Timepoints
140 were statistically different from baseline when compared with Friedman's Test ($p<0.01$).

141

142 Further, follow up was stopped because the resident's academic year ended in March 2021.

143

144 **DISCUSSION**

145 To our knowledge, this is the first attempt at estimating Statistical illiteracy among Latin
146 American Clinicians. Despite having found comparable statistical proficiency scores to those
147 in other countries¹¹, this population merits being analysed separately because most
148 educational tools that address this problem are only available in English^{12,13} and English
149 proficiency is not mandatory for practicing Medicine in all Latin American countries.

150

151 In contrast with Jenny, Keller and Gigerenzer study¹¹, we allowed for respondents to admit
152 they did not know an answer to the questions and measured for up to two months the lasting
153 effects of the educational intervention we tried. The fact that scores quickly and significantly
154 drop after a few weeks of having finished the course highlight the importance of continuous
155 teaching and periodical evaluation. The finding that it is infrequent that clinicians recognise
156 they do not know and the discrepancy between their self-perceived statistical skills and their
157 tests scores suggest clinicians overestimate their statistical proficiency. Teaching clinicians to
158 identify when they lack enough information or how to avoid cognitive biases should be
159 emphasized when designing educational tools.

160

161 Some questions evaluated the same concepts by evaluating theoretical knowledge (i.e.,
162 Which of the following factors influences the the positive predictive value of a test?) while
163 others by presenting practical scenarios (i.e., How does the positive predictive value of an
164 Influenza rapid test changes over the year?). Interestingly, clinicians performed better at
165 theoretical questions (63% right answers) than with practical ones (15% right answers). Thus,
166 it is likely than emphasizing practical interpretation over theoretical knowledge would yield
167 better results when designing educational resources for improving statistical literacy.

168 The main limitations of our study are inherent to the nature of self-reported, online-based
169 studies. Also, Mexican clinicians were overrepresented in our sample. Nonetheless, the large
170 number of participants and consistency of the results make it unlikely that more controlled
171 methods would yield very different results.

172

173 An additional limitation for extrapolating the utility of these short-term interventions comes
174 from the fact there is not a consensus about which specific statistical skills are necessary for
175 all physicians. Moreover, different types of specialists would likely require developing and
176 preserving different skills. For example, clinical trials are more frequent in Internal Medicine
177 Journals than in Forensic Medicine ones.

178

179 Nonetheless, since it is not possible to practise Evidence-Based Medicine if clinicians cannot
180 understand scientific evidence, further research is much needed to help guide future
181 educational strategies and policies that help reduce the educational, ethical and economical
182 impact Statistical Illiteracy has on everyday medical practice.

183

184

185 **CONCLUSION**

186 Similarly, to other populations, most Latin American clinicians struggle with statistical
187 concepts that are essential for correctly interpreting emerging evidence. Short-term
188 educational interventions can improve statistical skills; however, these improvements quickly
189 fade away if they are not reinforced. Our results highlight the need to periodically teach and
190 evaluate statistical proficiency by Medical schools and Medical boards.

191

192 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

193 The authors want to thank Dr Ricardo Macias for his help in distributing the online survey.

194

195 **FUNDING, DATA SHARING AND CONFLICT OF INTEREST DISCLOSURES**

196 This study did not receive funding. The authors declare they do not have conflicts of interest
197 to disclose. Data for research purposes will be shared upon request to the corresponding
198 author. Dr Adrian Soto-Mota is the guarantor of the integrity of this work.

199

200 **REFERENCES**

- 201 1. Johnson T v., Abbasi A, Schoenberg ED, et al. Numeracy among trainees: Are we
202 preparing physicians for evidence-based medicine? *Journal of Surgical Education*.
203 2014;71(2):211-215. Doi:10.1016/j.jsurg.2013.07.013
- 204 2. Anderson BL, Williams S, Schulkin J. Statistical Literacy of Obstetrics-Gynecology
205 Residents. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education*. 2013;5(2):272-275.
206 Doi:10.4300/jgme-d-12-00161.1
- 207 3. Naylor CD, Chen E, Strauss B. Measured enthusiasm: Does the method of reporting
208 trial results alter perceptions of therapeutic effectiveness? *Annals of Internal Medicine*.
209 1992;117(11):916-921. Doi:10.7326/0003-4819-117-11-916
- 210 4. Whiting PF, Davenport C, Jameson C, et al. How well do health professionals
211 interpret diagnostic information? A systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2015;5(7).
212 Doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-008155
- 213 5. Entwistle VA, Carter SM, Cribb A, McCaffery K. Supporting patient autonomy: The
214 importance of clinician-patient relationships. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.
215 2010;25(7):741-745. Doi:10.1007/s11606-010-1292-2
- 216 6. Sedrakyan A, Shih C. Improving depiction of benefits and harms: Analyses of studies
217 of well-known therapeutics and review of high-impact medical journals. *Medical Care*.
218 2007;45(10 SUPPL. 2): S23-8. Doi:10.1097/MLR.0b013e3180642f69
- 219 7. Wegwarth O, Gigerenzer G. The barrier to informed choice in cancer screening:
220 Statistical illiteracy in physicians and patients. In: *Recent Results in Cancer Research*.
221 Vol 210. Springer New York LLC; 2018:207-221. Doi:10.1007/978-3-319-64310-
222 6_13

12

- 223 8. Iacobucci G. Conservative conference: May announces new cancer strategy to boost
224 survival rates. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)*. 2018;363: k4198. Doi:10.1136/bmj. k4198
- 225 9. Gigerenzer G, Gray JAM. *Launching the Century of the Patient*. (Gigerenzer G, Gray
226 JAM, eds.). The MIT Press; 2011. Doi:10.7551/mitpress/9780262016032.001.0001
- 227 10. Garcia-Retamero R, Cokely ET, Wicki B, Joeris A. Improving risk literacy in
228 surgeons. *Patient Education and Counseling*. 2016;99(7):1156-1161. Doi:
229 10.1016/j.pec.2016.01.013
- 230 11. Jenny MA, Keller N, Gigerenzer G. Assessing minimal medical statistical literacy
231 using the Quick Risk Test: A prospective observational study in Germany. *BMJ Open*.
232 2018;8(8): e020847. Doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-020847
- 233 12. Understanding Medical Research: Your Facebook Friend is Wrong | Coursera.
234 Accessed May 4, 2021. <https://www.coursera.org/learn/medical-research>.
- 235 13. Stanford Medical Statistics Certificate | Stanford Online. Accessed May 4, 2021.
236 <https://online.stanford.edu/programs/stanford-medical-statistics-certificate>
- 237
- 238

239 **TABLE 1. Participants educational background and survey results.**

n= 392	(IQR / standard deviation)
Medical training level	
Undergraduate	26.3 %
General Practitioner	26.0 %
Resident	11.3 %
Graduated Specialist	36.4 %
Years from medical graduation	6 (+/- 3)
Scientific papers read per week*	3 (+/- 2)
Self-perceived level of Methodological understanding.	55 (+/- 17)
Extra-curricular statistical training	21%
Test score (on a scale of 10)	2.6 (+/-1.4)
Test scores by medical training level	
Undergraduate	2.7/10 (+/- 1.5)
General Practitioner	2.2/10 (+/- 1.8)
Resident	3.4/10 (+/- 1.3)
Graduated Specialist	2.9/10 (+/- 1.4)
Overall tests score	2.6/10 (+/- 1.4)

240

241

242 **TABLE 2. Performance in every evaluated concept.**

Statistical concept	% of correct answers	% “I don’t know”
Sensitivity and Specificity	24 %	11 %
Positive and Negative Predictive Values	63 % & 15 %	3% & 12%
Statistical Power	32 %	16%
Sample Size	19 %	10%
Statistical Significance	37 %	31%
Absolute and Relative Risk	18%	21%
Bayesian clinical reasoning	45%	5%
Statistical correlation	31%	26%
Dependent and Independent probabilities	14 %	5%

243

244

245

246

247

248

249


250

251

15

252 **FIGURE 1. Test score across multiple time points.**

253



254

255

256 Timepoints were statistically different from baseline when compared with Friedman's Test

257

($p < 0.01$). $n = 16$.

Test scores across multiple time points

