



# Systematic review and meta-analysis on laparoscopic cystectomy in bladder cancer: reply letter

Jialiang Zhu, Ziwen Lu, Wanbo Chen, Mang Ke, Xianguo Cai

Department of Urology, Taizhou Hospital of Zhejiang Province Affiliated to Wenzhou Medical University, Taizhou, China

Correspondence to: to: Xianguo Cai. No.150 Ximen Street, Linhai City, Taizhou, China. Email: mccaixianguo@126.com.

Response to: Tu J, Bao W, Ye X, *et al.* Laparoscopic radical cystectomy could be used in the clinical surgical treatment of bladder cancer patients. *Transl Androl Urol* 2022;11:731-2.

Submitted Mar 18, 2022. Accepted for publication Apr 10, 2022.

doi: 10.21037/tau-22-203

View this article at: <https://dx.doi.org/10.21037/tau-22-203>

We thank Tu *et al.* for their comments on the systematic review and meta-analysis: Systematic review and meta-analysis on laparoscopic cystectomy in bladder cancer (1). The mean difference (MD) is the difference between the mean of the experimental group and the mean of the control group, while standard mean difference (SMD) is the difference between the means of the experimental group and the control group divided by the mean standard deviation. In the paper, the weighted mean difference (WMD) and MD are used to analyze continuous variables. For the indicators with uniform units of statistical variables, MD is applied for analysis. For indicators with different units of variables, WMD is for analysis to eliminate the influence of units and to make MDs of different dimensions can be combined (2). However, there are no differences in the units of intraoperative blood loss, operation time, length of hospital stays, and usage of analgesics in the included literature, so MD is used in the main text for analysis.

In this paper, RevMan 5.3 software was used to analyze the data rate. For RevMan5.3 software, the relative risk (RR) refers to the ratio of the incidence of exposure factors in the experimental group to that in the control group. The odds ratio (OR) refers to the ratio of the exposure odds in two groups, which is the ratio of the number of cases that exposure factors occurred to that with no occurrence in the experimental group, to the ratio of the same in the control group (3). When the incidence of exposure factors studied is low,  $OR \approx RR$ ; therefore, RR can also be converted to OR and then merged (4). *Fig. 6* in the article represents a comparison of the blood transfusion rate of patients in the two groups. Since the incidence of blood transfusion is low

for the included research objects, the OR value is adopted for analysis.

## Acknowledgments

*Funding:* None.

## Footnote

*Provenance and Peer Review:* This article was commissioned by the editorial office, *Translational Andrology and Urology*. The article did not undergo external peer review.

*Conflicts of Interest:* All authors have completed the ICMJE uniform disclosure form (available at <https://tau.amegroups.com/article/view/10.21037/tau-22-203/coif>). The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

*Ethical Statement:* The authors are accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

*Open Access Statement:* This is an Open Access article distributed in accordance with the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0), which permits the non-commercial replication and distribution of the article with the strict proviso that no changes or edits are made and the original work is properly cited (including links to both the formal publication through the relevant DOI and the license).

See: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>.

## References

1. Zhu J, Lu Z, Chen W, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis on laparoscopic cystectomy in bladder cancer. *Transl Androl Urol* 2022;11:67-78.
2. Andrade C. Mean Difference, Standardized Mean Difference (SMD), and Their Use in Meta-Analysis: As Simple as It Gets. *J Clin Psychiatry* 2020;81:20f13681.
3. Doi SA, Furuya-Kanamori L, Xu C, et al. The Odds Ratio is "portable" across baseline risk but not the Relative Risk: Time to do away with the log link in binomial regression. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2022;142:288-93.
4. Xiao M, Chu H, Cole SR, et al. Controversy and Debate: Questionable utility of the relative risk in clinical research: Paper 4: Odds Ratios are far from "portable" - A call to use realistic models for effect variation in meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2022;142:294-304.

**Cite this article as:** Zhu J, Lu Z, Chen W, Ke M, Cai X. Systematic review and meta-analysis on laparoscopic cystectomy in bladder cancer: reply letter. *Transl Androl Urol* 2022;11(5):733-734. doi: 10.21037/tau-22-203