

References

1. Thompson SG. Systematic Review: Why Sources of Heterogeneity in Meta-Analysis Should Be Investigated. *BMJ*. 1994; 309(6965):1351.
2. Walter SD. Choice of effect measure for epidemiological data. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2000 Sep; 53(9):931-9.
3. Doi SA, Furuya-Kanamori L, Xu C, Lin L, Chivese T, Thalib L. Controversy and Debate: Questionable utility of the relative risk in clinical research: Paper 1: A call for change to practice. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2022 Feb;142:271-279. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2020.08.019.
4. Xiao M, Chen Y, Cole SR, MacLehose RF, Richardson DB, Chu H. Controversy and Debate: Questionable utility of the relative risk in clinical research: Paper 2: Is the Odds Ratio "portable" in meta-analysis? Time to consider bivariate generalized linear mixed model. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2022; 142:280-287. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.08.004.
5. Remiro-Azócar, A. Purely prognostic variables may modify marginal treatment effects for non-collapsible effect measures. 2022, arXiv:2210.01757v3.
6. Hong H, Chu H, Zhang J, Carlin BP. A Bayesian missing data framework for generalized multiple outcome mixed treatment comparisons. *Res Synth Methods*. 2016;7(1):6-22.
7. Wells, G.A. Commentary on controversy and debate 4 paper series: Questionable utility of the relative risk in clinical research, *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 2022, 142, 268-270.