



Benedetto, U., & Dimagli, A. (2020). Commentary: Too much ado about P value. *Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.02.027> [hideArticle Info](#)

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):  
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to published version (if available):  
[10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.02.027](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.02.027) [hideArticle Info](#)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)  
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier at <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2020.02.027> [hideArticle Info](#). Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

## University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

### General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:  
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/pure/about/ebr-terms>

## **Commentary: Too much ado about P-value**

Umberto Benedetto MD, PhD, Arnaldo Dimagli MD

Bristol Heart Institute, University of Bristol, United Kingdom

**The authors have no conflicts of interest.**

### **Corresponding Author:**

Umberto Benedetto

Office Room 84, Level 7,

Bristol Royal Infirmary, Upper Maudlin Street BS2 8HW, Bristol, United Kingdom

Tel. +44 (0) 117 3428854

email: [umberto.benedetto@bristol.ac.uk](mailto:umberto.benedetto@bristol.ac.uk)

**Word count: 371**

**Central message:** P-values do not provide clinically meaningful interpretation.

**Central picture:** P-values are far from being the source of thorough information that we believe.

For decades, research results have been strictly dichotomized into statistically significant or not significant, whether the p-value was below 0.05 or not. This method has been commonly used as a remark of the soundness of the study and used often as a major criterion on which the decision to submit a paper was based.

An evolving discussion in the definition of new statistical strategies to fill the power vacuum created by the extensive critiques addressed to the p-value is being debated [1, 2]. Many efforts still need to be taken in order to establish a new tool or a new plethora of statistical strategies, each suitable for different research questions. Hitherto, only a few journals are imposing new restricting rules about reporting the p-value, such as the New England Journal of Medicine [3].

The expert opinion by Prof. Visintainer [4] represents a valuable guidance to move beyond the robustly rooted misconduct of using statistical significance as a benchmark of the presence of an effect or an association. P-values are far from being the source of thorough information that we believe. For example, they do not relate to the extent of the clinical effect or do not tell the confidence we can have about the results. Confidence intervals can help interpreting results from a clinical perspective and providing more information regarding the precision of the estimate. Opposite to p-values which cannot be compared, confidence intervals can instead be compared regardless their statistical significance, and this can provide information on the consistency of treatment effect across studies thus supporting or disproving the original hypothesis.

However, confidence intervals may be mistakenly used just as the p-value if they are intended as an instrument to dichotomize conclusions and therefore used as proxy of p-value. Moreover, confidence intervals rely on the same statistical assumptions as p-value does, and therefore can provide distorted results in case of violation.

In conclusion, misconception continues to exist on whether the relevance of statistical association should only be interpreted on the basis of p-value. Cardiovascular research needs to rely upon robust and common rules of interpretability. Prof. Visintainer provided in his expert paper a guidance that should be taken into account by researchers aiming to successfully submit their research to JTCVS.

## References

1. Halsey LG. The reign of the p-value is over: what alternative analyses could we employ to fill the power vacuum? *Biol Lett.* 2019;15:20190174
2. Ronald L. Wasserstein & Nicole A. Lazar (2016) The ASA Statement on p-Values: Context, Process, and Purpose, *The American Statistician*, 2016;70:129-133.
3. Harrington D, D'Agostino RB, Gatsonis C, et al. New Guidelines for Statistical Reporting in the Journal. *N Engl J Med.* 2019;381:285-286.
4. Visintainer P., Moving Beyond Significance Testing: Confidence Intervals in Clinical Research, *JTCVS*, in press.