so we used exact inference and calculated odds ratios by adjusting for trial. Summary results for each trial and a prespecified analysis plan, which facilitate reproduction of our results, are publicly available and cited within our article.

Prof Andrade points to a "substantial difference" between the crude odds ratio of 0.8 for suicidal behavior and the adjusted (reported) odds ratio of 1.2. The ability for the direction of the effect to differ in this way is widely known as *Simpson's paradox*[1] and highlights the importance of presenting adjusted estimates in preference to crude estimates that ignore important design factors, for example, differing randomization ratios between trials in a meta-analysis. Although the relative risk is often said to be easier to understand than the odds ratio, its choice can limit the ability to handle these issues because of the lack of suitable statistical methods or software.

REFERENCE

1. Simpson EH. The interpretation of interaction in contingency tables. *J R Stat Soc, B.* 1951;13:238–241.

David J. Carpenter, MSc, PharmD
Regan Fong, PhD
Regan.2.Fong@gsk.com
John E. Kraus, MD, PhD
John T. Davies, MSc
Christine Moore, PhD
Michael E. Thase, MD

Editor's note: The article discussed in these letters begins on page 1503.

Dr Carpenter and Colleagues Reply

To the Editor: The method used to calculate odds ratios for suicidality data was described in the statistical methods section of our article. The number of suicidality-related events in each trial was low, particularly for the Definitive Suicidal Behavior endpoint,