

CORRESPONDENCE

Open Access



Methodological issues on evaluating agreement between two detection methods by Cohen's kappa analysis

Ming Li¹ and Tianfei Yu^{2*}

Abstract

We read with great interest the article by Hendershot et al. (*Parasit Vectors* 14:473, 2021). The authors compared a PCR method for detecting *Plasmodium vivax*'s mitochondrial (mt) cytochrome oxidase I (COX-I) gene with the current "gold standard" circumsporozoite (CSP) ELISA for detecting circumsporozoite protein for identification of different life stages of *Plasmodium vivax* during development within *Anopheles arabiensis*. We found that Cohen's kappa value for measuring the agreement between mt COX-I PCR and CSP ELISA was questionable. In addition, we recommend a more appropriate statistical method in this article.

In short, any scientific conclusion requires support by the reasonable application of methodological and statistical methods.

Keywords: CSP ELISA, COX-I PCR, Plasmodium, Mosquitoes, Cohen's kappa

To the Editor,

We read with interest the article entitled: "A comparison of PCR and ELISA methods to detect different stages of *Plasmodium vivax* in *Anopheles arabiensis*," which was published in *Parasites and Vectors* on 15 September 2021 [1]. The authors compared a PCR method for detecting *Plasmodium vivax*'s mitochondrial (mt) cytochrome oxidase I (COX-I) gene with the current "gold-standard" circumsporozoite (CSP) ELISA for detecting circumsporozoite protein for identification of different life stages of *Plasmodium vivax* during development within *Anopheles arabiensis*. They evaluated the agreement between the results of the mt COX-I PCR and the CSP ELISA by using Cohen's kappa.

Generally, Cohen's kappa [2] is calculated as follows:

$$k_C = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^n u_{jj} (i i') - \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} p_{i'j}}{1 - \sum_{j=1}^n p_{ij} p_{i'j}} \quad (1)$$

The value of $u_{jj} (i i')$ is the proportion of objects put in the same category j by both raters i and i' . The value of p_{ij} is the proportion of objects that rater i assigned to category j , and k is the number of raters. Cohen suggested the k value be interpreted as follows: $k \leq 0$ as indicating no agreement and 0.01–0.20 as none to slight, 0.21–0.40 as fair, 0.41–0.60 as moderate, 0.61–0.80 as substantial, and 0.81–1.00 as almost perfect agreement [2]. According to the author's description, according to Cohen's interpretation for k value, the agreement between mt COX-I PCR and CSP ELISA was "fair" for mosquitoes bisected at 9–15 dpi in the head and thorax ($\kappa = 0.312$).

Although this article has provided valuable information, some substantial points that may lead to misinterpretation of the results need to be clarified. Unlike the authors, for 9–15 dpi, we calculated the agreement between mt COX-I PCR and CSP ELISA with SPSS 18

*Correspondence: yutianfei2001@163.com

² College of Life Science and Agriculture Forestry, Qiqihar University, Qiqihar 161006, China
Full list of author information is available at the end of the article



Table 1 Kappa values for calculating agreement between COX-I PCR and CSP ELISA for 9–15 dpi

Body part	CSP ELISA				k value
COX-I PCR					
Head and thorax	Positive	84	101	185	$k = 0.312$ ($k^* = 0.299$)
	Negative	5	78	83	
	Total	89	179	268	
Abdomen	Positive	79	97	176	$k^* = 0.304$
	Negative	6	83	89	
	Total	85	180	265	
Head and thorax + abdomen	Positive	163 (84 + 79)	198 (84 + 79)	361	$k^* = 0.302$
	Negative	11 (5 + 6)	161 (78 + 83)	172	
	Total	174	359	533	

The data are cited from the article published by Hendershot et al. [1] and underwent modification
 k in the table is the kappa value calculated by Hendershot et al., and k^* is the kappa value calculated by us.

statistical package (SPSS 18 Inc., Chicago, IL, USA) software. The kappa values in head and thorax and abdomen samples were 0.299 and 0.304, respectively. Furthermore, a simple sum of the data was performed, and the kappa value obtained was 0.302 (Table 1). Each of the three kappa values was different from the authors’ kappa value of 0.312. We would be grateful if the authors could explain their results in detail and clarify the misunderstanding.

Furthermore, McHugh [4] provided a more logical interpretation of k value: 0–0.20 = no agreement, 0.21–0.39 = minimal agreement, 0.40–0.59 = weak agreement, 0.60–0.79 = moderate agreement, 0.80–0.90 = strong agreement, and 0.91–1.00 = almost perfect agreement. McHugh stated that: “For percent agreement, 61% agreement can immediately be seen as problematic. Almost 40% of the data in the data set represent faulty data. In healthcare research, this could lead to recommendations for changing practice based on faulty evidence. For a clinical laboratory, having 40% of the sample evaluations being wrong would be an extremely serious quality problem. This is the reason that many texts recommend 80% agreement as the minimum acceptable interrater agreement. Given the reduction from percent agreement that is typical in kappa results, some lowering of standards from percent agreement appears logical. However, accepting 0.40 to 0.60 as ‘moderate’ may imply the lowest value (0.40) is adequate agreement.” Therefore, we also recommend the authors use McHugh’s interpretation to replace Cohen’s interpretation to analyze the kappa values. In a word, any scientific conclusion needs to be supported by the reasonable application of methodological and statistical methods. Using appropriate statistical

methods can improve the scientific nature of research results.

Acknowledgements
 Not applicable.

Author contributions
 ML conceived and prepared the first draft of the manuscript. TY critically reviewed the draft. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Funding
 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Availability of data and materials
 Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate
 Not applicable.

Consent for publication
 Not applicable.

Competing interests
 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author details
¹College of Computer and Control Engineering, Qiqihar University, Qiqihar 161006, China. ²College of Life Science and Agriculture Forestry, Qiqihar University, Qiqihar 161006, China.

Received: 14 June 2022 Accepted: 19 July 2022
 Published online: 29 July 2022

References

- Hendershot AL, Esayas E, Sutcliffe AC, Irish SR, Gadisa E, Tadesse FG, et al. A comparison of PCR and ELISA methods to detect different stages of *Plasmodium vivax* in *Anopheles arabiensis*. *Parasit Vectors*. 2021;14:473.

2. Conger AJ. Kappa and rater accuracy: paradigms and parameters. *Educ Psychol Meas.* 2017;77:1019–47.
3. Cohen J. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ Psychol Meas.* 1960;20:37–46.
4. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb).* 2012;22:276–82.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

