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## NOTHING TO DISCLOSE

## Observational Study Designs

- By definition, an observational study is one in which the investigator does not control "assignment" of the potential risk factor of interest (e.g., smoking, cytomegalovirus)
- Good company: Geology, Astrophysics, Ecology, etc.


## Observational Study Designs

## Cohort

- Case-control
- Traditional (case-based)
- Case-cohort


## Cohort study

## Losses to follow-up



Initial
cohort.......................................................................
cohort

## Basic Design of a Prospective (Cohort) Study (Observational)

First, classify cohort by
presence of exposure to the suspected risk factor:

| Exposure* |
| :---: |
| Positive |
| Negative |

(*Example: smoking during pregnancy)
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## Basic Design of a Prospective (Cohort) Study (Observational)

First, classify cohort by presence of exposure to the suspected risk factor:

Then, follow up subjects to see who develops event (e.g., congenital malformation in offspring)

| Exposure* |
| :---: |
| Positive |
| Negative |$\rightarrow$| Total |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1200 |
| $2=\equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv \equiv=$ |
| 2400 |

(*Example: smoking during pregnancy)

## Basic Design of a Prospective (Cohort) Study (Observational)

First, classify cohort by presence of exposure to the suspected risk factor:

Then, follow up subjects to see who develops event (e.g., congenital malformation in offspring)

(*Example: smoking during pregnancy)
Incidence of event (e.g., congenital malformation):
smokers: 60/1200=5\% non-smokers: 24/2400=1\%

## Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study

- Cohort (prospective) concurrent study to examine risk factors for subclinical and clinical atherosclerotic diseases
- Approximately 16,000 persons aged 45-64 yrs at baseline (1987-89)
- Multi-center: Jackson (all African-American), Forsyth County, NC (about 15\% African-American), Minneapolis (mostly white) and Washington County, MD (mostly white)
- Follow-up approaches: Periodic visits to ARIC clinic; Annual telephone interviews $\rightarrow$ hospital chart and death certificate reviews


## Design of the ARIC Study



## Age-, Field Center- and Race-Adjusted Average Annual Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) Incidence Rates/1000, ARIC Cohort Study

| Risk Factor | Women |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rate | Rate | Men |

Diabetes
Difference in CHD risk

| Yes |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 9.2 <br> 1.8between women and <br> men decreases <br> substantially when | $\left.\begin{array}{c}13.8 \\ 6.4\end{array}\right)$ |

Smoking diabetes is present

| Current | 5.3 | CHD risk of former |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Former | 11.6 <br> Never <br> smokers is similar <br> to that of never <br> smokers | 5.8 |

First and often best way to analyze data (George Comstock): Before carrying out complex modeling, look at the data and think about what you are seeing!

## Measuring an Association Between a Suspected Risk Factor and a Disease

Age-, Field Center- and Race-Adjusted Average Annual Coronary Heart Disease (CHD) Incidence Rates/1000, ARIC Cohort Study

| Risk Factor | Women |  |  | Men |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rate | RR | $\mathbf{A R}_{\text {exp }} / \mathbf{1 0 0 0}$ | Rate | RR | $\mathbf{A R}_{\text {exp }} / \mathbf{1 0 0 0}$ |

Diabetes

| Yes | 9.2 | 5.1 | 7.4 | 13.8 | 2.2 | 7.4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No | 1.8 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | Ref. | 6.4 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | Ref. |

Smoking

| Current | 5.3 | 4.1 | $\mathbf{4 . 0}$ | 11.5 |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Former | 1.6 | $\mathbf{1 . 2}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 3}$ | 5.8 |
| Never | 1.3 | $\mathbf{1 . 0}$ | Ref. | 4.7 |
|  | Relative Risk= $^{\text {Incidence }}{ }_{\text {exp }} \div$ Incidence $_{\text {unexp }}$ |  |  |  |

$R R>1.0 \rightarrow$ Factor may be a risk factor
$R R<1.0 \rightarrow$ Factor may be protective
$R R=1.0 \rightarrow$ No association

## Observational Study Designs

- Cohort
- Case-control
-Traditional (case-based)
- Case-cohort


## Traditional Case-Control Study

First, select cases with the disease of interest and disease-free controls:
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## Cases Controls

## Traditional Case-Control Study

Then, ascertain past history of exposure to the suspected risk First, select cases with the disease of interest and disease-free controls: factor:

|  | Cases | Controls |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Exposed | a | b |
| Unexposed | c | d |
| Total | $\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{c}$ | $\mathrm{b}+\mathrm{d}$ | CONTROL STUDY

Design

Known variable at study's outset

Unknown variable the study wishes to ascertain
Cohort
Presence of exposure to Incidence of the a suspected genetic or event (disease) environmental risk factor

## Risk factor $\longleftrightarrow$ Disease

For the traditional case-control study, the most important concept is that sampling of subjects for inclusion occurs at the end of a potential causal process

Design
Known variable at study's outset

Unknown variable the study wishes to ascertain

Past exposure to suspected risk factor

## HOW TO MEASURE AN ASSOCIATION IN A CASE-CONTROL STUDY

Odds Ratios for the association maternal smoking and isolated clubfoot in the offspring, Atlanta, Georgia, 1968-80

| Maternal smoking | Cases | Controls |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $132(a)$ | $866(b)$ |
| No | $214(\mathrm{c})$ | $2163(\mathrm{~d})$ |
| Total | $346(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{c})$ | $3029(\mathrm{~b}+\mathrm{d})$ |

Relative Risk is the ratio of incidence rates/probabilities. Incidence cannot be calculated in case-control studies, for which the measure of association is the Odds Ratio: ad/bc.

Honein et al. Family history, maternal smoking, and clubfoot: an indication of gene-environment interaction. Am J Epidemiol 2000;152:658-65.

## HOW TO MEASURE AN ASSOCIATION IN A CASE-CONTROL STUDY

Odds Ratios for the association maternal smoking and isolated clubfoot in the offspring, Atlanta, Georgia, 1968-80

| Maternal smoking | Cases | Controls | OR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $132(\mathrm{a})$ | $866(\mathrm{~b})$ | $(132 \times 2163) \div(866 \times$ <br> $2163)=1.54$ |
| No | $214(\mathrm{c})$ | $2163(\mathrm{~d})$ |  |
| Total | $346(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{c})$ | $3029(\mathrm{~b}+\mathrm{d})$ |  |

Relative Risk is the ratio of incidence rates/probabilities. Incidence cannot be calculated in case-control studies, for which the measure of association is the Odds Ratio: ad/bc.

Honein et al. Family history, maternal smoking, and clubfoot: an indication of gene-environment interaction. Am J Epidemiol 2000;152:658-65.

## HOW TO MEASURE AN ASSOCIATION IN A CASE-CONTROL STUDY

Odds Ratios for the association maternal smoking and isolated clubfoot in the offspring, Atlanta, Georgia, 1968-80

| Maternal smoking | Cases | Controls | OR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $132(\mathrm{a})$ | $866(\mathrm{~b})$ | $(132 \times 2163) \div 866 \times$ <br> $2163=1.54$ |
| No | $214(\mathrm{c})$ | $2163(\mathrm{~d})$ |  |
| Total | $346(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{c})$ | $3029(\mathrm{~b}+\mathrm{d})$ |  |

When the disease is relatively rare (e.g., <5\%), the Odds Ratio is a good estimate of the Relative Risk

Honein et al. Family history, maternal smoking, and clubfoot: an indication of gene-environment interaction. Am J Epidemiol 2000;152:658-65.

## Observational Study Designs

- Cohort
- Case-control
-Traditional (case-based)
- Case-cohort:
- A case-control study within a defined cohort


## Example of case-cohort study

Association between CMV antibodies and incident coronary heart disease (CHD) in the Atherosclerosis Risk in Communities (ARIC) Study
(Sorlie et al: Arch Intern Med 2000;160:2027-32)
Cohort: 14,170 adult individuals (45-64 yrs at baseline) from 4 US communities (Jackson, Miss; Minneapolis, MN, Forsyth Co NC; Washington Co, MD), free of CHD at baseline.

Followed-up for up to 5 years.

## Case-cohort study



Relative Risks of Coronary Heart Disease by Level of CMV Antibodies in the ARIC Study

## CMV, P/N ratio <br> Relative Risk (95\% CI)

$$
\begin{array}{cc}
0.0-1.9 & 1.00 \text { (reference } \\
2.0-3.9 & 0.82(0.40,1.68) \\
4.0-5.9 & 0.90(0.42,1.90) \\
6.0+ & 1.89(0.98,3.67)
\end{array}
$$

(Sorlie et al: Arch Intern Med 2000;160:2027-32)
Mathematically, the calculation of the odds ratio in a case-cohort study yields the relative risk

## Case-cohort Design



## "Effect Modification" or Interaction

| Maternal smoking | Cases | Controls | OR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $132(\mathrm{a})$ | $866(\mathrm{~b})$ | $(132 \times 2163) \div(866 \times 2163)=$ |
| No | $214(\mathrm{c})$ | $2163(\mathrm{~d})$ | 1.54 |


| Family history of <br> clubfoot | Maternal <br> smoking | Cases | Controls | Stratified ORs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Yes | 14 | 7 | 3.64 |
|  | No | 11 | 20 |  |
| No | Yes | 118 | 859 | 1.45 |
|  | No | 203 | 2,143 |  |

Honein et al. Family history, maternal smoking, and clubfoot: an indication of gene-environment interaction. Am J Epidemiol 2000;152:658-65.

## "Effect Modification" or Interaction

| Maternal smoking | Cases | Controls | OR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | $132(a)$ | $866(b)$ | $(132 \times 2163) \div(866 \times 2163)=$ |
| No | $214(c)$ | $2163(d)$ | 1.54 |


| Family history of <br> clubfoot | Maternal <br> smoking | Cases | Controls | Stratified ORs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Yes | Yes | 14 | 7 | 3.64 |
|  | No | 11 | 20 |  |
| No | Yes | 118 | 859 | 1.45 |
|  | No | 203 | 2,143 |  |

Honein et al. Family history, maternal smoking, and clubfoot: an indication of gene-environment interaction. Am J Epidemiol 2000;152:658-65.

Cohort Vs. Traditional Case-Control Studies

| ADV ANTAGES AND DISADV ANTAGES | COHORT | CASE-CONTROL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calculation of incidence rates and <br> direct calculation of Relative Risks? | Yes | No. Odds Ratios estimate <br> Rel. Risks for diseases <br> with incidence <5\% |
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## Cohort Vs. Traditional Case-Control Studies

| ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES | COHORT | CASE-CONTROL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calculation of incidence rates and <br> direct calculation of Relative Risks? | Yes | No. Odds Ratios estimate <br> Rel. Risks for diseases <br> with incidence <5\% |
| Length of study? | Long | Shorter |
| Assessment of multiple exposures? | Yes | Yes |
| Assessment of multiple diseases <br> (outcomes)? | Yes | Possible, but usually only <br> one case group is studied |
| Ability to assess rare outcomes (e.g., <br> Reye's sindrome, aplastic anemia) | Poor | Better |
| Ability to assess rare exposures (e.g., <br> asbestos) | Greater | Poor |

## Cohort Vs. Traditional Case-Control Studies

| ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES | COHORT | CASE-CONTROL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calculation of incidence rates and <br> direct calculation of Relative Risks? | Yes | No. Odds Ratios estimate <br> Rel. Risks for diseases <br> with incidence <5\% |
| Length of study? | Long | Shorter |
| Assessment of multiple exposures? | Yes | Yes |
| Assessment of multiple diseases <br> (outcomes)? | Yes | Possible, but usually only <br> one case group is studied |
| Ability to assess rare outcomes (e.g., <br> Reye's sindrome, aplastic anemia) | Poor | Better |
| Ability to assess rare exposures (e.g., | Greater | Poor |
| asbestos) | +++ | + |
| Cost? |  |  |

## Cohort Vs. Traditional Case-Control Studies

| ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES | COHORT | CASE-CONTROL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calculation of incidence rates and <br> direct calculation of Relative Risks? | Yes | No. Odds Ratios estimate <br> Rel. Risks for diseases <br> with incidence <5\% |
| Length of study? | Long | Shorter |
| Assessment of multiple exposures? | Yes | Yes |
| Assessment of multiple diseases <br> (outcomes)? | Yes | Possible, but usually only <br> one case group is studied |
| Ability to assess rare outcomes (e.g., <br> Reye's sindrome, aplastic anemia) | Poor | Better |
| Ability to assess rare exposures (e.g., <br> asbestos) | Greater | Poor |
| Cost? | +++ | + |
| Probab. of selection/information bias? | + | +++ |

## Cohort Vs. Traditional Case-Control Studies

| ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES | COHORT | CASE-CONTROL |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Calculation of incidence rates and <br> direct calculation of Relative Risks? | Yes | No. Odds Ratios estimate <br> Rel. Risks for diseases <br> with incidence <5\% |
| Length of study? | Long | Shorter |
| Assessment of multiple exposures? | Yes | Yes |
| Assessment of multiple diseases <br> (outcomes)? | Yes | Possible, but usually only <br> one case group is studied |
| Ability to assess rare outcomes (e.g., <br> Reye's sindrome, aplastic anemia) | Poor | Better |
| Ability to assess rare exposures (e.g., <br> asbestos) | Greater | Poor |
| Cost? | +++ | + |
| Probab. of selection/information bias? | + | +++ |
| Time sequence (exposure $\rightarrow$ outcome) | Clear | Can be unclear |

- Population attributable risk:

The excess risk in the population that can be attributed to a given risk factor.


- Population attributable risk: The excess risk in the population that can be attributed to a given risk factor.


Levin's formula:
\%Pop $A R=\frac{p_{\mathrm{e}}(R R-1)}{\mathrm{p}_{\mathrm{e}}(R R-1)+1} \times 100$
(Levin: Acta Un Intern Cancer 1953;9:531-41)

Prevalence of diabetes $=614 / 7289=0.084$

$$
\% \text { PopAR }=\frac{0.084(6.3-1)}{0.084(6.3-1)+1} \times 100=30.8 \%
$$

