

Index

Note to index: An *f* following a page number designates a figure; a *t* following a page number indicates a table.

- α [alpha], 380. *See also* hypothesis testing
- β [beta], 381–82. *See also* hypothesis testing
 - testing
- adherence, 168–71, 284–94
 - adherence assessment, 286–89
 - to clinical schedule, 289
 - with direct observation, 286–88
 - without direct observation, 288–89
 - efficacy *vs.* effectiveness, 284–86
 - ethical issues, 293–94
 - key points, 294
 - measures to improve, 289, 293
 - per protocol analysis, 285–86
 - See also* recruitment and retention
- allocation bias. *See* prognostic bias
- alternative hypothesis, 378. *See also* hypothesis testing
 - testing
- analysis bias, 212–13
- archiving requirements, 372
- assent, 39. *See also* informed consent
- assessor
 - bias, 211–12, 222
 - training of, 223–24
- authorization form for protecting data, 18, 36–37
- avoiding bias. *See* bias, avoiding
- Belmont Report, 16–17
- bias, 203–16
 - analysis bias, 212–13
 - assessor bias, 211–12
 - avoiding
 - assessment methods and training, 223–24
 - blinding (masking), 143–44, 221–22
 - data monitoring during study, 224–25
 - ethical issues, 225–26
 - key points, 226
 - population selection, 217–19
 - randomization, 143–44, 219–21
 - care provider bias, 210–11
 - in case-control study, 204–05, 218, 222, 307–08, 315
 - in cohort study, 222
 - common sources, 203–13
 - and data storage, 371
 - ethical issues, 214–15

404 Index

- bias (*cont.*)
- historical controls, 206, 219, 317–18
 - and hypothesis testing, 387
 - interpretation bias, 213
 - in interventional study, 143–44
 - in interviews, 219, 223
 - key points, 215–16
 - laboratory bias, 212
 - learning effect, 209–10, 224
 - non-differential bias, 214
 - overlap among types of, 203
 - participant bias, 208
 - prognostic bias, 204–06
 - publication bias, 203, 213, 215
 - random variation vs., 203
 - and randomization (*see* randomization)
 - recall bias, 208–09, 218–19, 301–02
 - rater bias, 211–12
 - selection bias, 206–08
 - underreporting as, 209, 308
 - See also* ethics; randomization; validity
- binary variables, 175, 190–91
- blinding, 258–69
- breaking the blind, 266–68
 - ethical issues, 268
 - hierarchy of, 259–66
 - complete blinding, 261–62
 - double-blind study, 260–61, 334
 - open-label study, 264–66
 - in interventional study (*see* blinding techniques for interventional study)
 - single-blind study, 262–64
 - key points, 269
 - level of blinding, multiple, 266
 - in observational study, 334–39
 - ethical issues, 338
 - key points, 339
 - maintaining the blind, 335–37
 - what to blind, 334
 - when not possible, what to do, 337–38
 - reasons to use, 143–44, 221–22, 258–59
- blinding techniques for interventional study, 270–83
- common problems maintaining blinding, 279–81
 - efficacy, 280
 - leaks and guesses, 281
 - side effects, 279–80
 - of data management staff, 275
 - ethical issues, 281–82
 - of intervention, 270–75
 - non-pharmaceutical intervention, 273–74
 - pharmaceutical intervention, 270–73
 - key points, 282–83
 - of laboratory staff, 274–75
 - of treatment, 270–75
 - non-pharmaceutical treatment, 273–74
 - pharmaceutical treatment, 270–73
 - treatment provision, 275–78
 - by institutional pharmacist, 276–77
 - by manufacturer, 276
 - by study team, 277–78
- blocking, 252–54
- benefits and pitfalls with, 254–55
 - and interim analyses, 253
 - reason for, 250
- breaking the blind, 266–68
- care provider bias, 210–11
- carryover effect, 75. *See also* crossover study
- case-cohort study, 127–28
- case-control study, 51–52, 95–103
- advantages of, 86, 100–01
 - basic design of, 95–97
 - bias in, 204–05, 208–09, 218, 222, 307–08, 315

405 Index

- cohort study *vs.*, 100–01, 127–29
- control groups, multiple, 96–97, 316
- concurrent *vs.* historical controls, 95
- data issues in, 114–15, 128–29
- disadvantages of, 100–01
- ethical issues, 102
- key points, 102–03
- matching in, 98–99, 321–33
 - frequency matching, 99, 328–29
 - individual matching, 98–99, 321–33
- nested, 99–101, 127
- participant recruitment, 128
- record reviews as, 112, 130, 132
- research question as determinant of, 54, 119–20
- resource issues, 124
- time considerations, 129
- uses of, 95
- variables in, 182
- verification of data, 371
- See also* case-control study, participant identification; matching
- case-control study, participant identification, 97–98, 307–20
- case identification, 97, 308–10
- control identification, 311–13
 - general considerations, 97–98
 - multiple control groups, 96–97, 316
- ethical issues, 319
- general considerations, 307–08
 - bias, 307–08, 315
- historical controls, 317–18
- inclusion and exclusion criteria for controls, 313–16
 - and bias, 315
 - and definition of “normal or healthy,” 155–56, 314–15
 - and definition of “standard,” 315
- key points, 319–20
- nested, 317
- sample size, 318–19
- special situations, 316–18
- case series study. *See* single arm study
- censored data, 193
- children
 - age as inclusion and exclusion criterion, 152
 - and assent, 39
 - exclusion from study, 158–59
 - and informed consent, 35, 38–39, 149, 158
- clinical equipoise, 121
- clinical importance *vs.* statistical significance, 380
- clinical trials, 52–53
 - phases of, 53
- code book, 362
- coding, data, 184, 191–92
- coercion, 37. *See also* informed consent
- cohort study, 50–51, 82–94
 - advantages compared to interventional study, 86–87
 - basic designs, 82–86
 - and blinding, 222
 - case-control study *vs.*, 100–01, 127–29
 - concurrent, 82–83 (*see also* prospective cohort study)
 - cross-sectional study *vs.*, 108
 - data problems in, 114
 - disadvantages compared to interventional study, 87–89
 - ethical issues, 92–93
 - historical, 82–83 (*see also* retrospective cohort study)
 - key points, 93–94
 - outcome variables, 192

406 Index

- cohort study (*cont.*)
- participant recruitment, 128, 299–300, 304–05
 - prognostic bias in, 205–06
 - prospective 82–83 (*see also* prospective cohort study)
 - retrospective cohort study, 82–83 (*see also* retrospective cohort study)
 - variables in, 181, 182, 192, 197
 - verification of data, 371
 - See also* cohort study, participant identification; record review
- cohort study, participant identification, 297–306
- comparative cohort study, 304–05
- data
- availability, 297–300
 - completeness, 302
 - quality, 300
 - in prospective study, 297–98, 299
 - in retrospective study, 298, 299
 - sources, 299
- ethical issues, 305–06
- key points, 306
- multiple cohort study, 304–05
- stratified sampling, 299–300
- study time line, 302–04
- Common Rule (The Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects), 17, 23, 118
- comparative cohort study, 86
- compensation for participants, 16, 30–31, 169
- compliance. *See* adherence
- computers
- and confidentiality, 372, 373
 - and data storage, 358–74
 - programs for, 249
- concomitant variables. *See* predictor and confounding variables
- confidentiality, 22
- in case-control study, 308–10
 - communication with participants
 - general, 171
 - and Internet communication with participants, 172
 - in cohort study, 305
 - and data storage, 371–73 (*see also* data storage: confidentiality)
 - informed consent, 31, 34
 - examples of, 34
 - record review, 118
 - during recruitment and retention, 171–72, 173
 - Study ID, 246, 343–44, 372
 - See also* informed consent
 - conflict of interest, 36
 - confounding variables. *See* predictor and confounding variables
 - consent. *See* informed consent
 - control group
 - in case-control study, 97–98 (*see also* case-control study, participant identification)
 - in comparative cohort study, 304–05
 - in interventional study (*see* randomization)
 - intervention, 229–36 (*see also* intervention, control)
 - convenience allocation as not randomization, 242
 - Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS), 15
 - crossover study, 48–49, 53, 74–77
 - AB/BA design, 74–75

407 Index

- ethical issues, 80
- participant recruitment, 76–77
- problems with, 75–76
- study question for, 63, 64
- cross-sectional study, 52, 104–10
 - cohort study *vs.*, 108
 - common problems in, 108–09
 - ethical issues, 109–10
 - key points, 110
 - See also* record review
- databases, 358–61
- data collection, 343–57
 - ethical issues, 355–56
 - key points, 356–57
 - Manual of Procedures (MOP), 176, 183, 351, 354
 - methods, 344–52
 - biological tests, 351
 - interviews (*see* interviews)
 - other types of procedures, 351–52
 - questionnaires (*see* questionnaires)
 - smartphones 345–46
 - tablets 345–46
 - noise in, 214, 392
 - Study ID, 246, 343–44, 372
 - See also* data storage; variables
- data dredging, 194, 212–13, 387
- Data Safety and Monitoring Board (DSMB), 14, 25–26, 213, 267, 280
- data storage, 184–85, 358–74
 - basic approaches to, 358–61
 - analysis programs, 361
 - relational databases, 359, 360–61
 - spreadsheets, 359, 360, 361
 - capturing data for storage, 365–67
 - confidentiality, 371–73
 - archiving requirements, 372
 - computer records, 372
 - and data sharing, 372–73
 - images, 372
 - participant right to withdraw use of data, 372
 - and Study ID, 372
 - documenting data, 362
 - ethical issues, 373
 - key points, 374
 - numeric *vs.* alphabetic codes, 369
 - program selection, 364–65
 - terminology for, 358
 - verifying data, 367–71
 - and bias, 371
 - abstraction of source documents, 367–68
 - comparison of computer data to original records, 368
 - consistency and plausibility, 367, 368–70
 - uncorrectable variables, 370–71
- Declaration of Helsinki, 15–16
- Department of Health and Human Services (HHS), 17, 18, 26, 38
- dependent variables. *See* outcome variables
- derived outcomes, 184, 190–92. *See also* outcome variables
- design development
 - interventional study, 69–71
 - multiple designs considered, 130–32
 - record review, 130–32
- design selection, 119–33
 - ethical issues, 132–33
 - interventional compared to observational design, 54–57, 86–89
 - interventional study, 120–24
 - development, example, 69–71
 - ethical issues, 120
 - practicality of, 123

408 Index

- design selection (*cont.*)
- adequate number of participants, 124
 - resource issues, 123–24
 - time issues, 123
 - selection of, 124–27
 - parallel group study, 125
 - pre-post study, 125–26
 - randomized vs. non-randomized, 125–26
 - single arm study, 125
 - key points, 133
 - multiple designs, 119–20, 130–32
 - observational compared to interventional
 - design, 54–57, 86–89
 - observational study, 127–30
 - adequate number of participants, 124
 - case-control vs. cohort study, 100–01, 127–29
 - ethical issues, 120
 - prospective vs. retrospective cohort study, 90–92, 127–30
 - resource issues, 123–24
 - time issues, 123
 - devices for data collection, 345–46
 - dichotomous variables, 175, 190–91
 - documentation. *See* authorization form for
 - protecting data; informed consent
 - document; institutional review board, approval
 - double-blind study, 260–61. *See also* blinding
 - dropouts
 - large impact in crossover study, 76
 - and number to be randomized, 247
 - DSMB, 14, 25–26, 213, 267, 280
 - economic issues
 - and blinding, 281
 - and generalizability, 141, 142
 - effectiveness, 284–86
 - efficacy, 284–86
 - elderly persons
 - recruitment of, 168
 - electronic devices for data collection, 345–46
 - endpoints. *See* outcome variables
 - equivalence study, 63, 392
 - errors, statistical. *See* hypothesis testing
 - ethics, 14–27
 - additional reading, 26
 - addressing before start of research, 12–13
 - adherence, 293–94
 - case-control study, 102
 - participant identification, 319
 - cohort study, 92–93
 - defining populations for, 305–06
 - compliance, 293–94
 - crossover study, 80
 - cross-sectional study, 109–10
 - data collection, 355–56
 - Data Safety and Monitoring Board, 14, 25–26, 213, 267, 280
 - data storage, 373
 - design selection, 120, 132–33
 - development of guidelines for, 14–18
 - international codes, 15–16
 - Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences, 15
 - Declaration of Helsinki, 15–16
 - Nuremberg code, 15
 - United States, 16–18
 - Belmont Report, 16–17
 - Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act, 17–18
 - National Research Act, 16–17
 - Standards for Privacy of Individually Identifiable Health Information, 17–18

409 **Index**

- duration of study, 194–95
- generalizability, 144–45
- informed consent, 42–43 (*see also* informed consent)
- interventional study, 80, 120
- IRB (*see* Institutional Review Board (IRB))
- key points, 26–27
- observational study, 92–93
 - blinding, 332–33
- outcome variables, 194–95
- placebos, 281–82
- principles, 18–22
 - fair subject selection, 20
 - favorable risk-benefit ratio, 21
 - independent review, 21
 - informed consent, 22 (*see also* informed consent)
 - respect for potential and enrolled subjects, 22
 - scientific validity, 19–20
 - social and clinical value, 18–19
- record reviews, 118
- recruiting and retaining participants, 172–73
- resources for additional information, 26
- safety variables, 185
- sample size, adequacy of, 400
- study design selection, 59–61
- study population, 158–59
- tissue samples, 41–42
- validity, 145
- variables, use of, 185
- examples. *See book website for searchable index*
- FDA, 18, 24, 215, 233
- The Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects (Common Rule), 17, 23, 118
- fetuses and neonates, 31, 40–41
- Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 18, 24, 26, 215, 233
- frequency matching, 328–29
- generalizability, 137–43
 - definition, 137
 - economic issues in, 141, 142
 - ethical issues, 144–45
 - key points, 145–46
 - and population studied, 137–40
 - study procedures, 140–43
 - assessment methods, 142–43
 - treatment and treatment monitoring, 140–42
 - See also* validity
- Health and Human Services (HHS), 17, 18, 26, 38
- Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)
 - and data protection, 36–37, 298
 - and informed consent, 31–32, 35, 305
 - purpose of, 17–18
- “healthy” control, definition of, 155–56, 314–15
- HHS, 17, 18, 26, 38
- HIPAA. *See* Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA)
- historical controls, 95, 206, 219, 317–18
- hypothesis driven research, 7, 11–12
- hypothesis testing, 377–89
 - alternative hypothesis, 378, 379–80
 - one-sided vs. two-sided, 379–80, 383, 388
 - criminal trial as analogy for, 377–78
 - ethical issues, 387–88
 - potential for bias, 387
 - testing until you find significance, 387–88
 - key points, 388–89
 - null hypothesis, 378, 379

410 Index

- hypothesis testing (*cont.*)
 overview of, 378–82
 P-value, 382, 383–84
 process for, 383–86
 power, 382
 reject vs. fail to reject null hypothesis, 378–79
 statistical significance
 vs. clinical importance, 380
 determining, 383–86
 Type I error, 380–81
 Type II error, 381–82
- inclusion and exclusion criteria. *See* study
 population
- independent review, 21
- independent variables. *See* predictor and
 confounding variables
- informed consent, 22, 28–43
 and coercion, 37
 and cohort study, 305
 and confidentiality, 31
 ethical issues, 22, 42–43
 exemption or postponement of, 42, 149
 and IRBs, 24, 42
 key points, 43
 process, 28–36
 consent document, 29–34
 interview, 34–36
 special populations, 38–41
 children, 35, 38–39, 149, 158
 persons unable to understand and agree to
 study, 39, 149, 158
 pregnant women, fetuses, neonates, 31,
 40–41
 prisoners, 41
 speakers of other languages, 35, 40
 for tissue sample use and retention, 41–42
- waiver of informed consent, 42, 118, 123
 and undue influence, 37–38
See also informed consent document;
 Institutional Review Board (IRB)
- informed consent document
 authorization form for protecting data, 18,
 36–37
 elements of, 30–32
 examples of text for
 confidentiality, 34
 investigator and participant interactions at
 end of study, 33
 procedures in study, 32–33
 restrictions on immediate withdrawal from
 study, 33–34
 language used in 29
 level of detail expected, 32–33
 and reading level of participant, 29–30
 release to use data, included in 18, 36–37
 templates for, 30, 32
- institutional questionnaires, 346
- Institutional Review Board (IRB), 14, 16, 18
 approval required for
 cross-sectional study, 109
 cohort study, 298, 305
 interventional study, 58, 123
 record review, 111, 115, 118
 composition of, 23–24
 establishment of, 23
 exemption or postponement of informed
 consent, 42, 149
 and financial compensation for participants,
 169, 173
 overview of, 23–24
 private for-profit, 23
 purpose of, 24
 responsibilities of, 24

411 Index

- and risk-benefit ratio, 58, 60–61
- and safety monitoring plan, 180
- and special populations, 38, 40
- and undue influence, 37–38
- and waiver of informed consent, 42, 118, 123
- See also* Data Safety and Monitoring Board (DSMB); ethics
- instrument, definition of, 345
- Internet communication with participants, 172
- interpretation bias, 213
- intervention, control, 229–36
 - describing, 234–35
 - active controlled study, 234
 - placebo controlled study, 234
 - ethical issues, 235
 - placebo control group, 235
 - key points, 235–36
 - problems in, 229–31
 - standard of care, 230–31
 - taking of medication, 229–30
 - selecting, 231–33
 - active control group, 231, 233
 - placebo control group, 231, 232–33
 - See also* interventional study
- interventional study, 62–81
 - advantages of, 57
 - bias in, 143–44
 - avoiding (*see* blinding techniques for interventional study)
 - types of
 - historical controls, 219
 - learning effect, 209–10
 - prognostic, 204
 - recall, 208
 - blinding in (*see* blinding)
 - blinding techniques for, 270–75 (*see also* blinding techniques for interventional study)
 - case series study, 64–66 (*see also* single arm study)
 - confounding variables in, 178
 - crossover study 74–77 (*see also* crossover study)
 - ethical issues, 59–61, 80, 120
 - focus of, 47
 - key points, 61, 81
 - outcome variables in 177 (*see also* outcome variables)
 - overview of, 47–49, 62–63
 - parallel group study 69–70 (*see also* parallel group study)
 - participants, all receive intervention, 64–68
 - with randomization
 - crossover study 74–77 (*see also* crossover study)
 - without randomization
 - pre-post study 77–79
 - single arm study, 47–48, 64–66 (*see also* single arm study)
 - participants, some receive intervention 68–74
 - parallel group study 69–70 (*see also* parallel group study)
 - participants with and without intervention, 74–79
 - with randomization
 - crossover study, 74–77 (*see also* crossover study)
 - without randomization
 - pre-post study, 77–79
 - predictor variables in, 196
 - pre-post study, 77–79
 - randomization in, 48
 - with randomized intervention

412 Index

- interventional study (*cont.*)
 crossover study, 74–77 (*see also* crossover study)
 parallel group study, 69–70 (*see also* parallel group study)
 without randomized intervention
 pre-post study, 77–79
 single arm study, 47–48, 64–66 (*see also* single arm study)
 and risk-benefit ratio, 122
 safety variables in, 179
 single arm study, 64–66 (*see also* single arm study)
 summary of, 47–49, 62–63
 time line for, 302–03
 variables in, 176–81
 confounding, 178
 outcome, 177
 predictor, 177–78, 196
 predictor *vs.* confounding variable, 181
 role of variables, 180–81
 safety, 178
 and verification of data, 371
See also randomization; blinding
- interviews
 and blinding, 336–37
 free-form, 348–51
 interviewer training, 350–51
 language issues, 351
 transcribing and coding, 349–50
 structured, 349
 and bias, reducing, 219, 223
 and cross-training of raters, 223–24
 as data collection instrument, 345
 scoring of, 349
- laboratory bias, 212
 language issues. *See* speakers of foreign languages
- learning effect, bias due to, 209–10, 224
 list matching, 325
- Manual of Procedures (MOP), 176, 183, 351, 354
 masking. *See* blinding
- matching, 321–33
 definition, 321
 ethical issues, 332–33
 frequency matching, 328–29
 index group, 322–23
 individual matching, 325–28
 choosing between eligible controls, 327–28
 using distinct characteristics, 327
 using scores, 327–28
 defining matching criteria, 325–27
 using difference score, 326
 using distinct characteristics, 325–26
 using propensity score, 326–27
 using variable scores, 326
 key points, 333
 list matching, 325
 practical issues, 329–32
 appropriate controls, lack of, 331–32
 data analysis, 332
 excessive matching criteria, 330
 overmatching, 329–30
 recruitment of controls from general population, 331
 selection of controls from databases, 330–31
 reasons to use, 321–22
 when done, 323–25
 in analysis phase, 324–25
 in recruitment phase, 323–24
- minimizing bias. *See* bias, avoiding
- National Commission for the Protection of
 Human Subjects of Biomedical and
 Behavioral Research, 16–17

413 Index

- National Institutes of Health (NIH), 23, 26
 neonates and fetuses, 31, 40–41, 152
 nested case-control study, 63, 99–101, 127
 NIH (National Institutes of Health), 23, 26
 noise in data, 214, 392. *See also* sample size
 non-differential bias, 214
 non-inferiority boundary, 233
 non-inferiority study, 63, 71–72, 392
 “normal” control, definition of, 155–56, 314–15
 null hypothesis, 378. *See also* hypothesis testing
 Nuremberg code, 15
- observational study
 bias in
 assessor, 211–12
 historical controls, 219
 prognostic, 204–06
 recall, 208–09
 blinding in, 334–39
 ethical issues, 338
 key points, 339
 maintaining the blind, 335–37
 what to blind, 334
 when not possible, what to do, 337–38
 case-control study, 96 (*see also* case-control study)
 case-control vs. cohort study 100–01, 127–29
 cohort study, 82–83 (*see also* cohort study; prospective cohort study; retrospective cohort study)
 cross-sectional study, 105 (*see also* cross-sectional study)
 designs for, 49–52
 ethical issues, 92–93, 102, 118
 and informed consent, 30
 key points, 93–94, 102–03, 110, 118
 record review, 115, 116 (*see also* record review)
 retrospective vs. prospective cohort study, 90–92, 127–30
 selection of exposures, 49–50
 variables, 181–82
See also case-control study; cohort study; cross-sectional study; prospective cohort study; retrospective cohort study
- Office for Human Research Protection (OHRP), 26
- open label extension, 73
 open label study, 264–66. *See also* blinding
 outcome variables, 177, 187–95
 and data recoding, 184, 191–92
 and data relevance, 188
 defining, 187–90
 derived, 188–89, 190–92
 changes over time, 192
 dichotomous outcomes, 190–91
 efficacy, distinguishing from safety variables, 187
 ethical issues, 194–95
 and frequency of measurements, 190
 in interventional study, 188, 198
 key points, 195
 multiple equally important, 189
 in observational study, 182, 189
 as predictor variables, 180–81, 197–98
 primary vs. secondary, 177
 safety variables as, 178, 180
 specifying in advance of study, 187–88, 194
 surrogate, 193–95
 time-related outcomes, 192–94
 time-to-event, 193
 time trends, 192–93
 unexpected results, 194
 overmatching, 329–30

414 Index

- paper-based questionnaires, 345
- parallel group study, 69–70
- basic design, 48–49, 68–74
 - and blinding, 68–69
 - and clinical trials, 53
 - drop out problem in, 70
 - ethical issues, 80
 - with extension, 73 72–73
 - intervention vs. control group in, 68
 - and randomization, 68, 73–74
 - selection of, 124–27
 - variables, uses of, 175–76, 188, 197, 198
- See also* interventional study
- pharmaceutical interventions
- and blinding, 261, 270–72, 276–77
 - and pregnancy, 155
- Phase 1 clinical trial, 53, 264–66
- Phase 2 clinical trial, 53
- Phase 3 clinical trial, 53
- Phase 4 clinical trial, 53
- PHI (Protected Health Information), 17–18
- pilot study, 264–66
- placebo control study, 231, 232–33, 234, 235
- placebos
- as control group 231, 232–33, 234, 235
 - ethical issues with, 281–82
- population. *See* special populations; study population
- post-marketing study, 53
- power, 382. *See also* hypothesis testing
- post-hoc matching, 324–25
- predictor and confounding variables, 178, 196–202
- confounding variables, 198–99
 - examples of, 199
 - in observational study, 182, 199
 - distinction between, 181, 199–200
 - ethical issues, 200–01
 - and excessive data collection, 201
 - need to collect, 185
 - in interventional study, 181
 - key points, 201–02
 - in observational study, 322
 - predictor variables, 177–78, 196–98
 - in interventional study, 196, 197, 198
 - outcome variables as, 180–81, 197–98
 - in observational study, 196
 - primary and secondary, 177–78
 - specifying in advance of study, 196, 200–01
- pregnancy
- and informed consent, 31, 40–41
 - and pharmaceutical interventions, 155
- pre-post study, 77–79
- prisoners, and informed consent, 41
- privacy 17–18, 24, 298, 372.
- See also* confidentiality
- authorization form for protecting data, 18, 36–37
- prognostic bias, 204–06, 219–21
- prognostic variables, 240, 249–50
- proof of concept study, 65
- propensity score, 326–27
- prospective cohort study, 82–83
- comparative cohort study, 86
 - data quality issues, 129
 - long-term outcome, example, 83–84
 - recruitment for, 297–98, 299
 - resource issues in, 124
 - vs. retrospective, 90–92, 127–30
 - routinely collected data for, 85
 - short-term outcome, example, 84–85
 - study time line for, 303
 - time issues in, 129
- See also* cohort study

415 Index

- Protected Health Information (PHI), 17–18
 Authorization Form for use of, 18, 36–37
 publication bias, 203, 213, 215
- question, research. *See* research question
- questionnaires, 345–48
 common problems, 108
 as data collection instrument, 345
 designing, 347–48
 electronic devices, 345–46
 formatting, 346
 institutional, 346
 language issues, 347–48
 minimizing recall bias, 219
 for subjective data, 346
- random variation, bias vs., 203
- randomization, 237–44
 assessor bias, 243
 and blinding, 238, 278
 convenience allocation is not, 242
 defining, 237–40
 to eliminate bias, 143–44, 219–21, 240–42
 prognostic bias, 238, 240, 241–42
 prognostic variable balance, 240, 249–50
 selection bias, 240–41
 key points, 244
 participant bias, 243
 reasons for, 242–43
 requirements for valid, 245–46
 treatment unknown until participant
 enrolled in study, 246
 techniques for (*see* randomization
 techniques)
 unequal, 253, 255–56, 399
- randomization techniques 245–57
 ethical issues, 256–57
 key points, 257
 randomization schedule
 adding special features to, 249–55
 blocking, 252–54
 benefits and pitfalls with, 254–55
 and interim analyses, 253
 reason for, 250
 creation of, 246–49
 randomization number, 246–47
 Study ID number, 246
 treatment assignment list, 248
 number of randomization numbers in, 247
 randomization numbers of dropouts are
 not reused, 248–49
 stratification, 250–52
 benefits and pitfalls with, 254–55
 defining strata, 250–51
 separate randomization schedule for
 each stratum, 251–52
 reason for, 250
- randomized interventional study. *See*
 interventional study
- randomized parallel group study. *See* parallel
 group study
- rater bias, 211–12, 222
- recall bias, 208–09, 218–19, 301–02
- recoding variables, 184, 191–92
- record review, 111–18
 data
 availability, 111–13
 problems, 114–15
 quality, 113
 design development, example, 130–32
 case-control study, 130, 132
 morphing into prospective cohort study,
 92, 131
 retrospective cohort study, 130–31

416 Index

- record review (*cont.*)
 ethical issues, 118
 IRB approval for, 111, 115
 key points, 118
 observational study, 52
 observational study, examples of, 115–18
 case-control study, 116, 117
 cross-sectional study, 115–17
 retrospective cohort study, 115–17
 recruitment and retention, 161–74
 as part of planning, 163–64
 longitudinal study, 163
 ethical issues, 172–73
 and generalizability, 137–40
 key points, 174
 methods, 164–68
 advantages and disadvantages of, 165–66
 from clinics, 164–66
 from cohort study, 128
 from databases, 330–31
 from general population, 166–67
 Internet, use of 171–72
 random digit dialing, 167–68
 right number for, 161–63
 flow of participants, example, 162
 websites, 167
 retention, 168–71
 and alternative contact methods, 171
 and financial compensation, 169, 173
 and long periods between study visits, 169–71
 methods to improve, 293
 study flexibility, 171
 right to leave the study, 173
 special populations, 168
 staff role, 163–64
 See also adherence
 reducing bias. *See* bias, avoiding
- relational databases, 359, 360–61
- research
 broad issues in, 3–4
 assessment of success, 4, 11–12
 capability to achieve goal, 4, 10–11
 justification of research, 4, 9
 reasons for doing, 3–4, 5–7
 ethical issues in, 12–13
 issues to address before starting, 3–13
 key points, 13
See also research question
- research question, 4, 7–8
 abstract as way to clarify, 7–8
 framing may limit designs, 54–57
 multiple designs possible for one, 119–20
 multiple research questions from a single
 study, 53–54
 impact on design selected, 53–57, 63–64,
 119–20
- resource issues, 123–24. *See also* economic
 issues; time considerations
- retention. *See* recruitment and retention
- retrospective cohort study, 82–83 90–92
 advantages of, 86–87
 data collection, 104
 data quality issues, 129
 vs. prospective cohort study, 90–92, 127–29
 resource issues, 124
 speed of results, 129
 study time line, 302–04
See also cohort study
- risk-benefit ratio, 21, 60–61
 and blinding, 268
 and Institutional Review Board (IRB), 58,
 60–61
 and interventional study, 122
 and randomization, 243–44

417 Index

- safety variables, 178
 and blinding, 266–67
 ethical issues, 185
 in interventional study 179
 in observational study, 181–82
- sample size, 390–401
 alternative way of thinking about, 398–99
 calculating, 391–92
 effect size, 392
 ethical issues, 400–01
 importance of, 390–91
 “just right” number for
 calculating, 391–92
 clinically important difference, 393–94
 magical thinking and, 398–99
 problem with, 393–94
 ways to decrease, legitimate, 394–97
 change endpoint, 394–95
 decrease power, 397
 modify statistical characteristics, 397
 reduce variability between individuals,
 396
 reduce variability of measurements,
 395–96
- key points, 401
 noise, 392
 ratio of, between different groups, 399–400
 variability, 392
- scientific validity, as ethical issue, 19–20. *See also* validity
- scoring of structured interviews, 349. *See also* raters
- selecting design. *See* design selection
- selection bias, 206–08
- single arm study, 47–48, 64 64–66
 clinical trial phase, 53, 65–66
 disadvantages of, 64 64–66
 more than one group, 67 66–68
 for rare disease with uniformly poor
 outcome, 65
 with sequential groups, 65–66
- single-blind study, 262–64. *See also* blinding
- speakers of foreign languages
 and informed consent, 35, 40, 148
 and questionnaires, 347–48
 recruitment of, 168
- special populations
 and informed consent, 38–41
 children, 35, 38–39
 persons unable to understand and agree to
 study, 39
 pregnant women, fetuses, neonates, 31, 40–41
 prisoners, 41
 speakers of other languages, 35, 40
 recruitment of, 168
See also study population
- spreadsheets. *See* data storage
- staff, importance of, 168–71, 289
- “standard” diet, defining, 315
- Standards for Privacy of Individually
 Identifiable Health Information
 (Privacy Rule), 17–18, 24, 298, 372
- storage stepped wedge design, 79
- statistical significance
 vs. clinical importance, 380
 determining, 383–86
See also hypothesis testing; sample size
- statistics, 12
 validity of, 144
- stepped wedge design, 79
- storage. *See* data storage
- stratification, 250–52
 benefits and pitfalls with, 254–55
 defining study strata, 250–51

418 Index

- stratification (*cont.*)
 implementation, 251–52
 reasons for, 250
- structured interviews
 bias reduced with, 219, 223
 as data collection instrument, 345
 example of, 150–51, 223
 scoring of, 349
 and training of assessors, 223–24
- study design, 47–61
 ethics and, 59–61
 key points, 61
See also design selection; interventional study; observational study
- Study ID, 246, 343–44, 372
- study population, 147–60
 ethical issues, 158–59
 coercion of family members to participate, 159
 exclusion of subgroups, 158–59
 informed consent, 158
 screening procedures, order of 159
- inclusion and exclusion criteria, 148–57
 ability to communicate with participant as, 157
 availability for study as, 157
 in case-control study, 313–16
 in comparative cohort study, 304–05
 contraceptives, 154–55
 demographics, 152
 diagnosis as, 150–52
 exclusion criteria, 148
 common categories of, 149
 family history, 154
 inclusion criteria, 148
 common categories of, 149
 informed consent, 148–49
 lifestyle factors, 156–57
 medical history, 153–54
 medications, 149
 physical examination, 152–53, 155–56
 suitability, 238
 individuals actually studied, 157–58
 key points, 159–60
 study group, 157–58
 study pool, 147
See also case-control study, participant identification; cohort study, participant identification
- superiority study, 63, 71, 379–80
- surrogate variables, 193–95
- time considerations, 123, 129
- time-related outcomes, 192–94
 time to event, 193
 time trends, 192–93
- tissue samples, 41–42
- Type I (α) error, 380–81. *See also* hypothesis testing
- Type II error (β), 381–82. *See also* hypothesis testing
- unbalanced randomization, 255–56
- unblinded study, 264–66. *See also* blinding
- underreporting of adverse events, 209, 308
- undue influence, and informed consent, 37–38
- unequal randomization, 253, 255–56, 399
- United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), 15
- United States Public Health Service, 23
- US Code of Federal Regulations (45 CFR 46.116), 37
- validity, 143–44
 definition, 137, 143
 drop-out rate, 70

419 **Index**

- ethical issues, 19–20, 145
- key points, 146
- in multi-site study, 354–55
- scientific, as ethical issue, 19–20
- and study population, 139–40, 143
- See also* generalizability
- variables, 175–86
 - baseline value of, 176
 - binary, 175, 190–91
 - in case-control study, 182
 - in cohort study, 181
 - confounding (*see* predictor and confounding variables)
 - defining, 175
 - dichotomous, 175, 190–91
 - ethical issues, 185
 - field in database, 358
 - in interventional study, 176–81
 - key points, 186
 - measuring, 183–84
 - in observational study, 181–82
 - ordered categorical, 175
 - outcome (*see* outcome variables)
 - predictor (*see* predictor and confounding variables)
 - prognostic, 240, 249–50
 - recoding, 184, 190–92
 - safety (*see* safety variables)
 - storing (*see* data storage)
 - surrogate, 193–95
 - types of, 175–76
 - unordered categorical variable, 175–76
- women
 - exclusion from study as ethical issue, 158
 - and informed consent, 31, 40–41
- World Health Organization (WHO), 15, 26
- World Medical Association, 15