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Preface

... If the whole materia medica, as now used, could be sunk to the bottom of the sea, it would be all the better for mankind, and all the worse for the fishes.

Oliver Wendell Holmes, Medical Essays, Comments and Counter-Currents in Medical Science

The history of drug regulation in the United States is a history of political responses to epidemics of adverse drug reactions, each adverse reaction of sufficient public health importance to lead to political pressure for regulatory change.

The initial law, the Pure Food and Drug Act, was passed in 1906. It was a response to the excessive adulteration and misbranding of the foods and drugs available then. The 1938 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was a reaction to an epidemic of renal failure resulting from a brand of elixir of sulfanilamide being dissolved in diethylene glycol. The 1962 Kefauver–Harris Amendments were a response to the infamous “thalidomide disaster,” in which children exposed to thalidomide in utero were born with phocomelia, that is with flippers instead of limbs. The resulting regulatory changes led, in part, to the accelerated development of the field of clinical pharmacology, the study of the effects of drugs in humans.

The 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s continued to see a series of accusations about major adverse events possibly associated with drugs, ranging from those discussed in the first edition of this book (liver disease caused by benoxaprofen, subacute myelo-optic-neuropathy (SMON) caused by clofazimine, neuroendocrine-neuropathy syndrome caused by practolol, acute flank pain and renal failure caused by suprofen, liver disease caused by ticrynafen, anaphylactoid reactions caused by zomepirac), to those added in the second edition (arrhythmias from astemizole; hypertension, seizures, and strokes from postpartum use of bromocriptine; deaths from fenoterol; suicidal ideation from fluoxetine; hypoglycemia from human insulin; birth defects from isotretinoin; cancer from depot-medroxyprogesterone; multiple illnesses from silicone breast implants; memory and other central nervous system disturbances from triazolam; arrhythmias from terfenadine; hemolytic anemia and other adverse reactions from temafloxacin), to the new list added in this edition (including liver toxicity from amoxicillin-clavulanic acid; liver toxicity from bromfenac; cancer and myocardial infarction from calcium channel blockers; arrhythmias with cisapride interactions; primary pulmonary hypertension and cardiac valvular disease from dexamethasone and fenfluramine; gastrointestinal bleeding, postoperative bleeding, deaths, and many other adverse reactions associated with ketorolac; multiple drug interactions with mibebradil; thrombosis from newer oral contraceptives; myocardial infarction from sildenafil; seizures with tramadol; eosinophilia myalgia from tryptophan; anaphylactic reactions from vitamin K; and liver toxicity from troglitazone). Recently published data also suggest that adverse drug reactions could be as much as the fourth leading cause of death. These and other serious but uncommon drug effects have led to the development of new methods to study drug effects in large numbers of patients. Academic investigators, the pharmaceutical industry, regulatory agencies, and the legal
community have turned for these methods to the field of epidemiology, the study of the distribution and determinants of disease in populations.

The joining of the fields of clinical pharmacology and epidemiology has resulted in the development of a new field: pharmacoepidemiology, the study of the use of and the effects of drugs in large numbers of people. Pharmacoepidemiology applies the methods of epidemiology to the content area of clinical pharmacology. This new field has become the science underlying postmarketing drug surveillance, studies of drug effects that are performed after a drug has been released to the market. In recent years, pharmacoepidemiology has expanded to include many other types of study, as well.

The field of pharmacoepidemiology has grown enormously since the publication of the first edition of this book. The International Society of Pharmacoepidemiology, simply an early idea when the first edition of this book was written, has grown to a major international scientific force, with over 1200 members from 57 countries, an extremely successful and well attended annual meeting, a large number of very active committees, and its own journal. At least four other journals have been founded as well, all competing to publish the work of this field, and a number of established journals have targeted pharmacoepidemiology manuscripts as desirable. As new scientific developments occur within mainstream epidemiology, they are rapidly adopted, applied, and advanced within our field. We have also become institutionalized as a subfield within the field of clinical pharmacology, with a vigorous Pharmacoepidemiology Section within the American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, and with pharmacoepidemiology a required part of the Clinical Pharmacology board examination.

Most of the major international pharmaceutical companies have founded special units to organize and lead their efforts in pharmacoepidemiology, pharmacoconomics, and quality-of-life studies. The continuing parade of drug safety crises continues to emphasize the need for the field, and some foresighted manufacturers have begun to perform prophylactic pharmacoepidemiology studies, in order to have data in hand and available when questions occur, rather than waiting until a crisis has developed. Pharmacoepidemiology data are now routinely used for regulatory decisions, and many governmental agencies have been developing and expanding their own pharmacoepidemiology programs. Requirements that a drug be proven to be cost-effective have been added to national, local, and insurance health care systems, either to justify reimbursement or even to justify drug availability. A number of schools of medicine, pharmacy, and public health have established research programs in pharmacoepidemiology, and in response to a crying need for more manpower, a few of them have also established pharmacoepidemiology training programs. Pharmacoepidemiology research funding is now more plentiful, and even limited support for training is now available. An international foundation was formed, with one of its missions to support pharmacoepidemiology work, and then disbanded.

In the United States, drug utilization review programs are required, by law, of each of the 50 state Medicaid programs, and have been implemented as well in many managed care organizations. In addition, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations now requires that every hospital in the country have an adverse drug reaction monitoring program and a drug use evaluation program, turning every hospital into a mini-pharmacoepidemiology laboratory. As this book goes to press, the United States is again debating whether Medicare should begin providing drug benefits, that is, paying for drugs for those over age 65. If it does, this should generate an enormous new interest in this field, as a major branch of the federal government becomes concerned about the costs of and effects of prescription drugs. Stimulated in part by the interests of the World Health Organization and the Rockefeller Foundation, there is even substantial interest in pharmacoepidemiology in the developing world. Yet, throughout the world, the increased concern by the public about privacy has made pharmacoepidemiology research much more difficult.

In the first edition, my goal was to help to introduce this new field to the scientific world. The
explosion in interest in the field, the rapid scientific progress that has been made, and the unexpected sales of the first edition led to the second edition. The continued maturation of what used to be a new field, the marked increase in sales of the second edition over the first, and the many requests I have had from people all over the world have now led me to organize this third edition. Much in the field has changed, and so much of the book has changed. Most chapters have been thoroughly revised. A number of new chapters have been added, and many new authors. Overall, the book has continued to expand in size, although with some careful pruning of old chapters, the net growth has been kept to only four chapters.

As in earlier editions, Part I of this book provides background information on what is included in the field of Pharmacoepidemiology, a description of the epidemiologic study designs it uses, a description of its unique problem—the requirement for very large sample sizes—and a discussion about when one would want to perform a pharmacoepidemiology study. Also included is a chapter providing analogous basic principles of clinical pharmacology. Part II presents a series of discussions on the need for the field, the contributions it can make, and some of its problems, from the perspectives of the Food and Drug Administration, the pharmaceutical industry, academia, and the legal community. Part III describes the systems that have been developed to perform pharmacoepidemiologic studies, and how each approaches the problem of gathering large sample sizes of study subjects in a cost-effective manner. A number of new data resources have been developed, others lost, and some lost and then revived, with changes occurring even as we go to press. Part IV presents state-of-the-art discussions of some particular methodologic issues and opportunities that have arisen in the field. These are of particular interest as the field continues to turn its attention to questions beyond just those of adverse drug reactions. Finally, Part V provides my personal speculations as to the future of the field. My expectation is that Parts I, II, III, and V of this book will be of greatest interest to the neophyte. In contrast, Parts II, III, IV, and V should be of greatest interest to those with some background, who want a more in-depth view of the field.

This book is not intended as a textbook of adverse drug reactions, that is a compilation of drug-induced problems organized either by drug or by problem. Several of these already exist. Rather, it is intended to elucidate the methods of investigating adverse drug reactions, as well as other questions of drug effects. It is also not intended as a textbook of clinical pharmacology, organized by disease or by drug, or of epidemiology, but a text describing the overlap between the two fields.

It is my hope that this book can serve both as a useful introduction to pharmacoepidemiology and a reference source for the growing number of people interested in this field—in academia, in regulatory agencies, in industry, and in the law. It will also hopefully be useful as a text for the numerous courses now under way in this field. I have been excited by the rapid progress and growth our field has seen, and delighted that this book has played a small role in assisting this. With this new edition, it will document the major changes the field has seen. In the process, my hope is that it can continue to serve to assist the field in its development.

Brian L. Strom, MD, MPH, 1999
Preface to the Second Edition

The field of pharmacoepidemiology has grown enormously since the publication of the first edition of this book. The International Society of Pharmacoepidemiology has grown from an idea held by a few diehard stalwarts to a major international scientific force, with over 900 members from 40 countries, an extremely successful and widely attended annual meeting, a large number of very active committees, and its own journal. At least four other journals have been founded as well, all competing to publish the work of this field, and a number of established journals have targeted pharmacoepidemiology manuscripts as desirable. As new scientific developments occur within mainstream epidemiology, they are rapidly adopted, applied, and advanced within our field. We have also become institutionalized as a subfield within the field of clinical pharmacology, with a vigorous Pharmacoepidemiology Section within the American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, and with pharmacoepidemiology a required part of the new Clinical Pharmacology board examination.

Most of the major international pharmaceutical companies have founded special units to organize and lead their efforts in pharmacoepidemiology, pharmaeconomics, and quality-of-life studies. Pharmacoepidemiology data are now routinely used for regulatory decisions, and many governmental agencies have been developing and expanding their own pharmacoepidemiology programs. Requirements that a drug be proven to be cost effective have been added to many national health care systems, either to justify reimbursement or even to justify drug availability. A number of Schools of Medicine, Pharmacy, and Public Health have established research programs in pharmacoepidemiology, and in response to a crying need for more pharmacoepidemiologists, a few of them have also established training programs. Pharmacoepidemiology research funding is now more plentiful, and even limited support for training is now available. An international foundation has been formed, and one of its missions is to support pharmacoepidemiology work.

In the US, drug utilization review programs are now being required, by law, of each of the 50 state Medicaid programs, and is being discussed as a nationwide requirement as part of national health reform. In addition, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations now requires that every hospital in the country have an adverse drug reaction monitoring program and a drug use evaluation program, turning every hospital into a mini-pharmacoepidemiology laboratory. Stimulated in part by the interests of the World Health Organization and the Rockefeller Foundation, there is even substantial interest in pharmacoepidemiology now in the developing world.

In the meantime, the parade of pharmacoepidemiology crises continues, including birth defects from isotretinoin; multiple illnesses from silicone breast implants; memory and other central nervous system disturbances from triazolam; hypoglycemia from human insulin; suicidal ideation from fluoxetine; deaths from fenoterol and maybe other beta agonist inhalers; cancer from depot-medroxyprogesterone; arrhythmias from terfenadine and
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astemizole; hypertension, seizures, and strokes from postpartum use of bromocriptine; multiple adverse reactions from temafloxacin; etc. These continue to emphasize the need for the field, and a number of manufacturers have begun to perform prophylactic pharmacoepidemiology studies, in order to have data in hand and available when questions occur, rather than waiting until a crisis has developed.

In the prior edition, my goal was to help to introduce this new field to the scientific world. The explosion in interest in the field, the rapid scientific progress that has been made, the remarkable and unexpected sales of the first edition, and the many requests I have had from people all over the world, have now led me to organize this second edition. Much in the field has changed, and so much of the book has changed. As before, this book is not intended as a textbook of adverse drug reactions; several of these already exist. Rather, it is intended to elucidate the methods of investigating adverse drug reactions, as well as other questions of drug effects. It is also not intended as a textbook of clinical pharmacology, or of epidemiology, but a text describing the overlap between the two fields. As in the previous edition, Part I represents an introduction to the field, and a presentation of basic scientific principles of clinical epidemiology necessary to be a pharmacoepidemiologist. In the current edition, a chapter has now been added, providing analogous basic principles of clinical pharmacology, thereby correcting an omission. Part II remains a presentation of multiple different perspectives on the field. A number of new data resources have been developed, others lost, and some lost and then revived, with changes occurring even as we go to press. This has led to a number of new chapters and some substitutions of chapters in Part III. There have been many major new methodological developments in the field, as well, including the further development of drug utilization review, meta-analysis, N-of-1 clinical trials, and studies of quality-of-life, leading to the addition of six new chapters to Part IV. In addition, five new chapters have been added to Part IV presenting state-of-the-art discussions of selected methodological issues of special importance to pharmacoepidemiology research, including the validity of measurements of drug exposure and disease outcome in pharmacoepidemiology research, study design issues particular to pharmacoepidemiology, biostatistical issues particular to pharmacoepidemiology, etc. In total, 17 of the 41 chapters in this edition are totally new, and many of the remainder have been thoroughly revised. Many new authors have been added, as well. Fortunately or unfortunately, in the process the book has substantially grown, as the field has grown.

In the previous edition, I had hoped that this book could serve as both a reference source and a textbook, and it appears that it indeed served both roles. My hope is that this will continue. As before, Parts I, II, and III of this book will be of greatest interest to the neophyte. In contrast, Parts II, III, and IV should be of greatest interest to those with some background who want a more in-depth view of the field.

I have been excited by the rapid progress and growth our field has seen, and delighted that this book has played a small role in assisting this. With this new edition, it will document the major changes the field has seen. In the process, my hope is that it can continue to serve to assist the field in its development.

Brian L. Strom, MD, MPH
January 1994
Preface to the First Edition

If the whole materia medica, as now used, could be sunk to the bottom of the sea, it would be all the better for mankind, and all the worse for the fishes.

Oliver Wendell Holmes
Medical Essays, “Comments and Counter”
Currents in Medical Science

The history of drug regulation in the US is a history of political responses to epidemics of adverse drug reactions, each adverse reaction of sufficient public health importance to lead to political pressure for regulatory change.

The initial law, the Pure Food and Drug Act, was passed in 1906. It was a response to the excessive adulteration and misbranding of the foods and drugs available then. The 1938 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was a reaction to an epidemic of renal failure resulting from a brand of elixir of sulfanilamide being dissolved in diethylene glycol. The 1962 Kefauver–Harris Amendments were a response to the infamous “thalidomide disaster,” in which children exposed to thalidomide in utero were born with phocomelia, that is with flippers instead of limbs. The resulting regulatory changes led, in part, to the accelerated development of the field of clinical pharmacology, the study of the effects of drugs in humans.

The 1970s and 1980s have also seen a series of major adverse drug reactions, from subacute myelo-optic-neuropathy (SMON) caused by cloquine, to the ocularmucocutaneous syndrome caused by practolol, to deaths from liver disease caused by ticrynafen, to deaths from liver disease caused by benoxaprofen, to anaphylactoid reactions caused by zomepirac, and to acute flank pain and renal failure caused by suprofen. These and other serious but uncommon drug effects have led to the development of new methods to study drug effects in large numbers of patients. Academic investigators, the pharmaceutical industry, the Food and Drug Administration, and the legal community have turned for these methods to the field of epidemiology, the study of the distribution and determinants of disease in populations.

The joining of the fields of clinical pharmacology and epidemiology has resulted in the development of a new field: pharmacoepidemiology, the study of the use of and the effects of drugs in large numbers of people. Pharmacoepidemiology applies the methods of epidemiology to the content area of clinical pharmacology. This new field has become the science underlying postmarketing drug surveillance, studies of drug effects which are performed after a drug has been marketed. In recent years, pharmacoepidemiology has expanded to include other types of studies, as well.

A new generation of pharmacoepidemiologists is now arising, much larger than the previous one, to join the field’s few pioneers. The growing interest in this field is demonstrated by the increasing attendance at the annual International Conference on Pharmacoepidemiology, which has been held each year in Minneapolis. It is also demonstrated by the recent development of two new journals, each claiming to have pharmacoepidemiology as a major focus. There are even tentative plans for the formation of a society of pharmacoepidemiologists.
A recent paper in a pharmacy journal called for instruction in pharmacoepidemiology for all doctor of pharmacy students. In the US, Medicare is about to begin providing drug benefits, that is, paying for the drugs for those over age 65. This should generate an enormous new interest in this field, as a major branch of the federal government becomes concerned about the costs of and effects of prescription drugs. In addition, there is discussion in the US of replacing the largest premarketing clinical trials of drugs (“phase 3” testing) with increased postmarketing surveillance, at least for selected drugs. This, too, will lead to a marked increase in interest in the field.

My purpose in writing this book is to document the current state of this new and growing discipline. Although pharmacoepidemiology studies have already made contributions of public health importance, the field has the potential to accomplish much more. However, it is difficult for anyone, even with experience in the field, to gain an overall perspective on its current status. There is no introductory text now available for the neophyte. I am regularly asked to recommend a book for someone who wants to learn about this field, but none has existed.

This book is not intended as a textbook of adverse drug reactions, that is a compilation of drug-induced problems organized either by drug or by problem. Several of these already exist. Rather, it is intended to elucidate the methods of investigating adverse drug reactions, as well as other questions of drug effects. It is also not intended as a textbook of clinical pharmacology, organized by disease or by drug, or of epidemiology, but a text describing the overlap between the two fields.

Specifically, Section I of this book will provide background information on what is included in the field of pharmacoepidemiology, a description of the epidemiologic study designs it uses, a description of its unique problem—the requirement for very large sample sizes, and a discussion about when one would want to perform a phar macoepidemiology study. Section II will present a series of discussions on the need for the field, the contributions it can make, and some of its problems, from the perspectives of the Food and Drug Administration, the pharmaceutical industry, academia, and the legal community. Section III will describe the systems that have been developed to perform pharmacoepidemiologic studies, and how each approaches the problem of gathering large sample sizes of study subjects in a cost-effective manner. Lastly, Section IV presents some particular methodological issues and opportunities which have recently arisen in the field. This is of particular interest as the field turns its attention to questions beyond just those of adverse drug reactions. My expectation is that Sections I, II, and III of this book will be of greatest interest to the neophyte. In contrast, Sections II, III, and IV should be of greatest interest to those with some background who want a more in-depth view of the field.

It is my hope that this book can serve both as a useful introduction to pharmacoepidemiology and a reference source for the growing number of people interested in this field—in academia, in regulatory agencies, in industry, and in the law. It will also hopefully be useful as a text for the growing number of courses being developed in this field.

Brian L. Strom, MD, MPH, 1986
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Part I

INTRODUCTION
What is Pharmacoepidemiology?

BRIAN L. STROM
Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA

A desire to take medicine is, perhaps, the great feature which distinguishes man from other animals.
Sir William Osler, 1891

In recent decades, modern medicine has been blessed with a pharmaceutical armamentarium that is much more powerful than what it had before. Although this has given us the ability to provide much better medical care for our patients, it has also resulted in the ability to do much greater harm. It has also generated an enormous number of product liability suits against pharmaceutical manufacturers, some appropriate and others inappropriate. In fact, the history of drug regulation parallels the history of major adverse drug reaction "disasters." Each change in pharmaceutical law was a political reaction to an epidemic of adverse drug reactions. Recent data indicate that 100 000 Americans die each year from adverse drug reactions (ADRs), and 1.5 million US hospitalizations each year result from ADRs; yet, 20–70% of ADRs may be preventable. To clarify what is, and what is not, included within the discipline of pharmacoepidemiology, this chapter will begin by defining pharmacoepidemiology, differentiating it from other related fields. The history of drug regulation will then be briefly and selectively reviewed, focusing on the US experience as an example, demonstrating how it has led to the development of this new field. Next, the current regulatory process for the approval of new drugs will be reviewed, in order to place the use of pharmacoepidemiology and postmarketing drug surveillance into proper perspective. Finally, the potential scientific and clinical contributions of pharmacoepidemiology will be discussed.

DEFINITION OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY

Pharmacoepidemiology is the study of the use of and the effects of drugs in large numbers of people. The term pharmacoepidemiology obviously contains two components: "pharmac" and "epidemiology." In order to better appreciate and understand what is and what is not included in this new field, it is useful to compare its scope to
that of other related fields. The scope of pharmacoepidemiology will first be compared to that of clinical pharmacology, and then to that of epidemiology.

**PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY VERSUS CLINICAL PHARMACOLOGY**

*Pharmacology* is the study of the effects of drugs. *Clinical pharmacology* is the study of the effects of drugs in humans (see also Chapter 4). Pharmacoepidemiology obviously can be considered, therefore, to fall within clinical pharmacology. In attempting to optimize the use of drugs, one central principle of clinical pharmacology is that therapy should be individualized, or tailored to the needs of the specific patient at hand. This individualization of therapy requires the determination of a risk/benefit ratio specific to the patient at hand. Doing so requires a prescriber to be aware of the potential beneficial and harmful effects of the drug in question and to know how elements of the patient’s clinical status might modify the probability of a good therapeutic outcome. For example, consider a patient with a serious infection, serious liver impairment, and mild impairment of his or her renal function. In considering whether to use gentamicin to treat his infection, it is not sufficient to know that gentamicin has a small probability of causing renal disease. A good clinician should realize that a patient who has impaired liver function is at a greater risk of suffering from this adverse effect than one with normal liver function.² Pharmacoepidemiology can be useful in providing information about the beneficial and harmful effects of any drug, thus permitting a better assessment of the risk/benefit balance for the use of any particular drug in any particular patient.

Clinical pharmacology is traditionally divided into two basic areas: pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics. *Pharmacokinetics* is the study of the relationship between the dose administered of a drug and the serum or blood level achieved. It deals with drug absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion. *Pharmacodynamics* is the study of the relationship between drug level and drug effect. Together, these two fields allow one to predict the effect one might observe in a patient from administering a certain drug regimen. Pharmacoepidemiology encompasses elements of both of these fields, exploring the effects achieved by administering a drug regimen. It does not normally involve or require the measurement of drug levels. However, pharmacoepidemiology can be used to shed light on the pharmacokinetics of a drug, such as exploring whether aminophylline is more likely to cause nausea when administered to a patient simultaneously taking cimetidine. However, this is a relatively unusual application of the field.

Specifically, the field of pharmacoepidemiology has primarily concerned itself with the study of adverse drug effects. Adverse reactions have traditionally been separated into those which are the result of an exaggerated but otherwise usual pharmacological effect of the drug, sometimes called *Type A reactions*, versus those which are aberrant effects, so called *Type B reactions*.³ Type A reactions tend to be common, dose-related, predictable, and less serious. They can usually be treated by simply reducing the dose of the drug. They tend to occur in individuals who have one of three characteristics. First, the individuals may have received more of a drug than is customarily required. Second, they may have received a conventional amount of the drug, but they may metabolize or excrete the drug unusually slowly, leading to drug levels that are too high. Third, they may have normal drug levels, but for some reason are overly sensitive to them.

In contrast, Type B reactions tend to be uncommon, not related to dose, unpredictable, and potentially more serious. They usually require cessation of the drug. They may be due to what are known as hypersensitivity reactions or immunologic reactions. Alternatively, Type B reactions may be some other idiosyncratic reaction to the drug, either due to some inherited susceptibility (e.g., glucose-6-phosphate dehydrogenase deficiency) or due to some other mechanism. Regardless, Type B reactions are the most difficult to predict or even detect, and represent the major focus of pharmacoepidemiologic studies of adverse drug reactions.

The usual approach to studying adverse drug reactions has been the collection of spontaneous reports of drug-related morbidity or mortality (see
Chapters 10 and 11). However, determining causation in case reports of adverse reactions can be problematic (see Chapter 32), as can attempts to compare the effects of drugs in the same class. This has led academic investigators, industry, FDA, and the legal community to turn to the field of epidemiology. Specifically, studies of adverse effects have been supplemented with studies of adverse events. In the former, investigators examine case reports of purported adverse drug reactions and attempt to make a subjective clinical judgement on an individual basis about whether the adverse outcome was actually caused by the antecedent drug exposure. In the latter, controlled studies are performed examining whether the adverse outcome under study occurs more often in an exposed population than in an unexposed population. This marriage of the fields of clinical pharmacology and epidemiology has resulted in the development of a new field: pharmacoepidemiology.

PHARMA COEPIDEMIOLOGY VERSUS EPIDEMIOLOGY

Epidemiology is the study of the distribution and determinants of diseases in populations (see Chapter 2). Since pharmacoepidemiology is the study of the use of and effects of drugs in large numbers of people, it obviously falls within epidemiology, as well. Epidemiology is also traditionally subdivided into two basic areas. The field began as the study of infectious diseases in large populations, that is, epidemics. More recently, it has also been concerned with the study of chronic diseases. The field of pharmacoepidemiology uses the techniques of chronic disease epidemiology to study the use of and effects of drugs. Although application of the methods of pharmacoepidemiology can be useful in performing the clinical trials of drugs that are performed before marketing, the major application of these principles is after drug marketing. This has primarily been in the context of postmarketing drug surveillance, although in recent years the interests of pharmacoepidemiologists have broadened considerably.

Thus, pharmacoepidemiology is a relatively new applied field, bridging between clinical pharmacology and epidemiology. From clinical pharmacology, pharmacoepidemiology borrows its focus of inquiry. From epidemiology, pharmacoepidemiology borrows its methods of inquiry. In other words, it applies the methods of epidemiology to the content area of clinical pharmacology. In the process, multiple special logistical approaches have been developed and multiple special methodologic issues have arisen. These are the primary foci of this book.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The history of drug regulation in the US is similar to that in most developed countries, and reflects the growing involvement of governments in attempting to assure that only safe and effective drug products were available and that appropriate manufacturing and marketing practices were used. The initial US law, the Pure Food and Drug Act, was passed in 1906, in response to excessive adulteration and misbranding of the food and drugs available at that time. There were no restrictions on sales or requirements for proof of the efficacy or safety of marketed drugs. Rather, the law simply gave the federal government the power to remove from the market any product that was adulterated or misbranded. The burden of proof was on the federal government.

In 1937, over 100 people died from renal failure as a result of the marketing by the Massengill Company of elixir of sulfanilamide dissolved in diethylene glycol. In response, the 1938 Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act was passed. Preclinical toxicity testing was required for the first time. In addition, manufacturers were required to gather clinical data about drug safety and to submit these data to FDA before drug marketing. The FDA had 60 days to object to marketing or else it would proceed. No proof of efficacy was required.

Little attention was paid to adverse drug reactions until the early 1950s, when it was discovered that chloramphenicol could cause aplastic anemia. In 1952, the first textbook of adverse drug reactions was published.
year, the AMA Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry established the first official registry of adverse drug effects, to collect cases of drug induced blood dyscrasias. In 1960, the FDA began to collect reports of adverse drug reactions and sponsored new hospital-based drug monitoring programs. The Johns Hopkins Hospital and the Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program developed the use of in-hospital monitors to perform cohort studies to explore the short-term effects of drugs used in hospitals9,10 (see Chapter 12). This approach was later to be transported to the University of Florida–Shands Teaching Hospital, as well.11

In the winter of 1961, the world experienced the infamous “thalidomide disaster.” Thalidomide was marketed as a mild hypnotic, and had no obvious advantage over other drugs in its class. Shortly after its marketing, a dramatic increase was seen in the frequency of a previously rare birth defect, phocomelia—the absence of limbs or parts of limbs, sometimes with the presence instead of flippers.12 Epidemiologic studies established its cause to be in utero exposure to thalidomide. In the United Kingdom, this resulted in the establishment in 1968 of the Committee on Safety of Medicines. Later, the World Health Organization established a bureau to collect and collate information from this and other similar national drug monitoring organizations (see Chapter 11).

The US had never permitted the marketing of thalidomide and, so, was fortunately spared this epidemic. However, the “thalidomide disaster” was so dramatic that it resulted in regulatory change in the US as well. Specifically, in 1962 the Kefauver–Harris Amendments were passed. These amendments strengthened the requirements for proof of drug safety, requiring extensive preclinical pharmacological and toxicological testing before a drug could be tested in man. The data from these studies were required to be submitted to FDA in an Investigational New Drug Application (IND) before clinical studies could begin. Three explicit phases of clinical testing were defined, which are described in more detail below. In addition, a new requirement was added to the clinical testing, for “substantial evidence that the drug will have the effect it purports or is represented to have.”

“Substantial evidence” was defined as “adequate and well-controlled investigations, including clinical investigations.” Functionally, this has generally been interpreted as requiring randomized clinical trials to document drug efficacy before marketing. This new procedure also delayed drug marketing until the FDA explicitly gave approval. With some modifications, these are the requirements still in place in the US today. In addition, the amendments required the review of all drugs approved between 1938 and 1962, to determine if they too were efficacious. The resulting DESI (Drug Efficacy Study Implementation) process, conducted by the National Academy of Sciences’ National Research Council with support from a contract from FDA, was not completed until relatively recently, and resulted in the removal from the US market of many ineffective drugs and drug combinations. The result of all these changes was a great prolongation of the approval process, with attendant increases in the cost of drug development, the so called drug lag.13 However, the drugs that are marketed are presumably much safer and more effective.

The mid-1960s also saw the publication of a series of drug utilization studies.14–18 These studies provided the first descriptive information on how physicians use drugs, and began a series of investigations of the frequency and determinants of poor prescribing (see also Chapters 29–31).

With all of these developments, the 1960s can be thought to have marked the beginning of the field of pharmacoepidemiology.

Despite the more stringent process for drug regulation, the late 1960s, 1970s, and especially the 1980s and 1990s have seen a series of major adverse drug reactions. Subacute myelo-optic-neuropathy (SMON) was found to be caused by cloquinol, a drug marketed in the early 1930s but not discovered to cause this severe neurological reaction until 1970.19 In the 1970s, clear cell adenocarcinoma of the cervix and vagina and other genital malformations were found to be due to in utero exposure to diethylstilbestrol two decades earlier.20 The mid-1970s saw the discovery of the oculomucocutaneous syndrome caused by practolol, five years after drug marketing.21 In 1980, the drug ticrynafen was noted to cause
of bromocriptine. Multiple different adverse reactions were linked to temafloxacin. In some of these examples, the drug was never convincingly linked to the adverse reaction. However, many of these discoveries led to the removal of the drug involved from the market. Interestingly, however, this withdrawal was not necessarily performed in all of the different countries in which each drug was marketed. Most of these discoveries have led to litigation, as well, and a few have even led to criminal charges against the pharmaceutical manufacturer and/or some of its employees.

Since the last edition of this book, drug crises have occurred due to allegations of liver toxicity from amoxicillin–clavulanic acid; liver toxicity from bromfenac; cancer, myocardial infarction, and gastrointestinal bleeding from calcium channel blockers; arrhythmias with cisapride interactions; primary pulmonary hypertension and cardiac valvular disease from dexfenfluramine and fenfluramine; gastrointestinal bleeding, postoperative bleeding, deaths, and many other adverse reactions associated with ketorolac; multiple drug interactions with mibefradil; thrombosis from newer oral contraceptives; myocardial infarction from sildenafil; seizures with tramadol; anaphylactic reactions from vitamin K; liver toxicity from troglitazone; and intussusception from rotavirus vaccine.

Thirteen different prescription drug products have been removed from the US market, since 1980 alone (see Chapter 8).

Each of these was a serious but uncommon drug effect, and these and other serious but uncommon drug effects have led to an accelerated search for new methods to study drug effects in large numbers of patients. This led to a shift from adverse effect studies to adverse event studies.

In part in response to concerns about adverse drug effects, the early 1970s saw the development of the Drug Epidemiology Unit, now the Slone Epidemiology Unit, which extended the hospital based approach of the Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program (Chapter 12) by collecting lifetime drug exposure histories from hospitalized patients and using these to perform hospital-based case–control studies (see Chapter 13). The year 1976 saw the formation of the Joint Commission...
on Prescription Drug Use, an interdisciplinary committee of experts charged with reviewing the state of the art of pharmacoepidemiology at that time, as well as providing recommendations for the future.\textsuperscript{91} The Computerized Online Medicaid Analysis and Surveillance System was first developed in 1977, using Medicaid billing data to perform pharmacoepidemiologic studies\textsuperscript{92} (see Chapter 19). The Drug Surveillance Research Unit, now called the Drug Safety Research Trust, was developed in the United Kingdom in 1980, with its innovative system of Prescription-Event Monitoring\textsuperscript{93} (see Chapter 14). Each of these represented major contributions to the field of pharmacoepidemiology. A number of additional resources have been developed more recently, and are discussed in Part III of this book, along with the more established resources.

The 1980s and especially the 1990s have seen another shift in the field, away from its exclusive emphasis on drug utilization and adverse reactions, to the inclusion of other recommendations as well, such as the use of pharmacoepidemiology to study beneficial drug effects, the application of health economics to the study of drug effects, quality of life studies, meta-analysis, etc. These new foci are discussed in more detail in Part IV of this book.

Recent years have seen increasing use of these data resources and new methodologies, with continued and even growing concern about adverse reactions. The American Society for Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics issued, in 1990, a position paper on the use of purported postmarketing drug surveillance studies for promotional purposes,\textsuperscript{94} and the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology issued, in 1996, guidelines for good epidemiology practices for drug, device, and vaccine research in the United States.\textsuperscript{95} In the late 1990s, pharmacoepidemiology research has been increasingly hampered by concerns about patient confidentiality\textsuperscript{96–100} (see also Chapter 26).

Organizationally, in the US, the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 allowed the US FDA to charge manufacturers a fee for reviewing New Drug Applications. This provided additional resources to FDA, and greatly accelerated the drug approval process. New rules in the US, and in multiple other countries, now permit direct-to-consumer advertising of prescription drugs. The result is a system where more than 330 new medications were approved by FDA in the 1990s. Each drug costs $300–500 million to develop; drug development will cost the pharmaceutical industry a total of $24 billion in 1999. Yet, funds from the Prescription Drug User Fee Act of 1992 are prohibited from being used for drug safety regulation. In 1998, whereas 1400 FDA employees worked with the drug approval process, only 52 monitored safety; FDA spent only $2.4 million in extra external safety research. This has coincided with the growing numbers of drug crises cited above. As another measure of drug safety problems, the FDA’s new MedWatch program of collecting spontaneous reports of adverse reactions (see Chapter 10) now issues monthly notifications of label changes, and as of mid-1999, 20–25 safety-related label changes are being made every month. According to a study by the US Government Accounting Office, 51% of approved drugs have serious adverse effects not detected before approval.

There is also increasing recognition that most of the risk from most drugs to most patients occurs from known reactions to old drugs. Yet, nearly all of the efforts by FDA and other regulatory bodies are devoted to discovering rare unknown risks from new drugs. In response, there is growing concern, in Congress and the US public at least, that perhaps FDA is now approving drugs too fast.\textsuperscript{101} There are also calls for the development of an independent drug safety board, analogous to the National Transportation Safety Board,\textsuperscript{102,103} with a mission much wider than FDA’s regulatory mission, to complement the latter. For example, such a board could investigate drug safety crises such as those cited above, looking for ways to prevent them, and could deal with issues such as improper physician use of drugs, the need for training, and the development of new approaches to the field of pharmacoepidemiology.

**THE CURRENT DRUG APPROVAL PROCESS**

The current drug approval process in the US and most other developed countries includes preclinical
animal testing followed by three phases of clinical testing. Phase I testing is usually conducted in just a few normal volunteers, and represents the initial trials of the drug in humans. Phase I trials are generally conducted by clinical pharmacologists, to determine the metabolism of the drug in humans and a safe dosage range in humans, and to exclude any extremely common toxic reactions which are unique to humans.

Phase II testing is also generally conducted by clinical pharmacologists, on a small number of patients who have the target disease. Phase II testing is usually the first time patients are exposed to the drug. Exceptions are drugs which are so toxic that it would not normally be considered ethical to expose healthy individuals to them, like cytotoxic drugs. For these, patients are used for Phase I testing as well. The goals of Phase II testing are to obtain more information on the pharmacokinetics of the drug and on any relatively common adverse reactions, and to obtain initial information on the possible efficacy of the drug. Specifically, Phase II is used to determine the daily dosage and regimen to be tested more rigorously in Phase III.

Phase III testing is performed by clinician–investigators in a much larger number of patients, in order to rigorously evaluate a drug’s efficacy and to provide more information on its toxicity. At least one of the Phase III studies needs to be a randomized clinical trial (see Chapter 2). To meet FDA standards, at least one of the randomized clinical trials usually needs to be conducted in the US. Generally between 500 and 3000 patients are exposed to a drug during Phase III, even if drug efficacy can be demonstrated with much smaller numbers, in order to be able to detect less common adverse reactions. For example, a study including 3000 patients would allow one to be 95% certain of detecting any adverse reactions that occur in at least one exposed patient out of 1000. At the other extreme, a total of 500 patients would allow one to be 95% certain of detecting any adverse reactions which occur in six or more patients out of every 1000 exposed. Adverse reactions which occur less commonly than these are less likely to be detected in these premarketing studies. The sample sizes needed to detect drug effects are discussed in more detail in Chapter 3.

**POTENTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

The potential contributions of pharmacoepidemiology are only beginning to be realized, as the field is new. However, some contributions are already apparent (see Table 1.1). In fact, since the early 1970s the FDA has required postmarketing research at the time of approval for about one-third of drugs. In this section of this chapter, we will first review the potential for pharmacoepidemiologic studies to supplement the information available prior to marketing, and then review the new types of information obtainable from postmarketing pharmacoepidemiologic studies but not obtainable prior to drug marketing. Finally, we will review the general, and probably most important, potential contributions such studies can make. In each case, the relevant information available from premarketing studies will be briefly examined first, to clarify how postmarketing studies can supplement this information.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION**

Premarking studies of drug effects are necessarily limited in size. After marketing, nonexperimental

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1.1. Potential contributions of pharmacoepidemiology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Information which supplements that available from premarketing studies—better quantitation of the incidence of known adverse and beneficial effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Higher precision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) In patients not studied prior to marketing, e.g., the elderly, children, in pregnant women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) As modified by other drugs and other illnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) Relative to other drugs used for the same indication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) New types of information not available from premarketing studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Discovery of previously undetected adverse and beneficial effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Uncommon effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) Delayed effects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Patterns of drug utilization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) The effects of drug overdoses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) The economic implications of drug use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(C) General contributions of pharmacoepidemiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Reassurances about drug safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Fulfillment of ethical and legal obligations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
epidemiologic studies can be performed, evaluating the effects of drugs administered as part of ongoing medical care. These allow the cost-effective accumulation of much larger numbers of patients than those studied prior to marketing, resulting in a more precise measurement of the incidence of adverse and beneficial drug effects (see Chapter 3). For example, at the time of drug marketing, prazosin was known to cause a dose dependent first dose syncope.\textsuperscript{105,106} but the FDA requested the manufacturer to conduct a postmarketing surveillance study in the US to quantitate its incidence more precisely.\textsuperscript{91} In recent years, there has even been an attempt, in selected special cases, to release selected critically important drugs more quickly, by taking advantage of the work that can be performed after marketing. Probably the best known example was zidovudine.\textsuperscript{107,108}

Premarketing studies also tend to be very artificial. Important subgroups of patients are not typically included in studies conducted before drug marketing, usually for ethical reasons. Examples include the elderly, children, and pregnant women. Studies of the effects of drugs in these populations generally must await studies conducted after drug marketing.\textsuperscript{109}

Additionally, for reasons of statistical efficiency, premaking clinical trials generally seek subjects who are as homogeneous as possible, in order to reduce unexplained variability in the outcome variables measured and increase the probability of detecting a difference between the study groups, if one truly exists. For these reasons, certain patients are often excluded, including those with other illnesses or those who are receiving other drugs. Postmarketing studies can explore how factors such as other illnesses and other drugs might modify the effects of the drugs, as well as looking at the effects of differences in drug regimen, compliance, etc.\textsuperscript{110}

For example, after marketing, the ophthalmic preparation of timolol was noted to cause many serious episodes of heart block and asthma, resulting in over ten deaths. These effects were not detected prior to marketing, as patients with underlying cardiovascular or respiratory disease were excluded from the premaking studies.\textsuperscript{111}

Finally, to obtain approval to market a drug, a manufacturer needs to evaluate its overall safety and efficacy, but does not need to evaluate its safety and efficacy relative to any other drugs available for the same indication. To the contrary, with the exception of illnesses that could not ethically be treated with placebos, such as serious infections and malignancies, it is generally considered preferable, or even mandatory, to have studies with placebo controls. There are a number of reasons for this preference. First, it is easier to show that a new drug is more effective than a placebo than to show it is more effective than another effective drug. Second, one cannot actually prove that a new drug is as effective as a standard drug. A study showing a new drug is no worse than another effective drug does not provide assurance that it is better than a placebo; one simply could have failed to detect that it was in fact worse than the standard drug. One could require a demonstration that a new drug is more effective than another effective drug, but this is a standard that does not and should not have to be met. Yet, optimal medical care requires information on the effects of a drug relative to the alternatives available for the same indication. This information must often await studies conducted after drug marketing.

NEW TYPES OF INFORMATION NOT AVAILABLE FROM PREMARKETING STUDIES

As mentioned above, premaking studies are necessarily limited in size. The additional sample size available in postmarketing studies permits the study of drug effects that may be uncommon, but important, such as drug-induced agranulocytosis.\textsuperscript{112}

Premarketing studies are also necessarily limited in time; they must come to an end, or the drug could never be marketed! In contrast, postmarketing studies permit the study of delayed drug effects, such as the unusual clear cell adenocarcinoma of the vagina and cervix which occurred two decades later in women exposed in utero to diethylstilbestrol.\textsuperscript{20}

The patterns of physician prescribing and patient drug utilization often cannot be predicted prior to marketing, despite pharmaceutical manufacturers’ best attempts to predict in planning for
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drug marketing. Studies of how a drug is actually being used, and determinants of changes in these usage patterns, can only be performed after drug marketing (see Chapters 29 and 30).

In most cases, premarketing studies are performed using selected patients who are closely observed. Rarely are there any significant overdoses in this population. Thus, the study of the effects of a drug when ingested in extremely high doses is rarely possible before drug marketing. Again, this must await postmarketing pharmacoepidemiologic studies.114

Finally, it is only recently that our society has become more sensitive to the costs of medical care, and only recently have the techniques of health economics been applied to evaluate the cost implications of drug use.115 It is clear that the exploration of the costs of drug use requires consideration of much more than just the costs of the drugs themselves. The costs of a drug’s adverse effects may be much more than the costs of the drug, if these adverse effects result in additional medical care and possibly even hospitalizations.115 Conversely, a drug’s beneficial effects could reduce the need for medical care, resulting in savings that can be much larger than the cost of the drug itself. As with studies of drug utilization, the economic implications of drug use can be predicted prior to marketing, but can only be rigorously studied after marketing (see Chapter 35).

GENERAL CONTRIBUTIONS OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY

Lastly, it is important to review the general contributions that can be made by pharmacoepidemiology. As an academic or a clinician, one is most interested in the new information about drug effects and drug costs that can be gained from pharmacoepidemiology. Certainly, these are the findings that receive the greatest public and political attention. However, often no new information is obtained, particularly about new adverse drug effects. This is not a disappointing outcome, but in fact, a very reassuring one, and this reassurance about drug safety is one of the most important contributions that can be made by pharmacoepidemiology studies. Related to this is the reassurance that the sponsor of the study, whether manufacturer or regulator, is fulfilling its organizational duty ethically and responsibly by looking for any undiscovered problems which may be there. In an era of product liability litigation, this is an important assurance. One cannot change whether a drug causes an adverse reaction, and the fact that it does will hopefully eventually become evident. What can be changed is the perception about whether a manufacturer did everything possible to detect it and, so, whether it was negligent in its behavior.
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Pharmacoepidemiology applies the methods of epidemiology to the content area of clinical pharmacology. Therefore, in order to understand the approaches and methodologic issues specific to the field of pharmacoepidemiology, the basic principles of the field of epidemiology must be understood. To this end, this chapter will begin with an overview of the scientific method, in general. This will be followed by a discussion of the different types of error one can make in designing a study. Next the chapter will review the “Criteria for the causal nature of an association,” which is how one can decide whether an association demonstrated in a particular study is, in fact, a causal association. Finally, the specific study designs available for epidemiologic studies, or in fact for any clinical studies, will be reviewed. The next chapter discusses a specific methodologic issue which needs to be addressed in any study, but which is of particular importance for pharmacoepidemiology studies: the issue of sample size. These two chapters are intended to be an introduction to the field of epidemiology for the neophyte. More information on these principles can be obtained from any textbook of epidemiology or clinical epidemiology. Finally, Chapter 4 will review basic principles of clinical pharmacology, the content area of pharmacoepidemiology, in a similar manner.

OVERVIEW OF THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD

The scientific method is a three stage process (see Figure 2.1). In the first stage one studies a sample of study subjects. Second, one generalizes the information obtained in this sample of study subjects, drawing a conclusion about a population in general. This conclusion is referred to as an association. Third, one generalizes again, drawing a conclusion about scientific theory or causation. Each will be discussed in turn.

Any given study is performed on a selection of individuals, who represent the study subjects. These study subjects should theoretically represent a random sample of some defined population. For example, one might perform a randomized clinical
trial of the efficacy of enalapril in lowering blood pressure, randomly allocating a total of 40 middle aged hypertensive men to receive either enalapril or placebo and observing their blood pressure six weeks later. One might expect to see the blood pressure of the 20 men treated with the active drug decrease more than the blood pressure of the 20 men treated with a placebo. In this example, the 40 study subjects would represent the study sample, theoretically a random sample of middle aged hypertensive men. In reality, the study sample is almost never a true random sample of the underlying target population, because it is logistically impossible to identify every individual who belongs in the target population and then randomly choose from among them. However, the study sample is usually treated as if it were a random sample of the target population.

At this point, one would be tempted to make a generalization that enalapril lowers blood pressure in middle aged hypertensive men. However, one must explore whether this observation could have occurred simply by chance, that is due to random variation. If this were true, then the observation might not have been made if one had chosen a sample of 40 different study subjects. Perhaps more importantly, it might not exist if one were able to study the entire theoretical population of all middle aged hypertensive men. In order to evaluate this possibility, one can perform a statistical test, which allows an investigator to quantitate the probability that the difference seen between the two study groups could have happened simply by chance. There are explicit rules and procedures for how one should properly make this determination: the science of statistics. If the results of any study under consideration demonstrate a statistically significant difference, then one is said to have an association. The process of assessing whether random variation could have led to a study’s findings is referred to as statistical inference, and represents the major role for statistical testing in the scientific method.

If there is no statistically significant difference, then the process in Figure 2.1 stops. If there is an association, then one is tempted to generalize the results of the study even further, to state that enalapril is an antihypertensive drug, in general. This is referred to as scientific or biological inference, and the result is a conclusion about causation, that the drug really does lower blood pressure in a population of treated patients. To draw this type of conclusion, however, requires one to generalize to populations other than that included in the study, including types of people who were not represented in the study sample, such as women, children, and the elderly. Although it may be obvious in this example that this is in fact appropriate, that may well not always be the case. Unlike statistical inference, there are no precise quantitative rules for biological inference. Rather, one needs to examine the data at hand in light of all other relevant data in the rest of the scientific literature, and make a subjective judgement. To assist in making that judgement, however, one can use the “Criteria for the causal nature of an association,” described below. First, however, we will place causal associations into a proper perspective, by describing the different types of error that can be made in performing a study and the different types of association that each results in.

**Types of Error One Can Make in Performing a Study**

There are four basic types of association that can be observed in a study (Table 2.1). The basic purpose of research is to differentiate among them.
First, of course, one could have no association.
Second, one could have an artificial association, that is a spurious or false association. This can occur by either of two mechanisms: chance or bias. Chance is unsystematic, or random, variation. The purpose of statistical testing in science is to evaluate this, estimating the probability that the result observed in a study could have happened purely by chance.

The other possible mechanism for creating an artifactual association is bias. Epidemiologists’ use of the term bias is different from that of the lay public. To an epidemiologist, bias is systematic variation, a consistent manner in which two study groups are treated or evaluated differently. This consistent difference can create an apparent association where one actually does not exist. Of course, it also can mask a true association.

There are many different types of potential bias. For example, consider an interview study in which the research assistant is aware of the investigator’s hypothesis. Attempting to please the boss, the research assistant might probe more carefully during interviews with one study group than during interviews with the other. This difference in how carefully the interviewer probes could create an apparent but false association, which is referred to as an interviewer bias. Another example would be a study of drug-induced birth defects which compares children with birth defects to children without birth defects. A mother of an abnormal child interviewed about any drugs she took during her pregnancy may be likely to remember drug ingestion during pregnancy with greater accuracy than a mother of a normal child, because of the unfortunate experience she has undergone. The improved recall in the mothers of the abnormal children may result in false apparent associations between drug exposure and birth defects. This systematic difference in recall is referred to as a recall bias.

Note that biases, once present, cannot be corrected. They represent errors in the study design which can result in incorrect results in the study. It is important to note that a statistically significant result is no protection against a bias; one can have a very precise measurement of an incorrect answer! The only protection against biases is proper study design.

Third, one can have an indirect, or confounded, association. A confounding variable, or confounder, is a variable other than the risk factor and outcome under study which is related independently to both the risk factor and the outcome variable and which may create an apparent association or mask a real one. For example, a study of risk factors for lung cancer could find a very strong association between having yellow fingertips and developing lung cancer. This is obviously not a causal association, but an indirect association, confounded by cigarette smoking. Specifically, cigarette smoking causes both yellow fingertips and lung cancer. Although this example is transparent, most examples of confounding are not. In designing a study, one must consider every variable which can be associated with the risk factor under study and the outcome variable under study, in order to plan to deal with it as a potential confounding variable. Preferably, one will be able to specifically control for the variable, using one of the techniques listed in Table 2.2.

Fourth, and finally, there are true, causal associations.

Thus, there are three possible types of error that can be produced in a study: random error, bias,
and confounding. The probability of random error can be quantitated using statistics. Bias needs to be prevented by designing the study properly. Confounding can be controlled in either the design of the study or in its analysis. If all three types of error can be excluded, then one is left with a true, causal association.

CRITERIA FOR THE CAUSAL NATURE OF AN ASSOCIATION

The “Criteria for the causal nature of an association” were first put forth by Sir Austin Bradford Hill,16 but have been described in various forms since, each with some modification. Probably the best known description of them was in the first Surgeon General’s Report on Smoking and Health,17 published in 1964. These criteria are presented in Table 2.3, in no particular order. No one of them is absolutely necessary for an association to be a causal association. Analogously, no one of them is sufficient for an association to be considered a causal association. Essentially, the more criteria that are present, the more likely it is that an association is a causal association. The fewer criteria that are met, the less likely it is that an association is a causal association. Each will be discussed in turn.

The first criterion listed in Table 2.3 is coherence with existing information or biological plausibility. This refers to whether the association makes sense, in light of other types of information available in the literature. These other types of information could include data from other human studies, data from studies of other related questions, data from animal studies, or data from in vitro studies, as well as scientific or pathophysiologic theory. To use the example provided above, it clearly was not biologically plausible that yellow fingertips could cause lung cancer, and this provided the clue that confounding was present. Using the example of the association between cigarettes and lung cancer, cigarette smoke is a known carcinogen, based on animal data. In humans it is known to cause cancers of the head and neck, the pancreas, and the bladder. Cigarette smoke also goes down into the lungs, directly exposing the tissues in question. Thus, it certainly is biologically plausible that cigarettes could cause lung cancer.18 It is much more reassuring if an association found in a particular study makes sense, based on previously available information, and this makes one more comfortable that it might be a causal association. Clearly, however, one could not require that this criterion always be met, or one would never have a major breakthrough in science.

The second criterion listed in Table 2.3 is the consistency of the association. A hallmark of science is reproducibility: if a finding is real, one should be able to reproduce it in a different setting. This could include different geographic settings, different study designs, different populations, etc. For example, in the case of cigarettes and lung cancer, the association has now been reproduced in many different studies, in different geographic locations, using different study designs.19 The need for reproducibility is such that one should never believe a finding reported only once: there may have been an error committed in the study which is not apparent to either the investigator or the reader.

The third criterion listed is that of time sequence—a cause must precede an effect. Although this may seem obvious, there are study designs from which this cannot be determined. For example, if one were to perform a survey in a classroom of 200 medical students, asking each if he or she were currently taking diazepam and also whether he or she were anxious, one would find a strong association between the use of diazepam and anxiety, but this does not mean that diazepam causes anxiety! Although this is obvious, as it is not a biologically plausible interpretation, one cannot differentiate from this type of cross-sectional study

Table 2.3. Criteria for the causal nature of an association

| (1) | Coherence with existing information (biological plausibility) |
| (2) | Consistency of the association |
| (3) | Time sequence |
| (4) | Specificity of the association |
| (5) | Strength of the association |
|     | (a) Quantitative strength |
|     | (b) Dose–response relationship |
|     | (c) Study design |
which variable came first and which came second. In the example of cigarettes and lung cancer, obviously the cigarette smoking usually precedes the lung cancer, as a patient would not survive long enough to smoke much if the opposite were the case.

The fourth criterion listed in Table 2.3 is specificity. This refers to the question of whether the cause ever occurs without the presumed effect and whether the effect ever occurs without the presumed cause. This criterion is almost never met in biology, with the occasional exception of infectious diseases. Measles never occurs without the measles virus, but even in this example not everyone who gets infected with the measles virus develops clinical measles. Certainly, not everyone who smokes develops lung cancer, and not everyone who develops lung cancer was a smoker. This is one of the major points the tobacco industry stresses when it attempts to make the claim that cigarette smoking has not been proven to cause lung cancer. Some authors even omit this as a criterion, as it is so rarely met. When it is met, however, it provides extremely strong support for a conclusion that an association is causal.

The fifth criterion listed in Table 2.3 is the strength of the association. This includes three concepts: its quantitative strength, dose–response, and the study design. Each will be discussed in turn.

The quantitative strength of an association refers to its size. To evaluate this, one asks whether the magnitude of the difference between the two study groups is large. A quantitatively large association can only be created by a causal association or a large error, which should be apparent in evaluating the methodology of a study. A quantitatively small association may still be causal, but it could be created by a subtle error, which would not be apparent in evaluating the study. Conventionally, epidemiologists consider an association with a relative risk of less than 2.0 a weak association. Certainly, the association between cigarette smoking and lung cancer is a strong association: studies show relative risks ranging between 10.0 and 30.0.19

A dose–response relationship is an extremely important and commonly used concept in clinical pharmacology and is used similarly in epidemiology. A dose–response relationship exists when an increase in the intensity of an exposure results in an increased risk of the disease under study. Equivalent to this is a duration–response relationship, which exists when a longer exposure causes an increased risk of the disease. The presence of either a dose–response relationship or a duration–response relationship strongly implies that an association is, in fact, a causal association. Certainly in the example of cigarette smoking and lung cancer, it has been shown repeatedly that an increase in either the number of cigarettes smoked each day or in the number of years of smoking increases the risk of developing lung cancer.19

Finally, study design refers to two concepts, whether the study was well designed and which study design was used in the studies in question. The former refers to whether the study was subject to one of the three errors described earlier in this chapter, namely random error, bias, or confounding. Table 2.4 presents the study designs typically used for epidemiologic studies, or in fact for any clinical studies. They are organized in a hierarchical fashion. As one goes from the designs at the bottom of the table to those at the top of the table, studies get progressively harder to perform, but are progressively more convincing. In other words, associations shown by studies using designs at the top of the list are more likely to be causal associations than associations shown by studies using designs at the bottom of the list. The association between cigarette smoking and lung cancer has been reproduced in multiple well designed studies, using analyses of secular trends, case–control studies, and cohort studies. However, it has not been shown using a randomized clinical trial, which is the “Cadillac” of study designs, as will be discussed below. This is the other major defense used by the tobacco industry. Of course, it would not be ethical nor logistically feasible to randomly allocate individuals to smoke or not to smoke and expect them to follow that for 20 years.

The issue of causation is discussed more in Chapter 9 as it relates to litigation, in Chapters 10 and 11 as it relates to the process of spontaneous
Table 2.4. Advantages and disadvantages of epidemiologic study designs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Randomized clinical trial</td>
<td>Most convincing design</td>
<td>Most expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(experimental study)</td>
<td>Only design which controls for unknown</td>
<td>Artificial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or unmeasurable confounders</td>
<td>Logistically most difficult</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical objections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohort study</td>
<td>Can study multiple outcomes</td>
<td>Possibly biased outcome data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can study uncommon exposures</td>
<td>More expensive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selection bias less likely</td>
<td>If done prospectively, may take years to complete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unbiased exposure data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Incidence data available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case–control study</td>
<td>Can study multiple exposures</td>
<td>Control selection problematic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Can study uncommon diseases</td>
<td>Possibly biased exposure data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logistically easier and faster</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Less expensive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analyses of secular trends</td>
<td>Can provide rapid answers</td>
<td>No control of confounding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case series</td>
<td>Easy quantitation of incidence</td>
<td>No control group, so cannot be used for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hypothesis testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case reports</td>
<td>Cheap and easy method for generating hypotheses</td>
<td>Cannot be used for testing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

reporting of adverse drug reactions, and in Chapter 32 as it relates to determining causation in case reports.

**EPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDY DESIGNS**

In order to clarify the concept of study design further, each of the designs in Table 2.4 will be discussed in turn, starting at the bottom of the list and working upwards.

**CASE REPORTS**

Case reports are simply reports of single patients. As used in pharmacoepidemiology, a case report describes a single patient who was exposed to a drug and experiences a particular, usually adverse, outcome. For example, one might see a published case report about a young woman who was taking oral contraceptives and who suffered a pulmonary embolism.

Case reports are useful for raising hypotheses about drug effects, to be tested with more rigorous study designs. However, in a case report one cannot know if the patient reported is either typical of those with the exposure or typical of those with the disease. Certainly, one cannot usually determine whether the adverse outcome was due to the drug exposure or would have happened anyway. As such, it is very rare that a case report can be used to make a statement about causation. One exception to this would be when the outcome is so rare and so characteristic of the exposure that one knows that it was likely to be due to the exposure, even if the history of exposure were unclear. An example of this which has become apparent in the relatively recent past is clear cell vaginal adenocarcinoma occurring in young women exposed in utero to diethylstilbestrol. Another exception would be when the disease course is very predictable and the treatment causes a clearly apparent change in this disease course. An example would be the ability of penicillin to cure streptococcal endocarditis, a disease which is nearly uniformly fatal in the absence of treatment. Case reports can be particularly useful to document causation when the treatment causes a change in disease course which is reversible, such that the patient returns to his or
her untreated state when the exposure is withdrawn, can be treated again, and when the change returns upon repeat treatment. Consider a patient who is suffering from an overdose of methadone, a long-acting narcotic, and is comatose. If this patient is then treated with naloxone, a narcotic antagonist, and immediately awakens, this would be very suggestive that the drug indeed is efficacious as a narcotic antagonist. As the naloxone wears off the patient will become comatose again, and then if he or she is given another dose of naloxone the patient will awaken again. This, especially if repeated a few times, would represent strong evidence that the drug is indeed effective as a narcotic antagonist. This type of challenge–rechallenge situation is relatively uncommon, however, as physicians generally will avoid exposing a patient to a drug if the patient experienced an adverse reaction to it in the past. This issue is discussed in more detail in Chapters 10, 11, and 32.

CASE SERIES

Case series are collections of patients, all of whom have a single exposure, whose clinical outcomes are then evaluated and described. Often they are from a single hospital or medical practice. Alternatively, case series can be collections of patients with a single outcome, looking at their antecedent exposures. For example, one might observe 100 consecutive women under the age of 50 who suffer from a pulmonary embolism, and note that 30 of them had been taking oral contraceptives.

After drug marketing, case series are most useful for two related purposes. First, they can be useful for quantifying the incidence of an adverse reaction. Second, they can be useful for being certain that any particular adverse effect of concern does not occur in a population which is larger than that studied prior to drug marketing. The so-called “Phase IV” postmarketing surveillance study of prazosin was conducted for the former reason, to quantitate the incidence of first dose syncope from prazosin.21 The “Phase IV” postmarketing surveillance study of cimetidine22 was conducted for the latter reason. Metiamide was an H-2 blocker which was withdrawn after marketing outside the US because it caused agranulocytosis. Since cimetidine is chemically related to metiamide there was a concern that cimetidine might also cause agranulocytosis. In both examples, the manufacturer asked its sales representatives to recruit physicians to participate in the study. Each participating physician then enrolled the next series of patients for whom the drug was prescribed.

In this type of study, one can be more certain that the patients are probably typical of those with the exposure or with the disease, depending on the focus of the study. However, in the absence of a control group, one cannot be certain which features in the description of the patients are unique to the exposure, or outcome. As an example, one might have a case series from a particular hospital of 100 individuals with a certain disease, and note that all were men over the age of 60. This might lead one to conclude that this disease seems to be associated with being a man over the age of 60. However, it would be clear that this would be an incorrect conclusion once one noted that the hospital this case series was drawn from was a Veterans Administration hospital, where most patients are men over the age of 60. In the previous example of pulmonary embolism and oral contraceptives, 30% of the women with pulmonary embolism had been using oral contraceptives. However, this information is not sufficient to determine whether this is higher, the same as, or even lower than would have been expected. For this reason, case series are also not very useful in determining causation, but provide clinical descriptions of a disease or of patients who receive an exposure.

ANALYSES OF SECULAR TRENDS

Analyses of secular trends, also called “ecological studies,” examine trends in an exposure that is a presumed cause and trends in a disease that is a presumed effect and test whether the trends coincide. These trends can be examined over time or across geographic boundaries. In other words, one could analyze data from a single region and examine how it changes over time, or one could analyze data from a single time period and
compare how the data differ from region to region or country to country. Vital statistics are often used for these studies. As an example, one might look at sales data for oral contraceptives and compare them to death rates from venous thromboembolism, using recorded vital statistics. When such a study was actually performed, mortality rates from venous thromboembolism were seen to increase in parallel with increasing oral contraceptive sales, but only in women of reproductive age, not in older women or in men of any age.23

Analyses of secular trends are useful for rapidly providing evidence for or against a hypothesis. However, these studies lack data on individuals; they only study groups. As such, they are unable to control for confounding variables. Thus, among exposures whose trends coincide with that of the disease, analyses of secular trends are unable to differentiate which factor is likely to be the true cause. For example, lung cancer mortality rates in the US have been increasing in women, such that lung cancer is now the leading cause of cancer mortality in women.24 This is certainly consistent with the increasing rates of cigarette smoking observed in women until the mid-1960s,25 and so appears to be supportive of the association between cigarette smoking and lung cancer. However, it would also be consistent with an association between certain occupational exposures and lung cancer, as more women in the US are now working outside the home.

**CASE–CONTROL STUDIES**

Case–control studies are studies which compare cases with a disease to controls without the disease, looking for differences in exposures. As an example, one could select cases of young women with venous thromboembolism and compare them to controls without venous thromboembolism, looking for differences in antecedent oral contraceptive use. A number of such studies have been performed, generally demonstrating a strong association between the use of oral contraceptives and venous thromboembolism.26

Case–control studies can be particularly useful when one wants to study multiple possible causes of a single disease, as one can study any number of exposures as potential risk factors using the same cases and controls. This design is also particularly useful when one is studying a relatively rare disease, as it guarantees a sufficient number of cases with the disease. Using case–control studies, one can study rare diseases with markedly smaller sample sizes than those needed for cohort studies (see Chapter 3). For example, the classic study of diethylstilbestrol and clear cell vaginal adenocarcinoma required only eight cases and 40 controls,20 rather than the many thousands of exposed subjects that would have been required for a cohort study of this question.

Case–control studies generally obtain their information on exposures retrospectively, that is, recreating events that happened in the past. Information is generally obtained by abstracting medical records or by administering questionnaires or interviews. As such, they are subject to limitations in the validity of retrospectively collected exposure information. Also, the proper selection of controls can be a challenging task, and appropriate control selection can lead to a selection bias, which may lead to incorrect conclusions. Nevertheless, when case–control studies are well done, subsequent well done cohort studies or randomized clinical trials, if any, will generally confirm their results. As such, the case–control design is a very useful one for pharmacoepidemiology studies.

**COHORT STUDIES**

Cohort studies are studies which identify subsets of a defined population and follow them over time, looking for differences in their outcome. Cohort studies generally are used to compare exposed patients to unexposed patients, although they can also be used to compare one exposure to another. For example, one could compare women of reproductive age who use oral contraceptives to users of other contraceptive methods, looking for the differences in the frequency of venous thromboembolism. When such studies were performed, they in fact confirmed the relationship between oral contraceptives and thromboembolism which was noted using analyses of secular trends and case–control studies.27,28 Cohort studies can be
performed either prospectively, that is simultaneous with the events under study, or retrospectively, that is after the events under study, by recreating those past events using medical records, questionnaires, or interviews.

The major difference between cohort and case-control studies is the basis upon which patients are recruited into the study (see Figure 2.2). Patients are recruited into case-control studies on the basis of the presence or absence of a disease, and their antecedent exposures are then studied. Patients are recruited into cohort studies on the basis of the presence or absence of an exposure, and their subsequent disease course is then studied.

Cohort studies have the major advantage of being free of the major problem that plagues case-control studies: the difficult process of selecting an undisposed control group. In addition, prospective cohort studies are free of the problem of the questionable validity of retrospectively collected data. For these reasons, an association demonstrated by a cohort study is more likely to be a causal association than one demonstrated by a case-control study. Furthermore, cohort studies are particularly useful when one is studying multiple possible outcomes from a single exposure, especially a relatively uncommon exposure. Thus, they are particularly useful in postmarketing drug surveillance studies which are looking at any possible effect of a newly marketed drug.

However, cohort studies can require extremely large sample sizes to study relatively uncommon outcomes (see Chapter 3). In addition, prospective cohort studies can require a prolonged time period to study delayed drug effects.

**ANALYSIS OF CASE–CONTROL AND COHORT STUDIES**

As can be seen in Figure 2.2, both case–control and cohort studies are intended to provide the same basic information; the difference is how this information is collected. The key statistic reported from these studies is the relative risk. The relative risk is the ratio of the incidence rate of an outcome in the exposed group to the incidence rate of the outcome in the unexposed group. A relative risk of greater than 1.0 means that exposed subjects have a greater risk of the disease under study than unexposed subjects, or that the exposure appears to cause the disease. A relative risk less than 1.0 means that exposed subjects have a lower risk of the disease than unexposed subjects, or that the exposure seems to protect against the disease. A relative risk of 1.0 means that exposed subjects and unexposed subjects have the same risk of developing the disease, or that the exposure and the disease appear unrelated.

One can calculate a relative risk directly from the results of a cohort study. However, in a case-control study one cannot determine the size of either the exposed population or the unexposed population that the diseased subjects and undisposed subjects were drawn from. The results of a case–control study do not provide information on the incidence rates of the disease in exposed and unexposed individuals. Therefore, relative risks cannot be calculated directly from a case–control study. Instead, in reporting the results of a case–control study one generally reports the odds ratio, which is an estimate of the relative risk when the disease under study is relatively rare. Since case-control studies are generally used to study rare diseases, there generally is very close agreement between the odds ratio and the relative risk, and the results of case–control studies are often loosely referred to as relative risks, although they are in fact odds ratios.
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Both relative risks and odds ratios can be reported with \textit{p-values}. These \textit{p}-values allow one to determine whether the relative risk is statistically significantly different from 1.0, that is whether the differences between the two study groups are likely to be due to random variation.

Alternatively, and probably preferably, relative risks and odds ratios can be reported with \textit{confidence intervals}, which are an indication of the range of relative risks within which the true relative risk for the entire theoretical population is most likely to lie. A 95\% confidence interval around a relative risk means that we can be 95\% confident that the true relative risk lies in this range. If a 95\% confidence interval around a relative risk excludes 1.0, then the finding is statistically significant with a \textit{p}-value of less than 0.05. A confidence interval provides much more information than a \textit{p}-value however. As an example, a study which yields a relative risk (95\% confidence interval) of 1.0 (0.9–1.1) is clearly showing that an association is very unlikely. A study which yields a relative risk (95\% confidence interval) of 1.0 (0.1–100) provides little evidence for or against an association. Yet, both could be reported as a relative risk of 1.0 and a \textit{p}-value greater than 0.05. As another example, a study which yields a relative risk (95\% confidence interval) of 10.0 (9.8–10.2) precisely quantifies a tenfold increase in risk. A study which yields a relative risk (95\% confidence interval) of 10.0 (1.1–100) says little, other than an increased risk is likely. Yet, both could be reported as a relative risk of 10.0 (\textit{p} < 0.05). As a final example, a study yielding a relative risk (95\% confidence interval) of 3.0 (0.98–5.0) is strongly suggestive of an association, whereas a study reporting a relative risk (95\% confidence interval) of 3.0 (0.1–30) would not be. Yet, both could be reported as a relative risk of 3.0 (\textit{p} > 0.05).

Finally, another statistic one can calculate from a cohort study is the excess risk, also called the risk difference or, sometimes, the attributable risk. Whereas the relative risk is the ratio of the incidence rates in the exposed group versus the unexposed groups, the excess risk is the arithmetic difference between the incidence rates. The relative risk is more important in considering questions of causation. The excess risk is more important in considering the public health impact of an association, as it represents the increased rate of disease due to the exposure. For example, oral contraceptives are strongly associated with the development of myocardial infarction in young women.\textsuperscript{26} However, the risk of myocardial infarction in nonsmoking women in their 20s is so low that even a fivefold increase in that risk would still not be of public health importance. In contrast, women in their 40s are at higher risk, especially if they are cigarette smokers as well. Thus, oral contraceptives should not be used in these women.\textsuperscript{26}

As with relative risks, excess risks cannot be calculated from case–control studies, as incidence rates are not available. As with the other statistics, \textit{p}-values can be calculated to determine whether the differences between the two study groups could have occurred just by chance. Confidence intervals can be calculated around excess risks, as well, and would be interpreted analogously.

\textbf{RANDOMIZED CLINICAL TRIALS}

Finally, \textit{experimental studies} are studies in which the investigator controls the therapy that is to be received by each participant. Generally an investigator uses that control to randomly allocate patients between or among the study groups, performing a \textit{randomized clinical trial}. For example, one could theoretically randomly allocate sexually active women to use either oral contraceptives or no contraceptive, examining whether they differ in their incidence of subsequent venous thromboembolism. The major strength of this approach is random assignment, which is the only way to make it likely that the study groups are comparable in potential confounding variables that are either unknown or unmeasurable. For this reason, associations demonstrated in randomized clinical trials are more likely to be causal associations than those demonstrated using one of the other techniques.

However, even randomized clinical trials are not without their problems. The randomized clinical trial described above, allocating women to receive contraceptives or no contraceptives, demonstrates
the major potential problems inherent in the use of this study design. It would obviously be impossible to perform, ethically and logistically. In addition, randomized clinical trials are expensive and artificial. Inasmuch as they have already been performed prior to marketing to demonstrate each drug’s efficacy, they tend to be unnecessary after marketing. They are likely to be used in pharmacoepidemiology studies mainly for supplementary studies of drug efficacy. However, they remain the “gold standard” by which the other designs must be judged.

**DISCUSSION**

Thus, a series of different study designs are available (Table 2.4), each with its own advantages and disadvantages. Case reports, case series, analyses of secular trends, case–control studies, and cohort studies have been referred to collectively as *observational study designs or nonexperimental study designs*, in order to differentiate them from experimental studies. These are all studies in which the investigator does not control the therapy, but simply observes and evaluates the results of ongoing medical care. Case reports, case series, and analyses of secular trends have also been referred to as *descriptive studies*. Case–control studies, cohort studies, and randomized clinical trials all have control groups, and have been referred to as *analytic studies*. The analytic study designs can be classified in two major ways, by how subjects are selected into the study and by how data are collected for the study (see Table 2.5). From the perspective of how subjects are recruited into the study, case–control studies can be contrasted with cohort studies. Specifically, case–control studies select subjects into the study on the basis of the presence or absence of a disease, while cohort studies select subjects into the study on the basis of the presence or absence of an exposure. From this perspective randomized clinical trials can be viewed as a subset of cohort studies, a type of cohort study in which the investigator controls the allocation of treatment, rather than simply observing ongoing medical care. From the perspective of timing, data can be collected *prospectively*, that is simultaneously with the events under study, or *retrospectively*, that is after the events under study. In the latter situation, one recreates events that happened in the past using medical records, questionnaires, or interviews. Data can also be collected using *cross-sectional studies*, studies that have no time sense. These study the situation at one point in time only. In principle, either cohort or case–control studies can be performed using any of these time frames, although prospective case–control studies are unusual. Randomized clinical trials must be prospective, as this is the only way an investigator could control the therapy received.

The terms presented in this chapter, which are those that will be used throughout the book, are probably the terms used by a majority of epidemiologists. Unfortunately, however, other terms have been used for most of these study designs, as well. Table 2.5 also presents a number of the synonyms that have been used in the medical literature. The same term is sometimes used by different authors to describe different concepts. For example, in this book we are reserving the use of the terms “retrospective study” and “prospective study” to refer to a time sense. As is apparent from Table 2.5, however, in the past some authors used the term “retrospective study” to refer to a case–control study and used the term “prospective study” to refer to a cohort study, confusing the two concepts inherent in the classification schemes presented in the table. Other authors use the term “retrospective study” to refer to any nonexperimental study, while others appear

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2.5. Epidemiologic study designs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(A) Classified by how subjects are recruited into the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Case–control (case-history, case-referent, retrospective, trohoc) studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Cohort (followup, prospective) studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Experimental studies (clinical trials, intervention study)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(B) Classified by how data are collected for the study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) Retrospective (historical, nonconcurrent, retropective) studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Prospective (proектив) studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Cross-sectional studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to use the term to refer to any study they do not like, as a term of derision! Unfortunately, when reading a scientific paper, there is no way of determining which usage the author intended. What is more important than the terminology, however, are the concepts underlying the terms. Understanding these concepts, the reader can choose to use whatever terminology he or she is comfortable with.

CONCLUSIONS

From the material presented in this chapter, it is hopefully now apparent that each study design has an appropriate role in scientific progress. In general, science proceeds from the bottom of Table 2.4 upwards, from case reports and case series suggesting an association, to analyses of trends and case-control studies exploring them. Finally, if a study question warrants the delay and investment, cohort studies and randomized clinical trials can be performed.

For example, regarding the question of whether oral contraceptives cause venous thromboembolism, an association was first suggested by case reports and case series, then explored in more detail by analyses of trends and a series of case-control studies. Later, because of the importance of oral contraceptives, the number of women using them, and the fact that users were predominantly healthy women, the investment was made in two long-term, large scale cohort studies. This question might even be worth the investment of a randomized clinical trial, except that it would not be feasible nor ethical. In contrast, when thalidomide was marketed, it was not a major breakthrough; other hypnotics were already available. Case reports of phocomelia in exposed patients were followed by case-control studies and analyses of secular trends. Inasmuch as the adverse effect was so terrible and the drug was not of unique importance, the drug was then withdrawn, without the delay that would have been necessary if cohort studies and/or randomized clinical trials had been awaited. Ultimately, a retrospective cohort study was performed, comparing those exposed during the critical time period to those exposed at other times.

In general, however, clinical, regulatory, commercial, and legal decisions need to be made on the basis of the best evidence available at the time of the decision. To quote Sir Austin Bradford Hill, All scientific work is incomplete — whether it be observational or experimental. All scientific work is liable to be upset or modified by advancing knowledge. That does not confer upon us a freedom to ignore the knowledge we already have, or to postpone the action that it appears to demand at a given time.

Who knows, asked Robert Browning, but the world may end tonight? True, but on available evidence most of us make ready to commute on the 8:30 next day.
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Chapter 1 pointed out that between 500 and 3000 subjects are usually exposed to a drug prior to marketing, in order to be 95% certain of detecting adverse effects that occur in between one and six in a thousand exposed individuals. While this seems like a reasonable goal, it poses some important problems that must be taken into account when planning pharmacoepidemiology studies. Specifically, such studies must generally include a sufficient number of subjects to add significantly to the premarketing experience, and this requirement for large sample sizes raises logistical obstacles to cost-effective studies. This central special need for large sample sizes is what has led to the innovative approaches to collecting pharmacoepidemiology data which are described in Part III of this book.

The approach to considering the implications of a study’s sample size is somewhat different depending on whether a study is already completed or is being planned. After a study is completed, if a real finding was statistically significant, then the study had a sufficient sample size to detect it, by definition. If a finding was not statistically significant, then one can use either of two approaches. First, one can examine the resulting confidence intervals in order to determine the smallest differences between the two study groups that the study had sufficient sample size to exclude. Alternatively, one can approach the question in a manner similar to the way one would approach it if one were planning the study de novo. Nomograms can be used to assist a reader in interpreting negative clinical trials in this way.

In contrast, in this chapter we will discuss in more detail how to determine a proper study sample size, from the perspective of one who is designing a study de novo. Specifically, we will begin by discussing how one calculates the minimum sample size necessary for a pharmacoepidemiology study, to avoid the problem of a study with a sample size that is too small. We will first present the approach for cohort studies, then for case–control studies, and then for case series. For each design, one or more tables will be presented to assist the reader in carrying out these calculations.

SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATIONS FOR COHORT STUDIES

The sample size required for a cohort study depends on what one is expecting from the study.
To calculate sample sizes for a cohort study, one needs to specify five variables (see Table 3.1).\textsuperscript{3,4}

The first is the alpha (\(\alpha\)) or type I error one is willing to tolerate in the study. A type I error is the probability of concluding there is a difference when in fact one does not exist. Using diagnostic tests as an analogy, a type I error is a false positive study finding. The more tolerant one is willing to be of type I error, the smaller the sample size required.

The less tolerant one is willing to be of type I error, the smaller one would set \(\alpha\), and the larger the sample size that would be required. Conventionally the \(\alpha\) is set at 0.05, although this certainly does not have to be the case. Note that \(\alpha\) needs to be specified as one-tailed or two-tailed. If only one of the study groups could conceivably be more likely to develop the disease and one is interested in detecting this result only, then one would specify \(\alpha\) as one-tailed. If either of the study groups may be the one more likely to develop the outcome disease, and either result would be of interest, then one would specify \(\alpha\) as two-tailed. To decide whether \(\alpha\) should be one-tailed or two-tailed, an investigator should look at what his or her reaction would be to an answer which is statistically significant in a direction opposite to the one that would be expected. For example, what if one observed that a drug increased the frequency of dying from coronary artery disease instead of decreasing it, as expected? If the investigator’s response to this would be “Boy, what a surprise, but I believe it,” then a two-tailed test should be performed. If the investigator’s response would be: “I don’t believe it, and I will interpret this simply as a study that does not show the expected decrease in coronary artery disease in the group treated with the study drug,” then a one-tailed test should be performed. The more conservative option is the two-tailed test, assuming the results could come out in either direction. This is the one that is usually, although not always, used.

The second variable that needs to be specified to calculate a sample size for a cohort study is the beta (\(\beta\)) or type II error one is willing to tolerate in the study. A type II error is the probability of concluding there is no difference when in fact one does exist. In other words, a type II error is the probability of missing a real difference. Using diagnostic tests as an analogy, a type II error is a false negative study finding. The complement of \(\beta\) is the power of a study, the probability of detecting a difference if one really exists. Power is calculated as \((1 - \beta)\). Again, the more tolerant one is willing to be of type II errors, that is the higher the \(\beta\), the smaller the sample size required. \(\beta\) is conventionally set at 0.1 or 0.2, although again this need not be the case. \(\beta\) is always one-tailed.

The third variable one needs to specify in order to calculate sample sizes for a cohort study is the minimum relative risk one wants to be able to detect. The smaller the relative risk that one wants to detect, the larger the sample size required. Note that the relative risk often used by investigators in this calculation is the relative risk the investigator is expecting from the study. This is not correct, as it will lead to inadequate power to detect relative risks smaller than expected, but still clinically important to the investigator. In other words, if one chooses a relative risk of 2.5, one should be comfortable with the thought that, if the relative risk is 2.4, one may not be able to detect it as a statistically significant finding.

The fourth variable one needs to specify is the expected incidence of the outcome variable of interest in the unexposed control group. Again the more one asks of a study, the larger the sample size.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.1. Information needed to calculate a study’s sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For cohort studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1) (\alpha) or type I error considered tolerable,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and whether it is one-tailed or two-tailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) (\beta) or type II error considered tolerable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Minimum relative risk to be detected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Incidence of the disease in the unexposed control group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Ratio of unexposed controls to exposed study subjects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
one needs. The rarer the outcome of interest, the larger the sample size needed.

The fifth variable one needs to specify is the number of unexposed control subjects to be included in the study for each exposed study subject. A study has the most statistical power for a given number of study subjects if it has the same number of controls as exposed subjects. However, sometimes the number of exposed subjects is limited and, therefore, inadequate to provide sufficient power to detect a relative risk of interest. In that case, additional power can be gained by increasing the number of controls alone. Doubling the number of controls, that is including two controls for each exposed subject, results in a modest increase in the statistical power, but it does not double it. Including three controls for each exposed subject increases the power further. However, the increment in power due to increasing the ratio of control subjects to exposed subjects from 2:1 to 3:1 is smaller than the increment in power due to increasing the ratio from 1:1 to 2:1. Each additional increase in the size of the control group increases the power of the study further, but with progressively smaller gains in statistical power. Thus, there is rarely a reason to include greater than three or four controls per study subject. For example, if one were to design a study with an \( \alpha \) of 0.05 to detect a relative risk of 2.0 for an outcome variable that occurs in the control group with an incidence rate of 0.01, a study with 2319 exposed individuals and 2319 controls would give one a power of 0.80, or an 80% chance of detecting a difference of that size. With the same 2319 exposed subjects, ratios of control subjects to exposed subjects of 1:1, 2:1, 3:1, 4:1, 5:1, 10:1, and 50:1 would result in statistical powers of 0.80, 0.887, 0.913, 0.926, 0.933, 0.947, and 0.956, respectively.

It is important to differentiate between the ratio of the number of controls and the number of control groups. It is not uncommon, especially in case–control studies, where the selection of a proper control group can be difficult, to choose more than one control group. This is done for reasons of validity, not statistical power, and it is important that these control groups should not be aggregated in the analysis. The goal is to assure

\[
N = \frac{1}{[p(1-R)]^2} \left[ Z_{1-\alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{1}{K}}{U(1-U)}} + Z_{1-\beta} \sqrt{pR(1-Rp) + \frac{p(1-p)}{K}} \right]^2
\]

where \( p \) is the incidence of the disease in the unexposed, \( R \) is the minimum relative risk to be detected, \( \alpha \) is the type I error rate that is acceptable, \( \beta \) is the type II error rate that is acceptable, \( Z_{1-\alpha} \) and \( Z_{1-\beta} \) refer to the unit normal deviates corresponding to \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \), \( K \) is the ratio of number of control subjects to the number of exposed subjects, and

\[
U = \frac{Kp + pR}{K + 1}
\]

\( Z_{1-\alpha} \) is replaced by \( Z_{1-\alpha/2} \) if one is planning to analyze the study using a two-tailed \( \alpha \). Note that \( K \) does not need to be an integer.

A series of tables calculated using this formula is presented in Appendix A. In Tables A1–A4 we have assumed an \( \alpha \) (two-tailed) of 0.05, a \( \beta \) of 0.1, and control to exposed ratios of 1:1, 2:1, 3:1, and 4:1, respectively. Tables A5–A8 are similar, except they assume a \( \beta \) of 0.2. Each table presents the number of exposed subjects needed to detect any of a number of specified relative risks, for
outcome variables that occur with a number of specified incidence rates.

For example, what if one wanted to investigate a new nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug that was about to be marketed, but premarketing data raised questions about possible hepatotoxicity? This would presumably be studied using a cohort study design and, depending upon the values chosen for $\alpha$, $\beta$, the incidence of the disease in the unexposed, the relative risk one wants to be able to detect, and the ratio of control to exposed subjects, the sample sizes needed could differ markedly (see Table 3.2). For example, what if your goal was to study hepatitis which occurs, say, in 0.1% of all unexposed individuals? If one wanted to design a study with one control per exposed subject to detect a relative risk of 2.0 for this outcome variable, assuming an $\alpha$ (two tailed) of 0.05 and a $\beta$ of 0.1, one could look in Table A1 and see that it would require 31 483 exposed subjects, as well as an equal number of unexposed controls. If one were less concerned with missing a real finding, even if it were there, one could change $\beta$ to 0.2, and the required sample size would drop to 23 518 (see Table 3.2 and Table A5). If one wanted to minimize the number of exposed subjects needed for the study, one could include up to four controls for each exposed subject (Table 3.2 and Table A8). This would result in a sample size of 13 402, with four times as many controls, a total of 67 010 subjects. Finally, if one considers it inconceivable that this new drug could protect against liver disease and is not interested in that outcome, then one might use a one-tailed $\alpha$, resulting in a somewhat lower sample size: 10 728, again with four times as many controls. Much smaller sample sizes are needed to detect relative risks of 4.0 or greater, and these are also presented in Table 3.2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Incidence rate assumed in unexposed</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
<th>Control: exposed ratio</th>
<th>Sample size needed in exposed group</th>
<th>Sample size needed in control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abnormal liver function tests</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 104</td>
<td>3 104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 319</td>
<td>2 319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 323</td>
<td>5 292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 059</td>
<td>4 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 483</td>
<td>31 483</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 518</td>
<td>23 518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13 402</td>
<td>53 608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 728</td>
<td>42 912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 823</td>
<td>5 823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4 350</td>
<td>4 350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 253</td>
<td>9 012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 829</td>
<td>7 316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholestatic jaundice</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>315 268</td>
<td>315 268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235 500</td>
<td>235 500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>134 194</td>
<td>536 776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107 418</td>
<td>429 672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58 376</td>
<td>58 376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43 606</td>
<td>43 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22 572</td>
<td>90 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 331</td>
<td>73 324</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In contrast, what if one’s goal was to study elevated liver function tests which, say, occur in 1% of an unexposed population? If one wants to detect a relative risk of 2 for this outcome variable, only 3,104 subjects would be needed in each group, assuming a two-tailed \( \alpha \) of 0.05, a \( \beta \) of 0.1, and one control per exposed subject. Alternatively, if one wanted to detect the same relative risk for an outcome variable that occurred as infrequently as 0.0001, perhaps cholestatic jaundice, one would need 315,268 subjects in each study group.

Obviously, cohort studies can require very large sample sizes to study uncommon diseases. A study of uncommon diseases is often better performed using a case–control study design, as described in the previous chapter.

**SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATIONS FOR CASE–CONTROL STUDIES**

The approach to calculating sample sizes for case–control studies is similar to the approach for cohort studies. Again there are five variables that need to be specified (see Table 3.1). Three of these are \( \alpha \), or the type I error one is willing to tolerate; \( \beta \), or the type II error one is willing to tolerate; and the minimum relative risk (odds ratio) one wants to be able detect. These are discussed in the section on cohort studies, above.

In addition, in a case–control study one selects subjects on the basis of the presence or absence of the disease of interest, and then investigates the prevalence of the exposure of interest in each study group. This is in contrast to a cohort study, in which one selects subjects on the basis of the presence or absence of an exposure, and then studies whether or not the disease of interest develops in each group. Therefore, the fourth variable to be specified for a case–control study is the expected prevalence of the exposure in the unexposed control group, rather than the incidence of the disease of interest in the unexposed control group of a cohort study.

Finally, for cohort studies we are concerned about the ratio of the number of unexposed control subjects to the number of exposed study subjects. For a case–control study, we are analogously interested in the ratio of the number of unexposed control subjects to the number of exposed study subjects. The principles in deciding upon the appropriate ratio to use are similar in both study designs. Again, there is rarely a reason to include a ratio greater than 3:1 or 4:1. For example, if one were to design a study with a two-tailed \( \alpha \) of 0.05 to detect a relative risk of 2.0 for an exposure which occurs in 5% of the unexposed control group, a study with 516 diseased individuals and 516 controls would give one a power of 0.80, or an 80% chance of detecting a difference of that size. Studies with the same 516 diseased subjects and ratios of controls to cases of 1:1, 2:1, 3:1, 4:1, 5:1, 10:1, and 50:1 would result in statistical powers of 0.80, 0.889, 0.916, 0.929, 0.936, 0.949, and 0.959, respectively.

The formula for calculating sample sizes for a case–control study is similar to that for cohort studies (modified from reference):\(^3\)

\[
N = \frac{1}{(p - V)^2} \left[ Z_{1 - \alpha} \sqrt{\frac{1 + \frac{1}{K}}{U(1 - U)}} + Z_{1 - \beta} \sqrt{\frac{p(1 - p)}{K + V(1 - V)}} \right]^2
\]

where \( R, \alpha, \beta, Z_{1 - \alpha}, \) and \( Z_{1 - \beta} \) are as above, \( p \) is the prevalence of the exposure in the control group, \( K \) is the ratio of unexposed control subjects to exposed cases,

\[
U = \frac{p}{K + 1} \left[ K + \frac{R}{1 + p(R - 1)} \right]
\]

and

\[
V = \frac{pR}{1 + p(R - 1)}
\]

Again, a series of tables that provide sample sizes for case control studies is presented in the Appendix. In Tables A9–A12 we have assumed
an $\alpha$ (two-tailed) of 0.05, a $\beta$ of 0.1, and control to case ratios of 1:1, 2:1, 3:1, and 4:1, respectively. Tables A13–A16 are similar, except they assume a $\beta$ of 0.2. Each table presents the number of diseased subjects needed to detect any of a number of specified relative risks, for a number of specified exposure rates.

For example, what if again one wanted to investigate a new nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug that was about to be marketed but premarketing data raised questions about possible hepatotoxicity? This time, however, one is attempting to use a case–control study design. Again, depending upon the values chosen of $\alpha$, $\beta$, and so on, the sample sizes needed could differ markedly (see Table 3.3). For example, what if one wanted to design a study with one control per exposed subject, assuming an $\alpha$ (two-tailed) of 0.05 and a $\beta$ of 0.1? The sample size needed to detect a relative risk of 2.0 for any disease would vary, depending on the prevalence of use of the drug being studied. If one optimistically assumed the drug would be used nearly as commonly as ibuprofen, by perhaps 1% of the population, then one could look in Table A9 and see that it would require 3210 diseased subjects, as well as an equal number of undiseased controls. If one were less concerned with missing a real association, even if it existed, one could change $\beta$ to 0.2, and the required sample size would drop to 2398 (see Table 3.3 and Table A13). If one wanted to minimize the number of diseased subjects needed for the study, one could include up to four controls for each exposed subject (Table 3.3 and Table A16). This would result in a sample size of 1370, with four times as many controls. Finally, if one considered it inconceivable that this new drug could protect against liver disease, then one might use a one-tailed $\alpha$, resulting in a somewhat lower sample size: 1096, again with four times as many

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothetical drug</th>
<th>Prevalence rate assumed in undiseased</th>
<th>$\alpha$</th>
<th>Odds ratio to be detected</th>
<th>Control: case ratio</th>
<th>Sample size needed in case group</th>
<th>Sample size control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibuprofen</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2 398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolmetin</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10 765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5 856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1 840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylbutazone</td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>315 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>235 579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>134 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>107 455</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58 409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22 585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>0.05 (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18 342</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
controls. Much smaller sample sizes are needed to detect relative risks of 4.0 or greater and are also presented in Table 3.3.

In contrast, what if one’s estimates of the new drug’s sales were more conservative? If one wanted to detect a relative risk of 2.0 assuming sales to 0.1% of the population, perhaps similar to tolmetin, 31 588 subjects would be needed in each group, assuming a two-tailed $\alpha$ of 0.05, a $\beta$ of 0.1, and one control per exposed subject. In contrast, if one estimated the drug would be used in only 0.01% of patients, perhaps like phenylbutazone, one would need 315 373 subjects in each study group.

Obviously, case-control studies can require very large sample sizes to study relatively uncommonly used drugs. In addition, each disease requires a separate case group and, thereby, a separate study. As such, as described in the prior chapter, studies of uncommonly used drugs and newly marketed drugs are usually better done using cohort study designs.

**SAMPLE SIZE CALCULATIONS FOR CASE SERIES**

As described in Chapter 2, the utility of case series in pharmacoepidemiology is limited, as the absence of a control group makes causal inference difficult. Despite this, however, this is a design which has been used repeatedly. There are scientific questions that can be addressed using this design, and the collection of a control group equivalent in size to the case series would add considerable cost to the study. Case series are usually used in pharmacoepidemiology to quantify better the incidence of a particular disease in patients exposed to a newly marketed drug. For example, in the “Phase IV” postmarketing drug surveillance study conducted of prazosin, the investigators collected a case series of 10 000 newly exposed subjects recruited through the manufacturer’s sales force, to quantitate better the incidence of first dose syncope, which was a well recognized adverse effect of this drug.\(^5^6\) Case series are usually used to determine whether a disease occurs more frequently than some predetermined incidence in exposed patients. Most often the predetermined incidence of interest is zero, and one is looking for any occurrences of an extremely rare illness. As another example, when cimetidine was first marketed, there was a concern over whether it could cause agranulocytosis, since it was chemically closely related to metiamide, another H-2 blocker, which had been removed from the market in Europe because it caused agranulocytosis. This study also collected 10 000 subjects. It found only two cases of neutropenia, one in a patient also receiving chemotherapy. There were no cases of agranulocytosis.\(^7\)

To establish drug safety, a study must include a sufficient number of subjects to detect an elevated incidence of a disease, if it exists. Generally, this is calculated by assuming that the frequency of the event in question is vanishingly small, so that the occurrence of the event follows a Poisson distribution, and then one generally calculates 95% confidence intervals around the observed results.

Table A17 in Appendix A presents a table useful for making this calculation.\(^8\) In order to apply this table, one first calculates the incidence rate observed from the study’s results, that is the number of subjects who develop the disease of interest during the specified time interval, divided by the total number of individuals in the population at risk. For example, if three cases of liver disease were observed in a population of 1000 patients exposed to a new nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug during a specified period of time, the incidence would be 0.003. The number of subjects who develop the disease is the “Observed number on which estimate is based (n)” in Table A17. In this example, it is 3. The lower boundary of the 95% confidence interval for the incidence rate is then the corresponding “Lower limit factor (L)” multiplied by the observed incidence rate. In the example above it would be $0.206 \times 0.003 = 0.000618$. Analogously, the upper boundary would be the product of the corresponding “Upper limit factor”\(^4\) multiplied by the observed incidence rate. In the above example, this would be $2.92 \times 0.003 = 0.00876$. In other words, the incidence rate (95% confidence interval) would be 0.003 (0.000618–0.00876). Thus, the best estimate of the incidence rate would
be 30 per 10000, but there is a 95% chance that it lies between 6.18 per 10000 and 87.6 per 10000.

In addition, a helpful simple guide is the so-called “rule of threes,” useful in the common situation where no events of a particular kind are observed. Specifically, if no events of a particular type are observed in a study of X individuals, then one can be 95% certain that the event occurs no more often than 3/X. For example, if 500 patients are studied prior to marketing a drug, then one can be 95% certain that any event which does not occur in any of those patients occurs less often than three in 500 exposed subjects, or that it has an incidence rate of less than 0.006. If 3000 subjects are exposed prior to drug marketing, then one can be 95% certain that any event which does not occur in this population occurs in no more than three in 3000 subjects, or the events have an incidence rate of less than 0.001. Finally, if 10000 subjects are studied in a postmarketing drug surveillance study, then one can be 95% certain that any events which are not observed occur less often than three in 10000 exposed individuals, or that they have an incidence rate of less than 0.0003. In other words, events not detected in the study occur less often than one in 3333 subjects.

DISCUSSION

The discussions about sample size determinations in cohort and case-control studies above assume one is able to obtain information on each of five variables. Is this in fact realistic? Four of the variables are, in fact, totally in the control of the investigator, subject to his or her specification: α, β, the ratio of control subjects to study subjects, and the minimum relative risk to be detected. Only one of the variables requires data derived from other sources. For cohort studies, this is the expected incidence of the disease in the unexposed control group. For case-control studies, this is the expected prevalence of the exposure in the undiseased control group. In considering this needed information, it is important to realize that the whole process of sample size calculation is approximate, despite its mathematical sophistication. There is certainly no compelling reason why an α should be 0.05, as opposed to 0.06 or 0.04. The other variables specified by the investigator are similarly arbitrary. As such, only an approximate estimate is needed for this missing variable. Often the needed information is readily available from some existing data source, for example vital statistics or commercial drug utilization data sources. If not, one can search the medical literature for one or more studies that have collected these data for a defined population, either deliberately or as a by product of their data collecting effort, and assume that the population one will study will be similar. If this is not an appropriate assumption, or if no such data exist in the medical literature, one is left with two alternatives. The first, and better, alternative is to conduct a small pilot study within one’s population, in order to measure the information one needs. The second is simply to guess. In the second case, one should consider what a reasonable higher guess and a reasonable lower guess might be, as well, to see if one’s sample size should be increased to take into account the imprecision of one’s estimate.

Finally, what if one is studying multiple outcome variables, each of which differs in the frequency one expects in the control group? In that situation an investigator might base the study’s sample size on the variable that leads to the largest requirement, and note that the study will have even more power for the other outcome variables. It is usually better to have a somewhat larger expected sample size than the minimum, in any case, to allow some leeway if any of the underlying assumptions are wrong. This also will permit subgroup analyses with adequate power. In fact, if there are important subgroup analyses that represent a priori hypotheses one wants to be able to evaluate, one should perform separate sample size calculations for those subgroups.

Note that sample size calculation is often an iterative process. There is nothing wrong with performing an initial calculation, realizing that it generates an unrealistic sample size, and then modifying the underlying assumptions accordingly. What is important is that the investigator examine his or her final assumptions closely, asking whether, given the compromises made, the study is still worth mounting.
Note that the discussion above was restricted to sample size calculations for dichotomous variables, that is variables with only two options: a study subject either has a disease or does not have a disease. Information was not presented on sample size calculations for continuous outcome variables, that is variables that have some measurement, such as height, weight, blood pressure, or serum cholesterol. Overall, the use of a continuous variable as an outcome variable, unless the measurement is extremely imprecise, will result in a marked increase in the power of a study. Details about this are omitted because epidemiologic studies unfortunately do not usually have the luxury of using such variables. Readers who are interested in more information on this can consult a textbook of sample size calculations.9

All of the previous discussions have focused on calculating a minimum necessary sample size. This is the usual concern. However, two other issues specific to pharmacoepidemiology are important to consider as well. First, one of the main advantages of postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology studies is the increased sensitivity to rare adverse reactions that can be achieved by including a sample size larger than that used prior to marketing. Since between 500 and 3000 patients are usually studied before marketing, most pharmacoepidemiology cohort studies are designed to include at least 10,000 exposed subjects. The total population from which these 10,000 exposed subjects would be recruited would, of course, need to be very much larger. Case–control studies can be much smaller, but generally need to recruit cases and controls from a source population of equivalent size. These are not totally arbitrary figures, but are based on the principles described above, applied to the questions that remain of great importance to address in a postmarketing setting. Nevertheless, these figures should not be rigidly accepted but should be reconsidered for each specific study. Some studies will require fewer subjects; many will require more. To accumulate these sample sizes while performing cost-effective studies, a number of new techniques have been developed, which are described in Part III of this book.

Second, because of the development of these new techniques, pharmacoepidemiology studies have the potential for the relatively unusual problem of too large a sample size. It is even more important than usual, therefore, when interpreting the results of studies that use these data systems to examine their findings, differentiating clearly between statistical significance and clinical significance. With a very large sample size one can find statistically significant differences that are clinically trivial. Also, it must be kept in mind that subtle findings, even if statistically and clinically important, could easily have been created by biases or confounders (see Chapter 2). Subtle findings should not be ignored, but should be interpreted with caution.
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INTRODUCTION

Clinical pharmacology is defined classically as the study of the effects of drugs in humans. More broadly, it also considers non-pharmacologic (e.g., economic and social) determinants and effects of medication use. The development of clinical pharmacology had its roots in the so-called “drug explosion” that occurred between the 1930s and 1960s, which was marked by a pronounced escalation of the rate at which new drugs entered the markets of developed nations. With this rapid expansion of the “therapeutic armamentarium” came the need for much more information regarding the effects and optimal use of these agents, hence the growth of clinical pharmacology as a scientific discipline.

Some would define an additional related discipline, pharmacoepidemiology, which is the application of the principles of clinical pharmacology to rational prescribing, the conduct of clinical trials, and the assessment of outcomes during real-life clinical practice. Clinical pharmacology tries to explain the response to drugs in individuals, while pharmacoepidemiology is concerned with measuring and explaining variability in outcome of drug treatment in populations. Of course, neither approach would be justified if responses to drugs were totally predictable. Pharmacoepidemiology is the application of epidemiologic methods to the subject matter of clinical pharmacology. From this perspective, the origins of pharmacoepidemiology can be seen clearly in the disciplines of clinical pharmacology and pharmacoepidemiology.
In epidemiologic studies of non-drug exposures, it is frequently assumed that the amount and duration of exposure is proportional to the risk of the outcome. For instance, the risk of a stroke or heart attack is often presumed to increase in proportion both to the level of a risk factor, such as elevated blood pressure or blood cholesterol, and to the length of time the risk factor has been present. Likewise, duration of exposure to carcinogens (e.g., cigarette smoke) is sometimes assumed to be linearly related to the level of risk. On occasion, these proportionality assumptions hold true in pharmacoepidemiology. For instance, the risk of endometrial cancer increases in direct proportion to the duration of exposure to estrogens. In other situations, proportionality assumptions are invalid, as is the case with rashes, hepatic reactions, and hematologic reactions to drugs, which often occur in the first few weeks of treatment, the risk declining thereafter. These apparently declining risks may be an artifact of the epidemiologic phenomenon known as depletion of susceptibles, or they may be due to a number of factors that are unique to the ways in which drugs elicit responses, are handled by the body, and are used in clinical practice.

Exposure to a drug is never a random event, as individuals who receive a drug almost always differ from those not receiving it. The circumstances leading to a patient receiving a particular drug in a particular dose, at a particular time, are complex and relate to the patient’s health care behavior and use of services, the severity and nature of the condition being treated, and the perceived advantages of a drug in a specific setting. In addition, physicians alter or titrate the dose of a drug against a response, and will tend to switch medications in the case of non-response. Consequently, the choice of a drug and dose may be determined by factors that are themselves related to the outcome under study. In other words, the association between the drug and the outcome of interest may be confounded by the indication for the drug or other related features (see also Chapter 34).

In interpreting pharmacoepidemiology studies, it is important to realize that relationships exist between drug response and various biologic and sociologic factors and to attempt to explore the reasons for them. The disciplines of clinical pharmacology and pharmacoepidemiology have provided us with explanations for some of these variations in response to important drugs, and knowledge of these is necessary when conducting or interpreting pharmacoepidemiology studies.

This chapter is intended to introduce readers to some of the core concepts of clinical pharmacology. Obviously, a single book chapter cannot convey the entire discipline; many general and topic-specific clinical pharmacology textbooks exist that accomplish this. The emphasis of this chapter will be on concepts that are likely to be important in conducting and understanding pharmacoepidemiology research. In particular, one of the most important areas of study within clinical pharmacology that is inherently amenable to the use of epidemiologic methods is the variability of drug response that exists across the population. The following sections present some of the central concepts of clinical pharmacology that are important to the pharmacoepidemiologist who is attempting to understand differences in the population with regard to the effects of drugs. Specifically, this chapter will discuss the nature of drugs, the mechanisms of drug action, the concept of drug potency, the role of pharmacodynamics in determining variability, the role of pharmacokinetics in determining variability, and the importance of the human factor in explaining variability in drug effects.

**THE NATURE OF DRUGS**

A drug may be defined as any exogenously administered substance that exerts a physiologic effect. Taken as a group, drugs vary greatly with regard to their molecular structure. For example, interferon alfa-2a is an intricate glycoprotein, while potassium chloride is a simple salt containing only two elements. Most drugs are intermediate in complexity, and produce their pharmacologic
response by exerting a chemical or molecular influence on one or more cell constituents.

Typically, the active drug component of a tablet, capsule, or other pharmaceutical dosage form accounts for only a small percentage of the total mass and volume. The remainder is composed of excipients (such as binders, diluents, lubricants, and preservatives) that are chosen, among other concerns, because they are pharmacologically inert. This is relevant to the pharmacopidemiologist because a drug product’s ostensibly inactive ingredients can sometimes produce effects of their own. For example, benzyl alcohol, which is commonly used as a preservative in injectable solutions, has been implicated as the cause of a toxic syndrome that has resulted in the deaths of a number of infants.1

Also of potential concern to the pharmacopidemiologist is the fact that, over time, a pharmaceutica product can be reformulated to contain different excipients. Furthermore, because of the marketing value of established proprietary drug product names, non-prescription products are sometimes reformulated to contain different active ingredients, and then continue to be marketed under their original name. This is potentially of great concern to any pharmacopidemiologist interested in studying the effects of non-prescription drugs.

MECHANISMS OF DRUG ACTION

Pharmacology seeks to characterize the actions of drugs at many different levels of study, such as the organism, organ, tissue, cell, cell component, and molecular levels. On the macromolecular level, most drugs elicit a response through interactions with specialized proteins such as enzymes and cell surface receptors. While drug molecules may be present within body fluids either in their free, native state, or bound to proteins or other constituents, it is typically the free or unbound fraction that is available to interact with the target proteins, and is thus important in eliciting a response.

Enzymes are protein catalysts or molecules that permit certain biochemical reactions to occur. By directly inhibiting an enzyme, a drug may block the formation of its product. For instance, inhibition of angiotensin-converting enzyme blocks the conversion of angiotensin I to its active form, angiotensin II, resulting in a fall in arteriolar resistance that is beneficial to individuals with hypertension or congestive heart failure. Other drugs block ion channels, and consequently alter intracellular function. For example, calcium channel blocking drugs reduce the entry of calcium ions into smooth muscle cells, thereby inhibiting smooth muscle contraction, dilating blood vessels, and so reducing arteriolar resistance.2

Alternatively, drugs may interact with specialized receptors on the cell surface, which activate a subsequent intracellular signaling system, ultimately resulting in changes in the intracellular milieu. For instance, drugs that bind to and activate (beta) β2-adrenoceptors (β2-agonists) in the pulmonary airways increase intracellular cyclic adenosine monophosphate concentrations and activate protein kinases, resulting in smooth muscle relaxation and bronchodilation.3 Other drugs, such as the purine and pyrimidine antagonists that are used in cancer chemotherapy, and the nucleoside analogues that are used in the treatment of HIV and other viral infections, exert their effects by blocking cell replication processes.

DRUG POTENCY

In its pharmacologic usage, the term potency refers to the amount of drug that is required to elicit a given response, and is important when one is comparing two or more drugs that have similar effects. For example, 10 mg morphine has approximately the same analgesic activity as 1.3 mg hydromorphone, when both drugs are administered parenterally.4 Thus, we say that 10 mg morphine is approximately “equipotent” to 1.3 mg hydromorphone, and that hydromorphone is approximately 7.7 times as potent as morphine (10/1.3 = 7.7). As an aside, there is sometimes a tendency to equate potency with effectiveness, yielding the misconception that because one drug is more potent than its alternative, it is therefore more effective. This view is fallacious. As the active drug component typically accounts for only a small portion of a
pharmaceutical dosage form, the amount of drug that can be conveniently be delivered to the patient is rarely at issue; if need be, the dose can simply increased. Milligram potency is rarely an important consideration in therapeutic drug use.

On the other hand, drug potency may be important in interpreting pharmacoepidemiology studies. For example, if a particular drug is noted to have a higher rate of adverse effects than other drugs of the same class, it is important to investigate whether this is a result of an intrinsic effect of that drug, or if the drug is being used in clinical practice at a higher dose, relative to its potency, than other drugs of the class.

Clinical pharmacology can be divided broadly into pharmacodynamics and pharmacokinetics. Pharmacodynamics quantifies the response of the target tissues in the body to a given concentration of a drug. Pharmacokinetics is the study of the processes of drug absorption, distribution, and elimination from the body. Put simply, pharmacodynamics is concerned with the drug’s action on the body, while pharmacokinetics is concerned with the body’s action on the drug. The combined effects of these processes determine the time course of concentrations of a drug at its target sites. The role of each in contributing to the variability of drug effects among the population will be discussed in turn.

THE ROLE OF PHARMACODYNAMICS IN DETERMINING VARIABILITY OF DRUG RESPONSE

Compared with most non-drug exposures, there is considerable existing knowledge about the effects of a drug by the time it is marketed. This must be incorporated into the design of new studies that seek to gain further information about that drug’s actions. This is true whether the design of the new study is experimental or non-experimental. Further, there is considerable information about determinants of patients’ responses to drugs in general. In this section, we present the effects of adaptive responses, age, disease states, and concomitant drugs in determining variability in drug response.

EFFECTS OF ADAPTIVE RESPONSES

It is a general rule of pharmacology that pharmacodynamic responses tend to be followed by adaptive responses which, crudely put, are the body’s attempt to “overcome” the effects of the drug. An example is the increase in the concentration of the membrane-bound enzyme Na+/K+ ATPase that occurs during continued treatment with cardiac glycosides, such as digoxin. As cardiac glycosides exert their effects by inhibiting Na+/K+ ATPase, the localized increase in the concentration, or up-regulation, of this enzyme that occurs during therapy may be responsible for the relatively transient inotropic effects of the drugs that are seen in some individuals.

Cell surface adrenoceptors tend to up-regulate during prolonged administration of β-adrenergic blocking agents, such as propranolol, resulting in increased numbers of active β-receptors. If the beta-blocking drug is withdrawn rapidly, a large number of β-receptors become available to bind to their natural ligands, norepinephrine and epinephrine. This can produce tachycardia, hypertension, and worsening angina—the so-called “β-blocker withdrawal syndrome”.

In some cases, the mechanisms of apparent adaptive responses have not yet been fully explored. For example, among subjects taking NSAIDs, endoscopic studies have documented gastrointestinal mucosal damage within days of commencing treatment. Endoscopic investigation of patients chronically exposed to aspirin found that the mucosal damage appeared to resolve over time. While this suggested continued exposure promoted gastric adaptation, the mechanism by which this might occur was unclear. Although endoscopic evidence of mucosal damage represents a surrogate for the outcome of clinical interest, gastric ulceration and its complications of bleeding, perforation, and stenosis, epidemiological studies were in keeping with the observation, suggesting that the risk of gastrointestinal complications was highest in the early weeks of NSAID treatment, and declined thereafter. More recent evidence suggests the existence of an adaptive mucosal response is questionable. In a record linkage study, MacDonald et al. found that the
increased risks of admission to hospital with gastrointestinal complications related to NSAID use were constant during continuous exposure and that excess risk appeared to persist for at least a year after the last exposure. These findings were at variance with the earlier studies, but as the prospective design of the study by MacDonald et al. is better suited to the examination of temporal effects, their results are likely to be valid.

NSAID-induced gastric mucosal damage appears to be related to the inhibition of gastric prostaglandin synthesis by the enzyme cyclo-oxygenase. Prostaglandins are a large family of ‘local hormones’ or ‘autocoids’ (Greek, autos: self, akos: medicinal agent or remedy) with diverse haematological, smooth muscular, gastric, cardiac, renal, nervous system, endocrine, and metabolic effects. COX is known to exist in at least two isoforms. COX-1, physiological COX, is believed to predominate in the stomach, generating the prostaglandins that protect the gastric mucosa from acid damage. COX-2, inducible COX, is associated with the production of inflammatory prostaglandins. NSAIDs in common use, such as ibuprofen, diclofenac, naproxen, are non-selective COX inhibitors, blocking formation of both COX-1 and COX-2. It has been postulated that the anti-inflammatory actions of these agents are due to their inhibitory effects on COX-2 formation, their toxicity, in particular that relating to the GI tract, to COX-1 inhibition. The distinction between the COX isoforms led to a search for drugs that spare COX-1 (COX-2 inhibitors) in the expectation that such agents would be free of the serious GI toxicity caused by non-selective NSAIDs. The first COX-2 inhibitors, celecoxib and rofecoxib, have now been marketed and others are being developed. Endoscopic studies found that both celecoxib and rofecoxib were associated with significantly less mucosal damage than non-selective agents.66–68 The rates of clinically significant complications including symptomatic ulceration, perforation, bleeding, or stenosis were low, and thereby limited the trials’ capacity to quantify any advantage of COX-2 inhibitors in relation to these outcomes. Data from large numbers of patients will be required and this is most likely to be provided from post-marketing surveillance and epidemiological studies.

EFFECTS OF AGE

On the whole, the effects of age on pharmacodynamic responses have been less well studied than its effects on pharmacokinetics. This is particularly so in the very young, who are rarely included in experimental studies to investigate the clinical effects of drugs. Although it is somewhat counterintuitive, the elderly are often equally or even less sensitive to the primary pharmacologic effects of some drugs than are the young. Several examples of the effects of old age on pharmacodynamic responses may be found in the cardiovascular therapeutics:

- It has long been known that elderly subjects are relatively resistant to the effects of both the β-agonist drug, isoproterenol, and the β-blocking drug, propranolol.10 The extent to which this is due to elevated levels of plasma catecholamines is not clear.
- Elegant experimental work has demonstrated that elderly subjects have a blunted primary electrophysiologic response to the calcium channel blocking drug verapamil.11
- The degree of prolongation of the electrocardiographic P–R interval in response to a given concentration of verapamil was less pronounced in elderly than in younger subjects.10
- In contrast to its effect on the P–R interval, verapamil produces a greater drop in blood pressure in the elderly than it does in younger subjects.10

How may the last two observations be reconciled? The probable answer is that both the secondary adaptive physiologic responses and the primary pharmacologic response are impaired in the elderly subjects. Maintenance of blood pressure depends on activation of the sympathetic nervous system, which tends to be less responsive in the elderly.10 It is likely that impairment of secondary adaptive responses, rather than increased sensitivity to the primary pharmacologic actions per se, accounts for the increased susceptibility of elderly subjects to the side-effects of many drugs.

Homeostatic regulation (the body’s control of its internal environment) is often impaired in the elderly and may contribute to the occurrence of
adverse events as well as increased sensitivity to drug effects. For example, older individuals have an impaired ability to excrete a free water load, possibly as a result of lower renal prostaglandin production. This may be exacerbated by treatments which further impair either free water excretion, such as diuretics, or renal prostaglandin production, for example, NSAIDs. In either case, there is a risk of dilutional hyponatraemia or volume overload.

Postural hypotension (the sudden drop in blood pressure that occurs with standing or sitting up) is frequently symptomatic in the elderly and the pathogenesis probably includes decreased baroreceptor response, altered sympathetic activity and responsiveness, impaired arteriolar and venous vasomotor responses, and altered volume regulation. Accordingly, drugs that alter central nervous system function, sympathetic activity, vasomotor response, cardiac function, or volume regulation may exacerbate postural changes in blood pressure. The list of agents is extensive and includes such commonly used drugs as phenothiazines, anti-hypertensives, diuretics, and levodopa.

EFFECTS OF DISEASE STATES

The effects of disease states on pharmacodynamics have not been widely studied. It is a common clinical observation that individuals with certain diseases can have exaggerated responses to particular drugs. For example, individuals with chronic liver or lung disease sometimes exhibit extreme sensitivity to drugs that depress central nervous system function, such as benzodiazepines and opiates. This apparent increase in drug sensitivity may be due to (i) changes in receptor function, which would increase actual sensitivity to drugs, or (ii) disease-related changes in neuronal function, such as occur in encephalopathy caused by severe lung or liver disease. A further possibility, in the case of liver failure, is the presence of elevated concentrations of circulating endogenous ligands that bind to the benzodiazepine receptor, the effect of which is additive to that of diazepam.

Another example of the role of disease states in pharmacodynamic variability is the propensity for NSAIDs to impair renal function in certain groups of individuals. Both congestive heart failure and hepatic failure are characterized by high circulating levels of the vasoconstrictor hormones norepinephrine, angiotensin II, and antidiuretic hormone. In response to the presence of these hormones, the kidneys release prostaglandins to modulate their vasoconstrictor effects and thus help preserve renal blood flow in times of physiologic stress. In susceptible individuals, inhibition of prostaglandin synthesis (for example, as a result of NSAID administration) can lead to unopposed vasoconstriction with a marked and rapid reduction in renal blood flow, and a consequent fall in the rate of glomerular filtration.

DRUG-DRUG INTERACTIONS THAT OCCUR THROUGH PHARMACODYNAMIC MECHANISMS

Although most clinically important drug–drug interactions occur through pharmacokinetic mechanisms, a number of important interactions are pharmacodynamic in nature. Pharmacodynamic interactions arise as a consequence of drugs acting on the same receptors, sites of action, or physiological systems. In examining the variability that exists within the population with regard to the effects of drugs, the presence or absence of concomitant medications can play a particularly important role and must be considered as potential causal or confounding variables in pharmacoepidemiology studies. For example, individuals with any given serum digoxin concentration are more likely to suffer from digoxin toxicity if they are depleted of certain electrolytes, such as magnesium and potassium. Thus, patients on concomitant magnesium/potassium wasting diuretics such as furosemide are more likely than those who are not to develop arrhythmias, given the same serum digoxin concentration.

Many drugs have central nervous system depressant effects and these may be potentiated where a number of such agents are used together, such as hypnotics, anxiolytics, antidepressants, opioids, anti-epileptics, antihistamines, and methyldopa. A “serotonergic syndrome” (consisting of mental changes, muscle rigidity, hypertension, tremor, and diarrhea) may be induced in some patients given combinations of proserotonergic drugs such as
selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs), tricyclic antidepressants, monoamine oxidase inhibitors (MAOIs), carbamazepine, and lithium.

Competition between drugs acting at the same receptor sites usually results in antagonistic effects. These may be desired, as in the case of naloxone or flumazenil given to reverse central nervous system depression or coma resulting from opiate or benzodiazepine overdose respectively, or unintended, as in the case of the mutual antagonism occurring between β-agonists (bronchodilators) and nonselective β-antagonists (bronchoconstrictors).

Sildenafil (Viagra®) is a selective inhibitor of cyclic guanosine monophosphate (cGMP)-specific phosphodiesterase type 5, the predominant enzyme metabolizing cGMP in the smooth muscles of the corpus cavernosum. By doing so, it restores the natural erectile response to sexual stimulation in men with erectile dysfunction.16 However, the formation in the first place of cavernosal cGMP is due to the release of nitric oxide in response to sexual stimulation. In men taking concomitant nitrate drugs for heart disease, there is a risk of a precipitous fall in blood pressure due to potentiation by sildenafil of their hypotensive effects. Although concomitant use is contraindicated by the manufacturer, a number of sildenafil-associated deaths are considered to have been due to this drug combination.

Case–control pharmacoepidemiology studies have demonstrated an association between long term use (>3 months) of certain appetite suppressants (phentermine plus fenfluramine or dexfenfluramine, or dexfenfluramine alone) and cardiac valve abnormalities.17 The use of amphetamine-like appetite suppressants, mainly fenfluramine and dexfenfluramine, has also been associated with primary pulmonary hypertension.18 It has been postulated that these unintended effects were due to serotonin accumulation as a consequence of both increased release and reduced removal. Serotonin is the predominant mediator of pulmonary vasoconstriction caused by aggregating platelets and has been shown to increase pulmonary vascular smooth muscle proliferation. Prolonged use of fenfluramine and dexfenfluramine may have produced an excess of serotonin sufficient to damage blood vessels in the lungs. Serotonin excess is also thought to be responsible for the cardiac damage as the pathological findings in damaged valves resembled those of carcinoid heart disease or heart disease associated with ergotamine toxicity, both of which are serotonin related syndromes. Both fenfluramine and dexfenfluramine were withdrawn from the worldwide market in 1997.

In conclusion, adaptive responses, age, disease states, and concomitant medications can each have important effects on pharmacodynamic responses, and may result in considerable heterogeneity in the responses to drugs, both between and within individuals. Allowance must be made for this when interpreting pharmacoepidemiology data. We will now consider the effects of pharmacokinetic determinants of variability in drug response.

THE ROLE OF PHARMACOKINETICS IN DETERMINING VARIABILITY OF DRUG RESPONSE

As noted above, pharmacokinetics is the science that describes the time course of the absorption, distribution, and elimination of drugs within the body. From a research perspective, it is generally easier to measure changing concentrations of drugs in body fluids than it is to characterize the pharmacologic responses to those concentrations. Consequently, the literature on pharmacokinetics is voluminous, and it could be said that clinical pharmacology as a discipline has been overly concerned with its study. However, it must be acknowledged that variation in pharmacokinetic parameters is an important cause of the observed heterogeneity that exists with regard to patients’ response to drugs. In this section, we review the processes of absorption, distribution, and elimination of drugs, and then consider the effects of age, genetics, disease, and concomitant medications.

First, however, it is useful to define some of the basic mathematical parameters that are used in pharmacokinetics.

BASIC MATHEMATICAL PARAMETERS USED IN PHARMACOKINETICS

Figure 4.1 shows the serum concentration of a hypothetical drug following a single intravenous
the central compartment into one or more peripheral compartments, and is referred to as the 
distribution phase. After the concentration of drug molecules has reached equilibrium across the 
compartments, the more gradual decline in serum concentrations that is seen at the right-hand 
portion of the curve represents the elimination of 
drug from the body, and is referred to as the 
terminal elimination phase.
Because the dose of injected drug is known, and 
the initial plasma concentration immediately following administration ($C_p$, the peak plasma 
concentration) can be extrapolated from the points 
on the curve, a pharmacokinetic parameter known 
as apparent volume of distribution, or $V_d$, can be 
calculated by dividing dose by $C_p$. $V_d$ is expressed 
in units of volume, such as litres, and is the volume 
of fluid into which the drug appears to have been 
dissolved in order to produce the actual peak 
concentration. Just as with pharmacokinetic 
compartments, the apparent volume of distribution is a 
theoretical, rather than an actual volume, although 
it does have some physiologic interpretability. 
For example, a highly lipid-soluble drug such as 
a tricyclic antidepressant may have an apparent 
volume of distribution of hundreds of litres. This 
is because the drug partitions readily into fatty 
tissue, leaving little measurable drug in the blood 
stream.
The slope of the line that represents the 
elimination phase is known as the elimination rate 
constant, or $K_e$, and is expressed in units of 
reciprocal time, such as hours.1 Because of the 
linearity of the terminal elimination phase, the 
time that it takes for any given drug concentration 
to decline to half of this original concentration is 
constant, and is known as the drug’s half-life, or 
$T_{1/2}$. Half-life is expressed in units of time, such as 
hours. Mathematically, this parameter is calculated 
from the elimination rate constant using the 
formula $T_{1/2} = 0.693/K_e$.
An additional pharmacokinetic parameter, 
clearance, or Cl, can also be defined. Again, this 
is a theoretical parameter, and refers to the volume 
of the body fluid whose concentration is being 
measured that appears to be completely cleared 
of drug, per unit of time, regardless of the clearance 
mechanism. It is expressed in units of volume per
unit time, such as litres per hour. Clearance can be calculated by taking the product of the apparent volume of distribution and the elimination rate constant.

When a drug is administered according to a stable dosing regimen, the plasma drug concentration eventually reaches an equilibrium state, in which the amount of drug being administered is equal to the amount of drug being eliminated from the body (Figure 4.2). This is referred to as steady state. The amount of time required for a drug to reach steady state depends on the rate of elimination of the drug from that individual. For the purposes of therapeutic drug monitoring, achieving >95% of the steady state concentration is generally considered sufficient in order to estimate the true steady state concentration. This can be accomplished by obtaining a biologic sample after approximately five drug half-lives. The amount of drug that is administered affects the magnitude of the steady state drug concentration, but not the amount of time that it takes to reach steady state. Under these circumstances the longer half-life results in a longer time to achieve steady state concentrations and a tendency to accumulate.

Figure 4.2. Profile of plasma drug concentrations for two hypothetical drugs during repeated 12 hourly dosing schedule. The lower curve relates to a drug with a half-life of 10 hours; steady state concentrations are achieved after 50–60 hours. In contrast, the upper curve relates to a drug with a half-life of 20 hours and the plasma concentrations are still rising at the end of the study.

**EFFECTS OF VARIATION IN DRUG ABSORPTION**

In clinical practice, most drugs are administered by mouth. Because they are small and at least partially lipid soluble, most drug molecules are absorbed by passive diffusion across the large surface area of the mucosa lining the small intestine. The extent of absorption is determined primarily by the physicochemical properties of the drug and the integrity of the small intestine, while the rate of absorption depends largely on gastric emptying time and the motility of the small intestine.

Both increasing age and the presence of disease states can affect the extent and rate of gastrointestinal absorption of drugs and, if they have an effect, both will tend to decrease absorption. As a result, altered gastrointestinal absorption is unlikely to be a cause of increased susceptibility to adverse drug effects, and has traditionally been of little concern in pharmacoepidemiology research. An important exception exists where different formulations of the same drug have dramatically different absorption profiles. An example of this was seen in Australia involving the calcium antagonist, nifedipine, which was available both as sustained release tablets and as rapid release capsules. Individuals who were switched inadvertently from the former to the same dose of the latter sometimes experienced severe hypotension, presumably due to rapid absorption leading to elevated peak concentrations of the drug, with subsequent marked vasodilatation.

Also of interest to pharmacoepidemiologists is the systemic absorption of drugs that may occur following unintended absorption via other routes, such as transdermally, following administration by metered dose inhaler, or ocular instillation. The ability of lipid soluble compounds to be absorbed across intact skin has been utilized in the design of transdermal delivery systems for several drugs, including estradiol, nitroglycerin, nicotine, and scopolamine. Unfortunately, transdermal drug absorption can produce adverse as well as beneficial effects, as illustrated by the hexachlorophene toxicity that occurred in neonates following the mixture of excessive quantities of this antiseptic with talcum powder, and in another instance,
following the inadvertent contamination of talcum powder with the anticoagulant warfarin.21 Neonates are particularly susceptible to the effects of transdermal drug exposure because their skin provides a poor barrier to systemic absorption, and because they have a large surface area in proportion to their body weight.

In a similar fashion, quantities of corticosteroid sufficient to produce systemic effects can be swallowed following administration from a metered dose inhaler.22 Likewise, β-blocking drugs instilled into the eyes can travel down the nasolacrimal duct to be swallowed and absorbed, inducing bronchospasm or exacerbation of congestive heart failure in susceptible individuals.23

In summary, because variability in the absorption of oral dosage forms of drugs from the gastrointestinal tract typically reduces absorption, it is rarely important in pharmacoepidemiology studies of adverse effects. However, unintended systemic absorption can occur through a variety of routes, and can have important consequences.

EFFECTS OF VARIATION IN SYSTEMIC DISTRIBUTION OF DRUGS

As drug molecules are absorbed into the central compartment, they are distributed to various tissues at a rate and to an extent that are determined by (i) the lipid solubility of the drug, (ii) the degree of protein binding of the drug, and (iii) the amount of blood flow received by the different tissues. A high degree of lipid solubility confers an ability to move readily across cell membranes, and therefore results in a higher proportion of drug molecules being distributed to fatty tissues. Extensive binding to plasma proteins will reduce movement of drug molecules out of the central compartment, and thus reduce the drug’s apparent volume of distribution. Better perfused tissues will tend to receive a higher concentration of drug than tissues that are poorly perfused.

Protein binding is an aspect of drug distribution that receives considerable attention. Untoward effects of drugs are often attributed to altered protein binding, which can occur in certain disease states, pregnancy, or when other highly protein bound drugs are taken concurrently. However, there are relatively few occasions when disease induced disturbances of protein binding or protein binding drug–drug interactions have been shown to have clinically important effects. The main reason for this is that, while it is the free fraction of drug that interacts with target proteins in order to produce a pharmacologic effect, it is also the free fraction that is available to the clearance mechanisms. Therefore, any increase in the free drug concentration that is caused by either reduced albumin levels or by displacement by other drugs is also accompanied by an increase in clearance, so that the free, active concentration ultimately changes little.24 There are occasional situations in which this general rule may not apply, particularly where small changes in concentrations have large effects, or where the drug has a single clearance mechanism that has a limited capacity, and therefore can become saturated.

In conclusion, changes in drug distribution are often cited as reasons for variability in response to drugs and, therefore, may be implicated when seeking explanations for pharmacoepidemiology findings. However, alterations in drug distribution rarely produce clinically important effects. Pharmacokinetic explanations for variability in response usually involve a change in clearance of drugs from the body.

EFFECTS OF VARIATION IN DRUG ELIMINATION

Drugs are excreted from the body either as the unchanged parent compound, or as one or more products of drug metabolism. Although a number of organs, including the biliary system, the lungs, and the skin participate in drug elimination, the kidneys play the most important role. Most excretory organs remove water soluble compounds more efficiently than they remove lipid soluble compounds. Consequently, water soluble drugs tend to be eliminated unchanged in the urine, while lipid soluble drugs tend to undergo metabolism, usually in the liver, prior to being excreted.

Effects of Variation in Renal Elimination

Virtually all drugs are small enough to be filtered through the glomeruli, the filtering units of the
kidney, into the renal tubules. The extent of glomerular filtration depends on both the perfusion pressure to the glomeruli, and the protein binding characteristics of the drug. Because only the unbound fraction of a drug in the bloodstream is available to be filtered, a high degree of protein binding and a high affinity of the drug for the binding protein will limit the amount of drug that reaches the renal tubules. Once inside the renal tubules, highly lipid soluble drugs are readily reabsorbed into the bloodstream, across the lipid membranes of the cells lining the renal tubules, leaving virtually none of the filtered fraction to be excreted in the urine. Because this process does not involve the consumption of cellular energy, it is known as passive tubular reabsorption. Water soluble drugs, such as aminoglycoside antibiotics and digoxin, remain in the urine and are excreted. Active tubular secretion occurs when substances are secreted into the renal tubules by energy consuming carrier proteins. It is an important clearance mechanism for a number of drugs, including penicillin.

For drugs that are readily ionized at physiologic pH, such as salicylates, pH can be a crucial determinant of renal excretion. Because the non-ionized (uncharged) drug fraction is the most lipid soluble, it is most likely to undergo passive tubular reabsorption. Therefore, the renal excretion of salicylates, which are ionized at high (alkaline) pH, can be enhanced by the pharmacologic alkalization of the urine. This characteristic is exploited when alkaline diuresis is used to enhance renal clearance in cases of salicylate overdose.

From a pharmacoepidemiology standpoint, the importance of renal clearance is that it can be estimated and, therefore, individuals can be identified who are at risk of toxicity through accumulation of water soluble drugs. This is much simpler than estimating hepatic function (see below).

Blood creatinine concentration is a measure of renal function that is frequently used in clinical practice. The rate at which the kidneys clear creatinine from the blood (creatinine clearance) correlates closely with the glomerular filtration rate. Creatinine concentration at any point in time is a function of production and clearance, both of which tend to decline to a proportionally similar degree with age; the former because of declining muscle mass, the latter because of an age related decline in numbers of functioning glomeruli. For example, a blood creatinine level of 0.1 mmol L\(^{-1}\) in an 80-year-old female reflects a much lower level of renal function than the same creatinine concentration in a 20-year-old male (Figure 4.3).

The importance of considering age when interpreting blood creatinine concentrations is illustrated in Figure 4.3. If both subjects mentioned in the previous paragraph required treatment with digoxin, the dose used to achieve therapeutic concentrations in the older subject would be less than half that required by the young man. Remember that these individuals have identical blood creatinine concentrations, illustrating the limitations of relying on this parameter solely as a measure of renal function.

In conclusion, it is important to take account of variation in renal function when conducting

![Figure 4.3. Change in estimated creatinine clearance (Cockcroft and Gault formula\(^2\)) with age in a male and a female who maintain a serum creatinine of 0.1 mmol L\(^{-1}\) (NR 0.07 – 0.12 mmol L\(^{-1}\)), throughout their lives. In estimating creatinine clearance, it was assumed that the male maintained a weight of 75 kg, and the female a weight of 60 kg. The figure indicates that creatinine clearance declines in a linear fashion with age, and serum creatinine, alone, is an inadequate measure of glomerular filtration. Consequently, the clearance of some drugs is impaired in the elderly. For instance, the female depicted at 80 years (creatinine clearance 45 ml min\(^{-1}\)) would require less than half the dose of digoxin taken by the male at 20 years, despite having an identical serum creatinine level.](image-url)
pharmacoepidemiology studies of drugs for which this is the principal route of elimination from the body. Some linked pharmacoepidemiology databases include laboratory files, enabling estimates of renal function to be made and included in analyses of outcomes. Consequently, it is important to recognize that blood creatinine concentrations must be adjusted for age and body weight before being used as an estimate of renal function. A number of suitable formulae have been published, with the most widely used being that of Cockcroft and Gault.25

Drug-Drug Interactions Involving Renal Elimination

Drugs are capable of interfering with elimination of other substances by the kidney. This can occur through an effect on filtration, tubular reabsorption, or tubular secretion. A thorough discussion of this topic is beyond the scope of this overview, but one or two examples will illustrate the importance of this type of interaction. The deleterious effect of NSAIDs on renal blood flow that occurs in certain clinical states was mentioned earlier. As a result, NSAIDs are capable of inhibiting the clearance of a range of potentially toxic compounds, including lithium and methotrexate.26 Accumulation of these agents can produce serious adverse effects.

In cases where filtration pressure is maintained by vasoconstriction of the post-glomerular efferent arteriole, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors (ACEIs) may abruptly decrease the glomerular filtration rate through inhibition of angiotensin II synthesis. This may occur in renal artery stenosis, hypovolemia, and cardiac failure, thereby increasing the effects or the toxicity of concomitantly administered drugs that are renally excreted or that are nephrotoxic. The immunosuppressant, cyclosporin, induces vasoconstriction of the afferent glomerular arteriole in a dose related and reversible fashion. An increased risk of acute renal failure exists when cyclosporin is combined with NSAIDs, ACEIs, or other nephrotoxic drugs.

Probenecid, a drug that is used in the treatment of gout, reduces the reabsorption of uric acid by the renal tubules, and inhibits the active tubular secretion of penicillin. These actions explain two therapeutic effects of probenecid—it lowers uric acid concentrations in the blood and enhances the effect of a dose of penicillin. Both mechanisms are exploited in clinical practice.

Effects of Variation in Drug Metabolism

Variability in the metabolism of drugs is an important factor to be considered in the analysis and interpretation of pharmacoepidemiology studies. In this section, we will consider the effects of genetics, age, disease states, and concomitant drugs on the metabolism of drugs. Next, we will discuss some of the implications of active drug metabolites and intrinsic clearance. But first, an overview of drug metabolism is in order.

An Overview of Drug Metabolism

The majority of drugs are too lipid soluble to be effectively eliminated by the kidneys. First, they must be converted into water soluble metabolites that can then be excreted in the urine, or sometimes in feces, via the bile. The metabolic steps necessary for the conversions occur primarily in the liver. Chemical reactions that result in the metabolism of drugs are classified as either phase I or II reactions. Phase I reactions are usually oxidative (e.g., hydroxylation) and create an active site on the drug molecule that can act as a target for phase II conjugative (synthetic) reactions. Phase II reactions involve the synthesis of a new molecule from the combination of the drug and a substrate such as glucuronic or acetic acid (Figure 4.4). The product of this type of reaction, for instance the glucuronide or acetyl derivative of the drug, is highly water soluble, and is excreted in the urine, or occasionally in the feces, if it is of high molecular weight.

Most drugs that undergo phase I (oxidative) metabolism are transformed by a superfamily of enzymes called the cytochrome P450 (CYP; pronounced “sip”) system. Cytochrome P450 is so named because in a certain form its maximal light absorption occurs at a wavelength of approximately 450 nanometers. Most phase I drug metabolism involves cytochrome P450 families 1, 2, and 3 (CYP1, CYP2, and CYP3). Specific enzymes exist within CYP families. For example, enzymes
CYP2C9, CYP2C10, CYP2C18, and CYP2C19 are responsible for most drug metabolism within the CYP2C group of enzymes. Different drugs may be metabolized by different isoenzymes, or, because of incomplete substrate specificity, a given drug may be metabolized by more than one enzyme.

Some drugs are capable of participating in synthetic reactions without prior phase I metabolism. An example is the benzodiazepine, temazepam, which is conjugated directly with glucuronide, and is eliminated in the urine in this form. In contrast, diazepam, another benzodiazepine, must undergo several phase I oxidative reactions before it can be conjugated and eliminated. Phase I reactions are usually the rate limiting step in this process and are subject to much greater intra- and inter-individual variability than are phase II reactions. This explains why diazepam metabolism is largely affected by age and disease, while temazepam metabolism is relatively unaffected by these factors.

Effect of Genetic Factors on Drug Metabolism

Genetic factors are sometimes important in determining the activity of drug metabolizing enzymes. Studies have shown that half-lives of phenylbutazone and coumarin anticoagulants are much less variable in monozygotic than in heterozygotic twins. The half-lives of these drugs in the overall population display an approximately Gaussian distribution, although the limits are often wide, and may encompass five- to ten-fold variations.

The metabolism of the anti-tubercular drug, isoniazid, exhibits a bimodal distribution within the population. The conjugation of isoniazid with acetic acid is an important step in its inactivation and elimination. Variability in the rate of isoniazid acetylation results from a single recessive gene whose
distribution shows some racial dependence (acetylation polymorphism). For example, approximately half (50–60%) of most Caucasian communities are slow acetylators, and therefore have a reduced capacity to eliminate the drug.\(^{29}\) In Japan, the prevalence of the slow acetylator phenotype is only 15%, and slow acetylators have not been identified in Eskimo populations. Although attempts have been made to correlate acetylator phenotype with risk of isoniazid-induced hepatotoxicity, published reports are equivocal, with some showing an association with slow inactivators and others showing an association with rapid inactivators.\(^{30}\)

Acetylation polymorphism affects the metabolism of a number of drugs in addition to isoniazid; these include some sulfonamides (including sulfasalazine), hydralazine, procainamide, dapsone, nitrazepam, and caffeine. In general, the clinical implications are that slow acetylators require lower doses both for therapeutic effect and to minimize toxicity and side effects. This is particularly the case for drugs that have a narrow therapeutic index (that is, little difference between toxic and therapeutic concentrations).

Hydroxylation polymorphism was identified in 1977.\(^{31}\) It has since been established that around 10% of Caucasians and 1% of Asians exhibit hydroxylation deficiency as a result of reduced activity of the enzyme CYP2D6. First described in relation to debrisoquine, the deficiency also affects the metabolism of antidepressants (amitryptiline, clomipramine, desipramine, nortriptyline, mianserin, paroxetine), anti-arrhythmics (flecainide, propafenone), antipsychotics (haloperidol, perphenazine, thioridazine), and \(\beta\)-blockers (alprenolol, metoprolol) leading to accumulation of the active parent compound. In the cases of amitryptiline and thioridazine, both parent and active metabolite accumulate. Poor hydroxylators may have markedly increased effects or a prolonged duration of action of the affected drugs.

CYP2D19 polymorphism is described in 3% of Caucasians and 15–25% of Asians who have a deficient capacity to hydroxylate mephenytoin.\(^{31}\) CYP2D19 also catalyzes the metabolism of commonly used drugs such as diazepam, omeprazole, propranolol, some tricyclic antidepressants, and mocllobemide.

The clinical consequences of genetic polymorphism have not been fully elucidated, but it is likely that such genetically determined differences may account in some part for the interindividual and interethnic differences in therapeutic response and side-effect profile observed with many drugs.

The CYP2D6 phenotype of a given individual can be determined by testing the metabolic clearance of a test drug, such as debrisoquine or sparteine. This technique can be useful in performing pharmacoepidemiology studies. For instance, Wiholm compared debrisoquine hydroxylation in a group of subjects who had developed lactic acidosis while taking phenformin with the expected distribution in the Swedish population.\(^{32}\) This study illustrates the potential for investigating groups of individuals who display apparently idiosyncratic reactions to certain drugs. More recent examples of the use of laboratory techniques to investigate the occurrence of serious adverse reactions include the demonstration of possible familial predispositions to halothane hepatitis and phenytoin induced hypersensitivity syndromes.\(^{33,34}\)

The large series of well validated case reports held by many spontaneous reporting systems represent fertile areas for this type of research (see Chapters 10 and 11). The use of biochemical tests in concert with epidemiologic methods in order to predict variability in drug response is a promising new area of research.

### Effects of Disease on Drug Metabolism

Hepatic disease can result in reduced elimination of lipid soluble drugs that are metabolized by this organ. Unfortunately, there are no convenient tests of liver function that are analogous to the measurement of creatinine clearance for estimating renal function. The conventional biochemical tests largely reflect liver damage, rather than liver function. It is quite possible for an individual to have grossly disordered liver function tests, while still metabolizing drugs normally, or alternatively, to have apparently normal liver function tests, despite the presence of advanced liver disease with marked impairment of metabolic capacity. To complicate matters further, the liver behaves as
though it has a number of “partial functions” that respond differently to disease. For example, bilirubin synthesis conjugation may be impaired, while albumin synthesis continues fairly normally. Alternatively, both of these functions may be almost normal, despite the presence of liver disease that has progressed so far that it has resulted in elevated pressure in the portal vein, with subsequent bleeding esophageal varices. It is thus difficult to generalize about the effects of liver disease on hepatic drug metabolism. However, pharmacokinetic studies have shown that liver disease has to be severe, and usually chronic, to result in marked impairment of drug elimination. This is the case, for example, in individuals with cirrhosis or chronic active hepatitis, where phase I reactions are primarily affected, while conjugative reactions tend to be spared. Other individuals, such as those with biliary obstruction or acute viral hepatitis, may have remarkably normal drug metabolism.

Drug metabolism may also be affected by disease processes originating in other organs. For example, congestive heart failure can result in severe congestion of the liver, and therefore impair the hepatic clearance of some compounds, while hypoxia has been shown to reduce markedly the metabolism of theophylline.35

To summarize, liver disease is a relatively uncommon cause of clinically important impaired drug metabolism. Generally, it can be stated that genetic and environmental factors are more important causes of variability in hepatic metabolism of drugs than diseases of the organ itself.

Effects of Active Metabolites

The general rule that drug metabolism produces metabolites that are inactive or markedly less active than the parent drug does not always hold true and this should be considered as an explanation for unexpected pharmacokinetics findings. For example, several metabolites of carbamazepine contribute to its pharmacologic activity.36 The hydroxyl metabolite of propranolol has similar activity to its parent compound.37 Conjugated metabolites are usually devoid of activity, but morphine-6-glucuronide has been shown to have morphine-like action, and accumulation of this metabolite may explain the prolonged opiate effect of morphine that is found in individuals with advanced renal failure.37 Likewise, the acetyl derivative of the antiarrhythmic procainamide has been shown to have pharmacologic activity, and may cause toxicity.

Sometimes a metabolite has toxic effects that are not shown by the parent drug. N-acetylbenezquinoneimine is the toxic metabolite formed by the oxidative metabolism of acetaminophen. This is normally produced in small quantities but rapidly cleared by reaction with glutathione. In acetaminophen poisoning, the available glutathione reserves are exhausted and the toxic metabolite is free to exert its action on cell membranes, leading to hepatic damage that may on occasions be fatal. More of the metabolite may be formed in the presence of enzyme induction; as a result, chronic heavy drinkers and individuals taking long-term anticonvulsants are thought to be more prone to develop liver damage. Acute doses of alcohol, on the other hand, markedly inhibit the formation of the metabolite and may actually be protective.

Effects of Presystemic Clearance

Certain orally administered drugs are metabolized substantially in the intestine and/or in the liver before they ever reach the systemic circulation. This phenomenon is known as “first pass” metabolism or “presystemic” clearance. Drugs with high presystemic clearance include morphine, oral contraceptives, prazosin, propranolol, and verapamil. The differences between drugs with high or low presystemic clearances become apparent if hepatic metabolism is impaired by disease or inhibited by another drug.

In the case of a drug with low presystemic clearance, a reduction in hepatic metabolism results in a prolongation of the elimination half-life. Generally, it takes approximately five half-lives to reach a steady state concentration, and accumulation of the drug may cause toxicity. If the drug has a high presystemic clearance, a decline in metabolism will result in increased bioavailability of the drug with elevated, and possibly toxic,
concentrations early in the course of treatment, possibly after the first dose. Thus, in a study of the adverse effects of drugs in subjects with hepatic impairment or metabolic inhibition by other drugs, the time course of adverse effects can be critically dependent on this factor.

Drug–Drug Interactions Involving Drug Metabolizing Enzymes

Enzyme induction occurs when the chronic administration of a substance results in an increase in the amount of a particular metabolizing enzyme. When such enzymes are induced, the rate of metabolism of a drug can increase several-fold. The subsequent fall in the concentration of the drug in the blood, and, consequently, at its sites of action, may result in a substantial loss of drug activity. For instance, failure of ethynylestradiol containing oral contraceptives can result from the CYP450 enzyme inducing effects of some anti-epileptic medications.\(^26\)\(^,\)\(^39\) The rate of metabolism of warfarin is increased by concomitantly administered drugs including carbamazepine, rifampicin, and barbiturates, leading to reduced steady-state plasma concentrations, and therefore a reduced anticoagulant effect.

Enzyme induction proceeds through a mechanism that involves increases in gene transcription, resulting in increased synthesis of new enzyme protein.\(^3\) It can take several weeks to reach its peak, and can persist for some time after the inducing drug is ceased. CYP450 enzymes differ in their ability to be induced in response to a given exposure. For example, theophylline metabolism is readily inducible by cigarette smoking, while phenytoin metabolism is affected to a greater extent by barbiturates and anti-epileptic medications.\(^25\)

Enzyme inhibition occurs when the presence of one substance inhibits the metabolism of another substance. It involves either competition for active sites on the enzyme, or other binding site interactions that alter the activity of the enzyme. In contrast to induction, enzyme inhibition occurs rapidly, and is rapidly reversed once the inhibiting substance has been withdrawn. As with induction, interacting compounds display considerable specificity, and a number of commonly used drugs have the capacity to inhibit microsomal function. For example, cimetidine is capable of inhibiting the metabolism of many compounds including warfarin, theophylline, phenytoin, propranolol, and several benzodiazepines.\(^40\) In contrast, omeprazole has been shown to inhibit the metabolism of diazepam and phenytoin, but not of propranolol.\(^41\)\(^–\)\(^43\) Erythromycin is a clinically important enzyme inhibitor, well known for its effects on theophylline metabolism. More recently, erythromycin and other macrolide antibiotics have been shown to inhibit the metabolism of the antihistamines terfenadine and astemizole, with consequent adverse effects on cardiac conduction.\(^44\) The calcium antagonists diltiazem and verapamil (but not nifedipine) increase cyclosporin plasma concentrations, but with relative sparing of nephrotoxicity, and the interaction has been used in clinical practice to produce an immunosuppressive concentration of cyclosporin at a lower ingested dose.\(^45\) Drug cost savings of 14–48%, attributable to the use of calcium antagonists, have been reported in transplant pharmacotherapy. The novel calcium antagonist, mibebradil, was withdrawn from the market in 1998 as a consequence of its interactions with concomitantly administered \(\beta\)-blockers and dihydropyridine calcium antagonists which resulted in bradycardia, infarction, cardiogenic shock, and death.\(^46\)

Interactions arise not only as a consequence of other drugs; food constituents may affect drug metabolism. For example, the biflavonoids present in grapefruit juice have a strong inhibitory effect on the presystemic metabolism of calcium antagonists, causing a two- to three-fold increase in the systemic absorption of oral nifedipine and felodipine.\(^47\) A similar effect of biflavonoids on cyclosporin concentrations has been observed and has been utilised to reduce the doses, and therefore the side effects and costs, of cyclosporin therapy. Both calcium antagonists and cyclosporin are metabolized by the CYP450 isoenzyme CYP3A4 which is present in the gut wall and in the liver, and the biflavonoids inhibit its activity. Vitamin K containing foods such as cabbage, brussels sprouts, broccoli, spinach, lettuce, rape seed oil, and soya bean oil, taken in sufficient amounts, may antagonize the effects of warfarin.
CONSEQUENCES OF VARIABILITY IN PHARMACOKINETICS

The foregoing discussion on causes of variability in pharmacokinetics is only of importance if there are clinical consequences that are likely to be detected in pharmacoepidemiology studies. Therefore, it is important to determine the circumstances in which these factors will contribute to variability in drug response.

Several factors are important. The first is the relationship between the concentration of the drug and its effects. Alterations of drug pharmacokinetics tend to be important if they involve drugs that have a low therapeutic ratio. In such cases, a small increase in plasma concentration may have a disproportionate clinical effect. Examples of drugs with this profile are digoxin and lithium, which are primarily excreted unchanged by the kidneys, and theophylline and warfarin, which are primarily inactivated by hepatic metabolism. Cyclosporin also has a narrow therapeutic ratio, but wide variations between individuals in absorption, distribution, and metabolism have made definition of therapeutic, but nontoxic, concentrations difficult. It undergoes both hepatic metabolism and local metabolism in the gut, and the latter may be a major contributor to the variability in absorption.

Regardless of whether we are dealing with a decline in renal function or a reduction or inhibition of hepatic metabolism, the consequences in each case of increases in plasma concentration will be accumulation of the drug, and potential toxicity. In contrast, interactions involving drugs with high therapeutic ratios, for instance penicillin, will not produce significant adverse effects.

THE IMPORTANCE OF THE HUMAN FACTOR: PRESCRIBER AND CONSUMER BEHAVIOR

Human behavior may be a greater source of variability in patterns of drug use than any other factor considered so far in this chapter. In conducting pharmacoepidemiology studies, it is important to give cognisance to its impact upon observed prescribing patterns. The influences that determine prescribing practices and consumer behavior are complex and have not been studied comprehensively; they are known to include factors related to the illness itself, the doctor, the patient, the doctor–patient interaction, drug costs and availability, perceived and actual benefits and risks of treatment, and pharmaceutical company advertising.

TREATMENT OUTCOMES AND INDICATIONS

A primary influence on prescribing may be the natural desire to achieve the best possible treatment outcome for the patient. For example, if the starting dose of the drug of first choice is not effective in a given patient, the prescriber may choose to increase the dose, add another drug, or switch to a different medication. Sometimes, all of these options will be tried in sequence. For many disorders, the intensity of treatment is titrated against a measured response, such as the diastolic blood pressure, blood cholesterol measurement, or the distance that the patient can walk before developing anginal pain. As a result, individuals with more severe underlying disease or more resistant symptoms will tend to receive higher doses of drugs, and greater numbers of drugs. In pharmacoepidemiology studies, it may be therefore difficult to determine whether a given disease–drug association is caused by the drug under study, or is confounded by the nature or severity of the underlying disease state (see also Chapters 34, 43, and 44).

The occurrence of adverse events, for example, cough with ACE inhibitors or gastrointestinal bleeding with NSAIDs, will clearly cause prescribers to alter drug choices and to avoid the future use of such agents in the affected patients, and perhaps in other patients. Similarly, the existence of contraindications to certain drugs, such as β-blockers in asthma, or penicillin allergy, will impact on prescribers’ drug choices for certain patients. Underlying pathology frequently directs drug choice—for example, ACE inhibitors are a reasonable first choice for the treatment of hypertension in diabetic patients, but would be
regarded by many as an inappropriate first choice for newly diagnosed simple hypertension in an otherwise well individual. In the absence of information about diagnosis, other pathology, and contraindications, the accurate interpretation of drug use patterns observed in pharmacoepidemiology studies may be difficult.

**EXPECTATION AND DEMAND**

Patient demand and expectation have been cited as influencing doctors’ decisions to prescribe. However, it appears a gap exists between patients’ expectations of a prescription and doctors’ perceptions of their expectations. After controlling for the presenting condition, patients in general practice who expected a prescription were up to three times more likely to receive one than those who did not. However, patients whom the general practitioner believed expected a prescription were up to ten times more likely to receive one. It is speculated that failure to ascertain patients’ expectations is a major reason why doctors prescribe more drugs than patients expect. Other factors that influenced the decision to prescribe in these studies included the doctor’s level of academic qualification, practice prescribing rates, patient exemption from prescribing charges, and difficult consultations.

**RISKS AND BENEFITS OF TREATMENT**

The risks and benefits of treatment may exert influence on prescribing decisions—patients perceived to be at risk of unwanted adverse effects of therapy are less likely than those without such risks to receive treatment. Perception of risk and benefit may vary with the prescriber. For example, it has been found that compared with cardiologists, general physicians overestimate the benefits of certain cardiac treatments.

Information framing, that is, the manner of presentation of risks and benefits, may influence prescribing decisions. Treatment outcomes presented in terms of relative risk reduction are more likely to elicit a decision to treat than those presented in terms of absolute risk reduction or as numbers needed to treat. Promotional materials from pharmaceutical companies frequently present the benefits of treatments in relative as opposed to absolute terms. As the former are numerically higher in most cases than the latter, they may be judged sufficiently impressive to persuade prescription by prescribers too busy to consider the original data in detail. While the decision to prescribe based on such evidence may be justifiable in cases where the absolute benefit happens to be reasonable, inappropriate prescribing decisions may be made if it is very small or insignificant.

**ECONOMIC INFLUENCES**

Economic influences, exerted from various sources, may influence drug use and therefore the interpretation of pharmacoepidemiology studies. As medicines, particularly new ones, become increasingly expensive, budgetary restrictions, or indeed incentives, may impact upon prescribing decisions. For example, in 1993, the German government placed a limit on reimbursable drug costs and announced that a proportion of spending in excess of this limit would be recouped from doctors’ remuneration budgets. The changes in prescribing patterns, at least in the early aftermath of the limit, were significant. The numbers of prescriptions fell and there was a move to the use of both generic products and older less expensive drugs.

In England in the past decade, the Department of Health has introduced several schemes intended to contain the costs of National Health Service prescribing. These have included setting indicative prescribing budgets for general practices, offering incentives to make prescribing savings, and fundholding schemes whereby practices hold and manage their own budgets for a number of services, including prescribing. The effects on prescribing patterns have been variable. For example, practices tended to exceed their indicative budgets, but fundholders appeared to achieve more effective cost containment than non-fundholders, mainly through eliminating unnecessary prescribing, moving to generic prescribing, and altering drug choice within therapeutic classes.
In Australia, pharmaceutical companies are required to provide evidence of the cost effectiveness of their product, compared with that of an existing alternative, prior to listing on the national list of reimbursable medicines (see also Chapters 27 and 35).

Other approaches intended to contain prescribing costs have included national formularies and limited lists, patient co-payment, generic substitution, and practice guidelines.

While the approaches outlined above reflect some attempts of governments to contain drug costs by influencing prescribing choices, patients themselves may also exert influence based upon their ability to pay for medicines. Where patients are covered by state or private insurance schemes, medicine expense may not be perceived by the patient or the prescriber to be an issue and drug choice will not be constrained by ability to pay. In fact, more expensive choices than are absolutely necessary may be encouraged. However, for patients required to pay in whole or in part for their medicines, costs may well influence drug choice and, for instance, a diuretic as opposed to an ACE inhibitor or calcium antagonist may be chosen for hypertension treatment, although not necessarily the best choice for the individual concerned.

Prescribers themselves may have a pecuniary interest in prescribing. Fee-per-item methods of physician remuneration have been found to encourage a higher use of services. In Japan, physicians dispense as well as prescribe medicines and the associated financial incentive is considered to contribute to the high numbers of prescriptions per capita and the use of expensive drugs. Concerns about the effects on prescribing of incentives offered to doctors by the pharmaceutical industry have led to such practices being discouraged in most countries and most manufacturers have voluntarily adopted a code of good promotional practice.

THE PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY

Promotional activities of the pharmaceutical industry can affect prescribing practices in ways that are relevant to pharmacoepidemiology. For example, if a manufacturer promotes a new NSAID as being less prone to cause gastrointestinal toxicity than other NSAIDs, it may be given to individuals who have an intrinsically higher risk of gastrointestinal bleeding, such as those who have developed dyspepsia while receiving other NSAIDs, or who have a past history of gastric ulceration. These individuals would therefore be expected to have an increased risk of subsequent gastrointestinal bleeding in comparison with those receiving other NSAIDs, although such a finding might be wrongly attributed to the new drug.

Pharmaceutical companies may exert influence, direct and indirect, on prescribing choices. This may occur through their representatives who visit doctors to provide information about drug products on a one-to-one basis, the sponsorship of educational meetings, the employment of personnel (for example, nurses at asthma or diabetic clinics), sponsorship to attend international specialty meetings, or invitations to specialists to become “expert advisors” in their particular areas of practice.

PATIENT BEHAVIOR

Consumer behavior must also be considered in pharmacoepidemiology studies. Numerous studies have shown that individuals with some diseases, particularly illnesses that are asymptomatic, such as hypertension and hypercholesterolemia, tend to have poor compliance with prescribed drug therapy regimens. Therefore, if a pharmacoepidemiology study were to be performed in such a situation, and the use of a drug were operationally defined as the dispensing of a prescription, then the number of prescriptions dispensed might overestimate the true exposure to that medication. On the other hand, compliance with some drugs, such as oral contraceptives, tends to be good because consumers are highly motivated to take them. In the case of drugs that are taken for particular symptoms, such as pain or wheezing, individuals may take more medication than is prescribed. If this occurs chronically, it should be reflected in the number of prescriptions that have been dispensed for an individual over a given time period.
The use of nonprescription drugs, which sometimes have the same effects as prescription drugs, also needs to be considered. For example, when examining the effects of NSAIDs using prescription data, it is important to consider the possibility that individuals who appear to be unexposed might actually have been exposed to a nonprescription NSAID.

Consumers of prescribed medications may differ from nonusers in a number of other ways that may confound pharmacoepidemiology studies, for example, alcohol intake and smoking status. Unfortunately, this information is rarely, if ever, available from some data sources, e.g., automated databases. Individuals who take certain drugs may use other medical services or have different lifestyles from nonusers. In the case of postmenopausal estrogen therapy, consumers were shown to make greater use of other medical services and to have higher levels of exercise than nonconsumers. This is important, because these factors were potential confounders of the relationship between estrogen use and outcomes such as hip fracture and myocardial infarction (see Chapter 34).

Knowledge of prescriber and consumer behavior is crucial when conducting pharmacoepidemiology studies. Both high doses of drugs and the use of drug combinations are often markers for more severe underlying diseases. Therefore, attempts to link exposure to a drug with a particular outcome must take account of these factors. Disease severity or intolerance to previous medications may be linked in subtle ways to the outcomes of interest, and pharmacoepidemiology studies are subject to these forms of confounding. Economic and promotional influences may affect prescribing patterns in a number of ways, both obvious and subtle, and also require consideration as potential confounders.

CONCLUSIONS

Pharmacoepidemiology is a complex and inexact science. It would be convenient if exposures and outcomes could always be assumed to be dichotomous; the relationships could be assumed to be unconfounded; and risk could be assumed to increase proportionately with duration of exposure. However, because of the complexity of the use and effects of drugs among the population, these simplifying assumptions are often violated. Users of drugs will often differ in many respects from nonusers, and in ways that are not easily adjusted for. These differences may confound the associations between exposure and outcomes. Responses to drugs are very variable, not only between individuals but also within individuals over time. This variability in inter- and intra-individual responses can result in adverse reactions being manifest early in treatment, and the development of tolerance in long-term users. A study of clinical pharmacology provides us with many insights, and a knowledge of the underlying principles is essential during the conduct, and particularly the interpretation, of pharmacoepidemiology studies.
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When Should One Perform Pharmacoepidemiology Studies?
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As discussed in the previous chapters, pharmacoepidemiology studies apply the techniques of epidemiology to the content area of clinical pharmacology. This chapter will review when pharmacoepidemiology studies should be performed. It will begin with a discussion of the various reasons why one might perform pharmacoepidemiology studies. Central to many of these is one’s willingness to tolerate risk. Whether one’s perspective is that of a manufacturer, regulator, academician, or clinician, one needs to consider the risk of adverse reactions one considers tolerable. Thus, this chapter will continue with a discussion of the difference between safety and risk. It will conclude with a discussion of the determinants of one’s tolerance of risk.

**REASONS TO PERFORM PHARMACOEPIDEMILOGY STUDIES**

The decision to conduct a pharmacoepidemiology study can be viewed as similar to the regulatory decision about whether to approve a drug for marketing or the clinical decision about whether to prescribe a drug. In each case, decision making involves weighing the costs and risks of a therapy against its benefits.

The main costs of a pharmacoepidemiology study are obviously the costs of conducting the study itself. They clearly will vary, depending on the questions posed and the approach chosen to answer them. Regardless, with the exception of postmarketing randomized clinical trials, the cost per patient is likely to be at least an order of magnitude less than the cost of a premarketing study. Other costs to consider are the opportunity costs of other research that might be left undone if this research is performed.

One risk of conducting a pharmacoepidemiology study is the possibility that it could identify an adverse outcome as associated with the drug under investigation when in fact the drug does not cause this adverse outcome. Another risk is that it could provide false reassurances about a drug’s safety. Both of these can be minimized by appropriate study designs, skilled researchers, and appropriate and responsible interpretation of the results obtained.
The benefits of pharmacoepidemiology studies could be conceptualized in four different categories: regulatory, marketing, clinical, and legal (see Table 5.1). Each will be of importance to different organizations and individuals involved in deciding whether to initiate a study. Any given study will usually be performed for several of these reasons. Each will be discussed individually.

Table 5.1. Reasons to perform pharmacoepidemiology studies

(A) Regulatory
(1) Required
(2) To obtain earlier approval for marketing
(3) As a response to question by regulatory agency
(4) To assist application for approval for marketing elsewhere

(B) Marketing
(1) To assist market penetration by documenting the safety of the drug
(2) To increase name recognition
(3) To assist in re-positioning the drug
   (a) Different outcomes, e.g., quality of life and economic
   (b) Different types of patient, e.g., the elderly
   (c) New indications
   (d) Less restrictive labeling
(4) To protect the drug from accusations about adverse effects

(C) Legal
(1) In anticipation of future product liability litigation

(D) Clinical
(1) Hypothesis testing
   (a) Problem hypothesized on the basis of drug structure
   (b) Problem suspected on the basis of preclinical or premarketing human data
   (c) Problem suspected on the basis of spontaneous reports
   (d) Need to better quantitate the frequency of adverse reactions
(2) Hypothesis generating—need depends on whether
   (a) it is a new chemical entity
   (b) the safety profile of the class
   (c) the relative safety of the drug within its class
   (d) the formulation
   (e) the disease to be treated, including
      (i) its duration
      (ii) its prevalence
      (iii) its severity
      (iv) whether alternative therapies are available

REGULATORY

Perhaps the clearest and most compelling reason to perform a postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology study is regulatory: a plan for a postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology study is required before the drug will be approved for marketing. Requirements for postmarketing research have become progressively more frequent in recent years. In fact, since the early 1970s the FDA has required postmarketing research at the time of approval for about one third of all newly approved drugs.1 Many of these required studies have been randomized clinical trials, designed to clarify residual questions about a drug’s efficacy. Others focus on questions of drug toxicity. Often it is unclear whether the pharmacoepidemiology study was a regulatory requirement or merely a “suggestion” by the regulator, but the effect is essentially the same. Examples of studies conducted to address regulatory questions include the “Phase IV” cohort studies performed of cimetidine2 and prazosin.3 These are discussed more in Chapters 1 and 2.

Sometimes a manufacturer may offer to perform a pharmacoepidemiology study with the hope that the regulatory agency might thereby approve the drug’s earlier marketing. If the agency believed that a serious problem would be detected reliably and rapidly after marketing, it could feel more comfortable releasing the drug sooner. Although it is difficult to assess the impact of volunteered postmarketing studies on regulatory decisions, the very large economic impact of an earlier approval has motivated some manufacturers to initiate such studies. In addition, in recent years regulatory authorities have occasionally released a particularly important drug after essentially only Phase II testing, with the understanding that additional data would be gathered during postmarketing testing. For example, zidovudine was released for marketing after only limited testing, and only later was additional data gathered on both safety and efficacy, data which indicated, among other things, that the doses initially recommended were too large.4

Some postmarketing studies of drugs arise in response to case reports of adverse reactions reported to the regulatory agency. One response
to such a report might be to suggest a labeling change. Often a more appropriate response, clinically and commercially, would be to propose a pharmacoepidemiology study. This study would explore whether this adverse event in fact occurs more often in those exposed to the drug than would have been expected in the absence of the drug and, if so, how large the increased risk of the disease is. As an example, a Medicaid database was used to study hypersensitivity reactions to tolmetin, following reports about this problem to the FDA’s Spontaneous Reporting System.

Finally, drugs are obviously marketed at different times in different countries. A postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology study conducted in a country that marketed a drug relatively early could be useful in demonstrating the safety of the drug to regulatory agencies in countries that have not yet permitted the marketing of the drug. This is becoming increasingly feasible, as both the industry and the field of pharmacoepidemiology are becoming more international, and regulators are collaborating more.

MARKETING

As will be discussed below, pharmacoepidemiology studies are performed primarily to obtain the answers to clinical questions. However, it is clear that a major underlying reason for some pharmacoepidemiology studies is the potential marketing impact of those answers. In fact, some companies make the marketing branch of the company responsible for pharmacoepidemiology, rather than the medical branch.

Because of the known limitations in the information available about the effects of a drug at the time of its initial marketing, many physicians are appropriately hesitant to prescribe a drug until a substantial amount of experience in its use has been gathered. A formal postmarketing surveillance study can speed that process, as well as clarify any advantages or disadvantages a drug has compared to its competitors.

A pharmacoepidemiology study can also be useful to improve product name recognition. The fact that a study is under way will often be known to prescribers, as will its results once it is publicly presented and published. This increased name recognition will presumably help sales. An increase in a product’s name recognition is particularly likely to result from pharmacoepidemiology studies that recruit subjects for the study via prescribers. However, as discussed in Chapter 24, while this technique can be useful in selected situations, it is extremely expensive and less likely to be productive of scientifically useful information than most other alternatives available. In particular, the conduct of a purely marketing exercise under the guise of a postmarketing surveillance study, not designed to collect useful scientific information, is to be condemned. It is misleading and could endanger the performance of future scientifically useful studies, by resulting in prescribers who are disillusioned and, thereby, reluctant to participate in future studies.

Pharmacoepidemiology studies can also be useful to re-position a drug that is already on the market, i.e., to develop new markets for the drug. One could explore different types of outcome resulting from the use of the drug for the approved indication, for example the impact of the drug on the cost of medical care (see Chapter 35) and on patients’ quality of life (see Chapter 36). One could also explore the use of the drug for the approved indication in types of patients other than those included in premarketing studies, for example in children or in the elderly. By exploring unintended beneficial effects, or even drug efficacy (see Chapter 34), one could obtain clues to and supporting information for new indications for drug use. Finally, whether because of questions about efficacy or questions about toxicity, drugs are sometimes approved for initial marketing with restrictive labeling. For example, bretylium was initially approved for marketing in the US only for the treatment of life threatening arrhythmias. Approval for more widespread use requires additional data. These data can often be obtained from pharmacoepidemiology studies.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, pharmacoepidemiology studies can be useful to protect the major investment made in developing and testing a new drug. When a question arises about a drug’s toxicity, it often needs an immediate answer, or else the drug may lose market share or
even be removed from the market. Immediate answers are often unavailable, unless the manufacturer had the foresight to perform pharmacoepidemiology studies in anticipation of this problem. Sometimes these problems can be specifically foreseen and addressed. More commonly, they are not. However, the availability of an existing cohort of exposed patients and a control group will often allow a much more rapid answer than would have been possible if the study had to be conducted de novo. One example of this is provided by the experience of Pfizer Pharmaceuticals, when the question arose about whether piroxicam (Feldene) was more likely to cause deaths in the elderly from gastrointestinal bleeding than the other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Although Pfizer did not fund studies in anticipation of such a question, it was fortunate that a number of pharmacoepidemiology groups had data available on this question because of other studies which they had performed.\textsuperscript{8} McNeil was not as fortunate when questions were raised about anaphylactic reactions caused by zomepirac. If the data they eventually were able to have\textsuperscript{9} had been available at the time of the crisis, they might not have removed the drug from the market. More recently, Syntex recognized the potential, and the risk, associated with the marketing of parenteral ketorolac, and chose to initiate a postmarketing surveillance cohort study at the time of the drug’s launch.\textsuperscript{10–12} Indeed, the drug was accused of multiple different adverse outcomes, and it was only the existence of this study, and later its results, that saved the drug in its major markets.

LEGAL

Postmarketing surveillance studies can theoretically be useful as legal prophylaxis, in anticipation of eventually having to defend against product liability suits. One often hears the phrase “What you don’t know won’t hurt you.” However, in pharmacoepidemiology this view is short sighted and, in fact, very wrong. All drugs cause adverse effects; the regulatory decision to approve a drug and the clinical decision to prescribe a drug both depend on a judgement about the relative balance between the benefits of a drug and its risks. From a legal perspective, to win a product liability suit using a legal theory of negligence, a plaintiff must prove causation, damages, and negligence (see Chapter 9). A pharmaceutical manufacturer that is a defendant in such a suit cannot change whether its drug causes an adverse effect. If the drug does, this will presumably be detected at some point. The manufacturer also cannot change whether the plaintiff suffered legal damages from the adverse effect, that is whether the plaintiff suffered a disability or incurred expenses resulting from a need for medical attention. However, even if the drug did cause the adverse outcome in question, a manufacturer certainly can document that it was performing state-of-the-art studies to attempt to detect whatever toxic effects the drug had. In addition, such studies could make easier the defense of totally groundless suits, in which a drug is blamed for producing adverse reactions it does not cause.

CLINICAL

Hypothesis Testing

The major reason for most pharmacoepidemiology studies is hypothesis testing. The hypotheses to be tested can be based on the structure or the chemical class of a drug. For example, the cimetidine study mentioned above\textsuperscript{2} was conducted because cimetidine was chemically related to metiamide, which had been removed from the market in Europe because it caused agranulocytosis. Alternatively, hypotheses can also be based on premarketing or postmarketing animal or clinical findings. For example, the hypotheses can come from spontaneous reports of adverse events experienced by patients taking the drug in question. The tolmetin,\textsuperscript{5} piroxicam,\textsuperscript{8} zomepirac,\textsuperscript{9} and ketorolac\textsuperscript{10–12} questions mentioned above are all examples of this. Finally, an adverse effect may clearly be due to a drug, but a study may be needed to quantitate its frequency. An example would be the postmarketing surveillance study of prazosin, performed to quantitate the frequency of first dose syncope.\textsuperscript{3} Of course, the hypotheses to be tested can involve beneficial drug effects as well as
harmful drug effects, subject to some important methodologic limitations (see Chapter 34).

Hypothesis Generating

Hypothesis generating studies are intended to screen for previously unknown and unsuspected drug effects. In principle, all drugs could, and perhaps should, be subjected to such studies. However, some drugs may require these studies more than others. This has been the focus of a formal study, which surveyed experts in pharmacoepidemiology.13

For example, it is generally agreed that new chemical entities are more in need of study than so-called “me too” drugs. This is because the lack of experience with related drugs makes it more likely that the drug has possibly important unsuspected effects.

The safety profile of the class of drugs should also be important to the decision about whether to conduct a formal screening postmarketing surveillance study. Previous experience with other drugs in the same class can be a useful predictor of what the experience with the drug in question is likely to be.

The relative safety of the drug within its class can also be helpful. A drug that has been studied in large numbers of patients before marketing and appears safe is less likely to need supplementary postmarketing surveillance studies.

The formulation of the drug can be considered a determinant of the need for formal screening pharmacoepidemiology studies. A drug that will be used mainly in institutions, where there is close supervision, may be less likely to need such a study. Any serious adverse effect is likely to be detected, even without any formal study.

The disease to be treated is an important determinant of whether a drug needs additional postmarketing surveillance studies. Drugs used to treat chronic illnesses are likely to be used for a long period of time. As such, it is important to know their long-term effects. This cannot be addressed adequately in the relatively brief time available for each pre-marketing study. Drugs used to treat common diseases are important to study, as many patients are likely to be exposed to them. Drugs used to treat mild or self-limited diseases also need careful study, because serious toxicity is less acceptable. This is especially true for drugs used by healthy individuals, such as contraceptives. On the other hand, when one is using a drug to treat individuals who are very ill, one is more tolerant of toxicity, assuming the drug is efficacious.

Finally, it is also important to know whether alternative therapies are available. If a new drug is not a major therapeutic advance, since it will be used to treat patients who would have been treated with the old drug, one needs to be more certain of its relative advantages and disadvantages. The presence of significant adverse effects, or the absence of beneficial effects, is less likely to be tolerated for a drug that does not represent a major therapeutic advance.

SAFETY VERSUS RISK

Clinical pharmacologists are used to thinking about drug “safety:” the statutory standard that must be met before a drug is approved for marketing in the US is that it needs to be proven to be “safe and effective under conditions of intended use.” It is important to differentiate safety, however, from risk. Virtually nothing is without some risks. Even staying in bed is associated with a risk of acquiring bed sores! Certainly no drug is completely safe. Yet, the unfortunate misperception by the public persists that drugs mostly are and should be without any risk at all. Use of a “safe” drug, however, still carries some risk. It would be better to think in terms of a degree of safety. Specifically, a drug “is safe if its risks are judged to be acceptable.”14

Measuring risk is an objective but probabilistic pursuit. A judgement about safety is a personal and/or social value judgement about the acceptability of that risk. Thus, assessing safety requires two extremely different kinds of activity: measuring risk and judging the acceptability of those risks.14 The former is the focus of much of pharmacoepidemiology and most of this book. The latter is the focus of the following discussion.
RISK TOLERANCE

Whether or not to conduct a postmarketing surveillance pharmacoepidemiology study also depends on one’s willingness to tolerate risk. From a manufacturer's perspective, one can consider this risk in terms of the risk of a regulatory or legal problem. Whether one’s perspective is that of a manufacturer, regulator, academician, or clinician, one needs to consider the risk of adverse reactions which one considers tolerable. There are a number of factors that can affect one’s willingness to tolerate the risk of adverse effects from drugs (see Table 5.2). Some of these are related to the adverse outcome being studied. Others are related to the exposure and the setting in which it occurs.

FEATURES OF THE ADVERSE OUTCOME

The severity and reversibility of the adverse reaction in question are of paramount importance to its tolerability. An adverse reaction that is severe is much less tolerable than one that is mild, even at the same incidence. This is especially true for adverse reactions that result in permanent harm, for example birth defects.

Critical is the frequency of the adverse outcome in those who are exposed. Notably, this is not a question of the relative risk of the disease due to the exposure, but the excess risk. Tampons are extraordinarily closely linked to toxic shock: the relative risk appears to be between 10 and 20. However, toxic shock is sufficiently uncommon that even a ten- to 20-fold increase in the risk of the disease still leads to an extraordinarily small risk of the toxic shock syndrome in those who use tampons.15

In addition, the particular disease caused by the drug is important to one’s tolerance of its risks. Certain diseases are considered by the public to be so-called “dread diseases,” diseases which generate more fear and emotion than other diseases. Examples are AIDS and cancer. It is less likely that the risk of a drug will be considered acceptable if it causes one of these diseases.

It is also material whether the adverse outcome is immediate or delayed. Most individuals are less concerned about delayed risks than immediate risks. This is one of the factors that has probably slowed the success of anti-smoking efforts. In part this is a function of denial; delayed risks seem as if they may never occur. In addition, an economic concept of “discounting” plays a role here. An adverse event in the future is less bad than the same event today, and a beneficial effect today is better than the same beneficial effect in the future. Something else may occur between now and then that could make that delayed effect irrelevant or, at least, mitigate its impact. Thus, a delayed adverse event may be worth incurring if it can bring about beneficial effects today.

It is important whether the adverse outcome is a type A reaction or a type B reaction. As described in Chapter 1, type A reactions are the result of an exaggerated but otherwise usual pharmacological effect of a drug. Type A reactions tend to be common, but they are dose-related, predictable, and less serious. In contrast, type B reactions are aberrant effects of a drug. Type B reactions tend to be uncommon, are not related to dose, and are potentially more serious. They may be due to hypersensitivity reactions, immunologic reactions, or some other idiosyncratic reaction to the drug. Regardless, type B reactions are the more difficult to predict or even detect. If one can predict an adverse effect, then one can attempt to prevent it. For example, in order to prevent aminophylline-induced arrhythmias and seizures, one can begin

---

**Table 5.2. Factors affecting the acceptability of risks**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(A) Features of the adverse outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Reversibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Frequency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) “Dread disease”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Immediate versus delayed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(6) Occurs in all people versus just in sensitive people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(7) Known with certainty or not</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(B) Characteristics of the exposure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1) Essential versus optional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2) Present versus absent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(3) Alternatives available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(4) Risk assumed voluntarily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5) Drug use will be as intended versus misuse is likely</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(C) Perceptions of the evaluator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
therapy at lower doses and follow serum levels carefully. For this reason, all other things being equal, type B reactions are usually considered less tolerable.

Finally, the acceptability of a risk also varies according to how well established it is. The same adverse effect is obviously less tolerable if one knows with certainty that it is caused by a drug than if it is only a remote possibility.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE EXPOSURE

The acceptability of a risk is very different, depending upon whether an exposure is essential or optional. Major adverse effects are much more acceptable when one is using a therapy that can save or prolong life, such as chemotherapy for malignancies. On the other hand, therapy for self-limited illnesses must have a low risk to be acceptable. Pharmaceutical products intended for use in healthy individuals, such as vaccines and contraceptives, must be exceedingly low in risk to be considered acceptable.

The acceptability of a risk is also dependent on whether the risk is from the presence of a treatment or its absence. One could conceptualize deaths from a disease that can be treated by a drug that is not yet on the market an adverse effect of the absence of treatment. For example, the six year delay in introducing $\beta$-blockers into the US market has been blamed for resulting in more deaths than all recent adverse drug reactions combined.\footnote{16} As a society, we are much more willing to accept risks of this type than risks from the use of a drug that has been marketed prematurely. Physicians are taught primum non nocere—first do no harm. This is somewhat analogous to our willingness to allow patients with terminal illnesses to die from these illnesses without intervention, while it would be considered unethical and probably illegal to perform euthanasia. In general, we are much more tolerant of sins of omission than sins of commission.

Whether any alternative treatments are available is another determinant of the acceptability of risks. If a drug is the only available treatment for a disease, particularly a serious disease, then greater risks will be considered acceptable. This was the reason zidovudine was allowed to be marketed for treatment of AIDS, despite its toxicity and the limited testing that had been performed.\footnote{4} Analogously, studies of toxic shock syndrome associated with the use of tampons were of public health importance, despite the infrequency of the disease, because consumers could then choose among tampons that were shown to carry different risks.\footnote{15}

Whether a risk is assumed voluntarily is also important to its acceptability. We are willing to accept the risk of death in automobile accidents more than the much smaller risk of death in airline accidents, because we control and understand the former and accept the attendant risk voluntarily. Some people even accept the enormous risks of death from tobacco-related disease, but would object strongly to being given a drug that was a small fraction as toxic. In general, it is agreed that patients should be made aware of possibly toxic effects of drugs that they are prescribed. When a risk is higher than it is with the usual therapeutic use of a drug, as with an invasive procedure or an investigational drug, one usually asks the patient for formal informed consent. The fact that fetuses cannot make voluntary choices about whether or not to take a drug contributes to the unacceptability of drug-induced birth defects.

Finally, from a societal perspective, one also needs to be concerned about whether a drug will be and is used as intended or whether misuse is likely. Misuse, in and of itself, can represent a risk of the drug. For example, a drug is considered less acceptable if it is addicting and, so, is likely to be abused. In addition, the potential for overprescribing by physicians can also decrease the acceptability of the drug. For example, in the controversy about birth defects from isotretinoin, there was no question that the drug was a powerful teratogen, nor that it was a very effective therapy for serious cystic acne refractory to other treatments. There also was no question about its effectiveness for less severe acne. However, that effectiveness led to its widespread use, including in individuals who could have been treated with less toxic therapies, and a larger number of pregnancy exposures, abortions, and birth defects than otherwise would have occurred.\footnote{17}
PERCEPTIONS OF THE EVALUATOR

Finally, much ultimately depends upon the perceptions of the individuals who are making the decision about whether a risk is acceptable. In the US, there have been more than a million deaths from traffic accidents over the past 30 years, tobacco-related diseases kill the equivalent of three jumbo jet loads every day, and 3000 children are born each year with embryopathy from their mothers’ use of alcohol in pregnancy. Yet, these deaths are accepted with little concern, while the uncommon risk of an airplane crash or being struck by lightning generates fear. The decision about whether to allow isotretinoin to remain on the market hinged on whether the efficacy of the drug for a small number of people who had a disease that was disfiguring but not life threatening was worth the birth defects that would result in some other individuals. There is no way to remove this subjective component from the decision about the acceptability of risks. However, this subjective component is part of what makes informed consent so important. Most people feel that the final subjective judgement about whether an individual should assume the risk of ingesting a drug should be made by that individual, after education by their physician. However, as an attempt to assist that judgement, it is useful to have some quantitative information about the risks inherent in some other activities. Some such information is presented in Table 5.3.

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter reviewed when pharmacoepidemiology studies should be performed. After beginning with a discussion of the various reasons why one might perform pharmacoepidemiology studies, it reviewed the difference between safety and risk. It concluded with a discussion of the determinants of one’s tolerance of risk. Now that it is hopefully clear when one might want to perform a pharmacoepidemiology study, the next part of this book will provide perspectives on pharmacoepidemiology from some of the different fields that use it.
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INTRODUCTION

Pharmacoepidemiology is essentially a branch of public health, and, as such, it has as its prime goal the gathering of information leading to protecting the health of populations and improving the safety and efficacy of medications. Viewed from the perspective of academia, the field has as its goal the provision and evaluation of a public service. However, in a capitalist nation, the manufacture and sale of drugs are a branch of private sector economic activity and this fact can often lead to a conflict of goals.

The examples in Box 6.1 illustrate how far afield one can wander from the goals of pharmacoepidemiology as a public health activity, if one does not share these goals or simply views the field as an interesting quantitative exercise. Some practitioners are noted for ignoring the serious health consequences of adverse reactions or trivializing results and casting aspersions on findings as an exercise in debate (or for compensation as a well paid consultant). There is also the mistaken idea in some quarters that pharmacoepidemiologists should act as plaintiff or defense lawyers and provide the client with the best defense, even if it means jeopardizing the public health.

It is our view that, to function as a responsible and ethical epidemiologist working in the field of adverse drug reactions, one must possess a knowledge of the history of drug development and regulation, be familiar with the epidemiology and the natural history of the disease under study, have a background in the economics of the drug industry, and understand the history of drug adulteration and of efforts to resist testing for safety and efficacy.

EFFICACY VERSUS EFFECTIVENESS: NEED AND AIDS OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIology

At the time a new drug is marketed, much information has been systematically obtained by means of preclinical and clinical studies aimed at defining its therapeutic role (see also Chapters 1
Aspirin and Reye’s Syndrome

In the early 1980s, after several overwhelmingly convincing case-control studies indicted aspirin as a contributory cause of this disease, the aspirin manufacturers exerted political and economic pressure on the American Academy of Pediatrics to delay recommending that aspirin administration to children should be avoided during the winter months. At the same time there was political pressure on the US FDA to delay the implementation of warning labels on the aspirin packages. The over-the-counter analgesic market is large, lucrative, and competitive, and such warnings would interfere with sales and profits during the influenza season.

Benefit and risk of calcium channel blockers (CCBs)
and therapeutic guidelines for the treatment of hypertension

Several clinical trials indicated that, compared to other antihypertensive treatments, CCBs were associated with an increase in the risk of death, ischemic heart disease, other cardiovascular events, and severe hemorrhage. These risks were also seen in several observational studies. Meta-analyses of clinical trials of CCBs in ischemic heart disease also suggested an increased risk of death.

Ironically, the risks seemed to be highest among hypertensive diabetic patients, one of the subgroups for which these drugs had been more heavily promoted without any proof of benefit and with the blessing of the US FDA and other national drug regulatory agencies. An investigation into possible conflicts of interest on this issue found a strong association between published positions on the safety of CCBs and the authors’ financial relationships with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Following publication of these studies, guidelines for the treatment of hypertension were published which advocated the use of CCBs as first choice agents, almost interchangeable with low dose thiazide diuretics and β-adrenergic blocking agents. This recommendation was based on the results of the SYST-EUR trial, a placebo controlled study of uncertain quality using nitrendipine in the treatment of systolic hypertension in the elderly. At the end of the first year of this study, 44% of the patients initially allocated to nitrendipine were also on enalapril and/or hydrochlorothiazide, while patients initially allocated to placebo received more placebo in the case of uncontrolled hypertension. These guidelines have been judged as “consensus based,” rather than “evidence based.”

Box 6.1. Interests and conflicts of interest in pharmacoepidemiology.

and 4). After initial pharmacological screening using in vitro and in vivo models, pharmacodynamic, pharmacokinetic, and toxicological experiments are usually performed on animals. Pharmacodynamics is the study of the drug actions and effects on the body. Conversely, pharmacokinetics is the study of the actions of the body on the drug (drug disposition, including absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion). Toxicological studies include those after single and repeated doses, as well as special tests, including genotoxicity, mutagenesis, and carcinogenesis. If satisfactorily completed, this preclinical phase is followed by a clinical research and development program. This is arbitrarily divided into three premarketing phases.

Phase I is the first use of the new drug in human beings. Its main aim is the study of safety. It is generally undertaken in healthy volunteers, although certain categories of drugs (e.g., cancer chemotherapeutic agents) are necessarily studied in real patients.

Phase II aims at defining the pharmacodynamics and the pharmacokinetics of the new drug in the human being. Its main objective is to define the range of doses that will be used in phase III studies and in usual clinical practice. It is performed in healthy volunteers or in patients, depending on the drug and its indication.

Phase III aims to establish the therapeutic value of the new drug, by comparing it with a placebo and/or with alternative drugs used for its potential indications. This is generally carried out by means of the randomized controlled clinical trial (RCT). Subjects participating in a clinical trial are randomly assigned to one of the treatments under comparison. The groups produced by randomization tend to have equivalent baseline known prognostic characteristics. It is assumed that unknown prognostic factors will also be equally
distributed across the different groups. Therefore, any difference between the groups at the end of the observation period can be attributed to the different treatments assigned to each group. Because randomization avoids various sources of potential confounding, the RCT is considered the “gold standard” for the evaluation of the efficacy of any therapeutic or diagnostic intervention, and it is a necessary and central step of the drug development process. Once RCTs with a new drug have been completed, application for drug registration is made by the manufacturer.

Despite the complexity of the steps of drug development, at its completion, knowledge of its future potential effects in practice is only partial. The information gathered by means of RCTs concern efficacy, i.e., the ability of the drug to bring about the intended effect under ideal conditions (e.g., in clinical trials). However, little is known about effectiveness (i.e., about the ability of the drug to bring about the intended effect in the usual clinical setting), because the circumstances of clinical use differ so markedly from those of clinical trials, in several respects.

Number of Patients

Clinical trials are performed in limited numbers of patients (see also Chapter 3). The number of individuals who have received a new drug at the time of its marketing is very limited, of the order of a few hundred to a few thousand. This precludes identifying adverse effects with an incidence of less than 1/100 or 1/1000. On the other hand, once the new drug is marketed, it may be taken by millions of people and rare adverse effects may appear that had not previously been identified. A serious adverse effect with an incidence of 1 in 10 000 or 1 in 100 000 patients may, for example, generate limited direct clinical notice: a single physician will rarely be able to prescribe the particular drug to a sufficient numbers of patients to ever see one case. Nevertheless, an adverse reaction even of this rarity may still have a substantial public health impact if the particular drug is taken every day by, say, 100 000 new patients and the reaction is life threatening.

Length of Exposure

Clinical trials are generally of relatively limited duration and, for many drugs, they are much shorter than the expected length of treatment in normal clinical practice. For example, a study of 80 clinical trials supporting the efficacy of five nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and two analgesic drugs introduced into the United Kingdom showed that in 25 studies treatment lasted for less than one day, in 15 for a minimum of 28 days, and only in four had the duration of treatment lasted for three months or longer. This implies that any beneficial or adverse effects that appear after a relatively long exposure to the drug are unlikely to be identified before marketing.

Representativeness of the Target Population

Participants in clinical trials are seldom representative of the general population. Phase I and phase II studies are usually performed in healthy volunteers and in patients who may not be representative of the future real users, with respect to susceptibility to the drug’s effects and to drug disposition. Phase III clinical trials are generally performed in highly selected patients. The very young and the frail elderly are usually excluded. As a rule, selected participants have a single diagnosis; in contrast, the prevalence of one or more additional diseases among adults in primary health care is almost 40%. Patients with potential contraindications to the new drug and other high risk individuals are often excluded, thus tending to give a false impression of the benefit/risk ratio. They are usually healthier, younger, and of higher social status than the people who will ultimately receive the intervention. Patients in clinical trials have more accurate and clear cut diagnoses than those in routine practice (see Box 6.2). Thus, we believe that the deliberate and appropriate study of highly selected patients at the premarketing stage precludes the identification of those subgroups for whom the new drug may have an adverse risk-to-benefit ratio.
A meta-analysis of trials of antibiotic treatment in children with acute otitis media suggested that the treatment might not be effective. However, for ethical reasons, the sickest patients were excluded from many of the studies included in the meta-analysis. Therefore, it is difficult to generalize the results to all children with acute otitis media, including the sickest.

Several randomized clinical trials on thromboprophylaxis with oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation have shown that these drugs significantly reduce the risk of stroke. However, fewer than 10% (3–40%, depending on the trial) of eligible patients with atrial fibrillation were finally included in these trials, thus hindering their interpretation and translation to therapeutic decisions.

In a recent meta-analysis of 25 trials of the treatment of congestive heart failure with β-adrenergic blocking agents, the mean age of patients in the trials was 60 years, 25% were female, 86% had already been treated with an ACE inhibitor, and left-ventricular dysfunction was a prerequisite for entry into 24 of the 25 studies. In contrast, the average age of patients with heart failure in primary health care in the United Kingdom is 74 years, 54% are female, only 20% are treated with an ACE inhibitor, and yet only 30% have had ventricular imaging to measure ventricular dysfunction.

The summary estimates of discontinuation rates reported in clinical trials of antihyperlipidemic therapy were 31% for bile acid sequestrants, 4% for niacin, and 15% for gemfibrozil, while in cohorts of patients enrolled in two health maintenance organizations in the US, the one year probability of discontinuation was 41% for bile acid sequestrants, 46% for niacin, and 37% for gemfibrozil. Such discontinuation, of course, limits the effects of drug treatment.

While the discontinuation rates in long term clinical trials of antihypertensive drugs have been approximately 30%, dropout rates of approximately 50% have been reported in community based studies with one or more years of followup.

Box 6.2. Participants in clinical trials are seldom representative of the general population—some examples.

**Disease Conditions Under Study**

In developed countries, about 40% of all new disorders in primary health care do not evolve into conditions that meet accepted criteria for a diagnosis. The absence of clear definitions for undifferentiated disorders makes it extremely difficult methodologically to explore management using RCTs.

**Drug Interactions**

In phase III studies, the number of medicines that participants are allowed to take is generally limited to the drug under study or a small range of other drugs, thus precluding the identification of drug–drug interactions.

**Dosage**

Patients in clinical trials tend to follow precise protocol-driven dosage recommendations, while in actual community practice the doses of drugs tend to vary more widely, and thus drug ineffectiveness and type A (dose dependent) adverse reactions are more likely.

**Patient’s Values Versus Clinical Research Endpoints**

Drug trials tend to be driven by the mere existence of a new drug or a new potential indication, rather than by the need to answer clinically relevant questions that arise in practice. The majority of RCTs are promoted by drug manufacturers, as part of an investment that will yield a return once the new drug is marketed. Therefore, their main objective is to produce the evidence required by regulatory authorities, in order to apply for drug registration and licensing. If regulatory authorities do not require long term clinical outcome data in the broad population of patients in which the treatment is likely to be used, drug manufacturers are free to choose between performing definitive and expensive pragmatic clinical outcome studies mimicking routine clinical settings, or less expensive small studies using surrogate variables. According to
the FDA definition, a surrogate endpoint or marker is a laboratory measurement or physical sign that is expected to predict the effect of the therapy and is used in therapeutic trials as a substitute for a clinically meaningful endpoint that would be a direct measure of how a patient feels, functions, or survives. Long term outcome studies involve the risk of delayed marketing and a negative result, while a series of small studies aimed at pathophysiology, or on very selected patient populations, creates a less risky approach to product development.

Clinical Evaluation and Patient Followup

In a clinical trial, patient followup is likely to be more frequent and rigorous than in routine clinical practice, where clinical circumstances and judgement may dictate a rather different practice and patients may be less likely to follow the prescribed regimen or, for other reasons, less likely to receive the optimum therapy. It is then not surprising that, on average, patients in RCTs have better prospects of a favorable outcome than do patients treated in the community.

Evaluation of One Intervention Versus Various Simultaneous Interventions

The treatment of many chronic conditions may need more than one intervention. Unfortunately, however, clinical trials usually evaluate the effect of one intervention. Although specific designs exist to address this problem (e.g., factorial designs), clinical trials designed to evaluate two or more interventions simultaneously are scarce and difficult to conduct.

In summary, the generalization of results from trials is full of contradictions and complex conclusions. It seems clear that the observed differences should be regarded cautiously and should be carefully scrutinized in the real world of clinical practice. Generalization may be even more difficult for quality of life (see Chapter 36) and pharmacoeconomic (see Chapter 35) assessments than for hard variables such as mortality.

DRUG SAFETY AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

GLOBALIZATION, PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY, AND DEVELOPING COUNTRIES—FROM WHO TO WTO

In each country, the final effectiveness of drugs depends on many factors: priorities in research and drug development in the pharmaceutical industry, registration and licensing policies and practices, local production, supply, quality control, distribution and management, priorities of the health care system, training of health care professionals, financial accessibility, dissemination of reliable information on drugs, general quality of medical care and of pharmaceutical dispensing, cultural perceptions and expectations, and the level of public education (see also Chapter 27).

The primary goal of health services regarding pharmaceuticals is to deliver efficacious drugs to patients in a timely, efficient, and economic manner. This is particularly difficult to accomplish in developing countries. Although there is wide variability among them, in these countries the main limitations regarding health care are insufficient infrastructure, organization, equipment, and personnel. Resources are improperly utilized, a large proportion being allocated to the relatively small urban population and to hospitals. Drugs account for 30–40% of total health expenditures. A substantial proportion of medicines are procured from abroad on an irregular basis, and drug availability is unreliable. Quality control is inefficient or nonexistent, and counterfeit, adulterated, or poor quality pharmaceuticals are not unusual, with tragic consequences, such as the epidemics of deaths from acute renal failure due to acetaminophen syrups containing diethylene glycol. There is a lack of necessary professional resources for the evaluation of new drugs submitted for registration. There is at least one sales representative for every three to ten physicians and generally there are no regulations controlling information on pharmaceuticals disseminated by the manufacturers. A substantial proportion of medicines have inadequate proof of efficacy, many are irrational fixed dose combinations of
several drugs, and some of them are outdated or withdrawn from their original manufacturer’s countries. In 36 countries, less than 50% of the population has real access to health care and medicines.\textsuperscript{5} Prescription and dispensing practices often fall short of any acceptable standard, illiteracy rates are high, and cultural perceptions of conventional medicine vary, and as a result, patient adherence to a therapeutic plan is unreliable. Self-medication with potentially dangerous over the counter and prescription drugs is common, partly due to what has been called the UTC (“under the counter”) market, i.e., the sale of prescription only drugs without a prescription.\textsuperscript{6,7} Clinical follow up is rare, and adverse effect management and reporting are generally nonexistent or unknown to health professionals. All these circumstances add to the gap between clinical trials and usual practice described in the previous section. Consumption and drug utilization statistics are generally unavailable or kept secret.

In the 1970s, the World Health Organization’s Action Programme on Essential Drugs (ED) signaled a global recognition that a limited list of drugs could meet the health needs of most of the population in developing countries.\textsuperscript{8} The objective of the WHO’s Action Programme on ED was to ensure the availability of EDs to all members of the community at the lowest possible cost, by encouraging countries to set priorities for drug use and purchasing, dissemination of reliable drug information for health professionals and the public, and regional collaboration in bargaining with the multinational firms. Technical cooperation started in a number of countries to develop lists for their use at the different levels of the health care system. The program was set in the context of the overall objective of Health For All (HFA) By The Year 2000. Assistance was given to countries in the formulation of ED policies and strategies. Cooperation was established with other UN agencies. Since then, and despite initial resistance,\textsuperscript{9} the ED concept has been successfully adopted in a number of countries. Its implementation, nevertheless, has been generally limited to the public sector.\textsuperscript{9} The ED concept is evidence based, is simple, promotes equity, and is rooted in firm public health principles.\textsuperscript{10}

At the beginning of the new millennium the situation is changing. Today, new players, such as the World Bank and, increasingly, the World Trade Organization (WTO), have an influence on international health.\textsuperscript{11,12} Current world economic trends favor a strategy of development based on the liberalization of markets and on the assumption that free flow of trade, finance, and information will produce the best possible outcome for economic development. Globalization of the world economy is not only integrating trade, finance, and investment, but also consumer markets, and in particular the pharmaceutical market, with dramatic consequences on prices (unique worldwide prices may be set), therefore jeopardizing access to drugs.

Globalization has produced a cultural shift from the equitable Health For All principle, to the more pragmatic and market oriented “global burden of disease” (GBD) concept, by which the world is divided into market areas, where the basic assumption is that health indicators, such as life expectancy and disability from communicable and noncommunicable diseases, as well as their projections for the year 2020, are expressed in terms of costs.\textsuperscript{13–16} These costs are affordable only for certain populations living in wealthier countries and a minority living in less developed countries. The global burden of disease data reflect profound global inequalities (see Box 6.3).\textsuperscript{17,18}

On the other hand, the “demographic transition,” i.e., rapid growth of population and decrease in birth rates due to improved living and health conditions, leading to aging of the population, produces a shift from acute to chronic conditions, with the resulting increased health needs and health care costs.\textsuperscript{8}

Four processes have contributed to specifically shape this new situation created by globalization in the field of pharmaceuticals. These are the TRIPs Agreement, health sector reform and liberalization, moves to closer cooperation and harmonization of procedures among drug regulatory authorities, and mergers of pharmaceutical firms.

Patents: The WTO TRIPs Agreement

The Uruguay Round of negotiations on multilateral trade led to the creation of the World Trade Organization (WTO) in 1995. Its purposes are to help in the development of trade in an open
98% of all deaths in children younger than 15 years occur in the developing world. 83% of deaths at 15–59 occur in the developing world. The probability of death between birth and 15 years ranges from 22% in sub-Saharan Africa to 1.1% in the established market economies. Developed regions account for 11.6% of the worldwide burden from all causes of death and disability, and for 90.2% of health expenditure worldwide.

The following are per capita health and drug expenditures by global region in 1990. (Bennett et al., quoted)\(^5\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region Public</th>
<th>Health expenditures</th>
<th>Pharmaceutical expenditures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of countries (%)</td>
<td>Total per capita</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Established market economies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern Crescent</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Former Socialist countries</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin America and Caribbean</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asia and Pacific islands</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recent figures from WHO indicate that one-third of the world’s population does not have regular access to essential drugs.\(^1\) Pharmaceutical consumption in the top ten countries (including 17.5% of total world population) in the year ending 30 June, 1999 (amounting to 190 billion dollars) was around 60% of total world consumption in that year (amounting to 315 billion dollars). Developing countries, where three-quarters of the world’s population live, produce less than 10% of total global pharmaceutical production and account for less than 25% of annual global expenditure on drugs.

Although in most developing countries expenditure on drugs doubles every four years, the gross national product doubles only every 16 years.\(^2\) The WHO estimates that the 56 billion dollars spent each year on health research, less than 10% is spent on diseases known to affect 90% of the global population.

The following are examples of annual per capita incomes of less developed countries and costs of health technologies.\(^18\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Annual per capita income ($)</th>
<th>Health technology</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>Ceftriaxone, 7-day course</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Streptokinase, one course</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>One course of treatment for multidrug resistant tuberculosis</td>
<td>5 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbados</td>
<td>6560</td>
<td>HIV triple therapy (one year course)</td>
<td>16 000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Box 6.3. Global inequalities in health.

system, to settle trade disputes between governments, to organize trade negotiations, and to supervise global trade agreements approved during the "Uruguay Round".\(^19\) One of these is the Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs) Agreement, which links intellectual property and trade issues for the first time and establishes minimum universal standards for trade. Pharmaceuticals are treated like any other technological product, insofar as the granting of patent protection is concerned. Under the TRIPs Agreement, all Member States have to make patent protection available for at least 20 years to any invention of a pharmaceutical product for which a patent application had been filed after 1 January 1995.\(^20,21\) This is likely to have an important effect on the equitable access of populations to health and drugs, especially in developing countries (see Box 6.4).\(^9,10,22–25\) Case studies in Asian countries and in Argentina suggested that prices will increase,
A shift has occurred from the human rights oriented WHO’s “Health for All” principle to the economic and market oriented World Bank’s health sector reform and WTO’s patent protection policy.

The future availability and accessibility of pharmaceuticals will be significantly affected by patent protection (as a result of the WTO Agreement on TRIPs), economic integration (with the establishment of free-trade zones which require harmonization to facilitate the free flow of goods between countries),23 health sector reform (with decentralization and privatization), deregulation of pharmaceuticals (expedited approval and lifting of price controls), and mergers of pharmaceutical companies.

Far from the promised transfer of technology, since the introduction of protection for pharmaceuticals, 11 Argentinean companies have been acquired by foreign multinationals, and a dozen formulation plants have been closed down in the Andean countries. The prices of patented and nonpatented drugs and drug bills are expected to rise because of the lack of competition resulting from the disappearance of local laboratories producing cheap, nonpatented drugs. In Argentina, this increase may be more than $1 billion per year.24

Mergers of pharmaceutical companies give rise to huge transnational corporations with increasing influence. In 1999, the top 10 pharmaceutical companies had a business volume of 113 billion dollars, equivalent to 36% of the global market, and the top 20 had a business volume of 168 billion dollars (53.5% of the total world market).

Liberalization of pharmaceutical trade can result in real concentration of production in certain countries, so that multinational firms will be free to export finished or semifinished products rather than transferring technology or foreign investment directly to developing countries.

Of 1223 new chemical entities launched between 1975 and 1997, 379 (30.9%) were therapeutic innovations, but only 11 (1%) were specifically designed for tropical diseases. Most such products were either incidental discoveries recovered from veterinary medicine or molecules discovered by governmental or academic institutions and only later acquired and sold by the pharmaceutical industry. The development of eflornithine, a new drug for “sleeping sickness”, was discontinued because it was unprofitable. Two drugs for use in “tropical diseases” have been produced since the TRIPs agreement in 1994, and they are updated versions of existing products (new formulations of pentamidine and amphotericin B).2,9,10

Box 6.4. Cultural, social, and economic effects of globalization in less developed countries.2,9,10

the local rate of pharmaceutical research and development and the flow of technology and investments to developing countries is not likely to increase, research on diseases prevalent in developing countries will not be promoted, and local pharmaceutical industry will be dismantled.26,27 Developing and least developed countries have been granted a period of grace of five 10, or 11 years, depending on their level of development, in which to amend their national legislation in accordance with the standards of the TRIPs Agreement.27 The recent use of TRIPs to argue that access to the full clinical trial data would breach the intellectual property rights of an applicant for a marketing license in Europe, suggests that trade agreements reinforce justifications for commercial secrecy to the detriment of scientific openness and drug regulation.27

Prior to the TRIPs Agreement, many developing countries did not make patent protection available for pharmaceuticals, in order to allow the manufacture of copies and generic equivalents of drugs by local manufacturers at reduced prices. Such nonpatent regulation helped some countries (namely the Republic of Korea, Egypt, Argentina, Brazil, and Mexico) to build an indigenous pharmaceutical industry based on imitative cheaper drugs, in the same way as, during the 1970s and the 1980s, other countries in Western Europe and Japan persistently resisted providing pharmaceutical product patents for the same reasons.22

On the other hand, implementation of the WTO’s principles of free circulation of goods should imply that the procedures, criteria, and drug regulations of more developed countries are implemented just as rigorously in developing countries. However, poor social development prevents such implementation.28

The majority of drugs included in limited lists for the public sector in developing countries have
expired patents. However, new essential drugs are needed to meet pressing public health needs, and not all are affordable, or available due to the prohibitive prices that result from patent protection (see below), fluctuating international production, waste of resources due to counterfeiting or substandard production, or unsuitability for use in field conditions. An international coalition of health and legal professionals, including Médecins Sans Frontières, has recently warned that patent protection set up through the TRIPS Agreement is preventing poor countries from producing cheaper local versions of essential drugs.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^8\)\(^,\)\(^10\) Examples are azithromycin (trachoma), ceftriaxone (resistant bacterial meningitis), ciprofloxacin (resistant Shigella dysentery), didanosine, indinavir, lamivudine, nevirapine, and zidovudine (HIV infection), fluconazole (fungal infections), and ofloxacin (multidrug resistant tuberculosis).\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^2\) Lack of access to essential drugs and vaccines because of economic factors raises human rights issues. However, it is evident that financial access to pharmaceuticals does not necessarily imply effective use if it is not linked to the correction of a wide range of other deficiencies. Development of an effective national drug policy, adoption of the ED concept, use of compulsory licensing, parallel imports, promotion of the production and use of generic drugs, improvement of pharmaceutical management, dissemination of reliable drug information, and continuous training for health professionals are all measures that have been proposed to mitigate the effects of TRIPS on public health.\(^2\)\(^,\)\(^10\)\(^,\)\(^2\)

**STRUCTURAL ADJUSTMENT, HEALTH SECTOR REFORM AND DEREGULATION**

Economic adjustment introduced by the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank includes currency devaluation and liberalizing trade by increasing exports, decreasing imports, and increasing local access for foreign and transnational corporations. Government spending is cut by introducing user charges, withdrawing subsidies, privatization, retrenching civil servants, and introducing wage restraints.\(^3\)\(^0\) According to Unicef, during the 1980s structural adjustment has produced a drop of 10–25% in average incomes, a 25% reduction in *per capita* spending on health, and a 50% reduction in *per capita* spending on education in the poorest countries of the world.\(^3\)\(^1\)

A major change has occurred in the roles of WHO and the World Bank in the health sector. By applying a strategy of loan funding, the World Bank advocates health sector reform, including decentralization, privatization, and cost recovery.\(^3\)\(^2\)–\(^3\)\(^4\) In some countries, the World Bank has become active in funding the purchase of pharmaceuticals. The probity of financing a recurrent expenditure with loan funds has been challenged.\(^8\)

The imperative to liberalize trade is reducing state involvement in the social sectors. Health sector reform involves not only privatization processes,\(^3\)\(^5\) but also deregulation of drugs,\(^2\)\(^3\) with potentially dramatic consequences on populations with substantial illiteracy rates and low educational levels, living in countries where independent information is scarce or non-existent.\(^3\)\(^5\)

**DRUG REGULATION AND HARMONIZATION**

The aim of drug regulation is protection of the public (see also Chapter 8). The choices involved in deciding which medicines are useful and safe are complex and need knowledge, skill, and experience. Clinical and epidemiological drug safety experience show that the consequences of licensing ineffective or unsafe drugs can be very serious. Thus, drugs treated as mere consumer goods become a danger to public health. The broad responsibilities of the state with regard to pharmaceuticals should at least include registration, quality control, monitoring of drug use (including supervision of production, imports, and distribution as well as sale at pharmacies), monitoring of adverse drug reactions and of drug prescription and use, and informing and educating health professionals and the public.

Registration is no more than a step in the regulatory process, although it is one of the most important. In the United States, the FDA has the legal mandate to review all new drugs for licensing for sale. The manufacturer must prove the drug is “safe and effective” for the medical indications claimed. The legal requirement for efficacy is
relatively recent. The amendment to the law establishing this requirement was enacted in 1964, but the legal definition of “efficacy” was settled only after litigation and a 1971 Federal Court ruling. In most instances, the generally accepted legal requirement for proof of “efficacy” is a well designed, carefully conducted, and fully reported randomized controlled trial. Once a drug is licensed, there is no legal requirement to monitor it or keep it under formal surveillance for unexpected or rare side-effects, other than the spontaneous reporting system (see Chapters 8, 10, and 11), but the FDA has managed to persuade many manufacturers to establish such a postmarketing surveillance system “voluntarily”, using persuasion, or the tacit threat of slower or nonapproval. Often manufacturers understand such surveillance is ultimately in their own best interests (see Chapter 7).

Drug regulatory authorities have certain manifest obligations towards international collaboration, such as the need to eliminate counterfeiting and substandard products, to assure good manufacturing practices, and other aspects of control. Earlier international cooperation initiatives, such as the development of International Non-proprietary Names (INN) and collaboration in adverse drug reaction monitoring led by WHO, have been significant improvements in drug management and exchange of information.6,37

During the 1990s, the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH) has had a central role in globalizing the pharmaceutical market. The ICH was established to function as a forum to harmonize technical requirements for registration of new innovative pharmaceuticals. Its goals were to reduce redundancy and costs of drug development while hastening the delivery of proven new therapeutic agents to patients.37,38 It has set defined technical specifications regarding the testing of drug quality, safety, efficacy, and communication among authorities.34 The ICH will certainly have much wider reaching implications on the marketing, regulation, and utilization of drugs than has ever been explicitly stated.39 It was convened by the regulatory authorities of the US, Japan, and the European Union (EU), the secretariat is provided by the International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Associations (IFPMA), WHO is an observer, and developing country regulators and generic manufacturers have been excluded. The composition and membership has created concern.6,37 It has been criticized for being too much concerned with getting new drugs onto the market as quickly as possible, while paying insufficient attention to monitoring patterns of use, drug safety, and drug information, and for lacking accountability and openness.37 Its guidelines will benefit larger companies, which will now be able to submit the same set of data to regulatory authorities worldwide, but they will probably marginalize medium- and small-sized manufacturers in developing countries, which will not be able to meet the technical requirements outlined by ICH. The US Generics Pharmaceutical Industry Association (GPIA) noted that the requirements for generics were being increased without a scientific need to do so.37

In the EU, harmonization has mainly focused on the standardization of the criteria for new drug approval in member states and in developing common procedures for drug licensing and for safety review. Other aspects, such as a review of existing marketed products and the adoption of common standards governing information, advertising, and marketing of drugs have been omitted, sometimes because of strong opposition from the drug industry.40 Any inclusion of a “need clause” in the criteria for drug registration (i.e., that the manufacturer not only has to establish that a drug is safe and effective but also that there is a need for that drug—in other words that it has advantages over other already existing drugs) would constitute a trade barrier, in contravention of the Treaty of Rome, and is expressly excluded by the first pharmaceutical Directive (65/65/EEC).41 These steps are basically coherent with the fact that the European Medicines Agency functionally depends on the Industry Directorate of the European Union Commission, rather than the Consumers Protection Directorate (the EU has no Directorate on Health).

In developing countries, poor funding of drug regulatory agencies limits their activities mainly to registration and to routine controls (at best), and
generally monitoring and information activities are not undertaken. For this and other reasons, regulatory agencies in developing countries depend heavily upon the experience gained and the assessments carried out by larger national agencies elsewhere. The registration process is often feeble or simply nonexistent. In certain countries, “automatic registration” of drugs has been cynically advocated as a means to prevent corruption among drug regulators. In other countries the term “homologation” means that drugs are automatically licensed if they have been previously approved in a major country, with little or no local regard to manufacturing practices, quality control, need, approved indications, or information which will be disseminated by the manufacturer. These trends are the result of the lack of attention paid by governments to the role of regulation in protecting the public health. In some countries, the legal functions of drug regulatory bodies have been limited by new legislation. Some worrying effects of these policies have been identified, such as registration of many ineffective or unnecessary drugs, and a decrease in consumption volume, despite an increase in market value, due to price increase.42,43

MERGERS OF PHARMACEUTICAL FIRMS

There are certain features of the modern drug industry that affect the safety and efficacy of the drug supply. Like so many aspects of the economy, the drug industry is global in nature and is characterized by economists as an oligopoly. An oligopoly is a market dominated by a relatively small number of large firms, and with the mergers

Market success of pharmaceutical companies depends on the continuous launching of new products. Drug development costs are high and increasing, and only large companies can afford the investments necessary. The proportion of revenue allocated to research and development in the larger pharmaceutical companies is around 15%. At Glaxo Wellcome, for example, marketing and general administrative expenditure accounts for more than twice this amount. With mergers, companies’ activities can be streamlined and duplication reduced. Manufacturing plants can be closed down and production concentrated into fewer centers, in countries with cheaper labor. Locating production plants in particular countries may facilitate the introduction of the companies’ products in those countries. Similarly, the threat of closing the manufacturing plant may be used to obtain product registration and high prices. The power and influence of pharmaceutical companies thus increases. As the objective is maximizing profits, and it is unlikely that profit oriented organizations will devote much of their effort to poorer populations, large innovative firms focus on the most profitable segments of the market. The losers are people dismissed from their jobs. It is estimated that the Glaxo Wellcome merger led to 8000 lost jobs. Stockbrokers and stockholders are the obvious winners. The following are changes in market capitalization following announcement of the proposed merger of Glaxo Wellcome and SmithKline Beecham on 31 January 1998.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company</th>
<th>Capitalization ($billion)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31 Dec 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merck</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novartis</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roche Holdings</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bristol-Myers Squibb</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glaxo Wellcome</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pfizer</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SmithKline Beecham</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overconcentration may interfere with innovative activity and lead to monopolistic power. A monopoly of industries from the same (industrialized) country may not be so at the international level. As it is likely to benefit the national economy, and although close scrutiny of merger activity is important, there is little incentive for the governments of the country of origin to oppose any merger of two companies from that country, in the “national interest”. Under such circumstances, patients and governments of less fortunate countries have little to say.

Box 6.5. Winners and losers in mergers of pharmaceutical companies.44
of the past few decades, manufacturing capability is increasingly in the hands of fewer and larger firms with international operations (see Boxes 6.4 and 6.5). An oligopoly confers distinct advantages upon the participating firms: economies of scale, less competition, opportunity for collusion with competitors on price and market share division, and ability to carry out expensive research and development. The sheer size of the firm along with monopolies due to patent protection permit price setting with little possibility of negotiation by the purchaser, be it patient, hospital, or national agency. The admission in 1999 of price fixing by seven of the largest firms manufacturing vitamins is an example of the societal costs of oligopolistic arrangements; 80% of the vitamin market was controlled by seven firms acting in illegal collusion.

The large multinational drug manufacturing firms have a capability to invest in research and development impossible for smaller ones. Utilizing their own laboratory facilities or purchasing the development “rights” to the research of university laboratories, drugs can move relatively quickly from discovery to development to marketing. The “downside” of these arrangements is the pressure for secrecy, which is in opposition to the usual ethos of scientific investigation and cooperation.

The multinational firms, acting in unison, can even “blackmail” an entire government, or at least attempt to do so. This is illustrated by the recent threat of Glaxo to withdraw their manufacturing plants from the United Kingdom, if the National Health Service refused to purchase their anti-influenza drug called “Relenza”.

The potential ethical problems that can occur when academics accept industry funding are epitomized in the search for specific disease causing genes. On 18 October, 1999, the Wall Street Journal reported that the Glaxo Corporation had succeeded in identifying genes that are responsible for familial migraine, psoriasis, and type 2 diabetes mellitus. However, in order to protect Glaxo’s rights to “patent” these genes, this information will be kept secret and not published for at least one year. Part of the work related to the gene search was performed at Duke University, which presumably agreed to the secrecy/nonpublication policy.

This nonsharing and secrecy surrounding research results is in direct opposition to traditional practice in academia and has profound practical and ethical implications. We believe that secret medical research contravenes conventional ethical codes and is contrary to the entire purpose of academia. Further, the policy of placing future profits ahead of collegial sharing of data is a dangerous precedent for public health.

SURVEILLANCE OF PRESCRIBING PRACTICES

Many chapters of this book deal with postmarketing surveillance of drugs for adverse effects, and this is indeed a most important function of pharmacoepidemiology. A less recognized, but increasingly relevant activity of pharmacoepidemiology is monitoring the prescribing patterns of physicians and national drug utilization (see also Chapters 30 and 31). Numerous studies show that even in the developed world, where reliable prescribing information is usually available (but not always consulted), prescribing patterns leave room for much improvement. Common suboptimal practices include prescribing antibiotics for self-limited viral respiratory syndromes, overprescribing of minor and major tranquilizers, prescribing of expensive and unnecessary combination products for the common cold or headache, and, paradoxically, underprescribing of certain effective agents, such as β-blockers and antiplatelet drugs after myocardial infarction, antihypertensive agents, antibiotics for atrial fibrillation and analgesics for postoperative pain.45–48

National drug utilization studies consistently reveal extraordinarily high rates of use of tranquilizers, antibiotics, vitamins, and hypnotics. An older study of vitamin B12 injection in England and Wales suggested a greater than 20-fold difference between the amount injected and the highest possible estimate of pernicious anemia prevalence (the only justified use, other than as a placebo).49 This suggests either a misunderstanding of the vitamin’s true indications or high use of it as a “placebo”. Patient demand may also play a role here. Indiscriminant prescribing of antibiotics has
become an important problem all over the world. In the USA, the Centers for Disease Control have initiated a special program to educate both physicians and patients about the prudent use of these agents. Resistant strains of many bacteria have developed, in part due to overuse and inappropriate use of antibiotics.

Other problem areas in possible overutilization include the use of tranquilizers and the stimulant methylphenidate (Ritalin) indicated for “attention deficit disorder” (ADD), a somewhat vaguely and casually defined behavioral syndrome of school-age children. Estimates of the prevalence of Ritalin use in US children vary, but probably no less than one million children in the USA are daily users of this controversial but generally accepted pharmacotherapy. Long-term consequences of such use are under active investigation. While the drug is prescribed in other developed nations, the popularity of Ritalin treatment elsewhere does not come even close to rivaling the high utilization in the United States, where the ADD diagnosis is currently in vogue. No standardized surveillance system has been established, in spite of the high use rates and long term pattern of use of this amphetamine-like drug.50

In summary, pharmacoepidemiologists have developed methods for tracking prescribing practices and national or regional drug utilization patterns but it is the rare drug regulatory agency that monitors and analyzes these patterns and then follows with regulatory or remedial action.

Pharmacoepidemiologists are particularly at risk of becoming the targets of attempts to influence their research results, because the outcome of their studies can often affect the sales or even the licensing of drugs and medical devices. There are lamentable instances where epidemiologic studies have been conceived, designed, and conducted to obtain a predetermined result in order to obscure a drug/disease association, or, more rarely, to produce such an association.

It is still possible, but increasingly difficult, to defend the core values of academia and carry out contractual work with the private sector or certain government agencies subject to political pressures.

Yet another challenge to scientific integrity is the size in interest in homeopathic remedies. In Europe, homeopathic remedies have a large following and their popularity is increasing in the USA. Since the scientific rationale for the use of such “drugs” is completely absent, there is hardly any argument for even testing such concoctions, and yet the United Kingdom’s National Health Service has established a Royal Hospital of Homeopathic Medicine and in the USA academics accept grants from government and the private sector to study those “medicines.” Academic medical centers, in an attempt to capture the market, to appear responsive to public demand, and to receive research grants, wind up pandering to the latest vogue in unscientific therapeutics under the pretense of doing a public service. In the process, they divert precious resources to predictably worthless activities.

THE ROLE OF THE UNIVERSITY SCIENTIST IN THE FIELD OF PHARMACOEpidEMIOLOGY

The role of the university scientist should reflect the unique role and function of the university: the provision of disinterested inquiry and critique. This role becomes a more difficult one to fulfill as university scientists become more and more dependent on funding from sources that have a vested interest in obtaining particular outcomes from the studies they fund. This problem confronts the scientist who receives funding from public as well as private sources.

CONCLUSIONS

We have identified major threats to the integrity and mission of pharmacoepidemiology as conducted in academic settings:

- increasing secret work and non-sharing of data due to contractual obligations with the private sector;
- diversion of resources to “fringe” medicine where no basis for rational study investigation has been presented;
in the desire to obtain funding, conducting studies where a predetermined outcome is desired and engineered as a service to the funding agency;

- neglect by pharmacoepidemiologists of the plight of Third World consumers, where drug markets are often unregulated and drug advertising grossly and dangerously misleading; and

- increasing control and setting of research priorities in pharmacoepidemiology by the private sector to further its needs, which are not always congruent with public health goals.

We hope that by highlighting these threats, we can help protect against them.
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INTRODUCTION

Innovative and successful pharmaceutical manufacturers invest heavily in research and development, in order to achieve increases in profit and growth through the launch of new products. The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturer's Association (PhRMA) in the US estimates that companies will invest 24 billion dollars in 1999 to discover and develop new drugs, which represents a 14% increase over 1998. In the 1990s more than 330 new medications have been approved by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), to treat conditions that affect millions of people.  

Epidemiology has played an increasingly important role over the past 15 years in all phases of drug development, commercialization, and safety. Drug development has long relied on basic science research and on clinical studies of experimental rather than observational design. In the areas of safety and postmarketing surveillance, the pharmaceutical industry and regulatory authorities initially relied solely on clinical trials or on the spontaneous reporting system of the FDA or other regulatory authorities for information on safety. Epidemiology began its career in the pharmaceutical industry being used defensively, usually in response to legal or regulatory issues. However, most large pharmaceutical companies now recognize the proactive contribution that may be made by epidemiology. In addition to its traditional role in drug safety and risk management, pharmacoepidemiology has become increasingly important in providing support to product planning, marketing, and market analysis.

PHARMACEUTICAL INDUSTRY GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

The primary goal of the pharmaceutical industry is to improve the public's health and well-being through the development and sale of safe and effective pharmaceutical products. Manufacturers devote major efforts to research and development, as well as to marketing those products that have been approved. Products must be sold at a profit for a manufacturer to remain economically viable. These profits, in turn, help to support research and development and lead to new drugs. Throughout the entire process of drug development and marketing, government regulatory authorities, such as the US FDA and similar agencies in other countries, regulate the industry.

Most drug regulatory authorities require that a pharmaceutical manufacturer demonstrates that
its product (either drug or device) is safe and effective before approving the product for sale. Beyond meeting regulatory needs, the manufacturer has an ethical obligation to monitor its products for safety on an ongoing basis, in order to develop and maintain product labeling that reflects current knowledge. The manufacturer’s product label directly affects the safe prescribing of drugs by physicians and safe use of the product by the public.

In order to establish safety and efficacy, the manufacturer must have a basic understanding of the target patient population for both the successful development and sale of the product. To remain competitive, a manufacturer must be able to predict unmet medical need several decades into the future and understand the characteristics of the individuals afflicted with the various conditions of interest. Pharmaceutical research is extremely costly and time consuming. Given limited resources, decisions must be made as to which of many candidate drugs to develop. Once a drug is approved for sale, patient characteristics play an important role in developing marketing strategies and helping to maximize marketing resources by identifying specific target populations appropriate for the particular medication.

Throughout the lifespan of a drug, from discovery through the entire marketing and sales cycle, industry has an ongoing obligation to comply with worldwide regulatory requirements. Although few would seriously dispute the need for regulation, the pharmaceutical industry does need to function in a rational regulatory environment. Implicit in this goal is the need for a logical basis for drug approval, the need for a rational and balanced approach to both pre- and postmarketing surveillance of drug safety, and the need for a regulatory environment relatively devoid of non-scientific pressures.

Crucial to the continued success of the pharmaceutical industry in providing effective treatments for serious medical conditions is freedom from irresponsible attacks on safety issues. This is not to suggest that the industry should not be held accountable for its actions, but rather that challenges of drug safety should be motivated by consistently applied scientific principles. To minimize such attacks, there is need for rapid, efficient, and scientifically sound methods for evaluating drug safety. A proper understanding of the strengths and limitations of these methods is needed by government, special interest groups, the media, physicians, and the pharmaceutical industry itself. Sales of a product, either drug or device, can be irreparably damaged or the product itself withdrawn from the market based on unwarranted and insupportable attacks, as was the case with Bendectin. Even when the safety of the product has subsequently been established, the public’s trust may have eroded in both the product and the industry itself.

The manufacturer’s responsibility is to develop safe and effective products, have the capability to rapidly assess the health needs and the safety of the population, and encourage and support the public’s confidence in the actions of industry and government. The methods of pharmacoepidemiology can contribute to each of these areas.

UTILITY OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY

Epidemiology makes its greatest contribution to the pharmaceutical industry in support of several functions: evaluating drug safety, new product planning and portfolio development, and commercialization or marketing of drugs. The observational methods used in these functions are often described by other terminology, such as cost-effectiveness research (see Chapter 35), outcomes research (see Chapter 36), or quality of life research (see Chapter 36). Regardless of nomenclature, pharmacoepidemiology is playing an expanding role within the pharmaceutical industry.

EVALUATING DRUG SAFETY

Evaluating drug safety is the primary use of epidemiology within the pharmaceutical industry. Drug manufacturers have traditionally relied on two major sources for information on the safety of drugs: the clinical trials supporting the New Drug Application (NDA) and, once the drug is marketed, spontaneous reports received throughout
the world. Both are useful and have a place in assessing drug safety, but both have limitations that can be addressed, in part, by the proper use of formal observational epidemiology. Epidemiologic studies can complement these two sources of data to provide a more comprehensive and pragmatic picture of the safety profile of a drug.

Clinical Trials

The randomized controlled clinical trial is considered the gold standard methodology to study the safety and efficacy of a drug. However, trials are limited by the relatively small numbers of patients studied and the relatively short time period over which patients are observed. The numbers of patients included in premarketing clinical trials are usually adequate to identify only the most common and acutely occurring adverse events. Typically, these trials have a total patient sample size up to several thousand (occasionally as high as 7000). Using the “rule of three” where the sample size needed is roughly three times the reciprocal of the frequency of the event, at least 300 patients would be required in a trial in order to observe at least one adverse event that occurs at a rate of 1/100 (see also Chapter 3). Likewise, a sample of 3000 is needed to observe at least one adverse event with 95% probability if the frequency of the event is 1/1000. Thus, clinical trials are usually only large enough to detect events that occur relatively frequently, and are generally inadequate to address all potential safety issues related to a particular drug.

An additional limitation of clinical trials with respect to drug safety is the strict inclusion/exclusion criteria common in clinical trials. Patients included in pre-approval clinical studies may be the healthiest segment of that patient population. Special groups such as the elderly, pregnant women, or children may be excluded from some trials. Patients in clinical trials also tend to be treated for well defined indications, have limited and well monitored concomitant drug use, and are closely followed for early signs and symptoms of adverse events, which may be aborted or reversed with proper treatment. In contrast, once a drug is marketed, it is used by patients in “real-life” situations, who may have a constellation of disorders for which they are being treated simultaneously. Patients may also be taking over the counter medications, “natural remedies,” or illicit drugs unbeknownst to the prescribing physician. The interactions of various drugs and treatments may result in a particular drug having a different safety profile in a postmarketing setting compared to the controlled premarketing environment. A recent example is the drug Posicor (mibeferadil), which was voluntarily withdrawn from the market after less than a year by the manufacturer as a result of new information about multiple potentially serious drug interactions. Compliance in taking the drug as prescribed may also differ between closely monitored trials and general postapproval use.

Spontaneous Reporting Systems

Spontaneous reporting systems are valuable for identifying relatively rare events and providing signals about potentially serious safety problems, especially with respect to new drugs (see also Chapters 10 and 11). Signals are used to generate hypotheses, which then may be studied in observational or interventional studies. Spontaneous reports must be interpreted within the context of the strengths and limitations of the system. These reports are subject to many biases, which are unmeasured and unmeasurable. Events are generally underreported and the decision of which events to report is potentially strongly affected by bias. The effects of these biases differ among drugs and differ over time. The number of spontaneous reports received most often relates to the length of time a drug has been on the market, the initial rate of sale of the drug, secular trends in spontaneous reporting, and the amount of time a manufacturer’s sales representatives spend with physicians “detailing” the product. Certain types of event seem to be more likely to be reported, such as those which are serious and/or unlabeled, and events that occur rarely in the general population, those that occur acutely with drug administration, and those associated with publicity in the lay or professional media. The frequency of reporting varies by drug class and
drug company.\textsuperscript{21} The number of reports is not equal to the number of patients, since events are often reported several times.\textsuperscript{23} Valid incidence rates cannot be generated from spontaneous reporting systems, since neither the true numerator nor true denominator is known,\textsuperscript{17} and reporting rates between drugs cannot be validly compared; therefore, relative safety cannot be assessed.\textsuperscript{23} Additionally, the events reported have an underlying background rate in the population, even in the absence of drug treatment.\textsuperscript{17}

Notwithstanding these important limitations, the spontaneous reporting system has been successfully used in a number of circumstances to alert a manufacturer to a potentially high frequency of serious adverse events in a newly launched drug. One example is temafloxacin (Omniflox), which was approved by the FDA in January 1992. By June 1992, the drug was voluntarily withdrawn from the market by the manufacturer, following reports of six deaths and more than 70 other serious adverse events, including hemolytic anemia, renal failure, severe hypoglycemia, and anaphylaxis. In the first four months after marketing, an estimated 174,000 individuals took this drug,\textsuperscript{24} allowing the rapid observation of serious adverse events less frequent than those observed in clinical trials. Another example is that of mibefradil (Posicor), a calcium channel blocker first marketed in the US in August 1997. Three drugs (astemizole, cisapride, and terfenadine) were listed as having an interaction with mibefradil at the time of approval. Through spontaneous reports (as well as continued clinical studies), more than 25 drugs were identified that were potentially harmful if used with mibefradil. Mibefradil had no known special benefits that could not be met with other drugs. The manufacturer and the FDA decided that the number and diversity of drugs with which it interacted could not be practically handled via the usual warnings in the label, and the risk–benefit profile was unfavorable. The drug was voluntarily withdrawn from the US market in June 1998.\textsuperscript{15}

Of great concern is the misinterpretation and dissemination of misinformation based upon reports received through the spontaneous reporting system. A well publicized example deals with the claims that the antidepressant fluoxetine (Prozac) might be associated with suicidal behavior and violent aggression towards others.\textsuperscript{25} Intense publicity contributed to loss of market share for this product although practitioners and an FDA Advisory Committee had taken the position that suicidal behavior is an inherent part of depression and not associated with toxic effects of the drug, and that there is no scientific evidence linking aggressive behavior with this agent.\textsuperscript{26, 27} The FDA Advisory Committee did suggest that the manufacturer further support the evidence of the drug’s safety with prospective epidemiologic studies. Subsequent studies and re-analyses of clinical trial data did not support the speculation that fluoxetine increased the risk of suicide or aggressive behavior, and millions of patients worldwide have benefited from this therapy.\textsuperscript{28–31}

In order to evaluate safety signals arising from spontaneous reporting systems, one needs to know as much as possible about the population using the drug. For example, knowledge about the distribution of age, gender, concomitant illnesses, and medications in users of a particular drug can provide information necessary to estimate the expected background rates of events that one might observe. A number of commercial vendors such as NDC Health Information Services, HCIA Inc., and IMS Health provide extensive information about the use and sales of prescription products (see also Chapters 24 and 29). Although information about actual drug ingestion is not available, one can make some assumptions about the frequency of use from calculating the interval between refills in longitudinal resources. Additionally, information about the frequency of off-label use or the frequency of coprescribing with medications that are contraindicated may be explored.

There has been concern for many years that the FDA was taking too long to review New Drug Applications (NDAs) and make decisions on approval. While a thorough review of the safety and efficacy data is necessary, unnecessary delays due to staff shortages at the FDA delayed many valuable, and in some cases lifesaving, medications from being available to the large numbers of patients who could benefit. The community of
AIDS–HIV activists was instrumental in forcing change. In 1992, the Prescription Drug User Fee Act (PDUFA) was passed. This enabled the FDA to hire hundreds of additional reviewers with funds provided by the sponsors (manufacturers) submitting an NDA. In return, manufacturers could expect a decision on approval within one year of submitting an NDA (6 months if the drug was approved for expedited review by the FDA). In 1992, 26 new drugs were approved by the FDA, compared to 53 in 1996. The act expired in 1997 and was subsequently renewed by Congress. There has been increased emphasis on postmarketing surveillance since that time, and in some cases companies have been asked to perform formal observational studies as part of the approval commitment.

Formal Epidemiology Studies

There are many safety issues relevant to the pharmaceutical industry that can only be studied through observational epidemiology. Only epidemiologic methods are practical for estimating the incidence of and risk factors for rarely occurring events in large populations exposed to a drug, to study events with a long latency period, or to study cross-generational effects of a drug. For example, case reports of a few patients with primary pulmonary hypertension exposed to appetite suppressant drugs led to a formal epidemiologic study documenting this association and strengthened labeling for the drug.32

Epidemiologic studies may also be the source of hypotheses or signals that later are found not to be supported. For example, Pahor and associates suggested that calcium antagonists were associated with gastrointestinal hemorrhage33 and cancer.34,35 Later studies did not confirm these findings, but sales of the products had been compromised.36–41

Epidemiologic studies may also be used to examine the comparative risks associated with particular drugs within a therapeutic class. For example, one large study determined that, among anti-ulcer drugs, cimetidine was associated with the highest risk of developing symptomatic acute liver disease.42 Other studies examined the risk of hip fractures in users of benzodiazepines and found that users of long acting agents were at greater risk than those using short acting agents.43,44

Epidemiologic studies are extremely useful to place the incidence of adverse events observed during clinical trials in perspective. Data are often lacking on the expected rates of events in the population likely to be treated. For example, studies examining the risk factors for and rates of sudden unexplained death among people with epilepsy were able to provide reassurance that the rates observed in a clinical development program were within the expected rates for individuals with comparably severe disease.45–47

Epidemiologic methods have also been used extensively to examine possible teratologic effects of various agents (see also Chapter 42). Although animal teratology testing is part of the pre-approval process of all drugs, questions about a possible relationship between a specific drug and birth defects may arise in the postmarketing period. Experimental methods such as randomized, double blind clinical trials are not feasible to address these issues. Instead, epidemiologic methods are necessary to gather and evaluate the information in the population actually using the drug. Examples of epidemiologic studies examining possible teratogenicity include those studying diazepam use and oral clefts,48 spermicide use and Down’s syndrome, hypospadias, and limb reduction deformities,49 and Bendectin use and oral clefts, cardiac defects, and pyloric stenosis.50,51 In certain circumstances manufacturers may choose to set up pregnancy registries to obtain information about the use of their products.52,53

Epidemiologic methods have also been used to study cancers in individuals exposed to drugs in utero, periconceptually, or immediately after birth. A classic example is the association between maternal use of DES and clear-cell adenocarcinoma of the vagina.54,55 Other examples include the possible association between prenatal exposure to metronidazole and childhood cancer,56 and childhood cancers and the use of sedatives during pregnancy.57 A number of studies have examined the potential association between childhood cancer and exposure to vitamin K in the neonatal period.58–61
Epidemiologic methods provide the only practical way to study the association between drugs and effects with very long latency periods. Early recipients of human growth hormone (derived from human cadaveric pituitary tissue) were found to have elevated risks of Creutzfeldt–Jacob disease (CJD). Recombinant growth hormone became available in the mid-1980s, but due to the long latent period for CJD, cases continued to be diagnosed well after that time.

Modern chemotherapy for childhood cancer has only been in use since approximately 1970 and it is only fairly recently that large numbers of children are being cured of cancer, allowing for the estimation of the long-term risks associated with the use of cytotoxic agents. Epidemiologic studies have documented the association between iatrogenic leukemia and treatment with alkylating agents or epipodophyllotoxins for previous cancers. Second malignant neoplasms (of the solid tumor type) have also been associated with the use of alkylating agents and antitumor antibiotics. Chemotherapy given to children prior to or during the adolescent growth spurt has been associated with slowing of skeletal growth and loss of potential height. Decreased bone mineral density has also been documented following chemotherapeutic treatment in childhood.

Survivors of adult cancers have also been the subject of studies examining associations between chemotherapy and late effects. Examples include findings of decreased bone mineral density in women treated with cytotoxic agents for breast cancer and in men and women treated for Hodgkin’s disease, which may be due to a direct effect of treatment on bone, a secondary effect mediated via gonadal toxicity, or a combination of the two.

MEDICAL DEVICES

Some pharmaceutical manufacturers also produce medical devices. Epidemiologic methods may also be used to evaluate the safety of these devices, including those that are permanently surgically implanted, such as breast augmentation devices or prosthetic joint replacements (see also Chapter 41).

Premarketing testing of devices must, by definition, differ from that of drugs. Surgical implants are usually designed for long term or life-long use, and clinical trials are not feasible to study effects with long latency periods. Surgical techniques also differ widely among surgeons, and may influence later adverse events. Placebo comparisons are not possible to study surgical implants for obvious reasons. It may be only when the device has been in widespread use for many years that some adverse effects are noticed. At this point, epidemiologic studies may be useful.

The regulation of medical devices by the FDA also differs substantially from that of drugs, and will only be briefly discussed here (see also Chapter 41). Prior to the Medical Device Amendments of 1976 to the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act, devices could be marketed without review by the FDA. Now, devices are divided into three classes (I, II, and III) of increasing theoretical potential hazard, and consequently increasing regulatory rigor. Medical devices are also classified by whether they are “pre- or post-amendment” (marketed prior to or after the amendment of 1976), “substantially equivalent” to a pre-amendment device, and additionally, whether they are “implanted” (to remain for more than 30 days), “custom”, “investigational”, or “transitional” (previously defined as drugs, but now defined as devices, i.e., injectable silicone and intraocular lenses). If a manufacturer can provide data establishing “substantial equivalence” to a pre-amendment device, a premarketing notification to the FDA (“510[k]”) is all that is required, while full testing and approval are required for all postamendment devices that are not substantially equivalent. There has been considerable controversy over the ability to “grandfather” new devices through the 510(k) procedure by showing substantial equivalence to pre-amendment devices that had never been formally approved through the PMA process (Premarket Approval Application, similar to an NDA).

The best known recent example of an investigation regarding the safety of a medical device deals with silicone breast implants. In 1992, the Commissioner of the FDA recommended a temporary moratorium on the use of such devices. Lawsuits
were brought by hundreds of thousands of women against the manufacturers of the implants claiming that the silicone had caused a variety of connective tissue disease. Over 7 billion dollars in judgments and settlements were paid by the companies. A panel of experts appointed by the Institute of Medicine concluded that women with breast implants did not have an increased risk of cancer, immunologic diseases, or neurological problems over women without such implants. They did conclude that implants often led to complications requiring surgery to correct them.

**EPIDEMIOLOGY IN SUPPORT OF THE DEVELOPMENT AND MARKETING OF PHARMACEUTICALS**

New Product Planning and Portfolio Development

The future success of a pharmaceutical company lies in the value of its product pipeline. Product planning (the development of drugs) is a critical function within innovative pharmaceutical companies, because of the continuing need for new and promising developmental drugs to fill their product pipelines. Pharmacoepidemiology has become an effective tool in this area. Basic epidemiologic techniques have been useful for defining markets, for determining how a drug is actually being used in the population, and for determining public health needs, especially where no true commercial market already exists. Pharmacoepidemiology is also well suited to identifying high-risk groups such as the elderly, the poor, expectant mothers, and so on. Such knowledge aids a drug company in positioning its drugs in the market place and in weighing risks and benefits of therapy. Estimating the incidence and prevalence of a disease is crucial for estimating the potential market value of a drug, allowing a company to allocate limited research funds appropriately. This is especially important, given that drugs often take up to 15 years to develop and cost an average of $500 million to develop from the laboratory to use in humans in the US. Only five out of every 5000 products that enter preclinical testing eventually make it to human testing, and only one of those five products is approved for sale. Successful companies carefully choose which early candidates in their pipeline to progress. Information regarding the descriptive epidemiology of a condition may lead to decisions to progress a candidate drug on a “fast track.”

This type of information may be available through the rich data resources available for public use from the US National Center for Health Statistics, the Agency for Healthcare Policy and Research, the National Institutes of Health, and similar agencies outside of the US, such as the Office of National Statistics in the UK. Alternatively, this information may be derived from population based studies commissioned by industry, although the cost and time investment is considerably higher.

Epidemiologic studies can help a pharmaceutical company describe the prevalence of a condition in which they have an interest, describe the natural history of a condition prior to the introduction of their drug, and describe the frequency with which complications of that condition occur. The examples in the preceding sentence all relate to the Olmsted County Study of Urinary Symptoms and Health Status Among Men, funded by Merck Laboratories in support of the development of finasteride (Proscar). In addition to prevalence, epidemiologic studies can estimate the burden (cost and disability) associated with specific conditions, as has been done with migraine, asthma, and Alzheimer’s disease. The burden of disease estimates the cost, both human and economic, to sufferers and to society and is helpful for valuing a drug in terms of unmet medical need.

These same epidemiologic methods may be used for “evergreening” purposes (exploring new indications for existing products). Additionally, products with multiple indications may warrant investigations into the joint prevalence of specific comorbid conditions.

**Marketing Support**

Once a drug is approved, the manufacturer is interested in monitoring its use and the type of patient who receive the drug. Observational studies may be informative as to the frequency of
off-label use and use of multiple medications. Epidemiologic methods and databases such as the National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey may be used to monitor trends in the prescribing of certain pharmaceutical products, or changes in the characteristics of users over time. Epidemiologic methods may also be useful to study medication use among high risk populations, such as the elderly with cognitive impairment or pregnant women.

Epidemiologic methods may be used to benefit marketed compounds in several ways. Product positioning efforts may be informed by epidemiologic studies suggesting either special risk or special benefits in certain subpopulations. Disease awareness activities (professional and patient educational programs) may also be useful, particularly when the indication for a drug is a symptom or condition that the patient himself must bring to the doctor’s attention, such as erectile dysfunction. Information on patterns of health-care utilization may also help target marketing efforts.

The FDA’s Division of Drug Marketing Advertising and Communication (DDMAC) monitors advertising of drugs. Any claim in an advertisement must be based on scientifically sound studies. An example of a recent drug advertisement that used observational data is a professional journal advertisement for norethindrone acetate and ethinyl estradiol tablets (Estrostep), which cited a reference by Rosenberg and associates.

**BENEFICIAL EFFECTS OF DRUGS**

Epidemiologic methods are also useful to quantify the beneficial effects of drugs (see also Chapter 34). Study endpoints may vary from outcomes such as well-being or quality of life to more quantitative variables such as blood pressure level, direct and/or indirect cost savings, and utilization of the health care system. Examples include studies to document improvements in health related quality of life associated with drugs for migraine, benign prostatic hyperplasia, allergic rhinitis, osteoarthritis, and rheumatoid arthritis.

Manufacturers are also using the tools of pharmacoepidemiology to carry out economic studies (see also Chapter 35). Studies that demonstrate an economic advantage are useful for marketing if a manufacturer can demonstrate that use of its product is equally effective as but less costly than a competitor’s. These studies may be used to justify inclusion of brand name products on formularies of health maintenance organizations (HMOs), hospitals, and state Medicaid programs. Recent studies include the economic advantages of the addition of selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors to speed the improvement of depression, the cost-effectiveness of several agents for hypertension, the investigation of cost-effectiveness of a treatment for mild to moderate Alzheimer’s disease, the measurement of direct and indirect costs of treating allergic rhinitis, and the quality of life and health economic benefits, including work productivity, associated with improved glycemic control.

Beneficial effects of drugs with respect to prevention of disease have been studied using epidemiologic techniques. Examples include the decrease in risk of cardiovascular disease, a protective effect against worsening of osteoarthritis of the knee, the protection against tooth loss associated with post-menopausal estrogen replacement therapy, and the possible decreased risk of cancer of the digestive tract and certain other sites in users of aspirin or nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents.

**ISSUES IN PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

**RESOURCES FOR PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

In order to respond rapidly and responsibly to safety issues, industry must have access to high quality, valid data resources. As a result of this need, an area of pharmacoepidemiology that has experienced considerable growth is the development and use of record linkage and automated databases. Several databases will be discussed in depth in other chapters of this book (see Chapters 15–25) and the matter of databases will only be discussed generally here. Existing databases offer several advantages over ad hoc epidemiologic
studies or expanding the scope of clinical trials. First, automated databases are usually large in size, ranging from hundreds of thousands to millions of patients, often with many years of “observation.” A second advantage is speed; since information on study subjects is already computerized, the data can be accessed relatively quickly rather than waiting years for results of studies in which patients are identified and followed over time. The third advantage is cost relative to prospective studies. Clinical trials or other prospective observational studies may cost millions of dollars, compared to hundreds of thousands of dollars for database studies.

Considerable progress has been made in the development of both new and existing epidemiologic databases that contain information on drug usage and health related outcomes; however, further improvement is needed. A variety of different data sources are necessary since no single data system is sufficient to meet all needs. Existing automated databases have some major limitations. Often a study is needed regarding a newly marketed product. Sufficient numbers of users may not yet be recorded in the databases, or the product may not have yet been marketed in the particular country included in the database. Some data resources suffer from a considerable “lag time” between data entry and availability for research purposes. Many health maintenance organization databases have overall enrollments of hundreds of thousands of members, but these numbers may be inadequate to study the risks of extremely rare events associated with a specific drug.

Many databases were designed for administrative purposes, rather than for epidemiologic studies. As a result, specific information needed to assess a safety issue may be unavailable and quality of medical information may be inadequate. Continuing studies of the validity of this information are crucial. The usefulness of certain databases to answer a specific question can be severely limited if the data are not properly validated.

Even established resources of high caliber are not guaranteed to continue. Quality data sources are a function of the financial and administrative support received. Changes in support, such as loss of funding or alteration in study administration, may drastically affect the format of the data or the accessibility of the resource. An example is the Saskatchewan Drug database, which was substantially altered for a period of time because of administrative changes in the billing system (see Chapter 20). During the period from middle of 1987 until the end of 1998, the codes identifying individuals receiving particular drugs were replaced by family codes only. Outcome variables could no longer be linked to individuals who had received particular drugs. The Saskatchewan database previously been a rich source of data for studies such as a case–control study of cyclic antidepressants and the risk of hip fracture and a cohort study of NSAIDs and serious gastrointestinal events. However, with these changes in the billing system, the database would no longer be able to support such studies. After discussions with epidemiologists, the Saskatchewan health authorities reinstated the previous system of individually identifying patients and the database is once again being used for research purposes.

As another example, The General Practice Research Database (formerly known as VAMP) in the United Kingdom (see Chapter 23) suffered from uncertain funding for a number of years, and funds were provided primarily though two principal licensees of the data. In April 1999, the Department of Health announced that the Medicines Control Agency (MCA) would be responsible for the management of the GPRD and confirmed that 3 million pounds sterling would be invested in the database over the next five years to further develop the database, improve data submission procedures, improve feedback to the practitioners who contribute the data, and enhance services provided to the users of the database.

MISUSE OR MISINTERPRETATION OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGIC STUDIES

Careful, scientifically sound research carried out using quality resources does not guarantee that a study’s findings will be appropriately used. Assuming that a safety issue has been suitably
addressed using appropriate data resources, the study findings may be improperly interpreted or misused. The irresponsible use or misinterpretation of pharmacoepidemiology studies may have direct implications on the industry because of tremendous costs due to resulting liability or to the drug being removed from the market, and implications to the patients who could benefit from the medications. Regulatory agencies are affected by having to devote scarce resources to evaluating erroneous safety issues in order to make regulatory decisions. Ultimately, a disservice has been carried out to the public by generating unwarranted fears, by the removal of safe and effective drugs, and by higher costs for pharmaceuticals.

A well known example of study results being inappropriately interpreted is the controversy over the purported relationship between spermicide use and birth defects. Early studies suggested an association between spermicide use and a number of different birth defects, but subsequent studies did not confirm these findings. Despite the acknowledged weaknesses of the study design suggesting an association, the consistent and overwhelming evidence supporting the safety of the contraceptive method, as well as the opinion of the FDA and its Fertility and Maternal Health Drugs Advisory Committee, a court decision was found in favor of a plaintiff claiming that spermicide use caused their child’s birth defects.

The unfavorable consequences of such a finding to the individual drug manufacturer are potentially enormous. An immediate result is the loss of the lawsuit with its financial implications. Additional cases are likely and the manufacturer is faced with years of pending litigation. Less tangible, but perhaps more important to the industry, is the confirmation of safety brought forward by pharmacoepidemiologic research in the case of spermicide use and birth defects was trivialized in light of the findings made by the court. A certain amount of control can be exercised by drug companies in insuring that epidemiologic studies are thoughtfully designed and carefully executed, but industry is almost powerless to impact on how the studies are interpreted and used.

Misuse of epidemiologic results by the media may also result in a useful drug being precipitously withdrawn from the market. Bendectin, used for nausea during pregnancy, was marketed in the US from 1956 through 1983. The manufacturer voluntarily withdrew the drug from the market in 1983 because of the cost of defending the large number of product liability lawsuits filed following extensive publicity suggesting that the drug was teratogenic. Numerous epidemiologic studies in varying settings with various designs were performed to examine this issue. The results did not support the suspicion that Bendectin was a teratogen. Because of its withdrawal, this drug is no longer available to the 10–25% of all pregnant women who would potentially benefit from its use. Neutel et al. reported that in the year following withdrawal of Bendectin from the market, hospitalizations for vomiting in pregnancy (per thousand live births) in Canada rose by 37% and by 50% the year after that, with similar findings in the US. Their estimates of excess hospital costs over the years 1983–1987 was $16 million in Canada and $73 million in the US.

Misinterpretation of epidemiologic studies in the media perpetuates the impression that the discipline is fraught with weaknesses through generating controversy over study results. In such circumstances, the weaknesses of these studies are emphasized and the strength of the discipline overlooked. As a result, the information that epidemiology contributes may be considered to be of questionable usefulness. The dissemination of misinformation promotes needless anxiety on the part of both patients and physicians. Illustrations of this concern are unnecessary abortions that most likely resulted from an irresponsibly written newspaper article about the teratogenicity of Bendectin.

BALANCING LOGISTICS AND UTILITY

Epidemiologists in the pharmaceutical industry must balance the high cost and extended time-frame necessary for large prospective studies with usefulness to the company. When there is a potential safety concern, information is needed quickly in order to evaluate the balance between
benefit and risk. In other cases of less immediate concern, by the time study results become available, the drug may be off patent. It is important to quantify the risk associated with drug products and to do it in a rapid and efficient way.

**FUTURE DIRECTION OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

**QUANTITY OF RESOURCES**

Improving the number and variety of pharmacoepidemiologic data resources and methodologies is necessary to insure that drug manufacturers can validly and rapidly address safety questions using appropriate study populations and research designs, in both routine as well as acute drug safety situations. The pharmaceutical industry can play an active role in the enrichment of data sources by supporting existing resources, in addition to helping to develop new databases and new postmarketing surveillance methods. The active support of research groups and existing databases, even in the absence of a research question, will serve two purposes. First, it will help ensure that quality resources continue even though major funding sources disappear. Also, additional funds above and beyond administrative costs may be directed toward improving the database and toward making it more flexible or more appropriate for use by the drug manufacturer.

Industry support is critical to the development of new database resources. Research groups may have access to various types of information, but lack the financial resources to develop the information into a usable database. Pharmaceutical companies actively seeking new data resources should not overlook any potentially valuable sources of information. Industry guidance and funding in such cases may be critical to the development of a viable data resource. Data linkage between existing databases is another area where industry support can directly promote the growth of resources by providing financial support.

The development of new postmarketing surveillance methods is an additional area that should continue to grow. New methods are needed to accrue large numbers of individuals on particular therapeutic regimens rapidly and to be able to follow them prospectively for both beneficial and adverse health outcomes. Exploring new methods may be costly and demands a special commitment from drug companies that recognize that such an investment may ultimately pay off by providing additional means to evaluate drug safety and effectiveness. Industry epidemiologists should also keep abreast of new study designs that may offer improved methods of evaluating the risks and safety associated with pharmaceutical products. For example, a recent publication used the case-crossover design to investigate the association between road traffic accidents and benzodiazepine use.154

Finally, there are a limited number of formal training programs in pharmacoepidemiology at universities. This discipline is not supported as strongly by manufacturers as are clinical or basic science fellowships. In order to meet the increasing needs of industry with respect to trained epidemiologists, drug manufacturers should increase their role in supporting training and fellowship programs. Such support not only helps insure sufficient epidemiologic manpower requirements with specific training in drug safety, but also provides a structure for the implementation of high quality pharmacoepidemiologic research.

**QUALITY OF RESOURCES**

If pharmacoepidemiology is to continue to play an important role in the evaluation of the safety of drugs, then the resources and the research itself must be of the highest quality. One means of improving the quality of research and resources is by setting standards for investigations. High standards for study design and execution should be encouraged. Industry can exercise some control by supporting investigators with proven track records and by refusing to provide funding for protocols of poor quality. Industry can help improve the quality of various data resources by sponsoring seed money to set up such resources, and pilot studies to validate computerized information with the corresponding medical records.
Ultimately, poorly carried out studies or studies using data of questionable quality are damaging to both the industry and the credibility of the field of epidemiology.

**PROMOTING A GREATER UNDERSTANDING OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

Epidemiologic studies are of limited use to the pharmaceutical industry if they are not well understood. Greater understanding of the strengths and limitations of epidemiology is needed by the public, the media, the government, and by industry itself. These diverse groups have common interests and, through their joint efforts, the discipline of epidemiology may be improved by focusing support, assessing study quality, and advancing greater understanding of the field. Epidemiologists are also responsible for education about the discipline within their own companies so that the results of observational studies may be best leveraged according to the needs of the company.

**COMBINING EFFORTS WITHIN THE INDUSTRY**

Within the pharmaceutical industry there is a collegial relationship among epidemiologists and drug safety specialists. A number of venues provide the opportunity for industry representatives to work together, such as the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturing Association (PhRMA), and to work with members of regulatory authorities worldwide on issues of mutual interest (Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS)). Both industry and regulatory authority professionals collaborate with academic researchers through the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE).

Combining efforts among drug manufacturers on matters of mutual interest benefits the individual companies through shared knowledge regarding data resources and evolving epidemiological methods. Pooled funding also benefits the industry as a whole through the maintenance and development of improved resources. The field could also benefit from joint projects carried out by two or more pharmaceutical companies who want to explore a particular issue.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Epidemiology can make a significant contribution to the development and marketing of safe and effective pharmaceutical products worldwide. It may also serve to facilitate the regulatory process and provide a rational basis for drug safety surveillance. Like any other tool, it must be properly understood and utilized. Industry has a continuing opportunity to influence the development of the field and the responsibility to do so in a manner that will not only expand resources but will assure scientific validity. Achieving this goal requires financial and intellectual support as well as also requiring a better understanding of the nature of the discipline and its uses. The growing number of epidemiologists within the industry is a positive sign, but it is also clear that there is still need for greater commitment. A greater appreciation of the role of epidemiology is needed within the industry, the medical community, regulatory agencies, and the media.
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INTRODUCTION

Drug regulatory agencies exist in most countries, and are accountable for the safety of marketed medicines. They perform a public health function, the ultimate aim of which is to promptly safeguard patients from the adverse effects of medicines. Safety judgments made at the time of authorization need to be revised based on experience—hence the need for proactive monitoring and ongoing risk–benefit analysis.

Spontaneous adverse drug reaction (ADR) reporting is a cornerstone of this work and, although well established, it continues to be developed in response to environmental change (see Chapters 10, 11, and 32). However, the method has important limitations and formal pharmacoepidemiology studies are of great value in regulatory decision making. Their role has steadily increased over the years as regulators have recognized the importance of using comparative data and powerful methodologies. Modern databases have facilitated the availability of such data and provided resources for valid and timely investigations of drug safety issues.

Postmarketing regulatory decision making involves bringing together various types of data and often requires difficult judgements based on conflicting or inadequate data. The key output is communication with health professionals and patients of the necessary measures to promote safer use of medicines. International cooperation has increased greatly during the last decade and has important benefits. Technological advances are providing an opportunity to exchange information, making processes more efficient and facilitating common practices.

The views expressed are those of the authors and not necessarily those of their respective employers.
THE NEED FOR EFFECTIVE DRUG SAFETY PROGRAMS

The premarketing drug development process has been divided into three phases involving exposure to humans. Phase 1 generally involves small numbers of healthy volunteers who receive one or a few doses of a drug product for purposes of determining dose ranges and patterns of drug metabolism. During phase 2, small numbers of patients are treated, with the goal of defining the typical daily dose as well as of determining the pharmacokinetics and the most common side-effects of the drug under study. In phase 3, larger numbers of patients are treated in the setting of randomized clinical trials that are designed primarily to assess product efficacy for a specified indication, and to further characterize the safety profile of the drug.

Phase 3 trials often range in size from a few hundred to a few thousand patients, who may be treated for durations varying from a single dose to several months. The median number of patients enrolled in premarketing studies of new active substances was estimated in the late 1980s to be around 1500. For modern biotechnology products intended for use by specialists for the treatment of targeted smaller populations, this number is almost certainly lower. Patients enrolled in phase 3 trials are usually screened to exclude those not meeting certain narrowly defined criteria. The purpose of such screening is to reduce the presence of potential confounding factors that might cloud the analysis of efficacy. For example, patients with underlying renal or hepatic dysfunction or those taking other medications are often excluded. Additionally, children and older aged subjects are usually not highly represented. As a result of these design elements, phase 3 trials have limited ability to detect serious, but uncommon adverse reactions.

Because of sample size limitations, most phase 3 trials lack the statistical power to observe adverse reactions occurring at rates of 1 per 1000 treatment courses or less (see also Chapter 3). Also, because of the typical shorter duration of these trials, adverse reactions dependent on chronic or longer term exposure or those with long latency to onset cannot usually be observed. The tendency for patients with complicated medical histories or those taking multiple other medications to be excluded from phase 3 studies effectively precludes the possibility of detecting clinically relevant interactions between the study drug and a variety of disease states or other medications. Finally, because of the relatively narrow and specific selection criteria of trial participants, adverse reactions arising in patient subgroups or under less common circumstances cannot be observed.

International experience relating to the withdrawal of medicines for safety reasons illustrates the inherent limitations of phase 3 trials to identify serious, uncommon adverse drug reactions (ADRs). Studies indicate that, over a period of about 20 years, market withdrawals occur at a frequency of about 3–4%. In general, only after exposure to larger numbers of patients in a broader array of clinical settings than those studied premarketing did the reactions that led to a major safety concern become clinically apparent. In some cases (e.g., encainide, flosequanim), excess mortality was discovered in the setting of large clinical trials during the postmarketing period.

Many withdrawals for safety reasons have occurred simultaneously on a worldwide basis, but there have been some notable exceptions. For example, terfenadine was withdrawn in the USA in 1998 because of its effect in prolonging the QT interval, but it remains available with restrictions in the European Union (EU). In the past two years, hepatotoxicity associated with troglitazone (an antidiabetic), trovafloxacin (a quinolone antibiotic), and tolcapone (an anti-Parkinsonian) has led to withdrawal of these drugs in the EU but they have remained available with labeling safeguards in the USA. The reasons for these differing decisions have not been systematically explored but could include differences in perceptions of risk and of the effectiveness of potential safeguards. Other elements to consider are variations in clinical practice, in the nature of the regulatory powers available to the relevant authorities, and in the availability of alternative products for the same indication.

---

*Troglitazone was removed from the US market after this chapter went to press.*
Although withdrawals for safety reasons are fairly uncommon, new adverse reactions are discovered postmarketing for most drugs, resulting in a need to update the product information. Thus, our understanding of a drug’s safety profile evolves and changes as we learn more about it during the postmarketing phase of its development cycle. The drug development process does not end the day the product is approved for marketing, but continues throughout the postmarketing period. However, the first few years of marketing are a particularly important time and in some countries this is recognized by a formal intensive monitoring scheme for new drugs (e.g., the use of the black triangle symbol in the UK).

During this period, it is vital that new information regarding drug product safety be collected, analyzed, and acted upon. First and foremost, this information is important to the public. People naturally desire to be as fully informed as possible of potential risks associated with the drug products they consume. An important function of a drug regulatory authority in this regard is to ensure that important new safety information is identified as early as possible and then conveyed in an accurate and understandable manner to the public and to health practitioners. This information is important to the process of updating a product’s labeling, to refining the conditions for safe prescribing, and for the combined activities of risk management and regulatory decision making.

In a regulatory environment, the goal of postmarketing surveillance is the evaluation and prevention of drug hazards based on the collection, analysis, and communication of drug risk information. Pharmacoepidemiology has an essential role in this setting to help identify and evaluate adverse effects early in the postmarketing phase. Especially for those effects of greatest severity or with the greatest population impact, additional goals become important, namely, estimation of incidence, risk quantification in comparison to therapeutic alternatives, assessment of a causal relationship, elucidation of the determinants contributing to their occurrence (including patterns of drug use), and conveyance of relevant risk estimates to drug regulators. It is with these latter activities that the tools of pharmacoepidemiology uniquely contribute to postmarketing drug safety efforts.

Epidemiologic data must be considered in the context of other sources of data relating to the occurrence of serious adverse reactions. Frequently, clues to potential safety concerns arise from the clinical pharmacology of a drug product (see also Chapter 4). A drug’s pharmacokinetic or pharmacodynamic properties may provide advance notice of areas to focus attention upon in the postmarketing phase. For each aspect of a product’s pharmacokinetic journey through the human body, from absorption through distribution, metabolism, and elimination, opportunities exist for ADRs to arise. An especially important source of ADRs to emerge during the 1990s has been that of drug–drug interactions, primarily involving the cytochrome P450 system of isoenzymes.

Safety concerns may also be signaled by observations during phases 2 and 3 of premarketing development. A drug that induces frequent or severe liver transaminase elevations in clinical trials (even though they return to normal with discontinuation of therapy) may be a candidate to monitor for the occurrence of hepatitis and acute liver failure if the product is marketed. Depending upon the nature of the safety concern identified premarking, as well as the anticipated indication and extent of use postmarketing, a phase 4 commitment to conduct additional focused safety studies during the postmarketing period might be agreed to by a product’s manufacturer.

Once a drug is marketed, evidence of potential safety issues may be obtained from sources such as the medical literature (case reports, clinical trials, epidemiologic studies) or spontaneous case reports submitted to regulatory authorities (see Chapters 10 and 11). New safety information may be developed by the manufacturer or come from regulatory authorities and postmarketing experience in other countries.

When data from these multiple sources are properly integrated, analyzed, and interpreted, they become information which can help guide drug regulatory policy. This process of discovery requires a multifaceted interdisciplinary approach that draws on the fields of medicine, clinical pharmacology, and toxicology, and relies upon the methodologies
and tools of epidemiology and biostatistics. While it is frequently the case that the focus of this process is on new molecular entities that have been marketed for less than three years, older drugs also must be screened for important and previously unrecognized adverse effects. Ultimately, the timing of when a signal of a potentially new and serious adverse reaction is identified will depend upon the extent of product use in the population, the incidence rate of the adverse reaction, and the rate of reporting of that reaction to the literature, manufacturers, and regulatory authorities.\textsuperscript{14}

**ELEMENTS OF A DRUG SAFETY PROGRAM**

There are a number of components that contribute in varying degrees to national postmarketing drug safety programs.

**DRUG USAGE DATA**

Drug usage data is a valuable source of information important to drug safety surveillance and pharmacoepidemiology. It is of particular importance in the analysis and interpretation of spontaneous ADR data (see below).

The availability of drug usage data and the access to them vary greatly from country to country. In many countries, sales figures are the main source of information on drug usage, whether they are available from compulsory notification to authorities (e.g., within the framework of price–volume contracts) or from specific requests to companies. Sales figures are useful to estimate the total number of days of treatment in a defined period but, except in special conditions, they cannot provide accurate information on the number of treatments or the number of patients treated.

In some countries, the concept of a defined daily dose (DDD) is used to improve the utility of sales data. The DDD is a technical, arbitrary, unit of measurement defined as the average daily dose for an adult of 70 kg using the drug in its main indication (see Chapter 29). Using DDDs allows the summation of the quantities consumed for a drug existing in various physical units (e.g. grams, milliliters), preparations, or package sizes. It also allows the summation of consumption data for a drug used differently in various settings (e.g., hospital wards, regions, and countries) or for several drugs belonging to the same therapeutic class. Another advantage is the possibility of comparing the usage of a drug or class of drugs across these various settings, and to assess time trends in consumption. The DDD methodology is therefore used for an aggregate estimation of the consumption of a drug, to provide comparable denominators of exposure, and to evaluate the impact of regulatory decisions on drug usage. For these purposes, it does not require assumptions about patterns of treatment, which may vary from setting to setting. However, the number of patients treated cannot be estimated with accuracy.

Prescription data are also useful for estimating the number of treatment courses of marketed prescription medicines and for providing information on treatment modalities (see also Chapter 24). They become increasingly available to regulatory authorities with computerization of pharmacies and the collection of prescription records into national databases. National and international drug usage data are also available from commercial data providers (e.g., IMS Health).

In the US, two database resources are used routinely—the National Prescription Audit Plus (NPA\textsuperscript{TM}) and the National Disease and Therapeutic Index (NDTI\textsuperscript{TM}). The NPA\textsuperscript{TM} provides national estimates of prescription drug use in the US, based on data collected from over 20 000 computerized chain, independent, grocery, and mail-order pharmacies nationwide. These data can be used to track prescribing trends over calendar time and for calculation of ADR reporting rates. The NDTI\textsuperscript{TM} database is based on a prescription audit, from a sample of US physicians. It provides information on the age and gender distribution of patients using mainly outpatient drug products, as well as information on the duration of treatment course, indication for use, and prescriber specialty. Such data are frequently used by US regulatory pharmacoepidemiologists to help understand the population context within which ADRs occur.\textsuperscript{15}
When NDTI™ data are used with data from NPA™, estimates of the person time of exposure in the population can be derived. One can also estimate exposure in particular age and/or gender strata. However, because both NPA™ and NDTI™ collect data on prescription events rather than longitudinal data on patients, it is often difficult or impossible to estimate the actual size of the population receiving a drug product based on these data alone.

The situation in the UK is similar, with the most important source of usage data being derived from the Prescription Pricing Authority. Since these data are used for reimbursement purposes with the National Health Service they are generally complete but, as with the US data sources described above, they do not provide an accurate denominator of the numbers of patients exposed.

None of these sources provides estimates of inpatient hospital drug use. The Provider Perspective, another IMS Health database, produces estimates of bulk drug purchases by hospitals and other institutional health care providers. However, these data are difficult to translate into estimates of the number of patients treated with parenteral products as hospital inpatients. Other databases are being explored which might be helpful in the assessment of drug safety issues related to products used primarily in the hospital inpatient setting.

ADVERSE REACTION CASE REPORTING

One of the cornerstones of a comprehensive safety monitoring program is spontaneous ADR reporting, which relies on the systematic review of reported cases of suspected ADRs (see also Chapters 10 and 11). In many developed countries, suspected ADR cases are reported to the national drug regulatory authority, where they are reviewed and entered into a computerized database to facilitate future aggregate analyses and report retrieval.16-18

Relevant standards have been agreed upon under the process of the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH).19 These include use of a common ADR coding terminology and common data elements for individual case reports. This will help facilitate electronic submission of ADR data by pharmaceutical companies and the electronic exchange of ADR case reports between national regulatory authorities throughout the world.

Cases of suspected ADRs are reported by health professionals either directly to the regulatory authority or to the manufacturer, which is legally obliged to transmit them to regulatory authorities within defined timeframes (normally 15 days for a report of an ADR considered to be serious).4,20 In some countries, notably the USA, patients may also report ADRs to the regulatory authority. In some other countries, they may report to National Poison Centers that liaise as necessary with the regulatory authority.

Substantial emphasis is placed on systematic review of spontaneous ADR reports for the purposes of identifying unrecognized potential hazards and gaining new information about established ADRs. There is a particular focus on ADRs with serious outcomes and ADRs not currently mentioned in the product information. A “serious” outcome is defined as one resulting in death, or which is life-threatening or leads to hospitalization, disability, or a congenital abnormality.21

Inherent in any spontaneous adverse reaction reporting system is a monitoring process that recognizes the dynamic nature of data. A prerequisite for an effective system is a database in which new reports can be entered speedily, prioritized according to their importance, and from which data can be retrieved and analyzed in a variety of ways. Regular and systematic review of the database is necessary, and is most commonly achieved by reviewing individual drugs or products looking for reactions of potential concern.

There are a number of positive attributes to national passive case reporting systems. They cover all marketed prescription drugs from the day they first appear in the marketplace. This permits the signaling of potential new reactions early in the postmarketing phase. For example, within four months of the market introduction of temafloxacin in the USA, the FDA received the
first reports of hemolytic anemia and renal failure associated with use of this drug. Two months later, with continued accrual of new cases, temafloxacin was withdrawn from the market worldwide. This system was designed to quickly signal rare, serious ADRs once a product reaches the market. Temafloxacin is one of numerous examples of how such systems have performed this task well.

On a per report basis, and considering the breadth of drug coverage, passive case surveillance systems are relatively inexpensive. These systems essentially leverage the eyes and ears of health care professionals and consumers throughout the world in the effort of case finding. This type of surveillance system is especially well suited to the detection of extremely rare or unusual ADRs. Reactions such as acute liver failure, severe skin disorders, aplastic anemia, and hemolytic anemia are generally rare in the population and their occurrence often prompts some exploration for potential exposure to a drug or toxin. In settings where sufficient numbers of cases with usable data are reported, risk factors and at-risk subgroups can also be identified.

There are a number of important limitations to passive case reporting systems. Case reports may lack important clinical details or supporting materials such as laboratory results. Efforts to obtain this information from the primary reporter may be unsuccessful. A more serious limitation is that most adverse reactions are not reported, a phenomenon referred to as underreporting. The process of reporting an ADR may be thought of simplistically as a series of three barriers, each of which must be overcome for a case report to be available for analysis.

The first barrier is that of diagnosis. To be of value, an ADR must be diagnosed, that is, a label applied to it that classifies or specifies what the reaction is or appears to be. The diagnosis may range in specificity from a symptom or clinical sign to a precise, pathologically confirmed disease entity. An ADR can affect any or multiple organ systems in a variety of ways, resulting in a wide variety of potential presentations, contributing further to difficulty in diagnosis. The low specificity of some diagnoses can effectively amount to misclassification when it comes to the analysis of case reports. If a case of drug induced hemolysis with secondary jaundice is reported as “jaundice” or “hyperbilirubinemia”, the reaction “hemolysis” may be missed. This report might not be included in an analysis focusing on hemolysis because the diagnosis of hemolysis was not made or else was not included in the report.

The second barrier to ADR reporting is that of attribution. A disease process may be diagnosed correctly, but if it is not attributed to a drug exposure, the adverse reaction probably will not be reported. A major impediment to physician or patient attribution of disease signs and symptoms to a drug exposure is the fact that ADRs frequently mimic or resemble naturally occurring disease processes. Additionally, newly developing complaints may be incorrectly attributed to ongoing underlying disease processes rather than to a particular drug exposure. Thus, if an ADR is identical to a disorder occurring at an appreciable rate in the population (e.g., myocardial infarction), or if the ADR is identical to the underlying disease for which the drug is prescribed (e.g., asthma), the diagnosis of an ADR will often not be made. The situation is still more complex when occurrence of a complication or a consequence of the underlying disease can be misdiagnosed as an ADR to a newly introduced drug, and vice versa. The difficulty in dissociating these two factors may lead to failure to recognize severe adverse effects, or, conversely, to misinterpretation of disease complications as adverse drug effects. Examples of associations that illustrate these difficulties are bone pain and diphosphonates, reperfusion arrhythmia and thrombolytics, hepatic failure and fialuridine, and Churg–Strauss syndrome and leucotriene receptor antagonists.

The final barrier to reporting is the physical act of filing a report of the suspected adverse reaction with a drug sponsor or a regulatory authority (registration of the event). There are many potential reasons why a health professional might not report an ADR. Some years ago Inman described the “seven deadly sins” leading to the failure by physicians to report an adverse effect (complacency, fear of litigation, guilt, ambition to publish, ignorance, diffidence, and lethargy). Many studies have been published that address
this final barrier to reporting, almost invariably showing high levels of underreporting. For example, two US surveys found that the reporting rate for serious recognized ADRs in Rhode Island was below 3%,29 and that physicians in Maryland filed reports of serious reactions in only 8–13% of instances.30

In situations where diagnosis or attribution occurs at low rates, the magnitude of underreporting can be much greater. In the UK, an increase in asthma deaths among patients using pressurized inhalers was largely unrecognized and unreported, as was the occurrence of the oculomucocutaneous syndrome with practolol.28,31 The reporting efficiency in each of these instances was substantially below 1%. Low ADR reporting efficiency has important implications for how one uses and interprets spontaneous case reports data in a population or public health context.

Recent research across Europe has focused on physician attitudes to reporting and found that uncertainty about attribution and a perception that certain ADRs are trivial or well recognized are the most common reasons for nonreporting.32–34 Lack of awareness about ADR reporting is another underlying factor, but competing pressures on reporters’ time is probably even more important and needs to be counteracted by specific measures to stimulate reporting. Some authors have tried to identify incentives to reporting rather than barriers.35 Contribution to scientific knowledge, unexpectedness, severity of the reaction, and novelty of the suspected drug were the most frequently retrieved reasons for reporting.

Regulatory authorities have adopted various approaches to stimulate reporting. Broadly, these fall into four categories:

1. educational efforts directed at professional groups (e.g., medical students and junior doctors);
2. broadening the base of reporters by targeting specialists in particular therapeutic areas (e.g., HIV medicine, oncology) for which reporting tends to be low;
3. facilitating the process of reporting by making reporting forms easy to complete and widely available (including electronically via the internet); and
4. improved feedback to reporters (e.g., through bulletins).

POPULATION-BASED DATA RESOURCES

Because of the limitations of spontaneous ADR reporting, particularly in respect to measuring frequency and establishing causality, there is a critical need for population based resources. While these could be used for hypothesis generation, their principal value lies in rapid hypothesis strengthening and formal hypothesis testing.36 Increasingly, therefore, regulatory authorities are using such resources in the investigation of important safety issues. In the USA, the FDA maintains a Cooperative Agreement Program in Pharmacoepidemiology that provides access to claims based and record linked data from a variety of population based health care settings.37 The principal databases currently represented in this program include the General Practitioners Research Database (GPRD) from the UK (see Chapter 23), the Harvard Pilgrim Health Plan (a health maintenance organization) (see Chapter 17), Tennessee Medicaid (see Chapter 19), and United HealthGroup (multistate managed care) (see Chapter 18).

In the UK, the GPRD is regarded as a vital resource for pharmacoepidemiology (see Chapter 23). This database has been shown to provide information of sufficient quality for research purposes38 and in the past decade has been principally used for pharmacoepidemiology. The GPRD is now the largest source of longitudinal patient data in the world. During 1999, its management was taken over by the UK Medicines Control Agency, and a major investment in the infrastructure is being made in order to ensure that its potential is maximized.

The key elements of such databases are that they provide longitudinal followup of large numbers of patients with computerized information on outpatient prescriptions linked to diagnoses and hospitalizations. Also important is the capability to access primary medical records for outcome validation and abstraction of other information.
relevant to a particular safety issue. Such databases can be used to more accurately describe the demographics of drug usage and can demonstrate patterns of coprescribing with other medications, which is especially important to the study of drug–drug interactions. The data can also be used to determine the duration and pattern of product usage, thereby permitting one to create a life table describing the proportion of patients who remain on treatment for varying lengths of time. This type of information can be used to model prescription data and therefore to provide estimates of the number of patients using a particular drug or product.

Depending on the safety issue and related specifics of clinical pharmacology and medical setting, these databases can be used to assemble case series, and for the performance of retrospective cohort and/or case–control studies where the objective may be to estimate incidence rates or relative risks, or to identify important risk factors. An important advantage of such databases is that information on drug exposures and health events/outcomes is collected prospectively and in an unbiased fashion over time. Furthermore, it is often possible to study emerging safety issues rapidly and efficiently.

RESPONSES TO SIGNALS

CASE REPORTS AND CASE SERIES

The most common use of spontaneous case reports is for the updating of product information to include newly identified ADRs. In most countries performing pharmacovigilance activities, all serious unlabeled reports from manufacturers and all reports submitted directly by health professionals and consumers are reviewed by experienced safety evaluators. If a report is incomplete or important additional information is needed, followup with the reporter is undertaken. A routine labeling change may be based on a single well documented and compelling report, although typically there will be several well documented and unconfounded reports, with a variable number of reports of lower quality as supporting evidence. A formal causality assessment algorithm is usually not followed in this process due to the lack of flexible, simple, and reliable algorithms. However, reports are usually classified qualitatively as stronger or less strong in their support of a particular signal.

Occasionally, large numbers of case reports for a given drug–ADR combination will be reviewed for purposes of identifying potential risk factors or to understand better the clinical expression of that ADR. A review of 121 reports of seizure with alprazolam use found that 58% occurred within 24–48 hours of the last dose, suggesting the possibility of drug withdrawal. In another example, review of 95 cases of hemolytic anemia with temafloxacin showed that the median time to symptom onset was 6–7 days, compatible with an immune-mediated mechanism. Among cases following the first dose, seven of ten had prior exposure to fluoroquinolone antibiotics, compared to 11 of 85 among cases occurring beyond the first dose, further supporting the possibility of an immune mediated mechanism.

A further consideration is the complexity which is due to the large number of concomitant drugs taken by many patients presenting with an ADR, especially by the elderly. This factor can considerably obscure the overall picture. In community studies, drug interactions—broadly defined as the change of the effects of one drug by the presence of another drug—were found to occur at a rate of 2–4% of treated patients. The suspicion of a potential drug interaction in a case report leads to several difficulties. In many instances, the data provided on drugs taken concomitantly (e.g., dosage and dates of administration) are insufficient to evaluate the possibility of an interaction. A large amount of time is also usually required to locate and interpret drug interaction information, although this time may be reduced by the use of computerized software programs. Moreover, evidence on the clinical outcome of pharmacokinetic interactions is often lacking and much of the available information is based on case reports or small case series. As there is a large variability in patients’ response to the presence of potentially interacting drugs, a further limitation may be a lack of generalizability of the information to a wider population of users.
AGGREGATE ANALYSIS OF CASE REPORTS

One can also analyze case report data in an aggregate fashion, for purposes of signal identification or refinement. The proportional distribution of an ADR or group of ADRs within relevant strata of exposure (e.g., gender, age group, dose level, duration of use) for one drug can be compared with others in the same pharmacologic class, or with drugs from different classes used for the same indication. Such proportional distributions, while not informative regarding event incidence, can be useful in highlighting potential problem areas for a particular drug. A review of ADRs reported with amoxicillin-clavulanic acid found that 80% of liver related ADRs were reported in patients age 40 and older. At the same time, only 24% of product use was estimated to be in this older age group, suggesting that age may be a risk factor for hepatotoxicity with this drug product. On at least one epidemiologic study has found an association between hepatic ADRs and older age among amoxicillin-clavulanic acid users.45

The use of reporting rates is another aggregate approach that is sometimes helpful in the process of signal development or refinement, particularly when comparing drugs within the same pharmacologic class or drugs prescribed for the same indication. With this approach, the number of cases reported with a given ADR serves as the numerator, with a denominator derived from an estimate of product usage, usually the number of outpatient prescriptions. However, reporting rates can be difficult to interpret. Because of underreporting, they cannot be viewed directly as incidence rates. Other factors may further complicate the interpretation of reporting rates. These include differences in the market age of drug products being compared and publicity effects relating to a given drug–ADR association, to name a few.

It is also possible to perform aggregate analyses using the data from case reports that are stored electronically in the ADR database. The data from case reports describing specific drug–ADR combinations can be downloaded into individual datasets for further analysis. These data can be combined with prescription data to calculate reporting rates. It is possible to compare one drug with another used for the same indication, or to compare one drug class with another. The age and gender distribution of ADR reports can also be compared with that found in drug usage or population based healthcare databases, and subgroup reporting rates can be explored. Evidence of important differences between two drugs or drug classes, or within particular subgroups, may lead to further investigation in a population based setting. Of course, given the known limitations of these data, such analyses must be conducted and interpreted with great caution.

ANALYTIC USES OF CASE REPORTS

In situations where the ADR is a well defined outcome for which there are population based estimates of background incidence available, spontaneous case reports can be used to perform an “observed to expected” analysis.46 This method is best applied in settings where the outcome of interest is rare, such as acute liver failure or aplastic anemia, rather than more common outcomes, such as myocardial infarction. The “expected” number of events is obtained as the product of the population based incidence rate for the event multiplied by the person time estimate of the population exposure to the drug under consideration. This number is compared to the number of “observed” cases, that is, the number reported. Because of underreporting, the a priori expectation is that the “expected” number will far exceed the number that has been reported. However, in situations where the number reported is close to or exceeds the “expected” number, one has a strong signal of a problem. This approach was used in the study of Guillain–Barré syndrome following receipt of serum-derived hepatitis B vaccine,47 in the evaluation of felbamate and aplastic anemia,48 and, more recently, in the FDA’s assessment of bromfenac and acute liver failure.49

Under certain conditions, spontaneous reports can be combined with population based data to perform an analysis similar to that of a nested case–control study. Cases and noncases are all
exposed to the same drug of interest. The “cases” are those reported spontaneously as ADRs while the “controls” are obtained from a population based source such as a health insurance plan or an HMO. The dichotomized exposure measure being tested may be dose level, duration of use, or some patient-specific covariate. The proportional distributions of cases and noncases are calculated with respect to the categories of exposure, and, from this, a proportional odds ratio is derived. This approach was used to demonstrate that doses of alprazolam above 4 mg d⁻¹ appeared to confer a substantial increase in risk of withdrawal seizure compared to lower daily dosages in the setting of abrupt discontinuation of the drug. Recently, Moore et al. used voluntary ADR cases reported to the French national database to perform a “case–noncase” analysis. In this setting, “cases” and “noncases” were obtained from the entire ADR database. Odds ratios were calculated, comparing exposure to particular drugs of interest to all other drugs combined in the database. A similar approach, developed by the UK Medicines Control Agency (Proportional Reporting Ratios), is described elsewhere in this text (see Chapter 11).

**OTHER SIGNALING STRATEGIES**

Recent advances in information technology have opened new possibilities for the detection of previously unidentified ADR signals based on spontaneous case reports. An approach under development at FDA and WHO applies Bayesian techniques to the matrix of all drugs and all ADR coding terms in the spontaneous reports database to highlight drug–ADR combinations occurring in the database with greater than expected frequency (see also Chapter 32). Experience with this technique has shown promise thus far. In the course of validation testing, the method has successfully identified many known signals that were previously identified, evaluated, and verified. A potential advantage of this technique over current approaches is that it is completely automated and can screen all drug products simultaneously. With additional refinement, it is possible that this tool will be useful in pharmacovigilance, helping to prioritize signals and guide safety reviewers to focus on those issues that are most important to the public health.

Regulatory authorities adopt a proactive and systematic approach to signal generation. Although many signals are identified, relatively few turn out to require major investigation. Judgments have to be made, often based on limited evidence, as to whether or not there is an issue in need of attention. There are four key factors that help determine whether or not a particular signal is worth further investigation:

1. the strength of the signal,
2. whether or not the issue or some aspect of it is new,
3. the clinical importance as judged by the seriousness of the reaction and severity of the cases, and
4. the potential for preventive measures by the regulatory authority (signified by the acronym SNIP).

The SNIP criteria are useful in identifying which signals to pursue in greater depth, by bringing together all the relevant evidence available, and, sometimes, by designing specific studies to further investigate it. Consideration is given at an early stage to the possible outcomes and specifically as to how risks might be minimized.

**USE OF POPULATION BASED DATA RESOURCES**

Spontaneous case reports have great utility in signaling the existence of potential drug safety issues and frequently provide sufficient clinical information upon which to base labeling changes and other interventions such as informational letters to healthcare professionals. However, these reports do not permit an accurate estimation of incidence or relative risk. In some situations, it is important to understand the population impact and risk associated with a particular drug exposure. This requires formal epidemiologic approaches using data obtained from population based sources (see Part III of this book). In these
settings, the ADR of concern typically carries substantial morbidity or else is life threatening.

The Cooperative Agreement Program mentioned above is one means available to FDA for conducting epidemiologic postmarketing safety studies in the general population. Other approaches involve collaboration with interested professional organizations or else requesting that the company marketing the drug product of interest perform such studies.

Metformin, a biguanide oral hypoglycemic agent, was marketed in Europe and Canada during the 1970s and was approved in the US in 1995. The later approval in the US was related primarily to questions regarding the potential risk of lactic acidosis. This concern arose because phenformin, another biguanide, had been withdrawn from the US market in 1977 because of its association with lactic acidosis. Given the seriousness of the ADR and the anticipated use of metformin, the FDA used its Cooperative Agreement Program to obtain a population based estimate of the incidence rate of lactic acidosis in metformin users.53

A retrospective cohort study was performed using administrative databases from the province of Saskatchewan, Canada.53 All subjects filling at least one prescription for metformin between 1980 and 1995 were enrolled in the cohort contributing 22,296 person years of exposure. Review of computerized hospitalization claims for “acidosis” and subsequent medical record review identified two cases of lactic acidosis within the cohort, for an incidence rate of nine per 100,000 person years of metformin use. Of note, both cases had other medical conditions, each independently capable of causing lactic acidosis. These data provided additional information suggesting that the rate of lactic acidosis was relatively rare and substantially below that previously estimated with phenformin.

In another example, studies were conducted in both the USA54 and UK55 to investigate the spontaneously reported association between the dose of lipase containing pancreatic enzyme supplements and fibrosing colonopathy. Both were case–control studies with cases of histologically confirmed colonopathy being identified by survey of all accredited cystic fibrosis care centers in the US and from a national register in the UK. Controls were randomly selected from among cystic fibrosis patients treated with enzyme supplements but without colonopathy. Medical records and/or interviews were reviewed to obtain information on dose and type of supplement used as well as other potential risk factors. Both studies found significant increases in risk of fibrosing colonopathy with increasing daily dose of lipase, and provided support for recommendations that the maximum daily dose of enzyme supplementation should be 10,000 units of lipase kg⁻¹.

### USE OF POSTMARKETING SAFETY DATA IN REGULATORY DECISION MAKING

Regulatory decisions relating to postmarketing safety are made within a complex matrix of considerations. This matrix includes the medical importance and utility of the drug in question, the drug’s extent of usage, the severity of the disease being treated, the drug’s efficacy in treating this disease, the availability of other products to treat the same disorder, the product’s mechanism of action, and clinical pharmacologic features of the drug such as mode and site of metabolism. This multidimensional matrix also includes the severity of the ADR, its frequency and incidence in the relevant population, risk factors contributing to the ADR’s occurrence, and the clinical context in which the ADR arises.

The focus of regulatory decision making is to reduce or eliminate health risks so as to improve the balance of benefits and risks.16 There are no fixed formulae for the regulation of drug safety risks; each case is unique. In this context, the role of pharmacoepidemiology is to provide scientific support to help guide regulatory decision making and make it as evidence based as possible. Regulatory authorities respond to important hazards by gathering all the relevant evidence and undertaking a critical risk–benefit review. In the EU there is another dimension, which is the need for consensus across international boundaries. This is achieved through a scientific committee, known as the Committee for Proprietary Medicinal Products (CPMP), which includes representation from
all Member States. The CPMP has several specialist groups including a Pharmacovigilance Working Party, which is the EU forum for detailed debate of postmarketing safety issues.

As indicated above, drug withdrawal from the market because of safety concerns is relatively unusual and, for most issues, the regulatory decision is to amend the product information or to take no action other than continued monitoring. Various sections of the product information may be amended, particularly those specifying indications, contraindications, warnings/precautions, interactions, and adverse reactions. For serious hazards, a “Dear Healthcare Professional” letter might be required to ensure the dissemination of important new safety and/or prescribing information. In special circumstances, a restricted distribution program might be instituted or formal postapproval safety studies requested.

Provision of information to drug users is essential to support the safe and effective use of medicines. The key requirements for a successful drug safety communication are that it should be specific for the target audience, easily understandable, open and informative, and well balanced, placing the issue in an appropriate context.

It is particularly important in any communication about drug safety that essential information is clearly conveyed and not obscured by other less important information. The key facts and recommendations have to be worded unambiguously and placed in a prominently early position, if necessary with use of highlighting.

In the EU, patient information leaflets are now mandatory for all medicines. The key principles with patient information are that it should, in substance, be the same as the information provided to health professionals but presented in language that a lay audience can understand. The aim of patient information is to reinforce the main issues that should be discussed between health professionals and patients, and it should not make statements that could interfere with that relationship. The focus on written information for patients is likely to increase; maximizing its potential value will be an important challenge for regulatory authorities around the world.

After a decision has been made and a course of action taken, continued monitoring and followup are important as a form of feedback to the decision makers. If followup evidence suggests that the safety problem or conditions contributing to it persists despite a particular regulatory intervention, additional regulatory action might be indicated to successfully manage the drug risk.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

For many drug safety issues, public health responsibilities require that a regulatory decision be made in the face of imperfect and incomplete information. An important area for future development in pharmacoepidemiology relates to finding ways to meet these information needs in an efficient and timely manner, so as to reduce the level of uncertainty regarding the risk component of a drug risk–benefit evaluation.

Spontaneous case reports are an essential aspect of most drug risk assessments, and the case reports of greatest importance to decision makers are those describing serious adverse health effects. Underreporting creates uncertainty because it masks the magnitude of an ADR in the population and makes it difficult to measure the effect of regulatory interventions. Incomplete reporting contributes to uncertainty because important relevant information will often be absent from the report. Efforts to enhance both the quantity and quality of reported cases of suspected serious ADRs would help to reduce uncertainty, and potentially improve the effectiveness of drug risk management.

Another area where informational uncertainty is great relates to the use of drug products in hospitalized patients. There is a need for nationally representative patient-specific drug use data from the hospital inpatient setting. Were such data linked to hospital procedures and patient outcomes, it would represent a valuable addition to the information armamentarium. In a related manner, there is also a strong need for support of the development of surveillance systems for ADRs in hospitals based on recent experiences.56–58
A continuing challenge will be finding ways to make use of advancing technology to process, access, and analyze large numbers of drug safety data. The use of data mining techniques for signal detection within the spontaneous case reports database is a current example.\textsuperscript{51, 52} Refinements in this methodology will allow screening of subsets of the database stratified by age, gender, or seriousness of the ADR, and may also be useful in the identification of previously unrecognized drug–drug interactions. It is possible that such methods could also be applied to screening within claims based longitudinal databases.

Active surveillance is another means by which the information base for risk assessment and regulatory decision making might be improved. Several different approaches to such surveillance are possible. One approach might seek to augment or enhance spontaneous reporting. Another might build upon the infrastructure of other already established registries or databases. One focus of such approaches would be to provide a means of early case finding with the possibility of risk estimation. Another objective might be to provide ongoing feedback to regulatory authorities regarding the effect of regulatory interventions taken to improve the safety profile of a product.

In the realm of population based data resources, future developments could help to improve the information base available for regulatory risk management decision making. In too many instances, the only data available upon which to make risk assessments are those obtained from spontaneous case reports and drug use databases. Population based estimates of incidence are often lacking. The ADR of concern may be extremely rare or the drug product in question may have low levels of use, both indicating that the database lacks the statistical power to provide meaningful information. For new molecular entities marketed for less than three years, this is usually a severe limitation of existing population based resources. One solution would be for larger databases to be created and organized. It is possible that databases covering 10–20 million current lives might be required to permit study of rare or difficult to assess ADRs or those occurring with products new to the marketplace, with low levels of use in the general population, or with use limited to a small segment of the population.

For most studies using data from longitudinal databases, access to medical records is important for purposes of confirming the diagnosis or outcome and for obtaining information on potential confounders and risk modifiers. Obtaining these records can be a difficult and time consuming process, and is becoming more difficult as concerns increase about confidentiality (see Chapters 19 and 26). Systems that rely on computerized medical records could substantially improve the efficiency of this aspect of study execution. Larger size and improved ease and access to primary records would improve the capacity of these databases to contribute valuable information on risk for a broad range of drug products, and within timeframes responsive to public health urgency and the need for timely risk management decisions to be made. The process of accessing medical record information should be done in a way that protects patient privacy but, at the same time, permits this critical function to occur in the interest of the public health.

Another important area of future development that could help to reduce the level of informational uncertainty centers on the concept of partnership. Many pharmaceutical companies are international in scope and many of the same pharmaceutical products are marketed in multiple countries throughout the world. Many of these countries have departments working at national centers dedicated to the task of postmarketing drug safety assessment. In this regard, there is a growing need for real-time collaboration between the various national centers and their postmarketing drug safety professionals. The challenge of drug safety and of the successful management of drug risk transcends national boundaries, as do the drug products under surveillance.

Similarly, there is growing need for partnership with industry in the task of monitoring for drug safety. Under ICH agreements, the Periodic Safety Update Report (PSUR) represents a potential step in that direction.\textsuperscript{59} With the PSUR, pharmaceutical companies will assume greater responsibility for periodically conducting a comprehensive safety assessment of their products.
and of submitting this to the regulatory authority of each country where the product is marketed. A PSUR is intended to provide an update of the worldwide safety experience of a medicinal product to competent authorities at defined times postauthorization. It should contain a critical evaluation of the benefit to risk balance of the product in the light of new or changing postauthorization information. This evaluation should also ascertain whether changes should be made to the marketing authorization, Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC), patient information leaflet, or product advertising.

According to European legislation, marketing authorization holders are currently required to submit a PSUR to competent authorities once a medicinal product is authorized in the EU, even if it is not marketed. PSURs are normally required to be submitted at six-monthly intervals for the first two years following the authorization, then annually for 2 years, and thereafter at each renewal (which takes place at 5 year intervals). Although the level of compliance to the system may still be increased, the quality of PSURs submitted by companies has gradually improved over the years and they are generally considered as a valuable source of information. The concept of partnership can be extended to include other governmental agencies and organizations involved in the mission of public health as well as academia. In these ways, it may be possible to strengthen and improve the pharmacoepidemiologic safety net to the benefit of society.
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INTRODUCTION

Pharmacoepidemiologic evidence may be admitted to the courtroom to help prove legal issues such as failure to warn, or to demonstrate the presence or absence of valid associations between an event (i.e., the use of a drug) and an outcome (i.e., an adverse drug reaction). Due to the complex nature of epidemiologic studies, the use of these data has many times led to inappropriate interpretations in the courtroom.1,2 The situation worsens when “experts” lacking training in epidemiology are allowed to testify, because their testimony may be erroneously persuasive to a lay jury and, thus, misunderstood.

For all of these reasons, the importance of pharmacoepidemiology to the legal process, and the importance of its proper use, is clear. This chapter will explore this role in more detail. It will begin with some general background information on drug product liability litigation and the burden of proof it presents for each side. The differences among medical causality, epidemiologic causality, and legal causation will follow. Then a description will be provided of the impact of adverse drug event (ADE) reporting on litigation. Finally, a series of specific examples of these principles will be provided. While the viewpoint taken here is that from the US courtroom, pharmacoepidemiology litigation is most widespread in the US, so it is perhaps the best model to examine. Regardless, US litigation affects drug manufacturers, regulators, and academics around the world, as well as worldwide drug availability, and sometimes serves as a model, which is perhaps adopted too frequently elsewhere. For all of these reasons, the US perspective on litigation should be of interest to pharmacoepidemiologists around the world.

REGULATION VERSUS LITIGATION

THE FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION’S ROLE

With statutory authority from the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act (as amended by the FDA Modernization Act of 1997), the FDA’s role in regulating pharmaceutical manufacturers has included evaluating evidence of efficacy and safety,3,4 deciding on the approvability of new drug applications,5 deciding on the withdrawal of new drug applications,6 and recording all relevant information concerning the effectiveness and safety of marketed drugs.7 To accomplish these goals, certain implementing regulations have been
promulgated\(^8\) and guidelines issued. These guidelines state procedures or standards of general applicability that are not legal requirements, but are procedures acceptable to FDA for a subject matter that falls within the laws it administers. The vastness of the FDA’s task is then enhanced and assisted by a regulatory and administrative framework that solicits and, in fact, requires reports by manufacturers of any adverse experiences observed during administration of the drug in any manner (see also Chapter 10). This, in turn, generates a controversy over the best methodology for assessing causality in case reports (see Chapter 32).

Thus, the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act, legislated as a public safeguard, seeks to maintain the quality of the products over which it has governance.\(^9\) It even offers economic protection against adulteration and misrepresentation. However, it is not restitutive.\(^10\) It does not reimburse those who have been harmed by adverse drug effects. Rather, it relies on the seizure and condemnation of noncompliant products and injunctive and criminal sanctions against wrongdoers.\(^11\) Therefore, when individuals seek redress for an injury from a drug, vaccine, cosmetic, or device, they need to use the usual pathways for establishing civil liability, that is litigation.

The great importance of the statutory direction of the federal law is that it has established a duty for the Food and Drug Administration to monitor the manufacturing and distribution of drug products. The essence of that duty is, however, shared by those who research, develop, manufacture, market, and distribute those drugs. Thus, whereas in legal understanding, one who makes a claim for alleged injury must establish the existence of a legal duty owed by the defendant, here the law and regulations point toward such a conclusion. In addition, as will be explained in more detail below, failure to follow the law can make an important contribution to a product liability case.

Pursuant to requirements of the FDA Modernization Act of 1997 (FDAMA), section 555, if the FDA receives new information indicating that a new use of a drug may not be effective or may present a significant risk to public health, the agency may take appropriate action, including ordering the manufacturer to cease dissemination. It is certainly conceivable that such data could be of a pharmacoepidemiologic nature. Further, section 113 of FDAMA adds a new subsection (j) to the Public Health Service Act (PHSA) (42 U.S.C. section 282) that requires the Secretary of Health and Human Services to establish a coordinated program within the National Institutes of Health to create, maintain, and operate a data bank of information on clinical trials for drugs for serious or life threatening diseases and conditions. This data bank may contain information on the results of clinical trials, including information on potential toxicities. Thus, the data bank may provide source information for pharmacoepidemiologic followup.

**PLAINTIFFS’ BURDEN OF PROOF IN PRODUCT LIABILITY CASES**

Judgments for the plaintiff in product liability litigation are usually based on either of two legal theories: negligence or strict liability. Rarely, contract theory (via breach of warranty) or more extreme tort theory (such as fraud) comes into play.

For judgments based on showing negligence or fault, a plaintiff needs to show that there was a duty that was owed to him. He or she also needs to show that there was a dereliction from such duty that directly caused his economic and/or personal injury. Finally, he or she needs to show that this injury resulted in damages that are measurable and can be redressed by monetary award. For these actions, the court and the jury are looking primarily at whether there was defective conduct by the defendant(s).

For judgments based on strict liability, a plaintiff must show that a product was defective in some respect, whether due to defective design, construction, instructions for safe and effective use, or warnings. Further, to obtain a judgment based on strict liability, a plaintiff must show that the product came from the supplier in that defective condition, making it unreasonably dangerous, and caused the economic and/or personal injury that is the subject of the complaint. Thus, the defendant’s state of mind—his negligence, his
fault—is not an issue. The defective or nondefective condition of his product is the sole issue. The connection between conduct and product defect is then made only by plaintiffs seeking additional punitive or exemplary damages. The ultimate question that then arises is whether it is always defective conduct to sell a bad product.

Regardless of whether the legal theory is negligence or strict liability, expert testimony is required on the issue of causation, i.e., whether the product caused the injury in question. The sophistication of the pharmacology of prescription drugs, vaccines, and antibiotics precludes a jury from drawing an inference of causation based upon common knowledge; expert testimony is critically important. In fact, a jury could not be given a res ipso loquitur instruction (the thing speaks for itself) based on its common knowledge. A plaintiff is not precluded from setting forth the argument that he did not have polio, he ingested polio vaccine, and then he had polio, so the vaccine must have caused the polio, or at least it failed to prevent the polio it was supposed to prevent. The jury, of course, may or may not accept that argument.

In addition, if a plaintiff expects to prove that a product was defective due to a deficient warning, his or her burden of proof is somewhat similar, regardless of whether his argument is couched in strict liability or negligence terms. A plaintiff may attempt to establish a prima facie case based on evidence that the drug functioned improperly, but he is still not relieved of the burden of proving the product was in defective condition when it came to his use. The res ipso approach in medical malpractice litigation, and in product liability litigation to a lesser extent (where it applies to negligence rather than strict liability theory), also requires a plaintiff to show that the product failure, more probably than not, was due to the defendant. The plaintiff must show that the resultant injury was not one that could have happened if it were not for the defendant’s negligence, and no explanation is available other than defendant’s negligence. The plaintiff says “I did nothing to create my injury, nor did anyone prescribing, administering or applying the drug to me.” He is, however, permitted to prove the existence of a defective condition by offering circumstantial evidence. Circumstantial evidence is that which translates recognized human experience into a credible slant on events. For example, ordinarily one does not suffer an automobile tire blowout after only four miles of use unless the tire had a defect when received. Bolstered by additional facts, whether direct evidence or even more circumstantial evidence from another source, this type of evidence may be offered as proof of a defect. Conceivably, pharmacoepidemiologic testimony could give some weight to any circumstantial evidence that might be offered to make or refute a claim of injury associated with the use of a drug product, by indicating that it was plausible that the drug could have caused that injury.

Compounding the difficulty in connecting ADEs with causation is the nature of drug product liability suits today. In product liability suits based upon negligence, proximate cause involves apportionment of responsibility for an injury, and apportionment of damages upon perhaps several causes. In terms of strict drug product liability, however, whatever the product defect claimed—whether as to design, instructions for administration, or warnings on use—it must be shown to be the direct cause of the injury claimed. What if the proof offered creates equal opportunity for more than one direct cause? Can there be more than one direct cause? What if one cause represents a possibility and no more? What if one cause represents a possibility and another represents a probability? These “what ifs” have definite answers in law, but they tend to be answered by triers of fact—the jury—rather than by a judge, who rules as to law.

Can a strict liability demonstration of a product defect be based on possibility? As an individual question, that is addressed in every lawsuit in which the plaintiff has only pharmacoepidemiologic evidence to offer, alone and via the testimony of medical experts. The responses are not necessarily consistent. Some attorneys feel that the personalities of the adversaries and their counsel, the reputation of those who testify, the venue, and jurisdictional factors have a profound influence on outcome in such cases.
For example, federal judges have, in recent years, relied heavily on the expertise possessed by federal agencies such as the FDA. The state trial courts, however, are much less apt to feel the same about FDA expertise. For them, most times federal agency approval of products, procedures, labeling, or compliance with federal regulations are not necessary proof of rectitude or even good intentions. Thus, the fact that the FDA has complete records and reports concerning ADEs reported following use of a drug product that remains on the market does not of itself imply that the labeling or design of the product are non-defective. Yet, all too often state courts seem taken in by the “false aura of scientific infallibility, coupled with low probative value” that are imparted by analysis of any number of spontaneously generated ADEs by a party’s pharmacoepidemiologic witness in a lawsuit.

This theory is supported by the Richardson case, since a virtually companion case which was tried in the same jurisdiction earlier, but in a nonfederal court system, resulted in a substantial plaintiff’s judgment rather than an overturned judgment. As District Judge Jackson, in the federal case, described it,

This trial was a virtual reprise of “Oxendine” .... The trial judge ... set aside the verdict ... but the district of Columbia Court of Appeals, reversed an opinion ... bearing upon the current letter of scientific knowledge. It reopened a 20-year-old controversy which is by now essentially settled within the scientific community. Reasonable jurors could not reject scientific consensus that Bendectin® is not a teratogen without indulging in speculation and conjecture.”

DRUG PRODUCT LIABILITY DEFENSE

A defendant, in turn, will claim that when the drug product left his possession, it was not in defective condition. He may further attempt to show that it was used improperly or abnormally used. He also may introduce evidence about any reasonable secondary causes that may eliminate him from liability, as the initial burden of proof is on the plaintiff to show the product defect or the negligent conduct.

The two bellwethers of drug products liability defense have been, with regard to prescription drugs and devices, the “learned intermediary rule” and the “state of the art” defense.

The learned intermediary rule, while still accepted in most jurisdictions, may be eroding. In those locales where the learned intermediary rule still exists (the majority of states), it is the prescribing health care professional to whom the manufacturer’s duty to warn runs, not the patient. However, the implementation of direct to consumer advertising and the advent of the internet have created new issues not existing previously in the prescription drug arena. If a drug company chooses to unduly influence the public regarding a drug product and fails to warn properly, the learned intermediary defense may be lost. Thus, the special circumstances as previously set forth in Reyes v. Wyeth and Davis v. Wyeth and their progeny in the vaccine area and MacDonald in the contraceptive field may no longer be the exception to the rule, since it may be argued that, via direct to consumer advertising and internet promotion, the traditional relation between physician and patient is lost. Thus, due to the intentional acts of pharmaceutical manufacturers, a key defense may be forfeited. Additionally, for the “learned intermediary rule” to serve its function as prophylactic against liability, the package insert accompanying the product must have been adequately and honestly revelatory. Otherwise, as the patient’s agent, the prescriber could not weigh accurately the benefits against the risks.

The state of the art defense is evolving as well. “State of the art,” with respect to prescription drugs, has represented the quality of warning and instruction, based on the best information the product labeler could and should have available. These warnings are intended to give the prescribing or administering physician an adequate basis for making a benefit to risk assessment in the interests of the patient. This has been discarded by some jurisdictions with respect to problems other than these. However, this too is changing, due to the finalization of the Restatement 3rd of Torts. Many jurisdictions still adhere to the Restatement 2nd. As time passes, however, the newer version
will most likely become the rule. The Restatement 3rd holds liable anyone who sells a prescription product, unless the learned intermediary rule is in existence. It also diminishes some of the impact of comment (k) to section 402 of the Restatement 2nd concerning design defect. Under Restatement 3rd, one may be liable for a design defect if a prescription drug is found lacking efficacy in all instances. Thus, the burden would be to prove either the FDA made an erroneous decision, or it is totally irrational for the drug to be used under all circumstances. This is a tough burden to meet. It is still recognized that pharmaceutical products are unavoidably unsafe, as pointed out in comment (k) to section 402 of Restatement 2nd. The requirement also remains that the manufacturer needs to supply all the information known about the product’s safe and effective use that should reasonably be known to any expert who would be producing the product at that time.

THE IMPORTANCE OF COMPLIANCE WITH THE STATUTE TO PRODUCT LIABILITY LITIGATION

When an injury is accompanied by a statutory breach, the party injured need not necessarily be required to prove common law proximate causation. However, he or she must at least show that the claimed injuries resulted in whole or in part from violation of the statute. In the cited case, the court held that a violation of the Safety Appliance Act rendered carriers absolutely liable “for injuries resulting therefrom, without regard to negligence or time at which the malfunction occurred.” In a similar and unrelated lawsuit, citing the Federal Employers Liability Act, the court said that some showing of negligence would be required of plaintiff. However, “...any showing of negligence on the part of the railroad, even the slightest, is sufficient to create liability,” so the employer can suffer liability for negligence that does not rise to the level of common law negligence. Further, one can readily look at more recent litigation, where defendants’ failures to meet statutory and regulatory requirements fully and truthfully occasioned billions of dollars in adverse judgments and even corporate “wipe-outs.” These include the “MER-29” cases, the “Chloromycetin” cases, the “Selacryn” cases, the “Oraflex” cases, the Dalkon Shield cases, the “toxic shock” tampon cases, etc.

Thus, there is no denying now that statutes, and regulations promulgated thereunder, create duties whose breach feeds liability for the individual or business entity subject to that regulation. Certainly the failure to implement FDA requirements cost defendants heavily in *Stanton v. Astra*, where the reporting requirements about ADEs were declared by the plaintiffs to have been flouted. In that instance, the manufacturer, confident its anesthetic was no longer to be considered a new drug, did not deem itself required to file ADEs. The jury believed the plaintiff’s claim that, had they done so, the resulting warnings would have been believed and would have spared the injury to the child (see below).

However, when breach of statute is proffered by a plaintiff in making the so-called “negligence per se” position, the trial judge must undertake the responsibility for informing the “jury, in substance, of any possible excuse or justification, which might be applicable to the case, and how such excuse or justification would affect the parties’ respective burdens of proof.” There is little question that the substance of such an instruction must be introduced by the attorneys as part of their case, however. Judges cannot be expected to have sufficient independent understanding of what might represent possible excuses and justifications in drug, vaccine, or medical device product liability.

As an example, in *Stanton v. Astra*, mentioned in an earlier example, the judge found no possible excuse or justification for the absence of ADE reporting by Astra. Yet, there had been no judgment countering Astra’s position that “old” drugs according to the statutory “nondefinition” were not required to file ADEs. In fact, it was only in 1986 that the FDA formally declared this, by regulations published in the Federal Register and included in the Code of Federal Regulations. The FDA operates on a principle that a drug never leaves new drug status until they say so, yet the manufacturer’s attorneys argued that the statute clearly indicates when a drug is no longer a new
drug. The FDA took no action against Astra for failure to file ADEs for Xylcocaine®, although it clearly indicated its position in favor of the plaintiff at trial by testimony of FDA staff. The question still remains, therefore, whether the defendants could have urged the judge to explain to the jury that, regardless of other proofs mustered, the presumption of negligence created by the claimed breaks of statute and regulations could stand rebutted if Astra showed it acted as a reasonably prudent person would have acted under the same circumstances.

Within the considerations for court and jury will be the facts and evidence mustered by both parties on causation of the injury. Proximate cause of injury always seems to involve disputed questions of fact. Where statutory breach or regulatory noncompliance is sought to be equated with proximate cause of the plaintiff’s harm, while the burden of proof ostensibly remains with the plaintiff, he at least seemingly enjoys the presumptive advantage flowing from the “negligence per se” theory. Most courts will agree that the best rule in negligence alleging statutory or regulatory violation is that the plaintiff must first prove the violation, and that of itself will create a rebuttable presumption of negligence. However, even assuming a violation of the statutory duty spelled out in the Act, a question of fact will remain in existence as to whether that violation is the proximate cause of the injury. Therefore, given appropriate instruction on the point, and examining the evidence before it, a jury is free to find that a statutory breach is not necessarily the direct cause of the injury.30 There is always the possibility that conflicting facts and inferences relevant to the issue of proximate cause exist. As an example, in the host of decisions adverse to Parke-Davis in the Chloromycetin® cases, there was an underlying statutory breach involved with misbranding and new drug violations, according to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act. Yet, where the treating physician averred that he did not read the labeling and so was not influenced by such violations, but had prescribed the drug solely on the basis of his own independent knowledge and judgment, the Parke-Davis statutory and regulatory breaches failed to amount to proximate cause.27

CAUSALITY ASSESSMENT

MEDICAL VERSUS LEGAL VERSUS EPIDEMIOLOGIC CAUSALITY

If pharmacoepidemiologic findings, as expressed by experts, are to be presented to a court in support of a theory of injury, causation by a particular drug becomes a battleground between different experts. Observers, assessors, and evaluators with access to the same body of information about the drug and the adverse event associated with it should seemingly find consistent threads of causation and noncausation. But, as we examine the tonnage of “swine-flu” and Bendectin® testimony, to name just a few instances, along with Judge Weinstein’s findings in the “Agent Orange” cases,31 we find that this is not so. Must the answer lie in the expert’s elevation of his own subjective deliberations as overshadowing whatever objective sources may exist for the given ADE? Determining medical causation in individual cases is discussed more in Chapter 32. However, as Hutchinson says, “The standard adopted in the causality assessment literature is the unaided judgment of experts, supplemented by some consensus-producing convention when the experts disagree with one another”.32

For litigation, such a medical causality assessment, even consensually produced, may not meet the criteria for legal causation, i.e., proximate cause. The legal view of causation, because it was developed originally for almost exclusively economic redress, places heavy emphasis upon the proof necessary for one seeking such redress. “Actual cause has often been confused with proximate causation. The significance of proximate cause focuses upon legal policy in terms of whatever responsibility will be extended to the consequences of conduct which has occurred. Actual cause, however, is a factual question focusing on the antecedent factors producing a particular consequence”.33 The medical view of causation permits exploration and hypothesization based upon a high degree of subjective analysis brought to bear on whatever objective data are available. It allows for one to propound a theory of causation on first impressions. It gives full or
some consideration to any and all hearsay evidence. A physician who has never seen a case of periarteritis nodosa, as a medical student or a practitioner, nor has practiced in a medical specialty related to such a disease entity, can examine a patient’s record, find some criteria that resemble those of the disease, and unhesitatingly testify that the plaintiff suffers from that disease and contracted it from exposure to the particular drug. That is not to say that he will not be rebutted by another expert, but it does say that he has made what is, for him, a satisfactory causality assessment and will testify to it under oath. It is a judgment a jury may not find deficient. Legal writers stress “the principle that a logical, although not necessarily an empirical, fallacy lies in post hoc, ergo propter hoc reasoning”. Defendants complain that courts are too ready to recognize a close sequence between the defect alleged and/or proven and causation. That is understandable in light of medical causality assessment, which never has available the formal and diverse rendition of facts and expert testimony mustered at a trial.

Thus, there is a major difference between medical causality assessment and legal causation, one which should be, but often is not, appreciated by attorneys, courts, and expert witnesses. A spontaneous reporting system, with its individual medical causality assessment, deals in possibilities. Yet in the law, “possibility” is modified by the adjective “mere.” As Cardozo stated in his classic adaptation of our common law to the 20th century tort system, one does not find liability for negligence on mere possibility. That requires probability. “There must be knowledge of a danger, not merely possible, but probable. It is possible to use almost anything in a way that will make it dangerous if defective. That is not enough to charge a manufacturer with a duty independent of his contract”. Minus probability, the great Justice said, there could be no element of foreseeability, no use of the reasoning process in formulating warning or desisting from an action. Man can only be reasonable in his exercise of foresight when he makes his assessment on that basis.

Epidemiological analysis, on the other hand, biostatistically creates a basis for predictability. This has been recognized by the courts. Where a plaintiff’s decedent had worked in a uranium mine and died of cancer, the cause was supplied from epidemiologic study and testimony virtually alone. However, as this author previously pointed out, epidemiologic evidence, if used to assert and prove causation, “must meet the qualifications that traditionally distinguish real evidence. Like statistical studies, they may offer bricks to build,” or to fortify such theory of causation.

The process of deciding about whether or not there is epidemiologic causality is discussed in detail in Chapter 2. It is based on finding a statistical association, and then using established criteria to judge whether the finding is a causal one. Importantly, however, epidemiology uses inductive reasoning, not the deductive reasoning that is far more familiar to the attorney who employs an epidemiologist as an expert. Thus, an epidemiologic statement about causality generalizes from individuals to groups and populations, not the reverse. Unless the disease in question occurs very rarely in the absence of the exposure, epidemiology is unable to determine the cause in a particular case. Although epidemiology represents a systematic and a rigorous basis for deciding on cause, it still will not generally get one to a legal cause. This requires a medical judgment, although this in turn often needs to be based on rigorous epidemiologic data.

However, the results of thorough and validated pharmacoepidemiologic studies are far more often determinative than the results of testing animals or animal tissue. At best, as was pointed out in “Agent Orange,” citing a Dr Silbergeld, “animal studies are aimed at discovering a dose–response relationship while epidemiologic studies show an association between exposure and disease”. Time may give us additional assurance that the use of pharmacoepidemiologic methods will prove to be a most valuable means toward more complete, more valid, and more contemporary information about the effects of the potent and widely used drugs of this period. Time may also provide a better perspective on the way the courts should receive evidence, testimony, and exhibits based upon the reports and records that created the basis for
pharmacoepidemiologic analyses and statements of causation.

**IMPACT OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY ON LITIGATION**

**EXPERT TESTIMONY AND THE COURTS**

The potential usefulness of epidemiologic evidence in helping to establish associations between exposure to physical and chemical substances, including pharmaceutical preparations, and injuries alleged in products liability litigation has been recognized for a number of years. Scrutiny by courts as to the admissibility of expert testimony to assist in interpreting epidemiologic data and opining thereon initially assumed special meaning in a number of cases involving an area of law known as toxic torts. The common thread among these litigations was the allegation of a latent injury (i.e., injury that manifests years after exposure). Asbestos, Agent Orange, dioxin, radiation, polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and diethylstilbestrol (DES) are prime examples. Epidemiology has been used in these matters in an attempt to demonstrate associations between exposure to the substance in question and an increased risk to the exposed population of developing certain diseases. The cases discussed in this section, both pharmaceutical and nonpharmaceutical, have established the legal precedents regarding epidemiology and its relation to the law.

The use of epidemiology in litigation soon expanded beyond latent injury claims (e.g., cancer) to claims involving birth defects (e.g., Bendectin®) and other more immediate injuries (e.g., vaccines and neurologic injury, aspirin and Reye's Syndrome, xenobiotics and immune dysfunction, etc.). In many of the birth defect cases, a path was traced from administration or ingestion of an agent by the mother, to the fetus or newborn, and then to the resultant childhood, adolescent, or adult physical or mental damage. Epidemiologic evidence has then been used to help establish or disprove (via studies showing a lack of correlation between exposure and defect) an increased risk to the offspring.

In order to appreciate the evolution of how courts have dealt with epidemiologic evidence and the experts who testify concerning their interpretations of that evidence, a broader range of cases than exists solely within the pharmaceutical sphere must be discussed. While other sections of this chapter deal primarily with pharmaceutical cases, this section will discuss both pharmaceutical and nonpharmaceutical substances that have been the subject of litigation throughout the years.

Some of the earliest cases that considered these issues entailed close scrutiny and active involvement by the courts in determining the admissibility of expert testimony and interpreting the significance of both the data relied upon by expert witnesses and their credentials. *Johnston v. The United States* is illustrative.41 *Johnston* involved an action by four employees of an aircraft instrument and development plant who brought suit against the United States Government, alleging that their various cancers were caused by exposure to radiation while at their jobs. The court scrupulously analyzed the epidemiologic and scientific data as well as the experts presented by both sides. It determined that many of the plaintiffs’ experts were either advocates, alarmists, or that they were relying on unreliable data to support their opinions. The court also analyzed statistical risk calculations presented by the experts and determined that some of plaintiffs’ experts were using statistics in a speculative way. In its opinion, the court noted that an expert can easily manipulate numbers to, “… have a final result of over 50%, i.e., more probable than not.” Thus, plaintiffs’ case was dismissed, even though their experts opined that the plaintiffs’ cancers were “more likely than not” caused by exposure to workplace radiation.

*Allen v. The United States* provides another early example of the trial court evaluating scientific data proffered as evidence by experts.42 The *Allen* court, after discussing the difficulty that exists in establishing causation where latent, toxic injuries are concerned, broached the concept of statistical relationships, especially those arising from epidemiologic evidence. The court examined each
individually named plaintiff’s case, specifically looking at the following factors:

1. whether the plaintiff with cancer was probably exposed to radiation significantly in excess of background radiation rates;
2. whether the injury alleged is consistent with those known to be caused by ionizing radiation; and
3. whether the person injured resided in the geographic area in question in the lawsuit.

The court decided that, if these points were established, other relevant factors should then be evaluated in order to determine whether the “substantial factor” test was met by the claiming plaintiff. Epidemiologic data were used by the court to assess a number of these parameters, as well as the reported latency periods for various cancers. Upon completion of its analysis, the court determined that ten of the 24 representative cases warranted compensation.

As is discussed in other sections of this chapter, Judge Weinstein, in granting the defendants summary judgment regarding those plaintiffs who opted out of the class action in in re: “Agent Orange”, analyzed the deposition testimony and affidavits of plaintiffs’ experts. He found that, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Evidence, their opinions were inadmissible. Judge Weinstein determined that both the opinions of expert witnesses and the basis for their opinions should be evaluated by the court and that the Federal Rules of Evidence permit such an evaluation. Federal Rule of Evidence 702 states that an expert who is qualified by knowledge, skill, training, or education may testify in the form of an opinion as to technical, scientific, or other specialized knowledge if it will assist the trier of fact (generally a jury) in understanding the evidence. Judge Weinstein used this rule in conjunction with Federal Rule 403 (which allows a judge to exclude relevant evidence if it has a propensity to unfairly prejudice, confuse, or mislead a jury), to exclude the proposed testimony of a number of plaintiffs’ experts. Further, he invoked Rule 703 to show that the facts or data upon which plaintiffs’ experts were relying were not of the type upon which experts in
the particular field of expertise would reasonably rely. On appeal, Judge Weinstein’s decision was upheld by the Second Circuit Court of Appeals.

In Viterbo v. The Dow Chemical Co., the trial court dismissed plaintiff’s allegation that the herbicide, picloram, caused his mental depression. The court examined the credentials of plaintiff’s experts, their methodologies, and the basis upon which they formed their opinions. It determined that the data they used to form their opinions were unreliable and not of the type reasonably relied upon by experts in the field. Their testimony was ruled inadmissible, pursuant to the Federal Rules of Evidence Rule 703. The Viterbo decision was appealed to the Federal Court of Appeals. In rendering its opinion affirming the trial court, the Court of Appeals wrote, “In this case today we consider the question whether it is so if an expert says it is so.” The answer from the Court was a resounding, “no.”

The Fifth Circuit reasoned that, although Rule 703 expanded what was the acceptable basis of expert opinion in common law, this expansion does not make summary judgment impossible whenever a party produces an expert to support its position. The court went on to state that:

As a general rule, questions relating to the bases and sources of an expert’s opinion affect the weight to be assigned that opinion rather than its admissibility and should be left for the jury’s consideration .... In some cases, however, the source upon which an expert’s opinion relies is of such little weight that the jury should not be permitted to receive that opinion. Expert opinion testimony falls into this category when that testimony would not actually assist the jury in arriving at an intelligent and sound verdict.

Numerous other cases have followed the reasoning espoused in the above cases, e.g., various Bendectin cases, described elsewhere; Thomas v. Hoffman-LaRoche, Inc.; Novak v. United States; Sterling v. Velsicol Chemical Co.; and Boyles v. American Cyanamid Co.

However, there are also a number of cases that stand for the opposite proposition: that the trial court should not preclude expert testimony if the expert is qualified and uses methodologies
commonly accepted by others in the field. These cases hold that it should not be the expert’s opinion itself that a court should evaluate but, rather, the court should look at the methods used by the expert in arriving at an opinion and whether the methodology used is one that is generally accepted by the relevant scientific community. The court should allow the jury to decide the veracity of the testimony and of the opinion itself. An example is *Ferebee v. Chevron Chemical Co.*, which was brought by the children of an agricultural worker who died of pulmonary fibrosis against a defendant that manufactured the herbicide paraquat.

After the jury found for the plaintiffs, the defendant appealed on the grounds that the jury should never have been allowed to consider the testimony of plaintiffs’ experts because their expressed opinions and theories were not generally accepted in the scientific community. In rendering its opinion, the appellate court stated that, even though an expert’s opinion may be controversial in its conclusions, it should be admitted if it is based upon wellfounded methodologies. The court deferred to the jury in weighing the expert testimony and emphasized that judges, both trial and appellate, have no special competency to resolve complex causal issues such as arise in toxic tort cases.

In the *Paoli Railroad Yard PCB Litigation*, the trial court dismissed plaintiffs’ claims based upon a finding that plaintiffs’ expert witnesses were espousing “junk science” regarding the alleged health effects of PCB exposure. The court reviewed the literature on PCBs and determined that, “... no reasonable or scientific basis exists for concluding that chronic exposure to PCBs causes cancer, hypertension, cardiovascular diseases, elevations in serum triglycerides or cholesterol levels, liver disease, joint irritation, pancytopenia ...”. The trial court in *Paoli* (1989) stressed that “A vigorous examination is especially important in the toxic tort context, where presentation to the trier of theories of causation depends almost entirely upon expert testimony.” The US Court of Appeals for the Third Circuit reversed this decision (1990). The Third Circuit adopted a good part of the reasoning used in *Ferebee v. Chevron*. It concluded that almost all of the plaintiffs’ expert opinions were improperly excluded because of a misapplication by the trial court of the test for “novel scientific theories”.

On remand back to the trial court, six days of hearings were then held concerning defendants’ motion to exclude animal studies, certain laboratory analyses, and the testimony of ten of plaintiffs’ experts, pursuant to Federal Rules of Evidence 403, 702, and 703. The trial court did just that. As a result, the case is still pending.

*Petree v. The Dow Chemical Co.* is another example where a novel scientific theory was allowed to stand despite its lack of general acceptance in the scientific community. This case was originally part of the Agent Orange multidistrict litigation but was severed therefrom because it did not involve military exposure to Agent Orange. As a twist, in *in re ‘Agent Orange’* the herbicidal component in question was 2,4,5-T (2,4,5-trichlorophenoxy acetic acid) which was allegedly contaminated with dioxin (2,3,7,8-tetrachlorodibenzo-p-dioxin). Yet in *Petree*, the plaintiff chose to allege that the other component of Agent Orange, 2,4-D (2,4-dichlorophenoxy acetic acid), caused the decedent’s lymphoma. Despite histological evidence that the decedent had Hodgkin’s disease and epidemiologic studies that argued against Hodgkin’s disease as being associated with exposure to 2,4-D, plaintiff’s sole expert was permitted to testify that the decedent died of non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma and that just one molecule of 2,4-D was enough to cause the decedent’s disease. Moreover, the methods used by the plaintiff’s expert were questioned in that he relied upon another person’s medical records in forming his opinions. Despite this, the Third Circuit Court of Appeals upheld the verdict for the plaintiff.

*Rubanick v. Witco Chemical Corp., et al.* is a state court extension of the *Ferebee* concept. In *Rubanick*, the survivors of two deceased chemical company workers brought suit alleging that exposure to chemicals in the work place caused the decedents’ cancers. The plaintiffs produced an expert witness who held a Ph.D. in chemistry. This witness testified at a preliminary evidentiary hearing that, based upon the epidemiology of
colon cancer (the alleged cancer in the suit), the personal histories of the deceased, the fact that other workers in the plant developed other types of cancer, and data from animal studies, that decedents’ colon cancers were caused by workplace PCB exposure. The defendants produced three experts, a medical doctor coincidentally from the same institution where plaintiffs’ expert worked, a toxicologist, and an epidemiologist. These witnesses testified that plaintiffs’ expert was unqualified to render opinions as to the specific cause of an individual’s cancer, that his theory was “untenable from the scientific standpoint”, and that he was not qualified to interpret epidemiologic evidence. At the close of the hearing regarding these matters, the trial court determined that the testimony of plaintiffs’ expert was inadmissible and granted a dismissal for the defendant. The intermediate appellate court reversed that decision, however, upon the grounds that the standard for admissibility applied by the trial court was too strict for a toxic tort litigation. They concluded that “…the conventional standard for admissibility of causation ... [requires] a different test of reliability, one focusing on the soundness of the foundation for the novel scientific theory of causation, ... in toxic tort litigation.”

The New Jersey Supreme Court agreed. In a decision published on 1 August, 1991, the court determined that toxic tort cases were unique in that much of the science involved with the causes of latent injuries such as cancer is nebulous. The court adopted the position that, in these cases, it is beyond the province of the trial court to determine whether an expert’s opinion is one that is generally accepted in the particular field of science. The court further noted that the trial court should hold a hearing to determine whether the methodologies used by the expert in forming his or her opinions are acceptable methodologies and of the type that experts in the field generally use to form opinions. However, the trial court should not judge the opinions themselves; this, said the New Jersey Supreme Court, is the function of the jury.

The court also noted that the expert’s credentials should be examined in an evidentiary hearing, but that the jury again should be allowed to weigh an expert’s credentials when they are borderline.

Specific criticism was made of those cases wherein judges have excluded expert opinion because the opinion was outside of generally accepted scientific principles. The New Jersey Supreme Court in Rubanick, however, did not apply this standard to cases other than toxic tort situations that involve latent injuries and uncertain health effects.

A few months after Rubanick, the New Jersey Superior Court was faced with a motion for summary judgment, this time in a pharmaceutical case, Erickson v. Winthrop Laboratories et al. The plaintiffs in this case were alleging that exposure to 3% hexachlorophene in a skin cleanser caused an infant to suffer mental retardation. After extensive discovery, defendant manufacturers filed for summary judgment on the grounds that

1. the opinions expressed by plaintiffs’ experts were not based upon generally accepted methodologies,
2. their opinions were not based on the types of datum normally relied upon by experts in the field, and
3. their opinions were not in line with generally accepted scientific principles, since the conclusions reached by the plaintiffs’ experts did not logically flow from the scientific data then available.

Plaintiffs opposed the motion, basing their opposition on Rubanick. The plaintiffs claimed that pharmaceutical products should not be differentiated from toxic chemicals as appear in toxic tort cases. Defendants noted that a great difference exists between pharmaceuticals and toxic chemicals, in that pharmaceutical products are specifically tested for their safety on humans prior to use, whereas many toxic tort chemicals are not so tested. Further, they argued that pharmaceuticals are approved by the US Food and Drug Administration for human use, whereas toxic chemicals generally are not. Finally, they argued that the product in question had been on the market for over 40 years without scientific acceptance of any similar reports as was alleged in this lawsuit.

The judge in this case rendered an opinion granting the defendants summary judgment. The
judge agreed with the defendants that pharmaceutical products are not analogous to the types of chemical that appear in toxic tort cases. Further, the alleged injury in this case did not involve any latency. Thus, the court felt that the Rubanick standard should not apply. As noted by the court,

The Rubanick reasoning leads this court to analyze the question of whether the [sic] this litigation falls within the purview of a toxic tort or a pharmaceutical product case. If it does not fall within the scope of a toxic tort case, the conventional “general acceptance” standard applies.

... In toxic tort cases where PCBs or other known carcinogens are not intentionally administered to humans, study of the carcinogen is difficult because there is scarce information about human exposure to such carcinogens. In contrast, Phisohex is a product that was intentionally administered to humans and has been used by millions of people over the past forty years .... Thus, this court holds that Phisohex is not a toxic tort for purposes of a Rubanick analysis. Rather, it is a pharmaceutical drug to which the “general acceptance” standard for evaluating expert testimony applies.

The court in Erickson also looked at the methodologies used by plaintiffs’ experts in light of Rubanick and determined that, even under this standard, the methodologies were flawed and, thus, the testimony of the plaintiffs’ experts was inadmissible.

Several other recent cases have excluded testimony of experts because of its unreliability, despite the Ferebee, Paoli, and Rubanick reasoning. These include Boyles v. American Cyanamid Company, Porter v. Whitehall Laboratories, Inc., et al., and Kracker v. Spartan Chemical Co., Inc., et al. The Supreme Court of the United States decided the case of Daubert v. Merrill Dow Pharmaceuticals Inc. At issue was a Court of Appeals (9th Circuit) ruling affirming summary judgment against plaintiffs who alleged that birth defects were caused by Bendectin. The district court had ruled that the plaintiffs’ experts’ testimonies were inadmissible because their methodologies were not generally accepted within their scientific disciplines. The Ninth Circuit upheld the decision but proceeded to apply a standard for admissibility which was set forth in an older case, Frye v. United States, 54 App. D.C. 46, 47, 293 F. 1013, 1014 (1923). On appeal to the Supreme Court, the plaintiffs/petitioners contended that the Ninth Circuit erred, in that they applied the Frye standard to the Federal Rules of Evidence and that the Federal Rules of Evidence actually replaced the Frye standard with their enactment. Defendants/respondents countered by arguing that Federal Rules 403, 702, and 703 allow a judge to consider several factors in determining the admissibility of evidence and that, based upon these rules, summary judgment was justified.

The Supreme Court decision in Daubert (No. 92–102, decided June 28, 1993) took an intermediate position, setting forth a number of parameters that trial courts need to consider in evaluating expert testimony. This decision has had major implications to courtroom use of epidemiologic evidence, since one of the contentions was that an analysis of epidemiologic data performed by plaintiff’s experts for purposes of the litigation was not subject to peer review.

Initially, the Supreme Court expressly stated that the Frye “general acceptance” test was superseded by the Federal Rules of Evidence and that “general acceptance” of expert opinions is not a precondition to admissibility. However, the court noted that the Federal Rules, especially Rule 702, do place limits on the admissibility of scientific evidence. Further, the court set forth a number of methods available to a trial judge in assessing the admissibility of expert testimony. Among these are included an evaluation of “... whether the reasoning or methodology underlying the testimony is scientifically valid and of whether that reasoning or methodology can be applied to the facts in issue .... Whether a theory or technique is scientific knowledge that will assist the trier of fact ... [and] whether it can be (and has been) tested.” Proceeding further, the Court opined that publication does not automatically lead to admissibility nor does it necessarily correlate with reliability. However, peer review of a theory or process used by an expert in forming his/her opinion is something the court should consider. The fact that something is too new, novel, or of limited interest for it to be published is
something the trial court should realize but, also, the trial court needs to comprehend the fact that “... submission to the scrutiny of the scientific community is a component of “good science”, in part because it increases the likelihood that substantive flaws in methodology will be detected.” The Court also pointed out that a trial court, in assessing a particular scientific technique, should consider the known or potential rate of error of the method used. Finally, the Court acknowledged that general acceptance can be “... an important factor in ruling particular evidence admissible, and ‘a known technique that has been able to attract minimal support within the community,’ may properly be viewed with skepticism.”

As mentioned previously, Federal Rule 702 allows an expert to express opinions, or other testimony as to scientific, technical, or other specialized knowledge if it will assist the trier of fact in understanding the data. Rule 403 allows a judge to exclude evidence, even if relevant, if it can mislead the trier of fact. Thus, defendants/respondents in Daubert argued that these rules allow a judge to exclude expert testimony if it can mislead a jury and not assist the jury in understanding technical issues. The Supreme Court’s decision seems to support this position. However, it is the methods, rather than the opinions, that should be subject to scrutiny, and the Federal Rules of Evidence do require a “gatekeeping role for the judge” in this regard.

The use of experts in courts of law developed because of a need to aid nonexperts who must decide a case in understanding technical issues outside of the common human experience. To lose sight of this function does a disservice to those for whom the use of experts was envisioned. Science requires testing, affirmation, reproducibility by others, verification of data, verification of findings, and a host of other safeguards to protect against misinterpretation and error. Although there are instances of “major breakthroughs” that have occurred outside of the conventional process, such a happenstance is the rarity. However, even after such an event, the “new” finding must withstand scientific scrutiny. The problem with experts testifying in lawsuits to heretofore unknown or generally unaccepted phenomena is that the safeguards are not in place. Although opposing experts may disagree in front of a jury, technical points may become obscured by other factors (e.g., personalities, testimonial manerisms, sympathy, etc.), thus allowing a lay jury to be misled.

The decision in Daubert enforces the fact that courts should not lose sight of the role of the expert at trial. The Supreme Court made clear that “general acceptance” is not a precondition to the admissibility of scientific evidence. However, it also made clear that to allow experts to mislead is to hinder rather than aid the judicial system.

LITIGATION USE OF SPONTANEOUS REPORTS

The fact that a report is filed about a particular patient noting the association of an adverse event with the use of a defendant’s drug raises a possibility of causation, but it is quite insufficient to rise to the level of even a probability. As courts have noted on many occasions, “post hoc ergo propter hoc” does not provide sufficient evidence of probability for proof of legal cause. It is legally insufficient to show a possibility that the injury complained of was caused by the product. Justice Griffin, in Kramer v. Wilkins, spoke of “a possibility of skin cancer” as not meeting plaintiff’s requirement to show causation, when other experts stated it was not a probability. “Possibilities will not sustain a verdict.”57 The courts have many times held properly that no inference of defectiveness arises from the mere fact that an injury has occurred.58 Indeed, it is questionable whether the presence of unverified double and sometimes triple hearsay spontaneous reports, elicited from the present FDA ADE reporting system (see Chapter 10), should suffice even to thwart an early motion for summary judgment by the defendant. These are generally viewed, from scientific and expert pharmacoepidemiologic standards, as insufficient to support the plaintiff’s claim. They should be viewed in the same way by the courts.

Yet the FDA makes available, under the Freedom of Information Act59 the ongoing results of its Spontaneous Reporting System. Appropriately
included along with these results are the following caveats:

There are important things to remember when reviewing or analyzing data from the Spontaneous Reporting System:

1. For any given report, there is no certainty that the drug caused the reaction. This is because physicians are encouraged to report suspected reactions. In many instances, the event may have been related to the underlying disease for which the drug was given and not the drug itself.
2. The accumulated case reports cannot be inferred to reflect national incidences or estimates of drug risk.
3. Rates and/or frequencies generated from these data must be carefully interpreted as reporting rates and not occurrence rates. True incidence rates cannot be determined from this database.
4. Since reporting is voluntary it depends on many factors. This leads to reporting artifacts which must be kept in mind by anyone reviewing these data. Therefore comparisons of drugs for their relative safety should not be done without a complete understanding of the following and their impact on the comparisons.
   a. Length of time the drug has been marketed
   b. Changes in indication for use, or dosage schedules
5. Duplicate reports exist in the file. This must be kept in mind especially when generating and reviewing summary counts. There are two reasons for duplication.
   a. FDA was unable to determine that a report was previously submitted and computerized.
   b. A follow-up report was received, identified and entered as a separate case report. This is potentially solvable by examining the accession number on a detailed computer print-out. The last digit of the accession number is “1” for initial reports and a number greater than 1 represents a follow-up report.

This book is mostly concerned with the use of data from formal or otherwise carefully conceived and validated epidemiologic studies derived from biostatistics. To say, however, that such studies may be offered as relevant to the issue of causation is not to say that individual case reports within or without such a study should be, in and of themselves. If such case reports are not acceptable to scientists as such, not only can they not be used for causation, but they should not be admissible for the purpose of determining sufficiency of warning. Given that pharmacoepidemiology is a mathematical application of the powers and value of medical observation and given also that it can accumulate figures on the occurrence and distribution of adverse drug reactions in established human populations, it has merit for its use by the FDA in determining labeling and in designating products whose right to remain available is suspect. However, the ADE which appears within the FDA’s Spontaneous Reporting System is prima facie a hearsay or double hearsay document, whose validity singularly is open to considerable doubt. Thus, the use of such as evidence should occasion much need of proof, apart from proof of causation.

TYPICAL LITIGATION USE OF ADE REPORTS

Spontaneous reporting systems are utterly essential to postmarketing surveillance, in particular for hypothesis generation. As outlined in Chapters 10, 11, and 32, however, they are highly flawed for hypothesis testing. Unfortunately, one untoward result of such a system is that the numbers and characteristics it posts for each drug–disease association, because they are recorded, tallied, and distributed as such, create an aura of authenticity that is completely misleading, despite disclaimers.

While not the intention of the FDA Spontaneous Reporting System, materials submitted and accrued in compliance with the statutory and regulatory requirements have become a substantial contributor to drug, device, and vaccine product litigation. A legend appears on the FDA form that used to be used for logging or reporting ADEs (Form 1639) “Submission of a report does not necessarily constitute an admission that the drug caused the adverse reaction.” The new MedWatch Form 3500 (see Chapter 10) includes the statement: “Submission of a report does not constitute an admission that medical personnel or the product caused or contributed to the event.” No report is intended by the reporter or the FDA to take a definitive position as to causation with respect to the individual experience reflected in the
Neither does a tabulation of ADEs referring to a particular product prove positive causality. Medical experts who seek to argue or hypothesize from them in positive terms, no less than attorneys, are open to suspicion, to doubt, and to criticism. However, these materials are available for use by either party, and this may lead to testimony based on these materials.

Regardless of the fact that the FDA and pharmacoepidemiologists generally are dissatisfied with use of the present methods of reporting and recording ADEs to make judgments as to causation, many attorneys persist in introducing them for such purpose in product liability litigation. Thus, the poorest of all compilations, that resulting from the Spontaneous Reporting System of the FDA, often serves the plaintiff’s attorney, especially where the judiciary or the defense is equally unsophisticated, much of the means to fend off an initial motion for dismissal and even to make out a prima facie case. The availability of these reports is an exciting discovery to the neophyte plaintiff’s attorney who has a possible drug product liability lawsuit to consider. By studying the package insert or Physicians’ Desk Reference (PDR) monograph for the drug, he can determine whether his client’s claim of injury is described. If it is not clear that the claimed injury could possibly result from the use of the target product, a proper inquiry under the Freedom of Information Act can determine for him whether it has been reported. For the neophyte, each of these reports represents a real occurrence of a recorded reaction from the drug. If, as is highly unlikely, it is reported with greater frequency than it is described in the package insert, he has reason to be a little excited. He may be able to show that the labeler was on notice of the danger and did not incorporate it into his labeling in a timely manner. He may be able to show that it happened more frequently and with more serious results than was noted in the labeling. He may be able to show that the manufacturer reported ADEs inaccurately or with great delay, or even that the manufacturer never reported them.

Besides supplying himself with a listing of adverse reactions reported with use of the drug, a plaintiff’s attorney can buy a listing with accession numbers for each individual ADE report and followup report. Reports in the FDA’s computerized database of adverse reactions come from a variety of sources, but 80% or better are being forwarded by the regulatee, the product distributor (see Chapter 10). Since these separate reports do not identify the name of the reporting physician and institution, a plaintiff’s attorney may want to demand those precise reports from the defendant, in the hope of obtaining such identification. It also is impressive to the defendant to see such diligence. However, there are many problems. Some of these are problems generic to all present adverse reaction reporting. Some of these are problems involving attempts under the regulations to maintain the same confidentiality as does the FDA.

Once the underlying incident has been converted to an actual legal claim, both plaintiff and defendants will look to see whether an ADE has been filed concerning the event. Thereafter, the plaintiff will at some point seek to have an expert examination of the New Drug Application and subsequent file, which will reveal not only all the research and details of FDA approval, but the medical bibliography and ADE information as well. All available information will be examined to prepare the way to further evidentiary exploration, or to prepare for expert testimony on the eventual claim of tortious conduct or product defect.

Thus, a check into the defendant’s ADE materials and system may give the plaintiff much capital. When operating in a product liability clime of strict liability, the plaintiff need only convince a jury that the product was rendered defective before administration to the plaintiff. This defect can be inadequacy in product design, in testing and study, in formulation or choice of materials, in provision of instructions for safe and effective use, or in failure to note proper contraindications, warnings, or precautions as to its use. The registry of ADEs is a pathway to the claimed “failure to warn.” Given then the ability to show that the product was defective upon administration to the plaintiff, the only other element necessary to the strict liability case is to show a sum of money due to redress the injury caused to the plaintiff by that defect.

Mere association of an ADE with the use of a drug is of itself not a basis for a labeling change.
Similarly, medical events that coincidentally occur along with the use of the drug are not necessarily ADEs from that drug, to be included in the full disclosure labeling for the product. Why exhaust the reader of that labeling with incidental descriptions of unsubstantiated risks, diluting his interest? Meaningful pharmacoepidemiologic findings that support causality assessment in both the medical and legal community are quality observations of associations between the particular product and the particular injury, which are consistently observed by qualified but different observers in a variety of settings. Courts, and the judges whose discretionary power is so vast in the trial courts, must be more sophisticated in determining the credibility of scientific and medical evidence and opinions. They should not allow parties to present unique, non-peer-evaluated reports of studies, and the theories and statistics derived therefrom, to lay juries.

Neither the manufacturer nor the FDA wants every spontaneous report of an ADE, or every bibliographic reference to an ADE, to be incorporated into the package insert. Certainly the prescribing or administering practitioner does not either. Yet, as the manufacturer sensitive to product liability sees the alternatives, he approves the entry of many adverse events, however unvalidated, into his package insert sections for adverse reactions, solely to disarm a later plaintiff who will allege his client’s fate would have been different had that notice been available in the package insert before the incident. A court, finding allegation of a similar injury had been made before this one, and not finding warning of it in the package insert although it appears in the manufacturer’s adverse reaction files, tends to place much weight on the circumstances in favor of the plaintiff.

**IMPACT OF LITIGATION ON PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

Litigation can have a major impact on pharmacoepidemiology, in turn. Frequently involved as codefendants in litigation are others who brought the plaintiff into contact with the product, such as those who prescribed, administered, dispensed, or otherwise provided the product to the plaintiff. The majority of product liability cases involving prescription drugs also involve claims against treating physicians, hospitals, etc. Plaintiffs frequently seek to bring the various defendants into conflict with each other, to help make out the case. The perceived threat of being named in litigation, whether or not the threat is real, is a major deterrent to reporting adverse reactions to the FDA’s Spontaneous Reporting System. Also, because a practitioner or institution is aware of a potential for litigation at the time they compose the report of the incident, in many instances it is difficult for manufacturers to give as much credence to the resultant spontaneous reports, and often it is fruitless to attempt to follow them up.

Litigation can precipitate or result from in the filing of misleading adverse drug reaction reports. Formerly Form 1639s and currently, MedWatch form 3500s have identified a defendant drug company’s product as a culprit, even when it was not used. The reports called into a company by any source, may contain biased, untrue, and prejudicial information. Even attorneys (or their agents) can make complaints that can lead to ADE filing. Thus, courts may properly exclude these reports as prejudicial hearsay, since they may not even rise to the level of putting a company on notice of actual events. It has been the experience of these authors that reports dealing with myelographic media and, most recently, respiratory inhalants fell into this category of erroneous reports and even though the suits were dismissed by the plaintiffs, the reporting forms remain within the FDA files. The problem is compounded by generic drugs. Many times a generic version of a trade named product is dispensed, but the report is made to the trade name manufacturer. At times, this has resulted in lawsuits against the innovator company, even though a generic version was used. Finally, when the generic is identified, the case against the innovator manufacturer may be dismissed, but the ADE form remains. Thus, a skewing of adverse reports biased against a manufacturer’s products results. Add to these then a species of report generated from practitioners
threatened with litigation due to their acts and the epidemiologic role of pharmacovigilance is rendered uncertain at best. This becomes a report aimed to direct the potential plaintiff away from him or his institution, to the “deep pocket” of the manufacturer. Imagine what such a report, and any attempted followup, will then contribute to a pharmacepidemiologic study!

Lawyers for defendants are frequently appalled to see the misuse of ADE records and reports through the discovery process. We have personally known attorneys to use reports, however unrelated to their own plaintiff’s allegations of injury, as a means to identify physicians and hospital staff for their contact in their own lawsuit. The doctor who has made the report in assured confidence, as spelled out by the regulations, is amazed, embarrassed, and perhaps frightened by a plaintiff’s attorney who recites the doctor’s ADE experience from the “1639” he has “discovered.” This did not result from a breach of confidentiality at FDA, but from a lawyer’s diligent work using the manufacturer’s files during the pretrial discovery process. The call may only be to ask him if he would provide expert testimony for the plaintiff. Alternatively, it may be to enlist the doctor’s antipathy to the product if it exists. However, whatever the purpose, that doctor may think twice before he fills out another ADE!61

Finally, litigation can affect formal pharmacepidemiology studies, as well. As the earlier example and those to follow demonstrate, it can generate a major need for pharmacepidemiology studies. However, it also can create a climate where manufacturers are inappropriately fearful of the results of such studies, and are hesitant to fund them except when they are obligated to do so.

SELECTED EXAMPLES

THE SWINE FLU EXAMPLE
In order to encourage the manufacture and distribution of swine flu vaccine for a federal program of immunization, the government created an extraordinary limitation of future plaintiffs’ rights to sue.62 The effectuating law virtually removed any opportunity for a plaintiff to sue without showing negligence actionable under the Federal Tort Claims Act. Thus, merely showing a product defect, as would be sufficient to support actions in strict liability, would not be enough.

Immediately following the program and also considerably thereafter, claims arose for patient injury in the form of Guillain-Barré syndrome, an acute and serious polyneuritis. Plaintiffs attempted to establish their right to sue the government on the basis of epidemiologic studies of persons receiving the vaccine who later were diagnosed as suffering from the Guillain-Barré syndrome. Like some other syndromes, rather than representing an objectively definable disease entity, an inordinate amount of subjectivity is needed in the diagnosis of this disease. Therefore, a plethora of contradictory epidemiologic analysis was sought to be submitted as evidence by a body of experts, many of whom had little or no formal epidemiologic training.

To defend, and fairly, the government asked the Centers for Disease Control (CDCs) to conduct an epidemiologic analysis of the many records and reports available. Perhaps the most important result of this analysis was the determination that too many variables took over, in time, to consider this analysis as evidence for causation. In light of the circumstances, the CDC proposed, and the federal agency and courts accepted, the premise that only such claims of Guillain-Barré syndrome as arose within 10 weeks or less of the date of injection were credible for litigation.63 All others were deemed improper claims and only rarely were permitted to litigate to a successful result.64

DALKON SHIELD AND THE IUD CALAMITY

In the Dalkon Shield debacle for A.H. Robins Co. Inc., epidemiological testimony was used early on to indicate the level of awareness that might be expected from the product supplier. Thus, although the product was withdrawn from the market in 1974, thousands of suits were filed, posited on Robins’ failure to warn and to acknowledge a purported flawed design, given the multitude of reports that accrued associating it with injuries to users.65
DES, GOES ON AND ON

The diethylstilbestrol (DES) litigation is another of the important series of cases, involving billions of dollars, that was created by pharmacoepidemiologic analyses, using both retrospective and prospective studies. To lawyers, it resulted in an important breakthrough in addressing unidentifiable defendants, sparsely identifiable patients, and carcinogenic results, overcoming statutory limitations as to the time for filing suits, and proving defects in products cleared by the FDA. New theories, as well as expanded old theories, were prepared and accepted by the courts, overwhelmed with the generic nature of DES.

Since all DES was satisfactorily implicated by plaintiff’s attorneys, no matter the identity of the actual manufacturer of the pill the mother had ingested, the problem was simplified for the pharmacoepidemiologist. It seems to these authors and others that the effect of the newer amendments to the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to promote the supply of generic products which are deemed bioequivalent will be to create “DES” opportunities for plaintiffs claiming injury from other generic groupings of potent drugs. Thus, the important aspects of all reporting and recording systems for ADEs and postmarketing surveillance will represent an opportunity for the pharmacoepidemiologist to increase the denominators in his or her analysis. It also indicates that cooperation among complainants and, separately, cooperation among defendants, must increase.

The DES litigation also began creating a perhaps inordinate focus by the legal profession on reproductive toxicity. It carries with it a mystical mixture of anger and fear, compounded by frustration about incomplete knowledge about what to fear and what to be angry about. Conveyed, however, to the media, and ultimately to a jury, it is the stuff of which substantial judgments for classes of patients can be fashioned. Toss into the hopper ingredients such as the incalculable insults that chemicals can carry for the individual and the generic complexity of the factors that make up the male and female reproductive system. Add the experience—part documented, part intuitive—that such insults might be generationally disclosed, or even encoded on genes for later disclosure. Stir in hypotheses from the various medical disciplines, and it forms a strong and interesting incentive for attorneys, as well as scientists, physicians, and public health administrators. We see all of these in play, as well as the combined efforts of federal and state agencies to seek exploration, modification, and regulation in these areas.

What epidemiologic evidence will support the new “third generation” DES cases? “In the DES field,” said a leading plaintiff’s attorney, “there is a strong possibility that the drug is now reaching its third level of liability ... progeny of injured progeny ... it may be added that there is strong indications that ... patients to whom DES was administered, are sometimes heart victims.”

Since in many states cases were permitted to be filed beyond the normal date of expiration by special “toxic tort” legislation, the year revival statutes such as the one signed by Governor Cuomo in New York, attorneys are anxiously bringing suit within the new extended period. While most are relying upon the wealth of materials prepared by plaintiff’s attorneys in years past, by dint of a legal doctrine called collateral estoppel, both defense of such cases and even extension to the fourth generation lawsuit seems like a clarion call for pharmacoepidemiologic expertise. Collateral estoppel is a principle by which a plaintiff can profit from precedential judgments on causation and other important factors, providing these have been definitively established in earlier decisions. A plaintiff is not expected to prove again that which has been proven in a prior case. For example, in New York DES plaintiffs use Bichler v. Eli Lilly and Co. to foreclose attempts by defendants to claim that the plaintiffs failed to provide adequate proof of drug defect or manufacturer fault. Much judicial discretion exists in this regard.

Also, as one contemplates third and even fourth generation cases, consider all the settlements and releases that have been consummated in the prior cases involving the same defendant, probably the same plaintiff’s attorney, and representing the same family, even if not the same plaintiff. Releases may or may not, depending on their
exact language, cover claims for injuries discovered after their execution. Yet, as the Indiana Appellate Court has stated it well: "Releasees do not make settlement and take releases merely to pay the releaser the first installment ... leaving the matter open for the releaser to come back for more ... On the contrary, a settlement is made and a general release taken for the purpose of foreclosing further claims."70

THE BENDECTIN® CONTROVERSY

The controversial use of pharmacoepidemiologic evidence was recently perhaps best reflected in the series of lawsuits that were based on teratogenic manifestations in infants born to mothers who had ingested Bendectin® to allay morning sickness while pregnant. Although the manufacturer and many pharmacoepidemiologists believed the drug not responsible, the manufacturer voluntarily withdrew it from the marketplace, a drug that from profit had turned to a potential bankruptcy force.

Teratogenicity is an inflammatory charge and one that may subtly and forcefully affect jury judgment. Reports of birth defects picked up in the FDA’s Spontaneous Reporting System are used by plaintiff’s counsel to keep the case viable so it reaches a jury. Because of the frightening nature of teratogenicity, the plaintiff’s success with the jury can then be anticipated. The most that the defendant can aim for sometimes is reversal of a sympathetic jury verdict. A good example was in Richardson v. Richardson-Merrell, Inc., where the jury found appropriate a judgment of 1.16 million dollars.14 When the defendant moved for a judgment n.o.v. (i.e., for the judge to cast aside the jury verdict and rule in his favor) or the granting of a new trial, the federal district judge held that no reasonable jury could find on the basis of the scientific evidence that Bendectin® “more likely than not” caused the infant plaintiff’s birth defects or that Bendectin® was teratogenic (see also previous discussion).

Thalidomide, the catastrophic teratogen that helped to enact the New Drug Amendments of 1962, had been sought to be marketed in the US by then William S. Merrell Labs, whose successor corporation was defending the Bendectin® action. Merrell was defendant in a number of thalidomide suits involving deformed offspring. As might be expected, plaintiff used all but the name thalidomide in the Bendectin® case to invoke the past specter of liability for teratogenicity that hovered over the manufacturer. In fact, as this case was presented, “the parties and witnesses in recounting those implications, were required to employ the euphemism MRL-41 for Thalidomide” in an attempt by the court to prevent plaintiffs from invidiously equating the two. However, “MRL” itself was easily recognizable to the jury as Merrell.

Failing to prove an actual product effect that can be termed causative by probability assessment, plaintiffs will seek to elicit a “second best” theory of idiosyncrasy. In the Richardson case, the court refused the suggestion, also offered by the plaintiff to the jury, that even if the vast majority of infants exposed to Bendectin® were normal, that Bendectin® could be viewed as a “selective” teratogen and that Etheleen (the mother) or Carita (the infant) had a peculiar susceptibility to it (idiosyncrasy), or the composition of the Bendectin® distributed in her geographic area must have differed from that distributed elsewhere.

Although plaintiffs in the Bendectin® cases have relied upon animal toxicology, in vitro tests, and interpretations of Merrell’s animal experiments during the period of investigation, their main argument was that the molecular structure of the anti-histamine in Bendectin® was similar in some respects to that of anti-histamines known to be teratogenic in animals. For example, plaintiff’s witness described the effects of Bendectin® components in solution in in vitro experiments on frog nerve fibers and mesenchyme cells of mouse limb buds, postulating that other effects might occur in the human intrauterine environment, when Bendectin® was infused via the mother, which could inhibit the development of fetal organs. The defendants rebutted by “discipline to discipline” retorts” ... supplemented by extensive clinical experience and testimony.” Experts for the defendant asserted that “structural chemical resemblance does not import similar chemical activity; and that in vitro studies of animal tissues have never been scientifically validated as predictors of
physiological effects upon human beings ...” In his comments concerning the plaintiff’s chief principal witness on causation, Judge Jackson indicated the uncertainty of the court in accepting “possibilities” in place of “probabilities.” That expert had no hesitancy in declaring that

Based upon his knowledge of Bendectin®, chemical structure, the in vitro studies, the animal teratology studies conducted by Merrell (and others), and the “human data” he had reviewed, i.e., epidemiological studies which he found defective, inconclusive, or both, Dr. Done stated that, in his opinion, to a “reasonable degree of medical certainty,” Bendectin® was not only capable of causing birth defects in humans, but that it had, in fact, caused those limb defects with which Carlia Richardson had been born.

Commenting directly, the court noted

Had the epidemiological studies reported a statistically significant association between Bendectin® and limb reduction defects, Dr Done would have found the causation connection to have been established to a “scientific certainty” as well. As it was, they were unnecessary to his opinion for “medical certainty” purposes. The “drug experience reports” were likewise unnecessary to his opinion, although he would have relied upon them if permitted to do so.

It is interesting to note that, at trial, the same judge took a strong position as to admission and/or reliance upon Drug Experience Reports that plaintiffs had relied upon, among other items, to fight early dismissal. Whether in frustration or irascibility, the judge did not hesitate to imply criticism of plaintiff’s medical expert. And so, in this court, albeit not in all courts,

Plaintiffs were not permitted to introduce into evidence, nor were their experts allowed to rely upon, so-called “drug experience reports” or “adverse reaction reports,” i.e., anecdotal case reports of birth defects observed in the offspring of mothers whose histories included Bendectin® usage. The Court made a disputed preliminary finding that such reports are neither exceptions to the hearsay rule nor data reasonably relied upon by experts in the field of making determinations of causality.

At any rate, the court noted that, although the plaintiff’s expert(s) might disagree (citing their various disagreements), the FDA, having convened its advisory committee, evaluated all the evidence, including its own files of adverse drug reaction reports. The panel was composed of “five obstetricians, a biostatistician, a neonatologist, and a “consumer representative”, and was assisted by consultant epidemiologists from the National Institutes of Health and the National Cancer Institute.” It was asked by the FDA to answer three questions:

whether there is, in fact, an increased incidence of birth defects among Bendectin®-exposed infants;
whether further animal and epidemiological studies were needed; and whether Bendectin® should be withdrawn from the market. The answers according to the testimony of Dr David F. Archer, the chairman of the panel, were all in the negative.

The position taken by the judge in his opinion71 is almost a direct analogy to the Cardozoan opinion as to proximate cause more than half century prior, and puts epidemiological analysis on a somewhat different plane than regular evidence, when causation is at issue.

It is necessary to revive debate upon the wisdom of that rule of law which, for purposes of awarding damages in personal injury cases, allows unschooled triers-of-fact, whether judges or juries, to resolve those complex and refractory causal issues ... at the frontier of current medical and epidemiological inquiry.

As the judge opined as to Bendectin®, the impassioned advancement of pharmacoepidemiologic analyses of case reports as some form of evidence of causation is perhaps based on the “post hoc ergo propter hoc” logic, which perverts the use of res ipsa loquitur. It argues that the organism is injured and the organism experienced the suspect substance; therefore the suspect substance must have caused the injury. In general, this is the same argument brought to bear in “Agent Orange” product liability litigation.72 There again, a federal judge (J. Weinstein) decried reliance on pharmacoepidemiologic conjecture to suit a plaintiff’s theory of causation.
Thus, the Bendectin® line of cases demonstrate the two types of plaintiff’s attempt to offer proof of causation when a pharmaceutical ingredient is alleged to be the cause of injury, whether that allegation concerns teratogenicity, mutagenicity, or toxicity generally. One, as we have seen in Oxendine and in Richardson above, is based on laboratory studies, whether in animals or isolated animal tissues, whether in vivo or in vitro. When pharmacopelidemiologic presentations were somewhat inhibited in Richardson, the plaintiff’s expert placed considerable reliance on the animal studies and chemical relationships. In “Agent Orange,” the attempt provoked the opposite response. There Chief Judge Weinstein had noted that studies dealing with animal exposure to Agent Orange were conceded by even the plaintiff’s expert to be unpersuasive. As for other factors that are expected by a party to be probative on the issue of causation, the results of animal testing must first pass a threshold test of reliability and acceptability by recognized authorities in the area of inquiry. In “Agent Orange” they did not.

SPERMICIDES AND BIRTH DEFECTS
In contrast, the case Wells v. Ortho Pharmaceutical Corp. was the opposite situation to that which occurred in Bendectin®, where the judge overturned the verdict due to the state of medical science. In Wells, the manufacturer’s product was implicated as a cause of a limb reduction defect on the basis of a single flawed study, subsequently proven, cloaked epidemiologically through a rather singular medical opinion. The case had been heard before a Georgia federal judge, who was not swayed by the defendant’s arguments of “junk science.” He formally ruled that the law need not be bound by medical science. It was impossible for the defendants to appeal, since the US Supreme Court did not accept the case for review.73

THE WOODERSON CASE
Finally, the “Wooderson” case became a cause in which the entire major pharmaceutical industry recognized a stake, and ultimately tendered an amicus brief to the US Supreme Court, but to little avail. Pharmacopelidemiologists can draw some lessons from this case. No matter how well trained and reputed one may be, a jury can choose to believe one’s believed inferiors. Early on, British pharmacopelidemiology data pointed to a need to add a warning about hemolytic uremic syndrome to a certain dose level of hormonal contraceptive pills. FDA and American sources thought the analyses were unreliable and the FDA discouraged the pharmaceutical companies who were marketing such oral contraceptives from incorporating the additional warning. By the time the studies were duplicated in the US, and the package insert changed to incorporate the warning the British had earlier adopted, the plaintiff had developed the exact injury.

Lawyers drew from this case, with its multimillion dollar compensatory and punitive damage awards, the conclusion that, when epidemiologic evidence points to a danger, it may be better to adopt a warning before its more sophisticated validation.74 Somewhat similarly, when reports of tetracycline staining infant’s teeth were noted, the FDA’s approach to epidemiologic analysis left them unconvinced that this was a genuine concern for warning. The tetracycline manufacturers may have enjoyed the FDA sponsored period of “nonwarning” at the time, but it was no favor. Ultimately, many lawsuits were filed and the issue became one of “state of the art” in labeling the product.79

PHISOHEX®
Recently completed, the Stahl litigation involved the claim that the use of pHisoHex® (containing 3% hexachlorophene) as a bacteriostatic skin cleanser to help control impetigo in the diaper area of a two week old, full term infant, resulted in permanent seizure disorder and mental retardation.75 The use of pharmacopelidemiologic evidence was very pertinent in the defense of the case. Controversy arose regarding an incident in France, commonly referred to as Tale Morhange. Using epidemiologic followup, the defense demonstrated the lack of evidence of permanent seizure disorders and mental retardation in the population that survived that incident. Further, numerous
studies conducted around the world provided evidence against the plaintiff’s proposition. (It should be noted that the plaintiff had the burden to prove cause and effect, yet the defendant had to try to prove a negative in order to win.) The defendants put on their own experts, who were able to demonstrate that, despite the widespread use of pHisoHex\textsuperscript{®} on infants in millions of American children over the period of 1964 through 1972, there was no observable increase in the incidence of seizure disorders. Thus, the lack of such a finding was demonstrative of the lack of credible evidence in support of plaintiff’s contention. After a 3-month trial, a defense verdict was rendered by the jury in less than two hours.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Thus, the legal profession must join with professional colleagues in medicine and contributing sciences to assure that, in the best interests of the public, the reporting and recording procedures created to assure the safety and efficacy of therapeutic and diagnostic modalities are maintained and improved. They must also seek to discourage misuse or distortion of the information gleaned from these procedures, just as they must encourage the development and inclusion of “state of the art” warnings and instructions that accompany these products to the public.

As advice for educators, we have previously recommended recognition that the needs of the pharmacoepidemiologists’ three major constituencies—public health agencies, academia, and industry—probably cannot be met by a unitary teaching and training experience. As pointed out in the address of one of the authors to the Third International Conference on Pharmacoepidemiology in 1987, we would suggest that each university program in pharmacoepidemiology arrange for a course at the university or another affiliated law school. This course should explore the legal burden born by governmental agencies in implementing their statutory mandate. It should also provide a brief excursion into medicolegal and pharmacolegal principles associated with litigation involving both health professionals and suppliers of health care products. We would also suggest that, within the university curriculum in pharmacoepidemiology, an “internship” be offered, that would place candidates for certification as epidemiologists in an industrial habitat of their choice. In response, numerous eligible companies would register with the university, indicating their needs, their resources, and their capacity for affording the “intern” with the additional training to which he/she aspires.

Finally, as advice for manufacturers, the incorporation of “pharmacoepidemiology interns,” plus ongoing state of the art formal pharmacoepidemiology studies, would be in keeping with the invaluable pharmacoepidemiology prophylaxis that we envision to be part of appropriate planning by pharmaceutical manufacturers for the defense of subsequent litigation. As adopted by many now, it consists of either “in-house” or independent epidemiologists, functioning as outside consultants, conducting periodic or ongoing reviews of pharmacoepidemiologic data concerning the product line. This, plus any ongoing formal pharmacoepidemiology studies, can then be presented at trial as indicative of company diligence and intentions, as well as providing rationale for the currency of the labeling of the product in use at the time of the incident that generated the complaint.
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Spontaneous Reporting in the United States
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INTRODUCTION

The United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has the regulatory responsibility for ensuring the safety of all marketed pharmaceuticals (i.e., drugs and biologics). While the US has one of the most rigorous pre-approval processes in the world, clinical trials cannot uncover every safety problem, and they are not expected to do so. Premarketing clinical trials are effective tools primarily designed for assessing efficacy and risk–benefit ratio. However, due to the limited size and controlled nature of these studies, only the most common adverse events will be observed and subsequently listed in the product’s official labeling at the time of approval. The need for postmarketing surveillance is a direct result of these limitations. A degree of uncertainty always exists about both the benefits and risks from pharmaceuticals. The tradeoff for accepting these uncertainties is continued vigilance by the FDA and industry to collect and assess data during the postmarketing life of a product.

The FDA monitors the quality of marketed pharmaceuticals through product testing and surveillance. In addition, the agency develops policies, guidances, and standards for product labeling, current good manufacturing practices, clinical and good laboratory practices and industry practices to demonstrate the safety and effectiveness of pharmaceuticals.

As shown in Figure 10.1, risks from medical products generally fall into four categories. Most injuries and deaths associated with the use of medical products result from their known side-effects. Some side-effects are unavoidable even when the product is used appropriately (e.g., nausea with chemotherapy), but others can be prevented or minimized by careful product choice and use. It is estimated that more than half the side-effects of pharmaceuticals are avoidable. Other sources of preventable adverse events are medication errors, which may occur when the product is administered incorrectly or the wrong drug or dose is administered. Injury from product defects is unusual in the United States, because of the great attention paid to product quality control and quality assurance during manufacturing. The final category of potential risk involves the remaining uncertainties about a product. These include unexpected adverse events (AEs), long term effects, and unstudied uses and/or unstudied populations.

The FDA collects and maintains reports of AEs as an important component of its postmarketing surveillance program. These are sent to the FDA voluntarily from a variety of sources and as part of
a regulatory reporting requirement of pharmaceutical manufacturers. The term spontaneous reporting itself is somewhat misleading. Spontaneous reporting is spontaneous only in the sense that health professionals, consumers, or other individuals who initially decide to contact a manufacturer about a suspected adverse event or report an AE directly to the FDA do so at their own discretion. Thus, spontaneous generally refers to AEs spontaneously observed during the usual practice of medicine. However, the FDA’s Adverse Event Reporting System (AERS) also contains AE reports that are a result of observations made during more formal clinical studies, referred to as “study reports,” and reports from the medical and scientific literature.

Spontaneous AE reporting focuses on unexpected AEs, and may supply some information regarding unstudied uses and/or unstudied populations, but its effectiveness in detecting long term effects is less certain. The principal use of this type of passive reporting is to detect serious, unknown, rare events. Different methodologies for collecting AEs are being explored regarding the other remaining uncertainties.

This chapter reviews the history of AE reporting in the United States, its terminology, and its regulatory aspects. The strengths, limitations, and applications of the FDA’s Adverse Event Reporting System are discussed, as are future plans.

DESCRIPTION

HISTORY OF US PHARMACEUTICAL SAFETY REGULATION

The development of the US national postmarketing system, unfortunately, has been based on a series of medical disasters. The first US drug law came into existence during the 1848 Mexican War, after drugs imported for the US Army were found to have been adulterated. This law, although poorly enforced, outlawed the importation of such adulterated drugs.

The Progressive Era legislation that addressed drug safety was the Federal Food and Drugs Act of 1906, which defined and forbade the misbranding or adulteration of foods and drugs. However, the safety of drugs after consumption was not addressed until the 1930s, when there was a drive to enact legislation to update the 1906 food and drugs statute. It took a convincing disaster, however, to prompt the US Congress to include drug safety provisions in the new law.

During October and November of 1937, 107 people in the US died after exposure to Elixir Sulfanilamide. Neither the safety nor efficacy of the sulfanilamide was to blame. It was the solvent used in the preparation of the so-called elixir, diethylene glycol, which was the poison. Even though the toxic effects of diethylene glycol were
well documented by 1931, with no drug safety regulations in place, the only charge that could be brought under the 1906 Act was misbranding the product, because there was no alcohol in the “elixir” as implied by the name.

In the aftermath of this disaster, new drug safety regulations were placed in the bill and the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 was passed by the US Congress. The legislation required the submission of a New Drug Application (NDA), in which proof of drug safety was required for approval. Drugs on the market before 1938 were “grandfathered” with respect to drug safety testing, i.e., they were not required to submit, and thus do not have, an approved NDA.

In the early 1950s, reports of aplastic anemia associated with chloramphenicol use demonstrated the necessity for monitoring adverse events following the approval and marketing of new drugs. Chloromycetin® had passed drug safety testing for approval in 1949; however, the small number of patients exposed to chloramphenicol before approval was not adequate to observe this rare adverse event.7

In response to the need for a system to detect rare adverse events that do not appear until after drug approval, the American Medical Association (AMA) established a Committee on Blood Dyscrasias, which began collecting case reports of drug induced blood related illness in 1952. This group was later expanded to monitor all AEs.

During the 1950s, there was a rapid expansion of the pharmaceutical industry and an increase in the number of new products. Concerns began to be raised over drug efficacy claims. Once again, a disaster had to occur before legislation was passed. The well known tragedy of 10,000 birth defects (worldwide) as a result of in utero exposure to thalidomide® led the US Congress to address the need for more comprehensive drug regulation. The 1962 Kefauver–Harris Amendments to the Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act of 1938 required proof of efficacy before drug approval and marketing. For the first time, they also required pharmaceutical manufacturers to report AEs to the FDA for any of their products having an NDA, which constituted the vast majority of prescription products introduced since 1938.

The FDA began computer based storage of its AE reports in the mid-1960s, with data now retrievable only from late 1969 because of incompatibilities with early data files. The first computerized data storage system was called the Spontaneous Reporting System (SRS). The SRS was replaced in November 1997 with the new Adverse Event Reporting System (AERS), an internationally compatible system designed as a pharmacovigilance tool.

REGULATORY REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

In the US, AE reporting by individual healthcare providers or consumers is voluntary. However, manufacturers, packers, and distributors of FDA approved pharmaceuticals (drugs and biological products) all have mandatory reporting requirements governed by regulation. Historically, only nonbiologic pharmaceutical products with approved NDAs (i.e., all prescription and some over-the-counter drugs) were subject to mandatory reporting requirements. In 1994, this requirement was expanded to include biologic products.9

It should be emphasized that these regulations are aimed at pharmaceutical manufacturers, but also provide a useful framework for reporting by practitioners to either the FDA and/or the manufacturer. In the US, most health professionals and consumers report AEs to the manufacturer rather than directly to the FDA. This pattern is not seen in many other countries.

Current Requirements

The main objective of the FDA postmarketing reporting requirement is to provide signals about potentially serious, previously unknown safety problems with marketed drugs, especially with newly marketed drugs. To understand the regulatory requirements, one first needs to define several terms. These definitions are revisions that became effective in April 1998.10

An adverse experience (AE) is any adverse event associated with the use of a drug or biological product in humans, whether not considered product related, including the following: an AE occurring in the course of the use of the product in
professional practice; an AE occurring from overdose of the product whether accidental or intentional; an AE occurring from abuse of the product; an AE occurring from withdrawal of the product; and any failure of expected pharmacological action.

An unexpected adverse experience means any AE that is not listed in the current labeling for the product. This includes events that may be symptomatically and pathophysiologically related to an event listed in the labeling, but differ from the event because of greater severity or specificity.

A serious adverse experience is any AE occurring at any dose that results in any of the following outcomes: death, a life-threatening AE, inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, a persistent or significant disability/incapacity, or congenital anomaly/birth defect. Important medical events that may not result in death, be life-threatening, or require hospitalization may be considered a serious AE when, based upon appropriate medical judgement, they may jeopardize the patient or subject and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed in this definition. Examples of such medical events include allergic bronchospasm requiring intensive treatment in an emergency room or at home, blood dyscrasias or convulsions that do not result in inpatient hospitalization, or the development of drug dependency or drug abuse.

Table 10.1 outlines US mandatory reporting regarding pharmaceuticals. By regulation, these companies are required to report all adverse events of which they are aware to the FDA and to provide as complete information as possible. Although pharmaceutical reporting is mandated, it still relies heavily on information provided by health professionals through both voluntary reporting and the scientific literature.

In the case of over-the-counter (OTC) drugs, reports are only required on OTC products marketed under an approved NDA, including those prescription drugs that undergo a switch to OTC status. Reports are not currently required for other OTC drugs (i.e., older drug ingredients which are marketed without an NDA), although voluntary reporting is encouraged for serious events.

Both prescription and OTC drugs require FDA safety and efficacy review prior to marketing, unlike dietary supplements (which include vitamins, minerals, amino acids, botanicals, and other substances used to increase total dietary intake). By law, the manufacturers of these latter products do not have to prove safety or efficacy, but that same law puts the onus on the FDA to prove that a particular product is unsafe. In addition, manufacturers of these products do not have to report AEs to the FDA. As a result, direct-to-FDA voluntary health professional reporting of serious adverse events possibly associated with dietary supplements is particularly important.

Table 10.1. Mandatory AE reporting requirements for pharmaceuticals

15 day “Alert Reports”: All serious and unexpected AEs, whether foreign or domestic, must be reported to the FDA within 15 calendar days.

15 day “Alert Report” follow-up. The manufacturer must promptly investigate all AEs that are the subject of a 15 day Alert Report and submit a follow-up report within 15 calendar days.

Periodic AE reports. All non-15 day, domestic, AE reports must be reported periodically (quarterly for the first three years after approval, then annually). Periodic reports for products marketed prior to 1938 are not required. Periodic reporting does not apply to AE information obtained from postmarketing studies or from reports in the scientific literature.

Scientific literature. A 15 day Alert Report based on information from the scientific literature (case reports or results from a formal clinical trial). A copy of the published article must accompany the report, and must be translated into English if foreign.

Postmarketing studies. No requirement for a 15 day Alert Report on an AE acquired from a postmarketing study unless manufacturer concludes a reasonable possibility that the product caused the event.
The specific regulations governing postmarketing AE reporting by pharmaceutical companies are listed in Table 10.2. Accompanying separate guidances for drugs and biologics were made available in 1992\textsuperscript{12} and 1993\textsuperscript{13} respectively. As can be seen, the regulations have each been amended numerous times.

**Recent Changes**

In recent years, there has been a significant international effort to standardize the pharmaceutical regulatory environment worldwide through the auspices of the International Conference on Harmonization of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH). These efforts toward international harmonization have a direct impact on how FDA is currently rewriting regulations on adverse event reporting. The Adverse Event Reporting System (AERS), launched November 1997 and evolving, is an internationally compatible system in full accord with the ICH initiatives.

The initiatives that directly affect postmarketing surveillance are the following.

- **M1 IMT (International Medical Terminology).** AERS uses MEDDRA (Medical Dictionary for Drug Regulatory Affairs) as its primary tool to classify and search for medically significant adverse events.

- **M2 ESTRI (Electronic Standards for the Transfer of Regulatory Information).** AERS will require the use of ESTRI standards for submission of adverse reaction reports in electronic form.

- **E2A (Clinical Safety Data Management).** AERS implements the harmonized postmarketing surveillance definitions contained in E2A.\textsuperscript{14}

- **E2B (Data Elements For Transmission of Individual Case Safety Reports).** AERS has implemented the E2B data format into its database, and will require manufacturers to use the E2B standard for electronic submissions.

- **E2C PSUR (Periodic Safety Update Report).** Defines a standard format for periodic reports that manufacturers can submit to all ICH member regulatory authorities. Initially, PSURs will be submitted on paper, and will not be processed within AERS.

In line with international activities, the FDA has undertaken a major effort to clarify and revise its regulations regarding postmarketing safety reporting requirements for pharmaceutical products.

The agency published a proposed rule in the Federal Register of 27 October, 1994 (59 FR 54046) to amend these requirements, to implement international standards, and to facilitate the reporting of AEs. In the Federal Register of 7 October, 1997 (62 FR 52237), the FDA published

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 10.2. Federal regulations regarding postmarketing AE reporting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{21 CFR 310.305 Prescription drugs not subject to premarket approval}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{21 CFR 314.80 Human drugs with approved new drug applications (NDAs)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[22 Feb, 1985 (50 FR 7493) and 11 Apr, 1985 (50 FR 14212), amended 23 May, 1985 (50 FR 21238); 3 July, 1986 (51 FR 24481); 13 Oct, 1987 (52 FR 37936); 29 March, 1990 (55 FR 11580); 28 April, 1992 (57 FR 17983); 25 June, 1997 (62 FR 34166, 34168); 7 Oct, 1997 (62 FR 52251); 26 Mar, 1998 (63 FR 14611)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{21 CFR 314.98 Human drugs with approved abbreviated new drug applications (ANDAs)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[28 Apr, 1992 (57 FR 17983), amended 8 Sept, 1993 (58 FR 47352)]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textbf{21 CFR 600.80 Biological products with approved product license applications (PLAs)}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
a final rule amending its regulations for expedited safety reporting. This final rule implements the ICH E2A initiative on clinical safety data management. Based on E2A, the final rule provides an internationally accepted definition of “serious,” requires the submission of the MedWatch 3500A for paper submissions, requires expedited reports in a 15 calendar rather than “working” day timeframe, and harmonizes reporting pre- and postmarketing and internationally/domestically. To help the pharmaceutical manufacturers understand the new requirements, on 27 August, 1998 the FDA published an interim guidance for industry—“Postmarketing adverse experience reporting for human drugs and licensed biological products: clarification of what to report.”

In the Federal Register of 5 November, 1998 (63 FR 59746), the agency published an advanced notice of proposed rule making to notify manufacturers that it is considering preparing a proposed rule that would require them to submit individual case reports electronically using standardized medical terminology, standardized data elements, and electronic transmission standards as recommended by ICH in the M1, M2, and E2B initiatives. Many pharmaceutical companies are currently participating in an AERS electronic submission pilot project to jointly identify and resolve any technical or process issues related to the transfer of data via this means.

In addition, following a presidential directive to eliminate or modify regulations that are outdated or in need of reform, the FDA published a final rule in the Federal Register of 25 June, 1997 (62 FR 34166) that revokes the postmarketing safety reporting requirement to submit 15 day increased frequency reports for serious and expected AEs. This action was based on FDA’s determination that expedited increased frequency reports have not contributed to the timely identification of safety problems requiring regulatory action and are no longer necessary for FDA surveillance of postmarketing adverse experiences.

**Proposed Modifications**

At the current time, the FDA is working on further modifications to the postmarketing safety reporting requirements. An Adverse Drug Reaction Reporting Proposed Rule will be published that focuses on report quality, standardizes terminology to “Adverse Drug Reaction,” encourages active query, followup, and determination of seriousness, defines the minimum data set for safety reports, provides specific followup timeframes, and encourages a clinically intelligent process. The proposed rule will also implement the ICH E2C: International PSUR, which contains marketing status, core labeling, changes in safety status since last report, exposure data, clinical explanation of cases, data line listings and tables, status of postmarketing surveillance safety studies, overall critical analyses, and assessments. With regard to the 27 October, 1994 proposed amendments to the postmarketing periodic AE reporting requirements, these amendments will be reproposed in this proposed rule based on a guidance on this topic developed by ICH (“Guideline on clinical safety data management: periodic safety update reports for marketed drugs”; 19 May, 1997 (62 FR 27470)).

As noted previously, OTC products without an NDA are not subject to reporting. To bring these products into the postmarketing safety net, the FDA plans to publish an OTC ADR Reporting Proposed Rule. This rule will propose the requirement for ADR reporting for OTC monograph products and amend certain ADR reporting requirements for OTC drugs with approved NDAs.

Along with the changing regulations, the Agency will publish an overall “Guidance for industry: adverse experience reporting for human drug and licensed biological products including vaccines” that will supersede the March 1992 “Guideline for postmarketing reporting for adverse drug experiences,” the October 1993 “Guideline for adverse experience reporting for licensed biological products,” and the August 1997 “Postmarketing adverse experience reporting for human drug and licensed biological products: clarification of what to report.”

**DATA COLLECTION: THE MEDWATCH PROGRAM**

An effective national postmarketing surveillance system is dependent on voluntary reporting of
adverse events and product problems by health professionals and consumers to the FDA, either directly or via the manufacturer. Neither individual health professionals nor hospitals are required by federal law or regulation to submit AE reports on pharmaceuticals, although federal law does require hospitals and other “user facilities” to report deaths and serious injuries that occur with medical devices.

Some organizations do, however, help facilitate reporting of AEs to the FDA. Adverse event monitoring by hospitals is linked to Joint Commission on the Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO) standards. In order to be accredited, JCAHO requires each hospital to monitor for adverse events involving pharmaceuticals and devices, with medication monitoring to be a continual collaborative function. JCAHO standards indicate that medical product AE reporting should be done per applicable law/regulation, including those of state/federal bodies. The American Society of Health-System Pharmacists has also issued guidelines on ADR monitoring and reporting.

Given the vital importance of postmarketing surveillance, MedWatch, the FDA Medical Products Reporting Program, was established in 1993. While FDA’s long-standing postmarketing surveillance program predated MedWatch, this educational/promotional initiative was designed to emphasize the responsibility of healthcare providers to identify and report adverse events and problems related to the use of medical products.

The program has four general goals, with the first to increase awareness of drug, device, and other medical product induced disease and the importance of reporting. Health professionals are taught that no drug or other medical product is without risk and are encouraged to consider medical products as possible causes when assessing a clinical problem in a patient. This goal is accomplished through educational outreach, which includes professional presentations, publications, and an active continuing education program that provides free continuing education credit. The continuing education articles are accessible via the MedWatch homepage (http://www.fda.gov/medwatch).

The second goal of MedWatch is to clarify what should (and should not) be reported. Health professionals are asked to limit reporting to serious AEs. This is important both in improving the quality of individual reports and enabling the FDA and the manufacturer to focus on the most potentially significant events. Causality is not a prerequisite for reporting; suspicion that a medical product may be related to a serious event is sufficient reason for a health professional to notify the FDA and/or the manufacturer.

For those manufacturers participating in the FDA’s “MedWatch to Manufacturer” (MMP) program, copies of serious reports submitted directly to the FDA are sent expeditiously to the manufacturer. More information on the MMP program can be found at http://www.fda.gov/medwatch/report/mmp.htm.

The third goal is to make it as easy as possible for a health professional to report directly to the agency. Only one form is necessary for reporting adverse events and product problems with any human use medical product regulated by the agency—drugs, biologics, medical devices, special nutritionals (e.g., dietary supplements, medical foods, infant formulas), and cosmetics. There are two versions of the form (Figures 10.2 and 10.3). The postage-paid FDA Form 3500 is used for voluntary reporting, while the FDA Form 3500A is used for mandatory reporting, as described earlier. These forms are available from the FDA via a toll-free number (1-800-FDA-1088) or can be printed off the MedWatch homepage or downloaded as a software package.

In addition to mailing in a voluntary form, reporters also have the options of reporting via an interactive form on the MedWatch website, faxing their reports (1-800-FDA-0178), or calling 1-800-FDA-1088 to give a report verbally to a MedWatch health professional.

Vaccines are the only FDA-regulated human use medical products that are not reported on the MedWatch reporting form. Reports concerning vaccines are sent to the vaccine adverse event reporting system (VAERS) on the VAERS-1 form, available by calling 1-800-822-7967 or from the VAERS website at www.fda.gov/cber/vaers/vaers.htm. VAERS is a joint FDA/Center for
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**MEDWATCH**

**THE FDA MEDICAL PRODUCTS REPORTING PROGRAM**

For VOLUNTARY reporting by health professionals of adverse events and product problems

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Patient information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Patient identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age at time of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Weight</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Adverse event or product problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adverse event or/and Product problem (e.g., defects/malfunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcomes attributed to adverse event (check all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Date of event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Data of this report</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Suspect medication(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name (as labeled strength &amp; manufacturer, if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Dose, frequency &amp; route used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Therapy dates (if known, give duration)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Diagnosis for use (indication)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Event abated after use stopped or dose reduced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Lot # (if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Exp. date (if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Event reappraised after reintroduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. NDC # (for product problems only)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Concomitant medical products and therapy dates (exclude treatment of event)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Suspect medical device</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brand name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manufacturer name &amp; address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Operator of device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expiration date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Model #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If implanted, give date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If explanted, give date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Device available for evaluation? (Do not send to FDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Concomitant medical products and therapy dates (exclude treatment of event)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Reporter (see confidentiality section on back)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name &amp; address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Health professional?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Also reported to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mail to: MEDWATCH
5600 Fishers Lane
Rockville, MD 20852-9787
OR FAX to: 1-800-FDA-0178

FDA Form 3500

Submission of a report does not constitute an admission that medical personnel or the product caused or contributed to the event.
ADVICE ABOUT VOLUNTARY REPORTING

Report experiences with:
- medications (drugs or biologics)
- medical devices (including in-vitro diagnostics)
- special nutritional products (dietary supplements, medical foods, infant formulas)
- other products regulated by FDA

Report SERIOUS adverse events. An event is serious when the patient outcome is:
- death
- life-threatening (real risk of dying)
- hospitalization (initial or prolonged)
- disability (significant, persistent or permanent)
- congenital anomaly
- required intervention to prevent permanent impairment or damage

Report even if:
- you’re not certain the product caused the event
- you don’t have all the details

Report product problems – quality, performance or safety concerns such as:
- suspected contamination
- questionable stability
- defective components
- poor packaging or labeling
- therapeutic failures

How to report:
- just fill in the sections that apply to your report
- use section C for all products except medical devices
- attach additional blank pages if needed
- use a separate form for each patient
- report either to FDA or the manufacturer (or both)

Important numbers:
- 1-800-FDA-0178 to FAX report
- 1-800-FDA-7777 to report by modem
- 1-800-FDA-1088 to report by phone or for more information
- 1-800-822-7967 for a VAERS form for vaccines

If your report involves a serious adverse event with a device and it occurred in a facility outside a doctor’s office, that facility may be legally required to report to FDA and/or the manufacturer. Please notify the person in that facility who would handle such reporting.

Confidentiality: The patient’s identity is held in strict confidence by FDA and protected to the fullest extent of the law. The reporter’s identity, including the identity of a self-reporter, may be shared with the manufacturer unless requested otherwise. However, FDA will not disclose the reporter’s identity in response to a request from the public, pursuant to the Freedom of Information Act.

Figure 10.2. MedWatch Voluntary Reporting Form (FDA Form 3500).
**MEDWATCH**
THE FDA MEDICAL PRODUCTS REPORTING PROGRAM

For use by user-facilities, distributors and manufacturers for MANDATORY reporting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Patient information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Patient identifier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Age at time of event:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or event:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date of birth:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Weight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lbs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Adverse event or product problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Adverse event and/or:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Product problem (e.g., defects/malfunctions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Outcomes attributed to adverse event (check all that apply)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>congenital anomaly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>life-threatening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hospitalization — initial or prolonged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C. Suspect medication(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name (give labeled strength &amp; mf/tabletter, if known)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2. Dose, frequency &amp; route used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Therapy dates (if unknown, give duration)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Diagnosis for use (indication)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Event stated after use stopped or dose reduced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6. Lot # (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. Exp. date (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Event reappeared after reintroduction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9. NDC # — for product problems only (if known)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Concomitant medical products and therapy dates (exclude treatment of event)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>D. Suspect medical device</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Brand name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Type of device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Manufacturer name &amp; address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Operator of device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>key user/patient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Expiration date (month/day/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Model #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. If implanted, give date (month/day/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serial #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. If explanted, give date (month/day/year)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Device available for evaluation? (Do not send to FDA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>returned to manufacturer on</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Concomitant medical products and therapy dates (exclude treatment of event)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E. Initial reporter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Name &amp; address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>phone #</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Health professional?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Occupation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Initial reporter also sent report to FDA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unk</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Submission of a report does not constitute an admission that medical personnel, user facility, distributor, manufacturer or product caused or contributed to the event.
### Medication and Device Experience Report (continued)

**F. For use by user facility/distributor—devices only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1. Check one</th>
<th>2. UF/Dist report number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✅ user facility</td>
<td>✗ distributor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**3. User facility or distributor name/address**

**4. Contact person**

**5. Phone Number**

**6. Date user facility or distributor became aware of event (month/day/year)**

**7. Type of report**

**8. Date of this report (month/day/year)**

**9. Approximate age of device**

**10. Event problem codes (refer to coding manual)**

**11. Report sent to FDA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✅ yes</th>
<th>✗ no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**12. Location where event occurred**

**13. Report sent to manufacturer?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✅ yes</th>
<th>✗ no</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**14. Manufacturer name/address**

### G. All manufacturers

**1. Contact office—name/address (5 mailing site for device)**

**2. Phone number**

**3. Report source (check all that apply)**

| ✅ foreign | ✗ study | ✗ literature | ✗ consumer | ✗ health professional | ✗ user facility | ✗ company representative |

**4. Date received by manufacturer (month/day/year)**

**5. If IND, protocol #**

**6. Type of report (check all that apply)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>✅ 5-day</th>
<th>✗ 15-day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**7. OTC product**

**8. Adverse event term(s)**

**9. Mfr. report number**

### H. Device manufacturers only

**1. Type of reportable event**

| ✗ death | ✅ serious injury | ✗ malfunction (see guidelines) |

**2. If follow-up, what type?**

| ✗ correction | ✗ additional information | ✗ response to FDA request |

**3. Device evaluated by mfr?**

| ✗ not returned to mfr. | ✅ evaluation summary attached |

**4. Device manufacture date (month/day/year)**

**5. Labeling for single use?**

| ✗ yes | ✅ no |

**6. Evaluation codes (refer to coding manual)**

| method | results | conclusions |

**7. If remedial action initiated, check type**

| ✗ recall | ✗ notification |

**8. Usage of device**

| ✗ initial use of device | ✗ reuse | ✗ unknown |

**9. If action reported to FDA under 21 USC 360K(l), list correction/removal reporting number:**

**10. Additional manufacturer narrative and/or 11 Corrected data**

---

Figure 10.3. MedWatch Mandatory Reporting From (FDA Form 3500A).
Disease Control and Prevention program for mandatory reporting by physicians of vaccine related adverse events.  

The fourth goal of MedWatch is to provide feedback to health professionals about new safety issues involving medical products. As new information (e.g., “Dear Health Professional Letters,” Public Health Advisories, Safety Alerts, etc.) becomes available, it is posted on the MedWatch Homepage and immediate email notification goes out to members of MedWatch’s listservs. To join the general MedWatch listserv, send a subscription message to fdaalerts@archie.fda.gov. In the message body enter: subscribe medwatch YourEmailAddress@YourDomain (replace “YourEmailAddress@YourDomain” with your own email address). MedWatch also has a network of more than 140 health professional and industry organizations that have allied themselves with the FDA as MedWatch Partners. These partners are used to further disseminate safety notifications to their membership, thus acting as multiplier groups to expand notification.

These MedWatch partners encourage all healthcare providers (physicians, pharmacists, nurses, dentists, and others) to look upon adverse event reporting as part of their professional responsibility. The American Medical Association and American Dental Association advocate (respectively) physician and dentist participation in adverse event reporting systems as an obligation.  

Further, since 1994, *The Journal of the American Medical Association* instructs its authors that adverse drug or device reactions should be reported to the appropriate government agency, in addition to submitting such information for publication. The International Committee of Medical Journal Editors recently revised the “Uniform requirements for manuscripts submitted to biomedical journals” to also encourage timely reporting of urgent public health hazards. The FDA’s interest in informing health professionals about new safety discoveries is not only to enable them to incorporate new safety information into daily practice, but also to demonstrate that voluntary reporting has a definite clinical impact.

The FDA acknowledges that health professionals have concerns regarding their confidentiality as reporters, and that of the patients whose cases they report. In order to encourage reporting of adverse events, FDA regulations offer substantial protection against disclosure of the identities of both reporters and patients. This was further strengthened on 3 July, 1995, when a regulation went into effect extending this protection against disclosure by preempting state discovery laws regarding voluntary reports held by pharmaceutical, biological, and medical device manufacturers. To facilitate obtaining followup information, health professionals reporting directly to the FDA are asked to indicate whether they prefer that their identity not be disclosed through the MMP program to the manufacturer of the product involved in the case being reported. When such a preference is indicated, that information will not be shared.

**DATA MANIPULATION: THE ADVERSE EVENT MONITORING SYSTEM (AERS)**

A new tool used by FDA is the computerized spontaneous adverse event reporting system or AERS, which replaces older technology. This client server, Oracle based system contains all AE reports on pharmaceuticals submitted to the Agency either directly or via the manufacturer. AERS was designed and implemented with the following concepts in mind:

- Improve the operational efficiency, effectiveness, and quality control of the process for handling AEs.
- Improve the accessibility of AE information to all users.
- Implement and maintain compatibility with ICH standards.
- Build the capability to receive electronic submissions of AEs using ICH standards.
- Provide automated signal generation capabilities and improved tools for the analysis of potential AE signals.

Pharmaceutical manufacturers submit AE reports to the FDA central document room, where they are sorted and forwarded to the Office of Postmarketing Drug Risk Assessment (OPDRA)
in FDA’s Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER). Manufacturer reports are submitted in duplicate, with one copy forwarded to the reviewing division that is responsible for the marketing status of the drug being reported upon. Reports submitted by individuals are mailed, faxed, sent via the internet, or phoned into MedWatch, which in turn forwards the appropriate reports to OPDRA.

When received by OPDRA, these incoming 3500 and 3500A reports are assigned a single permanent report number, imaged and stored in an Excalibur imaging system; subsequently they are entered verbatim into the AERS database. Data entry has a number of sequential steps involving comparative entry, quality comparison of critical entry fields, and coding and quality control into standardized international medicinal terminology using MEDDRA. Direct and 15 day reports receive priority handling.

Automated quality control is performed to review reports for timeliness, completeness, and accuracy of coding. Statistical samples are also used to spot check manufacturer performance in providing accurate and timely reports, which can be used for compliance functions.

Although the bulk of the data entry into AERS is currently done through manual coding, AERS is designed for electronic submission of ICH standardized, MEDDRA pre-coded reports. This design concept incorporates the ICH standards for content, structure, and transmittal of individual case safety reports. To prepare for full scale implementation of electronic submissions, a step-by-step pilot program is in place. The pilot program is designed to develop and test the necessary processes, procedures, and technical architecture to implement electronic submissions. The process of transitioning to electronic reporting is a complex one that will take place over the next few years.

Copies of all reports in the AERS database are available to the public through the FDA Freedom of Information Office, with all confidential information redacted (e.g., patient, reporter, institutional identifiers). The AERS database, in non-cumulative quarterly updates, can be obtained from the National Technical Information Service.26

A variety of technology assisted features in AERS augment AE review by OPDRA’s safety evaluators. Some of these features are in place and some will be implemented when the system is fully developed. Safety evaluators will have the following pharmacovigilance tools available for AE report screening to generate signals:

- **Primary Triage.** The program screens incoming reports and alerts safety evaluators to serious and unlabeled events, and designated medical events known to often be drug related (e.g., torsade de pointes, agranulocytosis, toxic epidermal necrolysis, etc.).
- **Secondary triage/surveillance.** Provides a tool for signal identification based on overall specific counts for each risk category associated with all ADR reports received for a given drug.
- **Graphic monitoring indicators.** Allow visualization of graphical displays to enable signal generation. Eventually this will include statistical tools for data-mining events within the entire database.
- **Periodic (canned) reports.** Enable periodic reviews of the AERS database, including all new actions in a time period.
- **Active (canned and/or ad hoc) query.** Represents active investigation of case series signals found from any of the above levels of screening.

When fully deployed, the AERS system will constitute a world-class system for maximizing the ability of the agency to identify and assess signals of importance in the spontaneous reporting system.

### FDA EVALUATION OF REPORTS OF ADVERSE EVENTS

The uncontrolled nature of spontaneously reported data places great importance on the complex, intensive process of individual evaluation of submitted AE reports. This is perhaps most accurately characterized as a method, applied on a case-by-case basis, that is based on experience, knowledge of the medical product, and awareness of the limitations of the data.
Given the large number of AE reports that the FDA receives, it is obviously not possible to review all reports individually. The reporting forms seek information on dechallenge and rechallenge (positive, negative, not applicable), and this information is included in the computerized database. However, the causal relationship between the drug exposure and the adverse event reported to the FDA is not individually evaluated for most of the AE reports. Elements such as the temporal relationship between the event and the exposure and possible confounding factors such as concomitant drugs and underlying disease are assessed only for reports of specific AEs that are being closely monitored.

All reports sent directly to the FDA (i.e., nonmanufacturer reports) and all 15 day reports (manufacturer reports involving serious unlabeled events) are reviewed on a case-by-case basis by a safety evaluator, usually a pharmacist or a physician, because they are the most likely to involve events with potential significant public health impact. If the safety evaluator determines that the reported AE is new (i.e., unlabeled) and potentially significant, (s)he will then query the AERS database for similar reports to develop a case series. Each case report is evaluated for the adequacy of the information on the report, the temporal association of the drug and the event, possible confounding factors such as patient disease or concomitant drug therapy, and dechallenge–rechallenge information. If necessary, followup information is requested from the reporter or manufacturer. Further steps such as literature searches, use of drug utilization databases, or conducting further epidemiologic investigations may be taken. If the case series meets certain specific criteria, the issue is brought to the attention of others within OPDRA. An important new event is referred to as a MAR (monitored adverse reaction). These MARs are given further evaluation and are brought to the attention of the medical review divisions at the FDA that are responsible for regulatory actions involving the drug’s marketing status. The reviewing division may request manufacturer sponsored postmarketing studies to further evaluate the issue.

After a decision has been made regarding a safety issue, the FDA can initiate various actions, including labeling, name, or packaging change(s); a “Dear Health Professional” letter; restricting the use of the drug; or working with a manufacturer regarding possible withdrawal of a medical product from the US market.

To notify health professionals of important new safety information discovered after marketing, the FDA often requests that the manufacturer send a “Dear Health Professional” letter to warn providers of particular safety issues. This is done in combination with a labeling change, although only a small proportion of labeling changes result in such letters.

There were 34 drug or biologic letters/safety notifications posted in 1998, with another 19 added through the end of June 1999. In 1998, safety related labeling changes were approved by FDA for an average of 28 drug products each month (range = 18–41). (Note: “Dear Health Professional” letters and other safety notifications, and summaries of safety related labeling changes approved each month, can be found on the MedWatch homepage (www.fda.gov/medwatch/safety.htm).) Table 10.3 lists some examples of recent “Dear Health Professional” letters.

The FDA can restrict or limit the use of product if the adverse reaction associated with a drug product has severe consequences. For example, fetal abnormalities associated with the use of Accutane®, a drug to treat acne, resulted in a contraindication for use in women of childbearing age. If potential safety problems are an issue when a product is first approved, FDA may ask the company to conduct postmarketing studies (phase IV) or to continue phase III trials beyond their planned completion date. For example, results showed that patients taking flosequinan (Manoplax®) for congestive heart failure had initial improvement. However, the patients in the study continued to be followed after the product was approved in December 1992. It was ultimately shown that treated patients had an increased risk of death, as well as an increased hospitalization rate. This information led to the withdrawal of the drug after just 7 months on the market.

Previously unsuspected safety issues discovered after marketing can also lead to the removal of a
drug from the market. Fortunately, such product withdrawals are very uncommon; there have been only 13 drugs taken off the US market since 1980; these are listed in Table 10.4.

In addition to the technology used in current AE reporting, including sophisticated relational databases and network connections for electronic transfer, new methods to evaluate and assess spontaneous reports are being explored to take advantage of the sheer volume of data. Aggregate analysis tools and data-mining techniques are currently being developed by OPDRA, the European Union, the World Health Organization (WHO), and others, to systematically screen large databases of spontaneous reports.

OPDRA is specifically testing and validating the feasibility of using data-mining techniques employing a Bayesian statistical basis and commercial visualization computer tools to enhance surveillance efficiency. The strategy is to use the computer to identify potential signals in large databases that might be overlooked, for a variety of reasons, in a manual review on a case-by-case basis. Drug–AE signals are generated by comparing the frequency of reports with what would be expected if all drugs and AEs were assumed to follow certain patterns. The goal is to distinguish the more important or stronger signals to facilitate identification of combinations of drugs and events that warrant more in-depth followup.

**STRENGTHS**

LARGE-SCALE AND COST-EFFECTIVE

Two vital advantages of surveillance systems based on spontaneous reports are that they potentially

---

Table 10.3. Recent “Dear Health Professional” letters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Drug Name</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>June 1999</td>
<td>Cylvor® (pemoline)</td>
<td>Updated recommendations for liver function monitoring and patient information/consent form.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1999</td>
<td>Rezulin® (troglitazone)</td>
<td>Based on further evidence of serious and sometimes fatal liver injury, significant new changes in the labeling and recommended uses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1999</td>
<td>Trovan® (trovafloxacin/alatrofloxacin)</td>
<td>Because of associated serious liver injury, use should be reserved for use only in the treatment of patients who meet all of certain specified treatment criteria.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1999</td>
<td>Propulsid® (cisapride)</td>
<td>Two new contraindications (known family history of congenital long QT syndrome and clinically significant bradycardia) and a new drug interaction (coadministration of grapefruit juice increases the bioavailability of cisapride and concomitant use should be avoided).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1999</td>
<td>Celebrex® (celecoxib)</td>
<td>In patients concurrently taking warfarin, infrequent reports of increases in prothrombin time, sometimes associated with bleeding events, predominantly in the elderly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 1999</td>
<td>Enbrel® (etanercept)</td>
<td>Reports indicate that certain patients have developed serious infections, including sepsis, and that several of these patients have died from their infections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March 1999</td>
<td>Xeloda® (capecitabine)</td>
<td>Reports of altered coagulation parameters and/or bleeding in cancer patients who were taking coumarin derivatives concomitantly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1999</td>
<td>Cerebyx® (fosphenytoin)</td>
<td>Massive overdoses associated with serious adverse events, including death, have resulted from health care workers’ mistaken interpretation of the current vial label (both 2 ml and 10 ml vials). Specifically, some health care workers withdrawing fosphenytoin from the vial have misinterpreted the vial label to mean that the amount of phenytoin equivalents per millilitre actually represents the total amount of phenytoin equivalents in the vial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1999</td>
<td>Trovan® (alatrofloxacin mesylate)</td>
<td>Potential incompatibility of alatrofloxacin mesylate injection with two commonly used diluents, 0.9% sodium chloride injection, USP (usually referred to as normal saline solution), and lactated Ringer’s, USP.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 1999</td>
<td>Flovent® (fluticasone propionate)</td>
<td>Rare cases of patients on inhaled fluticasone propionate with systemic eosinophilic conditions, some with clinical features of vasculitis consistent with Churg–Strauss syndrome.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 10.4. Withdrawals from the market, 1980–1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brand name (generic name)</th>
<th>Reason for withdrawal</th>
<th>Year of marketing</th>
<th>Year withdrawn</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selacyn[R] (ticrynafen)</td>
<td>liver necrosis</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oralflex[R] (benoxaprofen)</td>
<td>liver necrosis</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zomax[R] (zomepirac)</td>
<td>anaphylaxis</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental[R] (nomifensine)</td>
<td>hemolytic anemia</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suprol[R] (saprofen)</td>
<td>flank pain syndrome</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enkaid[R] (encaïnide)</td>
<td>excessive mortality</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omniflo[R] (temafloxacin)</td>
<td>hemolytic anemia</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1992</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manoplax[R] (flosequinan)</td>
<td>excessive mortality</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redux[R] (dexfenfuramine)</td>
<td>cardiac valvular disease</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pondimini[R] (fenfuramine)</td>
<td>cardiac valvular disease</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldane[R] (terfenadine)</td>
<td>drug interactions/fatal cardiac arythmias</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Posicor[R] (mibefradil)</td>
<td>multiple drug interactions</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duract[R] (bromfenac)</td>
<td>serious hepatotoxic effects</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1998</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

maintain ongoing surveillance of all patients, and are relatively inexpensive. In fact, they are probably the most cost-effective way to detect rare, serious adverse events not discovered during clinical trials.

GENERATION OF HYPOTHESES AND SIGNALS

Making the best possible use of the data obtained through monitoring underlies postmarketing surveillance. Toward that goal, the great utility of spontaneous reports lies in hypothesis generation, with need to explore possible explanations for the adverse event in question. By fostering suspicions, spontaneous report based surveillance programs perform an important function, which is to generate signals of potential problems that warrant further investigation.

Assessment of the medical product adverse event relationship for a particular report or series of reports can be quite difficult. Table 10.5 lists factors that are helpful in evaluating the strength of association between a drug and a reported adverse event. (See also Chapter 32.)

The stronger the drug–event relationship in each case and the lower the incidence of the AE occurring spontaneously, the fewer case reports are needed to perceive causality. It has been found that for rare events, coincidental drug–event associations are so unlikely that they merit little concern, with greater than three reports constituting a signal requiring further study. In fact, it has been suggested that a temporal relationship between medical product and adverse event, coupled with positive dechallenge and rechallenge, can make isolated reports conclusive as to a product–event association. Biological plausibility and reasonable strength of association aid in deeming any association as causal. However, achieving certain proof of causality through adverse event reporting is unusual. Attaining a prominent degree of suspicion is much more likely, and may be considered a sufficient basis for regulatory decisions.

Table 10.5. Useful factors for assessing causal relationship between drug and reported adverse events

- Chronology of administration of agent, including beginning and ending of treatment and adverse event onset
- Course of adverse event when suspected agent stopped (dechallenge) or continued
- Etiologic roles of agents and diseases in regard to adverse event
- Response to readministration (rechallenge) of agent
- Laboratory test results
- Previously known toxicity of agent
OPPORTUNITY FOR CLINICIAN CONTRIBUTIONS

The reliance of postmarketing surveillance systems on health professional reporting enables an individual to help improve public health. This is demonstrated by one study that found direct practitioner participation in the FDA spontaneous reporting system was the most effective source of new ADR reports that led to changes in labeling. Ensuring that the information provided in the AE report is as complete and in depth as possible further enhances postmarketing surveillance. Thus, while possessing inherent limitations, postmarketing surveillance based on spontaneous report data is a powerful tool for detecting AE signals of direct clinical impact.

WEAKNESSES

As with clinical trials, there are important limitations to consider when using spontaneously reported AE information. These limitations include difficulties with AE recognition, underreporting, biases, estimation of population exposure, and report quality.

ADVERSE EVENT RECOGNITION

The recognition of AEs (or any other medical product associated adverse event) is quite subjective and imprecise. While an attribution between the medical product and the observed event is assumed with all spontaneously reported events, every effort is made to rule out other explanations for the event in question. It is well known that placebos and even no treatment can be associated with adverse events. In addition, there is almost always an underlying background rate for any clinical event in a population, regardless of whether there was exposure to a medical product.

Reaching a firm conclusion about the relationship between exposure to a medical product and the occurrence of an adverse event can be difficult. In one study, clinical pharmacologists and treating physicians showed complete agreement less than half the time when determining whether medication, alcohol, or “recreational” drug use had caused hospitalization.

Such considerations emphasize the crucial need for careful, thoughtful review of adverse event reports upon their receipt by FDA or the manufacturer. It is through this process that causality, or at least a high degree of suspicion for a product–AE association, is put to the test. Ultimately, formal pharmacoepidemiology studies are usually needed though, to be certain.

UNDERREPORTING

Another major concern with any spontaneous reporting system is underreporting of adverse events. It has been estimated that rarely more than 10% of serious ADRs, and 2–4% of non-serious reactions, are reported to the British spontaneous reporting program. A similar estimate is that the FDA receives by direct report less than 1% of suspected serious ADRs. This means that cases spontaneously reported to any surveillance program, which comprise the numerator, generally represent only a small portion of the number that have actually occurred. The impact of underreporting can be somewhat lessened if submitted reports, irrespective of number, are of high quality.

BIASES

Unlike clinical trial data, which are obtained under strictly controlled conditions, spontaneously reported information is uncontrolled, and therefore subject to the possible influence of a number of biases that can affect reporting. These biases include the length of time a product has been on the market, country, reporting environment, detailing time, and quality of the data. A striking illustration of the impact one such factor can have is the finding that the peak of spontaneous ADR reporting for a drug is at the end of the second year of marketing, with a subsequent precipitous decline in reporting, despite a lack of apparent decline in usage or change in ADR incidence. In addition to these biases, it is possible that reported cases might differ from nonreported cases in characteristics such as time to onset or severity.
ESTIMATION OF POPULATION EXPOSURE

Compounding these limitations is the lack of denominator data, such as user population and drug exposure patterns, that would provide the exact number of patients exposed to the medical product, and thus at risk for the adverse event of interest. Numerator and denominator limitations make incidence rates computed from spontaneously reported data problematic, if not completely baseless. However, even if the exposed patient population is not precisely known, estimation of the exposure can be attempted through the use of drug utilization data.

This approach, whose basic methodologies are applicable to medical products in general, can be of great utility. Major sources of data on the use of drugs by a defined population include market surveys based on sales or prescription data, third-party payers or health maintenance organizations, institutional/ambulatory settings, or specific pharmacoepidemiology studies. Cooperative agreements and contracts with outside researchers enable FDA to use such databases in its investigations. Device utilization studies employ the same sources of data, as well as Medicare derived information.

Care must be taken in interpreting results from studies using these databases. That drug prescribing does not necessarily equal drug usage, and the applicability of results derived from a specific population (such as Medicaid recipients) to the population at large, need to be weighed carefully.

REPORT QUALITY

The ability to assess, analyze, and act on safety issues based on spontaneous reporting is dependent on the quality of information submitted by health professionals in their reports. A complete AE report should include the following:

- product name (and information such as model and serial numbers in the case of medical devices)
- demographic data
- succinct clinical description of AE, including confirmatory/relevant test/laboratory results
- confounding factors (such as concomitant medical products and medical history)
- temporal information, including the date of event onset and start/stop dates for use of medical product
- dose/frequency of use (as applicable)
- biopsy/autopsy results (as applicable)
- dechallenge/rechallenge information (if available)
- outcome

SUMMARY

In summary, the major limitations of the FDA’s AE reporting system reflect the fact that the data are generated in an uncontrolled and incomplete manner. Although manufacturers are legally required to submit AE reports to the FDA and some of those reports are based on formal studies, the majority of AEs originate with practicing physicians who may or may not notify the manufacturer or the FDA when they observe an AE in one of their patients. It appears that they generally do not choose to report AEs, and the number of reports that the FDA receives is most underrepresentative of adverse events occurring in the United States. The number of reports in the system is also influenced by a variety of other factors, such as the extent and quality of the individual manufacturer’s postmarketing surveillance activities, the nature of the event, the type of drug, the length of time it has been marketed, and publicity in the lay or professional press. Because of these limitations, AE reports are primarily useful for hypothesis generating, rather than hypothesis testing. Ironically, the scientifically uncontrolled nature of AE reporting creates its greatest advantage—the ability to detect and characterize AEs occurring across a broad range of medical practice—as well as its most serious limitations.

PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

OVERALL

The FDA’s Adverse Event Reporting System (AERS) contains almost 2 million reports, with the earliest dating back to 1969. While reporting
levels remained fairly constant during the 1970s—about 18,000 reports were entered into the database in 1970, and slightly over 14,000 reports were added in 1980—reporting increased dramatically after 1985, as can be seen in Figure 10.4. By 1990, the annual number of reports had risen to 83,000, and in 1998 it was over 230,000.

As noted earlier, the AERS contains reports from a variety of sources. Reports may be from the United States or other countries. The suspected AEs may have been observed in the usual practice of medicine or during formal studies; case reports from the literature are also included. Reports come to the FDA either directly from health professionals or consumers, or from pharmaceutical manufacturers. The vast majority of reports are sent by manufacturers (over 90% in 1998).

Historically, most AE reports have originated with health professionals. However, the proportion coming from consumers has been increasing. In 1993, the proportions from health professionals and consumers were 72 and 27%, respectively (1% unknown). In 1996, the proportions were 58, 41, and 1%. Over the four year period from 1993 to 1996, reports from consumers increased in absolute numbers as well as proportionally. Over the same time, although the proportion from health professionals decreased, the absolute numbers went up. The increase in reports from consumers may very well be related to the large numbers of former prescription products now available OTC, as OTC packaging will frequently contain the company’s 800 number.

Although the majority of the FDA’s adverse drug event reports are channeled through the manufacturer, a substantial number of reports are received directly from health care professionals (over 15,400 reports in 1998). Direct reports have been shown to be more useful than other types of reports for identifying previously unsuspected AEs, resulting in the emphasis on such direct reporting via the MedWatch program. Direct reports tend to be more detailed, contain more specific information, and are more likely to have a suspected high likelihood of association between the event and the drug in question. Two-thirds of all direct drug reports involve serious AEs. Compared with all US physicians, physicians who report AEs to the FDA are likely to be younger, to practice in a primary care specialty, and to spend more time in teaching and research activities.

Of reports sent directly to FDA, 73% involve drugs, 14% medical devices, 3% biologics, and 2% dietary supplements. Fifty-nine% are from pharmacists, 15% from physicians, 9% from nurses, and 6% from non-health professionals.

**SPECIFIC EXAMPLES**

**Intravenous Immunoglobulin and Aseptic Meningitis Syndrome**

In early 1994, FDA learned of a report from the National Institutes of Health (NIH), which described a high rate of aseptic meningitis syndrome...
occurring in patients being treated for neuromuscular diseases with high doses of intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG). The patients had been receiving doses of 2 g/kg of IVIG, which is five to ten times higher than the normally recommended dosage. Six of 54 patients developed severe headache, meningismus, and fever within 24 hours of dosing. Cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) was consistent with aseptic meningitis syndrome in four of the six. Following this lead, 22 cases of IVIG associated aseptic meningitis syndrome that had been reported to the FDA were reviewed. Symptoms included fever and photophobia, and prominent painful headache. Twenty of the cases were associated with positive CSF findings, including leukocytosis (predominantly neutrophilic) and elevated protein.

Unexpectedly, 19 of the reports indicated that normal doses of IVIG had been administered (0.2–0.4 g/kg). The patients had been treated by withdrawal of the medication and administration of analgesics. Of particular note was the characteristic time course of IVIG associated aseptic meningitis syndrome. The illnesses all began between 12 and 24 hours after administration, and recovery ensued within several days following withdrawal of the medication.

As a result of this work, FDA and NIH workers published two articles on IVIG–aseptic meningitis syndrome simultaneously in the same journal. The FDA also directed IVIG manufacturers to modify labeling to include a precaution statement about the occurrence of the syndrome.

Temafoxacin and Hemolytic Anemia

Temafoxacin, a fluoroquinolone antibiotic, was first marketed in January 1992. By early April, FDA had received a few reports of hemolytic anemia occurring in patients treated with this drug. Over the next two months, many additional cases were reported, eventually totaling nearly 100. These provided a clear picture of what was subsequently called the “temafloxacin syndrome.”

The typical patient was a young woman with no underlying medical conditions who was treated for urinary tract infection with temafloxacin. Within 7–10 days of starting treatment, dark colored urine was often noted, sometimes with accompanying flank pain and chills. There was typically a drop in hemoglobin of 3 grams or greater. Acute renal failure developed in nearly two-thirds, with hemodialysis usually required. Mild hepatobiliary changes were noted in half the patients, and coagulopathy in one-third.

A subset of patients experienced the syndrome after their first dose of temafloxacin. That these patients were more likely to have had prior exposure to a fluoroquinolone antibiotic provided support for an antibody-mediated basis for massive hemolysis.

Based on spontaneously reported cases, the manufacturer, in consultation with FDA, voluntarily withdrew temafloxacin from the market worldwide in June, barely six months after initial marketing. In 1994, FDA staff published a multicase review article describing the “temafloxacin syndrome.”

L-tryptophan Related Eosinophilia–Myalgia Syndrome

In July 1989, a healthy 44-year-old woman in Santa Fe with a history of allergic rhinitis started taking L-tryptophan, an essential amino acid available as a dietary supplement, for insomnia. By early September, she was reporting onset of cough, shortness of breath, and weakness. When first seen by a physician in late September, she presented with a puffy, flushed face, abdominal pain, mucosal ulcers, myalgia, and weakness. Her white blood cell count was 11 900 cells/mm³, with an eosinophil count of 42%. Her condition worsened through October, with her white blood cell rising to 18 200 and eosinophil count to 45%.

Her physician consulted with a rheumatologist, who, while not knowing what was wrong with this patient, did know of a second patient who had been hospitalized in Santa Fe with similar symptoms and eosinophil count. In mid-October, a third patient in New Mexico, who had an eosinophil count of 9000 and had also been taking L-tryptophan, was discovered. While one patient was unusual and two was suspicious, three made it a cluster of a very uncommon disease.
All three original patients were middle-aged women. Although the severity differed, all had the common features of myalgia, weakness, oral ulcers, abdominal pain, shortness of breath, and skin rash. While the doses of L-tryptophan they had used were similar, the duration of use before onset of illness varied from a few weeks to 2 years. Common laboratory features included striking leukocytosis, eosinophilia, elevated aldolase (with a normal creatine kinase), and abnormal liver function tests.

An article about the condition appeared in the 7 November Albuquenque Journal News. On 11 November, FDA issued a Public Advisory against the use of L-tryptophan, followed four days later by the establishment by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) of a system of national state based surveillance for the newly named eosinophilia–myalgia syndrome (EMS).52

On 17 November, FDA requested a nationwide recall of all OTC dietary supplements in capsule or tablet form providing 100 mg or more of L-tryptophan in a daily dose. On 23 March, 1990, because of the identification of one case of EMS associated with a dietary supplement containing less than 100 mg, and continued efforts by some firms to circumvent the recall, the agency requested an expansion of the recall to all marketed products containing added manufactured L-tryptophan. Excepted were those that were permitted to contain added L-tryptophan under existing food additive regulations. Additionally, on 22 March, the agency had imposed an import alert to detain all foreign shipments of manufactured L-tryptophan.

Because virtually all manufactured L-tryptophan is imported into the US, the practical effect of the recall and import alert was to effectively eliminate the availability of L-tryptophan containing dietary supplements. Eventually, more than 1500 cases of EMS, including 38 deaths, were reported to the CDC, although the true incidence of the disorder is thought to be much higher.

The recognition of a cluster of cases was the key to the detecting of EMS. Interactions among various specialists, including a family physician, hematologist, rheumatologist, clinical immunologist, and epidemiologists, were crucial to this process.

Of equal importance is ongoing basic and clinical research to explain the etiology and pathogenesis of this disorder. Although it is widely believed that contaminants or impurities in the L-tryptophan are responsible for EMS, continuing research indicates a role for “pure” tryptophan itself,53–55 as well as for certain host factors in the etiology of the disorder.56,57 These findings support suggestions that the L-tryptophan associated EMS was caused by several factors and is not necessarily related to a contaminant in a single source of L-tryptophan.

FDA concerns about the safety of L-tryptophan containing products and the possibility of potential new cases of L-tryptophan related EMS are underscored by recent information indicating the availability of L-tryptophan by American sources. Both EMS’s clinical seriousness, and uncertainties surrounding its etiology, indicate the need for health professionals to remain vigilant regarding adverse events possibly associated with the use of L-tryptophan containing dietary supplements, and to report such events to MedWatch.

THE FUTURE

Adverse event reporting in the United States has come a long way since its inception in the early 1950s. Yet, it should be remembered that spontaneous reporting, although invaluable, is only one tool used in managing medical product risk. The FDA is committed to evaluating and improving its role in the current risk management system. The May 1999 report to the FDA Commissioner “Managing the risks from medical product use: creating a risk management framework”58 found that the postmarketing surveillance program currently in place performs well for the goal it was designed to achieve, namely the rapid detection of unexpected serious AEs that occur postmarketing. However, the report also stated that FDA’s programs are not designed to evaluate the rate, or impact, of known AEs. The report proposed several options for improving risk management including expanding the use of automated systems for reporting, monitoring, and evaluating AEs, and increasing the agency’s access to data sources.
that would supplement and extend its spontaneous reporting system. This could include use of large scale medical databases from health maintenance organizations to reinforce, support, and enhance spontaneous signals and provide background rates and descriptive epidemiology.

In recognition of the increasing importance of postmarketing surveillance and risk assessment in the regulatory setting, a variety of initiatives are under way within FDA to expand these activities. In 1998, the Office of Postmarketing Drug Risk Assessment (OPDRA) was established within CDER to explore and confirm safety signals from spontaneous reporting; to plan, direct, and collaborate in the conduct of epidemiological activities; and to explore other drug surveillance strategies.

Many of the basic problems with spontaneous reporting are still with us today, such as underreporting and poor quality of reporting. However, FDA, academia, and industry are making efforts to address these problems. These efforts can be summarized in the following areas: increasing the quality of incoming reports; establishing global reporting standards; promoting speed of reporting and assessment through electronic reporting; exploring new assessment and data visualizing methodologies; and, finally, exploring tools beyond spontaneous reporting. The last initiatives involve identification and assessment of linked databases and registries which can be accessed to expand surveillance, provide confirmatory evidence for signals, assess regulatory impact of labeling changes through studies, and, in general, build on the known strengths of spontaneous reporting—signal generation of potentially important events.

Studies to explore the barriers to reporting are being proposed by FDA with the goal of increasing the quality of reports and identifying areas in which effective reporting can be stimulated. Specific areas for consideration include the following.

- Identification of causes and factors contributing to product related injuries.
- Factors involved in identification and reporting of AEs.
- Identification of more effective risk communication methods to transmit information to health care professionals and consumers.
- Identification of methods to focus more attention on medical products in the immediate postmarketing period.
- Existing barriers to reporting in areas such as managed care.

In summary, the spontaneous reporting of AEs provides an important cornerstone for pharmacovigilance in the United States. Regulators and manufacturers of medical products worldwide are moving forward with global harmonization for data standards and data transmission, improvements in relational database systems, the development of new risk assessment methodologies, and increased access to other data resources to improve our overall ability to manage risk from pharmaceuticals.
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INTRODUCTION

The broad awareness that modern drugs could carry unexpected hazards was triggered by a letter to the editor of The Lancet published on 16 December 1961. In this historical document of 15 lines, Dr McBride from Australia reported that he had noted an increased frequency of limb malformations among babies, and that a common denominator seemed to be the intake of a new hypnotic drug—thalidomide—by their mothers.

In the wake of the public health disaster that then unraveled, the governments in many countries arranged procedures for a systematic collection of information about suspected adverse drug reactions (ADRs). These systems were based on the spontaneous reporting of suspected ADRs by physicians and were first organized in Australia, Canada, Czechoslovakia, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Sweden, the UK, the US, and West Germany. Each of these was initiated between 1961 and 1965. Similar systems now operate in more than 60 countries.

In 1968, ten countries from Australasia, Europe, and North America agreed to pool all reports which had been provided to their national monitoring centers in a WHO sponsored international drug monitoring project. The aim was to identify even very rare but serious reactions as early as possible. The WHO scheme was set up at WHO headquarters in Geneva in 1970. The economic and operative responsibilities of the WHO Center were transferred to Sweden in 1978. The formal responsibility for and the coordination of the program, however, still rest with WHO headquarters in Geneva. Today 56
countries participate in the program as full members and a further seven countries\textsuperscript{2,3} as associate members (Figure 11.1).

Spontaneous reporting systems are primarily designed to detect new ADRs: they generate signals about possible ADRs, creating hypotheses for subsequent studies. The next steps are to prove or refute these hypotheses; to estimate the incidence, relative risk, and excess risk of the ADRs; to explore the mechanisms involved; and to identify special risk groups. Under certain selected circumstances, spontaneous reporting can be used to provide valuable information for these latter tasks, as well.

In this chapter we intend to describe the organization, operation, and results from spontaneous reporting schemes outside of the US.

\section*{DESCRIPTION}

ADR reporting schemes differ in a number of dimensions. First, there are in essence two parallel, more or less global systems.

1. \textit{The medical literature}: many journals publish case reports of patients who experienced possible ADRs.

2. \textit{National pharmacovigilance systems}: case reports of suspected ADRs are collected by national pharmacovigilance centers.

The focus of this chapter is on the second system rather than the first. Literature case reports are, however, included in some of the national systems. In the second category there are now two

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{WHO_Drug_Monitoring_Programme.png}
\caption{A map showing countries participating in the Drug Monitoring Program.}
\end{figure}
international systems, one under the auspices of WHO in which data on all suspected ADRs are pooled and coordinated by the Uppsala Monitoring Centre in Sweden, and the European Union (EU) pharmacovigilance system. In the latter, all member states and the European Medicines Evaluation Agency (EMEA) are connected via secure intranet (Eudranet) for the exchange of pharmacovigilance information. A database, Eudrawatch, for the collation and analysis of reports of serious ADRs associated with products authorized through the EU centralized procedure, is also under development.

National systems themselves are organized in many different ways. Most are centralized, but an increasing number are decentralized. For most of the national systems the reporting of ADRs is voluntary, but for some it is mandatory. Most national systems receive their reports directly from health practitioners. Some, however, receive most of their reports from health practitioners via the pharmaceutical manufacturers, including the largest national system, that of the US (see Chapter 10). Most centers review each report on an individual basis using a clinical pharmacology approach, often making judgements about each case as to how likely it is that the drug caused the adverse event (see also Chapter 32). However, others use mainly an aggregate or epidemiological approach to the analysis of the reports (see Chapter 10). Finally, the national centers differ dramatically in how they interact with reporters. Some treat their reporters anonymously, providing feedback only in the form of regulatory actions or occasional published papers. Others provide very direct feedback—verbal, written, and/or published—to maximize the dialogue between the reporters and the center.

Each of these differences will be described in more detail.

ORGANIZATION, AFFILIATION, AND TASKS OF NATIONAL MONITORING CENTERS

In most countries, the monitoring center is part of the drug regulatory authority. In some countries, e.g., The Philippines and New Zealand, the functions are carried out jointly by the drug control authority and a university institution. In Germany, the ADR monitoring program was originally organized by the Drug Commission of the German Medical Profession. In 1978 the responsibility for the evaluation of drug-induced risks was transferred to the National Institute of Health (Bundesgesundheitsamt), and in 1993 a new agency was formed for control of medicines and devices (BfArM). The Drug Commission still collects and evaluates ADR reports from physicians and pharmacists, which then are relayed to the health authorities.

Also, in France a new drug control agency has been formed. The French Medicines Agency, formed in 1994, has taken up duties formerly part of the Ministry of Health. It also serves as a coordinating and executive body for a network of 31 regional centers that are connected to major regional university hospitals. Each center is responsible for ADR monitoring in its region. The evaluated reports are fed into a central database. The regional centers are co-sponsored by the agency, the hospitals, and the universities. Other public or even private sources of support can be used as well, provided they are ethical, reported to and agreed by the agency. Argentina, Canada, Spain, Sweden, and Thailand also have developed decentralized systems, in parts similar to that of the French. In the United Kingdom there are four selected regional centers connected to university hospitals, which have a special responsibility for stimulating ADR reporting in their particular areas.

Regional systems have the advantage that good communication and personal relationships may be established between the staff of the monitoring center and the reporting professionals. They are, however, demanding in the number of staff needed and, unless the reports are fed directly into a central database, result in delays in the flow of information.

In Morocco, New Zealand, and Tanzania, the national centers also function as Poison Information Centers. These may serve as useful models for other countries, since intoxication and adverse reactions are often related. The regional centers in France and in Sweden also have responsibility for a general drug information activity, providing
pharmacological advice for specific patients. This may further add to the value of a center, as the local physicians then feel that they not only feed in reports of ADRs, but in return they receive clinically relevant information from the center.

Some regional centers, e.g., in Barcelona in Spain, Bordeaux in France, and those in Sweden, are also engaged in formal pharmacoepidemiology studies to follow up potential signals created by the spontaneous reports.

REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

The greatest need for information on undesirable and unexpected drug effects relates to drugs that are newly marketed. Thus, most countries emphasize the need to report even trivial reactions to new drugs, while for established medicines only serious reactions are usually requested. Some countries have clearly identified which new drugs they want observed most closely. In the United Kingdom such drugs are marked with a black triangle in the British National Formulary and the Marketing Authorization Holders (MAHs) are encouraged to include it in all other product information and advertisements. This system is voluntary and in particular cannot be enforced for centralized products. In Denmark and Sweden, a list of drugs of special interest is published in the national medical journal. In New Zealand and Ireland, some selected new drugs are put in an Intensive Reporting program. Most countries have, however, issued rather general recommendations as to what type of reactions should be reported to the National Center.

- In at least ten countries, including France, Norway, and Sweden, it is mandatory by law for physicians and dentists to report cases of suspected serious adverse reactions to the regulatory authority. France has also written “Good Pharmacovigilance Practices” which set rules for the reporters (including access to raw clinical data), for the regional centers, for the pharmaceutical companies, and for the Agency in the proper management of individual cases, and case series.
- In some 25 countries, including the EU, Japan, and the US, it is obligatory for pharmaceutical companies (MAHs in the EU) to submit to the regulatory authority cases of suspected adverse experiences that have become known to them.

SOURCES OF REPORTS

The regulatory status and the organization of a national drug monitoring program also determines the sources and the type of information that will be received. Three main groups of countries can be identified:

- countries obtaining a substantial contribution of reports directly from physicians in hospitals and general practice, such as Australia, France, Ireland, the Netherlands, New Zealand, the Nordic Countries, Spain, Thailand, and the United Kingdom;
- countries receiving a vast majority of their information via the pharmaceutical industry, such as Germany, Italy, and the US; and
- countries mainly dependent on information from hospital physicians only, such as Japan, India, Romania, and Bulgaria.

The contribution from dentists is generally small. Some countries accept reports from pharmacists, nurses, and consumers.

HANDLING AND EVALUATION OF REPORTS

When a report reaches a national center it is normally read by a physician or a pharmacist, who makes a judgment about whether the information provided is sufficient as a basis for an opinion on the correctness of the diagnosis and causality, or whether more data should be requested. In some countries, pharmacists who have access to medical consultants staff the national centers. In a majority of countries participating in the WHO scheme, the medical officer makes an assessment of each case with regard to the probability of a causal relationship between the clinical event and the drug(s) administered. In many countries the national center is aided in making the final assessment of causality and the evaluation of the clinical
importance of the aggregate reports by an advisory committee of experienced clinical experts.

In recent years there has been an international effort to harmonize the terms used to describe the adverse events and to set criteria and definitions for at least the major serious types of reactions. This effort was started in France, and then international consensus was reached in meetings under the auspices of CIOMS (Council of International Organizations of Medical Sciences, which is linked to the WHO). For example, internationally agreed upon criteria and definitions have been published for hematological and hepatic reactions\(^6\) and some other types of reactions.\(^7\)\(^-\)\(^9\)

No common standard for the detailed operational assessment of causality has been agreed upon internationally. Most experts are able to agree about which factors should be taken into account in the assessment, but how much weight should be given to each of the factors is the subject of an ongoing scientific debate (see Chapter 32). During the last 15 years, a number of more or less complicated and comprehensive algorithms for the assessment of causality have been constructed.\(^10\)\(^-\)\(^11\) When tested by their inventors, these algorithms have, in general, been found to decrease inter-rater variability.\(^12\)\(^-\)\(^14\) This has not, however, always been the case when independent groups\(^15\)\(^-\)\(^16\) have tested the algorithms. Moreover, it has not been possible to test whether the assessments reached by the use of the algorithms have been more valid than those reached without them. No algorithm has yet been constructed that can cope with the wide variety of exposure–event categories seen by a national center and yet is simple enough to be used when evaluating a large number of cases on a routine basis.

The only country that today is using an algorithm on a routine basis for the assessment of causality in ADR reports is France, where the existence of 31 different regional centers necessitates some standardization.\(^17\) The use of this algorithm is also mandatory for the pharmaceutical industry. Beyond causality, the major interests of having a common assessment method are the harmonization of data content of case reports, and the didactic value of the exercise. In contrast, some national centers are of the opinion that causality rating of each single case as submitted introduces bias, and that it is an unacceptable allocation of resources. However, an international agreement has recently been reached among the countries participating in the WHO drug monitoring scheme on common definitions of the terms most often used to describe causality in a semi-quantitative way (Table 11.1). Methods for

Table 11.1. Terminology for causality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Certain</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Probable</th>
<th>Possible</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Unassessable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A clinical event, including laboratory test abnormality, occurring in a plausible time relationship to drug administration, and which cannot be explained by concurrent disease or other drugs or chemicals. The response to withdrawal of the drug (dechallenge) should be clinically plausible. The event must be definitive pharmacologically or phenomenologically, using a satisfactory rechallenge procedure if necessary.</td>
<td>A clinical event, including laboratory test abnormality, with reasonable time sequence to administration of the drug, unlikely to be attributed to concurrent disease or other drugs or chemicals, and which follows a clinically reasonable response on withdrawal (dechallenge). Rechallenge information is not required to fulfill this definition.</td>
<td>A clinical event, including laboratory test abnormality, with reasonable time sequence to administration of the drug, but which could also be explained by concurrent disease or other drugs or chemicals. Information on drug withdrawal may be lacking or unclear.</td>
<td>A clinical event, including laboratory test abnormality, with a temporal relationship to drug administration which makes a causal relationship improbable, and in which other drugs, chemicals, or underlying disease provide plausible explanations.</td>
<td>A clinical event, including laboratory test abnormality, reported as an adverse reaction, about which more data are essential for a proper assessment or the additional data are under examination.</td>
<td>A report suggesting an adverse reaction that cannot be judged because information is insufficient or contradictory, and which cannot be supplemented or verified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
assessing causality in case reports are discussed in more detail in Chapter 32. Many national regulatory authorities systematically review and evaluate information from a variety of sources, in addition to spontaneous ADR reports, to identify new ADRs or changing ADR profiles on the basis of which action should be initiated to improve the safe use of medicines.

FEEDBACK TO REPORTERS

Some form of feedback from the national center has to be arranged for clinicians to be involved in two-way communication. In many countries, each reporter receives a personal acknowledgement, often including a preliminary evaluation of the case. In France, feedback is left to the initiative of the individual regional centers. It is usually done on a case-by-case basis, sometimes with regularly produced information bulletins.

Adverse reaction bulletins are produced regularly in many countries and then distributed to the medical profession. Sometimes the information is included in a local medical journal or a drug information bulletin.

GENERATION AND EVALUATION OF SIGNALS

Spontaneous adverse drug reaction reporting is principally a method of identifying previously unrecognized hazards with marketed medicines. The process of generating “signals” of such hazards from the data has been likened to looking for a needle in a haystack.18

In the early days, when reports were relatively few, signals were looked for manually or through checking, for example, quarterly lists. Profiles based on the proportion of reports regarding different system organ classes were compared and differences in the proportion of reactions reported were used as prompts for further analyses.19-21 Later, differences in such proportions were tested by statistical significance tests. A signal published based on such a test was the higher proportion of serum-sickness-like reactions to cefaclor, than to other cephalosporins and ampicillin.22

The French case–non-case method is based on the same principle, comparing the proportion of, for example, hypoglycemia reported for acetylcholinesterase (ACE) inhibitors with that reported for other cardiovascular drugs.23 Using this technique, a strong signal was found for an association between ACE inhibitors and hypoglycemia. This signal disappeared, however, when the use of antidiabetics was controlled for in the analysis. These analyses were done manually, often on a case-by-case basis.

The WHO Collaborating Center, on the basis of reports received from member countries, increasingly produces signals of potential but previously unknown adverse reactions. Each quarter more than 2000 new potential drug–reaction combinations are identified. The WHO Center has created a system whereby independent experts in an international review panel screen these new signals. The results of these screenings are then circulated among the countries. Several such signals have been published, based on single or a few cases that appear in two or more countries and where the material was pooled to generate a signal of better quality (see Table 11.2). Compilations of all ADRs reported to a drug or a drug class are also published in medical journals or books.19-22 Very recently, computer-aided systems for the identification of new potential signals have been created in the UK and by the Uppsala Monitoring Centre.

Proportional Reporting Ratios

The UK system is a statistical aid to signal generation that is based on a proportionate and comparative approach. The proportion of all reactions to a drug which are a particular medical condition of interest is compared to the same proportion for all drugs in the database. The resulting statistic is called a proportional reporting ratio (PRR). Judgements about signals may then be made using the PRR, along with the associated value of $\chi^2$ and the absolute number of reports.

This approach uses the total number of reports for the drug as a denominator to calculate the proportion of all reactions which are the type of interest (e.g., hepatitis). This proportion may be compared with the value for other drugs. It is also
Table 11.2. Examples of publications on new adverse drug reactions during the 1980s and 1990s that have been discovered through spontaneous reports or where spontaneous reports have reinforced previous suspicions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Year of publication</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Ref</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agranulocytosis</td>
<td>Mebhydrolin</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diplopia</td>
<td>β-blockers</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testicular pain</td>
<td>Mazindol</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug interaction</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contraceptive/Griseofulvin</td>
<td></td>
<td>UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrosis</td>
<td>Ergotamine</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photosensitivity</td>
<td>Azapropazone</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>6 countries</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acute hypersensitivity</td>
<td>Paracetamol</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>10 countries</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agranulocytosis</td>
<td>Indapaline</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>France</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrapyramidal disorders</td>
<td>Flunarazine/Cinnarazine</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin reactions</td>
<td>Tretinadine</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>5 countries</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esophageal obstruction</td>
<td>Glucocmannan</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary infiltrates</td>
<td>Tollenamic acid</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angioedema</td>
<td>Enalapril</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>UK</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urticaria</td>
<td>Captopril</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

possible to compare complete profiles of ADR reporting for drugs of different types of reaction, where differences in the profile may represent signals. The result of such a calculation is called a proportional reporting ratio (PRR) where the PRR is \( a/(a+b) \) divided by \( c/(c+d) \) in the following two-by-two table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction(s) of interest</th>
<th>All other reactions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Drug of interest</td>
<td>( a )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other drugs in database</td>
<td>( c )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The expected or null value for a PRR is 1.0 and the numbers generated are measures of association that behave in fashion similar to relative risks. The higher the PRR, the greater the strength of the signal. Measures of statistical association for each value are calculated using standard methods such as 95% confidence intervals and Fisher’s exact test or the \( \chi^2 \) test with one degree of freedom (with Yates’s correction). Judgment about whether or not there is a signal, and its strength, may then be made on the basis of three key pieces of information, i.e., the PRR, the value of \( \chi^2 \), and the absolute number of reports. A minimum signal would be a PRR of at least 2, \( \chi^2 \) of at least 4, and three or more cases.

PRRs have some advantages over calculation of reporting rates. First, no external data are needed and the limitations of such data (including delay in receipt) do not apply. Second, they may be expected to counteract some of the biases related to variable reporting. For example, if the overall level of reporting is high because of new drug bias, this will not necessarily affect the proportion of all reactions for the drug that are of a specified type.

It is important to recognize that PRRs are not a substitute for detailed review of cases, but an aid to deciding which series of cases most warrant further review. Also, PRRs and \( \chi^2 \) values are measures of association and not causality.

There are a number of possible extensions to the method that are being evaluated further. For example, PRR calculations could be restricted to particular groups of drugs, to serious or fatal reports, or to particular age groups. Examination of changes in PRRs over time may help to demonstrate how signals of adverse drug reactions can be identified as early as possible.
A Bayesian Approach Using Neural Networks

The system developed by the Uppsala Monitoring Centre is based on Bayesian statistics and the use of a neural network computer program. Every quarter the reports that have come in are compared with those already in the database for proportions of specific drug–reaction combinations. If a specific drug–reaction combination appears significantly more often in the new reports than before, a signal is automatically generated.

Figure 11.2 depicts the number of reports received by the national centers in 1994. In most countries reporting has gradually increased over time. It usually takes some five to ten years of operation before reporting reaches a stable level. The number of reports has, however, increased substantially in Australia, Spain, and the UK. The number of reports relayed to the WHO Center is often less than that received in the country, for various technical reasons. In France,
reports received by the national agency from the manufacturers (50%) are not sent to the WHO, nor are reports on drugs that are marketed only in France. Also, reports evaluated as unclassifiable or reactions due to overdoses are omitted from some but not all countries. The US situation is special in this regard and is described separately (see Chapter 10).

INTERNATIONAL REPORTING

In recent years there has been an increasing tendency among regulators to demand that manufacturers report directly to them suspected ADRs that happened in other countries, in spite of the fact that most of these reports are already available to them through the WHO system. At first, these requirements also meant that the manufacturers had to report these cases on several different forms, according to different rules and time schedules. In order to decrease the workload of the manufacturers and increase the cost-effectiveness of international reporting, an initiative was started in 1986 to harmonize the rules for international reporting of single cases under the auspices of the Council of International Medical Organizations (CIOMS), which is affiliated to the WHO. This initiative, called “CIOMS I,” is now accepted in most countries and by most manufacturers, and has been accepted by the International Conference on Harmonization (ICH) as a guideline. This system has definitely decreased the diversity of the rules regarding international reporting. Many of the smaller drug control agencies felt that they did not have the capacity to cope with the massive increase in the number of reports that this CIOMS I initiative produced. They preferred periodic safety updates, including the evaluation of the safety situation at large by the company. In some countries laws and regulations mandated such safety updates, but again there were differences in the rules, formats, and time schedules for such safety updates. Therefore, a second CIOMS initiative—“CIOMS II”—was undertaken to harmonize the contents, format, and time schedule for periodic safety updates. Some novel features of this scheme were the creation of an international “birth date” for each drug product, which was the day of first approval in any country, the inclusion of drug exposure data and experience from both pre- and postmarketing studies, and the principle that the manufacturer should write an overall safety evaluation of the product.

The CIOMS II safety updates are now unofficially accepted by the ICH and have been made into a guideline followed by the EU, the US, and Japan. Many more countries accept periodic safety updates according to the ICH format.

The European Parliament has adopted a regulation creating the European Agency for the Evaluation of Medicinal Products (EMEA), which is located in London, UK. According to these regulations, all serious suspected adverse reactions that are reported to a Marketing Authorization Holder (MAH) by a health professional shall be reported to the health authority of the country in which it occurred within 15 days. Health authorities shall also report to the EMEA and to the MAH within 15 days. MAHs are also mandated to report ADRs occurring outside the EU as well as from the world literature that are both serious and unexpected (unlabeled).

The problem of managing and distributing large numbers of ADR reports within 15 days has led to a commitment from many to communicate data electronically. However, standardization of data sets and terminology is required for this to be implemented effectively. The Medical Dictionary of Regulatory Activities (MedDRA) and electronic standards for the transfer of regulatory information were introduced to the ICH (M1 and M2 topics) in 1994. Both are applicable to pre- and postmarketing phases of the regulatory cycle. MedDRA was based on the terminology developed by the Medicines Control Agency in the UK. It provides greater specificity of data entry (more terms) and hierarchical data retrieval categories. However, it does not contain specific definitions of the terms to be used. In this regard, the CIOMS initiative is relied upon. Its use for ADR reporting will be mandated in some countries, but other countries, especially small and developing countries, have expressed doubts since their computer resources are limited and their number of reports small.
**STRENGTHS**

A spontaneous reporting system can be relatively inexpensive to operate. One physician, one pharmacist, and a secretary can usually manage between one and two thousand reports a year, depending on the amount of scrutiny, followup, feedback, and other activities that are part of the program. The basic technical equipment needed is also a relatively minor investment. Together with other properties (Table 11.3), some of which are unique, this makes a spontaneous reporting system one of the basic ingredients in a comprehensive system for the postmarketing surveillance of drug-induced risks.

A spontaneous reporting system has the potential to cover the total patient population. It is not restricted to either hospitalized patients or those treated as outpatients, and does not exclude patients treated for other concomitant diseases. Moreover, the surveillance can start as soon as a drug is approved for marketing and has no inherent time limit. Thus, it is potentially the most cost-effective system for the detection of new ADRs that occur rarely, mostly in special subgroups, such as the elderly, or in combination with other drugs.

In an early analysis of how important ADRs were first suspected and then verified, Venning found that 13 out of 18 reactions were first signaled

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 11.3. Strengths and weaknesses of spontaneous reporting systems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Strengths</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inexpensive and simple to operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers all drugs during their whole life cycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Covers the whole patient population, including special subgroups, such as the elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does not interfere with prescribing habits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can be used for followup studies of patients with severe ADRs, to study mechanisms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Weaknesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The amount of clinical information available is often too limited to permit a thorough case evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under-reporting decreases sensitivity and makes the systems sensitive to selective reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reporting rate is seldom stable over time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No direct information on incidence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

by an anecdotal report made by a physician with an open and critical mind. The fact that these reports were published in medical journals led the author to conclude that spontaneous reporting systems were of little value in the signaling process. However, the majority of these reactions actually were detected before most spontaneous reporting systems were operational. In later analyses of where the first suspicion that a new drug could cause agranulocytosis and Stevens–Johnson syndrome appeared, it was found that, for the vast majority, the first report appeared in the WHO database more than six months before it was published. The opposite situation was found in only a few cases. Some of these signals were published. Table 11.2 presents these and some other examples of situations where a drug problem has been “discovered” or where a previous signal has been reinforced by the use of spontaneous reports. In most cases, however, a spontaneous reporting system needs to be supplemented by other sources of information, as described in the section on “Particular applications,” below.

**WEAKNESSES**

Spontaneous reporting systems are mainly intended to produce signals about potential new ADRs. To fulfill this function properly, one must recognize that a number of false signals will be produced and, therefore, each signal must be scrutinized and verified before it can be accepted and acted upon. Preferably a signal should be followed up using an analytic epidemiological study design and one or more of the data resources described in Chapters 12–25.

A more serious disadvantage is that not all reactions are reported and that the proportion that is reported in any specific situation is hard to estimate. A basic requirement for the generation of a report is that a physician suspects that the signs and/or symptoms of his patient may be caused by a drug. This is relatively easy when the inherent pharmacological actions or chemical properties of the drug can predict the reaction. There are also some diseases that are considered as “typically” drug-induced reactions, such as agranulocytosis.
and severe skin reactions, so that the basic level of suspicion is high. It is, however, very hard to make the mental connection between a drug therapy and a medical event if the event simulates a common, spontaneously occurring disease or other untoward event, which has never previously been described as drug induced, e.g., the first cases of the oculomucocutaneous syndrome, Guillain–Barré syndrome, changes in the body fat distribution, structural heart valve changes, and visual field defects with a specific pattern. It is also hard to make the mental connection between a drug and a medical event if there is a long time lag between exposure and disease.

Even if the physician suspects the signs and symptoms of his or her patient to be drug induced, there are a number of more or less irrational reasons for not reporting this suspicion. Ignorance of the value of ADR reporting, ignorance of the reporting rules, and too little time to report have been given as reasons for not reporting. Increased information and feedback by national agencies, the medical schools, the pharmaceutical manufacturer, and professional journals, in cooperation, could rectify these inadequacies. The health care providers also have a clear role here. It is their responsibility to monitor the quality of health care and to build in ADR reporting practices in their quality assurance systems, as well as in continuing medical education.

Besides delaying the detection of new ADRs, under-reporting creates two other important problems. First, it will underestimate the frequency of the ADR and, thereby, underestimate the importance of the problem. This may not be so serious as long as one recognizes that the reported frequency is a minimum level. More important is that under-reporting may not be random but selective, which may introduce serious bias. The effect of selective reporting becomes potentially disastrous if the number of reports of an ADR for different drugs is compared in an uncritical way. For example, in Sweden, as in many other countries, there was a surge of reports of gastrointestinal ulcers and bleeding suspected to have been caused by piroxicam soon after its introduction. If the number of ulcers and bleeding reported for piroxicam is compared with that reported for indomethacin or aspirin, one may be led to believe that the new drug was much more ulcerogenic than the old ones. However, there are many other possible reasons for the apparent differences. The overall rate of reporting has increased over the years, and reporting is often higher during the first years a new drug is on the market. Finally, a drug that is claimed to be very safe may first be tried on patients who do not tolerate the previous drug products (channeling bias). Furthermore, there may be reporting distortions if there are suspicions or rumors circulated about a drug.

Another interesting example of biased reporting is the fourfold difference in reports of hemorrhagic diatheses in relation to sales of the two penicillin-v products Calciopen® and Kăvepenin® that was discovered some years ago in Sweden. An analysis of the situation failed to reveal any differences in the two products. Actually, they were produced in the same factory from the same batch and only the form, product name, and MAH differed. There were, however, differences in the use of the products. The older product was used to a larger extent by older physicians, by ear, nose, and throat specialists, and by private practitioners, groups who traditionally do not report ADRs. This could not, however, totally explain the apparent difference in ADR rate, as the reporters seldom were the prescribers. The most important explanation was probably that the younger product was more commonly recommended and used in “high reporting” counties.

**PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS**

**WITHOUT THE ADDITION OF OTHER DATA**

A spontaneous reporting system can, in its basic form, be regarded as an incomplete (and at worst biased) case series, without any information on the size or characteristics of the population exposed to the drug. In this basic form it is rarely possible to use spontaneous reports to establish a causal connection between an adverse event and a drug, unless:

(a) there is at least one case with a positive rechallenge and some other supportive cases
who do not have known confounding drugs or diseases, or
(b) there is a cluster of exposed cases reported, the background incidence of the adverse event is close to zero, and there is no confounding.

The reappearance of an adverse event when a drug is given again is certainly no proof of causality. In practice, however, one is rather reassured that there is strong evidence for a causal connection if there is a cluster of cases with good clinical information, in which the same event has reappeared with repeated exposure at least once in each patient. Of course, this is only possible if the medical event in question were of a type that would diminish or disappear after withdrawal of the drug and not reappear spontaneously. Thus, the observation of five cases of aseptic meningitis that reappeared within hours after again taking the antibiotic trimethoprim for urinary tract infections will convince most clinicians that this drug did and can cause such a reaction. For typical "hit and run" effects like thromboembolic diseases and for diseases that can be cyclic, information on rechallenge, however, can be misleading. For example, a young boy in Sweden developed agranulocytosis three times in connection with infections treated with ampicillin. It was not until after the fourth time, when agranulocytosis developed before ampicillin was given, that his cyclic neutropenia was discovered.

Information on rechallenge is relatively uncommon in most spontaneous reporting systems. Planned rechallenge may be dangerous, is seldom warranted from a clinical point of view, and can be unethical. However, information on a positive re-exposure was available in as many as 13% of 200 consecutive nonfatal cases reported in the Nordic Countries. In the French pharmacovigilance database, re-exposure is reported in 8.5% of reports, positive in 6%. An example meeting the second criterion occurred with the cardiovascular drug aprindine. Four to five cases of agranulocytosis were reported in the Netherlands during the first two years the drug was marketed. As the background incidence of agranulocytosis is only five to eight per million inhabitants per year, this made a strong case for a causal relationship.

WITH THE ADDITION OF DENOMINATOR DATA

Today, most drug regulatory authorities in industrialized countries and pharmaceutical manufacturers have access to information that can be used to estimate both the size and the characteristics of the exposed population and the background incidence of diseases. In many countries there are national statistics on drug sales and/or prescribing (see Chapter 29). In many countries information on drug sales and prescribing is confidential, but in the Nordic countries this information is published periodically. Another source for information on pharmaceutical sales and prescribing habits in a large number of countries is Intercontinental Medical Statistics International (IMS). Data in a number of countries from IMS have been combined with ADR information from the WHO database to provide rough incidence estimates of certain drug-induced problems.

WITH THE ADDITION OF NUMERATOR DATA

If the rate of reporting is known, the estimate of the numerator can become more accurate. From studies using registers of hospital discharge diagnoses, it has been possible to calculate reporting rates for some areas, ADRs, and periods of time. Considering serious reactions such as blood dyscrasias, thromboembolic disease, and Stevens–Johnson syndrome, in general between 20% and 40% of the patients discharged with these diagnoses have been found to be reported. By identifying all positive BCG cultures in bacteriology laboratories, it was found that almost 80% of all children who developed an osteitis after BCG vaccination had been reported. However, reporting rates probably cannot be generalized. The magnitude of under-reporting is important to know when evaluating the data, but should not be used to correct for under-reporting in the calcula-
tions since the reporting rate is time-, problem-, drug-, and country-specific.

**USING SPONTANEOUS REPORTS TO ESTIMATE RISK**

If information from an efficient spontaneous reporting system can be combined with information on drug sales and prescription statistics, it is often possible to derive a rough estimate of the frequency or incidence rate of an ADR. Such estimates can, of course, never reach the accuracy of those derived from clinical trials or formal epidemiologic studies. However, they can serve as a first indicator of the size of a potential problem. For very rare reactions, they may actually be the only conceivable measure.

Specifically, with knowledge of the number of defined daily doses (DDDs) sold and the average prescribed daily dose (PDD), it is possible to obtain a rough estimate of the total person-time of exposure for a particular drug. The number of cases reported per patient “exposure time” might then be a rough estimate of the incidence. If prescription statistics are available, the number of prescriptions may actually be a better estimate of drug use among outpatients than the number of treatment weeks calculated from sales data, especially for antibiotics, where drug use is mostly short term and doses and treatment times may vary with patient age and indication. As an example, the frequency of reports of serum-sickness-like reactions and erythema multiforme was 17 and four per 10,000 prescriptions, respectively, among children aged 0–9 years prescribed a solution of cephalor (a cephalosporin antibiotic). No such reactions were reported among adults using tablets. These results could imply that there was something in the solution apart from the active substance that caused the reactions. However, other possible explanations are age-dependent differences in reporting or in actual immunological reactivity, and one must always be extremely careful in the interpretation of such data.

If the background incidence of a disease is known or can be estimated from other sources, it is sometimes also possible to calculate rough estimates of relative risks and excess risks from spontaneously reported data on ADRs plus sales and prescription statistics. For example, single cases of aplastic anemia in patients taking acetazolamide (a carbonic anhydrase inhibiting diuretic that is used mainly for the treatment of glaucoma) have been reported since the drug was introduced in the mid-1950s. There are no estimates of the incidence of this reaction, but it was certainly thought to be very rare, probably more rare than aplastic anemia occurring after the use of chloramphenicol. Between 1972 and 1988, 11 cases were reported to have occurred in Sweden. Based on sales and prescription data, it could be estimated that the total exposure time was 195,000 patient-years during the same period of time, giving a reported incidence of about one in 20,000, or 50 per million patient years. From a population-based case-control study of aplastic anemia in which Sweden participated, it could be estimated that the total yearly incidence of aplastic anemia in the relevant age groups was about six per million. In the case-control study it was not possible to estimate the relative risk for the association between acetazolamide and aplastic anemia, because there were no exposed controls. However, if the spontaneously reported incidence of aplastic anemia among people exposed to acetazolamide is compared with the total incidence of aplastic anemia from the case-control study, the relative risk could be estimated to be around 10.

Several potential sources of errors in this study must be considered. The degree of under-reporting in this example is unknown. However, in one study the reporting rate for aplastic anemia was found to be 30%, and since then reporting in general has doubled. There is no known association between glaucoma and aplastic anemia that could act as a confounder, but some of the reported patients had taken other drugs during the six months before the detection of their aplastic anemia. There were only two patients who had been treated with drugs which, on clinical pharmacological grounds, seemed to be reasonable alternatives. It is a clear limitation that multiple drug exposures cannot be corrected for in a rough analysis such as this.

In March 1982 a new antidepressant drug, zimeldine, was introduced in Sweden. Zimeldine
was a new selective serotonin uptake blocker. A hypersensitivity reaction that mimicked influenza—with fever, myalgia, arthralgia, and sometimes a slight rash or elevation of the liver transaminases—seemed to be the only characteristic new ADRs associated with the use of this new compound.

However, during the first 16 months of the marketing of zimeldine, 20 patients were reported to have developed various neurological complications during treatment with the drug. Eight of these patients fulfilled the criteria for suffering from Guillain–Barré syndrome. All of these patients developed a “flu-like” hypersensitivity reaction within the first month of treatment. This neurological complication developed in close connection to the hypersensitivity reaction. By using sales and prescription statistics a total exposure time of about 14,000 patient years was estimated. The average treatment time was 60–100 days and a maximum of 60,000 patients were estimated to have been treated with zimeldine. From Sweden’s hospital statistics, the yearly incidence of Guillain–Barré syndrome was estimated to be 2.5/100,000 inhabitants. The reported frequency of the Guillain–Barré syndrome among patients exposed to zimeldine could then be estimated to be at least about 1/6000, the incidence rate 0.6/1000 treatment years, the relative risk 24, and the excess risk 0.58/1000 treatment years.

In this situation no relevant confounding factors could be identified. All reported cases fulfilled strict criteria for the disease, so misclassification of the cases could be ruled out. Complete ascertainment of all cases (complete reporting) could not be guaranteed. However, this would lead to an underestimate of the risk estimates. Moreover, the population at risk (the denominator) might have been grossly overestimated. All patients who developed the Guillain–Barré syndrome did so between day 11 and day 30 of treatment. Thus, the risk did not seem to be independent of time. However, the denominator was calculated from the estimate of the total patient exposure time, which included patients who stopped treatment within the first week as well as those treated for several months.

In some instances it has been possible to compare risk estimates from a formal epidemiologic case–control study with those derived from the Swedish drug monitoring system. The relative risks for agranulocytosis induced by co-trimoxazole and sulfasalazine were astonishingly alike.48

USING SPONTANEOUS REPORTING DATA TO IDENTIFY MECHANISMS AND RISK GROUPS

As soon as it has been established that a drug can induce a certain adverse reaction, it becomes important to identify the mechanisms involved, whether any group of patients is at a particularly increased risk, and whether any measure could be taken at the patient and/or the population level to reduce the risk. Usually a multitude of different methods must be applied, both in the laboratory and at a population level. A good spontaneous reporting system can be of value in this work in certain circumstances, if the data can be compared to sales and prescription data or if the patients can be subjected to special investigations.

For example, in one study of the characteristics of patients developing hypoglycemia during treatment with glibenclamide (an oral antidiabetic drug), the distribution of prescribed daily doses was similar in patients with episodes of severe hypoglycemic episodes and in the general population. However, patients hospitalized because of severe hypoglycemia were older and were more likely to have had a previous episode of cerebrovascular disease.49

In one of the first follow-up studies published on oral contraceptives and thromboembolic disease, it was found that women who were reported to have developed deep vein thrombosis while taking oral contraceptives were of the blood group O more often than would have been expected from the distribution of blood groups in the population.50

A similar study51 investigated patients reported to have developed lupoid reactions while taking hydralazine for hypertension. A much higher percentage was slow acetylators than the 40% expected from the distribution of this phenotype in the population at large.

Finally, in a more sophisticated study, Strom used spontaneously reported cases of suprofen-induced “acute flank pain syndrome” in a case–
control study designed to identify patient-specific risk factors for the development of the syndrome. Patients who were reported to have developed the syndrome were compared to a random sample of patients who had taken the drug without problems. Risk factors identified were, among others, male sex, hay fever and asthma, participation in exercise, and alcohol consumption. Most of these factors are consistent with the postulated pathogenic mechanism of acute diffuse crystallization of uric acid in the renal tubules.

**THE FUTURE**

At least in the western countries, the population is growing progressively older and, thus, we can expect a steady increase in the chronic use of medications. Even if the drugs to be used are more sophisticated and “targeted,” they are also likely to be more pharmacologically active and hence may be more difficult to use. With the continued development of clinical trial methodology, adverse reactions that are caused by “pharmacologic” mechanisms will probably be better known as to type and incidence when new medicines are approved. However, there will still be the classical idiosyncratic reactions, which cannot be predicted and which are too rare to be detected in the clinical premarketing trials programs. Moreover, it would be naïve to assume that we will not be confronted with totally new and unexpected types of ADRs in the years to come. Thus, the importance of postmarketing surveillance will not diminish; we must continuously develop our total armamentarium of methods for this task. Spontaneous reporting of new and unexpected reactions is likely to remain one of the basic methods for pharmacoepidemiology for many years.

Pharmacovigilance programmes are now being established also in developing countries from which we have not had much information in the past. It is likely that monitoring of populations with another pattern of morbidity and a different nutritional status will reveal different types of adverse reactions from established medicines than what we have learned to expect from populations in the industrialized world. Influence of co-medication with traditional medicines and unexpected failure of efficacy because of substandard or counterfeit medicines will have to be covered by the pharmacovigilance systems.

The role of spontaneous reporting in the future will be even more central if it can be developed further. The basic requisite for its enhanced effectiveness is an increased flow of information, in both quantitative and qualitative terms. For example, to increase the reporting of classical, rare ADRs such as blood dyscrasias, toxic epidermal necrolysis, and liver and kidney damage, the automatic collection of information about all patients who have been hospitalized with these conditions could be instituted. This could be accomplished through case–control surveillance of rare diseases that are often elicited by drugs.

Alternatively, manual retrieval of case summaries, providing high quality information, or automated transfer of computerized hospital discharge diagnoses, could be used to study case series.

However, the detection of the totally unexpected will most probably continue to rely on the capacity of the alert human mind for the foreseeable future. Therefore, it is mandatory to enhance the practicing clinician’s awareness of and cooperation with ADR reporting. Here a regional system with mutual benefits, such as the French system, seems promising.

Periodically it may be beneficial to focus on certain new drug classes to clarify their ADR spectrum as soon as possible, e.g., the HIV ADR reporting scheme in the UK.

Finally, it is not enough to increase the reporting signaling function only quantitatively. To gain new knowledge and to guarantee drug safety, it is necessary to increase the qualitative aspects of the information. The number of signals of possible new adverse events that are reported (2000/quarter to WHO) calls for a more efficient procedure for scrutiny and evaluation than can be accomplished with the present resources in the WHO program. We must therefore set up a system where these signals can be analyzed and evaluated more effectively, such as the proportional reporting ratios in the UK and the neural network system developed by the Uppsala Monitoring Centre. This can only be accomplished through
increased resources for and a more effective collaboration among national monitoring centers, university institutions, and particularly pharmaceutical manufacturers.
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INTRODUCTION

Until the recognition of chloramphenicol-induced aplastic anemia\(^1\) and thalidomide-associated phocomelia,\(^2\) adverse drug reaction monitoring was almost entirely anecdotal. However, the thalidomide incident, in particular, led many countries to set up agencies to collect and evaluate information on spontaneously reported adverse drug reactions. These schemes were not without limitations and in 1965 Finney,\(^3\) a distinguished Scottish epidemiologist and statistician, advocated a more rigorous approach to searching for adverse drug reactions. He recommended routine recording of all demographic and clinical information on hospitalized patients together with all “events” occurring in these patients. This was to be done regardless of whether any links between drugs and events were made by their physicians. In his opinion, detailed analyses of the resulting information, in effect a series of cohort studies of drug recipients, could lead to the detection of new and previously unsuspected adverse drug effects. At about this time, Leighton Cluff and his colleagues in Baltimore were developing the first major intensive inpatient drug monitoring program.\(^4\) Their program concentrated on collecting details of suspected adverse drug reactions, but in some instances involved formal hypothesis testing, performed to establish with more certainty that a suspected reaction was truly an adverse drug effect.\(^5\)

These pioneering proposals and studies stimulated interest in this area and several groups began intensive inpatient monitoring programs to record suspected adverse drug reactions (ADRs), using as data collection monitors either medical staff,\(^6\) pharmacists,\(^7\) or nurses.\(^8\) The last named group has been by far the most successful. It was in 1966 that Hershel Jick and the late Dennis Slone started a pilot scheme to assess the feasibility of continuously monitoring large numbers of medical inpatients. Their goal was to determine the frequency with which these patients experienced acute undesired drug effects during hospitalization. So successful was this scheme that it was gradually expanded to medical wards in six different countries. By 1976, information had been collected from over 50 000 medical inpatients,
allowing much original research on the association between short-term drug exposures and acute ADRs to be carried out. After 1977, the focus of the program was changed to surgical inpatients. This new data resource, although smaller, provided additional information about drug exposure and events occurring in operating rooms. Small numbers of pediatric and psychiatric patients were monitored in a similar manner. All these methods and databases together came to be known as the Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program (BCDSP). A review of its published data gives an impressive idea of the scope of this approach, which has subsequently been adopted and applied by other groups.

**DESCRIPTION**

The aims of intensive hospital-based cohort studies in pharmacoepidemiology are fourfold: (i) to provide information on overall patterns of drug use in hospitals, and to determine whether particular subgroups of hospitalized patients are at greater risk of experiencing ADRs than others; (ii) to obtain details of acute adverse events attributable to drugs used in hospitals; (iii) to obtain information on the frequency of certain major life threatening events occurring during hospitalization, be they drug related or not; and (iv) to identify associations between pre-hospital drug use and diseases or adverse events causing hospital admissions.

The methods used in this type of study have been described in detail by Jick and his colleagues. Briefly, monitors, usually nurses, are employed to collect routine demographic, social, and medical information from consecutive admissions to the hospital. Details of drug exposures before the hospitalization are obtained from patients by the monitor using a standardized interview conducted shortly after admission. Details of all drug exposures during the hospitalization are also recorded, using standardized self-reporting data collection forms. The monitors attend ward rounds, where they gather information concerning undesired or unintended events thought by the attending physician to be causally related to drug therapy. The degree of certainty that any event is indeed drug related is assessed both by the attending physician and, at a later date, by an independent clinical pharmacologist. In addition to ADR data, information on certain specific events occurring during the hospitalization is recorded routinely, whether or not these events are thought to be due to drug therapy. All such events are major illnesses, and can include sudden death, jaundice, pulmonary embolism, renal failure, gastrointestinal bleeding, convulsions, deafness, and psychosis.

The resulting information is then evaluated for accuracy and completeness before being entered into computer files for detailed analysis. During data entry, several standard tests are applied to the information to ensure validity and internal consistency. Thereafter the information is available for detailed analyses. Routine analyses are then undertaken at regular intervals to search for associations in the data.

**STRENGTHS**

The main advantage of the intensive hospital-based approach to pharmacoepidemiology studies is the very broad and comprehensive nature of its primary information sources. This approach has made many important contributions to our knowledge about the effects of drugs used in hospitals. Included are studies of drug utilization, descriptive studies of ADRs and their predictors, studies testing hypotheses about ADRs, and studies generating hypotheses about ADRs. Additional information is available about drugs used shortly before the hospitalization. Examples of each of these are given in the section on Particular Applications, below.

Armed with these data, the BCDSP occupied a unique position in the early 1970s. Validated data of the highest quality were scarce at this time, as pharmacoepidemiology was just emerging as a unique scientific discipline. Various aspects of the data collection process also broadened its appeal. The “collaborative” nature of the work allowed international comparisons to be made. The demographic data available allowed the role of variables
WEAKNESSES

Intensive hospital based cohort studies have provided clinicians and researchers with accurate reproducible details of acute adverse reactions to virtually all commonly used drugs available in the USA and in Europe in the 1960s and 1970s. Since then, however, there have been some spectacular examples of ADRs occurring with newly introduced drugs or formulations, including practolol, benoxaprofen, tienilic acid, zimelidine, Osmosin, and temafloxacin. More recently, there have been the major safety issues associated with anorexigen's and third generation oral contraceptives. Those concerned with the release of new drugs, either in the pharmaceutical industry or in regulatory agencies, are now keen to have available monitoring systems that will detect such potentially serious ADRs quickly and efficiently. Unfortunately the intensive hospital-based monitoring system, as described above, is not such a scheme. It is expensive, is applicable only to drugs used frequently in hospitals, and, most importantly, the major data set extant of this type is unlikely to be useful in answering currently important questions. Other groups, however, have continued to collect and analyze data and, although there remains a fundamental problem with speed, the basic value of the method is repeatedly demonstrated. Details are given in a subsequent section.

By definition, intensive hospital based cohort studies are used to study drugs as they are used in a restricted (hospitalized) population. Thus, drugs that are primarily used on a long term basis in the community will only be studied indirectly when, for example, patients taking these preparations are admitted to a hospital. The concept of a centralized collaborative approach is, however, valuable when dealing with a specific drug that has significant safety concerns, whether it is used in primary or secondary care. One such example is clozarine. Local monitoring centers can link with national information resources and can also feed back to prescribers and health care providers, thus improving the effectiveness of therapy and patient care. This is a general application of the target drug approach as detailed below. In addition, even for drugs that are used in hospital, a new drug will usually take some time to penetrate the market (depending, of course, on advertising and sales promotion). Thus, a relatively infrequent ADR is likely to go undetected for long periods of time within a small, restricted hospital based program, particularly if the ADR is delayed in onset. Such an ADR might be occurring at an unacceptably high rate. For example, aplastic anemia occurring with a frequency of one case per 5000 courses of treatment would be considered unacceptable for a new drug, yet such a frequency could not be detected using this method. Routine review of the data may yield an occasional interesting case, but it would certainly not be possible to establish a large enough body of evidence to suggest a causal link. This type of monitoring system is therefore not in direct competition with the spontaneous reporting schemes for ADRs operating in the US, in UK, and elsewhere (see Chapters 10 and 11), nor with the well established community based record linkage cohort studies (see Chapters 15–23).

This type of approach works well in the general hospital environment, where details of patient presentation, investigation, treatment, and prescribing are all relatively standardized and well recorded. In such settings, ward monitors can document all important and relevant information on events, prescribing, and possible ADRs without too much difficulty. For example, drug prescription orders tend to be changed no more than once per day and illnesses tend to follow a predictable course under these circumstances. This relatively standardized information can easily be checked, validated, and entered onto a computer file. It is also feasible and practical to extract this information and analyze it.
However, the system of ward monitoring as described is not well suited to all types of modern hospital practice. For example, any attempt to monitor patients in an intensive care unit by these techniques is unlikely to yield comprehensible data. Drug orders may change by the hour and, unless a monitor is constantly present, may go unrecorded. Furthermore, the data accumulated in such cases would be extremely complex and difficult to analyze. Attempting to attribute events in such a situation to a particular drug or group of drugs would be fraught with difficulty and may be impossible. Therefore, either one would be left to collect and record all “events,” whether drug attributed or not, or unacceptable errors or biases could creep into judgments regarding causality. Either way, subsequent analyses would be difficult, if not impossible, to undertake with any degree of confidence. Having said all that, computerized hospital systems for recording drug orders and administration do bring this a step closer. The ADE Prevention Study Group has monitored patients in medical and surgical units including intensive care units.20 Similarly, hospital based reporting systems have been used to study putative adverse drug effects, e.g., those related to cardiopulmonary bypass.21 Thirteen percent of all cardiovascular adverse events in these patients were thought to be related to the administration of protamine, but only 19% of those were reported.

Intensive hospital based cohort studies require medical and epidemiologic expertise, trained monitors at all participating centers, data managers, data entry personnel, computer scientists, and secretarial help. In addition, many people are required to collect data. Such a program is therefore expensive to run. However, this cost must be viewed in light of the knowledge that can and has been gained, and in comparison with the cost of introducing a new chemical entity to the marketplace. Attempts have been made to quantify the costs attributed to ADRs.22 This is clearly an issue of importance to public health and to the pharmaceutical industry, as evidenced by the stringent safety requirements imposed by regulatory authorities.

Finally, and most importantly, BCDSP hospital cohort data are now approximately 15–20 years old and provide us with no information on several new classes of drugs, such as H2 receptor antagonists, calcium channel blockers, and angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors. Moreover, many new individual drugs in previously studied classes have appeared, such as antibiotics and β-blockers, which have not been monitored by this approach. Thus, to be of continuing value, this approach needs a continuous data collection program. In recent years a number of smaller systems have provided useful information and continue to do so, including local experience with modern drugs.23,24

PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

BCDSP: STUDIES OF THE IN-HOSPITAL DRUG USE OF MEDICAL INPATIENTS

Drug Utilization Studies

Although studies of prescribing habits and drug utilization in hospitals were not the primary aims of the BCDSP, during routine analyses substantial differences in drug use patterns were noted among and within the countries participating in the program. One study was undertaken in which inpatient drug use in matched Scottish and American patients was compared and contrasted.25 The American patients received twice as many drugs as did the Scots, and overall ADR rates were correspondingly greater. This was despite the fact that the ADR rate for individual drugs was similar in the two countries.

Similarly, the use of intravenous fluid therapy was seen to vary widely among participating hospitals. Whereas 53% of patients admitted to one hospital in the US received intravenous fluids, only 7% of patients admitted to an Israeli hospital did so. Even within a country with low overall drug usage such as Scotland, two medical units within one city with otherwise virtually identical drug use patterns showed a twofold difference in intravenous fluid use.26 Studies of this type highlight the need for careful studies of the reasons for prescribing expensive drugs if overall drug costs are to be held in check. A comprehensive data set
INTENSIVE HOSPITAL-BASED COHORT STUDIES

is essential if meaningful conclusions are to be made regarding differences in use and expenditure patterns between institutions, departments, or prescribers.

Information from hospital based cohort studies on the most commonly prescribed drugs, their indications for use, and the most common ADRs experienced by patients receiving these have been published in detail elsewhere.  

Descriptive Studies of Adverse Drug Reactions

Drug related deaths are recorded infrequently in medical inpatients. In a major review of patients studied during the early years of the program, only 24 drug attributed deaths were found among 24,462 consecutive admissions. Most of these were very ill patients in whom death was the expected outcome of hospitalization. In only six cases did it seem possible that the death could have been prevented. These were five patients who experienced fluid overload and one who had hyperkalemia from excessive potassium therapy.

With such large numbers of patients under study, it is possible to look for uncommon or rare drug effects that occur after short term drug use. For example, 119 cases of anaphylaxis, convulsions, deafness, or extra-pyramidal symptoms were found among 38,812 patients who received over 250,000 courses of drug treatment. As might be expected, very few drugs were found to be responsible, but for those that were, it was possible to estimate incidence rates, albeit with wide confidence intervals.

By regularly reviewing the accumulating information, it was possible to identify subgroups of the population who are at a greater than expected risk of developing ADRs. Thus, for example, in an early study of heparin, women, especially those over 60 years old, were found to be at greatest risk of bleeding. The strength of the association was such that the observation was made after only 97 patients had received the drug, further recipients serving to confirm the association. More recently the original observations have been confirmed and extended, by reviewing data on 2,656 patients receiving heparin therapy. Bleeding was a dose related phenomenon occurring most often in women, severely ill patients, and patients receiving aspirin during heparin therapy. The 7 day cumulative risk for bleeding was 9.1%.  

Similarly flurazepam, a commonly used hypnotic, was found to have a modest overall ADR rate of 3.1%, the most common ADR being excessive drowsiness or “hangover” on the morning following use. However, when the results were reviewed according to age and dose, it was clearly demonstrated that this drug had a very high ADR rate in the elderly, especially when high doses were used.

One particularly elegant study revealed a large number of factors associated with acute pharmacological effects of the hypotensive agent methyl-

dopa. In everyday use in the series of university teaching hospitals covered by the BCDSP, an average of 10% of 1067 methyl-dopa recipients experience clinically significant degrees of hypotension on starting treatment. Detailed analyses of these subjects showed a strong age relationship: the younger the patient, the greater the frequency of hypotension. There were also independent positive associations between hypotension and measurements of patient weight, daily drug dose, degree of hypertension on admission, and kidney function. The magnitude of these associations was considerable. Thus, for example, there was a sixfold greater frequency of drug associated hypotension in patients with renal impairment receiving a high initial dose of methyl-dopa, when compared with patients without renal impairment receiving low doses of this drug. These associations allowed the group to make recommendations for altering dosing regimens when starting treatment with methyl-dopa. There are several important points that should be noted about this study. First, the results were biologically and pharmacologically plausible. Second, the effects were predictable pharmacologic ones. Third, they were occurring during everyday use of a common medication. Finally, they were preventable with careful alteration in dosing. Other studies of considerable clinical interest and relevance included those on potassium chloride, fursemide, spironolactone, and the interrelationships between diuretic use and electrolyte responses in a large cohort of patients with congestive cardiac failure.  


Hypothesis Testing Studies

On routine review of the accumulated data, certain relationships between ADRs and biochemical data were observed. For example, the rate of ADRs attributed to phenytoin was noted to be related to serum albumin concentration, the rate being 11.4% when serum albumin was less than 30 g l\(^{-1}\) and 3.8% when serum albumin was greater than 30 g l\(^{-1}\).\(^{38}\) This relationship was independent of age, dose of drug, and renal function, and was likely to be due to phenytoin being both strongly protein bound and of a low therapeutic index. Thus, a small decrease in binding protein may lead to a large increase in free phenytoin concentrations and toxic effects.

Although drug interactions are not often a major clinical issue, they can be found in data of this type. For example, in 1970 it was suggested that the hypnotic chloral hydrate might enhance the anticoagulant activity of warfarin, the proposed mechanism being the displacement of warfarin from binding sites by the metabolite trichloroacetic acid. The BCDS data were ideal for testing this hypothesis, as they had been gathered before the hypothesis was put forward and prescribing doctors were therefore unaware of a potential interaction, that is there was no prescribing bias. To test this hypothesis, warfarin recipients were divided into three groups depending upon whether they received regular, intermittent, or no chloral hydrate during admission. The amount of warfarin required to maintain adequate anticoagulation was found to be inversely related to chloral hydrate ingestion, that is those taking chloral hydrate regularly required less warfarin. Thus, the original hypothesis was confirmed.\(^{39}\)

Similarly, isolated case reports on the interaction between phenytoin and the antituberculous drug isoniazid led to concern about their co-administration. Review of the BCDS data revealed that six of 22 patients receiving these two drugs concurrently experienced central nervous system adverse effects (27%). By contrast, only 30 of 1093 phenytoin recipients who did not receive isoniazid experienced these adverse effects (3%). Thus, these data confirmed the initial suggestion from the (uncontrolled) spontaneous reports.\(^{40}\)

In an interesting and important study, Duhme and his colleagues\(^{41}\) compared the adverse reaction rates attributed to digoxin in two Boston hospitals. Reactions were reported in 10% of 272 patients at one hospital and in only 4% of 291 patients at another. The differences did not appear to be due to different digoxin dosage, use of other drugs, or measured patient characteristics. They also did not appear to be related to reporting bias. In the hospital with the lower frequency of digoxin toxicity, serum digoxin levels were monitored more often (40% of patients) than in the other hospital (12% of patients). This led the investigators to conclude that frequent use of serum digoxin assays in clinical practice could decrease the frequency with which recipients experience adverse reactions.

In 1970 it was suggested that hospital patients with cardiac disease who were treated with tricyclic antidepressant drugs suffered excess mortality. Detailed review of the BCDS data on hospitalized medical patients showed a high overall rate of ADRs in tricyclic antidepressant recipients, but also showed that the rate of sudden death in tricyclic recipients (0.4%) was similar to that of nonrecipients (0.3%).\(^{42}\)

Smoking might be expected to influence drug metabolism since substances in cigarette smoke can induce hepatic microsomal activity. It was also possible to test this hypothesis in a number of ways. The effect of the analgesic drug propoxyphene was found to be inversely related to the amount of cigarette smoking, regardless of the condition that required analgesic therapy.\(^{43}\) Similarly, among users of diazepam and chlordiazepoxide, drug attributed drowsiness was less common in smokers than nonsmokers. This effect was not seen in phenobarbital users. It was suggested that users of phenobarbital already had maximally induced enzymes, and that smoking therefore made no difference.\(^{44}\)

Other hypotheses tested included relationships between tetracycline use and renal impairment (confirmed),\(^{45}\) increased nephrotoxicity in patients receiving both aminoglycoside and cephalosporin
(not confirmed), and amphetamine use and Hodgkin’s disease (not confirmed).

Hypothesis Generating Studies

Regular review of the BCDSP data often produced observations which led to hypotheses about previously unsuspected drug reactions. For example, after a short period of monitoring, when only 4000 patients had been enrolled, it was observed that gastrointestinal bleeding was more common in patients receiving intravenous ethacrynic acid. The risk was present both in patients receiving heparin and in those who did not receive anticoagulants. Although other loop diuretics have gastrointestinal side effects, few, if any, are associated with gastrointestinal bleeding.

An interesting example of the detection of increased susceptibility to ADRs was observed after the BCDSP was expanded to include monitoring centers in other countries. Skin rashes were found to be more common in Israeli patients, especially those receiving the analgesic drug dipyramine. The rates were 2.3% for American patients, 2.6% for Israeli patients not taking dipyramine, and 6.6% for Israeli patients taking dipyramine. This drug was given to a large number of Israeli patients and the rash often closely followed the start of drug therapy. The association was discovered from within the database, since the absolute frequency was low and the medical attendants rarely noticed the relationship.

In 1976, the first in a series of new analyses was undertaken, in which the drug incriminated by the attending physicians as the cause of a reaction was ignored. All 507 patients with a drug attributed skin rash among 22 277 consecutive patients were systematically reviewed. Having removed all information on recipients of penicillin and blood/blood products from the data set, and having defined certain rules of causality, 57 separate drugs were identified as having strong likelihood of causing skin reactions.

In a similar way, 57 cases of gastrointestinal hemorrhage in whom an underlying medical predisposition to bleed was unlikely and a drug related cause seemed possible were identified among 16 646 medical inpatients. This review indicated a strong likelihood that steroids, aspirin, anticoagulants, and ethacrynic acid could cause gastrointestinal hemorrhage in otherwise healthy subjects. It must be remembered that, although this seems a small number of cases, modern nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs were not in use at the time.

BCDSP: STUDIES OF THE PREHOSPITAL DRUG USE OF MEDICAL INPATIENTS

A review of the proportion of patients admitted to medical wards due to ADRs was published in 1974. This emphasized that between 1.8 and 5.6% of admissions to the medical wards of seven university teaching hospitals were due to such reactions. Foremost among the drugs associated with this type of reaction were digoxin, aspirin containing preparations, insulin, anticoagulants, and adrenal corticosteroids. However, the period of interest was initially restricted to the 3 months preceding hospitalization, as it was felt that patient recall of drug history for a longer period would be inaccurate. Regular drug use which stopped for a period exceeding three months before admission was not recorded, and any relationship between this drug use and subsequent morbid events was undetected. Modern approaches to this method often have access to computerized prehospital drug use information (see Chapters 15–23), thus eliminating potential recall bias.

This limitation may have been relevant to a study that sought an association between prehospitalization aspirin use and renal disease. No such association was found. However, the exposure status in some patients with renal disease may have been distorted by the 3 month rule. Such patients could have consulted a physician many months previously because of symptoms from renal disease and been advised to discontinue aspirin. If they complied with this request and then an admission to the hospital occurred later, a history of exposure to analgesics could have gone unrecorded. This problem could have been circumvented by confining analyses to newly diagnosed cases of the condition under review.

During the study of prehospital aspirin consumption, it was observed that there was a
significantly lower mortality than expected in this group of patients. Further analyses revealed that this was due to a reduction in myocardial infarction.\textsuperscript{54} This finding aroused considerable interest having, as it did, major implications for prevention. The work was repeated two years later, using a different group of monitored patients, with the same negative relationship being demonstrated.\textsuperscript{55} Analyses took account of age, sex, hospital, and reason for drug therapy. Furthermore, the association was found in patients with a wide range of clinical conditions, such as diabetes, hypertension, previous myocardial infarction, and arthritis. Details of potential risk factors such as diet, exercise habits, and lifestyle were not recorded. Although these could represent confounding factors, none were felt likely to significantly alter the result. Similarly, as only myocardial infarction patients who survived to reach a hospital could be studied, a theoretical explanation might be that aspirin takers were more likely to die in the acute phase of infarction. This seemed unlikely to explain the findings, however. It was to be over ten years before this finding was confirmed in a subsequent randomized clinical trial, and of course, aspirin is now a very important therapeutic tool in prevention and treatment of cardiovascular disease.

There exists within the framework of such an elaborate system for data collection the possibility of gathering information on substances which, although not drugs or medications in the accepted sense, may nevertheless have pharmacological actions or interactions with other drugs. Information on tea, coffee, and alcohol consumption was collected by the group. From the regular review of this information came the observation that regular coffee drinking was associated with nonfatal myocardial infarction.\textsuperscript{56} Risk was found to be increased twofold and was found to be independent of age, sex, previous myocardial infarction, other cardiac conditions, obesity, diabetes, smoking, and occupation. Further corroborative evidence was obtained in a separate cross-sectional study carried out in 1972 (see below), where risks of the same magnitude were found.\textsuperscript{57} Various explanations for the finding are theoretically possible.

Using a similar (case–control) approach, an association was sought between alcohol consumption and myocardial infarction, but neither an increase nor a decrease in risk due to alcohol consumption was demonstrated.\textsuperscript{58} Starting at a time when quantitative information about ADRs was poor or nonexistent, the BCDS\textsuperscript{P} has been the most successful group to study hospital based cohorts of drug recipients and to quantify the adverse effects of established drugs. A summary of the studies reported by these workers was published in 1986.\textsuperscript{59} By 1974, its Director, Hershel Jick, was able to review his work at BCDS\textsuperscript{P} and conclude that, although ADRs are common and may affect many millions of Americans annually, their severity and the rates with individual drugs are remarkably low.\textsuperscript{60} After that time, the emphasis of research work at BCDS\textsuperscript{P} shifted to different information sources (see Chapters 15 and 23), although \textit{ad hoc} studies are still conducted from time to time using their original methodology.

Other Intensive Hospital Based Cohort Studies

Although the largest proportion of analyses from the BCDS\textsuperscript{P} involved medical inpatients, detailed studies have been undertaken on smaller numbers of patients in pediatric wards\textsuperscript{10} and psychiatric wards.\textsuperscript{11} Further analyses of the psychiatric resource revealed a strong negative association between chlorpromazine associated drowsiness and cigarette smoking habits.\textsuperscript{61} Thereafter, a modest monitoring program was undertaken on 5232 surgical patients.\textsuperscript{9} This study emphasized the higher number of drugs used in surgical patients when compared to medical patients and also indicated a measurable proportion of ADRs occurring in these patients. Further detailed reviews of this surgical data resource defined the prevalence of acute respiratory events occurring after general anesthesia in the recovery room.\textsuperscript{52}

In addition, although the BCDS\textsuperscript{P} has accumulated the largest database using short term in-hospital cohort studies, it is by no means the only group that has been using this approach. The initial pediatric drug monitoring studies
undertaken by Jick and his colleagues\textsuperscript{10} were soon discontinued, in large part because the information suggested that the rates of reactions were low in all but seriously ill children. It was therefore concluded that the cost-effectiveness of this type of monitoring in pediatric wards was relatively low. Mitchell and his colleagues undertook a monitoring project in a large pediatric ward based on techniques similar to the original BCDSP study.\textsuperscript{63} Several important findings emerged in addition to essential basic quantitation of drug utilization problems. In 1985, they published an important study showing a significant inverse relationship between body weight and risks of hyperglycemia following infusion with 10% dextrose solutions.\textsuperscript{64} This emphasized the importance of careful dosage adjustment of treatments in the neonatal period and the necessity of continued vigilance even with apparently simple treatment regimens to avoid serious adverse effects. More recently, a review of the risks of heparin therapy used to monitor patency of venous access demonstrated a positive association with intraventricular hemorrhage in low birth weight infants.\textsuperscript{65} In view of their findings, it is perhaps a cause for concern that these workers showed a significant increase in drug use in low birth weight infants when comparing data from 1978–79 with 1985–86, especially in the first week of treatment in the intensive care unit. In the latter phase, some 71% of admissions to the neonatal intensive care unit had received gentamicin during their stay, and approximately 60% each received sodium chloride, potassium chloride, and heparin. Such reports emphasize the need for continued careful monitoring of this vulnerable age group of patients. Recognizing the limitations of inpatient monitoring, the group has recently stressed the importance of the randomized controlled trial in monitoring for drug safety in children (see Chapter 33). In a large study, no increase in risk of hospitalization for gastrointestinal bleeding, renal failure, or anaphylaxis was found in short term users of ibuprofen.\textsuperscript{57}

In the field of general medical inpatient monitoring studies, those from the University of Berne, Switzerland, deserve special mention. In 1974, Hoigne and colleagues began routine systematic followup of all patients hospitalized in several Berne medical units.\textsuperscript{68} This program, known as the Comprehensive Hospital Drug Monitoring Berne (CHDMB), has published many interesting and valuable papers on ADRs.\textsuperscript{69} Because of its size, this program is one of the few data resources whose work can be compared with that of the BCDSP. Their initial reports on drug related deaths in 17 285 medical patients in two teaching hospitals indicated an incidence of 0.4 per 1000 patients, a figure similar in magnitude to the 0.9 per 1000 patients recorded in a BCDSP study of 26 462 subjects.\textsuperscript{28}

CHDMB has published reports on drug induced blood dyscrasias\textsuperscript{70} and on allergic reactions to drugs.\textsuperscript{71} CHDMB published two reports on skin reactions attributed to penicillins and their relationship to allopurinol use.\textsuperscript{72,73} These were of great methodologic interest because, although they confirmed the high frequency of exanthemata associated with penicillins reported by BCDSP,\textsuperscript{74} they did not reveal an excess in patients concomitantly receiving penicillins and allopurinol, a finding initially coming from BCDSP.\textsuperscript{75} The CHDMB reviewed all the published information and concluded that the most likely explanation for the discrepancy was variations in the length of exposure to penicillins in the two studies. An alternative explanation, however, could be that the CHDMB data set was a record of all penicillin or allopurinol attributed rashes, whereas the BCDSP data set was collected and analyzed to look at virtually all rashes occurring in the monitored wards. The judgments inherent in deciding whether to include a patient in the Berne data could have introduced unwanted bias into an otherwise excellent system. These findings highlight the need both for extreme care in the analyses of this type of information and clarity in the documentation of the final results.

Data collection continues in two centers in Berne and St Gallen. By 1993, the database contained information on 48 005 consecutive admissions of 34 840 patients. By recording prescription information from the 21 day prehospitalization period, the Swiss workers have contributed to the growing body of published information on the association between upper gastrointestinal bleeding and non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.\textsuperscript{76} Twenty years
of experience have been reviewed in recent reports of drug induced asthma and skin reactions.\textsuperscript{77,78} Older information from these databases has recently revealed further information on heparin induced thrombocytopenia, antibiotics/colitis, and diuretics/hypokalemia.\textsuperscript{79,80,81}

The general methodology found recent application in an Italian project running under the acronym ARIES (Adverse Reaction Identification Evaluation System). The project was developed as a collaborative effort between ICI–Pharma and several hospital departments that comprise the Gruppo di Ricerca sulla Epidemiologia del Farmaco. Physicians worked with external monitors in the collection of data of three forms: (i) demographic and administrative information together with ICD coded diagnoses, (ii) prescription information including drug name, route, dose, and starting and stopping dates, and (iii) adverse event information obtained using a simple algorithm. Data collected between 1988 and 1991 yielded information on 9000 patients and 60 000 prescriptions. Much of this early effort was directed towards drug utilization studies,\textsuperscript{82} but there existed within the framework the possibility of conducting hypothesis generating and testing studies similar to those conducted using the Boston and Swiss data.

THE FUTURE

Having highlighted some of the strengths and drawbacks of this approach, and provided some examples, it is relevant to conclude this review by looking ahead and attempting to assess how this technique of intensive hospital based monitoring might continue to contribute to our knowledge about ADRs.

First, patterns of drug use change as our understanding of pathophysiology advances, new indications for old drugs emerge, often after many years of research, and established drugs are used in new formulations. Furthermore, patterns of hospitalization change as economic and political developments proceed. Populations change as birth rates change and longevity increases. For all of these reasons, it is predictable that patterns of ADRs will change with time. It might therefore be both reasonable and justifiable to conduct this type of intensive monitoring exercise every ten years or so, in order to keep abreast of current drug therapy and modes of clinical practice. The period over which monitoring might be done would not be crucially important. Indeed if a large number of centers were recruited and enough staff employed to cope with data handling, the required number of patients, say 50 000, could be processed quite quickly. Such a development would be both useful and justified. It would offer information of considerable value to prescribers, manufacturers, and regulators alike. However, the main advantage of periodically repeating the BCDSP exercise would be that all recently marketed drugs that have reached significant usage levels in hospitals could be monitored, their acute toxicity profile determined, and their interaction with other drugs and with smoking and alcohol habits assessed.

Realistically, cost is likely to be the main limiting factor. As hospital information systems improve, so does the extent and quality of information on drug prescribing and administration. Additional linkage to demographic, laboratory, procedures, and morbidity information raises the possibility of comprehensive multipurpose in-hospital information that would allow ongoing safety monitoring of the intensive in-hospital type, and indeed go a long way towards achieving the proposals for a scientifically rigorous system proposed by Finney in 1965.\textsuperscript{3}

Were a general monitoring program to be instituted on a regular basis every decade or so, even then information on newly marketed drugs would remain scarce. However, this could be circumvented by selected (targeted) drug monitoring studies. Such studies have been undertaken many times in the past, and clozapine has already been cited as a more recent example.\textsuperscript{17} Target drug surveillance is a modification of the basic system whereby, rather than selecting a hospital service and scrutinizing all patients and all drugs in that service, a drug of interest is selected and all users of that drug, regardless of location within the hospital, are studied. For example, Koch-Weser and his colleagues at the Massachusetts General Hospital performed a classic study of this type, reviewing information on 317 patients receiving
colistin treatment. Detailed analyses showed that altering the method of dose adjustment in patients with renal impairment would be likely to reduce the ADR rate significantly.83 This system has been used by the Boston group to study various drugs, including intravenous cimetidine84 and atracurium, a neuromuscular blocking agent for use in anesthesia.85,86 The work of the monitor in such a system is clearly different, for there must be close liaison with the hospital pharmacy if all drug users are to be identified and located. In this situation the monitor works throughout the hospital and interacts with many more people than his or her counterpart in the previously described system, so such a monitor must be both highly efficient and a good communicator.

The target drug system is certainly a more efficient way of answering specific questions about new drugs, and is therefore a more efficient approach for this defined purpose than the general inpatient monitoring system. It also lends itself to the multicenter approach. The Drug Surveillance Network is a nationwide network of clinical pharmacists in the USA and Canada. Clinical pharmacists in over 300 hospitals record relevant information and monitor progress and outcomes in consecutive eligible patients. Studies on antibiotic use have highlighted potential problems with renal and hematological ADRs, and methodological issues related to misclassification have also been addressed.87,88

Another way of focusing resources in an intensive hospital based monitoring program is by selecting specific patient groups who, for various reasons, may be worthy of particularly detailed study. The pediatric monitoring program conducted by Mitchell was referred to earlier.63–66 An additional example of such a group would be elderly persons, who are at considerable risk of developing ADRs by virtue of high drug usage, if for no other reason. Subjects over the age of 65 years comprise about 15% of the UK population and consume about 35% of prescribed drugs. They also comprise over half the total hospitalized population. ADRs in the elderly are common. Hurwitz89 provided documentation of this in her study of medical inpatients in Belfast. Williamson and Chopin90 studied a group of admissions to geriatric assessment units and predictably found a high rate of ADRs. They documented the drugs most frequently responsible and demonstrated a link between prehospitalization polypharmacy and ADRs. A significant proportion of hospital admissions is thought, at least in part, to be due to ADRs.91 There remains overall concern that elderly patients are at considerable risk from ADRs,92,93 although the complex relationship between age, altered physiology, multiple drug exposures, and multiple disease states needs careful interpretation.

Monitoring systems for assessing ADRs in elderly subjects have largely been confined to acute medical wards, although community based record linkage gives exciting opportunities to investigate drug exposure and outcomes in a very different group. Few studies have investigated elderly subjects in chronic care institutions, a group at high risk from serious reactions.94 A program gathering such data on a routine basis would be desirable, and the intensive hospital based system could be adapted for use in this environment.

In a detailed review of the “state of the art” of the discovery of drug induced illness, the Director of the BCDSP defined the contribution of various different research strategies to this end.95 He emphasized that the cohort approach was most useful in situations where a drug causes a significant increase in an already high baseline risk of an event or illness. Such situations are relatively unusual, albeit still of major importance. This view was upheld by Venning96–100 who undertook a detailed study of identification of adverse reactions to new drugs.

Finally, in the US the Joint Commission for Accreditation of Hospitals now requires all hospitals to develop the capability to document and evaluate ADRs that occur in their patients. This could simply involve the passive collection of spontaneous reports of adverse reactions occurring in the hospitals. Alternatively, it could result in systems as thorough as the existing systems for monitoring for nosocomial infections or even as thorough as the intensive hospital based cohort studies described here.

It seems likely therefore that intensive hospital based cohort studies of suspected adverse drug
reactions and of events in drug recipients will remain a relevant technique for studying selected drugs in specific circumstances for some time. General monitoring of medical inpatients by this approach would be useful if undertaken periodically by a trained research team, and may be a useful by-product of rapidly developing information systems.
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Secondly, the systems that have emanated from Boston—the initial system of intensive hospital monitoring and the new system of relatively nonspecific case–control enquiry—have made, or promise to make, valuable contributions.

Richard Doll, 1977

The experience of being disagreeably wrong is salutary; no epidemiologist should be denied it, and not many are.

Dennis Slone, 1975 (with apologies to John Kenneth Galbraith).

Over 20 years have passed since 1977, when Richard Doll discussed the promise of case–control surveillance (CCS), then only 18 months old and little more than a concept. In the intervening years CCS has contributed to the public health, and it has had a major impact on directions of research in the epidemiological evaluation of drugs, and indeed, on epidemiology in general (see the appendix: “Case–control surveillance. Publications 1975–1998”). CCS has discovered previously unsuspected relationships between drug use and disease risk, some beneficial and some adverse; CCS has also documented drug safety, and it has developed a large database for the testing of hypotheses proposed by others.

CCS came about as the end result of almost a decade of experience in the application of epidemiological principles to the evaluation of drug effects. That effort, which commenced in earnest in the mid-1960s, benefited from the conceptual formulations of Finney, who described a statistical model of drug surveillance (which he termed a “drug monitor”), and from the field studies of Cluff.

Finney and Cluff were among the first to appreciate that the drug explosion which followed the second world war, coupled with the occurrence of unanticipated adverse effects (e.g., phocomelia due to thalidomide), necessitated the development of surveillance systems. Finney proposed that drug surveillance should have the capacity to fulfill three functions: (i) to detect previously unsuspected drug/event associations (hypothesis generation); (ii) to validate such associations by in-depth analysis; and (iii) to test hypotheses proposed by others (hypothesis testing).

The foresight of Finney and Cluff was soon vindicated as a rapid succession of adverse effects were reported. Examples include oral contraceptives and venous thromboembolism, practolol and corneal perforation, in utero exposure to diethylstilbestrol and vaginal cancer, and estrogens and endometrial cancer. Case–control methods played a critical role in the quantitative elucidation of most of these and many other...
associations, and it was clear that for the foreseeable future they would continue in that role, particularly in relation to serious drug-induced morbidity.\(^1\)

The early successes of case-control methods were to influence the development of CCS, but at the time that Finney first proposed his model, their value as applied to drug safety was not yet widely appreciated. The classical studies of the oral contraceptive/thrombosis relationship,\(^7,12\) among others, helped to change that perception.\(^13\) Even then, however, it was still thought that the case-control approach was applicable only to \textit{ad hoc} studies of single outcomes, that it lacked the capacity to discover unsuspected connections between drug use and multiple outcomes, and that it therefore had little to offer to the development of a drug surveillance system. It was thought that such a system must necessarily be based on followup methods. In addition, the general prejudice of the time still decreed that “prospective studies” were superior to “retrospective studies”—if, indeed, the latter had any value at all.\(^14\) Thus, the early attempts to organize surveillance systems explored followup methods, implemented mainly\(^3,5,15\) (although not exclusively)\(^16\) within hospital wards (see Chapter 12). Nurses were trained to enroll consecutive patients, to record all drug exposures that occurred during the hospital stay, to record confounding factors, to follow the patients, and to record events.

The first such system to operate successfully on a large scale was the Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program (BCDSP).\(^17\) It was also the first to show that the three requirements of Finney’s drug surveillance model, or monitor, could be fulfilled. Computers were used to compare multiple drug exposures in relation to multiple events. Previously unsuspected associations could be identified, the associations could then be evaluated in depth, and hypotheses proposed by others could be assessed (see Chapter 12).

The demonstration that Finney’s drug surveillance monitor was feasible was an important accomplishment. With the passage of time, however, it became increasingly clear that hospital-based followup had the major limitation that it did not monitor the occurrence of serious diseases attributable to drug use in the population at large. The system could not, for example, have documented any of the associations mentioned above. To correct this situation, a case-control component was added to the BCDSP methods. On enrollment, the patients were followed, as before, but now they were also interviewed for histories of regular drug use during the month before admission. Then, with the experience already gained, it was an easy step to carry out multiple case-control comparisons: each primary diagnosis that led to admission (cases) could be compared with all other admissions (controls) for the prior use of all drugs to which the patients had been exposed. Contrary to the accepted wisdom at that time, as a conceptual matter it seemed possible, after all, to use case-control methodology to assess multiple drug exposures in relation to multiple outcomes.

As expected, noncausal associations soon became apparent (e.g., insulin and diabetes). Then, as large numbers accumulated, it became possible to screen for unsuspected associations. One association, observed after some 9000 patients had been studied, was a significantly reduced rate of antecedent aspirin use among patients with myocardial infarction (cases), relative to all other diagnoses (controls). On more detailed analysis, and in particular after the exclusion from the control series of patients whose primary diagnoses were not independent of aspirin use (e.g., arthritis), the inverse association held.\(^18\) The finding was of considerable interest because it had been shown that aspirin inhibited platelet adhesiveness.\(^19\)

To confirm the finding, and to evaluate risks of other diseases, a second study (colloquially, “the special study”) was soon organized. Nurses administered a standard questionnaire covering regular drug use in the three months before admission. They also recorded demographic data, and specific information on a few potentially confounding factors relevant to the aspirin/myocardial infarction association. In ten months they interviewed some 25,000 patients admitted to 24 hospitals, whose primary diagnoses were subsequently determined from the discharge summaries.

This study design had certain attractive features. First, because heart attacks are common, an
essentially random enrollment procedure yielded sufficient cases and specific advance provision could be made for at least limited control of confounding. In addition, among 25,000 admissions there were also sufficient primary diagnoses independent of aspirin use from which to select a valid control series. The "special study" confirmed the inverse association, the validity of which has since been established beyond all reasonable doubt. Second, the "special study" demonstrated that it was feasible to use the case-control approach as a surveillance methodology (see above). Third, the focus had now shifted in the direction of monitoring drug use in the population at large in relation to the occurrence of serious diseases—which is the principal concern with regard to issues of drug safety.

Experience also revealed that there were drawbacks to the "special study," and a critical review of that experience was the final and most important factor to influence the development of CCS. It is convenient to commence that review with the testing of hypotheses proposed by others.

(i) Hypothesis testing. Apart from confirming the aspirin/myocardial infarction association, the "special study" confirmed other hypotheses, such as an increased risk of major upper gastrointestinal bleeding among aspirin users, an increased risk of venous thromboembolism among oral contraceptive users, and a decreased risk of benign breast disease among oral contraceptive users. However, for the purpose of rigorous evaluation, the diagnostic data were insufficiently precise (e.g., histology of benign breast disease). Further, information on important confounders either was not recorded at all (e.g., prior history of gastrointestinal bleeding, or of thrombosis, or of breast biopsy), or it was recorded in insufficient detail. The lessons: more detailed and precise diagnostic data are needed; detailed medical history is essential; and cast the widest possible net for potential confounders.

(ii) Hypothesis generation and in-depth evaluation. Previously unsuspected associations were identified, and then documented in depth: for example, a reduced risk of functional ovarian cysts among oral contraceptive users. However, a related effect, that oral contraceptive use reduces the risk of ovarian cancer, went undetected because too few cases were enrolled, and because histories of long discontinued use were not recorded. The lessons: selectively enroll diseases of concern, and record lifetime histories of drug use. Later, when CCS carried out these measures, the negative association between oral contraceptives and ovarian cancer was confirmed.

Another association missed in the "special study" was the increased risk of endometrial cancer among estrogen users. Again, that association was subsequently evident in the CCS data within which it was possible not only to confirm what others had reported, but also, on in-depth analysis, to strengthen the evidence to suggest causality (see "Strengths"). Had the association not been known, CCS would have discovered it, and validated it. The lessons: to accrue all but the most common diagnoses, selective procedures must be used; lifetime drug histories are needed; and to validate and extend observations, large numbers are needed.

One finding, the association between the use of rauwolfia alkaloids and breast cancer, proved to be so disastrously wrong as to cast doubt in the minds of some on the concept of hypothesis generation itself and, indeed, even on the validity of case-control methods. In essence, the hypothesis-generating data were as follows: among 150 cases of breast cancer, 11 (7.3%) had used rauwolfia in the three months before admission, whereas the exposure rate among controls was 2.2%, for a relative risk estimate of 3.5 (p = 0.0007). Eventually, after a great many studies, the weight of the evidence suggested that the rauwolfia alkaloids do not increase the risk of breast cancer. In retrospect, the original data were not valid for the following reasons. (a) In the course of multiple comparisons, "significant" associations are sometimes bound to arise by chance. The question of how to distinguish between chance and
causation has been much debated, and the rauwolfia/breast cancer findings stimulated the debate afresh.\textsuperscript{29–32} As a practical matter, however, if we assume the absence of bias or confounding, chance associations should not be replicated if the same methods are used to collect further data. If, however, there are repeated replications, a causal inference becomes more tenable.

There is also the related issue of biological plausibility. When a relatively invariate association is observed in many studies, preferably based on different methods, such plausibility can play an important role, some would argue an essential one, in the final step of reaching a causal inference. However, when an association is first identified in the course of multiple comparisons, that criterion may be of little or no help in distinguishing between chance and causation, because it is almost always possible to invoke selective biological evidence either to support an association, or not to support it. Again, regardless of biological considerations, the first requirement after identifying an unexpected association must be to re-identify it.

The lesson: try to replicate unexpected findings by collecting more data. Even then, treat your own findings with suspicion until they have been independently confirmed in other studies.

(b) Since it eventually transpired that there is no increase in risk, the implications for a surveillance system of null findings (i.e., drug safety) must be considered. A drug surveillance system should have the capacity not only to detect associations, but also to rule them out. It is an unfortunate but inescapable statistical fact that documentation of the null within narrow confidence limits requires much larger numbers than the documentation of strongly positive associations. The lesson: enroll sufficient cases to document drug safety, on the assumption that the null hypothesis may be the “correct” one. Subsequently, after CCS was established and more than 1000 cases of breast cancer had been studied, even small associations with rauwolfia use were ruled out.\textsuperscript{33} The original association was not replicated, and the strong likelihood is that it was indeed due to chance.

(c) It is impossible to stipulate the exact time of onset of breast cancer. For those currently exposed, one can only be confident that the exposure came first if it lasted many years. For that purpose there were insufficient data. For the same reason, and in order to explore latent interval or duration effects, information on discontinued rauwolfia use was needed. Such information was also needed in order to distinguish between possible cancer initiation and promotion. The lessons: collect lifetime histories of drug exposure; define the exposure so that it unequivocally antedates the disease; study sufficient cases not only to test overall hypotheses, but also to test additional ones that might hold under causal assumptions (e.g., duration, dose–response, latent interval, or promotional effects).

(d) The study recorded data on confounders relevant mainly to the risk of myocardial infarction in relation to aspirin exposure. Virtually no information on breast cancer risk factors (e.g., parity) was collected, and confounding could not be controlled. For the same reason, it was not possible to evaluate consistency within relevant strata. In any event, with only 11 exposed cases such an evaluation would not have been feasible; still less would it have been feasible to attain statistical stability within strata. The lessons: cast a wide a net for confounders likely to be relevant to a wide range of hypotheses; for validation purposes, enroll larger numbers of cases than are needed simply to attain overall statistical significance.
In summary, the development of CCS was influenced by conceptual formulations, by early experience with drug surveillance, and by the contemporary development and refinement of case–control methods.

DESCRIPTION

CCS is conducted in full compliance with the Helsinki principles, and with NIH guidelines for human research. In addition, in all grant and contract arrangements, whether with government, industry, or others, strict provision is made for academic independence. The data collected in CCS are the exclusive intellectual property of the investigators, who are solely responsible for decisions concerning publication, or dissemination of information in other ways (e.g., reports to regulatory agencies or manufacturers).

Case–control studies can vary in their specificity (Figure 13.1). In an entirely specific study, a single exposure in relation to a single outcome is at issue; such a study is largely a conceptual abstraction, with little applicability in real life. In a semi-specific study, multiple exposures in relation to a single outcome are at issue. Ad hoc case–control studies conform to the semi-specific model. The unique contribution of CCS is that it is an extension to a nonspecific model, in which a wide range of exposures are studied in relation to a wide range of outcomes, within a single database.

METHODS

Nurse interviewers are stationed in selected hospitals, where they identify cases according to a priority list of diseases of special interest (Figure 13.2). Only incident cases diagnosed no more than a year previously are enrolled. Patients with a wide range of conditions other than those on the priority lists are also interviewed. The priority list is changed from time to time, partly in response to what is currently of concern, and partly based on review of the accumulated data. If sufficient cases of a given disease have been enrolled, that disease is removed from the list. Alternatively, from time to time new diseases are added. The nurses use sources such as admission lists, ward files, operation logs, and pathology logs to identify cases.

For some diseases, even the use of priority lists may yield insufficient cases, and it may be
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Figure 13.1. Types of case–control study (see text). In a specific study a single exposure (drug) is evaluated in relation to a single outcome (disease). In a semi-specific study multiple exposures are evaluated in relation to a single outcome. In a nonspecific study multiple exposures are evaluated in relation to multiple outcomes. The arrows point from outcome to exposure because the cases are identified first, and the exposures are then determined. (For simplicity, controls are omitted from the figure.)
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Figure 13.2. Case–control surveillance (see text). Surveillance is routinely conducted in hospitals \(n\) in which priority lists guide the selection of diseases of special interest; other diseases not on the priority lists are also selected. If sufficient priority list cases cannot be accrued, additional hospitals \((n+1)\) are added. Trained nurse interviewers administer standard questionnaires. If a particular research question necessitates the collection of additional information, the routine data collection is augmented on an ad hoc basis.
necessary to augment the routine data collection by special means (Figure 13.2). In recent years, CCS has focused most particularly on cancer risk, and has enrolled large numbers (sometimes thousands) of cases (see Table 13.1): to do so, appropriate hospitals, and within them, when there have been concerns about specific cancers, appropriate departments, have been added to the system (e.g., cases of malignant melanoma were enrolled from a melanoma clinic).\textsuperscript{34, 35}

A standard data collection form is used for routine surveillance. It has five parts:

1. \textit{Demographic data}. The usual information is recorded. Examples include age, sex, race, weight, height, marital status, and religion at birth (these data, of course, are also potentially confounding variables).

2. \textit{Lifetime histories of drug use}. The patients are questioned about the use of drugs in the year before admission, or at any earlier time, according to over 40 indication categories. The categories are not mutually exclusive or hierarchical. The wording is colloquial, and intended to prompt memory. Examples are: pain/headache/backache; blood pressure; change of life/menopause/hot flushes; sleeping medications; tremors/seizures/anticonvulsants. The emphasis is on the regular use of drugs, but all episodes of reported use are recorded. With the exception of oral contraceptives and conjugated estrogens, doses are not recorded. For analytical purposes, short episodes of use that took place within days or weeks of admission are considered to be sufficiently precise for the evaluation of acute drug effects (e.g., aspirin and gastrointestinal bleeding).\textsuperscript{36} However, it is unlikely that brief or occasional drug use in the distant past can be reliably remembered (see Chapter 39). Thus, although it is operationally convenient to record all reported use, as a general rule drug use that occurred more than a year previously is only analyzed if it was regular, and if it lasted for months or years. In addition, if there is any question as to the time sequence between exposure and outcome, only regular and long term use that clearly antedated the onset of the disease is analyzed (e.g., a reduced risk of cancer of the colon and rectum among aspirin users).\textsuperscript{37}

3. \textit{Confounding factors}. The possibility of confounding cannot ever be entirely eliminated in nonexperimental research, and sources of confounding can be multiple, subtle, and complex.\textsuperscript{38} Thus, relative to an \textit{ad hoc} study designed to test a specific hypothesis, a multipurpose system can seldom make the equivalent advance provision for the recording of all confounding factors relevant to hypotheses still to be generated and tested at a future date. Despite these intrinsic limitations, however, it is nevertheless feasible to record a sufficiently wide range of potential confounders to meet most of the requirements of routine surveillance (Figure 13.2). The routinely recorded potentially confounding factors can be broadly divided into three categories: (i) the standard demographic variables, mentioned above, (ii) comprehensive medical histories: all major illnesses and episodes of major surgery—and, for female patients, full gynecological and obstetrical histories, and (iii) environmental and lifestyle factors that may be correlates both of drug use and disease risk: smoking habits, alcohol, coffee and tea consumption; years of education; physical activity; and frequency of health care utilization. In addition, on those occasions when they are not met, \textit{ad hoc} information on relevant risk factors can be added to the routine data collection (Figure 13.2). For example, in order to evaluate oral contraceptives and malignant melanoma risk,\textsuperscript{39} information on sun exposure was added as a potential confounder.

4. \textit{Genetic data}. It has long been known that genetic factors play a role in determining the occurrence of certain drug effects.\textsuperscript{39} Case–control surveillance has focused on cancer risk, and for that purpose the collection of standard data on biomarkers of genetic susceptibility is desirable. Recently it has been shown that DNA can reliably be extracted from buccal swabs, and stored.\textsuperscript{40} The method is inexpensive and feasible on a large scale, and it has been added to CCS. Stored DNA will thus be available for testing future hypotheses.
5. **Diagnostic data.** The discharge summary, and, when appropriate, the pathology report (e.g., cancer), is obtained. The primary diagnosis, and up to five secondary diagnoses, are recorded.

**HYPOTHESIS GENERATION**

The completed data are stored in master computer files. At regular intervals, multiple comparisons are carried out. Drug exposure frequencies for each disease are compared with the corresponding frequencies among the remaining patients, after adjustment for age, sex, and geographic region. The associations that emerge may be obviously noncausal (e.g., trinitroglycerin and myocardial infarction), tentative and requiring further replication before they are considered seriously, or eligible for in-depth analysis. Unexpected associations observed for the first time have to be replicated before they are considered further. Three examples are useful in illustrating how the screens are used:

1. **Alcohol and breast cancer.** When only a few hundred cases of breast cancer had been studied, an unexpected association with alcohol intake was identified; it was judged to be too far-fetched to deserve more detailed scrutiny. The association was then repeatedly replicated as more data were collected. It was eventually analyzed in depth, and published as a hypothesis. Even then, because the association was of relatively low magnitude, confounding could not be ruled out, and the hypothesis was stated tentatively. The association has since been confirmed in some studies, but not in others, including an *ad hoc* study which we undertook ourselves. At present it is by no means certain that alcohol increases the risk of breast cancer.

2. **Vasectomy and prostatic cancer.** One association identified in the multiple comparisons was an apparent increase in the risk of prostatic cancer among men who had undergone vasectomy. In-depth analysis was deferred pending replication. The association was then reported independently by another group. At that point, the data were analyzed in depth, and published as a hypothesis. In an editorial comment that accompanied publication of the hypothesis, Guess reasoned that it was by no means certain that the association is causal.

3. **Estrogens and ovarian cancer.** During the first two years of CCS, the multiple comparisons resulted in a statistically significant positive association between estrogen use and ovarian cancer. However, as more data were collected, the association was not replicated. Eventually, after much more data had been collected, the relationship was analyzed in depth, mainly because a positive association with endometrioid ovarian carcinoma had been published. In the CCS data the risk of ovarian cancer, and of endometrioid carcinoma in particular, did not appear to be increased by estrogen use. In the absence of an ongoing data collection system, the original association might well have been published, and subsequently have been shown to be disastrously wrong.

**IN-DEPTH ANALYSIS**

Whether a hypothesis is derived from the multiple comparisons, or proposed by others, the procedures for in-depth analysis are the same. In all instances a spin-off tape is abstracted from the master files. To do so, the first step is to specify the hypothesis precisely; and then to specify the cases, controls (including the number, the acceptable diagnoses, and if relevant, the matching criteria), and the potentially confounding variables. The data are then ready for analysis. When there appear to be relatively few confounders (which is rare), the analysis may require little more than minimal adjustment for confounding by factors such as age. For more complex situations with multiple confounders (which is common), multivariate methods are used.

**STRENGTHS**

Since its foundation in 1975, CCS has enrolled some 82,000 patients, mainly in Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, and Maryland. Over 70
publications have appeared in medical journals, book chapters, symposia, and the like. A full publication list is provided in the appendix.

**STATISTICAL POWER**

Table 13.1 lists the primary diagnoses for which the accrual has exceeded 100 cases. Table 13.2 lists the drugs to which more than 1% of the population have been exposed at some time in their lives; in the range of 0.5–2%, several hundred drugs have been used (data not given). Table 13.3 classifies ever-use of drugs according to 50 categories, with exposure rates ranging from 1 to 60%. Table 13.4 gives estimates of numbers of cases required to document statistically significant relative risks of 0.5, 2.0, 3.0, 5.0, and 10, according to drug exposure rates of 0.5, 5, 10, and 25% (see also Appendix A of this book). Table 13.5 gives, for the same rates of drug exposure, the numbers of cases required to document an upper two-sided 95% confidence limit of <2.0, assuming the relative risk point estimate is 1.0. Cross-referral among the five tables indicates in broad quantitative terms the statistical power of CCS. It is not possible to consider the tables exhaustively, but a few salient points will be made.

Case–control methods are most efficient in the evaluation of relatively common exposures. When, in addition, diseases can be enrolled in very large numbers (thousands), it is possible to document modestly elevated risks (≥2.0) based on control exposure rates as low as 0.5%. For higher exposure rates power is considerably greater. Alternatively, if there is no apparent increase in risk (relative risk ≈ 1.0) exposure rates of 1–2% make it possible to “rule out” material increases in risk (upper confidence interval, <2.0). With large numbers, it is also possible to identify protective effects for commonly used drugs (exposure rate, >2%). For exposure rates much below 0.5%, it is beyond the capacity of the system to document safety; positive associations, if strong, can still be documented, but power declines.

For diseases that can be enrolled in lesser but still adequate numbers (hundreds), for drug exposure rates in excess of 1–5% it is still possible to document increased risks of some twofold or greater. For null estimates, however, it is not possible to exclude modest increases in risk, unless the exposure rates are reasonably high (>5%).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Breast cancer</td>
<td>8076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fractures/traumatic injury</td>
<td>3500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lung cancer</td>
<td>1900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malignant melanoma</td>
<td>1830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholecystitis</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colon cancer</td>
<td>1800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian cyst</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myocardial infarction</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ovarian cancer</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endometrial cancer</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate cancer</td>
<td>1185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendicitis</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rectal cancer</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herniated lumbar disc</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholelithias</td>
<td>1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pelvic inflammatory disease</td>
<td>850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inguinal hernia</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venous thromboembolism</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrocystic breast disease</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukemia</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder cancer</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatic cancer</td>
<td>549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ectopic pregnancy</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal calculis</td>
<td>460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal cancer</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osteoporotic fractures</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Testicular cancer</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diverticulitis</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stomach cancer</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous abortion</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hodgkin’s disease</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catarract</td>
<td>330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatitis</td>
<td>310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detached retina</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duodenal ulcer</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major upper gastrointestinal bleeding</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esophageal cancer</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastric ulcer</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone cancer</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemorrhoids</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulmonary embolism</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salpingitis</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crohn’s disease</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral cancer</td>
<td>130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 13.2. Ever-use of drugs in case–control surveillance, 1975–1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug name</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepines</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascorbic acid</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracycline</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibuprofen</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furosemide</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prednisone</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bufferin®</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propoxyphene HCl</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlordiazepoxide</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propranolol</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percodan®</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen with codeine</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methyldopa</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfoxazole</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contac®</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noril®</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugated estrogens, 0.625 mg</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphenoxyelate HCl/atropine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warfarin sodium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitroglycerin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk of magnesia</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indomethacin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorpheniramine maleate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flurazepam HCl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalexin monohydrate</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimetidine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levothyroxine sodium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heparin sodium</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diphenhydramine HCl</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiorinal®</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digoxin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meperidine HCl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chlorothiazide</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUD, Lippes loop</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amitriptyline HCl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methocarbamol</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nystatin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prochlorperazine</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetrahydrozoline HCl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenybutazone</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenytoin</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alka Seltzer®</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medroxyprogesterone acetate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pseudoephedrine HCl</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zinc</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isosorbide dinitrate</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13.3. Ever-use of drugs in case–control surveillance, classified according to categories, 1975–1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin containing drugs</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamins/minerals</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron salts</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen containing drugs</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzodiazepines</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antihistamines</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caffeine containing drugs</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural penicillins</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrogens</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcotic pain formulas</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corticosteroids</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfonamides</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiazides</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamin A</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine containing drugs</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracyclines</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin/amoxicillin</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excludes aspirin)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium salts</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylpropanolamine</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folic acid containing vitamins</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spermicides</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbiturates</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjugated estrogens</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β-blockers</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxatives—stimulant type</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thyroid supplements</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrolide antibiotics</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antifungals</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrauterine devices</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenothiazines</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenobarbital</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guanethidin</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrates</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium salts</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2 blockers</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Docusate salts</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaginal douches</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalosporins</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressants</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxatives—emollient type</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progestogens</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfonylureas</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laxatives—bulk type</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xanthines (excludes caffeine)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spironolactone</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antiarrhythmics</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aminoglycosides</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 13.4. Estimated numbers of cases required to document various relative risks (assumptions: power = 80%, $\alpha = 0.05$; control-to-case ratio = 4 : 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure rate in controls (%)</th>
<th>Relative risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 13.5. Estimated numbers of cases required to document an upper 95% confidence limit (two-sided) of <2.0, assuming a “true” relative risk of 1.0 (assumptions: power = 80%, $\alpha = 0.05$; control-to-case ratio = 4 : 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure rate in controls (%)</th>
<th>Number of cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

That is, power to reject the null is still adequate, but power to document the null is more limited.

For diseases that can only be enrolled in more modest numbers (about 50–100 cases) increases in risk of the order of threefold or greater can be documented, but, assuming the true relative risk is unity, it would not be possible to rule out appreciable elevations in risk. As numbers decline further, only powerful associations with common drug exposures can be documented (for example, an increased risk of liver cancer among users of oral contraceptives, based on only 12 cases); and it is beyond the capacity of CCS to demonstrate safety.

Based on these projections, and on the disease frequencies in Table 13.1, CCS has the capacity to monitor a wide range of drugs commonly used in the population at large, in relation to a wide range of diseases, and to document increased risks. With large numbers CCS can document decreased risks, or it can document safety.

However, many drugs are used by appreciably less than 0.5% of the population. For the most part such drugs are not evaluable by CCS (see “Weaknesses”).

To sum up, for the evaluation of commonly used drugs in relation to common diseases, which is the main public health concern, CCS has a capacity for the documentation of adversity, protection, and safety. As the diseases become less common and more difficult to accrue, or as the exposure rates decline, that capacity is correspondingly reduced. Of course, by the same token, so are the public health concerns. Even for quite rare diseases, increases in risk due to commonly used drugs can be documented.

**STRENGTH OF ASSOCIATIONS**

Given adequate study design, and statistical stability, when a relative risk estimate exceeds 2.0 (or is less than the inverse estimate of 0.5), as a rule it is unlikely that residual sources of bias or confounding, if identified and allowed for, would entirely eliminate it. For more modestly elevated relative risks (<2.0), or modestly reduced ones (>0.5), however, it is seldom within the resolving power of nonexperimental research to show that an apparent association is “real.” This is not an issue of statistical significance: minor sources of bias or confounding can produce spurious associations of low magnitude; if the biases remain invariant the attainment of “significance” then becomes simply a matter of augmenting the sample size.\(^{38}\) Thus, Tables 13.1–5 show that CCS can document a wide range of increases in risk of the order of twofold or greater. It is also possible to document strong protective effects (relative risk, <0.5). When diseases can be accrued in large numbers (hundreds or thousands), lesser associations can also be documented, but their interpretability becomes more difficult (e.g., alcohol and breast cancer).

**MISCLASSIFICATION OF EXPOSURE AND OUTCOME**

Misclassification of exposure is present in CCS inasmuch as memory loss is unavoidable in the
reporting of drug use (see “Weaknesses”). However, in terms of specifying the time relationships between exposure and outcome, CCS has greater precision than any other surveillance methodology. Prompt access to the patients ensures that for acute effects (e.g., bleeding) the timing of drug use and of disease onset can be determined to the nearest day; for long term effects (e.g., carcinogenesis), CCS is the only surveillance system (as distinct from ad hoc studies) that routinely and systematically records lifetime drug exposures; and it is the only ongoing system that routinely records the use of nonprescribed drugs.

With regard to defining the outcomes, CCS is precise because of access to discharge summaries and pathology reports. The recording of medical histories also ensures that only incident cases are studied (e.g., venous thromboembolism).\(^{50}\)

**SELECTION BIAS**

The refusal rate in CCS is 4.5\%, and bias due to losses can virtually be ruled out. In theory, the biased selection of cases is possible if a drug increases (or decreases) the likelihood that the disease will be fatal before hospitalization, or before interview. In practice that bias has yet to be demonstrated. Bias may also arise, however, if the likelihood of hospitalization is increased by medical surveillance (e.g., selective hospitalization for breast cancer of oral contraceptive users who undergo regular breast examinations\(^{51}\)), and special measures may be needed to minimize it.

With regard to the selection of controls for in-depth analyses, the use of hospital controls raises the theoretical possibility of a selection bias. However, the pool of patients from which to make that selection is so large that a valid control series can almost always be defined. Occasionally, however, if the overall probability of hospitalization across a wide range of diagnoses is influenced by the exposure (e.g., alcohol, cigarettes), it may not be possible to confidently eliminate selection bias.

**INFORMATION BIAS**

A limitation to the validity of interview based case–control studies is their susceptibility to bias if the cases, prompted by knowledge of the hypothesis, recall their drug exposure histories more fully than the controls. In CCS, information bias does not exist for hypothesis generation since there is no hypothesis to be aware of. When it comes to hypothesis testing, however, bias cannot be entirely ruled out (see “Weaknesses”).

**CONFOUNDING**

In nonexperimental research there is no validity issue more important than confounding. For drug surveillance, potential confounding is, if anything, of even greater importance because drug use is itself a health-related activity. Factors such as previous medical history and lifestyle factors profoundly influence drug use, and they profoundly influence disease risk. Most of the information required to control confounding can be obtained only by direct and prompt access to the patients. (An incomplete list of some of the more important confounders would include the following: years of education; family history of cancer; history of major illnesses; surgical history; obstetrical and gynecological history; lifetime history of nonprescription drug use; lifetime smoking history; lifetime history of alcohol and beverage intake.) A capacity to adequately control confounding is essential to drug surveillance, and we feel that CCS fulfills that requirement more fully than any other system.

**CONSISTENCY**

A causal inference is strengthened if the data are consistent, and statistically stable, across strata that make biological sense (e.g., age), or across technical strata relevant to validity (e.g., region). This requirement necessitates larger numbers than those required simply for overall statistical significance. Consistency also applies to dosage or duration effects, when these can reasonably be anticipated. Again, larger numbers are needed. Moreover, the analysis of effects according to duration or dose must be confined to the domain of the exposed, with the nonexposed excluded,\(^{52}\) necessitating still larger numbers: the error of including the non-exposed in testing for dose–response still occurs far
too commonly.\textsuperscript{52} CCS has only limited data on dosage (see “Weaknesses”); however, for the analysis of duration effects, the recording of lifetime histories of drug use is a strong advantage.

**WEAKNESSES**

**STATISTICAL POWER**

For practical purposes, it is beyond the capacity of CCS to evaluate exposure rates below 0.5\%. Many drugs are used less commonly, and as a rule they can be monitored only by means of followup methods (or by adaptations, such as nested case–control studies), and only to a limited extent.

The rarity of some diseases is also a limiting factor. CCS has shown that selective enrollment is effective in accruing even quite uncommon conditions such as malignant melanoma\textsuperscript{34, 35} or ovarian cancer.\textsuperscript{25, 48} However, if the outcome is exceedingly rare, special ascertainment procedures covering a massive population base may be required in order to attain adequate numbers (e.g., agranulocytosis\textsuperscript{55}). In certain circumstances, if both the exposure and outcome are rare, but a large proportion of the outcome is due to the exposure, a causal effect may only be demonstrable by means of an \textit{ad hoc} study (e.g., \textit{in utero} exposure to diethylstilbestrol\textsuperscript{18}). However, if only a small proportion of the outcome is due to the exposure, a causal effect may be detectable only by means of case reports (e.g., oxymetholone and peliosis hepatitis/hepatic cancer\textsuperscript{24}).

**STRENGTH OF ASSOCIATIONS**

For relative risk estimates below 2.0, no surveillance methodology, CCS included, is capable of distinguishing between bias, confounding, and causation. Sometimes the likelihood of bias may be remote. However, it is never possible to be confident that confounding has been fully controlled, and this is more particularly a problem in the setting of surveillance systems. Even in \textit{ad hoc} studies, the distinction between causal and non-causal associations can only occasionally be made in the context of a large amount of collateral evidence (e.g., side-stream cigarette smoke and lung cancer\textsuperscript{53}).

**MISCLASSIFICATION OF EXPOSURE AND OUTCOME**

In the absence of systematic bias, the effect of misclassification is almost always to dilute or obscure associations. In interview-based case–control studies, failure to fully recall exposure, or its timing and duration, is inevitable. Memory loss can be reduced by good study design, but it cannot be eliminated. However, given adequate study design, and in particular adequate questionnaire design, validation studies have shown that there is little memory loss for recent exposures, or for long duration ones\textsuperscript{56} (see also Chapter 39). The main problem is with the accuracy of recall of short duration exposures in the distant past. It is known, for example, that metronidazole damages DNA;\textsuperscript{57} the drug may therefore be carcinogenic to humans, but the recall of no more than a week or two of exposure that took place many years previously is beyond the scope of CCS. However, the valid evaluation of such exposures probably is beyond the scope of any other surveillance methodology as well.

**SELECTION BIAS**

It is sometimes claimed that hospital-based case–control studies are limited because of potential biases in the selection of controls.\textsuperscript{58} Sometimes that claim may be justified when insufficient attention is given to exactly which hospital controls to select (i.e., diagnoses independent of the exposure). It is not justified, however, if the control selection is both independent of the exposure, and representative of the proper study base.\textsuperscript{59–62} Indeed, there are circumstances (e.g., when the cases represent a secondary study base)\textsuperscript{59–62} when properly selected hospital controls may be the only valid reference group, as is generally applicable to CCS: the controls should be persons who would be admitted to the same hospitals as the cases, were they to develop the disease under study. As already mentioned, however, it may not be possible to meet the criterion of
independence when an exposure increases (or decreases) the overall probability of hospitalization across many diagnoses.

**INFORMATION BIAS**

When the hypothesis is known, interview-based case-control studies can seldom, if ever, demonstrate the total absence of information bias. Such bias can, however, be kept to an absolute minimum. For recent exposures, prompt access to the patients minimizes the likelihood of material memory loss; and memory loss can be further reduced by detailed attention to questionnaire design, and the use of prompts. The risk of differential recall between cases and controls may be greater for exposures in the distant past, but the likelihood of differential recall is reduced if the exposure has lasted for many years.

Validation studies have suggested that information bias, with the qualifications mentioned above, is not an intractable problem in well designed case-control studies (see also Chapter 39). Nevertheless, it would considerably strengthen the validity of CCS if reported exposures could be confirmed in an independent source, such as automated prescription records. Such records, however, also have problems, such as scanty or absent information on the following: adherence to therapy; precise timing of drug use, particularly in relation to acute events; lifetime history of drug exposure; and the use of nonprescribed drugs.

**CONFOUNDING**

Despite elaborate provision for control of confounding, circumstances arise in CCS when that provision is incomplete. Sometimes, it may be possible to report a finding in tentative terms, with the proviso that more detailed ad hoc research should be undertaken. For example, an in-depth analysis of the CCS data suggested that the use of aspirin and other nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs may confer protection against colonic and rectal cancer, but confounding from certain sources (e.g., diet) was not controlled. A more detailed ad hoc study is now in progress. One source of confounding, and a common one in drug epidemiology, arises when the indication for the drug is confounded with the outcome (see also Chapter 34). In that circumstance, the confounding can seldom be measured with adequate precision, and, as amply demonstrated in the recent fenoterol/asthmatic death controversy, there is no surveillance methodology that can cope with it. In that situation, a valid answer to the research question can be obtained only by means of a randomized controlled trial.

**CONSISTENCY**

The demonstration of a dose-response effect can be important in strengthening a causal inference. In CCS it has not proven feasible to collect dosage information: apart from problems such as variations between drugs in terms of dose formulations, schedules, and routes of administration, patients can commonly recall drug names, but not the doses. With a few exceptions, CCS cannot evaluate possible dose-response effects. On the other hand, however, CCS can evaluate duration effects (see “Strengths”).

**PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS**

CCS is applicable to the assessment of the risk of serious diseases in relation to drug use in the population at large. CCS can generate hypotheses, and document increased risk, decreased risk, and absence of risk. When particular issues arise, CCS has the flexibility to rapidly accrue diseases of interest. Diseases so rare that they cannot be accrued in adequate numbers are beyond the scope of CCS. CCS has only limited capacity to assess uncommonly used drugs.

From the public health perspective, CCS has made major contributions to the evaluation of the health effects of supplemental female steroids, and of contraceptive methods among males and females. The diseases studied have included female cancers (breast; endometrium; ovary; hydatidiform mole; and chorioacarcinoma), male cancers (prostate; testis), other cancers (large bowel; rectum; melanoma; liver); and nonmalignant conditions such as cardiovascular disease,
venous thromboembolism, pelvic inflammatory disease, gynecologic disorders, and gastrointestinal disorders. Common drugs such as analgesics, female steroid hormones, antihypertensives, diuretics, hypnotics, and tranquilizers, have been evaluated in relation to a wide range of outcomes. CCS has also made contributions to epidemiological methods, and to the evaluation of risk factors other than drugs (e.g., cigarettes; coffee; alcohol; vasectomy). Increased risks, decreased risks, and safety have all been documented, and some of the findings have been new discoveries.

HYPOTHESIS GENERATION AND TESTING

It is encouraging (but not surprising) to note that most of the multiple comparisons undertaken in CCS have generally favored drug safety. By definition, null effects do not result in hypothesis generation. Yet, although in number and importance they far exceed deviations from the null, as a rule evidence of safety is only published if a suspicion to the contrary has been raised (see below: “Testing of hypotheses proposed by others”). We consider the capacity to document safety to be one aspect of conducting multiple comparisons, and an important application of CCS.

The capacity of CCS to document drug safety is especially important. Recently, for example, based on data from a followup study, it was claimed that calcium channel blockers increase the overall risk of cancer, and inhibition of apoptosis was proposed as the biological basis for the association. In the CCS data an increased risk could be ruled out with close statistical confidence. There was also sufficient power to rule out increased risks for each of the specific neoplasms included in the original report. In that report the data for the individual neoplasms were sparse, and statistically unstable. To give another example, a purported association between acetaminophen use and cancer of the kidney that was based on inadequate data could be rebutted.

Some hypotheses have been generated. One of them is an apparent increased risk of cholecystitis among users of thiazide diuretics. Another association is an apparent increased risk of choriocarcinoma among women previously exposed to oral contraceptives. A more controversial relationship is the association between alcohol use and breast cancer. A finding of interest, but not a drug-related one, is an association between vasectomy and prostatic cancer. A reduced risk uncovered by CCS is the inverse association between the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and large bowel cancer. These associations have received varying degrees of confirmation in other studies, and our own ad hoc research has recently provided confirmatory evidence to support the apparent reduction of the risk of cancer of the large bowel among nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug users.

TESTING OF HYPOTHESES PROPOSED BY OTHERS

CCS has sometimes confirmed and sometimes rebutted hypotheses proposed by others. Rebutted hypotheses have included rauwolfia and breast cancer, hydralazine and various cancers, diazepam and breast cancer, oral contraceptives and malignant melanoma, and most recently calcium channel blockers and all-cancer risk.

A large number of associations have been confirmed, and sometimes the CCS data could also be used to extend them, and enhance their validity. For example, in two sequential studies, CCS first confirmed that estrogen use increases the risk of endometrial cancer, and in addition showed that the increased risk persisted after discontinuation of use. This observation discounted the argument that current estrogen use causes uterine bleeding, and hence the selective diagnosis of otherwise silent endometrial cancer. Then, after more data had been collected, CCS showed that estrogens increase the risk of both invasive and noninvasive cancer, that the elevated risk persists for at least 10 years following discontinuation of use, and that, even after such long discontinued use, the risk was duration-related.

Another example of confirmation and extension of a previously reported association is the increased risk of pelvic inflammatory disease among
women using intrauterine devices.\textsuperscript{78, 79} CCS data confirmed the association, and suggested in addition that the risk was duration-related. It also suggested that the risk may have been higher for the Dalkon Shield, and lower for copper containing devices.

Two reduced risks confirmed by CCS are the associations of oral contraceptive use with endometrial cancer\textsuperscript{80} and ovarian cancer.\textsuperscript{25} CCS extended the original observations by suggesting that the protective effects are duration-related, and that they persist for many years after oral contraceptives are discontinued.

\textbf{CASE–CONTROL SURVEILLANCE OF BIRTH DEFECTS}

CCS was developed to assess drug-related risks in adult populations. In conceptual terms, however, the methodology is also applicable to other populations, and it has been applied to the monitoring of \textit{in utero} drug exposure in relation to the risk of birth defects. As with CCS, the system has shown the capacity to generate and test hypotheses, to document positive and inverse associations, to document safety, and to be flexible in focusing on outcomes of concern, as needed. Methodological issues pertinent to the surveillance of birth defects are considered in Chapter 42.

\textbf{THE FUTURE}

New drugs cannot be said to have been adequately monitored until large populations have been exposed, and until those drugs have been monitored in relation to the risk of commonly occurring diseases. When applicable, the evaluations must include long term drug use—and, for cancer in particular, long latent intervals. Thus, we believe that CCS should continue indefinitely for as long as new drugs continue to be introduced. Even for well established drugs, CCS still needs to accrue diseases not yet accrued in sufficient numbers. Some of the oldest drugs continue to produce surprises. Aspirin, of course, is the prime example: increased risks (e.g., Reye syndrome\textsuperscript{83}) continue to be identified, as do reduced risks (e.g., heart attack;\textsuperscript{18–20} large bowel cancer\textsuperscript{77}) In short, all marketed drugs must be subjected to continuing surveillance for as long as they exist.

CCS cannot monitor exceedingly rare diseases, but the possibility that the methods can be suitably modified in order to do so is being explored. Wiholm\textsuperscript{82} has reviewed the reasons, worldwide, why governments have banned marketed drugs: 70% of the reasons can be accounted for by a relatively short list of rare diseases known to be caused by many drugs: for example, blood dyscrasias (e.g., agranulocytosis); hepatic disorders (e.g., hepatic necrosis); renal disorders (e.g., acute renal failure); and dermatological disorders (e.g., toxic epidermal necrolysis). For CCS to be applicable to the evaluation of the drug-related risks associated with these diseases, ascertainment mechanisms capable of identifying cases from base populations of many millions would be needed. That such an approach can be feasible and informative has already been shown in large scale \textit{ad hoc} studies of blood dyscrasias.\textsuperscript{53, 85, 84} An international case–control study of life-threatening skin disorders also supports the feasibility of this approach (unpublished data), as does a recently commenced study of anaphylactoid reactions (unpublished data).

Our experience with two of these diseases (agranulocytosis and aplastic anemia)\textsuperscript{53} indicates that they pose unique methodological problems, particularly with regard to biased misclassification of the timing of drug exposure and disease onset, and confounding. An example of misclassification is the association of antimicrobial use with agranulocytosis.\textsuperscript{53, 83} Agranulocytosis typically presents with sore throat, chills, and fever. Without accurate information on timing of exposure to the nearest day, and of disease onset, it is impossible to determine whether the antimicrobial caused the disease, or was administered to treat the symptoms. Similarly, for the valid study of anaphylactoid reactions, the timing information needs to be accurate to the nearest hour. Control of confounding is especially important because the diseases are caused by multiple drugs, and cases have commonly been exposed to more than one drug.\textsuperscript{52} Based on a large experience with agranulocytosis, aplastic anemia, thrombocytopenic
purpura, toxic epidermal necrolysis, Stevens–Johnson syndrome, and anaphylactoid reactions we judge that most of the disorders known to be caused by multiple drugs cannot be adequately monitored by any means other than direct access to the patients.

Our experience after more than two decades of CCS has confirmed our initial forecast\(^3,63,85\) that surveillance can seldom fully substitute for ad hoc research, and that it must be complemented by such research. For example, the positive association between oral contraceptive use and choriocarcinoma,\(^71\) and the inverse association between nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and cancer of the large bowel,\(^37\) have been investigated,\(^75\) or are currently being investigated, in ad hoc studies that are more detailed than was feasible in CCS. There are also situations so unique that they can never be covered by surveillance: for example, the association between in utero exposure to diethylstilbestrol and vaginal cancer.\(^10\) We consider the capacity to mount ad hoc studies to be an essential component of drug surveillance itself.

One goal, not yet realized, must be to overcome the single major weakness of case–control methodology, its susceptibility to information bias. In conceptual terms, if CCS were to be conducted in populations whose drug prescription data are automated,\(^86,87\) that weakness could be overcome, at least in part. Such a system would also offer the advantage of adequate control of confounding, and greater precision in the definition of outcomes—the Achilles’ heel of automated databases. Nested case–control methodology would also offer considerable advantages in terms of efficiency. Such an approach would thus combine the best features of case–control methodology and automated databases.

Finally, greater scientific excellence must be a future goal for CCS, as it must be for all of those engaged in the epidemiological evaluation of drug safety or adversity. The ultimate, if elusive, goal should be to avoid the experience of being disastrously wrong. Issues of drug safety, or adversity, lie at the intersection of conflicting pressures from politicians, regulators, manufacturers, public interest groups, the medical profession, academic peers, and others. We reject the argument that because of the pressures, there is sometimes a need for quick and cheap answers, if only approximate ones.\(^86–92\) Such answers are seldom either quickly available, or cheap—and they may be erroneous, as occurred, for example, when inadequate data, inadequately and hastily analyzed, produced spuriously low estimates of the risk of gastrointestinal bleeding due to the use of piroxicam.\(^93–95\) It is the responsibility of scientists to resist the pressures, and to insist on proper standards of evidence. Scientifically unsatisfactory evidence “..... is not considered acceptable for evaluating efficacy and it ought not to be considered acceptable for evaluating adversity.”\(^87\) Good science should be at the heart of drug epidemiology.
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Prescription-event Monitoring

RONALD D. MANN
Drug Safety Research Unit, Southampton, UK

INTRODUCTION

On 16 December 1961 the Lancet published the first report in the British medical press indicating that thalidomide might be a human teratogen. Following the thalidomide tragedy, a Committee on Safety of Drugs was established by the Health Ministers in the UK to deal, on a voluntary basis, with the problem of drug registration. This committee, at first chaired by Sir Derrick Dunlop, operated while legislation could be enacted. Its final report, for 1969 and 1970, preceded the implementation of the Medicines Act of 1968, and contained the following remarkable paragraph:

no drug which is pharmacologically effective is entirely without hazard. The hazard may be insignificant or may be acceptable in relation to the drug's therapeutic action. Furthermore, not all hazards can be known before a drug is marketed; neither tests in animals nor clinical trials in patients will always reveal all the possible side effects of a drug. These may only be known when the drug has been administered to large numbers of patients over considerable periods of time.

Thus, for almost 30 years it has been well recognized that drug safety depends upon post-marketing surveillance.

The essential reason for this is that the clinical safety database for new drugs is, in epidemiological terms, restricted both in size and in patient characteristics. In the UK, for example, successful applications for product licenses for medicines containing new active substances include safety information on a median of only 1480 (range 129–9400) patients. Most of these patients will have had only one well identified disease treated with only one drug. Few, if any of them, will be typical of the elderly patients with more than one disease who are likely to receive several drugs in everyday clinical practice.

The safety database at the time of licensing may, therefore, be only very poorly generalizable to the population that may be exposed to the drug once it is marketed.

For these and related reasons, at least 13 clinical safety withdrawals of new drugs licensed in the UK occurred in the 20 years following the implementation of the Medicines Act of 1968. It became clear that the modern drug regulatory apparatus, including the whole mechanism of spontaneous reporting that had been established by the Committee on Safety of Drugs in 1964 required some form of augmentation.

The Committee on Safety of Medicines (the successor to the Committee on Safety of Drugs),
wishing to consider these matters, established a working party under the chairmanship of Professor David Grahame-Smith. The working party reported in June 1983 and again in July 1985 and, in these reports, showed an appreciation of the need for prescription-based monitoring. It also specifically recommended that postmarketing surveillance (PMS) studies should be undertaken “on newly-marketed drugs intended for widespread long-term use”. It is these proposals that form the purpose and basis of what has now become known as prescription-event monitoring (PEM)—a non-interventional observational cohort technique first established in England by Dr William Inman, which remains a principal activity of the Drug Safety Research Unit at Southampton. PEM is one form of pharmacovigilance that, with the development and harmonization of drug regulation in the European Community, has its legal basis in Directives 65/65 and 75/319, and in Regulation 2309/93.

DESCRIPTION

PEM is noninterventional in the sense that there is no interference with the doctor’s decision regarding what to prescribe for the individual patient. Information is collected after the prescribing decision has been made and implemented. This means that in PEM, data are collected on patients who would receive the drug in question in everyday clinical practice and not upon some highly selected group of patients who may be nonrepresentative of the “real-world” population.

In the UK, virtually all patients are registered with a National Health Service (NHS) general practitioner (GP), who provides primary medical care and acts as a gateway to specialist and hospital care. The GP issues prescriptions for the medicines considered medically necessary. The patient takes the prescription to a pharmacist who dispenses the medication and then sends the prescription to a central Prescription Pricing Authority (PPA) which effects reimbursement. The Drug Safety Research Unit (DSRU) is, under long standing and confidential arrangements, provided with electronic copies of all those prescriptions issued throughout England for the drugs being monitored. These arrangements operate for the length of time necessary for the DSRU to collect the first 50 000 prescriptions that identify 20–30 000 patients given the new drug being monitored. For each patient in each PEM study, the DSRU prepares a computerized longitudinal record in date order of the use of the drug. Thus, in PEM, the exposure data are national in scope and provide information on the first cohort to receive the drug being monitored after it has been launched into everyday clinical usage. The exposure data are of drugs prescribed and dispensed, but there is no measure of compliance. Information is available on coprescribed drugs but not on the use of nonprescription medication. Collection of the exposure data begins immediately after the new drug has been launched. The drugs to be monitored are chosen by the DSRU, preference being given to medicines intended for widespread, long term use.

After an interval of 3–12, but usually 6, months from the date of the first prescription for each patient in the cohort, the DSRU sends to the prescriber a “green form” questionnaire seeking information on any “events” that may have occurred while the patient was taking the drug or in the months that followed. This takes place on an individual patient basis, but no GP is sent more than four green forms in any one month.

The green form is illustrated in Figure 14.1, which shows the definition of an “event” and the other information requested of the GP. The GP is not paid to provide this information, which is provided, under conditions of medical confidence, in the interests of drug safety. The system provides good contact with the GPs and facilitates the collection of any followup or additional data considered necessary by the research physicians monitoring each study and working within the DSRU. All pregnancies reported during treatment or within three months of stopping the drug are followed up to determine the outcome, and any deaths for which the cause is not known or which may have been related to medication are followed up by contact with the GP, the Office for National Statistics, or the health authorities of the National Health Service.
### Drug Safety Research Unit

**Prescription Event Monitoring**

**Medical - In Confidence**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Date of Birth</th>
<th>Was the drug effective?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don't know</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indication for prescribing**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Start date</th>
<th>Dose</th>
<th>If 'Yes' reason for stopping</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Date of last prescription**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of stopping if known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please list any asthma medication (including steroids) that this patient has taken since starting this drug (please continue overleaf if necessary)

**Event Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events while taking this drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If none, please tick box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Event Date**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Events after stopping this drug</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If none, please tick box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Important:** Please indicate any event reported to CSM or manufacturer

Figure 14.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic name</th>
<th>Drug name</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>GF sent</th>
<th>GF returned</th>
<th>Voids</th>
<th>Cohort</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisapride</td>
<td>Prepubid</td>
<td>Antispasmodic</td>
<td>23 133</td>
<td>14 422</td>
<td>12 08</td>
<td>13 234</td>
<td>5 485</td>
<td>7 623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Famotidine</td>
<td>Pepcid</td>
<td>H2-antagonist</td>
<td>20 399</td>
<td>10 560</td>
<td>9 060</td>
<td>9 500</td>
<td>4 899</td>
<td>4 396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nizatidine</td>
<td>Axid</td>
<td>H2-antagonist</td>
<td>19 454</td>
<td>8 691</td>
<td>9 09</td>
<td>7 782</td>
<td>4 098</td>
<td>3 555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misoprostol</td>
<td>Cytotec</td>
<td>Prostaglandin analogue</td>
<td>22 034</td>
<td>14 836</td>
<td>10 61</td>
<td>13 775</td>
<td>4 939</td>
<td>8 592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lansoprazole</td>
<td>Zoton</td>
<td>Proton pump inhibitor</td>
<td>36 722</td>
<td>18 742</td>
<td>14 13</td>
<td>17 329</td>
<td>8 160</td>
<td>8 975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omeprazole</td>
<td>Losec</td>
<td>Proton pump inhibitor</td>
<td>28 496</td>
<td>17 772</td>
<td>15 68</td>
<td>16 204</td>
<td>7 968</td>
<td>8 073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pantoprazole</td>
<td>Protiun</td>
<td>Proton pump inhibitor</td>
<td>28 159</td>
<td>12 521</td>
<td>9 80</td>
<td>11 541</td>
<td>5 350</td>
<td>6 068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betaxolol</td>
<td>Kerlone</td>
<td>β-blocker</td>
<td>3 187</td>
<td>1 743</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>1 531</td>
<td>644</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxazosin</td>
<td>Cardura</td>
<td>α-blocker</td>
<td>15 498</td>
<td>9 315</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>8 482</td>
<td>3 799</td>
<td>4 622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enalapril</td>
<td>Innovace</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>24 719</td>
<td>16 875</td>
<td>1 514</td>
<td>15 361</td>
<td>7 081</td>
<td>7 951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinopril</td>
<td>Zestril + Carace</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>20 631</td>
<td>13 091</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>12 438</td>
<td>5 469</td>
<td>6 712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perindopril</td>
<td>Coversyl</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>18 760</td>
<td>10 026</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>9 089</td>
<td>4 094</td>
<td>4 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramipril</td>
<td>Tritec</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>3 287</td>
<td>1 556</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>1 371</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>739</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Losartan</td>
<td>Cozaar</td>
<td>Antihypertensive</td>
<td>26 303</td>
<td>15 755</td>
<td>1233</td>
<td>14 522</td>
<td>5 834</td>
<td>8 617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amlodipine</td>
<td>Istin</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>24 140</td>
<td>14 177</td>
<td>1208</td>
<td>12 969</td>
<td>6 085</td>
<td>6 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diltiazem</td>
<td>Tildem</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>16 665</td>
<td>11 219</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>10 112</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>3 972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isradipine</td>
<td>Prescal</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>8 073</td>
<td>4 139</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>3 679</td>
<td>1 515</td>
<td>2 128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicardipine</td>
<td>Cardene</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>19 243</td>
<td>12 048</td>
<td>1138</td>
<td>10 910</td>
<td>5 276</td>
<td>5 484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicorandil</td>
<td>Ikorel</td>
<td>K-channel activator</td>
<td>25 451</td>
<td>14 266</td>
<td>1206</td>
<td>13 620</td>
<td>8 323</td>
<td>5 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Xamoterol</td>
<td>Corvin</td>
<td>Inotropic</td>
<td>8 561</td>
<td>5 882</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>5 373</td>
<td>2 846</td>
<td>2 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluvastatin</td>
<td>Lescol</td>
<td>Lipid lowering</td>
<td>12 883</td>
<td>8 143</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>7 542</td>
<td>4 075</td>
<td>3 427</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bambuterol</td>
<td>Bambec</td>
<td>β2-agonist</td>
<td>18 013</td>
<td>9 149</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>8 098</td>
<td>3 631</td>
<td>4 400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmeterol</td>
<td>Serevent</td>
<td>β2-agonist</td>
<td>28 019</td>
<td>17 347</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>15 407</td>
<td>7 844</td>
<td>7 445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nedocromil</td>
<td>Tilde</td>
<td>Asthma prophylaxis</td>
<td>20 644</td>
<td>14 057</td>
<td>1763</td>
<td>12 294</td>
<td>6 340</td>
<td>5 768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acrivastine</td>
<td>Semprex</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>15 772</td>
<td>8 911</td>
<td>1048</td>
<td>7 863</td>
<td>2 833</td>
<td>4 899</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getirazine</td>
<td>Zitrek</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>18 933</td>
<td>10 877</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>9 554</td>
<td>3 945</td>
<td>5 457</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fexofenadine</td>
<td>Telfast</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>35 817</td>
<td>18 238</td>
<td>1600</td>
<td>16 638</td>
<td>6 578</td>
<td>9 880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loratadine</td>
<td>Claritin</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>21 084</td>
<td>10 684</td>
<td>1376</td>
<td>9 308</td>
<td>3 912</td>
<td>5 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flunitrazepam</td>
<td>Rohypnol</td>
<td>Benzodiazepine</td>
<td>NK</td>
<td>9 325</td>
<td>1833</td>
<td>7 492</td>
<td>2 368</td>
<td>4 951</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zolpidem</td>
<td>Stilnoct</td>
<td>Hypnotic</td>
<td>30 986</td>
<td>15 169</td>
<td>1709</td>
<td>13 460</td>
<td>4 986</td>
<td>8 305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zopiclone</td>
<td>Zimovane</td>
<td>Hypnotic</td>
<td>24 026</td>
<td>13 177</td>
<td>1634</td>
<td>11 543</td>
<td>3 989</td>
<td>7 461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buspironone</td>
<td>Buspar</td>
<td>Anxiolytic</td>
<td>24 185</td>
<td>13 087</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>11 113</td>
<td>3 500</td>
<td>7 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Risperidone</td>
<td>Risperdal</td>
<td>Antipsychotic</td>
<td>14 189</td>
<td>9 174</td>
<td>1 490</td>
<td>7 684</td>
<td>4 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Moclobemide</td>
<td>Manerix</td>
<td>MAOI</td>
<td>21 287</td>
<td>12 518</td>
<td>1 683</td>
<td>10 835</td>
<td>3 940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>Prozac</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>24 738</td>
<td>14 444</td>
<td>1 752</td>
<td>12 692</td>
<td>3 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fluvoxamine</td>
<td>Faverin</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>20 504</td>
<td>12 279</td>
<td>1 296</td>
<td>10 983</td>
<td>3 094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Paroxetine</td>
<td>Seroxat</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>25 843</td>
<td>15 907</td>
<td>2 166</td>
<td>13 741</td>
<td>4 373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sertraline</td>
<td>Lustral</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>24 632</td>
<td>14 817</td>
<td>2 083</td>
<td>12 734</td>
<td>3 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nefazodone</td>
<td>Duoton</td>
<td>Antidepressant</td>
<td>24 351</td>
<td>13 365</td>
<td>1 531</td>
<td>11 834</td>
<td>4 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Venlafaxine</td>
<td>Effexor</td>
<td>Antidepressant</td>
<td>25 870</td>
<td>14 119</td>
<td>1 477</td>
<td>12 642</td>
<td>4 349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tramadol</td>
<td>Zydol</td>
<td>Analgesic</td>
<td>20 546</td>
<td>11 470</td>
<td>938</td>
<td>10 532</td>
<td>3 869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sumatriptan</td>
<td>Imigran</td>
<td>Antimigraine</td>
<td>23 625</td>
<td>16 724</td>
<td>1 796</td>
<td>14 928</td>
<td>2 881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lamotrigine</td>
<td>Lamictal</td>
<td>Anti-epileptic</td>
<td>19 448</td>
<td>13 196</td>
<td>1 880</td>
<td>11 316</td>
<td>5 646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Vigabatrin</td>
<td>Sabril</td>
<td>Anti-epileptic</td>
<td>17 000</td>
<td>11 769</td>
<td>1 591</td>
<td>10 178</td>
<td>5 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Gabapentin</td>
<td>Neurontin</td>
<td>Anti-epileptic</td>
<td>5 285</td>
<td>3 508</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>3 300</td>
<td>1 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Cefixime</td>
<td>Suprax</td>
<td>Cephalosporin</td>
<td>32 526</td>
<td>12 880</td>
<td>1 630</td>
<td>11 250</td>
<td>4 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>Zithromax</td>
<td>Macrolide</td>
<td>23 900</td>
<td>12 535</td>
<td>1 260</td>
<td>11 275</td>
<td>4 532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>Ciproxin</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>20 664</td>
<td>12 394</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>11 477</td>
<td>4 493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Enoxacin</td>
<td>Comprecin</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>7 369</td>
<td>3 281</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>2 790</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Norfloxacin</td>
<td>Utinor</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>26 036</td>
<td>13 029</td>
<td>1 919</td>
<td>11 110</td>
<td>1 852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ofloxacin</td>
<td>Tarivid</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>27 787</td>
<td>12 698</td>
<td>1 665</td>
<td>11 033</td>
<td>4 263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fosfomycin</td>
<td>Monuril</td>
<td>Antibacterial</td>
<td>8 303</td>
<td>3 783</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>3 363</td>
<td>286</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fluconazole</td>
<td>Diffucan</td>
<td>Antifungal</td>
<td>23 846</td>
<td>16 347</td>
<td>1 332</td>
<td>15 015</td>
<td>477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Itraconazole</td>
<td>Sporanox</td>
<td>Antifungal</td>
<td>24 216</td>
<td>15 370</td>
<td>1 725</td>
<td>13 645</td>
<td>1 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Aciclovir</td>
<td>Zovirax</td>
<td>Antiviral</td>
<td>17 027</td>
<td>12 611</td>
<td>1 560</td>
<td>11 051</td>
<td>3 953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Famciclovir</td>
<td>Famvir</td>
<td>Antiviral</td>
<td>23 420</td>
<td>15 311</td>
<td>1 142</td>
<td>14 169</td>
<td>5 782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Valaciclovir</td>
<td>Valtrex</td>
<td>Antiviral</td>
<td>21 725</td>
<td>13 926</td>
<td>1 122</td>
<td>12 804</td>
<td>4 935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Acarbose</td>
<td>Glucobay</td>
<td>Antidiabetic</td>
<td>23 910</td>
<td>15 004</td>
<td>1 349</td>
<td>13 655</td>
<td>6 442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Finasteride</td>
<td>Proscar</td>
<td>Prostate treatment</td>
<td>25 562</td>
<td>16 093</td>
<td>1 321</td>
<td>14 772</td>
<td>14 767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Alendronate</td>
<td>Fosamax</td>
<td>Biphosphonate</td>
<td>22 131</td>
<td>13 135</td>
<td>1 219</td>
<td>11 916</td>
<td>1 240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Terodiline</td>
<td>Terolin</td>
<td>Anticholinergic</td>
<td>20 069</td>
<td>13 971</td>
<td>1 527</td>
<td>12 444</td>
<td>3 378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Etodolac</td>
<td>Lodine</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>20 725</td>
<td>10 334</td>
<td>1 243</td>
<td>9 091</td>
<td>3 002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Meloxicam</td>
<td>Mobic</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>39 147</td>
<td>20 360</td>
<td>1 274</td>
<td>19 087</td>
<td>6 174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nabumetone</td>
<td>Reliflex</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>21 007</td>
<td>11 540</td>
<td>1 096</td>
<td>10 444</td>
<td>3 437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tenoxicam</td>
<td>Mobilex</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>26 375</td>
<td>11 731</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>10 882</td>
<td>3 702</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 1 366 322 | 796 003 | 82 398 | 713 606 | 283 066 | 422 019 |
Mean | 12 246 | 10 979 |
Response rate | 57.6 | 10.4 | 51.9 |
Table 14.2. Collection periods for 65 drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generic name</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>1st Rx</th>
<th>Last Rx used</th>
<th>Collection time (mths) for Rx</th>
<th>Rx on database</th>
<th>GF send interval approx</th>
<th>Last GF sent</th>
<th>Total time (mths)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Cisapride</td>
<td>Antispasmodic</td>
<td>Oct 90</td>
<td>Apr 91</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38 291</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 92</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Famotidine</td>
<td>$H_2$-antagonist</td>
<td>Nov 87</td>
<td>Mar 88</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31 809</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 88</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Nizatidine</td>
<td>$H_2$-antagonist</td>
<td>Sep 87</td>
<td>Sep 88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>35 474</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oct 89</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Misoprostol</td>
<td>Prostaglandin analogue</td>
<td>Oct 88</td>
<td>Jul 89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>38 624</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 90</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Lansoprazole</td>
<td>Proton pump inhibitor</td>
<td>May 94</td>
<td>Nov 94</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57 216</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nov 95</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Omeprazole</td>
<td>Proton pump inhibitor</td>
<td>Jun 89</td>
<td>Jun 90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>58 562</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oct 91</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Pantoprazole</td>
<td>Proton pump inhibitor</td>
<td>Dec 96</td>
<td>Jun 97</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42 135</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Apr 98</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Betaxolol</td>
<td>$\beta$-blocker</td>
<td>Nov 84</td>
<td>Jun 87</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16 527</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jun 88</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Doxazosin</td>
<td>$\alpha$-blocker</td>
<td>Mar 89</td>
<td>Jan 91</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>72 996</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 92</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Enalapril</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>Apr 85</td>
<td>Jan 86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>75 368</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jan 87</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Lisinopril</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>Jun 88</td>
<td>Mar 89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59 632</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 89</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Perindopril</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>Mar 90</td>
<td>Sep 93</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>95 164</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dec 94</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Ramipril</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor</td>
<td>Apr 90</td>
<td>Feb 91</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9 276</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>May 92</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Losartan</td>
<td>Antihypertensive</td>
<td>May 95</td>
<td>Oct 96</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>81 632</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 97</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Amlodipine</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>Mar 90</td>
<td>Mar 91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80 518</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jun 92</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Diliazem</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>Sep 84</td>
<td>Oct 86</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>63 620</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oct 87</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Isradipine</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>Mar 89</td>
<td>Feb 91</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38 792</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Mar 92</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nicardipine</td>
<td>Ca antagonist</td>
<td>Nov 86</td>
<td>May 88</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>82 222</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Jul 89</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Nicardil</td>
<td>K-channel activator</td>
<td>Dec 94</td>
<td>Oct 96</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>86 165</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>May 97</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Xamoterol</td>
<td>Inotropic</td>
<td>Aug 88</td>
<td>Nov 90</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>49 803</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Apr 91</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Fluvasatin</td>
<td>Lipid lowering</td>
<td>Feb 94</td>
<td>Feb 96</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44 342</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 96</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Bambuterol</td>
<td>$\beta_2$-agonist</td>
<td>Feb 93</td>
<td>Dec 95</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>61 368</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jul 96</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Salmeterol</td>
<td>$\beta_2$-agonist</td>
<td>Dec 90</td>
<td>May 91</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42 895</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Dec 92</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Nedocromil</td>
<td>Asthma prophylaxis</td>
<td>Nov 86</td>
<td>Sep 88</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>60 405</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Oct 89</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Acrivastine</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>May 89</td>
<td>Sep 90</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21 794</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Jan 91</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Cetirizine</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>May 89</td>
<td>Jul 89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20 789</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aug 90</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Fexofenadine</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>Mar 97</td>
<td>Aug 97</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>55 446</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Jan 98</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Loratadine</td>
<td>Antihistamine</td>
<td>May 89</td>
<td>Aug 89</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23 173</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Aug 90</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Flunitrazepam</td>
<td>Benzodiazepine</td>
<td>Oct 82</td>
<td>Nov 83</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Nov 84</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Zolpidem</td>
<td>Hypnotic</td>
<td>Jul 94</td>
<td>Jan 96</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>51 681</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 96</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Zopiclone</td>
<td>Hypnotic</td>
<td>Mar 91</td>
<td>Jul 91</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45 627</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sep 92</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Drug</td>
<td>Class</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Dose (mg)</td>
<td>Start Date</td>
<td>End Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Buspirone</td>
<td>Anxiolytic</td>
<td>Mar 88</td>
<td>Feb 89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40,950</td>
<td>Apr 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Risperidone</td>
<td>Antipsychotic</td>
<td>Jul 93</td>
<td>Apr 96</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67,977</td>
<td>Sep 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Molodermide</td>
<td>MAOI</td>
<td>Jun 93</td>
<td>Aug 95</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>66,752</td>
<td>Apr 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>Mar 89</td>
<td>Mar 90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>52,607</td>
<td>Mar 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Fluvoxamine</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>Feb 87</td>
<td>Feb 88</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>34,592</td>
<td>Mar 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Paroxetine</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>Mar 91</td>
<td>Mar 92</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48,508</td>
<td>Feb 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Sertraline</td>
<td>SSRI</td>
<td>Jan 91</td>
<td>Sep 92</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>50,664</td>
<td>Aug 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Nefazodone</td>
<td>Antidepressant</td>
<td>Jan 96</td>
<td>Feb 97</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51,158</td>
<td>Oct 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Venlafaxine</td>
<td>Antidepressant</td>
<td>May 95</td>
<td>Jun 96</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>54,549</td>
<td>Feb 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Tramadol</td>
<td>Analgesic</td>
<td>Jul 94</td>
<td>Dec 94</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73,179</td>
<td>Jul 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sumatriptan</td>
<td>Antimigraine</td>
<td>Nov 91</td>
<td>Jul 92</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58,625</td>
<td>May 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Lamotrigine</td>
<td>Antiepileptic</td>
<td>Dec 91</td>
<td>Feb 95</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>155,581</td>
<td>Sep 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Vigabatrin</td>
<td>Antiepileptic</td>
<td>Dec 91</td>
<td>Nov 94</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>152,200</td>
<td>Jun 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Gabapentin</td>
<td>Antiepileptic</td>
<td>Aug 93</td>
<td>Apr 95</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>28,432</td>
<td>Oct 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>Cefixime</td>
<td>Cephalosporin</td>
<td>Sep 90</td>
<td>May 91</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35,426</td>
<td>Jul 92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>Macrolide</td>
<td>Mar 92</td>
<td>Jun 93</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30,389</td>
<td>Feb 94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>Nov 88</td>
<td>Jan 89</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22,776</td>
<td>Jul 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>Enoxacin</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>Apr 89</td>
<td>Jan 91</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8,658</td>
<td>Oct 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Norfloxacin</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>Oct 90</td>
<td>Oct 91</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28,443</td>
<td>Feb 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Ofloxacin</td>
<td>Quinolone</td>
<td>May 90</td>
<td>Dec 91</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30,249</td>
<td>Dec 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Fosfomycin</td>
<td>Antibacterial</td>
<td>Feb 94</td>
<td>Jun 96</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9,558</td>
<td>Oct 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Fluconazole</td>
<td>Antifungal</td>
<td>Sep 88</td>
<td>Jan 89</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25,546</td>
<td>Jun 89</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Itaconazole</td>
<td>Antifungal</td>
<td>Apr 89</td>
<td>Apr 90</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28,228</td>
<td>Jan 91</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Aciclovir</td>
<td>Antiviral</td>
<td>Nov 85</td>
<td>Dec 86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20,224</td>
<td>May 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Famciclovir</td>
<td>Antiviral</td>
<td>Feb 94</td>
<td>Aug 95</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>24,484</td>
<td>Apr 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Valaciclovir</td>
<td>Antiviral</td>
<td>Mar 95</td>
<td>Feb 97</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22,851</td>
<td>Sep 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Acarbose</td>
<td>Antidiabetic</td>
<td>Jul 93</td>
<td>Aug 95</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>98,171</td>
<td>Mar 96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Finasteride</td>
<td>Prostate treatment</td>
<td>Oct 92</td>
<td>Feb 94</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>81,777</td>
<td>Mar 95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Alendronate</td>
<td>Bisphosphonate</td>
<td>Oct 95</td>
<td>Jan 97</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>67,422</td>
<td>Mar 98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Terodiline</td>
<td>Anticholinergic</td>
<td>Nov 86</td>
<td>Sep 87</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>43,041</td>
<td>Dec 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Endolac</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>Nov 85</td>
<td>Aug 86</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30,087</td>
<td>Nov 87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Meloxicam</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>Dec 96</td>
<td>Mar 97</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65,805</td>
<td>Nov 97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Nabumetone</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>Mar 87</td>
<td>Sep 87</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>30,794</td>
<td>Nov 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Tenoxicam</td>
<td>NSAID</td>
<td>Nov 88</td>
<td>Aug 89</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44,161</td>
<td>Mar 90</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 1 058 3 224 646
Mean 16.28 50 385
Thus, in PEM the exposure data are derived from the NHS prescriptions for the drug being monitored, and the outcome data are obtained from the green form questionnaires and the followup process.

PEM collects event data and does not ask the doctor to determine whether any particular event represents an adverse drug reaction (ADR). If, however, an event is considered to be an ADR or has been reported by means of the “yellow card” scheme, then the doctor is asked to indicate this on the green form.

PEM studies aim to collect clinical information on some 10 000 patients and this is routinely achieved unless the drug fails to establish itself in the market.

Each green form is seen on the day of receipt by the medical or scientific officer monitoring the study in the DSRU. This initial review aims to identify serious possible ADRs or events requiring immediate followup. It uses the previously published7 CSM (Committee on Safety of Medicines) Serious Adverse Drug Reactions List.

Interim analyses of the computerized data are undertaken every 2500 patients in each study and contacts are, whenever possible, maintained with the company holding the product license, so that they (although the study is independent of them) can comply with the ADR/drug safety reporting procedures of the regulatory authorities.

Further details of the methods of data coding, DSRU computerized event reporting dictionary, and methods of computerization and analysis have been given in recent publications.8–11 The DSRU is an independent registered medical charity (No. 327206), but is extensively supported by donations and grants from the pharmaceutical industry.

As shown in Table 14.1a, 65 PEM studies have been conducted to date, with a mean response rate (percentage of green forms returned) of 57.94 ± 7.95%. The mean cohort size has been 10 979 patients, after allowing for forms which contain information but not event data (voids). The collection periods (the time for which is has been necessary to collect prescriptions yielding a finished cohort size averaging over 10 000 patients) vary markedly. As shown in Tables 1 and 2, the meloxicam cohort was of 19 087 patients and with this (very successful) drug, it was necessary to collect prescriptions for only four months. At the opposite extreme, it was necessary to collect prescriptions for perindopril for 43 months, in order to achieve a finished cohort size of 9089 patients. Over all 65 studies, the mean collection period has been 16.28 (median 14; interquartile range 10 and 23) months.

**STRENGTHS**

PEM has a number of important strengths. First, as indicated above, the method is noninterventional in nature and does not interfere with the treatment the doctor chooses and advises as most appropriate for the individual patient. In this way, the technique avoids the selection biases involved in ordinary clinical trials.

Second, the method is national in scale and provides “real-world” data showing what actually happens in everyday clinical practice. It largely overcomes the problem of making clinical trial data truly representative of the whole population that will receive the drug.

Third, because the data are concerned with events, the method could detect adverse reactions or syndromes that none of the reporting doctors suspect to be due to the drug. The database allows the study of diseases as well as drugs. Both of these advantages accrue from the early proposals of Professor DJ Finney28 on event reporting.

Fourth, the method allows close contact between the research staff in the DSRU and the reporting doctors. This facilitates followup of important events, pregnancies, deaths, etc., and allows for the maximum clinical understanding of confounders, biases, and similar issues.

Fifth, the method prompts the doctor to fill in the green form and does not rely on the clinician taking the initiative to report. This “prompting” effect of PEM is most important and is probably the reason why ADR reporting is more complete in PEM than in spontaneous ADR reporting systems, such as the yellow card system in the UK (see Chapters 10 and 11).

Sixth, the method has been shown to be successful in regularly producing data on 10 000 or more patients given newly marketed drugs which, by virtue of their success in the market place, involve
substantial patient exposure. It fulfills, therefore, the original objective of providing a prescription based method of postmarketing surveillance of new drugs intended for widespread, long term use.

Finally, the method provides a technique that can generate signals or hypotheses which can themselves be refuted or confirmed by the established methods of epidemiology.

WEAKNESSES

Of course, PEM also has important weaknesses. Not all of the green forms are returned and this could conceal undisclosed sources of bias. Studies designed to show whether patients whose doctors do not return the green forms are different from those of responding doctors are currently in progress.

Second, PEM is currently restricted to general practice, although pilot studies in hospital are currently under way. The pilot studies are progressing satisfactorily and will be reported shortly. It is planned to develop a regional system if the pilot studies prove satisfactory.

Third, there is no measure of compliance using dispensed prescriptions, i.e., it is not known whether the patient actually took the dispensed medication.

Fourth, the outcome data and medical followup are collected by nonelectronic, labor-intensive methods, and this disadvantage is only gradually being overcome as more and more doctors run their practices totally by computer.

Finally, issues of patient privacy and confidentiality are sensitive and rely heavily on doctor-to-doctor contact pursued in the public interest. This question of confidentiality currently occupies much attention, both in the US and throughout Europe (see Chapter 26).

PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

SEARCHING FOR SIGNALS

Horrors List
The initial search is provided by the daily inspection of newly received green forms and their examination for adverse events of a typically iatrogenic kind, such as many of those given on the previously mentioned list. The green form questionnaire asks the doctor to record the reason why the drug was withdrawn if, in fact, it was withdrawn and it has been found that this is a most informative question.

Display of Events During the Study/Events on Drug

Table 14.3 shows the first page of a table that summarizes all reports received throughout a typical PEM study, whether or not the patient was still on the drug. Denominators are given (in terms of patient months of observation) for each month of the study, and for each of the 1900 or so events on the DSRU dictionary. The number of events reported is shown for each month of the study. Table 14.4 provides similar data but is restricted to events reported between the date of starting and stopping the drug being monitored. Each of these tables shows events grouped into system—organ class and displayed as higher and lower terms where the dictionary has been divided in this way. Each table also shows the total number of reports for each event, the total over the first six months of observation, and the number of events where the date of event was unknown. Comparison of these two tables (and a third table listing off-drug events of unknown date) indicates the number of reports for each event when the patients were not receiving the drug being monitored. This allows on-drug/off-drug comparisons (although the period after the drug being monitored has been withdrawn may be a period in which some other (and unknown) drug was being given in individual patients).

These tables can generate signals: the total for an event may be unusually high and this can be confirmed or refuted by comparisons across the database of all 65 drugs that have been studied, or by comparison with drugs of the same therapeutic group or with the same indication for use. The trend of reports over the months of observation may be informative: type A side effects tend to occur early in the study (although this period may also be affected by carryover effects from previous
Table 14.3. All events reported on green forms for meloxicam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mth 1</th>
<th>Mth 2</th>
<th>Mth 3</th>
<th>Mth 4</th>
<th>Mth 5</th>
<th>Mth 6</th>
<th>Mths 1–6</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denominator total</td>
<td>130 615</td>
<td>19 083</td>
<td>19 075</td>
<td>19 068</td>
<td>19 063</td>
<td>19 054</td>
<td>19 046</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator male</td>
<td>41 711</td>
<td>6 172</td>
<td>6 167</td>
<td>6 166</td>
<td>6 164</td>
<td>6 160</td>
<td>6 158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator female</td>
<td>86 690</td>
<td>12 586</td>
<td>12 583</td>
<td>12 577</td>
<td>12 574</td>
<td>12 568</td>
<td>12 562</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acne</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acne rosacea</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopecia</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyst sebaceous</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatitis</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatitis contact</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry skin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema atopic</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertigo</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema varicose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eruption bullous</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blister</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemphigoid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythema</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folliculitis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granuloma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granulomatosis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematoma nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair loss</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes simplex, skin</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes zoster</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperkeratitis</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperkeratosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pityriasis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection skin, unspecified</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local bacterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abscess skin</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellulitis</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erysipelas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impetigo</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection skin</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paronychia</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichen planus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus discoid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 14.4. Events reported on green forms during treatment with meloxicam

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Mth 1</th>
<th>Mth 2</th>
<th>Mth 3</th>
<th>Mth 4</th>
<th>Mth 5</th>
<th>Mth 6</th>
<th>Mths 1–6</th>
<th>Not known</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denominator total</td>
<td>74 948</td>
<td>15 382</td>
<td>10 812</td>
<td>9 497</td>
<td>8 676</td>
<td>8 036</td>
<td>7 560</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator male</td>
<td>23 711</td>
<td>4 895</td>
<td>3 384</td>
<td>2 979</td>
<td>2 723</td>
<td>2 528</td>
<td>2 377</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denominator female</td>
<td>50 185</td>
<td>10 245</td>
<td>7 282</td>
<td>6 392</td>
<td>5 840</td>
<td>5 403</td>
<td>5 084</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acne</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acne</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acne rosacea</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alopecia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyst sebaceous</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatitis</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dermatitis contact</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry skin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema atopic</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertrigo</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pompholyx</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eczema varicose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eruption bullous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blister</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pemphigoid</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythema</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Folliculitis</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granuloma</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Granulomatosis</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haematoma nail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair loss</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes simplex, skin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herpes zoster</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperkeratosis</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperkeratosis</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pityriasis</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection skin, unspecified/</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>local bacterial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abcess skin</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cellulitis</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erysipelas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impetigo</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infection skin</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paronychia</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lice</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lichen planus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lupus discoid</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
medication), or the number of reports may rise as
time passes (as with long latency adverse reac-
tions). Again, formal trend analysis can be used to
explore, on a comparative basis, such apparent
signals.

Ranking of Incidence Density and Reasons for
Withdrawal

The incidence density (ID) for a given time period \( t \) is
calculated, for each event in the dictionary, in the
usual way:

\[
ID_t = \frac{N_t}{D_t} \times 1000
\]

where \( N_t \) is the number of reports of the event
during treatment for period \( t \); \( D_t \) is the number of
patient months of treatment for period \( t \), and the
results are given in terms of 1000 patient months of
exposure. These results are then ranked in order of
the estimate of \( ID_t \) (the incidence density for the
event in question in the first month of exposure).
The incidence densities in the second to sixth
months of treatment are also routinely calculated
(\( ID_2 \)).

Table 14.5 shows the first page of such a report
of ranked incidence densities from a typical PEM
study. For each event, the table presents the value of
\( ID_1 \) minus \( ID_2 \) and the 99% confidence intervals
around this difference. This difference can itself
generate signals, which require confirmation or
rebuttal by comparative study. The ranked reasons for withdrawal can be compared with the
ranked incidence density estimates and this com-
parison can be signal generating. There is usually a
good correlation, in terms of the most frequently
reported events, and an example of this is given in
Table 14.6; other examples have been published
elsewhere.\(^9\)\(^\text{-11}\)

Comparison of Event Rates and Adjusted
Rates

Rate comparisons can be helpful in exploring
apparent associations. An example\(^\text{12}\) occurred
when looking at the long term safety of oral
compared with inhalational \( \beta \)-agonists. The origi-
nal signal detected in this study was that the value
of \( ID_1 \) with bambuterol for the event “cardiac
failure” was 4.9 per thousand patient months of
exposure, compared with 0.6 for salmeterol and
0.4 for nedocromil. Why was this value for
bambuterol over eight times higher than that for
salmeterol and nedocromil?

Further analysis showed that the relative risk of
nonfatal cardiac failure adjusted for age, sex,
indication, and season of starting treatment with
bambuterol was 3.31 (95% confidence limits 1.91
to 5.71) when compared with nedocromil. When
salmeterol was compared with nedocromil, the
adjusted relative risk of nonfatal cardiac failure
was 0.90 (limits 0.50 to 1.60). Such highly
suggestive differences clearly need further explora-
tion.

Other signals and comparisons continue to be
explored. These include hallucinations associated
with tramadol,\(^\text{13}\) gastrointestinal intolerance with
acarbose,\(^\text{14}\) galactorrhea with mecolbemide,\(^\text{15}\) esop-
ophageal reactions with alendronate,\(^\text{16}\) a com-
parison of five antibiotics,\(^\text{17}\) and a comparison of
antidepressant drugs.\(^\text{18}\)

Long Latency Adverse Reactions

Special interest attaches to reactions that
emerge only on prolonged treatment and may be
missed in the premarking trials, many of
which are frequently of short duration. An
example occurred in the PEM study of finaster-
de,\(^\text{19}\) when it was shown that reports of
impotence/ejaculatory failure and decreased
libido were received in relation to the first and
all subsequent months of treatment, but reports
of gynecomastia were only rarely received before
the fifth month of therapy. A further important
example\(^\text{20,21}\) has occurred in relation to visual
field defects in patients receiving long term
 treatment with vigabatrin. The initial PEM study
showed three cases of bilateral, irreversible
peripheral field defects, whereas no similar
reports occurred with other anti-epileptic drugs
or in any of the other drugs already monitored
by PEM. A followup exploration with a repeat
questionnaire, sent to the doctors whose patients
had received vigabatrin for over six months, has shown that the incidence of this serious lesion has risen to some 2% and that many of the relevant patients have objective evidence of visual field defects.

Outcomes of Pregnancy

Table 14.5. Incidence densities (ID) ranked for meloxicam in order of ID per 1000 patient months

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>N1</th>
<th>N2</th>
<th>ID1</th>
<th>ID2</th>
<th>ID1 - ID2</th>
<th>99% CI</th>
<th>Cl max</th>
<th>Nα</th>
<th>IDα</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Condition improved</td>
<td>903</td>
<td>1015</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>2067</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Dyspepsia</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>379</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Respiratory tract infection</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>675</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Nausea, vomiting</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Pain abdomen</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Diarrhoea</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Dose increased</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Headache, migraine</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Minor surgery</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Hospital referrals no admission</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Edema</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 Dizziness</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Gastrointestinal unspecified</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Pain joint</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Malaise, lassitude</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Constipation</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 Hospital referral paramedical</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Cough</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 Asthma, wheezing</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 Rash</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 Nonsurgical admissions</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 Noncompliance</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 Hypertension</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 Intolerance</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Urinary tract infection</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 Depression</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27 Pain back</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Dyspnoea</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 Fall</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 Infection skin, unspecified</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-1.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 Malignancies</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32 Unspecified side effects</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 Pain chest, tight chest</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34 Pain</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 Ischaemic heart disease</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 Cardiac failure</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 Pruritus</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38 Ulcer mouth</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39 Hematological tests</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 Palpitation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 Orthopaedic surgery</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>-1.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42 Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43 Micturation disorder</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 Anxiety</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
drugs during the first trimester. PEM studies have shown that from 831 such pregnancies, 557 infants were born, of whom 14 (2.5%) had congenital anomalies. This work has not shown unexpected findings, but continues in order to exclude, to the greatest extent possible, unexpected teratogenic effects.

Table 14.6. Reasons for stopping meloxicam (higher level terms)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not effective</td>
<td>2989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition improved</td>
<td>1834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspepsia</td>
<td>539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nausea, vomiting</td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain abdomen</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noncompliance</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastro-intestinal unspecified</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diarrhea</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopaedic surgery</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Headache, migraine</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital referrals no admission</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dizziness</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intolerance</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaise, lassitude</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient request</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edema</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor surgery</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital referral paramedical</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsurgical admissions</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unspecified side effects</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constipation</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asthma, wheezing</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ulcer mouth</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indication for meloxicam changed</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pruritus</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonformulary</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyspnoea</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemorrhage gastro-intestinal unspecified</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surgery unspecified</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tinnitus</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distension abdominal</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drowsiness, sedation</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haemorrhage gastro-intestinal upper</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain chest, tight chest</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anemia</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pain joint</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemorrhage rectal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

STUDIES OF BACKGROUND EFFECTS AND DISEASES

Background Effects

A database the size of that accumulated in the study of 65 drugs with an average cohort size of over 10,000 patients, provides an opportunity to study issues other than the tolerance and toxicity of each specific drug. An issue which has attracted our attention is that the values of ID<sub>1</sub> and ID<sub>2</sub> for upper respiratory tract infection vary very little throughout most PEM studies. This effect is apparent in the data of 40 PEM studies, and suggests that cohorts have colds in the nose month in and month out, and this provides a rough measure of the background incidence of a disease which, with many drugs, is independent of both the illness being treated and the drug being used for treatment. Seasonal effects are, of course, marked with some drugs, such as antihistamines and antibiotics, but with many drug classes the ID values for upper respiratory infection will show what effects are more frequently seen, or less frequently seen, than this simple clinical yardstick of the rate of URTIs.

Study of the database also shows some of the characteristics of ADR reporting. Doctors are asked to note on the green form if they have previously spontaneously reported an event as an ADR (in a patient being monitored by PEM). It has been shown that 3045 ADRs reported on the PEM green form questionnaires, only 275 (9.0%) had also been reported on yellow cards to the Committee on Safety of Medicines. It is of great interest that 26 (32.1%) of 81 serious unlabelled (i.e., not listed in the Data Sheet/Summary of Product Characteristics for the drug) reactions had been reported on yellow cards. This suggests that doctors use the spontaneous adverse reaction reporting scheme more energetically when reporting those unexpected reactions that worry them most. Our studies in this area have also shown that, in general practice in England, suspected ADRs to newly marketed drugs are recorded more often in adults aged between 30 and 59 years and are 60% more common in women than in men. This sex difference occurs in all age groups over 19 years of age.
Study of Diseases, Bias, etc.

All discussions of PEM studies need to emphasize that the events reported may be due to chance, the disease being treated, concurrent diseases, concomitantly administered drugs, over-the-counter medication, carryover effects of previous medication, channelling, switching and a whole panoply of confounding and biasing effects—all of which need to be considered before it can be assumed that the drug being monitored might be causing the event being reported.

The database does, however, allow study of diseases as well as drugs, and current studies are concerned with the serotonin syndrome and Churg–Strauss syndrome. In a study of 622 294 patients observed during 58 completed PEM studies, there were four cases of Churg–Strauss syndrome identified after followup. This gives an overall period prevalence estimate of 6.8 (95% confidence limits: −1.8 to 17.3) per million patient years of observation.

An example of the epidemiological aspects that have been studied is a paper on cough with ACE inhibitors—a study of reporting bias in observational cohort studies.27

THE FUTURE

Current efforts, other than continuing an ongoing program of 12 or more PEM studies being conducted simultaneously, concern the validation of PEM and its extension into hospital practice.

Much time and staff resource is also being expended in strengthening the Drug Safety Research Unit’s capability to undertake the formal methods of epidemiology, such as case–control studies, comparative cohort studies, and randomized controlled clinical trials. There is only limited point in being able to generate signals of possible adverse drug effects, unless these can be confirmed or refuted by appropriate studies.

Plans for the future largely concern our development of methods, based upon PEM, to study the comparative efficacy and safety of new drugs and their cost-effectiveness.
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INTRODUCTION

Traditional group and staff model health maintenance organizations (HMOs) employ a defined set of providers to deliver comprehensive health care services to a defined population of patients for a fixed, prepaid annual fee. HMO enrollees typically receive their health care within these integrated systems through a uniform benefit package. Care is usually provided within a defined geographic area that allows for large comparable groups of subjects for public health research.

The unique features of traditional group and staff model HMOs are being diluted somewhat by the pressure of market forces. “Managed care” organizations (MCOs) have been identified as the solution to increasing healthcare costs and enrollment in MCOs is now more than 70% of the US market. While the term “managed care” was once synonymous with traditional HMOs, it now encompasses new organizational forms such as network model HMOs and individual practice associations (IPAs). Most of these new models feature insurance organization contracts with physicians’ groups to provide care for enrollees, as opposed to fully integrated delivery systems. In order to compete with these new healthcare models, staff model HMOs are using more mixed models of care, creating their own networks and IPAs. Pressure is also mounting to offer a wider selection of benefit options, such as point-of-service plans, which allow enrollees to seek care wherever they want. “One-size-fits-all” benefit packages that used to be the rule in HMOs have been transformed into individualized plans that may number in the hundreds. Thus, while traditional HMOs continue to play an important role in public health research, including post-marketing drug surveillance, it is important to keep in mind the market trends that threaten some of the unique features of these organizations.
Some of these trends are evident at Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound. While this chapter emphasizes the advantages of conducting postmarketing drug surveillance in a predominantly closed staff-model HMO, it also acknowledges the implications of moving toward a more mixed model of care.

There has been longstanding interest in the use of data from HMOs to study the effects of marketed drugs. Since the time of the report of the Joint Commission on Prescription Drug Use, recommendations have been made on the use of HMO records for postmarketing drug surveillance.\(^3\) There are several advantages to conducting research in an HMO setting.\(^3\) Because every HMO has an identifiable population base, it is possible to determine denominators for epidemiologic research, enabling investigators to calculate incidence and prevalence rates. Other key features of HMOs relevant to the conduct of postmarketing drug surveillance include the availability of: (i) a relatively stable population base; (ii) accessible and complete medical records for each enrollee; and (iii) in many instances, computerized databases.

Data from the Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound (GHC) have been used extensively to evaluate drug usage and the adverse and beneficial effects of marketed drugs and medical procedures. In 1983, GHC made explicit its commitment to research and evaluation by establishing the Center for Health Studies. The mission of the Center for Health Studies is to develop GHC as a setting for population-based and intervention research, through its own program of research and through collaborative ties with other scientists, including those affiliated with the University of Washington, Kaiser Permanente Northwest, and the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center.

GHC data used in postmarketing drug surveillance research are generally derived from automated files containing information recorded during the routine delivery of health services. These data have been used to identify prospective and historical cohorts of users of drugs or other exposures of interest, appropriate comparison groups, clinical events, health services utilization, and confounding variables. This chapter reviews the characteristics of the GHC setting and databases, the advantages and disadvantages of GHC data resources for postmarketing drug surveillance, selected methodologic issues pertaining to postmarketing drug surveillance that arise in an HMO setting such as GHC, and expected future directions for research with the GHC databases.

**DESCRIPTION**

GROUP HEALTH COOPERATIVE OF PUGET SOUND

GHC, a nonprofit consumer-directed HMO established in 1947, provides health care on a prepaid basis to approximately 415,000 persons in western Washington State. Most of these are “staff model” enrollees who receive all care at Group Health facilities, with the exception of specific services not provided by Group Health providers (e.g., temporomandibular care). In the latter case, the Cooperative contracts with selected community providers to whom enrollees are referred. Approximately 15% of enrollees deviate from the staff model in that they receive care from non-GHC provider networks located in geographic areas not served by GHC medical centers. About 8% of enrollees have chosen point-of-service plans, which allow them to seek care wherever they want.

In addition to these 415,000 GHC enrollees, approximately 47,000 Western Washington residents belong to Options Health Care, Inc., a wholly owned subsidiary of GHC established in 1990. These “point-of-service” enrollees can receive care from Group Health providers at greater benefit coverage, or from community providers with less coverage. In 1996, only 17% of Options enrollees’ healthcare costs were incurred through these “outside” community providers.

Approximately 13% of Western Washington residents were enrolled in GHC in 1998. The majority of GHC enrollees, approximately 80%, receive health benefits through their place of employment (i.e., group enrollees). At present, nearly 2000 Puget Sound firms and unions offer GHC coverage to their employees. In addition, as
of January 1999 GHC had arrangements for providing services to approximately 54,000 Medicare, 25,000 Medicaid, and 26,000 Washington Basic Health Plan recipients. The Basic Health Plan is a state subsidized program that provides medical insurance to low income, uninsured residents who earn too much to qualify for Medicaid. In the last 6 years, the number of GHC Medicaid enrollees has increased more than tenfold. This increase is due to the advent of Healthy Options, the State of Washington’s Medicaid managed care program. GHC is one of the healthcare contractors involved in this program.

For the most part, GHC offers comprehensive health care coverage for outpatient care, inpatient services, emergency care, mental health services, and prescribed drugs. (A major exception is the lack of drug coverage for Medicare enrollees new to GHC since 1994.) As mentioned above, this healthcare is provided primarily through GHC’s own facilities, including one hospital, one skilled nursing facility, 26 primary care clinics, and four specialty centers. GHC operated two hospitals until the Cooperative formed a strategic alliance with Virginia Mason Medical Center in 1994, which resulted in the closure of one hospital; the two organizations contract with each other for hospital services. In 1999, nearly all benefit plans required small copayments for services, such as prescriptions, nonpreventive care outpatient visits, and emergency treatment. Coverage policies for outpatient drugs are controlled by GHC’s drug formulary.

GHC contracts with Group Health Permanente, a partnership of physicians responsible for providing medical services at the Cooperative’s facilities. In 1998, this Permanente Medical Group included 550 physicians, approximately 90% of whom were board certified. The large majority of GHC’s primary care physicians were trained in family practice residencies. GHC has a formal affiliation agreement with the University of Washington School of Medicine, the first in the nation between an HMO and a major medical school. The distribution of patients to primary care providers’ practices is based on a panel system in which each primary care provider (family practice physician, pediatrician, or internist) has responsibility for managing and coordinating the care of a panel or caseload of patients. Upon enrollment in GHC, patients are offered a choice of primary care physicians and may change primary care physicians at any time during their tenure in the plan. More than 95% of GHC enrollees are identified with a specific panel. In 1998, GHC enrollees had nearly 4 million outpatient drug prescriptions and almost 2.5 million outpatient visits to GHC physicians or allied professionals.

As shown in Table 15.1, compared to other Seattle–Tacoma area residents, GHC enrollees have slightly higher educational attainment but are quite similar in age, gender, and racial/ethnic composition. GHC enrollees have similar median income, but there is less representation within the highest extreme of income distribution. Differences noted between the GHC population and the US population (fewer blacks, higher educational level, less representation within the lowest extreme of income distribution among GHC enrollees) primarily reflect differences between the demographic composition of Seattle–Tacoma and the US population as a whole.

**DATABASES AT GHC**

GHC’s automated and manual databases serve as major resources for many epidemiologic studies, in part because individual records can be linked through time and across data sets by the unique consumer number assigned to each enrollee. Once assigned, the consumer number remains with an enrollee, even if the individual dis-enrolls and rejoins GHC at a later date.

Table 15.2 lists the research data sets that have been developed from GHC’s databases. Data are available in SAS format on several different platforms such as an MVS mainframe, a UNIX system, and the Center for Health Studies’ Data Warehouse on an NT server. For relational database purposes, much of these data are available in a Sybase Data Warehouse on a UNIX system. Files are updated daily, monthly, quarterly, or semi-annually, using data from clinical and administrative computer systems. Every file
contains the unique patient identifier common to all of the datasets. Physician identifiers are also unique across all files. A brief description of each of GHC’s data files is found in Table 15.2.

### Table 15.1. Demographic Characteristics of Adult Group Health Cooperative Enrollees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage of total adult population</th>
<th>GHCG enrollees&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Seattle–Tacoma area&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>United States&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–44</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45–64</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race or ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>90</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian, Eskimo or Aleut</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–15</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;15</td>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual income&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;$15,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15–30,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30–45,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$45–60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;$60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Age and sex based on 1990 Group Health enrollment data. Race based on two random samples of Group Health enrollees surveyed in 1990: 1,306 enrollees age 18–64<sup>22</sup> and 2,513 enrollees age 65 and up.<sup>23</sup> Years of education and household income based on a random sample of 1,133 enrollees surveyed in 1984.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>b</sup>Based on 1990 Seattle-Tacoma CMSA.

<sup>c</sup>Income figures are corrected for inflation between 1984 and 1989 and stated in 1989 dollars.

### Table 15.2. Automated databases organized for analytic studies at GHC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Database</th>
<th>Years Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>March 1977–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitalization</td>
<td>January 1972–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laboratory</td>
<td>January 1986–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient visits without diagnosis</td>
<td>January 1992–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cancer surveillance system</td>
<td>January 1974–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause of death</td>
<td>January 1977–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community health services</td>
<td>June 1989–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost Information System</td>
<td>June 1989–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claims from non-GHC providers</td>
<td>June 1989–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breast cancer screening program</td>
<td>January 1985–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunization</td>
<td>February 1991–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes registry</td>
<td>1996–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heart care registry</td>
<td>1997–present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selected population-based surveys</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health risk survey</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior survey</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronic pain</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco use</td>
<td>1991–1992</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Enrollment

There are two different types of enrollment files—current and historical. The current enrollment file consists of a record for every person currently enrolled in GHC, some 460,000 enrollees. It contains person-based information on selected patient characteristics such as patient consumer number, subscriber number (used to aggregate family members on the same contract), date of birth, sex, primary care provider, plan, assigned clinic, patient address, and telephone number. This file is often used to select probability samples of current GHC enrollees. The second type of enrollment file is historical. One dataset contains a record for each of the roughly 2,000,000 persons who have ever been enrolled at GHC. This dataset includes a person’s estimated original enrollment date (not available for all persons). A second historical dataset contains all enrollment periods (up to five) for the nearly 1.5 million persons who have been enrolled at GHC at any time since 1980.
Pharmacy
The pharmacy file includes data on each prescription dispensed at GHC-owned outpatient pharmacies since March 1977. Table 15.3 lists the five most frequently dispensed drugs in each of nine major drug categories in 1998. This table includes over-the-counter as well as prescription medicines. A computerized record is created for every medication at the time the prescription is filled. As shown in Table 15.4, each record contains selected information about the patient, the prescription, and the prescriber. A new variable, “daysupply”, was added to the pharmacy database in 1996. This field, motivated by the Cooperative’s need to charge the appropriate one-, two-, or three-month copay amount, indicates the number of days the medication should last.

Hospital
The hospitalization databases contain records of every discharge, including newborn and stillborn infants, from GHC-owned hospitals since January 1972. The Commission on Professional Hospital Activities—Professional Activity Study (CPHAS-PAS) provided hospital discharge information from January 1972 through December 1984. Since January 1985, GHC’s hospital information system (HIS) has included information for discharges from GHC-owned hospitals and a GHC-operated wing of a community hospital. The information in the hospitalization database includes patient characteristics, diagnoses, procedures, diagnostic related group (DRG), and discharge disposition. While data on inpatient prescription drug usage became available in mid-1989, this aspect of the HIS system has not been used extensively for analytic purposes. Virtually all hospitalizations not captured in HIS are included in GHC’s outside claims files. To facilitate evaluation of hospital costs and utilization, all records of discharges from GHC and non-GHC hospitals since June 1989 have been combined into an annual utilization dataset.

Laboratory
Automated laboratory data are available from January 1986. The on-line laboratory system interconnects all GHC laboratories, including inpatient settings, and contains patient-specific information on all laboratory tests. Specific variables contained in the research file include the name of the test ordered, the date ordered, the specimen source, the results, and the date of the results. This database has been used in studies of acyclovir safety and studies of the epidemiology of Chlamydia trachomatis infection. This database has also been used to evaluate the implementation of new Centers for Disease Control (CDC) guidelines on preventing Group B Streptococcal (GBS) disease. GHC laboratory data provided information on GBS screening during routine prenatal care visits and allowed GHC and the CDC to evaluate the rapidity of uptake of the new guidelines. The laboratory data also allowed investigators to evaluate how completely the new guidelines were being implemented.

Radiology
This system, established in 1986, contains records of all radiographic studies performed at GHC facilities, including CT and MRI scans. Radiology records were maintained in a separate database through June 1995; since then these records have been combined with those in the outpatient visits file.

Outpatient Visits
The GHC outpatient registration system was initiated in mid-1984 and includes selected information about each outpatient visit. The database includes a record of the date of visit, the provider seen, the provider’s specialty, and the location of care. Beginning in 1991, and fully operational in 1992, diagnosis and procedure data have been incorporated in the registration database. This information was not available in automated form before that time. This database has been used to examine ambulatory utilization patterns related to quitting smoking, ambulatory utilization patterns of children of smokers, and back pain related visit utilization following randomization to one of three treatments for low back pain. Outpatient visit data have been particularly useful in studies of
Table 15.3. Frequently dispensed drugs at GHC outpatient pharmacies in each of nine major drug categories: January–December 1998*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major category</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>No. of people</th>
<th>No. of prescriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Analgesics</td>
<td>Acetaminophen</td>
<td>44 565</td>
<td>107 888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oxycodone/hydrocodone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acetaminophen</td>
<td>25 974</td>
<td>44 771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acetaminophen–codeine</td>
<td>24 920</td>
<td>48 314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>21 151</td>
<td>51 608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propoxyphene combination</td>
<td>6 082</td>
<td>15 983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antihypertensives</td>
<td>Atenolol</td>
<td>19 625</td>
<td>77 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lisinopril</td>
<td>19 472</td>
<td>89 151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Propranolol</td>
<td>2 677</td>
<td>9 129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prazosin</td>
<td>2 638</td>
<td>11 028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clonidine</td>
<td>1 554</td>
<td>6 728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-infectives</td>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>59 642</td>
<td>83 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trimethoprim-sulfamethoxazole</td>
<td>39 601</td>
<td>53 809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cephalexin</td>
<td>34 184</td>
<td>46 175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>16 415</td>
<td>21 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Doxycycline</td>
<td>14 456</td>
<td>20 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonsteroidal</td>
<td>Ibuprofen</td>
<td>43 714</td>
<td>75 467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anti-inflammatory</td>
<td>Naproxen</td>
<td>25 188</td>
<td>45 471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drugs</td>
<td>Sulindac</td>
<td>5 424</td>
<td>12 072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indomethacin</td>
<td>4 264</td>
<td>8 296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Piromycin</td>
<td>2 228</td>
<td>5 820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium channel</td>
<td>Felodipine</td>
<td>4 933</td>
<td>26 796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blockers</td>
<td>Verapamil</td>
<td>4 565</td>
<td>18 910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diltiazem</td>
<td>3 136</td>
<td>13 922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Amlodipine</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>3 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cardizem</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>2 176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diuretics</td>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>14 896</td>
<td>49 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Furosemide</td>
<td>9 610</td>
<td>40 529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide–triamterene</td>
<td>7 498</td>
<td>27 661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide–spironolactone</td>
<td>1 492</td>
<td>4 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spironolactone</td>
<td>1 106</td>
<td>3 806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gastrointestinal</td>
<td>Cimetidine</td>
<td>18 121</td>
<td>47 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ranitidine</td>
<td>12 404</td>
<td>42 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Docusate sodium</td>
<td>8 525</td>
<td>16 686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lansoprazole</td>
<td>5 784</td>
<td>23 785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Antacids</td>
<td>5 611</td>
<td>11 401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotherapeutics</td>
<td>Paroxetine</td>
<td>13 886</td>
<td>52 231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trazadone</td>
<td>8 745</td>
<td>33 156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lorazepam</td>
<td>6 888</td>
<td>23 257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>6 635</td>
<td>34 297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sertraline</td>
<td>6 282</td>
<td>27 628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respiratory agents</td>
<td>Nasacort</td>
<td>37 621</td>
<td>79 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Albuterol</td>
<td>33 951</td>
<td>82 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fluticasone</td>
<td>3 971</td>
<td>13 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ipratropium</td>
<td>2 435</td>
<td>9 367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beclomethasone</td>
<td>2 035</td>
<td>5 229</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not include prescriptions from non-GHC pharmacies.
Table 15.4. Selected variables available from automated drug files on all prescriptions dispensed from GHC outpatient pharmacies, 1977 to present

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consumer No.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group coverage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Copay status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Therapeutic class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug form and strength</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date dispensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity dispensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost to GHC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refill indicator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of days supply dispensed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriber or pharmacy data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribing physician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy location</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

antibiotic usage among GHC children, because the majority of pediatric antibiotic use occurs in the context of outpatient ambulatory visits.\textsuperscript{11}

Cancer Surveillance System and Other Registries

Since 1974, GHC has participated in the National Cancer Institute’s Surveillance, Epidemiology, and End Results (SEER) program. As part of this program, the Center for Health Studies periodically receives data tapes with information on all newly diagnosed cancers among GHC enrollees from the Cancer Surveillance System (CSS) at the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, one of 13 SEER population based registries in the United States.\textsuperscript{12} The CSS reporting area consists of the 13 contiguous counties of northwest Washington State. The database, which currently covers the period 1974 through 1998, contains information for each newly diagnosed cancer case, including patient demographics, anatomical site, stage at diagnosis, and vital status at followup, which is ongoing for all surviving cases in the register. This database has been used to evaluate GHC’s Breast Cancer Screening Program\textsuperscript{13} and mammography performance.\textsuperscript{14}

GHC has also developed diabetes and heart disease registries as part of its commitment to “population-based care”.\textsuperscript{15,16} This concept refers to initiating systematic care for groups of patients with shared healthcare needs (e.g., all diabetics), instead of reacting to individual patient’s crises (the acute care model). The first step in implementing population-based care is to develop registries to identify the relevant population of patients. In the case of diabetes and heart disease, GHC has moved from paper-and-pencil to automated registries.

Cause of Death

Using data from the State of Washington vital statistics files, the Cancer Surveillance System, and GHC’s hospitalization files, a file of deaths among GHC enrollees between the years 1977 and 1997 has been developed. The death file was produced through record linkages between the State of Washington’s death certificate database and the GHC membership files.

Community Health Services System

GHC’s Community Health Services department operates visiting nurse, hospice, respite, and geriatric nurse practitioner programs, a nursing home rounding system, and numerous other community based service programs. Computerized information from this department, available since mid-1989, includes type of provider, type of procedure, diagnosis, location of service, and price and billing information.

Utilization Management/Cost Management Information System (UM/CMIS)

Due to a growing need for utilization and cost information, the Utilization Management/Cost Management Information System (UM/CMIS) was developed at GHC in 1989. This system uses information from feeder systems (e.g., registration, pharmacy) to assign both direct and indirect costs to individual encounters based on the units of service utilized. Thus, it is possible to use UM/CMIS data to estimate an individual’s total
health care costs, as well as the costs of individual components of care, such as primary care visits, pharmacy prescriptions, mental health services, and inpatient stays. These data have been used to study the healthcare costs associated with several conditions or diseases, including asthma,\(^{17}\) depression,\(^{18}\) and breast cancer.\(^{19}\) Analyses related to costs of care for children with attention deficit disorder are underway.

**Immunizations Database**

The immunizations database was initially developed as part of the Vaccine Safety Datalink (VSD), a CDC collaborative study with GHC, Kaiser Permanente Northwest, Northern California Kaiser, and Southern California Kaiser. This database contains immunization records from February 1991 to the present for GHC enrollees 0–6 years of age, while immunizations for GHC members of all ages have been included since 1995. The immunization database has been used in studies of vaccine safety\(^{20}\) and in studies of the utility of immunization tracking systems.\(^{21,22}\)

**Other Databases**

Claims databases record information on health care services which GHC purchases from non-GHC providers. These databases contain a record of each bill received by GHC for outside services since 1989, such as inpatient and emergency care and referrals to non-GHC providers. These claims databases have become even more critical as traditional HMOs have shifted to more mixed models of care, because they provide a means of giving a full accounting of an individual’s medical care. For example, they capture bills from network providers who have contracted to provide care to GHC enrollees in outlying areas and from community providers who deliver care to enrollees in point-of-service plans.

Important data are also being generated from an ongoing program on breast cancer screening. All GHC women aged 40 years or older are being mailed questionnaires that solicit information on factors associated with the incidence of breast cancer. Approximately 85% of the women complete the questionnaires. Programmatically, the information from this database is being used to ascertain individual level of risk for breast cancer, with a woman’s risk group determining the frequency of screening mammography. Included in the breast cancer screening database are items pertaining to lifetime smoking history, use of estrogens, and reproductive history.

Data obtained from population based GHC surveys have also served as resources for research studies. In many instances, survey data have been linked with automated files to investigate predictors of health care utilization. The Health Risk Survey data set consists of responses from an age and sex stratified random sample of 1133 GHC adult enrollees.\(^{23}\) The survey form included standardized questions about health status, sociodemographic information, and health-related practices. Another example is a survey of a random sample of 647 GHC enrollees aged 65 years and older. Among the topics included in this Senior Survey were health status, functional status, situational status, health-related practices, and sociodemographics. Other survey data have focused on specific topics such as chronic pain\(^{24}\) and tobacco use.\(^{25}\)

A variety of manually maintained outpatient and inpatient medical records, clinical logs, and registries are often employed in research. Many research studies include direct patient contact through in-person interviews, surveys, or clinical examinations and tests.

**STRENGTHS**

The advantages of the GHC databases derive from their size, the accessibility and quality of their data, and the feasibility of linking patients to a primary care provider in a staff model HMO. GHC serves a moderately large population, currently over 460,000 persons, and this allows the study of relatively uncommon adverse events. The GHC population is well defined in terms of age, sex, geographic location, and duration of GHC membership. Turnover in membership at GHC is estimated to be approximately 15% per year. This relative stability facilitates long-term
follow-up—Center for Health Studies’ longitudinal studies routinely obtain followup data for 85% of the original cohort after a one-year period. Typically, such studies are successful in following persons by telephone whether or not they remain GHC enrollees.

A single patient identification number permits following the records of individuals across time. The unique patient consumer number is assigned to each enrollee upon initial enrollment at GHC and remains with the individual even if disenrollment and re-enrollment occurs.

An obvious advantage to GHC is its setting for research is the extensive use of computer technology. As previously noted, numerous automated databases are available at GHC and can be utilized for postmarketing drug and vaccine safety surveillance. Because the data are collected in an ongoing manner as a by-product of health care delivery, there is no requirement for individual patient contact. Thus, the high cost and potential for recall bias that would otherwise be associated with primary data collection are minimized or avoided.

However, GHC has mechanisms for contacting patients directly for primary data collection, as appropriate. Examples include interview-based case-control studies, health surveillance activities, and clinical research studies. In addition, manual medical records and registries are also available for use.

Another advantage to GHC as a research setting is the longevity of the plan. In existence for more than 50 years, Group Health has a subset of enrollees whose tenure in the Cooperative spans decades. This longevity facilitates studies that require very long term followup. For example, one study examined a hypothesized relationship between inflammatory bowel disease (IBD) and measles vaccination. The onset of IBD often occurs in late adolescence or early adulthood, yet the immunization of interest (MMR vaccine) is delivered in the second year of life. This long lag between exposure and outcome necessitated the creation of a dataset of members born into GHC as far back as 1958 who remained enrolled until at least 1972. Medical records (both hospitalization and outpatient) were used to confirm the diagnosis of IBD, and, since these records extended back to birth, were also used to collect information on childhood immunizations.

WEAKNESSES

LOGISTIC AND OPERATIONAL

Despite the large size of the GHC databases, most drugs are used by a relatively small proportion of a population. Thus, the GHC databases still may be too small to detect associations between drugs and rare outcomes. The detection of rare adverse events requires combining data from multiple health care delivery systems.

The data currently available in automated files do not include some potentially important confounding variables. The lack of information on confounding factors such as smoking and alcohol consumption may lead to invalid conclusions regarding drug associated effects. Confounding by indication occurs when the underlying diagnosis or other clinical features that trigger use of a certain drug also predict patient outcome in their own right. For example, in a study of β-blockers and the risk of coronary heart disease (CHD) among persons with hypertension, confounding by indication was a concern because β-blockers are also used to treat angina pectoris and are avoided in cases of congestive heart failure, each of which may be an early manifestation of CHD.28 Analytic studies must consider alternative methods of obtaining the necessary information on confounding factors, such as medical record abstraction and patient interview. Also, automated information on inpatient drugs and outpatient diagnoses were not available until relatively recently, an important disadvantage for some retrospective studies.

Use of automated data to determine outcome is not always reliable without chart review. In the Vaccine Safety Datalink study of seizures following vaccination, it would have been optimal to rely on computerized seizure related diagnosis codes. However, the investigators found that these codes often identified visits of children with seizure conditions who were being seen for followup or well child care. They concluded that for chronic conditions such as seizure disorders or asthma,
medical record review is often necessary to distinguish acute events from followup or routine visits. In addition, “rule out” diagnoses can be misleading. In reviewing the medical records of a subset of people receiving a computerized diagnosis of rheumatoid arthritis (RA), one GHC researcher found that it was not uncommon for the diagnosis of RA to have been subsequently ruled out by further medical tests.

The present competitive environment in the health care industry has resulted in a growing number of mixed model benefit plans (e.g., non-GHC provider networks and point-of-service plans) being offered by GHC, which may jeopardize the completeness of databases of health services utilization. However, if necessary, it is possible to use automated data to exclude “non-staff” model enrollees from studies. Another threat to database completeness is the movement away from “one-size-fits-all” comprehensive benefit packages. This has resulted in varying coverage arrangements for different groups (e.g., State employees, BHP enrollees). For example, since 1994, GHC has not provided drug coverage to new Medicare enrollees (see “completeness” section). While using automated data to assess current coverage arrangements is possible, albeit complicated, the data are not structured to facilitate retrospective inquiries into coverage. Thus, it is very difficult to track changes in coverage over time, changes that could have serious ramifications for healthcare utilization. Increased competition may also lead to increased patient turnover in HMOs, resulting in decreases in followup time for cohort studies. The costs to the HMO associated with maintaining relatively complete healthcare data and archiving data for analytic use may also become an issue as the pressure for health care cost containment continues.

The GHC formulary limits the study of many newly marketed drugs, since GHC may decide not to add a new agent or may adopt a new drug only after it has been on the market for some time. GHC often maintains one brand of a drug on the formulary at a time, thereby preventing investigations of many direct drug-to-drug comparisons of relative toxicity and effectiveness. In particular, drugs which offer little therapeutic advantage or value over alternative agents may be excluded from the GHC formulary. If nonformulary drugs are commonly purchased outside the GHC pharmacy system, as may have been the case with Sildenafil (Viagra) and Fen/Phen, there is the potential for an inaccurate determination of the prevalence of usage, or even of the risk of use. Furthermore, this situation (outside procurement of nonformulary drugs) prevents GHC from proactively contacting enrollees if new information emerges concerning the potential risks or dangers of medication.

The poor and elderly have tended to be underrepresented in HMOs, leading to concerns about representativeness of studies. However, a Medicare managed care plan has been offered since 1985; GHC’s enrollee population is currently made up of a greater proportion of Medicare recipients than is the population of the Seattle Metropolitan area. Group Health’s involvement in Healthy Options, Washington State’s Medicaid managed care program, has resulted in an increase in Medicaid enrollment from 2000 to 25 000 between 1993 and 1998.

**PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS**

**EXAMPLES OF USE OF GHC DATA**

The principal use of the pharmacy database for epidemiologic research has been to ascertain drug exposures, often for evaluating the effectiveness or toxicity of specific medications. Examples of questions addressed by case-control studies include: (i) do β-blockers reduce the incidence of coronary heart disease in patients with high blood pressure; (ii) are thiazide diuretics associated with hip fracture; and (iii) is the use of exogenous hormones associated with increased risk for temporomandibular pain? The database has also been used in retrospective and prospective cohort studies of specific medications. Examples include studies of the medical outcomes and costs associated with pentoxifylline treatment of patients with peripheral arterial disease and the perinatal effects of acyclovir. Other applications include studying patterns of drug utilization.
Such studies have examined the effect of various levels of prescription drug copayments on overall drug utilization and the effect of gaps in mood stabilizer treatment among patients treated for bipolar disorder. One study examined physician variation in prescribing rates for opioid medications. Opioid use was determined from self-report after validation against the pharmacy database.

The pharmacy database is increasingly used as a sampling frame. In some instances, medication use is the primary sampling criterion, as in the case of studies restricted to hypertensive patients treated with medication. In other cases, medication use has been used as a proxy measure of disease status. For example, one of the methods used to identify cases for a case-control study of the risk factors for pelvic inflammatory disease was to identify women on certain antibiotic regimens (e.g., doxycycline or 2 g or more of tetracycline per day). The medical record was then reviewed to determine if the indication was for pelvic inflammatory disease. Other uses of the database include controlling for potential confounding represented by the use of certain kinds of drugs and drug utilization review activities.

Below are some detailed examples of how the GHC pharmacy database has been used for epidemiologic and health services research.

Primary care patients treated for depression often discontinue use of antidepressant medications before therapeutic benefit is achieved or take the medications at suboptimal dosages. These treatment deficiencies can be attributed to a combination of patient and provider characteristics and to drug side-effect profiles. GHC and University of Washington researchers conducted a randomized trial testing a patient and provider educational intervention designed to improve adherence to antidepressant therapy. One outcome measure used in this trial was an automated pharmacy based measure of antidepressant treatment adequacy. This measure was based on a computerized algorithm which used the timing and quantity of refills to assess whether a person took an adequate dose of a specific antidepressant medication for a minimum of 30 and 90 days over a 6 month period. The pharmacy-based measure was also used as an outcome in a randomized trial examining the “real-world” efficacy of three kinds of antidepressant (fluoxetine, imipramine, and desipramine). A separate analysis found that this automated measure of overall treatment adequacy agreed very well with a self-report measure ($\kappa = 0.8$).

National advisory groups issued conflicting advice as to the timing of the second dose of the measles-mumps-rubella vaccine (MMR2). One group recommended MMR2 at age 4–6 years; a second group recommended that the vaccine occur at age 10–12. As there was little information on the rate of adverse reactions following vaccination in these two age groups, GHC and Northern California Kaiser (NCK) investigators took advantage of differing immunization policies at their respective HMOs to compare the frequency of clinical events following, and possibly related to, MMR2. The investigators studied over 8000 children receiving MMR2 at age 4–6 years at NCK and over 18,000 children receiving MMR2 at age 10–12 years at GHC. The presence and timing of vaccinations were determined from automated data on vaccines. Automated diagnosis data were used to identify clinical events plausibly associated with the receipt of MMR2 in the two cohorts and then samples of these clinical events were confirmed by chart review.

To account for age-related differences in healthcare use, clinical events in a 30 day time period following immunization were compared to those in a 30 day period prior to vaccination. Children 10–12 years of age were 50% more likely to have an adverse event following MMR2 than in the period prior to immunization, while children 4–6 years of age were less likely to have a visit for an event following immunization compared to the period prior to immunization. These results suggested that the risk for adverse clinical events following MMR2 immunizations was greater in the 10–12 year age group.

A population based case-control study assessed the association between first myocardial infarction (MI) and the use of antihypertensive agents. Investigators hypothesized that hypertensive patients treated with calcium channel blockers, as
opposed to diuretics or β-blockers, may be at increased risk of a first MI. The study covered a
time period (1986–1993) when guidelines recom-
mended calcium channel blockers as one of the
initial therapies for hypertension.

Cases were defined as GHC enrollees with
pharmacologically treated hypertension who suf-
fected a first time fatal or nonfatal MI between
1986 and 1993. Cases were identified from one of
three sources: (i) computerized discharge records
from two GHC hospitals; (ii) bills for out-of-plan
services provided; and (iii) a computerized match
between GHC enrollment files and Washington
State death registry files. Frequency age–sex
matched controls had pharmacologically treated
hypertension but did not have an MI.

Analyses were restricted to subjects who were
current users of antihypertensive drugs on their
index date: the date of MI for cases or, for
controls, a computer generated random date
within the calendar year for which they had been
sampled. To determine current use, the investiga-
tors searched the computerized pharmacy
database for filled prescriptions immediately
preceding the index date. Subjects who received
enough pills to last until the index date were
considered current users. (Investigators assumed
that subjects were at least 80% compliant with
dosage instructions.) In order to avoid the
potential confounding effects of recently starting
drug therapies, investigators also required that
the subject took the medication for at least 30
days prior to the index date.

The study found that the use of short-acting
calcium channel blockers, especially in high
doses, was associated with an increased risk of
MI. In part as a result of this study, the FDA
issued a warning against the use of short-acting
nifedipine (a calcium channel blocker) in the
treatment of hypertension. The Heart Care Team
at GHC intervened with physicians to transfer
patients off this medication. Within 6 months
following the intervention, 80% of patients
taking short-acting nifedipine had discontinued
use. Most switched to other drugs, and a small
proportion stopped the use of antihypertensives
altogether.

METHODOLOGIC ISSUES PERTAINING TO
USE OF THE GHC PHARMACY DATABASE

The following sections describe methodologic
problems that have been addressed by researchers
using the GHC pharmacy database.

Completeness of the Database

An important issue when using GHC’s outpatient
pharmacy database for postmarketing drug sur-
veillance research is the completeness of the
database—that is, what proportion of prescrip-
tions written to GHC enrollees are filled at GHC
pharmacies. This issue has become more salient
over time because in 1994 Group Health no longer
offered prescription medication coverage to Med-
icare enrollees new to the Cooperative. In 1997, it
was estimated that 50% of Medicare enrollees did
not have pharmacy coverage. Another factor that
could potentially affect the completeness of the
database over time is copayments, because reim-
bursement policies may influence patients’ deci-
sions on where they fill prescriptions or obtain
health care services. Copayments were introduced
for some plans at GHC in 1985, and by 1993
nearly all plans required modest copayments for
visits and drugs. Another cause for concern is the
increase in the % of enrollees who do not have
traditional “staff model” plans. These enrollees
receive their prescriptions at community pharma-
cies. Assuming the enrollee has drug coverage, the
community pharmacy then has to bill Group
Health in order for the Cooperative to be informed
of the fill.

Scientists in the Cardiovascular Health Re-
search Unit regularly ask subjects about the
percentage of GHC prescriptions that they pur-
chase at GHC pharmacies. Ninety-seven% of
about 2400 control subjects interviewed before
1994 reported that they bought all or almost all
(90–100%) of their prescription medications at
GHC pharmacies (personal communication with
Bruce Psaty). This percentage remained about the
same (98%) when asked of 600 control subjects
after January 1994 (most were interviewed in 1994
and 1995). Thus, even in a time period (post-1993)
when almost all enrollees had requirements for
pharmacy copayments, the pharmacy database appeared to be very complete. Furthermore, Psaty and colleagues were able to examine completeness rates among senior enrollees (65 years of age and older) before and after January 1, 1994, the date GHC implemented its policy to no longer cover drugs for new Medicare enrollees. Among subjects 65 years and older, 97.6% filled all or almost all of their prescription medicines at a GHC pharmacy before 1994 compared with 98.3% from January 1, 1994 on.

Other survey data also provide information on the completeness of the pharmacy database. According to a survey of pain patients, more than 90% of prescription medications used for pain management, such as opioids, sedatives/muscle relaxants, and anti-inflammatory drugs, were always filled at GHC pharmacies (see Table 15.5). Among 762 study subjects treated with antidepressant medications in 1996–97, only 1.5% reported obtaining antidepressants from a non-GHC pharmacy in the prior 3 months.

### Indication for Use

Because there is no variable for disease or symptom indication for prescription in the pharmacy database, the medical record has often been used for this purpose. This brings up two points: (i) to what extent are drugs identified from the pharmacy database documented in the medical record? and (ii) to what extent are indications for prescription recorded. Regarding documentation of drugs, studies have found agreement rates ranging from 89 to 100% between the automated and manual sources. One of these studies assessed whether indication for a one-time NSAID prescription was recorded in the medical record and found that 7% of the charts (N = 501) contained missing or vague diagnoses. There was a correlation between incomplete drug documentation and absence of an indication.

With the availability of outpatient diagnoses, it became possible to assess the indication for prescription through automated means. For example, investigators wanted to identify primary care patients who were prescribed antidepressant medications for depression (antidepressants are also commonly prescribed for pain and sleep disturbance). They accomplished this by linking the antidepressant prescription record with visit records in the 120 day period preceding the prescription and in the several weeks following the fill, selecting only those prescriptions accompanied by a diagnosis of depression. This method is far less expensive than chart review.

In a study of antibiotic use at GHC (in collaboration with Harvard Pilgrim Health Plan in Boston, MA), investigators were able to calculate disease-specific antibiotic use rates by linking the pediatric antibiotic prescription to the diagnosis for the most recent ambulatory visit within the preceding three days. For this purpose,
the investigators developed an algorithm to assign a primary diagnosis to each patient when more than one diagnosis existed for a single visit.53

Disease Severity
Because of the high cost of obtaining health status information through survey or medical record review, there has been interest in developing automated measures of health status.54 To that end, Center for Health Studies researchers have used the pharmacy database to develop a chronic disease score (CDS) for adults, a weighted sum of medications used for management of significant chronic diseases. There have been several iterations of the chronic disease score over time.55–57 The latest methodology assigns empirically derived weights to almost 30 classes of medication used to treat specific diseases. An individual’s CDS is calculated by summing the weights of all classes of medications used (not prescriptions filled) in a 1 year period, in addition to weights assigned to his or her age group and gender, and an intercept term. The CDS predicts future outpatient visit frequency, healthcare costs, hospitalization, and mortality, after controlling for age and gender. Several studies have used the CDS as a proxy measure of health status.58–60 A pediatric chronic disease score has also recently been developed.61

THE FUTURE
GHC automated data on prescription medicine use and related health care utilization have been used in studies of the effectiveness, adverse effects, utilization, and costs of drugs for more than 20 years. These studies have contributed to our understanding of the strengths and limitations of large automated databases and of the effectiveness and safety of prescription medicines. Future research will focus not only on the effectiveness and costs of the drugs themselves, but also on how medications fit into the overall delivery of health care in ways that improve the effectiveness of care or reduce the costs of providing services. It is of increasing importance that managed health care systems, government, and pharmaceutical companies conduct research on the cost-effectiveness of prescription medicines and on how medicines can be delivered in the most cost-effective manner possible. In addition to assessing the effects of medicines on biological measures of disease status, the role of medicines in outcomes, particularly improving or harming functioning and overall quality of life, is now recognized as of critical importance. The research programs conducted by investigators of GHC’s Center for Health Studies, and by affiliated university-based scientists, are increasingly concerned with these issues of cost-effectiveness and impact on functional status and quality of life.

Additionally, as other HMOs and MCOs develop automated pharmaceutical databases, the future holds opportunity for collaborations across different sites. The resulting large population bases will allow for the study of events possibly associated with drug use, or drug use patterns across many geographic sites. While exciting, broader collaboration carries with it the concomitant challenge of maintaining confidentiality of prescription drug data.

REFERENCES
7. Davis RL, Hasselquist MB, Cardenas V et al. Introduction of the new Centers for Disease Control
GROUP HEALTH COOPERATIVE OF PUGET SOUND

Group B Streptococcal Prevention Guideline at a large West Coast Health Maintenance Organization (under review).


27. Barlow W, Davis RL, Glasser J et al. Risk for first seizure following DTP or MMR vaccination: Results from the Vaccine Safety Datalink study of children under age seven (under review).


60. Donahue J, Andrade S, Beck A *et al.* Epidemiologic study of gastric and duodenal safety in patients dispensed alendronate (working paper).

16

Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program: Division of Research, Northern California, and Center for Health Research, Northwest Division

GARY D. FRIEDMAN AND LAUREL A. HABEL
Division of Research, Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, Northern California, 3505 Broadway, Oakland, CA 94611, USA

MYDE BOLES
Center for Health Research, Kaiser Permanente Northwest Division, Portland, OR, USA

BENTSON H. McFARLAND
Center for Health Research, Kaiser Permanente Northwest Division, and Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland, OR, USA

INTRODUCTION

The Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, now serving approximately 8.5 million subscribers, is the largest group practice Health Maintenance Organization (HMO) in the United States. The program includes over ten regional divisions. The Northern and Southern California Regions of Kaiser Permanente were recently merged into a single California Division. Investigators in the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, Northern California, have been involved in pharmacoepidemiology for approximately 30 years. The Center for Health Research at Kaiser Permanente Northwest Division was founded in 1964. A program of drug related health services research began soon after and continues today. In recent years, the availability of an automated ambulatory medical record along with other automated medical data systems, including inpatient and outpatient prescription drug systems, have led the Center for Health Research also to become more deeply involved in pharmacoepidemiology and postmarketing surveillance studies. In this chapter, we review the role of the Kaiser Permanente systems in pharmacoepidemiology research. We begin with a description of the systems, discuss their strengths and weaknesses in conducting
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pharmacoepidemiology research, provide examples of work done using these resources, and conclude with some thoughts about where they are going in the future.

**DESCRIPTION**

**KAISER PERMANENTE NORTHERN CALIFORNIA REGION**

Clinical Organization

Kaiser Permanente’s largest and oldest regional division is in Northern California (initially centered in the San Francisco Bay Area), where the program now serves over 2.8 million subscribers. Approximately 30% of the general population in the geographic areas served belong to the health plan. The region spans a 14-county area that includes the San Francisco Bay and Sacramento metropolitan areas, the northern San Joaquin valley, and Sonoma, Napa, and Fresno counties. Comprehensive health care is provided by Kaiser Permanente medical staff at 15 hospitals and 31 outpatient facilities located throughout the region. Only a small amount of care (e.g., out-of-area emergency visits, radiotherapy) covered by the plan is provided at non-Kaiser Permanente facilities.

Most subscribers and their families join the Kaiser Health Plan as part of an employment group, but about 10% enroll as individuals or families, provided that they pass a health examination. Approximately 12% of members receive some Medicare coverage. Members come from all ethnic and age groups and all occupations, but the indigent and very wealthy are probably under-represented. After the initial year or two of membership, when there is a relatively high turnover, subscribers tend to stay with the program for relatively long periods of time. This makes it possible to use the members’ medical records for cohort studies with long followup periods and for case-control studies with long followback intervals from disease diagnosis to exposure.

Each subscriber receives a unique medical record number that is used for all encounters with the program. This makes it easy to link various records, e.g., pharmacy records with hospitalizations. Computer membership files that contain all current members at a given point in time can provide basic denominator counts for age- and sex-specific prevalence and incidence rates.

The amount of computer stored diagnostic and clinical data has increased substantially over the last 25 years. Since 1971, all hospitalizations in the Northern California program and the diagnoses that resulted from them have been stored annually on computer tapes. This makes it possible to search for hospitalizations of interest among members of a study group, or to identify cases of a particular disease for further investigation. Laboratory and pathology data are now stored in computer databases and radiology/diagnostic imaging data have been computer stored since 1992. Information on outpatient visits was computer stored as of 1994. This outpatient database can help identify individuals with diseases that lack a laboratory diagnostic and rarely result in hospitalization. Despite the growing availability of computerized diagnostic and clinical data, most epidemiologic studies in this setting still require some review of manual medical charts, at least for validation of certain computer stored data.

**Northern California Division of Research**

The Division of Research was established in 1961, primarily to develop technology based services for the support of medical care. Division researchers have conducted numerous studies over the last 37 years, covering a broad range of topics. The division staff is comprised of individuals with expertise in various disciplines including epidemiology, biostatistics/biometrics, applied behavioral science, economics, data management, research grants and contracts administration, and numerous clinical specialties. In addition, close collaborative ties exist with local universities and departments of health.

The current mission of the Division of Research is to conduct, publish, and disseminate high quality epidemiologic and health services research to improve the health and medical care of Kaiser Permanente members and the society at large. It
seeks to understand the determinants of illness and well-being and to improve the quality and cost-effectiveness of health care.

Pharmacoepidemiology in the Northern California Region

Pharmacoepidemiology first became a major focus of the Northern California Program’s Division of Research (formerly the Department of Medical Methods Research) in the late 1960s, as a result of a contract awarded by the US Food and Drug Administration to Dr Morris F. Collen, then director of the division. The aim of the program was to develop a system to monitor adverse drug reactions in both inpatients and outpatients, first in one medical facility and then regionally if feasible. When the contract ended in August 1970, only an outpatient system was sufficiently developed to be operational. It was located in the program’s medical center in San Francisco, which then served about 120,000 subscribers. There were two data collection components: a computerized pharmacy system and a clinic diagnosis system. These systems continued to collect data until August 1973, supported by a grant from the National Center for Health Services Research and Development.

The computerized pharmacy system recorded the dispensing of about 78% of the outpatient prescriptions issued by physicians in the facility, as determined by a small followup survey. The pharmacist recorded each prescription dispensed, using a typewriter terminal connected to a central computer system that contained a unique computer medical record for each patient. The data entered included the identifying numbers of the patient and physician, the date and time, the trade name, strength, and form of the drug, the amount dispensed, the number of refills permitted, and the “sig.” or instructions to the patient. The terminal printed a label for attachment to each drug container and the pharmacist verified, on-line, the accuracy of the information.

The diagnostic data were recorded by the physicians at the facility. Each specialty clinic had its own form on which were printed the 200–300 diagnoses most commonly made at that clinic, with provision for writing in the names of conditions not listed. For each condition diagnosed, the physician could indicate whether it was new (including recurrent), old or continuing, or worsening. In addition to writing a progress note, the physician was to mark the appropriate diagnoses on the form, on which a clerk had also recorded the patient’s and physician’s identifying numbers, date, and time. The information on these forms was entered into the patient-specific computer medical records, first by optical reader, and later by data entry operators using interactive typewriter terminals.

As a result of the 1969–1973 program, a considerable volume of data was collected. Computer stored records include 1,307,767 prescriptions for 3,446 drug products dispensed to 149,139 patients. A total of 217,768 patients had diagnoses from one or more clinic visits stored in these records. Most patients’ computer records showed a series of intermingled clinic and pharmacy visits that could be used to study the relation of drug use to subsequent clinical events. A cohort of 143,574 persons with satisfactory identifying information was derived from the 149,139 with records of prescription dispensed.

As of 1996 this cohort had more than 2.18 million person-years of followup within the Kaiser Permanente program. A total of 45,625 persons (31.8% of the original 143,574) were still members. In the previous three years, the average annual decrease in membership was about 3,800 cohort members per year. It should also be noted that older people are less apt to leave the plan. For example, of persons age 50–59 at entry (defined by their first computer stored pharmacy visit), 33% were still enrolled. Much of the loss was, of course, explained by death. For example, of the persons in this age decade at entry who were no longer members in 1980, 44% had died. Only 19% of the original group had left the Kaiser Permanente program for other reasons.

In 1991, the Northern California region again began computer storing outpatient pharmacy records. The Pharmacy Information Management System (PIMS) was phased in over a three-year period and has been operational at all 108 Kaiser pharmacies since 1994. Data on each prescription
filled are entered into the system in real time by pharmacy personnel before the prescription can be issued. Recorded information includes the patient’s and prescribing physician’s identification numbers, the drug name, strength, and route; date dispensed; treatment regimen; and days supply. Approximately 90% of the Health Plan membership has a pharmacy copayment of $10 per prescription per month, or less. However, the results of two recent surveys suggest that approximately 15–20% of adult members fill at least some of their prescriptions at non-Kaiser pharmacies. Since 1994, this system has recorded information on approximately 15 million prescriptions per year.

**KAISER PERMANENTE NORTHWEST DIVISION**

**Clinical Organization**

Kaiser Permanente, Northwest Division (KPNW) is a federally qualified, prepaid health maintenance organization that has operated in the Portland, Oregon–Vancouver, Washington metropolitan area since World War II. KPNW provides comprehensive medical care for over 430,000 members in 20 outpatient facilities located in the Portland–Vancouver area and in two smaller communities, Salem, OR, and Longview–Kelso, WA, each about 50 miles away. The demographic and sociographic characteristics of KPNW members correspond very closely to the metropolitan population as a whole (Table 16.1). The membership provides a well defined population base with known dynamic properties.

Most of the medical care is provided in the outpatient setting but KPNW owns and operates one hospital in Portland and contracts for beds in other Portland community hospitals and in Salem, OR, and Longview–Kelso, WA. The 550 physicians of Northwest Permanente, PC, provide the medical care for these members with the exception of a few specialized services that are performed under contract in the community. The terms of insurance coverage by Kaiser Permanente serve to concentrate members’ medical care within the walls of KPNW. This is particularly true for chronic diseases. Medical care in non-KPNW settings is largely confined to emergencies and out-of-area events. Almost all elective surgeries are carried out by KPNW surgeons in KPNW facilities. KPNW also operates a prepaid group practice dental care program, which currently enrolls about 190,000 members.

Benefit provided by KPNW include hospital and surgical services, maternity care, x-rays, mammography, laboratory tests, allergy testing, home health care, doctor office visits, well baby care, immunizations, emergency care, mental health and chemical dependency treatment, and routine checkups. More than 90% of the membership has a prepaid drug benefit, and for those without a drug benefit prescriptions are provided at or below prevailing community charges.

**Center for Health Research**

The Center for Health Research is a professionally autonomous, multidisciplinary research organization that conducts health related research in the public interest, using Kaiser Permanente as its primary laboratory. The center is dedicated to

---

**Table 16.1. Demographic characteristics of Kaiser Permanente Northwest Division members (percent of total population)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristic</th>
<th>KPNW (members)b</th>
<th>Portland–Vancouver area c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0–18</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19–64</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

bNumbers may not add to 100 due to rounding.
c1995 Membership Survey.
c1990 US Census data.
answering universal and general prevention, epidemiologic, and health services research questions, and this research is supported from a variety of sources, including governmental grants and contracts, private and corporate grants, and a basic support grant from Kaiser Foundation Hospitals.

The center brings experienced university and center based researchers in various disciplines—including biostatistics, dentistry, economics, epidemiology, genetics, gerontology, medical care organization, medicine, nursing, nutrition, pharmacy, psychology, public health, social psychology, and sociology—to a setting where extensive data are available from an operating medical care system that encourages research dedicated to serving the public good through the pursuit of knowledge.

KPNW Databases

The hallmark of the KPNW data systems is the KPNW medical record. Since its inception, KPNW has used unique and permanent health record numbers to identify all members. All encounters with the medical care system—e.g., clinic visit, telephone call, prescription, operation, laboratory test—are linked by this identifier. Kaiser Permanente has retained paper copies of the health records of all members since its founding in 1942. A single, comprehensive medical record for every member of the Health Plan is stored in a central location. Every contact an individual makes with the medical care system is recorded on this chart. Whenever a patient has an appointment at a clinic, his record is delivered to the attending physician to be available at the time of appointment. This record includes hard copy printouts of electronic medical records.

KPNW Administrative Data Systems

The Membership Information Processing System (MIPS) maintains the base of membership data and employer group data to support member and patient identification, group contact and benefit administration, group and direct-pay billing, and membership and revenue reporting. The Kaiser Appointment/Registration/Encounter System (KARE) provides data on all medical office visits for each KPNW member. The primary purpose of this administrative system is to assist medical offices in managing appointments.

The Outside Claims and Referral System (OSCAR) is KPNW's automated claims processing system for covered services provided by non-KPNW providers on a fee-for-service basis (some outside services are obtained under capitation contracts); it also identifies covered expense for outpatient drugs purchased at non-KPNW pharmacies.

KPNW Clinical and Dental Data Systems

The Inpatient Admission/Discharge/Transfer System (ADT), implemented in 1980, serves as the basis for the discharge abstract for all patients admitted to a regional KP hospital. This system also includes ambulatory surgical procedures and other major ambulatory procedures performed in the hospital operating suites since 1965. The ADT system also incorporates data from non-Kaiser hospitals.

The Outpatient Pharmacy System (TOPS) began in 1986 and records all prescriptions dispensed by KPNW’s outpatient pharmacies. Each prescription file contains 25 variables, including quantity dispensed, days supplied, refill number, date, NDC number and other product information. More than two million outpatient prescriptions are dispensed by KPNW pharmacies annually.

The Automated Inpatient Medication System (RAINS) is an inpatient pharmacy computer system that captures all inpatient medication orders; it provides a complete history of patient medication orders and stores the history via a unique hospital stay number that is generated on admission.

The EpicCare is an automated clinical information system that links data from several data bases to provide clinicians with immediate on-line information necessary for patient care. This computerized medical record has eliminated outpatient paper based clinical reporting and streamlined it into one on-line access point. Periodic write-offs to end-user files will make this rich data source available to researchers.
Adverse and Allergic Drug Event Reporting. Adverse events are entered into a database, and reports are prepared for the local KPNW Formulary and Therapeutics Committee. Data are also sent to the Food and Drug Administration’s MedWatch system.

The Advice Nurse Documentation System (RANDS) is an on-line system that documents the advice and triage functions of KPNW’s telephone advice nurses.

The Dental Administrative and Clinical Tracking System (TEAM) provides data on all dental office visits since 1987 in the KP Dental Care program and is updated at each patient visit to include demographic and benefit information, as well as the type of dental service provided.

Emergency Psychiatric Service Logbook. KPNW provides 24-hour emergency mental health services and, each year, the Emergency Psychiatric Service handles about 8000 telephone calls and 2000 face-to-face contacts.

The Emergency Department Database contains one line of information for each visit, including date, patient name and health record number, and presenting problem.

The Laboratory Information System (LIS) provides an integrated base for the medical laboratory to support processing and reporting of laboratory procedures that have taken place since mid-1992. Major functions of the system include order and specimen tracking, results interpretation and reporting, and cumulative patient reporting.

The Cytology Database and Histology Database contain the results of all outpatient and inpatient clinical and laboratory procedures starting in August of 1970. More than 85% of the cytology database is Pap smear results. The histology database comprises results on surgical specimens.

The Radiology Information Management (RIM) Database contains patient-specific information on all patients treated in any radiology department, including radiology, ultrasound, magnetic resonance imaging (MRI), nuclear medicine, and computerized tomography.

Triple Marker Prenatal Screening Database (MIPAF). In 1991, KPNW began offering to all pregnant women a prenatal screening protocol for Down syndrome and open neural tube defects commonly known as triple marker screening. Demographic, pregnancy, and screening outcome data are maintained in this database for all women who accept the screening protocol. Pregnancy outcome data are maintained for all women who screen positive for either risk.

Immunization Database. This database is an online chart abstraction system that maintains immunization records by individual member. Begun in the early 1980s to provide immunization records for school age children, the database was expanded in 1985 to include all members.

Medicare Plus II Database. The participants in this special program complete a questionnaire annually that includes standardized instruments measuring level of functioning (Activities of Daily Living and Instrumental Activities of Daily Living) and depression (Center for Epidemiologic Studies–Depression scale). This database records information from 1985, with an overall response rate of 90%.

The Continuing Care Service Database includes information about diagnosis and treatment for home care services for members who are homebound.

KPNW Disease Registries

Tumor Registry. KPNW maintains a centralized registry of all cancer patients diagnosed since 1960. Excluding basal cell carcinomas of the skin, more than 35,000 tumors have been registered. The registry tracks the entire course of a patient after a cancer diagnosis. Survival information is acquired through an aggressive followup program that achieves a rate of more than 95%.

The Benign Breast Disease Registry: Pilot Phase includes data on nearly 10,000 women diagnosed between 1970 and 1994.

The Kaiser Permanente Interregional Genetics Registry contains data on cytogenetic testing on more than five million members of the Northwest Division and the Northern California and Southern California regions from 1986 forward. The Hawaii Region joined the registry in 1992.

The Breast Cancer Family Registry: Pilot Phase is funded by a grant to explore the relationship
between benign breast disease and breast cancer, and the genetic changes that lead to breast malignancy. The registry contains nearly 10,000 women diagnosed between 1970 and 1994.

The Diabetes Registry is designed to improve the care of KPNW members with diabetes. Patients were identified by reviews of pharmacy records, inpatient and outpatient records, and diabetes clinic logbooks. The registry now includes more than 25,000 persons.

The Rheumatology Registry, which began in 1982, logs all rheumatological diagnoses and consultations, identifying members with specific rheumatological diagnoses. As of 1992, the on-line registry contained more than 8000 files.

Center for Health Research Databases

Outpatient Utilization System (OPUS). Since 1966, the CHR has maintained an outpatient utilization database for a continuously updated sample of the KPNW membership. Each month, a simple random sample of all new KPNW subscriber units is added to the pool of enrollees whose records are abstracted; the sample was 5% of Health Plan members until 1984 when it was reduced to 2% for the under-age-65 population only.

Current Membership Study Database. The surveys used for this study query KPNW members in the Northwest Division about their satisfaction with medical services and on their characteristics, such as health status and behaviors. The study surveys a 2% random sample of health plan members each year, with monthly batches of survey questionnaires sent to members—more than 95,000 since the study began in 1975.

Household Interview Survey Database. In 1970, the CHR initiated an intensive household interview survey of a subset of the OPUS population. The survey elicited extensive individual and family information, including objective, factual information such as demographic and socioeconomic characteristics of the families and individuals in the units, information about their health status and behaviors, perceptual or attitudinal information, including beliefs and opinions about health and medical care, and other social and psychosocial data.

The Common Recruitment Pool (CRP) is a computerized database system designed to hold information about individuals who could become volunteers or may have already volunteered for screening in a CHR clinical trial.

The Common Control Pool (CCP) contains the basic demographic and eligibility data for virtually all people who have ever been members of the Kaiser Foundation Health Plan, NW Division.

The Clinic Appointment System (CAS) is a computerized appointment database system designed specifically for use in randomized clinical trials. A variety of standard reports are produced from CAS and ad hoc queries may be issued, resolved, and reported if appropriate.

Medical Visit Survey Database. Since 1990, the CHR has conducted an ongoing survey of a sample of KPNW members, stratified by medical office, who have made recent visits to KPNW clinicians. Survey questionnaires are sent shortly after the visit, and focus on satisfaction with the visit.

Dental Visit Survey Database. A random sample survey of members making visits to KPNW dental clinics has been conducted since 1994.

Social Health Maintenance Organization (Social/HMO) Database. The Social/HMO is a national demonstration at four sites designed to evaluate the ability of a single delivery system—the HMO—to provide elderly members with a comprehensive package of preventive, acute, and long term services.

Vital Statistics Database. The CHR has access to various vital statistics maintained by the states of Oregon and Washington, including records of live births from 1965 and deaths from 1975. This database includes infant mortality from 1986 to 1991 and records of therapeutic abortions from 1975 to 1983.

Pregnancy Registry. The registry uses diagnoses, laboratory data, obstetric clinic visits, and obstetric ultrasound reports to identify pregnant KPNW members. Pregnancy outcomes of spontaneous abortion, therapeutic abortion, live birth, and still birth also are included in the registry.
The KPNW pharmacy database has been in operation since 1986. Table 16.2 lists the top 50 most frequently dispensed drugs and number of users in KPNW in 1997.

Automated pharmacy data can be employed to identify users of drugs. Automated medical records can also be searched to identify individuals with particular diagnoses who can then be followed. All data can be linked through unique identifiers. Cohort members can be followed as long as they remain enrolled in the health plan. Person time at risk can be calculated easily from the enrollment data. CHR researchers have conducted a number of long term followup studies on cohorts of medication users.

Some out-of-plan use of pharmaceuticals may not be recorded in the database; however, over 90% of the KP membership has some type of drug benefit that makes it financially advantageous to fill prescriptions at a KPNW pharmacy. Also, KPNW drug prices are generally equal to or lower than those at outside pharmacies. Finally, surveys of KPNW membership show that the vast majority of members fill their prescriptions at a KPNW pharmacy.

### STRENGTHS

The major strengths of the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program as a site for pharmacoepidemiology studies are mostly apparent. One is the size of the population available—over 2.8 million in the Northern California Region. KPNW currently has more than 430,000 members, representing about 25% of the population of the Portland, OR and Vancouver, WA, metropolitan area.

A second advantage is the representativeness of the population served by Kaiser Permanente. Although there is a relative lack of the poor or the very wealthy, the program is much more representative than a number of the alternative data systems.

#### Table 16.2. Top 50 Prescription Medications and Exposure for 1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medication</th>
<th>Users</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>129 614</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibuprofen</td>
<td>102 852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen with hydrocodone</td>
<td>86 578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole</td>
<td>77 136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuterol</td>
<td>60 982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beclomethasone dispropionate</td>
<td>60 542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen with codeine</td>
<td>58 056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cimetidine</td>
<td>49 304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estrogens, conjugated</td>
<td>44 581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamcinolone acetonide</td>
<td>39 088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>37 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine</td>
<td>36 626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinopril</td>
<td>35 565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalexin</td>
<td>31 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atenolol</td>
<td>28 914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medroxyprogesterone</td>
<td>25 889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocortisone</td>
<td>25 258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>24 709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prednisone</td>
<td>24 210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penicillin V potassium</td>
<td>22 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levothyroxine</td>
<td>20 164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>19 628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium chloride</td>
<td>18 615</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitroglycerin</td>
<td>18 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paroxetine</td>
<td>17 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methocarbamol</td>
<td>17 001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>16 941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenylpropanolamine</td>
<td>16 701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naproxen</td>
<td>16 271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxacin/clarulanate</td>
<td>15 819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neomycin/polymycin</td>
<td>15 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metronidazole</td>
<td>13 095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin trihydrate</td>
<td>11 790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doxycycline</td>
<td>11 691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium sulfacetamide</td>
<td>11 375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyclobenzaprine</td>
<td>11 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxycodone/acetaminophen</td>
<td>11 289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fexofenadine</td>
<td>10 767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omeprazole</td>
<td>10 426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trazodone</td>
<td>10 291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furosemide</td>
<td>10 015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norethindrone/ethinyl estradiol</td>
<td>10 007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azithromycin</td>
<td>9 334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glyburide</td>
<td>9 049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lovastatin</td>
<td>9 026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amritripylene</td>
<td>8 966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triamterene/hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>8 966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydroxyzine</td>
<td>8 821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sodium fluoride</td>
<td>7 335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benzonatate</td>
<td>7 875</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A third advantage is the racial and ethnic diversity of the membership in Northern California, which is approximately 65% Non-Hispanic White, 10% Hispanic, 7% African-American, 14% Asian-American, and 3% other. In contrast, although the KPNW membership mirrors the characteristics of the population in the geographic area it serves, it is strongly represented by white, middle class, employed individuals.

Fourth, the stability of the health plan population after the first year of membership permits followup of patients for long term drug effects. In KPNW, the median length of enrollment retention exceeds five years. For 0–14 year olds, the five-year retention percentage is 63%. Retention is lower for younger adults and higher for older adults. The Kaiser Permanente membership is not subject to the turnover inherent in programs in which eligibility changes with income.

Fifth, the existence of membership files allows one to enumerate those at risk for a drug exposure or disease and to calculate true prevalence and incidence rates.

Sixth, the use of a unique medical record number for each member allows the linkage of drug dispensing with inpatient and outpatient diagnosis data.

Finally, and probably most important, access to primary medical records is reasonably complete and fairly easy. This permits validation of diagnostic information and access to information on confounding variables that is not available in the computerized record.

WEAKNESSES

Like any other data system, the use of Kaiser Permanente data for pharmacoepidemiology studies also has its disadvantages. Probably foremost among these in the past, before the development of PIMS, was the absence of comprehensive computerized pharmacy information in Northern California, with the exception of the computerized pharmacy systems that were in effect for short periods of time.

A second disadvantage was the absence of confirmed computerized outpatient diagnostic data in Northern California before 1994. While automated systems to capture diagnostic information on outpatient visits now have been implemented, this information is sometimes incomplete and often needs to be confirmed with data from other sources, such as the manual medical record.

Third, there is limited demographic information on the Kaiser membership. Age and gender are collected on the full membership. Race/ethnicity is only available on hospitalized individuals and subgroups who have completed special questionnaires, and there is no system-wide collection of information on marital status, education, income, or occupation.

Fourth, although the Kaiser databases are a rich source of patient risk factors and confounders, not all relevant variables will be present in the automated data. For example, smoking status and alcohol consumption are not routinely recorded in the computerized databases. Alternative methods of collecting these data, such as survey or medical record review, will be required.

Finally, as with other HMOs, Kaiser Permanente formularies are somewhat limited. Many of the newest and/or most expensive drugs may not be available for study. It is not uncommon for only one brand of a particular drug to be available on the formulary at a point in time. This prevents investigation of head-to-head comparisons of drugs for effectiveness and toxicity. Nonlisted products prescribed by individual physicians are usually stocked. However, one cannot adequately study a drug that is rarely dispensed.

PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

Kaiser Permanente data are particularly useful for pharmacoepidemiology research when one needs a large population, especially a representative population, and if one needs prolonged followup. Kaiser Permanente data are easier to retrieve when one is studying a disease that results in hospitalization, especially when major confounding variables
also result in hospitalization or, at least, are recorded in the medical record. The use of Kaiser Permanente data is problematic if a population larger than a few million is needed, or if information is needed which is not usually available in a medical record.

In general, cohort studies using Kaiser Permanente data can be performed by using computerized pharmacy data to identify drug exposed individuals and computerized and/or medical record diagnosis data to evaluate outcomes. Case–control studies using Kaiser Permanente data can be performed by using computerized and/or medical record diagnosis data to identify cases, membership files to identify controls, and then computerized and/or medical record pharmacy or drug prescribing data to evaluate exposures. Examples of each will be provided.

NORTHERN CALIFORNIA KAISER PHARMAECOEPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES

Initial Phase

Our initial efforts at the analysis of the 1969–1973 data consisted primarily of a search for associations between drugs and subsequent clinical events. Incidence rates in users of a drug or group of drugs were compared with those in nonusers. At that time we were primarily concerned with short term drug effects. Using the data collected during the first six months of computerized pharmacy records, it could be shown, for example, that yeast infections of the vagina were about twice as common among users of oral contraceptives as among nonusers in the same age range, and that these infections occurred much more commonly among users of the “combination” than the “sequential” oral contraceptives.3

After data collection ended in 1973, we conducted a few additional studies with the accumulated data, including analyses of drug use that employed the pharmacy data and analyses of disease frequency that used the clinic data. We also carried out one study of an adverse drug reaction that provided some insight into the limitations of the computer stored diagnostic data. We investigated the incidence of diarrhea following the use of the antibiotic, clindamycin.4 Instead of relying solely on the computer stored diagnoses to detect the occurrence of diarrhea, we examined the medical charts of all clindamycin users identified in the computer records. This experience confirmed our suspicion that the computer stored diagnoses relating to this event were incomplete. In eight weeks of followup of some 300 persons who received clindamycin, there were ten cases of diarrhea recorded in the medical charts but only two cases recorded in the computer records. Despite the under-recording of diarrhea in the computer records, a comparison of the incidence of diarrhea among clindamycin users and nonusers showed a 6.5-fold greater occurrence in users, which was statistically significant (p < 0.05). Thus, the computer data alone could still be used to detect adverse reaction, despite their demonstrated incompleteness.

There were two main reasons why some of the computer records did not show this diagnosis. First, some of the clinics prescribing clindamycin (e.g., dermatology and ear, nose, and throat) did not have diarrhea listed on their data recording form, since it rarely comes to the attention of physicians practicing these specialties. Second, on other patients it seemed that some physicians were satisfied to record this new symptom in their notes and did not feel obligated to list it as a diagnosis. Thus, we learned that information stored by selecting from a limited list of conditions in computer medical record systems will not necessarily reflect all the problems a patient has. This is an extension of a limitation that is inherent in conventional medical charts—that the busy physician does not have time to record every detail reported by the patient.

Surveillance for Possible Carcinogenic Effects using 1969–1973 Pharmacy Data

Study Design

Using the 1969–1973 computer stored data, we developed a research program to detect carcinogenic effects of drugs. The problem of medicinal drugs as actual and potential causes of cancer has been reviewed by Selby et al.2 The list of drugs
already shown to have carcinogenic effects includes radioisotopes, immunosuppressive drugs, cytotoxic drugs, drugs that contain arsenic, phenacetin, and coal-tar, and certain hormones. Suspicion has been raised about a variety of others based on case reports and epidemiologic studies. Also, laboratory research has pointed out substances that are carcinogenic for animals and mechanisms of carcinogenesis that throw suspicion on certain drugs used by humans. Given the widespread use of drugs, the suspicions that have already been raised, and the seriousness of the adverse reactions under consideration, the importance of further work in this area is obvious.

In 1977 we initiated a two phase program to study drug carcinogenesis (currently supported by grant No. R35 CA49761 from the National Cancer Institute). Through 31 December, 1996, 15 533 incident cancers had been documented in the 1969–1973 San Francisco pharmacy cohort. At that time, the number of cancers was growing by about 500 per year. The hypothesis testing phase consists of followup of the 143 574 persons with computerized pharmacy records and comparison of the incidence of all types of cancer among users of various drugs with that among nonusers. The hypothesis testing phase involves mainly detailed case–control studies of Northern California Kaiser Permanente patients using their longitudinal medical records, but also other data analyses and study designs. The hypotheses to be tested are selected from those developed from the hypothesis seeking activities, as well as others appearing in the medical literature.

Among the 3446 drug products dispensed during the four years, there were 95 drugs given to at least 1000 people. Some drugs of interest had very large numbers of recipients. Tetracycline, one of the most commonly recorded drugs, was given to about 23 000 patients; it merits study because it is a tertiary amine with the potential for conversion to carcinogenic nitrosamines in the stomach if nitrites are also present. Another very commonly dispensed drug was promethazine. Over 17 000 patients received it in expectorant mixtures. This drug is also of interest since the phenothiazines are said to be stimulators of prolactin release and prolactin may be positively related to breast cancer development.

We have used two sources of data to detect subsequent cancer occurrence. Both of these can be linked to the drug dispensing data by means of each patient’s unique medical record number which follows her or him through the Kaiser Permanente system. One source is the computerized hospitalization records for the entire Northern California region. The discharge diagnoses are coded by medical records personnel and included with each hospitalization record. These cover the years 1971 to the present. The other major source of followup is the cancer registry of the Surveillance Epidemiology and End Results (SEER) program now operated by the Northern California Cancer Center. This initially covered those Kaiser Permanente hospitals located in the five counties closest to San Francisco. These records go back through 1973 and records from the same hospitals were obtained from the Third National Cancer Survey, covering the years 1969–1971. This cancer surveillance has been extended throughout the state, as now required by California law, and tumor registry coverage in Northern California Kaiser Permanente has been complete since 1990. In order to exclude from followup persons who already had cancer when followup began, those cases who were hospitalized in the San Francisco facility in 1968 were added to the cancer records, by manually reviewing listings in that hospital’s record room.

Our routine followup coverage does not extend beyond the Kaiser Permanente system, because losses to followup are small. After members have been in the Health Plan for two or more years, the dropout rate averages 3% per year. Also, because of the costs of cancer care, there is strong motivation for the cancer patient to continue his or her care within the Kaiser Permanente prepaid system.

We tested the adequacy of the within-Kaiser Permanente followup by submitting a sample of 10 252 subjects from the pharmacy cohort (every 14th record of the 143 531 subjects with names recorded) to the SEER program. Altogether, 437 cancers were found by SEER to have developed in this group by the end of 1982. Of these, 66 or 15.1% were clearly missing from our files. (Similar cancer codes in our files were not counted as
(missing.) Of these, 17 were diagnosed while the subject was a member and 49 while not a member of our Health Plan. Thus, altogether about 15% of cancers in 9–13 years of followup were known to be missed. Some additional cancers probably developed outside of both Kaiser Permanente and SEER surveillance, and the Kaiser Permanente data contain cancers not recorded by SEER.

Our surveillance for cancer within Kaiser Permanente records for the duration of membership appeared quite complete, in that only 17 cancers were diagnosed outside of Kaiser Permanente during membership and missed by our surveillance. This represents 17/388 or 4.4% of those cancers that occurred during membership according to SEER records.

We estimated the effect on the minimal detectable relative risk of having 18% (100%/[100%–15% missed]) more cancers detected in the screening analysis than are now detected with our Kaiser-only followup. Our calculations were based on a Poisson distribution, which is used in the relevant statistical significance testing. The error (significance) level was set at 0.05 (two-sided) and power at 0.80. The results appear in Table 16.3 for a wide range of expected numbers of cancers. Clearly the addition of 18% more cancers leads to little improvement in the sensitivity of the study.

The search for additional cancer cases in SEER records proved to be quite costly and, as seen, yielded little benefit to the study. Thus, we decided not to expand the surveillance in this way routinely. However, where there is an especially interesting or important association, or lack of association, observed in our data or elsewhere, a special ad hoc search for additional cases in users of a particular drug may be worthwhile.

Method of Analysis

We use traditional analytic methods to screen for possible carcinogenic effects. Users of the drug or drug group to be evaluated are compared with the entire pharmacy user cohort listed in the 1969–1973 computer records with respect to the incidence during the ensuing years of each major type of cancer and of any cancer. Followup of each user begins at the first computer recorded dispensing of the drug under study. Followup for the entire cohort begins with their first recorded receipt of any drug. Followup ends when the patient leaves the Northern California Kaiser Permanente Program. Of course, after a cancer is diagnosed in a subject, either before or after followup begins, he or she is not considered at risk of developing that cancer.

The users and nonusers are divided into males and females and classified initially according to their age when followup begins and reclassified as they progress into subsequent 10 year age groups. Incidence rates for each cancer and all cancers combined are calculated for each age-sex subgroup on a person year basis. These rates are compared with those for the entire cohort by means of the morbidity ratio, which is merely the drug user incidence rate divided by the cohort rate. An age-sex standardized morbidity ratio is calculated for all drug users. The degree of departure of the morbidity ratio from unity, that is, the magnitude of the association of the drug with the cancer, is evaluated for statistical significance using the Poisson distribution. Naturally, unless a drug–cancer association is hypothesized in advance, each probability (p) value obtained may be viewed as an underestimate of the true

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Expected number of cancers</th>
<th>Current approach</th>
<th>If 18% more cancers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.60</td>
<td>7.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.68^b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>3.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>1.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a We thank Bruce Fireman, MA, for assistance.

^b The anomalous result of a higher minimum detectable relative risk with 18% more cancers when there is one expected case is due to the fact that changing the expected from 1.00 to 1.18 and requiring that the observed number to be an integer changes the observed number required for significance from four to five.
probability, since we are looking, in an exploratory fashion, at so many drugs and cancers.

Our comparison of users of a particular drug with all pharmacy users has a bias toward not finding a drug–cancer association since the drug users form part of the entire group. However, users of most drugs comprise such a small fraction of the entire cohort that the bias will usually be very small. Even with one of the largest groups, the 23,000 who took tetracycline, a twofold increase in risk of cancer compared to nonusers would only be reduced to a 1.7-fold increase compared to all pharmacy users. The overriding advantage of using all pharmacy users as our standard of comparison was that the age–sex–specific incidence rates for each cancer had to be computed only once; they are stored and compared with those for each drug user group. If the analytic program had to compute a new set of incidence rates for nonusers every time we studied a different drug, this would be very costly and inefficient.

**The Question of Cancer Incubation Periods**

After exposure to a carcinogen, the incubation period for cancer is often many years, even decades. Thus, the question arises as to whether we have, in past years, been conducting these analyses prematurely. As of 1996, the over 45,000 persons still in the program had from 23 to 27 years of followup. It is true that a number of known occupational cancers do seem to require 20 years or more from the onset of exposure. However, there are some drug related cancers that suggest the possibility of a much shorter incubation period. For example, the excess risk of lymphoma in relation to immunosuppressive drugs for renal transplant patients appears within a year of their use. Leukemia develops after alkylating agents are given to patients with multiple myeloma after an average latent period of 4.5 years. An example of a shorter incubation period is radiation induced leukemia in adults, where the usual incubation period is 5 years, and 90% of all cases occur within 10 years. An important point is that, although the first indication of drug use would have been recorded in these data in 1969, some patients had used the drugs for quite some time beforehand, thus lengthening the actual incubation time. Thus, we believe that our analyses to date have been worthwhile. Nevertheless, our chances of finding drug carcinogenesis will increase as followup time increases, provided that not too many subjects are lost to observation. Prior use of a drug may have occurred in some persons regarded as nonusers of that drug. However, for nonusers of most drugs the proportion would have been very small and the effect on our findings negligible.

**Hypothesis Seeking by Following Up a Cohort**

Why do we consider these analyses primarily to be hypothesis generating rather than hypothesis testing, since cohort followup studies are often considered to be more definitive than case–control studies? The problem is that these computerized data lack the additional information on confounding variables that are so necessary to test hypotheses. Thus, for example, while they contain information on age and sex, they lack information on reproductive history that one would like to have for a study of breast cancer. Also, because they only cover a limited time, they do not provide a full picture of the duration of drug use and the total amount of the drug taken. For these reasons we feel it preferable to test hypotheses by means of case–control studies that involve a careful review of the patients’ complete longitudinal medical records. Another possibility that may be appropriate for hypothesis testing in certain situations is to use the cohort type of study and, in addition, investigate comparability with regard to possible confounding factors by examining the charts of a sample of users and nonusers.

**Examples of Results of Screening**

Our screening analyses have been summarized in four reports to date. One positive finding of great interest has been an association of barbiturate use with subsequent lung cancer. Phenobarbital is a known cancer promoter in experimental animals and further analyses of our computer stored data suggested a dose–response effect and that increased cigarette smoking among barbitu-
rate users was not the explanation. However, medical record review failed to confirm dose–response and revealed no restriction of the association with any specific histological type of lung cancer. Also, there were too few lung cancer cases among nonsmoking barbiturate users to be sure that uncontrolled confounding by cigarette smoking was not involved. Sixteen additional years of followup failed to demonstrate that the association was due to confounding by cigarette smoking.\(^{12}\) We continue to pay close attention to this association as more followup data accumulate.

A second finding of interest was the negative association between bladder cancer and pheno-barbital use. This has been observed in a few other studies and it has been hypothesized that pheno-barbital may induce drug metabolizing enzymes that detoxify bladder carcinogens found in cigarette smoke.\(^ {13}\) We linked our drug screening data with computerized smoking information that was available on a subset of our cohort because they had received a multiphasic health checkup. Although our estimates were imprecise, our results supported this hypothesis, as we found that there was a negative association between barbiturate treatment and bladder cancer risk only among current and former cigarette smokers.\(^ {14}\)

We have also had several negative findings that have been of particular interest in our drug–cancer analyses. When questions were raised about metronidazole as a cause of cancer\(^ {15}\) we showed that, in up to 11 years of followup, there was no increased risk of cancer of any site except uterine cervix, whose association with metronidazole use was explainable on other grounds.\(^ {16}\) Similarly, when it was suggested that use of digitalis was protective against breast cancer,\(^ {17}\) we could find no confirmation in our data.\(^ {18}\) We also tested the hypothesis that conflicting findings regarding rauwolfia and breast cancer were explainable if this drug increased risk only in women over age 50 who took it for at least five years.\(^ {19}\) We could not confirm this hypothesis.\(^ {20}\)

After looking at biennial analyses of the 215 most commonly used drugs, with followup now extending through 1996, we have been rather impressed at the apparent safety of most drugs, as they are ordinarily used, with regard to cancer causing effects. Drugs, after all, are “chemicals” that are introduced into the body in relatively high doses compared to the ingested quantity of many chemicals in the environment. However many of our analyses have low statistical power to detect associations. More assurance will come as cancer cases now accumulate after two decades of followup, since the latency period for some environmental cancers can be this long.

**Mortality Followup**

We also added mortality followup to our screening capabilities. A computer tape file listing 63,486 cohort members no longer in the Health Plan was given to Dr. Max Arellano for CAMLIS\(^ {21}\) computer matching with State of California death records. This program identifies probable and possible matches between persons in two sets of records with an indication of the strength of the probability that the matches are correct. Our chart reviewers manually checked the identity in our Health Plan records of all matched decedents about whom there was any doubt concerning their membership in the cohort. Altogether 9,771 deaths were confirmed through 1980.

We performed selected drug–cancer screening analyses on the mortality data analogous to what was done with the incidence data. We also added total mortality and a few grouped noncancer causes of death to the analysis. The findings for cancer mortality were generally similar to those for cancer incidence. Noncancer findings were also as expected (e.g., tranquilizers and other psychoactive drugs were associated with suicide and other traumatic death).

We have not continued routine mortality followup in our cancer surveillance because it adds relatively little to what we can learn from incidence data.

**Research Using Recently Implemented Pharmacy Information Management System (PIMS)**

As with the 1969–73 pharmacy data, information stored in PIMS can be used to examine adverse or beneficial outcomes associated with the use of
specific medications. PIMS data can be linked with automated membership records and a variety of clinical and diagnostic data to obtain information on other exposures as well as outcomes. Given the recency of implementation, this database is too young to look at drug–disease associations with a latency period of more than a couple of years (e.g., most drug–cancer associations). However, the short term effect of drugs can be evaluated. Examples of studies using PIMS include examinations of glycemic control among type 2 diabetics among users of hormone replacement therapy, or metformin, and vaginal bleeding and associated gynecologic care in postmenopausal women using hormone replacement therapy.

Several studies have used PIMS to examine patterns of drug utilization or drug costs among the Northern California membership at large, or among subgroups based on disease status. Some of these studies have been conducted with a purchased cost accounting software package that integrates the regional utilization databases with the general ledger to provide fully allocated costs by department, medical center, patient, or service. Examples of studies of drug cost include a cost analysis of a Helicobacter pylori eradication strategy and an examination of health care costs associated with obesity. Utilization studies include a comparison of continuation of transdermal versus oral estrogen postmenopausal hormone replacement therapy.

Another valuable use of our computerized pharmacy data is to help identify individuals with a particular disease condition or disease subgroup. PIMS was an instrumental case finding component of an effort to establish a Northern California Kaiser Permanente Diabetes Registry. This registry includes approximately 100,000 members with type 1 or type 2 diabetes and approximately 80% in any given year were identified, at least in part, from prescriptions in the pharmacy database. PIMS was also part of a computer based model to identify high risk children with asthma.

Case-Control Studies
A number of case–control studies of adverse drug effects have been conducted over the years using drug exposure data that have been both computer stored and manually abstracted from medical charts. In some studies, use of drugs such as oral contraceptives was assessed primarily by personal interview. Because of occasional errors in automated data and nonuniform diagnostic practices and criteria among the many physicians in our large health care system, the disease under study needs to be verified by medical record review when case subjects are identified. Control subjects representing the overall subscriber population are usually selected from membership rolls, applying matching criteria, as appropriate. Thus, in a case–control study focusing on prior drug use, it is often desirable to match control subjects to cases for age and for length of membership in the health plan.

APPLICATIONS OF KPNW

Regulatory Questions
Table 16.4 provides examples of projects that used KPNW databases to address issues of concern to regulators. These projects have had an impact on national policy. For example, in late May of 1996 the Food and Drug Administration was considering the approval of the antiviral drug sorivudine. Previous work in Japan indicated that sorivudine apparently blocks metabolism of 5-fluorouracil by inhibiting dihydropyrimidine dehydrogenase. Fatalities were reported due to 5-fluorouracil toxicity in users of both drugs. The regulatory question was the extent to which antivirals are used concomitantly with 5-fluorouracil. The KPNW automated pharmacy data for 1995 yielded 5627 acyclovir users and 209 injectable 5-fluorouracil users, of whom seven had been prescribed both medications. Records were sought and retrieved for all seven patients who may have been concomitant users. Record review showed there were four who had been using both drugs simultaneously.

The KPNW research team has also worked with the pharmaceutical industry on postmarketing surveillance. For example, KPNW participated with industry scientists in developing a registry for adverse events associated with use of the antiviral
Table 16.4. Examples of reports to the Food and Drug Administration from the KPNW Center for Health Research

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sildenafil use</td>
<td>1 November 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fenfluramine/phentermine use</td>
<td>1 July 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticlopidine use</td>
<td>30 May 1998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sumatriptan use</td>
<td>4 January 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and neutropenia</td>
<td>5 September 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceftriaxone, cholelithiasis, and nephrolithiasis</td>
<td>30 August 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluorouracil and acyclovir use</td>
<td>29 May 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamoxifen and macular edema</td>
<td>23 May 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tramadol and seizures</td>
<td>20 May 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aplodronate and esophagitis</td>
<td>15 May 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lamotrigine and Stevens–Johnson syndrome</td>
<td>21 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New molecular entities</td>
<td>15 April 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and hypoglycemia</td>
<td>15 October 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication use in pregnancy</td>
<td>1 October 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium channel blocker use</td>
<td>21 September 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metformin use</td>
<td>21 September 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norplant use</td>
<td>16 September 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methylphenidate and clonidine use</td>
<td>16 September 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Triazolam use</td>
<td>30 June 1995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tumor promotion and use of antihistamines or antidepressants</td>
<td>28 June 1995</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This project involved collaboration among several sites within Kaiser Permanente.

Use and Effects of Psychotropic Drugs

Supported by the Food and Drug Administration, the National Institute of Mental Health, and the pharmaceutical industry, KPNW investigators have examined use of antipsychotic medications, benzodiazepines, lithium, and antidepressant drugs in the defined population of KPNW members. These projects have provided a foundation for work on adverse events.

For example, KPNW researchers worked with scientists at the Food and Drug Administration and the National Cancer Institute to examine the contention that antidepressant and/or antihistaminic drugs may promote tumor growth. The study was stimulated by several laboratory studies suggesting that the growth of tumors in rodent cancer models could be markedly accelerated by commonly used antihistamine or antidepressant medications at usual doses. The laboratory data were reported prominently in the lay press. The KPNW subjects were identified from the automated tumor registry and included individuals with breast cancer, colon cancer, or melanoma. The cases were defined as patients who had recurrence of their original tumor. Controls were cancer patients with no recurrence. Exposure to antidepressant or antihistamine drugs (during the time at risk following treatment for the original tumor) was determined from the automated pharmacy system. The KPNW tumor registry provided stratification variables such as tumor stage at original diagnosis. As is discussed in detail by Weiss et al., no evidence was found to support the contention that antidepressant or antihistaminic drugs promote tumors.

The rise of managed care has stimulated considerable interest in the new discipline of pharmacoconomics. Workers at KPNW have addressed these issues by examining antidepressants since these medications have become one of the most expensive therapeutic drug classes. Especially noteworthy in this work is the finding that the overwhelming majority of prescriptions for antidepressant drugs are written by primary care providers.

Drug Use in Pregnancy

Work is under way at KPNW to expand a pregnancy registry derived from automated appointment, diagnostic, and laboratory data systems. The idea is to use automated data to identify pregnancy. The KPNW researchers are interested in pregnancies leading to spontaneous or therapeutic abortion, as well as those leading to live birth or still birth. The pregnancy registry will have several uses, such as examining the impact on the fetus of new anticonvulsant or antidepressant medications. Work to date on the pregnancy registry project has involved validating data from automated systems. Automated pregnancy markers include urine or serum human chorionic
gonadotrophin as well as obstetric ultrasound (sonogram) reports, in addition to outpatient diagnoses and referrals to the obstetrics department. The validation study used the paper medical record as the “gold standard.” The validation also allowed the researchers to compare the date of the last menstrual period with the date of the first automated marker of pregnancy. In addition, the validation study allowed the researchers to compare spontaneous abortion reports in the paper record with those in the automated databases. Generally speaking, the automated data appeared to reflect accurately the pregnancy related events described in the paper medical record. There are also linkages between KPNW’s deliveries and the Oregon and Washington birth certificate files. Mothers and babies have also been linked. The pregnancy registry can be expanded to incorporate other Kaiser Permanente programs nationally, which have over 50 000 pregnancies annually. Early reports on medication usage during pregnancy have been presented.  

Regarding devices, at the request of Food and Drug Administration scientists, the KPNW research team examined the possibility of studying adverse effects of contact lenses. Studies of this nature appear feasible as KPNW dispenses a wide variety of contact lenses and has a system that records the brand dispensed to a given KPNW enrollee. Roughly 40% of KP members have optical benefits. Also, KPNW researchers have worked with the staff at the Casey Eye Institute’s National Registry of Drug Induced Ocular Side Effects, which is located at the Oregon Health Sciences University in Portland.

Similarly, KPNW staff examined (at Food and Drug Administration request) the feasibility of examining the safety of amniocentesis and chorionic villus sampling. The KPNW Center for Health Research maintains a genetics registry that includes data from Kaiser Permanente programs in California, Hawaii, Oregon, and Washington. The genetics registry can be used for studies on devices used in prenatal diagnosis.

Studies Of Biologics and Devices

Both the KPNW Center for Health Research in Portland and the Group Health Center for Health Studies in Seattle participate in the Vaccine Safety Datalink project supported by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. This national study involves preparing customized data sets that are transmitted to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention in Atlanta. The project has also led to theoretical epidemiologic work on methodology for monitoring vaccine safety. As part of the vaccine project, Kaiser Permanente researchers prepare and ship to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention records from automated data sources pertaining to children. The data include information on vaccinations, enrollment, outcomes (e.g., hospital discharge, emergency department use, or death), and covariates (e.g., birth certificates). Associations inferred from screening analyses are validated by nested case–crossover or case–control studies. Medical records are abstracted to supply data for the detailed studies. Outcome measures of interest include seizures, ataxia, aseptic meningitis, and mortality.

Methodologic Work

An important aspect of work at KPNW has been the development of methodology for use in pharmacoepidemiologic and pharmacoeconomic studies. For example, KPNW researchers devised procedures for matching health maintenance organization data with state vital statistics (e.g., birth and death) records. These techniques are used to examine mortality within the defined population. The KPNW researchers developed a programming method to link Oregon and Washington death certificates to records of Kaiser Permanente members. The method was developed in collaboration with researchers at the Boston Collaborative Drug Surveillance Program and was implemented using advanced SAS programming techniques. This methodology has been used to ascertain infant mortality among the 18 000 newborns delivered in KPNW hospitals between 1986 and 1989 in a study pertaining to the alleged association between fluoride drops and Sudden Infant Death Syndrome.

A key issue for both pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacoconomics is the prevalence of
medication usage. This topic is not straightforward since the underlying health maintenance organization population (while it is well defined) is constantly changing. McFarland has devised statistical techniques that can be used to compare period prevalence derived from administrative databases with survey data and/or with one another. The statistical methodology deals with the varying times under observation.

Another issue of considerable interest is the dose of prescribed medications. KPNW workers have devised methodology that can be used to translate automated pharmacy system dispensing data into average daily dose information. This approach involves linking dispensing records from the drug utilization database and converting them into records of episodes of exposure to a drug or group of drugs. The software enables the research team to determine the period of exposure in which to search for suspected adverse drug effects. Furthermore, average daily dose of drug consumed can be estimated by this methodology. These techniques have been used in a study of withdrawal seizures possibly associated with discontinuation of high-dose alprazolam. As it happened, none of the users receiving average daily alprazolam doses of 4.0 mgs or higher had a hospital admission for a seizure disorder while using the drug or during a short time after stopping use of the drug. While some high dose alprazolam users did appear to have a seizure disorder, record review showed that treatment for the seizure disorder began prior to the receipt of alprazolam.

This methodology is also important in quality assurance. For example, McFarland points out that accreditation bodies such as the National Committee for Quality Assurance are using the duration and dose of antidepressant treatment as quality assurance measures. Major depressive disorder is a common condition and antidepressant drugs are often used as the main treatment modality in managed care systems. Information about the dosage and duration of antidepressant drug treatment derived from automated pharmacy systems can be helpful in examining quality of care.

**THE FUTURE**

The current Kaiser Permanente pharmacy databases will mature and provide a resource for evaluating long term as well as acute drug associated effects. Data from other recently implemented automated systems that capture a range of detailed clinical information can be linked with pharmacy data to conduct both retrospective and prospective evaluations of drug effects, utilization, and healthcare costs.

We anticipate that the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Program, Northern California will continue to increase the amount of clinical and diagnostic data stored in automated systems. There are also efforts under way to make systems compatible across regions. This will facilitate collaborative pharmacoepidemiologic research of infrequently prescribed medications and/or rare side-effects or disease conditions.

In addition to aiding in the development of new diagnostic tests, advancing biomedical technologies will allow for the identification of new molecular and genetic markers that may help predict individual response to drug treatment. As promising markers are identified, we expect that investigators will incorporate them into their pharmacoepidemiology research.

Finally, the Center for Health Research at KPNW has begun the development of a “data warehouse” that will provide research-quality medical and pharmacy data drawn from several HMOs throughout the United States. Currently, the data warehouse contains limited years of data from five midsize Kaiser Permanente Divisions: Northeast (New York, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Vermont, and Rhode Island), Southeast (Georgia only), Central East (Ohio), Rocky Mountain (Colorado, Kansas, and Missouri), and Northwest (Oregon and Washington). Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound in Seattle is also a participant. Collectively, these participating HMOs represent about 2.5 million enrollees. Efforts are under way to incorporate other Kaiser Permanente divisions into the data warehouse.

The creation and maintenance of a collaborative HMO data warehouse are subject to many challenges. The top priorities of the organizations
participating in the data warehouse are confidentiality, security, and protected use of the data. No single organization has access to the data without agreement from all participants. The data are a valuable research and business asset and are handled with extreme care.

The creation and maintenance of the data warehouse requires high level technical sophistication. Very large number of data arrive from other locations that use a myriad of operating systems, software, and data formats. Data must be “cleaned” for data quality and then integrated to allow for pooled data with minimum loss of detail. An important technical feature of the data warehouse is the “metadata.” Metadata are “data about data” and includes documentation of data from all contributing sources. Metadata also include the programs used to process the integration of the data. “Data marts” are also part of the data warehouse. These are structured applications that are created to produce routine reports and other standardized output of the data.

The data warehouse is currently being used by several multisite research projects. These projects not only rely on the data warehouse as a research asset, but also helped to create its infrastructure. Among these, the Global Risk Adjustment: Payment, Estimation, Simulation study, funded by the Health Care Financing Administration, Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and Kaiser Permanente, is the most prominent example. Researchers from Kaiser Permanente Northwest Division, Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound, Kaiser Permanente Northeast Division, Kaiser Permanente Rocky Mountain Division, Kaiser Permanente Central East Division, and HealthPartners are collaborating on a nationwide study of Medicare payment in HMOs. The data warehouse serves as the central, research quality database.
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INTRODUCTION

Harvard Pilgrim Health Care (HPHC), a 1.1 million member nonprofit health maintenance organization (HMO) in New England, has a long history of public domain research that uses automated record linkage methods in a wide range of epidemiologic and health services research (including pharmacoepidemiology, drug policy, and other health services research) and in support of clinical trials. Approximately 90% of HPHC members have prescription drug benefits that offers them a strong incentive to fill their prescriptions at a pharmacy that reports the dispensing to the HMO. These computerized pharmacy records are fully linkable to automated ambulatory care, emergency room visit, and hospital admission records. In addition, a fully automated ambulatory medical records system is in place for approximately 300,000 members. This system captures all encounters between members and providers, including telephone calls; diagnosis, test, and treatment codes for each ambulatory encounter; and providers’ full-text notes and dictations. It is possible to search these automated office records for coded clinical conditions, tests, and prescriptions and to link these data with emergency room and hospital discharge diagnoses. This chapter reviews the use of HPHC data for pharmacoepidemiology research.

DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW OF HPHC/HVMA

HPHC is the largest HMO in New England, with approximately 1.1 million members as of January 2000. This mixed-model, nonprofit HMO, which was formed in 1994 from the merger of the Harvard Community Health Plan and Pilgrim Health Care, provides primary care and all major medical subspecialty services. In 1998, the 300,000-member former staff-model component became a multi-specialty group, Harvard Vanguard Medical
Associates (HVMA). Most HVMA patients are HPHC members.

Pharmacy dispensing information is available from 1988 (when the health plan population was approximately 250,000) through the present; this information includes data on 90% of HPHC members with pharmacy benefits. In addition, prescribing information is available for 1969 onward for a cumulative total of roughly one million individuals (including 300,000 current members) with automated ambulatory medical records. The prescription drug benefit provides prescription drugs for a copayment (usually less than $10 for a month’s supply) that provides a strong incentive to use a pharmacy that provides automated dispensing data to HPHC. For each dispensing the following data are recorded: a unique patient identifier, gender, date of birth, dispensing date, prescriber identifier, generic drug name, dosage strength, amount dispensed, route, American Hospital Formulary System (AHFS) code, National Drug Code (NDC), member’s contract number, and dependency code (noting the relationship between family members and contract holders).

DEMographics of HPHC Members

The median age of HPHC members in 1998 was 31 years. Slightly more than half (53%) of members were female. Twenty-seven percent of members were age 17 or younger, and 6.7% were 65 or older. Among HPHC members who identified their race during a survey, 73% were White, 16% were African–American, 2% were Asian, and 9% were Hispanic/other. HPHC has active Medicare and Medicaid programs.

HPHC Automated Records

Membership Records

Membership files include demographic and health plan coverage information for each HPHC member. Date of birth, gender, dates of membership (including all starts, stops, and changes in coverage or benefit status during each membership interval), and most recent residential zip code are reliably recorded. Race, marital status, education, and occupation are less reliably recorded. This record also includes family membership information that allows linkage of family members and data on the organization through which membership was obtained (private corporation, state employer, Medicare, Medicaid, or individual).

Ambulatory Encounter Records

All ambulatory encounters generate claims with up to two primary and secondary diagnosis codes and one procedure code as well as information about the provider and dates of encounter. Diagnoses are coded according to the International Classification of Disease, 9th edition (ICD-9), and procedures are coded according to the Current Procedural Terminology (CPT).

In addition, there are fully automated medical records for HVMA patients. For these individuals, patients’ vital signs and an unlimited number of diagnoses per encounter are captured during encounters (including telephone calls). Providers’ notes and dictations are transcribed in their entirety into the automated medical record. Results of most laboratory tests, diagnostic imaging procedures, and other tests performed within and outside HVMA facilities are entered directly into the automated record and are linked with the patient encounter during which they were ordered. Hard copy medical records are maintained for information that cannot readily be incorporated into the automated medical record, such as electrocardiograms, signed informed consent forms, and medical records from prior health care providers.

Records for Emergency Room Visits, Hospitalizations, and Other Medical Services

All emergency room visits and hospitalizations generate claims (form UB82 was used through 1993 and form UB92 thereafter) with the hospital name, dates of hospitalization, discharge diagnoses, and procedures performed. The largest single inpatient facility for HPHC/HVMA patients is Brigham and Women’s Hospital, where detailed automated inpatient records are available.1 Other medical services, including long-term care and home care provided by physicians, nurses, or other private vendors, are reported to HPHC on UB92 or HCFA 1500 forms (which contain up to four ICD-9
coded diagnoses and six coded procedures) and are also available for automated searches.

Linkage to Data Sources Outside HPHC
The research staff can link information about the HMO’s members to external data sources, such as state vital statistics registries and the records of the state board of registry in medicine.

USE OF HPHC DATA FOR PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH
In many pharmacoepidemiology studies, use of a certain drug or a drug class is the “exposure” information and clinical events after the initial exposure are the “outcome” information. Drug prescribing or dispensing is sometimes the outcome of interest in studies of the effect of drug policies. Potential confounders and effect modifiers may include demographic factors, concomitant medications, and concurrent diseases. All these data are routinely collected for all members.

Use of Pharmacy Data
Most pharmacoepidemiology studies requiring complete drug-exposure information are restricted to individuals with prescription drug coverage. Members who have filled a prescription for a given drug can be identified by the brand name, generic name, AHFS class, NDC, or any combination of these identifiers. Further linkage with demographic records can restrict the exposed population to those who have continuous benefit coverage for prescription drugs during a certain period. Concomitant medications dispensed to the same individuals would provide information on concurrent diseases and the severity of these diseases.

Use of Diagnosis and Procedure Data
An outcome after drug exposure can be identified by information from several sources, including ambulatory diagnoses, hospital discharge diagnoses, radiology examinations, laboratory examinations, and procedures such as endoscopic examinations. Outcome identification usually involves a screening step in which one or more diagnosis and/or procedure codes are sought in automated ambulatory or hospital records and selected full-text records are reviewed to confirm the diagnosis. Information on medical history or concurrent illness can be obtained during the manual record review.

Coded Diagnosis Information
The ICD-9 diagnoses associated with ambulatory encounters or hospitalizations for all members can be identified from automated claims files. In order to use coded information for research purposes, several types of fixed length record are usually created for patients identified by such searches. There is a single record containing demographic data for each individual, a fixed length record for each ambulatory encounter, a separate clinical encounter record that contains prenatal information, and administrative records about each service that a member obtains, including care provided within physicians’ offices, at hospitals and emergency rooms, and by other providers, such as home health care agencies. All records include a unique patient identifier. If there are more diagnoses, tests, or treatments than can be recorded in a single fixed length encounter record, continuation records are created to capture all coded information. Records of laboratory testing contain the test type, test date, and test result. For members with automated ambulatory records, a fully automated record database can be searched in cases with diagnosis codes or characteristics of interest.

Review of Full-Text Medical Records
Selected parts of the full-text medical records are ordinarily reviewed to confirm coded information or to obtain details on the outcomes of interest and/or on potential confounders and effect modifiers. Record reviews have been performed routinely for research and quality assurance purposes. Hospital discharge summaries and full-text medical records for all members are obtained from participating hospitals and manually reviewed. Full-text ambulatory records are also available from medical care providers. For HVMA members with automated
ambulatory records, full-text records are available in electronic format, and text filters can be used to highlight specific text strings, thereby allowing efficient manual review. Typically, 75% of hospital records and nonautomated ambulatory records are accessible for review for research purposes; all automated ambulatory records are usually available.

Figure 17.1 shows an example of a full-text record retrieved during a study of asthma medications. The full-text records of these encounters were printed, with text strings indicating the conditions of interest highlighted. Words of interest are highlighted with automated text processing methods, i.e., by placing three asterisks before them and underlining the line in which they occur.

Figure 17.1. Excerpts of automated ambulatory medical record from two encounters for an HVMA member, after processing by a text filter designed to facilitate review for asthma by focusing on symptoms (cough) and prescription (a refill over the telephone).
The highlighting shown in Figure 17.1 can be applied to both coded information and free text. Similar methods are used to mask the names of drugs being studied. These selective text printing capabilities also can be used to enhance the efficiency of automated reviews, increase confidentiality by obscuring most occurrences of the patient’s name, and reduce the opportunity for reviewer bias by masking the names of specific drugs.

**STRENGTHS**

The HPHC/HVMA research environment offers several advantages for pharmacoepidemiology studies.

- The availability of data from 1969 onward allows certain longitudinal studies.
- Since most members have prescription drug benefits, exposure information is likely to be complete for most such drugs.
- Full-text ambulatory and hospital records can be used for research. Automated ambulatory records, which are available for part of the membership, are an extremely rich research resource, providing essentially complete, highly efficient automated access to a level of clinical detail that is often unavailable or available only with great effort.
- Laboratory test results can be obtained from automated sources for members with automated ambulatory records.
- A full-time research staff both has expertise in performing record linkage research and also has access to primary data sources.

**WEAKNESSES**

- The principal limitation of the data source, as of most HMO based databases, is the substantial turnover of the membership. The annual disenrollment rate is approximately 14% among all members. However, the attrition rate is much lower for members who have been enrolled for more than three years and for those with chronic conditions, such as asthma or hypertension. It is difficult to ascertain outcomes after membership ceases.
- Data required for research reside in diverse computer systems. Accessing these systems and obtaining information in usable form require research staffs with sophisticated programming skills and experience with these datasets.

**PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS**

**OVERVIEW OF RESEARCH STRATEGY**

The pharmacy dispensing and claims data support a variety of study designs, including cohort and nested case–control studies (Table 17.1). For cohort studies, exposure can be based on drug exposure or clinical status. Drug exposure is usually defined on the basis of the dispensing of a drug of interest. It is possible to select drug exposed cohorts with desired age, sex, and membership characteristics and to identify individually matched or group matched unexposed individuals for comparison. Usually the population is restricted to individuals who have prescription drug benefits and are therefore most likely to have filled prescriptions at HVMA or contract pharmacies.

**EXAMPLES OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES CONDUCTED AT HPHC**

Use of Pharmacy Dispensing Records and Hospital Discharge Diagnoses To Evaluate Potential Adverse Drug Reactions

A retrospective cohort study of the association between alendronate and gastroduodenal perforation, ulcer, or bleeding was conducted at HPHC and seven other HMOs. Health plan members to whom alendronate was dispensed during a specific interval were identified from drug dispensing records. Subjects were also required to have pharmacy benefits and to have been members for at least one year before the start of alendronate exposure. A comparison group who did not have
Table 17.1. Examples of pharmacoepidemiology projects performed using HPHC data

- Serum sickness associated with oral antibiotics
- *C. difficile* associated diarrhea following outpatient antibiotic treatment
- β-adrenergic receptor blocker-associated depression
- Sudden death, syncope and arrhythmias following prescription antihistamines
- Varicella zoster epidemiology, complications, and patterns of care
- Ibuprofen and skin and soft tissue superinfections in children with varicella
- H₂ blocker associated hemolytic anemia
- Cutaneous drug reactions and other dermatologic conditions in HIV infection
- Isotretinoin prescribing practices
- Use and effectiveness of asthma therapies
- Use and effectiveness of antihypertensives
- Use of drugs with high per patient costs
- Use of lipid lowering agents in primary care settings and reasons for discontinuation of use
- Incidence of severe skin eruptions after lamotrigine use
- Identification and epidemiology of surgical site infections after hospital discharge
- Alendronate and gastroduodenal perforation, ulcer and bleeding

alendronate dispensed but who were comparable in terms of age and sex distribution, pharmacy benefit, and duration of membership was randomly selected. Investigators then searched the records of exposed and unexposed subjects for hospital discharge diagnosis codes that may represent upper gastrointestinal perforation, ulcer, or bleeding. Hospital records were reviewed to confirm the clinical event of interest. Incidence rates for exposed and unexposed individuals were computed from the confirmed events and eligible person time. For alendronate exposed individuals, separate incidence rates were computed for all time after alendronate dispensing and time during which the individuals had an adequate supply of drug. Adjusted incidence rate ratios were derived, with covariates obtained from automated data sources, such as age, sex, and medical care (including exposure to a wide array of prescription drugs that are markers of specific chronic diseases) received during the year before observation for the outcomes of interest began.

A complementary assessment of confounding by indication, which would exist if osteoporosis were independently associated with gastroduodenal perforation, ulcer, or bleeding, was performed by assessing the rate of these events among age matched individuals with nonpathologic fractures, which were chosen as the best available marker of osteoporosis.

**Use of Automated Ambulatory, Pharmacy Dispensing, and Hospitalization Records To Evaluate Drug Effectiveness**

A retrospective cohort study among asthmatics was conducted in the group of HPHC members who had automated ambulatory records for 1991 through 1994 to evaluate risk factors associated with hospitalizations for asthma. Asthma was defined as at least one asthma diagnosis during an ambulatory encounter, a hospitalization, or an emergency room visit. The study population consisted of 16,941 HPHC members. After adjusting for age, sex, other asthma medications, and amount and type of ambulatory care for asthma, use of inhaled steroids was found to be associated with a 50% decrease in the risk of hospitalization due to asthma attacks. The large sample size and efficient data collection in this study illustrate the strength of research based on automated medical records.

**Use of Automated Dispensing, Ambulatory, and Hospital Data To Evaluate Adherence to Drug Therapy**

A study of lipid lowering agents at HPHC and another HMO utilized drug dispensing data to identify a cohort of users of these drugs, to evaluate the duration of drug use, and to characterize the reasons for drug discontinuation. Followup with automated data showed that the effectiveness and tolerability of these agents were poorer in general use than had been suggested by clinical trials.

Another study evaluated adherence to antihypertensive therapy. Treated hypertensive patients were identified among HPHC members with automated ambulatory medical records. Eligible subjects were
identified on the basis of measured blood pressure exceeding specified thresholds, a diagnosis of hypertension, and dispensing of antihypertensive therapy for at least six months. All patient selection was based on automated information. Subjects answered questionnaires and underwent three months of electronic adherence monitoring and pill counts. Automated ambulatory medical records and pharmacy dispensing records were reviewed to assess refilling frequency and blood pressures. Correlations between different methods for the assessment of adherence were estimated. Since the entire population of eligible people from whom the sample was recruited was known, it was possible to estimate the generalizability of the information obtained.

Use of Coded Ambulatory Diagnoses, Full-Text Medical Records, and Electrocardiograms Together with Pharmacy Records

Events considered to be either potential precursors or consequences of *torsades de pointes*, a form of ventricular tachycardia, that follows exposure to terfenadine or other antihistamines, were studied. These outcomes included sudden death, syncope, ventricular arrhythmia, and QTc interval prolongation. Exposures were defined as dispensing of an antihistamine of interest. Most syncopal episodes were diagnosed by a search of the automated medical record for diagnoses such as syncope and seizure and for diagnostic tests including electrocardiograms and Holter monitoring. Hospital records were also searched. Deaths were identified through state vital statistics records. Arrhythmias and QTc interval prolongation were determined by independent review of all electrocardiograms obtained during exposure by a cardiologist. Novel features of this study included the ability to identify many episodes of syncope, even those reported by telephone, and then to review the providers’ notes to confirm the diagnosis. In addition, it was possible to obtain approximately 90% of electrocardiograms. Sixty first episodes of syncope or arrhythmia were identified during 1.9 million antihistamine exposure days (0.86 million for terfenadine, 1.04 million for other agents). Comparison of terfenadine with other antihistamines revealed a risk ratio of 0.86, with a 95% confidence interval of 0.52–1.44. Furthermore, there was no difference in prolongation of the rate adjusted QT interval.

The intent of this study was to determine the burden of *C. difficile* associated diarrhea and its association with specific antibiotics. Since positive assays are uncommon relative to diarrhea diagnoses, the identification process began with a search for all positive *C. difficile* toxin assays performed in outpatient and hospital laboratories among HPHC members with automated ambulatory records. Ambulatory and hospital records were reviewed to determine which positive laboratory tests were associated with diarrhea and colitis and which cases were hospital acquired. Since the number of person years at risk was known, it was possible to estimate the incidence rate of community acquired symptomatic disease. In addition, antibiotic-specific attack rates were determined by identifying all prescriptions dispensed from HMO pharmacies to individuals with pharmacy benefits, assigning risk periods associated with these exposures, and determining which of these risk periods were associated with *C. difficile* associated diarrhea. The overall incidence rates were 7.7 cases per 100 000 person-year and 6.7 cases per 100 000 antibiotic risk periods. More than 80% of cases were identified only in ambulatory records. For most antibiotics, the risk was between 1 in 1000 courses and 1 in 100 000 courses. Disease was significantly more common among adults than among children. A few antibiotics were associated with a significantly higher age adjusted risk than was seen in a reference group of ampicillin/amoxicillin recipients, although the limited number of cases associated with each antibiotic precluded precise estimation of the magnitude of the excess risk.
Use of Prescribing Records To Study Physicians’ Behavior

A study focusing on prescribing practices used prescribing information from clinicians’ records rather than pharmacy dispensing records. The goal was to assess how frequently physicians determined women’s pregnancy status before prescribing isotretinoin, a teratogen. The automated medical record was used to identify isotretinoin prescriptions among women between the ages of 15 and 44 years. Women in this group who had undergone tubal ligation or hysterectomy were excluded. Automated medical records were used to identify pregnancy tests performed within 14 days before the date of prescription. Results were analyzed for the periods before and after FDA advisory committee hearings on isotretinoin and after the manufacturer’s implementation of a broad based education program for physicians. Overall, prescribing declined by 45% and pretreatment pregnancy testing increased from 51% of courses to 58% of courses. There were two different patterns of change: physicians who initially tested frequently reduced their prescribing by 94%, while physicians who initially tested infrequently increased their testing frequency from 6 to 56% but also slightly increased their prescribing frequency. These findings suggest that educational interventions may have disparate effects on prescribers that can be identified only by prescriber level analyses.

Use of Coded Diagnoses and Test Results To Identify a Cohort Requiring Intensive Review

Both coded diagnoses and test results were used to identify a cohort of potentially HIV infected individuals. Full-text ambulatory and hospital records were reviewed to confirm the diagnosis and to identify cutaneous diseases, including those attributed to drugs. The drug exposures of these individuals were identified from the automated pharmacy records, and attack rates were calculated. The risk of cutaneous diseases was substantially higher among HIV infected individuals than among HIV uninfected individuals. The risk increased with the clinical stage of HIV infection.

Other Studies

Additional published studies from HPHC include an assessment of the relative risk of serum sickness in children following exposure to commonly used antibiotics; diagnosis of depression after prescription of propranolol; occurrence of hemolytic anemia following exposure to selected H2 antagonists; surveillance for surgical site infection using a combination of drug exposures, diagnoses, and treatments to identify individuals who may have been infected, and ibuprofen and skin and soft tissue superinfections in children with varicella.

APPROPRIATE ROLE OF HPHC/HVMA DATA RESOURCES IN PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY

This record linkage system is useful for assessing clinical and laboratory outcomes after drug exposures. In addition to automated drug dispensing records and claims system records containing ICD-9 diagnosis and procedure codes that allow studies comparable to those of other automated record linkage systems, the HVMA system includes automated full-text ambulatory medical records, automated data on ambulatory blood pressures and other vital signs, coded physicians’ prescribing data, and automated ambulatory laboratory test results. The availability of these data permits several types of investigation, including studies of prescribing practices, assessment of prescription filling behavior, and evaluation of conditions that are identified and managed principally in the ambulatory setting. The ability to link outpatient and inpatient drug exposures for some members also allows researchers to assess post-discharge outcomes of inpatient drug exposures and to assess more completely drug exposures either in or out of the hospital.

THE FUTURE

In the future, we anticipate developing more studies that combine “classic” pharmacoepidemiology methods with a broad array of drug policy and other health services research ap-
proaches. Pharmacoepidemiology methods will play a larger role in HMO populations both in observational studies and in clinical trials of disease management guidelines and therapeutic interventions. We expect to place more emphasis on obtaining selected information (e.g., symptom data, quality-of-life assessments, or information on health beliefs) or specimens (e.g., blood samples for genotyping) directly from members as part of specific studies. We also expect to extend our collaborations with other research groups that will allow investigations encompassing the substantially larger populations (5 million–15 million individuals) required for the timely investigation of many topics of scientific and public health interest.
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INTRODUCTION

UnitedHealth Group is a diversified company providing health and well-being services to more than 13 million members throughout the United States. UnitedHealth Group established the Center for Health Care Policy and Evaluation (the Center) in 1989 as a private sector research institute with an independent research agenda. The Center was created to foster objective research for UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans and specialty companies as well as federal, state, and private sector clients. UnitedHealth Group provides a link to over 40 affiliated health care plans and their electronic administrative claims data. Typically, each affiliated health plan contracts with a large network of physicians and hospitals to provide health care services. This access to medical management information data reflecting a broad cross section of the population gives researchers at the Center and their collaborators unique research opportunities. The Center uses a subset of the electronic claims data, the research databases (RDB), to conduct a variety of customized studies including pharmacoepidemiology, quality and performance, health outcomes, and cost-effectiveness, often in collaboration with sponsors, academicians, and/or government agencies. For example, prescription drugs, biologics, and medical devices can be monitored for adverse events using postmarketing surveillance methods. This chapter describes UnitedHealth Group and the research databases that link various health care service data files, advantages and disadvantages of utilizing these databases for pharmacoepidemiology studies, examples of such studies, and future directions of postmarketing surveillance and pharmacoepidemiology studies in this setting.

DESCRIPTION

OVERVIEW OF UNITEDHEALTH GROUP

UnitedHealth Group is a health care management company serving purchasers, consumers, managers, and providers of health care. Founded in
1974, UnitedHealth Group serves more than 13 million persons through a continuum of health care and specialty services. These services include health maintenance organizations (HMOs), point of service (POS) arrangements, preferred provider organizations (PPO), and managed indemnity programs, Medicaid and Medicare managed care programs, and the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP) insurance programs. Other services include managed mental health and substance abuse services, utilization management, specialized provider networks, third-party administration (TPA) services, employee assistance services, managed pharmacy services, and information systems.

UnitedHealth Group has approximately 290,000 participating providers, 3,050 participating hospitals, and 53,000 participating retail pharmacies via a pharmacy benefits management company. Membership varies over time and includes approximately 5,800,000 commercial health plan members as well as 500,000 Medicaid and 450,000 Medicare beneficiaries. Unique member identifiers allow for tracking across enrollment periods so a member can be followed through disenrollment and re-enrollment.

Although managed care is often viewed as a unitary concept and was the initial HMO model, plan structures vary and range from staff or group models to independent practice associations (IPAs). UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans are typically IPA models, with open access to a wide network of providers. Certain UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans have offered gatekeeper or capitated models, although the emphasis remains primarily open access and discounted fee-for-service models.

THE CENTER FOR HEALTH CARE POLICY AND EVALUATION

The Center for Health Care Policy and Evaluation was recommissioned in 1997 by UnitedHealth Group with an independent research agenda to generate objective information that will contribute to improving health care delivery, advancing the health of the public, and better informing public policy makers, health care organizations, and government agencies. Initially, the Center collaborated with a consortium of pharmaceutical companies through the Medical Therapeutics and Outcomes Project (MTOP) to compare accuracy of administrative claims data and medical record information. Other early Center research resulted in the development of a Quality Screening Management (QSM™) system as the first quality measurement system implemented across health plans. Elements of QSM™ were incorporated into The Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set (HEDIS), which compares quality across health plans. Further, the Center developed health plan “Report Cards” to evaluate plan performance including quality of care, cost reduction, operating efficiency/administrative costs, and consumer satisfaction. The Center now collaborates with government agencies, universities, other health plans, and research organizations. An overview of health services research and evaluation activities at the Center is described in more detail elsewhere.

Most recently, the Center has collaborated with the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) as a Cooperative Agreement site with consultation from the Department of Pharmacy at the University of Washington in Seattle. Since 1994, the Center has used the large population based research databases (RDB) to evaluate drug usage and study adverse events that are first identified through the FDA Spontaneous Reporting System (SRS).

RESEARCH DATABASES (RDB)

The research databases are comprised of current and historical medical and pharmacy administrative claims data submitted by 12 UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans that are geographically diverse, including health plans in the Northeastern, Southwestern, Midwestern, and Western regions of the US. The RDB administrative claims databases are large longitudinal databases, consisting of more than nine years of data from 1990 to the present. In 1997, there were approximately 3.5 million members and 2.6 million member years, representing commercial, Medicaid, and Medicare populations. For the purpose of postmarketing
drug surveillance, analyses are typically restricted to those members having a drug benefit, approximately 93% of commercial members and most Medicaid members in the RDB. Since Medicare drug benefits vary depending on the plan, pharmacy files may not capture all prescribed drugs if beneficiaries reach the drug benefit limit.

The research databases are used to link files longitudinally and are organized from the following components (Table 18.1):

- **Membership data.** A member enrollment file stores demographic information on all health plan members, including dependents. Data elements include date of birth, gender, place and type of employment, and benefit package as well as linkage to dates of enrollment and disenrollment. A unique identifier is assigned to each member at the time of enrollment and is retained if a member disenrolls and later re-enrolls. Precautions are taken to safeguard the confidentiality of individually identifiable information.

- **Medical claims.** A claim form must be submitted by a health care provider in order to receive payment for any covered service. Medical claims are collected from all health care sites (e.g., inpatient, hospital outpatient, emergency room, surgery center, physician’s office) for virtually all types of covered service, including specialty, preventive, and office-based treatment. Health plan providers submit claims either by mail or electronically.

- **Pharmacy claims.** Claims for covered pharmacy services typically are submitted electronically by the pharmacy at the time a prescription is filled. The claims history is a profile of all pharmacy services covered by the health plan and filled by the member. In addition to a patient identification number, each pharmacy claim specifies the pharmacy, drug name, date dispensed, dosage of medication dispensed, duration of the prescription in days, and quantity dispensed.

- **Provider data.** A provider file contains data on the health plan’s participating physicians and other providers, including provider type and location, as well as physician specialty or

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Selected administrative data elements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Membership Data | HMO identifier  
Member identifier  
Date of birth  
Gender  
Date of enrollment  
Date of disenrollment |
| Medical claims data: ambulatory | HMO identifier  
Member identifier  
Provider specialty  
Provider identifier  
Date service provided  
ICD-9 diagnosis code  
CPT-4 procedure code  
Place of service  
Amount claimed |
| Medical claims data: institutional | HMO identifier  
Member identifier  
Provider identifier  
Beginning date of service  
Ending date of service  
Principal ICD-9 diagnosis code  
Other ICD-9 diagnosis codes  
CPT-4 procedure codes  
Revenue code  
Amount claimed |
| Pharmacy claims data | HMO identifier  
Member identifier  
Prescribing physician identifier  
Pharmacy identifier  
NDC code  
Generic code  
Drug name  
Drug strength  
Dosage form  
Quantity of drug dispensed  
Days supply  
Date filled  
Amount claimed |
| Provider data | HMO identifier  
Provider specialty  
Provider identifier  
Prescribing physician identifier  
Provider name  
Provider mailing address |
subspecialty. A unique provider identification number is assigned to each provider and institution. Precautions are taken to protect the identity of providers.

The components of these databases are directly applicable to addressing pharmacoepidemiology questions regarding drug exposures and adverse drug events. The various files described above are incorporated into software designed by United-Health Group to facilitate the investigation of pharmacoepidemiology research questions. Research capabilities include:

- **Performing record and file linkages.** Enrollment, medical claims, pharmacy claims, and physician records can be integrated by linking members' discrete records, inpatient and outpatient claims to pharmacy claims, and all claims to member and provider data. These linkages allow for the analyses of episodes of care and the investigation of procedures and treatments regardless of location rendered.

- **Constructing longitudinal histories.** Information on diagnosis, treatments, and the occurrence of adverse clinical events, as coded on claims, can be tracked across time. To facilitate this process, the Center constructs more complete longitudinal histories by tracking members who have had multiple enrollment periods and identification numbers with a plan. Similarly, programs have been written to combine data from providers with multiple identification numbers.

- **Identifying denominators to calculate rates.** UnitedHealth Group’s administrative databases can be used to calculate population based rates, and to adjust resource use rates for the effects of partial year enrollment. Through the member file, all individuals eligible to receive medical services or outpatient pharmacy services are identified. These populations can be defined by age, sex, or benefit status, period and duration of enrollment, or geography. Through the medical and pharmacy claims, subpopulations can be identified for calculating the prevalence and incidence of specific diseases or utilization of particular treatments.

- **Identifying treatment at a particular point in time.** The ability to identify and track treatment is a critical function in pharmacoepidemiology research. For instance, specific treatments at a particular point in time can be identified using procedure codes.

- **Identifying cases and controls for study.** Programs have been developed and tested to identify and select cases and controls for study based on eligibility criteria such as: insurance benefit status, age, current and/or continuous enrollment during a specific period of time, disease diagnosis, and covered medical procedures or drug therapies.

- **Identifying the treating physician.** For many studies, it is essential to attribute members' health care to a particular physician or other provider. For example, the researcher may want to locate a medical record for collection of detailed information not captured in the claims data. Because members receive care from multiple providers, logic has been developed to identify the physician who provided the majority of care or key treatments for a particular medical condition during the study period of interest.

- **Calculating person time at risk and time of event occurrence.** The databases contain the following data elements necessary to calculate person time at risk: (i) dates prescriptions were filled, amount dispensed, and days supply, and (ii) the period and duration of enrollment for each member. The drug strength, amount dispensed, and days supply fields can be used to determine the total dose per prescription, the cumulative dose, or the time at risk above a recommended dose. Software has also been developed to calculate the number of days members have been enrolled in the plan. Disenrollment from the health plan is a factor in establishing person time at risk for drug exposures or drug therapy.

**STRENGTHS**

The UnitedHealth Group databases provide an efficient and unobtrusive method to determine and study exposures to prescription drugs. Further, drug
utilization and adverse events within UnitedHealth Group affiliated plans reflect practice in the general medical community. Whereas clinical trials for new drugs are typically conducted in university or other unique settings to determine efficacy, postmarketing surveillance enables researchers to determine the effectiveness when usage has diffused to the broader medical community.6

The varied types of plan location and types of population, in combination with the large size of the databases, provide unique advantages to conduct pharmacoepidemiology research. Varied demographic characteristics of members provide strength for the utility of these databases when conducting this type of research. Specifically, populations of children (over 1 million), pregnant women (approximately 27,000 deliveries in 1997), and the elderly (almost 200,000 are 65 years of age or older) are sufficient for analysis given the large size of the RDB. In addition, use of these standardized databases provides both numerators and denominators for exposures to drugs and allows the calculation of incidence and prevalence. Further, as an example below illustrates, rare exposures and rare outcomes (such as birth defects) can be detected given the size of the databases. Table 18.2 provides a listing of the top 25 drug exposures for health plan members for a 1 year time period in 1997–1998 and indicates the numbers of prescriptions and members available for analysis.

The databases also provide the ability to link various types of files longitudinally for individual members, regardless of the site of service as described above. Thus, adverse events and outcomes may be analyzed considering temporality in relation to exposure through pharmacy claims and linking such varied health services as hospitaliza-

### Table 18.2. Top 25 outpatient prescription drugs from 12 UnitedHealth Group independent practice association (IPA) health plans between 1 April, 1997 and 31 March, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug name</th>
<th>No. of prescriptions</th>
<th>No. of members</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Estrogens, conjugated</td>
<td>824 499</td>
<td>168 234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin trihydrate</td>
<td>639 312</td>
<td>528 510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethinyl estradiol</td>
<td>639 259</td>
<td>162 666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levethyroxine sodium</td>
<td>431 303</td>
<td>109 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuterol sulfate</td>
<td>423 204</td>
<td>199 872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fluoxetine hydrochloride</td>
<td>335 540</td>
<td>84 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisinopril</td>
<td>334 024</td>
<td>69 960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loratadine</td>
<td>307 210</td>
<td>128 361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen w/hydrocodone</td>
<td>291 151</td>
<td>168 855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atenolol</td>
<td>257 552</td>
<td>60 161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Azithromycin dihydrate</td>
<td>254 100</td>
<td>207 118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simvastatin</td>
<td>245 068</td>
<td>54 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omeprazole</td>
<td>238 745</td>
<td>69 753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ranitidine hydrochloride</td>
<td>238 232</td>
<td>103 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insulin</td>
<td>229 920</td>
<td>45 067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paroxetine hydrochloride</td>
<td>228 822</td>
<td>69 187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide w/triamterene</td>
<td>226 997</td>
<td>60 507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimethoprim</td>
<td>223 722</td>
<td>174 301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estradiol</td>
<td>217 775</td>
<td>51 166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cephalexin</td>
<td>207 085</td>
<td>177 773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen w/proxiphenic</td>
<td>204 511</td>
<td>109 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ibuprofen</td>
<td>204 363</td>
<td>136 868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medroxyprogesterone acetate</td>
<td>203 733</td>
<td>59 647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>203 396</td>
<td>152 735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beclomethasone dipropionate monohydrate</td>
<td>197 591</td>
<td>98 471</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tion, emergency department use, physician visits, and any other site of health care service. Further, with respect to pharmacy claims, the prescribing physician can be determined as well as the specialty of that provider. Claims submissions are generally complete, since claims must be submitted by providers for payment at most of the UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans.

UnitedHealth Group has conducted a number of studies that utilize other data sources in addition to administrative data, including medical records information and surveys. As Iezzoni\(^7\) suggests, administrative claims data are useful for quality assessment and as a screening tool to identify quality problems. Similarly, the databases can be used to identify cases and controls or cohorts for study\(^1\) and additional information can then be obtained from medical records. This supplemental information can be crucial in pharmacoepidemiology studies. For example, using the abstraction of medical records one can confirm a diagnosis and obtain information on risk factors and outcomes. Using the above strengths of the administrative claims data, supplemented by other data sources, UnitedHealth Group has had experience conducting both cohort and case–control studies.

**WEAKNESSES**

Large databases must be used “judiciously”\(^8\) and require recognition of limitations as well as advantages. The constraints of a database must be recognized in order to fully understand and utilize data appropriately.\(^9\) For the UnitedHealth Group research databases, there are certain structural constraints that limit access to obtaining all possible prescription drug claims. Like many other resources for pharmacy management services, use of inpatient drugs is not available. In addition, given the pharmacy benefit structure if the cost of a prescription drug is lower than the co-payment amount, the prescription may not be included in the database since no prescription claim may be submitted. Overall, if a drug is not covered on the preferred drug list, exposures to that specific drug may be limited. However, as the list of exposures for the top 25 drugs suggests (Table 18.2), drug exposure is sizable.

Another limitation of claims data with respect to characterizing exposure to drugs is lack of information on patient compliance with the therapeutic regimen. A number of fields related to filling a prescription are provided in the pharmacy claim, such as dates filled, amount dispensed, and days supply that allow for proxy measures of compliance.

With respect to the completeness of the databases, certain plans that have different financial incentives than the typical discounted fee-for-service mechanism may not have complete data. If reimbursement to a specialist is capitated and there is no requirement to submit a bill for payment, that service may not be included as part of the databases. This disadvantage may be addressed by excluding this small number of plans from data extraction for research studies. Another disadvantage is certain variables that would be of interest are not available on the electronic claim databases, such as race/ethnicity or information that a member is deceased. If necessary for a specific study, this information may be determined through review of the medical record. However, since medical records are not standardized, it is also possible that this information still may not be available.

Another limitation is the claims lag or the length of time required to obtain all claims for a given time frame. The claims lag is short for pharmacy claims (one month) but is longer for physician and facility claims (out to approximately 6 months). The claims lag may be variable across study years and should be taken into account in the design of a study whenever feasible.

In summary, certain disadvantages of using the UnitedHealth Group administrative claims databases may be taken into account or minimized through study design or the use of proxy measures. Others must simply be noted in any summary of study findings. The following examples provide empirical information on both the strengths and limitations of UnitedHealth Group data and present specific applications of the utilization of the databases to address pharmacoepidemiology questions.
PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

The first summary of an application of the RDB is a feasibility study of the use of an osteoporosis medication in association with esophageal and gastric events. Two large scale studies are then discussed: (i) the association of an antibiotic taken during pregnancy with birth defects (including mother–baby sets), and (ii) a study of antibiotic associated diarrhea in a large population. Both of these studies involved the use of administrative data as well as medical records.

FEASIBILITY STUDY: OSTEOPOROSIS MEDICATION AND ESOPHAGEAL EVENTS

UnitedHealth Group conducts feasibility studies to estimate the rate of adverse events in the general population for specific events reported to FDA under the Spontaneous Reporting System. These evaluations are conducted using the administrative claims data from the RDB for 12 health plans affiliated with UnitedHealth Group, as described above. Preliminary descriptive data are obtained with a rapid turnaround time and usually involve drugs that have been newly introduced to the market. An example of such a feasibility study includes the incidence of adverse esophageal or gastric events in association with the use of a drug for osteoporosis, alendronate (Fosamax®, Merck & Co., Inc.).

Alendronate was approved for use by the FDA in September 1995. Subsequently, case reports of esophagitis, esophageal ulcer, and esophageal stricture were published. In 1996, the manufacturer revised the product safety information to warn about this risk. UnitedHealth Group computerized pharmacy claims were searched to identify the 1321 members who received a prescription for alendronate between 1 January, 1996 and 30 August, 1996. The medical claims data for these alendronate users were then searched for subsequent diagnosis codes indicative of adverse esophageal and gastric events including esophagitis, ulcer of the esophagus, esophageal perforation, gastric ulcer, and gastritis/duodenitis. For the 1108 female and 102 male users with no esophageal or gastric diagnoses prior to alendronate use, an incident diagnosis code of interest was identified for 39 users, 95% of whom were female. Thirteen of these cases had an endoscopic examination performed and five cases were hospitalized. The cumulative incidence of total upper gastrointestinal events was 3.3% in females, 2.0% in males, and 3.2% overall.

STUDY OF AN ANTIBIOTIC AND ASSOCIATED BIRTH DEFECTS DURING PREGNANCY

A study was conducted to evaluate the potential for human teratogenicity for the antibiotic, clarithromycin (Biaxin®, Abbott Laboratories), when used by women during pregnancy. Because previous findings from animal studies raised the question of an increased risk, clarithromycin was labeled a class C drug by the FDA and, therefore, is not recommended for use during pregnancy. The purpose of this study was to assess the rate and types of birth defect in infants born to women following exposure to clarithromycin in the first trimester of their pregnancy.

Claims data from UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans were used to determine exposure to clarithromycin from 1991 to 1995. In 1991, the underlying population that was screened for exposure consisted of 1.2 million health plan members. The number increased each year with about 2.3 million health plan members screened in 1995. Pharmacy claims were used to identify women exposed to clarithromycin and hospital claims were used to identify women who had a delivery. Enrollment files were used to link the mother–infant set. For each mother–infant set identified as exposed, medical records were abstracted to determine whether there was a birth defect outcome, since birth defect diagnoses from claims data at the time of delivery may not be complete.

Of the 48 003 women of childbearing age identified from pharmacy claims as having a prescription fill date for clarithromycin during the study period, 5372 also had a hospital claim for a delivery. Of these, the 315 women who had a clarithromycin fill date during the 270 days prior
to their delivery date were identified as potentially exposed during pregnancy (Table 18.3). Women were identified as potentially exposed during the first or second trimester using the assumptions that the first trimester occurred between 180 and 270 days prior to the delivery date for a full-term pregnancy and between 90 and 180 days to account for a possible preterm delivery. For efficiency in obtaining primary medical records, the eight health plans with the largest number of estimated exposed women were selected for the study. The regional representation for the eight health plans included five health plans from the Midwest, and one each from the Northeast, the Southeast, and the West. Of these 209 women, medical record abstractions were completed for 199 mother–infant sets, for a completion rate of 96%. A new calculation of the exposure period was made using the gestational age obtained from the medical record, which identified the 143 women and their 149 infants who were exposed to clarithromycin during the first trimester (Table 18.3).

The results showed that 91 (64%) of the exposed women had a prescription fill date during the first month of pregnancy, consistent with the likelihood that the drug was prescribed prior to the knowledge that the woman was pregnant. Birth malformations were identified for eight (all singleton births) of the 149 infants, excluding infants with undescended testicles likely to resolve \((n = 4)\), for an observed overall birth defect rate of 5.8% (rate calculated with twins excluded for comparison). Of interest is that this rate was not statistically significantly different compared to the expected rate of 4.5% based on national data.\(^{15}\) Of the five malformations considered major, there was no consistency in the types of malformation. There were two heart defects and one each of a chromosomal, a gastrointestinal, and a genital abnormality. Although study size precluded the detection of weak associations or an association with a specific outcome, the results suggested that clarithromycin was unlikely to be a major teratogen in humans.

This study provides an example of an efficient method to ascertain the potential for adverse outcome(s) where both the exposure and the outcome are rare. A subsequent analytic study could have been completed if these results had indicated a major problem. These capabilities can be used to address public health concerns or to evaluate therapeutic outcomes. In this situation, a claims-based study supplemented by medical records provided a way to obtain human outcome information from a population of pregnant women who have been excluded from premarketing clinical drug trials.

### STUDY OF ANTIBiotic-ASSOCIATED DIARRHEA

The purpose of this retrospective cohort study was to determine the relative risk of diarrhea and *Clostridium difficile* associated diarrhea for oral antibiotics dispensed in the ambulatory setting. Diarrhea is a common, although usually mild, adverse effect of antibiotics occurring in up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>149 001</td>
<td>Members with a pharmacy claim for clarithromycin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 003</td>
<td>Women who were 14–44 years of age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 372</td>
<td>Women who had a delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>315</td>
<td>Women who were identified as potentially exposed to clarithromycin during pregnancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>Women who were identified as potentially exposed to clarithromycin during the first or second trimester</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>209</td>
<td>Women (and 217 infants) who were from the eight largest health plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>199</td>
<td>Mother–infant sets for whom medical records were obtained</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>143</td>
<td>Women (and 149 infants) who were identified as exposed to clarithromycin in the first trimester</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to 5–30% of individuals receiving antibiotic therapy. A small proportion of patients develop severe antibiotic-associated diarrhea with evidence of colitis and pseudomembranous colitis requiring hospitalization. Factors that may influence the risk of diarrhea include type of antibiotic, exposure to multiple antibiotics, duration of antibiotic use, young or elderly age, pre-existing gastrointestinal problems, abdominal surgery, and care provided in an institutional setting. Antibiotic use has been consistently associated with an increased risk of infection with \textit{C. difficile}. \cite{16-19}

The study included 358,389 members enrolled in four UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans between 1 July, 1992 and 31 December, 1994, located in the Southeastern, Northeastern, and Midwestern United States. Members were followed for up to 42 days following the date of each dispensed antibiotic. Survival analysis was used to estimate the risk of diarrhea accounting for the number of days at risk for a single antibiotic group or for the first antibiotic in multiple antibiotic group risk periods. The analyses were adjusted for the potentially confounding effects of age, gender, health plan, and selected medical conditions obtained from claims data. Results indicated 3230 events of diarrhea (90/10,000 risk periods) determined by claims data with a diagnosis for diarrhea. Six different antibiotics (including two quinolone antibiotics, ofloxacin, and ciprofloxacin) had significantly higher risk of diarrhea in adults 21 to 50 years of age when compared to amoxicillin (Table 18.4). A separate analysis of the cephalosporins showed that, compared to first generation cephalosporins, the adjusted relative risk of diarrhea was greater for second generation cephalosporins (RR = 1.45, \(p < 0.01\)) and, although not statistically significant, was greater for a third generation cephalosporin.

The results of this study showed that several antibiotics had greater risk for diarrhea compared to amoxicillin. Limitations of this study include the potential underidentification of diarrhea using diagnosis codes, and the inability to identify type or severity of diarrhea from claims data alone. A strength of this study was the large sample size across multiple antibiotic groups allowing for calculation of relative risks after adjusting for potential confounding factors. Use of population based data from multiple geographically diverse health plans can contribute to the understanding of risks of drugs available in the ambulatory setting in association with adverse events.

### THE FUTURE

Postmarketing surveillance and pharmacoepidemiology studies are, by necessity, conducted in the context of a rapidly changing health care environment. Looking to the future this dynamic environment has implications for the nature of the data obtained, the ability to obtain information, and characteristics of the general and specific populations that form the basis of these studies. Changes in the health care system, given the concern with the cost of health care, will continue to impact the health benefits structure, including pharmacy benefits coverage. As the pharmacy benefit struc-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibiotic</th>
<th>Risk periods (21–50 years of age)</th>
<th>% of risk period with diarrhea</th>
<th>Relative risk ((p) value)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>45 506</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefixime</td>
<td>1 202</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>2.08 ((p &lt; 0.05))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefaclor</td>
<td>2 570</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.73 ((p &lt; 0.05))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cefuroxime</td>
<td>8 316</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.97 ((p &lt; 0.001))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciprofloxacin</td>
<td>5 693</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>3.17 ((p &lt; 0.001))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin/clavulanic acid</td>
<td>8 673</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.64 ((p &lt; 0.001))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ofloxacin</td>
<td>2 511</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.91 ((p &lt; 0.001))</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ture is broadened to include coverage across a larger number of defined tiers (e.g. brand, generic, and not on the preferred drug list), certain transactions may not be captured in the pharmacy files if the cost is lower than the copayment. This may, however, be balanced by the increasing cost of prescription drugs.

The political environment reflects increasing sensitivity by the public to use of medical information and medical records (see also Chapter 26). Reflecting this, Congress required in passage of the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPPA), that Federal confidentiality standards for medical information be adopted by Congress or by the Department of Health and Human Services in 1999. In a study conducted in a state with stringent regulations (Minnesota), the ability to complete medical record abstraction was reduced to a completion rate of approximately 20% when study-specific informed consent was required. When such a low percentage of the study population is willing to participate, this may interject potential but unknown bias into the results. Regulations at both the Federal and State levels will potentially compromise the ability to conduct health care research of any type, if they are not carefully balanced to allow access to medical records for bona fide research purposes while also protecting patient confidentiality. International concern has also arisen, evidenced by the promulgation of the European Privacy Directive and the International Society of Epidemiology (ISPE) professional association guidelines for data privacy.

With respect to the ability to obtain data, additional automation may be available in the future for health care companies such as UnitedHealth Group. Laboratory test results and medical records may become available electronically. However, the process is likely to be stymied both by a lack of standards and by the potential high cost to implement electronic medical records across a diverse network of independent practitioners. The size of the research databases will increase in the future as other UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans are added to the RDB using commonly defined data elements.

The importance of pharmacoepidemiology and the ability to conduct postmarketing surveillance will become increasingly critical in the future due to a number of factors relating to changing characteristics of the American population. First, changes attributable to the aging of the US population will augment the need for a better understanding of the use of prescribed medications in the older population, including variations in metabolism and appropriate dosages. Second, as the population ages, more Americans are likely to receive a larger number of medications due to the prevalence of chronic disease in this group, raising polypharmacy questions. Increased use of over-the-counter (OTC) drugs, alternative medications, and devices will also need to be explored. Third, developments in the biotechnology field may also result in new formulations of drugs that will need to be addressed by reviewing adverse events related to prescription medications in groups with different biological factors. Finally, as a larger number of drugs are approved by FDA in a faster timeframe, given the acceleration of technological innovation, the potential for adverse events in both the general population and the elderly population will increase.

As innovation accelerates, postmarketing surveillance will become more crucial as society attempts to balance public health concerns with individual access to new therapies. The challenge for the future will be in balancing these competing demands. The information gained from the results of pharmacoepidemiology research using data from national health care settings will help meet this challenge.
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INTRODUCTION

The Medicaid system is the United States’ health insurance system created in 1965 to provide access to medical care to some categories of economically disadvantaged and disabled persons. During the past two decades, Medicaid billing databases have been used for health services research and to examine the utilization and effects of drugs. In this chapter, we will explore the current status of these databases, and our view of the appropriate role of Medicaid data in pharmacoepidemiology research. We will first describe the Medicaid program in general. We will then review the three Medicaid databases that have most often been used for academic pharmacoepidemiology research: the Computerized On-Line Medical Pharmaceutical Analysis and Surveillance System (COMPASS®), the Tennessee Medicaid system, and the New Jersey Medicaid system. We will then explore the advantages and disadvantages of Medicaid systems, and provide examples of studies that have been performed using this data. We will conclude with a description of the situations in which Medicaid data are most useful for pharmacoepidemiology research.

DESCRIPTION

MEDICAID PROGRAM

“The Medicaid Program” is a series of 54 programs, each supported jointly by federal and state funds and each managed independently by a US state or jurisdiction. Eligibility criteria are determined separately by each state, although certain groups must be covered in order to qualify for the federal contribution. Until the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, these included individuals covered under the Aid to Families with Dependent Children Program (AFDC), single parent families who met state determined income standards, and individuals eligible for the Supplemental Security
Income Program (SSI) because they are aged, blind, or disabled, and have limited income. Other needy patients also could be covered by the state, although federal matching funds were not available to pay for these benefits. Since the 1996 Welfare Reform Act, eligible individuals include children under age six and pregnant women whose family income is at or below 133% of the Federal poverty level; children born after 30 September, 1983 who are under age 19, in families with incomes at or below the federal poverty level; individuals eligible for the Supplemental Security Income Program (SSI) because they are aged, blind, or disabled, and have limited income; recipients of adoption or foster care assistance under Title IV of the Social Security Act; certain Medicare beneficiaries; and special protected groups, including people who lose their cash assistance due to income from work or from increased Social Security benefits. Other needy patients may also be covered by the state for which federal matching funds are available to pay for these benefits. These optional groups are similar to the mandatory groups but eligibility criteria are more lenient. Included are others considered “categorically needy,” and also a group considered “medically needy,” who would be eligible for Medicaid under one of the mandatory or optional groups, except that their income and/or resources are above the eligibility level set by their state. The latter may qualify immediately, or may “spend down” by incurring medical expenses that reduce their income to or below their State’s medically needy income level. Because of these requirements, the population served by Medicaid differs significantly from the overall US population, with an overabundance of children, females, and non-whites (see Figure 19.1).

Medicaid reimburses providers through both fee-for-service and capitated models. A registry of persons eligible for Medicaid and records of services provided are maintained in computerized files. For data elements related to claims payment, there is routine auditing of data accuracy and completeness, resulting in high data quality. However, because Medicaid programs are administered by the individual states, there is substantial variation between the states in enrollment criteria, program operation, and data element availability/quality.

The services provided to Medicaid recipients also vary among the states. The minimum services mandated by federal law include physician services, home health care services, nurse–midwife services, care in skilled nursing facilities, inpatient hospital care, outpatient hospital care, rural health clinic services, independent laboratory and radiology services, early and periodic screening of children, family planning services, and transportation to and from medical services. Many other services are also provided at the option of the state. Although not a mandatory service, virtually all states provide for reimbursement for prescribed drugs. The number of drugs eligible for reimbursement also varies among the states.

Research using Medicaid data from multiple states has been simplified by the development of the Medicaid Management Information System (MMIS), a set of specifications for computerized claims processing and management information. This was created in 1972 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare for fiscal and administrative control of this very large health care program. MMIS has six components: recipient files, provider files, claims processing files, reference file, surveillance and utilization review, and management and administrative reporting. Each state may tailor the system to their specific needs, although minimum standards must be met.
The recipient file includes a unique identifier for each patient in the database. If accurate, this file would be useful for determining the enrollment and follow-up status of cohorts of patients. This is especially important because of changes in the eligibility of Medicaid patients. In Tennessee, for example, at the end of one year, 25% lost enrollment and 3% had died, leaving 72% available for follow-up. After five years, 49% of the cohort were still alive and under observation. Loss of eligibility was greatest in children and young adults. The quality of the eligibility files varies among the different states. In particular, patients can sometimes become retroactively eligible or ineligible, sometimes for claims from years before.

In many states maternal and child records can be linked, thereby permitting investigations of birth defects that may be associated with drugs or procedures. For some states, this link is inherent in the individuals' identification numbers. In other states, separate linking files are needed.

The claims processing files include information on age, sex, state, inpatient and outpatient diagnoses (by ICD-9-CM code), outpatient drugs (by NDC code), deaths (in some states), and procedures, such as laboratory and radiographic procedures. The pharmacy data consists of records of all outpatient and nursing home prescriptions filled at the pharmacy for drugs and medical equipment/supplies included on the Medicaid formulary. There is generally one claim for each filled prescription and for each refill. This record contains date the prescription was filled, a code identifying the drug dispensed (currently the National Drug Code), quantity of the drug dispensed, including the days the supply of drug is anticipated to last and the ID of the pharmacy and prescribing physician. Usually no more than a 30-day supply of medication can be dispensed at one time, although some states permit or even encourage a larger supply (e.g., 90 days) to be dispensed for chronically used drugs.

The diagnosis data contain the records of hospitalizations and outpatient claims for care provided to Medicaid enrollees. For hospitalizations, information in this file includes the identity of the hospital, and can include the hospital admission and discharge dates. For non-Medicare recipients, this file can also contain primary and secondary diagnoses and surgical procedures. For enrollees over 65 years of age, Medicare is usually the primary payer. The resulting Medicaid claims (“crossovers”) may not retain complete information. Medicaid files can be linked with Medicare Part A files to obtain the missing data elements, which include admission diagnosis, up to five discharge diagnoses, and surgical procedures billed. In the Medicare inpatient files, both diagnoses and procedures are coded with the ICD-9-CM system.

Other Medicaid encounter files include nursing home, home health care (which can be augmented with Medicare data), ambulance services, vision and dental services, durable medical equipment, and other miscellaneous services.

**COMPUTERIZED ON-LINE MEDICAL PHARMACEUTICAL ANALYSIS AND SURVEILLANCE SYSTEM®**

The Computerized On-Line Medical Pharmaceutical Analysis and Surveillance System (COMPASS®) was originally conceived by Health Information Designs, Inc. (HID), and it has been developed by HID, in part under contract to the FDA, since 1977. This database is currently owned by Protocare Sciences, Herndon, VA, and no longer called COMPASS®, but rather the Protocare Sciences Proprietary Medicaid Database. However, most, if not all, published papers have come from the older COMPASS® database. Researchers at the University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine and the UMDNJ–Robert Wood Johnson Medical School have assisted this development since 1980. The original database included includes billing data from Medicaid patients in the following states: Florida, Missouri, Nebraska, Arkansas, Mississippi, Ohio, Michigan, Virginia, Colorado, Maryland, and Minnesota, bringing the total Medicaid population to over eight million patients. However, over the past 3 years, new data are only available for approximately 1.25 million patients from Ohio. There is up to a 2-month lag period between the time a drug is dispensed and the time that it appears on the system. Diagnoses may lag up to three
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DATE</th>
<th>DIAGNOSIS</th>
<th>DRUG</th>
<th>STRENGTH</th>
<th>QTY &amp; DAY</th>
<th>PHYS/HOSP</th>
<th>PHARMACY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>85053</td>
<td>EPISTAXIS</td>
<td>7847</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85053</td>
<td>CHRONIC RENAL FAILURE</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85058</td>
<td>00451102 HYALURONATE 50 MG</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85059</td>
<td>00490502 LOPRESSOR TABLET 100</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85065</td>
<td>00741410 ALUPENT INHALANT SOLUTION, 5 PERCENT, 10</td>
<td>585</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85076</td>
<td>EPISTAXIS</td>
<td>7847</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85076</td>
<td>CHRONIC RENAL FAILURE</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47059252300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85077</td>
<td>EPISTAXIS</td>
<td>7847</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85077</td>
<td>HYPERENSION NOS</td>
<td>4019</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85078</td>
<td>CARIDOMEGALY</td>
<td>4293</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85081</td>
<td>PLEURAL EFFUSION NOS</td>
<td>3119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85084</td>
<td>CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85089</td>
<td>00453512 CHLOR-TRIMETON ALLERGY TABLET</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85099</td>
<td>00560902 SULFAMETHOXAZOLE 800/STRIMETHOPRIM-DS</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85092</td>
<td>ABDOMINAL PAIN</td>
<td>7890</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85092</td>
<td>SPRAIN TORACIC REGION</td>
<td>8471</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85092</td>
<td>PLEURAL EFFUSION NOS</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85092</td>
<td>CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85092</td>
<td>CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85092</td>
<td>HEART DISEASE NOS</td>
<td>4299</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85095</td>
<td>NONE CARTILAGE DIS NEC</td>
<td>73399</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85096</td>
<td>00423412 LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85096</td>
<td>00471410 ALUPENT INHALANT SOLUTION, 5 PERCENT, 10</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85096</td>
<td>00474312 LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85096</td>
<td>00474312 LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85096</td>
<td>00474312 LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85100</td>
<td>OTIS MEDIA NOS</td>
<td>3829</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85105</td>
<td>00651102 HYALURONATE 50 MG</td>
<td>49390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85105</td>
<td>00651102 HYALURONATE 50 MG</td>
<td>49390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85105</td>
<td>00651102 HYALURONATE 50 MG</td>
<td>49390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85110</td>
<td>00651102 HYALURONATE 50 MG</td>
<td>49390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85112</td>
<td>PERGOCET-5 TABLET 5 MG</td>
<td>49390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85113</td>
<td>VENTOLIN INHALER 17 GRAM</td>
<td>49390</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50862915000</td>
<td>4701371000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85117</td>
<td>CHRONIC RENAL FAILURE</td>
<td>585</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85117</td>
<td>PULM CONGESTIVE POSTASIS</td>
<td>514</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85117</td>
<td>CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85117</td>
<td>CONGESTIVE HEART FAILURE</td>
<td>4280</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4502334704</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85117</td>
<td>VALIUM TABLET, 5 MG (500 PRICE)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85119</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85120</td>
<td>LASIX TABLET 80 MG</td>
<td>5119</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>47058719903</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19.2. Sample COMPASS® profile.
months. The currently available billing data for each patient are identical to those previously described. Importantly, because of the increasing societal concern about confidentiality (see Chapter 26), medical record access is no longer available.

An example of a patient profile from the Ohio Medicaid database is provided in Figure 19.2. Listings of its most common drugs and diagnoses appear in Tables 19.1 and 19.2. More detailed descriptions of the system have been published elsewhere.4–6

A number of studies have now been published using the system.7–14 Some are described later in this chapter.

TENNESSEE MEDICAID DATABASE

Since 1973, the Department of Preventive Medicine at Vanderbilt University School of Medicine has had a contract from the state of Tennessee to collect the claims files of the Medicaid program, to analyze the quality of the claims, and to perform research tasks of interest to the state. In 1997, there were 1,421,963 enrollees, 27% of the state’s population.15 There were 156,657 enrollees 65 years of age and older and 31,910 were 85 years of age and older. In 1996, there were 35,707 births to women enrolled in Tennessee Medicaid, which accounted for 49.4% of births in Tennessee.

Prior to January 1994, the Medicaid program in Tennessee was a vendor payment, fee-for-service program. It then changed to a capitated model called TennCare.16,17 The program licenses 12 managed care organizations and requires each enrollee to select an managed care organization. The managed care organizations receive monthly capitation payments and each has its own formularies that restrict the reimbursable drugs. The quality of the database has generally been maintained. However, further work to investigate the accuracy of outpatient claims is in progress, because there are no longer financial incentives for complete and accurate data.

The Tennessee system has developed linkages to files that include information not available in Medicaid. These include the following.

1. Medicare files to Medicaid enrollment. This provides a consistent record of inpatient admissions, outpatient visits and short nursing home stays for persons 65 and older.

2. Vital statistics files to Medicaid enrollment. Birth and death certificate files are obtained annually from the Tennessee State Center for Health Statistics. The birth certificate file establishes Tennessee residence and provides additional information such as birthweight, gestational age, and parity. The death certificate file contains date of death and underlying cause of death.

3. Medicaid mothers and children linkage. This link permits study of fetal exposures because of the capacity to identify pregnancies, establish their duration (gestational age), and identify the resultant child, thus enabling maternal/fetal drug effects studies.

4. Public health clinic files. These are used to link information on routine childhood immunizations administered at public health clinics permitting the study of vaccine safety.

5. Motor vehicle files. The Medicaid enrollment file is linked with the Tennessee Department of Transportation’s file of licensed drivers and motor vehicle crash reports for the period 1984 to 1988. This database was created to study the effects of medication use among the elderly on driving safety.18,19


Researchers using the Tennessee Medicaid database currently have access to medical records. For each study, the procedure involves obtaining permission from the Medicaid program and then contacting each provider in advance to explain the specific study for which records are requested. Trained nurse–abstractors then travel to the facility and complete structured study forms. With this procedure, between 80 and 95% of hospital medical records identified in the computer are obtained.20–22

Medicaid enrollment and encounter files are updated on a quarterly basis. Pharmacy data and data for the elderly from Medicare are reasonably current. Inpatient and outpatient encounter files for persons <65 years of age may be delayed by
### Table 19.1. Most frequent diagnoses—January 1995–June 1997 Ohio Medicaid data*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD code</th>
<th>Diagnosis</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4659</td>
<td>Acute URI Nos</td>
<td>277,465</td>
<td>195,884</td>
<td>473,349</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V202</td>
<td>Routine Child Health Exam</td>
<td>214,374</td>
<td>217,099</td>
<td>431,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3829</td>
<td>Otitis Media Nos</td>
<td>180,519</td>
<td>154,582</td>
<td>335,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2398</td>
<td>Neoplasm Nos, Site Nec</td>
<td>224,321</td>
<td>105,350</td>
<td>329,671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>462</td>
<td>Acute Pharyngitis</td>
<td>196,971</td>
<td>120,412</td>
<td>317,383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V726</td>
<td>Laboratory Examination</td>
<td>220,589</td>
<td>80,396</td>
<td>300,985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V725</td>
<td>Radiological Exam Nec</td>
<td>174,534</td>
<td>84,728</td>
<td>259,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4660</td>
<td>Acute Bronchitis</td>
<td>140,384</td>
<td>81,022</td>
<td>221,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5990</td>
<td>Urinary Tract Infection Nos</td>
<td>173,281</td>
<td>30,171</td>
<td>203,452</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7890</td>
<td>Abdominal Pain</td>
<td>145,778</td>
<td>52,021</td>
<td>197,799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78650</td>
<td>Chest Pain Nos</td>
<td>126,633</td>
<td>67,739</td>
<td>194,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5589</td>
<td>Noninfectious</td>
<td>111,909</td>
<td>76,876</td>
<td>188,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3679</td>
<td>Refraction Disorder Nos</td>
<td>119,350</td>
<td>61,471</td>
<td>180,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>490</td>
<td>Bronchitis Nos</td>
<td>105,877</td>
<td>63,038</td>
<td>168,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78609</td>
<td>Respiratory Abnormal Nec</td>
<td>103,736</td>
<td>64,061</td>
<td>167,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7806</td>
<td>Pyrexia Unknown Origin</td>
<td>84,162</td>
<td>70,278</td>
<td>154,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4019</td>
<td>Hypertension Nos</td>
<td>98,599</td>
<td>44,893</td>
<td>143,492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6929</td>
<td>Dermatitis Nos</td>
<td>86,058</td>
<td>57,111</td>
<td>143,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7840</td>
<td>Headache</td>
<td>98,558</td>
<td>39,457</td>
<td>138,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>486</td>
<td>Pneumonia, Organism Nos</td>
<td>73,003</td>
<td>54,834</td>
<td>127,837</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4739</td>
<td>Chronic Sinusitis Nos</td>
<td>82,535</td>
<td>42,101</td>
<td>124,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V723</td>
<td>Gynecologic Examination</td>
<td>121,905</td>
<td>586</td>
<td>122,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4619</td>
<td>Acute Sinusitis Nos</td>
<td>82,220</td>
<td>40,031</td>
<td>122,251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7862</td>
<td>Cough</td>
<td>72,669</td>
<td>47,381</td>
<td>120,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V222</td>
<td>Preg State, Incidental</td>
<td>109,420</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>109,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7295</td>
<td>Pain In Limb</td>
<td>71,447</td>
<td>35,794</td>
<td>107,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49390</td>
<td>Asthma W/o Status Asthma</td>
<td>63,409</td>
<td>42,345</td>
<td>105,754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3671</td>
<td>Myopia</td>
<td>70,341</td>
<td>33,384</td>
<td>103,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101</td>
<td>Dermatophytosis of Nail</td>
<td>68,230</td>
<td>29,166</td>
<td>97,396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3670</td>
<td>Hypermetropia</td>
<td>56,862</td>
<td>35,108</td>
<td>91,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61610</td>
<td>Vaginitis Nos</td>
<td>91,170</td>
<td>565</td>
<td>91,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7242</td>
<td>Lumbago</td>
<td>62,816</td>
<td>28,139</td>
<td>90,955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V270</td>
<td>Deliver-Single Liveborn</td>
<td>90,450</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>90,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>463</td>
<td>Acute Tonsillitis</td>
<td>50,861</td>
<td>37,034</td>
<td>87,895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37230</td>
<td>Conjunctivitis Nos</td>
<td>47,502</td>
<td>37,711</td>
<td>85,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V221</td>
<td>Supervised Otherwise</td>
<td>84,517</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>84,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0799</td>
<td>Normal Pregnancy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25000</td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>59,792</td>
<td>24,051</td>
<td>83,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2859</td>
<td>Uncomplicated Adult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>920</td>
<td>Anemia Nos</td>
<td>55917</td>
<td>27,476</td>
<td>83,393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>311</td>
<td>Contusion Face/Scalp/Neck</td>
<td>42,250</td>
<td>36,502</td>
<td>78,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7245</td>
<td>Depressive Disorder Nec</td>
<td>57,640</td>
<td>20,648</td>
<td>78,288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>496</td>
<td>Backache Nos</td>
<td>53,530</td>
<td>22,584</td>
<td>76,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4779</td>
<td>Chronic Airway Obstruct Nec</td>
<td>45,725</td>
<td>29,611</td>
<td>75,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V270</td>
<td>Allergic Rhinitis Nos</td>
<td>44,985</td>
<td>28,370</td>
<td>73,355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0340</td>
<td>Strep Sore Throat</td>
<td>42,871</td>
<td>30,436</td>
<td>73,307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>650</td>
<td>Normal Delivery</td>
<td>72,996</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>73,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7870</td>
<td>Hypovolemia</td>
<td>45,025</td>
<td>26,855</td>
<td>71,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7807</td>
<td>Nausea And Vomiting</td>
<td>45,674</td>
<td>24,462</td>
<td>70,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7808</td>
<td>Malaise And Fatigue</td>
<td>50,894</td>
<td>18,456</td>
<td>69,350</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents unduplicated counts of diagnoses for 1,921,006 patients.
### MEDICAID DATABASES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen W/Codeine</td>
<td>97 276</td>
<td>39 278</td>
<td>136 554</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxil (250 mg/5 ml)</td>
<td>63 095</td>
<td>63 182</td>
<td>126 277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimox 250 (250 mg/5 ml)</td>
<td>59 132</td>
<td>58 838</td>
<td>117 970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipro (500 mg)</td>
<td>81 689</td>
<td>30 907</td>
<td>112 596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biaxin</td>
<td>77 285</td>
<td>77 564</td>
<td>155 849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimox 500</td>
<td>77 259</td>
<td>25 253</td>
<td>102 512</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardec-DM</td>
<td>47 733</td>
<td>38 614</td>
<td>86 347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proventil</td>
<td>56 825</td>
<td>28 412</td>
<td>85 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxil (125 mg/5 ml)</td>
<td>41 408</td>
<td>43 070</td>
<td>84 478</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propoxyphene Napsylate W/Apap</td>
<td>59 882</td>
<td>19 750</td>
<td>79 632</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nix</td>
<td>50 984</td>
<td>28 622</td>
<td>79 606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimox 125 (125 mg/5 ml)</td>
<td>36 386</td>
<td>37 058</td>
<td>73 444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone W/Acetaminophen</td>
<td>49 636</td>
<td>22 020</td>
<td>71 656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bactroban</td>
<td>38 478</td>
<td>65 971</td>
<td>104 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zithromax</td>
<td>50 014</td>
<td>15 148</td>
<td>65 162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimox 250</td>
<td>45 789</td>
<td>19 106</td>
<td>64 895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ultram</td>
<td>46 566</td>
<td>17 618</td>
<td>64 184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zantac</td>
<td>44 685</td>
<td>18 946</td>
<td>63 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoloft</td>
<td>47 519</td>
<td>16 079</td>
<td>63 598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toradol</td>
<td>44 657</td>
<td>17 418</td>
<td>62 075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuterol Sulfate</td>
<td>26 200</td>
<td>33 249</td>
<td>59 449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen W/Codeine</td>
<td>42 478</td>
<td>16 597</td>
<td>59 075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claritin</td>
<td>42 075</td>
<td>15 281</td>
<td>57 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Macrobid</td>
<td>52 325</td>
<td>3 380</td>
<td>55 705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amoxicillin</td>
<td>40 796</td>
<td>14 401</td>
<td>55 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ventolin</td>
<td>35 887</td>
<td>19 192</td>
<td>54 079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terazol 7</td>
<td>54 628</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>54 945</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfastrim Pediatric</td>
<td>30 961</td>
<td>23 431</td>
<td>54 392</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veetids 500</td>
<td>37 642</td>
<td>16 299</td>
<td>53 941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prozac</td>
<td>39 051</td>
<td>13 360</td>
<td>52 411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Axid</td>
<td>36 414</td>
<td>15 617</td>
<td>51 031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotrisonite</td>
<td>34 529</td>
<td>16 855</td>
<td>51 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardec-DM</td>
<td>24 421</td>
<td>25 644</td>
<td>50 065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augmentin 500</td>
<td>33 215</td>
<td>15 801</td>
<td>49 016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poly-Histine DM</td>
<td>27 596</td>
<td>20 900</td>
<td>48 496</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augmentin 250</td>
<td>32 359</td>
<td>15 349</td>
<td>47 708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Celfin</td>
<td>34 928</td>
<td>12 745</td>
<td>47 673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lotrisonite</td>
<td>30 393</td>
<td>16 755</td>
<td>47 148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenergan</td>
<td>35 999</td>
<td>10 180</td>
<td>46 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paxil</td>
<td>34 416</td>
<td>11 298</td>
<td>45 714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augmentin 250 (250 mg/5 ml)</td>
<td>22 159</td>
<td>23 213</td>
<td>45 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daypro</td>
<td>32 560</td>
<td>11 550</td>
<td>44 110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zantac</td>
<td>30 631</td>
<td>13 156</td>
<td>43 787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Priosec</td>
<td>30 692</td>
<td>12 870</td>
<td>43 562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duricef</td>
<td>29 037</td>
<td>14 219</td>
<td>43 256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ery-Tab</td>
<td>32 070</td>
<td>11 119</td>
<td>43 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrostat</td>
<td>29 399</td>
<td>13 784</td>
<td>43 183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cipro (500 mg)</td>
<td>33 148</td>
<td>9 325</td>
<td>42 473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zithromax</td>
<td>31 342</td>
<td>9 289</td>
<td>40 631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuterol</td>
<td>27 179</td>
<td>13 436</td>
<td>40 615</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Represents unduplicated counts of drugs for 1,921,006 patients.
medical care organizations’ late submission of data to the state. The vital records files are available approximately 10 months after the end of a calendar year.

Early in its use, the Tennessee database was principally used for drug utilization studies.\textsuperscript{23–28} For example, studies have examined the use of tetracycline and chloramphenicol and demonstrated the frequent inappropriate use. Efforts to change prescribing behavior with educational interventions were then demonstrated to be effective.

More recently, several important analytic epidemiology studies have been performed: psychotropic drugs were demonstrated to be associated with hip fractures,\textsuperscript{29} nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs were demonstrated to be associated with fatal peptic ulcer and upper gastrointestinal bleeding,\textsuperscript{30,31} corticosteroids were demonstrated to be associated with peptic ulcer disease when taken with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs,\textsuperscript{32} childhood immunizations were demonstrated to be associated with seizures,\textsuperscript{33} hip fractures were demonstrated to occur frequently during the first week after discharge from a hospital,\textsuperscript{34} risk factors for hypoglycemia were demonstrated,\textsuperscript{35} and association between hypoglycemia and antihypertensive drugs.\textsuperscript{36}

**NEW JERSEY MEDICAID DATABASE**

Avorn and associates have obtained access to Medicaid data from New Jersey, including data on approximately 700,000 patients from 1980 to 1996. These data sets are linked with Medicare data. In addition, these data can be combined with drug exposure information from the 250,000 recipients 65 years of age or greater enrolled in the Pharmacy Assistance Aging Program. No mechanism for accessing primary medical records has yet been established and tested. Examples of how these data have been used include examination of the effect of changes in reimbursement for drugs and its effect on drug utilization,\textsuperscript{37} the frequency of nursing home placement,\textsuperscript{38} the use of antidepressants in patients prescribed \( \beta \)-blockers,\textsuperscript{39} and the association between antihypertensive drug therapy and initiation of medications for diabetes mellitus.\textsuperscript{40}

**STRENGTHS**

The most important advantage of Medicaid databases is their size. Currently, the three states actively in use by pharmacoepidemiology investigators each have between 1 and 2 million patients available for study. This very large sample size permits studies to be performed even when the drug exposure or the disease of interest is uncommon. A related advantage is that this sample of study subjects can be examined at a relatively small cost, since the data are generated as a by-product of a billing and administrative system. While using such a system is not inexpensive, a study of an equal number of patients that collected data \textit{de novo} would be orders of magnitude more costly. In addition, because the data already exist, studies can be carried out relatively quickly.

Medicaid databases ostensibly include all reimbursed medical care provided by any provider to eligible patients, although it remains to be established whether Medicaid managed care has changed that. Thus, the system includes information on medical care that the patient may not remember and any given provider may not be aware of. In addition, both inpatient and outpatient diseases can be studied. Also, the system is, theoretically, population based, which permits the calculation of incidence rates. In reality, because of difficulties defining the eligible population at any one time due to continually changing eligibility, the population that sometimes has been used for these calculations consists of all those with a claim for medical services during a defined time frame.

A very important advantage of Medicaid data is that the data on exposure are not subject to recall or interviewer bias. Recall bias occurs when groups of patients who are being compared to each other differ in their ability to recall antecedent exposures or events. For example, this might represent a special problem in a case–control study of drug-induced birth defects,\textsuperscript{41} in which a mother of an abnormal child may be much more likely to remember prior drug exposures than a mother of a normal child. Interviewer bias occurs when groups of patients who are being compared to each other differ in the way they are questioned by the
study’s interviewers. This could occur, for example, if a patient with an outcome of interest is questioned more intensively about prior drug exposure than a patient without the disease. Since drug exposure is defined by a claim by a pharmacist for reimbursement and is collected before the outcomes occur, neither of these potential biases are a problem in a billing database.

There is now agreement that automated pharmacy claims are one of the best sources of information on drug use, although this source also has its limitations. The primary issues are patient compliance and the use of drugs from other sources. Several studies have found excellent concordance between pharmacy records and patient self-reports.\textsuperscript{122–124} Data from Tennessee nursing homes have found excellent concordance between medical administration records and the Medicaid prescription files (unpublished data). The major problem areas are drugs taken intermittently for symptom relief, over-the-counter drugs, drugs not on the formulary, drugs usually given by injection, immunizations, and drugs given in a hospital.

An advantage of Medicaid databases, even relative to other automated databases, is the overrepresentation of special populations. Medicaid has substantially greater numbers of pregnant women, young children, the elderly, nursing home residents, and African Americans than would be expected in a population of comparable size. Because these populations often are excluded from or underrepresented in premarketing trials, it is particularly important to include them in postmarketing studies. Published studies for these vulnerable populations include fetal metronidazole exposure and childhood cancer,\textsuperscript{42} angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors and sharply increased risk of angioedema in African Americans,\textsuperscript{43} and safety of \( \beta \)-blockers in elderly users of hypoglycemics.\textsuperscript{36}

\section*{WEAKNESSES}

\subsection*{GENERALIZABILITY}

Because of the skewed nature of the population served by Medicaid, one must be concerned that results obtained with these databases may not be generalizable to non-Medicaid patients. This is less of a problem for analytic studies, i.e., cohort and case–control studies, as both their study group and their control group come from the same population. In fact, it can be considered advantageous, as it may help to control for socioeconomic status as a potential confounding variable. As an example, studies evaluating the gastrointestinal side effects of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs using Medicaid data and from multiple other sources have produced similar results.\textsuperscript{44} It is much more of a problem for descriptive studies.

\section*{DIAGNOSTIC TERMINOLOGY}

Medicaid diagnosis data is coded using the International Classification of Disease Ninth Revision—Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM) coding scheme. While this coding system is the most common scheme used for such purposes, its use can still be problematic.

First, there are often many different ICD-9-CM codes compatible with the same disease process. For example, upper gastrointestinal bleeding from a duodenal ulcer could be coded as upper gastrointestinal bleeding not otherwise specified (ICD-9-CM code 578.9), hematemesis (ICD-9-CM code 578.0), melena (ICD-9-CM code 578.1), acute duodenal ulcer with bleeding (ICD-9-CM code 532.0), peptic ulcer with bleeding (ICD-9-CM code 533.0), etc. Thus, it is necessary to combine many different ICD-9-CM codes into a single diagnostic code.

Second, there is no incentive for a provider to code specifically, e.g., duodenal ulcer with bleeding rather than peptic ulcer with bleeding or upper gastrointestinal bleeding not otherwise specified. Thus, one must be careful in interpreting such distinctions and, in general, researchers using claims data must be “lumpers” rather than “splitters.”

Third, ICD-9-CM codes do not always quite fit the clinical syndrome of interest. One must be prepared to use multiple different aggregations of codes as different definitions of the same disease. For example, in a study of zomepirac and hypersensitivity reactions\textsuperscript{45} the investigators used
six different definitions of hypersensitivity reactions:

1. bronchospasm and laryngospasm,
2. shock, other than septic and cardiogenic shock,
3. allergy unspecified,
4. allergic skin reactions (e.g., urticaria),
5. adverse effects of medicinal and biological substances, and
6. the subset of each of the first five codes which was felt to best approximate the syndrome of anaphylaxis without including too much non-anaphylactic disease.

Fourth, the ICD-9-CM coding scheme can sometimes be too inclusive. For example, the code for erythema multiforme (ICD-9-CM code 695.1) includes erythema multiforme major, erythema multiforme minor, Stevens-Johnson Syndrome, toxic epidermal necrolysis, staphylococcal scalded skin syndrome, etc., some of which may share common mechanisms but others of which probably do not. In this situation, one must use primary medical records to make the distinction.

Finally, outcomes that do not reliably result in medical encounters are subject to underascertainment. This applies most notably to quality of life endpoints.

CONFOUNDING VARIABLES

A confounding variable is a patient characteristic that is related to both the disease and the exposure under study in such a way that it could create a false association between the exposure and the disease or mask a real one. For example, if one were examining the relationship between alcohol consumption and lung cancer, a positive association might emerge. However, it has been observed that people who use alcohol tend to be smokers. If the relationship between alcohol and lung cancer were then re-evaluated accounting for this fact, the initial relationship might disappear. In this situation it would be possible to control for the confounding variable (smoking) by stratifying cases and controls according to smoking status and then testing to see whether the relationship between alcohol use and lung cancer persisted for smokers and nonsmokers. This is discussed in more detail in Chapters 2 and 43.

In any epidemiologic study there will be a number of important potential confounding variables, including age, sex, geographic location, indications or contraindications for drug therapy, concomitant drug therapy, and underlying diagnoses. When information on the confounding variable is available, it can be controlled by using standard epidemiologic techniques: exclusion, matching, stratification, and/or mathematical modeling. Each of these, however, requires that one have information on that confounding variable. In Medicaid databases, those risk factors which are prescribed by physicians, such as drugs or procedures, or can be coded in ICD-9-CM format, such as diagnoses, can be controlled. However, as a billing database, Medicaid datasets lack information on some variables which can be very important as potential confounding variables. For example, smoking, environmental exposures, illicit drug use, alcohol use, occupation, family history, and use of over-the-counter drugs all are missing from Medicaid data.

Sometimes other variables can be used as proxies. As an example, one could use alcohol-related illnesses as a surrogate for alcoholism. These would include alcoholic cirrhosis, alcoholic hepatitis, delirium tremens, etc. The results would then need to be interpreted realizing that considerable misclassification remains, but that this is unidirectional misclassification. All those classified as alcoholics clearly would be, but many others would be alcohol abusers, as well. The control of some other factors, such as occupational exposures, is impossible.

Alternatively, information on confounders which is missing can be obtained from primary medical records. This approach has been used widely in recent studies. For example, in a study of drug induced liver disease, cases with a history of significant alcohol use in their medical record were excluded. This approach will be completely successful only for variables for which the information is uniformly recorded in the medical record. In a study of subjects with liver disease, the use of alcohol will be almost always be recorded since alcohol is one of the most
common causes of liver disease. In contrast, smoking may not be reliably recorded in this study because this variable is not related to liver disease. However, in a study of lung cancer patients, smoking would almost always be recorded in the medical record.

This approach to control for confounding is limited if similar exclusions are not applied to controls. However, it is usually not possible to obtain the medical records for outpatient controls. The variable of interest is controlled for in the cases by exclusion. Since information on the variable in the controls is not available, it must be assumed that this variable is uncommon. If the variable is not uncommon, than other methods must be used to control for confounding.

Another approach is to assess the degree of potential confounding in the cases. This approach is applicable for risk factors identifiable from medical records and is based upon the fact that, in the absence of effect modification, a true confounder will have a different prevalence in exposed and unexposed cases. This approach was used in a study of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and peptic ulcer disease and found that among cases of peptic ulcer disease, current NSAID users are not more likely to be smokers or to have a past history of peptic ulcer disease than are nonusers.

Other approaches include use of control groups as similar as possible to drug users by comparing drugs from the same therapeutic class or time-on: time-off drug. However, because confounders may be linked with choice of therapeutic agent (e.g., avoiding long acting benzodiazepines in frail patients) or with reasons for stopping drug (e.g., a prodromal symptom of the disease under study), this approach cannot rule out confounding.

Many of these techniques are used in a study. However, the potential for confounding by factors unavailable in a database sometimes may be so great that conducting a study is not advisable. For example, comparison of rates of suicide between users of different antidepressants could be substantially confounded by differences in severity of depression, a factor that is very difficult to reliably ascertain retrospectively.

DATA VALIDITY

The most important concern with using billing data is the validity of its data. An FDA-funded validation study of COMPASS was completed in 1984, comparing Medicaid data from Michigan and Minnesota to its primary sources, i.e., data from hospitals, physicians, pharmacies, etc. The results of this study indicated that the demographic and drug data appeared to be of extremely high quality. Within pre-established limits, year of birth agreed in 94% of sampled patients, and could not be determined from the medical records in another 2.5%; sex agreed in 95% of patients, and could not be determined from the medical records in another 4%; and the date of a pharmacy’s dispensing of each drug agreed in 97% of sampled prescriptions. Regarding medical services, of those records that could be evaluated, 93% of the services in Medicaid data could be found in the provider records looking within 1 week of the Medicaid date; in 17% of those, the provider record included a previous or subsequent visit that was not in the Medicaid data. Diagnostic agreement to at least three digits of the ICD-9-CM code occurred in 41%, agreement within a broad diagnostic category in another 16% (i.e., same body system and/or type of illness), no diagnosis was present on the provider record in 12%, a single diagnosis in 3%, and there was no agreement in 28%. Clearly, this study suggested that diagnostic data validity needs to be considered in each individual study.

Several levels of validation need to be considered. The first is whether the computer diagnosis accurately reflects the medical records. This merely implies that there was not a coding error. The second level is whether the diagnosis made and recorded by the physician is correct. For example, a physician may diagnose a skin rash as erythema multiforme, when in fact it is some other skin disorder. Specific criteria need to be developed to validate diagnoses in this way. It is important to keep in mind that primary medical records may not include adequate detail to perform the second level of validation. However, validation efforts must keep each of these two different types of validation clearly in mind.
A series of formal validation studies have now been completed in COMPASS® using primary medical records. Samples of patients were selected with an inpatient diagnosis of erythema multiforme (n = 168), an inpatient diagnosis of neutropenia (n = 198), any diagnosis of hypersensitivity reactions (n = 52), and inpatient diagnosis of acute liver disease (n = 414), among others. Overall, a diagnosis compatible with the computerized claim diagnosis was present in approximately 95% of the medical records reviewed in detail.

Each of the specific studies, however, illustrated strengths and weaknesses of the data. In the neutropenia validation study, out of 198 medical charts that were reviewed, 192 contained information on white cell counts that confirmed the diagnosis of neutropenia (i.e., 97% agreement).10 The median total white cell count was 2700 with a minimum of 100 and a maximum of 8800. The few patients with a normal white cell count had a very low percentage of their white cells that were polymorphic leukocytes, i.e., their total neutrophil count was low, and, therefore, the diagnosis was correct. However, 13.5% of the cases had recurrent disease, and 9.9% had cyclic neutropenia. Thus, even when the computer diagnosis is highly accurate, other information from the medical record can be needed to characterize the cases accurately.

For the Stevens–Johnson Syndrome study, the primary medical records of 249 cases with an inpatient diagnosis of “erythema multiforme” (ICD-9-CM code 695.1) were sought from three states.51 Of these, 128 (51.4%) of medical records were received. Sufficient information to assess the accuracy of the diagnosis was found in 122 (95.3%). Of the 128 records that were reviewed, 121 (94.5%) had a skin diagnosis that could have been compatible with ICD-9-CM code 695.1. Of the 128 cases with a computer diagnosis of “erythema multiforme,” only 15.6% of patients had a discharge diagnosis of erythema multiforme major or minor. When these records were reviewed by a dermatologist, 14.8% had the diagnosis of erythema multiforme major confirmed and another 27.3% had erythema multiforme minor diagnosed. This analysis confirmed that this ICD-9-CM code includes many unrelated diagnoses, and that the physicians’ discharge diagnosis is not always accurate.

For a study of drug induced acute liver disease, the medical records of 414 patients with a computer diagnosis of liver disease were reviewed.12 One of the goals of the review was to exclude patients with identifiable causes of liver disease besides drugs. Of the records reviewed, 15.9% were alcoholics, 31.9% had acute hepatitis A or B, 13.5% were intravenous drug users, 8.2% had acute cholecystitis or cholelithiasis, and 4.1% had received a transfusion within 6 months. No liver diagnosis was found in 10.6%, and 5.7% had chronic liver disease. Of the 169 cases of idiopathic acute liver disease identified, many were hospitalized for reasons besides liver disease, and had very mild disease. Thus, this study found that Medicaid billing data has high reliability and validity for the diagnosis of acute liver disease. However, primary medical records are essential for the study of drug induced hepatitis, to be able to exclude other causes of liver disease, and to obtain other information not included in the computer data.

Our experience suggests that, with few exceptions, medical records must be obtained in every study to confirm the diagnosis, characterize the severity of the disease, and to obtain information on potential confounding variables not found in the computer data. This is particularly problematic, since the New Jersey database never developed access to medical records, and COMPASS® has lost its access. In general, we have also found that outpatient records are difficult to obtain and often do not have the information necessary for the study. This suggests that studies using Medicaid data should be limited to diseases severe enough to result in hospitalization.

An exception when primary medical records may be less important is studies which focus on evaluating drug to drug relationships, or studies which can use drugs or procedures as markers of diagnoses. For example, studies that found an association between patients receiving a new prescription for levodopa containing medication and prior exposure to metoclopramide is probably valid, since drug exposure is accurate.52
Table 19.3. Selected known associations reproduced using Medicaid data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exposure</th>
<th>Disease</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alcoholism</td>
<td>UGI bleeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>Skin rash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antibiotics</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antithyroid drugs</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Captopril</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diethylstilbestrol</td>
<td>Thromboembolism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythromycin</td>
<td>Liver disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female sex</td>
<td>Hypersensitivity reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased age</td>
<td>UGI bleeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infections</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory bowel disease</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iron</td>
<td>Hypersensitivity reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male sex</td>
<td>UGI bleeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metoclopramide</td>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAIDs</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAIDs</td>
<td>Renal disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSAIDs</td>
<td>UGI bleeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obesity</td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral contraceptives</td>
<td>Thromboembolism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other bacterial infect</td>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other viral infect</td>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pancreatitis</td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penicillin</td>
<td>Hypersensitivity reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenothiazines</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phenothiazines</td>
<td>Parkinson’s disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potassium chloride</td>
<td>UGI bleeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pregnancy</td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous abdominal disease</td>
<td>UGI bleeding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procainamide (sustained release)</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diethylstilbestrol</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Splenomegaly</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfa drugs</td>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sulfonamides</td>
<td>Liver disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflammatory bowel disease</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tetracyclines</td>
<td>Liver disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiazides</td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thiazides</td>
<td>Gout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticrynafen</td>
<td>Liver disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole</td>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper respiratory infection</td>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinary tract infection</td>
<td>Erythema multiforme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valproic acid</td>
<td>Neutropenia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zomepirac</td>
<td>Hypersensitivity reaction</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Many known associations have been reproduced using Medicaid data, e.g., those presented in Table 19.3.

**POTENTIAL BIASES**

Other potential errors in classification, i.e., misclassification biases, may occur in a number of ways. Drug entries should be valid since drug identity determines the amount of pharmacy Medicaid reimbursement. This is carefully audited by the states, and was confirmed in the FDA’s validation study. The problem of a drug not being recorded in a patient’s file is minimized by the fact that a chronic drug may legally be dispensed for a maximum of 90 days; most drugs can only be dispensed for 30 days. A prescription refill requires a return visit to the pharmacy. For drugs that can be purchased over the counter, it is likely that some individuals classified as nonusers may actually be users. It is likely that patients from the socioeconomic group eligible for Medicaid are less likely to pay for over-the-counter medications if they are required chronically or in large doses. However, this cannot be guaranteed.

Conversely, it is virtually guaranteed that some individuals who are prescribed a drug do not take the drug as directed. There is no way other than examining refill frequency to ascertain patient compliance in Medicaid datasets, although one advantage of the billing data systems is that they provide data on prescriptions which have been dispensed by the pharmacist, rather than simply written for by the physician. Therefore, in studies comparing patients exposed to a drug to unexposed patients, the risk associated with a drug may be underestimated if noncompliance is a significant problem. Analogously, studies which compare the relative risk of two drugs may be biased if there is a difference in compliance. For example, the risk of peptic ulcer disease has been demonstrated to be higher in patients taking piroxicam (once per day) compared to ibuprofen (four times per day).31

**ELIGIBILITY CHANGES**

Finally, and importantly, if a patient loses eligibility for Medicaid benefits during the study,
it may appear as if the patient does not develop the outcome of interest when in fact the patient is no longer included in the database. This problem is minimized by applying eligibility requirements, as discussed in more detail above, or using the recipient files in the states where the information is accurate.

PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

EXAMPLES OF MEDICAID BASED STUDIES

In this section, we describe several studies that illustrate the use of Medicaid data for pharmacoepidemiology studies.

Griffin et al. studied the association of NSAID use and fatal upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage in a case–control study of Medicaid patients over 60 years old.\(^\text{31}\) Cases were defined as patients who died from upper gastrointestinal bleeding and were confirmed by review of the medical record. Controls were matched for age, sex, race, calendar year, and nursing home status. Cases were 4.7 (95% confidence interval, 3.1–7.2) times more likely to have filled an NSAID prescription than the controls. In a second study that extended these observations, Griffin et al. published the largest case–control study of peptic ulcer disease.\(^\text{31}\) The study included 1415 hospitalized cases 65 years of age or older, and 7063 controls from Medicaid enrollees. The diagnosis of peptic ulcer disease was confirmed by review of the medical record. Cases were 4.1 (95% CI, 3.5–4.7) times more likely to be current users of NSAIDs than controls. A dose and duration effect was again demonstrated. Finally, in a subanalysis of these data, Piper et al. demonstrated that the relative risk of peptic ulcer disease associated with the use of corticosteroids was 2.0 (95% CI, 1.3–3.0).\(^\text{21}\) However, the risk in patients taking both NSAIDs and corticosteroids was 4.4 (95% CI, 2.0–9.7), while in patients only taking corticosteroids was 1.1 (95% CI, 0.5–2.1).

In a second series of studies, Carson and colleagues assessed the incidence of hospitalization for acute symptomatic hepatitis and performed two case–control studies.\(^\text{13, 46}\) The diagnosis of idiopathic liver disease was validated by review of the medical record. The incidence of acute liver disease resulting in hospitalization was 2.2 per 100 000 per year. In a study of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug induced acute liver disease, the odds ratio was 1.2 (95% CI, 0.5–2.8).\(^\text{14}\) These results suggest that liver disease from NSAIDs is an infrequent clinical problem. In a second study of antibiotic induced liver disease, several important associations were demonstrated.\(^\text{46}\) For erythromycin the odds ratio was 5.2 (95% CI, 1.1–26.6), for sulfonamides the odds ratio was 11.4 (95% CI, 2.7–67.8), and for tetracycline the odds ratio was 5.2 (95% CI, 1.4–19.7). The results did not change substantively after adjustment for multiple potential confounders.

In another set of studies, in order to evaluate a series of \textit{a priori} hypotheses about drug-induced neutropenia, a population based case–control study was undertaken using 1980–1985 COMPASS\(^\text{8}\) data from six states. Cases hospitalized for neutropenia were compared to four times as many age-, sex-, and state-matched controls, randomly chosen from the same datasets. The frequency of exposures of interest in the 30 days before hospital admission in the cases was compared to the frequency in the identical time periods in the controls. The annual incidence rates for neutropenia and agranulocytosis ranged from 31.5 to 40.5 and 6.3 to 8.1 per million per year, respectively.\(^\text{19}\) When properly adjusted for demographic differences, the incidence rates observed were virtually identical to those found in the International Agranulocytosis and Aplastic Anemia Study (at 1/100 the cost). Increased risks (odds ratio (90% confidence interval)) of neutropenia were seen with viral infections (4.7 (90% CI, 1.7–12.9)), other hematological diseases (72.6 (90% CI, 45.2–116.7)), splenomegaly (51.4 (6.1–∞)), autoimmune diseases (9.5 (90% CI, 4.6–19.7), sarcoidosis 27.4 (2.3–∞)), antibiotics other than cephalosporins (2.2 (90% CI, 1.5–3.2)), nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (4.2 (90% CI, 2.0–8.7)), antithyroid drugs (19.5 (90% CI, 1.1–∞)), and slow release procainamide (27.4 (90% CI, 2.3–∞)). Allopurinol, captopril, and valproic acid all had odds ratios greater than 2.5, but the results did not reach conventional levels of statistical significance. In a separate analysis, no association was demonstrated between cimetidine and neutropenia.\(^\text{53}\)
Avorn and colleagues have performed a series of studies examining prior exposure to drugs in patients prescribed drugs to treat Parkinson’s disease for the first time. Patients started on levodopa containing drugs were three times more likely to have been exposed to metoclopramide (odds ratio = 3.09, 95% CI, 2.25–4.26) than nonusers of drugs to treat Parkinson’s disease.52 In a similar study, neuroleptic exposure was 5.4 times more likely (95% CI, 4.8–6.1) in patients started on antiparkinsonian therapy than nonusers.54 These studies have the advantage of primarily relying on the drug exposure information, reducing the importance of obtaining medical records to confirm the diagnosis.

Medicaid data have been used to evaluate drug utilization and cost related to drug therapy. For example, a study using NJ Medicaid data showed that only about half of patients were still using lipid lowering treatment five years after initiating treatment.55 Another study showed that prior authorization requirement for the use of brand name nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs reduced the expenditure for nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs by 53%.56 A third study found the excess cost of gastrointestinal disease associated with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs to be very expensive.57

There are also several situations when Medicaid data should not be used for pharmacoepidemiology studies. First, Medicaid data cannot be used to study inpatient drug use. Second, Medicaid data cannot be used to study over-the-counter drug use. Third, Medicaid data should not be used to study diseases that will not reliably come to medical attention, such as minor nausea and mild skin rashes. Fourth, a Medicaid database should not be used if it lacks information about confounders important to that study. For example, it would not be appropriate to use Medicaid data to perform a study on lung cancer, since smoking history is unavailable. Fifth, Medicaid data should not be used if the ICD-9-CM coding system does not adequately describe the outcome of interest. An example would be a study of warfarin induced skin necrosis. There also are times when this coding system is too inclusive, so that related diseases are grouped together. An example would be a study of drug induced retroperitoneal fibrosis, since retroperitoneal fibrosis is grouped into the code for urethral obstruction. Sixth, Medicaid data may not be suitable to study long term effects of drugs if frequent eligibility changes result in many subjects losing benefits. Finally, Medicaid (or other automated databases) should not be used if crucial study variables need to be determined via patient contact, such as depression, hypertension, and lipid levels.

**APPROPRIATE ROLE OF MEDICAID DATA IN PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

Medicaid data are especially useful for studies in several circumstances. Many postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology studies require very large sample sizes, since the outcome and/or drug exposure of interest is very uncommon. If a quick answer to a question is required for a study, then databases that use data already collected such as these are preferable. Similarly, if resources are restricted, then studies can generally be performed at significantly reduced cost compared to an ad hoc study requiring de novo data collection. Finally, billing databases are preferable when studies are especially prone to recall bias, such as a study of drug induced birth defects, or interviewer bias.

**THE FUTURE**

The three Medicaid databases commonly used for pharmacoepidemiology research are composed of Medicaid billing data from about three million patients. Other Medicaid databases are available as well, although they have not often been used for pharmacoepidemiology studies. Very large studies can be performed with these resources, relatively quickly and inexpensively. These comprehensive databases permit studies of both inpatient and outpatient diseases and permit calculation of incidence rates. Maternal–fetal linkage permits studies of birth defects.

The principal concern in using this type of database is the validity of the diagnosis data.
Recent experience documents that high quality studies can be performed when primary medical records are reviewed. The recent past has seen increasing use of these data for pharmacoepidemiology studies, with increasing awareness of those diagnoses that can be validly studied using these data versus those that cannot. The future is also likely to see the inclusion of data from more Medicaid programs, and more non-Medicaid programs. However, public concerns about protecting confidentiality have made it harder to obtain primary medical records. This is a problem which must be solved, if these resources are to continue to be most useful. However, overall, used with care, Medicaid databases appear to be potentially very useful, growing, and important sources of drug use/diagnosis experience data for the FDA, the pharmaceutical industry, and academic institutions.
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INTRODUCTION

Saskatchewan is one of ten provinces and three territories in Canada. It is located in western Canada and has a stable population of about one million people, or 3.4% of the total population of Canada.

Saskatchewan has a publicly funded health system. Within this system, Saskatchewan Health, a provincial government department, and 32 district health boards (local health authorities) provide health services to the citizens of Saskatchewan. With funding from Saskatchewan Health, the district boards plan and deliver most services to people within their geographic jurisdictions based on the needs of their residents. Saskatchewan Health coordinates province-wide programs such as the Prescription Drug Plan and physician services.

In almost all of the provincially funded programs, residents of the province enjoy universal health insurance. There is no eligibility distinction based on socioeconomic status. As a by-product of these universal health care programs, Saskatchewan Health has been accumulating a very large amount of health care information in computerized databases over a number of years. These databases have been recognized as a resource for drug utilization review and pharmacoepidemiology.1-8 Publications of studies based on the data reflect the value of the databases for this research.9-81

DESCRIPTION

The major databases include the registry of the eligible population, prescription drug data, hospital services data, physician services data, the cancer registry, and vital statistics information. These and some of the other health databases are described in more detail below.

ELIGIBLE POPULATION

Saskatchewan residents are entitled to receive benefits through the health care system once they have established residence and have registered with Saskatchewan Health. A Health Services Number (HSN), assigned at registration, is a lifetime number that uniquely identifies each resident. The HSN is captured in records of health service utilization and enables linkage of the computer databases.
Saskatchewan Health maintains an accurate, comprehensive, and current population registry that includes all residents eligible for health coverage (the “covered population”). As of 30 June, 1998, more than one million people were eligible for health benefits (Table 20.1). More than 2.2 million individuals have been registered for coverage since 1968. Excluded from eligibility, and therefore from the population registry, are people whose health care is fully funded federally. This category, which includes members of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, members of the Canadian Forces, and inmates of federal penitentiaries, accounts for less than 1% of the total population. Consequently, the population registry (together with specific health services information) enables study of all segments of the population including children, women of childbearing age, and the elderly.

The population registry captures demographic and coverage data on every member of the eligible population (Table 20.2). It is updated daily for name or address changes, births, deaths, new residents, departing residents, and those qualifying for social services supplementary health coverage. The registry is verified and updated through continuous, routine checks by field staff and by a variety of mechanisms which signal changes in eligibility, identification, or demographic data. Transactions for an insured health service are checked against the population registry for eligibility of the claimant and for accuracy of identification and demographic information; inconsistencies are manually checked.

### Table 20.2. Information contained in the population registry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Health services number</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Marital status</th>
<th>Date of birth</th>
<th>Date of death (if applicable)</th>
<th>Mailing address</th>
<th>Location code</th>
<th>Indicator for registered Indian status</th>
<th>Indicator for current recipients of Saskatchewan Assistance Plan (welfare)</th>
<th>Dates of coverage initiation and termination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**PRESCRIPTION DRUG DATA**

All Saskatchewan residents are eligible for benefits under the Prescription Drug Plan (the “Drug Plan”), with the exception of approximately 9% of the population (primarily registered Indians) who have their prescription costs paid for by another government agency. (These ineligible individuals can be excluded from studies.)

Drugs covered by the Drug Plan are listed in the Saskatchewan Formulary; nonformulary drugs generally are not covered, although there are exceptions. All drugs listed in the Saskatchewan Formulary are intended for outpatients. (This database also includes prescriptions dispensed to most residents of long term care facilities, however.) The formulary is updated semi-annually; as of July 1998, it included 2875 drug products. Listed drugs are under continuous review; new drug products are evaluated as applications are made and are added if they meet the standards of professional expert committees that aid the provincial government. Drugs must be prescribed by a licensed practitioner in order to be covered.

The Drug Plan began providing benefits to residents on 1 September, 1975. When the program began, consumers paid a portion of the professional fee, and Saskatchewan Health paid the pharmacy for the remainder of the prescription.

### Table 20.1. Eligible population by age and sex: 30 June, 1998

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 1</td>
<td>6 061</td>
<td>6 151</td>
<td>12 212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–9</td>
<td>63 828</td>
<td>69 066</td>
<td>134 894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10–19</td>
<td>78 721</td>
<td>82 985</td>
<td>161 706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>68 075</td>
<td>71 011</td>
<td>139 086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>76 811</td>
<td>76 802</td>
<td>153 613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>71 430</td>
<td>74 052</td>
<td>145 482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>47 921</td>
<td>48 728</td>
<td>96 649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–69</td>
<td>39 971</td>
<td>38 569</td>
<td>78 540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70–79</td>
<td>37 142</td>
<td>30 157</td>
<td>67 299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80–89</td>
<td>22 176</td>
<td>13 604</td>
<td>35 780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90+</td>
<td>4 614</td>
<td>2 058</td>
<td>6 672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>518 750</td>
<td>513 183</td>
<td>1 031 933</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


cost; those individuals who could not afford to pay even a portion of the prescription fee were entitled to benefits without any payment. Currently, a family based deductible system is in place.

Since January 1989, pharmacies have submitted claims to Saskatchewan Health through point-of-service (POS) computer terminals, connected via telecommunication lines to a central database. All prescription data are collected (including those whose costs do not exceed the deductible) and data are collected on an individual patient basis.

There are a number of validation checks made of the data. The computerized, claim processing system checks each transaction for identification and demographic accuracy, claimant eligibility, and drug coverage under the Drug Plan. The immediate visual feedback incorporated in the POS computer—telecommunication processing system provides an additional verification check at the pharmacy level during data entry. Pharmacy audits are conducted on a regular basis. In addition, drug utilization review and program evaluations using the drug data are ongoing within the Drug Plan; to some extent, this data usage affords validation.

The database contains information from September 1975 to June 1987 and from January 1989 to date. (Drug data are incomplete from July 1987 to December 1988.) It includes patient, drug, prescriber, pharmacy, and cost information (Table 20.3). The drug classification schemes used enable analysis of drugs at a brand, generic, or class level; customized programs facilitate categorization into various therapeutic and/or pharmacological groups. Because the patient is identified by the HSN, the drug data can be linked to the population registry to compile information on the age, sex, and residence of users of a product. The prescriber number can be linked with a physician registry for additional information, such as location of practice and prescriber specialty. The pharmacy number enables classification by location, type of pharmacy (chain or independent), and prescription volume. The drug database does not include information on most nonformulary prescription drug use, most over-the-counter drug use, use of professional samples, and in-hospital medications. In addition, it does not include information about the dosage regimen prescribed, the reason the drug was prescribed, or patient compliance.

In the fiscal year 1997–98, more than 6.2 million prescription claims were processed by the Drug Plan (Table 20.4). Sixty-six percent of those eligible received benefits; individuals 65 years and older made up 15.5% of the eligible population and received over 45% of all prescriptions processed under the Drug Plan.

## HOSPITAL SERVICES DATA

Under the hospital care insurance program, hospitals provide medically necessary services without charge to beneficiaries. All members of the covered population are eligible to receive benefits. Data are collected on every hospital separation and day surgery case, thus creating a

---

**Table 20.3. Information contained in the prescription drug database**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Patient information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of birth; age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designation of special status (e.g., welfare recipient, palliative care registrant, long-term care home resident)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Drug information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacologic–therapeutic classification&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug identification number (DIN)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active ingredient number of drug (AIN)&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generic and brand names</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength and dosage form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturer of drug</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date dispensed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity dispensed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“No substitution” indicator, if applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Prescriber information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescriber identification number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dispensing pharmacy information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy identification number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cost information</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit cost of drug materials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispensing fee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumer share of total cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Plan share of total cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The American Hospital Formulary Service classification system is used.

<sup>b</sup> Assigned by the Health Protection Branch of Health Canada.
Table 20.4. Prescriptions covered by the drug plan by pharmacologic–therapeutic classification: 1997–98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacologic–therapeutic classification</th>
<th>Number of prescriptions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 : 00 Anti-infectives</td>
<td>745 730</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 : 00 Antineoplastic drugs</td>
<td>1 308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 : 00 Autonomic drugs</td>
<td>246 781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 : 00 Blood formation and coagulation</td>
<td>96 618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 : 00 Cardiovascular drugs</td>
<td>1 441 984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 : 00 Central nervous system drugs</td>
<td>1 238 508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36 : 00 Diagnostic agents</td>
<td>68 974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 : 00 Electrolytic, calor ic and water balance</td>
<td>380 588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48 : 00 Cough preparations</td>
<td>506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52 : 00 Eye, ear, nose and throat preparations</td>
<td>243 339</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56 : 00 Gastrointestinal drugs</td>
<td>351 746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 : 00 Gold compounds</td>
<td>781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64 : 00 Metal antagonists</td>
<td>735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68 : 00 Hormones and substitutes</td>
<td>933 133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76 : 00 Oxytocics</td>
<td>194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84 : 00 Skin and mucous membrane preparations</td>
<td>236 470</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86 : 00 Spasmolytics</td>
<td>40 111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88 : 00 Vitamins</td>
<td>45 508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92 : 00 Unclassified</td>
<td>188 153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6 261 167</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The American Hospital Formulary Service classification system is used.
* Refers to formulary and exception drug status prescriptions.

Provided by: Drug Plan and Extended Benefits Branch, Saskatchewan Health. Regina, Saskatchewan.

central databank of diagnostic and other health information on a defined population. (In Saskatchewan, a separation is defined as the discharge, transfer, or death of an inpatient.)

Five large hospitals provide a full range of hospital services to the populace in their immediate areas, serve as the tertiary referral centers for the province, and play a major role in research and education. There is also one rehabilitation hospital in Saskatchewan that offers physical and occupational rehabilitation. Seven regional hospitals serve as referral centers for the people from outside their immediate vicinity, provide basic hospital care to residents in their immediate locale, and assume a limited role in education. The largest number of general hospitals are classified as district or community hospitals that serve the local populace and offer a more limited range of services than do the base or regional hospitals.

Data are collected from all hospitals in the province. Included in the database are all acute care inpatient separations, day surgeries, long term care separations on patients who occupy a bed in a general hospital, inpatient psychiatric separations on patients treated in general hospitals, active rehabilitation, and out-of-province hospital separations involving a member of the covered population.

All health service transactions are cross-checked with the population registry for patient eligibility and for identification and demographic accuracy. There are computer programs designed to detect illogical entries. Beginning in 1984–85, diagnostic data for over one-half of the admission/separations were processed by a national body, currently known as the Canadian Institute for Health Information (CIHI); as of 1998–99, all separations are being processed by CIHI. CIHI assigns a case mix group (CMG) and resource intensity weight (RIW) to each hospital separation, based on the discharge diagnoses and procedures performed in hospital. The CMG and RIW values enable estimation of costs associated with a given hospitalization.

The hospital separation database includes patient, diagnostic, treatment, and other information
(Table 20.5). Standard diagnostic and procedure classification systems are used. The diagnostic classification system is the World Health Organization International Classification of Diseases, Ninth Revision (ICD-9). The procedure classification system is the Canadian Classification of Diagnostic, Therapeutic, and Surgical Procedures (CCP). Both diagnoses and procedures are coded to four digits. Diagnostic coding for the majority of hospital discharges is undertaken at the hospital level, usually by health records administrators. Limited routine validation of the accuracy of this coding procedure is undertaken centrally. The data are accessible electronically from 1970 to the present. Data from hospitals are available approximately six months from date of discharge.

Inpatient medical records are stored in the hospitals. Hospitals must retain a patient’s file for a minimum period of ten years from the date of last discharge or until age 19 if the patient is a minor, whichever period is longer, and must retain the record in its original form for a minimum period of six complete years.

In 1997–98, there were 159 800 separations for adults and children, 78 900 day surgery cases, and about 13 000 newborn records (including those born out-of-province). Table 20.6 provides a breakdown of the inpatient separations by ICD-9 diagnostic chapter.

### PHYSICIAN SERVICES DATA

In Saskatchewan, most physician services are an insured benefit. All members of the covered population are eligible to receive benefits. Most physicians are reimbursed on a fee-for-service basis. Medical, surgical, obstetric, anesthesia, and diagnostic services are included. A small number of physician services are not insured (e.g., cosmetic surgery, examinations for employment or insurance). As of March 1998, 40% of the province’s approximately 1130 active physicians were specialists; 60% were family practitioners. A beneficiary may seek services from any physician desired, while physicians retain the ability to accept or decline any patient.

Physicians submit claims to Saskatchewan Health for payment for services provided. Claims received from physicians contain patient identifiers, details to support payment, and the primary diagnosis of the patient’s condition. Submitted claims are subjected to a series of computer checks to determine the validity of the claim data. Transactions are cross-checked with the population registry for patient eligibility and identification. Other internal computer checks are in place to check accuracy and to detect illogical entries. Claims rejected during the computer processing are reviewed manually.

Considerable patient, physician, diagnostic, and service information is available by using the claims file and the physician registry file (Table 20.7). Diagnoses are recorded using three-digit ICD-9 codes. (ICD-8 coding was used from 1971 to 1979.) Procedures are coded using fee-for-service codes from a payment schedule. Fee-for-service codes are established through consultation between Saskatchewan Health and the provincial medical association. Because diagnostic data are given only to support the claim for payment and because only one three-digit ICD-9 code is recorded per visit,
Table 20.6. Hospitalizations by ICD-9 diagnostic chapter: 1997–98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 Chapter</th>
<th>ICD-9 Codes</th>
<th>Separations</th>
<th>Patient days</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per 1000 covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I. Infectious and parasitic diseases</td>
<td>001–139</td>
<td>2 521</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Neoplasms</td>
<td>140–239</td>
<td>8 727</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases, and immunity disorders</td>
<td>240–279</td>
<td>3 755</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Diseases of the blood and blood-forming organs</td>
<td>280–289</td>
<td>1 259</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Mental disorders</td>
<td>290–319</td>
<td>3 610</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Diseases of the nervous system and sense organs</td>
<td>320–389</td>
<td>3 864</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Diseases of the circulatory system</td>
<td>390–459</td>
<td>20 899</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Diseases of the respiratory system</td>
<td>460–519</td>
<td>17 560</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Diseases of the digestive system</td>
<td>520–579</td>
<td>18 818</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Diseases of the genitourinary system</td>
<td>580–629</td>
<td>9 878</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth, and the puerperium</td>
<td>630–676</td>
<td>17 019</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Diseases of the skin and subcutaneous tissue</td>
<td>680–709</td>
<td>2 077</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Diseases of the musculoskeletal system and connective tissue</td>
<td>710–739</td>
<td>7 326</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Congenital anomalies</td>
<td>740–759</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Conditions originating in the perinatal period</td>
<td>760–779</td>
<td>3 480</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. Symptoms, signs, and ill defined conditions</td>
<td>780–799</td>
<td>9 754</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. Injury and poisoning</td>
<td>800–999</td>
<td>12 953</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary classification of factors influencing health status and contacts with health services</td>
<td>V01–V80</td>
<td>15 358</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total                                                  | 159 848     | 156.7       | 881 262      | 864    |
HEALTH DATABASES IN SASKATCHEWAN

health outcome studies should not be performed with unvalidated physician services data alone. When used in conjunction with the other databases, the outpatient physician services data can, however, play a useful role in data linkage projects. Claims data are accessible electronically from 1971 to the present. Data are available on most services within 90 days of the date the service was provided.

In 1997–98, more than 10 million services were provided by physicians. Table 20.8 shows the distribution of these services by ICD-9 diagnostic chapter.

**CANCER SERVICES DATA**

The Saskatchewan Cancer Program encompasses prevention, early detection, diagnosis, treatment, and followup of patients with malignant or premalignant disease. Provincial legislation mandates that information from medical professionals and hospital records required to complete the cancer registration must be provided to the Saskatchewan Cancer Agency. Thus, the cancer registry has a record of all people in the province diagnosed with cancer. Approximately 95% of cancer notifications are from specialist referral or a pathology report. 5% are from death registrations or autopsy (singly or combined), and a small number are through physician claims. In situ cancers and some neoplasms of uncertain behavior are also registered and followed. Within Canada, patients who move out of the province receive continued surveillance through the appropriate provincial cancer clinic. All cases of invasive cancer are maintained on a followup program for a minimum of 10 years. The rate of loss to followup is approximately 3%.

The population based registry was established in 1932. Complete computerized data for all cancer sites are available since 1967; pre-1967 data are being computerized retroactively. Breast cancer data are now computerized from 1960 to the present. The cancer registry contains identification, case, death, and review information (Table 20.9) and can be related to radiotherapy and in-clinic chemotherapy treatment data. The registry increases by about 7000 cases per year (including nonmelanoma skin cancer and in situ cancers). Both confirmed and suspected cases of cancer are registered. The database includes approximately 160 000 individual patients and over 200 000 case records (the difference indicates the number of patients with cancer of two or more primary sites). Data are available within six months from the date of diagnosis of the cancer.

In 1997, the overall cancer incidence rates were 455.8 per 100 000 for males and 392.4 for females. Incidence rates by cancer site are shown in Table 20.10.

**VITAL STATISTICS**

All birth, death, stillbirth, and marriage data are collected by Saskatchewan Health. Electronic data are readily accessible from 1974 to the present. Cause of death is recorded by a physician or coroner and is coded as received on a death registration form. If updated information such as an autopsy diagnosis is received, it takes priority
Table 20.8. Physician services by ICD-9 diagnostic chapter: 1997–98

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ICD-9 chapter</th>
<th>ICD-9</th>
<th>Services</th>
<th>Patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I. Infectious and parasitic diseases</td>
<td>001–139</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Per 1000 covered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. Neoplasms</td>
<td>140–239</td>
<td>309 996</td>
<td>303.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III. Endocrine, nutritional and metabolic diseases, and immunity disorders</td>
<td>240–279</td>
<td>205 712</td>
<td>201.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV. Diseases of the blood and blood-forming organs</td>
<td>240–279</td>
<td>306 458</td>
<td>300.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V. Mental disorders</td>
<td>280–289</td>
<td>68 834</td>
<td>67.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI. Diseases of the nervous system and sense organs</td>
<td>320–389</td>
<td>530 387</td>
<td>519.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VII. Diseases of the circulatory system</td>
<td>390–459</td>
<td>856 990</td>
<td>839.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIII. Diseases of the respiratory system</td>
<td>460–519</td>
<td>860 019</td>
<td>842.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IX. Diseases of the digestive system</td>
<td>520–579</td>
<td>1 254 686</td>
<td>1 229.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X. Diseases of the genitourinary system</td>
<td>580–629</td>
<td>325 996</td>
<td>319.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XI. Complications of pregnancy, childbirth, and the puerperium</td>
<td>630–676</td>
<td>530 742</td>
<td>520.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XII. Diseases of the skin and subcutaneous tissue</td>
<td>680–709</td>
<td>78 584</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIII. Diseases of the musculoskeletal system and connective tissue</td>
<td>710–739</td>
<td>438 880</td>
<td>430.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XIV. Congenital anomalies</td>
<td>740–759</td>
<td>539 255</td>
<td>528.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XV. Conditions originating in the perinatal period</td>
<td>280–289</td>
<td>325 996</td>
<td>319.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVI. Symptoms, signs, and ill defined conditions</td>
<td>780–799</td>
<td>530 742</td>
<td>520.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XVII. Injury and poisoning</td>
<td>800–999</td>
<td>78 584</td>
<td>77.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supplementary classification of factors influencing health status and contacts with health services</td>
<td>800–999</td>
<td>530 742</td>
<td>520.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other diagnoses</td>
<td>V01–V80</td>
<td>1 103 090</td>
<td>1 081.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>10 047 469</td>
<td>9 847.1</td>
<td>855 486a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Does not equal column total; some patients are counted in more than one chapter.

Provided by: Medical Services and Health Registration Branch, Saskatchewan Health. Regina, Saskatchewan.
over the registration form. (Autopsy reports are submitted voluntarily, but most are received.) The underlying cause of death is recorded electronically and is defined as the disease or injury that initiated the sequence of events that led to death. Four-digit ICD-9 coding is used.

Live births are registered by the family. Live birth registrations record obstetrical information and gestational age. Although health information regarding the infant is not captured on the birth registration form, some information regarding the health of the infant, especially major congenital anomalies, will be found in the hospital services database because most births (over 98%) occur in

| Table 20.9. Basic information contained in the cancer registry |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Patient information        | Case information            |
| Health services number     | Registration information   |
| Name                       | (including tentative     |
| Sex                        | diagnosis, height, and     |
| Date and place of birth    | weight)                   |
| Address                    | Final diagnostic information |
| Mantal status              | (ICD-O, behaviour, grade) |
| Indicator for rural or urban residence | Staging information |
| Metastases at diagnosis    | Dates of diagnoses         |
| Dates of diagnoses         | Method of diagnosis        |
| Pathology report and hospital record numbers | Summary treatment at diagnosis (within four months) |
| Performance status (functional level) | Disease status |
| Followup type              | Death information           |
| Date and place of death    | Primary and secondary cause of death |
| Primary and secondary cause of death | Autopsy status |
| Disease status at death    | Disease status at death    |
| Autopsy status             | Review information         |
| Review date                | Physician identifier       |
| Type of review             | Recurrence information     |
| Recurrence information     | Metastases information     |
| Metastases information     | Treatment information      |
| Treatment information      | Performance status         |
| Performance status         | Disease status             |
| Disease status             | Height and weight          |

| Table 20.10. Incidence rates per 100 000 by cancer site: 1997 |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Cancer site | Incidence rate per 100 000 |
| Males         | Females         |
| Lip               | 8.5             | 1.4             |
| Oral cavity       | 2.2             | 2.3             |
| Head and neck     | 4.1             | 2.5             |
| Esophagus          | 6.5             | 3.1             |
| Stomach            | 11.8            | 6.6             |
| Colon              | 38.7            | 35.0            |
| Rectum             | 23.7            | 14.0            |
| Liver, gall bladder and biliary tract | 6.5 | 4.7 |
| Pancreas           | 8.1             | 9.7             |
| Digestive tract    | 1.8             | 1.8             |
| Larynx             | 6.3             | 1.0             |
| Trachea, bronchus, lung, and respiratory system | 72.8 | 39.9 |
| Bone and connective tissue | 3.2 | 3.1 |
| Malignant melanoma of skin | 10.5 | 11.9 |
| Breast a | 122.4 |
| Cervix: invasive    | —               | 12.3            |
| Uterus              | —               | 20.8            |
| Ovary               | —               | 16.7            |
| Female genital organs | —             | 4.3             |
| Prostate            | 120.8           | —               |
| Male genital organs | 6.1             | —               |
| Kidney              | 13.0            | 7.6             |
| Bladder             | 30.2            | 11.7            |
| Other urinary tract | 3.0             | 1.0             |
| Brain and central nervous system | 7.5 | 4.5 |
| Thyroid and other endocrine glands | 3.2 | 6.4 |
| Lymphoma            | 21.7            | 16.3            |
| Hodgkin’s disease   | 1.8             | 3.7             |
| Multiple myeloma    | 5.1             | 4.5             |
| Leukemia            | 20.5            | 9.5             |
| Primary site unknown | 14.8           | 10.5            |
| Other primary sites | 2.6             | 3.1             |
| Total               | 455.8           | 392.4           |

*There were fewer than five cases of breast cancer among males in 1997.*

Provided by: Saskatchewan Cancer Agency. Regina, Saskatchewan.
a hospital. Stillbirth registrations include a “medical certificate” section, which is completed and signed by a physician or coroner.

Although Vital Statistics data prior to 1992 do not include the HSN, those records can be searched by name or by the Vital Statistics registration number for linkage with other databases.

OTHER SASKATCHEWAN HEALTH INFORMATION

Other data are available that can be either linked with the HSN or manually reviewed to provide additional information on study populations. The following is a brief description of these databases.

Supportive Care Services

Data on institutional long term care and home care services delivered by district health boards are available in electronic form since April 1987, but are most accessible from April 1989.

Mental Health Services

Comprehensive mental health services including inpatient psychiatric care and community based outpatient services are provided throughout the province. All members of the covered population are eligible for benefits. Data on insured services are available in electronic form since 1967, but are most accessible from 1979 to 1996 for community based outpatient services and from 1979 to present for inpatient psychiatric care. Outpatient data are not available for 1997 or 1998 and may be limited in 1999. The mental health services database is currently undergoing a platform conversion which, when fully operational, should result in more timely data capture and improved data quality.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse Treatment Data

Some information is available on alcohol and drug abuse services provided by provincially funded programs. Computerized data are available since 1984–85.

Laboratory Records

A large volume of microbiologic and biochemical testing is centralized at the Saskatchewan Health Provincial Laboratory. Since October 1996, all tests performed centrally have been captured electronically. For some tests, this is the only laboratory in the province where the tests can be done, so the data are complete. These tests include neonatal screening, prenatal screening, chlamydia, pertussis, several viruses, DNA markers, and some hormones. The data are linkable with the other health databases and quality control checks are under way.

Medical Records

Hospital record abstraction has been used for a number of studies to collect additional information to complement or validate information derived from the administrative databases.17–21, 30–39, 44–51, 56–64, 69, 71, 79 Medical records in hospitals are accessible upon approval from individual district health boards and affiliated facilities. To date, all those approached have permitted use of their records. Personnel under contract with Saskatchewan Health access records for the purpose of abstraction. Positive identifiers are available to the abstractor but are removed before information leaves the facility. The final records are either unidentified or coded with a pseudoidentifier. Record retrieval rates have been excellent and typically exceed 95%.

Primary health records held by physicians have been accessed for research, but experience is limited. The process has been varied and has included both Saskatchewan Health abstractors visiting physician clinics and physician self-reporting. To date, physician participation and record retrieval rates have not approached the levels achieved with institution held records. As an example, in one recent study on antidepressant use, 58% of physicians approached agreed to participate; among participating physicians, approximately 88% of the required charts were available.79 Lower rates of availability reflect the more dynamic nature of individual physician practice.
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STRENGTHS

SUBJECT IDENTIFICATION
One of the greatest advantages of Saskatchewan’s health databases is the use of the unique HSN to identify individuals. This number is used to code all health care services and hence can be used to link data from any of the computerized databases electronically.

POPULATION BASED DATA
Saskatchewan is a geopolitical entity composed of over 1 million people; over 2.2 million individuals have been covered in the registry over its tenure. The registry is updated regularly; therefore, it is very useful for providing current, valid denominator data.

ELECTRONICALLY LINKABLE DATA
Data housed within Saskatchewan Health are electronically linkable. This means that information can be compiled across the databases and over time. It also means that data can be merged and sorted on the basis of age, sex, geographic location, diagnosis, and a variety of other parameters.

CROSS-SECTIONAL AND LONGITUDINAL STUDIES
It is possible to carry out both cross-sectional and longitudinal outcome studies by linking data from two or more databases. Given the long tenure of the databases, it is possible to compile information about prior drug use and previous disease experience for study populations.

OUTPATIENT PRESCRIPTION DRUG DATA
The Saskatchewan Formulary is extensive and lists over 2800 drug products (as of 1998). The database captures the majority of prescription drug use in the province.

DIAGNOSTIC CODING WITH THE INTERNATIONAL CLASSIFICATION OF DISEASES
Both the hospital separation and the physician services data use the ICD-9 coding system for diagnoses. The hospital data include up to three discharge diagnoses coded at the four-digit level. The physician services data include one three-digit code per visit. The advantage of using the standard international coding system is that other agencies and other researchers can compare information from Saskatchewan with that from other jurisdictions. Adoption of the ICD-10 coding is currently planned for 1 April, 2001.

MEDICAL RECORD ACCESSIBILITY
Medical records in hospitals are accessible upon approval from individual district health boards and affiliated facilities. Cooperation by individual health districts and affiliated facilities to allow access to records has been excellent. Availability of records in the institutions has ranged from 95 to 100%, depending on the age of the record.

Physician records may also be accessed for specific studies. Access to physician records and the availability of information from them, however, are more variable than from hospital records.

DATA VERIFIED AND VALIDATED
For pharmacoepidemiology studies, it is important that data validity and reliability be evaluated. Data integrity is the responsibility of the respective administrative programs within Saskatchewan Health. The various claims processing systems have built in audit and eligibility checks.

For research purposes, further validation is necessary. The process of linking the various databases for a specific study provides a validation or reliability check for certain variables. For example, using data pooled from several studies, there was 96% agreement between the death flag on the registry and the death indicator on the hospital file. Validation, mostly by hospital chart review, has been built into a number of studies using
Saskatchewan data. A wide range of conditions has been validated in this way, including rheumatoid arthritis,36,37 hip fractures,18,19,21,44 gastrointestinal bleeding,17,60,62,69 asthma-related conditions,30,31,38,39,45–48,56–59 puerperal seizures,20 liver injury,33,34 and acute renal failure.63 The validity of the diagnostic data is generally very good, but is dependent upon the ability of a diagnostic code to properly represent the condition in question and therefore varies with the condition. For example, for hip fracture diagnoses the sensitivity was over 99%,18 whereas for gastrointestinal bleeding and/or perforation it was 77%17 based on the particular case definition used in the study. Therefore, validity should be quantified for each condition studied.

Rawson conducted a comprehensive validation study on several diagnoses and procedures in the database. The agreement between hospital data and clinical charts was excellent for hysterectomy,50,61 ischemic heart disease,51 chronic obstructive pulmonary disease,51 and cholecystectomy.50 When the researcher compared psychiatric diagnoses from several data sources, he found good agreement for schizophrenia but less so for depressive disorders.64

Physician records have been used on a limited basis for validation. One study attempted to assess the usefulness of the databases for research on depression and its treatment.79 For a cohort of antidepressant users, the three-digit ICD-9 diagnoses on the physician services database were compared to physicians’ records. The agreement, sensitivity and specificity were good (77, 71, and 85% respectively).

WEAKNESSES

The health databases have been constructed by the Saskatchewan government primarily for program management purposes. Research, therefore, is a secondary use, and the databases may not be well suited to some types of study. As well, being administrative in nature, changes in policy and/or program features may influence the data collected. The gap in the drug database from July 1987 to December 1988 is an example of how a program change affected the completeness of the data collected.

The current population of Saskatchewan is relatively small for the evaluation of rare risks. To some extent, this limitation is mitigated by the fact that over 20 years of drug exposure data and almost 30 years of outcome/diagnostic data are available. Nevertheless, the databases still may be too small to evaluate low prevalence exposures or low incidence outcomes.

There are some limitations regarding exposure data. The Drug Plan operates on a formulary system. While the Saskatchewan Formulary is extensive (over 2800 drug products in 1998), the drug must be listed in the formulary or covered under a special program in order for records of its use to be included in the drug database. Consequently, it is not always possible to study exposure to prescription drugs as soon as they are available on the Canadian market. As well, there is no centralized computer database on inpatient drug use, over-the-counter drug use, or use of alternative therapies.

Diagnostic information is derived primarily from hospital separation or physician billing data. If the outcome does not result in any medical attention, it cannot be identified. As well, if the outcome does not result in hospitalization, the diagnostic information is weaker because it is based on physician billing data, which have less complete and less specific diagnostic coding. The lack of a complete, centralized laboratory information database limits the ability to detect outcomes that must be identified and/or confirmed by specific test results.

In any epidemiological analyses, information on confounding is important. The databases do not contain information on some potentially important confounding variables (e.g., smoking, alcohol use, occupation, and family history). Study designs must consider alternative methods of obtaining the necessary information on confounding factors (e.g., use of medical record abstraction or patient interviews).

Some of these limitations may be offset by the ability to access individual patient records to obtain information not included in the computer databases. This is a manual process, however, and is therefore more time consuming and expensive.
PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

Researchers interested in using the data may submit proposals to Saskatchewan Health. Policies and procedures are in place that enable the data to be used for research while maintaining beneficiary and provider confidentiality and database integrity. Researchers using the data have included those from academia, other governments, the pharmaceutical industry, other private companies, and practitioners.

The prime consideration for use of the databases is confidentiality of both recipients and providers of services. Identifiable information including, for example, the identity of the patient, physician, pharmacy, or hospital will not be released. As well, Saskatchewan Health will not allow source files, even if pseudo-identified, to be released; only aggregated information or limited fields of information at a person level may be released. Any data release must be consistent with the terms and conditions of Saskatchewan’s Freedom of Information and Protection of Privacy Act. Further, information collected directly from study subjects will not be linked with the administrative data without the explicit consent of the study subjects.

The Research Services Unit of the Population Health Branch has responsibility for conducting and/or facilitating pharmacoepidemiology and other outcomes research, and is the point of contact for investigators who are interested in using the data for research. Personnel in the Unit have combined expertise in project management, research methodology, and analyses as well as extensive experience in using the large computerized databases for pharmacoepidemiology and epidemiology research.

The Saskatchewan databases have been used for a variety of studies.9–81 To illustrate the types of pharmacoepidemiology study that have been conducted, synopses of several projects are outlined below.

EXAMPLES OF USES

Studies of New Chemical Entities

Stang et al. conducted a study to determine the incidence of lactic acidosis in metformin users.71 This project was done in collaboration with the United States Food and Drug Administration (FDA) under a Cooperative Agreement.

Metformin, a biguanide oral antihyperglycemic agent, was a recent new chemical entity in the United States, but had been on the market in Canada since 1972 and listed in the Saskatchewan Formulary since 1981. The study design was historical cohort. Subject selection, based on information in the outpatient prescription drug database, identified 11 797 beneficiaries who received one or more prescriptions for metformin, for 22 296 person years of exposure. Within this cohort, ten cases were identified as having hospitalization with a primary, secondary, or other discharge diagnosis of acidosis (ICD-9: 276.2) within 120 days following the dispensing of a metformin prescription. Since the code 276.2 is not specific for lactic acidosis, but also includes metabolic, respiratory, and acidosis not otherwise specified, primary records for all cases were abstracted. An incidence rate of nine cases per 100 000 person years (95% confidence interval (0, 21)) was calculated based on the person years of exposure and two cases of lactic acidosis with substantiating lactate levels. One case had a possible spurious laboratory value which, if discounted, resulted in an incidence of 4.5 cases per 100 000 person years (95% confidence interval (0, 13)).

This was the first known population based longitudinal (16 years) postmarketing study with complete ascertainment of patients dispensed metformin and hospitalizations associated with lactic acidosis. Because the rate of lactic acidosis in metformin users is low, this study had the advantage of having enough accumulated person time of metformin exposure for detection of cases.

Studies of Drug Exposure and Health Outcomes

1. A study of the use of statin cholesterol lowering drugs and the risk of cancer is being conducted by Beck et al.73, 76 The objectives of this study are to determine whether the use of any or all of the statins is associated with an increase in the overall risk of developing cancer or the risk of
developing certain types of cancer, in particular breast or gastrointestinal cancer.

A feasibility study was conducted to determine whether there were enough users of statins exposed to these drugs for a sufficiently long period to be able to detect an association between their use and the incidence of cancer. Based on the findings of the feasibility study, work on a historical cohort study is proceeding. Four study groups, defined based on their exposure or lack of exposure to certain lipid lowering drugs, are being identified for follow-up. The exposed cohort consists of those individuals identified as having received one or more prescriptions for statins during the period January 1989 to June 1997. For the breast cancer analyses, 13 592 female statin users were identified, with a total of 20 953 person years of exposure. The nonexposed comparison group was selected from the population of eligible beneficiaries who did not have any prescriptions for lipid lowering drugs during the study period. The remaining two comparison groups were selected based on their exposure to other commonly used lipid lowering drugs (cholestryramine or gemfibrozil). Use of these comparison groups will help to control for the presence of potentially confounding variables that may be associated with the use of lipid-lowering drugs (e.g., obesity).

2. A research project was undertaken by Pérez Gutthann et al. to look at the association between concurrent use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) and several serious outcomes in the Saskatchewan population during the period 1982 to 1986. One of the outcomes of interest was acute renal failure.63

The study population consisted of 228 392 patients who had received a prescription for a specific NSAID at any time from January 1982 to December 1986. Each study member was followed until admission to hospital for a renal disorder, death, emigration from Saskatchewan, or the end of the study period. Potential cases were initially identified from hospital separation data. As well, information was abstracted from hospital records by trained abstractors to validate cases and to obtain other clinical information not available in the computerized databases. Controls were selected from the 228 392 members of the study population according to certain criteria. Person time of NSAID exposure was calculated and aggregated across calendar periods, sex, and five-year age strata for each of the NSAIDs into four main exposure categories (current users, recent users, past users, and nonusers). The researchers concluded that idiopathic acute renal failure is a rare occurrence among persons not using NSAIDs (about two cases per 100 000 person years), but that there was a fourfold increase in risk associated with NSAID use which was dose dependent and occurred especially during the first month of therapy.

The data compiled for this research project have also been used to study several outcomes related to gastrointestinal and liver effects.62,69

Chronic Disease Surveillance and Burden Of Illness Studies

The Saskatchewan databases are being used to study diabetes in the province.72,75,77 All Saskatchewan Health beneficiaries who had one or more outpatient prescriptions for insulin or an oral hypoglycemic agent, two or more physician visits with a diagnosis of diabetes within a two year period, and/or one or more hospitalization for diabetes during the period January 1991 to December 1996 were identified. Annual incidence and prevalence rates were calculated.

A total of 45 716 individuals were identified as being diabetic in Saskatchewan during the study period. Of these, 52.1% were male and 86.8% were 40 years of age or older. The overall prevalence in 1996 was 3.7% (38 124 diabetics). Analyses are ongoing and will include descriptions of comorbidities and investigation of drug outcomes among the diabetic cohort. The dataset will be updated regularly to enable ongoing measurement of trends in diabetes in Saskatchewan. The general methodology will be applied to other chronic diseases for broader surveillance activities.
Adverse Drug Reaction Surveillance

A demonstration project using Saskatchewan’s health databases was conducted to assess the feasibility of using administrative healthcare databases for adverse drug reaction (ADR) alerting.41 The drug database was used to identify the first 20,000 patients prescribed a new drug for the first time. These patients were then followed for a year after their initial prescription to identify all medical “events” experienced while on the medication. In this study, an “event” was defined as any diagnosis or medical service recorded in the physician services or inpatient hospital databases as well as any prescription recorded in the outpatient drug data. Two of the drugs selected for this project were nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: piroxicam and sulindac. The drugs were selected because their adverse effect profiles were reasonably well known and each drug had been covered by the Saskatchewan Drug Plan for an appropriate time period. Analyses examined age, sex, patterns of treatment continuation, and diagnostic “event” rates.

The investigator concluded that an acute ADR alerting system based on administrative data files like those in Saskatchewan is feasible and practical for the systematic evaluation of significant acute adverse effects of drugs. The cost of using such a system is relatively inexpensive and there are no followup problems.

Studies of Drug Use In Pregnancy

A study was carried out as a rapid response to a report from France of a highly significant association between maternal use of valproate during pregnancy and spina bifida in the offspring.12 The purpose was to determine whether epileptic women were being prescribed valproate during pregnancy and, if so, whether use of the drug was associated with the occurrence of spina bifida or other malformations.

Initially the outpatient drug file was scanned for valproate prescriptions in 1980–81 for women aged 16–40. This identified 95 women. The drug records of the 95 valproate users were then linked to their hospitalization files via their unique identification number for the period January 1980 to June 1982, and women who had a pregnancy related admission were identified. During the study period of interest, the Vital Statistics file did not use the unique identification number, so the file was searched by name for that period to validate the births found in the hospital file and also to identify stillbirths among the 95 women. Both sources found eight births among the valproate users, and no stillbirths. Finally, the outpatient drug histories were reviewed for the eight women to look more closely at the timing of the valproate prescriptions relative to the pregnancy.

In this study, the exposed population was too small to provide sufficient statistical power to detect an association. The project did, however, demonstrate the potential of using the Saskatchewan databases to study certain effects of drugs used during pregnancy. In addition, complete review of the records was finished within eight days of the initial decision to conduct the study, illustrating the value of relatively current and linkable health databases.

Economic Studies

1. Albright et al. used the Saskatchewan databases to assess the change in health care resource utilization and costs related to the initiation of risperidone therapy in patients with chronic schizophrenia.65 The project was a retrospective cohort study that linked registry, prescription drug, hospital separation, physician services, and mental health services data. Study participants included all those patients who received at least one prescription for risperidone between July 1993 and December 1993. Utilization information from the databases was collected for equivalent periods (an average of 10 months) before and after initiation of risperidone therapy. The results demonstrated that treatment with risperidone produced substantial reductions in the utilization of health care services which translated to cost savings across hospital, physician, and mental health services.
The incremental cost of risperidone therapy was offset almost eightfold by these savings.

2. The Saskatchewan databases were used to examine information on care received and cost of that care as one component of a study of the cost-effectiveness of home care as a substitute for hospital care.\textsuperscript{85}

During the 1990s, hospital stays have become shorter and home care after hospital stays more common in Saskatchewan. The study was designed to provide health care providers and decision makers with information on whether this shift has affected patient health and whether it truly saves money. The results showed that about half of all adult medical and surgical patients could be discharged from hospital an average of two days sooner and that these patients could be provided with alternate care, mostly home care, to achieve the same health outcomes at less cost. The study also found that, while outcomes were the same, it costs more overall ($830 CAN 1998) to provide a patient with nonacute care in hospital than to discharge them home with alternate followup care.

Drug and Other Health Service Utilization Studies

1. The use of cholesterol testing and drug treatment for lowering blood cholesterol have grown rapidly in the past decade. As part of a project to develop guidelines on cholesterol testing and treatment, the Saskatchewan Health Services Utilization and Research Commission (HSURC) examined adherence to cholesterol lowering agents in Saskatchewan using drug data from 1991 to 1993.\textsuperscript{55} Analyses focused on 11,002 subjects defined as new users of lipid lowering drugs during the study period.

The researchers found that the proportion of new users stopping medication after filling only one prescription ranged from 30 to 38%. The estimated median time on medication for these new users was 111 days, and the proportion of new users remaining on medication at one year was 25%. Drug type was the single strongest predictor of time on drug therapy with the pattern of adherence paralleling known drug side effects. For example, new users of niacin and cholestyramine were most likely to stop their medication, while those dispensed a statin were most likely to continue. The researchers concluded adherence to lipid lowering drug therapy in the Saskatchewan population was poor. After this study, the HSURC also examined more closely the factors that contribute to nonadherence.\textsuperscript{86}

2. Habbick \textit{et al.} conducted a descriptive pharmacoepidemiology study. The prescription drug database was used to examine recent trends in use of inhaled $\beta_2$-adrenergic agonists and inhaled corticosteroids and to determine whether these trends were in keeping with widely publicized guidelines recommending a reduction in the use of agents to treat symptoms (i.e., inhaled $\beta_2$-adrenergic agonists) and increased use of prophylactic agents (i.e., inhaled corticosteroids).\textsuperscript{52}

All Saskatchewan residents 5 to 54 years of age who had received one or more prescriptions for a drug used to treat asthma (inhaled drugs and oral $\beta_2$-adrenergic agonists and methylxanthines) from 1989 to 1993 were included. There was a steady increase in the proportion of the population receiving prescriptions for drugs to treat asthma over the five-year period. There was also a marked change in the patterns of prescriptions for drugs used to treat asthma with a shift toward the use of inhaled corticosteroids. In contrast, the proportion of patients who received $\beta_2$-adrenergic agonists remained fairly constant. The authors concluded that the trends suggest many physicians adopted current guidelines advocating increased attention to prevention of airway inflammation in the treatment of asthma.

Product Assurance Evaluations

The databases have been used to provide information for “product assurance” agreements with the Saskatchewan Drug Plan.\textsuperscript{57}

When a new drug is introduced to the Canadian market, the manufacturer may submit a request to the Saskatchewan Drug Plan for the drug to be
considered for coverage. Part of the documentation submitted includes information on the manufacturer’s expectations regarding utilization and health outcomes if the particular drug is listed in the formulary. If the Drug Plan’s expert advisory committees recommend formulary listing for the drug, the Drug Plan may enter into a product assurance agreement with the manufacturer to evaluate whether the actual use of the particular drug after it is listed in the formulary is consistent with the prelisting information provided by the manufacturer. Depending on the differences between actual and expected use, an intervention may occur and a financial adjustment may be made against the manufacturer. The data (either drug data alone or in combination with other health services data) have been used to provide the information on the actual utilization and outcomes in Saskatchewan for such agreements.

THE FUTURE

One of the principles guiding future initiatives in the province’s health system is the coordination and integration of health services for a more responsive, efficient, client-centred system. One of the objectives integral to this principle is the effective use and development of information, technology, planning, and reporting management systems.

Saskatchewan Health is developing new reporting systems to collect and provide data electronically to improve the accuracy, comprehensiveness, and timeliness of health information. For example, one information system under development will support the provincial immunization program. This system is expected to be functioning province-wide by April 1999. When fully implemented, it will operate through the Internet, and data will be collected from all public health offices in the province with infants and pre-schoolers being the priority. (A small proportion of vaccinations that are done in physicians’ offices will not be included.) This database will be linkable with the other health databases and will enhance surveillance and other risk/benefit assessments.

As well, the Saskatchewan Health Information Network (SHIN) is being designed to build on Saskatchewan’s existing fiber optic network and advances in information technology to establish computer connections between health service sites across the province. Through the information network, health service providers would be able to access the data when authorized, examine records and tests, and consult with clients and colleagues. The SHIN is still in early design stages, but the information technology developed will be valuable as it develops the information access using this technology: it will be valuable not only for direct patient care but also for population-based studies including research, using de-identified data, into the effectiveness of treatments and interventions.

Collection of appropriate information and preservation of confidentiality of personal health information will continue to be of paramount importance. In 1997 and 1998, Saskatchewan Health held extensive consultations within the province on the protection of personal health information. As a result of those consultations and in order to put a legal framework around good information practices, The Health Information Protection Act was passed in the legislature in the spring of 1999 with proclamation anticipated in 2000. This act will establish a common set of rules for everyone in the health system. It will emphasize protection of privacy of personal health information while ensuring that, with proper precautions, information is available to provide efficient health services. Research under specific conditions will continue to be a permitted use of health service information.

The value of the Saskatchewan health databases as a resource for pharmacoepidemiology research has been demonstrated. As enhancements of the databases continue and as the information is used in a responsible manner, the databases will continue to contribute to providing valuable information on public health issues related to drug use.
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INTRODUCTION
Pharmacoepidemiology is a relatively new discipline in The Netherlands but, as in other countries, it has many antecedents, each with some decades of history. The traditions of academic medicine in The Netherlands are long and strong. Bedside teaching as a basic pedagogic device was pioneered by Herman Boerhaave in Leiden in the early 18th century, attracting students from as far as Japan. Around the turn of this century, van’t Hoff’s discovery of osmosis and Einthoven’s discovery and development of electrocardiography laid important scientific foundations for modern medicine; both were early Nobel Laureates. Clinical research developed in The Netherlands in parallel with other Western countries, with increasing use of randomized clinical trials after the Second World War.

In the latter 1980s, a number of Dutch clinical pharmacologists began shifting towards observational studies, bridging the gap between clinical pharmacology and epidemiology. Notable findings in this work have been, for example, the role of dietary potassium intake in prevention of cardiovascular disease,\(^1\) information about the risks of stroke in patients on antihypertensive treatment,\(^2\) and the adverse effects on the cardiovascular system of the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).\(^3\) The latter study has stimulated further pharmacoepidemiologic research with the PHARMO-system (more about this later) on the association between NSAID use and adverse cardiovascular effects. Heerdink \textit{et al.} found a twofold increased risk of hospitalization for CHF during periods of concomitant use of diuretics and NSAIDs compared with use of diuretics only.\(^4\)

As elsewhere, the long term consequences of oral contraceptive use became a focus of what we would today call pharmacoepidemiology research, with a series of studies investigating the preventive effect of oral contraceptives on the risk of rheumatoid arthritis,\(^5,6\) followed more recently...
by studies from the same group on mechanisms and magnitude of thrombogenic risk with so-called third generation oral contraceptives. The early oral contraceptive studies, together with those performed at Mayo Clinic, have contributed greatly to the awareness of methodologic problems of case–control studies.

Two notable antecedents of Dutch pharmacoepidemiology are pharm covigilance and drug utilization research. The Dutch pharmacovigilance system began in the 1960s, and has generated a succession of signals of suspected adverse effects, generating hypotheses and fostering pharmacoepidemiology studies to test them (see also Chapter 11). Drug utilization research dates back to the early 1970s under the WHO Drug Utilization Research Group, recently renamed EURO-DURG, strengthening methods for ascertaining drug exposure (see also Chapter 29). These two lines of research have been strongly reinforced by the essentially universal computerization of Dutch community pharmacies in the mid-1980s, which has played a key role in a cornerstone of Dutch pharmacoepidemiologic studies: the reliable ascertainment of drug exposure.

This focus on the reliable ascertainment of drug exposure anticipates the future integration of a strong pharmacodynamic perspective into the analysis of pharmacoepidemiology data, for the very basic reason that the actions of drugs depend on both dose and dose timing. Temporal sequence is basic to the inference of causality, as causes precede but do not follow effects. To exploit this principle in pharmacoepidemiology, requires reliable information on the time sequence of events in relation to initial and refill dispensing of drugs. When the record of events is scattered over multiple pharmacies, physicians, and hospitals, it becomes virtually impossible to give adequate descriptions of drug exposure, clinical correlates, and their temporal relations with drug exposure. Thus, in considering the importance of having reliable answers to the questions “which patients got which drugs, in what doses, and when?,” one cannot overemphasize the “s” in “drugs,” given that multiple drugs are the rule, not the exception, in much of pharmacotherapy.

Progress in pharmacoepidemiology in The Netherlands has, as elsewhere, been closely related to specific features of the systems for healthcare delivery and its reimbursement. The discipline could flourish in environments where there is good access to data on drug exposure, diagnoses, reasons for hospitalization, clinical status, and outcomes. Yet there is no Valhalla where all these sources of information freely come together, so the possibilities for pharmacoepidemiology research vary greatly from one country to another, and within countries, as the different chapters in this section of this book demonstrate. Indeed, differences in the organization and reimbursement of healthcare that are trivial from an administrative perspective can have major impacts on the possibilities for epidemiologic research—a point that epidemiologists have traditionally found difficult to communicate to administrators. It was only a decade ago that Ellwood underscored the value of administrative and reimbursement arrangements that facilitate the collection of data on the vast array of natural experiments that comprise routine healthcare for outcomes research. Building a bridge between (clinical) epidemiology and outcomes research based on such data from routine health care remains a major challenge. There are still ample opportunities for happenstance, serendipity, ingenuity, and individual initiative to allow individual researchers to glean useful information from reimbursement systems that had been designed to fit local customs and administrative convenience.

DESCRIPTION

DUTCH MEDICINE

Pharmacoepidemiology in The Netherlands is naturally imbedded in the principles of medicine as practiced in this country of approximately 15 million people. Demographically, The Netherlands is similar to the other Western countries—very low mortality rates until past age 60, with an increasing population of elderly, in which females outnumber males. The three main causes of death are, as in other technologically advanced
countries, coronary heart disease and other cardiovascular diseases, the various cancers, and accidents. *Per capita* expenditures on health care are in line with other western European countries, and about half of those in the United States. One searches in vain, however, for substantive differences in public health indices between The Netherlands and the United States.

The drug regulatory system in The Netherlands has been widely acknowledged as one of the most stringent in Europe, and plays an important role in European Regulatory Affairs within the framework the European Agency for the Evaluation of medicinal products (EMEA) in London. Governmental and reimbursement policies in The Netherlands show a certain reluctance towards new pharmaceutical products. Rising health care costs reinforce this policy. As a result, and because of the relatively small size of the country, the adoption of new drugs by Dutch prescribers leads only exceptionally to more than 8000 recipients of a new drug within its first year in the market. Thus, for most new drugs, The Netherlands is too small for the detection of very rare events.

Pharmaceutical prices in The Netherlands have long been among the highest in Europe, although recent regulatory action has forced industry to harmonize pricing according to European Union (EU) levels.

Dutch medicine is closely connected to British and North American medicine, contributing substantially to British and American medical journals, monographs, and textbooks. This fact is in keeping with the strongly international outlook that pervades many aspects of Dutch economic and social life. It is reflected in the national proficiency in English, German, and French languages, and is a natural consequence of the country’s need to compete successfully in international markets. There are no special conceptions of disease, as one finds, for example, in the Teutonic conception of hypotonia or the hepatocentricity of Gallic medicine. If there is any special feature to Dutch medicine, it is a much more liberal use of oral anticoagulants in clinical situations where the risk of intravascular thrombosis is elevated. All patients prescribed oral anticoagulants in The Netherlands have their anticoagulant dosing managed by a specially organized Thrombosis Service, which focuses exclusively on this difficult area of ambulatory pharmacotherapy. This specialization is believed to tip the risk–benefit balance much further in favor of benefit than in other countries where anticoagulation is in the hands of GPs, internists, or cardiologists. Moreover, this system has proved to provide an excellent source for tracing patients with bleeding disorders for epidemiologic research.

The Dutch system of medicine is based on primary care physician—general practitioners (GPs) called “house doctors” (*huisarts*)—who practice in the community but not in hospitals, referring ambulatory patients to specialists for out-of-patient care, as circumstances require. Hospital care, as in other continental countries, is provided by full time staff physicians who are specialists of various kinds. Medical care, including prescription drugs, is essentially fully paid for by public or private insurers. Hospitals are organized regionally, with well defined catchments. It is, in principle, possible to link data from the community and hospitals, though with strict attention to anonymization, as discussed later. Health care of essentially uniform quality is provided to all citizens. Neither Dutch medicine nor the Dutch pharmaceutical industry is much influenced by the tort system of medical malpractice and product liability that is so prominent in the United States, and increasing in the United Kingdom.

The public insurers are regional agencies collectively called *Ziekenfonds* (“Sickfunds”). They provide essentially complete insurance coverage for approximately two-thirds of the population who fall below a defined annual income level. Patients covered by Sickfunds are required to designate a general practitioner for primary care and a community pharmacy for all reimbursed prescription drugs. The remaining third of the population are covered by private insurers, usually organized through one’s employer. All insurers are nominally in competition with one another, but it is a muted form of competition that has, thus far, avoided serious poaching on each other’s actuarial bases.

Like other social democracies in Western Europe, the Dutch have tax policies that tend to
minimize disparities in income. These socio-economic factors have important corollaries for health care. It would, for example, be unthinkable for a Dutch physician to decline to treat Sickfunds-insured patients. Inevitably there will be reflections of differential affluence in health data from Sickfunds-insured and privately insured, but minimization of the socio-economic and health factors that would underlie such differences has been one of the main driving forces in Dutch political and social life throughout this century. However, what the future will bring remains uncertain. The interplay between demographic and socio-economic factors, technological change, and other forces in the health care market, may result in very different, but all plausible scenarios.

GENERAL PRACTICE SYSTEM

Computerization of general practices began in the late 1980s. Debate and confusion about taxonomy and software have impeded its development, as has the lack of any distinct economic incentive for physicians to abandon paper based records. This situation contrasts sharply with the almost complete computerization of community pharmacies during the 1980s, facilitated by distinct economic incentives, a well developed taxonomy for products, and major investment in the development and marketing of several competing systems of software.

As in the United Kingdom, various schemes of pharmaceutical promotion, thinly veiled as post-marketing surveillance studies, succeeded in placing microcomputers in the offices of many Dutch physicians. These schemes eventually attracted attention from news media and professional organizations, with controversy and a certain overreaction that has cast suspicion on all studies done with marketed products. Whatever the extent of “seeding” of new pharmaceuticals these schemes may have achieved, they certainly succeeded in “seeding” computers among physicians, but it is still not clear that these schemes have brought computers and computer skills to a critical mass of Dutch physicians. Meanwhile, each year’s new crop of medical graduates bring their computer skills into the profession. Another aspect of “seeding” types of promotional activity is discussed later.

Since the late 1970s, a number of research networks of “sentinels” in general practice have been established among primary care physicians, doing population based (pharmaco)epidemiology studies. For example, Hoes conducted a case–control study among hypertensive patients, demonstrating an association between the use of potassium wasting diuretics and an increased risk of sudden cardiac death, based on data collected through a network of GPs in Rotterdam. Pharmacy data were used to validate the drug exposure data provided by the GPs. No significant discrepancies between the two sets of data were found, which is noteworthy, in view of numerous examples of incomplete prescribing information from paper-based GP records.

Visser et al. looked at the association between the use of ACE inhibitors and cough in a network of the practices of 161 Dutch GPs, in which all consultations, morbidity, mortality, medical interventions, and prescriptions were registered (the NIVEL study). A case–control study in this population showed that female cases of cough were three times more likely to be exposed to ACE inhibitors than noncough controls. This association was not seen in men.

An interesting development is seen in the Integrated Primary Care Information (IPCI) system, which is a research oriented database with information from computerized patient records of GPs throughout The Netherlands. The system has been developed by the Department of Medical Informatics of the Erasmus University Medical School. The database included all demographic information, patient complaints, symptoms and diagnosis (ICPC), laboratory tests, discharge and consultant letters, and detailed prescription information (drug name, ATC code, dosing information, and indication). The system covers over 400 000 people, is population based, and provides a powerful tagging system enabling prospective followup of well defined target groups.
Dutch community pharmacies are typically three to four times larger than their counterparts in other Western European countries or North America, having 8000–14 000 patients per pharmacy. Dutch pharmacies essentially limit themselves to prescription drugs, and have none of the long shelves of consumer products that one finds in pharmacies in the United States, Canada, and the United Kingdom. Dutch pharmacies do carry over-the-counter products, but keep them behind the counter. In the past five years, the government has acted in various ways to restrict pharmacists’ incomes, but most Dutch community pharmacies continue to be economically strong. Computerization of pharmacy records, and thus the compilation of prescription drug histories, is almost universal. Sickfunds insured patients, as noted above, receive all their reimbursed prescription drugs from a designated community pharmacy. The remaining third of the population, with private insurance, have the option to use more than one pharmacy—a frequent occurrence in cities, but infrequent and usually identifiable among those who reside in villages, which often have only one pharmacy. Thus, there is ample opportunity to identify complete ambulatory prescription drug histories in these pharmacies’ computers, even among privately insured patients. In rural areas, an occasional dispensing physician is found, but their numbers are decreasing due to governmental policies.

Grouping patients as recipients of a particular pharmaceutical is thus possible by linking medication files, creating a pharmacy based cohort, as first defined by Borden at Upjohn in the 1970s. Borden’s method consisted of the identification and followup of patients whose treatment with a certain pharmaceutical is defined by pharmacy records showing that the product in question had been dispensed to them. After obtaining informed consent from the patient, he collected data on health outcomes by means of written questionnaires and telephone followup. Borden’s approach has now been widely adopted. For example, recipients of acitretine in The Netherlands were traced nationally through pharmacies and dispensing physicians, after it became known that the teratogen etretinate was a metabolite of acitretine. A written survey to all pharmacies and dispensing physicians was responded to by 87% of all dispensers, representing the same proportion of recipients of etretinate. Using this unique source of drug exposure information, several networks of so-called “sentinel” pharmacies have been developed for pharmacoepidemiology research. More on this will follow.

MEDICAL RECORD LINKAGE

There is widespread, deep seated resistance in The Netherlands to the use of a unique personal identification number. Identification for insurance purposes is done by an anonymized family number, with substring codes used to distinguish individuals within the family, to enable linkage of individual patients’ records.

To address the occasional need to ascertain specific information from an individual patient’s medical records, in several studies community pharmacists have acted as an intermediary between the epidemiology researcher and the responsible physician. Coded and sealed envelopes were used for the exchange of information, maintaining the patients’ anonymity but allowing correlation of drug exposure information with the corresponding patients’ medical data. In one of these studies, however, the response rate of the GPs was only 81%, which could be a substantial obstacle to certain study designs. Moreover, the procedure was time consuming and costly. The same sealed envelope scheme was used by Petri et al. to search for clinical signs of Parkinson’s disease in recipients of flunarizine.

In the early 1990s, a formal system of record linkage was developed, called PHARMO. Developed by Herings and Stricker, it links community pharmacy and hospital data, within established hospital catchment regions, on the basis of patients’ birth date, gender, and GP code, preserving anonymity. While there are certain probabilistic aspects of the linkage, the combination of
these three data items yields a sensitivity and specificity of over 95% each. The PHARMO system has been expanded to a population of over 500,000, is population based, links all prescription drug data to hospital data,\textsuperscript{4,33,34} and has been used to study a number of drug effects severe enough to require hospitalization. Presently, PHARMO is being linked also to primary care data, population surveys, cancer and accident registries, mortality data, and economic outcomes. In the absence of a unique patient identifier—which remains lacking in The Netherlands—the PHARMO system provides a powerful approach for conducting follow-up studies, case–control studies, and other analytical epidemiologic studies for evaluating drug induced effects. The data collection is longitudinal and goes back to 1987. The system has well defined denominator information, allowing incidence and prevalence estimates, and is relatively cheap because existing databases are used and linked. PHARMO figures in a number of applications discussed below.

**STRENGTHS**

The most important advantage of the Dutch system lies in its complete coverage of a relatively homogeneous population of reasonable size. We believe that the quality of data on drug exposure in The Netherlands is second to none, because of three factors: (i) computerized dispensing records are subject to financial audit because they are the basis for reimbursement; (ii) a long tradition that patients frequent a single GP and pharmacy; and (iii) the lack of economic incentive for between pharmacy shopping. Data on drug exposure can be linked to various outcomes and to data on possible confounders or effect modifiers. With respect to the latter, the strong increase in possibilities of linking genetic information to studies evaluating drug exposure–outcome associations is an important development.\textsuperscript{3,35}

A second major advantage are the strong liaisons between patients, physicians, and pharmacists, facilitating the gathering of crucial followup information. One expression of these liaisons is a regional adverse drug reactions reporting scheme, called LAREB (Landelijke Regionale Evaluatie Bijwerkingen), based on liaison between pharmacists and physicians.\textsuperscript{36} LAREB plays a key role in pharmacovigilance, in close collaboration with the national regulatory agencies. The system provides prompt feedback to reporting physicians, aiming thereby to increase the interest in, and incentive for, ADR reporting. A rather more indirect approach is represented by a national scheme for collaboration between physicians and pharmacists, called Pharmacotherapy Discussion Groups.\textsuperscript{37} These are monthly meetings between a pharmacist and his/her main prescribers—rarely more than ten physicians—to discuss a pertinent topic in pharmacotherapeutics. A national foundation provides programmatic teaching materials for these small group meetings, on the premise that the meetings improve the general level of understanding of prescription drugs, reinforce rational prescribing, and motivate the recognition and reporting of adverse drug reactions.

**WEAKNESSES**

The Dutch system is not immune from problems, such as unreliable or outdated information in the patient file undermining the quality of pharmacy records. Patient files in pharmacies are maintained mostly by hand, on the basis of information provided by patients, relatives of patients, or local administrative sources. This eclectic sourcing of information limits the value of demographic information contained in pharmacy computers. The occurrence of missing data on gender or birth date, and probably fictitious birthdates, e.g., the frequently encountered 01–01–01 or 11–11–11, exemplify the concern. Today, a number of pharmacy computer systems include logical checking procedures in order to minimize the entry of false data in patient files.

There is a growing need for quality assessment of data for epidemiology research that are derived from medical information systems. As in many countries, the patient’s medical record, being in the past a personal registry compiled by the individual health professional, has become a target for numerous interest groups, e.g., insurance compa-
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PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

THE DIMENSION OF TIME IN DRUG EXPOSURE

The ascertainment of drug exposure is determined by various factors. Time is a crucial variable that has the power to reject hypotheses about causality, e.g., when the putative adverse reaction precedes the first record of dispensing of the suspected drug. Thus, in assessing causal relationships between drug use and suspected events, it is essential to verify the temporal sequence of events in relation to exposure to the drug. This very basic point is not an easy one to apply, because of the prevalence of timing errors in casual reporting: an ostensibly minor error in data entry can transpose the onset of drug exposure, or the onset of disease, negating or supporting a hypothesis about causality.38-40

A time oriented database consists essentially of three distinct types of variable: headers, point events, and interval events. Interest focuses not only on the interval between the beginning and end of drug exposure, termed the “risk window,” but on periods prior to, and after, the risk window, for these provide information on events in the patient’s life at times proximate to, but outside, the risk window. When the date of the first dispensing of drug is known, one can calculate, from the amount dispensed and the prescribed daily dose, the expected, or “legend,” period of treatment. Thus, Dutch pharmacy records provide a sound basis for estimating the duration of drug exposure.41

There are practical problems, however. The onset of drug exposure is putatively defined by the date of drug dispensing to the patient, but is subject to uncertainties about when the patient actually began taking the medicine, which is not necessarily coincident with the dispensing date. Greater uncertainty attends definition of the cessation of exposure. When there have been one or more refills of the same prescription, one can examine the intervals between refills for evidence of delay due to omitted doses, which is the most common form of noncompliance with prescribed drug regimens.42 When the last refill has been dispensed, one faces the question of defining when

...ties, regulators, consumer organizations, lawyers involved in liability actions, and epidemiologists. There is thus a need for careful monitoring of the quality of medical registries, including the process of data recording, its completeness, and its validity. For reasons already discussed, pharmacy dispensing data are of generally high quality. However, proper evaluation of the quality and validity of data is always needed.38-40

Probably the biggest potential risks to the future of the Dutch pharmacy database are the consequences of politically motivated tinkering with a health care system that has worked very effectively and, relative to other countries, economically. Yet there is a strong sense that health care costs must be reduced, which has led to a series of recent changes that, from the perspective of the situations in health care in other countries, suggest failure to heed the warning “if it ain’t broke, don’t fix it.” In a certain sense, we suffer the consequences of having a system of health care that evolved before extensive, effective interventions were possible. Effective interventions are the dividends of the large investment in biomedical research that all advanced nations have made since the end of the Second World War. So, interventions that “work” have grown in number, complexity, and cost, with steeply accelerating growth during the past few decades, but they have arrived piecemeal, changing the face of medicine in the fashion of a complex picture puzzle only gradually coming together, unguided by a view of the completed picture. The political and economic reactions have been similarly piecemeal, naturally lagging behind the technological changes, as the political and economic reactions develop in response to, never in anticipation of, accumulating problems created by growing costs, ethical dilemmas, and—the ultimate dividend—demographic changes.

There is also pressure to stimulate competition among pharmacies by freeing Sickfunds patients from the obligation to designate a single pharmacy. Yet Dutch patients have no economic incentive to use one pharmacy over another. Thus, personal service is the main basis for competition among pharmacies. It remains to be seen whether provision of “pharmaceutical care,” as currently conceptualized, will develop into a competitive force.
the last dose is likely to have been taken, and how long the effects of treatment may linger after the last dose was taken. An unfortunate lacuna in clinical pharmacology is its one-sided focus on studying, with great care and diligence, the temporal details of the onset of drug action, while almost totally ignoring the offset of drug action.\textsuperscript{45} Most clinical pharmacologists assume that the time course of decline in the concentrations of drug and/or active metabolites dictate the time course of cessation of drug action, but that assumption is contradicted by too many examples of drug actions long outlasting any detectable drug in plasma.\textsuperscript{45} Thus, the pharmacoepidemiologist who seeks to define the period of effective exposure is left having to make a number of assumptions. One that seems reasonable, pending experimental data, is to assume that the duration of drug action after the last dispensing is equal to 150\% of the legend duration of the last prescription.\textsuperscript{31} However, if intervals between prior refills are appreciably longer than the legend durations, then one should frame a hypothesis consistent with refill intervals about the prevailing degree of poor compliance and adjust the estimates of total duration correspondingly.

This approach was applied by Petri \textit{et al.} to assess a postulated association between the antimigraine/antivertigo drug, flunarizine, and mental depression.\textsuperscript{31} That study, which pioneered the use of computerized Dutch pharmacy records, identified 1284 ever recipients of flunarizine, 180 of whom (14\%) had, at one time or another during the study interval, been prescribed also an antidepressant. If, as postulated, flunarizine did trigger mental depression, one would have expected to see a flurry of antidepressant prescribing in the wake of flunarizine prescribing. Of course, in an ideal world, the appearance of signs of depression would lead physicians to terminate the prescription for flunarizine rather than add a prescription for an antidepressant, but the reality is that physicians are, on the whole, much more likely to start new prescriptions rather than to stop old ones, unless there is a very well characterized adverse effect of a previously prescribed drug. The data showed no clustering of antidepressant prescribing in the wake of flunarizine prescribing, but did show clear evidence for channeling of flunarizine into use by patients who were unusually likely to be prescribed antidepressants, prior to or long after their use of flunarizine.

Using a subsequent prescription to treat an adverse effect was also applied by Sturkenboom \textit{et al.}, who estimated the risk of vulvo-vaginal candidiasis among users of acitretin.\textsuperscript{46} Prescriptions of drugs for treatment of vulvo-vaginal candidiasis were used as proxy for the occurrence of vulvo-vaginal candidiasis (sensitivity of 87\%, specificity of 99\%, respectively). The study showed a threefold-increased risk of vulvo-vaginal candidiasis during acitretin exposure.

\textbf{DIMENSIONS OF DRUG EXPOSURE AND ITS CORRELATES}

Important dimensions in interpreting the correlates of drug exposure are the patient’s profile and health status. The profile includes age, gender, education, socio-economic status, and estimated compliance with prescribed pharmacotherapy. Health status is judged on the basis of information about disease severity and comorbidity—simple words that stand for considerable complexity. The difficulties in judging health status and prognosis are well illustrated by the analysis of Concato \textit{et al.} of a purported increase in long term mortality following transurethral versus open prostatectomy.\textsuperscript{37} An often overlooked factor whose importance cannot be overemphasized in judging health status is the patient’s prescription drug history within the past several years.

Use of the prescription drug history alone as an indicator of health status and prognosis remains an underexplored topic. On its face, several things are evident. First, the writing of a prescription represents a summary medical judgment that the prescribed agent’s indications are appropriate for the patient’s present situation, as perceived and interpreted by the prescribing physician. Those perceptions and interpretations may be irrational or otherwise wrong, which one cannot, of course, judge from the prescription—though a clear clash between the indications and contra-indications of concomitantly prescribed agents may signal irrational prescribing. More information can, of
course, be gained from the physician’s notes written around the same time, but at considerably greater cost. Whether the added information to be gleaned from physicians’ notes justifies the “gleaning costs” depends on the importance of the question at issue. A second consideration is that drugs differ widely in the specificity of their indications, so the clinical information implicit in a first prescription will depend on the drug, its indications, and the other agents with which it is co-prescribed.\textsuperscript{17,48} Whether or not a first prescription is refilled, and for how long, gives an indication of whether it has struck enough of a perceived balance of good and ill to warrant its continuation. A third point is that many physicians prescribe certain drugs as a way of “buying time,” to see after some days or weeks how a patient’s complaints either resolve or become more indicative of a specific medical problem.

Obviously, the prescription drug history is far from a complete medical record, but can nevertheless tell a great deal. Several examples will illustrate. The finding of rifampicin, isoniazid, and ethambutol in a prescription drug history surely indicates the physician’s conclusion that the patient has tuberculosis. The finding of a prescription drug history that, since 6 months ago, has included digoxin, captopril, furosemide, isosorbide dinitrate, sublingual nitroglycerin tablets, and procaainamide, indicates the sudden appearance of coronary heart disease. The use of the prescription drug history is becoming also a useful tool to estimate the incidence and prevalence of disease, as shown in the example of epilepsy.\textsuperscript{49}

CHANNELING

Comparisons are the sinew of observational epidemiologic studies, but they depend on comparing like with like. One source for misclassification occurs when drugs with more or less identical pharmacology and indications are assumed to be used by patients with more or less identical profiles and health status.\textsuperscript{17} Figure 21.1(A), however, shows a prototypical description of the distribution of several patient populations along the dimension of disease severity. Patients included in randomized clinical trials (RCTs) often are positioned at the right side of the figure in order to obtain enough impact versus placebo to show efficacy. In the example of Figure 21.1(A), usual recipients of drug A in everyday medical practice are positioned in the mild–moderate region. This shift in the severity of illness from the trials population to the general population of users probably reflects the change in pre-versus postmarketing uses of captopril, and is one of the reasons that the initially recommended dose was so much higher than that necessary for the vast majority of patients prescribed the drug in routine clinical practice.\textsuperscript{50}

Figure 21.1(B) shows rather an opposite picture of the RCT population, in the mild–moderate region of the population distribution of severity. This situation probably prevails in most RCTs, which exclude patients who have complex health problems associated with multiple diseases: the RCT population tends to be recruited from the low end of severity, in the interest of simplicity of analysis. Consequently, the profile and health status of patients prescribed drug B in routine practice may differ considerably from patients in the RCTs. Inman reported data supporting this situation in his PEM study of the osmotic pump formulation of indomethacin (Osmosin, Indosin) and other NSAIDs\textsuperscript{51} (see also Chapter 14). The new formulation of indomethacin had been promoted as a form of the drug less likely than the conventional capsule form to produce gastrointestinal side effects, thereby prompting many physicians to choose the osmotic pump formulation for patients with a history of gastrointestinal problems. One of us has termed this phenomenon “channeling.”\textsuperscript{52} It highlights one of the basic, often difficult-to-answer questions in pharmacoepidemiology: “did the drug bring the problems to the patient, or did the patient bring the problems to the drug?.”\textsuperscript{17} One way to judge this matter is to compare the frequencies with which recipients of ostensibly identical agents are coprescribed other agents that indicate more severe disease. Some examples will be used illustrate this point.

Channeling may explain the flow of adverse reaction reports from an NSAID that was formulated and promoted in a manner very similar to that of Osmosin.\textsuperscript{51,53} In January 1989, SmithKline Beecham introduced into the Dutch
market a controlled release formulation (Oscorel, Oruvail) of the established NSAID ketoprofen. The product was heavily promoted with claims of safety with respect to gastrointestinal toxicity. In the first year after introduction of this product, the national authorities received a surge of case reports of gastrointestinal bleeding and/or perforation in recipients of Oscorel. This observation led to a pharmacy based study in which 837 patients receiving first prescriptions for Oscorel were identified. The drug use histories of these patients over the period 1987–1988 were searched for prescribing of agents indicated for the treatment of peptic ulcer disease. It was found that 24.1% of Oscorel recipients had received anti-ulcer drugs, versus 15.7% in a reference population (RR = 1.54; 95% CI 1.36–1.74). This pattern of channeling of Oscorel toward patients with a history of gastrointestinal disease was recognized in time to help interpret the adverse reaction reports, and to prevent an incorrect conclusion, simply on the basis of adverse reaction reports, that the product was more prone than the conventional form of ketoprofen or other NSAIDs to cause gastrointestinal problems.

Another example where channeling has occurred is in the prescribing of the several inhalational β-2 agonists—salbutamol, terbutaline, and fenoterol. To evaluate the role of channeling in the controversy over the mortality risk attributed to fenoterol by Crane et al. in New Zealand, Petri et al. examined the extent to which fenoterol is channeled into use by high risk asthma patients, by studying the co-prescribing of β-2 agonists marketed in The Netherlands with systemic corticosteroids, as an indicator of asthma severity. Compared to patients prescribed inhalational salbutamol, approximately twice the proportion of patients prescribed inhalational fenoterol were concomitantly prescribed systemic steroids;
patients prescribed inhalational terbutaline were intermediate with respect to the prescribing of systemic steroids. These data indicate that, in The Netherlands, fenoterol was channeled into use in patients with severe asthma. These different usage patterns appear to relate to the sequence with which the products were introduced into the market, with the later entering products having been promoted mainly to specialists for patients with more severe disease. Of course, the existence of channeling of a particular product in one country does not necessarily imply that the same channeling occurred in other countries, with the potential for different dates of marketing, different alternative therapies available, different medical practice, and different marketing activities.

Since the first channeling studies, other examples of substantial channeling have been found. Egberts et al. observed that patients receiving newly introduced antidepressants during the first year after their respective introductions were not comparable to patients who were receiving longer available antidepressants of the tricyclic class.\(^5\) The recipients of the newly introduced agents tended to be patients who had failed to respond satisfactorily to older agents. Of course, failure to respond has a dual origin: pharmacologic nonresponse and clinically unrecognized noncompliance, so when the latter problem is the true reason for failed treatment, there is a high likelihood that the new treatment will similarly fail, unless the patient chooses that moment to commence proper dosing. It is important to recognize channeling, because it signifies that drugs that may be scarcely distinguishable on clinical pharmacological grounds nevertheless end up being used by patients with quite different health status.\(^5,52\) Careful analysis in attempting to adjust for differences in disease severity is needed to make unbiased comparisons among the groups of patients receiving one drug versus another.

UNDERSTANDING OF EXTRAORDINARY PROMOTIONAL MANEUVERS LEADING TO HYPERPRESCRIBING

Inman’s PEM studies revealed that a small minority of physicians tend to generate disproportionately large fractions of prescriptions for newly launched pharmaceuticals.\(^56\) We have also observed this phenomenon in The Netherlands. It can take on remarkable proportions, with a half dozen physicians accounting for a third or more of all prescriptions country wide, with one or two physicians writing prescriptions numbering in the hundreds, which must have meant that virtually every patient who visited the doctor was given a prescription for the new agent. In some instances, the same physicians hyperprescribed one new product after another. We reported these findings in a letter to The Lancet, commenting that, in contrast to Inman’s conclusions, the hyperprescribers had no distinguishing demographic or educational attributes.\(^57\) Fortuitously, our letter was published the day before headline news in The Sunday Times (London) reporting schemes by which some physicians received a substantial cash payment for each prescription for the new product. In following weeks, there ensued a series of such stories in the London papers involving several major pharmaceutical firms, each of which firmly denied the firm’s involvement, attributing the reported maneuvers to rogue sales representatives and reporting dismissal of those responsible.

The seeding phenomenon takes many forms, of which the foregoing is an extreme, and the liberal distribution of micro-computers was perhaps somewhat less egregious. However distasteful these maneuvers may be, they are an expression of the intense economic pressures on new pharmaceuticals, which have incurred increasingly larger development costs that must be not only repaid but also rewarded against current market standards for high risk investments, within the time period of the remaining life of applicable patents. Pharmacoepidemiologists, whatever their personal opinions about the ethical ramifications of these economic matters, are obliged to understand how these intense promotional efforts operate, for they are an integral part of the environment—just as, for example, microbiologists and parasitologists are not expected to “like” the various stratagems by which bacteria, viruses, and parasites infect or infest healthy humans, but it is their task to understand how these objects of their studies work. For this reason, we encourage students and researchers in pharmacoepidemiology...
to undertake self-directed, ad hoc study of current promotional programs.

THE FUTURE

While the small size of The Netherlands has certain inherent disadvantages, it has a number of advantages, too. It is, for example, possible to have personal contact with all the leading experts in a given field, which creates the possibility of extensive “learning” before starting with “confirming.”

Another feature that can facilitate pharmacoepidemiology research is the large number of villages in which a single pharmacy or five or six primary care physicians together constitute the core of pharmacotherapy in their area. This integration has recently gained official status in the Pharmacotherapy Discussion Groups, which, in their improvement of communication between pharmacists and physicians, have the potential to improve the quality of prescribing and the recognition and reporting of unexpected drug induced effects, beneficial as well as adverse.

The future will see more work on record linkage, to be sure, but also work to help define the contributions that the prescription drug history can make in the evaluation of health status, and the uses of objective, quantitative information on drug exposure and patient compliance to improve the quality of ambulatory health care.

With the introduction of new drug therapies in upcoming years, there will be a clear need for comparative risk/benefit evaluation after the drug has been used widely in daily practice. Risk/benefit comparisons of different drug therapies are subjects for observational epidemiologic studies, a logical next step after the conduct of randomized clinical trials designed to provide evidence for efficacy.19,29 However, there is increasing evidence that bad response to drug therapy is correlated with both patient factors (disease severity, co-morbidity, metabolism, genetics) and utilization factors (quality of diagnosis, inappropriate prescribing, concomitant use of other drugs, noncompliance and other patterns of interrupted drug usage).38,39

There is increasing evidence that the risk/benefit balance of different drug therapies are often subject to scientific debate because factors such as confounding by indication, channeling bias, and other types of misclassification may cause flaws in the interpretation of the results of such studies.32 Because of commercial interests being an important feature of today’s pharmaceutical marketplace, these questions need careful and independent scientific consideration. Identifying individual patient characteristics is considered an important strategy to improve like-with-like comparisons.48

An important lead for future research is “patient typing,” starting from the scope of epidemiology towards clinical, and molecular sciences as well. This approach requires the availability of extensive and longitudinal data on drug exposure, advanced medical record linkage systems, and an integrative knowledge base of pharmacoepidemiology, clinical epidemiology, and relevant fields in molecular epidemiology, e.g., genetics. There is increasing evidence that both the efficacy of drugs (e.g., cholesterol lowering agents) and their safety (e.g., Factor V Leiden and thrombotic risk) have their genetic correlates.7,35 These findings argue for innovative approaches to integrate research on drug exposure, patient characteristics of various types, and outcomes. Moreover, the impact of undertreatment is becoming increasingly visible and needs to be better understood.59 The cry for evidence based pharmacotherapy should go hand in hand with this type of research, in order to provide the scientific basis for sound clinical decision making. In the interest of patient needs and public health in general, there is a great challenge ahead of us, to search for better methods and concepts for comparative risk/benefit evaluation in drug therapy.
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INTRODUCTION

The Medicines Monitoring Unit (MEMO) is a university based organization that was set up to carry out studies to detect and quantify serious drug toxicity in the community, using record linkage techniques. MEMO has access to data generated within the United Kingdom National Health Service (NHS). This service is tax funded and free at the point of consumption. There are thus no socioeconomic eligibility distinctions and the level of health care given to an individual is based on need alone. Currently MEMO utilizes data from the Tayside region of Scotland, which is geographically compact and serves over 400,000 patients. It has a low rate of patient migration with, for example, only 5% of nearly 4000 cimetidine takers lost to follow-up in a five year period.1

Health care for the region is coordinated by the Tayside Health Board, which maintains a computerized record of all patients registered with general practitioners as well as data on inpatient hospital morbidity and mortality. These data are available to MEMO and form the backbone of the record linkage system.

The potential of the MEMO system for pharmacoepidemiology research was described in 1994.2 Since then, this potential has clearly been realized, as descriptions of completed and current research in this Chapter will show. Although MEMO was originally set up for pharmacoepidemiology research and this is still the main focus of its research activities, recent advances mean that studies in outcomes research, general epidemiology, and economics are also possible.
DESCRIPTION

PATIENT IDENTIFICATION

Every person who is registered with a general medical practitioner (GP) in Scotland is allocated a unique identifying number known as the Community Health Index number (CHI number). This is a ten-digit integer, the first six digits indicating the date of birth, the ninth digit indicating sex, and the tenth digit incorporating a check sum to ensure the validity of the number. For practical purposes, the entire Tayside population is registered with a GP and thus appears in the central computerized records held by the Health Board, the Community Health Master Patient Index. This file also contains GP and address details, and a log of deceased persons along with the date of death. The demographic breakdown of the Tayside population can therefore be readily obtained.

The CHI number is used as the patient identifier for all health care activity in Tayside, be this primary care or hospital inpatient care. The number can be found by combining the name with the date of birth and performing a computer search. This unique number allows efficient linkage of records of patient activity and outcome, and once it is allocated it never changes.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG DATA

In Scotland, all community prescribing is performed by GPs, sometimes on the advice of hospital physicians. Only hospital inpatients receive drugs by a different mechanism. MEMO has devised a method of capturing GP prescribing. When a patient receives a prescription from his doctor, he takes it to any of the community pharmacies where the prescription is dispensed. The pharmacist then sends the original prescription form to the Pharmacy Practice Division of the Common Services Agency (PPD) in Edinburgh to obtain reimbursement (Figure 22.1).

After paying the pharmacists and dealing with any appeals, the PPD sends the cashed prescription forms to MEMO, where they are stored on a database linked to the CHI number. The following system has been developed to perform this task.

![Record linkage](image)

Figure 22.1. An outline of the data flow in record linkage drug safety studies.

ASCRIBING THE CHI NUMBER TO PRESCRIPTIONS

All prescriptions contain the patient’s name and address (sometimes handwritten and barely legible), but not the date of birth. In addition, the prescription lists the prescribed drug name (generic or proprietary), the dispensed drug (generic or proprietary), the drug dose, the total number of doses, the dosing instructions, and the GP code number. In order to handle this information efficiently, a custom-made, interactive, menu-driven computer system has been developed. Using this system, it is possible to determine the CHI number from the patient details on the prescription, even if only some of these details are readable. The program regards each part of the name and address as a potentially unique patient-identifying symbol. The entire Health Board Master Patient Index is indexed by these symbols. For any patient, one or more of these symbols is all that is required for identification. Thus, if a patient lives at 269 Perth Road, and is called MacDonald, simply entering “MacDonald” and “269” is usually sufficient for identification. Alternatively, typing in “269” and “Perth” lists all those occupants of addresses in Tayside which contain the terms 269 and Perth. A unique GP code appears at the bottom of each prescription.
form and is also a useful symbol. Each person is registered with a GP and so should appear on that GP’s list only. To cope with patients seeing other GPs in the same practice, the computer checks that the GP code on the prescription belongs to a GP in the practice.

This system ascribes in excess of 98% of CHI numbers to prescriptions on the first pass. The remaining 2% consist of persons who have recently changed address within Tayside or moved into Tayside from outside, and those visitors that are not registered with GPs. The Community Health Master Patient Index is continually updated by the Health Board, but nevertheless the copy held in MEMO is always a little out of date. Consequently, data on those patients not identified on the first pass are entered manually and reconciled when the CHI number update data are available.

PREScriBER DATA

The code number of the GP with whom the patient is registered is known and the code number of the GP issuing the script is held with each prescription record. Repeat prescriptions may be written by GP partners in rotation. This method of data collection allows the identification of the prescriber who initiated a course of treatment.

DRUG DATA

The date the prescription was written is recorded and then the individual drug code is entered using the PPD’s own coding system. This has some limitations in that it is simply a list of all products currently reimbursed. Generic and proprietary names are not linked and neither are pack sizes. Furthermore, because it is simply a drug list, constituent parts of products (for example triamterene, which forms the potassium sparing element of many diuretic combinations) cannot be automatically linked and this process has to be carried out manually. However, there are several more sophisticated drug dictionaries now available and it is likely that one may be adopted by MEMO in the future.

The data clerk entering prescribing data selects the drug preparation from a menu of all available products. This is important as it avoids miscoding of preparations and spelling errors. Where a drug is prescribed generically but dispensed in proprietary form (e.g., sudenaphil is only available as Viagra) this is recorded. The total amount of drug dispensed is also entered together with the dosing instructions, thus allowing the duration of any prescription to be calculated (Table 22.1). To ensure accuracy, regular quality control checks are carried out by dual entry of a proportion of prescription items.

MEMO currently employs clerks to enter these data and, although their collection is relatively labor intensive and expensive, in its favor is that it is under the direct control of MEMO and that the data are held in a format suitable for the needs of record linkage. Since January 1993, data on all drugs dispensed in Tayside have been collected, although prior to this data were collected on specific drugs only (notably non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, ulcer healing drugs and hormone replacement therapy). MEMO now has records of over 15 million prescriptions dispensed in Tayside between 1989 and 1996.

HOSPITAL DATA

Since 1961, all hospitals in Scotland have been required to compile and return coded information on all acute inpatient admissions, forming the basis of the Scottish Morbidity Record 1 (SMR1), which contains administrative, demographic, and diagnostic information. In Tayside this is coded by medical clerks before being entered onto computer and subjected to quality control. The data are then
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sent to the Information and Statistics Division (ISD) of the Common Services Agency of the National Health Service. Each SMR1 record has one principal and five other diagnostic fields coded according to the International Classification of Diseases ninth revision (ICD9).3 There is also one main operation or procedure field and three others coded according to the Office of Population and Census Surveys fourth revision (OPCS4) classification.4 In 1996, the NHS introduced the tenth revision of the ICD codes,5 and there is still debate as to whether Read codes will be introduced.6 In Tayside there are approximately 63 000 hospital discharges per year. MEMO has in-house historical SMR1 data going back to 1980. These data allow for a past medical history of hospitalization for a condition to be controlled.

The SMR1 database contains details of deaths certified in hospital, which may be up to 85% of the total mortality.1 The Community Health Master Patient Index records the date of death of subjects in the Tayside population, while information on the certified cause of death of patients is provided to MEMO by the Registrar General. Population based morbidity and mortality studies are thus feasible.

OTHER IN-HOSPITAL DATA
Any health care dataset that is indexed by the CHI number can be linked into MEMO’s record-linkage database, including other Scottish Morbidity Record returns supplied by ISD. In MEMO, commonly used datasets are the cancer registration database (SMR6), child development records, maternity records (SMR2), psychiatric records (SMR4), and neonatal discharges (SMR11).

OTHER OUTCOME DATASETS
Some health care datasets are available in Tayside that are not indexed by CHI number. However, provided that some patient demographic detail is present, such as name, date of birth, and postcode, MEMO can usually identify the correct CHI number in the same way that CHI numbers are identified for prescriptions. Thus, biochemical laboratory reports filed on computer tape back to 1977 and computerized records of histopathology reports have been used. MEMO has also constructed a database of 100 000 endoscopy and colonoscopy procedures, and, in collaboration with Tayside Police, subjects involved in 22 000 road traffic accidents in Tayside.

VALIDATION OF HOSPITAL DATA
One of the strengths of MEMO is that the original case records of hospitalized patients in Tayside can be examined. This allows for quality control of the computerized data and can also deal with some elements of confounding. For example, persons admitted with gastrointestinal bleeding are nearly always asked about their previous ingestion of aspirin and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. Over-the-counter (OTC) preparations are not recorded on the MEMO drug exposure database and this confounding can be partly controlled by such data. Similarly, information may be available on potential confounding factors such as smoking and alcohol consumption.8

PRIMARY CARE DATA
Progressively more GPs are using computerized systems to aid patient management, although at present they are not available to MEMO for record linkage. However, it is possible to abstract written records in primary care manually and research nurses in MEMO have been granted access to primary care records for specific studies.7,8

OTHER INFORMATION
Since all patients and their addresses are known, including post code, and information is available from the decennial census regarding the relative deprivation levels of postcode areas, the so-called Carstairs deprivation score can be used as a relatively crude indicator of the socioeconomic status of patients.9,10
STRENGTHS

PATIENT IDENTIFICATION
One of the greatest advantages of using data from Tayside is the unique patient identifier. This allows for relative ease of record linkage and, since this number is also age and sex specific, it is relatively easy to choose age, sex, GP, or practice matched comparator groups from the population. Selection of patients for both cohort and case-control studies is thus efficient.

POPULATION BASED DATA
MEMO is regularly supplied with updated copies of the Community Health Master Patient Index from Tayside Health Board, and uses this to track the population of patients alive and resident in Tayside to define study populations for drug safety studies. Such population based data allow the calculation of incidence rates, excess risk, and attributable risk.

DRUG EXPOSURE DATA
The data captured at MEMO represent prescriptions that have been dispensed at a pharmacy and so primary noncompliance is eliminated. In a study carried out to assess the extent of primary noncompliance in Tayside, a large family practice (11 500 patients) wrote all prescriptions in duplicate (carbon copy) forms over a three month period.11 The copies were sent to MEMO. The original top copy forms which were redeemed by patients at community pharmacies were also returned to MEMO by the PPD. Duplicate forms for which no original was present represented the prescriptions which were not redeemed. Figure 22.2 shows the rate of primary noncompliance by age and sex, and it is clear that in some age groups this is a significant problem.

Prescribing may be influenced by the experience and interests of particular GPs, and this might distort studies in certain conditions. For example, Figure 22.3 shows the prescribing of misoprostol by GPs in Tayside between January 1989 and December 1991. There are clear variations in prescribing, with the majority of the prescribing being done by the minority of GPs. Since the list of patients registered with individual GPs and groups of GPs (practices) are known and the GP who initiated the therapy is recorded, it is possible to pick comparator groups from patients under the care of the same (or different) physician(s) or practice(s). Thus, it is possible to control for confounding by prescriber behavior.

Figure 22.2. The percentage of uncashed prescriptions by age and sex (primary noncompliance).
A further advantage in Tayside is that there is currently no structure to inhibit the prescribing of newly marketed drugs. Thus, studies of new agents with high market penetration are possible.

ACCESSIBILITY TO MEDICAL RECORDS
A major strength of MEMO is the ability to examine original hospital case records where necessary. Several studies validating the computerized diagnostic data with the case records have been carried out, with variable results (see next section) depending on the criteria used. Within the NHS such case record searching for the purposes of drug safety evaluation is ethically permissible.12

WEAKNESSES
The current population of Tayside is approximately 400,000 and is comparatively small for pharmacoepidemiology studies, even for the study of relatively commonly prescribed drugs. In addition, drug exposure data in Tayside are only available from 1989 and cover only a limited set of drugs until January 1993 (from when all dispensed prescriptions have been collected). Scottish doctors are conservative prescribers of new drugs, so the market penetration of new agents tends to be low in the first few years after launch. This limits the ability to study new chemical entities, arguably the most important drug group to study. Offsetting these disadvantages, the profile of certain diseases, for example cardiovascular disease, is higher in Scotland than in other populations and consequently the prescribing of drugs used in the prevention and treatment of these diseases is proportionately higher.

Another weakness, but one that is common to most drug safety databases, is the inability to capture directly exposure to OTC drugs or drugs prescribed in hospital. Perhaps more importantly, given that confounding by indication is arguably one of the most difficult potential sources of error in pharmacoepidemiology research, the diagnostic indication for prescribing is not available. Where the indication for a drug is wide (e.g., beta adrenoceptor blocking drugs can be given for indications varying from anxiety to hypertrophic cardiomyopathy), this can lead to considerable difficulties.

MEMO has undertaken not to contact patients directly to elicit information on possible confounding factors without the explicit permission and cooperation of GPs. However, primary care and hospital records can be checked and, although the quality varies, some data on smoking and alcohol can be retrieved from them.8 This is also a method
by which to discern outpatient diagnoses, which are not available electronically for record linkage in MEMO. MEMO is therefore currently best suited for the study of serious drug toxicity that requires hospital admission.

One of the criticisms leveled at record linkage studies is the inaccuracy of computerized medical diagnoses. The discharge diagnoses for SMR1 are abstracted from the clinical discharge summaries by specially trained coding clerks. These clerks on occasions have to interpret “soft diagnoses,” such as symptoms for which no cause can be found. In addition, non-standard terminology may be employed to describe an illness, for example eponymous terms, and so the coding of diagnoses may be imprecise. Computerized algorithms exist to detect and reject the most glaring errors, but errors of interpretation persist within the database. Several validation studies of the accuracy of hospital discharge data in Scotland have been performed, comparing the coded diagnoses with diagnoses inferred by one or more senior doctors who have reviewed the original case records.13–15 The most pertinent of those studies carried out on Tayside data found 18% of internal medicine diagnoses to be clinically unacceptable.13 Since the publication of this study, steps have been taken, mainly for resource management reasons, to improve the diagnostic accuracy of computerized data by involving clinicians in quality control. This initiative has improved substantially the diagnostic accuracy of records.

In MEMO, the coded diagnoses are usually checked individually for drug safety studies. This is a labor intensive process. It is also arguable whether nondifferential misclassification is a major problem, or whether the selection bias that could be introduced if not all records are available for checking is potentially more damaging.16

Another problem that must be appreciated with computerized SMR data is that the currency is the “consultant episode of care.” In other words, a patient who is hospitalized under the care of a physician with a gastrointestinal hemorrhage and is transferred to the care of a surgeon, transferred to an intensive care specialist postoperatively, and then back to a physician prior to discharge, will have four computerized admission and discharge records, each containing diagnostic terms and procedure terms. Government statistics on health care activity, often used in determining power calculations for drug safety studies, list these consultant episodes and not hospital admission events. Typically, 100 consultant episodes would translate into 70 admission and discharge events. The weakness of this system is that consultant episodes must be reconciled into admission and discharge events. The strength is that more diagnostic terms are used and the likelihood of incorrect coding is minimized.

**PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS**

A considerable amount of development work has gone into MEMO over several years and a suite of custom written software is available to perform record linkage drug utilization studies, case–control studies, and cohort studies. Prior to 1990, several studies showed the potential viability of the record linkage system,1,17,18 but these studies were tedious to perform, since the data were distributed between Health Board and university mainframe computers and much of the analysis had to be performed manually. The software developed by MEMO allows interactive searching of the databases by non-computer-literate researchers, thus allowing a rapid response when necessary.

**DRUG UTILIZATION RESEARCH**

MEMO is able to produce very detailed drug utilization data, broken down by age, sex, date, day of the week prescribed, prescriber, generic or proprietary dispensing, co-prescribing, acute prescribing and/or repeat prescribing, dose, and duration (Figure 22.4). Specific studies can then be carried out to examine in more detail how drugs are prescribed and used in Tayside, from the standpoint of either the prescriber or the patient. This is important as the safety and efficacy of drugs may depend on whether they are used properly.

One important dimension is the audit of GP prescribing in the population, although GP specific data are analyzed anonymously and individual
GPs are never identified. For example, one study identified rare instances of potentially hazardous co-prescribing of β-antagonists and β-agonists to patients in Tayside likely to have asthma or chronic obstructive airways disease, by linking the dispensed prescribing database to hospital admission records.\(^19\) Another study exploited the detailed data on dose and duration (inferred from the total amount dispensed and the dosage instructions) and showed that various anti-depressants are often prescribed at ineffective doses for insufficient durations.\(^20\) For example, Figure 22.5 shows that the majority of patients prescribed tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs) receive subtherapeutic doses, although this is not the case for the newer selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitors (SSRIs). The processing of prescribing data according to the demographic characteristics of prescribing GPs has also yielded some useful insights into the characteristics of “good” prescribers. For example, differences in the prescribing of antibiotics and psychotropic medication have been seen between GP registrar training and non-training practices.\(^21\)

Prescribing might also vary by patient factors, independent of need or disease severity, an example being the variation in the use of hormone replacement therapy by socioeconomic status.\(^10\) A related issue is patient compliance with medication, and by assessing how medication is collected by patients, in terms of numbers of prescriptions dispensed and intervals between them, and linking

---

**Figure 22.4.** Duration of new prescribing of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) by dose.

**Figure 22.5.** The percentages of patients prescribed antidepressant drugs at therapeutic and subtherapeutic doses.
this to outcome datasets, it is possible to assess the effects of noncompliance. For example, a study in diabetes showed that adolescents in Tayside who have “brittle” diabetes are often noncompliant with insulin.22

DRUG SAFETY RESEARCH

While development was under way, software was tested by running several studies using a database of primary care prescribing in a practice of 11 000 patients dating from 1985. As an example, Figure 22.6 shows a graph illustrating the power of a simple plotting program to detect the occurrence of vaginal candidiasis following the ingestion of oral antibiotics in women.23 The occurrence of a prescription for a vaginal antifungal drug was taken as a surrogate measure of candidiasis and the occurrence of this prior to and following any oral antibiotic was plotted. It is clear that there is an excess of candidiasis within 30 days of commencing antibiotics. In order to confirm this relationship, a case–control study was mounted, with the risk period varied sequentially by six days. Thus, the study was run examining antibiotic prescribing in the six days prior to a prescription for an antifungal agent, then it was repeated for the period between 7–12 days prior, then 13–18 days, etc. The results broadly confirmed the previous finding, demonstrating a similar pattern of risk with the overall risk for the 28 day period being 5.5 (95% CI 3.8 and 7.9).

Numerous drug safety studies have been completed in MEMO since this early work. For example, cohort study designs have been used to evaluate the risk profile of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs). Although the increased risk of upper gastrointestinal complications associated with NSAID use is well established,24 the large number of study subjects and the additional information available in MEMO has allowed investigation that is more detailed. For example, a cohort study among 78 191 patients newly exposed to NSAIDs and 78 207 unexposed comparators, showed that there was an increased risk only among patients without a history of upper gastrointestinal events.25 Another study in 50 000 subjects investigated the risk with duration of use, and found that it remained constant with continuous exposure,26 in contrast to previous findings.27

The case–control method is a study design often chosen for its efficiency, as the number of study subjects required is usually less than that of a cohort study. In MEMO, when a study involves checking the original medical records of patients to
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Figure 22.6. A plot of the prescribing of vaginal antifungal drugs both before and after the prescribing of an antibacterial drug in women. Note the clear excess of prescribing of antifungal drugs in the 30 days following the prescription of an antibacterial drug.
validate diagnoses or to obtain additional information on confounding factors, this is often an important consideration. For case–control studies in MEMO, study populations are rigorously defined, for example only including patients who were resident in Tayside during the entire study period (to ensure complete exposure histories are available). Cases are then identified from one of the SMR databases, and matched sets of either “community” controls (from the study population) or “hospital” controls (from patients admitted to the same hospital as the case but with a diagnosis unrelated to exposure) can be generated.

Experience has shown that risks are more likely to be overestimated using community controls, and underestimated using hospital controls, therefore the nature of the risk may be important here. For example, arguably it is preferable to overestimate, rather than underestimate, the risk of a lethal side effect. Exposure frequencies can be calculated for cases and controls using data from the dispensed prescribing database, and exposure odds ratios calculated. It is also possible to adjust for confounding from other drug use.

The case–control design has been used in a range of MEMO studies investigating the side-effect profile of topical and oral NSAIDs. These studies have shown, for example, that oral NSAIDs, but not topical NSAIDs, are implicated in hospitalization for upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage and perforation, acute renal failure, and acute colitis, but that they are unlikely to be associated with acute appendicitis.

The case-crossover design was employed in a study examining the risks of road traffic accidents associated with benzodiazepine use. This design is suitable for the evaluation of transient risks, and because cases are used as their own controls, problems of confounding can be dealt with neatly.

METHODODOLOGICAL STUDIES

MEMO has also provided the setting for some methodological work in pharmacoepidemiology. For example, an investigation into the selection of study subjects and the relative importance of misclassification and selection bias was completed for the case–control method, in addition to a comparison of different data sources for information on confounding “lifestyle” factors, such as smoking and alcohol. Work on the cohort method has focused on the selection of comparator groups and whether the length of “risk windows” influences the estimate of effect. This is the length of time after a drug has been prescribed during which a potential side-effect might be identified. Work on sample sizes for cohort studies has also been published.

OTHER RESEARCH APPLICATIONS

An interesting application of record-linkage in MEMO is the compilation of patient-specific disease registers using information from different sources. For example, a validated diabetic register of all patients (treated or nontreated) with type 1 and type 2 diabetes has been constructed. This is known as the DARTS initiative (Diabetes Audit and Research in Tayside Scotland), a collaboration between MEMO, all GP practices in Tayside and the Diabetes Units in three Health Care Trusts. The register is compiled by record-linking data from eight independent data sources: Scottish Morbidity Record 1 (SMR1), four diabetes clinics in three Health Care trusts, and a mobile eye van that has been operating in Tayside since 1990 performing community retinopathy screening, all of which use the CHI number routinely as a patient identifier. Data from MEMO’s dispensed prescribing database (which includes glucose monitoring equipment) and the results of biochemistry tests in hospitals are also used. The register has been used for pharmacoepidemiology research.

The incorporation of cost into the MEMO dispensed prescribing database also makes this an important resource for pharmacoeconomic research, particularly that which recognizes the cost of adverse reactions to drugs that occur in the community, as an aspect often overlooked. There are also other more general health economics opportunities. One recent study assessed the cost-effectiveness of antibiotic treatment in a large health care center in Tayside. An interesting evaluation of the economic consequences of hip replacement showed that while this procedure
THE FUTURE

Dispensed prescribing data collection in MEMO is labor intensive and expensive. The automated capture of computerized dispensed prescribing data has therefore been investigated in five test pharmacies, a method which could eventually become Tayside-wide or Scottish-wide. Client-server systems have been developed which use Integrated Services Digital Network (ISDN) links between community pharmacies and MEMO. MEMO makes available to pharmacy computer systems the CHI database along ISDN lines, and the CHI number can be allocated to data collected by the pharmacy at source. These data are then transmitted to MEMO immediately. Of 200,000 prescription items for which data were collected using this methodology, a comparison with a sample of duplicate data collected by MEMO in the usual way showed that there was agreement for 98% of the items.

As previously discussed, the underlying population of Tayside used for MEMO’s drug safety studies is too small for accurate quantification of the risks of adverse drug reactions that occur at low frequency in the population (either because the drug is rarely prescribed or because the reaction itself is rare). A project has therefore been carried out to test the feasibility of performing record-linkage projects in the entire population of Scotland (5.5 million). This is a collaboration between MEMO, the Pharmacy Practice Division (PPD), and the NHS Information and Services Division (ISD). Three test drugs have been chosen: azapropazone, dornase alpha, and losartan. MEMO has obtained facsimiles of prescriptions dispensed in Scotland between April 1994 and August 1995 for these drugs from the PPD, and allocated CHI numbers using Scottish-wide CHI databases. On the basis of up-to-date demographic details provided by the CHI, ISD used a probability match on sex, full name, date of birth, and current and previous postcodes to identify any SMR1 hospital admission data from 1981 to June 1995 for the 14,536 patients who received these drugs. There were 43,457 hospital episodes for 10,248 of them. Analyses showed that the rate of hospital admission for upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage and perforation was 11.3 events per 1000 patient years for patients exposed to azapropazone, compared with 2.0 per 1000 patient years for unexposed patients, giving an incidence rate ratio of 5.7 (95% confidence intervals 3.5–9.3). That these results fit in with what is already known about the risk profile of azapropazone is encouraging. Analyses for the other drugs are under way. Now that this pilot study has demonstrated that patient-specific exposure datasets can be compiled for the Scottish population, the range and quality of the outcome data to which they can be linked by ISD would make drug safety studies using these resources unrivalled in detail and scope.

Studies in MEMO use highly confidential, although anonymized, medical data, and MEMO has an agreement with the Local Medical Committee of the British Medical Association never to divulge person-specific or GP-specific data, unless it is to a doctor requesting information on one of his or her own patients. All staff in MEMO sign confidentiality agreements and all databases are registered for research purposes with the Data Protection Officer. All studies use data that are anonymized by the CHI. With regard to independent ethical approval for drug safety studies, guidelines issued by the Scottish Office indicate that postmarketing surveillance studies were exempt from this requirement. Research involving access to medical records without direct patient involvement is also exempt, provided that confidentiality and anonymity of patients is assured, and a senior professional person who can be disciplined by a professional body is accountable. The rationale for this is set out in a recent report into ethical issues from a Working Group of the Royal College of Physicians of London. However, the ethical and data protection issues are continuing to evolve and MEMO is taking steps to
ensure that it meets the standards in both of these areas. 42

In conclusion, MEMO has realized its potential as a comprehensive record linkage system that can be used for the detection and quantification of serious drug toxicity, with Figure 22.7 summarizing the record-linkable data that are now available. The next few years are likely to see increasing numbers of applications of its capabilities, along with additions to what it can accomplish.
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INTRODUCTION

Before the advent of automated databases, the identification and appropriate followup of large cohorts of users of even a single medicine was extremely expensive and required a major administrative effort to assemble and ensure complete and accurate collection of the required followup information. The initial use of computerized information which began in the late 1970s permitted new, highly efficient research. However, the available resources had characteristics which limited the quantity and types of study that could be conducted. In considering how one might generate a larger, more efficient source of directly accessible medical information, it was apparent that the UK’s National Health System provided a unique medical environment within which to create an optimum computerized medical data resource. In the UK, traditionally the general practitioner (GP) acts as a gatekeeper to services within the National Health Service. This function allows a comprehensive record keeping of clinical events of individual patients. A comprehensive record of prescriptions written, outpatient diagnoses, and referral letters to hospitals resides in the individual patient records that GPs file in their offices. A few pharmacoepidemiology studies had, in fact, already been conducted based primarily on review and abstraction of information derived directly from original paper GP medical records. Such studies were extremely expensive and the quality and quantity of data that could be derived from the search and review of clinical records was limited. Nevertheless, such studies demonstrated that GP records contain the comprehensive medical information that is required for pharmacoepidemiology studies.

In the late 1980s, VAMP Health, a commercial company, designed and marketed a GP computer
system that allowed for comprehensive recording of medical information for individual patients on office computers. This system was based on software designed in the early 1980s by Dr Alan Dean, a practicing GP in England. The system provided for computer recording of patient demographics, all prescriptions, and all clinical diagnoses, together with considerable additional information on patient medical care. From the start, the directors of VAMP, which included Dr Alan Dean, recognized that the information recorded on GP office computers could represent a highly valuable resource for clinical research in general, and for pharmacoepidemiology research in particular.

Two steps were taken to achieve the goal of constructing an automated clinical research data resource. First, VAMP signed an agreement with approximately 1000 general practices encompassing some 3000 GPs, whereby GPs would (i) agree to be trained to enter on computer critical data items in a standard manner; (ii) provide a copy of the data to VAMP, stripped of patient identifiers; and (iii) provide anonymized photocopied referral letters required to complete clinical studies. In return, GPs were to receive compensation for their cooperation.

Second, the directors of VAMP entered into a cooperative agreement with the BCSDP, a research center with many years of experience with the use of computerized data for pharmacoepidemiology, whereby the BCSDP received the anonymized raw data generated by the GPs in order to evaluate its potential use for pharmacoepidemiology research and to conduct such research if the data quality and completeness were satisfactory.

The initial task to be accomplished was to merge the information from hundreds of participating general practitioners into a single file. In order to accomplish this crucial first step, it required that the participating GPs enter the required data in a standard manner. Initially there were approximately 600 general practices, caring for about four million patients, who fulfilled this requirement; a single file encompassing these practices was created. The next step was to reorganize the files into a form that was efficient and designed for pharmacoepidemiology studies. Efficient access also required that the codes used by VAMP to identify medicines and diagnoses, which numbered in the tens of thousands, be mapped onto more efficient coding schemes. For instance, at the BCSDP, the original drug dictionary was mapped to a unique BCSP drug coding system and the diagnosis dictionary was mapped onto the International Classification of Diseases (ICD) coding system. The original coding systems can be used to obtain particular details of individual products for the drug codes such as strength and route of administration, or to obtain more specific diagnoses.

The next and critical step was to evaluate the quality and completeness of the recorded data. In order to determine the quality of the diagnosis information, the BCSDP conducted extensive studies involving thousands of patients, in which the diagnoses present on photocopies of referral letters from hospital consultants were compared to the diagnoses recorded on computer (see below).5,6

Since 1994, the database has been known as the General Practice Research Database (GPRD), has belonged to the UK Department of Health, and has been maintained by the Office of National Statistics (ONS).7 The GPRD contains computerized information entered by GPs after a trial period of data entry and quality training. For a limited number of practices, prospective data collection is available from as early as 1987. Starting in 1991, most practices participating in the GPRD have been providing data with the quality and completeness required for pharmacoepidemiology research projects. Currently, around 1500 general practitioners, with a population coverage in excess of 3 million, systematically provide their computerized medical data anonymously to the ONS. Upon receiving data from the GPs, the ONS personnel organize this information and perform a series of quality checks. Access to these data has also been broadened to include others, beyond just the BCSDP. Data for research projects can be obtained from the ONS after review of research protocols by a Scientific and Ethical Advisory Board (SEAG). The main task of SEAG is to ensure that scientific and ethical standards are maintained, including anon-
ymity. All information remains strictly anonymized, as no patient, general practitioner, or practice identifiers are present in the data sent to investigators. The costs involved in the collection of the data and the present scheme of funding of the GPRD have been reviewed elsewhere.8

**DESCRIPTION**

The GPRD data are recorded using four data screens or files. These include the registration file, the drug file, the events (diagnoses, procedures) file, and the “findings” file.

**REGISTRATION FILE**

This file contains information regarding the registration status of all individuals covered in the GPRD data files. As with other GPRD files, this one contains a unique patient identification number that enables information from all files to be linked. There is also a number that identifies the practice (though the practice identity is confidential and known only to people in the MCA who maintain the data, and to people working in Alan Dean’s EPIC Research Unit who provide medical record retrieval services). Finally, there is a family identification number that enables members of the same family to be linked (e.g., mothers and babies etc.). Other information includes year of birth (and month for those under age 5), gender, date of registration with the current general practice, most recent registration status (permanent, transferred out, died), and date of death or departure from the practice (where applicable). All computerized data are processed to ensure complete patient and GP confidentiality and anonymity, when data are transmitted to researchers.

**DRUG FILE**

This file contains detailed information on all drugs prescribed by the GP. Drugs are coded with the prescription pricing authority (PPA) coding system, with a specific code for each commercial preparation. Details include the date of each drug prescription, the precise drug formulation and strength, the quantity of drug prescribed, and the dosing instructions. In addition, the indication for treatment is required for all new courses of therapy. This is done by cross-referencing prescriptions against medical events on the same date. GPs participating in the GPRD data scheme are required to record all vaccinations administered as well as contraception prescribed. In certain instances, a specialist may initiate a course of treatment; therefore, this first prescription is not recorded in the database. Refills for subsequent prescriptions are then written by GPs and recorded in the database. It is worth noting that when patients are seen by consultants or in hospital, future drug therapy is directed through the GP and is thus captured by the database.

**EVENT FILE**

This file contains all clinically relevant patient diagnoses, both inpatient and outpatient, along with the date of the event. In addition to usual care in the GP office, GPs are required to enter the indication for any new drug therapy, as noted above, as well as all diagnoses resulting from hospitalizations, consultations, or emergency medical care. There is also a field that indicates, for each diagnostic code, where the care was received (in the GP’s office, the hospital, an outpatient consultant, emergency care, etc.). Diagnoses or events are coded using the OXIMIS (Oxford medical indexing system) coding system.9 This dictionary was originally created in the 1960s to specifically address the coding needs of physicians in a general practice setting. The coding is loosely based on the ICD coding but it has seven digits including alpha and numeric characters to provide more detail in the coding. This data file also contains a comment field that allows the GP to enter up to 19 characters of free text for each diagnosis entry. These comments often provide useful additional details about the diagnosis coded.

Because the GP is the primary care giver for all patients in the National Health Service, all consultants are required to send a letter to the GP whenever a patient is seen in hospital or by an outpatient specialist, describing the relevant
clinical events and final diagnoses. The contents of these letters are then entered into the computer file by the GP. The details of a patient’s hospital or specialist clinical history are not recorded on the computer, although the final diagnoses are.

FINDINGS FILE
This file contains patient information in areas such as blood pressure, height, weight, smoking status, alcohol use, contraceptive use, cervical smears, immunizations, medical procedures, laboratory tests, results, and social factors. While the GPs are not required to update all of these data fields, information on characteristics such as height, weight, and smoking have been used repeatedly and are available on greater than 70% of the population.

MEDICAL RECORDS
While most information is available on the computerized medical files, it is essential to have access to the original medical records in order to validate recorded diagnoses and to obtain additional detailed information about hospitalized and referred medical events. It is essential, in most studies, to know whether a diagnosis is a first time (incident) diagnosis and the precise date of onset, whether or not there was some exclusion criteria not recorded on the database, and whether the diagnosis was confirmed by certain tests or procedures. These details cannot always be ascertained with complete confidence from the computer record. As noted above, access to consultant medical records is provided by Alan Dean’s EPIC Research Unit.

STRENGTHS
POPULATION-BASED DATA
As the UK National Health System provides universal coverage, no segment of the population is excluded from the GPRD. The nature of the data makes it possible to link mother and offspring information to study human reproductive epidemiology, and in particular the teratogenicity of drugs used during pregnancy. The geographical distribution of the practices participating in the GPRD is representative of the UK population, apart from small variations among regions. Recent comparisons of age and sex distributions with the National Population Census have shown these to be very similar.

POPULATION LARGE ENOUGH TO STUDY RARE DISEASES
Over 3 million persons are included in the GPRD at any one time. For most practices, data have been entered prospectively on computer for a period exceeding seven years. In addition, many GPs have entered at their discretion historical medical data preceding prospective data recording. Data collected to date represent some 25 million person years of information. This has allowed researchers to study rare outcomes, with an incidence rate of less than one per 10 000 persons per year, as well as chronic disorders and conditions with short or medium term incubation periods.

QUALITY OF THE DIAGNOSIS INFORMATION
One of the primary purposes of GPs’ data recording is the daily clinical management of their patients; there is no separate medical record. As such, to the degree the care was provided by the GP, it should be recorded very accurately. The only potential exception would be the consultant and hospital records, which need to be entered into the data manually. However, validation studies of the GPRD have documented the recording of medical data in the general practitioners’ computers to be near complete. In several independent studies, hospital consultant letters in the manual records of GPs were photocopied and the consultant’s clinical diagnoses were compared to those recorded on the GPs computer. Agreement between the consultants’ letters and the GP computer records was over 87% (1038/1191) in a
1991 study, over 90% (121/126) in a 1992 study, and over 95% (539/553) in a 1994 study.\textsuperscript{5,6,12} In addition, numerous research papers requiring validation of coded diagnostic outcomes have shown good agreement between the computer recorded diagnosis and the diagnosis on the written clinical records (see appendix).

Regarding outpatient drug information, the prescriptions are issued to the patients directly from the computer, ensuring that virtually all outpatient prescriptions are captured by the database and that the prescription information is accurate. GPRD also therefore includes the dosage instruction written by GPs. There is over 90% concordance between the prescriptions recorded on the computer and those recorded at the UK Prescription Pricing Authority.\textsuperscript{13,14}

ACCESS TO ORIGINAL MEDICAL RECORDS

One of the sine qua non conditions to carry out valid research using automated databases is the possibility of obtaining copies of original medical records and death certificates. Access to original records is needed in order to confirm the diagnosis initially identified through a computer search, as well as to abstract additional information on past history and laboratory findings. To date, studies performed with the GPRD in which medical records were requested have resulted in response rates well over 80%, and in many 90% or above. Due to the excellent collaboration of the participating GPs, around 80% of medical records are received within three months of the initial request date. Another unique additional feature of the GPRD is the possibility of sending the GP project-specific questionnaires requesting information that is usually not recorded in the computer files. In some rare instances, questionnaires have also been sent to patients through their GPs, once consent was obtained from both GPs and patients. As previously mentioned, all computer and paper based information is anonymized before being sent to researchers.

WEAKNESSES

COMPLETENESS OF DATA

As noted above, the GPRD file represents the primary medical record for the GP, and as such the GP data are likely to be very complete. The same is not true of diagnoses provided by specialists and care provided in hospitals. One of the requirements to become a participant in the GPRD is to agree to record all referrals to specialists as well as the information resulting from these visits. Three validation studies have documented the completeness of this information.\textsuperscript{5,6,12} In these studies, researchers reviewed information from anonymized photocopied consultant referral letters present in the offices of GPs and compared them to the diagnoses recorded in the computer files. The concordance for clinically relevant outcomes was between 90 and 95%. While this clearly is reassuring, 5–10% missing data could be critically important when studying outcomes that occur uncommonly. Further, these studies do not evaluate the completeness of hospital outcomes, nor quantify the degree to which the GPs do not have in their files consultant referral letters corresponding to care provided to their patients.

ADDITIONAL COMPUTERIZED INFORMATION

At least in the area of pharmacoepidemiology, the essential data for studies are demographic information, outpatient prescriptions, and hospital based diagnoses. However, in this and other research areas, a number of other variables would be welcome, such as smoking habits, weight, height, life style (diet, exercise) and socioeconomic and marital status. Some of these are already being recorded in the GPRD, but not yet routinely. Currently, data on smoking, weight, and height are available for over 70% of the population, but this leaves nearly 30% of the data missing. Socioeconomic status information is not recorded for each patient, although this information is available for the practice and that could potentially be used as a surrogate. A limitation in reproductive
epidemiology is the relatively low recording of last menstrual period in the pregnant woman, and weight and length at birth in the offspring. Also, impacting specific areas of research are low recording levels of data such as date of menarche and menopause, family medical history, and historical information on surgical interventions and chronic conditions. Other useful information would be data on over-the-counter medication (by asking the patient at each visit about over-the-counter drug use), in-hospital drug use, and other health care treatments delivered outside the GP practice (e.g., chemotherapy, PUVA). Finally, direct economic information on health care resource utilization is not present in the GPRD.

LINKAGE TO OTHER HEALTH CARE DATABASES

Linkage to other existing health care automated databases would be welcome to facilitate followup and diagnostic validation processes. One of the most desirable would be a linkage to hospital databases containing information on discharge diagnoses and procedures performed. Other useful linkages would be to cancer registries, congenital malformation reporting systems, and laboratory test result databases. In principle, these links could be arranged.

ADDITIONAL RESEARCH UNITS

The complexities of observational data and in particular GPRD data require an extended period of learning before embarking on studies using the GPRD as the primary source of information. Experience with the GPRD is still limited and restricted to a handful of research units around the world. Also, input from these researchers could help to improve certain aspects of future data collection.

PARTICULAR APPLICATIONS

The appendix lists a compilation of 80 papers that have been published to date using the GPRD. The majority are pharmacoepidemiology studies, covering therapeutic areas such as nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, hormone replacement therapy, anti-infective agents, oral contraceptives, antihypertensive drugs, acid suppressing drugs, antidepressants, anticonvulsants, and drugs to treat diseases such as asthma and diabetes. The clinical outcomes of these studies included liver disorders, upper gastrointestinal bleeding and perforation, metabolic and endocrine disorders, seizures, suicide, blood dyscrasias, severe cutaneous reactions, ocular disorders, myocardial infarction, neoplasia, sudden unexplained death, congenital malformations, venous thromboembolism, renal disorders, and bacterial infections. The database has been less frequently used for studies of drug utilization, natural history of disease, pharmacoconomics, and health care utilization. However, a few studies are available in these areas: resources used by schizophrenic patients, evaluation of prevention strategies in the general practice setting, resources needed for the care of patients with eating disorders, use of influenza vaccines, and natural history and drug utilization in asthma and diabetes mellitus. As examples, we will briefly review three of the pharmacoepidemiology studies performed with the GPRD: one that quantified the risk of acute hepatic injury in patients using the combination of amoxicillin with clavulanic acid, another one that compared the risk of developing cancer in users of different antihypertensive agents, and lastly a study that evaluated the risk of heart valve disorders in users of diet medicines.

LIVER INJURY AND ANTIBIOTICS

Several studies have been performed with the GPRD on the epidemiology of drug induced liver injury. Among antibiotics incriminated as hepatotoxic, use of the combination of amoxicillin and clavulanic acid has been the source of numerous case reports since the late 1980s. A large cohort study including over 90 000 users of the combination of amoxicillin and clavulanic acid and 360 000 users of amoxicillin alone was identified with the GPRD, and followed for a two year period. The objective of the study was to quantify and compare the risk of acute liver injury among users of these two antibiotics. After
review of the original medical records, 35 cases met all the case definition criteria. The absolute risks of acute liver injury associated with the combination of amoxicillin and clavulanic acid, and amoxicillin alone, were 1.7 and 0.3 per 10,000 prescriptions, respectively. The data also made it possible to characterize the groups at highest risk, namely elderly patients receiving more than one course of amoxicillin and clavulanic acid combination therapy, with a risk of developing acute liver injury of greater than ten per 10,000. The clinical features of liver injury could be evaluated in detail based on the information from the medical records. This showed that the liver injury was predominantly cholestatic, and occasionally presented after the end of the combination therapy, confirming earlier individual case reports. Data from this study formed part of the evidence for revised conditions of use of the combination of amoxicillin and clavulanic acid, in the UK and abroad.18

CALCIC CHANNEL BLOCKERS AND CANCER

An association was recently reported between the use of calcium channel blockers (CCBs) and an increased risk of all cancer. Using the GPRD, a study was conducted to assess whether cancer was associated with CCB use.19 The source cohort was restricted to hypertensive patients using β-blockers only, inhibitors of angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) only, or CCBs only. A nested case–control analysis was performed within this cohort. A total of 446 cases of cancer and 1750 controls were analyzed. After adjustment for smoking, body mass index, change of antihypertensive medication, duration of hypertension, and diuretic use, the odds ratio estimates for all cancers combined were 1.3 (95% CI 1.0–1.6) for CCBs and 0.8 (95% CI 0.6–1.2) for ACE inhibitors, relative to β-blockers. The corresponding odds ratio among patients older than 70 years was 1.2. No duration effect was found among users of CCBs, and a small dose effect was observed. Subgroup analyses by specific cancers did not show an increased risk for any particular location associated with use of CCBs. The authors concluded that no evidence of a material increase in the risk of any cancer or of any particular cancers was found associated with use of calcium channel blockers, relative to use of β-blockers. Subsequently, two other studies also failed to demonstrate an excess risk among users of CCBs.20,21 However, additional research is still needed to resolve the controversy.

DIET MEDICINES AND HEART VALVE DISORDERS

Case reports have suggested that a combination of the appetite suppressants fenfluramine and phentermine is associated with an increased risk of cardiac valve regurgitation. There were also reports of valvular disorders in persons taking fenfluramine or dexfenfluramine alone. Using the GPRD, a population based followup study and a nested case–control analysis were conducted on 6532 subjects who received dexfenfluramine, 2371 who received fenfluramine, and 862 who received phentermine to assess the risk of a subsequent clinical diagnosis of a valvular disorder of uncertain origin.22 For comparison, a group of 9281 obese subjects who had not taken appetite suppressants who were matched to the treated subjects for age, sex, and weight were identified. All subjects were free of diagnosed cardiovascular disease at the start of followup. The average duration of followup for all subjects was about four years.

There were 11 cases of newly diagnosed idiopathic valvular disorders, five after the use of dexfenfluramine and six after the use of fenfluramine. There were six cases of aortic regurgitation, two cases of mitral regurgitation, and three cases of combined aortic and mitral regurgitation. There were no cases of idiopathic cardiac valve abnormalities among the subjects who had not taken appetite suppressants or among those who took only phentermine. The five year cumulative incidence of idiopathic cardiac valve disorders was 0 per 10,000 subjects (95% CI 0–15.4) among those who had not taken appetite suppressants; 0 per 10,000 subjects (95% CI 0–76.6) among those who took phentermine alone; 7.1 per 10,000 subjects (95% CI 3.6–17.8) among those who took either fenfluramine or dexfenfluramine for less than four months ($p = 0.02$ versus those who
had not taken appetite suppressants); and 35.0 per 10,000 subjects (95% CI 16.4–76.2) among those who received either of these medications for four or more months ($p < 0.001$ versus those who had not taken appetite suppressants). The authors concluded that the use of fenfluramine or dexfenfluramine, particularly for four months or longer, is associated with an increased risk of newly diagnosed cardiac valve disorders, particularly aortic regurgitation.

THE FUTURE

In the recent history of pharmacoepidemiology research in Europe, the UK General Practice Research Database is the single largest source of published studies. GPRD data have been used extensively in the area of pharmacoepidemiology, contributing on several occasions to decision making by regulatory authorities and industry. However, there are still some areas where the GPRD has been underused, such as drug utilization, natural history of disease, pharmacoconomics, and health care utilization research.

Numerous studies have documented the completeness and high quality of the information recorded in the GPRD, as well as the excellent access to original medical records and collaboration of general practitioners. Welcome improvements would be the recording of additional information on life style habits and linkage to other medical databases.

The General Practice Research Database has proved that valuable data can be collected in a general practice setting. The potential of this rich computerized database has not yet been fully exploited. Hopefully, the coming years will witness new projects and expanding applications of this database. This experience should also serve as a stimulus to efforts to generate similar population based data in other countries.
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INTRODUCTION

As described in Chapter 3, although pharmacoepidemiology studies use the traditional study designs of epidemiology, they pose a special problem. Inasmuch as most drugs are studied in between 500 and 3000 individuals prior to marketing, postmarketing surveillance cohort studies will not be able to detect rarer drug effects reliably unless they include at least 10,000 exposed individuals. Postmarketing surveillance case-control studies need to accumulate diseased cases and undiseased controls from a target population of sufficient size to have included 10,000 exposed patients if a cohort study had been performed. The need to study populations this large without incurring undue costs represents an unusual logistical challenge.

Some of the major approaches useful for addressing this challenge have been presented in Chapters 10 through 23. There are a number of other approaches, as well. Several of these are derived from one or more of the approaches presented earlier, but some represent important potential resources that the reader should be aware of. Thus, the purpose of this chapter is to describe them. The approaches will be presented according to the study designs they usually utilize, in order of the hierarchy of study designs presented in Chapter 2. Approaches will be presented that involve performing analyses of secular trends, case-control studies, cohort studies, and randomized clinical trials. None of these approaches involves analyzing case reports. Case series will be discussed under case-control and cohort studies, since exposed (or diseased) patients in case series should generally be compared to unexposed (or undiseased) controls.

DATA SOURCES FOR ANALYSES OF SECULAR TRENDS

As described in Chapter 2, analyses of secular trends examine trends in an exposure and trends in a disease and explore whether the trends coincide. These trends can be examined over time or over geographic area. In other words, one could analyze data from a single country or region and examine how the exposure and the disease have changed.
over time. Alternatively, one could analyze data from a single time period, exploring how the prevalence of the exposure and the incidence of the disease differ from region to region or country to country.

The advantages and disadvantages of this study design are presented in Chapter 2. Analyses of secular trends in pharmacoepidemiology are *ad hoc* studies, i.e., there are no ongoing systems for performing such studies. In order to perform such studies, however, one obviously needs data on both the frequency of the exposure and the incidence of the disease. Thus, this discussion will focus on the data sources available for performing such studies in pharmacoepidemiology.

**DRUG UTILIZATION DATA**

In pharmacoepidemiology studies, the primary exposure of interest is drug use. Thus, in order to perform analyses of secular trends, one needs to have one or more sources of data on drug utilization. In the US, and in many other countries, the major sources of data on drug utilization are several private companies that specialize in collecting these data and then selling them to pharmaceutical manufacturers for use in marketing studies.

Probably the best known source of such data is IMS HEALTH. IMS HEALTH conducts a number of different ongoing surveys of drug use, which it then sells to pharmaceutical manufacturers and to government agencies. Perhaps the most useful of these for pharmacoepidemiology research is the National Disease and Therapeutic Index™ (NDTI™), an ongoing medical audit that provides insight into disease and treatment patterns of office-based physicians. A rotating panel of over 3500 of the approximately 400 000 office-based US physicians reports four times each year on all contacts with patients during a 48 hour period. Data are collected on the drug prescribed and its quantity, the diagnosis the drug was prescribed for, the action desired, concomitant drugs, concomitant diagnoses, and whether the prescription in question was the first time the patient received the drug or whether it was for continuing therapy. Demographic data about the patient and the prescriber are also collected. Periodic reports are prepared, including reports organized by drug and by diagnosis. In addition, special analyses can be performed using the data.

Although the physician panel is relatively small compared to the overall total of office-based physicians in the US, NDTI data are projected to the national level using statistical methodology. The sample of physicians used for the NDTI is a thin one, that is it contains relatively few individuals, relative to the number of individuals that are being generalized to and the number of variables that are being studied. Nevertheless, the results obtained using the NDTI tend to be relatively stable over time,¹ and agree fairly well with other sources of drug utilization information.² NDTI has proven itself very useful, and it has been used often for pharmacoepidemiology research.

A few of the other IMS HEALTH databases include the following: (i) the National Prescription Audit Plus™ (NPA™), a study of pharmacy sales from retailers, mail order, and long-term care facilities, based on a panel of computerized pharmacies which submit data on dispensed prescriptions to IMS HEALTH electronically; (ii) LifeLink, a patient longitudinal database of medical and pharmacy claims; (iii) Retail Perspective™ and Provider Perspective™, two audits that provide national sales dollar estimates of pharmaceutical products purchased by retail drug stores, food stores, mass merchandise, closed wall HMOs, nonfederal hospitals, federal facilities, clinics and long-term care facilities. The Retail Perspective Report, based on data from both audits, covers over 90% of drug sales. The existence of these and other IMS HEALTH databases changes over time, as new products are developed and old products are discontinued. These and other IMS HEALTH databases can sometimes be useful for pharmacoepidemiology research, but the NDTI is generally the most useful. Generously, IMS HEALTH is often willing to make its data available to academic investigators at little or no cost.

There are other commercial sources of drug utilization data in the US, as well, although these have not been used as frequently for academic
research. In addition, as part of its National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey, the US National Center for Health Statistics has been studying drug use, providing data very similar to that included in IMS America’s NDTI. A summary of these results is published in an annual publication entitled *Highlights of Drug Utilization in Office Practice*.5 Other special analyses can be requested, as well. Other potential sources of drug utilization data include all of the databases described in Chapters 12 through 23.

Finally, in a number of countries other than the US, true national data are available on drug sales. For example, Sweden’s Apoteksbolaget (now called Apotek AB), The National Corporation of Swedish Pharmacies, provided pharmacy services for the entire country.4 It retains remarkable data on the drugs dispensed in Sweden, regionally or nationally. Through analyses of this type of data, Scandinavian investigators have become the world’s leaders in studies of drug utilization (see Chapter 29).

It is important to note that, with the exception of data derived from the databases described earlier in the book, all of the drug utilization databases are useful for descriptive studies only, not analytic studies. In some drug utilization datasets, information on subsequent diagnoses is unavailable. For example, in NDTI the patients who happen to be seen in any given 48-hour cycle are unlikely to be the same as those in the preceding or subsequent 48-hour cycles. In some drug utilization datasets information is available on diagnoses, but it is inappropriate. For example, the diagnosis data in NDTI includes the indication for treatment rather than the results of treatment. Finally, in some drug utilization datasets the information on diagnoses cannot be linked to disease outcome. For example, the excellent Swedish drug data cannot be linked to the excellent Swedish hospitalization data, as the former are retained in aggregate only, that is without individual patient identification numbers. Thus, this type of data can only be used for descriptive studies or aggregate analyses, such as those performed for analyses of secular trends. More information on drug utilization studies is provided in Chapter 29.

DISEASE INCIDENCE DATA

Data Sources

The major source of disease incidence information useful for this type of study is the vital statistics maintained by most countries in the world. Most countries, for example, maintain mortality statistics, derived from the death certificates completed by physicians at the time of death. Importantly, these death certificates include information on causes of death. In the US, these death certificates are collected and maintained by the states. However, the National Center for Health Statistics then obtains magnetic tapes of a portion of these data from the states’ vital statistics offices. These have been compiled into ‘The National Death Index, which can be used for research purposes at a modest cost.5 Data are available beginning in 1979. The index contains the following information for each of those who died: last name, first name, middle initial, social security number, date of birth, state of birth, father’s surname, sex, race, marital status, and state of residence. It also contains the name of the state, the death certificate number, and the date of death. To obtain cause of death information, an investigator must request a death certificate directly from the state. A similar data resource in Canada is the Canadian Mortality Database.6 US death data are also available from the Social Security Administration, as the “Social Security death tapes”. These arise out of the government’s need to know of deaths, in order to avoid paying Social Security benefits to individuals who have died.

Other types of vital statistic that are recorded by most countries include birth data, marriage data, divorce data, and so on. These are less likely to be useful for pharmacoepidemiology research.

Morbidity data can be more problematic. There is no comprehensive source of morbidity data in most countries, comparable to mortality data. However, many specific types of data are available. A large number of countries maintain cancer registries, collecting all cases of cancer in one or more defined populations.6,7 These can be used to calculate incidence rates of cancer. For example, a 1976 study demonstrated that the increased use of postmenopausal estrogens was
accompanied by a sharp increase in the incidence of endometrial cancer, the latter evaluated using data from cancer registries. Other specialized registries can also exist. For example, in the US the Centers for Disease Control maintains a registry of children born with birth defects in the Atlanta metropolitan area (see Chapter 42).

In addition, many developed countries maintain “population laboratories”, defined and stable populations which have been observed over time, with multiple measurements made of both exposures and diseases. The classic “population laboratory” in the US has been Framingham, MA, which has been the source of an enormous amount of knowledge about risk factors for cardiovascular disease, as well as other diseases.

Many developed countries also conduct periodic health surveys, in order to explore trends in exposures and diseases. For example, the US National Center for Health Statistics conducts a periodic Health Interview Study as a study of illnesses reported by patients. The National Center for Health Statistics also conducts a periodic Health Examination Survey, including physical examinations and laboratory tests. The National Ambulatory Medical Care Survey, mentioned above, investigates samples of office based physicians. The Health Records Survey and the Institutional Population Survey investigate samples of institutionalized patients. The Hospital Discharge Survey investigates samples of patients discharged from acute care hospitals. As a last example, the National Natality and Mortality Surveys collect additional data on individuals sampled from vital statistics data.

Finally, many countries have selected “reportable diseases.” These are diseases of particular interest to the local public health authorities, and are often infectious diseases. Sometimes reporting is “required,” although enforcement is difficult. Sometimes reporting is just requested. In either case, however, reporting is not complete, and so it can be difficult to disentangle trends in disease incidence from trends in reporting.

Potential Problems
This type of data can be extremely useful in performing analyses of secular trends, and has been used to address a number of important questions in pharmacoepidemiology. However, whenever one uses data that were not collected specifically for the study at hand, one must be very careful to be aware of its limitations. Each of the data sources described presents its own problems. Mortality data are the most likely to be used for analyses of secular trends, and the problems of these data represent good illustrations of the types of problem one must consider when using any of the data sources. As such, they will be discussed in more detail.

Overall, in using mortality data one is limited by the care, or lack of care, taken by physicians in completing death certificates. This is particularly a problem for studies that rely on information about the cause of death. Physicians may not know the cause of death accurately or, even if they do, they may not be careful in recording it. This is unlikely to create false findings in analyses of secular trends, unless there is a systematic change in these errors over time or across geographic areas. Unfortunately, however, these systematic changes can occur in many ways.

First, one can see changes in physicians’ index of suspicion about any given disease. This can lead to trends in how frequently patients are diagnosed with the disease. For example, pulmonary emboli frequently are not detected. As physicians have become aware of this problem, one would expect that a larger proportion of patients with this disease would be diagnosed.

Second, diagnostic methods can change over time. This, too, can create false trends. For example, clinical diagnoses of pulmonary emboli have been shown to be wrong over 50% of the time. As lung scanning procedures have become widely available, one would expect that a larger proportion of patients with pulmonary embolism may be receiving correct diagnoses.

Third, diagnostic terminology can change over time. For example, with the development of the extractable nuclear antigen serologic test, patients previously diagnosed with other conditions are now being diagnosed as having mixed connective tissue disease.

Fourth, there can be changes in coding systems. A blatant example is the periodic shift from an
older version of the International Classification of Diseases to a more recent one, such as from ICD-8 to ICD-9. Less obvious changes can cause major problems, as well. For example, in a study of methylodopa and biliary carcinoma using data from multiple international cancer registries, all but one showed no association between drug sales and disease incidence or mortality. In one, however, a marked increase shortly after drug marketing was seen in cancer of the biliary tract, excluding the code for cancer of the biliary tract—part unspecified. A complementary pattern was seen for the excluded code. Further investigation revealed that a change in coding policy was instituted in that registry in 1966. After that date, more specific coding was to be used. This resulted in an apparent increase in the incidence rates of the diseases of specified sites, accompanied by an apparent decrease in the incidence rates of diseases with unspecified sites.

Fifth, there can be changes in population demographics. The aging of the US population now under way would obviously dictate a shift in mortality from diseases of the young to diseases of the old. Age-specific analyses could be performed to control for this trend, but other trends cannot be adjusted for as easily, for example migration.

Finally, using mortality data one cannot differentiate between a change in the incidence rate of a disease and a change in the case-fatality rate of a disease. For example, we know that cardiovascular mortality is decreasing in much of the developed world. However, we do not know whether that decrease is because fewer people are developing coronary artery disease or whether the same proportion of the population is developing the disease, but they are living longer with the disease before dying.

DATA SOURCES FOR CASE–CONTROL STUDIES

REGISTRY DATA
As discussed above, there are a number of registries available, each comprised of cases of selected diseases. Usually these are just a collection of cases, without controls. However, if there is a registry extant which has a collection of cases of a disease one wishes to study, then this can be useful for performing a case–control study of that disease. One needs to be careful, however, about whether the registry collected all cases of a disease in a defined population or just some of them. If the latter, then one needs to consider whether the method of recruitment might introduce some bias into the study.

One particular registry which is often forgotten in this context is the spontaneous reporting system maintained by regulatory bodies throughout the world (see Chapters 10 and 11). These represent sources of cases of adverse drug reactions and can be used for case finding for case–control studies. As a specific example, a study used this approach to investigate the pathophysiology of the suprofen induced flank pain syndrome. Cases with the acute flank pain syndrome were compared to controls without the syndrome, both groups exposed to suprofen. This provided interesting information on risk factors for the acute flank pain syndrome among those who have been exposed to suprofen.

OLMSTEAD COUNTY MEDICAL RECORDS
Another approach to performing case–control studies takes advantage of the unique medical record system in Olmstead County, MN. The Mayo Clinic and its affiliated clinics and hospitals provide the medical care for most of the 250 000 residents of Olmstead County. These data have been supplemented since 1966 by information on diagnostic and surgical procedures from the other medical groups and hospitals in Olmstead County, as well as the few independent practitioners who were not part of the Mayo Clinic system. These records represent an extremely useful and productive resource for epidemiologic studies, including case finding for case–control studies. For pharmacoepidemiology studies, however, drug exposure data must usually be gathered de novo.

MANITOBA
The Canadian province of Manitoba maintains computerized diagnosis files for its clients, as a
by-product of its provincial health plan. As with
the Mayo Clinic data, computerized prescription
drug information is generally unavailable and, so,
needs to be obtained on an \textit{ad hoc} basis.

**AD HOC CASE–CONTROL STUDIES**

Finally, case–control studies can be performed as
\textit{ad hoc} studies, as well. Cases can then be recruited
from whatever source is appropriate for that
disease, whether hospitals, outpatient practices,
or some other source. Investigators in some
geographic areas maintain ongoing relationships
with a number of hospitals, to permit case finding
for case–control studies.

Case definitions must, of course, be clear. Cases
should be “incident cases,” that is individuals who
have recently developed the disease, so one can
inquire about exposures that preceded the onset of
the disease. All individuals who meet the case
definition should be enrolled, if possible, to
decrease the risk of a selection bias. Finally, if all
cases can be identified in a defined population,
then the incidence of the disease in the population
can be determined.

Controls can then be recruited from either the
site of medical care for the cases or from the
community the cases come from. The latter is now
generally perceived as a better approach than
the former. Community controls can be recruited
from friends of the cases, from neighbors of the
cases, from a reverse telephone directory, by using
random digit dialing, or from some comprehensive
listing of the target population. The last is
generally the best approach, although it often is
not available. Exceptions are selected geographic
areas in which the government maintains such a
list; organized medical care programs which can
provide listings of eligible individuals, such as
General Practitioners’ patient lists in the United
Kingdom and the other programs described in
Chapters 15 through 23; and other special situa-
tions. An example would be a study limited to the
elderly, which could obtain listings of those eligible
for Medicare in the local area.

Friend controls are convenient, but risk over-
matching; friends may be similar in personal
habits, and this can be problematic if these are
risk factors of importance in the study. Reverse
telephone directories list individuals by address,
rather than by name. They can be useful for
choosing community controls which are matched
for neighborhood and, thereby, crudely matched
for socioeconomic status. However, the use of
reverse telephone directories to recruit controls is
problematic in areas where a large proportion of
the population has unlisted telephone numbers.
This is becoming common in major metropolitan
areas in the US. Thus, random digit dialing is often
the best method available for the selection of
community controls.

The validity of exposure data collected from
patients as part of \textit{ad hoc} case–control studies is
discussed in Chapter 39.

Of course, many other details must be consid-
ered in planning a case–control study. A more
extensive discussion of this is beyond the scope of
this book. The interested reader is referred to a
standard epidemiology textbook and/or to one of
the books now available which specifically discuss
case–control studies. Overall, the advantages
and disadvantages of this approach are identical
to those of case–control surveillance, described in
Chapter 13. The major additional advantages of
the latter are that it has a large database of
potential controls and a standardized procedure,
which can expedite the study process. However, \textit{ad
hoc} studies have more flexibility in their design,
which allows one to use community controls and
to tailor the data collection effort to the question
at hand.

**DATA SOURCES FOR COHORT STUDIES**

The major logistic issues in performing pharma-
cepidemiology studies using a cohort design are,
first, how to identify a cohort of patients exposed
to a drug of interest and one or more control
groups without exposure to the drug and, second,
how to determine their clinical outcome. The
major sources of information about drug expos-
ures are billing claims, physicians, pharmacies,
and patients. To date, the last has been considered
relatively unreliable, and most approaches have
used one of the other three. Examples of each will
be presented below. As to clinical outcomes, the
major source of information must be the physician, directly or indirectly, through the medical record. Patients can be used as a partial source of this information, but confirmatory and supplementary information will generally be needed from physicians. The validity of disease outcome data collected from different sources is discussed in more detail in Chapter 39.

**PHARMACY-BASED POSTMARKETING SURVEILLANCE STUDIES**

A relatively underused method of recruiting patients into pharmacoepidemiology studies is through the pharmacy that dispenses the drug. One approach to this would be to collect data on drug exposures from computerized pharmacies. This would be similar to a billing data source. Alternatively, one could obtain the participation of the pharmacist, asking him to solicit patient recruitment. Finally, one could enclose recruitment information in a drug’s packaging, requesting that patients return an enclosed business reply card to enroll in the study.

Until recently, the major pioneer in the use of pharmacy-based methods of pharmacoepidemiology had been the pharmacoepidemiology group at Upjohn Pharmaceuticals. The results of a feasibility study using this approach have been published. Briefly, the study consisted of the identification and followup of 21372 patients treated between July 1975 and July 1977 with oral antibacterials in an ambulatory care setting. Participating centers were limited to those which combined medical care delivery sites with on-site pharmacies, excluding large hospital outpatient clinics and large referral centers. The pharmacists at participating sites were asked to invite a patient to participate if he or she received a drug of interest. The patient was given an explanatory brochure, which was supplemented by a discussion with the pharmacist, if needed. The brochure included a “release of information” statement, which was retained by the pharmacist. At weekly intervals, the pharmacist sent the Coordinating Center a list of all antibacterials dispensed, information about each prescription, and information about the patients who agreed to participate. The pharmacists were paid for the time this involved. Data on health outcomes were collected from the patients using a questionnaire mailed to them one month later. This was supplemented by telephone followup when needed. Reports of hospitalizations or deaths were confirmed at the place of treatment.

Pharmacy-based surveillance was used by Upjohn in other studies as well. In general the approach remained the same, although computer assisted telephone interviews were used to collect outcome data, rather than mailed questionnaires. People who could not be contacted by telephone were sent certified letters, asking them to telephone the research center. If they signed the receipt for the certified letter, but still could not be contacted, they were classified as alive.

The advantages of this approach are that it is free of the selection bias inherent in using physicians to recruit patients. Also, this approach does not interfere with prescribing practices, it allows one to collect information about patients’ use of concomitant drugs other than those any given physician may be aware of, it allows one to study outcomes which need not come to medical attention, and, compared to studies that recruit patients via prescribers, it is less expensive—it is free of the large cost of reimbursing the prescriber for his cooperation. The disadvantages of the approach are the potential for a volunteer bias and the extensive resources and time needed for site recruitment and data collection. Overall, however, this appears to be a very effective, although underused, approach to performing cohort studies in pharmacoepidemiology.

As another approach to pharmacy-based surveillance, the Center for Medication Monitoring at the University of Texas Medical Branch in Galveston has been performing postmarketing surveillance using patient self-monitoring. Patients filling a prescription for a target medication are presented an announcement of the study along with their prescription. Patients who agree to participate then are asked to report during the next month any changes in their health status. While they are mailed two questionnaires to obtain demographic and medication usage information, patients are asked to telephone the Center to report any new clinical
events. This is a variation on pharmacy-based surveillance which relies on patients to self-report new events. While this type of approach raises concerns about the representativeness of patients agreeing to participate, that may not be a problem since there is a control group subject to the same selection process. Unless willingness to participate was somehow different among the groups of study subjects being compared, no bias should result. Perhaps more serious, however, is the risk of missing many clinical events by relying on patient initiative to report them, and that the degree of incomplete reporting could easily be related to study group, or, alternatively, sufficiently severe to mask any real result due to nondifferential misclassification.

Finally, more recently, pharmacy-based surveillance was used to conduct a massive study of parenteral ketorolac. A retrospective cohort study between 18 November 1991 and 31 August 1993, identified subjects from 35 hospitals in the Delaware Valley Case-Control Network. Included were 9907 inpatients given 10,279 courses of parenteral ketorolac and 10,248 inpatients given parenteral narcotics and no parenteral ketorolac, matched on hospital, admission service, and date of initiation of therapy. Patients were enrolled by identifying users of these drugs from the hospital pharmacies. The source of data was then chart review, using computer-assisted chart abstracting forms. The study concluded that the adverse event profiles of ketorolac and narcotics appeared different, mostly in the pattern predicted, with ketorolac having an increased risk of GI bleeding, especially in the elderly, with higher doses, and with use over 5 days, and with narcotics having a higher risk of respiratory depression, but without a difference in risk in many other outcomes. Overall, the risk/benefit balance of parenteral ketorolac versus parenteral opiates was felt to be similar, but that improving the use of ketorolac (e.g., duration < 5 days) would improve the risk/benefit balance further, and the choice of the optimal drug needs to be made on a patient-specific basis. Extensive changes were made to the drug’s labeling in response to these results, and they protected the drug’s availability in some markets where concerns had been raised.

AD HOC COHORT STUDIES

The “traditional” approach to recruiting patients into pharmacoepidemiology cohort studies has been for pharmaceutical manufacturers to use their sales representatives (also known as “detail men”) to solicit physicians to enroll the next few patients for whom they prescribe the drug in question. The physicians then provide followup information on the results of this treatment. For example, in the “Phase IV” postmarketing drug surveillance study conducted of prazosin, the investigators collected a series of over 20,000 newly-exposed subjects, recruited through the manufacturer’s sales force. The goal of this study was to better quantitate the incidence of first dose syncope, which was a well recognized adverse effect of this drug. As another example, when cinetidine was first marketed there was a concern over whether it could cause agranulocytosis, since it was chemically closely related to metiamide, another H-2 blocker which had been removed from the market in Europe because it caused agranulocytosis. This study also collected 10,000 subjects, using a similar design, and found no cases of agranulocytosis.

Although this is the “standard” approach to this type of study, it suffers from a number of important problems. First, it is extremely expensive. The studies mentioned above cost over a million dollars each, without taking into account the considerable time of the pharmaceutical representatives.

Second, these studies did not include any control group. A control group was not necessary for them to provide useful information about the questions they were designed to answer. They were designed to quantitate the frequency of a defined medical event in those who were exposed to the drug, rather than to test hypotheses about whether the drug caused particular outcomes. However, in general the absence of a control group is a major problem. Without a control group, one cannot determine whether the observed frequency of any medical event is larger or smaller than would have been expected. Thus, one would expect that such studies would provide little new information, despite their cost, and this is what has been observed.
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It often would be difficult or impossible to enroll appropriate controls for a new drug in this type of study. For example, no other H-2 blocker was on the market at the time cimetidine was marketed. When a United Kingdom postmarketing surveillance study was performed which compared users of cimetidine to the next eligible patient in their general practitioners' offices, differences were seen which were likely to be due to the underlying disease for which the cimetidine was being administered, rather than the cimetidine. 31 Whether or not recruiting a valid control group would be possible, however, it would double the already considerable cost of a study of this type.

Finally, the physicians recruited into a study via a pharmaceutical company's sales representatives are unlikely to be representative of all physicians. In addition, there is no way to monitor whether the physicians select patients who are representative of all their patients, recruit patients sequentially, or even provide complete information on the patients selected. For all of these reasons, there is a considerable potential for biased results.

Thus, although this method continues to be used, this is mainly for its marketing potential rather than for the scientific information it will gather. In fact, some so-called postmarketing surveillance studies which are designed in this way are in fact pure marketing efforts, with no real attempt to gather useful scientific information. These are described to participants as pharmacoepidemiology studies, while in fact they are market seeding studies. This practice is unfortunate, however, and should be abandoned. In addition to being of questionable honesty, this practice is troublesome, as physicians could become jaded as well as disillusioned with and skeptical about postmarketing surveillance studies in general, jeopardizing future studies which could make important contributions. 34

OTHER APPROACHES

Other approaches to recruiting patients for cohort postmarketing surveillance studies are more opportunistic. As an example, most of the databases described in earlier chapters can be used to identify individuals exposed to selected drugs (see Chapters 15 to 23).

As another example, in a United Kingdom postmarketing surveillance study, the Prescription Pricing Bureau and local pharmacies in four geographic areas were used to identify individuals prescribed cimetidine by their general practitioners. Controls were selected from the general practitioners' practice file, as the next patient in the file of the same sex, age (by decade), and who had attended the practice within the prior 12 months. Outcome data were collected by visiting the general practitioner again 15 months later and reviewing his records for any intervening care received by the patient. 35

Finally, other approaches can be thought of as well, such as by systematically approaching physicians who are likely to be prescribing the drug. For example, to evaluate cimetidine one could solicit via mail the cooperation of all gastroenterologists. As another example, to evaluate a new vaccine one could approach city health clinics that administer the vaccine, and one could solicit the cooperation of pediatricians.

USING RANDOMIZED CLINICAL TRIALS AS POSTMARKETING SURVEILLANCE STUDIES

For the reasons described in Chapter 2, randomized clinical trials do not have as large a role in postmarketing studies as they do in premarketing studies. 36 They are artificial and raise logistical problems. Perhaps most importantly, however, they are often unnecessary, because of the studies performed premarketing. In fact, however, most studies performed after drug marketing are randomized clinical trials. 37 Most of those are intended to address specific questions about drug efficacy, and are conducted as if they were premarketing studies. A few are designed to study drug safety. 38 However, there is a relative lack of postmarketing surveillance randomized clinical trials that take advantage of the fact that they are studying an approved drug.

Specifically, pharmacoepidemiology techniques can be used to conduct postmarketing clinical
trials in ways that could be less costly and less artificial. An example is the Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound’s randomized clinical trial comparing the toxicity of microencapsulated versus wax-matrix formulations of oral potassium chloride. Since these are both FDA-approved products and are theoretically interchangeable formulations of the same active drug, this Health Maintenance Organization randomly allocated its pharmacies to dispense either the wax-matrix formulation or the microencapsulated formulation.

As another example, we have planned a large scale double-blind randomized clinical trial of two different drugs in the same drug class. The study would be performed by mail. After obtaining patient consent, participating prescribers would use special preprinted prescription pads for the “study drug.” These prescriptions would be telephoned, and later mailed, into the coordinating center, which would then mail the drug to the patient, who would not have to pay for the drug. Data collection would be performed by questionnaires mailed to the patients and by obtaining copies of the physicians’ medical records. The incentives needed to obtain physician participation should be much less than those used in classical premarketing clinical trials, because of the markedly decreased amount of work being requested. This would be explored within a pilot study to be conducted first.

Thus, postmarketing randomized clinical trials can be conducted in innovative ways that take advantage of the postmarketing setting, rather than simply performing a premarketing randomized trial after marketing. This is uncommonly done, however. Much more is presented in Chapter 33, on the use of randomized clinical trials for pharmacoepidemiology studies.

Additional Databases Useful for Pharmacoepidemiology Research

Finally, there are a number of other databases potentially useful for pharmacoepidemiology research. In addition, new databases are continuously under development. In general these, of course, can be used for either cohort or case-control studies. Most have been used only rarely for pharmacoepidemiology, but could be used more often, especially if expanded.

One of these is the medical record linkage system used in Finland. The Finnish Cancer Registry, Congenital Malformation Register, and Hospital Discharge Register can each be linked to the Register of Persons Entitled to Free Drugs.39 The particular advantages of this system is that it collects nationwide data and some of the notifications are mandatory. The particular disadvantages are the small population size (Finland’s population is only 4.6 million, in total, and there are only 60,000 individuals per year with data reported to the Register of Persons Entitled to Free Drugs), and the limited staff available to make use of the data set. Nevertheless, it has been used on occasion for formal analytic research in pharmacoepidemiology. For example, a paper reported a case-control study that did not confirm the initial reports of an association between reserpine and breast cancer.40

An analogous database was created using the Oxford Record Linkage Study.41 It included four group practices and one solo practice, a total of 16 general practitioners’ practices, 33,000 patients at any point in time, and 43,117 patients over the two-year time period of study. Demographic information came from the computerized Oxford Community Health Project. Medical outcome data were collected by obtaining photocopies of prescriptions from the Prescription Pricing Authority, which were then computerized.

Another database occasionally being used for pharmacoepidemiology research is the longstanding Regenstrief Medical Record System.42 This database contains all laboratory, pharmacy, and appointment information for a network of inner city facilities in Indianapolis, including a 340-bed hospital and associated outpatient practices. It has been used for many studies, although only a few pharmacoepidemiology studies (e.g., 43–45). While a uniquely deep data resource, e.g., in its availability of laboratory data, for the purposes of pharmacoepidemiology studies, it suffers from a relatively small population, and incomplete ascertainment of
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outcomes, i.e., patients who go to other facilities in Indianapolis for some of their care, will not have the associated care recorded. This means that key exposures or outcomes could be missed, as well as important confounders.

Another database used for pharmacoepidemiology research, very different from Regenstrief, is IMS America’s MediPlus database. This is a UK medical record database, very similar to the General Practice Research Database described in detail in Chapter 23. One difference is the lack of an attempt to add hospital outcome data to these data, so it is mostly useful for studies of outpatient prescribing patterns and of events that do not result in hospitalization. There have been relatively few papers published to date using this resource. An analogous database exists in Germany.

Yet another, very different, type of database that has been available for a number of years is the Health Evaluation through Logical Processing (HELP) System at LDS Hospital, Salt Lake City, UT (540 beds). This is a computerized hospital information system designed to provide administrative, financial, and clinical hospital services. This system consists of a large database capable of assisting with the management of clinical data, order communications, results review, the production of comprehensive clinical reports, and decision making. It has taken over 20 years to develop the current system, and it is continuously updated and changed, and new functions are added. There is patient-based information on the drugs administered, which can be linked to events, other therapies, and procedures. To date, the epidemiologic applications of the HELP system have been primarily in the area of infectious diseases and antibiotic use (e.g., 53, 54). Another application of the HELP system has been for computerized surveillance of adverse drug events. The adverse drug event monitoring system combined “enhanced” voluntary reporting by hospital personnel through entry of potential adverse events at any computer terminal in the hospital, with automated detection of adverse drug events through signal events, e.g., sudden discontinuation of a drug, an order for an antidote, certain laboratory tests, and abnormal results. Using this system, 36 653 patients were monitored over an 18-month period. Of these patients, 648 experienced 731 adverse drug events. Before initiation of this program, only 10–20 adverse drug events were reported on a voluntary basis annually. The investigators were able to determine the patient populations at risk for an adverse drug event and those drug classes most often associated with an adverse event.

A number of new databases are emerging from Italy, as well. There is one in particular, from the Italian region of Friuli-Venezia Giulia that has been productive of a number of papers in the international literature. Of the 1.2 million inhabitants of that region, this database contains information on those who are covered by the Italian National Health Service, including outpatient prescriptions, demographic information, and hospital services provided. A methodological paper from that database indicates that the diagnoses of upper gastrointestinal bleeding and perforation are sufficiently valid to be useful for pharmacoepidemiology research. This is a database that is likely to be used much more often for pharmacoepidemiology research in the next few years.

CONCLUSIONS

In summary, there are a number of other approaches to pharmacoepidemiology studies, in addition to the ones described in detail earlier. No approach to pharmacoepidemiology studies is ideal. Each available approach has its advantages and its disadvantages. In the next chapter, we will place all of these options in perspective, discussing how one chooses among the available alternatives.
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INTRODUCTION

As discussed in the previous chapters, pharmacoepidemiology studies apply the techniques of epidemiology to the content area of clinical pharmacology. Between 500 and 3000 individuals are usually studied prior to drug marketing. Most postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology studies need to include at least 10,000 subjects, or draw from an equivalent population for a case–control study, in order to contribute sufficient new information to be worth their cost and effort. This large sample size raises logistical problems. Chapters 10 through 24 presented each of the different approaches that have been developed to perform pharmacoepidemiology studies efficiently, despite these very large sample sizes. This chapter is intended to synthesize this material, to assist the reader in choosing among the available approaches.

CHOOSING AMONG THE AVAILABLE APPROACHES TO PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY STUDIES

Once one has decided to perform a pharmacoepidemiology study, one needs to decide which of the resources described in the earlier chapters of this book should be used. Although, to some degree, the choice may be based upon a researcher's familiarity with given data resources and/or the investigators who have been using them, this author feels strongly that it is important to tailor the choice of pharmacoepidemiology resource to the question to be addressed. One may want to use more than one approach, in parallel or in combination. If no single resource is optimal for addressing a question, it can be useful to use a number of approaches that complement each other. Indeed, this is probably the preferable approach for addressing important questions.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacoepidemiology approach</th>
<th>Relative size</th>
<th>Relative cost</th>
<th>Relative speed</th>
<th>Representativeness</th>
<th>Population-based</th>
<th>Cohort studies possible</th>
<th>Case-control studies possible</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous reporting</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive hospital-based cohort studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Programs</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Pilgrim Health Care</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnitedHealth Group</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid databases</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health databases in Saskatchewan</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRD</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc analyses of secular trends</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-control surveillance</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry-based case-control studies</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc case-control studies</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Event Monitoring</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy-based surveillance:</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outpatient</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc cohort studies</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacoepidemiology randomized trials</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*See the text of this chapter for descriptions of the column headings, and previous chapters for descriptions of the data resources.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacoepidemiology approach</th>
<th>Validity of exposure data</th>
<th>Validity of outcome data</th>
<th>Control of confounding</th>
<th>Inpatient drug exposure data</th>
<th>Outpatient diagnosis data</th>
<th>Dates of available data</th>
<th>Loss to followup</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous reporting studies</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>fall 1969 to date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive hospital-based cohort studies</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1966–1976</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1972 to date</td>
<td>15%/year x 2 years after 2 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Programs</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4/88 to date</td>
<td>14%/year unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Pilgrim Health Care</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>1990 to date</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnitedHealth Group</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ to +++++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>9/75–6/87, 1/89 to date</td>
<td>20–25%/year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid databases</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health databases in Saskatchewan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1987 to date</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1989 to date</td>
<td>nil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRD</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+ to +++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1990 to date</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc analyses of secular trends</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>as desired</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case–control surveillance</td>
<td>+ to ++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1975 to date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry-based case–control studies</td>
<td>+ to ++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>variable</td>
<td>as desired N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc case–control studies</td>
<td>+ to ++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>1975 to date</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Event Monitoring</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>as desired variable</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy-based surveillance: outpatient</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>as desired variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc cohort studies</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>as desired variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacoepidemiology randomized trials</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>as desired variable</td>
<td>variable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1In the Northern California Program, computerized pharmacy data are complete for: (i) 1969–1973 for one large pharmacy; (ii) 1981 to date, for a 1% sample, and (iii) March 1984 through at least April 1985 for one large pharmacy, all pharmacies since 1986 in Oregon, and since 1994 in Northern California. Discharge diagnoses are computerized from 1971 to date.

2Tennessee: 1973 to date; other programs 1980 to date.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacoepidemiology approach</th>
<th>Hypothesis generating&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Hypothesis strengthening&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Hypothesis testing&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Study of benefits (vs. risks)</th>
<th>Incidence rates desired</th>
<th>Low incidence outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous reporting</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive hospital-based cohort studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Programs</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Pilgrim Health Care</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnitedHealth Group</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid databases</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health databases in Saskatchewan</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPRD</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc analyses of secular trends</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case–control surveillance</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>−</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry-based case–control studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc case–control studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Event Monitoring</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy-based surveillance:</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outpatient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc cohort studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacoepidemiology randomized trials</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>See the text of this chapter for descriptions of the column headings, and previous chapters for descriptions of the data resources.

<sup>b</sup>Hypothesis-generating studies are studies designed to raise new questions about possible unexpected drug effects, whether adverse or beneficial.

<sup>c</sup>Hypothesis-strengthening studies are studies designed to provide support for, although not definitive evidence for, existing hypotheses.

<sup>d</sup>Hypothesis-testing studies are studies designed to evaluate in detail hypotheses raised elsewhere.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacoepidemiology approach</th>
<th>Low prevalence exposure</th>
<th>Important confounders</th>
<th>Drug use inpatient (vs. outpatient)</th>
<th>Outcome does not result in hospitalization</th>
<th>Outcome does not result in medical attention</th>
<th>Outcome a delayed effect</th>
<th>Exposure a new drug</th>
<th>Urgent question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous reporting</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intensive hospital-based cohort studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Programs</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harvard Pilgrim Health Care</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UnitedHealth Group</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid databases</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health databases in Saskatchewan</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tayside</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>/-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPDR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+/-</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc analyses of secular trends</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case-control surveillance</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>to +++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registry-based case-control studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc case-control studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>to +++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescription Event Monitoring</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>to +++</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy-based surveillance:</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>outpatient</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc cohort studies</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacoepidemiology randomized trials</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>++</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+++</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regardless, investigators are often left with a difficult and complex choice.

In order to explain how to choose among the available pharmacoepidemiology resources, it is useful to synthesize the information from the previous chapters on the relative strengths and weaknesses of each of the available pharmacoepidemiology approaches, examining the comparative characteristics of each (see Table 25.1). One can then examine the characteristics of the research question at hand, in order to choose the pharmacoepidemiology approach best suited to addressing that question (see Table 2). The weightings provided in this discussion and in the accompanying tables are arbitrary. They are not being represented as a consensus of the pharmacoepidemiology community, but represent the feelings of this author alone. Nevertheless, I think that most would agree with the general principles presented, and even many of the relative ratings. My hope is that this synthesis of information, despite some of the arbitrary decisions inherent in it, will make it easier for the reader to synthesize the large amount of information presented in the prior chapters.

**COMPARATIVE CHARACTERISTICS OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY DATA RESOURCES**

Table 25.1 lists each of the different pharmacoepidemiology data resources that were described in earlier chapters, along with some of their characteristics.

The relative size of the database refers to the population it covers. Only spontaneous reporting systems, The Netherlands Record Linkage System, and Prescription Event Monitoring cover entire countries or large fractions thereof. Medicaid databases are next largest, with UnitedHealth Group approaching that, with about 13 million persons. The GPRD database has a population of about 3 million individuals. Then, Kaiser in Northern California currently includes 2.8 million subscribers, Kaiser in Southern California about 2 million, and Kaiser Northwest about 400,000. The Saskatchewan database includes about 1 million currently active individuals. The other data resources are generally smaller. Case-control surveillance, as conducted by the Slone Epidemiology Unit, can cover a variable population, depending on the number of hospitals and metropolitan areas they include in their network for a given study. The population base of registry-based case-control studies depends on the registries used for case finding. Ad hoc studies can be whatever size the researcher desires for the study at hand.

As to relative cost, studies that collect new data are most expensive, especially randomized trials and cohort studies, for which sample sizes generally need to be large and followup may need to be prolonged. In the case of randomized trials, there are additional logistical complexities. Studies that use existing data are least expensive, although their cost increases when they gather primary medical records for validation purposes. Studies that use existing data resources to identify subjects but then collect new data about those subjects are intermediate in cost.

As to relative speed, studies that collect new data take longer, especially randomized trials and cohort studies. Studies that use existing data are able to answer a question most quickly, although considerable additional time may be needed to obtain primary medical records for validation purposes. Studies that use existing data resources to identify subjects but then collect new data about those subjects are intermediate in speed.

Representativeness refers to how well the subjects in the data resource represent the population at large. Spontaneous reporting systems, Prescription Event Monitoring, the health databases in Saskatchewan, the Netherlands System, and the Tayside system each include entire countries, provinces, or states and, so, are typical populations. Medicaid programs are limited to the disadvantaged, and so include a population that is least representative of a general population. Randomized trials include populations skewed by the various selection criteria plus their willingness to volunteer for the study. The GPRD uses a nonrandom large subset of the total UK population, and so may be representative. Group Health Cooperative, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, Kaiser, and UnitedHealth include
HMO populations. These are closer to representative populations than a Medicaid population would be, although they include a largely working population and, so, include few patients of low socioeconomic status. Some of the remaining techniques are listed as “variable”, meaning their representativeness depends on which hospitals are recruited into the study. Ad hoc studies are listed as “as desired,” as they can be designed to be representative or not, as the investigator wishes.

Whether a database is population-based refers to whether there is an identifiable population, all of whose medical care would be included in that database, regardless of the provider. This allows one to determine incidence rates of diseases, as well as being more certain that one knows of all medical care that any given patient receives. As an example, assuming little or no out-of-plan care, the Kaiser programs are population-based. One can use Kaiser data, therefore, to study medical care received in and out of the hospital, as well as diseases which may result in repeat hospitalizations. For example, one could study the impact of the treatment initially received for venous thromboembolism on the risk of subsequent disease recurrence. In contrast, hospital-based case–control studies are not population-based: they include only the specific hospitals that belong to the system. Thus, a patient diagnosed with and treated for venous thromboembolism in a participating hospital could be readmitted to a different, nonparticipating, hospital if the disease recurred. This recurrence would not be detected in a study using such a system. The data resources that are population-based are those that use data from organized medical systems. Registry-based and ad hoc case-control studies can occasionally be conducted as population-based studies, if all cases in a defined geographic area are recruited into the study, but this is unusual (see also Chapters 2 and 24).

Whether cohort studies are possible would depend on whether individuals can be identified by whether or not they were exposed to a drug of interest. This would be true in any of the population-based systems, as well as any of the systems designed to perform cohort studies.

Whether case–control studies are possible depends on whether patients can be identified by whether or not they suffered from a disease of interest. This would be true in any of the population based systems except the Netherlands system, which lacks access to linked diagnosis data, as well as any of the systems designed to perform case–control studies. Even the Netherlands is developing that capability, using PHARMO. Data from spontaneous reporting systems can be used for case finding for case–control studies, although this has been done infrequently.

The validity of the exposure data is most certain in hospital-based settings, in which one can be reasonably certain of both the identity of a drug and that the patient ingested it. Exposure data in spontaneous reporting systems originate mostly from health care providers and, so, are probably valid. However, one cannot be certain of patient compliance in these data. Exposure data from organized systems of medical care are unbiased data recorded by pharmacies, often for billing purposes, a process that is closely audited as it impacts on reimbursement. They are likely to be accurate, therefore, although again one cannot assure compliance. In addition, in HMOs there are drugs that may fall beneath a patient’s deductibles, or not be on formularies. For UnitedHealth Group, since Medicare drug benefits vary depending on the plan, pharmacy files may not capture all prescribed drugs if beneficiaries reach the drug benefit limit. In GPRD, drugs prescribed by physicians other than the general practitioner could be missed, although continuing prescribing by the general practitioner would be detected. Case–control studies generally rely on patient histories for exposure data. These may be very inaccurate, as patients often do not recall correctly the medications they are taking. However, this would be expected to vary, depending on the type of drug taken, the questioning technique used, etc. (see Chapter 39).

The validity of the outcome data is also most certain in hospital-based settings, in which the patient is subjected to intensive medical surveillance. It is least certain in outpatient data from organized systems of medical care. There are,
however, methods of improving the accuracy of these data, such as using drugs and procedures as markers of the disease and obtaining primary medical records. The outcome data from automated databases are listed as variable, therefore, depending on exactly which data are being used, and how. GPRD analyzes the actual medical record, rather than claims, and can access additional questionnaire data from the general practitioner, as well. Medicaid databases are no longer able to access medical records to validate their outcomes, for reasons of confidentiality.

Control of confounding refers to the ability to control for confounding variables. The most powerful approach to controlling confounding is the randomized clinical trial. As discussed in Chapter 2, the randomized clinical trial is the only way of controlling for unknown, unmeasured, or unmeasurable confounding variables. Techniques that collect sufficient information to control for known and measurable variables are next most effective. These include intensive hospital-based cohort studies, Group Health, GPRD, Kaiser, case–control surveillance, ad hoc case–control studies, and ad hoc cohort studies. The health databases in Saskatchewan, UnitedHealth Group, Tayside, and Harvard Pilgrim Health Care can obtain primary medical records, but not all information necessary is always available in those records. They generally are unable to contact patients to obtain supplementary information that might not be in a medical record. Medicaid databases have considerable additional data available, but are no longer able to access medical records. Finally, spontaneous reporting systems and analyses of trends have no control of confounding.

Relatively few of the data systems have data on inpatient drug use. The exceptions include spontaneous reporting systems, intensive hospital based cohort studies, Group Health (only since 1989, and not yet used for research), Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, ad hoc studies, and the rare analyses of trends designed to study inpatient drug use.

Only a few of the data resources have sufficient data on outpatient diagnoses available without special effort, to be able to study them as outcome variables. Ad hoc studies can be designed to be able to collect such information. In the case of ad hoc randomized clinical trials, this data collection effort could even include tailored laboratory and physical examination measurements. In some of the resources, the outpatient outcome data are collected observationally, but directly via the physician, and so are more likely to be accurate. Included are spontaneous reporting systems, GPRD, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, Prescription Event Monitoring, and some ad hoc cohort studies. Other outpatient data come via physician claims for medical care, including Medicaid databases, UnitedHealth Group, and the health databases in Saskatchewan. The latter include outpatient data, but only to three digits of the ICD-9 coding system. Finally, other data resources can access outpatient diagnoses only via the patient, and so they are less likely to be complete; although the diagnosis can often be validated using medical records, it generally needs to be identified by the patient. These include most case–control studies and outpatient pharmacy-based monitoring.

The dates of the available data differ substantially among the different resources, as does the degree of loss to followup. They are specified in Table 25.1.

**CHARACTERISTICS OF RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE CHOICE OF PHARMA COEPIDEMIOLOGY DATA RESOURCES**

Once one is familiar with the characteristics of the pharmacoepidemiology resources available, one must then examine more closely the research question, to determine which resources can best be used to answer it (see Table 25.2).

Pharmacoepidemiology studies can be mounted to generate hypotheses about drug effects, to strengthen hypotheses, and/or to test a priori hypotheses about drug effects. Hypothesis-generating studies are studies designed to raise new questions about possible unexpected drug effects, whether adverse or beneficial. Virtually all studies and approaches can and do raise such questions, through incidental findings in studies mounted for other reasons. In addition, virtually any case–control
study could be used, in principle, to screen for possible drug causes of the disease under study, and virtually any cohort study could be used to screen for unexpected outcomes from the drug exposure under study. In practice, however, the only approaches that have attempted to do this systematically have been Kaiser Permanente, case–control surveillance, Prescription Event Monitoring, and Medicaid databases, none of which have resulted in notable new findings. To date, the most productive source of new hypotheses about drug effects has been spontaneous reporting.

Hypothesis-strengthening studies are studies designed to provide support for, although not definitive evidence for, existing hypotheses. The objective of these studies is to provide sufficient support for, or evidence against, a hypothesis to permit a decision about whether a subsequent, more definitive, study should be undertaken. As such, hypothesis-strengthening studies need to be conducted rapidly and inexpensively. Hypothesis-strengthening studies can include crude analyses conducted using almost any dataset, evaluating a hypothesis that arose elsewhere. Because potentially confounding variables would not be controlled, the findings could not be considered definitive. Alternatively, hypothesis-strengthening studies can be more detailed studies, controlling for confounding, conducted using the same data resource that raised the hypothesis. In this case, because this was not an a priori hypothesis, a hypothesis-testing type of study could only serve to strengthen, not test, the hypothesis. Spontaneous reporting systems are useful for raising hypotheses, but are not very useful for providing additional support for those hypotheses, although some limited additional work on this is under way. Conversely, randomized trials can certainly strengthen hypotheses, but are generally too costly and logistically too complex to be used for this purpose. Of the remaining approaches, those that can quickly access, in a computerized form, both exposure data and outcome data are most useful. Those that can rapidly access only one of these, exposure or outcome data, are next most useful, while those that need to gather both are least useful, because of the time and expense that would be entailed.

Hypothesis-testing studies are studies designed to evaluate in detail hypotheses raised elsewhere. Such studies must be able to have simultaneous comparison groups and must be able to control for most known potential confounding variables. For these reasons, spontaneous reporting systems cannot be used for this purpose, as they cannot be used to conduct studies with simultaneous controls (with rare exception—see reference 2). Analyses of trends cannot be used to test hypotheses as they cannot control for confounding. The most powerful approach, of course, is a randomized clinical trial, as it is the only way to control for unknown or unmeasurable confounding variables. Techniques which allow access to patients and their medical records are the next most powerful, as one can gather information on potential confounders that might only be reliably obtained from one of those sources or the other. Techniques which allow access to primary records but not the patient are next most useful.

The research implications of questions about the beneficial effects of drugs are different, depending upon whether the beneficial effects of interest are expected or unexpected effects. Studies of unexpected beneficial effects are exactly analogous to studies of unexpected adverse effects, in terms of their implications to one’s choice of an approach; in both cases one is studying side-effects. Studies of expected beneficial effects, or drug efficacy, raise the special methodologic problem of confounding by the indication: patients who receive a drug are different from those who do not in a way which usually is related to the outcome under investigation in the study. This issue is discussed in detail in Chapter 34. As described there, it is sometimes possible to address these questions using nonexperimental study designs. Generally, however, the randomized clinical trial is far preferable, when feasible.

In order to address questions about the incidence of a disease in those exposed to a drug, one must be able to quantitate how many people received the drug. This information can be obtained using any resource that can perform a cohort study. Techniques that need to gather the outcome data de novo may miss some of the outcomes if there is incomplete participation and/or reporting of
outcomes, like Prescription Event Monitoring, \textit{ad hoc} cohort studies, and outpatient pharmacy-based cohort studies. On the other hand, these approaches are the only way of collecting information about outcomes that need not come to medical attention (see below). The only approaches that are free from either of these problems are the hospital-based approaches. Registry-based case–control studies and \textit{ad hoc} case–control studies can occasionally be used to estimate incidence rates, if one obtains a complete collection of cases from a defined geographic area. The other approaches listed cannot be used to calculate incidence rates.

To address a question about a low incidence outcome, one needs to study a large population (see Chapter 3). This can best be done using either spontaneous reporting, Prescription Event Monitoring, the Netherlands system, or \textit{ad hoc} analyses of secular trends, which can or do cover entire countries. Alternatively, one could use United-Health Group or Medicaid databases, which cover a large proportion of the United States, or GPRD. Other case–control studies, either \textit{ad hoc} studies, studies using registries, or studies using case–control surveillance, can also be expanded to cover large populations, although not as large as the previously-mentioned techniques. Because they recruit patients on the basis of the patients suffering from a disease, they are more efficient than attempting to perform such studies using analogous cohort studies. Kaiser in Northern California includes 2.8 million subscribers, Kaiser in Southern California over 2 million, and Kaiser Northwest about 400 000. Saskatchewan contains a population of about one million. Pharmacy-based surveillance methods and \textit{ad hoc} cohort studies could potentially be expanded to cover equivalent populations. Group Health Cooperative includes fewer individuals and so would be less useful to answer questions about uncommon outcomes. Harvard Pilgrim Health Care and Tayside are also small. Finally, intensive hospital-based cohort studies and randomized trials could, in principle, be expanded to achieve very large sample sizes, but this would be very difficult and costly.

To address a question about a low prevalence exposure, one also needs to study a large population (see Chapter 3). Again this can best be done using either spontaneous reporting, the Netherlands system, or Prescription Event Monitoring, which cover entire countries. Alternatively, one could use UnitedHealth Group or Medicaid databases, which cover a large proportion of the United States, or GPRD. Pharmacy-based surveillance methods and \textit{ad hoc} cohort studies could also be used to recruit exposed patients from a large population. Analogously, randomized trials, which control exposure, could assure an adequate number of exposed individuals. Other case–control studies, either \textit{ad hoc} studies, studies using registries, or studies using case–control surveillance, could theoretically be expanded to cover a large enough population, but this would be difficult and expensive. \textit{Ad hoc} analyses of trends would not be useful, as a change in the prevalence of a rare exposure is unlikely to affect the general burden of disease enough to be detectable.

When there are important confounders that need to be taken into account in order to answer the question at hand, then one needs to be certain that sufficient and accurate information is available on those confounders. Spontaneous reporting systems and analyses of trends cannot be used for this purpose. The most powerful approach is a randomized trial, as it is the only way to control for unknown or unmeasurable confounding variables. Techniques which allow access to patients and their medical records are the next most powerful, as one can gather information on potential confounders that might only be reliably obtained from one of those sources or the other. Techniques which allow access to primary records but not the patient are the next most useful.

If the drug use in question is inpatient drug use, then the data resource must obviously be capable of collecting data on inpatient drug exposures. The number of approaches which have this capability are limited, and include spontaneous reporting systems, intensive hospital-based cohort studies, Harvard Pilgrim Health Care, and inpatient pharmacy-based surveillance systems. \textit{Ad hoc} studies could also, of course, be designed to collect such information.

When the outcome under study does not result in hospitalization, but does result in medical attention,
the best approaches are randomized trials and ad hoc studies which can be specifically designed to be sure this information can be collected. Prescription Event Monitoring and GPRD, which collect their data from general practitioners, are excellent sources of data for this type of question. Harvard Pilgrim Health Care is similar, with data collected in an automated fashion. Reports of such outcomes are likely to come to spontaneous reporting systems, as well. Medicaid databases can also be used, as they include outpatient data, although one must be cautious about the validity of the diagnosis information in outpatient claims. Saskatchewan is similar, although outpatient data are more limited. Finally, registry-based case-control studies could theoretically be performed, if they included outpatient cases of the disease under study.

When the outcome under study does not result in medical attention at all, the approaches available are much more limited. Only randomized trials can be specifically designed to be certain this information is collected. Intensive hospital-based cohort studies might observe such outcomes, but are unlikely to do so unless data gathering was specifically targeted to observe the outcome in question. Ad hoc studies can be designed to try to collect such information from patients. Finally, occasionally one could collect information on such an outcome in a spontaneous reporting system, if the report came from a patient or if the report came from a health care provider who became aware of the problem while the patient was visiting for medical care for some other problem.

When the outcome under study is a delayed drug effect, then one obviously needs approaches capable of tracking individuals over a long period of time. The best approach for this is the health databases in Saskatchewan. Drug data are available for more than 25 years, and there is little turnover in the population covered. Thus, this is an ideal system within which to perform such long term studies. Group Health Cooperative and Kaiser Permanente have even longer followup time available. However, as HMOs they suffer from some turnover, albeit more modest after the first few years. Analogously, any of the methods of conducting case-control studies can address such questions, although one would have to be especially careful about the validity of the exposure information collected many years after the exposure. Medicaid databases have been available since 1973. However, the large turnover in Medicaid programs, due to changes in eligibility with changes in family and employment status, makes studies of long-term drug effects problematic. Similarly, one could conceivably perform studies of long-term drug effects using ad hoc analyses of secular trends, Prescription Event Monitoring, outpatient pharmacy-based surveillance, ad hoc cohort studies, or randomized clinical trials, but these techniques are not as well suited to this type of question as the previously discussed techniques. Theoretically, one also could identify long-term drug effects in a spontaneous reporting system. This is unlikely, however, as a physician is unlikely to link a current medical event with a drug exposure long ago. Finally, one cannot study long-term drug effects using inpatient approaches.

When the exposure under study is a new drug, then one is, of course, limited to data sources that collect data on recent exposures, and preferably those which can collect a significant number of such exposures quickly. Any of the cohort study approaches or a randomized clinical trial are ideal for this, as they recruit patients into the study on the basis of their exposure. Spontaneous reporting is similarly a good approach for this, as new drugs are automatically and immediately covered, and in fact reports are much more common in the first three years after a drug is marketed. The major databases are next most useful, especially Medicaid databases, as their large population base will allow one to accumulate a sufficient number of exposed individuals rapidly, so one can perform a study sooner. In some cases, there is a delay until the drug is available on the program’s formulary, however. Intensive hospital-based cohort studies will take a long time before an adequate sample size is collected, although this may be the only viable approach to studying a drug used in the hospital only. Ad hoc analyses of secular trends and case-control studies, by whatever approach, must wait until sufficient drug exposure has occurred that it can affect the outcome variable being studied.
Finally, if one needs an answer to a question urgently, potentially the fastest approach, if the data are included, is a spontaneous reporting system; drugs are included in these systems immediately, and an extremely large population base is covered. Of course, one cannot rely on any adverse reaction being detected in a spontaneous reporting system. Also very useful are the Medicaid databases. In many states, the drugs are available almost immediately; both exposure and diagnosis data are available in a computerized format; both inpatient and outpatient diagnosis data are available in a computerized format, if desired; the time delay between the exposure or the medical event and its appearance in the computerized record is relatively short; and the large population base allows one to attain the needed sample sizes quickly. The other computerized databases are also very useful for these purposes. Analyses of secular trends can be mounted faster than other ad hoc studies, and so these can be useful sometimes when an alternative approach will not work. The remaining techniques are of limited use, as they take too long to address a question. One exception to this is Prescription Event Monitoring, if the drug in question happens to have been a subject of one of its studies. The other, and more likely, exception is case–control surveillance, if the disease under study is available in adequate numbers in its database, either because it was the topic of a prior study or because there were a sufficient number of individuals with the disease collected to be included in control groups for prior studies.

**EXAMPLES**

As an example, one might want to explore whether nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) cause upper gastrointestinal bleeding and, if so, how often. One could examine the manufacturer’s premarking data from clinical trials, but the number of patients included is not likely to be large enough to study clinical bleeding, and the setting is very artificial. Alternatively, one could examine premarking studies using more sensitive outcome measures, such as endoscopy. However, these are even more artificial. Instead, one could use any of the databases to address the question quickly, as they have data on drug exposures that preceded the hospital admission. Some could only investigate gastrointestinal bleeding resulting in hospitalization (e.g., Kaiser Permanente, except via chart review, or Tayside). Others could explore inpatient or outpatient bleeding (e.g., Medicaid, Saskatchewan). Because of confounding by cigarette smoking, alcohol, etc., which would not be well measured in these databases, one also might want to address this question using case–control or cohort studies, whether conducted ad hoc or using any of the special approaches available, for example case–control surveillance or Prescription Event Monitoring. If one wanted to be able to calculate incidence rates, one would need to restrict these studies to cohort studies, rather than case–control studies. One would be unlikely to be able to use registries, as there are no registries, known to this author at least, that record patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding. One would not be able to perform analyses of secular trends, as upper gastrointestinal bleeding would not appear in vital statistics data, except as a cause of death. Studying death from upper gastrointestinal bleeding is problematic, as it is a disease from which patients usually do not die. Rather than studying determinants of upper gastrointestinal bleeding, one would really be studying determinants of complications from upper gastrointestinal bleeding, diseases for which upper gastrointestinal bleeding is a complication, or determinants of physicians’ decisions to withhold supportive transfusion therapy from patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding, for example age, terminal illnesses, etc.

Alternatively, one might want to address a similar question about nausea and vomiting caused by NSAIDs. Although this question is very similar, one’s options in addressing it would be much more limited, as nausea and vomiting often do not come to medical attention. Other than a randomized clinical trial, for a drug that is largely used on an outpatient basis one is limited to outpatient pharmacy-based surveillance systems which request information from patients, or ad hoc cohort studies.
As another example, one might want to follow up a signal generated by the spontaneous reporting system, designing a study to investigate whether a drug which has been on the market for, say, five years is a cause of a relatively rare condition, such as allergic hypersensitivity reactions. Because of the infrequency of the disease, one would need to draw on a very large population. The best alternatives would be Medicaid databases, _ad hoc_ analyses of trends, case-control studies, or Prescription Event Monitoring. If this is a drug used primarily as an inpatient, then the Harvard Pilgrim Health Care would be the only viable choice, if the outcome were common enough to be detectable with their sample sizes. If this was a drug used primarily as an outpatient, then the other techniques would be feasible. To expedite this hypothesis-testing study and limit costs, it would be desirable if it could be performed using existing data. Prescription Event Monitoring and case-control surveillance would be excellent ways of addressing this, but only if the drug or disease in question, respectively, had been the subject of a prior study. Other methods of conducting case-control studies require gathering exposure data _de novo_.

As a last example, one might want to follow up on a signal generated by a spontaneous reporting system, designing a study to investigate whether a drug which has been on the market for, say, three years is a cause of an extremely rare but serious illness, such as aplastic anemia. One’s considerations would be similar to those above, but even Medicaid databases would not be sufficiently large to include enough cases. One would have to gather data _de novo_. Assuming the drug in question is used mostly by outpatients, one could consider using Prescription Event Monitoring or a case-control study.

**CONCLUSIONS**

Once one has decided to perform a pharmacoepidemiology study, one needs to decide which of the resources described in the earlier chapters of this book should be used. By considering the characteristics of the pharmacoepidemiology resources available as well as the characteristics of the question to be addressed, one should be able to choose those resources that are best suited to addressing the question at hand.
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INTRODUCTION

In the last 50 years, as medical research has evolved rapidly, the discipline of research ethics has assumed a largely protectionist posture, largely because of a series of unfortunate scandals and the public outcry that ensued.1-3 As a result, research ethics has focused primarily on protecting human subjects from the risks of research. The goal has been to minimize risks to subjects, rather than minimizing the risks and maximizing the potential benefits for both subjects and society.4 Themes that run through many of these scandals are scientists' failure to adequately review and disclose research risks and potential benefits, and their failure to obtain explicit permission from research subjects. As a result of these events, review by an institutional review board (IRB) and full informed consent have become the cornerstones of the protection of human subjects from research risks.

Research ethics and research practice have become separate and even, sometimes, antagonistic enterprises. The role society expects of ethics is to regulate science. Scientific practice reflects this fact. IRB review and the practice of informed consent have become as integral to the design of a clinical research as sample size calculations, the accurate measurement of endpoints, or robust statistical analysis.

These and other requirements have been remarkably effective in defining the limits of ethical research, and have made it much less likely that the most egregious ethical errors of the past will be repeated. Overall, they should be viewed as welcome additions to the practice of clinical research. However, serious scientific and ethical problems may arise when the requirements that were developed to guide clinical research are applied to other kinds of research. In particular, standard protections in clinical research are not
easily exported and applied to the very different challenges of epidemiologic research. Therefore, as these rules have been applied to pharmacoepidemiologic research, the result has been the parallel development of modifications to the ethical guidelines and principles, on one hand, and increasing consternation and confusion, on the other, about how these modifications should be applied.

The central problem has been that, while the ethics of human subjects research has been built upon the protection of human subjects, the human subjects involved in pharmacoepidemiologic research are quite different. Indeed, it may be difficult to see why and how the analysis of a dataset makes the patients whose information contributes to that set “human subjects” and the research in need of ethics review board review. The idea that a patient can become a subject without his or her knowledge, and without any direct contact with an investigator, is not intuitively clear. Moreover, the risks to the subjects of epidemiology research are not the usual health risks of research that can be balanced against the potential health benefits of research. Harm is not the issue in pharmacoepidemiology research. It is almost always what in law and philosophy is referred to as “wrong”, that is—a violation of a person’s rights. The chief risk is the violation of confidentiality. While investigators and ethics review boards may be able to balance medical risks against medical benefits, they may find balancing these different currencies to be challenging.

In an effort to deal with these problems, investigators, governments, and professional associations have developed regulations and guidelines to provide ethical structure to the growing field of epidemiology. Most of these guidelines apply equally well to pharmacoepidemiology research, although this field has begun to develop its own principles. These guidelines and regulations have made it clear that the protection of subjects in epidemiology research represents only one part of the ethical obligations of epidemiology investigators. Guidelines have addressed four broad categories of ethical issues in epidemiology research: obligations to society, obligations to funders and employers, obligations to colleagues, and obligations to subjects.

Although these guidelines acknowledge a range of ethical obligations, one of these, the investigators’ obligations to subjects, has clearly proven to be the most challenging. This is because the procedures of ethical research, like ethics board review and informed consent, may be overly protectionistic or prohibitively difficult in epidemiologic research. Ethical concerns about pharmacoepidemiology research, and more broadly about epidemiology research, have therefore focused on the kinds of research that require ethics board review and the kinds of research that require the subject’s informed consent.

The answers to these questions define the ethical procedures that allow researchers to have access to information gathered for clinical and administrative purposes. Therefore, investigators face a considerable challenge. They must protect patients’ privacy and confidentiality in a way that accomplishes research goals accurately and efficiently. This challenge lies at the heart of the ethics of pharmacoepidemiology research.

National and international organizations have created principles that provide a backdrop to the research framework, the best established being those adopted by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development in 1980. These recommendations suggest that limits to the collection of data should be sought, that the quality of data is important, that data use should be specified in advance, and that investigators should adhere to specified uses. Finally, the Co-operative suggests a requirement of “openness,” that is, a requirement that goals, uses, and access to data should be a matter of public record, and that individuals should be able to determine whether and how data about them are being used. Despite general agreement about these and other principles, the international community has failed to achieve a consensus about the proper balance of protections and research progress.

The goal of this chapter is to present an overview of this balance and specifically of the challenges that arise when the principles of research ethics are applied to issues surrounding privacy and confidentiality. In order to accomplish this goal, this chapter will tend to emphasize regulations in the United States. This is not
because these regulations can or should be generalized to other countries, but simply because at the current time international guidelines vary widely and are often contradictory.\textsuperscript{3,10} Therefore, although the experience of the United States is not universal, these regulations provide a frame of reference for comparison. Where instructive, however, experience from other countries is discussed as well.

This chapter begins by defining the terms that describe the procedures and requirements of ethical research. These are the normative boundaries in which pharmacoepidemiology must operate in order to maintain the public’s trust. If research is to move forward, pharmacoepidemiologists must develop procedures that permit them to balance a need for scientific rigor, on one hand, with respect for ethical requirements, on the other. This chapter will discuss three such strategies and the challenges that investigators face in applying them: de-linking subject identifiers from their information and modifications to both bioethics review board review and subject informed consent requirements. This chapter concludes with a critical consideration of some of the available guidelines and regulations, and recommendations for future regulatory efforts.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLGY RESEARCH**

The birth and subsequent development of research and scholarship in research ethics, like any field of specialized knowledge, has constructed a language that is particularly its own. This language provides a taxonomy of ethical issues in research and is essential to this discussion because it forms the foundation of any communication and discourse between the fields of ethics and epidemiology. These terms also offer an excellent vantage point from which to examine critically the current emphasis on human subjects protections and its applicability to pharmacoepidemiologic research.

**RESEARCH**

Any productive analysis of the ethics of pharmacoepidemiologic research is critically dependent on a clear and precise understanding of the term “research.” Given the frequency with which this term is used by ethicists, investigators, and the public, a definition would seem to be a simple matter. Unfortunately, this has been far from the truth.\textsuperscript{11} Yet, perhaps the best established definition is also the oldest. In its summary statement (the Belmont Report), the US National Commission for the Protection of Human Subjects defined “research” as any activity designed to “develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.”\textsuperscript{12} This is a definition that has been embraced by other scholars, and has become the standard by which a proposed project is assessed.\textsuperscript{13}

Unfortunately, this definition creates a challenge for pharmacoepidemiologic researchers and ethics review boards, because it is not always easy to characterize the intent of the person who generates the knowledge. For instance, data may be gathered as part of a health care organization’s drug surveillance program, the intent of which is to define the patterns of medication use in a local population. It is not clear, given the definition based on “generalizable knowledge,” whether this project should be construed as research, clinical care, or even as a quality improvement activity. These distinctions are important because once a project is identified as “research” investigators must meet a series of requirements designed to protect the patients who are now human subjects. This definition is particularly problematic in pharmacoepidemiologic research, because it is hard to distinguish the routine practice of epidemiology from research. The extremes are evident. The paradigmatic practice of epidemiology is public health case finding and surveillance for adverse drug reactions. This is a social good that we do not, generally, consider to be research, although the activities are conducted for the purpose of creating generalizable knowledge upon which to base public health decisions. These sorts of investigations proceed, and often produce publishable data, without review by ethics review boards. These activities differ from more “research
oriented” epidemiology designed to test hypotheses about drug adverse event associations, interactions, compliance, or efficacy. These investigations may be identified as research, and they may be required to undergo ethics review board review. However, the difference between these two types of activity can be difficult to demarcate.

HUMAN SUBJECT

Although it is important than any discussion of research and research ethics be clear about the definition of a research subject, this definition is as elusive as the definition of research, on which it depends. Broadly, though, a useful definition comes from the United States “Common Rule,” the set of Federal regulations first promulgated in 1981 that govern research ethics. The Common Rule defines a “research subject” as “a living individual, about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains either: 1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or 2) identifiable private information.” For pharmacoepidemiologists, the key issue here is that the use of information that can be linked to an individual constitutes a contact between an investigator and a human subject. This is true even if the information was gathered in the past and no contact occurs between the investigator and the person. A key issue, then, becomes whether information can be linked to an individual.

This may not be a universally accepted definition. However, the Common Rule applies, at a minimum, to all research carried out by US investigators using federal funds. In addition, its influence is far greater because the vast majority of institutions that accept these federal funds have signed an agreement, called a Multiple Project Assurance, to abide by the Common Rule requirements in all research, regardless of the source of funding. Therefore, the Common Rule serves as de facto law governing research at the most productive research institutions in the US and offers a reasonable working definition. Further, even when research is performed outside of the United States, if it is done with US federal support or at an institution with a Multiple Project Assurance then it must conform to American regulations governing research ethics.

ETHICS REVIEW BOARDS

In many countries over the last 30 years, ethics review boards have become central to the practice of research. In the American context, these are committees with at least one “community representative,” appointed by institutions that receive federal monies to conduct research. In other nations, there are regional or national committees that are appointed by professional organizations or government agencies.

This requirement reflects the consensus that scientists, and science, could benefit from independent review of research protocols. This idea first appeared in the World Medical Association’s Declaration of Helsinki in 1964, which requires that an independent committee review all protocols. The Declaration recommends that this committee be responsible for “consideration, comment and guidance” but does not define further the committee’s authority to approve or reject protocols that it finds unacceptable. These recommendations have been taken up rapidly, and review boards have become widespread. Their authority has been clarified as well, and these committees typically have the power to review and reject all research that takes place in their institution or in which their institution’s investigators are involved.

In the US, while some states have enacted legislation governing human subject research, the formal system of review has evolved primarily in a manner that links federal authority and funding. A committee is required to review all research that is funded by all federal government branches that have signed on to the Common Rule. Examples are the National Institutes of Health, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research. Further, as noted above, institutions that have filed a Multiple Project Assurance have agreed to abide by the Common Rule requirements in all research, regardless of the source of funding. In most other countries, research regulations are not limited by
provisions regarding funding but, instead, apply to all research conducted in that country.

The composition of these review boards varies widely across international boundaries. However, a consistent feature is the need for inclusion of expertise from outside of the scientific community. For instance, the US regulations mandate the inclusion of at least one member who is not affiliated with the institution, and one member who may be affiliated but who represents law, ethics, or another nonscience discipline.\textsuperscript{14,46,107} Australian regulations mandate a committee’s composition by requiring a mix of genders, and by extending the inclusion of nonscience representatives.\textsuperscript{10, pp. 343–54} The purpose of these requirements is to introduce accountability to society and minimize conflicts of interest between scientists who act as research reviewers and researchers.

Although review boards have become a commonplace feature on the research landscape, even under US federal guidelines, not all research requires review. Certain kinds of research can receive expedited review, that is, review by the IRB chair or a designated member of the IRB instead of the full committee, and some may be exempt. This is a means to assure that the research risks are truly minor and the research fulfills basic subject protections without expending unnecessary IRB resources. Research that does not require ethics board review is any project that does not involve human subjects.\textsuperscript{14,46,101} For example, when investigators use data in which nothing would permit the investigator to identify the individual from which the data came, ethics board review is not required. According to the Common Rule, research may be eligible for expedited review if it poses no more than minimal risk (see below for definition) and the research involves “existing data”, which means a retrospective analysis of records that exist as of the date the research is proposed.\textsuperscript{12,46,10} Most European nations have similar provisions for expediting the review of research that poses no more than minimal risks to subjects. Internationally, there is some disagreement about whether pharmacoepidemiology research should require review. For instance, while the Royal College of Physicians would not require review,\textsuperscript{15} the Committee of the International Organization of Medical Societies recommends ethics board review for all research.\textsuperscript{16}

**PRIVACY AND CONFIDENTIALITY**

In pharmacoepidemiology research, these terms are of paramount concern. Although they are often discussed together, they are distinct concepts. It is useful to distinguish them, and to describe individually the ethical basis for requirements of each. Of these, privacy is the most basic and confidentiality is in a sense derivative.

Privacy, in the setting of research, refers to each individual’s right to be free from unwanted inspection of, access to, or physical manipulation of records and documents containing personal information. In the case of epidemiology research in particular, privacy refers each individual’s right to prevent access to his or her medical records. The right to privacy, and others’ corresponding obligation to respect privacy, is justified in part by each individual’s right to be left alone.\textsuperscript{17} This is a legal way of considering a right to privacy, but privacy has an important social function as well. Viewed in this light, a right to privacy is a precondition for social interaction and cooperation because it allows and requires a degree of trust.\textsuperscript{18}

Confidentiality is a derivative right that is based upon the right to privacy. When individuals choose to allow a health care provider access to personal medical information, they have chosen to waive their right to privacy.\textsuperscript{5} Individuals may choose to exercise this right with the expectation, either implicit or explicit, that no one else will have access to that information without the patient’s permission. This right to limit the transfer of information, to control the secondary use of information by others, is the right to confidentiality.

Like the right to privacy, the right to confidentiality is also based on a basic right to a freedom from interference, in the sense that a right to confidentiality is not possible unless there is an underlying right to privacy. However, the right to confidentiality also engenders a responsibility on the part of the person who has information about another person. The expectation that someone will
not disclose the information to a third party creates a fiduciary relationship. That is, it creates an agreement based on a mutually understood set of goals and understandings. This means that confidentiality may be more highly specified by arrangements that may be made at the time that an individual initially grants access to information. For instance, patients may have specific concerns or expectations about ways in which the information they divulge may be used. These expectations may include transfer to a third party in either identifiable or unidentifiable form, or access to particular kinds of information within a medical record, or limits as to the period of time information may be available to others.

The fundamental issue is whether information that was gathered in a clinical setting, where rules of confidentiality apply, can be used for reasons, such as research, that were not part of the conditions of that relationship. Both the law and research regulations are ambiguous over what constitutes a substantive violation of confidentiality. Does the use of records without prior authorization constitute a violation of confidentiality? Or does it constitute a risk of a violation that depends on how those records are used, and on what is done with the information?

In general, society has not articulated clear answers to these questions, in large part because the questions engage well formed but conflicting political and philosophical views about how society should organize the exchange of information. For example, proponents of communitarianism (the perspective of a community created by voluntary association) argue that the good of the individual is inextricably tied to the public good. Thus, ethical dichotomies that pit individuals against society (such as the unauthorized use of a person’s clinical information for research) must be resolved with attention to both personal and public goods.

However, proponents of liberalism, or a rights based individualism, disagree. From this perspective, what is right exists prior to what is good. This means that any unauthorized use of a person’s information threatens to violate a fundamental right to privacy and the potential good derived from that use is not a proper condition to balance against that violation.

In most states in the US, these conflicting views exist in a perhaps deliberately unresolved tension. Laws (or the absence of laws) generally allow procedures that attempt to circumscribe the extremes of either view. Laws are silent on whether medical records can be used for research without the prior authorization of the patient, although a few states have laws that records can be used for research after IRB review. Many European nations have very strict protections of individual rights to privacy and confidentiality. For example, Iceland and Sweden have very strict requirement of individual informed consent for the use of identifiable information. Other nations lean toward a more communitarian perspective with respect to epidemiologic research.

However, US research regulations do provide a set of conditions that permit the use of records regardless of whether the patient authorized their use for research. The key features of these conditions is that the research risks are minimal and the potential violation does not adversely affect subjects’ rights and welfare. The following sections will discuss both of these key arguments.

MINIMAL RISK

Although the general goal of research is to produce knowledge that will benefit society, investigators must also minimize the risks to subjects. It is axiomatic that, as risks to subjects increase, the degree of subject protections, such as ethics review and informed consent, increases as well. The concept of minimal risk attempts to operationalize a risk threshold, above which protections should be more strict. Conversely, subject protections are relaxed if a research protocol does not exceed the level of minimal risk. Although the concept of minimal risk is relatively straightforward, and would apply to most pharmacoepidemiology protocols, its definition is problematic.

According to American regulations stated in the Common Rule, research risks are “minimal” if “the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or
psychological examinations or tests.\textsuperscript{14, 46.102} In most situations, this concept is difficult to operationalize.\textsuperscript{20} This is in large part because the definition lacks a clear standard against which to compare the research risks: the daily lives of healthy or “normal” persons, or the daily lives of persons who might be subjects of the research. In pharmacoepidemiology research, where the risk is a potential violation of confidentiality, there is the additional problem of deciding whether any such violation is ordinarily encountered during daily life, such that a violation in the course of research is “minimal risk.”

INFORMED CONSENT

Perhaps the most disturbing feature of many of the research scandals in recent history has been the total disregard for informed consent. Every nation which has addressed the subject, as reflected in International Codes of Ethics and professional society statements about research ethics, recognizes that subjects, or for incompetent patients, their surrogates, are to be told about the nature of research and alternatives to participation, and to have the chance to volunteer to participate. It is not surprising, therefore, that research ethics guidelines, recommendations, and regulations have stressed the procedural requirement of a subject’s informed consent. In order for a subject’s consent to be informed, he or she must understand the research and must agree to participate voluntarily, without inducement or coercion.\textsuperscript{21}

The regulations governing research informed consent in the US, while not universal, are illustrative of these features.\textsuperscript{14, 46,116} The US regulations convey the feature of understanding by requiring that the investigator explain the research risks, benefits, and alternatives of research participation; the confidentiality of any information obtained; and the procedures for compensation and for contacting a person responsible for the research. Voluntariness is expressed by the requirement that investigators tell subjects that participation in the research study is voluntary, and that subjects have the right to discontinue participation at any time. In some situations, informed consent may be modified to be verbal instead of written, or even may not need to be obtained at all. Whether informed consent must always be obtained, and in what form consent should be documented, have been the subject of vigorous debate.\textsuperscript{22, 23}

Again, while the US guidelines are not universal, they offer a helpful perspective on the complexities that this issue raises. The Common Rule requires that written informed consent be obtained in most research situations.\textsuperscript{14, 46,116} However, it makes two notable exceptions. First, written documentation of informed consent is not required if the principal risk of the research is a breach of confidentiality and if the written record is the only link between personal data and the subjects’ identity.\textsuperscript{14, 46,117} In this case, whether or not a written informed consent document is used depends on each subject’s preferences regarding linking information. Second, informed consent can be entirely waived if the research meets four conditions:\textsuperscript{14, 46,116}

1. the research involves no more than minimal risk to the subjects;
2. the waiver or alteration will not adversely affect the rights and welfare of the subjects;
3. the research could not practicably be carried out without the waiver or alteration; and
4. whenever appropriate, the subjects will be provided with additional pertinent information after participation.

These criteria are often applied to pharmacoepidemiology research and other forms of research that rely on the use of pre-existing records. The controversial conditions here are whether the research risks are minimal and whether a waiver of informed consent will adversely affect the subjects’ rights and welfare. These are controversial because, in research that involves the use of medical records, the principal risk is the violation of the subjects’ confidentiality. A consensus about the proper application of these conditions requires a consensus about whether access to the patient’s medical record without the patient’s permission is a violation of confidentiality that is greater than minimal risk and violates the subject’s rights and welfare.
There are two competing answers to this question. The first relies upon a strict adherence to the principle of respect for autonomy. Accordingly, any unauthorized use of records violates confidentiality, presents more than minimal risk, and adversely affects subjects’ rights and welfare. Hence, in all human subject research, the subject’s informed consent could be perceived as an absolute requirement. Although this view follows from strict adherence to some research ethics codes, this is not the view held by most contemporary researchers and ethicists.

Instead, a second interpretation allows for flexibility in the priority of the principle of respect for autonomy. Accordingly, some potential or even actual violations of confidentiality do not adversely affect the subject’s rights and welfare or present more than minimal risk. This interpretation requires that we be able to determine to which kinds of information, if any, most people would be willing to grant access. For instance, at one extreme, research using information about patients’ sexual activity or certain genetic characteristics might well be perceived as posing a greater than minimal risk. In such a study, obtaining that information without patients’ consent might well have an adverse impact upon patients’ rights and welfare, depending on the use of the information and the safeguards in place to protect access by third parties. In contrast, information about patients’ age and blood pressure might seem to pose only minimal risks, even though blood pressure information could be more predictive of future disability status than the results of a genetic test. Obtaining information without patients' consent must be considered in appropriate context in a rapidly changing environment, because the potential impact on an individual is heavily dependent on social, economic, and medical factors.

In between these extremes, reasonable people can and do disagree about the magnitude of harm and impact upon rights caused by unauthorized use of information. There are two useful ways to settle this. This first is to assure that the ethics board review is truly multi-disciplinary so that a variety of reasonable views are heard. The second is to require that researchers take steps to minimize the risks and adverse effect upon rights if patient confidentiality is violated. These methods are addressed in the next section.

**METHODODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

There are several procedures available that can protect patient confidentiality. These methods allow patients to control who has access to information. At the time that clinical data are gathered, such as upon enrollment in a health system, patients can provide a “universal consent” to determine whether his or her medical record can be used for research. This term should not be construed to mean an informed consent to participate in research, because the patient is simply consenting to the generic use of his or her records and not whether to participate in actual protocols. A variation on this method is that patients can shield some aspects of their medical records from use in research. This is possible in some electronic record management systems. For example, patients could place into an electronic “black box” records of certain medications, such as antidepressants. Finally, at the time of the research, patients can be contacted to provide informed consent for the use of their archived records. However, there are two problems in applying these methods to pharmacoepidemiology research. First, they may not really protect privacy to the degree that investigators and ethics review boards would hope. Second, they may erode the validity of the research findings, and therefore generalizability to the population that stands to benefit from the research.

First, there is reason for skepticism about whether these interventions actually foster patient confidentiality. For instance, if individuals must be contacted each time their records may be used in a particular study, such contact may be considered intrusive by the individual. Individuals may consider that their confidentiality has been violated if researchers must obtain consent for the use of otherwise de-identified records. Individuals may
also refuse participation if contacted for a study they consider irrelevant to their health. An individual may also become alarmed if asked to consent for records to be used in such a study of a disease for which she has not been diagnosed (e.g., a case–control study of patients with and without breast cancer). Although these concerns cover very different ground, they all provide grounds for concern that a variety of procedures for protecting privacy may not be ideal.

Validity is a necessary precondition for all ethical research, and research should not be done if it cannot answer the hypothesis it claims to test. In pharmacoepidemiologic studies that use archival records, methods that allow patients to control who has access to data can severely limit the validity of the research to be done. For instance, consider the procedure of universal consent, in which each patient is given the opportunity to remove his or her electronic medical records (such as Medicaid data) from use research. It is certain that at least some patients will opt out. The problem is that willingness to provide consent is generally not random, and varies in ways that may bias study results, as demonstrated in a study of consent bias in the Rochester Epidemiology Project. In an ethics review board approved study at the Mayo Clinic, patients were mailed an educational brochure and a request for authorization to allow use of medical records for research. Characteristics of patients who did and did not provide written authorization were compared. Among persons returning the form, the refusal rate was low (3.2%), but the persons declining consent varied from the study population by age, gender, residence, and prior diagnoses, suggesting that the ability to opt out of databases creates a potential bias in the data.

Such practices may prohibit the evaluation of a key medication–adverse event association if the shielded information is in the pathway between the medication exposure and outcome of interest. For example, the results of a study of a drug–outcome association may be misleading if there is a large increased risk due only to an interaction between the study medication and the shielded antidepressant. The overall study results may show a low level association between the study drug and the outcome. No interaction could be analyzed. Further, if all patients treated with antidepressants chose to withhold their medical records from any research, the drug–outcome study would show no association, since no data on patients experiencing the reaction would be included in the research data file.

When researchers attempt to contact all patients in a database to seek informed consent, some patients may be unavailable to provide consent because they have died, moved, or changed health plans. Those patients are likely to be distributed in a nonrandom fashion. The potential bias was demonstrated using hypothetical data from the Mayo Clinic Rochester Epidemiology Project. Data available from all patients over a 50 year period showed a decrease in the population incidence of hip fracture. Data from only those patients known to be alive and able to give consent would produce results showing an increasing risk of hip fracture over time. This consent issue poses particular challenges in studies requiring long periods of exposure or followup, studies evaluating events of long latency, and the evaluation of intergenerational effects of medications.

The number of studies using archival records will likely increase with growing availability of electronic records and increasing interest in answering important drug safety questions. However, as the number of studies increases, there will undoubtedly be a decreasing consent rate if all studies require consent. Jacobsen showed a high consent rate among persons who returned consent forms, but only 79.3% of persons contacted returned the consent forms. This return rate should be considered optimal, given the high credibility of the Mayo Clinic within Minnesota. Another study of consent, a drug safety study within a population of members of a Minnesota health plan, showed much poorer participation. In this study, with more representative results, only 19% of individuals contacted provided consent, and only 52% provided any response.

An additional problem is encountered in the conduct of large, multi-institutional case–control studies in which access to a large number of data must be reviewed in order to identify the cases and controls prior to contacting the appropriate
patients for consent. Ethics review boards typically waive the requirement for consent in the initial case finding review of records, and evaluate the consent used when patients are invited to participate in the study. Applying the current Common Rule framework to these studies requires separate review by ethics review boards from each participating institution of the same protocol. Issues raised by these ethics review boards and encountered in the review process may relate less to true local differences in the research environment than to the administrative differences of each institution’s ethics review board process. Absent a more streamlined approach to the current ethics review board process, the time and cost of seeking multiple approvals discourage the conduct of these studies that may have important public health implications.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

These methodological challenges pose considerable obstacles to the conduct of pharmacoepidemiology research. For records based studies using data not directly identifying subjects, investigators have relied on the confidentiality policies governing the use of information in the individual institution. For studies using identifiable records, investigators receive guidance and direction, if they receive it at all, through a process of negotiation with local ethics review boards, whose task is to balance the requirements of the research design with the rights and welfare of prospective subjects. Because the tension between ethics requirements and the exigencies of pharmacoepidemiology research require this balancing process, in a very real sense the ethics of pharmacoepidemiology research is a negotiated agreement between investigators and one or more review boards. The available solutions to the methodological challenges outlined in the previous section, therefore, depend upon two factors. First, they depend upon the steps investigators can take in gathering and handling data. Second, they depend upon the degree to which review boards can and should be involved in research, and on their ability to review research in a manner that is both competent and efficient. We examine each of these in turn.

The past several years have seen a rapid movement toward legislative protections for data privacy both in the US and internationally. These legislative approaches to protect the confidentiality of medical data provide potentially strong protections and safeguards on the creation and reuse of confidential information. For instance, the European Union (EU) directive that went into effect in October 1998 covers all information that is either directly identifiable or information from which identity could be inferred. EU member states are currently bringing their laws into conformity with the directive, and tailoring these laws to the individual concerns and circumstances of their countries. The EU directive requires, first, consent for all uses of information beyond that for which the information was originally collected. Safeguards on the use and transfer of information are required as well. Each institution must have a data controller/data privacy officer, who is accountable for appropriate procedures and use of data within the institution. In addition, data cannot be transferred from a member state of the EU to another country outside the EU unless that country has safeguards at least as stringent as those of the EU. (This provision has led to revisions in law and/or regulation now under way in the US.) Notably, however, member states may grant deviations from some provisions of the directive for activities of substantial public interest. Interestingly, there is no mention of ethics review boards in the Directive. All research would presumably (i) be conducted with explicit consent, (ii) be conducted only with delinked records, or (iii) be exempted by a specific member state as a type of activity of substantial public interest.

For pharmacoepidemiology, a number of implications of the directive are of concern. For example, pharmacovigilance activities currently must be conducted using identifiable data. A requirement for patient consent would stifle the collection of a substantial proportion of cases and therefore hinder the ability to identify signals of drug safety problems. Furthermore, analysis of secondary information (from clinical trials or administrative databases) for research questions
not anticipated at the time patients signed consent, would not be possible without additional consent. Very little research could be conducted using secondary files from which direct patient identifiers have been deleted. This restriction is due to the broad definition in the directive of identifiable and “indirectly identifiable” data.

In the US, proposed legislation promises stricter scrutiny of research and tighter protections as well. Bills S.881, S.578, and S.573 all promise greater protections of privacy, restrictions on the uses to which existing data can be put, and requirements that individuals must be able to determine who and why others may have access to their personal data. In most proposals, research using identifiable records would be covered and what constitutes “identifiable” information is, therefore, a critical factor determining the true scope of these laws.

One of the more novel proposals to emerge from these US bills has been the creation of strategies for addressing the ethical challenges created by the use of existing datasets. In these bills, several options would be available: review by an ethics review board, review by a committee established for review of protocols for archival records studies, or review and approval of a data confidentiality officer. Under this latter model, the data confidentiality officer would assure appropriate safeguards are in place, tailored to the local circumstances, and would also determine which studies could be approved, denied, or referred to an ethics review board. These last proposals may have considerable promise. Because oversight of electronic medical records confidentiality requires a more system-wide view than a study-specific review performed by review boards, a model that requires a data privacy officer has much to recommend it. That officer would be responsible for creation, maintenance, and compliance with procedures tailored to the needs and issues of the specific institution, and is responsible for maintaining records of all uses of identifiable data. The office would be organizationally isolated from functions in the organization with a vested interest in the use of the data. A data privacy officer could establish local policies that determine which studies might risk patient confidentiality and therefore require ethics review board review.

Because pharmacoepidemiology research often requires use of electronic records across large populations, studies may cross many different institutions (e.g., hospitals, physician practices) and multiple provider groups or insurers. In this kind of multi-institution research, a key that links the identifiable records with the code in the de-identified research files is maintained separately and cannot be accessed by the researcher. The data management officer model provides one way to streamline the delinking process.

While these proposals hold some promise, there are also opportunities to improve the ethics board review process. Ethics review varies widely from country to country, and they may even be different within one country. In existing guidelines there is general agreement that protocol review by ethics review boards is valuable in principle. However, there is considerably less agreement about what kinds of pharmacoepidemiology research require this review.

For instance, the Royal College of Physicians position statement on ethics board review suggests that ethics board review is not necessary, even for linked studies, as long as investigators take appropriate precautions to safeguard the confidentiality of information. On the other hand, the Committee of the International Organization of Medical Societies recommends ethics board review for all epidemiology research, whether or not they involve identifiable data. In the middle are the recommendations of the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE) and the Common Rule which require ethics board review only when subjects are identifiable through linked data.

In some cases, it is not even the features of the research, but the source of funding that determines whether ethics board review is necessary. For example, as noted above, the Common Rule regulations apply only to research that is conducted using federal funds or research that is conducted in institutions that have agreed to follow these regulations voluntarily. The result is that while some researchers are required to apply for ethics review board approval, other researchers whose research present the same kinds of research risk are not. Although this distinction on the basis of funding source respects the limits of federal
authority in intrastate activities, it lacks moral force.

As examples of efficient protection of human subjects, the Common Rule and ISPE positions seem the most sensible position. This means that investigators and ethics review boards will at times need to negotiate the kinds of research that achieve standards such as “existing data” and minimal risk. However, this negotiation is a far better system to assure adequate subject protections for research than a system in which decisions are either entirely left in the hands of the investigators or made by others.

Nevertheless, this system of research oversight, and its heavy dependence on ethics board review, means that oversight can vary widely among institutions. This variability creates enormous administrative challenges for pharmacoepidemiology investigators, challenges that may be magnified in the case of multicenter research that crosses international borders. Certainly, sensitivity to local issues may be a desirable feature for the ethical review of research, particularly if institutions have special populations or circumstances that warrant special scrutiny of protocols. However, this variability may also be the result of variability in the quality of the ethics review board’s skills and resources.

The ability of ethics review boards to review research in a manner that is both competent and efficient addresses issues of the training and certification of membership and resources for handling the volume of new and renewing research protocols. The Office of Extramural Research’s 1998 evaluation of the ethics review board system suggested that among the chief causes of variability in the quality and efficiency of ethics board review are the limited resources available to ethics review boards and the variable competency of their membership. In general, the requirements for the skills and knowledge needed for ethics review board membership are handled by the local ethics review board. No certification exists to assure that ethics review board members possess adequate understanding of research ethics and regulation. Finally, ethics review boards are funded through indirect means, such as the general pool of indirect funds generated from grants. Potential ways to improve the quality and efficiency of ethics board review include training and certification of board members, reduction in the amount of paperwork for routine monitoring of protocols, and explicit funding that is proportionate to an ethics review board’s workload.

THE FUTURE

The variability and quality of ethics board review pose significant challenges for pharmacoepidemiology investigators. These should be the focus of future efforts to harmonize research regulations and set minimum standards for ethics review board competency and funding. However, these solutions do not adequately address a larger problem. Although ethics review boards may offer a reasonable procedural solution to ethics review, it is less clear how ethics review boards should make the sorts of decisions that are required of them. Specifically, it is not clear how ethics review boards and investigators should balance ethical and methodological requirements. Without a careful consideration of this balancing process, any efforts at regulation, and particularly efforts to standardize ethics board review and boost their resources, will achieve only limited success.

The idea of balancing is not new. Traditional approaches to balancing the ethical and methodological requirements of research typically use as their guide the research risks. In most guidelines, and the Common Rule is an excellent case in point, increasing risks to subjects requires increasing attention to full ethics board review and the informed consent process, including written documentation of informed consent.14 Seen in this light, there is a simple proportional relationship between research risks and subject protections such as informed consent. This relationship describes the degree of subject protections solely in terms of the balance of the risks and potential benefits to the subjects of the proposed research.

The problem, though, is that this relationship is too simple for the situation of pharmacoepidemiology research. The ethical requirements of traditional biomedical research do not fit entirely with the practice of pharmacoepidemiologic
research. The risks to the subjects of epidemiology research are not the usual health risks of research that can be balanced against the potential health benefits of research. They are instead largely risks of another kind. The chief risk is the violation of confidentiality, which is really a civil, rather than a medical, risk.

We suggest that investigators and ethics review boards should consider an additional factor in this relationship: the value of the knowledge to be gained. An ethical justification for this position begins, first, with the example of social services research. United States research regulations currently include an exception for studies designed to evaluate social programs. The implicit argument for this exception is that these social programs offer clear and evident value. They contribute in an important way to the social good. Studies designed to evaluate them, even if these studies bear all of the markings of “research,” are considered to be exempt from the requirements of ethics board review and subject informed consent that govern the ethical conduct of research. In a sense, the requirements of ethical research are suspended for studies that offer significant and generally agreed upon value.

This is an extreme case of balancing value against research risks. Indeed, it effectively removes research involving social programs from the purview of ethics oversight. This example is informative not only because it is so extreme, but also because studies of social programs have a great deal in common with pharmacoepidemiology research. Pharmacoepidemiology’s goals of studying medication use and identifying adverse drug reactions are directed as much toward the preservation of the public’s health as they are toward the production of generalizable knowledge. The value of pharmacoepidemiology research is therefore as clear and as readily evident as it is in studies designed to evaluate social programs. On these grounds alone, a compelling argument might be made that some kinds of pharmacoepidemiology project, like projects to evaluate important social programs, should be exempt from research review.

Of course, this argument may not be equally cogent and convincing for all pharmacoepidemiology research because pharmacoepidemiologic research, like any research, spans a continuum. Certainly studies of adverse drug reactions resemble closely the example of social program research. This is one standard, perhaps the highest standard, for a study’s potential to produce valuable knowledge. Phrased somewhat differently, the knowledge must be immediately relevant and applicable to the subjects who are being studied. In pharmacoepidemiology research, one example might be a study of adverse drug reactions among individuals taking a certain medication. Results of this research would have immediate consequences for the health of the patients, or “subjects,” for whom data is gathered.

Other studies may be done for private companies or organizations following vigorous methodological standards but where the findings would not be made public or shared with anyone outside the sponsoring organization. It is difficult to know how to balance concerns for privacy against the desire of private entities to obtain pharmacoepidemiology data. Studies like these should arguably be held to a different ethical standard because they do not hold the immediate possibility of clinically relevant knowledge that could be applicable to the people involved. The problem is that no public and national body exists to decide what kinds of research achieve this level of value.

The central ethical issue in pharmacoepidemiology research is deciding what kinds of project will generate generalizable knowledge that is widely available and highly valued and do this in a manner that protects individuals’ right to privacy and confidentiality. The problem is that these two ends differ in kind. The knowledge generated by pharmacoepidemiology is health related knowledge about such things as the risks and benefits of medicines. In contrast, individuals’ right to privacy is a matter of civil law. Although the two are frequently cast as in need of balancing, it may not be possible to weigh a certain amount of knowledge to be gained against a certain amount of confidentiality to be lost.

Instead, perhaps the most productive approach will be to determine what kinds of procedures and practices warrant crossing thresholds of confidentiality in the pursuit of valuable knowledge. Such a discussion should include research, but should not
by any means be limited to it. For example, society allows journalists wide access to gather and disseminate information, provided the journalist adheres to standards of practice (such as preserving the confidentiality of sources) and journalism is still viewed as a valuable instrument for preserving a democratic society.

Therefore, if the ethical requirement of informed consent is absolute and inviolable, then any balancing would be indefensible. However, this is not a tenable solution, nor is it a solution that would be consistent with the way that society responds to a need for valuable information in other settings. Further public discussion is needed to identify ways in which the policies and procedures for the protection of privacy and the maintenance of confidentiality are fair and consistent with the requirements imposed on other sectors of society.
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INTRODUCTION

Pharmacoepidemiology exists primarily to quantify the effects of medicinal drugs in communities. Drug policies are the instruments used by governments (with varying degrees of success) to control the development, distribution, subsidization, pricing, and use of drugs in communities. Pharmacoepidemiology methods, such as pharmacoeconomics, drug utilization studies, adverse drug reaction monitoring, and formal analytical designs, are some of the tools that can be used to plan, monitor, and evaluate medicinal drug policies. It can be seen that drug policies are very relevant to pharmacoepidemiology, and vice versa.

National Medicinal Drug Policies have become a topical subject in recent years. A number of developing and developed countries now have comprehensive written policies that are implemented to varying degrees. It must also be recognized that many countries have made significant progress in controlling the supply and use of modern drugs without recourse to written policies. However, national governments, district health authorities, and managed care organizations around the world have to deal with the rising costs of modern drugs, and the results of the suboptimal prescribing and consumption patterns that are common in so many communities. National policies that set standards to be followed by manufacturers, healthcare organizations, health professionals, and patients are very valuable, even in an era of “small government.” Such policies have to operate in an environment shaped by budgetary pressures, community expectations, medical politics, corporate lobbying, and media coverage.

This chapter can do no more than scratch the surface of this complex subject; many specific issues are covered in more detail in other chapters (e.g., adverse reaction detection, drug utilization...
studies, and pharmacoconomics). Readers who wish to learn more are referred to the web page of the World Health Organization/Essential Drugs and Other Medicines (WHO/EDM) (http://www.who.int/dap/edm.html), which has an extensive range of technical reports, and to an excellent publication Managing Drug Supply.\(^1\) We have drawn extensively on this work when compiling this chapter.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

The “problem” that needs to be addressed in relation to drug policies has been succinctly defined by Sven Hamrell\(^2\) in a study of drug policy in South-East Asia.

The problem isn’t so much in the drugs, which are medicines used to relieve sickness or cure disease. The problem lies in the way these drugs are dispensed, manufactured and marketed. The problem can be put simply; there is a disparity between the world’s health needs and what drugs the world actually gets.

It is a sad indictment of our attempts to improve the health of the world’s populations that, while the technologies and treatments needed to save lives and reduce suffering are technically feasible and available in many countries, they are denied to too many of those who need them most. The reasons are a lack of political will, an international desire to protect the commercial interests of some of the world’s most profitable corporations, and significant failures of national drug policy development and implementation in many developing countries.

The problems that beset developing countries can be categorized under four broad and overlapping headings:

- poor quality and counterfeit drugs
- lack of availability of essential drugs for a population
- poor quality use of pharmaceuticals, e.g., overuse, misuse, polypharmacy
- unintended effects of international activities

It is entirely appropriate to give priority to the policy needs of developing countries. However, there are many examples of policy failures in developed countries as well, and we will highlight some of these in this chapter in addition.

**POOR QUALITY AND COUNTERFEIT DRUGS**

Drugs must be produced according to appropriate standards of good manufacturing practice. Although such standards have been developed and implemented in most developed countries, and are widely promulgated by the World Health Organization, many developing countries do not have the technical, financial, or human resources required for their implementation. Often criticized for their promotional activities in developing countries, trans-national pharmaceutical manufacturers have high quality manufacturing practices and can help maintain standards in developing countries. However, because many drugs are unaffordable (at international prices), there are major incentives for the development of local producers. Lack of technical expertise, and ineffective government inspection, may lead to substandard products being sold, and in some circumstances contaminated or counterfeit products becoming available. Hanif et al.\(^3\) and O Brien et al.\(^4\) provide the two most recent descriptions of “epidemics” of renal failure in children due to diethylene glycol contamination of acetaminophen syrup (perhaps mistaken for the nontoxic propylene glycol). There are many other reports of diethylene glycol poisonings, dating back to the 1937 “epidemic” in the United States.\(^5\) - \(^9\) In all cases, the contamination has been a result of the failure of manufacturing practice, or the failure of regulatory and surveillance systems to adequately control manufacturing practices.

Counterfeit drugs are another manifestation of problems of inadequate regulation and control of the quality of pharmaceuticals. A recent example was the release of a counterfeit meningococcal
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vaccine during an epidemic of meningitis in Niger. As described by Pecoul et al., the problem was first noted when a team from Medics Sans Frontieres working with local health workers noticed that vaccines from Nigeria, labeled as a product from Pasteur Merieux, had an unusual appearance. Subsequent investigations identified them as counterfeit. It was estimated that approximately 60,000 persons were vaccinated with the false vaccine; the scale of the production would have required a large scale manufacturing facility. In other words, this was large scale organized crime, certainly not an isolated example.

There seem to be two general groups of counterfeit products—organized illegal circuits that manufacture copies of known trademarked products, and nonorganized production of small quantities of inadequate or substandard products, including generic drugs. Shakoor et al. described a study of chloroquine products available in Thailand and Nigeria which found that 36.5% of the products sampled were substandard. In general, this appeared to be due to substandard manufacturing processes and problems with decomposition of the products, rather than fraudulent manufacturing. Nazerali and Hogerzeil described a similar problem in an investigation of the quality of essential drugs in Zimbabwe; they identified initial quality problems with ampicillin, retinol, and ergometrine, as well as problems with the stability of ergometrine injections over time.

Ensuring that pharmaceutical products are of satisfactory quality not only requires adequate controls on manufacturing. An adequate distribution system for drugs is critical to ensure that drugs reach the user in good condition. Degradation of products during distribution has been most extensively documented for vaccines; this has been a problem in both developed and developing countries. Standards for vaccine handling have been developed by WHO, initially to allow for the transport of the most fragile of the essential vaccines, oral polio vaccine. Studies in South Africa, Italy, Australia, Malaysia, India, and Nigeria document the difficulties of maintaining an adequate cold chain in different environments. The problems that were identified ranged from the central storage facility having inadequate monitoring systems to refrigerators in pharmacies and doctors’ surgeries being inadequate for storage of vaccines immediately prior to their administration.

Serious problems can also occur during bulk transport. Hogerzeil et al. examined drugs that were shipped by sea or land from a donor agency to recipient countries. They found that the drugs in the shipment were exposed to much higher temperatures and humidity than was recommended by their manufacturers. However, this only affected the clinical effectiveness of two of the products.

LACK OF AVAILABILITY OF ESSENTIAL DRUGS

The chronic mismatch between drugs that are available in developing countries, and the diseases and populations requiring treatment, led to the development of the “essential drugs” concept. The history of this important movement has been described in detail by Kanji et al. “Essential drugs,” as defined by WHO in 1975, are “those considered to be of utmost importance and hence basic, indispensable and necessary for the health needs of the population. They should be available at all times, in the proper dosage forms, to all segments of society.” The first model list of essential drugs was prepared by WHO in 1977; it is now in its tenth edition. Despite the policy having been adopted in many countries, Pecoul et al. consider that access to essential drugs of adequate quality appears to be getting worse, not better, in many settings. This is illustrated when one considers the consumption of pharmaceuticals in various countries. Developed countries account for approximately 16% of the world’s population, and, in 1990, accounted for approximately 72% of consumption, with the US and EU being the largest markets. Developing countries account for approximately 77% of the world’s population, and in 1990, consumed 19% of the pharmaceuticals. This has declined from 24% in 1975.

There have been many studies that describe the lack of availability of essential drugs in developing and developed countries. In Rwanda, for example,
Habiambere and Werheimer\(^{28}\) estimated that 70% of the population did not have access to essential drugs. Another manifestation of this problem can be excessive and unregulated supply of the wrong drugs, as described by Sri-Nyen-nyaung\(^{29}\) in Thailand. The reasons for lack of essential drugs may vary from setting to setting, ranging from lack of production because the drug is unprofitable (such as meglumine antimoniate for leishmaniasis\(^{12}\)), to because the drugs are too expensive, such as the widely discussed antiretrovirals for the treatment of HIV. Other more complex reasons have been described by Foster\(^{30}\) and may relate to the structure of the local pharmaceutical market and the various components of the supply and distribution chain.

The mismatch between what is available and what is needed can lead to a range of strategies to obtain essential drugs. Kandel\(^{31}\) illustrates this with the example of the effect of the economic embargo on Iraq. As the supply there of essential drugs became compromised, residents with relatives and friends overseas ensure that any visitors’ suitcase contains supplies of basic drugs such as antibiotics and thyroxine. Kent and Glatzer\(^{32}\) noted the chaos that developed in Bosnia, with the media coverage determining the supply of particular medicines. If the story of the week emphasized a shortage of anesthetic agents, the hospital concerned would be overwhelmed with inappropriate donation of expensive anesthetic agents at the expense of more essential products. (Drug donations are discussed in more detail below.)

Lack of access to essential drugs is not only a problem in developing countries. In developed countries, vulnerable populations can be without access to essential drugs, usually because of avoidable failures of government policy. The most spectacular examples of this are in the US, where a significant proportion of the population lacks guaranteed access to affordable supplies of the drugs that they need.\(^{33}\) Attempts to contain drug costs at a state level or in managed care organizations can have unintended effects. In an earlier study, Soumerai et al.\(^{34}\) described the impact of a three-month prescription payment limit or “cap” on the use of psychotropic drugs and acute mental health care by patients with schizophrenia. Not surprisingly, the “cap” resulted in an immediate reduction in the use of psychotropic medication by the population. With decreased consumption of essential medications, the use of acute mental health services (and the associated costs) increased. Rabon et al.\(^{35}\) describe another manifestation of this type of problem in their survey of the availability of cancer medication in pharmacies in South Carolina. They found that only 25% of a list of cancer medications were available to be dispensed from 90% of the pharmacies surveyed.

In many cases, the lack of availability of essential drugs is due to the high prices being requested by manufacturers. This mismatch of demand and affordable supply is an important example of market failure, and the inadequacy of government intervention in many countries. International comparisons of prices of pharmaceuticals are difficult and are influenced by fluctuating exchange rates, variable purchasing power of currencies, and wages. However, Health Action International, a consumer organization that aims to promote the rational use of drugs, published price comparisons of 12 commonly used drugs in five Asian countries and Canada (\textit{HAI News}, December 1995). Enormous price variation was documented. For example, the price of 100 × 150 mg ranitidine tablets ranged from SUS3 in India to SUS150 in Indonesia, presumably due to different manufacturers and suppliers negotiating different prices, plus the variability in retail systems.

Finally, it is important to recognize that “essential” drugs only deserve that title so long as they are used in an appropriate manner. There are many examples of the misuse of drugs on the WHO’s model list, and ensuring appropriateness of use is just as important as establishing stable systems for selection, procurement, and distribution.

POOR QUALITY USE OF PHARMACEUTICALS

The third aspect of the policy problem that needs to be considered is the poor quality \textit{use} of pharmaceuticals. This can be divided into three
areas: overuse of pharmaceuticals, underuse, and misuse. The problems of overuse have probably received most attention and there is an extensive literature in this field. The overuse and inappropriate use of antibiotics is a problem internationally. \textsuperscript{36} Most surveys in developing countries show that antibiotics are prescribed in 35–60\% of clinical visits, although they are appropriate in less than 20\%. \textsuperscript{37} The size of the antibiotic market in developing countries has been estimated to be double that of developed countries. \textsuperscript{38} The factors that contribute to this include free availability of products combined with poor prescribing and information. The resulting significant problems of antibiotic resistance have been extensively documented. Ironically, many patients are unable to afford more than 1 to 2 days’ treatment. The perverse situation arises in which those who do not need the drugs receive a brief course, which may encourage antibiotic resistance, while those who really need antibiotics receive a totally inadequate course of treatment.

Overuse of drugs in developing countries is not restricted to antibiotics. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs have been described as being inappropriately used in Brazil, where expenditure on one agent (diclofenac) exceeds that on almost any other drug—a clear example of the misalignment of community needs and clinical practice. \textsuperscript{39} Elzubier and Al-Shery\textsuperscript{40} have documented the excessive use of vitamins in diabetic patients in Saudi Arabia.

Medication practices vary not only by country, but by area within a country, so that descriptive studies of local prescribing patterns are essential to determine the precise nature of the problem in any given locality.

Hogerzelle \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{41} have described a standard set of indicators that were developed for the measurement of drug use in developing countries, but these can also be applied to a developed country setting, and these are summarized in Table 27.1.

In developed countries, there are other manifestations of the problems of overuse and polypharmacy. Use of greater numbers of drug therapies has been found to be associated with an increased risk of developing adverse drug reactions. \textsuperscript{42} Polypharmacy in the elderly has been shown to be associated with urinary incontinence, delirium, \textsuperscript{43} and syncope. \textsuperscript{44} Studies in a variety of settings have shown that patients over 65 years of age use an average of two to six prescribed medications and one to 3.4 nonprescribed medications. \textsuperscript{45} In nursing homes in particular, overuse of psychotropic drugs has been shown to be a problem. \textsuperscript{46}

Equally problematic, however, is the underuse of appropriate medications in this population. This is probably best documented for the lack of use of \( \beta \)-blockers following myocardial infarction, \textsuperscript{47} although it has also been suggested to be the case for the use of diuretics in hypertension, \textsuperscript{48} and (more controversially) the use of hormone replacement therapy. \textsuperscript{49}

### Table 27.1. Core drug-use indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prescribing indicators</th>
<th>Patient care indicators</th>
<th>Health facility indicators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Average number of drugs per encounter</td>
<td>Average consultation time</td>
<td>Availability of a copy of essential drugs list or formulary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of drugs prescribed by generic name</td>
<td>Average dispensing time*</td>
<td>Availability of key drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of encounters with an antibiotic prescribed</td>
<td>Percentage of drugs actually dispensed</td>
<td>* Time that personnel dispensing drugs spend with patients.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of encounters with an injection prescribed</td>
<td>Percentage of drugs adequately labeled</td>
<td>Source: Hogerzelle \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{31}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of drugs prescribed from essential drugs list or formulary</td>
<td>Patients’ knowledge of correct dosage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

UNINTENDED EFFECTS OF INTERNATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Although this chapter is primarily concerned with national drug policies, we cannot ignore the impact of some important global trends. One that we wish to highlight here is the difficulty created for national governments, and aid workers, by unsolicited donations of drugs during national emergencies caused by natural disasters or acts of war. Although these donations are nearly always
well intended, they can create many problems, as has been well documented.\textsuperscript{50} Hogerzeil \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{50} give a number of examples, including seven truckloads of expired aspirin tablets delivered to Eritrea that took six months to burn, and the arrival of contact lens solution, appetite stimulants, and lipid-lowering drugs in a war zone in the Sudan. Sometimes donated drugs have been close to expiry and in poor condition, labeled in foreign languages, and quite inappropriate to the recipient country’s short to medium term needs. The work involved in disposing of unwanted pharmaceuticals can tie up key personnel for long periods, and may be very costly if it involves either burying the pharmaceuticals in concrete filled drums or high temperature incineration.

The motives behind drug donations may be altruistic (although perhaps not always—see below), but good intentions do not invariably translate into good deeds. One perverse incentive is the tax relief in the US that can be earned on the commercial value of drug donations. This has led to the cynical view that some manufacturers can make more money by donating expiring stock than by trying to sell it to their normal clients. One difficulty for recipients of donations is that they do not want to appear ungrateful as it may compromise future, more appropriate, aid, and so vociferous complaints are uncommon.

The World Health Organization, in collaboration with a number of agencies, has produced detailed guidelines for drug donations (WHO/DAP 1996), and for the safe disposal of unwanted pharmaceuticals (WHO/EDM 1999). The guidelines make it clear that the responsibility of donors is to ensure that the recipients have been allowed to specify their needs, that the donations are appropriate, in good condition, have a long shelf-life, and are labeled in a way that enables them to be used effectively and safely in the field. If in doubt, cash donations will always be acceptable. It is likely that countries with well-established national drug policies will be well positioned to make the best use of appropriate drug donations.

The second major international influence comes in the form of the agreements on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) mediated by the World Trade Organization (WTO). Through these agreements, member states are expected to guarantee intellectual property rights for a period of 20 years.\textsuperscript{51} These agreements have the potential to limit the access of developing countries to new health technologies at affordable prices, as they might be denied the right to manufacture drugs locally at prices much lower than will be demanded by transnational corporations. This issue received a great deal of publicity during 1999 because of attempts by the US pharmaceutical industry to block the local production of cheap antiretroviral drugs in South Africa, where the prevalence of AIDS is very high. Much of the argument has centered on the legal interpretation of the WTO treaty obligations. However, most observers consider that TRIPS does not actually remove the right of countries to force compulsory licensing, i.e., forcing an international manufacturer to give a license to a local manufacturer to produce a drug that is essential to the national interest. This position was admitted by the US Trade Secretary in late July 1999, after an effective campaign by AIDS activists in the US that was aimed at Vice-President Al Gore. A coalition of organizations including the US-based Consumer Project on Technology, \textit{Médecins Sans Frontières}, and Health Action International, held a meeting in early 1999 to explore ways of introducing compulsory licensing more widely as a means of improving the access of developing countries to the drugs that they need. Although this issue may be seen as one grounded in obscure interpretations of international law, it is clearly an important argument and one that will have major implications for national drug policies in the future.

\section*{Methodologic Problems to Be Addressed by Pharmacoepidemiology Research}

\subsection*{Defining National Medicinal Drug Policies}

Public “policies” can range from having written documents that express intent on particular issues, to a complex process in which values, interests, and
resources compete through institutions to influence government actions. They should be distinguished from “politics,” although increasingly politics influence policy, as the costs of drugs continue to rise and restrictive policies are seen to limit access to drugs and to reduce corporate profits.

Health policies should reflect, and ideally meet, health needs. As pharmaceuticals are recognized to play a major role in meeting health needs, medicinal drug policies need to be part of health policies and use of drugs in a community should be consonant with overall health goals. This requires “careful analysis of existing and desirable relationships between health needs, drug demands and drug sales, within fluctuating political, economic and social pressures. These are often in conflict with each other because of the different and sometimes competing interests of the groups involved.”

Since the mid-1970s, national medicinal drug policies (NMDPs) have been developed in many countries to ensure access to pharmaceutical products of adequate quality, safety, efficacy, and cost-effectiveness. These developments have received strong encouragement, and great practical support, from the World Health Organization, through its Action Program on Essential Drugs (recently restructured as the Program for Essential Drugs and other Medicines). As a result, drug policy development has become recognized as a legitimate topic for study, not just the preserve of governments.

Ideally, NMDPs should provide the framework to coordinate the activities of the pharmaceutical sector, the public and private sectors, NGOs, donors, and other stakeholders. They have been described as a “guide for action.” It is not only developing countries that should pursue such an approach; many developed countries have similar aims, but few have produced formal documents. Increasingly, experts are advocating that a policy document, even where the elements of a comprehensive NMDP already exist, can be of value, especially as part of any evaluation process.

OBJECTIVES OF NATIONAL MEDICINAL DRUG POLICIES

The objectives of an NMDP will vary from setting to setting, but in general terms, are likely to include the following:

- to make essential drugs available and affordable to those who need them
- to ensure the safety, efficacy, and quality of all medicines provided to the public
- to improve prescribing and dispensing practices and to promote the correct use of medicines by health care workers and the public
- to ensure an appropriate balance of local production and importation of pharmaceutical products
- to build and maintain human capacity to ensure the sustainability of the NMDP.

Clearly, the extent to which these components are included in an individual country’s NMDP will vary depending on the country’s particular needs, and there are many examples of this variation. This is illustrated by Table 27.2, which summarizes the core objectives of national medicinal drug policies in a developing and a developed country (using Australia as an example).

It is immediately apparent that there are similarities and differences between these two sets of goals, and both are revealing. Assuring the efficacy, safety, and quality of medicines is a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Developing Country (from reference 1)</th>
<th>Developed Country (Australia)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>to make essential drugs available and affordable to those who need them</td>
<td>to achieve affordable access to a satisfactory range of cost-effective drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to ensure the safety, efficacy, and quality of all medicines provided to the public</td>
<td>to ensure the safety, efficacy, and quality of medicines provided to the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to improve prescribing and dispensing practices and promote the correct use of medicines by health workers and the public</td>
<td>to achieve quality use of medicines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to encourage the development of a successful pharmaceutical industry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
common goal, but is much easier to achieve in developed countries because of the high quality of production facilities that usually exist in these countries. Both quality assurance procedures (maintenance of good manufacturing practices, close examination of data packages) and testing of samples can be carried out in a rigorous manner. As noted earlier, failure of these systems in developing countries may lead to drug contamination, substandard drugs, or counterfeit drugs. However these processes are labor intensive, and expensive, and a large investment may not be a priority when the health budget is insufficient to meet the most basic needs of the community.

Relevant to this consideration is the objective of any industry policy that is in place. This is explicit in the Australian policy. Most governments in developed countries appear to give a high priority to investment by large pharmaceutical manufacturers (although sometimes the reasons for this lack clarity), and also encourage the local production of generics. In some cases, the large international companies own the generic manufacturers. The situation in developing countries is different. It is often unclear whether a government should encourage local generic manufacture (risking quality failures), investment in manufacturing capacity by international companies (which may provide employment but do little to meet the health needs of the local community), or the development of sound procurement practices using the international market for essential drugs (most suppliers are based in Europe).

The affordability and accessibility of important drugs is an essential issue in any drug policy. Most developed countries (the US is a notable exception) have universal insurance programs that guarantee access to heavily subsidized drugs. Generally, the distribution and sales of drugs within such programs are handled fairly efficiently by the private sector.

Insurance programs are less common in developing countries, however, largely because of their great expense, and distribution systems that are taken for granted in developed countries often fail. A variety of procurement and distribution systems has been employed, with technical details that are beyond this scope of this chapter (see reference\textsuperscript{1} for details). Finding the right public/private sector mix is a challenge; poor quality manufacture, theft, improper storage, and expiration due to poor stock control can lead to losses of 40\% or more of the total value of purchases.\textsuperscript{1}

Achieving quality use of medicines (a less pejorative term than “rational drug use”) must be a priority in both developing and developed countries. In the former, the targets for educational campaigns and behavior change strategies include a wide range of health workers (including unlicensed drug sellers) and the public. In developed countries, most programs are aimed at prescribing doctors, and a few at consumers. However, essentially the aims are the same: to reduce the adverse effects associated with excessive drug use, to ensure that adequate treatment is given to those that need it, and to contain expenditures. In many ways, developing countries are more advanced in investigating and implementing techniques for improving drug use practices.\textsuperscript{33} General methods for modifying physician prescribing are discussed in Chapter 30, and Chapter 31 discusses the use of drug utilization review as a specific and common technique used toward that end. In the remainder of this chapter, we will discuss the use of National Medicinal Drug Policies for this and other purposes.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

**THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NATIONAL MEDICINAL DRUG POLICIES (NMDPs)**

The components that are necessary to implement NMDPs have been defined by WHO.\textsuperscript{54}

- an appropriate legislative and regulatory framework
- a system for choosing appropriate drugs
- a mechanism for ensuring supply and distribution
- a program for improving rational use of drugs
- appropriate economic strategies for the pharmaceutical sector
- the development of human resources
● a system for monitoring and evaluating the impact of the policy
● research—drug research and development, and operational R&D.

As mentioned in the section on objectives of NMDPs, the correct policy mix will vary according to the stage of development and economic state of a country. However, experience indicates that successful implementation requires a strong central group with the necessary expertise, concentration on some key issues (it is not possible to achieve everything), public endorsement by senior politicians (the president/prime minister or health minister should “launch” the policy), international support, and a thick skin (the industry and local medical association may object on the grounds that the policy will reduce profits and clinical freedom).

A number of the features of NMDPs have been covered in previous sections of this chapter and there is insufficient space to do justice to all of the topics listed above. However, we would like to cover some selected implementation issues, including the growing interest in the use of formal economic analyses in the selection and pricing of drugs within a NMDP.

Legislative And Regulatory Frameworks
A key step for national drug policies is the drafting and implementation of an appropriate law that regulates the supply of pharmaceuticals. In developed countries, drug laws have usually evolved over many years. For example, in the US, the first national drug law was passed in 1906 and this was then modified following public health “disasters” such as the contamination of sulfonilamide in 1938 and thalidomide in the early 1960s (see also Chapter 1). The aims of most drug laws are similar: to regulate the supply of pharmaceuticals (including import and export), and to ensure that the forms in which pharmaceuticals are supplied meet accepted standards. Most drug laws do not try to regulate the way in which pharmaceuticals are used, by either the prescriber or the consumer.

In developing countries, drug laws have often been developed in the recent past, based on the WHO Model Drugs Law, for example in Laos and some of the eastern European countries. To be effective, such legislation has to be supported by appropriate enforcement strategies. This may appear to be self-evident, but there are many examples where legislation has been implemented without enforcement, particularly relating to provisions about who can supply pharmaceuticals to the consumer. In Thailand and Vietnam, for example, despite the existence of national drug laws, there is as yet no effective control over the supply of antibiotics to the consumer, which contributes to major problems of inappropriate use.

It is not altogether clear what makes drug regulation effective. The WHO estimates that, of its member states, only 1/6 have an “effective” drug regulatory system. It is possible to identify some factors that will contribute to ineffective drug regulation, such as lack of appropriate technical expertise, and inefficient or corrupt administration. Solutions to these problems are more difficult.

Systems For Choosing Appropriate Drugs And Ensuring Access
The Essential Drugs Program has probably been the most effective solution that has been implemented for choosing appropriate drugs. The advantages of using a limited list are summarized in Table 27.3. For example, Hogerzeil et al. documented the impact of the introduction of an Essential Drugs Program in Yemen, that improved availability, use, and knowledge in relation to a selection of essential medicines. One of the difficulties, however, has been that in many settings, industry has not accepted the Essential Drugs Program and it has not been prepared to produce essential drugs at affordable prices.

At the International Conference on National Medicinal Drug Policies held in Manly, Australia, in 1995, the policy options for improving access to essential drugs were discussed. The options identified included price control, price competition, price awareness, and health insurance. Although a number of examples appeared to be successful, the conditions for success of any particular strategy are still not fully understood.
Table 27.3. Advantages of adopting a limited list of essential drugs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• easier procurement, storage, and distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lower stocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• easier dispensing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescribing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• training more focused and therefore easier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• more experience with fewer drugs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• no irrational treatment alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• focused drug information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• better recognition of adverse drug reactions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• lower prices, more competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• focused education efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• reduced confusion and increased adherence to treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• improved drug availability</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Systems for choosing between drugs are developing. The “VEN classification” proposed by the WHO59 represents a logical approach, as it provides a basis for choosing between a range of medications, of different types, and for different indications, when working under budgetary constraints. Briefly, drugs are classified as vital, essential, or nonessential, and this establishes a hierarchy for managing choices. When drugs are genuinely different from each other, those that are classified as “vital” should be selected ahead of those that are “essential.” When drugs are similar in their actions and indications (i.e., in the same VEN category), the decision should be based on an assessment of their comparative cost effectiveness (see Chapter 35). When the drugs are identical, the only decision criterion is the acquisition cost. As will be seen in the section on economic considerations, this approach, advocated by the WHO for use in developing countries, is very similar to the selection processes used in the operation of the Australian Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme.

A Program For Achieving Quality Use Of Medicines

A key component of any NMDP is a program to encourage the quality use of medicines. Factors that influence use of pharmaceuticals are complex and may be culture specific. A number of strategies for changing professional practice have been studied, for example the provision of standard treatment guidelines, the use of educational seminars, and more intensive approaches such as “academic detailing.” The most recent reviews of the various approaches suggest that a combination of methods is usually required to have sustained impact on practice.60,61 (See also Chapters 30 and 31.) The methods for changing consumer practices are still being defined.

The provision of adequate information about the efficacy and safety of pharmaceuticals is regarded as an important component of any program that is aimed at improving use of pharmaceuticals. Premarketing evaluation of drugs can help provide information about the efficacy of products, but it is well recognized that premarketing data do not provide the complete picture of the safety of products (see also Chapter 1). Surveillance systems for adverse drug reactions can be an important contributor to the information base as well as to other aspects of national medicinal drug policies. For example, spontaneous reporting systems can contribute to the education of prescribers and hopefully improve the quality of use of pharmaceuticals (see Chapters 10 and 11). In Australia, the hepatic side-effects of fluocacinil that were identified through the spontaneous reporting system were publicized in the quarterly adverse drug reactions bulletin. Formal investigation of the problem (using case-control methodology) identified the dose and duration of therapy and the age of the patients as major risk factors for developing the reaction.62 This allowed appropriate advice to be issued regarding the usage of the product, and eventually there was a marked decline in usage.

Appropriate Economic Strategies for the Pharmaceutical Sector—the Example of Australia

The use of formal economic analysis (see Chapter 35) in the selection and pricing of drugs has been a controversial issue for a number of years. However, recently there has been a surge of interest; a
number of countries are considering the implementation of this approach and have published guidelines to assist the pharmaceutical industry in making applications for listing on their national formularies of subsidized products.

Most experience of this approach to formulary management has been gained during the operation of the Australian Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme (PBS). The PBS and the processes used for evaluating drugs have been described in a number of articles. The use of economic analysis in the choice and pricing of pharmaceuticals is a central activity of the Australian national drug policy.

The PBS is a comprehensive, publicly funded, insurance program that reimburses pharmacists for the costs of a selected range of prescription drugs. Drugs are placed in different categories of access (restricted benefit, authority required), based on evidence of their comparative efficacy and cost-effectiveness in defined patient groups. The decisions to place new drugs in the PBS are made by the Commonwealth Health Minister on the advice of the Pharmaceutical Benefits Advisory Committee (PBAC). The PBAC receives advice from an economics subcommittee regarding the validity of the economic analyses contained in submissions from the pharmaceutical industry. The PBAC has a strong preference for using data from randomized controlled clinical trials as the basis of its judgement about the comparative efficacy of drugs. The guidelines for economic analysis released by the Department of Health and Aged Care (DHAC) encourage the sponsors of new drugs to conduct a preliminary economic analysis, based on the results of randomized trials, before conducting a modeled analysis in which assumptions are made about long-term health effects and costs when the drugs are used in Australia. The database of submissions to the PBS that is maintained by the DHAC contains details of more than 300 submissions from the industry. Eighty-six percent of submissions were based on the results of randomized clinical trials, of which one quarter included the results of meta-analyses (see Chapter 38). This is the most extensive experience in the world of the use of trial data in the assessment of the comparative efficacy and cost effectiveness of any healthcare intervention.

The key decisions that have to be made when a drug is considered for listing are whether it is superior to its comparators in clinical terms (improved efficacy, greater safety, both, or neither). The net costs associated with its use are then related to the assessment of comparative clinical performance. If there is no worthwhile difference in efficacy or safety, the new drug will receive the same price as the comparator (an established drug for the same indication). If the new drug is superior, the additional clinical benefits have to be related to the net costs in an incremental cost-effectiveness ratio. Whether this ratio represents “value for money” is the judgement of the advisory committee, and the decisions are sometimes quite controversial. It should be noted that factors other than cost-effectiveness are considered in the decision-making process, such as clinical need, equity of access, “rule of rescue,” and total cost to the health-care system. The complexity of this process reflects the true difficulties of making this sort of decision, and the provision of evidence at different stages helps to make the issues more clearcut.

The overall impact of this policy is difficult to judge, but one effect on drug pricing is fairly clear. The use of “cost minimization” to eliminate cost differences between very similar drugs has considerable social value, as it reduces expenditure that has no prospect of bringing greater health benefits. It also minimizes the need for educational efforts directed at doctors that are intended to shift prescribing between very similar drugs for purely economic reasons. An example of the effect of this policy is given in Figure 27.1, where the prices of commonly used (but very similar) nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in Australia and the United Kingdom are compared. The difference in average price is not the issue, as this is influenced by the exchange rate at the time the study was carried out. However, the notable difference between the two countries is in the price variation across this class of very similar compounds. Undoubtedly, there are benefits to the community in pursuing a policy that minimizes price differences across classes of equivalent drugs. This will apply in both developing and developed countries.
Figure 27.1. The impact of cost minimization on drug prices. A comparison of the prices of commonly used and similarly performing NSAIDs in Australia (dark shading) and the United Kingdom. The comparisons are based on the prices listed in the Australian Schedule and British National Formulary in the last quarter of 1997. The Australian prices were adjusted to the maximum quantities provided by a UK prescription. Prices are in $AU, using an exchange rate of $1AU = £0.40.

THE FUTURE

As countries become increasingly concerned with costs of drugs and with their proper use, it is likely that there will be increasing attention paid to the development of National Medicinal Drug Policies. The development of these policies will modify the types of research that pharmacoepidemiologists will be able to perform.

In addition, as these programs are expanded and developed, it is important that their effects are rigorously evaluated. There are several obvious roles for pharmacoepidemiologists in this process. These include drug utilization studies as part of a program to improve the quality of use of medicines (see Chapter 29), designing interventions to improve prescribing (see Chapters 30 and 31), the conduct and evaluation of pharmacoeconomic studies (see Chapter 35), and identifying and quantifying adverse drug reactions (see Chapters 10–25). In developing countries, there is still a need for adverse reaction reporting as part of process to identify failure in the quality of production. A range of indicators of quality drug use have been suggested by the WHO, and by some countries. However, as with any system of assessment, there are virtues in simplicity.

Table 27.4 lists a few basic indicators that can be used to assess the degree of implementation of national drug policies. It should be stressed (again) that their use should not be confined to developing countries—they have relevance across all stages of economic development and there are few countries that will perform well on all of these indicators.

Pharmacoepidemiologists also have the potential to make major contributions to policies, by recognizing policy issues in the environments in which they work, measuring the impact of National Medicinal Drug Policies, and contributing to policy development. Many pharmacoepidemiologists already have considerable influence with governments and pharmaceutical manufacturers. That influence can be used to persuade governments to develop better policies, and to commit resources to policy research. It could also be used to persuade governments and manufacturers to respect the rights of developing countries and to recognize the legitimacy of their efforts to improve the access of their populations to essential drugs. Through these initiatives, both in research and policy, pharmacoepidemiologists can play an important role in improving the risk/benefit balance of drug use in their communities.
Table 27.4. Indicators used in the world drug situation to assess the effectiveness of national drug policies (modified from WHO 1988)

Indicators of availability
- The existence and use of an essential drug list (or selective national formulary)
- the extent of an operating system for procurement
- the extent of an operating system for distribution
- the extent of quality assurance
- the extent of regulatory mechanisms
- the extent of coverage.

Indicators of rational use of drugs
- The existence of a functioning and independent system that provides objective information on drugs to health workers and patients
- the existence of a system of continuing education for all types of personnel dealing with drugs
- the existence of a monitoring system for adverse drug reactions.

Indicators of the commitment of government
- The existence of a national medicinal drug policy.
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INTRODUCTION

While most of the interest in pharmacoepidemiology has centered on its role in the evaluation of drug safety after marketing, epidemiologic methods are also useful in evaluating safety concerns that arise prior to market approval. Much of the premarketing patient exposure to many pharmaceutical products occurs in studies conducted without a control group. Often these studies are open extensions of randomized trials in which all patients are offered the option of receiving active treatment upon completion of the blinded phase of the studies. Other sources of premarketing patient exposure without a control group are Treatment IND (Investigational New Drug) Studies and Compassionate Use Programs. These programs are intended to give physicians the opportunity to use investigational drugs to treat patients with life-threatening illnesses which are not adequately controlled with approved drugs and for which the investigational drugs are considered likely to be beneficial. Typically, such patients are more seriously ill than those in the randomized clinical trials designed to evaluate efficacy. Use of epidemiologic methods can sometimes be useful in determining whether rare adverse events in noncomparative clinical studies are occurring at rates above those expected among similar patients not exposed to the study drug. In addition, retrospective analyses of noncomparative clinical trials can help identify risk factors for specific adverse events and thereby contribute to safer use of the study drug.

Premarketing applications of pharmacoepidemiology are similar in many ways to analyses of postmarketing surveillance studies (phase 4 studies). Two important ways in which premarketing and postmarketing applications of pharmacoepidemiology differ are that (i) safety questions arising in clinical trials typically require answers in a matter of days rather than weeks or months, and (ii) the threshold for either the manufacturer or a regulatory agency to decide to halt human exposure to a drug is much lower before market approval than after approval.

In this chapter, we will first review the clinical and regulatory context for epidemiologic evalua-
tions of drug safety during premarketing clinical studies. Next, we will briefly mention information technology requirements and statistical methods. Finally, we will discuss some interesting case studies in which the analyses resulted in publications. Because premarketing applications of pharmacoepidemiology normally require access to premarketing, as yet unpublished, clinical data, such studies are of greatest importance and interest to those in the pharmaceutical industry or regulatory agencies, and the perspective taken in this chapter reflects this. However, the topic should also be of interest to others in the field of pharmacoepidemiology, including academic researchers and clinical investigators.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

The need for premarketing epidemiologic assessments of drug safety may arise in several situations, including evaluation of serious adverse events in noncomparative clinical trials, preparing integrated summaries of safety for a New Drug Application (NDA) or international marketing application, and answering inquiries from regulatory agencies or advisory committees. For clinical trials conducted under US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) regulations for Investigational New Drugs (IND), the Code of Federal Regulations (21 CFR 312.32) currently (January 1999) mandates reporting to FDA and all participating investigators within 15 calendar days any adverse experience which simultaneously meets the three conditions: (i) “serious,” (ii) “unexpected,” and (iii) having a reasonable possibility of having been caused by the study drug. If, in addition to the above three conditions, the event is also fatal or life threatening, a report to FDA by telephone or facsimile transmission within seven calendar days is required (6). The publication of these regulations in the Federal Register noted that they were issued to implement definitions, reporting periods, formats, and standards as recommended by the International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH)\(^7,8\) and by the World Health Organization’s Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS).\(^9,10\) This is part of an ongoing process of international standardization of definitions and reporting procedures used in drug safety evaluation.

According to current regulations,\(^6\) a “serious” adverse drug experience is any adverse drug experience occurring at any dose that results in any of the following outcomes: death, a life-threatening adverse drug experience, inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, a persistent or significant disability/incapacity, or a congenital anomaly/birth defect. Important medical events that may not result in death, be life threatening, or require hospitalization may be considered a serious adverse drug experience when, based upon appropriate medical judgment, they may jeopardize the patient or subject and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed in this definition. Examples of such medical events include allergic bronchospasm requiring intensive treatment in an emergency room or at home, blood dyscrasias or convulsions that do not result in inpatient hospitalization, or the development of drug dependency or drug abuse.

An “unexpected” adverse drug experience is any adverse drug experience, the specificity or severity of which is not consistent with the current investigator brochure; or, if an investigator brochure is not required or available, the specificity or severity of which is not consistent with the risk information described in the general investigational plan or elsewhere in the current application, as amended. In reporting IND safety reports, the regulations indicate that the sponsor shall identify all safety reports previously filed with the IND concerning a similar adverse experience and shall analyze the significance of the adverse experience in light of the previous similar reports.

An epidemiologic approach to the preparation of an IND safety report can occasionally be useful when the report concerns a rare adverse event for which appropriate comparative incidence data are available. For example cancer incidence and
mortality data by age, gender, and race are available online from a number of countries.\textsuperscript{11–13} To produce an epidemiologic assessment it is necessary to perform, review, and report the analysis in time to meet the 15 calendar day regulatory reporting deadline. This naturally puts a constraint on how comprehensive such an assessment can be.

The FDA has made available a number of guidelines to assist manufacturers in preparing NDAs and FDA medical officers in reviewing them. A recent draft guideline for medical reviewers outlines the goals of a safety review of an NDA.\textsuperscript{14}

In general, the goals of a safety review are (1) to identify important adverse events that are causally related to the use of the drug, (2) to estimate incidence for those events, and (3) to identify factors that predict the occurrence of those events, e.g., patient factors such as age, gender, race, comorbid illnesses, and drug factors such as dose, plasma level, duration of exposure, concomitant medications. The safety review is useful not only in making a risk/benefit decision, but also in drafting labeling for a drug that is going to be approved.

The guideline also emphasizes the difference between the formal, prespecified efficacy evaluation and the more exploratory approaches used in safety evaluation in pre-approval clinical trials:

Approaches useful for evaluating the safety of a drug under development generally differ substantially from those useful in evaluating its effectiveness. In fact, most of the studies in phases 2–3 of a development program focus on establishing a drug's effectiveness. In designing these trials, critical efficacy endpoints are identified in advance and sample sizes are estimated to permit an adequate test of the null hypothesis. For the most part, phase 2–3 trials are not designed to test hypotheses about safety. In fact, the safety endpoints are generally not known prior to the conduct of these trials, and for many of the observed safety outcomes, one can assume that the available studies are underpowered. The usual approach is to screen broadly and sensitively for adverse events, and it is hoped that this approach should reveal the common adverse event profile of a new drug and detect some of the less common and more serious adverse events associated with the drug as well. While hypothesis testing for effectiveness outcomes generally is done within individual studies, it usually is not appropriate to proceed with hypothesis testing procedures for safety outcomes. Rather, the approach to safety data may be viewed more as exploration and estimation.

This discussion of the goals and approaches of a pre-approval safety evaluation makes it clear that epidemiologic reasoning and methods are clearly useful. The need to evaluate data from all trials, with different kinds of patient population, differing designs, and differing durations makes epidemiologic approaches especially appropriate. The approach required is one that recognizes the limited nature of the data and avoids overinterpretation in either direction.

METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

Epidemiologic Approaches to Assessing Causality of Adverse Events in Pre-Approval Clinical Trials

Clinical investigators and clinical monitors continually review reports of adverse events occurring in pre-approval clinical trials. Investigators are asked to provide a clinical assessment as to the causality of each event. Such assessments are a necessary part of safety monitoring in clinical research, although they are known to be subjective and imprecise\textsuperscript{14} (see also Chapter 32). Criteria to help guide causality assessments have been published by FDA.\textsuperscript{15} These criteria are most useful when there are well defined differences in clinical features of drug related and non-drug-related cases of the adverse event. However, for serious, uncommon adverse events where the clinical features of the drug related cases could be similar to those of non-drug-related cases, it can sometimes be helpful to supplement clinical causality assessments of individual cases by epidemiologic
assessment criteria based on comparisons between groups of patients.

The epidemiologic literature provides several sets of criteria for helping to decide whether an empirical association is likely to be causal. The best known criteria are those proposed in 1965 by Bradford-Hill to help evaluate evidence linking cigarette smoking with lung cancer\(^\text{15}\) (see also Chapter 2). The nine Bradford-Hill criteria are discussed briefly below as they relate to evaluation of adverse experiences in premarketing clinical trials.

**Strength of Association**

This is commonly quantified in terms of a suitably adjusted hazard function ratio or risk ratio (relative risk), rather than a \(p\)-value. In general, the farther the ratio is from unity, the less likely it could be entirely attributable to imbalances in risk factors between groups. An exception to this occurs when the ratio is based on very small numbers or highly influenced by only a few cases.

In addition, it is worth noting that with the large number of different kinds of adverse events often seen in large clinical trials, it is quite likely that some risk ratios far from unity will occur by chance alone. Multiple comparisons not only distort \(p\)-values, but can also bias risk ratios and their confidence intervals away from unity. This happens because screening many different adverse event terms and selecting those with very low \(p\)-values inherently selects for relative risks that are biased away from unity.\(^\text{17}\) Since the confidence interval is centered about the observed relative risk, it will also be biased away from unity. This type of selection bias, a form of regression to the mean, is common to all programs of screening for unusually large or small values and is well known in the statistics literature. One example where this appears to have occurred is in some observational studies of vasectomy and prostate cancer.\(^\text{17,18}\) Because pre-approval reviews of drug safety use the same set of data for identifying potentially drug related events and for providing preliminary estimates of the risk, the relative risk estimates can be biased away from unity.

It is also important to recognize that the absence of any association between a drug and any given adverse event has to be judged in the context of the limited amount of patient exposure in pre-approval clinical trials. This topic is reviewed in ICH Guideline E1A, which addresses the extent of population exposure needed to assess clinical safety for drugs intended for long term treatment of non-life-threatening conditions.\(^\text{7,8}\) The guideline notes that

It is expected that short-term event rates (cumulative 3-month incidence of about 1\%) will be well characterized. Events where the rate of occurrence changes over a longer period of time may need to be characterized depending on their severity and importance to the risk–benefit assessment of the drug. The safety evaluation during clinical drug development is not expected to characterize rare adverse events, for example, those occurring in less than 1 in 1000 patients.

**Consistency**

The original wording was, “Has [the association] been repeatedly observed by different persons, in different places, circumstances and times.” This is a useful criterion for assessing adverse experiences in a program of several clinical trials. Results that show a consistently elevated incidence on drug across studies are generally more convincing than those in which the elevated risk is largely due to one study. It has been noted by FDA, however, that an apparent lack of consistency among trials may simply reflect differences in trial design, making the event less likely in some trials than others. For example, in a combined analysis of several studies in an NDA, a reassuringly low incidence of phototoxicity was seen. Examination of individual studies revealed that in one study the rate of phototoxicity was substantial—a finding that had been obscured by combining the data. This study was the only outpatient study and thus these were the only patients who had an opportunity to have the event by virtue of having sun exposure.\(^\text{14}\)

**Temporality**

In both epidemiologic and clinical assessments of causality, it is important to distinguish between
events having onset before a drug was started and those having onset after drug therapy was started. Especially in the evaluation of adverse experiences from studies without a comparison group, it sometimes occurs that early symptoms of a disease which is present but not yet recognized lead a patient to be prescribed a drug, which then appears to be the cause of the disease when it is eventually diagnosed. This has been called “protopathic bias” and is a special case of the broader concept of “confounding by indication” (see also Chapter 34). A classic example of this form of bias was seen in uncontrolled postmarketing surveillance studies of cimetidine, where a higher than expected incidence of gastric carcinoma was found among users than among nonusers. It is likely that many of the cancers were present but undiagnosed at the time the cimetidine was started. Subsequent studies showed that elevations in gastric cancer risk diminished with duration of followup, returning to baseline with long term use.\(^{19}\)

Another way in which the concept of temporality plays a role in the evaluation of adverse experiences is whether the timing of the reaction in relation to duration of exposure is consistent with the proposed mechanism. Thus, an elevated incidence of cancer in patients who had been taking a drug for several years would be of more concern than would an elevated incidence in the first year of therapy. Timing plays a major role in the evaluation of adverse events that are thought to be due to immune mechanisms (e.g., anaphylaxis, angioedema, hemorrhagic anemia, serum-sickness), altered metabolism, or drug interactions.\(^{15}\) A classic example where timing provided highly convincing evidence of causality was in the evaluation of Guillain-Barré syndrome in association with the “swine-flu” vaccine\(^ {20}\) (see Figure 28.1).

### Dose–Response

Adverse effects caused by exaggerated pharmacological actions of a drug are often dose dependent. Examples include hypotension resulting from the use of antihypertensive drugs and gastrointestinal hemorrhage from nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. For such adverse events it is especially important to characterize how the incidence of the event varies with dose in different patient populations. This is not only important in assessing causality and quantifying incidence, but also in understanding the mechanism and providing guidance to clinicians. The case of renal failure in patients with congestive heart failure treated with the angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor enalapril provides an excellent example of where a life saving drug was initially thought by some commentators to be inherently nephrotoxic, when the actual problem was that the starting dose in patients with severe congestive heart failure was too high. While ACE inhibitors improve survival in patients with congestive heart failure, too high a dose can shut off renal function, because angiotensin-II is part of the compensatory process for

---

Fig. 28.1. Onset of Guillain-Barré syndrome in relation to day of vaccination.\(^ {16}\) Reproduced with permission.
maintaining adequate renal perfusion pressure in the face of low cardiac output. This example illustrates the importance of understanding both pathophysiology and dose–response relationships in evaluating drug safety.

Experimental Evidence

Evidence from animal experiments or from previous human clinical trials can be especially important in helping to interpret adverse experiences. Well designed animal studies can be especially helpful in determining the extent to which animal results are applicable to humans. On the other hand, poorly designed animal studies may produce misleading results, which can require carefully designed further experiments to correct.

Biological Plausibility

In the original statement of biological plausibility as one of the considerations in judging causality, Bradford-Hill noted

It will be helpful if the causation we suspect is biologically plausible. But this is a feature I am convinced we cannot demand. What is biologically plausible depends on the biological knowledge of the day.

He went on to note, among other examples, that the role of rubella in causing congenital malformations was initially doubted on the basis of presumed lack of biological plausibility. As important as we consider biological plausibility to be, it is equally important to realize that it can mislead in either direction. It is worth noting, however, that some epidemiologists have expressed the view that too little attention is currently paid to biological plausibility in reviews of epidemiologic evidence.

Coherence

The postulated cause-and-effect interpretation should not seriously conflict with what is known of the natural history and biology of the event. In this regard, biological and laboratory evidence may strengthen a causal interpretation, but lack of it cannot be used to nullify one.

Analogy

Reasoning by analogy often serves as a basis for having a lower threshold for judging an adverse event to be causally related to one drug in a class when the same effect is considered to be causally related to another drug in the class. Such reasoning is even more problematic than reasoning based on biological plausibility and this criterion has been criticized as being potentially misleading. It is worth noting, however, that certain types of adverse event are commonly enough associated with drugs to be worth anticipating as topics which regulatory agencies are likely to ask to be specifically addressed. The FDA medical reviewer guidance document states that

There is an expanding checklist of adverse events that we now routinely think about when reviewing new drugs, e.g., sedation, anticholinergic effects, vasodilator effects, QT prolongation, tachycardia, beta agonist effects, hepatotoxicity, hematological effects, such as neutropenia. All of these standard concerns should be specifically addressed within the appropriate body systems.

The document suggests that medical reviewers perform a “review of body systems” to help judge whether potential safety concerns within each body system had been adequately evaluated.

... within each body system, the reviewer should comment on the adequacy of the development program in evaluating the new drug with regard to the body system in question. This gets at the question of whether or not “all tests reasonably applicable” were conducted to assess the safety of the new drug. Were all the appropriate animal tests done? Were all the appropriate clinical tests done? Were all potentially important findings adequately explored, e.g., to what extent was psychomotor impairment specifically assessed in a drug that is sedating? If not, this could be the basis for a non-approval action, or alternatively, a phase 4 study for additional testing.

Thus, it is important to anticipate potential mechanism based toxicity and to design the drug
development program to address concerns that can reasonably be anticipated and tested. This requires understanding both the pharmacology of the compound and its class and the natural history and epidemiology of the disease being treated.

**Specificity**

The finding that an adverse event has a very specific presentation or is associated with a specific histopathology can be useful evidence in favor of causality. Absence of specificity in an epidemiologic study often manifests itself as elevation in positive associations between an exposure and a large number of unrelated outcomes. Such a finding raises the possibility of uncontrolled confounding or selection bias.

In summary, while the Bradford-Hill criteria were originally proposed for use in interpreting evidence from observational studies, they also provide a good framework for evaluating evidence from unplanned comparisons of adverse experiences in pre-approval clinical trials.

Another approach to assessing causality is through Bayesian causality assessment, which provides a framework for using clinical and epidemiologic information to compute a probability that a specific drug caused a specific set of events in a specific patient. In Bayesian causality assessments the statement that a given drug “D” caused an event “E” is defined to mean that the event would not have happened as and when it did, if drug “D” had not been administered. Using this definition, a Bayesian causality assessment begins by decomposing the calculation of a probability of causation into a number of subcalculations, some of which make use of epidemiologic information and others of which make use of pharmacologic and medical information specific to the case. Thus, rather than being alternatives to epidemiologic assessments, Bayesian causality assessments require epidemiologic assessments as a (somewhat hidden) part of a process which yields a numerical probability of causation. Bayesian analysis is discussed in more detail in Chapter 32.

**Statistical Analysis Methods**

While both cohort and case–control study designs are commonly used in postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology, premarketing studies typically involve only cohort designs. One of the most common problems in premarketing pharmacoepidemiology is to compare the incidence of a given adverse event in the cohort of patients exposed to the study drug to the incidence in a suitably chosen cohort of historical controls. Here incidence is used in the epidemiologic sense, where the numerator refers to the number of events (counting only the initial event in each patient) and the denominator often refers to the total person time at risk during exposure to the study drug, sometimes referred to as incidence density. Person time at risk is typically measured in person days, where each patient contributes one person day for each day he or she is on the study drug and is at risk for the given adverse event. The person time of exposure for each patient is thus most commonly measured from the day of first exposure to the study drug, up to the earlier of (i) the date of last followup for the patient or (ii) the day that the patient first experienced the adverse event. When analyzing incidence it is important to review the data for any evidence of temporal trends in relation to start of therapy. When such trends are found, it may be necessary to produce separate risk computations for different windows of time on therapy. This is part of the general topic of effect modification by time on therapy, as discussed elsewhere (see also Chapter 43).

For example, Suissa and colleagues recently showed that when risk in relation to duration of therapy was taken into account in comparing the risk of venous thromboembolism among new users of second and third generation oral contraceptives, the incidences in the two groups were much closer than had been found in previous analyses where this approach had not been used. This phenomenon has been termed “effect modification by duration of therapy” or “depletion of susceptibles.”

Analyses of events in relation to person time can be analyzed by Cox regression, Poisson regression, or by stratified incidence density
computations\textsuperscript{28} using standard software packages, such as Stata\textsuperscript{R} or SAS\textsuperscript{R}. When the sample sizes are very small confidence intervals on the stratified relative risk estimates may be computed by exact methods.\textsuperscript{29} Analytic methods and their limitations are further discussed in standard references.\textsuperscript{28,30} Issues that often arise include calculation of point and interval estimates of standardized morbidity or mortality ratios (SMRs) (30, p 65), comparing adjusted risk ratios for different groups of patients (30, pp 106–109), and testing for heterogeneity (representing potential effect modification) and dose–response trend (30, p 110). As with all epidemiologic studies, it is essential to approach these analyses with recognition of the biological and clinical aspects of the problem, as well as with an understanding of the meaning and limitations of the formal computational methods. Examples of applications of these methods are given in a later section.

Since pre-marketing epidemiologic evaluations typically have to be performed under tight time constraints, it is sometimes necessary to use published data to help estimate risks. One method which has been used in environmental epidemiology, but does not appear to have been used yet in pharmacoepidemiology, involves using risk factor prevalence in cases together with relative risks from published studies to produce adjusted incidence ratios.\textsuperscript{31} Using this method, one can compute risk comparisons with an external control group in which the prevalence of risk factors differs from those in the cases that have occurred in the clinical study.

Dean and colleagues\textsuperscript{31} presented this method and used it to determine whether the observed elevation in breast cancer incidence in one community with a contaminated water supply was higher than in surrounding communities, after adjusting for differences in prevalence of known risk factors for breast cancer. The method of adjustment makes use of the population attributable risk fraction (AR) for each population, i.e., the fraction of risk in each population attributable to the known risk factors (32, p 163). The complementary fraction, $1 - AR$, is the fraction of risk that is not attributable to the known risk factors. If $I_T$ is the total incidence in the exposed community, then $I_T(1 - AR)_E$ is the incidence of breast cancer in the exposed community that is not attributable to the known risk factors. The corresponding quantity, $I_C(1 - AR)_C$, is the incidence of breast cancer in the comparison communities that is not attributable to the known risk factors. Hence, the ratio of these two quantities is the incidence ratio for breast cancer not attributable to the known risk factors. This is the risk ratio of interest for comparing risk in the two communities, while adjusting for the difference in prevalence of risk factors.

The novelty of the approach lies in using the prevalence of risk factors in only the cases to estimate the attributable risk fraction, AR. The method for doing this was outlined by Bruzzi and colleagues (33, equation (6)) and involves using published information on relative risks associated with known risk factors to compute the values of AR for the exposed community and the control community. Here information from published sources is used to compute a relative risk for each case based on all known risk factors for that case, relative to some reference group. Of course, the same reference group and the relative risk information must be used for the cases in the exposed community and the cases in the control communities. One major drawback of this approach is that no methods for expressing the statistical uncertainty of the resulting incidence ratio have been published.

This approach would appear to be mainly useful in noncomparative drug studies to provide a rough idea whether what appeared to be an elevated incidence of an adverse event could be attributed to a greater prevalence of risk factors in the exposed group, relative to the prevalence in some historical control group. For example, the method would appear to be of some value in evaluating adverse events among a group of very ill patients in a compassionate use program. The advantage of only requiring risk factor data from the cases is that sometimes these are the only patients for whom information on important risk factors for the adverse events is available.

**Information Technology Requirements**

Effective premarketing pharmacoepidemiology requires considerable advanced planning to make
sure that information can be assembled, analyzed, summarized, reviewed, and reported in hours or days. For historical data to be useful, it must be either available in sufficient detail from published sources or from existing datasets that can be accessed, analyzed, and checked for errors within a day or two. This can only be done if one can anticipate at least some types of problems likely to arise and have appropriate sources of epidemiologic information readily accessible.

In addition, the clinical trials data management organization has to be able to produce accurate, suitably detailed patient exposure information from many different trials in a number of different countries. This is more difficult than it might initially appear to be. Because of regulatory reporting requirements, adverse experience information (the numerator) will typically be current to within a few days, while the patient exposure information (the denominator) may be weeks behind and may not yet have essential covariate information and demographics in accurately retrievable form.

Getting new drugs approved in a timely manner can depend on the ability to answer safety questions rapidly and accurately, and that can depend on the way in which data management is staffed, organized, and equipped. One of the rate-limiting factors in securing timely approval is the manpower needed to process worldwide clinical trial data on thousands of patients from many different countries accurately. This entails producing both standard efficacy and safety analyses and special ad hoc safety analyses required for responding to questions raised by reviewers at drug regulatory agencies. The data management problems posed by the need to answer ad hoc safety questions rapidly are different from those posed by the need for the formal statistical analyses of efficacy required for drug approval.

To be successful, the data management organization and systems must meet both challenges.

As potential capabilities of data management systems increase, the potential benefit from using them effectively increases dramatically, as does the potential gap in productivity from using them ineffectively. For example, a request by a regulatory agency for an analysis of certain types of laboratory data on all patients exposed to a study drug for more than two months might take only a day or two for a response if the data from all worldwide studies were stored so that a query could readily be run against the entire database. However, the query could take weeks and consume much more scarce manpower critically needed for other tasks if: the specific data requested were stored differently by different countries; the way the data were stored made custom programming necessary; a decision had been made not to have centralized computer storage of the specific data needed; the laboratory methods used in different countries were different and cross-translation files had not been centrally stored; there were problems with getting data entered, checked, and available for analysis in a timely manner; or there were other organizational impediments to producing a unified worldwide tabulation and analysis. During the course of regulatory review of a new drug many standard and ad hoc analyses must be performed for different regulatory agencies in different countries. The difference between effective and somewhat less effective clinical data management and analysis can easily translate into differences of several weeks in drug approval time. Such differences can translate into substantial lost revenue for each new drug.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

Epidemiologic investigation of pre-marketing drug safety problems is a collaborative undertaking that requires the ability not only to respond to inquiries promptly and accurately, but also to recognize and answer questions that should have been asked but were not. Sometimes the initial request from the clinical or regulatory group in a company to the epidemiology group asks for a specific tabulation or calculation, which may not in fact represent the most appropriate way to approach the problem. Requests transmitted through several intermediaries often change in meaning, so that what finally reaches the person responsible for the analysis may be quite different from what was originally asked. When the original request is a written inquiry (e.g., from a regulatory agency), it is important to read the actual written question and the surrounding
context before attempting to answer a paraphrased version of it.

As with all epidemiologic and statistical consulting, the best way to approach a request for consultation on a potential safety problem with a premarketing investigational drug is to first understand the broader context surrounding the immediate inquiry. This includes gaining at least a basic understanding of the pharmacology, mechanism of action, preclinical toxicity profile, and clinical safety profile of the compound. It also entails understanding the characteristics and comorbidities of the patient population in which the drug has been studied. Finally, it requires knowing how and in what context the question arose. A review of several case studies may be helpful in conveying these concepts.

One example, which illustrates the interplay between clinical pharmacology and epidemiology, involved seizures in seriously ill hospitalized patients with systemic gram-negative infections being treated with the β-lactam antibiotic, imipenem/cilastatin. During initial randomized clinical trials few seizures were reported, either with imipenem/cilastatin or with control antibiotics. In subsequent noncomparative studies an increasing number of seizures were noted, often in patients with predisposing factors, such as compromised renal function that could alter drug metabolism and affect serum levels of the antibiotic. An association of seizure risk with antibiotic level was biologically plausible, in light of known epileptogenic properties of β-lactam antibiotics. At the time these studies were conducted, laboratory techniques to measure serum levels had not yet become widely available and so serum levels on these patients were rarely known.

To study seizure risk in relation to serum level, clinical pharmacology studies were reviewed to determine how serum levels varied with dose, body weight, gender, age, and renal function. An equation was developed to predict serum level as a function of these parameters. The predicted serum levels were then used as one variable in an analysis of seizure risk in the noncomparative clinical trial patients. It was found that risk of seizure was strongly and independently related to predicted serum level, after controlling for several non-drug-related seizure risk factors. At the same time, however, the other factors found to be related to seizure risk in patients receiving imipenem/cilastatin were also found to be risk factors for seizures in patients who had not received imipenem/cilastatin. These factors included a history of seizures, central nervous system insults, and renal impairment. Age was not found predictive of seizures when adjustment for the above factors was made.

This study illustrates the concept of pharmacoepidemiology in a study where methods of clinical pharmacology and epidemiology were both brought into play to investigate and solve a problem that arose during the course of premarketing clinical trials. It also illustrates the important point that merely quantifying risk and identifying patients at increased risk would not have been sufficient. What was needed was to identify measures to help reduce the risk and to help educate physicians on the need for dosage adjustments. The investigation into seizure risk led to improved prescribing information with better recommendations for dosage adjustments in the presence of impaired renal function.

An illustration of statistical methods for pharmacoepidemiology cohort studies is provided by a study comparing the observed incidence of Guillain-Barré syndrome among recipients of a plasma-derived hepatitis-B vaccine with that which would be expected in the general population, controlling for age in a stratified analysis. Although this study involved postmarketing data, it provides a good illustration of the type of cohort study methods typically used in pre-marketing analyses. During the first three years of marketed use of the vaccine, nine cases of Guillain-Barré syndrome were reported among vaccinees. Six of the nine cases occurred within six weeks after the first dose and the remaining three occurred within eight weeks after either the second or third dose. (The vaccine was administered in three injections, with the second occurring one month after the first and the third occurring six months after the first.) Based on knowledge of the temporal pattern of risk of Guillain-Barré syndrome with other vaccines and on the serological response of the hepatitis-B vaccine, a decision was made to
consider four analyses based on two time windows (six weeks or eight weeks) applied to either the first dose only or to all three doses. The total number of vaccinees was estimated from sales data and the age distribution was estimated from surveys. Comparison data were obtained on the age-specific incidence of Guillain-Barré syndrome in several studies, including a community-based study of Guillain-Barré syndrome among residents of Olmsted County, MN. Because the number of cases in vaccinees was so small, the confidence intervals about the relative risks were calculated by an exact binomial method.29 The age adjusted relative risks in the four analyses ranged from the lowest value of 1.7 (95% confidence interval: 0.8–3.6), based on nine cases occurring in an at-risk interval of 8 weeks after each of the three doses, to the highest value of 3.6 (95% confidence interval: 1.3–8.3), based on six cases occurring in an at-risk interval of six weeks after the first dose only (37, Table 6). Although the numerator (number of cases) in the latter analysis was less than in the former, the denominator (person time at risk) was also less, and the age adjusted relative risk was higher.

Another example involved the question of whether herpes zoster might be expected to occur more frequently following vaccination with a live-virus varicella (chickenpox) vaccine than following natural varicella. It was found that the incidence and clinical characteristics of herpes zoster in childhood following natural varicella were not well enough known to permit any meaningful comparison with cases of childhood herpes zoster following vaccination with the varicella vaccine. This led to an epidemiologic study to document the incidence and clinical features of herpes zoster following natural varicella.38 It was found that herpes zoster in children was both much more common than had been previously thought and also was much milder than herpes zoster in adults. Using these data as a point of comparison, subsequent studies suggested that the incidence of herpes zoster in childhood following vaccination did not appear to be more common with the vaccine than with natural varicella.39

In this example, what was needed was more information about the incidence and clinical spectrum of the adverse event following natural varicella. This illustrates the point that to quantify risk associated with a therapeutic or prophylactic intervention, it is often necessary to develop additional information about the natural course of the disease itself.40 Such studies need to be started very early in drug or vaccine development in order to be able to have information available when needed to address safety concerns that arise in clinical studies.

A third example evaluated the risk of angioedema in relation to angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitors, based on data from three large studies involving about 12,000 patients each.41 Previous studies had suggested that angioedema was more common early in therapy than later in therapy. This hypothesis was tested by examining incidence as a function of time on therapy. It was found that the incidence in the first week of therapy was about one case per 3000 patients per week; thereafter the incidence was about 14-fold lower, with no evidence of any temporal trend in incidence beyond the first week of therapy (Figure 28.2).

This study illustrates several important points. First, it is essential to establish a clear case definition in any epidemiologic study. Failure to do this can lead to continued confusion about what is being counted. The epidemiologic case definition may be different from whatever case definition is used for regulatory reporting. (The latter definition is typically maximally inclusive, while the former may be more restrictive.) In this study, the clinical case definition was established in consultation with clinical experts in the diagnosis and treatment of angioedema. Using this case definition, all case reports that might have represented angioedema were re-reviewed, classified, abstracted, and used in computing incidence. Second, the study illustrates the importance of examining risk in relation to time on therapy.24–26 Any temporal patterns detected will be of clinical relevance. Further, failure to account for temporal differences can invalidate calculation of relative risks. Finally, this study shows how to combine epidemiologic analyses with a clinical review of case reports so as not only to quantify the incidence and temporal pattern of occurrence of
an adverse event, but also to describe its clinical features and spectrum of severity.

**THE FUTURE**

Premarketing and postmarketing applications of pharmacoepidemiology differ in the speed of response required and in the fact that the threshold for halting human exposure to a drug is lower before market approval than after market approval. In addition, premarketing pharmacoepidemiology uses cohort study designs almost exclusively, while postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology often uses case-control study designs as well. Safety monitoring in clinical trials can be improved by anticipating potential questions and organizing data resources in advance to answer them as rapidly as possible. Having a responsive data management system is as essential to premarketing applications of pharmacoepidemiology as it is to the entire process of drug development. Epidemiologic planning should be regarded as one of the first steps in drug development, rather than as something to be considered at or after market approval. This requires effort to build and maintain a repository of disease incidence and natural history data from governmental surveys, public-use data tapes of governmental studies, publications, and other sources. It also requires undertaking epidemiologic studies far enough in advance of clinical trials to be able to contribute to clinical trial planning and analysis. Finally, it requires that the epidemiologic group maintain an awareness of pertinent research findings in areas relevant to the diseases under study and to the types of measurement and analytic technique likely to be needed.
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INTRODUCTION

DEFINITIONS

Drug utilization was defined by the World Health Organization (WHO) as the “marketing, distribution, prescription and use of drugs in a society, with special emphasis on the resulting medical, social, and economic consequences.”¹ Some authors have suggested that the development of drugs relative to health priorities should also be included.² This broad definition differs from the more narrow one which appeared in the North American literature, “the prescribing, dispensing and ingesting of drugs”.³ ⁴

In both of the above definitions, recognition is granted, explicitly or implicitly, of the nonpharmacologic (socioanthropological, behavioral, and economic) factors influencing drug utilization. Studies of the process of drug utilization focus on the factors influencing and events involved in the prescribing, dispensing, administration, and taking of medication. However, the broader definition of the WHO goes beyond the “process” or “pharmacokinetic” aspect of drug utilization, that is the movement of drugs along the therapeutic drug chain, to include consideration of the various “outcomes” or “pharmacodynamics” of drug use.⁵ According to this definition, studies of drug utilization include not only studies of the medical and nonmedical aspects influencing drug utilization, but also the effects of drug utilization at all levels. Studies of how drug utilization relates to the effects of drug use, beneficial or adverse, are usually labeled analytic pharmacoepidemiology research. These two aspects of the study of drug utilization have developed along parallel lines, but may now be regarded as interrelated and part of a continuum of interests and methodologies.⁶ ⁷

As stated by Lunde and Baksaas,⁸ the general objectives of drug utilization studies are “problem identification and problem analysis in relation to importance, causes, and consequences; establishment of a weighted basis for decisions on problem solution; assessment of the effects of the action taken. These objectives are relevant to problems
and decision making throughout the drug and health chain. The approaches may vary according to the purpose and the needs of the users. Those include the health authorities, the drug manufacturers, the academic and clinical health professionals, social scientists, and economists as well as the media and the consumers.13

This chapter focuses on the current status of descriptive epidemiological approaches to the study of the processes (or “pharmacokinetics”) of drug utilization. The epidemiological approaches to the study of the effects (or “pharmacodynamics”) of drug utilization, both beneficial and harmful, are covered in other chapters of this book.

TYPES OF DRUG UTILIZATION STUDY AND THEIR USES

Drug utilization studies may be quantitative or qualitative. In the former, the objective of the study is to quantify the present state, the developmental trends, and the time course of drug usage at various levels of the health care system, whether national, regional, local, or institutional. Routinely compiled drug statistics or drug utilization data that are the result of such studies can be used to estimate drug utilization in populations by age, sex, social class, morbidity, and other characteristics, and to identify areas of possible over- or underutilization. They also can be used as denominator data for calculating rates of reported adverse drug reactions; to monitor the utilization of specific therapeutic categories where particular problems can be anticipated (e.g., narcotic analgesics, hypnotics and sedatives, and other psychotropic drugs); to monitor the effects of informational and regulatory activities (e.g., adverse events alerts, delisting of drugs from therapeutic formularies); as markers for very crude estimates of disease prevalence (e.g., digitalis utilization for congestive heart failure, antiparkinsonian drugs for Parkinson’s disease); to plan for drug importation, production, and distribution; and to estimate drug expenditures.2

Qualitative studies, on the other hand, assess the appropriateness of drug utilization, usually by linking prescription data to the reasons for the drug prescribing (see also Chapter 30). The crucial difference between these studies and quantitative drug utilization studies is that they include the concept of appropriateness.9 Explicit predetermined criteria are created against which aspects of the quality, medical necessity, and appropriateness of drug prescribing may be compared. Drug use criteria may be based upon such parameters as indications for use, daily dose, and length of therapy. Other possible criteria for poor drug prescribing include the failure to select a more effective or less hazardous drug if available, the use of a fixed combination drug when only one of its components is justified, or the use of a costly drug when a less costly equivalent drug is available.10 In North America, these studies are known as drug utilization review (DUR) or drug utilization review studies. For example, a large number of studies in North America have documented the extent of inappropriate prescribing of drugs, in particular antibiotics, and the associated adverse clinical, ecological, and economic consequences.11–24

In Spain, the appropriateness of drug utilization has been assessed on the basis of adequate evidence for the clinical efficacy (“high intrinsic value”) of the most commonly sold drugs. The analysis revealed a striking proportion of drugs of “doubtful, no, or unacceptable value” among the 400 top pharmaceutical products in sales, albeit a trend toward more rational consumption as reflected in consumption of drugs of “high intrinsic value.”25 More recently, this approach has been used to assess prescribing patterns in France, Germany, Great Britain, and Italy:26 appropriateness of non-prescription drug sales in Brazil;27 and drug prescribing in Spanish primary care centers.28,29 Another novel approach analyzed the number of drugs that accounted for 90% of drug use (DU90%) and the percentage of these drugs that adhered to the guideline issued by the Drug Committee in the catchment area.30 The number of different products in the DU90% segment varied twofold among 24 primary health care centers in Stockholm; adherence to the guideline varied between 54 and 78%.

DUR and DUR studies are not interventions but rather activities aimed at problem detection and quantification. They should be distinguished,
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Table 29.1. Drug utilization studies in perspective: operational concepts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug statistics</th>
<th>Drug utilization study</th>
<th>Drug review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Synonyms (therapeutic)</td>
<td>Drug utilization data</td>
<td>Drug utilization review or drug utilization review study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantitative approach</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Usually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qualitative approach</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Maybe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continuous (ongoing)</td>
<td>Usually</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

therefore, from DUR programs (Table 29.1) (see also Chapter 31). DUR studies are usually one-time projects, not routinely conducted. They provide for only minimal feedback to the involved prescribers and, most importantly, do not include any followup measures to ascertain whether any changes in drug therapy have occurred. A DUR program, on the other hand, is an intervention in the form of an authorized, structured, and ongoing system for improving the quality of drug use within a given health care institution. The quality of drug prescribing is evaluated by employing predetermined standards for initiating administrative or educational interventions to modify patterns of drug use which are not consistent with these standards. The measurement of the effectiveness of these interventions is an integral part of the program.9,31,32

In the US, DUR programs (commonly known in hospitals as Drug Use Evaluation or DUE Programs) are part of the quality assurance activities required by Medicaid–Medicare regulations, the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO), the former Professional Standards Review Organizations (PSRO), and Section 4401 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 19909,32,33 (see Chapter 31). In Europe, DUR programs have taken the form of periodic drug utilization studies as elements of a “therapeutic audit” performed at various levels (patient, prescriber, hospital, county, municipality, country, and groups of countries), assessing not only the clinical consequences of drug utilization, but also the social and economic consequences. These are followed by whatever feedback is felt to be necessary and appropriate to effect changes in therapeutic practices.34–39 The therapeutic audit is performed on an epidemiological scale and interventions (regulatory or educational) are aimed accordingly at whole populations or sub-groups.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

In order for a drug to be marketed, it must be shown that it can effectively modify the natural course of disease or alleviate symptoms when used appropriately, that is for the right patient, with the right disease, in the proper dosage and intervals, and for the appropriate length of time. However, used inappropriately, drugs fail to live up to their potential, with consequent morbidity and mortality. Even when used appropriately drugs have the potential to cause harm. However, a large proportion of their adverse effects is predictable and preventable.40

Studies in the United States,41,42 Sweden,43 and Denmark44 have documented the importance of adverse drug reactions, as well as drug noncompliance, as causes of hospital admissions. Many of these drug related admissions are preventable, through the application of existing principles and data.40 The situations that may lead to preventable adverse drug reactions and drug induced illness include the use of a drug for the wrong indication; the use of a potentially toxic drug when one with less risk of toxicity would be just as effective; the concurrent administration of an excessive number of drugs, thereby increasing the possibility of adverse drug interactions; the use of excessive doses, especially for pediatric or geriatric patients; and continued use of a drug after evidence
becomes available concerning important toxic effects. Many contributory causes have been proposed: excessive prescribing by the physician; failure to define therapeutic endpoints for drug use; the increased availability of potent prescription and nonprescription drugs; increased public exposure to drugs used or produced industrially that enter the environment; the availability of illicit preparations; and prescribers’ lack of knowledge of the pharmacology and pharmacokinetics of the prescribed drugs.\(^{40}\)

Increased morbidity or mortality due to medication error,\(^ {45}\) poor patient compliance,\(^ {46}\) discontinuation of therapy,\(^ {47,48}\) and problems in communication resulting from modern day fragmentation of patient care are also to be considered. The failure of physicians to prescribe an effective drug or effective doses for a treatable disease is a significant concern. For example, in a geographic area of Sweden with a higher suicide rate than average for the country, sales of antidepressant drugs were about half of those in other areas.\(^ {49}\) In the US, the underuse of \(\beta\)-blockers in elderly patients with myocardial infarction was associated with an increased risk of death.\(^ {50}\) Other studies have documented significant underuse of antithrombotic drugs,\(^ {51-55}\) lipid-lowering therapy,\(^ {54,55}\) beta-blockers,\(^ {56}\) aspirin,\(^ {57}\) and thrombolytics\(^ {58}\) in patients with appropriate indications, but the outcomes were not assessed.

Therapeutic practice, as recommended, is based predominately on data available from premarketing clinical trials. Complementary data from studies in the postmarketing period are needed to provide an adequate basis for improving drug therapy.\(^ {59,60}\) Regardless, drug utilization studies address the relationship between therapeutic practice as recommended and actual clinical practice.\(^ {61}\)

### METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

A considerable amount of drug use data may be obtainable or are already available, the usefulness of which depends on the purpose of the study at hand. All have certain limitations in their direct clinical relevance.\(^ {62}\) For quantitative studies, the ideal is a count of the number of patients in a defined population who ingest a drug of interest during a particular time frame. The data available are only approximations of this, and thereby raise many questions about their presentation and interpretation. For qualitative studies, the ideal is a count of the number of patients in a defined population who use a drug inappropriately during a particular time frame, of all those who received the drug in that population during that time frame. Again, the data available are suboptimal—both the exposure data and the diagnosis data. In addition, the criteria to be used to define “appropriate” are arbitrary.

Since most statistics on drug consumption were compiled for administrative or commercial reasons, the data are usually expressed in terms of cost or volume (see Table 29.2). First, data on drug utilization can be available as total costs or unit costs, that is cost per package, tablet, dose, or treatment course. Although such data may be useful for measuring and comparing the economic impact of drug use, these units do not provide information on the amount of drug exposure in the population. Moreover, cost data are influenced by price fluctuations over time, distribution channels, inflation, exchange rate fluctuations, price control measures, etc.\(^ {63}\)

Volume data are also available, as the overall weight of the drug that is sold or the unit volume sold, that is the number of tablets, capsules, or doses sold. This is closer to the number of patients exposed. However, tablet sizes vary, making it difficult to translate weight into even the number of tablets. Prescription sizes also vary, so it is difficult to translate number of tablets into the number of exposed patients.

#### Table 29.2. Types of drug utilization datum available

| 1. | Cost or unit cost |
| 2. | Weight |
| 3. | Number of tablets, capsules, doses, etc. |
| 4. | Number of prescriptions |
| 5. | Number of patients ingesting drug\(^a\) |

\(^a\) Generally not available
The number of prescriptions is the measure most frequently used in drug utilization studies. However, different patients receive a different number of prescriptions in any given time interval. To translate the number of prescriptions into the number of patients, one must divide by the average number of prescriptions per patient, or else distinctions must be made between first prescriptions and refill prescriptions. The latter is, of course, better for studies of new drug therapy, but will omit individuals who are receiving chronic drug therapy. Additional problems may be posed by differences in the number of drugs in each prescription. Finally, it should be noted that all these units represent approximate estimates of true consumption. The latter is ultimately modified further by the patients’ actual drug intake, that is, their degree of compliance.

In the context of DUR, drug utilization data may be presented in the form of profiles of physicians according to the number, monetary value, and even type of prescription ordered during a given time period. Pharmacies may be ranked according to the number, cost, and type of prescription dispensed for similar intervals. However, these gross measures of prescription activity and drug use are very limited in their capacity to reflect the wide spectrum of specific problems in prescribing. For example, they ignore problems such as the wrong drug for the indication, the wrong drug for the patient, the wrong dose, the wrong interval, and the wrong duration of therapy. Also, one’s deviation from the practices of the mean practitioner is not a good measure of one’s “appropriateness” as a provider. Purely quantitative data characterizing prescribers as “high” or “low” may be driven, for example, by the number of patients seen by the physician and the type and severity of the patients’ diseases. Likewise, cost profiles are not indicative of appropriateness, whether high or low relative to the mean.

From a qualitative perspective, to interpret drug utilization data appropriately, there is a need to relate the data to the reasons for the drug usage. Data on morbidity and mortality may be obtained from national registries (general or specialized); national samples where medical service reimbursement schemes operate; ad hoc surveys and special studies; hospital records; physician records; and patient or household surveys. “Appropriateness” of use must be assessed relative to indication for treatment, patient characteristics (age, sex, habits), drug dosage (over- or underdosage), concomitant diseases (that might contraindicate or interfere with chosen therapy), and the use of other drugs (interactions). However, no single source is generally available for obtaining all this information. Moreover, because of incompleteness, the medical record may not be a very useful source of drug use data.64, 65

Generally agreed upon standards or criteria for appropriateness, based upon currently available knowledge, are essential elements of the drug utilization review process. These criteria must be based on scientifically established evidence; updated regularly according to new scientific evidence; explicitly stated (to ensure consistency in the evaluations); and applicable to a given setting.31 The development and standardization of these criteria are major undertakings. Finally, for drug utilization review programs, even the strategy to be used to optimize one’s intervention is unclear.66

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

THE EVOLUTION OF DRUG UTILIZATION STUDIES

The current growth of interest in drug utilization studies began on both sides of the Atlantic in the early 1960s. Previously, drug utilization studies had been conducted mostly for marketing purposes and data were not widely available for use by academic researchers or health authorities. The increased interest resulted from recognition of the virtual explosion in the marketing of new drugs, the wide variations in the patterns of drug prescribing and consumption, the growing concern about the delayed adverse effects, and the increasing concern about the cost of drugs, as reflected in the increase in both the sales and the volume of prescriptions of drugs.35–38,63 However, the development of pharmacoepidemiological methods can be characterized by two different lines of work currently approaching each other from opposite
directions, strongly influenced by the varied availability and accessibility of data sources.

Drug utilization studies at the national and international levels have been more developed in Europe, where this line of research was pioneered by the Scandinavian countries, Scotland, and Northern Ireland. Under the auspices of the WHO Regional Office for Europe, a Drug Utilization Research Group was established in the 1970s to stimulate interest in comparative studies with a common methodology. Factors that contributed greatly to this line of development, primarily in the countries of Northern Europe, have been the relatively small size of the populations involved, the limited number of pharmaceutical products on the market (2000–3000 in Norway and Sweden), and the availability of centralized statistics on sales or prescriptions. Drug utilization studies in Europe have been predominantly quantitative, describing and comparing patterns of utilization of specific groups of drugs according to geographic regions and time. For example, international studies have documented wide variations in the utilization of antidiabetic, psychotropic, and antihypertensive drugs among several European countries.

Followup studies on the utilization of antidiabetic and antihypertensive drugs among some of these countries indicate that the differences cannot be explained only by differences in the prevalence of disease. National studies have also revealed striking variations in drug utilization among regions and communities within the same country. More recently, one study addressed the relation between variations in drug sales and treatment outcomes. For example, the degree of good metabolic control, as defined by the authors, in diabetic subjects in three Swedish areas with high, medium, and low sales of antidiabetic drugs was achieved among only 16, 17, and 12% of subjects, respectively.

In the US, drug utilization research has developed on a smaller scale, primarily at institutional or local health program levels. Factors that have hindered studies at a national level have been the size of the population, the number of pharmaceutical products on the market (20 000 to 30 000), and the lack of an all-encapsulating pharmaceutical data collection system. Data on drug use are more readily available from prepaid health plans, health delivery institutions, and public health care programs. For example, early studies of physician prescribing showed that prescribing patterns varied greatly among physicians, according to their place and type of practice and the community in which they prescribed. In US drug utilization research, greater emphasis has been placed on the study of the quality of physician prescribing habits, in particular with respect to antibiotics, in both hospital and outpatient settings. However, studies of the national patterns of drug utilization and expenditures in the US have also been published.

Because of the critical importance of the decision making process in drug prescribing, a number of studies have addressed the factors that influence this decision: education, advertising, colleagues, working circumstances, personality, control and regulatory measures, and demands from society and patients. Some controversy exists concerning the relative impact of the various sources of influence on prescribing behavior, particularly the influence of pharmaceutical advertising. In studies of hospital practice the following factors have been stated to contribute to excessive or inappropriate prescribing: simple errors of omission; physician ignorance of cost issues in prescribing; failure to review medication orders frequently and critically; inability to keep up to date with developments in pharmacology and therapeutics; insulption of physicians and patients from cost considerations because of third party coverage; and lack of communication between physicians and pharmacists.

The intervention strategies aimed at improving prescribing behavior in hospital as well as primary care settings have been critically reviewed. These include (discussed in Chapter 30) dissemination of printed educational materials alone, multimedia warning campaigns, drug utilization audit followed by mailed or interactive feedback of aggregated results, group education through lectures or rounds, use of computerized reminder systems, use of opinion leaders to informally “endorse” or support specific behavior change interventions, one-to-one education initiated by a drug utilization expert, and required consultation or justification prior to the use of specific drugs.
CURRENT DATA SOURCES

Currently available computer databases for studies of drug utilization may be classified as non-diagnosis-linked and diagnosis-linked (see Table 29.3). Most of these data sources lack information on morbidity and are mostly used for generating drug statistics and descriptive studies of patterns of drug consumption. Some collect data in the form of drug sales (e.g., the National Corporation of Pharmacies in Sweden, Norwegian Drug Monopoly, and the National Agency for Medicines and Social Insurance in Finland),\(^{82-84}\) drug movement at various levels of the drug distribution channel (IMS America’s National Prescription Audit, US Pharmaceutical Market—Hospitals, US Pharmaceutical Market—Drugstores),\(^{73}\) pharmaceutical or medical billing data (Prescription Pricing Authority in the UK, Spain’s Drug Data Bank, Medicaid Management Information System),\(^{35,85,86}\) or samples of prescriptions (Swedish Prescription Survey).\(^{87}\)

The County of Jämtland Project (Sweden) is of interest for longitudinal patient-specific studies of drug utilization.\(^{49,88,89}\) All drug prescriptions dispensed to 13\% of the Jämtland population (approximately 17 000) have been continuously monitored since 1970. The recorded information includes the patient’s unique identity number; name, dosage, quantity, and price of the drug; date of dispensing; dispensing pharmacy; and prescribing physician. Information relating to morbidity (diagnoses), however, is missing. Unfortunately, because of sensitivity to the issue of data confidentiality in Sweden, the correspondingly recorded data relative to individual patients in other parts of Sweden is not available for use in health care audits.\(^{64,89}\)

The Odense Pharmacoepidemiologic Database (OPED) and the Pharmacoepidemiologic Prescription Database of the County of North Jutland are two similar databases that include about half a million inhabitants in Denmark.\(^{90,91}\) These databases contain all dispensed prescriptions since the early 1990s. The following information is captured for each prescription: a unique person identifier, the date of dispensing, identification of the dispensed product, the pharmacy, and the prescriber. The databases do not include information on over-the-counter medications (laxatives, antacids, ibuprofen, antihistamines, antitussives, and certain anti-ulcer drugs) or nonsubsidized

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 29.3. Some computer databases for drug utilization studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Not diagnosis-linked</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- National Prescription Audit(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US Pharmaceutical Market—Drugstores(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- US Pharmaceutical Market—Hospitals(^a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Medicaid Management Information Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saskatchewan Health Plan(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Europe</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Swedish National Corporation of Survey Pharmacies Project(^b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sweden’s Prescription Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Sweden’s County of Jämtland Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Norwegian Medicinal Depot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- United Kingdom’s Prescription Pricing Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Spain’s Drug Data Bank (National Institute of Health)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Denmark’s Odense Pharmacoepidemiologic Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Denmark’s Pharmacoepidemiologic Prescription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Database of the County of North Jutland</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) IMS America, Ltd.
\(^b\) Patient-specific data available for longitudinal studies.
\(^c\) Health Information Designs, Inc.
drugs (oral contraceptives, hypnotics, and sedatives). They have been used for a number of population based pharmacoepidemiologic surveys such as the use of the new antidepressants, inappropriate use of inhaled steroids in asthma treatment, inappropriate use of sumatriptan, hemorrhagic complication during oral anticoagulant therapy and low use of long term hormone replacement therapy. The OPED database has also been used to develop a graphical approach to reduce the overwhelming volume of data in population based pharmacoepidemiological databases into a few parameters and a “waiting time distribution” that can be used to screen for certain unusual or unexpected patterns of drug use. Based on prescriptions dispensed to individual patients, key parameters such as incidence, one-year and point prevalence, duration of treatment, relapse rate, and seasonality receive a visual correlate.

Several databases contain both drug and morbidity data but have been used to a relatively limited extent for this type of study, as opposed to hypothesis testing studies. These include data from the Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound and the Kaiser Permanente Medical Care Programs, described in more detail in Chapters 15 and 16, respectively.

The National Disease and Therapeutic Index (NDTI), by IMS America, Ltd., is an ongoing study of physician prescribing conducted mainly for use by pharmaceutical companies in their marketing activities. This study employs a rotating sample of office-based physicians who record all patient encounters and corresponding “drug mentions” for two-day periods four times a year. A special prescription form is used to collect information on the drug (specific product, dosage form, new versus continuing therapy), patient characteristics (sex), prescriber (specialty, location, region), type of consultation (first versus subsequent), concomitant drugs and diagnoses, and the desired pharmacological action. Data have been made available to academic researchers and the US Food and Drug Administration. Although useful for studies of prescribing, longitudinal patient-specific studies are not possible with this database.

Similar to IMS America’s NDTI, the Swedish Diagnosis and Therapy Survey is a collaborative project run by Swedish Pharmaceutical Data Ltd (LSAB), the National Corporation of Pharmacies (Apteket), the Swedish Medical Association, and the National Board of Health and Welfare. A random sample of one out of eight physicians (2200 per year) is asked to participate (non-participation rate estimated at 25%). During a study week all prescriptions are recorded on self-copying forms with additional information on indication/diagnosis for each drug, patient age, sex, type of consultation, etc. The data are analyzed according to the IMS routines and are available as printouts to subscribers twice a year. Drug utilization data from this ongoing survey, in combination with overall sales statistics, are published yearly by the National Corporation of Pharmacies and also made available for research.

The Community of Tierp Project is run by the Center for Primary Care Research, University of Uppsala, Sweden. Prescription and morbidity data have been routinely collected from all pharmacies and the health center within the community for all residents since 1972. Although diagnosis information is collected in this project, studies published in English have not exploited this aspect of these data. They have been limited to using the database to identify and study drug utilization patterns in patients with certain characteristics, such as “heavy use,” or users of antidiabetics or psychotropic drugs. Limitations of this database are the small size of the population covered (21,000 persons) and questions regarding the representativeness of this community for the whole of Sweden. Moreover, aggregate drug data are kept on a pharmacological or therapeutic class basis so, with the exception of the benzodiazepines, it is difficult to study individual drugs.

In Canada, the province of Saskatchewan has a series of computerized databases describing health services paid for by the provincial Department of Health, including prescription drugs. A variety of drug utilization studies have been performed using these data, which are described in more detail in Chapter 20.
In the United States DURbase® and COMPASS® are two databases developed by Health Information Designs, Inc. Both are based on Medicaid medical care and pharmaceutical billing data from 11 out of the 50 US states.\textsuperscript{105,106} Selected portions of these data are processed to compile patient-specific diagnosis and drug profiles containing the following information: patient age, sex, race, county of residence, drug information (identity, dosage form, strength, quantity dispensed), prescriber code, dispensing pharmacist code, diagnosis, and corresponding dates of services provided. DURbase® is the drug utilization review program for some of these state Medicaid programs, and for other non-Medicaid programs. Other commercial firms offer similar services. COMPASS® uses the data obtained from DURbase® for pharmacoepidemiology studies (see Chapter 19). Drug utilization studies performed using COMPASS® have been limited. With the skewed population included in COMPASS®, the generalizability of the results would be of concern.

Medical and pharmaceutical computer databases are generally not available outside North America and Europe. An indicator-based approach, developed in the early 1990s by the International Network for Rational Use of Drugs (INRUD) and WHO,\textsuperscript{107} has facilitated the study of drug utilization in developing countries. It includes recommendations on minimum sample sizes, sampling methods, and data collection techniques, depending on study objectives. The methodology recommends 12 core indicators and seven complementary indicators to study drug use in health facilities (Table 29.4). These indicators can be used to describe prescribing practice,\textsuperscript{108} conduct monitoring and supervision,\textsuperscript{109} and assess the impact of interventions.\textsuperscript{110–112} To date, researchers in more than 25 countries of Africa, Asia, and Latin America have used this methodology.

### Units of Measurement

The defined daily dose (DDD) methodology was developed in response to the need to convert and standardize readily available volume data from sales statistics or pharmacy inventory data (quantity of packages, tablets, or other dosage forms) into medically meaningful units, to make crude estimates of the number of persons exposed to a particular drug or class of drugs.\textsuperscript{35,63} The DDD is the assumed average maintenance dose for the main indication of a particular drug. Expressed as DDDs per 1000 inhabitants per day, it can be interpreted as the proportion of the population that may receive treatment with a particular drug.\textsuperscript{113–115} For use in hospital settings, it may be expressed as DDDs per 100 bed days (adjusted for occupancy rate).\textsuperscript{116–118} The method has been useful in describing and comparing patterns of drug utilization,\textsuperscript{35,36} providing denominator data to estimate adverse drug reaction rates,\textsuperscript{119} performing epidemiological screening for problems in drug utilization,\textsuperscript{39} and monitoring the effects of informational and regulatory activities.\textsuperscript{2,120,121}

The advantages of this methodology include: its usefulness for working with readily available gross drug statistics at various levels of the health chain;
as a standardized unit of measurement, it allows comparisons between drugs in the same therapeutic class and between different health care settings or geographic areas, and evaluations of trends over time; and it is relatively easy and inexpensive to use. The methodology is being used by an increasing number of researchers worldwide.\textsuperscript{35,36,117,118,121–129}

The DDD methodology has, however, some significant limitations. The DDD is not a recommended dose, but rather a technical unit of comparison. Since the standard DDDs are based on usage in the Nordic countries, some DDDs may be high or low relative to other countries. Many drugs that are not marketed in the Nordic countries have not been assigned DDDs, although guidelines have been published for defining DDDs under these circumstances.\textsuperscript{115} Additional problems arise when dosages vary widely (antibiotics), when one drug is used for more than one major indication (aspirin), or when drugs are used in combination with other drugs for the same disease. Moreover, the DDD does not take into account pediatric uses. Since children’s doses are substantially lower than the established DDDs, this situation will lead to an underestimation of population exposures, which may be significant in countries with a large pediatric population. However, pediatric DDDs have also been proposed.\textsuperscript{130} Finally, DDDs do not, of course, take into account variations in compliance.

The prescribed daily dose (PDD) is another unit, developed as a means to validate the DDDs. The PDD is the average daily dose prescribed, as obtained from a representative sample of prescriptions.\textsuperscript{131} Problems may arise in calculating the PDD due to a lack of clear and exact dosage indication in the prescription, as is often the case with the prescribing of insulin. Prescriptions for chronic therapy, as in the case of insulin, may be refilled many times and the dosage may be altered verbally between prescribing events.\textsuperscript{132} For certain groups of drugs, such as the oral antidiabetics, the mean PDD may be lower than the corresponding DDDs. Up to twofold variations in the mean PDD have been documented in international comparisons.\textsuperscript{133} Higher PDDs have been observed in the US relative to Sweden for commonly prescribed drugs, such as hydrochlorothiazide, diazepam, and oxazepam.\textsuperscript{133–135} In risk assessments of antidepressants among suicides, a refined person year of use estimate was obtained from adjusting the DDD by the average PDD for individual antidepressants.\textsuperscript{136,137} Although the DDD and the PDD may be used to estimate population drug exposure, the methodology is not useful to quantify or identify patients who receive doses lower or higher than those considered effective and safe.

\section*{Classification Systems}

The Anatomic Therapeutic Chemical (ATC) classification system is generally used in conjunction with the DDD methodology.\textsuperscript{115} The Norwegian Medicinal Depot, currently a WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology, developed it. The ATC system is based on the main principles of the Anatomical Classification system developed by the European Pharmaceutical Market Research Association (EPhMRA) and the International Pharmaceutical Market Research Group (IPMRG).

The ATC system consists of five hierarchical levels: a main anatomical group, two therapeutic subgroups, a chemical–therapeutic subgroup and a chemical substance subgroup. The coding of furosemide preparations is used to illustrate the ATC classification structure in Table 29.5. The first three levels are modifications of the three-level EPhMRA and IPMRG classification system. The fourth and fifth levels are extensions developed by the Norwegian Medicinal Depot. On-going discussions aim to identify differences in the two classification systems and harmonize the first three levels. Statistics reported with the ATC system should not be directly compared with figures prepared with the EPhMRA system.

The ATC system has a number of limitations. Drugs that have two or more equally important indications can only use one ATC code. For example, there is no ATC code for propranolol use as an antiarrhythmic drug; the only ATC codes available are as an antihypertensive or antiarrhythmic drug. Propranolol may also be coded differently in one country if its use is mainly as an antihypertensive while in another it is used
mainly as an antimigraine drug. Some drugs may be coded differently if the therapeutic use is associated with the dosage form or strength. For example, prednisolone may use one code for dermatological products and another for systemic use products; one strength of clonidine may be classified as an antihypertensive and another as an antimigraine drug; and one strength of medroxyprogesterone may be classified as endocrine therapy for cancer treatment while another strength is coded as a sex hormone. Fixed dose combination products may also pose difficulties. For example, a combination product that contains an analgesic and a tranquilizer is classified as an analgesic, even though it also contains a psychotropic substance.

The European Drug Utilization Research Group (EURO DURG), formerly WHO Drug Utilization Research Group and currently an association of national Drug Utilization Research Groups, recommends the use of the ATC classification system for reporting drug consumption statistics and conducting comparative drug utilization research. This has been implemented in the five Nordic countries, Australia, and some European countries. The WHO International Drug Monitoring Program uses the system for drug coding in adverse drug reaction monitoring. Some developing countries have begun to use the ATC system to classify their essential drugs; this may eventually lead to preparation of drug utilization statistics.

In the US, the Iowa Drug Information System (IDIS) is a hierarchical drug coding system that is based on the three therapeutic categories of American Hospital Formulary Society (AHFS), to which a fourth level was added to code individual drug ingredients. The IDIS code has eight numeric digits, two digits per level (see Table 29.5). This coding system was used in the Established Populations for Epidemiologic Studies of the Elderly survey. Other coding systems such as the National Drug Code and the Veterans’ Administration Classification do not provide unique codes for drug ingredients.

**INTERVENTION STRATEGIES BASED ON DRUG UTILIZATION DATA**

Numerous studies have described interventions aimed at improving prescribing by the use of drug utilization data obtained from qualitative drug utilization studies, and are discussed more in Chapter 30. Two innovative intervention strategies exemplify different approaches to the use of drug utilization data available from computer databases of office practice.

In a randomized clinical trial, Avorn and Soumerai used data from the Medicaid Management Information System to identify physicians who were prescribing drugs that were assessed as inappropriate (based on considerations of documented efficacy, relative efficacy, and relative cost). These physicians were targeted for educational or information activities, as either face-to-face contacts or written drug information. Schaffner et al. and Ray et al. used a similar approach in another controlled intervention study comparing different strategies aimed at modifying physician prescribing behavior: written drug information versus personal visits by pharmacists versus personal visits by physician educators. These two studies demonstrated the efficacy of face-to-face methods in improving drug prescribing.
The second approach uses claims data to perform computerized screening for patients who may be at increased risk for drug-induced illness, using patient-specific medical and drug histories. Health professionals then evaluate profiles of patients with possibly inappropriate drug use. If considered appropriate, a letter is sent to the prescriber providing a profile of the patient’s relevant computerized claims record and a warning of the potential for drug-induced disease. Often the problem is a concomitant drug or diagnosis that the prescriber was unaware of. This approach is obviously much less expensive than the face-to-face approach. Using before and after comparisons, a significant reduction in drug-induced hospitalizations has been noted. However, the interpretation of these results is hampered by the use of a non-experimental design. A simultaneously controlled trial is needed to adequately assess the value of this approach. (See Chapter 31 for more information about computerized claims-based drug utilization review programs.)

Many other studies have described intervention strategies based on providing drug utilization data feedback, alone or in combination with printed material and/or other “educational strategies,” for example group discussions, lectures, seminars, or personal visits by “experts.” The results from these studies are conflicting. Some suggest that methods that involve only feedback of drug utilization data or audit results are ineffective. Others suggest a transient effectiveness for those that combine the use of drug utilization review data with group discussions, lectures, and visits by “experts.” However, these are difficult to interpret because of limitations in their research designs.

Conceptually, DUR programs are aimed at the improvement of medical care and cost containment. However, in practice traditional approaches have focused on the control of abuse or overuse of drugs, polypharmacy, or patients obtaining prescriptions from many different prescribers. Additionally, most DUR studies have emphasized process measures of quality of care, for example the use of clinical laboratory tests to monitor for adverse effects during chloramphenicol or aminoglycoside therapy. The approach described by Strom et al., Morse et al., and Groves is a significant advance in DUR programs, as it is primarily aimed at improving measurable patient outcomes. Also, it does not impose arbitrary restrictions on drug use, potentially impairing patient care, but seeks to reduce costs by improving patient care. In seeking to reduce the financial impact of drug use, it does not focus on the drug costs themselves, but on the effects of the drugs. By reducing the need for medical care through the beneficial effects of drugs, or by increasing the need for remedial medical care because of drug toxicity, pharmaceuticals can have a financial impact on the health care system that is much larger than the cost of the drugs themselves. (This is discussed more in Chapter 35.) Despite their appeal, however, the true impact of such programs on the quality of care still remains to be established. (See Chapter 31 for a detailed discussion of DUR.)

THE FUTURE

OPPORTUNITIES

From a public health perspective, the observed differences in national and international patterns of drug utilization require much further study. Among other things, the medical consequences as well as the explanations for such differences are still not well documented.

Numerous studies have addressed the factors influencing drug prescribing. However, the relative importance of the many determinants of appropriate prescribing still remains to be adequately elucidated. Further research is needed to better define to what degree and which determinants of inappropriate prescribing are susceptible to modification and what might be an appropriate mix of interventions to achieve optimal impact. Although regulation is effective, it is not possible to regulate all aspects of the clinical decision making process to ensure optimal drug prescribing. Other approaches in addition to educational and informational measures need to be explored.

Many strategies aimed at modifying prescribing behavior have been proposed and adopted. The evidence to date indicates that mailed educational
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materials alone are not sufficient to modify prescribing behavior.\(^{80}\) In addition, a recent Australian study concluded that mailed, unsolicited, centralized, government-sponsored feedback based on aggregate prescribing data had no impact on the prescribing levels of general practitioners.\(^{150}\)

For interventions that have been shown to be effective in improving drug prescribing (discussed in Chapter 30), there is a need to further define their relative efficacy and proper role in a comprehensive strategy for optimizing drug utilization. Questions yet to be addressed through proper methodology deal with the role of printed drug information such as drug bulletins, the duration of effect of educational interventions such as group discussions, lectures, and seminars, each in both the outpatient as well as the inpatient settings, and the generalizability of face-to-face methods as described by Avorn and Soumerai.\(^{144}\) Schaffner et al.,\(^{145}\) and Ray et al.\(^{146}\)

More clinically applicable approaches to drug utilization review programs, such as the computerized screening of patient-specific drug histories in outpatient care to prevent drug-induced hospitalizations, still require further development and assessment (see Chapter 31). Although numerous studies have described the results of these and other novel programs, documentation of their efficacy in improving quality of care is an important subject for future work. Patient outcome measures as well as process measures of quality of drug utilization have to be included in such studies. To be effective and efficient, health care policy options should be based on sound scientific evidence.\(^{151}\)

PROBLEMS

The use of computerized databases has greatly facilitated the study of drug utilization. Although useful, most of these databases are far from ideal, as they have been set up mainly for administrative purposes, such as reimbursement, and drug utilization data are obtained as “spin off” information. The model information system that will suit both medical and administrative needs\(^{152}\) is not to be expected in the near future. Existing medical and pharmaceutical databases, with all their described limitations, will continue to be the main resources for these drug utilization studies.

Confidentiality of patient records has been successfully handled at the technical level. However, in many countries political acceptance may be much more difficult to achieve. For example, although patient-specific information is captured in some of the current databases in Sweden, due to legal restrictions this valuable information is not saved or stored and, thus, not available for health services research. EURO DURG researchers have reported difficulties arising from confidentiality laws in five of 10 European countries.\(^{153}\) It is feared that implementation of Directive 95/46/EC of 24 October 1995, on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on the free movement of such data in the European Union, may adversely affect researcher access to patient health data (see also Chapter 26).

In an era of increased interest in cost containment and cost-effectiveness, research may not be awarded high priority, resulting in reduced opportunities for financing much needed drug utilization research. Moreover, the recruitment and training of researchers for this relatively new field may be hampered by limitations in funding, as well as limitations in career opportunities. These two problems will impose significant constraints on the future development of studies in drug utilization. However, despite this, the search must continue for simple and relatively inexpensive methods for conducting descriptive studies of drug utilization and effective intervention strategies that may contribute to the optimization of drug therapy. Fortunately, the increasing commitment to drug utilization research is reflected in the development and growth of international groups such as the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE),\(^{154}\) the International Clinical Epidemiology Network (INCLEN),\(^{155}\) the European Drug Utilization Research Group (EURO DURG),\(^{156}\) and the International Network for Rational Use of Drugs (INRUD).\(^{157,158}\)

In summary, the study of drug utilization is still evolving. Studies in Europe may be characterized as large scale—regional, national, and international—but primarily quantitative studies of descriptive epidemiology, exploiting relatively
cheap and readily available sources of drug statistics. In North America, most studies have been of more limited geographic scope, but have addressed the issues of appropriateness of drug prescribing, based primarily on process measures of quality of care. The development of large computerized databases that allow the linkage of drug utilization data to diagnoses, albeit subject to some inherent limitations, is contributing to the expansion of this field of study. The WHO/INRUD indicator-based approach to drug utilization studies is facilitating the development of drug utilization research in developing countries. Many strategies have already been proposed and are being implemented to improve the quality of drug prescribing. Drug utilization review programs, particularly approaches that take into primary consideration patient outcome measures, are one such strategy that merits further rigorous study. Opportunities for the study of drug utilization continue to be virtually unexplored, but the political issue regarding the confidentiality of medical records, as well as the shortage of funds and manpower in the current era of cost containment, may slow the growth of drug utilization research.
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Research and clinical practice may be on parallel tracks headed in the same direction, but in contact only through rotting ties.1

INTRODUCTION

The broad purposes of pharmacoepidemiology are to advance our knowledge of the risks and benefits of medication use in real-world populations, and to foster improved prescribing and patient health outcomes. If, however, physicians and other health practitioners fail to update their knowledge and practice in response to new and clinically important data on the outcomes of specific prescribing patterns, then the “fruits” of pharmacoepidemiology research may have little impact on clinical practice.

It is for these reasons that a new discipline in the fields of health services research and clinical decision making has grown rapidly in importance—the science of assessing and improving clinical practices. The rapid growth of this new field, fueled by increasing research support from the National Institutes of Health and the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, is based on the recognition that passive knowledge dissemination (e.g., distributing practice guidelines) is generally insufficient to improve clinical practices without supplemental behavioral change interventions based on relevant theories of diffusion of innovations, persuasive communications, and adult learning theory.2–6

This chapter reviews some of these developments as they relate to medication use; defines several types of drug prescribing problems; discusses several thorny methodologic problems in this literature; reviews existing pharmacoepidemiologic and other evidence on the effectiveness of common prescribing-improvement interventions;
and concludes with a discussion of future research needs. For a more detailed and comprehensive examination of the literature on prescribing education, the role of the clinical pharmacist as a change agent, and managerial strategies for use in various settings, the reader is advised to consult several previous works published elsewhere.7–18 Portions of this chapter are derived from this body of work; in addition, we conducted computerized literature searches (published through 1998), consulted personal files, hand-searched references, and consulted The Cochrane Collaboration on Effective Professional Practice, a rigorous and continuously updated registry and synthesis of available evidence on studies of interventions to change physician behaviors.19 A substantial, if uneven, literature also exists on the intended and unintended impacts of cost sharing and other reimbursement restrictions designed to control drug expenditures. Review articles,20,21 a synthesis of two decades of research,22 and two additional studies in this area have recently been published,23,24 and, because it is beyond the scope of this chapter, will not be reviewed here.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

There is little doubt that the importance of suboptimal prescribing practice (both under- and overuse) vastly outweighs the costs of medications themselves25,26 (see Chapter 35). Drug therapies are the most common treatments in medical practice; their potential for both alleviating and causing illness are illustrated throughout this book. The types of prescribing error are at least as varied as their causes, and include

- use of toxic or addictive drugs when safer agents are available (e.g., barbiturates instead of benzodiazepines),
- use of drug therapy when no therapy is required (e.g., antibiotics for viral respiratory infections),
- use of an ineffective drug for a given indication (e.g., cerebral vasodilators for senile dementia),
- use of a costly drug when a less expensive preparation would be just as effective (e.g., newer calcium channel blockers, instead of effective and inexpensive thiazide diuretics, for uncomplicated hypertension),
- under- or excessive use of effective agents (e.g., too high dosages of benzodiazepines for the elderly),
- failure to discontinue therapy when the drug is no longer needed (e.g., use of \( H_2 \)-blockers for four or more months),
- failure to introduce new and effective drugs into practice (e.g., inhaled corticosteroids for asthma),
- failure to prescribe necessary drug therapies (e.g., use of \( \beta \)-blockers following acute myocardial infarction), and
- failure to achieve recommended therapeutic goals (e.g., LDL cholesterol levels below 100 mg/dL for the secondary prevention of myocardial infarction).

Specific illustrations of the above problem categories are ubiquitous in the drug utilization literature (although not always carefully documented). For example, propoxyphene, a toxic and abusable narcotic analgesic, is often prescribed for mild-to-moderate pain when other safer, more effective analgesics are available.27,28 In the hospital setting, numerous studies have documented that as much as 50% of antibiotic use is inappropriate, based on well established guidelines (e.g., wrong choice of agent, incorrect administration, drug not required). Furthermore, overuse of antibiotics may be increasing microbial resistance to these agents.29 In the nursing home setting, abundant evidence exists that potent anti-psychotic drugs are often administered inappropriately to demented elderly patients, posing serious iatrogenic risks.30,31

Because of the absence of diagnostic data in most published drug utilization research, and because of the emphasis on cost containment within drug utilization review programs, the existing literature may underemphasize the important problem of underuse of highly effective medications. For example, a study in a large US health maintenance organization found that nearly two-thirds of newly diagnosed hypertensive
patients (those with diastolic blood pressures of greater than 100 mm Hg) were not followed up for treatment 6–12 months after diagnosis.\textsuperscript{32} In addition, a 1990 study of 623 outpatients treated for acute myocardial infarction at the Yale-New Haven Hospital found that one-third of the patients meeting strict randomized clinical trial eligibility criteria for use of β-blockers did not even receive a trial of therapy—contrary to existing guidelines from the American College of Cardiology. As a result, they experienced a 20–40% higher post-myocardial infarction mortality rate.\textsuperscript{35}

Another recent study found that almost 60% of medical and surgical inpatients reported “horrible” or “excruciating” pain, despite the availability of safe and powerful analgesics which can eliminate virtually all pain in this setting.\textsuperscript{34} The authors concluded that irrational fears of prescribing narcotic analgesics for acute pain were significant barriers to appropriate treatment.

Finally, recent studies have documented that strict reimbursement restrictions on medications among chronically ill elderly in Medicaid were associated with reductions in use of essential agents (e.g., insulin, cardiovascular drugs, and lithium) and subsequent increases in the risk of nursing home admission.\textsuperscript{35,36}

Why do these problems occur? Can a comprehensive theory of behavioral change provide the basis for programs designed to improve prescribing? Such an ideal model must be complex given the diversity of economic, organizational, educational, psychological, social, and informational influences on daily prescribing practices. Some of the factors responsible for suboptimal prescribing include the failure of clinicians to keep abreast of important new findings on the risks and benefits of medications; overpromotion of some drugs through pharmaceutical company advertising or sales representatives (i.e., “detailers”); underpromotion of highly effective, but nonprofitable medications (e.g., aspirin); simple errors of omission;\textsuperscript{37} negative attitudes towards issues of cost-effectiveness of medications; direct-to-consumer marketing strategies; patient and family demand for a particular agent, even when it is not scientifically substantiated;\textsuperscript{38} physician overreliance on clinical experience in opposition to scientific data;\textsuperscript{38} a skepticism toward, and distrust of, the literature and academia among some community-based physicians;\textsuperscript{39} the need to take some “definitive” therapeutic action, even when “watchful waiting” may be the most justifiable action under conditions of uncertainty; outdated therapeutic protocols; and influence from clinical opinion leaders or other health practitioners (e.g., clinical pharmacists). These diverse influences suggest the need for tailoring intervention strategies to the key factors influencing a given clinical behavior based on models of behavioral change. One promising model will be discussed in the section entitled “Currently Available Solutions.”

\textbf{METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH}

Research on the impact of educational and administrative interventions to improve drug prescribing presents numerous methodological challenges. This section will review several of the most important methodological problems and suggested solutions, including internal validity, regression toward the mean, unit of analysis, logistical issues, ethical and legal problems, and the detection of effects on patient outcomes.

\textbf{INTERNAL VALIDITY}

As early as 1975, Gilbert \textit{et al.} established that poorly controlled studies produce misleading estimates of the effects of a variety of social programs.\textsuperscript{40} Many nonintervention factors can affect medication utilization over time, such as marketing campaigns, mass media, state or federal regulatory policies, seasonal effects, changing in staffing of health care organizations, changes in eligibility for insurance programs, shifting demographics, etc. Because randomized clinical trials (RCTs) are sometimes not feasible (e.g., contamination of controls within a single institution) or ethical (e.g., withholding quality
assurance programs from controls), other strong quasi-experimental designs (e.g., interrupted time series with or without comparison series, pre-post with comparison group) should be used instead of weak one-group post-only or pre-post designs that do not generally permit causal inferences.

*Interrupted time-series designs* include multiple observations (often ten or more) of study populations before and after intervention. Such designs permit investigators to control for pre-intervention secular changes in study outcomes and to estimate the size and statistical significance of sudden changes in the level or slope of the time series occurring at initiation of the treatment. The availability of a comparison series collected from a similar, but unexposed, comparison group can further increase causal inferences if no simultaneous change in trend is observed for this group.  

Another popular design that can often lead to interpretable results is the *pre-post with comparison group design*. This design includes a single observation both before and after treatment in a nonrandomly selected group exposed to a treatment (e.g., physicians receiving feedback on specific prescribing practices), as well as simultaneous before and after observations of a similar (comparison) group not receiving treatment. Although this design controls for many threats to the validity of causal inferences (e.g., due to the effects of testing or maturation), it cannot control for unknown factors (e.g., a regulatory policy) which might result in pre-intervention differences in trends between study and comparison groups.

The weakest, and not uncommon, design is the *one-group, post-only design*, which consists of making only one observation on a single group which has already been exposed to a treatment.

![Figure 30.1. Reported effectiveness of dissemination of printed educational materials alone in well designed versus inadequately controlled studies. Reprinted with permission from the Milbank Quarterly.](image-url)
The one-group pre–post design merely adds a single pre-intervention observation to the previous design. As described below, such weak designs are unlikely to produce valid or reliable estimates of the effects of educational or managerial interventions. Unfortunately, however, 60% of 76 studies designed to improve drug prescribing in primary care and inpatient settings used the weakest nonexperimental designs.7

Inadequately controlled studies may exaggerate the effectiveness of many interventions to improve prescribing. For example, as shown in Figure 30.1, inadequately controlled studies of the dissemination of print-only materials used alone (right side) have all reported positive effects on behavior, while well controlled studies of such strategies (left side) all reported small or non-existent changes in behavior. The “success” of uncontrolled studies is often due to the attribution of pre-existing trends in practice patterns to the studied intervention.

The potential bias of failing to account for prior trends was recently demonstrated by examining naturally occurring trends in utilization of 23 specific categories of substitute medications whose utilization averaged at least one prescription per 1000 enrollees per month in a 4 year study of 390,000 enrollees in the New Jersey Medicaid program.42 The results indicated that 50% of the estimated 1-year percent changes in prescriptions per 1000 enrollees exceeded +20.5% or –10.8% of baseline levels. It is interesting to note that the size of many of the “effects” reported in the drug utilization/intervention literature7 are similar to these natural fluctuations, suggesting that changes in drug use attributed to such interventions could merely reflect these underlying trends.

The above findings provide further support for more widespread application of RCTs or, when RCTs are not feasible, time-series and comparison series designs to evaluate whether suddenly introduced interventions are associated with corresponding changes in the level or slope of the utilization series, after controlling for prior trends (see references 23, 27, 36 for examples). If the collection of time-series data is not feasible, investigators may consider utilizing pre–post with comparison group designs, which also control for most threats of history, as described in respected texts on intervention research design.41

REGRESSION TOWARD THE MEAN

Regression toward the mean, the tendency for observations on populations, selected on the basis of exceeding a predetermined threshold level, to approach the mean on subsequent observations, is a common and insidious problem in much of the drug utilization literature. For example, the most common Medicaid drug utilization review programs typically screen utilization data and eligibility files for possible co-occurrences of two interacting medications, or higher than recommended dosages for individual drugs. After case-by-case review by expert committees, letters are written to responsible physicians questioning the practice and asking for written responses. Unfortunately, however, the only published research evaluating this methodology utilized poorly controlled designs that are unable to control for regression to the mean. For example, in one often cited drug utilization review study.43 50% of prescribing problems were absent several months after letters were sent, suggesting to the noncritical reader that the program was effective. However, it is equally plausible that the offending medications were withdrawn because the patients’ conditions improved or because the physicians detected the error on their own.

The likelihood that all screening algorithms employed in drug utilization review programs are subject to regression toward the mean argues strongly for the need to conduct randomized controlled experiments and well controlled quasi-experiments (e.g., time series with comparison series) to justify the efficiency and effectiveness of these programs before they become a routine part of private and public quality-improvement methods. If regression effects are unavoidable—for example, due to selection of at-risk (high-use) populations—investigators may consider including a “wash-out”
period after selection and before pre- and post-intervention observations.\textsuperscript{35}

UNIT OF ANALYSIS

A common methodological problem in studies of physician behavior is the incorrect use of the patient as the unit of analysis. Such a practice violates basic statistical assumptions of independence because prescribing behaviors for individual patients are likely to be correlated within each physician’s practice. This often leads to exaggerated significance levels when the correct unit of analysis is the physician or health care facility. As a result, interventions may appear to lead to “statistically significant” improvements in prescribing practices when in fact no such claim is warranted.

A recent review of articles on physicians’ patient care behavior found that 70% of 54 articles incorrectly analyzed the data using the patient as the unit of analysis;\textsuperscript{44} among 19 reviewed studies of medication prescribing, 58% used the incorrect unit of analysis.

The simplest, although sometimes overly conservative, solution to the problem of incorrect unit of analysis is to analyze data by facility or physician. Alternatively, new methods for analyzing clustered data are also becoming increasingly available; such models can control for clustering of observations at the patient, physician, and facility levels.\textsuperscript{45} Such models allow aggregation at the patient level by controlling for correlation between patients cared for by the same provider or facility. The resulting significance levels for differences in prescribing rates between study and control groups are more conservative than assuming no intraclass correlation, but are greater than the most conservative methods of analyzing at the provider or facility level.

LOGISTICAL ISSUES

While continuity of care is a goal in most settings, many patients, particularly those treated within academic medical centers, see multiple primary providers over time. For example, patients treated by residents may be reassigned to other residents at the end of the academic year. Providers may go on extended leave and transfer cases to other clinicians. Patients themselves may choose another primary care provider. In addition, many patients develop ongoing relationships with specialists as particular problems develop and are resolved.

While these changes may or may not improve patients’ care, they almost always complicate and sometimes weaken research conducted in a clinical setting. Particularly in settings where providers may be assigned to both “intervention” and “control” patients, contamination problems are difficult to avoid. Even when interventions can be focused effectively on the intended patients or providers, informal communication among providers can lead to contaminated effects, thereby decreasing the likelihood of detecting significant changes.

Fortunately, solutions to the above problems exist. First, investigators should identify through baseline interviews and organizational records the extent to which patients are cared for by multiple providers, and the patterns of consultations and referrals between caregivers within and between facilities. If randomization of clinicians is likely to lead to contamination of controls, or if patient–provider pairs are frequently broken, the entire facility or subunit (e.g., primary care center) should be assigned to the same study group. For instance, a recent quality-improvement intervention randomized 37 hospitals in one state to intervention or control status.\textsuperscript{46} However, when this strategy is not feasible, because it results in a small sample of facilities and inadequate statistical power, investigators are encouraged to collect data on medication use during multiple observation periods both before and after the intervention, and to use time-series regression methods that can often detect modest changes in utilization levels after as few as 7–12 months.\textsuperscript{10,35,47}

ETHICAL AND LEGAL PROBLEMS

HINDERING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF RANDOMIZED CLINICAL TRIALS

Adequate control groups are essential for rigorous evaluation of results. Yet it has been argued that there are ethical and legal problems related to
withholding interventions designed to improve drug-prescribing practices. This is especially true in government-funded programs such as Medicaid.

This argument assumes that the proposed interventions are known to be beneficial. In fact, the efficacy of many programs to improve drug utilization is the very question that should be under investigation. In those rare instances in which the intervention has shown unusual promise in similar populations, the application of randomized clinical trials may be inappropriate. In such cases, alternative research designs should be considered. Feasible design alternatives are quasi-experimental designs such as interrupted time-series analysis, or staged implementation in which the control population (or regions) receive the intervention after comparative data have been collected.\textsuperscript{22,41}

**DETECTING EFFECTS ON PATIENT OUTCOMES**

While a number of studies have demonstrated positive effects of various programs on prescribing practices, almost no large well controlled studies have linked such changes in prescribing to improved patient outcomes. Recently, under the auspices of the Health Care Financing Administration, Marciniak \textit{et al}. conducted a controlled trial of guideline dissemination and feedback by peer-review organizations on seven quality (i.e., process) indicators for acute myocardial infarction care in Medicare patients in four states.\textsuperscript{48} This was a before (1992–93) and after (1995–96) intervention study, with a post-only comparison to a random national sample of patients from the other states. Almost 24,000 patient records were abstracted. Performance on all quality indicators improved in the intervention states compared to baseline; however, only the use of aspirin and \textbeta{}-blockers and counseling for smoking cessation were significantly greater than in the control states. An important strength of this study, beyond its size and scope, was an analysis of patient outcomes, namely mortality. There was no difference in mortality between intervention and control states in 1992–93, but after the intervention and consistent with documented improvements in process, mortality was approximately 1% lower (1 year mortality 30.4\% versus 31.4\% in the control states, \(p = 0.004\)) in the intervention states. Bearing in mind certain important threats to validity (e.g., no baseline measurement of process indicators in control states, and possible lack of comparability between intervention and control states), this is one of the few studies that suggest a link between improvements in process and patient outcomes.

These results, and those of other studies,\textsuperscript{31} underline the difficulty of demonstrating statistically significant changes in patient outcomes in response to intervention. Explanations for the dissociation between improvements in prescribing and better patient outcomes include (i) available clinical outcome measures may not be sensitive to the kinds of patient outcome that might be affected by introduction or withdrawal of medications, (ii) changes in physician prescribing may lead to little or no change in patients’ health status if patients do not adhere to the recommended regimens, and (iii) many medical therapies require months to years of continued compliance before clinical benefits become apparent.

Because of the above problems, sample sizes may need to be enormous to detect modest changes in patient outcomes (see Chapter 3 for a discussion of methods for determining statistical power). These problems are much less severe in standard drug trials because of experimenter control over the major independent variable—exposure to medications. However, process outcomes (e.g., use of recommended medications for acute myocardial infarction from evidence-based practice guidelines) may often be sensitive and appropriate measures of quality of care,\textsuperscript{49} and improvements in process should not be dismissed outright as surrogate outcomes. They may be important in and of themselves, as long as the processes are a measure of proven effective therapy.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK**

A useful starting point for designing prescribing-improvement interventions is to develop a framework for organizing the clinical and nonclinical
factors that could help or impede desired changes in clinical behaviors. One such model—PRECEDE—was developed for adult health education programs by Green and colleagues, and proposes factors influencing three sequential stages of behavior change: predisposing, enabling, and reinforcing factors. Predisposing variables include such factors as awareness of a consensus guideline on appropriate use of a thrombolytic agent, knowledge of clinical relationships supporting such a guideline (e.g., major actions of thrombolitics in the artery), beliefs in the efficacy of treatment (e.g., probability of survival), attitudes or values associated with recommended behaviors, etc. However, while a mailed drug bulletin may predispose some physicians to new information (if they read it), behavior change may be impossible without new enabling skills (e.g., skills in administering a new therapy, or overcoming patient or family demand for unsubstantiated treatments). Once a new pattern of behavior is tried, multiple and positive reinforcements (e.g., through peers, reminders, or positive feedback) may be necessary to establish fully the new behavior. A number of recent thoughtful reviews of the literature have come to a similar conclusion: multi-faceted interventions that encompass all stages of behavior change are most likely to improve physician prescribing.6,7,13,15,19,51

EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF PRESCRIBING-IMPROVEMENT INTERVENTIONS

Does existing empirical evidence on the effectiveness of alternative prescribing interventions provide any lessons on the key characteristics of successful approaches to this problem? Illustrative findings from several research syntheses will be used to evaluate the effectiveness of the most commonly studied or applied approaches. Because of severe biases introduced by uncontrolled designs which do not measure pre-existing trends in target drug use behaviors (see prior Methodologic Problems section), only studies utilizing adequate experimental or quasi-experimental research designs (e.g., pre-post with comparison group and time-series designs) are discussed.

DISSEMINATION OF EDUCATIONAL MATERIALS AND CLINICAL PRACTICE GUIDELINES

Distributing printed educational materials aimed at improving prescribing practice remains the most ubiquitous form of prescribing education in the industrialized world. While the most sophisticated materials may incorporate visually arresting graphs, illustrations, and headlines to convey important behavioral and educational messages, such a strategy rests on assumptions that physicians will be exposed to the information, and that such rational information will be sufficiently persuasive to change clinical practices. Unfortunately, several reviews provide consistent evidence that use of disseminated educational materials alone (such as drug bulletins, self-education curricula, objective, graphically illustrated “un-advertisements,” or other professionally prepared educational brochures) may affect some of the predisposing variables in the change process (e.g., knowledge or attitudes), but has little or no effect on actual prescribing practice.

A study of the effect of warning letters mailed to 200,000 physicians who were high prescribers of zomepirac sodium corroborate this previous literature. As shown in Figure 30.2, the warning letters, which alerted these physicians to serious or fatal anaphylaxis associated with use of zomepirac, were not associated with any reduction in its use, especially in the face of stronger face-to-face marketing campaigns which may have counteracted the warning messages. Several previous controlled trials in five states also failed to document the effects of well illustrated brochures on use of oral cephalosporins, contraindicated antibiotics, propoxyphene (a marginally effective analgesic), and ineffective agents for senility and claudication. A distinct subset of educational materials are clinical practice guidelines. Although primarily educational in nature, they are also a codification of current best practice, and are intended to improve quality and decrease costs by decreasing variations in practice. However, faith in the simple act of guideline dissemination presupposes that information alone, regardless of how reliable or how well referenced, can change
behavior. When rigorously studied, guideline dissemination alone has not significantly influenced prescribing behavior or other clinical practices.\textsuperscript{5,13,17,55,56}

In general, simple dissemination of educational materials does not appear to be effective by itself in altering prescribing patterns, but these materials may provide a necessary “predisposing” foundation for other “enabling” and “reinforcing” strategies.

MULTIMEDIA WARNING CAMPAIGNS

Occasionally, the discovery of important adverse effects of marketed drugs is accompanied by mailed educational materials to physicians as part of a broader warning campaign involving the medical and popular press, newspapers, television, and radio. When the adverse effects are severe and preventable, alternative agents exist, and the messages are simple enough to convey in mass communications, such multimedia campaigns may sometimes be effective in changing prescribing patterns in large populations. Previous examples include marked reductions in the use of chloramphenicol (aplastic anemia),\textsuperscript{57} and much smaller reductions in the use of calcium channel blockers (myocardial infarction) in response to widespread media warnings.\textsuperscript{58}

Figure 30.3 provides data from a US study suggesting that widespread reporting of the risk of Reye’s syndrome associated with pediatric aspirin use by the medical and lay press was associated with declines in Reye’s syndrome. This media campaign was conducted after Reye’s syndrome was linked to aspirin use and several antecedent viral illnesses in several epidemiological studies.\textsuperscript{59} The authors concluded, based on this and other studies, that mass media warnings may be effective in changing both consumer and physician behavior when the illness is severe or life-threatening, the behavioral message is simple, no or few barriers to alternative behaviors (e.g., acetaminophen versus aspirin) are present, and the campaign is comprehensive, involving both health professionals and consumers.
GROUP EDUCATION

Although rounds, seminars, and other group didactic educational programs are among the most universal methods for prescribing education, controlled studies of this approach are almost nonexistent in the literature, especially in nonteaching settings. Nevertheless, small group discussions conducted by clinical leaders in academic primary care settings have been shown to improve use of antibiotics and agents for hypertension treatment and control.\textsuperscript{59,61} These successful approaches have included reviews of patient records to establish the need for change and participatory methods based on adult learning theory. Traditional large group, didactic continuing medical education seminars have not been as successful, by themselves, in improving physician performance for other medical technologies.

PROFILING, AUDIT, AND FEEDBACK

During the last 20 years, a new approach to improving physician performance has become increasingly popular—feedback of prescribing patterns to individuals or groups of physicians. A recent survey found more than half of all US physicians received clinical or economic feedback regarding their prescribing practices.\textsuperscript{16} While managers and health policy makers often assume that “feedback” is a unidimensional technique, its many variations have not been well defined or well studied.

One well studied form of feedback is patient-level medication profiles. It has frequently been hypothesized that simply making clinicians aware of all of the medications a patient may be prescribed might be an effective method for reducing use of excessive, duplicative, or interacting medications. The best controlled trials of this approach confirm that simply distributing such profiles, without explicit suggestions for changes in practices, has no detectable effect on prescribing practice.\textsuperscript{62–64} Likely reasons for the failure of this intuitively appealing approach include the following: (i) much of the generated information was probably clinically irrelevant; (ii) unsynthesized
and voluminous data may cause information “overload” and desensitization of busy clinicians; (iii) there was no provision of alternative measures to improve care; and (iv) the feedback was not derived from credible sources of information. This approach represents one of the few instances in which the volume of negative findings from methodologically rigorous studies strongly supports the exclusion of this approach from prescribing-improvement options and future research.

Other forms of feedback may compare practice patterns with peers or predetermined standards such as practice guidelines. The former is typified by interventions of peer-comparison feedback, while drug utilization review (DUR) programs typify the latter (DUR is discussed extensively in Chapter 31 and will not be covered here). A recent meta-analysis of 12 RCTs concluded that peer comparison feedback had a statistically significant, but clinically minimal, effect on prescribing or other physician behaviors. Further, the authors doubted that such programs were likely to offset the costs of the intervention, much less lead to cost savings.

In addition to the type or content of the feedback, a number of variables must be considered. Communication channels could be by letter, computer, or face-to-face encounter with a supervisor or colleague. The credibility of the source of the feedback information probably influences its effectiveness in changing behavior. For example, Eisenberg has found that data feedback only works when it is delivered by clinical leaders. Thus, feedback programs operated by a government regulator or managed care organization may be less effective than professionally based educational programs in which an ongoing relationship exists between the sender and receiver of information.

The level at which feedback is given is another important issue that may differentiate successful and valid programs from questionable ones. For example, many existing DUR programs attempt to review the appropriateness of medication prescribing for individual patients (e.g., drug interactions and dosage). Since the majority of feedback messages are likely to be clinically unimportant, the clinically relevant messages could be unintentionally ignored. For this reason, a more valid method may be to compare patterns of prescribing by individual physicians with clinical guidelines. Lastly, beyond the medium and the message, if physicians are not able to respond immediately to the feedback delivered, by altering prescribing during a specific patient encounter, they may not respond at all. It is not necessarily true that physicians will generalize behavior from one specific encounter to similar clinical situations.

Unfortunately, given the diversity of feedback approaches, published evaluations of well controlled studies in community populations are rare, and the results are mixed. Computerized feedback on outpatient prescribing charges did not affect prescribing practices in a recent randomized clinical trial. One noteworthy exception is a randomized clinical trial of computerized feedback by senior physicians to 44 family practitioners in an academic medical center. Computer messages targeted 28 brand-name drugs with suggested generic alternatives, which were fed back to each physician every month. Each message summarized instances when significant savings could have occurred. After the feedback program began, the rate of generic prescribing in the study group was almost double the rate in the controls. As described above, the ability and influence of the senior physician was probably a key factor in the success of this program, and the results may not be generalizable to nonacademic settings.

REMINDER AND DECISION SUPPORT SYSTEMS

Often, physicians are predisposed to certain therapeutic interventions, but simply omit them due to oversight or lack of coordination in the health care/communications system. In these cases, computerized reminder systems have been developed that enable physicians to reduce these errors of omission by issuing alerts to perform specific actions in response to patient-level information such as laboratory findings or diagnoses.

Several studies in managed care organizations and primary care settings have provided strong evidence that such systems can prevent the omission of essential preventive services such as influenza immunization, hypertension treatment,
and others. In general, prospective reminders are more effective than retrospective feedback; however, such systems are effective only as long as the reminders continue. Further, it is likely that such systems are only effective when clinicians are already predisposed to acting in concert with the protocols. Few data are available on the potential for such systems to reduce inappropriate drug prescribing in cases when physicians have strong beliefs in opposition to recommended practice. Finally, few well-controlled studies are available on the potential for such computerized systems to succeed beyond a “secretarial reminder” function, although early work using advanced decision support systems at Brigham and Women’s Hospital in Boston, and LDS Hospital in Salt Lake City, and the Regenstrief Institute in Indianapolis shows great promise in altering physicians’ prescribing decisions in more complex areas such as dosage, schedule, suboptimal choices, and prevention of adverse drug events.

OPINION LEADERS OR EDUCATIONALLY INFLUENTIAL PHYSICIANS

The role of local opinion leaders in the adoption of new pharmaceutical agents has been well documented by Coleman et al. Their data indicated that after opinion leaders adopted drugs, other less integrated physicians eventually followed in a classic curve of technology diffusion. In several studies of diffusion of scientific information on treatment of arthritis and the inappropriate use of Cesarean sections, local opinion leaders or educationally influential physicians have been identified and encouraged to consult informally with colleagues. These opinion leaders are approached frequently for clinical advice; trusted by their colleagues to evaluate new medical practices in the context of local norms; have good listening skills; and are perceived as clinically competent and caring. In addition to opinion leader involvement, these interventions generally included brief orientation to research findings, printed educational materials, and encouragement to implement guidelines during informal “teachable moments” that occur naturally in their ongoing collegial associations. Success of these programs was attributed to “the importance of the local community’s norms, the orientation of practitioners to locally credible individuals, and the need to translate the research findings into a locally applicable message.”

A recently reported RCT demonstrated that opinion leaders could be used to improve prescribing in the treatment of acute myocardial infarction. Thirty-seven hospitals in Minnesota were randomized to guideline dissemination, performance feedback, and opinion leaders (intervention) or guidelines and feedback alone (controls). Both the unit of randomization and the unit of analysis were the hospital. Clinical and process data were collected for a year before and a year after the intervention (which itself lasted about 6 months). The opinion leaders were asked to promote four separate practices, each consistent with national evidence-based guidelines: increased use of aspirin, increased use of β-blockers, increased use of thrombolytic therapy in elderly patients, and decreased routine use of lidocaine prophylaxis. Compared to controls, the intervention hospitals successfully increased the use of aspirin (absolute median improvement 13%, p = 0.04) and β-blockers (absolute median improvement 31%, p = 0.02) (see Figure 30.4). However, there was no improvement in the use of thrombolytic therapy, and all hospitals decreased use of lidocaine by about 50%. This latter finding is evidence of a secular trend, a trend more powerful than the intervention itself, and one that would have been attributed to the intervention if a weaker study design had been employed. Whether or not such interventions can improve prescribing outside the hospital setting, for other conditions, and are cost effective, remains to be determined.

FACE-TO-FACE EDUCATIONAL OUTREACH

A growing number of well controlled studies supports the conclusion that programs combining professionally illustrated educational materials with brief, face-to-face visits (15–25 minutes) by medical-school or medical-society-based clinical pharmacists (academic detailers) or physician “counselors” are effective in reducing prescribing of contraindicated or marginally effective therapies.
in primary care settings. Similarly, several controlled studies of direct educational efforts by clinical pharmacists have also documented improvements in targeted prescribing practices. The principles and methods of this approach are described in detail elsewhere and include targeting of physicians with higher than average needs for education (e.g., through analyses of administrative data), conducting motivational research (e.g., surveys of focus group interviews) in advance of the intervention to understand the causes of suboptimal prescribing patterns, sponsorship by authoritative and credible medical organizations, two-way communication with prescribers to increase clinician involvement and relevance to different patient populations and settings, presentation and discussion of counterarguments to which physicians have been opposed, brevity, use of high-quality, graphical educational materials (both for mailings and discussion), repetition of major messages and positive reinforcement, and follow-up reinforcement visits.

Figure 30.5 provides an example of the reverse side of an educational leaflet briefly summarizing the main educational messages concerning the costs and lack of efficacy of propoxyphene that were emphasized in one randomized trial of a four-state academic detailing program. The only formal economic analysis of this approach concluded that targeting moderate to high prescribers of propoxyphene, cephalaxin, and peripheral/cerebral vasodilators using administrative claims databases could lead to high benefit-to-cost ratios, even without considering positive spillover effects to nonparticipating physicians, improved quality of care, or possible cost savings due to elimination of adverse drug effects.

If academic detailing is truly cost neutral (or even cost saving), the main barrier to more widespread use of the strategy is its labor intensiveness.Nevertheless, all 15 RCTs of educational outreach identified by the Cochrane Collaboration have demonstrated significant improvements in one or more measures of performance. A number of controlled trials have attempted to replicate the positive results of face-to-face outreach with small group outreach sessions (often referred to as “group detailing”). Group detailing has the additional advantage of encouraging discussions within the group, which may enhance the diffusion of
Efficacy:
Recently, Miller analyzed all double-blind controlled studies of propoxyphene published since 1950. Eight trials compared the drug directly with aspirin or acetaminophen. Here are the results of that review:

Propoxyphene (Darvon, etc.) \(^*\) versus Aspirin or Acetaminophen \(^{2-9}\)
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</table>

Cost:
Propoxyphene (Darvon, etc.) offers unimpressive efficacy—at a higher price:

Estimated Cost to Patient of a Single Week of q.4h. Therapy \(^*\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Cost (in $)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophene</td>
<td>$3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Propoxyphene</td>
<td>$4.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrocodone</td>
<td>$4.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Codeine</td>
<td>$5.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opioid Analgesic</td>
<td>$6.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For mild to moderate pain, aspirin or acetaminophen is still the drug of choice.\(^{11,12}\)

Patient resistance to "plain aspirin" can usually be overcome by an explanation of these facts. For the patient who demands a prescription, enteric-coated aspirin offers the safety and efficacy of aspirin without the drawbacks of Darvon-like drugs.

If symptoms are too severe to control with aspirin or acetaminophen, it is unlikely that propoxyphene will control the pain. For acute treatment, codeine may be a better choice.

This information has been prepared by the Drug Information Program of Harvard Medical School, under the direction of Jerry Avorn, M.D. A brief pamphlet for laypersons, "Why Your Doctor Prescribed Plain Aspirin," has been written for physicians to distribute to patients in explaining the material presented above. For copies (specify number desired), and for additional information, please write to the Drug Information Program, Harvard Medical School, 645 Huntington Avenue, Boston, MA 02115. The Drug Information Program is supported in part by grant No. HS00880 from the National Center for Health Services Research of the Public Health Service.

\(^*\)Propoxyphene and related compounds are national center of effort: hydrocodone, including Darvon, Darvon Compound, Codeine K, Codeine N, Renuzit, Acetaminophen.

Figure 30.5. Reverse side of graphically illustrated and referenced educational leaflet emphasizing the lack of efficacy and high cost of propoxyphene in comparison to aspirin or acetaminophen. The leaflet was used in a face-to-face academic detailing study.\(^{10,11}\)
ideas and increase their impact. For example, in a recent trial to improve the treatment of hyperlipidemia in Sweden, Diwan et al. randomized 134 health centers. The intervention, for 67 of the health centers, consisted of printed guideline dissemination, an informational video, and four 30 min group detailing sessions between all health center physicians and a clinical pharmacist, while the control centers only received printed information. The unit of analysis was the health center. Compared to baseline measurements, hyperlipidemia was treated more often for all patients in the intervention centers, although this reached conventional statistical significance only for women younger than 65 years. Moreover, “first-line prescribing” (specific agents in accordance with national guidelines) was 20% higher ($p = 0.03$) for the intervention centers. It is likely that as long as the group size is relatively small (i.e., fewer than ten participants), and the other precepts of academic detailing are adhered to, group detailing is a reasonable approach to educational outreach. This is an area that merits further research.

FINANCIAL INCENTIVES AND PENALTIES

Although there are few studies of the effects of financial incentives or penalties on physician prescribing behavior per se, numerous observational studies suggest that differing payment methods do affect the way that physicians practice medicine. In addition, it appears that financial incentives are consistently more powerful than penalties in terms of changing behavior. Most methods involve some form of capitation (e.g., capitation-based prescribing budgets). Any savings on prescribing are reinvested in other health services (the model in the UK) or are delivered to physicians as rewards or penalties (the model in the US and Germany).

For example, in response to escalating drug costs, an increasing number of physician organizations in the US are entering into drug risk-sharing arrangements with health maintenance organizations and other managed care plans. These innovative drug payment mechanisms are designed to hold down the cost of drugs by encouraging physicians to prescribe “preferred” drug products (e.g., generic drugs or those that are under rebate arrangements with manufacturers). Of note, there appears to be only one rigorous, well controlled study examining the effects of capitating physician organizations, and that study did not separate drug information from other services. This lack of pharmacy data limits our understanding of the dynamics of how and why changing drug payment mechanisms influence the cost and quality of care.

In general, it is believed capitation encourages physicians to examine their prescribing more critically, resulting in the choice of appropriate, effective, and low cost medications. This belief is based on a number of untested assumptions: (i) practices must be large enough to absorb risk, so that costly, but appropriate prescribing decisions for the individual patient are not unduly affected; (ii) performance feedback to prescribers must be timely and provide specific advice about costs, risks, and possible substitutions; and (iii) physicians must understand and be sensitive to differences in drug pricing. Because it is unlikely that these assumptions (in general) can be met, any intervention using financial incentives must be considered experimental. As such, any strategy employing financial incentives to change prescribing must be studied rigorously, with particular attention to the quality of prescribing, unintended consequences (e.g., cost shifting), and patient outcomes. Reductions in prescribing costs alone are not appropriate or sufficient outcomes. As Bloor and Freeman have noted, experimental or quasi-experimental studies are needed before sound evidence-based policies can be formulated.

THE FUTURE

Based on this synthesis of the research literature, it is clear that our knowledge of the characteristics of successful prescribing-improving interventions is growing rapidly. Passive dissemination of drug information or practice guidelines is a necessary but insufficient method for improving most prescribing behaviors. In general, the achievement of long-term changes in practice will depend on inclusion of multiple strategies that predispose, enable, and reinforce desired prescribing behaviors.
The following characteristics recur in successful prescribing-improvement interventions:

- identification of key factors influencing target and alternative prescribing decisions through surveys, focus groups, or in-depth interviews;
- targeting of physicians in need of education (e.g., through review of claims data) and/or local opinion leaders to increase program cost-effectiveness;
- use of credible and objective messengers and materials;
- face-to-face interaction, especially in primary care settings;
- repetition and reinforcement of only a few major messages and behaviors at a time;
- provision of acceptable alternatives to practices to be extinguished;
- brief, graphic educational guidelines to expose and reinforce messages; and
- an emphasis on the goal of improvement in the quality of prescribing, not just cost-minimization in the guise of quality improvement.

There is also a tremendous need for carefully controlled research of some existing and new methods for improving prescribing. New models are needed to predict the most effective types of intervention for specific problem types. For example, interactive video disc technology is being used to help patients share in decision making with their clinicians by evaluating the risks and benefits of, and preferences for, various treatments of benign prostatic hyperplasia. Although this technology might not be cost-effective for everyday prescribing decisions, it may be helpful in situations where particular medications pose both large risks and benefits (e.g., clozapine for psychoses, hormone replacement therapy post-menopause). Are face-to-face interventions (either one on one or in small groups) always necessary to address strongly held incorrect beliefs? Can reminder systems that are so effective in correcting errors of omission change more resistant errors of commission? Lastly, are advanced decision support systems effective, and if so, are they worth the time, effort, and cost necessary to use them?

Practice settings may also influence the choice of interventions to be evaluated. For example, organized systems of clinicians (e.g., medical groups, independent practice associations) may be conducive to participatory approaches in which practicing physicians, and possibly patients, work with a facilitator/educator to explore current practices and barriers to change, and then develop (or modify) practice guidelines along with methods to measure guideline adherence. The group meetings also serve an additional function, as vehicles for active learning. These approaches have been used to upgrade antibiotic use in Mexico and decrease the use of injectable medications in Indonesia. Furthermore, many trials of physician behavior change have used trainees or university-affiliated physicians as study subjects. Much more attention needs to be paid to the study of changing the behavior of busy physicians in community practice. Many successful strategies may not be directly transferable from a university hospital to a busy ambulatory clinic.

Most of the studies we reviewed were designed to assess only whether an intervention changed behavior; few studies have undertaken formal cost–benefit analyses. One formal economic analysis of a four-state randomized controlled trial of “academic detailing” found that the intervention actually led to a net savings. This is a clear illustration of what Eddy described as “getting more for less,” the potential to improve quality and reduce costs simultaneously. We are unaware of other well controlled studies that compare the costs and benefits of alternative approaches to improving prescribing practice. This is clearly an important research need.

At present, we know that prescribing problems exist, but we know little about their prevalence or determinants. This paucity of data is remarkable considering three-quarters of all physician visits end in the prescription of a drug. In a study of over 30 000 hospital admissions, drug-related complications were common and accounted for 19% of all adverse events. Bates et al. found that almost one-third of adverse drug events occurring in the hospital were preventable. Less is known about the ambulatory setting; however, the Risk Management Foundation of the Harvard Medical
Institutions reported that about 6% of all professional liability claims were related to medication errors that occurred outside the hospital.\(^9\) Most of these errors were related to inadequate monitoring, incorrect dosage, improper management of a medication regimen, and the use of the wrong drug. These are all errors of commission; the extent of omission (e.g., underuse of effective therapies) has been virtually ignored. A notable exception is a recent study of 5,332 elderly survivors of myocardial infarction, that found only 21% of eligible patients received a \(\beta\)-blocker, leading to an estimated 381 excess deaths among the 2,952 eligible nonrecipients.\(^9\)

Several factors determine the relative frequency of problems associated with the use of specific medications. Drugs such as the nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents, even if prescribed appropriately, are likely to be among the frequently implicated “problem” drugs simply because they are prescribed so commonly. Alternatively, medications such as the benzodiazepines are particularly difficult to monitor due to their variable rate of metabolism across patients or the fact that they are commonly prescribed along with other psychotropic agents. Moreover, manyiatrogenic symptoms are nonspecific and difficult to discern from the complex clinical picture of patients with multiple chronic diseases; consequently, drugs commonly prescribed to frail or clinically complex patients may be disproportionately implicated in prescribing problems.

An assessment of the types and rates of problem associated with various drugs could help to differentiate among these various factors. However, previous studies have provided only a gross assessment of the problem. For example, Lesar and colleagues (1990)\(^9\) reported that of the problems they identified through chart review, antimicrobial agents were the most common drug class involved in prescribing problem errors (23% of the problems), and cardiovascular drugs were the next most common (10% of all problems). However, it is unclear whether this was due to the disproportionate rate of prescriptions for these drugs, an unusually high likelihood of all problems for each prescription, or both factors. Future research efforts need to describe in greater detail the nature, prevalence, rate of prescribing, and severity of prescribing problems associated with the overuse, underuse, and misuse of medications.

Further, we lack information regarding what proportion of an outpatient population “at risk” (i.e., on targeted problematic drugs) subsequently suffers adverse outcomes such as increased severity of illness, diminished quality of life, drug-related use of medical care services, and mortality. Needed, for example, is a more precise estimate of drug-related problems related to increased medical service use and an analysis of the proportion of these that may be preventable.

Characterization of the multiple and complex factors contributing to adverse drug-related patient outcomes will help to promote safe and effective drug use by alerting physicians to drug-related problems that can be treated immediately. Further, once we identify specific physician prescribing practices and patient drug use behaviors that are related to adverse health outcomes, we can target appropriate interventions designed to reduce the incidence of these outcomes.

Finally, linkage between intervention-induced improvements in prescribing practice and changes in patient outcomes would be an enormous accomplishment in this nascent field. While regulatory-induced reductions in use of essential medications have been associated with increased institutionalization among frail elderly\(^3\) and partial hospitalizations among schizophrenic patients,\(^2\) very few analogous patient outcome studies exist in the literature on prescribing education. Because of the important effects of medications on many health outcomes that have been demonstrated in clinical trials, it is reasonable to hypothesize that more appropriate use of some medications could reduce morbidity and mortality, increase patient functioning, and improve quality of life. Whether improved prescribing is a surrogate measure, or an outcome that directly leads to improved health outcomes, it remains a critically important area for study in the next decade and beyond. Furthermore, the promise of a comprehensive electronic patient record, one that is knowledge generating and linked to prescriptions, clinical and laboratory information, and claims data, has yet to be realized.\(^9\) When it does come to
pass, the fields of health services research and pharmacoepidemiology will enter a new era when innovative measures to improve the quality of prescribing will be studied with heretofore unknown methodologic rigor.
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INTRODUCTION

Drug utilization review (DUR) is one of a growing number of approaches to improve quality and reduce costs in health care. As the term implies, DUR programs focus on medication use problems, which have been well described.\(^1\)\(^2\) DUR programs have been defined as “structured, ongoing initiatives that interpret patterns of drug use in relation to predetermined criteria, and attempt to prevent or minimize inappropriate prescribing.”\(^3\) In this chapter, we distinguish DUR programs from similar activities, describe the conceptual framework that underlies DUR, review the history of DUR, and describe the DUR process and how it is applied in different settings. We then describe the clinical and methodologic problems to be addressed by pharmacoepidemiology research in this area, critically evaluate the evidence regarding the effectiveness of DUR programs, and look to DUR’s future. While DUR programs hold promise for improving the quality of drug therapy, there is currently no credible evidence that DUR programs improve patient outcomes. Continued support of DUR programs should be conditional on credible evidence that they are effective.

DUR has many synonyms, including drug use review, drug use evaluation, and medication use evaluation. DUR programs differ from drug utilization studies (see Chapter 29), which are time limited investigations that quantify drug use, but do not assess appropriateness or attempt to change practice. Although DUR programs and DUR studies both measure and assess the appropriateness of
therapy, DUR programs are ongoing and include an intervention component, while DUR studies are time limited and do not intervene to change therapy.

DUR programs operate in many different settings, and within the context of other programs that seek to improve quality and reduce costs in health care. One such program is the formulary system, which makes use of _formularies_, or enumerated lists of drugs that may be prescribed (and, through exclusion, those that may not be prescribed). Other administrative programs that affect medication use within drug benefit programs include the imposition of limits (so called “caps”) on the monetary cost of prescription medications or on the number of prescriptions that will be paid per person in a given time period, required co-payments by consumers, mandatory generic drug substitution, and requirements for prior approval for particular drugs. DUR is also related to monthly, federally mandated drug regimen reviews performed by pharmacists in US nursing homes. Finally, DUR is intertwined with contemporary pharmacy practice, which involves reviewing patient-specific information maintained by the individual pharmacy (i.e., the patient profile) each time a prescription is filled.

As discussed later, some programs calling themselves DUR rely exclusively on such reviews.

DUR programs are often categorized by the timing of interventions within the drug use process. Unfortunately, the use of such terms has been inconsistent. In this chapter, we will classify DUR programs as _prospective_ if they intervene before the patient receives the medication and _retrospective_ if they intervene after the patient has received the medication.

**CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK UNDERLYING DUR**

Lipton and Bird have elucidated a conceptual framework underlying DUR, which is presented schematically in Figure 31.1. According to this model, prospective and retrospective DUR programs affect either current or future prescribing and dispensing practices within the context of other important factors. These factors can be categorized as patient and family influences, prescriber characteristics, and system factors (Figure 31.1). Patient and family influences include demographic characteristics, cultural beliefs, unwillingness to take needed drugs, and demands for unnecessary drugs (e.g., demands for antibiotics in the setting of viral infections, which do not respond to antibiotics). Prescriber characteristics include inadequate knowledge about pharmacology, inadequate knowledge of drug prices, and forgetfulness. System factors include drug reimbursement policies, formularies, organization of the medical care system, influence of pharmaceutical companies, abundance of drug therapy options, and lack of data on comparative safety and efficacy among therapeutic alternatives.

DUR programs are theorized to counteract many of the detrimental influences of patient, prescriber, and system factors. Also reflected in this model is the fact that both prospective and retrospective DUR might influence care for patients identified in the alerts, the care of future patients (called the “spillover effect”), or both. Finally, integration of prospective and retrospective DUR might hold greater promise for improving prescribing than would their use in an uncoordinated fashion. Naturally, this possibility deserves to be evaluated empirically.

**HISTORY OF DUR**

The literature on DUR programs, and particularly on outpatient DUR programs, has emanated predominantly from North America. Several developments are viewed as having sentinel importance in the emergence of DUR in the US. One such factor is the growth of insurance coverage for outpatient prescriptions that took place in the 1970s and 1980s, which created both the financial interest to minimize prescription drug costs and the computerized patient-level data needed to conduct large scale programs. Technical feasibility within US Medicaid (the federally sponsored health care benefit program for the poor) was enhanced in the early to mid-1960s, when the US Department of Health, Education and Welfare (DHEW, predecessor of the present US Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS)) collaborated with state Medicaid agencies to develop computerized information systems to perform administrative functions within Medicaid. The first published reference to
Figure 31.1. Relationship of DUR interventions to drug prescribing and dispensing. Reprinted with permission from Lipton HL, Bird JA. Drug utilization review in ambulatory settings: state of the science and directions for outcomes research. Med Care 1993; 31: 1069–82.

DUR was a 1969 background paper by the US DHEW’s Task Force on Prescription Drugs, which was charged with evaluating the feasibility and implications of providing prescription drug coverage to beneficiaries of the US Medicare system. As part of this evaluation, the Task Force raised the possibility of examining claims data in order to improve the quality and reduce the cost of drug therapy. Although the Task Force perceived that outpatient DUR appeared promising, it believed that evidence of effectiveness was needed before implementation, and recommended further study of DUR rather than its widespread adoption. However, this did not occur.

In 1970, PAID Prescriptions, a private sector pharmaceutical benefit management company in
the US, began a formal DUR program in California’s San Joaquin Valley Medicaid program that focused on cost issues.\textsuperscript{12,13} By the mid-1970s, other US Medicaid agencies and other third party payers had begun collaborating with private companies, known as DUR vendors, to initiate outpatient DUR programs that focused both on cost and quality of care issues. Based largely on the intuitive appeal and promise of DUR, it was enthusiastically advocated in a 1977 report that examined issues surrounding a drug benefit for a proposed US national health insurance program.\textsuperscript{14} The Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations (JCAHO), which accredits health care facilities in the US, required hospitals to conduct inpatient DUR for antibiotics beginning in 1985, and for medications in general beginning in 1987 (Rich D, personal communication, 13 October 1998). By that time, DUR had been practiced in some hospitals for over a decade.\textsuperscript{15–18} In 1988, DUR programs were required to be part of a US Medicare drug benefit,\textsuperscript{19} although this mandate was revoked when the legislation providing the benefit was repealed the following year.\textsuperscript{20} Probably the most significant event in the growth of outpatient DUR in the US was the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990,\textsuperscript{21} which mandated that all US states conduct both retrospective and prospective DUR on behalf of Medicaid enrollees.

A 1994 report by Walser\textsuperscript{9} indicated that outpatient DUR programs were being adopted more frequently outside of the US, as well. However, literature describing and evaluating such programs is lacking.

THE DUR PROCESS

Although there is some variation in how various authors specify the steps of the DUR process,\textsuperscript{6,13,22,23} one general and widely accepted model for both retrospective and prospective DUR was described by Erwin:\textsuperscript{22}

1. Design the basic structure.
2. Seek approval.
3. Construct criteria.
4. Apply criteria.
5. Evaluate and analyze yield.
7. Establish intervention strategies.
8. Re-apply criteria to databases.
9. Revise criteria as needed.

Although this basic model is applied differently in different settings, some characteristics are common across settings. In general, the DUR process involves comparing actual behavior to explicit, prospectively established standards, referred to as criteria. For example, a commonly used criterion is that patients should not receive more than one nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agent at any one time. Criteria have been developed to identify the following types of problems: drug–drug interactions, drug–disease interactions, drug–age interactions, drug–allergy interactions, use of too high or too low a dose, duplication of therapeutic class, excessive duration of therapy, obtaining prescription refills sooner or later than should be needed, failure to prescribe a known effective agent in patients with certain conditions, apparent abuse of psychoactive medications, and use of a more costly agent when a less costly agent is available. However, it has been observed that DUR programs tend to focus on errors of commission, giving less attention to problems of underuse.\textsuperscript{24}

Naturally, a criterion must be valid in order for the application of that criterion to improve clinical outcomes. In this context, we define validity as the ability of a DUR criterion to detect instances in which a change in therapy would ultimately benefit the patient. However, because no outpatient DUR program has ever been shown to reduce morbidity or mortality, the validity of the criteria used in outpatient DUR programs is unknown. Further, there is good reason to withhold judgement on the validity of any DUR criterion until it has been demonstrated empirically. Specifically, the current state of knowledge in drug therapy is such that what is considered to be “good care” is supported by levels of evidence that range from case reports, to reasoning based in pharmacologic theory, to conclusive randomized trials. Even when DUR criteria are based on the results of conclusive randomized trials (i.e., the best case scenario), it remains uncertain that the criteria will identify patients whose care will improve if therapy is
changed. For example, the use of β-blockers has been conclusively shown to improve survival in patients who have had a heart attack. Thus, a very reasonable criterion would be that patients with a history of myocardial infarction and no evidence of a clinical condition that would preclude the use of a β-blocker (e.g., chronic obstructive lung disease) should receive a β-blocker. However, it is conceivable that applying this criterion in real life would identify patients who, because of some measured or unmeasured characteristics, would fail to benefit from β-blocker therapy. This is because patients in whom criteria are violated may well be different from the population in whom β-blockers were tested. Thus, the only way to know for certain whether a given criterion is valid is to measure the clinical effectiveness of a DUR program that employs that criterion.

The next step in the DUR process is to measure adherence to criteria by examining individual-level data. Instances in which medication use does not agree with criteria are called exceptions. Next, interventions are implemented where appropriate. Although the general model for DUR does not require that practitioners be made aware of individual exceptions occurring in their patients (that is, interventions can be made based on aggregate rather than individual findings), this step usually involves alerting the physician and/or pharmacy of record as to the occurrence of the exception. Naturally, the intervention needs to be successful in achieving a beneficial change in therapy (rather than any change in therapy, or even the desired change in therapy) for a DUR program to be effective. The effectiveness of different approaches to changing prescribing is discussed in detail in Chapter 30.

General differences in how the general DUR model is applied in different settings will now be discussed.

OUTPATIENT RETROSPECTIVE DUR PROGRAMS

Although US federal law requires outpatient retrospective DUR programs only for Medicaid patients, most non-Medicaid outpatient drug benefit plans in the US also perform retrospective DUR. Because of the large number of patients, virtually all outpatient retrospective DUR programs use computerized administrative data (i.e., data maintained for billing and other administrative purposes) to identify exceptions. Some DUR programs use both pharmacy and medical claims data, while others use pharmacy claims only. Naturally, one would expect that programs that use medical claims data (which typically include diagnoses) would be in a better position to improve care than those that do not have access to diagnoses. However, this expectation deserves to be studied empirically.

Although the frequency of exceptions varies with the criteria employed, one study showed that, each year, 3–7% of persons who filled a prescription had an exception to a set of 61 DUR criteria. In most outpatient retrospective DUR programs, computer generated exceptions are reviewed by a physician or pharmacist, or by a committee of health professionals, and result in an intervention only when the exception does not meet some implicit or subjective criterion.

Most outpatient retrospective DUR programs intervene by mailing an alert letter to the physician, and sometimes to the pharmacist of record. This alert letter typically describes the DUR program and the criterion, and provides literature references supporting the criterion and a patient profile demonstrating that the criterion was violated. A few outpatient retrospective DUR programs use telephone calls or face-to-face meetings to convey alerts. An ongoing development in outpatient retrospective DUR is the use of data grouped at the level of the prescriber (an approach known as "physician profiling") to make decisions regarding interventions, rather than making intervention decisions by viewing each exception in isolation. This approach has intuitive appeal, and its potential advantages deserve to be studied.

Recent years have also seen a dramatic rise in the proportion of US Medicaid recipients who are enrolled in managed care (rather than fee-for-service) programs, with an increase from 12 to 40% of the covered population from 1992 to 1996 (source, Health Care Financing Administration world wide web site: http://www.hcfa.gov/medicaid).
Because managed care companies are often responsible for performing DUR within their enrollee population, DUR within Medicaid appears to be becoming increasingly decentralized. As discussed below, this decentralization may hamper efforts to conduct rigorous studies of the effectiveness of DUR.

OUTPATIENT PROSPECTIVE DUR PROGRAMS

Prospective DUR includes efforts that occur before or during the prescribing process, or during the dispensing process. Thus, the use of computerized decision support programs, whether by physicians or by pharmacists, is a form of prospective DUR. Computer applications have been developed for use by physicians in outpatient settings for managing particular therapies such as oral anticoagulants, and to reduce drug costs. However, in the US at least, computer entry of outpatient prescriptions by physicians remains rare.

In current US practice, most outpatient prospective DUR programs intervene by conveying computer alerts to the pharmacist filling the prescription. If the pharmacist is able to override the alert and dispense the medication, the alert is known as a “soft edit.” If the DUR program refuses payment for the medication in question, it is called a “hard edit.” The responsibility of resolving the potential problem then belongs to the pharmacist, who must contact the prescriber if the prescription is to be changed. The fact that the alert is conveyed to the pharmacist rather than the physician (who is in a better position to change therapy) would be expected to hamper prospective DUR’s effectiveness in changing drug therapy.

Manual review by the pharmacist of patient profiles is a form of prospective DUR, and has been a standard component of pharmacy practice for decades. Computer aided review of patient profiles, also a form of prospective DUR, has become increasingly common in recent years. Computer aided review may have advantages over manual review because of increased sensitivity in detecting potential problems. However, it is also possible for systems to miss important problems while providing a false sense of security to the user. As well, computer review systems that frequently produce apparently trivial alerts may foster disregard of alerts, reducing the potential effectiveness of such systems.

A distinction can be drawn between on-line prospective DUR, which uses a centralized profile containing all of a patient’s prescriptions, regardless of which pharmacies have filled them, and in-pharmacy prospective DUR, which uses data from a single pharmacy or pharmacy chain. Centralized systems would be expected to have an advantage over in-pharmacy systems because of the former’s more complete patient-specific database. This potential advantage deserves to be studied. In addition, some US states fulfill their federal mandate to perform prospective DUR for Medicaid patients by requiring pharmacists in their state to perform in-pharmacy prospective DUR, whether by manual or computer aided methods.

Currently available on-line prospective DUR programs do not use diagnosis data, which would be expected to limit the ability of prospective DUR programs to identify drug–disease interactions and omitted-but-necessary therapies. Finally, unlike retrospective DUR, prospective DUR incorporates no human reviewer to serve as a filter between raw computer output and the person receiving the alert. If a large proportion of such alerts is perceived to be falsely positive, the alerts may become increasingly ignored, thus limiting the effectiveness of prospective DUR programs.

HOSPITAL DUR PROGRAMS

Hospitalized patients are sicker, and take more numerous and toxic medications than community dwelling individuals. Hospitals are also characterized by more centralized decision making and better availability of clinical data than is present in most outpatient environments. Therefore, it is not surprising that DUR originated in hospitals, where it is both more acutely needed and more politically and logistically feasible.

Hospital DUR programs are usually conducted by the pharmacy department acting in conjunction
with and by the authority of a medical staff committee, such as the pharmacy and therapeutics ("P&T") committee. They use the same overall process that is described above, although they generally do so on a more limited number of patients than do most outpatient programs. As a result, many hospital DUR programs obtain data through manual techniques such as chart review in addition to using computerized data. Hospital DUR programs tend to perform series of discrete evaluations rather than ongoing evaluations, and often include elements of both prospective and retrospective review.

A growing number of hospitals use computer tools to evaluate therapy as physicians enter drug orders (as prescriptions are called in hospitals) into a computer. However, even the direct physician order entry system described by Bates et al., 43 which is advanced by today's standards, was designed to reduce dosing and transcription errors, rather than to improve drug therapy by identifying drug–drug interactions, drug–disease interactions, and the other types of medication problem usually targeted by DUR programs.

Because of more centralization in decision making authority, hospital DUR programs are often able to use regulatory interventions that are unavailable to many outpatient DUR programs. These interventions can include formulary deletions, restriction of a medication for use in particular circumstances, restriction of a medication for use by certain specialists, and mandatory drug order forms, which tend to be more effective than nonregulatory interventions in affecting prescribing. 44

Therapeutic areas that have received recent attention by DUR programs include antimicrobials, 45-73 analgesics, 74-80 sedative–hypnotics, 74, 75, 79-83 and anti-ulcer drugs. 84-87 Some hospitals have implemented ongoing antibiotic management programs in which patients receiving certain antibiotics have their therapy reviewed by an infectious disease physician, who makes treatment recommendations to the prescribing physician when therapy is deemed to be suboptimal. 88

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

While the entire process of DUR can be seen as an application of pharmacoepidemiology, the primary role for pharmacoepidemiology research in the area of DUR is to evaluate the effectiveness of these programs in meeting their stated goals. Namely, to what degree do they change prescribing, improve clinical outcomes, and reduce costs?

Clarifying the mechanisms by which DUR acts is also of substantial interest. For example, if DUR is effective in altering prescribing, does it do so by changing prescribing for patients identified in alerts, or by changing prescribing in future patients (“spillover” effects)? What features of DUR programs influence their effectiveness, and how might programs be made more effective?

A number of papers 12, 89-97 have described comprehensive DUR programs or individual drug use audits without evaluating their effects. Several papers 98-105 have examined physician and pharmacist responses to DUR alerts and attitudes regarding DUR programs, but provide no evidence regarding the effectiveness of the programs. Three uncontrolled studies, 106-108 one study with an inappropriate control group, 109 and one study that failed to use the intention-to-treat principle 110 have examined the effects of DUR programs, but are all uninterpretable because of methodologic flaws.

METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

BARRIERS TO RANDOMIZED TRIALS

There are a number of challenges to studying the effectiveness of DUR programs. Although it is well recognized that randomized experiments provide the most convincing evidence for the effectiveness of an intervention, significant barriers exist to the
conduct of randomized trials to evaluate DUR programs. One important barrier is that in the US, Medicaid programs are required by federal law to perform DUR, making randomized trials of DUR programs impossible within Medicaid.

A barrier to randomized trials outside of Medicaid is the fact that some agencies appear interested in DUR primarily as a means to reduce medication costs, and thus have little or no incentive to study the health effects of DUR. Another major barrier is that some private sector programs consider both DUR criteria and the data needed to measure effectiveness to be proprietary information, and thus secret.111 Despite these barriers, one experimental trial of an overall DUR program, and a number of experimental trials of individual drug use audits, have been conducted, although most have looked at drug utilization rather than health end points.

CLUSTERED OBSERVATIONS

When randomized experiments have been performed, the need to keep the intervention and control groups free from cross-contamination has necessitated the randomization of clusters, or units such as physicians, pharmacies, or geographic regions, rather than the randomization of individual patients. Randomization by cluster results in fewer randomized units, and thus reduced statistical power.112–121 However, unless clustering is correctly accounted for in the analysis, the results will tend to overstate the true precision of the data. This means that ignored clustering can artificially reduce p-values and the width of confidence intervals. Although statistical methods to account for clustering have been developed,115,116 they have not been used widely in studies of DUR. An additional disadvantage of randomization by cluster is that clustered data techniques currently exist for relative effect measures (such as the odds ratio and the risk ratio), but not for absolute measures (such as the risk difference).

RARE OUTCOMES

An additional challenge to research in this area is that the serious health outcomes that DUR programs are intended to prevent (for example, serious gastrointestinal bleeding caused by non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs) are relatively infrequent on a population basis. Thus, in most settings, the relatively small effect that DUR programs are likely to have on clinical outcome measures such as all-cause and even cause-specific hospitalizations is likely to be overwhelmed by underlying variability in the rates of these events. Therefore, studies attempting to show clinical effects of DUR programs need to be enormous in size.

POTENTIALLY NONCOMPARABLE STUDY GROUPS

Challenges associated with the use of nonrandomized study designs to make causal inferences are a central theme throughout pharmacoepidemiology (see Chapters 2, 34, 43 and 44). Not surprisingly, they are central to the interpretation of nonrandomized studies of DUR programs, as well. That is, the validity of any nonrandomized study is subject to threat by many factors, the most prominent of which is unmeasured differences between treated and untreated subjects.

Nonrandomized studies of programmatic interventions like DUR can be described using epidemiologic vocabulary (e.g., ecologic study, cohort study) as described in Chapter 2, or that of the program evaluation (“quasi-experimentation”) literature (e.g., interrupted time series, pre–post with comparison group) as developed by Campbell and Stanley122 and Cook and Campbell,123 and summarized in Chapter 30. Because program evaluation terminology is more descriptive in the current context, it will be used here to describe nonexperimental studies of DUR programs. As described elsewhere122,123 and in Chapter 30, there is a general hierarchy that ranks quasi-experimental designs with respect to scientific rigor and the strength of the causal inferences that can be drawn from them.

AVAILABILITY OF DATA

An additional methodologic challenge has arisen from the growth in managed care within US
Medicaid programs. Because US Medicaid managed care programs frequently do not report individual-level claims data back to the state Medicaid agency, these data become unavailable to investigators conducting research using data obtained from the state agency. A related challenge is the administrative and logistic barriers faced by independent researchers in gaining access to data held by private and government agencies. Decisions regarding data access need to be made with proper consideration to issues of public health, patient confidentiality, proprietary concerns, and costs of transferring data (also see Chapter 26).

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

**FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATING THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DUR**

As noted above, the true effectiveness of the DUR model can be evaluated only by examining the effects of real-life DUR programs. Thus, it is possible that DUR is ineffective as currently implemented, yet that it might be effective if it were implemented differently, or under different circumstances.

Real-world DUR programs operate by performing individual drug use audits, which are either discrete or ongoing. In this context, each criterion or small group of related criteria used by a DUR program is considered to be a distinct drug use audit. Studies focusing on the effects of specific drug use audits (i.e., the application of an individual criterion or small group of related criteria) will be more specific, and thus more credible than evaluations of overall DUR programs.

Similarly, evidence for more specific, proximal effects of a DUR interventions, such as changes in prescribing, tends to be more credible than evidence for more distal effects such as reductions in the rate of all-cause hospital admission. This is because more distal outcomes have greater potential to be affected by external factors.

In addition to being more credible, demonstrating an effect of DUR on prescribing is also easier than showing an effect on clinical outcome measures. This is because prescribing outcomes occur much more frequently than the clinical outcomes that DUR programs are intended to prevent.

However, this increased credibility and relative ease in showing an effect comes at the price of reduced importance. That is, an effect on prescribing, even if it is the desired effect, may not result in an improvement in clinical outcomes. Further, many DUR interventions are intended not to improve clinical outcomes, but to reduce drug expenditures. Given these considerations, decision makers evaluating a given DUR program would probably be best served by research that evaluates a balance of important, albeit difficult to demonstrate clinical effects, and mechanistic evidence in the form of effects on prescribing.

Because one of the goals of DUR programs is to reduce health care costs, their ability to do so is frequently evaluated.124 In fact, every US Medicaid program is required to estimate the cost savings of their retrospective and prospective DUR programs each year.21 Naturally, however, if DUR programs are ineffective in changing prescribing, they could not possibly be cost saving. If they are effective in changing prescribing, then they might result in lower drug costs. Of course, any drug cost savings could easily be overwhelmed by even small beneficial or deleterious effects on health outcomes. Thus, until the health effects of DUR programs are known, their true economic effects cannot be known.

Inpatient DUR programs often use approaches to change prescribing that are not typically used by outpatient programs, including special order forms, formulary restrictions, restriction of drugs to particular clinical specialties, and influence by local opinion leaders.23 The effectiveness of these interventions in changing prescribing is reviewed in detail in Chapter 30. In general, these approaches can be successful in changing prescribing, although studies evaluating their clinical effects are lacking.

Nearly all outpatient DUR programs attempt to change medication use by alerting the physician of record (either directly or by alerting the dispensing pharmacist) to the existence of patient-specific exceptions to pre-established criteria. Because this
strategy is so overwhelmingly used by outpatient DUR programs, studies evaluating the effectiveness of this approach are reviewed here in detail. In particular, we will review the evidence evaluating the effect of such interventions in changing prescribing and in improving clinical outcomes.

EVIDENCE FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUTPATIENT RETROSPECTIVE DUR PROGRAMS IN CHANGING PRESCRIBING FOR THE PATIENT IDENTIFIED IN THE ALERT

Zimmerman et al.\textsuperscript{125} used a nonrandomized, pre-post design with control group to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention to reduce overuse of histamine-2 receptor antagonists (H\textsubscript{2}RAs) within the Wisconsin Medicaid DUR program. Patients who received acute dose therapy for more than 90 days were assigned to intervention or control status based on whether their prescribing physician cared for three or more such patients (intervention group) or two or fewer such patients (control group). The intervention consisted of a packet mailed to the prescriber that included a letter explaining the concerns of chronic full-dose H\textsubscript{2}RA therapy, profiles of patients with an exception, and literature references. H\textsubscript{2}RA use was measured six months pre- and 12 months postintervention. Although treatment assignment was based on physician (i.e., cluster of patients), clustering was ignored in the analysis. Therefore, the precision of the effect measures presented by the authors may overestimate the true precision.

Both study groups reduced their use of H\textsubscript{2}RAs during the 12 month postintervention period. Among patients in long term care facilities, the pre-post reduction was 16\% greater in the intervention group than in the control group, although this difference was not statistically significant. Among ambulatory patients, the pre-post reduction was 30\% greater in the intervention group than in the control group, a difference that was statistically significant. Thus, despite possibly incomparable treatment and control groups, and potential overstatement of the degree of precision, this study provides some evidence that a retrospective drug use audit aimed at reducing chronic use of acute-dose H\textsubscript{2}RA therapy can have a small to moderate-sized effect on prescribing for identified patients.

Okano and Rascati\textsuperscript{126} performed a randomized trial to examine the effectiveness of an intervention aimed at reducing duplicative peptic ulcer therapy within the Texas Medicaid population. The intervention consisted of a mailed alert letter that included a patient profile. Physicians practicing within a given small town were randomized as a single unit. Thus, randomization was by cluster, although the analysis ignored clustering, which may have resulted in overstatement of the precision of the results. The outcome measure was the continued presence of duplicative therapy six months after the intervention.

The desired outcome (discontinuation of at least one component of the duplicative therapy) was seen in 42\% of patients in the intervention group and 33\% of patients in the control group, for a risk ratio of the desired outcome of 1.70 (95\% confidence interval, 1.12 to 2.59). Thus, these data appear to support the conclusion that a drug use audit that uses a mailed alert letter can have a modest effect on duplicative therapy. However, the true precision of the effect estimate may be less than that reported by the investigators.

Farris et al.\textsuperscript{127} studied the effectiveness of a DUR intervention designed to reduce the use of broad spectrum antibiotics and first-line use of nonsedating antihistamines in a Health Maintenance Organization (HMO). The intervention group consisted of physicians at two family practice clinics, and two control groups were assembled from the remaining pool of physicians within the HMO. Thus, there were only three experimental units, and there appeared to be substantial differences in baseline characteristics among the three. Because of these limitations, the study results are difficult to interpret.

Collins et al.\textsuperscript{128} performed an experimental study to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention designed to reduce dipyridamole use among patients not receiving concomitant warfarin. The rationale was that the only FDA approved indication for oral dipyridamole was adjunctive use with warfarin in prophylaxis of thromboembolism after cardiac valve replacement. The intervention
consisted of a mailed alert letter containing patient profiles, and was performed within the Wisconsin Medicaid DUR program. For purposes of the study, the state was divided into four geographic regions, with each region assigned to one of the following study groups: no intervention, alert letters mailed to pharmacies, alert letters mailed to physicians, and alert letters mailed to both physicians and pharmacies. For practical reasons, one region was assigned to the control group, while the remaining three regions were assigned using random allocation. Subjects were followed for six months following the intervention. The proportion of patients in whom dipyridamole was discontinued was compared among study groups. Clustering by region was ignored in the analysis.

In patients residing in long term care facilities, the adjusted odds ratios for discontinuation of therapy (with 95% confidence intervals) compared with the control group were: pharmacy only, 0.92 (0.55–1.55); physician only, 1.31 (0.83–2.08); pharmacy + physician, 2.10 (1.63–3.68). In ambulatory care patients, the corresponding odds ratios were: pharmacy only, 1.67 (0.89–3.14); physician only, 2.22 (1.16–4.24); pharmacy + physician, 3.81 (2.10–6.93). Predictably, the magnitude of effect appears highest in the group in which both the physician and pharmacist received the intervention, followed by the physician only and pharmacist only groups, in that order.

The difference between the physician + pharmacist group and the physician only group was not statistically significant. In contrast, the difference between the physician + pharmacist group and the pharmacist only group was statistically significant. Together, these data support the hypothesis that letters sent to physicians had a greater effect than those sent to pharmacists.

In summary, these data provide some support for the hypothesis that alert letters to physicians were effective in reducing the chronic use of a possibly ineffective medication. However, the true precision of the effect measures (as measured by the width of the 95% confidence intervals) may be less than that reported in the paper.

Sleath et al. conducted a randomized trial to determine whether sending intervention materials to both pharmacies and physicians was more effective than sending them only to physicians. However, because the authors reported only pre–post comparisons within each group, and did not include any between-group comparisons of pre–post differences, the study is essentially uninterpretable.

Smith et al. conducted a randomized trial to measure the effect of an intervention aimed at reducing the use of five benzodiazepines for which the only US Food and Drug Administration approved indication was insomnia. This drug use audit was conducted as part of the Washington State Medicaid DUR program, and targeted patients who had received one of the target medications at a dose of at least one tablet per day for at least one year. Thus, the DUR program targeted patients whose treatment was well outside of published guidelines. The intervention consisted of a mailed alert letter to the prescriber that contained guidelines on sedative–hypnotic use, the patient profile or profiles treated by that prescriber, and physician-specific measures of sedative–hypnotic prescribing. Contamination of the control group by exposure to the intervention was avoided by randomizing physicians rather than individual patients. The effect of clustering on inferential statistics was eliminated by including in the analysis only one randomly selected patient per physician. The amount of sedative–hypnotic drug dispensed in the three-month postintervention period was the outcome measure of interest.

Patients in the intervention group reduced their use of target drugs by 28%, while those in the control group reduced their use by 8%, a difference that was statistically significant. The study results also suggested that some undesirable use of nontargeted sleep agents may have resulted. In addition, despite advice to the contrary, some prescribers appeared to have immediately discontinued sedative–hypnotic medications, potentially placing patients at risk of withdrawal. As well, anecdotal responses from physicians in the intervention group suggested that, despite the investigators’ attempt to use well accepted criteria to identify a group of patients for whom therapy was clearly inappropriate, even careful discontinuation of sedative–hypnotic therapy may not have been in the best interest of some medically complicated
patients. That is, despite great care in developing apparently clearcut criteria, they may not have been valid, as defined above. Thus, this study provides strong evidence that a DUR program that identifies patients on long term therapy can have a moderate effect on prescribing and dispensing for the identified patient. It also points to the possibility that even carefully chosen criteria can have appropriate exceptions, and that unintended responses to alerts are possible.

Raisch and Sleath performed an experimental trial to measure the effectiveness of an intervention designed to reduce inappropriate prescription of anti-ulcer drugs, including histamine-2 receptor antagonists, in the New Mexico Medicaid DUR program. The intervention consisted of a mailed alert letter containing a fact sheet on prescription of anti-ulcer agents, and patient profiles. Contamination was avoided by excluding patients who were seen by physicians in both study groups. Dispensing of anti-ulcer agents in the three-month postintervention period was measured.

Forty-three percent of patients in the intervention group had no exceptions to anti-ulcer criteria in the followup period, compared to 28% in the control group (unadjusted odds ratio for the desired outcome = 1.98; 95% confidence interval, 1.23–3.18). Anti-ulcer agents were not dispensed during the followup period for 33% of intervention patients and 18% of control patients (odds ratio = 2.29; 95% confidence interval, 1.35–3.87). Clustering of patients within physician practice was ignored in the analysis, which may have artificially increased apparent precision. Regardless, this study provides relatively strong evidence that a DUR program using mailed alert letters can have a moderate effect on prescribing of chronically administered medications for patients identified in the alert letters.

A report by Abt Associates Inc. presented results from four studies that evaluated the hypothesis that alert letters sent to prescribers can affect the drug therapy of patients identified in alert letters. None of these studies has appeared in the peer-reviewed literature as of the date of this writing. According to the report, the results suggested that patient-specific DUR intervention letters sent to prescribers were effective in (i) increasing the prescription of misoprostol to patients receiving nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents, (ii) increasing the use of short acting bronchodilators in patients receiving salmeterol (a long acting β-agonist bronchodilator), and (iii) reducing long term therapy with acute-dose ranitidine. However, the level of clarity of the Abt report is not as high as the standard set by high quality peer reviewed journals. Therefore, critical evaluation of these studies is difficult.

In summary, the available evidence indicates that alert letters containing patient-specific profiles mailed to physicians can have a small but measurable effect on prescribing practices for the patient identified in the alert. There is some evidence suggesting that sending a similar letter to the pharmacy of record augments the effect of the letter to the prescriber, but this evidence is equivocal. Many published outpatient DUR efforts have focused on cost rather than quality issues. Failure to account for clustering in the analysis of studies with clustered treatment assignment is common. Publication of original research findings in peer reviewed journals should be encouraged by those who fund research.

EVIDENCE FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUTPATIENT RETROSPECTIVE DUR PROGRAMS TO CHANGE DRUG THERAPY IN PATIENTS NOT IDENTIFIED IN ALERTS (“SPILOVER” EFFECTS)

No studies yet published in the peer reviewed literature have evaluated the impact of DUR intervention letters on prescribing for patients who are not specifically identified in the alert letters, or “spillover” effects. Three studies described in the report by Abt Associates evaluated the hypothesis that DUR intervention letters can affect prescribing for patients other than those who were identified in alert letters. The report concluded that there was no evidence of spillover effects of an intervention designed to increase the prescription of misoprostol in patients receiving nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory agents, and in an intervention designed to increase prescription of short acting bronchodilators in patients receiving salmeterol. In contrast, the report concluded that
there was evidence of a spillover effect of an intervention designed to reduce long term therapy with acute-dose ranitidine. However, given the absence of studies appearing in the peer reviewed literature, the difficulty in evaluating the studies presented in the Abt report, and the conflicting findings within that report, it is difficult to draw any conclusions regarding the potential spillover effects of DUR programs. This remains an important, albeit challenging area for research.

EVIDENCE FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUTPATIENT RETROSPECTIVE DUR PROGRAMS IN IMPROVING CLINICAL OUTCOMES

Jay et al.\textsuperscript{132} conducted a controlled trial of the effectiveness of the California Medicaid DUR program. The study compared two counties that implemented retrospective DUR to two counties that did not, over a 24 month pre-intervention period and a 12 month post-intervention period. It examined trends in indices of health service utilization such as hospital admissions, physician visits, and drug expenditures in the Medicaid population. The study did not assess the program’s effectiveness in altering prescribing. The investigators observed no materially important or statistically significant changes in health services utilization attributable to the program. Although these results suggest that the California program may have been ineffective, the magnitude of effect that can be statistically excluded is not provided, nor is it readily calculable from the data presented. The results of this study have also not been reported in the peer reviewed literature. Given that the study was performed within a single state, and examined the program’s effect in the overall population rather than in any of the specific subgroups of the population that were most likely to benefit (such as those identified in an exception or those at highest risk of hospitalization), it is likely that the results can exclude the existence of only large effects. In addition, the investigators cite a number of weaknesses of the DUR program (such as the unavailability of diagnosis data, the small proportion of exceptions that resulted in alerts, and the inability to identify prescribers in about one-fourth of exceptions) that may also have contributed to the absence of demonstrable effect.

The previously described study by Zimmerman et al.\textsuperscript{125} of a DUR intervention designed to reduce overuse of histamine-2 receptor antagonists (H2RAs) also looked for an increase in the occurrence of hospitalization for gastrointestinal ulcer or bleeding, which might occur if the intervention resulted in the discontinuation of H2RAs in patients who actually needed them. The investigators did not detect an effect of the DUR intervention on this outcome, although the study was large enough only to detect a dramatically large effect. Thus, this study provides some evidence that a DUR intervention that aimed to reduce H2RA use did not enormously increase the occurrence of serious gastrointestinal ulcer and bleeding.

Thus, three decades after outpatient DUR was first proposed, and despite the existence of a cadre of thoughtful and well intentioned professionals conducting DUR programs, there is no empiric evidence supporting the effectiveness of outpatient retrospective DUR in achieving its primary objective of improving clinical outcomes. This deficiency has received substantial attention in the literature,\textsuperscript{3,5} and is currently being addressed by a controlled nonexperimental study funded by the National Institute on Aging (R01-AG14601), the Agency for Health Policy and Research (F32 HS00105), and the Pharmark Corporation.

EVIDENCE FOR THE EFFECTIVENESS OF OUTPATIENT PROSPECTIVE DUR PROGRAMS IN CHANGING DRUG THERAPY AND IMPROVING CLINICAL OUTCOMES

Chrischilles et al.\textsuperscript{28,133} performed a randomized trial to evaluate the effectiveness of an on-line prospective drug utilization review program. The results of this trial have not yet appeared in the peer reviewed literature. The study was conducted within the Iowa Medicaid program, and recruited pharmacies through newsletters, recruitment letters, and articles in the state pharmacy association journal. Eligible pharmacies were grouped into clusters based on shared prescribers in order to
reduce contamination of study groups. Clusters were randomized to intervention or control status. Pharmacies in the intervention group received online, point-of-service DUR messages that resulted from computerized reviews of prescription medication (but not diagnosis) data. Pharmacies in the control group received no on-line messages, but still could have received alerts from in-pharmacy computer systems. Pharmacies in both groups documented nondispensable activities (“cognitive services”) performed for Medicaid beneficiaries.

The rate of cognitive services was not statistically different between groups (Chrischilles E, personal communication, 2 April 1999). The investigators also evaluated the effect of the intervention on (i) use of health care services, (ii) use and cost of prescription drugs, (iii) occurrence of subsequent exceptions, and (iv) occurrence of adverse events related to use of a particular set of prescription drugs, but found no consistent evidence that the intervention had an effect on any of these measures.

Thus, the conclusions do not appear to support the hypothesis that providing pharmacists with computerized DUR messages based on patients’ overall prescription profile impacts drug therapy or clinical outcomes. Importantly, this study did not compare prospective DUR with no prospective DUR, but rather compared centralized prospective DUR with in-pharmacy prospective DUR (which is the current standard of care in pharmacy practice).\(^4\) Thus, the incremental benefit of incorporating data from other pharmacies was evaluated. Finally, it remains possible that a system that uses diagnosis data derived from medical claims to identify drug–disease interactions and omitted-but-necessary therapy might have a demonstrable effect. This hypothesis deserves to be evaluated empirically.

Monane et al.\(^{134}\) evaluated a prospective DUR program performed by 13 mail order pharmacies owned by a pharmaceutical benefit management company. The DUR program identified prescriptions that were presented for elderly patients that violated one of 11 prespecified clinical criteria. The intervention consisted of attempted telephone contact of the prescriber, with a pharmacist initiated discussion of therapeutic alternatives. Pharmacists performing the telephone intervention successfully contacted the prescriber in 56% of cases (95% confidence interval, 56–57%), and were successful in persuading the prescriber to change the target prescription in 8% of all cases (95% confidence interval, 8–9%). However, the “DUR change rate” of 24% presented in the paper is overly optimistic, since it (i) includes as successes cases in which the prescriber did not change the prescription, but rather stated an intention to review the patient’s therapy at the next visit, and (ii) included in the denominator only cases in which the physician was successfully contacted, rather than all attempted contacts. Because no concurrent control group was included, it is not known how many prescriptions would have been intervened upon by pharmacists in the normal course of pharmacy practice, and how many of the physicians would have stopped the therapy on their own.\(^{135}\) Therefore, the degree to which this program represents an incremental benefit over standard pharmacy practice is unknown.

**SUMMARIZING THE EVIDENCE**

Retrospective and prospective DUR are both mandated in the US for Medicaid programs, and are widely employed outside of Medicaid. Although there is evidence that some forms of retrospective DUR can have a measurable but modest impact on prescribing, there is no evidence that it achieves its primary objective of improving clinical outcomes. Further, some evidence suggests that even thoughtfully considered and well intentioned interventions aimed at improving care might have unintended consequences. For example, some physicians in a study by Smith et al. appeared to have abruptly discontinued sedative–hypnotic medications, which can precipitate withdrawal reactions.\(^{130}\) Similarly, if there are patients who benefit from long term therapy with histamine H2 receptor antagonists, then interventions to reduce this treatment may cause instances of gastrointestinal ulcer or bleeding. Despite the intuitive appeal of prospective DUR, there is currently no empiric evidence that it provides an incremental benefit over standard pharmacy practice. Although the conduct of rigorous re-
search in this area is challenging, continued support for these programs as a means to improve clinical care should be based on empiric evidence. Three decades after outpatient DUR programs were first proposed, such evidence is still lacking.

THE FUTURE

The 1969 US DHEW Task Force on Prescription Drugs believed that DUR held great promise for improving patient care, but that evidence concerning its effectiveness was needed. Because DUR was adopted widely in the absence of empiric evidence, there is still little known about the effectiveness of DUR programs in improving health outcomes. Decisions to continue DUR programs should be conditional on evidence regarding its effectiveness, some of which is now being produced.

The development that is likely to have the most substantial and permanent impact on DUR in the immediate future is direct computer entry of prescriptions by the prescriber (also see Chapter 30). DUR systems applied in this setting will provide direct, immediate feedback to the person who is in the best position to alter therapy. Such systems would optimally incorporate drug, medical, laboratory, and formulary information in generating real-time alerts. Based on current experience, such a system would need to have a sufficiently low false positive rate so as not to foster disregard of alerts. Development of such systems is a formidable challenge, and will require ongoing, perhaps perpetual development.

Future developments will undoubtedly show even greater promise than anticipated approaches. However, like our drugs, these programs should be held to high standards of evidence for demonstrating that they achieve their intended goal (i.e., they are effective) and that they are free of important and predictable unintended effects (i.e., they are safe) before undergoing widespread adoption.
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Determining Causation from Case Reports
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INTRODUCTION

A major component of the evaluation of reports of suspected adverse drug reactions, or events in a clinical trial, is a judgment about the degree to which any reported event is, in fact, causally associated with the suspected drug. In reality, a particular event either is associated or is not associated with a particular drug, but the current state of information almost never allows a definitive determination of this dichotomy. Accordingly, a number of approaches to the determination of the probability of a causal drug–event association have evolved over the past several years. This chapter will first discuss the historical development of these efforts, and several of the current approaches, uses, and evolving efforts will then be reviewed, including a brief consideration of the evaluation of single events in the clinical trial setting.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

The basic clinical problem to be addressed is illustrated in Figure 32.1. A clinical event occurs within the milieu of a number of possible causal factors. That event either occurred independently or in some way its occurrence was partially or totally linked to one or more of the potential causative agents. The primary task is to determine the degree to which the occurrence of the event is linked to one particular suspected causal agent, in this case a drug.

This task of evaluating causality in case reports shares some similarities with the problem of evaluating causality in chronic disease epidemiology, as discussed below and in more detail in Chapter 2. However, both the nature of the exposure and sometimes the nature of the event make the determination of causality in case reports a major challenge. This set of circumstances presents a special challenge to anyone who evaluates cases of suspected adverse drug reactions, as the evaluator must make, at the very least, an implicit judgment of causality. It also presents a special challenge to those who desire a coherent, consistent, and reliable method of determining whether there is a causal relationship between these events. Specifically:

1. The usual focus of adverse reaction assessment is an individual clinical event suspected of being
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Figure 32.1. Diagram depicting the dilemma for determining causation of an event in a clinical setting. In reality a drug either did or did not cause or contribute to an event. However, given the multiple factors associated with the event, the actual truth can seldom be ascertained. Instead, some expression of probability that the drug was associated with the event is made. The method by which this expression is determined is the primary concern of those in adverse reaction causality research.

associated with a drug. The reporting of this event will, therefore, typically be in the context of a suspicion that the event is drug induced, which will often bias the collection of data required to evaluate other possible causes.

2. The data available about a patient’s drug exposure in the typical case report are incomplete, usually missing precise information on duration, actual dose ingested, and/or concomitant drugs administered. The one exception is the report that comes from a hospital, but this is less often a source of reports because of the excess of events and exposures that occur during a hospitalization, confounding most suspicions.

3. The data available on the event, including its onset, characteristics, and time course, are also typically incomplete, because the suspicion is usually retrospective and the desired data (e.g., baseline laboratory data) are often not available.

4. As a corollary to 3 above, since adverse reactions can be acute, subacute, or chronic, can be reversible or not (e.g., death and birth defects), can be rare or common, and can be unique pathologically or identical to known common diseases, it has been difficult to define general data elements and criteria which will apply to most types of adverse reaction. For example, for irreversible events, criteria that require dechallenge and rechallenge are irrelevant. More recently, as described below, this is changing.

5. Data on concomitant diseases and other confounding conditions, such as diet and habits, are typically not available, often because of factors discussed in 1 and 3 above.

Closely linked to the task of determining whether there is a causal relationship between a drug exposure and an event is the reason for that particular determination and the impact of that inference on any actions taken. If the determination is perceived to have little impact, it might logically be less rigorous. However, the evolution of recent interest in the entire subject of adverse drug reactions and the recognition of the broad use of alleged drug–event associations has supported a need for consistent and reliable methods of causality determination.

Additionally, with the appearance of regulations for reporting in clinical trials of adverse events that are “reasonably” associated with a drug,2 there is a growing need to describe the basis for defining an association within this setting. Although some of the above-listed uncertainties are less likely to exist, there are similar difficulties with rare events, which will be considered below.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVES

Development of Concepts of Causality for Adverse Reactions

The development of thinking about the causality of adverse reactions has evolved in two disciplines: (i) in epidemiology, and (ii) in the study of individual case reports of adverse reactions. Consideration of both is important.
In the 1950s, epidemiologists grappled with the issue of causality, and Yerushalmi and Palmer, drawing upon the Bradford Hill epidemiology criteria as well as the Koch–Henle postulates for establishing causation for infectious diseases, developed a set of proposed criteria for causality. These evolved, after considerable deliberation with other epidemiologists, into five criteria for the causal nature of an association. They included determinations of:

1. the consistency of the association;
2. the strength of the association;
3. the specificity of the association;
4. the temporal relationship of the association; and
5. the coherence, or biological plausibility, of the association.

These criteria continue to be generally used in chronic disease epidemiology, although they have also been actively discussed and criticized. They are discussed in more detail in Chapter 2. Although seldom explicitly noted, the reasoning behind these criteria appeared at about the same time as did thinking about the causal assessment of individual reports of adverse reactions.

Prior to the last two decades in the adverse reactions field, the typical approach to case reports of suspected drug associated clinical events was to consider the events as possibly associated with the drug if there were a number of similar reports. Considerations of pharmacologic plausibility, dose–response, and timing factors were sometimes implicit, but seldom explicit. This approach continued until relatively recently, and in some cases is still used.

The more perplexing proposed drug–event associations were then typically referred to one or more experts, who generally approached the evaluation by what has been termed “global introspection.” In this approach, the experts collect all the facts relevant to the problem at hand, compile them, and make unstructured judgements to decide the answer. In the causality assessment context, this answer has usually been expressed in terms of a qualitative probability scale, for example “definite” versus “probable” versus “possible” versus “doubtful” versus “unrelated.”

The subjective nature of global reasoning as an approach led a number of investigators to develop more structured methods of causality assessment. Irey, in examining the details of cases of suspected reactions at the US Armed Forces Institute of Pathology, clearly demonstrated the discrepancy between cases initially reported as drug associated and those found by careful detailed examination to be actually likely to be drug associated. Shortly thereafter, the clinical pharmacologists Karch and Lasagna also recognized the inadequacy of expert “global” evaluations of adverse reactions and developed a decision table, or algorithm, to segment the evaluation of a case into several components. These two groups of investigators identified very similar basic data elements that they felt were necessary for a more standardized assessment:

1. the timing of the event, relative to the drug exposure;
2. the presence or absence of other factors which might also cause the event;
3. the result of withdrawing the drug (“dechallenge”);
4. the result of reintroducing the drug (“rechallenge”); and
5. other data supporting an association, e.g., previous cases.

Although the criteria shared some similarities with those in chronic disease epidemiology, the special characteristics of adverse drug reactions required considerations that differed somewhat. The usual setting for this latter causality assessment was a single case or group of cases from an ill defined exposed population. The criteria derived for chronic disease epidemiology were therefore inapplicable.

Following the introduction of these new methods for the assessment of suspected adverse drug reactions, a large number of other approaches were developed, either as algorithms, decision tables, or, in at least one case, as a diagrammatic method. These were reviewed and summarized in monographs from two con-
ferences held in the early 1980s on the causality of adverse reactions—one in Morges, Switzerland,\(^\text{16}\) and another in Crystal City, VA.\(^\text{17}\) The vast majority of these methods shared the basic elements originally suggested by Irey and by Karch and Lasagna, but many added many other details useful for the evaluation of special cases, such as injection site reactions or in vitro verification (e.g., 14). Some included extensive scoring systems linked to relatively extensive algorithms, such as the approach published by Kramer et al.\(^\text{8}\) A summary of some of the major methods is presented in Table 32.1, and selected methods are discussed in detail in the next section of this chapter.

The 1981 Morges conference,\(^\text{16}\) the 1983 Crystal City conference,\(^\text{17}\) and a 1983 Paris meeting\(^\text{18}\) were all intended to compare a number of these approaches and to consider whether a single method might be developed that could represent a consensus. An international study group, the Associated Permanent Workshop of Imputologists (APWI) (“imputology” being the French term for causality), was initiated at the Morges meeting and continued into the 1990s.\(^\text{19,20}\) Although a consensus method was not established, the Crystal City conference had requested an outside observer (Dr. David Lane, a theoretical statistician) to provide a critique of the deliberations.\(^\text{21}\) His critique and subsequent participation in the Paris conference and APWI resulted in the development of a new approach for assessing the causality of adverse reactions based on Bayes probability theorem.\(^\text{22}\) This approach considered the probability of an event occurring in the presence of a drug relative to its probability of occurring in the absence of the drug, considering all details of the case.\(^\text{23–26}\) Although in use elsewhere in medicine, this approach had not been applied to analyses of suspected adverse effects. This method will be discussed in more detail in the next section of this chapter.

### Potential Uses of Causality Assessment

Despite the proliferation of methods and the great interest in adverse effects of drugs, the actual use of these methods for decision making has been infrequent. However, causality assessment has been required in France for many years and has been formally considered in a European Community Directive\(^\text{27,28}\) (see also Chapter 11). This has resulted in a general consensus on the causality terms used by the European Union member states.\(^\text{29}\) In fact, there are a variety of settings where these approaches could be useful, from drug development and monitoring by the pharmaceutical manufacturer, to evaluation and monitoring by regulators, to the clinical setting, the courtroom, and even the newsroom.\(^\text{3}\)

### Pharmaceutical Manufacturers

Manufacturers of pharmaceuticals must view causality assessment for events associated with their drugs from the standpoints of both regula-

---

Table 32.1. A summary of the information categories in the method of Kramer et al. (8) for determining the causality of adverse reactions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Axis(^a)</th>
<th>Information category</th>
<th>Number of questions(^b)</th>
<th>General content</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>Previous experience with drug</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Literature or labeling information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Alternative etiologies</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Character, frequency of event with disease versus drug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>Timing of events</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Timing consistent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>Drug levels, evidence of overdose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Blood levels, other dose related issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Dechallenge</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>All aspects of timing, results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VI</td>
<td>Rechallenge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>All aspects of response</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\)Axis in the published algorithm. Although the visual format of the published algorithm appears complex, the axes correspond to the information considered in the majority of causality assessment methods. The authors then weight the answers to the questions to provide a score for each axis which, when summed, gives a numerical estimate of the probability of an association, ranging from 6 or 7 = definite to less than 0 = unlikely.

\(b\)Not all questions are asked for any one problem.
tory requirements and product liability. Until recently, US pharmaceutical manufacturers have not had to consider assessment of causality for regulatory purposes. Regulations covering post-marketing event monitoring in the US required reporting of all events associated with the drug “whether or not thought to be associated with the drug” (earlier, US Code of Federal Regulations 21:310.300; now, 21:314.80) (see also Chapter 10), and causality assessment did not formally apply to events in clinical trials. However, recently US FDA regulations implicitly require causality assessment for determination of reporting certain types of clinical event in clinical trials in the Investigational New Drug (IND) regulations (CFR 21:312.22), This has come about by requiring the reporting of serious unexpected events associated with use of a drug where there is a reasonable possibility that the events may have been caused by the drug. A disclaimer is noted that such a safety report does not constitute an admission that the drug caused the events. These regulations do not provide criteria or a suggested method; however, they do imply that such methods might be useful.

Independently, manufacturers faced with a serious event in drug development have also been motivated to explore formal evaluation methods for serious events that could be used to signal the need for discontinuation of drug development if causality is established.

Outside of the US, the requirements for manufacturers to consider causality have varied from country to country. Many regulatory agencies have requested or implied some type of evaluation to minimize the number of nonspecific events reported.30 Given this environment, particularly in a growing international milieu, manufacturers have been actively interested in this area. In fact, several of the specific methods for causality assessment have been published by investigators based in the pharmaceutical industry.11,14,15,31–33

Causality definitely is an issue for pharmaceutical manufacturers in the arena of product liability (see Chapter 9). Freilich has considered many aspects of this,34 concluding that a company must have a rigorous process for the review of any adverse event reports and “make causality assessments on an ongoing basis” for product liability purposes. This is necessary to comply with the duty to warn, which he summarizes as follows: “Information must be given of any risks of death or serious harm, no matter how rare, as well as information concerning side effects where there is a substantial probability of their occurrence, no matter how mild.” Others in the legal arena dealing in product liability have considered causality issues and the notion of the “substantial factor” test for contributing to causation.35,36

Drug Regulators

The use by drug regulators of causality assessment of spontaneously reported postmarketing adverse reactions has varied considerably. Most countries’ drug regulators have some method of approaching causality, but this method has been best defined in France, Australia, and certain other countries30,37,38 (also see Chapter 11).

In France—owing in part to the considerable original work and interest in adverse reaction causality by a regulator, J. Dangoumou, and his colleagues—all reports of suspected reactions must be evaluated by the “French method.” This method combines symptom and chronologic criteria to give a “global intrinsic score,” and then adds bibliographic data from standardized sources to give an “extrinsic score.”39

In the US (see also Chapter 10), although a data element for causality was incorporated into the initial file format for the computerized reports of suspected adverse reactions submitted to the FDA, no formal method for evaluating all reports was used until a simple algorithm was developed in the early 1980s, based on the Irey and the Karch and Lasagna work.12,13 This method very specifically excluded the consideration of previous literature reports as a basis for considering the strength of the association. It was reasoned that, in many cases, the FDA would be in the position of receiving the first reports of an association, and such a criterion would suppress a signal of a possibly new drug associated event. The primary use of the assessment by the FDA was administrative, i.e., the causality assessment was a mechanism for identifying the best
documented cases—those with a “probable” or “highly probable” association. The causality judgment was specifically deleted from publicly available files, which consistently carry the caveat, “a cause and effect relationship has not been established.” Although the FDA algorithm existed for the reviewers of the reports, the frequency of its actual use was not determined, and this causality data element was removed from the computer file in 1986. The FDA does not now use formal causality assessment on a routine basis (see Chapters 8 and 10).

Publishers of Reports of Adverse Reactions

The medical literature containing case reports of suspected adverse reactions has largely avoided the issue of causality. The majority of single case reports, letters to the editor, or short publications do not provide an explicit judgement using any of the published algorithms. Further, many reports do not provide information on confounding drug therapy or medical conditions, data elements considered by most knowledgeable in adverse reaction assessment to be essential for considering causality. This issue was recognized as one of several problems relating to the publication of adverse reactions in the literature, and was discussed extensively during the conference in Morges, Switzerland in 1983. A number of editors of medical publications were present and discussed the quality of information in reported cases. They developed a list of the types of information that would be desirable for published reports, information that would permit the reader to assess independently the likelihood of the association. More recently, Harambaru and her colleagues compared the value of 500 published reports with 500 spontaneous reports with respect to the availability of information needed in most standard causality assessments. Although analysis suggested the published reports contained significantly more information, the tabulation suggests very sparse data on both alternate causes/other diseases and other drugs in both types of report.

METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

The problem to be solved in determining whether an event is caused by a drug is to find one or more methods that are reliable, consistent, accurate, and useful for determining the likelihood of association. This problem is compounded by the nature of drug associated adverse events. They vary in their frequency, their manifestations, their timing relative to exposure, and their mechanism, and mimic almost the entire range of human pathology, as well as adding unique new pathologies (e.g., kidney stones consisting of drug crystals and the oculomucocutaneous syndrome caused by prazolol). In addition, since drugs are used to treat illnesses, drug associated events are always nested within other pathologies associated with the indication for the drug. Since drugs are used to produce a beneficial effect, known or expected adverse events are grudgingly accepted within the clinical risk/benefit equation. However, unknown or unexpected events are inconsistently recognized and described, and seldom are the desired baseline and other detailed measurements taken.

The nature of this task, and its context, has generated two divergent philosophies. One philosophy discounts the value or importance of causality assessment of individual reactions, deferring judgment to the results of formal epidemiological studies or clinical trials. The alternate view contends that the information in single reports can be evaluated to determine at least some degree of association, and that this can be useful, and sometimes critical, when drug withdrawal is a consideration. This latter view has spurred the evolution of causal evaluation from expert consensus opinion based on global introspection to structured algorithms, and to elaborate probabilistic approaches, as described previously. Further, because of the nature of drug associated effects, particularly those that are rare and serious, the question has been raised about whether epidemiologists need to consider using methods for causal evaluations of cases in their formal studies and in clinical trials, since the small
numbers available may not be amenable to standard statistical analysis.\textsuperscript{45}

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

There are now a variety of methods for causality assessment of spontaneous reports. Four basic types will be described, chosen as illustrative examples and because they have been widely described in various publications.

**UNSTRUCTURED CLINICAL JUDGEMENT/GLOBAL INTROSPECTION**

Probably the most common approach to causality assessment is unstructured clinical judgement. An expert is asked to review the clinical information available and to make a judgement as to the likelihood that the adverse event resulted from drug exposure. However, it has been amply demonstrated that global introspection does not work well, for several reasons.\textsuperscript{4}

First, cognitive psychologists have shown that the ability of the human brain to make unaided assessments of uncertainty in complicated situations is poor, especially when assessing the probability of a cause given an effect, precisely the task of causality assessment.\textsuperscript{46} This has been clearly demonstrated for the evaluation of suspected adverse reactions. Several studies have used “expert” clinical pharmacologists to review suspected reactions. Comparing their individual evaluations, these studies documented the extent of their disagreement and illustrated, thereby, how unreliable global introspection is as a causality assessment method.\textsuperscript{11–13,47,48}

Second, global introspection is uncalibrated. One assessor’s “possible” might mean the same thing as another assessor’s “probable.” This has been well demonstrated in a study of one pharmaceutical company’s spontaneous report reviewers, who used both a verbal and numerical scale.\textsuperscript{16} These and other shortcomings of global introspection as a causality assessment method for adverse reactions are discussed in detail by Lane, Hutchinson, and Kramer.\textsuperscript{4,21,49}

**ALGORITHM/CRITERIAL METHOD WITH VERBAL JUDGMENTS**

The subsequent attempts to address this problem have resulted in the proliferation of approaches (see references 16 and 17 for reviews and examples of these methods, the appendix in reference 20 for a complete bibliography, and a recent summary).\textsuperscript{50} These methods range from simple flow charts posing ten or fewer questions to lengthy questionnaires containing up to 84 items. However, they share a common basic structure essentially based on the original Karch and Lasagna and Irey work—the timing of the adverse event in relation to administration of the drug, alternative etiological candidates, previous recognition of the event as a possible adverse reaction to the drug, the response when the drug is discontinued (dechallenge), and the response when the drug is subsequently readministered (rechallenge). Information relevant to each factor is elicited by a series of questions, the answers to which are restricted to “yes/no” (and, for some methods, “don’t know”).

These approaches have advantages when compared to global introspection,\textsuperscript{49} since there is a great improvement in the consistency of ratings among reviewers. Since the consideration of each case is segmented into its components (e.g., timing, confounding diseases, etc.), this also allows for a better understanding of areas of disagreement. However, there is still considerable global introspection required to make judgments on the separate elements of the algorithms or decision tables. These judgments require, in some cases, “yes” or “no” answers where, in fact, a more quantitative estimate of uncertainty would be more appropriate. For example, the reviewer might have to consider whether the appearance of jaundice within one week represented a sufficient duration of drug exposure to be consistent with a drug–event association. Even adherents of some of the methods agree that their procedures for converting answers into probability ratings are arbitrary.

This type of approach, with various degrees of complexity, is used by some drug regulatory agencies, such as that of Australia.\textsuperscript{57} The FDA algorithm, currently not in official use, was
another example of this approach, inquiring sequentially about temporal sequence, dechallenge, rechallenge, and concomitant diseases that might have caused the event. Based on the Irey and the Karch and Lasagna concepts, it was tailored to be amenable for rapid use by professionals with varied backgrounds for the administrative purpose of finding well documented cases for regulatory signal evaluation. It was also considered useful and easily remembered by clinicians in initial differential diagnosis of a clinical event. However, this very simple approach is less useful for irreversible drug effects, since they have neither dechallenge or rechallenge possibilities. To address this, an alternate algorithm for fatal outcome events was developed in the aftermath of the FDA algorithm (Dries, in 14).

ALGORITHMS REQUIRING SCORING OF INDIVIDUAL JUDGMENTS

Many algorithms permit quantitative judgments by requiring the scoring of their criteria. The answers to the algorithms’ questions are converted into a score for each factor, the factor scores are summed, and this overall score is converted into a value on a quantitative probability scale. These judgments range from the extensive, multiple question method of Venulet et al., which has now been translated for computer use, to the relatively simpler French method. The method developed by Kramer et al. received considerable review and is representative of the scored methods. Although it was presented in algorithm format with multiple steps, it can also be represented in tabular format, as shown here (Table 32.1). One of the more practical methods of this type was developed by Naranjo et al. This has been adopted in a number of clinical settings (Naranjo, personal communication) and is shown in Figure 32.2.

These quantitative methods have found applications in a number of settings, ranging from evaluations of suspected adverse reactions by hospital committees (US hospitals are now required by the Joint Commission on Accreditation of Health Care Organizations (JCAHO) to have programs of adverse reaction surveillance) to use by some regulatory authorities, as in France. They are also used, although sometimes only in a research context, by some pharmaceutical manufacturers. The specific manner in which they are used has not been well described in the literature.

PROBABILISTIC METHODS

Recognition of the various problems inherent in the previously existing methods set the stage for the development of an alternative approach based on the Bayesian probability approach to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAUSALITY ASSESSMENT EXAMPLE: NARANJO SCORED ALGORITHM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>QUESTION</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previous reports?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event after drug?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Event abate on drug removal?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ Rechallenge?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative causes?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction with placebo?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug blood level toxic?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaction dose-related?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Past history of similar event?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADR confirmed objectively?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 32.2. A critical scored algorithm illustrated by the method of Naranjo et al., in wide use. This particular method uses some of the basic data elements as well as more details of the history and characteristics of the case, and an arbitrary score is designated for each response.
assessment of causality. This method has provided an opportunity for a fresh look at the issue of causality, and its initial apparent difficulty (due to its requirement for using all available information) raised some new issues about causality assessment of adverse reactions. It has also brought the area of adverse reactions evaluation into a larger discussion of the value of the Bayesian and probabilistic approaches to the analysis of medical and scientific data.\textsuperscript{3}

First published as a method for adverse reaction assessment by Auriche,\textsuperscript{33} who participated with Lane and others in a working group within the APWI organization, this method was first presented in extensive form in a workshop in 1985 (see Figure 32.3). Several examples were published in a monograph and subsequently in early papers.\textsuperscript{25,26} The methods have been incorporated into automated versions by both Naranjo and Hutchinson, the latter developing a model using an expert system.\textsuperscript{51,52} Naranjo and colleagues have implemented a practical spreadsheet/automated version called BARDI (Bayesian Adverse Reaction Diagnostic Instrument) and have now applied it to a number of practical adverse event problems.\textsuperscript{44,53,54}

The Bayesian method determines the probability of an event occurring in the presence of a drug, relative to the probability of that event occurring in the absence of the drug, as illustrated in Figure 32.3. Estimation of this overall probability, the “posterior probability,” is based on two components:

1. what is known prior to the event, the “prior probability,” which is based on clinical trial and epidemiologic data, and
2. what the likelihoods are or are not for drug causation of the components of the specific case, including its history, timing, characteristics, dechallenge and its timing components, rechallenge, and any other factors, such as multiple challenges.

The full application of this method requires knowledge of the clinical event, its epidemiology, and relatively specific information about the event’s characteristics and kinetics over time. Examples have been published for several types of event, including Stevens–Johnson Syndrome, renal toxicity, lithium dermatitis, and ampicillin associated colitis, agranulocytosis, and Guillain–Barré syndrome.\textsuperscript{23,44,53} Thus far, this approach appears to be useful for the analysis of the perplexing first events in new drug clinical trials,
serious spontaneous adverse reaction reports, and possibly rare events discovered in both case–
control and cohort pharmacoepidemiology studies, when standard methods of statistical analysis
will not provide sufficient clues as to causality because of inadequate sample size.

With the logistic problem of the length of time required for the actual calculations minimized by
automation, the major impediment to more general application of the Bayesian method is the state
of the information required for robust analyses of events. There is no abundance of data on the
incidence of most events and their occurrence in the presence and absence of most drugs (the
required information for the prior probability). There are even fewer data available on the
historical risk factors, the time course, and specific characteristics of the drug associated conditions,
as opposed to the naturally occurring conditions. Although this lack of information is a current
limitation, it represents both an important challenge and a framework for structuring further
understanding. Benichou and collaborators have delved further into a mapping process of reactions
by type in an attempt to begin classifications of specific drug associated disease, using acute liver
disease as one model that incorporates qualitative clinical definitions of the disease into the judge-
ment.58,59

For this reason, there appear to be several advantages of using this method for the analysis of
suspected drug-associated events:

1. All judgments must be explicit and quantified, which permits better explanations of the degree
   of uncertainty about each component of information. Further, this approach makes maximum use of the available information
   and follows the basic rule of not discarding information.

2. Since each component is analysed separately, a sensitivity analysis of each information compo-
   nent can estimate its overall contribution to the final posterior odds or probability estimate.
   This, in turn, can be used to determine which information is pivotal. For example, if a tenfold
   difference in the estimate of the timing does not materially modify the overall posterior odds
   estimate, further efforts to determine the “best” estimate would not be worthwhile.

3. Because of the multistep approach to a judgement, combined with a lack of the prejudged
   weighting present in most other methods, this approach resists the tendency to achieve a result
   expected on an a priori global judgement. This is quite important in evaluating events with
   multiple causes.

4. This approach can provide an extensive summary of the information needed and areas
   needing further research and data compilation. Thus, the Bayesian approach ultimately
   provides a “map” to define the information most critical for understanding drug induced
disease and serves to help formulate the most critical questions to be researched. As disease
natural histories and drug induced diseases are now being described in large population
databases, it will be essential to link these two types of analysis. For example, the timing
and risk factor data on antibiotic associated diarrhea in three state Medicaid populations
(Jones et al. unpublished) will provide extensive population data which can be used in one of
the Bayesian analyses of this entity in single cases.25,51,52

COMPARISON AMONG THE DIFFERENT
METHODS FOR CAUSALITY ASSESSMENT

Several efforts have been made to evaluate and compare these methods. The 1983 conference in
Crystal City involved the application of several of the methods to a standardized case, illustrating a
considerable lack of concordance for some methods.18

A much more elegant and detailed evaluation of six representative algorithmic methods has been
conducted more recently by Pere et al.,55 who identified standard evaluation criteria and carried
out an evaluation of 1134 adverse reactions using the various methods. Significantly, they found
only moderate agreement between all pairs, and considerable disagreements on weightings of three
of the major criteria—timing, dechallenge, and alternate etiologies.

Given the current state of affairs, where a number of published methods exists, the choice of a method for use in evaluating individual adverse effects will likely be determined by a number of practical factors. These include the following.

1. How the evaluation will be used. This refers to both its short term use (e.g., a higher rating may be needed to result in a “signal” or need to report an event in a clinical trial) and long term use (e.g., will a single highly probable case in a file, not otherwise acted upon, be a source of liability for the evaluator?)

2. The importance of the accuracy of the judgement.
   If this evaluation will determine either a specific clinical outcome or, for example, the continuation of a clinical trial or the continued marketing of a drug, the accuracy of the judgement may be critical. Conversely, if little hinges upon the judgement, cruder estimates and methods, recognized as such, may suffice.

3. The number of causality evaluations to be made.
   The above considerations must also be weighed against the time required to make judgments on large numbers of reports. This is particularly a dilemma for regulatory agencies and manufacturers, where the need for accurate judgements is pitted against the volume of evaluations to be considered. One approach to this problem is suggested by the FDA’s approach to identifying high priority problems according to their newness and seriousness (1, and see Chapter 8).

4. The accrued value of thorough evaluations.
   In some circumstances, the careful, rigorous evaluation of certain categories of drug associated event will facilitate the more accurate evaluation of subsequent, related events. For example, consider a case where a drug under development is anticipated to cause hepatic events. Detailed evaluations of hepatic events induced by other drugs may allow more satisfactory causality evaluation of reports received on the new drug.56 In some cases this results from data collection being focused to a much greater degree, as has been initiated in France by Benichou et al.; here special reporting forms based on disease-specific criteria for events are being developed.56,57

5. Who will be carrying out the evaluation?
   Although no specific studies have been carried out to evaluate the inter-rater differences among differently trained professionals, it is likely that the body of information held by each reviewer will have considerable impact on any of the methods used, including the Bayesian method.

THE FUTURE

The field of adverse reaction causality assessment has many unresolved issues, both methodologic and practical, which have been described in the preceding sections. Although there was an original hope that there would be some basis for a consensus method,18 the current state of the field would suggest that this is not likely to be the case, as again evidenced at the Third International APWI meeting in Paris (November 1992). Several reasons can be suggested. First, a number of individuals and institutions have adopted one or sometimes a few methods and have committed to their use, often through their choice of data collecting systems or software.14 Second, the practical aspects of the use of these methods have appeared to play a very real role. Although discussed with excitement as the possible “gold standard” for adverse reaction causality, the Bayesian method was not rapidly embraced, in part because of the difficulty of its use without automation. Now that this barrier has been lifted, and with further use for practical applications, its potential may be realized. It is likely that the complex appearance of the algorithm of Kramer et al.9 likewise discourages its use in some sectors, although this has not been documented. Again, this is diminished with automation. Third, concern about the misuse of judgment terms or scores within the legal arena (see Chapter 9) has generated concern (34), particularly given the fact that there is no gold standard method.
All of these factors suggest the need for considerable further work. This work would appear to fall into at least three areas:

1. Further definition of the applications of causality assessment, that is the “output” of the process, so as to better define the desired rigor, accuracy, and usability of the methods. It would appear that there will probably always be needs for simpler and rougher methods, as well as more complete and rigorous methods, when the determination has considerable impact.

2. Further definition of the critical elements needed for the evaluation of causality for different types of adverse reaction. This has long been recognized\(^{10,18,55}\) and is being implemented in some centers (e.g., France, University of Toronto). Further work in this area can have a major impact on:

   (a) the collection of better information, using data collection instruments tailored to the event of interest, and

   (b) the better definition of the dynamics and, ultimately, the mechanisms of certain types of drug induced condition.

3. Gathering of data on these critical elements in the course of both clinical trials and epidemiologic studies. Risk factor, history, timing, characteristics, and resolution patterns of adverse events should be described in these studies and incorporated into general data resources on the characteristics of medical events and diseases.

4. Further work on automation of the causality evaluation process. Global introspection is still widely used because of the cumbersome nature of many of the more complete methods. Fortunately, several methods are now being automated, including the French method,\(^{55}\) the Venulet method (J. Venulet, personal communication), and the Bayesian BARDI method.\(^{54}\) Convenient access to the proper questions, arrayed in logical order, as well as background data on the state of information to date, has the potential for radically changing the state of adverse reaction causality evaluation.
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INTRODUCTION

When properly conducted, randomized controlled trials (RCTs) are considered the gold standard for demonstrating the effectiveness of a new medication because they provide unbiased estimates (see Chapter 2). While generally used for studies of beneficial drug effects (see also Chapter 34), too often pharmacoepidemiologists overlook the fact that the advantages of this study design also make it ideal for obtaining an unbiased estimate of the risk of adverse outcomes.

During the premarketing phases of drug development, RCTs involve highly selected subjects and on aggregate include at most a few thousand patients. These studies are sufficiently large to provide evidence of a beneficial clinical effect and exclude large increases in risk of common adverse clinical events. However, premarketing trials are rarely large enough to detect small differences in the risk of common adverse events or to reliably estimate the risk of rare events, whether serious or trivial. Identification and quantification of these potentially important risks require large studies, which typically are conducted after a drug has been marketed. Because of design complexity and costs, large controlled trials have not generally been considered in the pharmacoepidemiologist’s armamentarium for the postmarketing evaluation of drugs. Until recently, we too did not consider this approach for our postmarketing studies. However, our search for the best method to assess the risk of serious but rare adverse reactions to pediatric ibuprofen caused us to expand our view.1 The experience that led to that change serves as the basis for this chapter and may prompt others to consider randomized trials for the postmarketing assessment of drug safety.
CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMAECOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

Pharmacoepidemiologic methods are used to quantify risks and benefits of medications that could not be adequately evaluated in studies performed during the premarking phase of drug testing. In this chapter, we will consider the role of postmarketing randomized trials in assessing only the risks of medications; however, the same principles can be applied to the postmarketing evaluation of the benefits of medications (see also Chapter 34).

As noted above, premarking studies are typically too small to detect modest differences in the incidence rates (e.g., relative risks of 2.0 or less) for common adverse events or even large differences in the incidence rates for rare events, such as those that affect one per 1000 treated patients. Modest differences in risk of non-life-threatening adverse events can be of substantial public health importance, particularly if the medication is likely to be used by large numbers of patients. For example, following the introduction of angiotensin converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitor use in patients with congestive heart failure, case reports of severe hypotension began to appear in the literature. Although similar events were noted after initial use of other medications (e.g., vasodilators) in congestive heart failure patients, reliable estimates of the risk for different classes of medication were not available. Because of the high prevalence of the indication, differences in risk too small to be detected by conventional RCTs were judged to be clinically important, and a large RCT was conducted to resolve the question. Modest risks are especially relevant to drugs being considered for over-the-counter (OTC) sale, because these agents are likely to be very commonly used and are widely viewed by the public as safe. After a drug has been licensed, large observational studies are typically used to satisfy the sample sizes needed to identify (or rule out) such risks. The respective strengths and weaknesses of these designs are discussed elsewhere in this volume (see Chapter 2). However, potential confounding is a major concern for virtually every observational study. Uncontrolled or incompletely controlled confounding can easily account for modest associations between a drug and an adverse clinical event. For example, in the relation between phenylpropanolamine and cerebrovascular disease, obesity increases both the likelihood of exposure to the drug and the risk of a cerebrovascular accident; thus, body weight must be controlled in any analysis of this association. The challenge to the pharmacoepidemiologist is to recognize those factors that represent potential confounders and then control for their effects. To do so requires the relevant information to be included in the data to be analyzed, but information on important confounding factors is frequently incomplete or unavailable. Although surrogate variables are often used (e.g., years of education to reflect socioeconomic status), these may be poor measures of the underlying confounding factor, and their control therefore may not eliminate confounding.

An investigator observing a crude association between a drug and an effect attempts to control for confounding by adjusting for one or more factors. If a crude odds ratio (or relative risk) of 5.0 (for example) remains essentially unchanged after controlling for all known confounders, residual confounding is usually not considered an important concern; although the true (unconfounded) odds ratio may be somewhat smaller than the unadjusted estimate, it is generally assumed to be of similar magnitude. On the other hand, if the adjusted odds ratio (or relative risk) is closer to the null value of 1.0, there is empirical evidence of confounding in the data, and the adjusted odds ratio is usually considered the “best” (least biased) measure of the association. However, it is not possible to determine whether there remains any residual confounding in this best estimate, which if completely controlled might reveal that the true association is still weaker or even nonexistent.

We have direct experience with this concern. Infants treated in newborn intensive care units often receive medications and intravenous fluids through indwelling catheters, and low doses of heparin are periodically infused to help maintain the patency of
these catheters. In 1986, we published the results of a case–control study of the use of intravenous heparin in relation to the risk of intraventricular hemorrhage (IVH) in low birth weight infants. We compared 66 infants with IVH (cases) to 254 infants with no evidence of IVH (controls), matched on study hospital and duration of observation. Compared to no heparin exposure, the matched odds ratio for heparin exposure on the day prior to detection of IVH was 14 (95% confidence interval (CI), 5.4–34). As additional potential confounders were taken into account, the magnitude of the association became progressively smaller (Table 33.1). Adjustment for the matching factors, birth weight, volume of parenteral fluids administered, and the presence of pneumothorax by logistic regression, reduced the odds ratio to 3.9 (95% CI, 1.4–11), which did not change further when other potential confounding factors were added to the multivariate model. Although we described an observation that was statistically significant, biologically plausible, and clinically important, we concluded that control of confounding may have been incomplete and that, “...the association could have been partly, or even wholly, due to the severity of the infants’ underlying conditions rather than to the use of heparin.” We suggested that the question could only be answered by a randomized trial. A second observational study also found an increased risk (odds ratio = 1.96) among infants who received doses of heparin above the lowest quartile of exposure. Uncertainty about the association persisted until 1997, when results were published from a randomized, double blind trial of heparin added to umbilical catheters used to treat premature infants. In this study involving 113 infants, Chang et al. found no difference in the incidence of intraventricular hemorrhage between the heparin treated and control groups (p = 0.6). Although the odds ratios from the earlier observational studies were moderately large (3.9 and 1.96) and statistically significant, these “best” estimates of risk were likely due to confounding by one or more factors not completely controlled in the analyses. As this example demonstrates, when residual confounding is a possible explanation for an apparent association, additional research is needed before a change in clinical practice is warranted.

Weak associations deserve particular attention. Although there are important exceptions, the general view is that the stronger the association, the more likely the observed relationship is causal. This is not to say that a weak association (e.g., a relative risk ≤ 1.5) can never be causal; rather, it is more difficult to be certain of it because such associations, even if statistically significant, can easily be an artifact of confounding. As an example, consider an analysis where socioeconomic status is a potential confounder and education is used as a surrogate for this factor. Because the relation between years of education completed (the surrogate) and socioeconomic status (the potential confounder) is, at best, imperfect, analyses controlling for years of education can only partially control for confounding. This leads to the familiar caveat in reports of observational studies, “...residual confounding may account for the observed association.” This qualification is no more appropriate than for studies reporting weak associations. As a consequence, even after rigorous efforts have been made to control for confounding, some seasoned

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Potential confounders included</th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Hospital and duration of observation</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.4–34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Model 1 + birth weight</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>2.8–20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Model 2 + fluids</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.6–12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Model 3 + pneumothorax</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.4–11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated by logistic regression controlling for the potential confounders listed.
Adapted from reference 3.
epidemiologists consider small relative risk estimates to be most compatible with no association, regardless of the confidence interval (or \( p \) value). Whether or not one subscribes to this view, it is advisable to use extreme caution in making causal inferences from small relative risks derived from observational studies.

When there is concern about residual confounding prior to embarking on an observational study, one may wish to consider using a nonobservational study design. We faced just this situation when we considered how to best assess the safety of pediatric ibuprofen. Ibuprofen is a nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) that has become widely used among adults in the US, first by prescription and then as an OTC drug. In 1989, ibuprofen suspension was licensed as a prescription product for fever control in children. It was approved based on premarketing studies in children, which established that it was effective and safe for use under a doctor’s supervision. Events known to occur in adults using ibuprofen, such as acute gastrointestinal bleeding, acute renal failure, and anaphylaxis, were either not observed at all during the premarketing trials in children or occurred so infrequently that it was not possible to obtain reliable estimates of the risk. In addition, it was at least theoretically possible that Reye’s syndrome (a toxic encephalopathy in children associated with another NSAID, aspirin) might be associated with ibuprofen use in children. Other events, possibly unique to children, might also be associated with this drug. Thus, premarketing studies were unable to exclude even a substantially increased risk of important rare but serious adverse reactions.

Once available OTC, pediatric ibuprofen would likely be widely used for the treatment of fever, which is typically a minor and self-limited condition. (We will not discuss the debate over when it is appropriate to treat fever in children.) Given the generally benign nature of this indication, it is reasonable to require greater assurance of safety than may be expected for a drug used to treat a life threatening illness. Further, an effective antipyretic with an excellent record of safety in children, acetaminophen, had been available OTC in the US for more than 20 years. For these reasons, the US Food and Drug Administration required additional data concerning the risk of rare but serious adverse events before it would approve pediatric ibuprofen for OTC sale.

What approach would best provide this information? Observational postmarketing studies, especially case–control studies, are one source of data for very rare conditions. However, the circumstances surrounding ibuprofen use in 1989–90 raised serious concern about whether observational studies could adequately control confounding. Specifically, prior to the availability of pediatric ibuprofen, febrile children in the US received no antipyretic or were given acetaminophen, which was generally considered safe by both physicians and parents. On the other hand, because ibuprofen was available only by prescription, treatment with this drug required contact with a physician. In addition, for fever less than 102.5 °F, the recommended dose of prescription ibuprofen is 5 mg kg\(^{-1}\), whereas for fever of 102.5 °F or greater, the dose is 10 mg kg\(^{-1}\). Both its status as a prescription medication and the two-tier dosing schedule predicted that ibuprofen would be used for more severe illness than acetaminophen. This prediction was supported by a survey of 108 physicians (61 pediatricians, 47 family practitioners) conducted in 1992. More than half of the physicians in the study reported that they treated children with ibuprofen after acetaminophen failed, but none reported using acetaminophen only when ibuprofen was not effective. Further, both the minimum age and temperature at which the physicians recommended using these drugs were higher for ibuprofen than acetaminophen. It seemed clear that pediatric ibuprofen would be most commonly used among children whose illness was relatively severe, or whose fever was particularly high or unresponsive to acetaminophen. Because of the greater severity of illness (and potential exposure to antibiotics or other medications), there was a reasonable basis to believe that ibuprofen users would experience relatively high rates of adverse clinical events, unrelated to the ibuprofen itself. It was apparent, then, that to provide a valid assessment of the risks of pediatric ibuprofen, a study must be able to distinguish the risks of the drug from the risks
associated with the illness for which ibuprofen was given.

**METHODODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

The phenomenon described above for pediatric ibuprofen is known as confounding by indication (also referred to as indication bias, channeling, confounding by severity, or contraindication bias). According to Slone et al., confounding by indication exists when “patients who receive different treatments... differ in their risk of adverse outcomes, independent of the treatment received.” In general, confounding by indication occurs when an observed association between a drug and an outcome is due to the underlying illness (or its severity) and not to any effect of the drug. Put another way, confounding by indication occurs when the risk of an adverse event is related to the indication for medication use but not the use of medication itself. As with any other form of confounding, one can, in theory, control for its effects if one can reliably measure the severity of the underlying illness. In practice, however, this is not easily done. Confounding by indication is a particular concern in a number of settings (see Chapters 34 and 43). When there is a single therapy for an illness, and all patients receive the therapy (i.e., are “channeled” to the treatment), it is not possible to control for confounding in an observational study simply because no patients are left untreated to serve as controls. For example, it is standard practice to administer artificial surfactant to premature infants at risk for respiratory distress syndrome of the newborn. If any infants are not treated, they are likely to differ from treated infants in that they may have a very mild form of the illness, or they may have a major congenital malformation and not be expected to survive. Thus, they are also likely to have different risks for many clinical outcomes. While it may be rare for all patients with a given illness to be treated in exactly the same way, this situation is not unusual for subgroups of patients. For example, all patients with diabetes are not treated with insulin, but patients with type I (insulin-dependent) diabetes are. In general, observational studies are most informative when patients receiving different medications are similar. Cohort studies will be compromised if there is no reasonable alternative to the study treatment, including no treatment, to serve as a control. Case-control studies may be infeasible if one cannot identify controls that, aside from any effect of the exposure, are equally at risk of having the outcome diagnosed as the cases.

When there is at least one alternate treatment option and it is possible to control for obvious confounding, observational studies can contribute to our understanding of a medication’s risks, particularly where the adjusted relative risk is large. However, as discussed above, a small relative risk (e.g., 1.3) can easily be an artifact of confounding by an unknown factor or by incomplete control of a recognized confounder.

When confronted with the task of assessing the safety of a marketed drug product, the pharmacoepidemiologist must evaluate the specific hypothesis to be tested and estimate the magnitude of the hypothesized association and determine whether confounding by indication is possible. If incomplete control of confounding is likely, it is important to recognize the limitations of observational research designs and consider conducting an RCT. There is nothing inherent in an RCT that precludes a pharmacoepidemiologist from designing and carrying out these studies. To the contrary, the special skills of a pharmacoepidemiologist can be very useful, in performing large scale RCTs after a drug is marketed.

**OVERVIEW OF CLASSIC RCTS**

In the evaluation of drugs, RCTs are most commonly used during the premarketing phases of drug development to demonstrate a drug’s efficacy (and to gather general information concerning safety). By randomization, one hopes to make the distributions of confounding factors (both known and unknown) equal in all groups. If the study is sufficiently large, the assigned treatment is the most likely explanation for any
observed differences in the clinical outcomes (improvement in the illness or the occurrence of adverse clinical events) between the treatment groups. By definition, participants in observational studies are not assigned treatment at random. As we have seen, the choice of treatment may be determined by the stage or severity of the illness or by the patient’s poor response to or adverse experience with alternative therapies, which can introduce bias.

Sample Size
In homogeneous populations, balanced treatment groups can be achieved with relatively small study sizes. In heterogeneous populations (e.g., all children less than 12 years of age), a large sample size may be required to insure the equal distribution of uncommon confounders between study groups. Study size is determined by the need to assure balance between treatment groups and the magnitude of the effect to be detected. Large studies minimize the chance that the treatment groups are different with respect to potential confounders and permit the detection of small differences in clinical outcomes.

Blinding
Blinding is used to minimize detection bias, and is particularly important where the outcome is at all subjective. Reporting of subjective symptoms by study participants and the detection of even objectively defined outcome events may be influenced by knowledge of the medications the patient is using. For example, if a patient complains of abdominal pain, a physician may be more likely to perform a test for occult blood in the stool if the patient was being treated with ibuprofen than acetaminophen. Thus, followup data collection will be unbiased if both parties are unaware of the treatment assigned. Blinding may not be possible for nondrug treatments such as diet, exercise, and surgery, and double blinding may be difficult to achieve and maintain in drug studies as well, particularly if either the study or control medication produces specific symptoms (i.e., side-effects) or easily observable physiologic effects (e.g., change in pulse rate or blood pressure).

Choice of Control Treatment
The hypothesis being tested determines the choice of control treatment. Placebo controls are most useful for making comparisons with untreated disease but may not represent standard of care and have been challenged as unethical. Further, it may be difficult to maintain blinding in placebo controlled studies, as noted above. Studies employing an active control typically utilize common drug treatments, which frequently represent the standard of care. Although often considered more ethical and easier to keep blinded because the illness and symptoms are not left untreated, these studies do not permit comparison with the natural history of the illness.

Data Collection
Data collection in a premarketing clinical trial is generally resource intensive. Detailed descriptive and clinical data are collected at enrollment, and extensive clinical and laboratory data are collected at regular intervals during followup. In addition to the data needed to test the hypothesis of a clinical benefit, premarketing trials of medications must also assess safety and therefore must collect extensive data on symptoms, physical signs, and laboratory evaluations. Such data collection contributes substantially to the high cost of these trials.

Data Analysis
In observational studies, data analyses are driven by the hypothesis being tested and may be quite complex. In contrast, analysis of the primary hypothesis in many clinical trials is straightforward and involves a comparison of some measure of the outcome event (which may be either a continuous or categorical variable) in different groups. While analyses involving repeated measures, subgroups of study subjects, or adjustment to control for incomplete or ineffective randomization may be performed, they add complexity.
Methodologic strengths notwithstanding, there are several features of the RCT that limit its use as a postmarketing study design. First, the complexity and cost of traditional premarket RCTs, with their detailed observations and complex followup, make such very large studies generally infeasible. Second, it may be unethical to conduct a study in which patients are randomly assigned a potentially harmful treatment, such as an RCT to test the hypothesis that cigarette smoking increases the risk of heart disease. However, if the study can be simplified and used the epidemiologist’s tools to track patients and collect followup data, it may be possible to both control costs and make a study feasible. The ethical dilemma can be resolved by studying only questions that are truly important to the public’s health and for which the answers are not known.

Generalizability of Results
The usual clinical trial conducted during the premarketing evaluation of a drug almost always involves highly selected patients; as a consequence, the results of the trial may not be generalizable to the large numbers of patients who may use the medication once it is licensed. Pharmacoepidemiologists may be more attracted to observational studies because they can reflect the real world experience of medication use and clinical outcomes, and because their modest costs permit studies involving large numbers of patients.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

LARGE SIMPLE TRIALS
Large, simple trials (LSTs) may be the best solution when it is not possible to completely control confounding by means other than randomization. If the volume and complexity of data collection can be kept to a minimum, there is no reason that large trials cannot be conducted. Indeed, beginning with the Salk vaccine trial, LSTs have been used to test the efficacy of medical interventions.8–19 This approach has also been used successfully to evaluate the risk of adverse drug effects when the more common observational designs have been judged inadequate.2,20 These studies are really just very large randomized trials made simple by reducing data collection to the minimum needed to test only a single hypothesis (or at most a few hypotheses). Randomization of treatment assignment is the key feature of the design, which controls for confounding by known and unknown factors. The large study size provides the power needed to evaluate small risks, either absolute or relative.

How Simple is Simple?
Yusuf et al. have suggested that very large randomized studies of treatment related mortality need collect only data concerning the vital status of participants at the conclusion of the study.21 Because the question of drug safety frequently concerns outcomes less severe than mortality, these ultrasimple trials may not be sufficient. Hasford has suggested a somewhat less restrictive approach to data collection, in which “large trials with lean protocols” include only relevant baseline, follow-up, and outcome data.22 Collecting far fewer data than is common in the usual RCT is the key feature of both approaches. With simplified protocols that take advantage of epidemiologic followup methods, very large trials can be conducted to test hypotheses of interest to pharmacoepidemiologists.

Power/Sample Size
Study power is not simply a function of the number of subjects enrolled. It is related to the number of events observed during the course of the study, which in turn is a function of the incidence rate for the event, the sample size, and the duration of observation (or followup). Power requirements can be satisfied by studying a population at high risk, enrolling a large sample size, or conducting followup for a prolonged period. The appropriate approach will be determined by considering the goal of the study and the hypothesis to be tested. Allergic or idiosyncratic events require a very large study population, and events with long latency periods may be best studied with long duration
followup. While an elderly population may be at high risk for gastrointestinal bleeding or cardiovascular events, a study limited to this group may lack generalizability and would be inappropriate to assess the risk of these events in younger adults or children.

Data Elements

The data collection process can be kept simple by restricting the study to a few primary endpoints that satisfy the study hypothesis, are objective, are easily identified, and are verifiable. Epidemiologists may need to overcome their predisposition to data collection when it comes to secondary outcomes (i.e., those that do not directly relate to the study hypothesis), as these must be ignored to eliminate unnecessary data collection. Because confounding is controlled by randomization, data on potential confounders need not be collected. A few basic demographic variables can be collected in order to confirm that effective randomization was achieved.

Data Collection

The data collection process itself can be streamlined to keep the study simple. Followup data can be collected by mailed questionnaires or telephone interviews conducted directly with the study participants. Because the study will be limited to clear and objective outcomes, which can be confirmed by medical record review or other means, self-report by the study participants can be an appropriate source of followup data.

The primary advantage of this simplicity is that it allows very large groups of study participants to be followed at reasonable cost. The tradeoff, of course, is that a simple trial cannot answer all possible questions about the safety of a drug but must be limited to testing, at most, a few related hypotheses.

**Table 33.2 Conditions appropriate for the conduct of a large randomized trial**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The research question is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Genuine uncertainty exists about the likely results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3a. When the absolute risk is small and confounding by indication is likely</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3b. The relative risk is small, regardless of the absolute risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Important effect modification (interaction) is unlikely.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Research Question

Although a simple trial will cost less per subject than a traditional clinical trial, the total cost of a large study (in money and human resources) will still be substantial. The cost will usually be justified only when there is a clear need for a reliable answer to a question concerning the risk of a serious outcome. A minor medication side-effect such as headache or nausea may not be trivial for the individual patient, but does not warrant the expense of a large study. On the other hand, if the question involves the risk of premature death, permanent disability, hospitalization, or other serious events, the cost may well be justified.

Uncertainty Must Exist

An additional condition has been referred to as the “uncertainty principle.” This was originally described by Gray et al. as a simple criterion to assess subject eligibility in LSTs. It states that “...both patient and doctor should be substantially uncertain about the appropriateness, for this particular patient, of each of the trial treatments. If the patient and doctor are reasonably certain that one or other treatment is inappropriate then it would not be ethical for the patient’s treatment to be chosen at random” (italic in the original). We support this principle and would extend its use to evaluate when it is appropriate to conduct an LST to test a given hypothesis related to the risk of an adverse clinical event. Very large randomized trials are justified only when there is true uncertainty about the risk of the treatment in the population.
Apart from considerations of benefit, it would not be ethical to subject large numbers of patients to a treatment that was reasonably believed to place them at increased risk, however small, of a potentially serious or permanent adverse clinical event. The concept of uncertainty can thus be extended to include a global assessment of the combined risks and benefits of the treatments being compared. One treatment may be known to provide therapeutic benefits that are superior to an alternative, but it may be unknown whether the risks of important side-effects outweigh the therapeutic advantage. For example, the antiestrogen tamoxifen may improve breast cancer survival, but may do so only at the cost of an increased risk of endometrial cancer. Appropriately a randomized trial was undertaken to resolve uncertainty in this and similar situations.19

Power and Confounding
LSTs will only be needed if (a) the absolute risk of the study outcome is small and there are concerns about confounding by indication, or (b) the relative risk is small (in which case, there are inherent concerns about residual confounding from any source).21 By contrast, LSTs would not be necessary if the absolute risk were large, because premarket or other conventional RCTs should be adequate, or where confounding by indication is not an issue, because observational studies would suffice; also, if the relative risk were large (and confounding by indication were not a concern), observational studies would be appropriate.

No Interaction between Treatment and Outcome
An additional requirement for LSTs is that important interactions between the treatment and patient characteristics (effect modification) are unlikely.21 In other words, the available evidence should suggest that the association will be qualitatively similar in all patient subgroups. Variation among subgroups in the strength of the association is acceptable, but there should be no suggestion that the effect would be completely reversed in one or more subgroups. Because of the limited data available in a truly simple trial, it may not be possible to test whether an interaction has occurred, and the data collected may not be sufficient to identify relevant subgroups. Because randomization only controls confounding for comparisons made between the groups that were randomized, subsets of these groups may not be strictly comparable with respect to one or more confounding factors. Thus, if clinically important interaction is considered likely, additional steps must be taken to permit the appropriate analyses (e.g., stratified randomization). This added complexity may result in a study that is no longer a truly simple trial.

WHEN IS AN LST FEASIBLE?
LSTs are feasible when all of the conditions in Table 33.3 are met.

Simple hypothesis
LSTs are best suited to answer focused and relatively uncomplicated questions. For example, an LST can be designed to test the hypothesis that the risk of hospitalization for any reason, or for acute gastrointestinal bleeding, is increased in children treated with ibuprofen. However, it may not be possible for a single LST to answer the much more general question, “Is ibuprofen safe with respect to all possible outcomes in children?”

Simple Treatments
Simple therapies (e.g., a single drug at a fixed dose for a short duration) are most amenable to study

Table 33.3 Conditions which make a large, simple randomized trial feasible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>The study question can be expressed as a simple testable hypothesis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>The treatment to be tested is simple (uncomplicated).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>The outcome is objectively defined (e.g., hospitalization, death).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Epidemiologic followup methods are appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>A cooperative and motivated population is available for study.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
with LSTs. They are likely to be commonly used, so that it will be easy to enroll large numbers of patients, and the results will be applicable to a large segment of the population. Complex therapeutic protocols are difficult to manage, reduce patient compliance, and by their very nature may not be compatible with the simple trial design.

**Objective and Easily Measured Outcomes**

The outcomes to be studied should be objective, easy to define ("simple"), and easy to recall. An example might include hospitalization for acute gastrointestinal bleeding. Study participants may not correctly recall the details of a hospital admission, or even the specific reason for admission, but they likely will recall the fact that they were admitted, the name of the hospital, and at least the approximate date of admission. Medical records can be obtained to document the details of the clinical events that occurred. Events of this type can be reliably recorded using epidemiologic followup methods (e.g., questionnaires, telephone interviews, or linkage with public vital status records). On the other hand, clinical outcomes which can be reliably detected only by detailed in-person interviews, physical examinations, or extensive physiologic testing are not as amenable for study in simple trials.

**Cooperative Population**

Particularly in LSTs, a cooperative and motivated study population will greatly increase the probability of success. Striking examples are the large populations in the Physicians’ and Women’s Health Studies; the success of these studies is at least partly due to the willingness of large numbers of knowledgeable health professionals to participate.24,25 Because of the participants’ knowledge of medical conditions and symptoms and participation in the US health care system, relatively sophisticated information could be obtained using mailed questionnaires, and even biologic samples could be collected. Success of the Boston University Fever Study was also largely due to parents whose motivation and cooperation were encouraged by their private physicians who had invited them to participate in the study.20

**LOGISTICS OF CONDUCTING AN LST**

An LST may be appropriate and feasible, but it will only succeed if all logistical aspects of the study are kept simple as well. In general, LSTs are “multicenter” studies involving a group of primary investigators who are responsible for the scientific conduct of the study, a central data coordinating facility, and a network of enrollment sites (possibly the offices of collaborating physicians or other health care providers). Health care professionals (e.g., physicians, nurse practitioners, and pharmacists in private practice or members of large health care organizations) can participate by recruiting eligible patients and obtaining informed consent. Alternative methods to identify and enroll eligible subjects (e.g., direct mailings to professional groups, print advertisements) may be appropriate for some studies. Because success depends on the cooperation of multiple health care providers and a large number of patients, it may be best to limit the extent of each individual’s involvement.

To facilitate patient recruitment and to maximize generalizability of the results, minimal restrictions should be placed on patient eligibility. As Gray et al. have said, “Any obstacle to simplicity is an obstacle to large size, and the wider the range of the patients studied, the wider the generalizability of the results will be.”23 Patients with a medical contraindication or known sensitivity to either the study or control drug should not, of course, be enrolled, but other restrictions should be kept to a minimum and should ideally reflect only restrictions that would apply in a typical clinical setting.

Simple informed consent and registration documents should be completed in triplicate with one copy kept on file by the enrolling collaborator, one given to the study participant, and one forwarded to the data coordinating center by mail or facsimile. Substantial bias can be introduced if either physician or patient can choose not to participate after learning (or guessing) which treatment the patient has been assigned. Therefore, patients should be randomized only after eligibility
has been confirmed and the enrollment process completed. For studies requiring immediate treatment, patients can be registered and treatment assigned by telephone contact with the coordinating center.

Particularly in studies requiring a long duration of medication use, validity may be seriously compromised by poor compliance with the treatment regimen. A run-in period prior to randomization can be used to identify patients who are unable or unwilling to adhere to a chronic treatment regimen and are likely to drop out of the study. During the run-in period, eligible subjects are given a “test” medication and their compliance with the protocol is assessed. Patients who cannot comply with the protocol are withdrawn from the trial. Patients who remain in the study are likely to be highly compliant, so that relatively few will drop out after randomization. Depending on the characteristics of drugs under study, either the active drug or the control may be preferable for the run-in period. In the Physicians’ Health Study, for example, the study drug aspirin was used for the run in period to identify subjects who could not tolerate the gastrointestinal side-effects of the drug. As a consequence, however, the data cannot be used to assess the risk of gastrointestinal bleeding following aspirin use.

Importance of Complete Followup

Because dropouts and losses to followup may not be random but rather may be related to treatment side-effects, it is important to make every effort to obtain followup data on all enrolled subjects. For example, a study that has followup data on tens of thousands of patients may not be able to provide a valid answer to the primary study question if this number represents only half of those randomized. Beyond choosing a motivated and interested study population, the investigators can minimize losses to followup by maintaining regular contact with all study participants. Regular mailings of supplies of medication or a study newsletter can be helpful, and memory aids such as medication calendar packs or other devices may help maintain compliance with chronic treatment schedules. In addition, followup data collection itself can help maintain contact with study participants.

Followup Data Collection

An important element of a successful LST is that followup data collection is the responsibility of the central study staff. Busy health care providers frequently cannot commit the time required to consistently obtain even minimal but specific followup data from large numbers of subjects. However, the clinician who originally enrolled the subject may be able to provide limited followup data (e.g., vital status) or a current address or telephone number for the occasional patient who would otherwise be lost to followup. A questionnaire delivered by mail, supplemented by telephone interviews when needed, has been shown to work quite well.20 The response rate will likely be greatest if the questions are both simple and direct and the time required to complete the questionnaire is limited. Medical records can be reviewed to verify important outcomes, such as rare adverse events, and the work needed to obtain and abstract the relevant records should be manageable. If there is a need to confirm a diagnosis or evaluate symptoms, a limited number of participants can be referred to their enrolling health care provider for examination or to have blood or other studies performed. In addition, a search of public records (e.g., the National Death Index in the US) can identify study subjects who have died during followup.

ANALYSIS

Primary Analysis

Analyses of the primary outcomes are usually straightforward and involve a simple comparison of incidence rates between the treatment and control groups. Under the assumption that confounding has been controlled by the randomization procedure, complex multivariate analyses are not necessary (and may not be possible because only limited data on potential confounders are available). Descriptive data collected at enrollment
should be analyzed by treatment group to test the randomization procedure; any material differences between treatment groups suggest an imbalance despite randomization. As noted above, it is assumed that there is no material interaction between patient characteristics and medication effects, thus eliminating the need for complex statistical analyses to test for effect modification.

Subgroup Analyses

It is important to remember that confounding factors will be distributed evenly only among groups that were randomized; subgroups which are not random samples of the original randomization groups may not have similar distributions of confounding factors. For example, participants who have remained in the study (i.e., have not dropped out or been lost to followup) may not be fully representative of the original randomization groups and may not be comparable with respect to confounders. Despite all efforts, complete follow-up is rarely achieved, and because only the original randomization groups can be assumed to be free of confounding, at least one analysis involving all enrolled study subjects (i.e., an intention-to-treat analysis) should be performed. Also, unless a stratified randomization scheme was used, one cannot be certain that unmeasured confounding variables will be evenly distributed in subgroups of participants, and the smaller the subgroup, the greater the potential for imbalance. Therefore, subgroup analyses will be subject to the same limitations as observational studies (i.e., the potential for uncontrolled confounding).

Data Monitoring/Interim Analyses

Because of the substantial commitment of resources and large number of patients potentially at risk for adverse outcomes, it is often appropriate to monitor the accumulating data over the course of the study. The study may sometimes be ended prematurely if participants experience unacceptable risks, if the hypothesis can be satisfactorily tested earlier than anticipated, or if it becomes clear that a statistically significant result cannot be achieved, even if the study were to be completed as planned. A data monitoring committee, independent of the study investigators, can conduct periodic reviews of the data using an appropriate group sequential analysis procedure to preserve the study’s overall type I error rate.26,27

THE FUTURE

With accelerated approval of new medications and rapid increases in their use, we may see a greater need for large postmarketing studies capable of randomizing exposures in order to assess small differences in risk. In the absence of techniques that reliably control for confounding by indication in observational studies, there may be a growing need for LSTs to evaluate larger relative risks. Improvements in the efficiency with which such trials can be carried out may lead to their increased use.

One possible approach that may improve efficiency in large studies would be to conduct trials involving patients who receive care from very large health delivery systems with automated medical records. If reliable data concerning relevant outcomes (e.g., hospitalization for gastrointestinal bleeding) were available in automated medical records for all study participants, it would be theoretically possible to eliminate the need to contact patients to collect followup data. It would still be necessary to identify eligible subjects, obtain consent, and randomize treatment. In theory, it may be possible to conduct such a “hybrid trial,” but, to our knowledge, such a trial has not been attempted.

In settings where there is no appropriate control treatment and it is not ethical to randomize between active drug and placebo, an alternative to an LST might be to enroll and follow a single cohort of perhaps the first 10 000 users of a study medication. Though the absence of a comparison group would make it impossible to determine whether the observed risks were due to the drug, the disease, or other factors, it would at least be possible to accurately estimate the absolute risk of important events, whatever their cause, among exposed subjects. An alternative approach would
be to randomize to different doses, when possible, and search for a dose–response relationship.

It is clear that very large simple controlled trials of drug safety can be successfully carried out.\textsuperscript{2,20} It is less clear, however, how frequently the factors that indicate the need for a very large trial (Table 33.2) will converge with those that permit such a trial to be carried out (Table 33.3). As pharmacoepidemiologists become more comfortable with LSTs, we may see more of them being conducted, and new methods of subject recruitment and more efficient sources of followup data are likely to be developed.
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INTRODUCTION

In order to be approved for marketing in the United States, drugs must be proven to be safe and effective using “adequate and well-controlled investigations.” Earlier chapters in this book have shown that this premarketing information often is insufficient to provide some of the information about drug toxicity which is clinically most important. The same applies to information about drug efficacy.

In this chapter we will begin by clarifying the different definitions of various types of beneficial drug effect. Then we will discuss the need for postmarketing studies of drug effectiveness. Next, we will present the unique methodologic problems raised by studies of beneficial drug effects, as well as potential solutions to these problems. Finally we will evaluate the frequency with which these proposed solutions might be successful. Specific examples of approaches to the study of efficacy also will be presented.

DEFINITIONS

There are at least four different types of measurable drug effect of interest to a prescriber. Unanticipated harmful effects are the unwanted effects of drugs that could not have been predicted on the basis of their preclinical pharmacologic profile or the results of premarketing clinical studies. These effects are most often Type B adverse reactions, as defined in Chapter 1. For example, chloramphenicol was not known to cause aplastic anemia at the time it was marketed, nor was the skeletal muscle pain associated with use of HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors. A major research challenge is to discover medically important unanticipated harmful effects as soon as possible after drug marketing. Quantitation of the incidence of these effects is medically useful as well.

Anticipated harmful effects are unwanted effects of drugs that could have been predicted on the basis of preclinical and premarketing studies. They can be either Type A reactions or Type B reactions.
(see Chapter 1). One example is the syncope that sometimes occurs after patients take their first dose of prazosin. Although this effect was known to occur at the time of marketing, a major question remaining to be answered was how often the event occurred. The dominant research challenge that this type of drug effect presents is establishing its incidence.

Unanticipated beneficial effects are desirable effects of drugs that were not anticipated at the time of drug marketing. Although these effects may be medically useful, they are nevertheless side-effects, if they are not the purpose for which the drug was given. An example of an unanticipated beneficial effect is aspirin’s ability to decrease the probability of a subsequent myocardial infarction in patients who were given the drug for its analgesic or anti-inflammatory action. Only recently has this been confirmed as a valid new indication for the use of aspirin. A major research challenge is to discover this type of drug effect. For example, it currently remains an open question whether non-aspirin nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs have the same beneficial effects. Secondarily, it is useful to quantitate the frequency of the event.

Anticipated beneficial effects are the desirable effects that are known to be caused by the drug. They represent the reason for prescribing the drug. The study of anticipated beneficial effects has three aspects. A study of drug efficacy is a study of whether a drug has the ability to bring about the intended effect. In an ideal world, with perfect compliance, no interactions with other drugs or other diseases, etc., could the drug achieve its intended effects? Drug efficacy usually is studied using a randomized clinical trial.

In contrast, a study of drug effectiveness is a study of whether, in the real world, a drug in fact achieves its desired effect. For example, a drug given in experimental conditions might be able to lower blood pressure but, if it causes such severe sedation that patients refuse to ingest it, it will not be effective. Thus an efficacious drug may lack effectiveness. Studies of drug effectiveness usually are performed after a drug’s efficacy has been established. In contrast, if a drug is demonstrated to be effective, it also is obviously efficacious.

Studies of drug effectiveness generally would best be conducted using nonexperimental study designs. However, these raise special methodologic problems, which are discussed below.

Lastly, a study of efficiency is a study of whether a drug can bring about a desired effect at an acceptable cost. This type of assessment falls in the province of health economics, and is discussed in Chapter 35.

Note that the outcome variable for any of these studies can be of multiple different types. They can be clinical outcomes (diseased/undiseased), or so-called “outcomes research,” as defined by health services researchers (see Chapter 39 for a discussion of the validity issues involved in measuring such outcomes); they can be measures of quality of life (see Chapter 36), often referred to in the pharmaceutical industry as “outcomes research;” they can be measures of utility, i.e., global measures of the desirability of certain clinical outcomes (see Chapters 35 and 36); they can be economic outcomes (see Chapter 35); etc. Regardless, the same methodologic issues apply to each.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

In order to make optimal clinical decisions about whether to use a drug, a prescriber needs to know whether, and to what degree, the drug actually is able to produce the intended effect (see Table 34.1). Premarketing randomized clinical trials generally provide information on whether a drug can produce at least one beneficial effect. Specifically, premarketing studies generally investigate the efficacy of drug relative to a placebo, when both are used to treat a particular illness. These premarketing studies of efficacy tend to be conducted in very atypical clinical settings, compared to those in which the drug ultimately will be used. Compliance during these studies is assured, and the patients included are similar to each other in age and sex, do not have other diseases, and are not taking other drugs. Such restrictions maximize the ability of premarketing studies to demonstrate
Table 34.1. Clinically important information about intended beneficial effects of drugs

| 1. Can the drug have the desired effect? |
| 2. Does the drug actually achieve the desired effects when used in practice? |
| 3. Can and does the drug have other beneficial effects, including long-term effects for the same indication? |
| 4. Can the drug achieve these desired effects better than other alternative drugs available for the same indication? |
| 5. For each of the above, what is the magnitude of the effect in light of the many different factors in medical practice that might modify the effect, including:
  (a) variations in drug regimen: dose per unit time, distribution of dose over time, duration of regimen,
  (b) characteristics of the indication: severity, subcategories of the illness, changes over time, and
  (c) characteristics of the patient: age, sex, race, genetics, geographic location, diet, nutritional status, compliance, other illnesses, drugs taken for this or other illness (including tobacco and alcohol), etc. |

*Modified from reference 4.

A drug’s efficacy, if the drug actually is efficacious. Additional information may then be needed on whether, in the world of daily medical practice, the drug actually achieves the same beneficial effects and whether the drug can and does have other beneficial effects. In addition, at the time of marketing there may be little data on a drug’s efficacy relative to other medical or surgical alternatives available for the same indication. Finally, a number of factors that are encountered in the practice of medicine can modify a drug’s ability to achieve its beneficial effects. Included are variations in the drug regimen, characteristics of the indication for the drug, and characteristics of the patient receiving the drug, including demographic factors, nutritional status, the presence of concomitant illnesses, the ingestion of drugs, and so on. Many, if not most, of these factors that can influence the effects of drugs are not fully explored prior to marketing.

In order to quantitate the need for postmarketing studies of the beneficial effects of drugs, a comparison was made of the 100 most common drug uses of 1978 (drug–indication pairs) to the information available to the FDA at the time of its regulatory decisions about the marketing and labeling of the drugs involved in these uses. The comparison restricted itself to drugs approved after 1962, when the Kefauver–Harris Amendments introduced a requirement for the submission of data about drug efficacy prior to approval of the drug for marketing.

Of the 100 common drug uses, 31 had not been approved by the FDA at the time of initial marketing, and 18 still had not been approved at the time of the comparison. Eight of the 18 unapproved uses were probably medically and therapeutically inappropriate. For example, the use of antibiotics is not justified for the treatment of viral infections, but such use was common. Other unapproved drug–indication pairs could well have been quite appropriate, but the regulatory process does not need to and did not reflect the current medical practice.

Of the 100 common drug uses, eight were based on the assumption that a drug had a particular long-term effect, but only an intermediate effect had been studied prior to marketing. For example, antihypertensive drugs are used for their presumed ability to prevent long-term cardiovascular complications, but are approved for marketing on the basis of their ability to lower blood pressure. Five of the 100 common drug uses may have been for either the intermediate effect or the long-term effect of the drugs, but only the intermediate effect was studied prior to marketing. For example, hypoglycemic agents may be used to control the symptoms of diabetes or to prevent the vascular complications of diabetes, but only the former were studied before drug marketing.

Drugs other than those in the list of 100 common uses were sometimes prescribed as treatment for each of the 52 indications included in those 100 uses. Yet, eight of the uses involved drugs whose effects relative to alternative drugs had not been studied prior to marketing.

The 100 common drug uses also included a number of examples of clinical factors that are able to modify the effects of the drug, but these were not discovered until after drug marketing. Some are listed in Table 34.2.
Table 34.2. Examples of factors determining drug efficacy that were demonstrated after marketing, selected from the 100 most common drug uses of 1978a

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Indication</th>
<th>Comments</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regimen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dose per unit time</td>
<td>Ibuprofen</td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis, osteoarthritis</td>
<td>Daily dosage initially approved proved to be suboptimal</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution of dose</td>
<td>Furosemide</td>
<td>Congestive heart failure</td>
<td>Efficacy improved by more frequent, smaller doses</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Clonidine</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>Tolerance develops in the absence of a diuretic</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypoglycemics (e.g.,</td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>Tolerance develops in many patients</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acetoheaxamid and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tolazamide)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indication</td>
<td>Metaprotenerol</td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>Patients with severe illness do not have a response without additional, supplementary therapy</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcategories</td>
<td>Desipramine</td>
<td>Depression</td>
<td>May vary with endogenous versus exogenous depression</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes over time</td>
<td>Ampicillin</td>
<td>Otitis media</td>
<td>No longer the drug of choice in some geographic areas due to bacterial resistance</td>
<td>11, 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Age</td>
<td>Diazepam</td>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td>A given regimen is more effective in the aged than in the young Metabolism varies markedly from premature infants (half-life 54 hours), to full term infants, to older children (half-life 18 hours); young children can have paradoxic reactions</td>
<td>13, 14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other illness</td>
<td>Gentamicin</td>
<td>Infection</td>
<td>Lower doses required in renal failure</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Drugs</td>
<td>Lithium</td>
<td>Manic–depressive illness</td>
<td>Clearance impaired by diuretics, e.g., furosemide</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acetoheaxamide</td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>Many drugs interfere, by causing hyperglycemia (e.g., diuretics), displacing drug from binding sites (e.g., nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs), etc.</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diet</td>
<td>Diuretics (e.g., metolazone, furosemide)</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>A decrease in sodium intake can improve efficacy</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lithium</td>
<td>Manic–depressive illness</td>
<td>Significant sodium depletion or excess can modify renal excretion</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*From Reference 4.
additional prescriptions accompanied 62% of the prescriptions studied, and 41% of the prescriptions were for patients who had illnesses other than just the one the drug was being used to treat. Of the 100 common drug uses, the mean number of concomitantly administered drugs ranged from 0.04 to 2.1. The mean number of concomitant diagnoses ranged from 0.1 to 1.2. Yet, for none of the uses was the potential for modification of the drug effect by concomitant drugs or concomitant diagnoses fully explored before marketing.

The proportion of prescriptions for patients less than age 20 ranged from 0.0%, for 43 of the uses, to 97%. Yet, many of these uses had not been tested in children prior to marketing. Analogously, only three of the drugs were approved for use in pregnant patients, yet we know that drug use in pregnancy is common.19–21

Thus, this study revealed considerable gaps in the information about beneficial drug effects at the time of drug marketing. These deficiencies in the available information should not be surprising, nor should they be considered inadequacies that should prevent the release of the drug to the marketplace. The data needed for clinical decisions are frequently and understandably different from those needed for regulatory decisions. Studies performed prior to marketing per force are focused predominantly on meeting appropriate regulatory requirements, and only secondarily on providing a basis for optimal therapeutic decisions. The physician also should keep in mind that the FDA is not allowed to regulate physicians but, rather, pharmaceutical manufacturers. This regulation is not aimed at telling a physician precisely how an agent should be used. In addition, the FDA does not initiate its own studies of drug effects, but generally evaluates those submitted to it by manufacturers. Finally, there are reasonable logistical limitations on what can be expected prior to marketing, without undue cost in time and resources, as well as delaying the availability of a chemical entity with a proven potential for efficacy. Thus, it seems that more studies of beneficial drug effects are needed, perhaps as a routine part of postmarketing drug surveillance.

Chapter 2 introduced the concept of a confounding variable, that is a variable other than the risk factor and outcome variable under study which is related independently to each of the other two and, thereby, can create an apparent association or mask a real one. Studies of intended drug effects present a special methodologic problem of confounding by the indication for therapy.22,23 In this case the risk factor under study is the drug and the outcome variable under study is the clinical condition which the drug is supposed to change (cure, ameliorate, or prevent). In clinical practice, one would expect treated patients to differ from untreated patients, as the former have an indication for the treatment. To the extent that the indication is related to the outcome variable as well, the indication can function as a confounding variable.

For example, if one wanted to evaluate the effectiveness of a β-blocker used after a myocardial infarction in preventing a recurrent myocardial infarction, one might conduct a cohort study comparing patients who were treated with the β-blocker as part of their usual post-myocardial infarction medical care to patients who were not, measuring the incidence of myocardial infarction in both groups. However, patients with angina, arrhythmias, and hypertension, all indications for β-blocker therapy, all are at increased risk of subsequent myocardial infarction. As such, one might well observe an increase in the risk of myocardial infarction, rather than the expected decrease. Thus, even if use of the drug was beneficial, it might appear to be harmful!

Confounding by the indication for the treatment generally is not a problem if a study is focusing on unexpected drug effects, or side-effects, whether they are harmful or beneficial. In this situation, the indication for treatment is not usually related to the outcome variable under study. For example, in a study of gastrointestinal bleeding from nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, the possible indications for treatment, such as arthritis,
dysmenorrhea, and acute pain, have little or no relationship in and of themselves to the risk of gastrointestinal bleeding. Nevertheless, sometimes the problem of confounding by indication can emerge even in studies of unexpected drug effects (beneficial or harmful). For instance, in a study of hypersensitivity reactions associated with the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, the increased risk of hypersensitivity reactions evident in patients taking nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs was higher in those using the drugs for acute pain than in those using the drugs for osteoarthritis and other chronic conditions. This probably was because of the intermittent ingestion of the drug by those receiving it for acute pain.

Although confounding by the indication is a relatively uncommon problem for studies of side effects, this is not the case for studies of anticipated beneficial effects. In these studies one would expect the indication to be more closely related to the outcome variable. In fact, the problem presented by confounding by the indication has been thought by some to invalidate nonexperimental approaches to studies of the beneficial effects of drugs. Some have felt that questions of beneficial drug effects can be addressed only by using randomized clinical trials. Yet, although postmarketing randomized clinical trials certainly can be very useful, they are vexed by many of the same logistical problems, ethical restrictions, and artificial medical settings found in premarketing clinical trials.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

Not all studies of beneficial drug effects need be randomized clinical trials (see Table 34.3). First, some questions do not require any comparative (analytic) research for their answer. For these, simple clinical observations, as reported in a case report or case series, can be sufficient. For example, the efficacy and effectiveness of naloxone, used as a narcotic antagonist, is demonstrable simply through the observation of a single patient. Consider a patient comatose from an overdose of methadone. An injection of naloxone results in his prompt awakening. However, 30 minutes later, as the effects of the narcotic antagonist wear off, the patient returns to coma. Another injection of naloxone results in awakening once more, and then later the coma returns again. This sequence of events represents a convincing demonstration of the drug’s ability to have its desired effect. No elaborate studies are needed to make this point. The same would be true for a case series of patients given penicillin to treat pneumococcal pneumonia.

However, in applying this approach, the course of a patient’s disease must be sufficiently predictable that one can differentiate a true drug effect from spontaneous improvement. In particular, one must be able to exclude regression to the mean as the mechanism of the observed change: individuals selected to participate in a study based upon the severity of their disease spontaneously and usually will tend to improve. One example would be a patient with recurrent headaches. The patient would most likely seek medical attention when the headaches are most severe or most frequent. A spontaneous return to the baseline pattern of headaches generally could be expected. However, if the patient were treated in the interim, then the treating physician likely would view the return to normality as evidence of successful therapy, no matter what treatment was used or whether it contributed anything to the recovery.

Second, some questions about beneficial drug effects can be answered using formal nonexperimental studies, because there is no confounding by the indication. If the decision about whether to treat is not based on a formal indication, but on some other factor that may not be related to the outcome variable under study, such as limited availability of the drug in question, then there is no opportunity for confounding by the indication. This situation occurs most commonly in studies of primary prevention. The use of measles vaccine, routinely administered to healthy infants, is one example.

Third, there are several settings in which confounding by the indication may exist but theoretically can be controlled. When the indication can be measured sufficiently well, the traditional epidemiologic techniques of exclusion, matching, stratification, and mathematical modeling can be applied. The indication clearly can be
Table 34.3. Classification of research questions according to their problems of confounding by the indication for therapy\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Comparative studies unnecessary</td>
<td>Naloxone used for methadone overdose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) Drug effect obvious in the individual patient, or</td>
<td>Penicillin used for pneumococcal pneumonia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) drug effect obvious in a series of patients</td>
<td>Measles vaccine given routinely to healthy infants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Confounding by the indication nonexistent: there is no indication</td>
<td>Anti-Rh (D) immune globulin given to Rh (D) negative mothers who deliver Rh (D) positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>newborns to prevent future erythroblastosis fetalis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Confounding by the indication exists but is controllable</td>
<td>Penicillin used for endocarditis prophylaxis in patients with congenital aortic stenosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) The indication is dichotomous</td>
<td>who are undergoing tooth extraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Gradients in the indication do not exist, or</td>
<td>Penicillin used to prevent tertiary syphilis, given to patients with an asymptomatic positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Gradients in the indication are unrelated to the choice of treatment,</td>
<td>serologic test for syphilis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Gradients in the indication are unrelated to expected outcome, or</td>
<td>Anticoagulants used after myocardial infarctions to prevent death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Special clinical settings</td>
<td>Isoniazid used for tuberculosis prophylaxis in a patient with an asymptomatic positive PPD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) The indication is sufficiently characterizable</td>
<td>Ampicillin used to treat urinary tract infection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Complete characterization of the indication as it relates to choice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Characterization must continue after initiation of therapy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Confounding by the indication exists and is not controllable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)From reference 22.

sufficiently measured if it is dichotomous or binary. In this situation, the indication either is present or absent, but has no gradations in severity. The indication also can be sufficiently measured if any gradations in severity either are unrelated to the choice of whether or not to treat or are unrelated to the expected outcome. Alternatively, sometimes one can find special clinical settings in which the gradations are not related to the choice of therapy. For example, if the availability of drugs is limited or there are consistent philosophical differences among prescribers for using or not using the drug, then gradations in the indication will not be related to the choice of therapy.

Finally, if an indication is graded but can be sufficiently precisely measured, it can be controlled by mathematical modeling using, for example, multiple regression. Then confounding by the indication can be controlled. Recently, researchers have begun to use Propensity Scores towards this end.\(^{27,28}\) This is an approach that uses mathematical modeling to predict exposure, rather than the traditional approach of predicting outcome. This is, essentially, a direct measure of indication. One can then use the propensity score to create categories of probability of exposure, and control for those categories in the analysis. While this approach has many attractive features, especially as a direct way to control for confounding by indication, it is important to point out that it is still dependent on identifying and measuring those variables that are the true predictors of therapeutic choice.
When questions of intended drug effects do not fall into any of the preceding categories, confounding by the indication cannot be controlled. Non-experimental study designs cannot then be used, or they can only be used to demonstrate qualitatively some degree of beneficial effect. Specifically, if confounding by the indication is such that treated patients would have a worse clinical outcome than untreated patients, yet the outcome observed in treated patients is better than that observed in untreated patients, some degree of confidence that the drug has a beneficial effect can be built. As an example, patients treated with corticosteroids for status asthmaticus would be expected to be sicker than those not so treated. If patients receiving corticosteroids stop wheezing sooner than those not receiving corticosteroids, corticosteroids would indeed seem to have a beneficial effect. However, if the patients receiving corticosteroids do not stop wheezing sooner than those not receiving corticosteroids, the results of the study are uninterpretable. It is possible that the corticosteroids in fact have no beneficial effect. However, it is also possible that a beneficial effect was present but was being masked by the difference in severity between the two treatment groups.

The qualitative approach illustrated above must be used with caution. First, the effect of the confounding by indication must be opposite in direction to the expected effect of the drug. Second, the effect of the confounding by indication must be absolutely predictable in its direction. Third, the effect of the confounding by indication must be sufficiently large so as to exclude regression to the mean as an explanation for the results. Even if all of these conditions are met, the results must be interpreted only qualitatively, not quantitatively.

Examples of each of these situations are presented in Table 34.3 and discussed further in reference 22.

APPLICABILITY OF THE PROPOSED APPROACHES

How commonly are the nonexperimental approaches we have described applicable for the study of beneficial drug effects? A list of the 100 most recently approved new molecular entities as of December 1978 was studied to determine what types of nonexperimental study design, if any, could be used to evaluate drug effectiveness. Of these 100 “drugs,” seven were used in contact lenses and were excluded. The remaining 93 drugs were examined for all potential indications and clinical outcomes that could be used to evaluate intended drug effects. Ultimately we assessed 131 drug uses, that is 131 drug–indication pairs. Each drug use was categorized as to whether a study evaluating the effectiveness of that drug for that indication would present the problem of confounding by the indication and, if so, whether one of the approaches described above would be adequate to address it. Eighty-nine (67.9%) of the drug uses could have been evaluated using simple clinical observations, without formal comparative research. A very few of these drugs were, in fact, approved by FDA on the basis of such studies, e.g., nitroprusside (approved for malignant hypertension) and beryllium (approved for life threatening arrhythmias, in patients refractory to all other antiarrhythmics). The remaining 42 drug uses required comparative research for their evaluation, because they all presented the problem of confounding by the indication. In seven of the 42 (5.3% of the total), this confounding was not an obstacle to valid nonexperimental research. Most often the validity of the approach rested on the observation that any given physician usually used the drug to treat either all or none of his patients with the indication.

In the remaining 35 of the 42 uses (26.7% of the total), confounding by the indication was judged to be uncontrollable using currently available nonexperimental techniques.

To place these findings in perspective, of the 42 drug uses that required comparative research to evaluate their effectiveness, 30 could not ethically be addressed using a randomized clinical trial and a placebo control. Most of these 30 involved the use of drugs to treat infections or malignancies. In these situations, patients could not ethically be left “untreated,” that is assigned to the placebo group.

Studies of the effects of one drug relative to another active drug, of course, gave different results. Formal comparative research was necessary
for all 131 drug uses. Nonexperimental studies theoretically could be conducted validly for 94 of the 131 drug uses (71.8%). Experimental studies would be ethical for all of them.

Of course, judging theoretically that a question of effectiveness is “studiable” by a given technique is not the same as proving that a valid outcome would emerge from such a study. There are many specifics in the actual conduct of such studies that must be addressed on a case by case basis. It is, therefore, instructive to examine some specific examples of nonexperimental research into beneficial drug effects.

**SPECIFIC EXAMPLES**

**Estrogens for Prevention of Osteoporotic Fractures**

One of the first series of studies of drug effectiveness using rigorous nonexperimental study designs examined whether exogenous estrogens could prevent fractures in postmenopausal women with osteoporosis. Biochemical studies had documented that the menopause resulted in a negative calcium and phosphorus balance, and that the balance returned towards normal with the ingestion of exogenous estrogens. Studies of bone density documented that exogenous estrogens prevented the loss of bone density that was associated with the menopause, for as long as the estrogens were continued. It seemed plausible that the use of estrogens might prevent fractures from osteoporosis, but no data directly addressed that question. On the other hand, postmenopausal estrogens had been shown to cause endometrial cancer.

A randomized clinical trial would have been the ideal way to address the effect of estrogen on fractures. However, such a study was impractical for many reasons. This is prophylactic therapy. Although postmenopausal fractures are common, they are experienced by a sufficiently small proportion of the population during any defined time period that an extremely large sample size would be needed. Also, the study would need to be carried on for many years before a beneficial effect could begin to be seen.

Instead of a randomized clinical trial, a series of nonexperimental studies were performed. Both case–control and cohort designs were used. In general, these studies were rigorous and well done. Unfortunately, however, the question of confounding by the indication was not addressed in most of the studies. In particular, most of the studies failed to address why some of the women received the postmenopausal exogenous estrogens and others did not. Given the data already available on the effects of estrogens on bone density and endometrial cancer, it is reasonable to assume that some physicians might preferentially routinely use the drugs and others might routinely avoid them. In such a setting, nonexperimental techniques could yield valid results, unaffected by confounding by the indication (category 3.a.iv) in Table 34.3). However, many physicians might try to selectively prescribe the drugs for patients who have undergone hysterectomy, because these patients are at no risk of endometrial cancer. Alternatively, some physicians may try to use the drugs only on patients who feel they are at high risk of fractures or are at high risk of complications from fractures. These situations would represent uncontrollable confounding by the indication—category 4 in Table 34.3. Finally, one might expect that the direction of the confounding by indication might be opposite to that of the drug effect, allowing one to use these data to make at least qualitative conclusions. This assumes, however, that physicians can accurately predict who is at high risk of fracture. Such a presumption was not borne out by the available data.

In fact, the three studies that closely examined the comparability of the study groups were able to document that they were not comparable. Specifically, one study was a case–control study within an orthopedic service, and documented that cases with fractures of the hip or radius weighed less than controls matched for age and race, had a later menopause, and more frequently were alcoholics. A second was a cohort study of patients with known estrogen deficiency. In this study, those who were treated with estrogens differed from those who were not in age, age of menopause, duration of followup, height, weight, blood pressure, marital status, race, economic status, and
Gravidity, as well as in the frequency of the following diagnoses: atrophic vaginitis, bilateral oophorectomy, premature ovarian failure, hypopituitarism, gonadal dysgenesis, endocrine disease, hypertension, and osteoporosis.47

A third study used a case–control design to investigate patients admitted to surgical services.49 It compared cases with hip fractures to a control group of surgical patients, divided into those with trauma and those without trauma. Cases were noted to be older, taller, and to have a lower body weight than the controls. The cases more frequently had undergone ovariectomy, breastfed fewer times and for fewer months, and were hypothyroid less frequently than the controls. When these factors were controlled for as confounding variables, the effect of estrogens was still apparent. However, as in the other studies, there was no information on how or why the decision was made to treat with or withhold estrogens.

Anticoagulants for Prevention of Recurrent Venous Thromboembolism

The use of intravenous anticoagulants reduces the risk of recurrent venous thromboembolism,54 and the addition of oral anticoagulants to intravenous anticoagulants probably reduces the risk even further.55 However, how long oral anticoagulant treatment should be continued had not been well studied. Most explicit advice from experts on the optimal duration of anticoagulation therapy was and is based on anecdotal experience.56,57 Most of the data available that are used to suggest the appropriate duration of therapy are derived from clinical observations in a single medical center.58–61 They represent an accumulating case series. Over time, gradually patients’ treatment has been prolonged. Thus, changes in the duration of treatment are intermingled with other changes in medical care over decades. In addition, the studies do not compare patients receiving treatments of different length, but simply observe when most recurrences tend to occur. The investigators have assumed that treatment should be prolonged sufficiently to include that time when recurrences can be expected. Problems with these studies have been detailed.56,57

As with the question of the effect of estrogens on bone fractures from osteoporosis, a randomized clinical trial would be the ideal design to address the question of the optimal duration of anticoagulation after venous thromboembolism, but such a study is impractical. After patients have been anticoagulated in the hospital and followed for a short time as outpatients, the risk of recurrence is sufficiently small that an enormous population would be needed to detect a difference in outcome due to differences in therapy. Until recently, the only randomized clinical trial in the literature that addressed this question compared six weeks of outpatient treatment to six months of treatment. No difference in recurrence rate between two groups of patients was observed.62 However, only 186 subjects were included, yielding a total of only seven recurrences. In addition, over half the study subjects had known short-term risk factors for venous thromboembolism. These included pregnancy, use of oral contraceptives, and recent surgery. Patients with these transient underlying risk factors might be expected to be less likely to benefit from longer-term anticoagulant therapy than patients with idiopathic disease.

The question of the optimal duration of anticoagulation was addressed in a cohort study using data from the Northern California Kaiser Permanente Medical Program.63 The study required the use of ten years of data from this population of 1.6 million, or a total of 16 million patient years of experience. There were a total of 3384 individuals identified as being hospitalized for venous thromboembolism. Of these, 2473 suffered from idiopathic venous thromboembolism. Their clinical outcomes were evaluated, according to how long they had been treated with oral anticoagulants. Using those treated with six weeks of therapy or less as a control group, prolongation of therapy beyond that point was found to increase the risk of major bleeding dramatically, but to have no effect on recurrence rates.

The feature of this study that allowed the investigators to overcome the problem of confounding by indication was that physician behavior regarding how long therapy was continued
as essentially random (category 3.a.ii in Table 34.3). The choice of how long to treat became random, because there was no prior information on how long one should treat. In fact, the duration of treatment was relatively uniformly distributed across the years of followup, and the results were no different when one restricted the analysis to those who had their anticoagulation stopped because of hemorrhage, rather than at the option of their physician.

Lidocaine for Prevention of Death from Myocardial Infarction

In another study, the efficacy of lidocaine in preventing death from myocardial infarction was studied using a case-control design. Among patients admitted to a coronary or intensive care unit for acute myocardial infarction, those who died were compared to an equal number of patients who survived. The controls were matched to the cases for age, gender, race, and date of hospitalization. Overall, lidocaine did not protect against death. Lidocaine was effective only when deaths attributable to ventricular arrhythmia were analyzed separately.

In this careful study, the investigators obviously were well aware of the risk of confounding by indication. They attempted to control for this confounding by using the epidemiologic technique of stratification, that is classifying patients according to their risk of dying from myocardial infarction, in order to control for this inequality of risk as a confounding variable. Thus, they treated the study as a category 3.b question in Table 34.3. Unfortunately, however, it is doubtful that one can accurately and fully measure the basis for physicians’ judgments about who they think is at high risk of death from myocardial infarction. Similarly, it is unlikely that each individual’s risk of dying from a myocardial infarction can be predicted, especially death by ventricular arrhythmia. Certainly a classification according to just the presence or absence of congestive heart failure, as was used, is overly simplistic. In fact, the rates of death attributed to ventricular arrhythmia were virtually identical in those patients with and without congestive heart failure. Nevertheless the results do coincide with those of a randomized clinical trial evaluating the efficacy of lidocaine in preventing primary ventricular fibrillation. However, while the drug prevented the arrhythmia in that randomized clinical trial, it did not alter mortality.

Anticoagulants for Prevention of Death from Myocardial Infarction

Whether anticoagulants can prevent death from myocardial infarction had been addressed using randomized clinical trials. However, the results had been inconsistent and inconclusive, possibly because of problems of sample size. Thus, this question would appear to be a good candidate for a case-control study. Such a study was done with the investigators treating this research question as if it were a category 3.b question in Table 34.3. However, as with the study of the effects of lidocaine on myocardial infarction, it is doubtful whether one can measure and quantitate precisely the risk of dying from a myocardial infarction at the time of the acute episode. This study might have been more convincing if the investigators had identified the patients of practitioners who always used anticoagulants for their patients with myocardial infarctions, and then compared them to a control group of patients of practitioners who never used anticoagulants for their patients with myocardial infarctions. Inasmuch as the choice of therapy in these patients would not have been made on the basis of any perceived difference among the patients in their risk of dying from myocardial infarction, confounding by the indication would not be a problem. Of course, if the investigators had designed the study as we suggest, they then would have had to consider whether the physicians themselves were somehow a predictor of outcome, and whether this was consistently related to their philosophy of using anticoagulants, across multiple physicians. Thus, randomized trials are really needed to provide the answer to this question, and of course in recent years, with the advent of low molecular weight heparin and thrombolytic therapy, many have been forthcoming.
Generic versus Brand Name Drugs

Another potential use of nonexperimental study designs to study the beneficial effects of drugs arose with the passage of the 1984 Waxman–Hatch Act in the US. Generic drugs can now be marketed after simple demonstration of bioequivalence i.e., equivalent bioavailability, in 18 to 24 normal adults. However, it is not clear whether bioequivalence assures clinical equivalence, that is equivalent efficacy and toxicity. Clinical inequivalence is more likely to be evident as a difference in beneficial effects than as a difference in adverse effects. In developing a drug, dosages are sought which optimize drug efficacy. Toxicity, other than idiosyncratic or allergic reactions, usually occurs at higher doses and concentrations than efficacy. Modest variations in the plasma concentration of the active drug, created by receiving the same dose in different preparations, are most likely, therefore, to be a problem for drug efficacy than for drug toxicity. Variations in plasma concentration are even more likely to be a problem for drug effectiveness and cost-effectiveness. Even a simple change in the physical appearance of the drug could conceivably lead to a decrease in compliance and, thereby, effectiveness.

Studies designed to evaluate differences in efficacy among different preparations of the same drug require enormous sample sizes, as one would be searching for relatively small differences. However, such sample sizes can be achieved relatively easily and efficiently as part of nonexperimental pharmacoepidemiology studies. Thus, the suggestion has been made that studies of clinical equivalence could possibly be carried out as postmarketing surveillance studies. Confounding by the indication is unlikely to be a problem because, as far as the physician is concerned, he or she is dealing with different products of the same drug, products which are theoretically interchangeable. The choice among the alternative therapies is not being made by the prescriber on the basis of patient characteristics, but by the pharmacist on the basis of product availability — category 3.a.ii in Table 34.3.

A few pharmacoepidemiology studies on the relative effectiveness of different preparations used for the same purpose have been performed by Strom, using the COMPASS database. These studies compared patients who began on a brand name product and switched to a generic product when it became available to patients who remained on the brand name product. The drugs studied were thiouracil, chlorpropamide, and slow absorption theophylline. These studies naturally raise concerns about the ability to identify the actual product dispensed. Very few of the pharmacoepidemiology approaches described in Part III of the book are able to identify the specific product dispensed. Often the approach does not even distinguish whether it is a brand name product or a generic product that is being used. Even when the distinction is made, for example most Medicaid datasets use the National Drug Code to identify specifically the drug, the manufacturer, the dosage form, and the dose, one is inevitably left with questions about whether a brand name is being billed for, while a generic drug is dispensed. In addition, such studies raise concerns about how to define the clinical outcome variable. For example, how is drug efficacy reflected in a claims database? The studies described above used outcomes like number of physician visits, number of hospitalizations, and use of adjunctive therapy to obtain an estimate of drug efficacy.

Using these outcomes, the investigators first analyzed the baseline data, comparing the experience, prior to switching, of those who ultimately switched to generic products to the experience of those who did not later switch to a generic product. In each of the three studies, the future switchers were different from the future non-switchers, prior to the switch. Thus, it appears that patients who were to be switched to generic products were different than patients who stayed on the brand name products: confounding by indication was indeed operating. Because of this, no analyses of efficacy after the switch were performed. Parenthetically, because of this, and questions about the uncertain interpretability of the clinical outcomes, it was elected not to publish the results of these papers.
Cost-Effectiveness Studies

An important new category of studies of beneficial drug effects includes studies of their cost-effectiveness. These studies measure the resources necessary to achieve a particular beneficial outcome, and thus have two main study variables—one that is clinical and one that is economic. For example, one could perform a cohort study comparing treated patients to untreated patients, and determine whether the clinical outcomes they experience and the cost of the medical care they subsequently receive is different. In such a study, one would need to consider the possibility of confounding by the indication for both the clinical outcome and the cost variables. It should be noted that the indication may have different effects on the clinical outcomes and the costs. Thus, while performing the clinical outcome assessment, one needs to consider and, potentially, quantify the implications of the indication for the treatment on the clinical outcome variable. In contrast, while performing the cost assessment, one needs to consider and, potentially, quantify the cost implications of the indication on both the clinical outcomes and the costs. The subject of health economics as applied to drug use is discussed in more detail in Chapter 35.

Vaccines

In the last several years, nonexperimental study designs have been widely used to evaluate the efficacy of vaccines. Specifically, case–control studies have been used to explore the efficacy of pneumococcal vaccine,⁷⁰, ⁷¹ rubella vaccine,⁷², ⁷³ measles vaccine,⁷⁴–⁷⁷ Haemophilus influenzae type b polysaccharide vaccine,⁷⁸–⁸⁶ oral poliovirus vaccine,⁸⁷, ⁸⁸ meningococcus vaccine,⁸⁹ Japanese encephalitis vaccine,⁹⁰, ⁹¹ and BCG vaccine in protecting against tuberculosis⁹²–⁹⁹ and leprosy.¹⁰⁰, ¹⁰¹ Cohort studies have been used to explore the efficacy of Haemophilus influenzae type b polysaccharide vaccine,⁷⁹ measles vaccine,⁹⁰ and pertussis vaccine.¹⁰², ¹⁰³

Again studies like these should ideally be conducted as randomized clinical trials. However, the relative infrequency of the diseases the above vaccines are designed to prevent, particularly in populations which are partly vaccinated, make use of this design difficult, although not impossible. In fact, in one situation, a new Chinese manufactured Japanese encephalitis vaccine was studied for efficacy using a case–control design,⁹⁰ despite a study of its safety conducted by the same authors using a randomized clinical trial design.⁹¹ In considering the applicability of nonexperimental study designs, the relatively indiscriminate use of such vaccines places the study in category 2 of Table 34.3. Patients who receive these vaccines differ from those who do not in their socioeconomic status, their access to medical care, and their physicians’ attitudes towards vaccines. However, for most vaccines, an individual physician is not likely to give only some of his eligible patients the vaccine, withholding it from other eligible patients. Thus, patients receiving vaccines are not likely to differ from those who do not get the vaccine, at least in their physicians’ perceptions about the patients’ risk of contracting these diseases. Nonexperimental studies of such questions should produce valid results, therefore. We refer the interested reader to some methodologic papers on the subtleties of designing nonexperimental studies of vaccine efficacy.¹⁰⁴–¹¹⁰

Cancer Screening

Another recent and frequent use of nonexperimental study designs is to evaluate the efficacy of cancer screening programs. Although this does not directly relate to drugs, the methodological implications are the same, and have been better enunciated than in the pharmacoepidemiology literature. The use of nonexperimental study designs to evaluate the efficacy of cancer screening programs will be briefly discussed here, therefore.

Once again, ideally questions about the value of screening would be addressed using randomized clinical trials. However, most diseases that are screened for are relatively uncommon. Only a very small fraction of those in a broad screening program could be expected to benefit from the screening program. Thus, randomized clinical trials of screening can be expensive and may require years to complete. Even more importantly,
once a screening procedure is widely accepted, even without data documenting its efficacy, recruiting patients into a randomized clinical trial can be impractical and possibly truly unethical.

Instead, investigators have used nonexperimental designs. Screening procedures that have been evaluated repeatedly in this fashion include the value of “Pap” smears for cervical cancer\textsuperscript{111–122} and mammography and self-examination for breast cancer.\textsuperscript{123–136} Other studies investigated screening measures for lung cancer\textsuperscript{122, 137, 138} and gastric cancer.\textsuperscript{139} All of these were case–control studies. Again, they raise similar methodologic considerations of confounding by indication. Specifically, why do some women choose to have the screening procedure and others do not? One randomized clinical trial documented that women who attended screening sessions were at higher risk of developing breast cancer than women who were offered screening but did not attend.\textsuperscript{140} In addition, case–control studies of screening present additional thorny methodologic problems regarding how to define cases, how to define controls, the time period to choose for the study, etc.\textsuperscript{141–156}

Other Examples

Other analogous work using case–control study designs has explored the effectiveness of bicycle safety helmets in preventing face injuries,\textsuperscript{157} antibiotic prophylaxis in preventing post-dental infective endocarditis,\textsuperscript{158} β-blockers in preventing mortality in patients with acute myocardial infarction,\textsuperscript{159} β-blockers and incident coronary artery events,\textsuperscript{160} etc.

THE FUTURE

Clinicians have long recognized the value of clinical observations and nonexperimental research. Much of our current knowledge about the usefulness of medical interventions is based on information that is nonexperimental. Yet the data and conclusions from the information are useful and valid. However, the information that observational techniques generate cannot be accepted uncritically. Perhaps in reaction to the limitations of nonexperimental studies, some scientists have insisted that “the randomized clinical trial (RCT) is the only scientifically reliable method for assessment of the efficacy (and risks) of most clinical treatments.”\textsuperscript{126} Sackett et al. argue “... to keep up with the clinical literature ... discard at once all articles on therapy that are not randomized trials.”\textsuperscript{161} In light of the analysis presented above, this posture seems too simplistic and far-reaching. If overbearing, it results in clinically necessary and potentially available information being uncollected and unused. The proper balance in attitude about the value of these approaches probably lies somewhere between the two extremes. To quote Sir Austin Bradford Hill, one of the developers of the randomized trial: “Any belief that the controlled trial is the only way (to study therapeutic efficacy) would mean not only that the pendulum had swung too far but that it had come right off its hook.”\textsuperscript{162} Many investigators are now applying nonexperimental designs to studies of beneficial drug effects. However, careful attention needs to be paid to the possibility of confounding by the indication. Some approaches to this problem are now available, and hopefully more will be available in the future. However, when confounding by indication can be addressed, clinical observations and nonexperimental research can be used. The results of nonexperimental research are unlikely to be as powerful or as convincing as those of experimental research. We are not suggesting that nonexperimental studies be used as replacements for experimental studies. However, when an experimental study is felt to be unnecessary, unethical, infeasible, or too costly relative to the expected benefits, there frequently is a good alternative.
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INTRODUCTION

Conventional evaluation of new medical technologies such as pharmaceutical products includes consideration of efficacy, effectiveness, and safety. Other chapters of this book describe in detail how such evaluations are carried out. The methodology is well developed, and federal regulation requires studies of safety and efficacy to be performed prior to drug marketing. Recently, health care researchers from a variety of disciplines have developed new techniques for the evaluation of the economic effects of clinical care and new medical technologies. Clinicians, pharmacists, economists, epidemiologists, operations researchers, and others have contributed to a new field of “clinical economics,” an evolving discipline dedicated to the study of how different approaches to patient care and treatment influence the resources consumed in clinical medicine.1–14

The growth of clinical economics has proceeded rapidly as health policymakers have faced a

* This chapter does not necessarily represent the views of DHHS or the Federal government.
continuing series of decisions about funding new clinical therapies in an era of increasingly constrained health care resources. Assessments of new therapies include the resources required for the new therapy, the extent of the substitution of the new resources for existing resources, if any, and the health outcomes that result from therapeutic intervention. Thus, clinical economics includes not just an assessment of the cost of a new therapy, but an assessment of its overall economic and clinical effect.

This chapter discusses the need for applying economic concepts to the study of pharmaceuticals, introduces the concepts of clinical economics and the application of these concepts to pharmaceutical research, reviews some of the methodologic issues addressed by investigators studying the economics of pharmaceuticals, and finally offers examples of this type of research.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED BY PHARMACOEPIEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

Recent years have seen increasing concern about the cost of medical care, which has caused both purchasers and producers of pharmaceuticals to realize that the cost of drugs is not limited to their purchase price. The accompanying costs of preparation, administration, monitoring for and treating side-effects, and the economic consequences of successful disease treatment are all influenced by the clinical and pharmacologic characteristics of pharmaceuticals. Thus, in addition to differences in efficacy and safety, differences in efficiency (or the effectiveness of the agent in actual clinical practice compared to its cost) distinguish drugs from one another.

Concerns about the cost of medical care in general and pharmaceuticals specifically are being felt in nearly all developed nations. Australia is implementing and Canada is considering a set of national guidelines that would mandate the presentation of pharmacoeconomic data at the time of product registration for pharmaceuticals to qualify for reimbursement through the national health insurance systems. Clinical economics research is being used increasingly by managed care organizations in the United States to inform funding decisions for new therapies. At the local level, hospital administrators and other providers of health care are seeking ways of delivering high quality care within the constraints of limited budgets or reduced fee schedules. These decision-makers increasingly are interested in guidance regarding the cost-effectiveness of new medical technologies such as pharmaceuticals. This guidance can be provided by clinical economic analyses.

TRENDS IN PHARMACOECONOMIC RESEARCH

The biotechnology revolution in medical research has added another challenge to pharmacoeconomic research. Pharmacoeconomics is increasingly being used to help determine the effect on patients of new classes of therapies before they are brought to the marketplace and to help determine appropriate clinical and economic outcomes for the clinical development program. The challenge is twofold: (i) understanding the potential effect of a therapy (e.g., whether a new antiseptic agent is a new type of antibiotic compound where a short term evaluation, efficacy at 14 days, is the appropriate clinical endpoint for analysis, or a life supporting therapy where a longer-term evaluation, efficacy at 6 or 12 months, is the appropriate clinical endpoint for efficacy assessment) and (ii) understanding the issues related to the transition from efficacy to efficiency in clinical practice. These challenges span the clinical development spectrum. As we learn more about the potential effect and use of a new product, these issues can be re-addressed in an iterative process. Finally, more and more firms are beginning to use economic models to help guide the business planning process and the new product development process to address the economic issues surrounding new therapies at the beginning of the product development cycle.

Pharmacoeconomic studies are designed to meet the different information needs of health care purchasers and regulatory authorities. Economic data from phase III studies are used to support
initial pricing of new therapies and are used in professional educational activities by pharmaceutical firms. Postmarketing economic studies are used to compare new therapies with existing therapies and increasingly to confirm the initial phase III economic assessments of the product.

No single study can possibly provide all interested audiences with complete economic information on a new therapy. Thus, specific studies are undertaken to address economic concerns from specific perspectives, such as a postmarketing study of a new therapy from the perspective of a health maintenance organization. They may also be undertaken to assess the effect of therapy on specific cost categories, such as an assessment of the productivity costs of treatment to provide data to federal governments in Europe, since these governments fund both the health insurance system and the disability system.

ECONOMIC EVALUATION AND THE DRUG DEVELOPMENT PROCESS

New pharmaceuticals are developed in a series of well-defined stages due to the regulatory process of drug approval. After a compound is identified and thought to be clinically useful, four distinct sets of evaluations—referred to as phase I through IV studies—are mandated by the US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and most other equivalent regulatory bodies. Phase I studies represent the first introduction of a new compound into (usually undiseased) humans, principally for the evaluation of safety and dosage. In phase II studies, the drug is introduced into a patient population with the disease of interest, again primarily for the evaluation of safety and dosing. Phase III studies are randomized trials evaluating the safety and efficacy of new drugs, compared either with placebo or with a therapy that the new drug might replace (in the US, the appropriate comparator often is the subject of negotiations between the developer of the drug and the FDA). In addition to these three types of study, drugs often are evaluated after they are marketed in what are referred to as phase IV or postmarketing studies. The drug development process allows for timely collection of data that can be used to evaluate the costs and effects of pharmaceuticals early in their product life, with an opportunity for further data collection and evaluation once the product has been approved and marketed.

Clinical economics is now being integrated throughout the development process, with goals that parallel the clinical development stages. Phase I and II studies are used to develop pilot economic data, such as estimates of the mean and variance estimates for costs, quality of life, and utilities for patients with a specific clinical syndrome. These studies are also used to perform pilot tests of data collection tools, including economic case report forms that prospectively capture resources used by patients who will be entered into the phase III and postmarketing clinical trials. From these data, issues such as sample size and power for pharmaeco-economic studies can be assessed.

One of the fastest growing areas in the economic assessment of new drugs is the incorporation of economic analyses as part of phase III clinical trials. Phase III studies can include economic assessments of new therapies as a primary or secondary endpoint (i.e., an assessment of changes in the use of specific resource categories resulting from treatment, such as changes in length of hospital stay or changes in hospitalization rates).

Lastly, a wide variety of postmarketing economic studies can be performed. These include efficiency trials and postmarketing surveillance studies. In efficiency trials, comparisons between products are made in more realistic settings with less restrictive protocols than those designed for phase III safety and efficacy trials. These postmarketing studies may include assessments of the new therapy compared with “usual care” or compared with specific therapeutic agents. In postmarketing surveillance studies, observational data may be used to evaluate costs, effectiveness, and adverse experiences related to the drug. Again, the economic analysis can serve as a primary or secondary endpoint of the study.

Developing economic data as an endpoint in a clinical trial requires integrating pharmaecoconomics into the clinical development process. While there recently has been an increase in the number of trials that collect economic data, the
challenge remains to ensure that pharmacoeconomic endpoints are considered sufficiently early in the clinical development process so that designing the economic protocol does not impede the process of designing the clinical trial. Economic analysis requires the establishment of a set of economic endpoints for study (e.g., direct, productivity, and intangible costs to patients and caregivers, as well as quality of life or preference measures for patients and caregivers), review of the clinical protocol to ensure that there are no economic biases in the design of the clinical trial, and the development of the economic protocol. Ideally, the economic study will be integrated into the clinical protocol and the economic data will be collected as part of a unified case report form for both clinical and economic variables.

In the following sections, we briefly review the research methods of pharmacoeconomics, discuss some methodologic issues that have confronted researchers investigating the economics of pharmaceuticals, and review several studies that illustrate the usefulness of pharmacoeconomic research.

METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

TECHNIQUES OF CLINICAL ECONOMICS

Economists emphasize that costs are more than just transactions of currency. Cost represents the consumption of a resource that could otherwise be used for another purpose. The value of the resource is that of its next best use, which no longer is possible once the resource has been used. This value is called the resource’s “opportunity cost.” For example, the time it takes to read this chapter is a cost for the reader, because it is time that cannot be used again; the opportunity to use it for another purpose has been foregone. Good investments are made when the benefits of the investment (e.g., what you learn) are greater than or equal to the value of the opportunities you have forgone (e.g., what you would be doing if you were not reading this chapter).

In addition to the fact that not all costs involve a transaction of money, it is important to remember that, at least from the perspective of society as a whole, not all transactions of money should be considered costs. For example, monetary transactions that do not represent the consumption of resources (e.g., social security payments, disability payments, or other retirement benefits) are not costs by this definition. They simply transfer the right to consume the resources represented by the money from one individual to another.

In considering economic analysis of medical care, there are three dimensions of analysis (represented by the three axes of the cube in Figure 35.1) with which readers should become familiar.1 Along the x axis are three types of economic analysis—cost identification, cost–effectiveness, and cost–benefit. Along the y axis are four points of view, or perspectives, that one may take in carrying out an analysis. One may take the point of view of society in assessing the costs and benefits of a new medical therapy. Alternatively, one may take the point of view of the patient, the payer, or the provider. Along the third axis, the z axis, are the types of cost and benefit that can be included in economic analysis of medical care. These costs and benefits, which will be defined below, include direct costs and benefits, productivity costs and benefits, and intangible costs and benefits.

Types of Analysis

Cost–benefit Analysis

Cost–benefit analysis of medical care compares the cost of a medical intervention to its benefit. Both costs and benefits are measured in the same (usually monetary) units (e.g., dollars). These measurements are used to determine either the ratio of dollars spent to dollars saved or the net saving (if benefits are greater than costs) or net cost. All else equal, an investment should be undertaken when its benefits exceed its costs.

Costs and benefits are considered to be either positive or negative. A cost can be incurred or avoided and a benefit can be gained or lost. Thus, the cost–benefit ratio is open to manipulation. For
example, by reclassifying a cost that is incurred as a lost benefit, one can move the term from the numerator, where it would be considered a cost, to the denominator, where it would be considered a negative benefit. The net savings calculation where cost and benefits are summed together cannot be manipulated in this way and is, therefore, generally preferred.

The methods of cost–benefit analysis may be applied to evaluate the total costs and benefits of the interventions that are being compared by analyzing their cost–benefit ratios or their net benefits. Furthermore, the additional or “incremental” cost of an intervention (i.e., the difference in cost between a new therapy and conventional medical care) may be compared with its additional or “incremental” benefit. Incremental analysis is generally preferred to comparisons of totals because it allows the analyst to focus on the differences between any two treatment modalities.

One potential difficulty of cost–benefit analysis is that it requires researchers to express an intervention’s costs and outcomes in the same units. Thus, monetary values must be associated with years of life lost and morbidity due to disease and with years of life gained and morbidity avoided due to intervention. Expressing costs in this way is obviously difficult in health care analyses. Outcomes (treatment benefits) may be difficult to measure in units of currency. Translating disease and treatment outcomes into monetary measures may be more difficult than translating them into clinical outcome measures, such as years of life saved or years of life saved adjusted for quality.

Cost–effectiveness Analysis

Cost–effectiveness analysis provides an approach to the dilemma of assessing the monetary value of health outcomes as part of the evaluation. While
cost generally is still calculated only in terms of dollars spent, effectiveness is determined independently and may be measured only in clinical terms, using any meaningful clinical unit. For example, one might measure clinical outcomes in terms of number of lives saved, complications prevented, or diseases cured. Alternatively, health outcomes can be reported in terms of a change in an intermediate clinical outcome, such as cost per % change in blood cholesterol level. These results generally are reported as a ratio of costs to clinical benefits, with costs measured in monetary terms but with benefits measured in the units of the relevant outcome measure (for example, dollars per year of life saved).

When several outcomes result from a medical intervention (e.g., the prevention of both death and disability), cost–effectiveness analysis may consider these two outcomes together only if a common measure of outcome can be developed. Frequently, analysts combine different categories of clinical outcomes according to their desirability, assigning a weighted utility, or value, to the overall treatment outcome. A utility weight is a measure of the patient’s preferences for her health state or for the outcome of an intervention. The comparison of costs and utilities sometimes is referred to as cost–utility analysis.

As with cost–benefit analysis, cost–effectiveness analysis can compare a treatment’s total costs and total effectiveness, or it can assess only the treatment’s incremental costs and incremental effectiveness. In the former, the cost–effectiveness ratio of each intervention is calculated and the two ratios are compared (e.g., the cost per life saved using each intervention). In the latter approach, which assesses incremental costs and benefits, the incremental cost of the innovation is calculated, as is the incremental effectiveness, and the analyst can calculate the additional effect (e.g., lives saved) per additional treatment dollar spent. Programs that cost less and demonstrate improved or equivalent treatment outcomes are said to be dominant and should always be adopted. Programs that cost more and are more effective should be adopted if both their cost–effectiveness and incremental cost–effectiveness ratios fall within an acceptable range and the budget for the program is acceptable. Programs that cost more and have worse clinical outcomes are said to be dominated and should never be adopted. Programs that cost less and have reduced clinical outcomes may be adopted depending upon the magnitude of the changes in cost and outcome.

As with the translation of clinical outcomes into monetary measures, there also are difficulties associated with combining different outcomes into a common measure in cost–effectiveness analysis. However, it generally is considered more difficult to translate all health benefits into monetary units for the purposes of cost–benefit analysis than to combine clinical outcomes measures. Thus, cost–effectiveness analysis is used more frequently than cost–benefit analysis in the medical care literature.

Cost–identification Analysis

An even less complex approach than cost–benefit or cost–effectiveness analysis would be simply to enumerate the costs involved in medical care and to ignore the outcomes that result from that care. This approach is known as cost-identification analysis. By performing cost–identification analysis, the researcher can determine alternative ways of providing a service. The analysis might be expressed in terms of the cost per unit of service provided. For example, a cost–identification study might measure the cost of a course of antibiotic treatment, but it would not calculate the clinical outcomes (cost–effectiveness analysis) or the value of the outcomes in units of currency (cost–benefit analysis). Cost–identification studies, which include comparisons among different treatments based upon their costs alone, are appropriate only if treatment outcomes or benefits are equivalent for the therapies being evaluated.

Sensitivity Analysis

Most cost–benefit and cost–effectiveness studies require large amounts of data that may vary in reliability, validity, or the effect on the overall results of the study. This is especially the case when models are developed for the economic analysis using secondary data sources, when data collection is performed retrospectively, or when critical data
elements are unmeasured or unknown. Sensitivity analysis is a set of procedures in which the results of a study are recalculated using alternate values for some of the study’s variables in order to test the sensitivity of the conclusions to these altered specifications. Such an analysis can yield several important results by demonstrating the independence or dependence of a result on particular assumptions, establishing the minimum or maximum values of a variable that would be required to affect a recommendation to adopt or reject a program, and identifying clinical or economic uncertainties that require additional research. In general, sensitivity analyses are performed on variables that have a significant effect on the study’s conclusions but for which values are uncertain.

Types of Costs

Another dimension of economic analysis of clinical practice illustrated by Figure 35.1 is the evaluation of costs of a therapy. Economists consider three types of cost—direct, productivity, and intangible.

Direct Medical Costs

The direct medical costs of care usually are associated with monetary transactions and represent costs that are incurred during the provision of care. Examples of direct medical costs include payments for purchasing a pharmaceutical product, payments for physicians’ fees, salaries of allied health professionals, or purchases of diagnostic tests. Because the charge for medical care may not accurately reflect the resources consumed, accounting or statistical techniques may be needed to determine direct costs.\(^7,19-22\)

Direct Nonmedical Costs

Monetary transactions undertaken as a result of illness or health care to detect, prevent, or treat disease are not limited to direct medical costs. There is another type of cost that often is overlooked—direct nonmedical costs. These costs are incurred because of illness or the need to seek medical care. They include the cost of transportation to the hospital or physician’s office, the cost of special clothing needed because of the illness, the cost of hotel stays for receiving medical treatment at a distant medical facility, and the cost of special housing (e.g., the cost of modification of a home to accommodate an ill individual). Direct nonmedical costs, which are generally paid out of pocket by patients and their families, are just as much direct medical costs as are expenses that are more usually covered by third party insurance plans.

Direct medical costs can be further classified to help determine the potential effect of a therapy in terms of the ability to change patterns of resource consumption by patients. If these costs increase with increasing volume of activity, they are described as variable costs. However, if the same costs are incurred regardless of the volume of activity, they are described as fixed costs. For example, the paper used in an electrocardiogram machine is a variable cost, since a strip of paper is used for every tracing. However, the machine itself is a fixed cost since it must be purchased whether one tracing is needed or many are performed. Of course, fixed costs are fixed only within certain bounds. A very large increase in activity will require the purchase of another piece of equipment. Even the fixed cost of a hospital’s building is only fixed within certain limits of activity and a certain time frame. If enough increase in activity occurs, a new building might be needed. Alternatively, if patient care is transferred from an inpatient to an outpatient setting, a part of the building may be closed and the staff size decreased. Still, for the purposes of most decisions in clinical practice, costs can be considered to be fixed or variable.

Productivity Costs

In contrast to direct costs, productivity costs do not stem from transactions for goods or services. Instead, they represent the cost of morbidity (e.g., time lost from work) or mortality (e.g., premature death leading to removal from the workforce). They are costs because they represent the loss of opportunities to use a valuable resource, a life, in alternative ways. A variety of techniques are used to estimate productivity costs of illness or health care.\(^23-27\) Sometimes, as with patients infected with
human immunodeficiency virus, the productivity costs of an illness are substantially greater than the direct costs of the illness.

*Intangible Costs*

Intangible costs are those of pain, suffering, and grief. These costs result from medical illness itself and from the services used to treat the illness. They are difficult to measure as part of a pharmacoeconomic study, though they are clearly considered by clinicians and patients in considering potential alternative treatments. Although investigators are developing ways to measure intangible costs—such as willingness-to-pay analysis whereby patients are asked to place monetary values on intangible costs—at present these costs are often omitted from clinical economics research.

**Perspective of Analysis**

The third axis in Figure 35.1 is that of the perspective of an economic analysis of medical care. Costs and benefits can be calculated with respect to society’s, the patient’s, the payer’s, and the provider’s point of view. A study’s perspective determines how costs and benefits are measured, and the economist’s strict definition of costs (the consumption of a resource that could otherwise be used for another purpose) no longer may be appropriate when perspectives differ from that of society as a whole are used. The economic impact of an intervention will be reported differently depending upon the perspective taken.

For example, a hospital’s cost of providing a service may be less than its charge. From the hospital’s perspective, then, the charge could be an overstatement of the resources consumed for some services. However, if the patient has to pay the full charge, it is an accurate reflection of the cost of the service to the patient. Alternatively, if the hospital decreases its costs by discharging patients early, the hospital’s costs may decrease, but patients’ costs may increase because of the need for increased outpatient expenses that are not covered by their health insurance plan.

Similarly, the cost to society is the opportunity cost, the value of the opportunities foregone because of the resource having been consumed. Society’s perspective usually is taken by measuring the consumption of real resources, including the loss of potentially productive human lives. As already noted, this cost does not count transfer payments, such as social security benefits. (From the point of view of the Social Security Administration, however, these payments would be a cost, because the perspective of the Social Security Administration is not the perspective of society.)

Because the costs of medical care may not be borne solely by the same parties who stand to benefit from it, economic analysis of medical care often raises vexing ethical problems related to equity, distribution of resources, and responsibility for the health of society’s members.

In summary, economic analysis of medical technology or medical care evaluates a medical service by comparing its dollar cost with its dollar benefit (cost–benefit), by measuring its dollar cost in relation to its outcomes (cost–effectiveness), or simply by tabulating the costs involved (cost identification). Direct costs are generated as services are provided. In addition, productivity costs should be considered, especially in determining the benefit of a service that decreases morbidity or mortality. Finally, the perspective of the study determines the costs and benefits that will be quantified in the analysis, and sensitivity analyses test the effects of changes in variable specifications for estimated measures on the results of the study.

**METHODOLOGIC ISSUES IN THE PHARMACEUTICAL ASSESSMENT OF THERAPIES**

The basic approach for performing economic assessments of pharmaceutical products, as discussed above, has been adapted from the general methodology for cost–effectiveness and cost–benefit analysis. These methods have been well developed in medical technology assessment as well as in other fields of economic research. However, there remain a number of methodological issues that confront investigators in economic evaluations of pharmaceutical therapies. This section reviews some of these issues as they arise
in the design, analysis, and interpretation of pharmacoeconomic evaluations.

Clinical Trials Versus Common Practice

One of the most vexing of these issues is how to assess the cost implications of products during clinical trials. Ascertaining whether or not a product’s costs are adequately offset by its effects or benefits presents a number of issues for consideration.\textsuperscript{31, 32} We shall discuss some of these issues related to the case of the pharmacoeconomic assessment of a new prophylactic therapy for thromboembolic disease.

The Problem

As has been pointed out in other chapters of this volume, clinical trials are useful for determining the efficacy of therapeutic agents. However, their focus on efficacy rather than effectiveness and their use of protocols for testing and treating patients poses problems for cost-effectiveness analysis. One difficulty in assessing the economic impact of a drug as an endpoint in a clinical trial is the performance of routine testing to determine the presence or absence of a study outcome. For example, in a study of prophylaxis against thromboembolic events, the protocol may specify testing of all patients for deep vein thromboses (DVTs) (e.g., fibrinogen scanning, venograms, or Doppler testing), whether or not the patients show clinical signs of these events. While this diagnostic strategy may be appropriate, it is not necessarily common practice. Yet, it can have wide ranging effects on the calculated costs and outcomes of care.

First, the protocol may induce the detection of extra cases—cases that would have gone undetected if no protocol were used in the usual care of patients. These cases may be detected earlier than they would have been in usual care. In the prophylaxis example above, repeated testing of all patients is likely to increase the number of DVTs that are detected, especially if, in usual care, patients are only tested when they develop clinical symptoms or signs of DVTs. This extra or early detection may also reduce the average costs for each case detected, because subclinical cases or those detected early may be less costly to treat than clinically detected cases. However, because these two potential biases—more cases, each of which may cost less—work in opposite directions, the total costs of care for the patients in the trial may or may not exceed those that would occur in usual care.

Second, protocol induced testing may lead to the detection of adverse drug effects that would otherwise have gone undetected. As above, the average costs of each may be less because the adverse effects would be milder. However, their frequency would obviously be higher, and they could result in additional testing and treatment.

Third, protocol induced testing also may lead to the occurrence of fewer adverse events from the pharmaceutical product than would occur in usual care. The extra tests done in compliance with the protocol may provide information that otherwise would not have been available to clinicians, allowing them to take steps to prevent adverse events and their resulting costs. For example, an antibiotic protocol may call for more frequent testing of creatinine levels than would be conducted in usual care. These tests may warn physicians of impending renal problems, allowing them to change the drug dosage or the antibiotic. Thus, cases of nephrotoxicity that would have occurred in usual care may be avoided. This potential bias of reducing the costs of side-effects and adverse events would tend to lower the overall costs of care observed in the trial compared to usual care.

Fourth, due to ethical obligations that arise when patients are enrolled in trials, outcomes detected in trials may be treated more aggressively than they would be in usual care. In trials, it is likely that physicians will treat all detected treatable clinical outcomes. In usual care, physicians may treat only those outcomes that in their judgment are clinically relevant. This potential bias would tend to increase the costs of care observed in the trial compared to usual care.

Fifth, protocol induced testing to determine the efficacy of a product or to monitor the occurrence of all side-effects, whether clinically detectable or
not, generally will increase the costs of diagnostic testing in the trial, because many of these tests likely would be omitted in usual care. Alternatively, the protocol may reduce these costs in environments where there is overuse of testing. In teaching settings, for example, some residents may normally order more tests than are needed, and this excess testing may be limited by the protocol’s testing prescriptions.

Sixth, clinical protocols may offer patients additional resources that are not routinely available in clinical practice. These additional resources may provide health benefits to patients. For example, protocols offering extensive home care services may affect the observed benefits of a therapy if the nursing intervention improves the management of the patient’s illness. This could result in a bias in the study design if there are differences in the amount of home care services provided to patients in the treatment and control arms of a trial, or may result in additional health benefits to all study patients.

Seventh, patients in trials often are carefully selected. If a study sample has a mean patient age of 45, the result of the trial may not be readily generalizable to substantially older or younger populations. Similarly, exclusion criteria in clinical protocols may rule out patients with specific clinical syndromes (e.g., diabetes mellitus), women of childbearing potential, or patients of advanced age. These patients may require additional resources or may receive less benefit from therapy because their lifespan is shorter. These exclusions further limit the generalizability of the findings of efficacy studies.

A related issue in pharmacoeconomics trials is the generalizability of the health care delivery system of the patients in the study. A pharmacoeconomic study conducted through an HMO using its members as subjects may observe fewer referrals to specialist physicians than would the same clinical study in a different practice setting. This effect may be even more pronounced in multinational clinical trials, where health care systems, physician education, and patients’ expectations for treatment differ by country.

Other difficulties in projecting the results of clinical trials to usual care arise because the patients in clinical trials generally comply more completely with their treatment than do patients in usual care; they receive prescribed patterns of care; and because trials often have a placebo arm. If there is an actual placebo effect, this last factor may tend to underestimate the effectiveness the agent will have when it is utilized in usual care.

Routinely appending economic evaluations to clinical trials will likely yield “cost–efficacy” analyses, the results of which may be substantially different from the result of cost–effectiveness analyses conducted in the usual care setting. The problem of generalizability is similar to that found in clinical epidemiology research. However, clinical economics explicitly recognizes the added complexity of having different resource induced costs and benefits derived from clinical protocols and from observing patients in different health care systems in multicenter clinical trials.

Possible Solutions

One possible solution to this problem will be illustrated by examining the impact of a “usual care” arm appended as a third arm of a clinical trial. In such a three-arm study, patients randomized to the usual care arm of the study would be treated as they would be outside of the trial, rather than as mandated by the study protocol, and economic and outcomes data from usual care could thus be collected. These data would make it possible to quantify the number of outcomes that likely would be detected in usual care and the costs of these outcomes.

One drawback to this method is that physicians in the trial may treat all patients similarly, whether they are in the protocol driven arm or the usual care arm of the study. This contamination can be partially overcome by randomizing physicians to the protocol or usual care arms, and can be overcome more completely by randomizing the sites of care (e.g., different hospitals for different arms of the study). However, these options require large numbers of physicians and/or sites of care and, thus, are very costly to implement.

A second method that has been used to overcome these problems is to collect data retrospectively
from patients who are not in the trial but who would have met its entry criteria, using these data to estimate the likely costs and outcomes in usual care. These patients could have received their care prior to the trial (historical comparison group) or concurrent with it (concurrent comparison group). In either case, some of the data available in the trial may not be available for patients in the comparison groups. Thus, to insure comparability between the data for usual care and trial patients, the data for trial patients may have to be collected retrospectively as well.

Two problems arise when using a concurrent comparison group to project the results of a trial to usual care. First, as with the randomization scheme above, the use of a protocol in the trial may affect the care delivered to patients who are not in the trial. If so, usual care patients may not receive the same care they would have received if the trial had not been performed. Thus, the results of the trial may lose generalizability to other settings. Second, the trial may enroll a particular type of patient (e.g., investigators may “cream-skim” by enrolling the healthiest patients with the fewest complications), possibly leaving a biased sample (e.g., of sicker and more complicated patients) for inclusion in the concurrent comparison group. This potential bias would tend to affect the estimate of the treatment costs that would be experienced in usual care.

Adoption of a historical comparison group would offset the issue of contamination. Because the trial was not ongoing when these patients received their care, it could not affect how they were treated. A historical comparison group would also tend to offset the selection bias: the subset of patients who would have been included in the trial if it had been carried out in the historic period will be candidates for the comparison group. However, use of a historic comparison group is unlikely to offset this bias entirely. Because this group is identified retrospectively, its attributes likely will reflect those of the average patients eligible for the trial, rather than those of the subset of patients that would have been enrolled in the trial (e.g., if cream-skimming had occurred).

However, differences between the care provided to patients in the trial and that provided to patients in this group may be due as much to secular trends in the provision of medical care as they are to the adoption of a study protocol. For example, length of stay in the United States has decreased since the early 1980s, due in part to the implementation of the Medicare Prospective Payment System. Thus, historical cohorts from earlier periods may have had longer lengths of stay as inpatients than is currently seen in clinical practice. These data may suggest a protocol induced decrease in length of stay when one really does not exist.

To avoid these difficulties, the usual care comparison group may include both historic and concurrent comparison groups. In this case, multivariable methods such as multiple regression analysis or other analytic techniques must be used to control for differences among the historic and concurrent comparison groups as well as between the comparison groups and the patients in the trial. For example, in a regression analysis of length of stay in the trial and in usual care, variables representing each of the groups will indicate the magnitude of the secular trends, the selection bias, and the protocol effects of the trial.

A number of methods currently are being investigated to help overcome the potential biases of resource induced costs and benefits in clinical trials. These approaches include the development of “large and simple clinical trials,” increased attention to the generalizability of patient selection criteria in study design, and conducting the trial in different health systems simultaneously to assess the impact of the therapy in different delivery settings (e.g., using a large health maintenance organization as a clinical testing site).

**Issues in the Design of Prospective Pharmacoeconomic Studies**

We have already addressed some of the general issues in the design and interpretation of pharmacoeconomic studies. Yet, prospective pharmacoeconomic studies, especially within phase III clinical trials, are often our only opportunity to collect and analyze information on new therapeutic products.
before decisions are made concerning insurance reimbursement and formulary inclusion for these agents. We now address issues that arise in the design of these studies.

**Sample Size**

The size required of the sample to identify a meaningful economic difference is frequently problematic. Often those setting up clinical trials focus on the primary clinical question when developing sample size estimates. They fail to consider the fact that the sample required to address the economic questions posed in the trial may differ from that needed for the primary clinical question. In some cases, the sample size required for the economic analysis is smaller than that required to address the clinical question. More often, however, the opposite is true, in that the variances in cost and patient preference data are larger than those for clinical data. Then one needs to confront the question of whether it is either ethical or practical to prolong the study for longer than need be to establish the drug’s clinical effects. Furthermore, in many cases the variances for the pharmacoeconomic data are unknown. Power calculations can be performed, however, to determine the detectable differences between the arms of the study given a fixed patient population and various standard deviations around cost and patient preference data (see Table 35.1). More recently, several investigators have proposed methods for calculating the sample size for economic evaluations.33

**Participation of Patients**

Those planning phase III clinical trials usually are more focused on the clinical results of the trial than they are on the economic results; they would usually like to keep the number of centers needed to complete the trial to a minimum; and they would rather finish the trial sooner than later. Thus, they have a concern that patients might agree to participate in the clinical trial, but not be willing to participate in the economic portion of the trial. In such a case, the investigators often argue that patients should be allowed to participate in the clinical portion of the trial but be excluded from the economic portion of the trial. While self-selection always poses difficulties for trials, it should be clear that this suggestion is particularly worrisome. The economic assessment would end up comparing an estimate of effects from the entire sample with an estimate of costs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Standard deviation (LOS$/s)</th>
<th>Detectable difference R² for covariables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 150 \text{/group} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>1354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 300 \text{/group} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( n = 450 \text{/group} )</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>500</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1000</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2500</td>
<td>391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5000</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Values represent minimum detectable differences between trial arms given the standard deviation reported for the row in the table, and a fixed sample size for each arm of the trial.
from a nonrandom subset of the entire sample, thus allowing substantial bias to enter the analysis. Protocols should allow prospective collection of resource consumption and patient preference data, while sometimes incorporating a second consent to allow access to patients’ financial information. This allows patients to consent to the clinical protocol and decline participation in the financial data collection, preventing the patient selection bias. However, given the low rates of refusal to the release of financial information, a single consent form should be considered for all trial data.

Data Collection
In many cases, by the time clinical investigators think to include economic assessments in their trials, they generally have asked for the collection of so much clinical data that it is nearly impossible to ask the data collectors to collect any economic data. Collection of resource consumption data from primary or secondary sources is essential for a prospective economic evaluation of a pharmaceutical therapy. Some data elements, such as patient preference assessments, can only be collected on a prospective basis. Other data elements, such as outpatient physician treatment records for a linked inpatient and outpatient economic evaluation of a therapy, or patient resource consumption information for many European hospitals without centralized billing systems, must be collected prospectively to simplify the data collection process for the study.

While some prospective data collection is required for almost all pharmaco-economic studies, the amount of data to be collected for the pharmaco-economic evaluation is still the subject of much debate. There is no definitive means of addressing this issue at present. Phase II studies can be used to develop data that will help determine which resource consumption items are essential for the economic evaluation. Without this opportunity for prior data collection, however, we have to rely upon expert opinion to suggest major resource consumption items that should be monitored within the study. Duplicate data collection strategies (prospective evaluation of resource consumption within the study’s case report form with retrospective assessment of resource consumption from hospital bills) can be used to ensure that data collection strategies do not miss critical data elements.

Resources are divided into specific categories for assessment for prospective data collection: inpatient resource use, outpatient resource use, and non-acute-care resource use. Within each of these categories, data can be subdivided into several categories: professional services (physicians, nurses, allied health professionals), hospital setting (intensive care unit, step-down unit, general medical floor), major diagnostic tests, (radiologic tests, laboratory tests, nuclear medicine studies), major surgical procedures (operations and non-operating-room procedures), and medications. Sample data collection forms for inpatient and outpatient resource consumption are presented as Figures 35.2 and 35.3. Issues related to data collection for economic studies have been reviewed recently.33

Appropriate Comparators
Selection of appropriate treatment alternatives in a clinical study is essential for a useful economic evaluation of a pharmaceutical therapy. This issue is both a clinical and an economic one. Comparators can be the most common alternative therapies for a condition, or the lowest possible cost alternatives, even when not frequently used. However, in pharmaco-economic studies, treatment comparators may be inappropriately selected as much for their relatively high price as they for their likely effectiveness. Phase III studies have special limitations in this regard, because agents will be compared against the placebo to assess efficacy rather than against alternative treatments to assess the relative effectiveness of the agent.

Multicenter Evaluations
Study results report an average cost–effectiveness ratio of a therapy given that the costs of study patients generally are not representative of any one of the centers in the trial. The argument here is that clinical results are about biology, which is
Figure 35.2. Inpatient resource assessment. This is a sample case report form for prospective assessment of inpatient resource consumption in a pharmacoeconomic study.
### OUTPATIENT VISIT RECORD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Physician and Location of Visit (e.g., Emergency Room, Outpatient Clinic, Day Surgery, Home, Office)</th>
<th>Duration (in minutes)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Date</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Nurse Clinician and Location of Visit (e.g., Emergency Room, Outpatient Clinic, Day Surgery, Home, Office)</th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
<th><strong>Date</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Procedure</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnostic Tests</th>
<th>Number of Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MRI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT Scan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bone Scan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other Therapy (medications, etc.)</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
relatively unaffected by state or, increasingly, national boundaries. Economic results, on the other hand, are highly dependent upon the setting in which the care is delivered. This may be especially true for trials in which different centers are in different countries with different health care systems and different patterns of treatment for patients with defined clinical conditions.

One might conclude that economic results should not be combined across centers, given the potential differences in resource consumption and resource pricing. However, this argument rests on the assumption that the resources used in the care of a patient do not affect the outcome of therapy. We are unaware of any evidence that supports such an assumption. In fact, resources may contribute directly to the treatment outcome (e.g., additional monitoring at one center may discover adverse side effects of a new treatment in time to prevent a resource intensive complication from developing; home nursing visits may prevent additional hospitalizations for trial patients). To the extent that people are willing to conduct subanalyses of efficacy results, economists should be willing to conduct subanalyses of economic results. However, if the disaggregation of clinical data occurs only at very gross levels, such as by continent, then only continent-specific differences in cost should be reported.

Factors Affecting Resource Consumption
Pharmacoeconomic research holds as a basic assumption the proposition that clinical severity of disease is the sole determinant of resource use by patients. Studies of regional variation, such as those by Wennberg et al.,34 highlight the shortcomings of this assumption. This creates a significant challenge for health services research, and for pharmacoconomics in particular. For example, when a new therapy is introduced to reduce severity of disease as a substitute for physician services that similarly reduce the severity of disease, if physicians either continue to provide the service to maintain their clinical practice or change the characteristics of the patients to whom they provide services (i.e., operate on less severely ill patients), we will not achieve the potential economic advantage afforded by the new therapy.

Economic Data
Analysts generally have access to resource utilization data such as length of stay, monitoring tests performed, and pharmaceutical agents received. When evaluating a therapy from a perspective that requires cost data rather than charge data, however, it may be difficult to translate these resources into costs. For example, does a technology that frees up nursing time reduce costs, or are nursing costs fixed in the sense that the technology is likely to have little or no effect on the hospital payroll? Economists taking the social perspective would argue that real resource consumption has decreased and thus nursing is a variable cost. Accountants or others taking the hospital perspective might argue that, unless the change affects overall staffing or the need for overtime, it is not a saving. This issue depends in part on the temporal perspective taken by the analyst. In the short term, it is unlikely that nursing savings are recouped; in the long term, however, there probably will be a redirection of services. This analysis may also be confounded by the potential increase in the quality of care that nurses with more time may be able to provide to their patients. In countries that have a shortage of hospital beds, hospital administrators often do not recognize staffing savings from early discharge programs, because the bed will be occupied by a new patient as soon as the old patient is discharged.

Perspective
When perspectives other than the societal perspective are adopted, it is unclear what benefits or outcomes should be counted in the analysis. For example, if a governmental agency’s perspective is adopted, in which transfer payments such as pensions are counted as costs, quick deaths at age 65 may be valued more than long, costly deaths at age 75. Independent of whether we should condone this perspective, we must determine whether health
status is an independent goal to be included in the analysis.

In summary, due to their focus on efficacy and their use of clinical protocols, economic assessments of pharmaceutical products based upon phase III clinical trials are not without their problems. However, these issues can be developed in pharmaco-economic analysis plans and addressed prospectively or through supplemental data collection activities conducted concurrently with the clinical trial.

Measurement and Modeling in Clinical Trials

Previously, we have discussed the development of pharmaco-economic data throughout the drug development process. However, the types of datum available at the end of the trial will depend upon the trial’s sample size, duration, and clinical endpoint.

There are two categories of clinical endpoints considered in pharmaco-economic analysis: intermediate endpoints and final endpoints. An intermediate endpoint is a clinical parameter, such as systolic blood pressure, which varies as a result of therapy. A final endpoint is an outcome variable, such as change in survival, or quality adjusted survival, that is common to several economic trials, which allows for comparisons of economic data across clinical studies and is of relevance to policymakers.

The use of intermediate endpoints to demonstrate clinical efficacy is common in clinical trials, because it reduces both the cost of the clinical development process and the time needed to demonstrate the efficacy of the therapy. Intermediate endpoints are most appropriate in clinical research if they have been shown to be related to the clinical outcome of interest, as in the following:

- the use of changes in blood cholesterol levels to demonstrate the efficacy of new lipid lowering agents (intermediate endpoint, changes in low density and high density lipoprotein levels; final endpoint, changes in myocardial infarction rate and survival; demonstration of the relationship between intermediate and final endpoints, Framingham Heart Study);35
- the use of change in blood pressure to demonstrate the efficacy of new antihypertensive agents (intermediate endpoint, changes in systolic and diastolic blood pressure; final endpoint, changes in stroke rates and survival; demonstration of the relationship between intermediate and final endpoints, Framingham Heart Study);36 and
- the use of changes in CD4+ cells to demonstrate the efficacy of new therapies for patients infected with human immunodeficiency virus (intermediate endpoint, changes in CD4+ cells; final endpoint, changes in progression of disease and survival; demonstration of the relationship between intermediate and final endpoints, Walter Reed Army Medical Center HIV Staging System).37

Ideally, a clinical trial would be designed to follow patients throughout their lives, assessing both clinical and economic variables, to allow an incremental assessment of the full impact of the therapy on patients over their lifetimes. Of course, this type of study is almost never performed. Instead, most clinical trials assess patients over a relatively short period of time. Thus, some pharmaco-economic assessments must utilize data collected from within the clinical trial in combination with an epidemiologic model to project the clinical and economic trial results over an appropriate period of a patient’s lifetime.

The importance of this effort is illustrated in the following hypothetical example. A new therapy is under development that reduces the absolute risk of dying from a chronic disease by 50% as measured in a one-year trial. However, this therapy is not curative. A four-year trial was initiated at the same time as the one-year trial. The first-year results were the same in both the four-year trial and the one-year trial. However, there was an increased risk of death for treatment patients in the second and third years of the four-year trial, and by the end of the third year of the trial the survival rate was identical in the treatment and control arms of the four-year trial.
While there was a clear benefit to the new therapy in terms of postponing events from the first year of treatment to later years, the economic assessment of the therapy would suggest a greatly reduced treatment benefit from the four-year trial as compared with the one-year trial.

In projecting results of short term trials over patients’ lifetimes, we usually present at least two of the many potential projections of lifetime treatment benefit. A one-time effect model assumes that the clinical benefit observed in the trial is the only clinical benefit received by patients. Under this model, after the trial has ended, the conditional probability of disease progression for patients is the same in both arms of the trial. Given that it is unlikely that a therapy will lose all benefits as soon as one stops measuring them, this projection method generally is pessimistic compared to the actual outcome. A continuous-benefit effect model assumes that the clinical benefit observed in the trial is continued throughout the patients’ lifetimes. Under this model, the conditional probability of disease progression for treatment and control patients continues at the same rate as that measured in the clinical trial. In contrast to the one-time model, this projection of treatment benefit most likely is optimistic compared to the treatment outcome.

While we and others have developed models as secondary analyses of new therapies, 17, 18, 36–41 a number of clinical trials are now under way in which primary economic data are being collected. This change has resulted from an increasing awareness of the need for reliable economic data about new therapies at the time when the therapies are being introduced to the market. This impetus has also resulted from issues related to the complexity and cost of developing appropriate economic data for a secondary analysis of a new therapy, and issues related to the potential for bias in the design of economic studies conducted from analysis of secondary data sources. 15, 16, 42–44 However, as illustrated above, even primary data collection in clinical trials does not eliminate the need for treatment models in the economic analysis of new therapies.

Analysis Plan For Cost Data

Analysis of cost data shares many features with analysis of clinical data. One of the most important is the need to develop an analysis plan before performing the analysis. Table 35.2 identifies a set of tasks that should be addressed in such a plan. The analysis plan should describe the study design (e.g., report on whether the trial is randomized and double blind; identify the randomization groups; outline the recruitment strategy; describe the criteria for patient evaluation) and any implications the design has for the analysis of costs (e.g., how one will account for recruiting strategies such as rolling admission and a fixed stopping date?).

The analysis plan should also specify the hypothesis and objectives of the study, define the primary and secondary endpoints, and describe how the endpoints will be constructed (e.g., multiplying resource counts measured in the trial times a set of unit costs measured outside the trial). In addition, the analysis plan should identify the potential covariables that will be used in the analysis and specify the time periods of interest (e.g., costs and clinical outcomes at six months might be the primary outcome, while costs and clinical outcomes at 12 months might be a secondary outcome). Also, the analysis plan should identify the statistical methods that will be used and how hypotheses will be tested (e.g., a p-value cutoff or a confidence interval for the difference that excludes zero). Further, the plan should prespecify whether

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 35.2. Steps in an economic analysis plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Study design/summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Study hypothesis/objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Definition of endpoints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Covariates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Prespecification of time periods of interest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Statistical methods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Types of analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Hypothesis tests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Interim analyses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Multiplicity issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Subgroup analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Power/sample size calculations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interim analyses are planned, indicate how issues of multiple testing will be addressed, and redefine any subgroup analyses that will be conducted. Finally, the analysis plan should include the results of power and sample size calculations.

If there are separate analysis plans for the clinical and economic evaluations, efforts should be made to make them as consistent as possible (e.g., shared use of an intention-to-treat analysis, shared use of statistical tests for variables used commonly by both analyses, etc.). At the same time, the outcomes of the clinical and economic studies can differ (e.g., the primary outcome of the clinical evaluation might focus on event-free survival while the primary outcome of the economic evaluation might focus on quality adjusted survival). Thus, the two plans need not be identical.

The analysis plan should also indicate the level of blinding that will be imposed on the analyst. Most, if not all, analytic decisions should be made while the analyst is blinded to the treatment groups (i.e., fully blinded rather than being simply blinded to treatment A versus treatment B). Blinding is particularly important when investigators have not precisely specified the models that will be estimated, but instead rely on the structure of the data to help make decisions about these issues.

**Methods for Analysis of Costs**

When one analyzes cost data derived from randomized trials, one should report means of costs for the groups under study as well as the difference in the means, measures of variability and precision, such as the standard deviation and quantiles of costs (particularly if the data are skewed), and an indication of whether or not the costs are likely to be meaningfully different from each other in economic terms.

Traditionally, the determination of a difference in costs between the groups has been made using Student’s *t* tests or analysis of variance (ANOVA) (univariate analysis) and ordinary least squares regression (multivariable analysis). Recently, a growing number of other methods have been used for making such determinations.

**Univariate Analysis**

A basic assumption underlying *t* tests and ANOVA (which are parametric tests) is that cost data are normally distributed. Given that the distribution of these data often violates this assumption, a number of analysts have begun using nonparametric tests, such as the Wilcoxon rank-sum test (a test of median costs) and the Kolmogorov–Smirnov test (a test for differences in cost distributions), which make no assumptions about the underlying distribution of costs. It has been reported that the Wilcoxon rank-sum test has 96% efficiency compared with the *t* test when the distribution is normally distributed, and that it is more powerful than the *t* test when data are not normally distributed.7

Table 35.3 shows the results of the univariate analysis of hospital costs measured among men receiving vehicle and an investigational medication for the treatment of aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage.45 The mean cost for patients receiving vehicle was $20,287 (SD, $22,542); the mean cost for patients receiving the investigational medication was $25,185 (SD, $22,619). The distribution (as seen from the quantiles reported in Table 35.3, which shows the distribution of costs for the two groups) is skewed. For example, the difference between the 25th and 50th percentiles is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Vehicle</th>
<th>Tiralazid, 6 mg kg⁻¹ per day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cost ($)</td>
<td>20,287</td>
<td>25,185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>(22,542)</td>
<td>(22,619)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>4,506</td>
<td>10,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9,691</td>
<td>13,765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>13,773</td>
<td>18,834</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75%</td>
<td>23,044</td>
<td>31,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95%</td>
<td>53,728</td>
<td>51,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparison of differences</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t</em> test</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>t</em> test (log of costs)</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon rank sum</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolmogorov–Smirnov</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
approximately $4500 for the two treatment groups, but it is approximately $10,000 between the 50th and 75th percentiles. Of note, from the 5th to the 75th percentile, there was approximately a $5000 difference between the two treatment groups. By the 95th percentile, the costs in the two groups were similar. These distributions provide evidence that the costs differ between the two treatment groups.

The parametric and nonparametric statistical tests, however, yielded conflicting conclusions about whether or not the cost differences were statistically different from one another. The \( t \) test comparing mean costs between the groups indicated a nonsignificant difference \( (p = 0.15) \), whereas the \( t \) test comparing the mean log of costs and both of the nonparametric statistical tests indicated they differed \( (p < 0.02) \). In this case, given the nonnormality of the data, it is likely that the 0.15 finding conceals the fact that there are differences in the costs of the two groups, and that the test of the log of costs and the nonparametric tests correctly indicate that costs differed significantly between the groups. Similarly conflicting conclusions about the statistical significance of observed differences in costs have been reported in other studies.\(^{46}\)

Use of statistical tests of the log of costs or of the median of costs to determine whether costs differ between the treatment groups may lead to a potential confusion about the outcome that is important for the analysis of the value for the cost of the new therapy (e.g., the cost−effectiveness ratio). Regardless of the statistical test used in this determination, the outcome used in the numerator of the cost−effectiveness ratio should always be the difference in mean costs. In other words, if for technical reasons one statistically assesses differences in the log of costs or differences in medians to determine whether costs differ between two treatment groups, the outcome of interest should still be the difference in mean costs and should not be the difference in the log or median of costs.

**Multivariable Analysis**

Regression analysis often is used to assess differences in costs, in part because the sample size needed to detect economic differences may be larger than the sample needed to detect clinical differences (i.e., to overcome power problems). Traditionally, ordinary least squares regression has been used to predict costs (or their log) as a function of the treatment group while controlling for covariates such as disease severity, costs prior to randomization, etc. However, use of the log of costs as the outcome variable simply to avoid statistical problems posed by untransformed costs leaves one with the problem that we are not interested in this outcome itself; rather we are interested in the difference in untransformed costs. In addition, the retransformation of the predicted difference in the log of costs into an estimate of the predicted difference in costs is not trivial.\(^{47,48}\)

While univariate \( t \) tests and ANOVAs assume the normal distribution of cost data, ordinary least squares regression assumes that the error terms from the prediction of costs are normally distributed. Because of the potential violation of this assumption, however, a number of alternative multivariable methods have recently been proposed for analyzing costs. These include nonparametric hazards models,\(^{49–53}\) parametric failure-time models,\(^{49}\) Cox semiparametric regression,\(^{54}\) and joint distributions of survival and cost.\(^{55}\) The relative merits of several of these methods have been compared by Lipscomb and colleagues;\(^{56}\) however, there is little conclusive evidence regarding which model is best in a given analytic circumstance.

Table 35.4 shows selected results of an ordinary least squares regression predicting hospital costs measured among men receiving vehicle and the investigational medication for the treatment of aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage. On average, costs among those receiving the investigational medication were $6058 higher than costs among patients receiving vehicle \( (p = 0.03) \). Increasing levels in the neurograde of subarachnoid hemorrhage upon entry to the study (grades of subarachnoid hemorrhage range from I to V, with V being the most severe) were generally associated with increasing costs; the reduction in costs among those in grade V was due principally to the large number of patients in this category who died in the hospital. Other predictors of hospital costs
Table 35.4. Selected coefficients and \( p \) values for the hospital cost regressions for men receiving tirolized for subarachnoid hemorrhage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Randomization group(^a)</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 mg kg(^{-1}) per day</td>
<td>6058</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 mg kg(^{-1}) per day</td>
<td>-100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.6 mg kg(^{-1}) per day</td>
<td>-247</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neurograde of subarachnoid hemorrhage</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 2</td>
<td>3950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 3</td>
<td>3904</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 4</td>
<td>9132</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 5</td>
<td>5406</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)6 mg kg\(^{-1}\)/day versus vehicle, 2 mg kg\(^{-1}\)/day, and 0.6 mg kg\(^{-1}\)/day, \( p = 0.03, 0.03, \) and 0.02, respectively; no other comparisons statistically significant.

included the additional days between onset of subarachnoid hemorrhage and randomization into the trial (+), age (+), and country (+/−) (data not shown).\(^{45}\)

Uncertainty in Economic Assessment

There are a number of sources of uncertainty surrounding the results of economic assessments. One source relates to sampling error (stochastic uncertainty). The point estimates are the result of a single sample from a population. If we ran the experiment many times, we would expect the point estimates to vary. One approach to addressing this uncertainty is to construct confidence intervals both for the separate estimates of costs and effects and for the resulting cost–effectiveness ratio. Recently a substantial literature has developed related to construction of confidence intervals for cost–effectiveness ratios.\(^{57–61}\)

One of the most dependably accurate methods for deriving 95\% confidence intervals for cost–effectiveness ratios is the nonparametric bootstrap method.\(^{51}\) In this method, one resamples from the study sample and computes cost–effectiveness ratios in each of the multiple samples. To do so, one (i) draws a sample of size \( n \) with replacement from the empiric distribution and uses it to compute a cost–effectiveness ratio; (ii) repeats this sampling and calculation of the ratio (by convention, at least 1000 times for confidence intervals); (iii) orders the repeated estimates of the ratio from lowest (best) to highest (worst); and (iv) identifies a 95\% confidence interval from this rank ordered distribution. The percentile method is one of the simplest means of identifying a confidence interval, but it may not be as accurate as other methods. When using 1000 repeated estimates, the percentile method uses the 26th and 975th ranked cost–effectiveness ratios to define the confidence interval.\(^{62}\)

In the multivariable regression analysis above, we estimated that therapy with the investigational medication added $6058 to the cost of hospitalization (95\% CI, $693–11 423). The results of a logistic regression predicting death indicated that the investigational medication yielded a difference in the predicted probability of death of 0.225.\(^{45}\) The cost per death averted was $26 924 ($6058/0.225). The results of the bootstrap analysis indicated that the 95\% CI for the cost–effectiveness ratio ranged from $4300 to $54 600.\(^{48}\) Interpreting the results of the bootstrap in a Bayesian sense, evaluating stochastic uncertainty alone, there is a 96\% chance that the ratio is below $50 000 per death averted.

In addition to addressing stochastic uncertainty, one may want to address uncertainty related to parameters measured without variation (e.g., unit cost estimates, discount rates, etc.), whether or not the results are generalizable to settings other than those studied in the trial, and, for chronic therapies, whether the cost–effectiveness ratio observed within the trial is likely to be representative of the ratio that would have been observed if the trial had been conducted for a longer period. These sources of uncertainty are often addressed using sensitivity analysis.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

The previous sections of this chapter dealt with the principles of clinical economics and methodological issues surrounding the economic analysis of pharmaceutical products. This section presents a
set of case studies that illustrate the practical application of these methods to the evaluation of pharmaceuticals. The following cases illustrate cost–effectiveness analyses of granulocyte-macrophase colony stimulating factor (GM-CSF) and interleukin three (IL-3) for Hodgkin’s and non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma patients undergoing autologous bone marrow transplantation (ABMT), tirilazad mesylate for aneurysmal subarachnoid hemorrhage, and epoprostrenol for patients with severe congestive heart failure.

**COST-EFFECTIVENESS OF IL-3/GM-CSF FOR HODGKIN’S AND NON-HODGKIN’S LYMPHOMA PATIENTS UNDERGOING AUTOLOGOUS BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTATION**

In this study, cost–effectiveness analysis was used to assess the economic effect of a new cytokine therapy, IL-3 with GM-CSF, compared to the standard care of GM-CSF alone in patients undergoing autologous bone marrow transplantation (ABMT) for treatment of Hodgkin’s and non-Hodgkin’s lymphoma. Patients enrolled in the study were randomized to receive either 21 days of GM-CSF starting on the day of ABMT or ten days of IL-3 starting on the day of ABMT followed by 11 days of GM-CSF. Patients were followed up to 12 months after treatment to assess safety. A total of 206 patients were enrolled in the trial from June 1993 through March 1995. The preliminary results of the phase III clinical trial indicated that there was no difference in hematopoietic recovery between the administration of IL-3/GM-CSF after ABMT compared to the administration of GM-CSF alone. An economic protocol ran parallel to the clinical trial.

Patients were enrolled in the economic study on a rolling admissions basis. An admissions stopping date was fixed at six months after the last patient was enrolled in the clinical protocol. A total of 115 of the 206 patients from the clinical arm of the trial were enrolled in the economic study.

Data were collected through monthly telephone interviews with the patient. Data collection included assessment of the initial hospital length of stay, post-discharge resource consumption, and assessment of patients’ health-related quality of life at baseline, three months, six months, nine months, and one year. Patients’ quality of life was measured using the EuroQol EQ-5D thermometer, a visual analog scale. This scale measures a patient’s preferences for their health state on a scale of zero to 100. A score of zero represented the worst imaginable health state, and 100 represented the best imaginable health state.

Costs were estimated for each of the resource categories assessed (rehospitalization, chemotherapy, radiation therapy, transfusion, outpatient procedures, and professional services). All costs are reported in 1995 dollars.

Hospital bills from the ABMT hospitalization and rehospitalizations provided information on charges for resource use during the hospital stay. These charges were converted into costs using hospital-wide cost-to-charge ratios from the Medicare cost report data set. Cost information was used to allow for better assessment of the actual use of resources by patients. Ordinary least squares regression was used to predict costs if complete hospital bills from the ABMT hospitalization or rehospitalizations were unavailable. Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) codes were used to identify physician services and were assigned costs using the 1995 Medicare fee schedule. The Medicare fee schedule was also used to assign costs to physician time for administering chemotherapy, radiation therapy, physician followup visits, and outpatient surgery and procedures. The costs for transfusions were based on cost data from a university hospital.

The cost for IL-3/GM-CSF was not included because therapy was part of the clinical protocol. The cost of chemotherapy was calculated by using the standard doses and frequencies for each patient’s chemotherapy regimen. The cost was based on average wholesale price. Physician time investment for administration of the chemotherapy was also included in the cost of chemotherapy.

Whenever outpatient data were missing, costs were based on patient means when more than one month of data was available for that particular patient. If one month of data was unavailable, the mean cost across all patients for the month was
assigned to the patient with missing outpatient data.

The results of the resource use analysis indicate that there was no statistically significant difference between treatment groups in length of ABMT hospitalization or survival (Table 35.5). While not statistically significant, patients in the standard care group had more rehospitalizations than the IL-3/GM-CSF group. However, the average length of stay of rehospitalizations was shorter for the IL-3/GM-CSF group than the standard care group. Patients in the GM-CSF alone group had fewer outpatient visits per month, required less radiation therapy, less chemotherapy, and fewer transfusions after discharge from ABMT hospitalization than the IL-3/GM-CSF group. However, these differences were not statistically significant. The results of the cost analysis indicate that there were no statistically significant differences in the average ABMT hospitalization costs, survival weighted costs after discharge, total costs, or quality adjusted life months between the GM-CSF group and the IL-3/GM-CSF group. While not statistically significant, patients in the IL-3/GM-CSF group had slightly lower rehospitalization costs than the GM-CSF group, but this was not statistically significant.

The authors conclude that there was no significant effect of IL-3 on costs of care for patients undergoing ABMT for the period up to 13 months after the procedure. The findings of this study are consistent with the model that IL-3 does not add any clinical benefit to GM-CSF. This study demonstrated the feasibility of prospective economic evaluation in phase III trials of new cancer therapies.

Table 35.5. Results table from IL-3 manuscript

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Length of stay for randomization hospitalization (SD)¹</th>
<th>Length of stay after discharge for ABMT (SD)²</th>
<th>Number of rehospitalizations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GM-CSF</td>
<td>31.97 (10.42)</td>
<td>4.46 (8.72)</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM-CSF/IL-3</td>
<td>33.47 (8.58)</td>
<td>4.45 (8.49)</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ p value for difference in hospital stays = 0.397.
² p value for difference in hospital stays = 0.913. Among patients with rehospitalizations, the average hospital stay was 5.18 days and 7.15 days (p = 0.16) for GM-CSF and GM-CSF/IL-3, respectively.
the study results were known and while the investigators were blinded to the treatment groups. Patient status at three months was evaluated prospectively by assessing daily residence costs at three months for patients living at home with supervision or dependent on others as well as for those in minimal care, skilled care, or long term rehabilitation institutions. The daily employment value at three months was also assessed for homemakers and for full- and part-time workers.

Local health economists from six countries collected unit costs of inpatient resource utilization. The averages of the unit costs from the six countries were used for the five other countries. The $137.50 cost per 150 mg of tirilazad was based on a price set by the manufacturer. The authors determined values for employment using wage and salary data from the participating countries. The unit costs from other countries were converted into 1993 US dollars. The authors state that during the sensitivity analysis, deaths averted were translated into gains in life expectancy both with and without adjustments for quality of life.

The results of the study indicate that patients were similar in all groups except in the proportions having right-to-left and left-to-right shifts of the midline structures and those having generalized, as opposed to localized, brain swelling. Total length of hospital stay, number of days between the onset of subarachnoid hemorrhage and randomization, number of days the patient was intubated, characteristics of the hemorrhage, the country in which patients received care, and mortality of the patients were all predictors of stay by unit type.

Results of the economic analysis showed that the average hospital cost was $20,341 (SD, ± $17,239) for the whole sample. The average hospital cost for women ($19,569 ± $15,156) was less than the cost among men ($21,835 ± $20,743). The results also indicated that the majority of the cost was attributable to length of stay and the most difference in cost was due to the costs of tirilazad. The cost analysis at three months showed that the largest difference in employment value was observed between men who received tirilazad 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day and those who received vehicle ($920 additional earnings per day). In addition, the results showed that the largest difference in residence cost was also between these two groups ($15.80 additional residence cost per day). However, none of these differences was statistically significant. One significant finding of this study was that those who received tirilazad 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day had a significant reduction in the probability of death in the whole sample (\(p = 0.002\)) and in men (\(p = 0.0001\)). There was no significant difference in the probability of death among women between the group who received tirilazad 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day and those who received vehicle. When costs and outcomes were compared, the results showed that in both the entire sample and in men, tirilazad 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day was associated with improved survival compared to vehicle, but also to increased hospital costs. The cost per death averted was $29,615 for the sample as a whole and $26,924 for men. There were no significant differences in costs or probability of survival of women in either the tirilazad 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day or vehicle group.

The results were subjected to a sensitivity analysis, showing that the cost–effectiveness ratio (95% confidence interval) between those in the entire sample who received tirilazad 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day and vehicle was $9189 per death averted due to tirilazad, adding hospital costs and mortality. The cost–effectiveness ratios among men (95% CI) ranged from $4300 to $54,600 per death averted. The sensitivity analysis also showed that in 68.8% of women, 6 mg kg\(^{-1}\) per day of tirilazad resulted in an increase in hospital costs and survival. Five percent experienced decreased costs and survival, 11.6% had decreased costs and increased survival, and 14.3% had increased costs and decreased survival. Another finding was that in the entire sample, the ratios of cost per year of life saved and cost per quality adjusted year of life saved fell below $50,000 if survivors live on average 0.6 and 0.8 years respectively. For men, these ratios fell below $50,000 if survivors at the end of the trial lived an average of 1.1 and 2.4 years. Among men, the ratio of cost per year of life saved did not fall below $27,500. Also, the ratio of the cost per quality adjusted year of life saved did not fall under $36,400.

The economic analysis of this study showed that treatment with tirilazad mesylate is associated with
a significant increase in survival and increase in the cost of care. The results also showed that the ratios of cost per death averted, cost per year of life saved, and cost per quality adjusted year of life saved are favorable when compared to other interventions.

RESULTS OF THE ECONOMIC EVALUATION OF THE FIRST STUDY: A MULTINATIONAL PROSPECTIVE ECONOMIC EVALUATION

The Flolan International Randomized Survival Trial (FIRST), (Flolan), a potent vasodilator, for the treatment of patients with severe congestive heart failure. The economic evaluation was conducted concurrently with the phase III clinical trial. The primary objective of the economic evaluation was to assess whether additional resources required for the use of epoprostenol delivered as a continuous infusion were offset by reductions in other resources required in patient care, or were related to health benefits sufficient to justify the use of this therapy in heart failure patients. The secondary objective was to assess the effect of epoprostenol on quality of life. The clinical trial ended early due to increased mortality in patients receiving epoprostenol.

Two economic analyses were conducted: the first assessed the costs and outcomes of patients randomized to epoprostenol with best usual care or best usual care alone; the second analysis projected costs and outcomes that would have been observed had all patients been followed for 12 months.

Data on resource consumption, unit costs of resources, and patient quality of life were collected. Case report forms were used to collect data on inpatient hospital days, inpatient procedures, in- and outpatient physician and nursing visits, outpatient laboratory use, and nonacute care (i.e., nursing home) required for care of the patient. Total costs of care were calculated by multiplying the unit costs of resource categories by the counts of medical services. Unit costs for inpatient services were drawn from a cost accounting system in a single university hospital in the United States.

Unit costs for physician services were based on the 1994 Medicare Fee Schedule. Epoprostenol therapy was not included in the cost analysis because there was no market price available for the therapy. Both the EuroQol instrument (described above) and the Nottingham Health Profile (NHP), a generic measure of patients' subjective health status, were used to measure patient quality of life. The evaluation of quality adjusted life months (QALM) was based on the EuroQol instrument. QALMs were calculated by multiplying patients' survival time by their EuroQol scores. QALMs are expressed along a 0–1 scale.

A total of 471 patients were enrolled in the study, of which 232 were randomized to receive best usual care alone. At the time of randomization, both groups were similar except for the proportion of patients receiving assistance in daily living from someone other than a friend, relative, spouse, or home health aide (\( p < 0.05 \)).

The results of the economic analysis showed that the cost of care for those patients receiving usual best care was $11,797 (95% CI, $9184 to $14,412). The majority of this cost was accrued in the inpatient setting. The patients in this group had an average survival of 4.7 months (95% CI, 4.2 to 5.2) and 6.3 months of potential followup time (see Table 35.6). These patients also experienced 2.3 quality adjusted months of survival (95% CI, 2.0 to 2.6). In contrast, patients receiving epoprostenol had costs that were $5022 more than the cost of

Table 35.6. Mean total costs in US dollars, survival time, and potential followup time among patients receiving epoprostenol and those receiving usual care (SD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Usual care</th>
<th>Epoprostenol</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Costs ($)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient visits</td>
<td>1174 (1374)</td>
<td>1331 (1826)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outpatient procedures</td>
<td>151 (207)</td>
<td>177 (339)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient stay</td>
<td>10 314 (19994)</td>
<td>14 894 (25 871)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient procedures</td>
<td>158 (297)</td>
<td>417 (408)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survival time (months)</td>
<td>4.7 (3.6)</td>
<td>4.3 (3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential followup time</td>
<td>6.3 (4.0)</td>
<td>6.2 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
the usual care group (95% CI, $13,453 to $20,187), a statistically significant difference. Similar to the usual care group, most of the costs were incurred in the inpatient setting. The epoprostenol patients survived an average of 4.3 months (95% CI, 3.9 to 4.7). However, this was not statistically different from the usual care group. The epoprostenol group also experienced a decrease in the quality adjusted months of survival (2.2 months, 95% CI, 1.9 to 2.5) but this was not statistically significant. Ordinary least squares regression was used to predict the total costs during the trial. The results show that epoprostenol was associated with increased cost of care for patients ($p < 0.05). Duration of potential followup time and requirement of assistance with activities of daily living at the time of randomization were associated with increased costs or a trend toward increased costs. Unemployment status and chronic hypertension at randomization were associated with decreased costs or a trend toward decreased costs. An increase in utility adjusted survival was associated with the EuroQol score at randomization, duration of potential followup time, disabled status at randomization, and greater than 60 ft min$^{-1}$ in the 6 min walk test. New York Heart Association (NYHA) class IV heart failure at randomization was associated with a decrease in quality adjusted survival. However, this only trended toward significance ($p < 0.10$). There was no significant association of epoprostenol with a decrease in survival time.

The results of the analysis on expected 12-month costs and survival time showed that the expected treatment costs during the year for the usual care group were $22,476 (95% CI, $15,268 to $29,863). The costs declined during the first four months and then remained constant for the remainder of the study. The projected overall survival time and quality adjusted survival time for the usual care group were 7.1 (95% CI, 6.4 to 7.8) and 4.4 (95% CI, 3.8 to 4.9) months. The epoprostenol group had costs of $27,747 (95% CI, $21,806 to $34,228). Their costs were higher than the usual care group for the seven months after randomization and then became lower than the cost for the usual care group. The projected overall survival and quality adjusted survival for the epoprostenol group were 5.8 (95% CI, 5.07 to 6.52) and 3.7 (95% CI, 3.08 to 4.23) months. In the epoprostenol group, there was a difference in survival of −1.3 months (95% CI, −1.27 to −1.34) and in quality adjusted survival of −0.67 months (95% CI, −0.65 to −0.70). The quality adjusted survival was greater in some months than in preceding months, which indicates that the improvements in quality of life offset decreases in survival in those months.

The authors concluded that this study successfully quantifies resource utilization and quality of life in a population with severe heart failure and in explaining the variation between patients receiving epoprostenol with usual best care and usual best care alone. This study demonstrates that an economic analysis can be conducted during a phase III clinical trial.

THE FUTURE

The emergence of cost as a criterion for the evaluation of pharmaceutical products requires the continued development and application of research methods to guide decisionmakers. Patients, and physicians acting on their behalf, are principally concerned about the effectiveness and safety of drugs. However, as patients, payers, and society become more concerned about the cost of medical care, the clinical contribution of pharmaceutical agents will be weighed against their costs and compared with the next best alternative. As third party payers increasingly cover drug costs, they will be concerned with their expenditures on pharmaceuticals and the value obtained for the money spent. Hospitals and other providers of care, operating under increasingly constrained budgets, will increase their assessments of pharmaceutical expenditures.

The naïve decisionmaker might weigh drugs according to their purchase price alone. This paradigm ignores two essential elements in choosing pharmaceuticals. First, in identifying a drug’s cost, its purchase price is only part of its real economic impact. The costs of preparation and delivery, as well as the cost of monitoring for and
treating adverse events and side-effects, are unavoidable elements of the cost of treating patients.

Second, a full analysis should go beyond the identification of cost. Only if the safety and effectiveness of two pharmaceutical agents are equivalent will cost alone determine the choice of therapy. Cost–effectiveness analysis requires that cost be weighed against effectiveness and that when two or more alternatives are being compared, the additional cost per additional unit of effectiveness be measured. Beyond these considerations of cost identification and cost–effectiveness, a full economic analysis will also assess the net value, or utility, of the drug’s clinical contribution.

As physicians are asked simultaneously to represent their patients’ interests while being asked to deliver clinical services with parsimony, they increasingly will need to turn for assistance to collaborative efforts of epidemiologists and economists in the assessment of new therapeutic agents. Through a merger of epidemiology and economics, better information can be provided to clinical decision makers, and limited resources can be used most effectively for the health of the public.
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INTRODUCTION

One may judge the impact of drug interventions by examining a variety of outcomes. In some situations, the most compelling evidence of drug efficacy may be found as a reduction in mortality (β-blockers after myocardial infarction), rate of hospitalization (neuroleptic agents for schizophrenia), rate of disease occurrence (antihypertensives for strokes), or rate of disease recurrence (some form of chemotherapy after surgical cancer treatment). Alternatively, clinicians frequently rely on direct physiological measures of the severity of a disease process and the way drugs influence these measures—for example, left ventricular ejection fraction in congestive heart failure, spirometry in chronic airflow limitation, or glycosylated hemoglobin level in diabetes mellitus.

Clinical investigators have recognized that there are other important aspects of the usefulness of the interventions which these epidemiological, physiological, or biochemical outcomes do not address. These areas encompass the ability to function normally; to be free of pain and physical, psychological, and social limitations or dysfunction; and to be free from iatrogenic problems associated with treatment. On occasion, the conclusion reached when evaluating different outcomes may differ: physiological measurements may change without people feeling better,1,2 a drug may ameliorate symptoms without a measurable change in physiological function, or life prolongation may be achieved at the expense of unacceptable pain and suffering.3 The recognition of these patient oriented (versus disease oriented) areas of well-being led to the introduction of a technical term: health related quality of life (HRQL).

Quality of life, as it is often used, lacks focus and precision and, because it is an abstract concept, its definition has led to much debate. Since the patient’s subjective well-being is influenced by many factors unrelated to the disease process or treatment (i.e., education, income, quality of the environment, etc.), investigators have adopted the narrower term,
HRQL. Some definitions of HRQL stem from the recognition that HRQL may be considered on different levels: an overall assessment of well-being; several broad domains—physiological, functional, psychological, and social status; and subcomponents of each domain—for example pain, sleep, activities of daily living, sexual function within physical and functional domains.

It follows that HRQL is a multifactorial concept that, from the patient’s perspective, represents the final common pathway of all the physiological, psychological, and social influences of the therapeutic process. It follows also that when assessing the impact of a drug on patients’ HRQL, one may be interested in describing the patients’ status (or changes in the patients’ status) on a whole variety of domains, and that different strategies and instruments are required to explore separate domains.

Definitions of HRQL, both theoretical and practical, remain controversial. Most HRQL measurement instruments focus largely on how patients are functioning, e.g., their ability to care for themselves and carry out their usual roles in life. While this pragmatic view of HRQL has gained ascendancy, there remain those who argue that unless you are tapping into individual patients’ values you may be measuring health status, but you are not measuring HRQL.

These issues can be clarified by thinking of a woman with quadriplegia who, despite her limitations, is very happy and fulfilled and values her life highly (more, for instance, than most people, or than she did before she suffered quadriplegia). On most domains of most HRQL instruments, this woman’s results would suggest a poor HRQL, despite the high value she places on her health state. Investigators and those interpreting the results of HRQL measure should be aware of the varying emphasis put on individual patient values in the different types of instrument.

### CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

HRQL effects may be pertinent in both investigating and documenting beneficial as well as harmful aspects of drug action. The knowledge of these drug effects may be important, not only to the regulatory agencies and physicians prescribing the drugs, but to the people who are to take the medication and live with both its beneficial actions and side effects. Investigators must therefore recognize the clinical situations where a drug may have an important effect on HRQL. This requires careful examination of data available from earlier phases of drug testing and, until now, has usually been performed in the latter stages of phase III testing. For example, Croog and colleagues studied the effect of three established antihypertensive drugs—captopril, methyldopa, and propranolol—on quality of life, long after their introduction in clinical practice. Their report, which showed an advantage of captopril in several HRQL domains, had a major impact on the drug prescription pattern at the time of its publication. The earlier in the process of drug development potential effects on quality of life are recognized, the sooner appropriate data may be collected and analyzed.

### METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

Researchers willing to accept the notion of the importance of measuring HRQL in pharmacoepidemiology research and ready to use HRQL instruments in postmarketing (or, in some cases, premarketing) trials, face a considerable number of challenges. These challenges start with the realization that, as we have noted, there is no universal agreement on what the concept of quality of life actually entails. Thus, investigators must define as precisely as possible the aspects of HRQL in which they are interested.

Having identified the purpose for which a HRQL instrument is to be used, one must be aware of the measurement properties required for it to fulfill its purpose. An additional problem occurs at this stage if the original instrument was developed in a different language—the adequate performance of an instrument cannot be assumed after its translation. At the next step, the investi-
gator is challenged by the task of choosing from many available HRQL measurement instruments. When all these problems are dealt with satisfactorily, the investigator has to ensure that the measurements (interviews or self- or computer administered questionnaires) are made in a rigorous (standardized, reproducible, unbiased) fashion. Finally, one is left with the chore of interpreting the data and translating the results into clinically meaningful terms.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

QUALITY OF LIFE MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS IN INVESTIGATING NEW DRUGS: POTENTIAL USE AND NECESSARY ATTRIBUTES

In general terms, any HRQL instrument could be used either to discriminate among patients (either according to current function or according to future prognosis), or to evaluate changes occurring in the health status (including HRQL) over time. In most clinical trials, quality of life measurement instruments are used for evaluation of the effects of therapy, with treatment effect being expressed as a change in the score of the instrument over time. Occasionally, instruments are used to discriminate among patients. An example would be a study evaluating the effect of drug treatment on functional status in patients after myocardial infarction, where the investigators may wish to divide potential patients into those with moderate versus poor function (with a view toward intervening in the latter group).

The purpose for which an instrument is used dictates, to some degree, its necessary attributes. Each HRQL measurement instrument, regardless of its particular use, should be valid. The validity of an instrument refers to its ability to measure what it is supposed to measure. This attribute of a measurement instrument is difficult to establish when there is no gold standard, as is the case with evaluation of HRQL. In such situations, where so called criterion validity cannot be established, the validity of an instrument is frequently established in a stepwise process including examination of face validity (or sensitivity) and construct validity.

Sensitivity relies on an intuitive assessment of the extent to which an instrument meets a number of criteria including applicability, clarity and simplicity, likelihood of bias, comprehensiveness, and whether redundant items have been included. Construct validity refers to the extent to which results from a given instrument relate to other measures in a manner consistent with theoretical hypotheses. For example, one could hypothesize that changes in spirometry related to a use of a new drug in patients with chronic airflow limitation should bear a close correlation with changes in functional status of the patient and a weaker correlation with changes in their emotional status.

The second attribute of an HRQL instrument is its ability to detect the “signal,” over and above the “noise” is introduced in the measurement process. For discriminative instruments, those that measure differences among people at a single point in time, this “signal” comes from differences between patients in HRQL. In this context, the way of quantitating the signal-to-noise ratio is called reliability. If the variability in scores between subjects (the signal) is much greater than the variability within subjects (the noise), an instrument will be deemed reliable. Reliable instruments will generally demonstrate that stable subjects show more or less the same results on repeated administration. The reliability coefficient (in general most appropriately an intraclass correlation coefficient) measuring the ratio of between subject variance to total variance (which includes both between and within subject variance) is the statistic most frequently used to measure signal-to-noise ratio for discriminative instruments.

For evaluative instruments, those designed to measure changes within individuals over time, the “signal” comes from the differences in HRQL within patients associated with the intervention. The way of determining the signal-to-noise ratio is called responsiveness and refers to an instrument’s ability to detect change. If a treatment results in an important difference in HRQL, investigators wish to be confident they will detect that difference, even if it is small. The responsiveness of an
In our own work, we have often used global ratings of change (patients classifying themselves as unchanged, or experiencing small, medium, and large improvements or deteriorations) as the independent standard. We construct our disease-specific instruments using seven-point scales with an associated verbal descriptor for each level on the scale. For each questionnaire domain, we divide the total score by the number of items so that domain scores can range from 1 to 7. Using this approach to framing response options, we have found that the smallest difference that patients consider important is often approximately 0.5 per question. A moderate difference corresponds to a change of approximately 1.0 per question, and changes of greater than 1.5 can be considered large. So, for example, in a domain with four items, patients will consider a one point change in two or more items as important. This finding seems to apply across different areas of function, including dyspnea, fatigue, and emotional function in patients with chronic airflow limitation; symptoms, emotional function, and activity limitations in both adult and child asthma patients, and parents of child asthma patients; and symptoms, emotional function, and activity limitations in adults with rhinoconjunctivitis. Similar observations may be derived from reports of others.

The approach that we have just described relies on within-patient comparisons as the independent standard. One alternative is between-patient comparisons. In one example of this approach, we formed groups of seven patients with chronic airflow limitation participating in a respiratory rehabilitation program. Each patient completed the Chronic Respiratory Questionnaire. The patients conversed with one another long enough to make judgements about their relative experience of fatigue in daily life. While there was a bias in their assessment (patients generally considered themselves better off than one another), their relative ratings allows estimates of what differences in Chronic Respiratory Questionnaire score constitute small, medium, and large differences. The results were largely congruent with the findings from the within-patient rating studies.
Investigators can also use measures that physicians, through long experience, already know well, as independent standards. For example, scores on a generic measure of HRQL, the Sickness Impact Profile (SIP), range from an average of 8.2 in patients with American Rheumatism Association arthritis class I, to 25.8 in class IV. Another standard would be obtained by administering questionnaires to patients before and after an intervention of known effectiveness with which clinicians are familiar, so that they can see the change in score associated with response to treatment. For example, patients shortly after hip replacement have scores of 30 on the SIP, scores which decrease to less than 5 after full convalescence. Relationships between HRQL and a variety of marker states can also be useful: SIP scores in patients with chronic airflow limitation severe enough to require home oxygen are approximately 24; scores in patients with chronic, stable angina are approximately 11.5.

Clinicians and investigators tend to assume that if the mean difference between a treatment and a control is appreciably less than the smallest change that is important, then the treatment has a trivial effect. This may not be so. Let us assume that a randomized clinical trial (RCT) shows a mean difference of 0.25 in a questionnaire with a minimally important difference (MID) of 0.5. One may conclude that the difference is unimportant, and the result does not support administration of the treatment. This interpretation assumes that every patient given treatment scored 0.25 better than they would had they received the control and ignores possible heterogeneity of treatment effect. Depending on the true distribution of results, the appropriate interpretation may be different.

Consider a situation where 25% of the treated patients improved by a magnitude of 1.0, while the other 75% did not improve at all (mean change of 0). This would mean that the 25% of treated patients obtained moderate benefit from the intervention. Using the methodology that has recently been developed for interpreting the magnitude of treatment effects, the number needed to treat (NNT), investigators have found that clinicians commonly treat 25 to 50 patients, and often as many as 100, to prevent a single adverse event. Thus, the hypothetical treatment with a mean difference of 0.25 and an NNT of four proves to have a powerful effect.

We have shown that this issue is much more than hypothetical. In a crossover randomized trial in asthmatic patients comparing the short acting inhaled β-agonist salbutamol to the long acting beta inhaled β-agonist salmeterol, we found a mean difference of 0.3 between groups in the activity dimension of the asthma quality of life questionnaire (AQLQ). This mean difference represents slightly more than half the minimal important difference in an individual patient. Knowing that the minimal important difference is 0.5 allows us to calculate the proportion of patients who achieved benefit from salmeterol—that is, the proportion who had an important improvement (greater than 0.5 in one of the HRQL domains) while receiving salmeterol relative to salbutamol. For the activity domain of the AQLQ, this proportion proved to be 2.2. The NNT is simply the inverse of the proportion who benefit, in this case 4.5. Thus, clinicians thus need to treat fewer than five patients with salmeterol to ensure than one patient obtains an important improvement in their ability to undertake activities of daily living.

In another randomized trial examining the effect of a respiratory rehabilitation program in patients with chronic lung disease, we found a mean difference between rehabilitation patients and the community controls of 0.40 in the emotions domain of the Chronic Respiratory Questionnaire. This difference is appreciably less than the value of 0.5 that represents the minimal important difference in an individual patient. However, the data from the trial allow us to calculate the proportion of patients who were 0.5 points or more better in their emotional function while receiving rehabilitation than would have been the case had they been in the community control group. This turns out to be 0.30, which translates into an NNT of 3.3 patients.

This discussion emphasizes that to interpret the results of HRQL measurement in pharmacoepidemiology studies requires clinicians to be aware of the changes in score that constitute trivial, small,
medium, and large differences in HRQL. Further, looking at mean differences between groups can be misleading. The distribution of differences is critical, and can be summarized in an informative manner using the NNT.

QUALITY OF LIFE MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS: TAXONOMY AND POTENTIAL USE

During the last decade, clinical journals have started to publish trials in which HRQL instruments are the primary outcome measures. With the expanding importance of HRQL in evaluating new therapeutic interventions, investigators (and readers) are faced with a large array of instruments. Researchers have proposed different ways of categorizing these instruments, according to the purpose of their use, into instruments designed for screening, providing health profiles, measuring preference, and making clinical decisions, or into discriminative and evaluative instruments (as above).

We have also suggested a taxonomy based on the domains of HRQL which an instrument attempts to cover. According to this taxonomy, an HRQL instrument may be categorized, in a broad sense, as generic or specific. Generic instruments cover (or at least aim to cover) the complete spectrum of function, disability, and distress of the patient, and are applicable to a variety of populations. Within the framework of generic instruments, health profiles and utility measures provide two distinct approaches to measurement of global quality of life. Specific instruments are focused on disease or treatment issues specifically relevant to the question at hand.

GENERIC INSTRUMENTS

Health Profiles

Health profiles are single instruments that measure multiple different aspects of quality of life. They usually provide a scoring system that allows aggregation of the results into a small number of scores and sometimes into a single score (in which case, it may be referred to as an index). As generic measures, they are designed for use in a wide variety of conditions. For example, one health profile, the Sickness Impact Profile (SIP) contains 12 “categories,” which can be aggregated into two dimensions and five independent categories, and also into a single overall score. The SIP has been used in studies of cardiac rehabilitation, total hip joint arthroplasty, and treatment of back pain.

In addition to the SIP, there are a number of other health profiles available: the Nottingham Health Profile, the Duke–UNC Health Profile, and the McMaster Health Index Questionnaire. Increasingly, a collection of related instruments from the Medical Outcomes Study have become the most popular and widely used generic instruments. Particularly popular is one version that includes 36 items, the SF-36.

While each health profile attempts to measure all important aspects of HRQL, they may slice the HRQL pie quite differently. For example, the McMaster Health Index Questionnaire follows the World Health Organization approach and identifies three dimensions: physical, emotional, and social. The Sickness Impact Profile includes a physical dimension (with categories of ambulation, mobility, body care, and movement), a psychosocial dimension (with categories including social interaction and emotional behavior), and five independent categories including eating, work, home management, sleep and rest, and recreations and pastimes.

General health profiles offer a number of advantages to the clinical investigator. Their reproducibility and validity have been established, often in a variety of populations. When using them for discriminative purposes, one can examine and establish areas of dysfunction affecting a particular population. Identification of these areas of dysfunction may guide investigators who are constructing disease-specific instruments to target areas of potentially greatest impact on the quality of life. Health profiles, used as evaluative instruments, allow determination of the effects of an intervention on different aspects of quality of life, without necessitating the use of multiple instruments (and thus saving both the investigator’s and the patient’s time). Because health profiles are designed for a wide variety of conditions, one can...
potentially compare the effects on HRQL of different interventions in different diseases. Profiles that provide a single score can be used in a cost–effectiveness analysis, in which the cost of an intervention in dollars is related to its outcome in natural units (see Chapter 35).

The main limitation of health profiles is that they may not focus adequately on the aspects of quality of life specifically influenced by a particular intervention. This may result in an inability of the instrument to detect a real effect in the area of importance (i.e., lack of responsiveness). We will return to this issue when we discuss the alternative approach, specific instruments.

Utility Measurement

Economic and decision theory provides the underlying basis for utility measures (see Chapter 35). The key elements of an utility instrument are, first that it is preference based, and second, that scores are tied to death as an outcome. Typically, HRQL can be measured as a utility measure using a single number along a continuum from death (0.0) to full health (1.0). The use of utility measures in clinical studies requires serial measurement of the utility of the patient’s quality of life throughout the study.

There are two fundamental approaches to utility measurement in clinical studies. One is to ask patients a number of questions about their function. Based on their responses, patients are classified into one of a number of categories. Each category has a utility value associated with it, the utility having been established in previous ratings by another group (such as a random sample of the general population). This approach is typified by two widely used instruments, the Quality of Well-Being Scale42–44 and the Health Utilities Index.45

The second approach is to ask patients to make a single rating which takes into account all aspects of their quality of life.46 This rating can be made many ways. The “standard gamble” asks patients to choose between their own health state and a gamble in which they may die immediately or achieve full health for the remainder of their lives. Using the standard gamble, patients’ utility or HRQL is determined by the choices they make, as the probabilities of immediate death or full health are varied. Another technique is the “time trade-off,” in which subjects are asked about the number of years in their present health state they would be willing to trade off for a shorter life span in full health.

A major advantage of utility measurement is its amenability to cost–utility analysis (see Chapter 35). In cost–utility analysis, the cost of an intervention is related to the number of quality adjusted life years (QALYs) gained through application of the intervention. Cost per QALY may be compared and provide a basis for allocation of scarce resources among different healthcare programs. Results from the utility approach may thus be of particular interest to program evaluators and health policy decision makers.

However, utility measurement also has limitations. Utilities can vary depending on how they are obtained, raising questions of the validity of any single measurement.47,48 Utility measurement does not allow the investigator to determine which aspects of HRQL are responsible for changes in utility. Finally, utilities potentially share the disadvantage of health profiles, in that they may not be responsive to small but still clinically important changes.

SPECIFIC INSTRUMENTS

An alternative approach to HRQL measurement is to focus on aspects of health status that are specific to the area of primary interest. The rationale for this approach lies in the increased responsiveness that may result from including only those aspects of HRQL that are relevant and important in a particular disease process or even in a particular patient situation. One could also focus an instrument only on the areas that are likely to be affected by a particular drug. This latter approach is advanced in the design and conduct of randomized controlled trials in individual patients—N-of-1 randomized clinical trials49 (see Chapter 37).

In other situations, the instrument may be specific to the disease (instruments for chronic lung disease, for rheumatoid arthritis, for cardiovascular diseases, for endocrine problems, etc.); specific to a population of patients (instruments
designed to measure the HRQL of the frail elderly, who are afflicted with a wide variety of different diseases; specific to a certain function (questionnaires that examine emotional or sexual function); or specific to a given condition or problem (such as pain) that can be caused by a variety of underlying pathologies. Within a single condition, the instrument may differ depending on the intervention. For example, while success of a disease modifying agent in rheumatoid arthritis should result in improved HRQL by enabling a patient to increase performance of physically stressful activities of daily living, occupational therapy may achieve improved HRQL by encouraging family members to take over activities formerly accomplished with difficulty by the patient. Appropriate disease-specific HRQL outcome measures should reflect this difference.

Specific instruments can be constructed to reflect the “single state” (how tired have you been: very tired, somewhat tired, full of energy) or a “transition” (how has your tiredness been: better, the same, worse). Theoretically, the same could be said of generic instruments, although none of the available generic instruments has used the transition approach. Specific measures can integrate aspects of morbidity, including events such as recurrent myocardial infarction.

The disease-specific instruments may be used for discriminative purposes. They may aid, for example, in evaluating the extent to which a primary symptom (for example dyspnea) is related to the magnitude of physiological abnormality (for example exercise capacity). Disease-specific instruments can be applied for evaluative purposes to establish the impact of an intervention on a specific area of dysfunction, and hence aid in elucidating the mechanisms of drug action. Guidelines provide structured approaches for constructing specific measures. Whatever approaches one takes to the construction of disease-specific measures, a number of head-to-head comparisons between generic and specific instruments suggest that the latter approach will fulfill its promise of enhancing responsiveness.

In addition to the likelihood of improved responsiveness, specific measures have the advantage of relating closely to areas routinely explored by the physician. For example, a disease-specific measure of quality of life in chronic lung disease focuses on dyspnea during day-to-day activities, fatigue, and areas of emotional dysfunction, including frustration and impatience. Specific measures may therefore appear clinically sensible to the physician.

The disadvantages of specific measures are that they are (deliberately) not comprehensive, and cannot be used to compare across conditions or, at times, even across programs. This suggests that there is no one group of instruments that will achieve all the potential goals of HRQL measurement. Thus, investigators may choose to use multiple instruments, an issue we will deal with in the next section.

USE OF MULTIPLE QUALITY OF LIFE MEASURES IN CLINICAL STUDIES

Clinical investigators are not restricted to using a single instrument in their studies, and investigators will often conclude that a single instrument cannot yield all the relevant information. For example, utility and disease-specific measures contribute quite different sorts of data, and an investigator may want to use one of each.

Another, somewhat different way of using multiple instruments is to administer a battery of specific instruments. An example of such an approach was a double blind, randomized trial of three antihypertensive agents in primary hypertension. The investigators identified five dimensions of health they were measuring: the sense of well-being and satisfaction with life, the physical state, the emotional state, intellectual functioning, ability to perform in social roles, and the degree of satisfaction from those roles. Even within these five dimensions, additional components were identified. For example, separate measurements of sleep and sexual function were made. Patients taking one of the three drugs under investigation, captopril, scored better on measures of general well-being, work performance, and life satisfaction. The lesson for the clinician is clearly important: one can have an impact on not only the length, but also the quality of the patient’s life according to choice of antihypertensive agent.
This approach, although comprehensive, has limitations. First, investigators must find a valid, responsive instrument for every attribute they wish to measure. Second, it is possible (indeed likely) that only some of the instruments chosen will show differences between the treatments under investigation. Unless one of the instruments has been designated as the primary measure of outcome before the study started, different results in different measures may make interpretation difficult. The greater the number of instruments used, the greater the probability that one or more will favor one treatment or the other, even if the treatments’ true effectiveness is identical. Thus, the α error (the probability of finding an apparent difference between treatments when in fact their outcomes do not differ) increases with each new instrument used. Although this problem may be dealt with through statistical adjustment for the number of instruments used, such adjustment is often not made.62

Another problem occurs if a small proportion of the instruments used favor an intervention (or if some measures favor one treatment and other instruments favor the other). In these situations, the clinician may be unsure how to interpret the results. The use of multiple instruments opens the door to such potential controversy.

A final limitation of using a battery of instruments is that it gives no indication of the relative importance of various areas of dysfunction to the patient. For example, had Croog et al.7 found that one antihypertensive agent disturbed sleep, while another had an adverse impact on sexual function, their approach would not have allowed determination of which drug had a greater net adverse impact on patients’ lives.63 If they have not, clinicians may have more difficulty applying the results to their patients.

If the study has addressed HRQL issues, have investigators chosen the right instruments? In particular, does evidence suggest the measure(s) used are valid measures of HRQL? If so, and the study failed to demonstrate differences between groups, is there good reason to believe the instrument is responsive in this context? If not, the results may be a false negative, failing to show the true underlying difference in HRQL.

Whatever the differences between groups, the clinician must be able to interpret their magnitude. Knowledge of the difference in score that represents small, medium, and large differences in HRQL will be very helpful in making this interpretation. Clinicians must still look beyond mean differences between groups, and consider the distribution of differences. The number of patients needed to treat to ensure that a single patient achieves an important benefit in HRQL offers one way of expressing results that clinicians are likely to find meaningful.
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INTRODUCTION

Clinicians are used to, and comfortable with, making initial clinical recommendations for their patients on the basis of medical research consisting of formal randomized clinical trials of groups of patients (see Chapter 2). However, individual patients may not behave the same way as the group. Responding to this heterogeneity of treatment effect, psychological research has long taken advantage of experimental studies of single subjects. In this chapter, we describe how clinicians can use an experimental approach that focuses on the individual to facilitate clinical research and, especially, to enhance the clinical care of their patients. We believe the approaches we describe are highly relevant to pharmacoepidemiology because they apply fundamental epidemiological principles to the selection of drugs for individual patients, and to the drug development process.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

Traditionally, important questions that patients, and clinicians caring for them, consider include: does treatment have the potential to eradicate the disease?; what is the probability of prolonging the life of the patient?; what is the chance of delaying the progression of a disease?; what is the frequency and impact of a drug’s side effects? Randomized
controlled trials (RCTs) address these questions, and are usually necessary to establish valid evidence of drug efficacy\(^1\) (see also Chapters 1, 2, and 34). When deciding which therapy is more beneficial for an individual patient, however, clinicians often cannot rely on the results of RCTs. For example, an RCT addressing the issue may not be available; some conditions are so rare that even multicenter collaborative trials are not feasible. Further, even when a relevant RCT generated a clear answer, its result may not apply to an individual patient. First, if the patient does not meet the eligibility criteria, extrapolation may not be appropriate.\(^2\) Second, regardless of the overall trial results, some patients may benefit from a given therapy while others do not.

Under these circumstances, clinicians typically conduct the time-honored “trial of therapy,” in which the patient is given a treatment and the subsequent clinical course determines whether the treatment is judged effective and continued. However, many factors may mislead physicians conducting conventional therapeutic trials. They include the placebo effect, the natural history of the illness, the expectations that the clinician and patient have about the treatment effect, and the desire of the patient and the clinician not to disappoint one another. To avoid these pitfalls, clinicians must conduct trials of therapy with safeguards that keep both patients and themselves “blind” to the treatment being administered. Investigators routinely use such safeguards in large scale RCTs involving dozens or hundreds of patients. To implement these safeguards in a clinically sensible manner while investigating drug effects in the individual patient constitutes a considerable challenge.

**METHODOLOGICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

To maintain the methodological safeguards provided by RCTs and to avoid the disadvantages of large sample multicenter studies, we built on the work of experimental psychologists to develop a corresponding methodology for examination of an intervention’s effect in individual patients in clinical practice.\(^3\) Any person conducting an RCT in an individual patient (N-of-1 RCT) faces several formidable methodological challenges. The first one is to identify a clinical situation in which an N-of-1 RCT may potentially provide useful information. The second is to properly assess the patient’s (and clinician’s) willingness to undergo the time and effort consuming process of the N-of-1 RCT. The third is to choose appropriate treatment targets to monitor the effects of therapy (both beneficial and potentially harmful). Once these elements are in place, the clinician–patient team has to design, execute, and analyze the results of the trial. The clinician must carefully think through each of these elements before commencing an N-of-1 RCT.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

**N-OF-1 RCT: THE GENERAL CASE**

The methodology of experimental studies of single patients is known as “single case” or “single subject” research, \(N = 1\), or, as we call it, N-of-1 RCTs.\(^4,5\) We have previously described how N-of-1 RCTs may be used in medical practice to determine the optimum treatment of an individual patient, described an “N-of-1 service” designed to assist clinicians who wish to conduct such a trial, provided detailed guidelines for clinicians interested in conducting their own N-of-1 RCTs, and reviewed our own three years’ experience in conducting such studies.\(^6,7\) In each of two conditions (chronic airflow limitation and fibromyalgia) we conducted over 20 N-of-1 RCTs, and described our experience with these patients in two separate reports.\(^8,9\)

In general terms, the N-of-1 RCT design is based on pairs of active/placebo, high dose/low dose, or first drug/alternate drug combinations, the order of administration within each pair determined by random allocation (see Figure 37.1). Treatment targets (directed specifically at the patient’s complaints) are monitored in a double blind fashion on a regular, predetermined
schedule. The trial continues as long as the clinician and patient agree that they need more information to obtain a definite answer regarding the efficacy, superiority, or side-effects of the treatment, or until the patient or clinician decide for any other reason to end the trial. Experience drawn from conducting numerous N-of-1 RCTs indicates that one should usually aim for at least three treatment pairs. If a very short duration of treatment periods is feasible, the number of pairs could be greater.

Several criteria must be satisfied before clinicians begin an N-of-1 RCT. In addition to the effectiveness or harmful side-effects of treatment being in doubt, the disorder should be relatively chronic and stable. The treatment, if effective, should be continued relatively long term, and the patient should be eager to collaborate in designing and carrying out the N-of-1 RCT. The treatment(s) must have a rapid onset and termination of action, and the clinician should be aware of the optimal treatment duration, which must be practical. Last but not least, the clinician must secure the cooperation of a pharmacy in the preparation of blinded medication.

N-OF-1 RCT: CHOOSING APPROPRIATE OUTCOME MEASURES

The choice of the target to be monitored during N-of-1 RCTs depends on the clinical context. Although one may choose physiological variables as treatment targets (say forced expired volume in one second in an RCT of a bronchodilator, or postural blood pressure change in a trial of amitriptyline in symptomatic postural hypotension), N-of-1 RCTs are uniquely suitable in sorting out the effects of a given drug on different aspects of health related quality of life (HRQL, see Chapter 36). Let us assume that the problem with which the clinician is faced is new onset of pain associated with walking (intermittent claudication) in a patient with peripheral vascular disease and a previous myocardial infarction. This patient began taking β-blockers some time ago to prevent a recurrent myocardial infarction. Now the clinician reads the insert to the β-blocker and confirms what she remembers from medical school: β-blockers may exacerbate the symptoms of peripheral vascular disease. She then finds a meta-analysis that concludes that β-blockers do not have this effect.10 A clinical dilemma ensues—should the patient (free of symptoms of claudication before being put on β-blocker) stay on the medication or should it be discontinued? This situation fulfills all the requirements necessary for conduct of an N-of-1 RCT: the condition is chronic; the potential effect of the β-blocker on peripheral vasculature should have rapid onset and termination of action; and the drug, if proven not to cause the troublesome symptoms, will be continued long term.

The clinician should establish the treatment targets most important for the patient before the trial, tailoring the choice to the individual case. The patient may be concerned about his ability to walk a dog, visiting a family who lives on the fourth floor of a building with no elevator, the severity of his discomfort when playing golf, or embarrassment due to other people noticing problems with walking. The clinician must moni-
tor whatever symptoms the patient judges as sufficiently important and troublesome that getting rid of them may be worth a 25% increase in the risk of myocardial infarction.

The simplest outcome measure could be the preference for β-blocker or placebo in a pair of treatment periods. If one would like to quantify the degree of symptoms and explore the reasons behind the patient’s preference, the response options depend on the nature of the treatment target. We have found seven-point scales an optimal method for recording the severity of symptoms because of their ability to detect small degrees of change, patients’ ease in understanding them, and their ease of interpretation.\(^{11}\) Using a seven-point scale response, for example, one may ask

Please indicate how much leg discomfort have you been experiencing while playing golf last week by choosing one of the options from the scale below:

1. Extreme discomfort
2. Severe discomfort
3. Quite a lot of discomfort
4. Moderate discomfort
5. Mild discomfort
6. A little discomfort
7. No discomfort at all.

Using the taxonomy introduced in the chapter on quality of life studies, we call a set of such questions a disease- and patient-specific questionnaire (see Chapter 36). Other options for monitoring treatment targets include other disease-specific or general quality of life questionnaires.

To summarize our hypothetical example, one could conduct a N-of-1 RCT consisting of three treatment pairs, with each treatment pair including a two week treatment period on β-blocker and a two week period on placebo. The patient could complete the outcome measures (a disease- and patient-specific three to five item symptom questionnaire) twice during the second week of each treatment period (second week only as the results during the first week could be influenced by the medication taken during the preceding treatment period).

**N-OF-1 RCT: STATISTICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS**

An Example Trial

To illustrate issues in the interpretation of data from N-of-1 trials, we will use an example of an N-of-1 RCT in which we tested the effectiveness of ipratropium bromide in a dose of four inhalations four times a day (each inhalation 20 μg of the drug) in a patient with chronic airflow limitation. Each day, the patient rated the severity of a number of symptoms, judged by him as important in his daily life. The symptoms included shortness of breath while walking upstairs, playing the vibraphone, drying the dishes, and overall shortness of breath. Each symptom was rated on a seven point scale in which a higher score represented better function (i.e., “1”, extremely short of breath; “7”, not at all short of breath). The treatment periods were seven days in length (with measurements obtained during last five days of each period), and the trial included four pairs of treatment periods. Table 37.1 presents the mean scores for each of the eight weeks of the study.

Interpreting the Results: Visual Inspection

One way of evaluating these data is visual inspection. Visual inspection of the data is based on a graphical display of outcome assessments over time and in relation to the treatment being received. A conclusion that the treatment is effective would be supported to the extent that there is minimal variability within periods, that the difference between active and placebo periods is large relative to the within-period variability that is seen, and to the extent that the magnitude of the difference between active and placebo periods is consistent. Using the visual inspection of data one tries to intuitively draw conclusions about direction, magnitude, and consistency of response to experimental treatment. We invite readers to make conclusions on the basis of the data presented in Table 37.1 and Figure 37.2 before considering a more formal analysis.

Visual inspection is appealing in that it makes intuitive sense to both patient and clinician. Yet,
Table 37.1. Results of an N-of-1 RCT: ipratropium, symptom score (data represent mean score on four questions)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Day 1</th>
<th>Day 2</th>
<th>Day 3</th>
<th>Day 4</th>
<th>Day 5</th>
<th>Treatment mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>5.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>4.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>4.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>Placebo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pairs</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+1.438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ t_3 = 1.438 / (0.7686/4) = 3.74 \]
[\{NB \, t_3 = 14.00\}]

visual inspection is subjective and thus may allow inconsistency in the evaluation of intervention effects. Use of the criteria presented above will help reduce subjectivity and thus increase the likelihood of consistent interpretation. However, even experts in visual analysis often disagree about particular data patterns and whether the effects are reliable.\textsuperscript{12}

Interpreting the Results: Nonparametric Tests

An alternative approach to analysis of data from N-of-1 RCTs is to utilize a statistical test of significance, and a number of tests are possible candidates. These tests fall into two main classes: nonparametric and parametric tests. The major problematic issue in the interpretation of the

Figure 37.2. Results of an N-of-1 RCT: a visual display of mean daily symptom scores in a trial of ipratropium bromide versus placebo.
results of N-of-1 RCTs is that the errors associated with each data point may be correlated with the errors associated with other data points. This is called “autocorrelation” or “serial dependence” and we will address the issue in detail later in the discussion.

Like most statistical comparisons, nonparametric tests start from the hypothesis that treatment has no effect. An apparent effect of treatment observed in an N-of-1 RCT may well be due to a quirk of the order in which treatments were allocated within pairs. To evaluate this possibility, one considers the apparent treatment effects that would result from all other randomized treatment orders that could have occurred. The proportion of randomizations that produce apparent treatment effects as or more extreme than that actually observed is the p-value of the test.

In its simplest form, a randomization test would be based on the direction (i.e., sign) of the observed treatment difference in each pair. One can compute the p-value for the sign test which is appropriate for this form of randomization test from the binomial distribution or obtained from published tables. Using this approach for the analysis of the results of the ipratropium study described above, the first step is to calculate the mean score for each treatment period (presented in the last column of Table 37.1). In each pair of periods, the mean score favored the active treatment. Using the binomial theorem, the probability of this result occurring by chance if the treatment was ineffective is $1/2 \times 1/2 \times 1/2 \times 1/2 = 1/16$ (or 0.0625 for a one-sided test).

Two other nonparametric tests that incorporate the size of the outcome score differences are also commonly used. The Wilcoxon signed rank test uses the ranks of score differences. The absolute differences within pairs are first ordered from smallest to largest and ranks given to the difference, then if the two treatments are equivalent we would expect that the sum of ranks for positive differences should equal sum of negative ranks.

One can utilize a third option, a “pure” quantitative randomization test, by building up the empirical distribution of the difference in mean treatment outcome over all possible randomizations of the observed data. Under the null hypothesis of no systematic difference, the distribution of treatment mean difference would be centered on zero, but particular random treatment orderings would have led to variability in mean difference in both the positive and negative directions. The p-value of the test is again simply the proportion of randomizations that would have led to treatment differences as or more extreme than the one actually observed in the trial itself. This randomization test takes into account not only the direction of the difference (as the sign test does) and its relative size (as signed rank test does), but also its numerical size.

If one uses randomization tests, to obtain conventional one-tailed statistical significance one must complete at least five pairs and hope to obtain the most extreme result, because $1/2^2 = 1/32 = 0.0313$, while $1/2^4 = 1/16 = 0.0625$. The advantage of tests that quantify the size of the paired treatment differences rather than just their sign is manifest when one does not observe this extreme result. Whereas the sign test immediately drops to a $p$ of 6/32 (0.1875) if only four of five pairs favor active treatment, the signed rank and, particularly, the pure randomization test can yield lower $p$-values (perhaps as low as 2/32) if the one pair favoring placebo does so only marginally. Thus, the expected $p$-values associated with an efficacious treatment tend to decrease from the sign test through the signed rank test to the randomization test, as each one is using more information. Tables for the Wilcoxon signed rank test are available, but the randomization test approach depends upon the actual data observed and must be calculated anew (either by hand or with a computer program) for each application.

Interpreting the Data: Parametric Tests

While nonparametric tests are very appealing in the context of an N-of-1 trial, their avoidance of strong distributional assumptions about the data make them relatively conservative compared to tests which make such assumptions. More powerful techniques for normally distributed outcomes, which we will refer to generally as analysis of variance, include analysis of variance itself and, as
a special case, the Student $t$-test (either in the paired or unpaired form).

In the ipratropium trial, there were four pairs of treatment periods and five symptom scores per period. If one assumes that the day-to-day fluctuation in outcome within treatment period is simply inherent random variation in the disease process one would call this, in the parlance of analysis of variance, a balanced two factor crossed design with replication. The factor of interest is treatment, but we must also allow for possible shifts in mean from one pair of periods to another and thus period pair represents the second factor. Less obvious to the statistical lay person is the need to allow for the possibility of interaction between treatment and period pair. In this situation, the interaction measures the tendency of the treatment effect to vary in size from one period pair to another.

The results of the analysis of variance with the imputed missing values are given in Table 37.2. The mean square for between pairs measures the variation in mean symptom score between period pairs, the mean square for between treatments reflects consistent differences in mean between active and placebo periods, and the mean square for interaction reflects the variation in active–placebo mean difference over period pairs. It is crucial to realize that period pair is a random factor in this design; in other words, that the four pairs of periods in which the study was run can be thought of as a sample from a much larger population of time periods that could have been used. Because of this, the appropriate test of treatment compares the average difference between active and placebo means to the variability in active–placebo differences over treatment pairs, in the ratio of the mean square treatment to mean square interaction. The resulting $F$ test ($F_{3,13} = 13.99, p = 0.033$) is identical to the square of the paired Student $t$-test conducted on the four pairs of treatment means.

One might reasonably question why one should use ANOVA here when the result is identical to the simple and more familiar paired $t$-test. The answer lies in the second test provided by the ANOVA, namely the test of interaction, which is computed as the ratio of the mean square interaction to the mean square error ($F(3, 31) = 19.03, p < 0.0001$). This formally asks the question, “Is there evidence of extra variation in treatment effect from period pair to period pair over and above that we would expect from the inherent day-to-day variation in symptom score?” If evidence for this extra variation were very weak, we would gain great advantage statistically by comparing the mean square treatments to the mean square error (or even the pooled error incorporating the interaction). Although the numerical size of $F$ would not change much, the gain in degrees of freedom could have an appreciable effect on the $p$-value. In essence, the switch from using the yardstick of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between pairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7.32</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>$2.44 = 31.33$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.88$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($p &lt; 0.0001$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between treatments</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>$20.68 = 13.99$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1.48$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($p = 0.033$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction treatment $\times$ pairs</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>$1.48 = 19.03$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$0.08$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>($p &lt; 0.0001$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34.84</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired $t$ approach:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mean active–placebo difference = 1.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>SD (active–placebo difference) = 0.7686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
interaction mean square to the error mean square in testing the treatment effect allows us to use the variation in all 40 individual observations, rather than only the treatment mean differences in the four pairs of periods.

The ipratropium trial shows relatively strong evidence of extra variation through the test of interaction ($F(3, 31) = 19.03, p < 0.0001$). Thus, in this particular case, one could have used the simple paired t-test. However, we have used this approach in 16 N-of-1 trials to look at serial dependence. We found clear evidence of extra variation in treatment effect over period pairs in about 50% of trials. The additional variation could be a reflection of the long term ebb and flow of the disease. Alternatively, isolated, short term, truly random changes in symptom severity could also be responsible. In any case, the presence of the interaction dictates that, in the majority of situations, the simple paired ANOVA is not an appropriate approach.

Given that the test of interaction may be of limited power in the context of an N-of-1 trial, because of the relatively small number of period pairs, one should err on the side of caution and in general use the more conservative paired t-test. However, in those situations where there is no evidence of extra variation (say when the mean square interaction is less than or equal to the mean square error), then one should consider the comparison based upon the pooled error. We acknowledge that many statisticians may be reluctant to accept our position regarding the appropriateness of use of any parametric methods, including the paired t-test. More conservative practitioners, therefore, will restrict themselves to use of nonparametric methods.

Interpreting the Data: Autocorrelation

Large group studies are usually so designed that, within the constraints of the design, the responses of the different patients are statistically independent. On the other hand, data for successive treatment periods for one and the same patient are of the nature of a “time series” and may be serially dependent or “autocorrelated.” That is, any individual observation is to some extent a function of the previous observation. Thus, an individual observation may bear a closer relation to an adjacent observation than to an observation much earlier or later in the series. Serial dependence can occur for instance when there is a natural ebb and flow of the severity of the underlying disease process. The lack of independence of individual outcome assessments over time, if present, is important to recognize since it constitutes a serious threat to the valid application of either parametric or nonparametric methods to N-of-1 RCTs.

While one can postulate all kinds of biologic reason why symptom scores could be expected to be correlated from day to day, it is necessary to formally examine many N-of-1 trials in similar disease processes to demonstrate empirically the level of dependence. One such investigation has already been reported by Huijtema.16 He reviewed the results of almost 500 N-of-1 trials in the behavioral area, and concluded there was very little evidence of important serial dependence. He refers to the widely held belief that autocorrelation is a problem in N-of-1 studies as a “myth.”

We have conducted a similar analysis in 16 N-of-1 trials in patients with a spectrum of medical conditions. The 16 N-of-1 RCTs involved repeated outcome assessments during each treatment period, and between three and six pairs of treatment periods. Autocorrelations were estimated from data which had first been “detrended” by subtraction of the period mean to produce residual variation. Serial correlation coefficients can be calculated for pairs of residuals which are one time unit apart (i.e., adjacent in time), two units apart, etc. Even if there is no real correlation between successive raw observations, the subtraction of period means will create slight negative correlation among pairs of residuals within a period. This correlation, equal to $1/(k - 1)$ (where $k$ is the number of observations per period), is created by the fact that the sum of residuals within a period must add to zero. One must take this feature into account when examining observed residuals for autocorrelation.

In practice, only the first few autocorrelations need to be investigated. Since one might expect that serial dependence, if present in this type of
data, would be in the form of a first order autoregressive process (highest correlation between adjacent observations), one should be sensitive to the appearance of the characteristic exponentially decaying pattern of autocorrelations. We found almost no evidence of autocorrelation of individual assessments over time and reasonable normality for a variety of composite symptom scores and physiologic outcomes (Table 37.3). Although 22 of 64 of the autocorrelations shown in Table 37.3 are greater than 0.2, only five of these are statistically significant and only two of these are first order correlations. The pattern of autocorrelation is little different from that which would be expected by chance if there were no underlying autocorrelation at all.

While the power of the tests for autocorrelation is limited, the data nevertheless suggest that autocorrelation is the exception rather than the rule. Autocorrelations of 0.2 and higher can alter p-values, so that the true p-value will be greater than the p-value that one observes when one conducts the statistical test.\(^{17}\) An autocorrelation of 0.2 for instance, will result in a true p-value of 0.089 being associated with an observed p-value of 0.05. However, even if such autocorrelations were present in the individual data, the autocorrelation of the mean scores from each treatment period (which we advocate using in the paired t-test described above) would be substantially lower and unlikely to significantly distort observed p-values.

If one wishes to be reasonably secure in the use of parametric or nonparametric methods that assume no serial dependence in an individual N-of-1 RCT, one can begin by testing for the presence of autocorrelation of the residuals. In our trial of ipratropium, for instance, the first and second order autocorrelations (± standard error) for the symptom data were 0.10 (±0.11) and −0.06 (±0.10) respectively. The corresponding figures for the peak flow data were 0.07 (±0.16) and 0.24 (±0.16). These autocorrelations are not statistically significant and their magnitude is small. The results therefore support application of standard parametric or nonparametric analysis to the data. Had significant autocorrelation been found, an analytic method applicable for dealing with autocorrelated data from N-of-1 RCTs could have been applied.\(^{18}\)

A summary of our viewpoint regarding autocorrelation is as follows. First, in 16 N-of-1 studies we found a consistently small magnitude of autocorrelation. The pattern of the serial dependence observed suggests that most of the autocorrelation was due to the play of chance, rather than a true finding. Although this is a small sample, the results suggest that autocorrelation of large magnitude may be unusual in N-of-1 RCTs. Second, Huijema’s study of almost 500 single case studies supports the hypothesis that important correlation is unusual in these experiments. Third, the impact of any autocorrelation would be minimized by using mean scores from each period and by the paired design. Fourth, if concern regarding autocorrelation remains, the data from an individual study should be tested to determine the extent of autocorrelation.

Table 37.3. Number of N-of-1 RCTs showing varying magnitudes of autocorrelation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Degree of separation</th>
<th>Magnitude of autocorrelation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt;0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1</td>
<td>7/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>5/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+3</td>
<td>4/16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+4</td>
<td>5/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No correlations reach conventional levels of statistical significance unless otherwise stated.

\(^a\) One of these correlations reached conventional levels of statistical significance (\(p < 0.05\)).

\(^b\) Two of these correlations reached conventional levels of statistical significance (\(p < 0.05\)).
N-OF-1 RCT: CLINICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE RESULTS

We have touched on the problem of interpreting the results of studies using HRQL measurements in assessing the effectiveness of therapeutic interventions in the “Quality of life” chapter in this book (see Chapter 36). In that chapter we noted that, while conducting classical (multi-subject) RCTs and measuring symptoms on a seven point scale, we have noted that a difference of 0.5 points per question approximates the smallest important difference. This observation was made when the minimal important difference was defined as the smallest difference in score in the domain of interest which patients perceive as a change and which would mandate, in the absence of troublesome side-effects and excessive cost, modification in the patient’s management. While the clinician would participate in the decision regarding modification of management, the definition otherwise focuses on the patient’s experience. This follows from a conceptual or philosophical perspective that sees quality of life as part of an individual’s subjective experience.

Conducting N-of-1 RCTs provides an opportunity to define the size of the minimally important difference and other effect sizes. The strategy that we have used in the N-of-1 RCTs performed to date could be summarized as follows.19

All these N-of-1 RCTs were designed to examine the efficacy of specific interventions in ameliorating symptoms due to a variety of conditions. The primary outcome measure in each N-of-1 RCT was an HRQL questionnaire measuring the severity of symptoms identified by patients as related to their disease and important in their day-to-day life. The operational definition of the minimal important difference that we used was the smallest difference that was important enough that patients would choose to continue indefinitely with the intervention.

We conducted each trial according to the principles outlined in the previous sections. To assess drug efficacy and side-effects, we constructed an individualized questionnaire examining the severity of symptoms identified by patients as part of their disease and as being important in their day-to-day life. We identified the symptoms to be measured from detailed interviews with patients in which we elicited patients’ experience of the illness or the drug, and what bothered them most. The questionnaires that followed consisted of four to seven items (symptoms), with severity of symptoms measured on a seven point scale (see previously presented response option example). We calculated the difference in the mean score per question between treatment periods for each treatment pair.

To directly assess the patient’s perception of the drug’s effect, we asked the following questions after each pair of treatment periods:

Overall in which of the two periods did you feel better?

1. First period
2. Second period
3. No difference.

If patient expressed a preference on the above question we then asked:

Would you continue drug A indefinitely if it was actually drug A that made you feel better?

1. Yes
2. No

When the patient answered yes to the above questions we asked her/him to provide us with the magnitude of the drug effect by asking the following question (global rating):

If it turns out that you felt better during the period in which you were on drug A, we would like you to rate how important the difference between the two periods is to you:

1. Not important
2. Slight importance
3. Some importance, consistent benefit
4. Moderate importance, consistent benefit
5. Much importance, good deal of benefit
6. Very important
7. Great importance.
A global rating score of 0 was assigned if the patient indicated that there was no difference between periods, or if the observed difference was not sufficient to make him or her take the drug indefinitely.

We subsequently examined the relation between patients’ subjective assessment of drug efficacy (global rating) and differences in the quality of life questionnaire score in every pair of every N-of-1 RCT in which data were available. As different questionnaires included from four to seven questions, the difference in the HRQL score was expressed as the total difference in score divided by the number of questions in a particular questionnaire. The minimal important difference was defined as the difference in the questionnaire score corresponding to a small degree of importance (answers (1)–(3) on the global rating); moderate benefit as differences corresponding to answers (4) or (5); and large benefit as differences corresponding to answers (6) or (7).

To help understand the significance of different changes in questionnaire score, we calculated the mean differences on the HRQL questionnaire score in patients who told us they had experienced small, moderate, and large changes using global rating. A mean difference of 0.29 points per question in HRQL questionnaire score corresponded to a global rating of a small degree of change—the minimal important difference. Differences of approximately 0.66 points per question corresponded to the moderate difference by the global rating; differences of about 1.09 points per question represented a marked difference. We have found similar results in the setting of quality of life measurement in conventional multipatient studies using a variety of interventions, though the difference corresponding to a minimal important difference has tended to be somewhat higher (around 0.5).20–23

While analyzing the size of minimal important difference in the setting of N-of-1 RCTs, we observed large between-patient variability in the changes in symptom questionnaire score, corresponding to varying estimates of drug efficacy. Some portion of this variability is certainly due to the less than perfect validity of the independent standard (in this case, the global rating of drug efficacy). However, it is likely that patients have different standards about the changes in symptoms that they view as important or trivial. Physiological measures also display the same variability in the clinical significance of a particular change in score or value. On the other hand, establishing the range of changes in score that correspond to small, medium, and large effects across a group of patients undergoing N-of-1 RCTs and confirming that these changes conform to the previous estimates24 provided us with information allowing meaningful interpretation of study results and was useful in the planning of future studies.

N-OF-1 RCTs: PRACTICAL ASPECTS

Conducting an N-of-1 RCT that incorporates the appropriate safeguards against bias and misinterpretation can be challenging. Usually, the clinician requires collaboration with a pharmacist or pharmacy service. Preparation of placebo targeted to the active medication in appearance, taste, and texture is required. Occasionally, pharmaceutical firms can supply such placebos. More often, however, clinicians must collaborate with a local pharmacist to repackaging the active medication; if it comes in pill form, it can be crushed and repackaged in capsule form. Identical appearing placebo capsules can be filled with lactose. While somewhat time consuming, preparation of placebos is not technically difficult. Our own average cost for preparing medication for N-of-1 studies in which placebos have not been available from the drug’s manufacturer has been $125. The pharmacist is also generally charged with preparing the randomization schedule (which requires nothing more than a “coin toss” for each pair of treatment periods). This allows the clinician, along with the patient, to remain blind to allocation.

The pharmacist may also be helpful in planning the design of the trial through knowledge of the drug’s action and the washout period needed, thus helping with decisions about the duration of study periods. The pharmacist can also help monitor compliance and drug absorption. Both pill counts and the drawing of serum drug levels at the end of each treatment period can help establish that the
patient is taking the study medication conscientiously throughout the trial.

Another major issue is the ethics of an N-of-1 RCT. Is the conduct of an N-of-1 RCT a clinical or a research undertaking? If the former, is it the sort of clinical procedure, analogous to an invasive diagnostic test, that requires written informed consent? We would argue that the N-of-1 RCT could, and should be, a part of routine clinical practice. However, like all medical innovations, it may require a period of experimentation and study before being accepted by clinicians, and by ethics committees.

Nevertheless, a number of ethical issues are important. We believe that patients should be fully informed of the nature of the study in which they are participating, and there should be no element of deception in the use of placebos as part of the study. Clinicians should obtain written informed consent (the consent form we use is presented in the Appendix). Patients should be aware that they could terminate the trial at any time without jeopardizing their care, or their relationship with their physician. Finally, followup should be close enough to prevent any important deleterious consequences of institution or withdrawal of therapy.

All these considerations suggest that setting up an N-of-1 trial can involve a substantial amount of effort. One must explain the endeavor fully to the patient, obtain informed consent, construct the outcome questionnaire, negotiate with the pharmacist regarding preparation of medication, carry out the study, and conduct the analysis. These challenges may seem formidable to the busy clinician. Nevertheless, with effort, they can be managed.25–27

N-OF-1 RCTs: EXPLORING NEW DRUG USE

The Conventional Approach

In the preceding sections, we described the application of N-of-1 RCTs in deciding about optimal therapy in individual patients. The concept of N-of-1 RCTs, however, could also be used to draw more general conclusions regarding drug efficacy. The main role for this methodology is likely in the early, premarketing stages of drug development,28 but the same principles may apply in the postmarketing phase while exploring new areas of possible drug utilization—using different doses, examining the effects in different populations, or investigating previously unrecognized beneficial actions or side effects.

Let us use as an example the hypothetical observation that a long used antidepressant medication (drug A) improves itching associated with renal failure. Although this example is hypothetical, it is not inconceivable; recall amantadine’s use in Parkinson’s disease, β-blockers in familial tremor, or amitriptyline in fibrositis, chronic pain, or diabetic neuropathy. Now, the investigators wish to compare drug A with currently used modes of therapy. In large sample parallel group trials, patients are assigned at random to drug A or an alternative drug (say, an antihistamine). The treatment groups are followed and the treatment target monitored. These trials are the standard approach to establishing drug efficacy, and to persuading regulatory agencies that a new medication should be placed on the market or a new indication for an old medication accepted.

There are three major hurdles that need to be overcome before such large sample parallel group studies of the efficacy and safety of a drug can be undertaken. First, investigators must determine whether the drug shows sufficient promise to justify the initiation of a large clinical research program. Second, they must define the patient population to be studied. Third, they must establish the dose regimen to be used in the major trials.

These decisions are generally based on findings from early clinical safety, tolerance, pharmacology, and drug disposition studies in healthy volunteers and patients, augmented by ideas gained from initial small scale efficacy studies. These efficacy studies are often open, and use baseline status or a historical reference group as a control. Such studies tend to yield anecdotal information of questionable validity. Investigators may use classical double blind randomized parallel groups studies in the early exploration of drug properties, but their small sample size results in
findings that leave considerable uncertainty about the answers to the three key questions described above.

Thus, when designing the first large sample efficacy study, investigators face difficult decisions concerning both dose regimen and sample selection. They may gamble on a single dose (with a possibility of suboptimal efficacy with too small a dose or excessive side-effects with too large a dose), or take a safer approach that includes two or more different regimens for comparison. At the same time, they may hazard a guess at a suitable homogeneous target population of patients, or take a more conservative approach that includes a heterogeneous (possibly stratified) population.

If the investigators decide to gamble or guess and turn out to be wrong, the large sample efficacy study misfires. Nevertheless, the choice for gambling and guessing is frequently made. The reason is that, even with a well defined, homogeneous patient population, a parallel groups study of a single dose of a new drug often requires large numbers of patients for adequate statistical power. The extra numbers required for a heterogeneous patient population and/or several different dosage regimens might well be considered prohibitive.

Even if, through good luck or sound judgment, the first large sample efficacy study is successful and the study population is clearly shown to benefit from the selected dosage of the new drug, important questions are likely to remain. Would an equivalent benefit have been obtained at lower doses, or would there be additional benefit with higher doses? Will the use of lower dose allow preservation of drug benefit with reduced side effects? Are there subgroups of patients who are particularly responsive or resistant to the new drug?

Several successive rounds of large sample parallel group studies may well fail to provide clearcut answers. One reason is that in such studies, there is usually much uncontrolled variation among patients. The result of this variation is that the determination of the profiles of responsive and drug resistant subpopulations of patients is hindered and at times rendered impossible.

The Role of N-of-1 RCTs

N-of-1 trials share many features in common with the traditional crossover trials used in drug evaluation. The fundamental difference between the N-of-1 approach and traditional crossover trials is their primary purpose: N-of-1 trials attempt to establish effects in an individual, whereas crossover trials attempt to establish effects in a group. As a secondary goal, one may use a crossover trial to examine individual responses. Similarly, one may analyze a series of N-of-1 trials with a similar design as a multiple crossover trial. However, the N-of-1 trial will be designed so that individual effects can be reliably detected; the crossover trial will be designed so that individual estimates of response are imprecisely estimated but the magnitude of the average group effect can be efficiently determined.

In some therapeutic indications (including our hypothetical example of itch), the problems faced by investigators involved in drug development may be overcome by including in the program a short series of carefully designed N-of-1 RCTs. These studies will permit the reliable identification of responders and nonresponders and an estimate of the proportion of patients in each category. They may also make it possible to determine the optimal dosage regimen for individual patients. The availability of this type of information makes the design of large scale parallel group studies less problematic.

In relating the foregoing example to the general use of N-of-1 RCTs in drug development, we will deal in turn with the following six issues: the role of an open run-in period, determining the rapidity of onset of drug action, optimizing dose, measuring outcome, assessing potential drug impact, and predicting response.

The Role of an Open Run-in Period

To increase the efficiency of generating data in drug development (or in the exploration of a new indication), one could argue for first conducting formal N-of-1 RCTs only among patients who showed an apparent benefit during an open run-in period. Then, only responders in N-of-1 trials
would be included in subsequent large sample parallel group studies. In open therapeutic trials, potential biases, including patient and physician expectations and the placebo effect, generally favor a conclusion that the new treatment is beneficial. Thus, a false positive conclusion (concluding the drug works better when it does not) is far more likely than a false negative conclusion (concluding the drug does not work when in fact it does). Accordingly, it would be reasonable to conduct formal N-of-1 studies only on the subgroup of patients with apparent benefit from a new drug in open trials. Obviously, any estimates of the degree to which patients prefer drug A over drug B then have to take into account that only potential respondents were included in the formal evaluation.

Determining the Rapidity of Onset and Termination of Action

Conducting visual and statistical analyses of the data generated while obtaining numerous measurements during each treatment period in an N-of-1 RCT may help in determining the rapidity of the onset and termination of the treatment effect. One may incorporate this knowledge into the design of subsequent N-of-1 RCTs and large sample parallel group studies may then incorporate this knowledge. Precise information about the rapidity of action may also add to the understanding of the drug’s mechanism of action—a drug exerting its action within minutes of administration and another drug starting to act only after days of use are likely to have different biological modes of action.

Optimizing Dose

When one does not know the optimal dose of a drug, one option is to allow open, unblinded dose titration to obtain a response in the individual patient. One of many alternative approaches would be to conduct an N-of-1 RCT, beginning with the lowest plausible effective dose of the new drug. If the first pair or set of pairs showed superiority of drug B (the accepted method of treatment), a higher dose of drug A could be used in the next pair. The process could continue until side-effects appeared, the highest acceptable dose of drug A was reached, or a difference in favor of drug A emerged. This last observation could be confirmed by conducting additional pairs of treatment on the apparently favorable dose of drug A. This approach would not only help determine the optimal dose, but would reveal whether this optimal dose differed among different patients, an issue that would be very difficult to elucidate using parallel group studies. In addition, it would be possible to modify the doses used after only a few N-of-1 trials, if a high incidence of toxicity (use lower doses) or a low incidence of response (use higher doses) were found.

Measurement of Outcome

In the initial study of a drug in a new setting, investigators may be uncertain about the outcomes upon which to focus. This is particularly true if the primary outcomes relate to patients’ symptoms, and if the condition being treated (or the treatment) results in a spectrum of problems. For example, an antidepressant used for itchiness may have differential impact on the primary complaint, mood, and a number of possible side-effects, including problems with vision, dry mouth, and constipation (some of which may be idiosyncratic to people with renal failure). These differences may become apparent in the initial positive N-of-1 RCTs, giving the investigator an opportunity to shift the focus of outcome measurement to the areas most likely to show benefit or to important side-effects.

Assessing Potential Drug Impact

Once a number of N-of-1 trials have been conducted, one is in a position to evaluate the potential impact of the medication. If only one out of 20 patients has an N-of-1 RCT that shows drug A relatively superior, the drug may not be worth further development; if 15 out of 20 patients favor a new drug, one clearly has an important new treatment. Between such extremes, the decision concerning further study of the drug will depend on factors such as the prevalence of the condition
being treated, its associated morbidity, the expense and toxicity of the treatment, and the availability of other effective treatments. If a condition is of major importance to a relatively large population of patients, and if the drug (at the doses used) is inexpensive and nontoxic (both of which would be true for the use of amitriptyline in renal failure induced itchiness), a 25% response rate likely suggests an important role for the medication. In a condition that results in severe morbidity and for which there is no other treatment, the use of an inexpensive and nontoxic drug might be worth exploring and using even if only a small proportion of patients gained a clinically important benefit.

If initial N-of-1 RCTS suggest further study is warranted, the results can help in planning subsequent investigations. For example, sample size for a parallel group study can be informed by prior N-of-1 RCTS which provide accurate information concerning both within-person variability over time and heterogeneity of treatment response. The lower the response rate in preceding N-of-1 RCTS, the larger the sample size required in subsequent parallel group designs to detect the desired clinically important difference.

Predicting Response

N-of-1 RCTS can also help determine eligibility criteria for subsequent studies. The precise identification of responders and nonresponders allows powerful examination of predictors of response. If there is very little overlap between responders and nonresponders (for example, if virtually all people on peritoneal dialysis respond and all those on hemodialysis do not), a small number of N-of-1 RCTS will allow identification of variables associated with response. If a larger number of N-of-1 RCTS have been completed, weaker predictors may also be identified. If the number of trials is large enough, one can use logistic regression methods to determine the independent contribution of a set of variables in differentiating responders from nonresponders.

Identifying variables associated with response is important for clinicians in deciding when to use a drug. In addition, the ability of N-of-1 RCTS to define responders precisely may provide a solution to one of the major dilemmas facing those exploring the use of a drug in a new situation: choosing the population for the first large sample parallel group RCT.

In summary, N-of-1 RCTS have an important potential role to play in the development of new drugs or in explorations of the use of an old drug in a new clinical situation. Information regarding rapidity of onset and termination of drug action, the optimal dose, the outcomes on which to focus, and predictors of response may be obtained most efficiently using N-of-1 RCTS. The ultimate impact of a medication can be thus assessed early in the process of clinical testing.

THE FUTURE

We have previously reported our experience with the use of N-of-1 methodology and found that the method is able to aid in resolution of difficult clinical dilemmas; that based on the results of N-of-1 trials treatment frequently changes; and that, with long-term followup, physicians continue to follow the conclusions based on the N-of-1 RCT results. In addition to Larson’s work which we have already cited, other clinical groups have reported on their experience with N-of-1 RCTS, generally confirming the feasibility and usefulness of the approach.

These reports do not definitively answer the question about whether patients who undergo N-of-1 RCTS are better off than those whose treatment regimen is determined by conventional methods. The most rigorous test of the usefulness of N-of-1 RCTS would be a randomized trial. Two such trials, in which investigators randomized patients to conventional care or to undergo N-of-1 RCTS, have addressed the impact of N-of-1 RCTS. Both were conducted by the same group of investigators, and both studied the use of theophylline in patients with chronic airflow limitation. The investigators found that while using N-of-1 RCTS did not affect patients’ quality of life or functional status, of patients initially on theophylline, fewer in the N-of-1 RCT groups ended up receiving the drug in the long term. Thus, N-of-1 RCTS saved patients the expense,
inconvenience, and potential toxicity of useless long term theophylline therapy.

While confirming the potential of N-of-1 RCTs, groups with extensive experience with N-of-1 RCTs have noted the time and effort required. It is unlikely that full implementation of N-of-1 RCTs will become a major part of clinical practice. Clinicians can, however, incorporate many of the key principles of N-of-1 RCTs into their practice without adopting the full rigor of the approach presented here. Medication can be repeatedly withdrawn and reintroduced in an open or unmasked fashion. Symptoms and physical findings can be carefully quantified. However, without the additional feature of double blinding, both the placebo effect and physician and patient expectations can still bias the results.

In summary, the N-of-1 approach clearly has potential for improving the quality of medical care and the judicious use of expensive and potentially toxic medication in patients with chronic disease. Using the guidelines offered here, we believe that clinicians will find the conduct of N-of-1 RCTs feasible, highly informative, and stimulating.

APPENDIX: CONSENT FORM FOR N-OF-1 RANDOMIZED TRIALS

Often, doctors and patients try to decide what treatment is best by starting a particular drug and seeing if it makes the patient feel better. Unfortunately, the results of such ‘therapeutic trials’, as we call them, are often misleading. The patient may have gotten better anyway, even without any medication. Or, the doctor and the patient may be so optimistic that they may misinterpret the results of the therapeutic trial. Finally, people often feel better when they are taking new medication even when it doesn’t have any specific activity against their illness (the placebo effect), and this may also lead to a misleading interpretation of the value of the new treatment.

We believe we have developed a better way of conducting therapeutic trials. In this new approach, the patient alternates between taking active drug and placebo. The placebo is a medication that looks identical, but doesn’t contain the active ingredient. While taking the active and placebo medication the patient keeps careful track of how he or she is feeling. Neither the doctor nor the patient knows when the patient is taking the active drug and when the patient is taking the placebo. After several periods on both active and placebo medication the ‘code’ is broken and the patient and the doctor then look at the results. Together, they decide whether the drug is of any benefit and should be continued.

We think that it would help you to take part in one of these therapeutic trials of [NAME OF DRUG]. We will conduct a number of pairs of periods. Each period will be [DURATION OF PERIOD]. During one period of each pair you will be taking the active treatment, and during the other you will be using the placebo. If at any time during the study you are feeling worse we can consider that treatment period at an end and can go on to the next treatment. Therefore, if you begin to feel worse, just call my office at [INSERT NUMBER] and I will get in touch with you.

If you don’t think this new way of conducting a therapeutic trial is a good idea for you, we will try the new drug in the usual way. Your decision will not interfere with your treatment in any way. You can decide to stop the trial any time along the way, and this will not interfere with your treatment either. All information we collect during the trial will remain confidential.

PATIENT SIGNATURE ____________________________

WITNESS SIGNATURE __________________________

PHYSICIAN SIGNATURE _________________________

DATE ____________________________
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INTRODUCTION

Meta-analysis has been defined as “the statistical analysis of a collection of analytic results for the purpose of integrating the findings.” Other definitions have included qualitative, as well as quantitative, analyses. Meta-analysis is used to identify sources of variation among study findings and, when appropriate, to provide an overall measure of effect as a summary of those findings. While epidemiologists have been cautious about adopting meta-analysis, the need to make the most efficient and intelligent use of existing data prior to (or instead of) embarking on a large, primary data collection effort, has dictated a progressively more accepting approach.

Meta-analysis may be regarded as a “state-of-the-art” literature review, employing statistical methods in conjunction with a thorough and systematic qualitative review. The distinguishing feature of meta-analysis, as opposed to the usual qualitative literature review, is its systematic, structured, and presumably objective presentation and analysis of available data. The traditional review has been increasingly recognized as being subjective. With the support of leading scientists and journal editors, there has been growing acceptance of the concept that the literature review can be approached as a more rigorous scientific endeavor, specifically, an observational study with the same requirements for planning, prespecification of definitions, use of eligibility definitions, etc., as any other observational study. In recent years, the terms research synthesis and systematic review have been used to describe the structured review process, in general, while meta-analysis has been reserved for the quantitative aspects of the process. For the purposes of this chapter, we shall use meta-analysis in the more general sense. Meta-analysis provides the conceptual and quantitative framework for such rigorous literature reviews; similar measures from comparable studies are tabulated systematically and the effect measures are combined when appropriate.

Several activities may be included under the above definition of meta-analysis. Perhaps the most popular conception of meta-analysis, for
most clinically oriented researchers, is the summary of a group of randomized clinical trials dealing with a particular therapy for a particular disease. An example of this approach would be a study that examined the effects of aspirin following myocardial infarction. Typically, this type of meta-analysis would present an overall measure of the efficacy of treatment, e.g., a summary odds ratio. Summary measures may be presented for different subsets of trials involving specific types of patients, e.g., studies restricted to men versus studies that include both men and women. More sophisticated meta-analyses also examine the variability of results among trials and, when results have been conflicting, attempt to uncover the sources of the disagreements.19

More recently, meta-analyses of nonexperimental epidemiologic studies have been performed20–28 and articles have been written describing the methodologic considerations specific to those meta-analyses.3,6,11–13,29–38 In general, both the meta-analyses of nonexperimental studies and the associated methodologic articles tend to focus more on the exploration of reasons for disagreement among the results of prior studies, including the possibility of bias. Given the greater diversity of designs of nonexperimental studies, it is logical to find more disagreement among nonexperimental studies than among randomized trials.

This chapter summarizes many of the major conceptual and methodologic issues surrounding meta-analysis and offers the views of one meta-analyst about possible avenues for future research in this field.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

There are a number of reasons why a pharmacoepidemiologist might be interested in conducting a meta-analysis. These include the study of uncommon negative outcomes of therapies (adverse drug reactions) free of the confounding and bias of nonexperimental studies, the exploration of reasons for inconsistencies of results across previous studies, the exploration of subgroups of patients in whom therapy may be more or less effective, the combination of studies involved in the approval process for new therapies, and the study of positive effects of therapies, as in the investigation of new indications for existing therapies, particularly when the outcomes being studied are uncommon or the past studies have been small.

The investigation of adverse effects has been a recurring theme throughout this book, as it is a major focus of pharmacoepidemiology. It is most often, but not always, pursued through nonexperimental studies. The difficulties in studying these events have also been detailed throughout this book. One major challenge involves obtaining information on adverse reactions that is unconfounded by indication (see Chapter 43). These adverse events often occur only rarely, making their evaluation still more difficult. The results of nonexperimental studies of whether such events are associated with a particular drug may be conflicting, leaving a confusing picture for the practicing clinician and the policy makers to interpret. Meta-analysis, by combining results from many randomized studies, can address the problem of rare events and rectify the associated lack of adequate statistical power in a setting free of the confounding and bias of nonexperimental studies. For example, Chalmers and colleagues used meta-analysis of randomized clinical trials to explore possible gastrointestinal side-effects of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs).39 These studies individually had almost no power to detect any association between NSAIDs and adverse gastrointestinal outcomes, but collectively the number of subjects was adequate both to show some important associations and to show the rarity of most complications. The details of this NSAID meta-analysis will be presented later in this chapter.

When reports of several investigations of a specific adverse drug reaction disagree, whether randomized or nonexperimental in design, meta-analysis can also be used to help resolve these disagreements. These disagreements among studies may arise from differences in the choice of endpoints, the exact definition of exposure, the eligibility criteria for study subjects, the methods
of obtaining information, other differences in protocols, or a host of other reasons possibly related to the quality of the studies. While it is not possible to produce a definitive answer to every research question, the exploration of the reasons for heterogeneity among studies’ results may at least provide valuable guidance concerning the design of future studies.

The exploration of subgroups of patients in whom therapy may be more or less effective is a controversial question in individual randomized trials. Most trials are not designed with sample sizes adequate to address efficacy in subgroups. The finding of statistically significant differences between the effects of therapy in different subgroups, particularly when those groups were not defined prospectively, raises the question of whether those are spurious findings. Conversely, the lack of statistical significance for clinically important differences between prospectively defined subgroups can often be attributed to a lack of statistical power. Such clinically meaningful but statistically nonsignificant findings are difficult to interpret. Meta-analysis can be used to explore these questions with improved statistical power.

The use of meta-analysis in the approval process for new drugs represents another potential application, although experience in this area is as yet rather limited. However, many of the methodologic issues arising in the context of new drug approval also arise in the investigation of new indications for pharmaceutical products that have previously been approved for other purposes. For some therapies, such as streptokinase in the treatment of myocardial infarction, meta-analysis could have been used to summarize evidence prior to embarking on a very large scale, multicenter, randomized trial.40

**METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

As the skeptical reader might imagine, many methodologic issues can arise in the context of performing a meta-analysis. Many, but not all, of these problems relate to the process of combining studies that are often diverse with respect to specific aspects of design or protocol, some of which may be of questionable quality.

**QUALITY OF THE ORIGINAL STUDIES**

Meta-analysis seems particularly prone to the “garbage in, garbage out” phenomenon. Combining a group of poorly done studies can produce a precise summary result built on a very weak foundation. This apparent precision may lend undue credibility to a result that truly should not be used as a basis for formulating clinical or policy strategies.5 However, if the quality judgment is subtly influenced by the direction or magnitude of the findings of the study, excluding studies based on such a subjective judgment about their quality could open the meta-analytic process to a serious form of bias.

**COMBINABILITY OF STUDIES**

Clearly, no one would suggest combining studies that are so diverse that a summary would be nonsensical. For example, one would not combine studies of aspirin in the primary prevention of coronary heart disease with studies of aspirin given after myocardial infarction. Beyond obvious examples like this, however, the choices may not be so clear. Should studies with different patient populations be combined? How different can those populations be before it becomes unacceptable to combine the studies? Should nonrandomized studies be combined with randomized studies? Should nonrandomized studies ever be used in a meta-analysis? These are questions that cannot be answered without generating some controversy.

**PUBLICATION BIAS**

Unpublished material cannot be retrieved by literature searches and is likely to be difficult to find referenced in published articles. Publication bias occurs when study results are not published, or their publication is delayed, because of the results.41-50 The usual pattern is that statistically significant results are published more easily than
nonsignificant results, although this bias may not be as severe for randomized studies as it is for nonrandomized studies.\textsuperscript{42,51} While one could simply decide not to include unpublished studies in a meta-analysis, since those data have often not been peer reviewed,\textsuperscript{52} unpublished data can represent a large proportion of all available data.\textsuperscript{53} If the results of unpublished studies are systematically different from those of published studies, particularly with respect to the magnitude and/or direction of the findings, their omission from a meta-analysis would yield a biased summary estimate (assuming that the quality of the unpublished studies is at least equal to the quality of the published studies).

Publication bias is a potentially serious limitation to any meta-analysis. The retrospective identification of completed unpublished trials is clearly possible\textsuperscript{53} in some instances, but generally is not practical. One study\textsuperscript{54} used a survey of investigators to attempt to identify unpublished studies. The authors surveyed 42,000 obstetricians and pediatricians, asking whether they had participated in any unpublished trials completed more than two years previously, i.e., during the period prior to the end of 1984. They identified only 18 such studies, despite an overall response rate of 94% to their survey.

Other forms of bias, related to publication bias, have also been identified.\textsuperscript{45} These include reference bias, i.e., preferential citation of significant findings,\textsuperscript{55} language bias, i.e., exclusion of studies in languages other than English,\textsuperscript{56,57} and bias related to source of funding.\textsuperscript{42,43,58–60}

BIAS IN THE ABSTRACTION OF DATA

Meta-analysis, by virtue of being conducted after the data are available, is a form of retrospective research and is thus subject to the potential biases inherent in such research.\textsuperscript{61} In the meta-analysis of gastrointestinal side-effects of NSAID\textsuperscript{s} mentioned above,\textsuperscript{39} and described more fully below, Chalmers and colleagues examined over 500 randomized studies. They measured the agreement of different individuals when reading Methods sections of papers that had been masked as to their source and the results. There were disagreements on 10–20% of items, which had to be resolved in conference with a third person. These disagreements arose from errors on the part of the reader and from lack of clarity of the presentation of material in the original articles. Whatever its source, when such variability exists, the opportunity for observer bias may exist as well.\textsuperscript{61}

In a number of instances, more than one meta-analysis has been performed in the same general area of disease and treatment. A review of 20 of these instances\textsuperscript{52} showed that, for almost all disease/treatment areas, there were differences between two meta-analyses of the same topic in the acceptance and rejection of papers to be included. While there was only one case (out of the 20) of extreme disagreement regarding efficacy, there were several cases in which one or more analyses showed a statistically significant result while the other(s) showed only a trend. These disagreements were not easily explainable. For example, differences between meta-analyses of the same topic in the acceptance and rejection of papers did not always lead to differences in conclusions.

More generally, the acceptance or rejection of different sets of studies can drastically change conclusions. This is illustrated by several meta-analyses of whether or not corticosteroid drugs cause peptic ulcer. The first published paper argued that corticosteroids did not cause peptic ulcer, because the \( p \)-value for the meta-analysis was only 0.07.\textsuperscript{62} Five years later, a second analysis, by a second set of authors, included a larger number of studies and found evidence for an association with a \( p \)-value of less than 0.001.\textsuperscript{63} Re-analysis of the data from the second meta-analysis by the authors of the first meta-analysis, with the addition of several more studies, gave a \( p \)-value of 0.40.\textsuperscript{64} Another meta-analysis done by the second set of authors gave a revised \( p \)-value of 0.01.\textsuperscript{65} Despite efforts to make meta-analysis an objective, reproducible activity, there is evidently some judgment involved.

In a separate commentary,\textsuperscript{66} DerSimonian reanalyzed data from one meta-analysis and one clinical review of parenteral nutrition with branched-chain amino acids in hepatic encephalopathy. She pointed to differences in the data
extracted by the two sets of authors\textsuperscript{67,68} for the same endpoints from the same original papers. When combined statistically, the data extracted by the two sets of authors led to substantively different conclusions about the efficacy of therapy.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

This section will first present the general principles of meta-analysis and a general framework for the methods typically employed in a meta-analysis. Much of this material has been presented in review articles in major clinical journals,\textsuperscript{7,9,10} so only the most important points will be highlighted here. In the second part of this section, specific solutions to the methodologic issues raised in the previous section are presented. Finally, case studies of applications that should be of interest to pharmacoepidemiologists will be presented, illustrating approaches to some of the clinical and methodologic problems raised earlier.

**STEPS INVOLVED IN PERFORMING A META-ANALYSIS (SEE TABLE 38.1)**

Define the Purpose

While this is an obvious component of any research, it is particularly important to define precisely the primary and secondary objectives of a meta-analysis. The important primary question might be “Are NSAIDs associated with an increased risk of gastrointestinal side effects?”. Another might be “Are corticosteroids effective in the treatment of alcoholic hepatitis?”. Secondary objectives might include the identification of subgroups in which a treatment appears to be uniquely more or less effective. For NSAIDs, estimating the absolute risk difference (and, thus, the public health implications) as well as the relative risk (and, thus, the etiologic implications) might be a secondary objective.

**Perform the Literature Search**

While computerized searches of the literature can facilitate the retrieval of all relevant published studies, these searches are not always reliable. Several studies have examined problems with the use of electronic searches.\textsuperscript{69–71} Use of search terms that are too nonspecific can result in large numbers of mostly irrelevant citations that need to be reviewed to determine relevance. Use of too many restrictions can result in missing a substantial number of relevant publications. For example, in preparing for meta-analyses of neonatal hyperbilirubinemia, MEDLINE was searched for relevant clinical trials.\textsuperscript{69} A search by a trained librarian identified only 29% of known trials in the Oxford Database of Perinatal Trials.\textsuperscript{72} It is generally suggested that a professional librarian with training and experience in searches of clinical topics be consulted, although, as just cited, even a trained librarian may not perform perfectly. Other methods of searching, such as review of the reference sections of retrieved publications found to be relevant, and hand searches of relevant journals, are also recommended.

**Establish Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria**

A set of rules for including and excluding studies from the meta-analysis should be defined during the planning stage of the meta-analysis and should be based on the specific hypotheses being tested in the analysis. One might, for example, wish to limit consideration to randomized studies with more than some minimum number of patients. In a meta-analysis of epidemiologic studies, one might wish to include studies of incident cases only, excluding studies of prevalent cases, assuming that the relationship between exposure and outcome could be different in the two types of study. Practical considerations may, of course, force changes in the inclusion criteria. For example,
one might find no randomized studies of a particular new indication for an existing therapeutic agent, thus forcing consideration of nonrandomized studies.

In establishing inclusion/exclusion criteria, one is also necessarily defining the question being addressed by the meta-analysis. If broad inclusion criteria are established, then a broad, and perhaps more generalizable, hypothesis may be tested. The use of broad entry criteria also permits the examination of the effects of research design on outcome (e.g., do randomized and nonrandomized studies tend to show different effects of therapy?) or the exploration of subgroup effects. In the example of aspirin administered following myocardial infarction, restriction of the meta-analysis to studies using more than a certain dose of aspirin would not permit an exploratory, cross-study comparison of dose–response effects, which might prove illuminating.

A key point is that exclusion criteria should be based on a priori considerations of design of the original studies and completeness of the reports and specifically not on the results of the studies. To exclude studies solely on the basis of results that contradict the majority of the other studies will clearly introduce bias into the process. While that may seem obvious, the temptation to try to justify such exclusions on a post hoc basis may be strong, particularly when a clinically plausible basis for the exclusion can be found. Such exclusions made after having seen the data, and the effect of individual studies on the pooled result, may form the basis for legitimate sensitivity analyses (comparing pooled results with and without that particular study included), but should not be viewed as primary exclusion criteria.

Another important note is that studies may often generate more than one published paper. For example, later reports might update analyses previously published, or might report on outcomes not addressed in earlier papers. It is essential, for two reasons, that only one report on the same patients be accepted into the meta-analysis. First, the validity of the statistical methods depends on the assumption that the different studies represent different groups of individuals. Second, the inclusion of a study more than once would assign undue weight to that study in the summary measure. A caution is that it is not always obvious that the same patients have been described in two different publications. Contacting the authors may be of some help in determining whether there is duplication, although some authors may perceive the inquiry as questioning their academic integrity. The issue of multiple publications based on the same study has been addressed in more detail by Huston and Moher.

Collect the Data

When the relevant studies have been identified and retrieved, the important information regarding study design and outcome needs to be extracted. Typically, data abstraction forms are developed, pilot tested on a few articles, and revised as needed. As in any research, it is necessary to strike a balance between the completeness of the information abstracted and the amount of time needed to extract that information. Careful specification in the protocol for the meta-analysis of the design features and patient characteristics that will be of clinical or academic interest may help avoid over- or undercollecting information. It is generally advisable, when possible, to collect raw data on outcome measures, e.g., numbers treated and number of events in each group, rather than derived measures such as odds ratios, which may not be the outcome measures of interest in the meta-analysis or may have been calculated incorrectly by the original authors.

Many articles on “how to do a meta-analysis” (e.g., 7, 10) recommend that the meta-analyst assess the quality of the studies being considered in a meta-analysis. One might wish to use a measure of study quality as part of the weight assigned to each study in the analysis, as an exclusion criterion (e.g., excluding studies with quality scores below some arbitrary threshold), or as a stratification factor allowing the separate estimation of effects for good quality and poor quality studies. Chalmers and colleagues have developed a quality assessment scoring system for randomized trials. Several groups have opted for other, far shorter and simpler, systems (e.g., 77–80). Issues related to quality scoring have been discussed more generally
by Moher and colleagues,\textsuperscript{81} and an annotated checklist of quality scoring systems is available.\textsuperscript{82} Most of these systems were proposed as very general systems that could be applied to clinical trials covering a wide range of therapies and endpoints. Scoring systems designed for epidemiologic studies have been developed as well, in the context of evaluating studies of specific exposure–disease relationships (e.g.,\textsuperscript{71}).

The argument has been made, however, that general scoring systems are arbitrary in their assignment of weights to particular aspects of study design, and that such systems risk losing information, and can even be misleading.\textsuperscript{38, 83, 84} Juni and colleagues,\textsuperscript{84} for example, examined studies comparing low molecular weight heparin with standard heparin with respect to prevention of postoperative thrombosis. They used 25 different quality assessment scales to identify high quality trials. For six scales, the studies identified as being of high quality showed little to no benefit of low molecular weight heparin, while for seven scales, the “high quality” studies showed a significant advantage of low molecular weight heparin. This apparent contradiction raises questions about the validity of such scales as methods for stratifying studies.

Thus, in a given meta-analysis, one might wish to examine specific aspects of study design that are unique to that clinical or statistical situation.\textsuperscript{38, 83–85} For example, Schulz and colleagues\textsuperscript{85} found that trials in which the concealment of randomized allocation was inadequate on average produced larger estimates of treatment effects compared with trials in which allocation was adequately concealed. This specific finding was not detected when these same authors looked for an overall association between quality score and treatment effect. In the analysis of low molecular weight heparin, Juni and colleagues\textsuperscript{84} found that studies with unmasked outcome assessment showed larger, and presumably biased, benefits of low molecular weight heparin than studies using masked assessment of outcome.

Two procedural recommendations have been made regarding the actual techniques for data extraction. One is that studies should be read independently by two readers. The justification for this comes from meta-analyses in which modest but important inter-reader variability has been demonstrated.\textsuperscript{39, 61} A second recommendation is that readers be masked to certain information in studies, such as the identity of the authors and the institutions at which a study was conducted, and masked to the specific treatment assignments.\textsuperscript{52} While masking has a high degree of intuitive appeal, the effectiveness of masking in avoiding bias has not been demonstrated. Only one randomized trial examines the issue of the effect of masking on the results of meta-analyses.\textsuperscript{86} This study compared the results of the same meta-analyses performed independently by separate teams of meta-analysts, with one team masked and the other unmasked. The masked and unmasked teams produced nearly identical results on a series of five meta-analyses, lending little support to the need for masking.

### Perform Statistical Analyses

In most situations, the statistical methods for the actual combination of results across studies are fairly straightforward. If one is interested in combining odds ratios or other estimates of relative risk across studies, for example, some form of weighted average of within-study results is appropriate, and several of these exist.\textsuperscript{87} A popular example of this is the Mantel–Haenszel procedure, in which odds ratios are combined across studies with weights proportional to the inverse of the variance of the within-study odds ratio.\textsuperscript{29, 31, 87} Other approaches include inverse variance weighted averages of study-specific estimates of multivariate adjusted relative risks,\textsuperscript{29, 87} and exact stratified odds ratios.\textsuperscript{88} One popular method, sometimes called the “one-step” method, which is similar to the Mantel–Haenszel method,\textsuperscript{89} has been shown to be biased under some circumstances. Since this method offers no clear advantage over the Mantel–Haenszel method, which is more robust, the Mantel–Haenszel method may be preferable in many circumstances.\textsuperscript{31} Choices are never simple, however. In a simulation study, Deeks and colleagues\textsuperscript{90} showed, at an international meeting, that in situations where there are rare events, and
consequently frequent zero cells in contingency tables, the one-step method tended to perform better than other alternatives, including Mantel–Haenszel and exact methods.

One basic principle in most analytic approaches is that the comparisons between treated (exposed) and untreated (unexposed) patients are typically made within a study prior to combination across studies. In the combination of randomized trial results, this amounts to preserving the randomization within each study prior to combination. In all of the procedures developed for stratified data, “study” plays the role of the stratifying variable. In general, more weight is assigned to large studies than to small studies because of the increased precision of larger studies. A second basic principle to note is that these methods generally assume that the studies are all estimating a single, common effect, e.g., a common odds ratio. In other words, the underlying treatment effect (whether beneficial or harmful) that all studies are estimating is assumed to be the same for all studies. Any variability among study results is assumed to be random and is ignored in producing a summary estimate of the effect.91,92

In any meta-analysis, however, the possible existence of heterogeneity among study designs and results should be examined, and may warrant a set of exploratory analyses designed to investigate the sources of that heterogeneity. Methods for detecting and describing heterogeneity are described in detail by Hardy and Thompson.93 One might stratify the studies according to patient characteristics or study design features and investigate heterogeneity within and across strata. To the extent that the stratification explains the heterogeneity, the combined results would differ between strata and the heterogeneity within the strata would be reduced compared to the overall result. In addition to stratification, regression methods such as weighted least squares linear regression could be used to explore sources of heterogeneity.3,29,94–96 These might be important when various components of study design are correlated with each other, acting as potential confounders. Graphical methods for meta-analysis have also been proposed, that focus on issues related to heterogeneity.97

There are also methods for combining studies that do not make the assumption of a common treatment effect across all studies. These are the so-called “random effects” models, which allow for the possibility that the underlying true treatment effect, which each study is estimating, may not be the same for all studies, even when examining only studies with similar designs, protocols, and patient populations. Hidden or unmeasured sources of among-study variability of results are taken into account by these random effect models through the incorporation of such variability into the weighting scheme when computing a weighted average summary estimate. The practical consequence of the random effect models is to produce wider confidence intervals than would otherwise be produced by the traditional methods.91,92 This approach is particularly useful when there is heterogeneity among study results, and exploratory analyses have failed to uncover any known sources of observed heterogeneity. However, random effect models should not be viewed as a panacea for unexplained heterogeneity. One danger is that a summary measure of heterogeneous studies may not really apply to any particular study population or study design, i.e., they lose information by averaging over potentially important study and population characteristics.38

A second practical effect of random effect models, which is only apparent from examining the mathematics involved, is that they tend to assign relatively higher weights to small studies than the traditional methods would assign.93 This equalization of weights may have unwanted consequences in some circumstances (see section on “Publication bias,” below), and can lead to counterintuitive results, with very small studies making contributions to the summary equal to those of very large studies. A thorough discussion of the interpretation and application of fixed versus random effect models is presented by Hedges and Vevea.98

Bayesian statistical methods are also being proposed with increasing frequency in the statistical literature.99–104 These include the so-called “confidence profile” method developed by Eddy and colleagues.105,106 These methods can incorporate into the analysis the investigator’s prior beliefs.
about the size of an effect or about the factors biasing the observed effects. When the investigator has no prior beliefs about the effect, the results of the observed studies are sometimes used to estimate the components of the “prior” distribution. Thus, the final answers reflect the observed data very closely. In practice, when the investigator does not specify prior beliefs, the summary results are similar to those from standard methods, especially the random effect models described above.

Another approach is based on summing the statistical evidence provided by each study for each value of the effect measure (e.g., the odds ratio). The value of the odds ratio with the maximum evidence (the maximum likelihood estimate) has usually proved the same as the pooled estimate produced by other methods, in the situations where this method has been used. By providing a mathematical and graphical picture of what is occurring at other values of the effect estimate, this method also provides information on the contribution of each study to the total.

An important word of caution is that statistical tests of heterogeneity, i.e., formal statistical tests of the variability among the studies, suffer from a notorious lack of statistical power. Thus, a finding of significant heterogeneity may safely be interpreted as meaning the studies are not all estimating the same parameter. A lack of statistical significance, however, may not mean that heterogeneity is not important in a data set or that sources of variability should not be explored.

Formulate Conclusions and Recommendations

As with all research, the conclusions of a meta-analysis should be clearly summarized, with appropriate interpretation of the strengths and weaknesses of the meta-analysis. Authors should clearly state how generalizable the result is, how definitive it is, and should outline the areas that need future research. Any hypotheses generated by the meta-analysis should be stated as such, and not as conclusions.

APPROACHES TO SELECTED METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS IN META-ANALYSIS

Combinability of Results from Diverse Studies: Heterogeneity is your Friend

The underlying question in any meta-analysis is whether it is clinically and statistically reasonable to estimate an average effect of therapy, either positive or negative. If one errs on the side of being too inclusive, and the studies differ too greatly, there is the possibility that the average effect may not apply to any particular subgroup of patients. Conversely, diversity of designs and results may provide an opportunity to understand the factors that modify the effectiveness (or toxicity) of a drug. In fact, it has been argued that because of the potential for bias in observational epidemiologic studies, exploring heterogeneity should be the main point of meta-analyses of such studies, rather than producing a single summary measure.

In addition to considering the clinical and methodologic differences among studies, prior to the actual combination of results, it is essential to evaluate the extent to which study results are combinable from a strictly statistical viewpoint. This would usually involve some kind of statistical test of the variability (heterogeneity) of results among studies. If the variability of odds ratios (on the natural logarithm scale), for example, is greater than that which could be attributed to sampling variability alone, one should question the wisdom and meaning of a combined result. Efforts should subsequently focus on exploring the reasons for the variability of results, rather than proceeding to combine them.

The generality of the question posed will clearly influence the generalizability of the result, but also may affect whether the primary studies involved are viewed as combinable or not. Because the set of available studies is likely to be heterogeneous with respect to design features, the choice of a more general question may be preferred to a very specific one. For example, Dickersin and Berlin suggest that a more general question might be “Is taking aspirin associated with decreased mortality
in patients who have already had a myocardial infarction?” rather than “Is administration of 325 milligrams of aspirin per day, started within seven days of a first documented myocardial infarction and taken for at least six months, in the absence of other preventive treatments, in patients followed for at least one year, associated with a decrease in subsequent cardiovascular mortality?” If addressing the second question, the meta-analyst may quickly find him or herself with only one available study. Diversity of study designs, on the other hand, can provide a more generalizable result than restriction to a very narrowly defined group of studies. Issues of study design, such as dose or duration of therapy, and how study design relates to study results, could be addressed through a series of exploratory analyses.13

As an example of the type of analysis that could be used to investigate study design issues, Berlin and colleagues,7 in a methodologic paper, examine data originally presented by Romieu and colleagues20 on the relationship between duration of oral contraceptive use and risk of breast cancer. They show, using regression methods and stratified analyses, that case–control studies involving mostly premenopausal women show a marked and quite homogeneous increase in risk with increasing duration of use of oral contraceptives. Studies including postmenopausal cases, conversely, show no such increase in risk, on average. Furthermore, the average effect is difficult to interpret, since the results of the postmenopausal studies are quite heterogeneous, with some studies showing an increase in risk with increasing duration of oral contraceptive use and others showing a decrease. One technical difficulty with meta-analysis of group-level data is also illustrated by this example. Although some studies present age-specific results, or are restricted to certain age groups, many studies do not present subgroup analyses that are of interest in a meta-analysis. Thus, for example, some studies that include postmenopausal women also include premenopausal women, and the data within such studies may not be presented by menopausal status.

In the situation just described, there were strong biological reasons for performing separate analyses by menopausal status. It is sometimes instructive to perform more exploratory analyses of meta-analytic data as well. These may provide valuable insights into the biology of the problem and/or may generate hypotheses for future confirmation. Morgenstern et al.28 found that the association between neuroleptic medication and tardive dyskinesia was stronger in studies conducted in the United States than in studies conducted elsewhere. They used regression methods to show that this association was not simply the product of confounding by other study design features. The authors suggest that the US study samples may have had a higher baseline frequency of unmeasured factors (e.g., affective disorders such as schizophrenia) than the exposed groups in other countries. As with any exploratory analysis, due caution must be exercised in the interpretation of such a posteriori hypotheses, even though they may be based on very sound biological reasoning.

Publication Bias

As discussed above, when the primary source of data for a meta-analysis is published data, there is usually a danger that the published studies represent a biased subset of all the studies that have been done. In general, it is more likely that studies with statistically significant findings will be published than studies with no significant findings. A practical technique for determining the potential for publication bias is the “funnel plot,” first proposed by Light and Pillemer.111 The method involves plotting the effect size (e.g., the risk difference) against a measure of study size, such as the sample size, or the inverse of the variance of the individual effect sizes. If there is no publication bias, the points should produce a kind of funnel shape, with a scatter of points centered around the true value of the effect size, and with the degree of scatter narrowing as the variances decrease. If publication bias is a problem, the funnel would look as though a bite had been taken out, with very few (if any) points around the point indicating no effect (e.g., odds ratio of 1.0) for studies with large variances. This method requires a sufficient number of studies to permit the visualization of a funnel shape to the data. If the funnel plot does indicate the existence of publication bias, then one
or more of the correction methods described below should be considered. In the presence of publication bias, the responsible meta-analyst should also evaluate the ethics of presenting a summary result that is likely to represent an overestimate of the effect in question.

Two examples of funnel plots are given in Figures 38.1 and 38.2. These plots represent studies of psychoeducational programs for surgical patients.111,112 In the first plot, only the published studies are represented. The funnel appears to have a “bite” taken out of it where the small studies showing no effect of these programs should be. In the second plot, the unpublished studies, including doctoral dissertations, are included, and the former “bite” is now filled with these unpublished studies.

Several mathematical approaches to the problem of publication bias have also been proposed. An early method, first described by Rosenthal,113 is the calculation of a “fail-safe N” when the result of the meta-analysis is a statistically significant rejection of the null hypothesis. This method, in a kind of sensitivity analysis, uses the Z-statistics from the individual studies included in a meta-analysis to calculate the number of unpublished studies with a Z-statistic of exactly 0 that would be required to exist, in order for the combined Z-score (published + unpublished studies) to become nonsignificant. Because this method focuses only on Z-statistics, and ignores the estimation of effects (e.g., odds ratios), it is of limited utility. That is, the fail-safe N approach focuses only on the statistical significance of the combined result and does not help provide an overall estimate of the effect that is “adjusted” for publication bias.

A number of related methods to deal with potential unpublished studies have been developed in recent years. These include other methods for estimating the number of unpublished studies,114,115 formal methods to test for the presence of publication bias,116–118 and methods to adjust summary estimates to account for unpublished studies,114,119–122 but several of those methods make some fairly strong assumptions about the specific mechanism producing the publication bias. The available data are used to estimate both the average effect size for the comparison of groups and the probabilities of publication. (Note that only published data are used to estimate the probability of publication, strengthening the dependence of such methods on the underlying

assumptions regarding the nature of the relationship between study findings and publication probabilities.

An additional methodologic caution relates to the use of random effect models for combining results. When the results of the studies being analyzed are heterogeneous and a random effect model is being used to combine those results, one of the properties of the model, described above, is to assign relatively higher weights to small studies than would otherwise be assigned by more traditional methods of combining data. If publication bias is a problem in a particular data set, one consequence implied by the funnel plot is that small studies would tend to show larger effects than large studies. Thus, if publication bias is present, one of the reasons for heterogeneity of study results is that the small studies show systematically larger effects than the large studies. The assignment of higher relative weights to the small studies could, when publication bias is present, lead to a biased summary result. In fact, this appears to be exactly the situation presented by Poole and Greenland in an examination of studies of water chlorination and cancer. Random effect summary estimates of the relative risk for various cancers were larger than corresponding fixed effect summaries. This was apparently due to the assignment of higher relative weights to small studies which, in this case, showed relatively larger effects, that may not be representative of the findings of all small studies.

A proposed solution to the problem of publication bias is the use of prospective registration of studies at their inception, prior to the availability of results. Going one step further, several prospectively planned meta-analyses are either being planned or have been conducted.

CASE STUDIES OF APPLICATIONS OF METANO-ANALYSIS

Investigation of Adverse Effects

As mentioned earlier, the investigation of adverse or unwanted effects of existing therapies is an important application of meta-analysis. As discussed in Chapter 3, adverse events associated with pharmaceutical products are often so uncommon as to be difficult to study. In particular, the usual premarketing randomized studies frequently have too few patients to provide any useful information
on the incidence of uncommon adverse events. By the same token, individual studies may have low statistical power to address particular questions. Meta-analysis provides the benefit of vastly increased statistical power to investigate adverse events. In fact, since 1982, the safety evaluation of drugs in the US has included pooled analyses.134

The assessment of the excess risk of gastrointestinal side-effects associated with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) provides an excellent example of a situation in which meta-analysis has been helpful. Four different meta-analytic approaches to this problem will be reviewed here.

Chalmers and colleagues examined data from randomized trials of NSAIDs.39 They argued that the typical epidemiologic approaches to investigating NSAIDs as risk factors for gastrointestinal side-effects, i.e., cohort or case–control studies, are subject to too many potential biases. Randomized trials, on the other hand, would provide internally valid comparisons of NSAID users to nonusers. Presumably, although not stated explicitly, the combination of results from numerous studies, with varied entry and exclusion criteria, would alleviate the problem of the potential lack of generalizability from patients enrolled in a particular trial. The pooling of results from numerous studies would permit the assessment of rare events.

The authors performed a meta-analysis of randomized trials, excluding trials involving topical usage of NSAIDs, those that examined pharmacological endpoints only, studies of newborns, trials involving fewer than four days of treatment, trials in which patients were taking NSAIDs within the three days before randomization, and trials of drugs for dysmenorrhea (because of the short duration of the drug regimen and the confounding gastrointestinal symptoms from the dysmenorrhea). The meta-analysis was limited to those trials in which the anti-inflammatory drug was compared with a placebo, no drug, or a drug with no anti-inflammatory property. Photocopies of the “Methods” sections of 525 potentially relevant studies (blinded as to author, journal, and time and place of study, as well as all allusions to results) were read by two independent observers who determined inclusion suitability according to the above criteria.

Data were extracted for the following endpoints: nausea, indigestion or dyspepsia, gross gastrointestinal bleeding, suspected ulcer only, proven ulcer, gastric side-effects, and unspecified gastric side-effects. Factors that might be related to the incidence of these endpoints were also extracted from the studies: disease under study, drug ingested, dose and duration of drug, age of patients, sex of patients, and date of publication. The data were analyzed by crude pooling (i.e., ignoring the stratification by study and simply collapsing over studies), by unweighted averaging of the within-study risk differences, and by a weighted average of the risk differences. Additional analyses were performed to determine whether any factors seemed to be associated with a study showing a harmful effect of NSAIDs.

As a methodologic aside, the authors examined inter-reader disagreements. Overall, a disagreement rate of 19% was observed for the final decision on inclusion or exclusion of studies. These disagreements were resolved in conference.

There were 100 randomized trials of nonaspirin NSAIDs included in the final analysis, containing 123 comparisons with a no-treatment control group, which usually received a placebo. A total of 12,853 patients were included in these trials, with a mean duration of treatment of about 67 days (median 21 days) and a mean age of 46 years. For the sake of brevity, the aspirin trials will not be discussed here. The data revealed a generally low risk of gastrointestinal side-effects. For example, only two patients were reported with proven ulcers out of 6460 treated patients, with none in the controls. In the ten studies explicitly mentioning gross upper-gastrointestinal hemorrhage, the risk was 8/1103 (0.73%) in the control patients and 24/1157 (2.1%) in treated patients, giving a crude relative risk of 2.8. The length of followup for these ten studies was not specifically mentioned by the authors of the meta-analysis. However, the analysis of duration of therapy showed that duration was longer for studies showing a harmful effect of NSAIDs (geometric mean = 81 d) than for studies showing no effect of NSAIDs (geometric mean = 25 d) for the gross hemorrhage endpoint, consistent with a duration–response effect.
This meta-analysis was faced with some interesting statistical and other methodologic questions. There were numerous studies that did not explicitly mention side-effects in general or did not mention particular side-effects, even though others were mentioned. The authors chose to do a kind of sensitivity analysis by analyzing all studies, assuming that the risk of an unreported side-effect was zero, and separately analyzing results from only those studies explicitly mentioning a particular side-effect.

Another issue was the extensive number of studies with no occurrences of a particular endpoint in either the treated or the control group. The usual pooling procedures, e.g., the Mantel–Haenszel procedure,\textsuperscript{87} essentially ignore such studies, since they contribute no information, under one interpretation, concerning the common odds ratio. On the other hand, if over 90 of 100 separate trials report no proven ulcers in either the treated or the control groups, then another interpretation of those results is that the risk of an ulcer is fairly low. Chalmers and colleagues chose to work with risk differences to address this issue, allowing studies with no events in either group to enter the calculations. This is the type of situation considered by Deeks and colleagues,\textsuperscript{90} whose results suggest that the one-step method would have been the most appropriate for these studies with frequent occurrence of zero cells.

Another meta-analytic approach to the problem of side-effects of NSAIDs was used by Gabriel and colleagues,\textsuperscript{135} who examined the results of 16 non-experimental studies (nine case–control and seven cohort) of serious gastrointestinal complications related to use of NSAIDs. The studies had to have a comparison group and provide an estimate of risk for serious gastrointestinal complications (defined as bleeding, perforation, or other adverse gastrointestinal events resulting in hospitalization or death) in NSAID users compared with non-users, regardless of underlying disease. They excluded studies if the primary goal was to assess effectiveness.

The odds ratio found by these authors for gastrointestinal bleeding, based on nine studies reporting this endpoint, was 2.39 (CI 2.11, 2.70). The authors performed separate analyses for case–control and cohort studies. Although these separate summaries are only reported graphically and the exact values are difficult to read, the summary odds ratio from the cohort studies is clearly closer to unity than the result from the case–control studies. These authors also found that the size of the odds ratio was related to the duration of NSAID use. Interestingly, though, the highest odds ratios were obtained from studies in which the duration of NSAID consumption was less than 1 month. (Note: Gabriel \textit{et al.} only presented this finding without adjustment for study design, case–control versus cohort. Although they performed a multiple regression to examine interstudy heterogeneity, the findings of that model with respect to the individual potential sources of heterogeneity were not presented. It is possible that the studies with under one month of NSAID use were also predominantly case–control studies, but that cannot be determined from their paper, leaving the underlying source of heterogeneity somewhat ambiguous.)

The consistency of results for gastrointestinal bleeding between the two meta-analyses is of interest and lends some support to a causal association. Several points are important in considering the above results. In a cohort study of gastrointestinal bleeding and NSAIDs, Carson and colleagues\textsuperscript{136} found a quadratic duration–response relation. They argue that this is compatible with an increasing risk with increasing duration of NSAID use, as suggested by Chalmers \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{39} until many of those patients who would develop gastrointestinal bleeding from NSAIDs were removed from the cohort and then the risk declined. This reasoning may explain the apparently anomalous finding by Gabriel \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{135} of highest odds ratios for studies with less than one month of NSAID use.

Bollini and colleagues\textsuperscript{137} also examined epidemiologic studies that investigated the association between NSAIDs and severe upper gastrointestinal tract disease, including hematemesis, melena, peptic ulcer, ulcer perforation, and death attributable to these outcomes. The studies had to compare groups exposed and unexposed to NSAIDs. Of the 34 studies they examined, seven were cohort, eight case–control with community
controls, and 19 case–control with hospital controls. The type of study design was associated with varying estimates of the relative risk. Case–control studies with hospital controls had the highest average relative risk (4.4 [3.3–6.0]) and the cohort studies had the lowest (2.0 [1.2–3.2]). They found that studies with satisfactory methods yielded on average a lower relative risk (2.6 [1.8–3.9]) as compared with studies whose methods were unsatisfactory (4.2 [3.1–5.6]).

In perhaps the most comprehensive and clinically useful of the systematic reviews in the area of NSAIDs side effects, Henry and colleagues addressed the issue of comparative relative risks of serious gastrointestinal complications with individual NSAIDs. Their stated motivation for this approach was that one strategy for reducing NSAID toxicity in populations would be to choose, as first line therapy, a drug and dose with a comparatively low risk of gastrointestinal side-effects.

The authors used meta-analytic methods to examine the range of relative risks for particular NSAIDs and explore the extent to which differences in toxicity could be related to different doses, or to different susceptibility among patients receiving the various drugs. To do this, they identified case–control or cohort studies of relationships between use of specific NSAIDs in the community and development of serious peptic ulcer complications requiring hospital admission. In estimating pooled relative risks, analyses were restricted to studies that compared another drug with ibuprofen as the reference. They used unadjusted relative risks based on 2 × 2 tables in the pooling.

The authors found 12 studies examining 14 NSAIDs, including two unpublished reports. Eleven of the studies were case–control studies. The estimated relative risks for specific drugs versus ibuprofen ranged from 1.6 (95% CI 1.0, 2.5) for fenoprofen, to 9.2 (95% CI 4.0, 21) for azapropazone. All of the relative risks were significantly greater than 1.0. Using a weighted ranking system, which incorporated study size into the weights, the authors found that ibuprofen had the lowest rank (least toxicity), followed by diclofenac. Aspirin and naproxen had intermediate risks, while azapropazone, tolmeth, and ketoprofen had the highest risks. High dose ibuprofen (i.e., greater than 1600 mg daily) was also associated with an elevated relative risk.

It is important to keep in mind that the conclusions reached by Henry et al. were based on indirect comparisons of the various drugs with ibuprofen. They claimed to find little evidence that the relative rankings were due to confounding by patient susceptibility. Despite any shortcomings of their approach, as the authors point out, clinical and regulatory decisions have to be made on some type of scientific basis, and these are the only data available. Risks need to be weighed against benefit, and the authors highlight the known variability across patients in clinical response to particular drugs. Thus, it seems that this systematic review provided useful information for clinical decision making.

In qualitative reviews of the literature on the gastrointestinal side effects of NSAIDs, Taragin et al. and Carson and Strom point out differences in study designs that could lead to differences in results. For example, bleeding could be defined as all bleeding, fatal bleeding, bleeding requiring hospitalization, bleeding requiring transfusions, or bleeding requiring surgery. Several procedures exist for the detection of gastrointestinal bleeding. The clinical relevance of the different methods is sometimes unclear. Case–control studies may show higher odds ratios because of the likelihood of recall bias; patients with bleeding requiring hospitalization might be more likely to recall NSAID use than controls, particularly if probing by interviewers, or by health care providers prior to interview, is more extensive for cases than for controls. This possibility is supported by the data from the meta-analysis of Gabriel et al. Cohort studies based on claims data, such as that conducted by Carson and colleagues described above, sometimes use unvalidated outcomes. To the extent that false events may be documented for both the exposed and unexposed cohorts, the relative risk observed in such studies would show less of an effect of exposure. Of course, these cohort studies may exaggerate the apparent effect of exposure if spurious diagnoses of gastrointestinal events are more likely to occur when a patient
has a history of NSAID use. Further variability may be generated among study results by the inclusion of many different kinds of NSAID, some of which may have more potential to cause gastrointestinal side-effects than others.

Thus, another benefit of meta-analysis is the ability to examine findings according to study characteristics and study design, leading to hypotheses about subgroups or particular therapies of special interest and suggestions for the design of subsequent studies. Meta-analysis can quantify differences related to study design that the traditional review can only observe in qualitative terms.

There are numerous other examples of the application of meta-analysis to the evaluation of adverse effects of pharmaceutical therapies. These include the following.

1. Two meta-analyses have been published on the effects of prophylactic lidocaine in acute myocardial infarction.\textsuperscript{141–143} These studies showed that, although lidocaine effectively prevented ventricular fibrillation,\textsuperscript{143} there seemed to be an excess in mortality among those patients randomly allocated to lidocaine compared with those allocated to placebo. In a related paper, using meta-analytic regression methods, Antman and Berlin\textsuperscript{144} calculate that, given the low baseline incidence of ventricular fibrillation in the current coronary care unit environment, 400 patients would require treatment with lidocaine to prevent a single episode of ventricular fibrillation. Considering this estimate in addition to the possibly increased risk of mortality, the authors suggest that prophylactic lidocaine should not be given routinely.

2. In a meta-analysis of randomized trials regarding the efficacy and safety of quinidine therapy for the maintenance of sinus rhythm after cardioversion,\textsuperscript{145} the authors show that quinidine is, indeed, effective at maintaining sinus rhythm, but that mortality seems to be elevated in quinidine patients (mortality odds ratio = 2.98, 95% CI 1.1, 8.3, based on 12 deaths among patients randomized to quinidine versus only three among patients randomized to placebo). In a subsequent paper, the authors examine the relationship between study design and outcome.\textsuperscript{146} The nonrandomized studies tended to show less benefit of quinidine with respect to maintenance of sinus rhythm compared with the randomized studies. The odds ratios for mortality also varied according to study design, although there were few deaths overall: OR = 3.5 (1.0, 12.4) for randomized studies; OR = 9.9 (0.8, 123.2) for nonrandomized studies. The overall mortality risk was 2.0% (34/1709) for quinidine-treated patients and 0.6% (4/681) for all control patients.

3. A third example is the meta-analysis of nonexperimental studies of oral contraceptives and the risk of breast cancer discussed above.\textsuperscript{29} An association between increasing odds ratio and increasing duration of oral contraceptive use was found in case–control studies in which the cases were mostly premenopausal (defined as age limit of 45 years old or less). In a subsequent methodologic paper, Berlin and colleagues\textsuperscript{3} use these same data to show that the magnitude of the odds ratio depends not only on the menopausal status of the cases but on the calendar years during which cases were accrued, presumably because of the changing formulations of oral contraceptives.

New Indications for Existing Therapies

Meta-analysis has also been used to assess the effectiveness of existing therapies for new indications. As an example, the efficacy of antilymphocyte antibodies in the perioperative period of cadaveric kidney transplantation (induction therapy) had not, until recently, been conclusively demonstrated. Individual studies, both randomized and nonexperimental, had failed individually to show a significant benefit of induction therapy with respect to allograft survival. Szczec and colleagues performed a meta-analysis of the published data from the randomized trials of induction therapy\textsuperscript{147} in adults receiving cadaveric renal transplants. That analysis, using survival analytic methods on the group level (published) data, showed a statistically significant 31% lower
rate of allograft failure at two years in patients receiving induction therapy.

In a subsequent analysis of the individual patient data from five of the seven randomized trials of induction therapy, Szczech and colleagues examined the effect of induction therapy beyond two years and in subgroups of patients with risk factors for early allograft failure.\textsuperscript{148} The subgroup analyses are examined in the next section. The five studies included in the individual patient analyses gave results for the two year analysis virtually identical to those obtained from the full set of seven studies using the published data, i.e., a relative rate of 0.69 favoring induction therapy. When extended to five years, the rate of allograft survival was 69.0\% in patients receiving induction therapy and 64.4\% in those not receiving induction therapy ($p = 0.13$). Thus, the overall benefit demonstrated at two years was smaller and it was no longer significant at five years.

Differential Effects Among Subgroups of Patients

In the analysis of individual patient data by Szczech and colleagues, the authors were able to examine the specific effects of induction therapy in subgroups of patients at high risk for allograft failure. Before proceeding to analyses \textit{within} particular subgroups, the authors tested statistical interactions between each of the relevant patient characteristics and induction therapy. One of the patient characteristics of interest was the panel reactive antibody level (PRA), an indicator of immune system presensitization. Patients with PRA levels less than 20\% were considered unsensitized, while those with PRA of 20\% or higher were considered presensitized. At two years, the effect of induction therapy differed in presensitized and unsensitized patients ($p = 0.03$ for interaction). The rate ratio at two years was 0.12 (CI 0.03--0.44, $p = 0.002$) in presensitized patients (85 patients with 15 failures) and 0.74 (CI 0.50--1.09, $p = 0.13$) in unsensitized patients (511 patients with 100 failures). This interaction was still significant at five years ($p = 0.009$ for interaction), with a rate ratio of 0.20 (CI 0.09--0.47, $p < 0.001$) in presensitized patients (85 patients with 33 failures) and 0.97 (CI 0.71--1.32, $p > 0.2$) in unsensitized patients (510 patients with 163 failures). The authors found no other significant interactions between induction therapy and any other variable.\textsuperscript{148}

Several advantages of meta-analysis, and particularly individual patient analyses, are demonstrated by this example. The improved precision provided by large numbers of patients is an important benefit. Having individual level data allowed an analysis that could go beyond the simple, unadjusted analyses to which most meta-analyses of published data are limited. The availability of patient characteristics permitted not only \textit{adjustment} for those characteristics, but also examination of subgroup effects in larger numbers of patients than would typically be included in a single trial. Although one might wish to confirm these subgroup results in an independent data set, the patient level analyses strongly suggest that induction therapy is effective in the 14\% of patients who are presensitized. If confirmed, these results could mean that induction therapy could be targeted to the group in which it is highly effective, while avoiding needless treatment and potential toxicity in other patients.

In another example of a meta-analysis addressing subgroup issues, Midgette and colleagues\textsuperscript{149} examined the use of intravenous streptokinase in patients with suspected acute myocardial infarction. The authors found a summary relative risk of 0.72 (0.65, 0.79), favoring streptokinase, in patients with suspected acute anterior myocardial infarction, and a summary risk ratio of 0.87 (0.76, 1.01) in those with a suspected inferior infarction. The authors conclude that there is a protective effect of intravenous streptokinase in anterior infarction, but that the protective effect in inferior infarction is smaller and less certain.

Selection From Among Several Alternative Therapies

In a meta-analysis of therapies for the prevention of supraventricular arrhythmias after coronary bypass surgery, Andrews \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{150} looked separately at verapamil, digoxin, and \textbeta{}-adrenoceptor blockers as prophylactic agents. Only randomized trials
were included. Neither digoxin nor verapamil reduced the risk of supraventricular arrhythmias after coronary artery bypass surgery (digoxin: OR = 0.97, CI = 0.62, 1.49; verapamil: OR = 0.91, CI = 0.57, 1.46). The risk of a supraventricular arrhythmia in patients treated with β-blockers was dramatically reduced (OR = 0.28, CI = 0.21, 0.36), although significant heterogeneity among the study results was present. The authors explored this heterogeneity by examining separately studies of different β-blockers, and by summarizing separately preoperative and postoperative treatment. While these separate summaries suggested varying degrees of heterogeneity within subgroups of studies, all of the summaries showed statistically significant benefits of β-blockers. The authors drew no firm conclusions from the subgroup analyses other than to suggest directions for future research.

As another example, for several decades, heparin has been used as the primary antithrombotic drug for the initial treatment of venous thromboembolism. There has been some controversy over the optimal mode of administration of heparin: intermittent intravenous, continuous intravenous, or subcutaneous injection. While continuous infusion has been shown to be safer than intermittent injection, and equally effective, continuous infusion has disadvantages, such as the need for hospitalization for most patients, possibly prolonged immobilization, enhanced risk for sepsis related to the infusion cannula, and possible increased cost. Hommes and colleagues performed a meta-analysis of randomized trials of intravenous versus subcutaneous heparin administration in the initial treatment of deep vein thrombosis. They found eight studies meeting their inclusion criteria. The overall summary relative risk for efficacy was 0.62 (0.39, 0.98), indicating a benefit from the use of subcutaneous compared with intravenous administration. The analysis of safety (i.e., risk of major hemorrhage) also showed a modest benefit of subcutaneous injection (relative risk = 0.79, CI 0.42, 1.46). In the analysis of efficacy, as in others described above, there was highly significant among study heterogeneity. The source of this heterogeneity was apparently a single study showing a significant benefit from intravenous administration. The authors of the meta-analysis speculate that the particular study failed to achieve therapeutic levels of heparin in the subcutaneous group.

A somewhat different approach to subgroup analyses has emerged in recent years. This strategy views the risk of events in the control group of a trial (baseline risk) as a general indicator of severity of disease in the treated population. The relationship between treatment benefit and baseline risk can then be estimated, i.e., examining whether there is an interaction between treatment and baseline risk. A number of statistical issues arise in such analyses, including the inherent association induced by regressing treatment benefit (e.g., the log relative risk, which is calculated using the baseline risk) on baseline risk, and the fact that the baseline risk, except in very large studies, is affected by sampling variability. These approaches all use group level (published) data, examining whether the risk in the population is associated with the magnitude of treatment benefit. This may not necessarily yield the same result as looking at the interaction on an individual patient basis between treatment and individual level estimates of risk. It is also clearly different clinically from examining specific patient characteristics, as opposed to calculating estimates of risk that depend on several characteristics. Information may be lost by using multivariable risk estimates, as opposed to potentially biologically specific patient characteristics.

Saving Time and Money If You Believe a Meta-Analysis

One of the potential benefits of meta-analysis is the potential to shorten the time between a medical research finding and the clinical implementation of a new therapy. This is a concern not only for the development of new drugs, but for the exploration of new indications for existing therapies. A group at Harvard University has advocated the routine use of what they have termed “cumulative meta-analysis,” i.e., performing a new meta-analysis each time the results of a new clinical trial are published. Antman et al. applied this technique in combination with a classification
scheme of the treatment recommendations for myocardial infarction found in review articles and textbook chapters. They found many discrepancies between the evidence contained in the published randomized trials and the timeliness of the recommendations.

As an example, Antman and colleagues analyzed data from 17 trials of β-blockers for the prevention of death in the years following a myocardial infarction. On the left hand side of Figure 38.3, the same data are presented as a traditional meta-analysis, with individual study results presented along with the summary odds ratio arbitrarily estimated after 17 trials had been completed. On the right hand side of Figure 38.3, the same data are presented as a cumulative meta-analysis, with an updated summary estimate calculated after the completion of each new trial. The cumulative meta-analysis clearly shows that the updated pooled estimate became statistically significant in 1977 and has remained so ever since.

The process of cumulative meta-analysis was applied by these authors to eight therapies for acute myocardial infarction. In five of the six instances in which the cumulative meta-analyses
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Figure 38.3. Results of 17 randomized control trials of the effects of oral β-blockers for secondary prevention of mortality in patients surviving a myocardial infarction presented as two types of meta-analysis. On the left is the traditional one, revealing many trials with nonsignificant results but a highly significant estimate of the pooled results on the bottom of the panel. On the right, the same data are presented as cumulative meta-analyses, illustrating that the updated pooled estimate became statistically significant in 1977 and has remained so up to the present. Note that the scale is changed on the right-hand graph to improve clarity of the confidence intervals. Reprinted with permission from Antman et al., Journal of the American Medical Association; July 8, 1992; volume 268; pages 240–248. Copyright 1992, American Medical Association.
revealed the therapies to be of statistically significant benefit in reducing in-hospital mortality, it was several years before experts recommended the therapy with any consistency. An important example was thrombolytic therapy, which did not begin to be recommended by more than half the experts, even for specific indications, until 13 years after the cumulative meta-analysis would have shown therapy to be effective. Six years passed between the publication, in a major journal,\textsuperscript{40,155} of the first meta-analysis showing an impressive reduction in mortality by thrombolytic therapy and the year in which the majority of the experts whose opinions were studied by the authors recommended it for routine or specific use. In 1985, a 20\% reduction in mortality was established at the \( p < 0.001 \) level (OR = 0.78; CI 0.69, 0.90). A total of 14 reviews after 1985 did not mention the treatment or felt that it was still experimental. The authors concluded that identifying and interpreting the therapeutic trials in a given field is extremely difficult, so that clinical experts need access to better databases and new statistical techniques (such as cumulative meta-analysis).

Some caution may be advised in interpreting cumulative meta-analyses. The issue of multiple statistical tests, for example, is considered by some to be an important consideration. The problem is that testing and estimation procedures may need to make adjustments for the increased probability of a spurious positive finding (type I, or \( \alpha \) error) introduced by the use of repeated statistical tests.\textsuperscript{100,156} At least, one might wish to consider using a more stringent criterion for statistical significance than the traditional \( p < 0.05 \) cutoff. Another consideration is that estimates of treatment effect may not be stable over time, perhaps due to changing clinical environments. In the \( \beta \)-blocker example, there is an apparent “drift” of the effect estimate back toward the null in more recent years, i.e., treatment appears to be less effective in the most recent studies. Thus, it may be important to re-evaluate therapies as other treatment strategies evolve for the same conditions.

A final caution with regard to interpreting cumulative meta-analyses relates to the continuing need for well designed randomized controlled trials. New indications for existing therapies, for example, are often suggested by nonexperimental studies, including cohort and case-control studies and nonrandomized phase 2 clinical trials. The results of these studies are not always confirmed by subsequent, properly designed randomized trials. For example, consider the case of \( \beta \)-carotene in the prevention of cancer. A series of observational studies (see Ziegler \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{157} for a review) examined the relation between dietary intake of foods rich in \( \beta \)-carotene and the risk of lung cancer. Overall, they showed a relatively consistent association between diets rich in \( \beta \)-carotene and reduced risk of lung cancer. Subsequent randomized trials of this specific nutrient as a supplement have failed to confirm a protective effect against lung cancer.\textsuperscript{158--160}

**THE FUTURE**

The examples above have raised several important issues that will need to be addressed in the future. A set of issues not fully addressed above relates to the availability of individual level data. From the above examples, it becomes increasingly apparent that the pursuit of questions about subgroups of patients is often an informative and important element of a well conducted meta-analysis, at least for certain therapies. One should certainly exercise due caution in the interpretation of subgroup effects, emphasizing those that are specified \textit{a priori} with biological justification. By assembling large numbers of patients, meta-analysis can at least begin to address the problems related to statistical instability of subgroup effects. It is too often the case, however, that results are not reported separately for subgroups of patients. Typically, some trials will exclude particular patients while others will not exclude them. At the level of grouped data from published reports, one is faced with analyzing the two groups of studies separately as the only way of addressing the subgroup question, or using meta-regression techniques on what amounts to ecological data. As a trivial hypothetical example, suppose one wanted to perform separate analyses of the effect of treatment X in men and women. Among the existing randomized trials, six exclude women and four do not, but the four also include men. Ideally,
one would like to obtain information on the effect in men alone from all of the ten trials, since all include men. Similarly, one could obtain a separate estimate of the effect of treatment in women from the four studies including women. It is possible to use the group level data only to show, for example, that studies that include women tend to show different effects than studies excluding women, but one cannot perform a separate analysis of women. One might alternatively regress the treatment effect measure (e.g., log relative risk) against the percent male (or female), but that is still less satisfactory than obtaining patient level data. For further practical discussions of the use of individual patient data, see Stewart and Clarke\textsuperscript{161} and Stewart and Parmar.\textsuperscript{162}  Mechanisms for the sharing of person level data need to be promoted.

In the development of cumulative meta-analysis, some of the most important issues will be philosophical ones. Some of the same issues apply to the approval process for new drugs. How much evidence is required before a therapy can be accepted as efficacious? Should we require the existence of a certain minimum number of trials showing a statistically significant benefit of a therapy? Suppose ten studies all show a 20% (or thereabouts) reduction in mortality in patients treated with drug X compared to placebo, but none of the individual studies shows a statistically significant effect. If the combined analysis shows a highly statistically significant 20% reduction in mortality due to treatment X, and 20% is considered clinically significant, should the combined analysis be sufficient evidence for the acceptance of drug X as beneficial? What would an additional, large clinical trial contribute?

In this context, it is worth noting that several empirical studies have examined discrepancies between large trials and meta-analyses of the same therapies.\textsuperscript{163–168}  The assumption made by some of the authors of these studies, that larger studies are necessarily better studies, may not be valid. Replication of a finding by independent studies must certainly be a key element to establishing efficacy, as compared with a single trial. Large trials may also be poorly designed. For example, for BCG vaccine, a huge trial using passive followup, and therefore missing (by the authors’ own admission) at least 50% of all cases of tuberculosis, failed to show the protective effect found in a number of other studies with more complete followup.\textsuperscript{169,170}

When there is little or no heterogeneity of results among trials, and the likelihood of serious publication bias is minimal, one might be willing to accept meta-analytic evidence as helping to establish effectiveness. It is less obvious what to do with the results of a meta-analysis when there is substantial heterogeneity. If the heterogeneity is adequately explained in the analysis in terms of subgroup effects, or trial quality, meta-analysis might still be an acceptable part of demonstrating effectiveness, but such a conclusion might be conditional on the type of patient or other factors.

Similarly, the technique of cumulative meta-analysis could be applied to the analysis of adverse events. As nonexperimental studies of adverse effects are completed, the same approach could be applied. The likelihood seems to be, however, that such meta-analyses would be faced with much more serious issues of heterogeneity of findings than meta-analyses of randomized studies typically have to confront. The acceptance of meta-analytic results in this context might be extremely slow. (Consider the slow pace, demonstrated by Antman \textit{et al.},\textsuperscript{160}  with which new therapies are accepted even when the evidence is provided by randomized trials.) Even if a meta-analysis of, for example, oral contraceptive use and breast cancer risk were to show a convincing, consistent duration–response relationship, the issue of what to do with that information is complex. If the relative risk for 10 years of use is 1.5, is that sufficient to warrant removal of oral contraceptives from the market? Would 2.5 be a sufficiently high relative risk? What other factors, e.g., family history, etc., need to be considered when prescribing oral contraceptives?

While these are clearly more general issues, not restricted to the interpretation of meta-analyses, the additional precision provided by meta-analyses makes their interpretation all the more difficult.

The concept of prospective meta-analysis also merits further attention. Along with registration of trials, this closely related strategy has been advocated as a means of avoiding publication bias.\textsuperscript{130–133}  It may be possible, however, to go
beyond simply planning the logistics of multiple trials and the collection of common data elements to allow pooling of results upon the completion of all trials. It may be possible to go further toward planning the scientific questions to be addressed. As a simple example, by regulation, sex and age (adult versus pediatric) would need to be addressed for a new analgesic. In addition, it would be important to consider indication (emergency department, postoperative, etc.) and dose (cumulative dose, daily dose, need for a loading dose, etc.). How best to design the series of studies to address all of these questions, either simultaneously or sequentially, needs further consideration (see Berlin and Colditz for a more complete discussion of this issue).33

While there are no easy answers to many of these questions, it is clear that meta-analysis will play an increasingly important role in the formulation of treatment and policy recommendations. Thus, the quality of the meta-analyses performed is of the utmost importance and needs to be reviewed by the scientific community in an open, published forum. Meta-analyses, if they are carefully interpreted in view of their strengths and weaknesses, should prove to be extremely helpful in pharmacoepidemiology research.
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INTRODUCTION

In discussing the quality of data for research, Gordis remarked that epidemiologists have become so enamored with statistical analysis of the data that they have paid too little attention to the validity of the raw data being analyzed with these sophisticated techniques.¹ Although this statement referred to questionnaire data, it applies equally to data generated by abstracting medical records or data from automated databases. Whatever the source of the data, the veracity of a study’s conclusions rests on the validity of its data.

We begin this chapter by discussing the validity of the drug and diagnosis information used by clinicians in the management of patients’ care. Next, the methodologic problems involved in validity assessment are presented, with some background on measurement error and the cognitive theories of autobiographical memory. Most of the chapter presents a literature review of the studies that have evaluated the validity of drug, diagnosis, and hospitalization data and the factors that influence the accuracy of these data. This information will be presented for the three primary information sources available for pharmacoepidemiology studies: questionnaires, administrative databases, and aggregate data sources. The chapter concludes with a summary of our current knowledge in the field as well as directions for future research.

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOL OGY RESEARCH

Physicians rely on patient supplied information on past drug use and illness to assist with the
diagnosis of current disease. Proper diagnosis and treatment of current illnesses may be compromised by poor recall of past illnesses and drugs. This problem is particularly relevant in the clinical situation, where a patient may be treated concurrently or sequentially by several different physicians. In circumstances such as these, the physician may not have a complete past history recorded in the chart and may need to rely on the patient to provide this information, especially for drugs that were not efficacious or that resulted in an adverse drug reaction. Recall may be worse for illnesses and medication use that occurred many years previously. Thus, a physician’s ability to diagnose and/or prescribe successfully may be compromised by the patient’s recall abilities. A patient’s recall ability also plays a role in the success of drug therapy, since a patient needs to recall the physician’s instructions for most efficacious drug use. Brody\textsuperscript{2} found that 55 (53\%) of 104 patients interviewed immediately after seeing their physician made one or more errors in recalling their therapeutic regimens.

Of particular concern to the subject of this book is the validity of data on drug exposure and disease occurrence, since the typical focus of pharmacoepidemiology research is the association between a drug exposure and the occurrence of disease. Further, many potential confounders of importance in pharmacoepidemiology research (although certainly not all) are either drugs or diseases. Clinicians recognize that patients very often do not know the names of the drugs they are taking currently, and request that they bring their drugs at every visit. In this context, one certainly would not expect a patient to recall past drug use accurately, at least absent any aids to this recall. Superficially at least, patients cannot be considered reliable sources of diagnosis information either; in some instances they may not even have been told the correct diagnosis, still less recall it. Yet, these data elements are crucial to pharmacoepidemiology studies. Special approaches have been developed by pharmacoepidemiologists to obtain such data more accurately, from patients and other sources, but the success of these approaches needs to be considered in detail.

METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

COGNITIVE THEORY OF AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL MEMORY

Epidemiologic research often relies on asking study subjects to recall events or exposures that occurred at some time in the past, with recall intervals spanning from days to several years. To appreciate the accuracy of data derived by patient recall, it is important to understand the response process in general and the organization of autobiographical memory, a key element of the response process.

Measurement error for survey data depends on the adequacy of the response process which is made up of four key respondent tasks: (i) question interpretation; (ii) search for and retrieval of information to answer the question or to construct an answer; (iii) judgment for formulating the response; and (iv) editing to determine what, if any, information will be disclosed to the interviewer.\textsuperscript{3–5} Often, too little attention is paid to the first two key tasks when developing survey instruments, the result of which is questions that are too complex or too vague for respondents to marshal retrieval processes appropriately. Thus, understanding memory organization and retrieval are critical components for developing questionnaires for collecting accurate health related data.

Cognitive psychologists report that individuals reconstruct memories either as independent events (episodic recall) or as schema, i.e., generalizations based on patterns of events that have a generic quality. Their research also indicates that individuals retrieve some well learned memories directly, but that other memories are constructed based on information that can be recalled and inferences to fill in the gaps.\textsuperscript{6} With passing time, the recall of events (episodic recall) becomes more difficult and biases due to inferential reconstruction are more likely to occur.\textsuperscript{7} In the survey context, the under-reporting of medical conditions and health visits is more widespread as the interval since the event increases.\textsuperscript{8}
Memories for recurring similar events often blend together and people have difficulty accurately recalling the individual events. Thus, while the diagnosis and treatment of an infection might be accurately recalled because it occurs at a distinct point in time and is not temporally related to any other health event, Papanicolaou (pap) smears may be represented as generic memories, or schema, because they are done during regularly occurring physical examinations. The accuracy of information reported using schemas depends on which information is sought, how regularly the patterns occur (i.e., physical examinations), and the recall interval between the event and the query. Schema not only make the recall of the specific details of an individual event, such as the date that the last pap smear occurred, more difficult, but can also obscure deviations or exceptions from what typically occurs. Thus, a respondent may overlook the fact that they missed their last appointment for a pap smear.

There are four basic approaches to providing time cues to respondents in interviews or questionnaires. One is to ask how long ago an event took place. A second is to ask how old the respondent was at the time of the event. A third is to place the event of interest (e.g., first use of a particular drug) in a previously established chronology of significant life events (marriage, menarche, graduation from high school, birth of a child, etc.). A fourth is simply to ask when the event of interest occurred. Any of these approaches may be most suitable, depending on the nature of the event of interest, the context of the interview or questionnaire, the age and mental status of the respondent, and other conditions. The fourth approach is the least structured and most open ended, but it can be used effectively in interviews with proper interviewer training. This approach can be implemented so that the respondent essentially makes the choice among the other three options, perhaps on a question-by-question basis, answering “right after my second child was born” for one question, “in 1979” for another, etc. Then, together with the respondent or later, depending on the information offered, the interviewer converts the response to the desired time format (usually calendar time).

As will be evident in the studies described below, researchers have been employing the findings from cognitive research to pharmacoepidemiology studies. The continued and innovative application of these findings can only further improve the methodology for collecting health related data via questionnaire.

THE INFLUENCE OF MEASUREMENT ERROR ON PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

Epidemiologic assessments of the effects of a drug on disease incidence depend upon an accurate assessment of both drug exposure and disease occurrence. Measurement error for either factor, whether due to inaccurate recall or poorly acquired data, may identify a risk factor in the study that does not exist in the population or, conversely, may fail to detect a risk factor when one truly exists.

In an epidemiologic study, the measure of association is often based on the number of subjects categorized by the cross-classification of presence or absence of disease and exposure. In a study of the association between drug A and disease B, if study participants forgot their past exposure to drug A, they would be incorrectly classified as nonexposed. This misclassification is a measurement error. Although the measurement process usually involves some error, if this measurement error is of sufficient magnitude, the validity of the study’s findings is diminished.

There are two types of measurement error or misclassification: nondifferential and differential. The difference between these errors relates to the variables under study. In particular, differential misclassification is said to occur when the misclassification of one variable (e.g., drug usage) varies according to the level of another variable (e.g., disease status), so that the direction of the bias can be toward or away from the null. For example, in a case–control study of oral contraceptives (OCs) and breast cancer, there would be concern that those with breast cancer would recall past OC use differently from those without breast cancer. Cases might ponder the origins of their illness and recall and report OC use they otherwise
would have forgotten or failed to report. Alternatively, cases might be distracted by their illness during the interview and forget their past OC use or fail to report it to get the interview over more quickly or because of psychological denial in favor of something else that they may feel is more likely as an explanation for that disease (e.g., pesticide exposure). The state of mind of the respondent, and of the interviewers at the time of the interviews, are crucial determinants of the overall accuracy of the interview or questionnaire information and of the degree to which the accuracy might differ by respondent characteristics (e.g., case or control status). Patients who learn they have serious diseases, and parents who learn the same about their children, often go through phases or stages in questioning how these illnesses might have come about. In earlier stages, attention is often directed inward toward self-blame. As the time passes, external explanations are often sought. The time course of the psychological state of seriously ill patients and their close family members is highly variable, but potentially of great importance to the validity of interview and questionnaire data obtained from them. The traditional assumptions that cases remember true exposures better than noncases (i.e., that exposure classification has higher sensitivity among cases than among controls) and that cases intentionally or unintentionally report more false positive exposures than noncases (i.e., that exposure classification has lower specificity among cases than among noncases) are undoubtedly too simplistic for general reliance.

A difference in the accuracy of recall between cases and noncases could influence the determination of OC exposure and the resulting measure of association. In case–control studies, differential misclassification of exposure can result from recall bias.\(^1\) It is commonly thought that the potential for recall bias can be minimized if the study is designed to obtain complete exposure data, i.e., information on the names and usage dates for every drug used in the time period of interest.\(^2\)

**Nondifferential misclassification** of exposure occurs when the misclassification of one variable does not vary by the level of another variable and may occur if both cases and controls simply forget their exposures to the same degree. The measure of association is affected by nondifferential misclassification of exposure, as well; it is usually biased toward the null. Exceptions can occur when classification errors are not independent of each other,\(^3,4\) when there are more than two categories of exposure,\(^5\) and for some forms of disease misclassification.\(^6,7\) In addition, it is important to keep in mind that when an expected bias is toward the null, this is the direction of the bias on average. The actual bias in any given study may be away from the null even when the misclassification probabilities are nondifferential.\(^8,9\)

### Quantitative Indices of Measurement Error

Three kinds of comparison may be drawn between two (or more) methods or sources of information on exposure or outcome. Many different terms have been used to describe each of them, resulting in a certain amount of confusion.

When the same method or source is used more than once for the same information on the same individual, comparisons of the results measure the **reliability** of the method or information source. An example of a reliability study would be a comparison of responses in repeat interviews using the same interview schedule. Reliability is not validity, though the term is sometimes used as such.

When different methods or sources of information are compared (e.g., prescription dispensation records and interview responses), but neither of them can be considered distinctly superior to the other, the comparisons measure mere **agreement**. Agreement between two sources or methods does not imply that either is valid or reliable.

Only when one of the methods or sources is clearly superior to the other can the comparison be said to measure **validity**, a synonym for which is **accuracy**. The superior method or source is often called a “gold standard.” In recognition that a method or source can be superior to another method or source without being perfect, the term “alloyed gold standard” has come into use recently.\(^10\)

For a binary exposure or outcome measure, such as ever versus never use of a particular drug,
there are two measures of validity. *Sensitivity* (also called *completeness*) measures the degree to which the inferior source or method correctly identifies individuals who, according to the superior method or source, possess the characteristic of interest (i.e., ever used the drug). *Specificity* measures the degree to which the inferior source or method correctly identifies individuals who, according to the superior method or source, lack the characteristic of interest (i.e., never used the drug).

Sensitivity and specificity are the two sides of the validity coin for a dichotomous exposure or outcome variable. In general, sources or methods that have high sensitivity tend to have low specificity, and methods with high specificity tend to have low sensitivity. In these situations, which are very common, neither of the two sources or methods being compared can be said to have superior overall validity to the other. Depending on particulars of the study setting, either sensitivity or specificity may be the more “important” validity measure. Moreover, absolute values of these measures can be deceiving. For instance, if the true prevalence of ever use of a drug is 5%, then an exposure classification method or information source with 95% specificity (and perfect sensitivity) will double the measured prevalence to 10%. The ultimate criterion of “importance” is the degree of bias exerted on a measure of effect such as an estimated relative risk. Because the degree of bias depends on such study-specific conditions as the true prevalence of exposure, no general guidelines can be given. Each study situation must be evaluated on its own merits.

As measures of validity, sensitivity and specificity have “truth” (i.e., the classification according to a gold standard or an alloyed gold standard) in their denominators. Investigators should take care not to confuse these measures with the *predictive values* of positive and negative classifications, which have the classification according to the inferior measure in their denominators. The proportion of persons classified as having the exposure or outcome who are correctly classified is the predictive value positive. The proportion of persons classified as lacking the exposure or outcome who are correctly classified is the predictive value negative. Predictive values are measures of *performance* of a classification method or information source, not measures of validity. Predictive values depend not only on the sensitivity and specificity (i.e., on validity), but on the true prevalence of the exposure or outcome as well. Thus, if a method or information source for classifying persons with respect to outcome or exposure has the same validity (i.e., the same sensitivity and specificity) in two populations, but those populations differ in their outcome or exposure prevalence, the source or method will have different predictive values in the two populations.

In many “validation” studies, the “confirmation” or “verification” rates are not measures of validity, but merely measures of agreement. In other such investigations, one method or source may be used as a gold standard or as an alloyed gold standard to assess another method or source with respect to only one side of the validity coin. Studies that focus on the “completeness” of one source, such as studies in which interview responses are compared with prescription dispensation records to identify drug exposures that were forgotten or otherwise not reported by the respondents, may measure (more or less accurately) the sensitivity of the interview data. However, such studies are silent on the specificity without strong assumptions (e.g., that the respondent could not have obtained the drug in any way that would not be recorded in the prescription dispensation records).

In general, it is all too common for studies that measure mere agreement to be interpreted as though they measured validity or accuracy. The term “reliability” tends to be used far too broadly, to refer variously not only to reliability itself, but to agreement or validity as well. A widespread increase in the care with which such terms are used would be very helpful.

Figure 39.1 illustrates the calculation of sensitivity and specificity. For a drug exposure, a true gold standard would be a list of all drugs the study participant has taken, including dose, duration, and dates of exposure. This drug list might be a diary of prescriptions kept by the study participants or, perhaps more readily available, a computerized database of filled prescriptions,
although neither of these data sources might be a genuine gold standard. Prescription diaries cannot be assumed to be kept in perfect accuracy. For instance, there may be a tendency to record that drug use was more regular and complete than it actually was. Similarly, there may be substantial gaps between when a prescription is filled and when it is ingested, or that it is used according to the typical prescribed regimen.

There are two methods to quantify the validity of continuously distributed variables, such as duration of drug usage. The mean and standard error of the differences between the data in question and the valid reference measurement are typically used when the measurement error is constant across the range of true values, (i.e., when measurement error is independent of where an individual’s true exposure falls on the exposure distribution in the study population).

Realizing that it is only generalizable to populations with similar exposure distributions, the product-moment correlation coefficient may also be used. However, high correlation between two measures does not necessarily mean high agreement. For instance, the correlation coefficient could be very high (i.e., close to 1), even though one of the variables systematically overestimates or underestimates values of the other variable. The high correlation means that the over- or underestimation is systematic and very consistent. When the two measures are plotted against one another and they have the same scale, full agreement occurs only when the points fall on the line of equality, which is 45° from either axis. However, one is said to have perfect correlation when the points lie along any straight line parallel to the line of equality. It is difficult to tell from the value of a correlation coefficient how much bias will be produced by using an inaccurate measure of disease exposure.

Quantitative Measurement of Reliability

To evaluate reliability for categorical variables, the percent agreement and related \( \kappa \) coefficient are used. They are used only when two imperfect classification schemes are being compared, not when there is one classification method that may be considered \textit{a priori} superior to the other.\textsuperscript{10,21} The \( \kappa \) statistic is the percent agreement corrected for chance.\textsuperscript{21} Agreement is conventionally considered poor for a \( \kappa \) statistic less than zero, slight for \( \kappa \) between zero and 0.20, fair for a \( \kappa \) of 0.21–0.40, moderate for a \( \kappa \) of 0.41–0.60, substantial for a \( \kappa \) of 0.61–0.80, and almost perfect for a \( \kappa \) of 0.81–1.00.\textsuperscript{21} Figure 39.2 illustrates the percent agreement and \( \kappa \) calculations for a reliability assessment between questionnaire data and medical record information.

The intraclass correlation coefficient is used to evaluate the reliability of continuous variables.\textsuperscript{10} It reflects both the average differences in mean values and the correlation between measurements. The intraclass correlation coefficient indicates how much of the total measurement variation is due to the differences between the subjects being evaluated and to differences in measurement for one individual. When the data from two sets of measurements are identical, the intraclass correlation coefficient is equal to 1.0. Under certain conditions, the intraclass correlation coefficient is

![Figure 39.1. Formulas for calculating sensitivity and specificity.](image)
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\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{Exposed} & \text{Not exposed} \\
A & B & m_1 \\
C & D & m_2 \\
n_1 & n_2 & N \\
\end{array}
\]

Accuracy = \( A + D / N \)

Chance agreement (expected) = \((n_1 \times m_1) + (n_2 \times m_2) / N_2 \)

Kappa = \frac{\text{accuracy} - \text{chance agreement}}{1 - \text{chance agreement}}

Figure 39.2. Formulas for calculating the percent agreement and \( \kappa \).

exactly equivalent to Cohen’s weighted \( \kappa \).\(^{21}\) It is difficult to translate values of measures of agreement, such as \( \kappa \) into expected degrees of bias in exposure or disease associations.

EFFECTS OF MEASUREMENT ERROR ON THE POINT ESTIMATE OF ASSOCIATION

Copeland \textit{et al}. evaluated misclassification in epidemiologic studies using a series of computer generated graphs. They showed that the bias—i.e., discrepancy between the point estimate and the true value of the measure of association—was a function of the disease frequency, exposure frequency, sensitivity, and specificity of the classification.\(^{24}\) It is instructive to note that Copeland \textit{et al}. were not able to describe bias as a function of the product-moment correlation coefficient, the intra-class correlation coefficient, percent agreement, or \( \kappa \). This means that higher or lower values of these measures, even when one of the measurement methods is a gold standard, should not be interpreted as evidence of greater or lesser degrees of bias. When nondifferential misclassification occurred, the point estimate was biased toward the null. Their results for nondifferential misclassification also indicated that the rarer the disease, the more potential for bias in cohort studies. Likewise, the potential for bias increases in case–control studies, the less prevalent the exposure. For differential misclassification, the point estimate could be biased toward or away from the null. This presents a problem for \textit{ad hoc} case–control studies, where recall bias is always a concern.

Copeland’s simulations were all done on binary disease and exposure variables. Dosemeci \textit{et al}. presented additional simulations to show that nondifferential misclassification of exposure may bias the point estimate toward or away from the null, or may cause the point estimate to change direction when polytomous exposure variables (i.e., variables with more than two categories) are considered.\(^{15}\) A typical example of a polytomous variable would be never, some, or frequent use of a drug. For a continuous variable, nondifferential misclassification may \textit{not} produce a bias towards the null if there is perfect correlation between the variable as measured and the true value.\(^{10}\) For example, if both cases and controls in a case–control study underestimate duration of drug use by an equal percent, then there would \textit{not} be a bias towards the null.

CORRECTING MEASURES OF ASSOCIATION FOR MEASUREMENT ERROR

To correct effect estimates for measurement error, estimates of sensitivity and specificity are required.\(^{24}\) These estimates can be derived from previous research or from a subsample within the study being analyzed. However, estimates of sensitivity and specificity of exposure classification from previous research are rarely available. Should these estimates be available, they may not prove to be useful since the classification methods need to
be similar in both the correctly classified and misclassified data. The classification probabilities will vary according to the questionnaire design, study population, and time period of administration. In addition, the correction methods most familiar to epidemiologists are appropriate for bivariate, not multivariate data.

For differential misclassification of exposure by disease status (recall bias), Raphael contended that it is the researcher’s responsibility to either present a strong case that recall bias did not threaten the study’s validity or to statistically control for it. One extremely important way to help make the case for which Raphael has called is to conduct a sensitivity analysis. Sensitivity analysis is the last line of defense against biases after every effort has been made to eliminate, reduce, or control them in study design, data collection, and data analysis. As used in this context, the meaning of the term “sensitivity” differs from its other epidemiologic meaning as the counterpart to specificity as a measure of classification validity. In a sensitivity analysis, one alters key assumptions or methods reasonably to see how sensitive the results of a study are to those variations. One key assumption, usually implicit, is that the exposure and the outcome in a study have been measured accurately. With estimates from previous research or “guessimates” from expert experience and judgment, one can modify this assumption and use analytic methods ranging from the very simple to the highly complex to “back calculate” what the results might have looked like if more accurate methods had been used to classify participants with respect to outcome, exposure, or both. Sometimes it may be found that wildly implausible degrees of inaccuracy would have to have been present to produce observed associations. Other times it may be found that the overall study results are highly sensitive to what might seem out of the appropriate context to be minor inaccuracies in exposure or outcome classification.

It has been shown that intuitive judgments, even those of the most highly trained and widely experienced investigators, can be poorly calibrated in such matters. For many years, this kind of assessment has been conducted informally and qualitatively. Sensitivity analysis makes the assessment of residual bias transparent and quantitative, and forces the investigator (and other critics) to defend criticisms that in earlier times would have remained qualitative and unsubstantiated.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

OVERVIEW OF APPROACHES USED TO EVALUATE THE ACCURACY OF PHARMA COEPIDEMIOLOGY DATA SOURCES

The accuracy of drug exposure and diagnostic data has been measured in pharmacoepidemiology studies, sometimes as a validation effort in etiologic studies and elsewhere as separate methodologic evaluations.

Etiologic Studies

In the etiologic studies, where drug exposure and disease occurrence are typically derived from questionnaires, “validation” is often done by comparison with medical records. Although the literature uses the term “validation study” or “verification” to describe the agreement between two sources of information, “concordance” or “agreement” might be a more appropriate term to describe the comparison between questionnaire data and medical records, because the medical record itself is not a true “gold standard” for several reasons.

First, retrieval of medical records depends not only on a person’s ability to remember and report who prescribed the drug or diagnosed the condition in question, but on the health care provider’s care in recording the information, and on the availability of the medical record. If the medical record cannot be retrieved because the health care provider could not be identified, had retired, or the record was destroyed or lost, the events cannot be verified.

In addition, even if the medical record is available, it may not list all diagnoses and medications prescribed. In a recent study, Kirking and colleagues found that, in general, prescrip-
tions were poorly documented in the medical record when compared with a pharmacy claims database. Documentation was associated with the number of prescriptions dispensed. Overall, only 39% of prescriptions were documented in the prescriber visit notes of the chart, varying from 34% for patients with 12 or more dispensions in a six-month period to 56% for those with fewer than 12 prescriptions in the same time period.

Monson and Bond used patient pharmacy folders that contained all prescription drug orders as the gold standard for evaluating outpatient medical record completeness. Virtually all outpatient medications were obtained from the hospital pharmacy. The medical records for 89% of all patients who received drugs from the pharmacy had documentation that any prescription had been written. Of the 1326 individual prescriptions issued for the 355 patients, 26% were not recorded in the chart, and for only 38% of the 1326 prescriptions did the medical record contain the name, dose, strength, and directions as they appeared on the prescription form. Documentation of therapy was inversely correlated with the number of drugs dispensed, similar results to that of Kirking and colleagues.

Using a different study design that looked at a documentation of a single drug, West et al. reported that 89% of the outpatient medical records of patients who were dispensed one fill of one NSAID prescription contained documentation of that prescription. Age, gender, and whether the NSAID was used for an acute or chronic condition did not influence the likelihood that the drug was documented on the chart. Similarly, Christensen and colleagues reported that 92–95% of antihypertensive medications were noted in the medical record using a database of drug dispensations for comparison. Thus, study design appears to influence the findings of medical record documentation, with better results noted for those studies that evaluated only one drug or one therapeutic class compared to those that looked for documentation of all prescriptions in a given period of time.

The therapeutic class may also affect medical record completeness, with psychotropic medications being poorly documented. Buchsbaum et al. reported that the names of benzodiazepines were more often omitted from the chart than the names of nonbenzodiazepine medications (95% versus 81%, respectively, p < 0.01), as were the indications for use (95% versus 57%, respectively, p < 0.0001), with 15% of benzodiazepine and only 2% of nonbenzodiazepine prescriptions missing from the chart entirely.

Two studies have used computerized files of dispensed prescriptions to evaluate the completeness of drug documentation in the inpatient medical record. Strom et al. studied 128 cases of Stevens–Johnson syndrome, looking specifically at only those drugs commonly suspected of causing the syndrome. The patients' inpatient medical records recorded only 50% of the 234 prescriptions for these drugs known to be dispensed to these patients in the 30 days prior to hospitalization, according to computerized Medicaid pharmacy claims files. These data indicate that drugs prescribed during an outpatient visit often are not documented in a subsequent inpatient chart, even when the drugs may have caused the disease resulting in the hospitalization. Guess et al. reported similarly poor completeness comparing discharge and autopsy reports to the computerized drug file from the Saskatchewan Health Plan. In their study of persons with fatal upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage or perforation, NSAID use was mentioned in the discharge or autopsy report for only 31% of cases identified as exposed according to the drug file. In another inpatient medical record study, Lloyd and Rissing reported that the average inpatient medical record contains approximately 2.3 physician errors, such as failure to list treatments or diagnoses that were either treated or affected length of stay. They also noted that procedures performed in locations other than the operating room were often omitted from the chart.

In summary, the medical record does not document all medications prescribed for the patient. Record completeness is likely to vary by type of drug, type of chart (outpatient versus inpatient), and the number of drugs prescribed in a given period. This diminishes the usefulness of medical records for verifying self-reported drug exposure.
Methodologic Studies

Exposure confirmation performed as part of etiologic studies are often only partial verification, for two reasons. First, the comparison data source may be an alloyed gold standard, where the rate calculated is a measure of agreement not a measure of validity. More commonly, verification studies, although using a gold or an alloyed gold standard, can assess only one of the two validity measures, either sensitivity or specificity.

Methodologic studies that use alternative data sources such as prospectively collected data or databases of dispensed drugs can measure both the sensitivity and specificity, if one assumes that the prescription database is a gold standard. Lower sensitivity is often more of a concern than is lower specificity, depending on the data source used for the study. Drug exposures or diseases that are not recorded on a questionnaire or in a record linked database, i.e., data sources with low sensitivity, cannot be evaluated as risk factors for the association under investigation. Alternatively, low specificity is often less of a problem in pharmacoepidemiology unless the characteristic with low specificity also has very low prevalence in the population being studied. In situations where the factor has low prevalence and low sensitivity, a small degree of misclassification can have a dramatic effect on measures of association.

Besides the need for completeness on the individual level, it is also critical that information from all persons who are covered by the health plan from which the database is generated appear in the database. Systematic omissions of specific population groups, such as certain ethnic or racial groups, diminish the quality of the database.

In the remainder of the chapter, we will examine the available data on the validity and reliability of data obtained from ad hoc questionnaires and automated databases containing patient level data. In each case, we will examine the information available regarding drug exposure data and medical diagnoses separately. We will then end with some conclusions, as well as recommendations for related areas requiring research in the future.

SELF-REPORTED DRUG DATA FROM AD HOC QUESTIONNAIRE STUDIES

Accuracy

Concern for the validity of medication data obtained from patients prompted the conduct of several studies, the first of which was published in 1967. This study evaluated whether recall of medication use during pregnancy was influenced by the outcome of the birth. Since then, numerous studies have evaluated self-reported medication use for oral contraceptives, for postmenopausal estrogen, and for exposures during pregnancy. Recall accuracy for each of these different types of exposure will be discussed in this section, as well as information from the few studies that report on medications other than hormones or pregnancy related exposures.

Oral Contraceptive Use

Most of the studies concerned with the accuracy of interview data have evaluated how well women remember past use of oral contraceptives (OCs) (see Table 39.1) and hormone replacement therapy (see Table 39.2). Accuracy of self-reported OC and hormone replacement therapy has been assessed as part of etiologic studies by verifying exposure using medical records or as separate, methodologic studies. The latter have compared self-reported data to prospectively collected information ascertained as part of cohort studies or from drug dispensation records and files.

First examining the OC studies (Table 39.1), the time between when the exposure occurred and when it was queried (period of recall or recall length) varied from 0 (i.e., current use) to 17 or more years between use and questionnaire date. Two of the five methodologic studies were of OC recall. The methodologic study by Coulter et al. employed memory prompts whereas that by Bean et al. did not. The former study employed two different types of memory aid, one which listed the different OC brands available (memory aid A) and the second which used both
Table 39.1. Studies of self-reported prior oral contraceptive use by period of recall and type of questionnaire administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Memory aids</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Glass et al., 1974<sup>41</sup> | 3–17 years, median: 5 | Personal interview  
<sup>n</sup> = 75 | No                          | Medical records            | Percent agreement  
First brand used: 74  
Most recent used: 79  
Current use: 100 |
| Stolley et al., 1978<sup>43</sup> | 2+ years              | Personal interview  
<sup>n</sup> = 246 | List of brand names       | Medical records            | Percent agreement  
Most recent OC: 89  
<sup>k</sup> = 0.93  
Previous OC: 63  
<sup>k</sup> = 0.57  
Start date of most recent ± 1 month: 52  
Stop date of most recent ± 1 month: 74  
Total duration ± 1 month: 36  
Total duration ± 1 year: 77 |
| Bean et al., 1979<sup>38</sup> | 9.1 years             | Personal interview  
<sup>n</sup> = 160 | No                          | Menstrual and Reproductive History Cohort | Percent agreement  
First use, exact age: 55  
Age ± 1 year: 88 |
| Adam et al., 1981<sup>40</sup> | Unknown               | Self-administered  
<sup>n</sup> = 676 | No                          | Medical records            | 25% exposed by questionnaire  
32% exposed by medical charts |
| Rosenberg et al., 1983<sup>43</sup> | 4–16 years            | Personal interview  
<sup>n</sup> = 130 | Calendar and photos       | Medical records            | Month-specific agreement as a percent:  
Duration: 90  
Duration and brand: 62  
Duration, brand and dose: 54 |
| Coulter et al., 1986<sup>39</sup> | 10–15 years           | Personal interview  
<sup>n</sup> = 99 | A: Brand names listed only  
B: Calendar and photos | Oxford Family Planning Association Cohort | Percent agreement  
<sup>(All ± 1 yr)</sup>  
Aid A  
Aid B  
Duration  
First use  
Last use  
First brand  
Recent brand | Cases: 57  
First use: 90  
Last use: 63  
First brand: 69  
Recent brand: 53 |
| Nischan et al., 1993<sup>42</sup> | <20 years             | Personal interview  
<sup>n</sup> = 758 | Calendar and samples      | Medical records            | Percent agreement  
Cases: 77  
Controls: 78  
First brand used: 77  
Last brand used: 70  
First use ± 1 year: 68  
<sup>r</sup> = 0.83  
Last use ± 1 year: 69  
<sup>r</sup> = 0.88  
Total duration ± 1 month: 17  
Total duration ± 1 year: 59  
<sup>r</sup> = 0.91 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Memory aids</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Findings</th>
<th>κ/correlation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Horwitz et al., 1980</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Telephone interviews n = 324</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ever use</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conventional controls: 80</td>
<td>κ = 0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternative controls: 86</td>
<td>κ = 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spengler et al., 1981</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Personal interview n = 153</td>
<td>Samples of estrogens</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Ever use, pooled cases and controls (percent agreement)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- versus private MD’s records: 82</td>
<td>κ = 0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- versus hospital records: 80</td>
<td>κ = 0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganini-Hill and Ross 1982</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Personal interview n = 334</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical and pharmacy records</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ever use (versus medical record): 75</td>
<td>κ = 0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dose (versus medical record): 80</td>
<td>κ = 0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total duration (by month)</td>
<td>r = 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persson et al., 1987</td>
<td>≤3 years</td>
<td>Self-administered n = 116</td>
<td>List of brand names</td>
<td>Prescription forms</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Month begun, exactly: 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Name: 85</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dose: 88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodman et al., 1990</td>
<td>1–11+ years</td>
<td>Personal interviews n = 964</td>
<td>Samples of estrogens</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ever use: 87</td>
<td>κ = 0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration of use:</td>
<td>r = 0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First use (±3 years): 58</td>
<td>r = 0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West et al., 1995</td>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>Telephone interviews n = 103</td>
<td>Pictures of estrogens</td>
<td>Pharmacy database</td>
<td>Recall percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7–11 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estrogen name: 78 (95% CI: 70–86)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Estrogen name and dose: 26 (95% CI: 17–34)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Agreement (%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>±6 months</td>
<td>±1 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>First use:</td>
<td>±2 year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Last use:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duration:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: For those with multiple estrogen exposure, a single estrogen was selected as the target drug for assessing name, dose and dates of use.

*Results for comparison with physician records only, other records were incomplete.*
pictures of OCs and a calendar to record life events (memory aid B).

Overall, the available studies indicate that women accurately remember when they first began using OCs, although the brand names and duration of use are not remembered as well (see Table 39.1). We will present the available data on the accuracy of the date or age of initiation of OC use, duration of use, and brand name in turn.

The two methodologic studies reported that approximately 90% of women were able to recall the age (±1 year) that they began using OCs, regardless of whether a memory aid was used or the type of memory aid used. The results of the studies which verified OC questionnaire data using medical records indicate that women’s recall of the exact month and year when they began or stopped OC use was poorly recalled (Table 39.1). The difference in the rates between studies may be attributed to the recall length, which was estimated at up to 10 years for the Stolley et al. study and up to 20 years for the Nischan et al. study.

The accuracy of self-reported data on the exact months of use varied from a high of 90% in the study by Rosenberg et al., which used picture memory aids but measured agreement differently from other authors, to a low of 17% reported by Nischan et al., which provided the respondents with both a calendar and samples of OCs.

Recall accuracy for OC brand names depended on the order of their use. The first brand was recalled with reasonable accuracy. There were far greater discrepancies among the studies for the accuracy of the most recent OC brand used, but this may be due to how accuracy was defined, by name or by name and dose. It was very difficult for respondents to recall all OC brands with their correct dosages. Coulter et al. found that only 33% of those provided memory aid A and 48% of those given memory aid B could recall all OCs used for six months or longer. Rosenberg et al. reported similarly poor results for the recall accuracy of OC duration, brand, and dose. In the Nischan et al. study, agreement on duration of brand-specific OC use ranged from 31.4 to 100% (r = 0.21 to 0.96). Agreement was best for the most recently introduced product and lowest for the OCs that had similar brand names.

**Postmenopausal Hormone Use**

In contrast to the studies of OCs, which evaluated age, duration, and brands used, the studies of postmenopausal estrogen use focused primarily on ever/never use (Table 39.2). There have been two methodologic studies to evaluate the recall accuracy for postmenopausal estrogen use, both of which used pharmacy dispensations for comparison and some type of recall aid. West et al. reported a sensitivity of 78% for accurately reporting estrogen name but lower sensitivity for dates and duration of use, with similar results for both recall periods. The specificity for nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug or estrogen exposure was 95%. As previously noted, although sensitivity was lower than specificity, the relative importance of these two measures depends on the true prevalence of exposure in the population.

Persson et al. reported similar results to those of West et al. for the accuracy of reporting drug name, but much better results for reporting the exact month the estrogen was begun. The difference between the two studies may be due to study design, the questionnaire used to obtain the drug exposure information, or the recency of estrogen use.

The verification studies comparing self-reported estrogen use to medical record documentation reported percent agreements ranging from 75 to 87% and κ ranging from 0.51 to 0.74, indicating moderate to substantial agreement. In particular, the study of Goodman et al. verified both use and nonuse of estrogen exposure as part of an etiologic study of breast cancer. They found that 14% of “users” and 12% of “never users” according to self-report would have been misclassified using the information from medical records for comparison. This interpretation assumes that the medical record is correct and the women’s recall is inaccurate. A more likely explanation for the 14% of women whose reported estrogen use could not be confirmed is that their medical record was incomplete, i.e., it failed to document their prescriptions. In fact, this 14% error rate noted by
Goodman et al. agrees very well with the results from the studies evaluating the completeness of the medical record for documenting prescriptions.\textsuperscript{30–32}

**Use of Nonhormonal Medications**

There are several studies assessing the current use of different types of medication, but only a few studies have evaluated how well respondents report past use of medications other than OCs or postmenopausal estrogens (see Table 39.3). The only two methodologic studies\textsuperscript{50, 51} that evaluated the recall of non-hormone medications indicated that respondents have great difficulty accurately recalling specific information about drug use. Despite using memory aids and a structured questionnaire, many respondents were unable to recall the name of the nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug they had used in the past, and had even more difficulty with the dose, duration, and dates of use.

In the second methodologic study, Van den Brandt et al. compared self-report to pharmacy records of dispensed prescriptions, noting that the number of drug dispensations recalled was highest for cardiovascular medications (66\%) and poorest for alimentary tract medications (48\%).\textsuperscript{30} Recall was influenced by the number of chronically used medications: 71\% for one drug, 64\% for two drugs, and 59\% for three or more drugs, although duration of use was not related to recall. This study could evaluate only recall of current and very recent (within the past two years) medication use. Questionnaire design may have influenced the results of this study. Insufficient space was allocated for the recording of all medications used in the time period under study. If the respondents were unable to record all medications due to space limitations, it would appear that they were unable to recall all medications when this self-reported information was compared to the medications dispensed according to the database.

Four etiologic studies verified the accuracy of self-reported exposure to drugs other than hormones several years in the past, using medical records for comparison.\textsuperscript{40, 48, 52, 55} The study by Adam et al., which compared data collected by self-administered questionnaire to information from the patient history portion of the medical record, indicated that women greatly under-report antipsychotic agents,\textsuperscript{40} whereas Cotterchio et al. reported substantial agreement for antidepressant use, even by drug name.\textsuperscript{53} Paganini-Hill and Ross showed different agreement rates between self-reported information and medical record documentation depending on the medication.\textsuperscript{48} Of course, discrepancies between the questionnaire data and medical record data can be partially attributed to the incompleteness of the medical records used for comparison.

There are several studies that evaluate the recall accuracy for currently used medications. The first methodologic study conducted by Hulka et al. in 1975 looked at how well drugs were reported overall and, for any errors noted, whether patients failed to report drug use or whether the omissions were due to the physicians being unaware of drugs their patients currently use.\textsuperscript{54} The results differed by therapeutic class, but even for the cardiac and diabetic medications, there were many discrepancies between the two sources of drug data. Similar discrepant results were noted for other methodologic studies\textsuperscript{55–57} and two etiologic studies\textsuperscript{58, 59} assessing the accuracy of self-reported current drug use comparing questionnaire data to medical records, in-home assessments, or pharmacy databases.

**Medication Use In Pregnancy**

Assessing the frequency and timing of pregnancy associated exposures is important for determining the potential for teratogenic effects. Nine studies addressed how well women recall medication exposures that occurred during the three different trimesters of pregnancy. Recall accuracy for pregnancy related exposures was evaluated by two different methods. Four studies used a pre- and postdelivery questionnaire approach, evaluating the accuracy of reporting exposures that occurred during pregnancy to that recalled at different times postdelivery.\textsuperscript{37, 60–62} Two studies used information from the obstetric or hospital records as the gold standard and evaluated self-report using questionnaires,\textsuperscript{53, 64} and four others used the interview as the standard and evaluated
Table 39.3. Studies of self-reported drug use other than oral contraceptives and estrogens by period of recall and type of questionnaire administration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Memory aids</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hulka et al., 1975&lt;sup&gt;34&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Personal interview &lt;br&gt;n = 357</td>
<td>Drug bottles</td>
<td>Medical records and pharmacy records</td>
<td>Antihistamines &lt;br&gt;Antibiotics &lt;br&gt;Cardiac/congestive heart failure (CHF) &lt;br&gt;CNS &lt;br&gt;Antidiabetics (DM) &lt;br&gt;GI &lt;br&gt;Vitamins</td>
<td>Results were not available by drug. Overall agreement and type of error (in percent) stratified by underlying chronic condition &lt;br&gt;DM 40 27 &lt;br&gt;Patient omits drug(s) 21 22 &lt;br&gt;MD not know of drug(s) 18 22 &lt;br&gt;Patient or MD omissions 21 29 &lt;br&gt;Reporting errors were less than average for cardiac and antidiabetic drugs whereas CNS, antibiotics, GI had more than the average error rate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adam et al., 1981&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Self-administered &lt;br&gt;n = 676</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Phenothiazine</td>
<td>1% exposed by questionnaire &lt;br&gt;20% exposed by medical record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganini-Hill and Ross, 1982&lt;sup&gt;40&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Personal interview &lt;br&gt;n = 334</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical and pharmacy records</td>
<td>Ever use &lt;br&gt;Reserpine &lt;br&gt;Other &lt;br&gt;Antihypertensives &lt;br&gt;Barbiturates &lt;br&gt;Thyroid medications</td>
<td>Percent agreement&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; &lt;br&gt;86, $\kappa = 0.44$ &lt;br&gt;87, $\kappa = 0.60$ &lt;br&gt;69, $\kappa = 0.38$ &lt;br&gt;83, $\kappa = 0.62$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landry et al., 1988&lt;sup&gt;56&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Self-administered and telephone interviews &lt;br&gt;n = 38</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>In-home assessment</td>
<td>Percent agreement between home visit and two types of questionnaire &lt;br&gt;Self-administered (SA) &lt;br&gt;Telephone</td>
<td>High blood pressure 90 71 &lt;br&gt;Arsenitic/pain 75 48 &lt;br&gt;Tranquilizers 67 42 &lt;br&gt;Heart pills 89 50 &lt;br&gt;Seizures 100 50 &lt;br&gt;Diabetes pills 80 100 &lt;br&gt;Insulin 100 75 &lt;br&gt;Antibiotics 50 0 &lt;br&gt;Ulcer drugs 50 25 &lt;br&gt;Blood thinners 100 100 &lt;br&gt;Thyroid pills 100 100 &lt;br&gt;Hormones 100 50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Percent agreement between methods by method-specific percent agreement.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Recall period</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Memory aids</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Johnson and Vollmer, 1991[^52]</td>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Self-administered n = 83</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Computerized pharmacy records and in-home assessment</td>
<td>Cardiac agents 0.85</td>
<td>Sensitivity Specificity PPV[^6]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diuretics 0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Analgesics 0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychotropics 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiovasculars 0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-inflammatories 0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-asthmatics 0.92</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sedatives/hypnotics 0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anti-Parkinson’s 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thyroid agents 0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hormones 1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van den Brandt et al., 1991[^50]</td>
<td>Up to 2 years</td>
<td>Self-administered n = 207</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Computerized pharmacy records</td>
<td>Alimentary 48</td>
<td>Percent recall:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiovasculars 66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CNS 54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other 61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehoe et al., 1994[^50]</td>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Personal interview n = 942</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Insulin 0.84</td>
<td>Sensitivity Specificity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral hypoglycemics 0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aspirin 0.73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral steroids 0.66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gout medications 0.68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Antihypertensives 0.88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandvik and Hunskaar, 1995[^52]</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Personal interview n = 82</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Estrogens (95% CI) 0.58 (0.39–0.77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Anticholinergics 0.33 (0.07–0.59)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathomimetica 0.32 (–0.07–0.71)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West et al., 1995[^51]</td>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>Telephone interviews n = 319</td>
<td>Pictures of NSAIDs</td>
<td>Pharmacy database</td>
<td>Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)</td>
<td>Recall percent for any NSAID use: 57 (95% CI: 50–64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7–11 years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Single NSAID dispensed in 12 year period: 41 (95% CI: 32–50)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For those with repeated NSAID use, a single NSAID was selected as the target NSAID name: 30 (95% CI: 24–36)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug for assessing name, dose, and dates of use: 15 (95% CI: 10–20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^50]: http://example.com
[^52]: http://example.com
[^6]: http://example.com
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Record Type</th>
<th>Agreement (%)</th>
<th>±6 months</th>
<th>±1 year</th>
<th>±2 year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Law et al., 1996&lt;sup&gt;59&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Recent use</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>Name only</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Computerized pharmacy records and medical records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AZT</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ddl</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ddlC</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Acyclovir</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluconazole</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ketoconazole</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith et al., 1999&lt;sup&gt;55&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Current use</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Serum levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>0.16 (0.0–0.32)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Propranolol</td>
<td>0.43 (0.27–0.59)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hydrochlorothiazide</td>
<td>0.62 (0.53–0.91)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Digoxin</td>
<td>0.94 (0.74–1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotterchio et al., 1999&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Ever use of anti-depressants (AD)</td>
<td>Self-administered</td>
<td>List of 11 most common drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AD use by class and by individual type</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>AD as a class</td>
<td>0.60 (0.47–0.74)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Amitriptyline</td>
<td>0.64 (0.40–0.88)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fluoxetine</td>
<td>0.69 (0.45–0.94)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Imipramine</td>
<td>0.28 (–0.24–0.79)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Desipramine</td>
<td>0.83 (0.54–1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maptroline</td>
<td>0.84 (0.54–1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sertaline</td>
<td>0.64 (0.19–1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Doxepin</td>
<td>0.79 (0.38–1.0)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Paroxetine</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Date AD first taken</td>
<td>0.48 (0.23–0.72)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Results for comparison with physician records only; other records were incomplete.

<sup>b</sup>Positive predictive value.
the completeness of obstetric, hospital, and/or pharmacy records.\textsuperscript{37, 65–67} Note that in the above discussion, Klemetti and Saxen\textsuperscript{37} used two techniques to assess the recall accuracy of exposures that occurred during pregnancy. It may be for this reason that their paper has been cited as providing evidence both for and against recall bias.

The studies that used the pre- and postdelivery approach evaluated the completeness of exposure reporting using the predelivery questionnaire as the criterion. All four studies found that, when questioned after delivery, women forget at least some medications that occurred during gestation\textsuperscript{37, 66–69} and there is a small tendency to over-report exposures that did not occur during the pregnancy (range: 0.4 to 20\%). For example, 34.1\% of women failed to report an antibiotic or antibacterial exposure, whereas 0.7\% over-reported this exposure.\textsuperscript{60} The recall interval for these four studies spanned from weeks,\textsuperscript{60} to months,\textsuperscript{37, 61} to eight years.\textsuperscript{62} Feldman et al.\textsuperscript{62} and Mackenzie and Lippman reported that recall differed by type of medication. Chronically used medications were recalled more often than acute exposures and salient exposures (those that prompted study initiation) were also more accurately recalled (81\%) than were common and less disconcerting exposures (33\%).\textsuperscript{61} Similarly, Mackenzie and Lippman reported fewer deletions for prescription drugs such as antibiotics, compared with over-the-counter medications such as vitamins, analgesics, and cold preparations.

Whereas Feldman et al.\textsuperscript{62} found that factors such as maternal age, marital and employment status, and pregnancy outcome did not influence the reporting of pregnancy medication exposures, de Jong\textsuperscript{62} reported better recall in mothers with higher educational attainment and poorer pregnancy outcome (low birth weight, gestational age, or Apgar score). The two other papers\textsuperscript{37, 60} did not find recall differences based on pregnancy outcome.

Two studies used the obstetric record as the gold standard to assess the accuracy of self-reported medication histories.\textsuperscript{63, 64} These two studies had widely differing times between exposure and self-report. In the study of Tilley et al.,\textsuperscript{62} women were questioned anywhere from 10 to 30 years after their pregnancy to elicit information on diethylstilbestrol use.\textsuperscript{63} Of the women who had been exposed according to their records, 37\% either did not recall or denied diethylstilbestrol exposure. Women in the Werler et al.\textsuperscript{65} study were interviewed during their postpartum hospital stay. Compared with the obstetric record, there was both under- and over-reporting of exposures that differed by the type of exposure and by pregnancy outcome. For example, compared to women with favorable pregnancy outcomes, those with an adverse pregnancy outcome more accurately reported using birth control after conception and experiencing urinary tract infections. The Werler et al.\textsuperscript{65} study supports the potential for recall bias when using non malformed infants as the control group for studying teratogenic exposures.

Finally, there are four studies that used the mother’s self-reported drug exposure as the criterion and verified reported exposures using medical records and/or pharmacy records.\textsuperscript{37, 63–67} Klemetti and Saxen found that only 6\% of the mother’s reports were incorrect when compared with medical records.\textsuperscript{37} McCredie et al.\textsuperscript{65} used medical records to confirm Bendectin\textsuperscript{6}\ exposure in a random sample of 30 mothers who reported use during pregnancy; 57\% of the exposures were documented in the charts.\textsuperscript{66} Of the remaining unconfirmed reports, 20\% of the mothers’ physicians indicated that they often prescribe the drug without recording it on the medical record and 27\% of the records were unavailable. Bryant et al.\textsuperscript{66} reported moderate agreement between self-reported information and medical records for use of any prescription drugs during pregnancy ($\kappa = 0.48$), but as expected, very poor agreement for over-the-counter medications ($\kappa = 0.02$) and vitamin supplements ($\kappa = 0.07$).\textsuperscript{66} de Jong et al.\textsuperscript{66} reported a 50\% confirmation of self-reported medication exposure using pharmacy, general practitioner, and hospital records, with the best verification noted for general practitioner and hospital records combined (69\%).\textsuperscript{65} Of particular concern is that most studies that use medical or pharmacy records to verify exposure are only unidirectional. They confirm drug exposure if reported but typically do not evaluate whether a respondent omits reporting an exposure that
actually occurred, i.e., the validation efforts typically assess sensitivity but not specificity.

Influences on Accuracy
The accuracy of medication exposure reported via questionnaire is affected by several factors. Research indicates that the type of question influences how well respondents answer medication questions. Mitchell et al. reported that open-ended questions such as “Have you ever used any medications?” yielded 13–45% of the affirmative responses for use of three different medications. The addition of indication-specific questions added an incremental 35–58% affirmative responses concerning exposures. Finally, 20–35% reported drug exposure only when asked medication-(name)-specific questions. This study supports the work by Cottler and Robins suggesting that questionnaire design influences the completeness of self-reported psychoactive medication use. Asking medication-specific questions in addition to indication-specific questions increased reported drug use by 26–36%. In particular, the medication-specific questions substantially increased reporting for certain subgroups, including 25–44 year olds, males, African-Americans, and those with eight or more years of education.

Studies have also shown that memory aids such as photographs of medicines or calendars improve recall. Using two different types of memory aid, Coulter et al. (Table 39.1) noted that recall of total duration of use and date of last use were greatly improved when respondents were provided with pictures of OCs and a calendar compared with a list of OC brands. Similarly, Beresford and Coker found that only 29% of women were able to recall the name and dose of the estrogen without pictures, increasing to 71% for those who used pictures to enhance recall.

Recall period, the time between when the exposure occurred and when it is reported influences accuracy of recall. Stolley et al. reported that agreement on OC starting date between self-report and medical records was 55% if the OC was used within one month of hospitalization and 45% if the OC was used within the most recent two years. Goodman et al. reported correlations of 0.7 and 0.4 for agreement on duration of estrogen use for recall periods of 0–11 and 11+ years, respectively, and similar differences in agreement for age at first use for these two recall periods ($r = 0.7$ and $r = 0.5$, respectively). In the only methodologic study to evaluate recall period, West et al. reported that the names of drugs stopped 2–3 years prior to interview were recalled more frequently than those stopped 7–11 years prior to interview (odds of recall = 3.0, 95% CI: 1.6–5.7, and 2.4, 95% CI: 0.9–6.7, for nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and estrogens, respectively). All three studies indicated greater inaccuracies as more time elapsed between occurrence of exposure and its subsequent reporting.

Further analysis of the methodologic study by West et al. indicated that individuals were better able to recall the name of the nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug in question (target NSAID) as the number of its dispensations increased: for every four dispensations of the target NSAID, the odds of recalling its name increased by 1.7 (95% CI: 1.3–2.2). Similarly, as the number of different types of NSAID used increased, there was better recall: for every three different NSAIDs used, there was a 3.6-fold (95% CI: 1.3–9.9) increased odds of recalling the target NSAID name. However, this same study did not report similar findings for recalling estrogen use, which indicates that recall accuracy for past drug use and its predictors differs by therapeutic class.

The possibility of recall bias was the motivation for many validation studies of past medication use. Whereas many of the studies that address this issue evaluate recall accuracy for mothers of normal and abnormal infants, others have assessed differences between cases and controls in case–control studies of non-pregnancy related conditions. Overall, the literature does not strongly support a general or uniform indication of recall bias in either circumstance, although there are some exceptions. Werler et al. reported differences in recall by both exposure and birth outcome (normal and malformed infants) and Stolley et al. found that cases showed better percent agreement between self-report and medical
records than did controls for starting date of the most recently used OC (61% versus 48%, respectively) and for duration of use (47% versus 31%, respectively).\textsuperscript{44} Rosenberg \textit{et al.} also found similar percent agreements for recalling the duration of past OC use between cases and controls: 94% versus 87%, respectively.\textsuperscript{43}

To date, few studies have evaluated whether demographic and behavioral characteristics influence the recall of past medication use. Cotterchio \textit{et al.} evaluated age, household income, and education as predictors of recall accuracy for reporting ever having used an antidepressant with inconsistent results.\textsuperscript{53} Calculating percent agreement using the medical record to confirm self-reported data, Goodman \textit{et al.} noted small variations in recall accuracy for any past estrogen use by ethnicity (96% for Japanese ancestry, 91% for non-Japanese ancestry) and education, with more educated women having less accurate recall (90%) than those without a college education (96%).\textsuperscript{45} West \textit{et al.} noted a similar finding for education; sensitivity was 26% for women with some college and 47% for those without any college recalling the NSAID name (odds of recall = 0.4, 95% CI: 0.1 – 1.3).\textsuperscript{70}

Recall accuracy was affected by age in two of four studies evaluated. West \textit{et al.} reported that persons aged 50–65 years of age recalled the NSAID name more accurately than those aged 66–80, odds of recall = 1.8 (95% CI: 1.0 – 3.4).\textsuperscript{51} Van den Brandt \textit{et al.} found better recall accuracy for younger age groups as well, with sensitivities of 65%, 60%, and 58% for those aged 55–59, 60–64, and 65–69, respectively.\textsuperscript{50} Goodman \textit{et al.} did not report age differences in recall accuracy for past estrogen use\textsuperscript{46} and Stolley \textit{et al.}\textsuperscript{44} did not find age differences in the agreement between the person and the prescriber for the name of the OC used most recently. Study design may explain the different results noted; the two studies that reported an age effect were methodologic studies evaluating recall accuracy\textsuperscript{50,51} whereas the two that reported no age effects\textsuperscript{44,46} were etiologic studies that reported verification of drug use as a measure of exposure misclassification for the association under study.

Few other demographic factors were evaluated consistently across studies. No differences in recall accuracy were noted by gender.\textsuperscript{50,51} Stolley \textit{et al.} reported racial and socioeconomic differences in reporting with whites having better percent agreement than nonwhites (92% versus 83.1%, respectively) and private paying users having better agreement than those receiving public health care funds (91.3% versus 77.1%, $\chi^2 = 6.6, p < 0.04$).\textsuperscript{44}

Behavioral characteristics such as smoking and alcohol use have been investigated as predictors of recall accuracy.\textsuperscript{46,70} Nonsmokers had better recall of ever/never use of estrogens (89.8%, $\kappa = 0.79$) than did smokers (82.2%, $\kappa = 0.64$) in the study of Goodman \textit{et al.} study, which was not supported in the work of West \textit{et al.}, which found no relationship between recall accuracy for past NSAID or estrogen use and cigarette smoking. Similarly, West \textit{et al.} reported that current alcohol use was unrelated to recall accuracy for NSAIDs or estrogens.

With regard to predictors of recall accuracy, factors such as questionnaire design, use of memory aids, recall period, extent of past drug use, age, and education sometimes influence how well respondents remember past drug use, the effect often seeming to vary by therapeutic class. Behavioral characteristics such as smoking and alcohol use were rarely evaluated as predictors of accuracy and inconsistent findings were noted in the two studies that reported the results of their evaluation. Due to the paucity of information on predictors of recall, further research in this area is warranted.

Conclusions

It is apparent from this review, as well as an earlier review by Harlow and Linet,\textsuperscript{72} that most of the work on recall accuracy for past medication use has focused on OCs and replacement estrogens. The results of the studies indicate that both OCs and replacement estrogens are recalled accurately, especially if researchers allow a range of one year for agreement on age and duration of use. However, women do have difficulty recalling the brands of OC and replacement estrogens used, even if provided photos or lists of brand names. Recall of other drugs appears potentially more problematic. It is difficult to evaluate the recall
accuracy for medications other than OCs and replacement estrogens, because there are so few studies in the literature that address this and there are substantial differences among these studies. For example, recall periods ranged from one month to several years, or the exact number of years was not specified. The drugs studied were as diverse as the recall periods. As more researchers combine verification with their data collection efforts, more information will hopefully become available on the recall accuracy of other types of medication.

As for data collection techniques for self-reported drug data, it is apparent that providing recall enhancements produces better data. Calendars and photos of drugs augment recall to a greater degree than listing only the brand names of the drugs in question. Using both medication-specific and indication-specific questions also provide more complete drug data. In fact, these techniques, namely photos, calendars, and the two different types of drug question, have become the state of the art for collecting self-reported drug data by personal or telephone interview.

More work is needed to understand the influence of patterns of drug use (duration, drug switching, recall period, totality of past drug exposure) and respondent characteristics (demographic and behavioral) on recall accuracy of past drug use. Interestingly, the two studies that evaluated educational attainment as a predictor of recall accuracy found that those with at least some years of college had less accurate recall than those with no more than a high school diploma. In evaluating other demographic factors, gender was unrelated to recall accuracy but the respondent’s current age was important in two of the four studies assessing its contribution. The discrepancies among the studies may be caused by differences in study design (methodologic or etiologic investigations) or differences in the drugs evaluated.

In conclusion, longstanding and widespread concern about substantial recall bias as a major concern in case–control studies of medication use appears to be a misapprehension. Further, the literature to date suggests that recall accuracy of self-reported medication exposures is sometimes, but by no means always, influenced by the type of medication, drug use patterns, the design of the data collection materials, and respondent characteristics. Thus, epidemiologists who plan to use questionnaire data to investigate drug–disease associations will need to consider which factors may influence recall accuracy in the design of their research protocols.

self-reported diagnosis and hospitalization data from ad hoc studies

accuracy

Much of the methodologic research on the ability to remember past medical conditions and the factors that influenced this recall has been sponsored by the US National Center for Health Statistics, to determine how accurately chronic conditions were being reported in the US National Health Survey. These were large studies comparing interview data with administrative forms used by the health maintenance organizations participating in the study.73,74 Other investigations have verified self-reported medical conditions using medical records as part of case–control or cohort studies.75–81 The Baltimore Study82 and the study by Heliovaara et al. 83 differed from the other studies. Persons who had responded to questions regarding chronic illness were then clinically evaluated for presence or absence of the conditions under study.

Just as recall accuracy of past medication use varies by the type of drug, the ability to remember disease conditions varies by disease (Table 39.4). The best reporting was shown for conditions that are specific and familiar, such as diabetes mellitus,58,78,79,82–86 hypertension,58,75,79,83,84 asthma,78,82,83 and cancers such as breast, lung, large bowel, and prostate.75,84,87,88 It is difficult to assess the reporting accuracy for common, symptom based conditions such as sinusitis, arthritis, low back pain, and migraine headaches, which many people may have, or believe they have, without having been told so by a clinician. In studies comparing self-report to clinical evaluation, depending upon the type of condition, there is both under- and over-reporting.82,83
Table 39.4. Studies of self-reported illnesses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commission on Chronic Illness 1957\textsuperscript{82}</td>
<td>Personal interview where one person reported on all those in the household ( n = 809 )</td>
<td>Clinical evaluation</td>
<td>Selected conditions\textsuperscript{4}</td>
<td>Percent agreement on presence of disorder (interview and clinical evaluation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malignant neoplasms</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Asthma</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thyroid disease</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Psychoses/neuroses</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other mental disorders</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heart disease</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chronic sinusitis</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Osteoarthritis</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganini-Hill and Ross, 1982\textsuperscript{48}</td>
<td>Personal interview ( n = 334 )</td>
<td>Medical and pharmacy records</td>
<td>Ever had:</td>
<td>( \kappa )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gallbladder disease</td>
<td>95, 0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>90, 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>96, 0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Benign breast disease</td>
<td>87, 0.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hysterectomy</td>
<td>98, 0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oophorectomy</td>
<td>93, 0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tretli et al., 1982\textsuperscript{76}</td>
<td>Self-administered ( n = 12,694 )</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Ever had or recently had:</td>
<td>Percent agreement on ever having had disorder between questionnaire and records</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Percent agreement between new events occurring during followup and questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcox and Horney, 1984\textsuperscript{81}</td>
<td>Self-administered ( n = 362 )</td>
<td>Menstrual and Reproductive Health Cohort</td>
<td>Spontaneous abortion</td>
<td>Percent agreement: 75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Predictors of recall (percent of abortions recalled)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Length of pregnancy when abortion occurred:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt;6) weeks: 54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&gt;13) weeks: 93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recall period:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&lt;10) years: 82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(&gt;20) years: 73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>New report of disease between follow-ups,</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colditz et al., 1986*</td>
<td>Self-administered</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>New report of disease between follow-ups,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sample size varied</td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>by disease being</td>
<td>Large bowel</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>validated</td>
<td>Thyroid</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 121 700</td>
<td>Ovary</td>
<td>87</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Corpus uteri</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stroke</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>100 (only 60% had medical records available to confirm the diagnosis)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Fractures</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spitz et al., 1988*</td>
<td>Self-administered</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Past medical conditions</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 72</td>
<td>Hypertension</td>
<td>82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Duodenal ulcer</td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coronary artery disease</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Gout</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Emphysema</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Previous cancers diagnosed two or more years ago:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colorectal</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genital tract</td>
<td>93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melanoma</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hematopoietic</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Liver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Skin</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Operations:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appendectomy</td>
<td>95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hysterectomy</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cholecystectomy</td>
<td>88</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Bush et al., 1989<sup>79</sup> | Self-administered questionnaire  
 n = 107 | Medical records | Ever had any of the following:  
 Angina 85 0.57  
 Cancer 89 0.72  
 Cataracts 76 0.53  
 Diabetes 98 0.93  
 Fracture 91 0.71  
 Hypertension 86 0.71  
 MI 94 0.70  
 Stroke 98 0.85 |
| Linet et al., 1989<sup>78</sup> | Personal interview with some surrogate interviews  
 n = 338 | Medical records | Ever had any of the following selected conditions<sup>4</sup>  
 Tuberculosis 95 0.49  
 Chronic sinusitis 80 0.24  
 Diverticulitis 96 0.53  
 Hepatitis 97 0.59  
 Rheumatoid arthritis 95 0.00  
 Asthma 98 0.39 |
| Linton et al., 1991<sup>92</sup> | Self-administered  
 n = 3588 | Ocular examination | Ever been told of having the following: | Self-reported disease at the ocular exam compared to results of exam  
 Percent agreement  
 Cataract 84 0.46  
 Macular degeneration 92 0.18 |
| Midthjell et al., 1992<sup>85</sup> | Self-administered  
 n = 507 | Medical records | Presence or absence of diabetes 96.4% of diabetes cases and 99.7% of noncases were verified.  
 Approximately 50% of diabetics recalled the year their diabetes was diagnosed.  
 Prospective study of nonspine fractures  
 78% of nonspine fractures were confirmed  
 False positive report rate was 12% for all nonspine fractures  
 Of those with no reported fractures by self-report, medical records confirmed that no fractures occurred  
 Overreporting was lowest for shoulder, wrist/forearm, elbow, ankle, and hip  
 Overreporting was greatest for hand, finger, rib, or face |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Methodology</th>
<th>Sample Size</th>
<th>Disease Validation</th>
<th>Presence of selected chronic conditions</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>$\kappa$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heliovaara et al., 1993&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>$n = 7217$</td>
<td></td>
<td>Arterial hypertension 0.73 0.99 0.90 0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coronary disease 0.55 0.97 0.55 0.52</td>
<td>Cerebral stroke 0.58 1.00 0.65 0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Any cardiovascular disease 0.80 0.94 0.80 0.74</td>
<td>Bronchial asthma 0.72 0.99 0.59 0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pulmonary emphysema 0.23 0.99 0.37 0.28</td>
<td>Osteoarthritis 0.34 0.97 0.53 0.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low back disorder 0.56 0.92 0.44 0.43</td>
<td>Any mental illness 0.20 1.00 0.93 0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes 0.81 0.99 0.77 0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paganini-Hill and Chao, 1993&lt;sup&gt;86&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Self-administered</td>
<td>$n = 9734$</td>
<td>Disease being validated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>$n = 8884$</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Development of the following diseases during 2 year followup</td>
<td>Percent agreement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1983 questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1985 questionnaire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hip fracture 85 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Heart attack 44 36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cancer 80 56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colon 70 70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectum 13 25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lung 87 57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breast 90 35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uterine 74 44</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prostate 57 34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bladder 78 47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lymphoma/leukemia 65 29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kehoe et al., 1994&lt;sup&gt;58&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Personal interview</td>
<td>$n = 942$</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Ever diagnosed with: Arthritis 0.75 0.66 0.76 0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Coronary heart disease 0.64 0.96</td>
<td>Hypertension 0.91 0.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes 0.84 0.97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Other CVD 0.57 0.82</td>
<td>Cancer 0.71 0.89</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Continued*
Table 39.4 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Questionnaire and sample size</th>
<th>Comparison data source</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rosamond et al., 199561</td>
<td>Personal interview n = 1053</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Previous occurrence of an acute MI or heart attack</td>
<td>60% of previous acute Mls were confirmed; unconfirmed reports were confused with unstable angina, coronary heart failure, and other conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kriegsman et al., 199666</td>
<td>Personal interviews n = 2380</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Presence or absence of:</td>
<td>$\kappa$ (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(physicians were sent a questionnaire to complete)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-specific lung disease</td>
<td>0.59 (0.53–0.65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cardiac disease</td>
<td>0.69 (0.65–0.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Peripheral atherosclerosis</td>
<td>0.38 (0.30–0.46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cerebrovascular disease</td>
<td>0.56 (0.48–0.64)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td>0.85 (0.81–0.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Malignant neoplasms (excluding non-melanoma skin cancer)</td>
<td>0.66 (0.60–0.72)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rheumatoid arthritis and/or osteoarthritis</td>
<td>0.31 (0.27–0.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law et al., 199659</td>
<td>Personal interview n = 123</td>
<td>Medical records</td>
<td>Previous HIV illnesses</td>
<td>$\kappa$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Hairy leukoplakia</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oral candidiasis</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Herpes zoster</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pneumocystis carinii</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kaposi's sarcoma</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Esophageal candidiasis</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergmann et al., 199867</td>
<td>Self-administered n = 65 582</td>
<td>Cancer registry</td>
<td>MD ever diagnosed:</td>
<td>Sensitivity PPV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>All cancer sites</td>
<td>0.79 0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Colon</td>
<td>0.85 0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rectum</td>
<td>0.16 0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>0.90 0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Melanoma</td>
<td>0.53 0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Breast</td>
<td>0.91 0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Uterus</td>
<td>0.71 0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walker et al., 1998&lt;sup&gt;90&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Self-administered Medical record n = 5787 for heart attack n = 5907 for stroke</td>
<td>Diagnosis of heart attack or stroke during 12 year followup</td>
<td>Heart attack</td>
<td>Stroke</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κ</td>
<td>False positive rate (%)</td>
<td>False negative rate (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostate</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bladder</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukemia</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lymphoma</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhu et al., 1999&lt;sup&gt;99&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Self-administered Medical record Prostate cancer cases, ( n = 181 ) Controls, ( n = 297 )</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>κ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vasectomy</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benign prostatic hyperplasia</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prostatitis</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epididymitis/orchitis</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTI</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inguinal hemia</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kidney stones</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Refer to the report for an entire listing.
using medical records to assess recall accuracy for common ailments typically found poor agreement, where under-reporting was often the major cause of the disagreement in some studies. but over-reporting occurred as well, especially for conditions where the diagnostic criteria are less explicit.

Depending on the data source used for comparison, cardiovascular conditions may be over or under-reported as well. 

Poor agreement in most studies was due to over-reporting of disease. but some studies by design could only finding over-reporting. In phase one of a cohort study to ascertain cardiovascular disease occurrence by self-report, only 61 (81%) of 75 myocardial infarctions (MIs), 20 (65%) of 31 strokes, and 29 (66%) of 44 reports of diabetes could be verified by medical record review. Others noted both under- and over-reporting, depending upon the cardiovascular disease being studied. 

Heliovaara et al. and Spitz et al. noted accurate recall of cardiovascular conditions and Kehoe et al. suggested that their results were due to under-reporting of disease. In most instances of recall error, many who had incorrectly reported MIs and stroke had other conditions which they may have mistakenly understood as coronary heart disease, MI, or stroke, based upon communication with their physician during their diagnostic visits.

Only two studies assessed the recall accuracy for mental illnesses, both comparing interview to clinical evaluation. The results indicated poor agreement between the two data sources with under-reporting as the primary reason for poor agreement. It is unclear from these studies whether the reason for under-reporting is an unwillingness on the part of the respondent to admit to mental illness or whether the conditions were actually under-diagnosed.

There have been only three studies that evaluated reporting of cataracts, two comparing presence of cataract by clinical examination and the third using medical record review for comparison. Agreement was best in the study by Bush et al., whereas the studies that used clinical assessments typically reported poor agreement. Similar to the evaluation of mental illnesses, the question remains, could the under-reporting be due to under-diagnosis?

Finally, fractures were evaluated in four studies, all of which used medical records for comparison. The overall results from the studies indicated good agreement although the one methodologic study of fracture incidence indicated a slight tendency for over-reporting of hand, finger, rib, or facial fractures.

Although menarche and menopause are not medical conditions per se, the age at which they occur is often of interest in pharmacoepidemiology studies. Using data from the Menstrual and Reproductive Health Study which had recall periods ranging from 17 to 53 years (mean 33.9 years), Bean et al. found that the exact age of menarche was recalled by 59%, and age within one year was recalled by 90%. Similarly for menopause, 45% of women were able to report their exact age at natural menopause and 75.5% reported age within one year. The percent agreements were 55.6% and 83.4%, respectively, for surgical menopause. The recall lengths for menopause were 7.6 years and 10.6 years for natural vs. surgical menopause, respectively. The lower percent agreement for age at which natural menopause occurred compared to that for surgical menopause may be attributed to the gradual occurrence of natural menopause compared to the definitive nature of hysterectomy.

Influences on Accuracy

The reporting of a medical condition during an interview is influenced by several factors, including the type of condition as well as the patient’s understanding of the problem. Reporting is also dependent upon the respondent’s willingness to divulge the information. Conditions such as venereal disease and mental disorders may not be reported because the respondent is embarrassed to discuss them with the interviewer or worries about the confidentiality of self-administered questionnaires. As a result, conditions considered sensitive are likely to be under-reported when ascertained by self-report.
Conditions with substantial impact on a person’s life are better reported than those with little or no impact on lifestyle. Of those with current restrictions on food or beverage due to medical problems, 64.2% reported chronic conditions that were confirmed in medical records, compared with 58.2% for those without these restrictions. Similarly, 71.2% of those who had restrictions on work or housework reported chronic conditions, versus 45.9% for those who did not have these restrictions. The major determinant of recall for spontaneous abortions was the length of the pregnancy at the time the event occurred. Fifty-four percent recalled a spontaneous abortion occurring within the first six weeks of pregnancy, whereas 93% remembered those occurring more than 13 weeks into the pregnancy.

Other factors that influence reporting accuracy of past diagnoses and hospitalizations include the number of physician services for that condition and the recency of services. For peptic ulcer hospitalizations, 90% of those hospitalized 2–6 months prior to interview remembered the date of admission, compared with 80% for those hospitalized 7–18 months prior to interview and 60% for those hospitalized 5 or more years prior to interview. For reporting of diagnoses, the longer the interval between the date of the last medical visit for the condition and the date of interview, the poorer the recall was for that condition. Ninety-one percent of the conditions requiring a visit within the week before interview were recalled, compared to 76% for conditions requiring visits 2–4 weeks prior. The numbers were 54 and 41% for conditions requiring visits 6 months prior and one year prior, respectively.

One of the limitations of the National Center for Health Statistics study is that it only assessed recall of conditions occurring in the past year. An unanswered question is the ability of respondents to recall conditions that were diagnosed and resolved more than one year previously. According to Wilcox and Horney, 82% of women were able to recall a spontaneous abortion that had occurred in the past 10 years, but only 73% recalled those that occurred 20 or more years previously. While not large, can these differences in recall be explained by age, recall interval, a cohort effect, or some intertwining of all three? What may have been considered “sensitive” by one generation may not be considered as such by the subsequent generation. Further, terminology changes over time with prior generations using the nomenclature “miscarriages” whereas more recent generations use “spontaneous abortions.” Despite differences in recall accuracy by recall interval, Wilcox and Horney’s results indicate that spontaneous abortions appear to be recalled fairly accurately, probably as a result of their emotional impact.

Perhaps as a result of the emotional stress, lifestyle changes, and potential financial strain, hospitalizations tend to be reported accurately. There was only a 9% under-reporting of hospitalizations where surgery was performed, compared to 16% of those without a surgical procedure. The under-reporting in those with only a day hospital stay was 28%, compared with 11% for 2–4 day stays and approximately 6% for stays lasting 5 or more days.

There is also consensus that the type of surgery is remembered accurately. Coulter et al. reported that 90% of the surgeries reported during interview were confirmed by general practitioner records. For the remaining 10%, there was a suggestion that the medical record lacked the information. Recall of the surgery date (±1 year) was correct for 87.5%. Recall accuracy was very good for hysterectomy and appendectomy, most likely because these surgeries are both salient and familiar to respondents. Cholecystectomy and oophorectomy were not as well recalled and were subject to some over-reporting. The over-reporting noted in the study of Pagani-Hill and Ross may have been due to the potential incompleteness of the medical records used for comparison. For induced abortions, there was only marginal agreement for the occurrence of surgical abortions as noted by records from a managed care organization, with 19% of women under-reporting their abortion history, 35% over-reporting abortions, and 46% reporting accurately according to their medical record.

There has been a thorough evaluation of the influence of demographic characteristics on re-
reporting of chronic illnesses, although the results are conflicting. The most consistent finding is that recall accuracy decreases with age, although this may be confounded by recall interval, or cohort (generational) effects. Whether gender influences recall accuracy is uncertain. Linet et al. found men to report better than women, independent of age, whereas the Baltimore Study found that women reported better than men, especially in older age groups. There was also a suggestion that the gender and age differences depended upon the disease under investigation, with women over-reporting malignancies and men over-reporting stroke. Unlike chronic illnesses, no difference was found for reporting of hospitalizations by age or gender.

There was a consistent finding that reporting of both illnesses and hospitalizations was better for whites than for nonwhites, but the number of nonwhites in each of the studies was relatively small. Udry et al. also reported racial differences in reporting accuracy, with nonwhites under-reporting surgical abortions more frequently than whites.

Reporting by educational level was equivocal, with one study showing no difference, another study indicating better recall for those with less education, and four studies suggesting more accurate responses for those with a college education. With the exception of the study by Nevitt et al., many studies found that reporting was more complete for self-respondents compared to proxy respondents, including reporting for hospitalizations where the under-reporting was estimated at 7% for self-respondents and 14% for proxies. For self-respondents, those with a poor or fair current health status reported conditions more completely than those with good to excellent health status.

As with the validity of medication data, the validity of disease and hospitalization data obtained by self-report is also influenced by questionnaire design. Providing respondents with a checklist of reasons for visiting the doctor improves recall of all medical visits. This research has also indicated that simpler questions yield better responses than more complex questions, presumably because complex questions require the respondent to first comprehend what is being asked and then provide an answer. Cannell and colleagues reported that increasing the length of the question improves recall because of the longer question’s inherent redundancy and because respondents are provided with more time to develop an answer to the question. However, longer questions could increase the cost of the research and could needlessly tire the respondents.

In summary, whether a person reports an illness during an interview appears to be related to the type of illness, when it occurred, and its saliency, but is less likely to be mediated by demographic characteristics such as age, gender, race, and education. Illnesses that are embarrassing and that do not substantially alter the person’s lifestyle are not reported completely. Likewise, reporting accuracy is dependent upon the consistency of the terminology—from the questionnaire, to the medical records, and finally, what has been communicated to the patient. Although difficult to measure, respondent motivation appears to influence the completeness of reporting as well.

VALIDITY OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY

DRUG AND DIAGNOSIS DATA FROM COMPUTERIZED DATABASES

CONTAINING ADMINISTRATIVE DATA

In addition to conducting ad hoc studies to evaluate drug–disease associations, a variety of computerized, administrative databases are available for pharmacoepidemiology research, as reviewed in Chapters 15 to 24. The strengths and limitations of using each of these databases were also discussed in these chapters. One major advantage of using such databases for pharmacoepidemiologic research is the comparative validity of the drug data in lieu of questionnaire data, where recall bias is always a concern, as previously described.

In general, the databases differ widely on many factors, such as size (e.g., from several hundred thousand to several million covered lives); number of plans included; the type of health service provided and therefore available for analysis (e.g., prescriptions, dental benefits, etc.); whether
out-of-plan claims are included in the main database or resident in other databases; and the timeliness of the data (e.g., the lag for prescriptions is typically in weeks whereas that for outpatient visits may be six or more months) (see also Chapter 25). The databases also differ on the number of demographic variables that are available, with all having age and sex, but few having race, occupation, or a measure of health status.\textsuperscript{103} Because the plans were developed primarily for reimbursement, they all have relatively complete data on health service use and charges.

The drawbacks and limitations of the data systems discussed below are important to keep in mind. Their most critical limitation for pharmacoepidemiologic research is the manner in which health insurance is covered in the United States, typically through the place of employment. If the employer changes plans, which is often done on an annual basis, or the employee changes jobs, the plan no longer covers that employee or his or her family. Thus, the opportunity for longitudinal analyses is hindered by the continual enrollment and disenrollment of plan members.

Along these lines, the most critical elements in the selection of a database for research are the completeness and validity of the data. Completeness is defined as the proportion of all exposures and/or events that occurred in the population covered by the database that appear in the computerized data. Missing subjects, exposures, or events could introduce bias in the study results.\textsuperscript{102} For example, completeness of the drug data might vary by income level if persons with higher incomes and drug co-payments choose to obtain their medications at pharmacies not participating in a prescription plan, which is how pharmacy data are collected. Similarly, a bias may be introduced in the association between a drug and a serious adverse drug reaction if some of the hospitalizations for that adverse reaction are missing from the database.

For the data in an administrative database to be considered valid, those who appear in the computerized files as having a drug exposure or disease should truly have that attribute and those without the exposure or disease should truly \textit{not} have the attribute. Validity and completeness would be determined by comparing the database information with other data sources, such as medical records, administrative or billing records, pharmacy dispensions, procedure logs, etc. In a recent review, Rawson and D’Arcy\textsuperscript{103} used the Saskatchewan Health Databases to describe the different validation analyses that could be conducted to evaluate the usefulness of administrative databases for conducting observational studies. These analyses include reviewing the sources noted above, i.e., medical records, billing records, etc., and suggested that pharmacoepidemiologists assess three others as well: the consistency between data files within the same system, surrogate markers of disease such as insulin for diabetes, and time sequenced relationships, i.e., a diagnostic procedure preceding a surgery.

The availability of validation analyses and consistency checks will be discussed briefly for each database, separately for drug and diagnosis data. For all of the pharmacy dispensation databases that will be described, it is important to realize that none of them can address compliance and drug ingestion, and that over-the-counter medications are not included. More details about each of the databases are given in Chapters 15 to 24.

Drug Data in Administrative Databases

\textit{Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound}

The Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound (GHC) record linked database was developed as a medical and administrative information system, hence its drug data have been considered to be of very high quality for pharmacoepidemiology research (see Chapter 15).

Using the GHC database, West \textit{et al.} found the medical records confirmed that an identical NSAID had been prescribed as was dispensed according to the pharmacy database for 89\% of all persons who received only one dispensation of one NSAID in a 12 year period.\textsuperscript{31} Since the chart review for each NSAID was to begin four weeks prior to the dispensation, some of the remaining 11\% of NSAIDs not documented in the medical record may have been prescribed more than four
weeks prior to their dispensation. Therefore, the pharmacy database appears to be reasonably reliable if one uses medical records for verification.

Other data also provide information on the completeness of the pharmacy database. According to a survey of GHC patients, more than 90% of prescription medications used for pain management, such as opioids, sedatives/muscle relaxants, and anti-inflammatory drugs, were always filled at GHC pharmacies (see Chapter 15). Preliminary results in a case–control study among 936 postmenopausal women indicate that 96% of the women filled all their prescriptions through GHC pharmacies. Among 762 study subjects treated with antidepressant medications in 1996–1997, only 1.5% reported obtaining antidepressants from a non-GHC pharmacy in the prior 3 months (see Chapter 15).

Copayments were introduced for some GHC plans in 1985 and by 1993, nearly all plans required modest copayments for visits and drugs. Prior to drug copayments, 99% of all prescriptions were filled at GHC pharmacies. In contrast, as of 1986, only 89% of prescriptions for those with copayments were filled at GHC, compared to 93% for those without drug copayments. Data from a subsample of GHC enrollees with and without drug copayments indicated that the copayments did not affect the out-of-plan drug dispensation but did have an affect on drug use, especially for discretionary drugs. Despite the copayments, even in the Medicare population where approximately 50% of enrollees did not have pharmacy benefits, the most recent data indicates that 98% continue to use GHC pharmacies for dispensation of prescription medications (see Chapter 15).

Kaiser Permanente

As discussed in Chapter 16, the Pharmacy Information Management System (PIMS) has been operational since 1994 and contains dispensation information from 108 Kaiser pharmacies. Most of the Health Plan members have a pharmacy benefit (90%) with a $10 per drug per month co-payment. Because approximately 15–20% of adult members fill at least some of the prescriptions at non-Kaiser pharmacies, the PIMS is not a complete source of drug dispensing information for all members.

Approximately 90% of Kaiser Permanente Northwest region members have a pharmacy benefit; the remainder who choose to use Kaiser pharmacies are charged at or below current community prices. Computerized drug data are available at Kaiser Permanente Northwest region and most members fill their prescriptions at plan pharmacies (see Chapter 16).

Harvard Pilgrim Health Care

Approximately 90% of Harvard Pilgrim Health Care members have prescription drug benefits that provide a month’s supply of drug for a nominal copayment (see Chapter 17). Drug data may be missing for the 10% of members without drug benefits, for drugs that cost less than the copayment, or for those who do not submit their drug claim for reimbursement (see discussion on Group Health Cooperative above, for the effects of copayments). However, drug exposure can be defined on the basis of either dispensing from affiliated pharmacies or prescribing, as indicated in the encounter records. This is a major advantage, and may permit the identification of drug exposures that otherwise would be missing. No formal evaluations of the completeness of these data have been performed.

UnitedHealth Group

UnitedHealth members are derived from commercial, Medicaid, and Medicare populations (see Chapter 18). Approximately 93% of commercial members and most Medicaid members have drug benefits. Because Medicare pharmacy benefits vary by plan, the completeness of drug exposure data on the elderly is somewhat compromised. Like other health plans with pharmacy copayments, medications that are less expensive than the copayment are likely to be missing from the computerized claims database.
VALIDITY OF PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY DRUG AND DIAGNOSIS DATA

Medicaid

As discussed in Chapter 19, Medicaid databases have been used extensively for pharmacoepidemiology research, mainly due to the validity and completeness of the drug data. Given that Medicaid covers an indigent population, it is less likely that drugs will be purchased outside of the insurance plan. An FDA-funded validation study of one of the Medicaid databases was completed a few years ago, comparing claims data from Michigan and Minnesota to its primary sources, i.e., data from hospitals, physicians, pharmacies, etc.\textsuperscript{107} The results of this study indicated that the demographic and drug data appear to be of extremely high quality. Within pre-established limits, year of birth agreed in 94% of sampled patients, and could not be determined from the medical records in another 2.5%; sex agreed in 95% of patients, and could not be determined from the medical records in another 4%; and the date of a pharmacy’s dispensing of each drug agreed in 97% of sampled prescriptions.

In addition, because computerized drug utilization review programs are required by law of Medicaid programs (see Chapter 31), thousands of patient-specific alerts each month are sent to the physicians and pharmacists who are providing the patients’ medical care. These alerts request that the practitioner verify the accuracy of the billing data, and, if they agree with the basis of the alert, modify their patients’ drug therapy regimen to minimize the risks for a possible drug induced illness. Many of the alerts are responded to by the practitioners involved in writing, and few of their responses indicate that the drug data, upon which the alert was generated, were erroneous.

Finally, as noted earlier in this chapter, Strom \textit{et al.} found that, for 128 cases of Stevens–Johnson syndrome, the Medicaid patient’s inpatient medical record had only 50% of the 234 prescriptions for drugs suspected of causing the syndrome known to be dispensed according to the computerized Medicaid pharmacy claims files.\textsuperscript{34} However, these data probably reflect incompleteness of the medical chart, rather than poor quality claims data on drugs.

Of course, as with the other databases, there is no way to evaluate patient compliance with drugs dispensed, other than examining patterns of refills for chronically used medications, nor are there data on over-the-counter medications.

Saskatchewan Health Plan

The Saskatchewan Health Plan has also been used considerably for pharmacoepidemiology research, as was discussed in Chapter 20. There are separate plans within the system, i.e., the Prescription Drug Plan, the Saskatchewan Hospital Services Data, etc., and each plan is responsible for verifying and validating its data. There are a series of checks on each information field on the claim submitted to the drug plan before the claim is approved for payment. These checks include verification that the person was eligible for benefits under the program and that the drug dispensed was eligible for coverage under the program. The information, once verified, is stored permanently on magnetic tape. In addition, on a regular basis, a sample of paid claims is selected and sent to the beneficiaries for confirmation that the service paid for had been provided and that all the information on the claim was correct.

The Drug Prescription Plan is remarkably complete: all residents except the 9% who have their prescription drug costs paid by another agency are covered by the plan and individuals without coverage can be excluded from studies. In fiscal year 1997–98, approximately 66% of individuals eligible to receive pharmacy benefits actually did so.

Dutch System

In the Netherlands, there is almost universal computerization of pharmacy records enabling the compilation of prescription of drug histories (see Chapter 21). Sickfunds insured patients, i.e., publicly insured individuals, are assigned to a single pharmacy for all reimbursed prescription drugs. The remaining third of the population has coverage by private insurance firms and have the option to use more than one pharmacy. Those who reside in large cities frequently use more than one pharmacy but those who reside in villages typically do not. The investigators using this system believe that the data are of high quality for two reasons.
First, the computerized dispensing records are subject to financial audit, as they are the basis of reimbursement. Second, patients have traditionally used only one pharmacy since there is no economic incentive for between-pharmacy shopping. Comparing currently used prescription drugs as ascertained by home visits to 157 elderly people with those identified by the Dutch pharmacy database, Lau et al. reported that 85% of all drugs in the database and 89% of oral drugs were validated, i.e., they were actually used by the study participants.108

**Tayside Medicines Monitoring Unit (MEMO)**

As explained in Chapter 22, all community prescribing is done by the general practitioners in Scotland. By devising a system for capturing and computerizing general practitioner prescriptions dispensed through community pharmacies, MEMO has developed a prescription drug database. The system is not automated, i.e., the dispensation claims for this pharmacy database are entered manually. There are several checks on the accuracy of the data entry, at the time of assigning the Community Health Index number and after entry of system drug codes, i.e., a proportion of prescriptions are dually entered for quality control. The result of this quality control exercise has not been documented.

**The UK General Practice Research Database**

The information for this database is amassed from general practitioners who have agreed to provide data for research (Chapter 23). The computerized drug file for this data source is based on physician prescribing, not pharmacy dispensations. Thus, a patient may receive a prescription for a medication but choose not to have it filled—the database would have this person as exposed unless algorithms to deal with compliance are developed. Alternatively, a patient may see a specialist who prescribes a medication. Because this system relies on the prescribing done by general practitioners, specialist prescribed medications would not be available in the database until the patient needs to have it refilled, a responsibility of the patient’s general practitioner. There are two potential drawbacks for using this pharmacy database for pharmacoepidemiology: (i) compliance, as drug prescribing does not equate with drug use, and (ii) specialist prescribed medications are not available in the database unless the specialist provides a consultant letter to the patient’s general practitioner. However, compliance does not appear to be a major impediment to using the GPRD for research. As noted in Chapter 23, there is 90% concordance between the prescriptions from the GPRD pharmacy database and the UK Prescription Prescribing Authority, indicating that patients do fill most of the prescriptions written by their general practitioners.

**Diagnoses and Hospitalizations in Administrative Databases**

Unlike the drug data, where most researchers are comfortable with data accuracy and completeness, there is considerable concern regarding the inpatient and outpatient diagnoses in these databases. The accuracy of the outpatient diagnoses is more uncertain than the inpatient diagnoses, for several reasons. Hospitals employ experienced persons to code diagnoses for reimbursement, which may not occur in individual physicians’ offices where outpatient diagnoses are determined. Also, inpatient diagnoses are scrutinized for errors by hospital personnel,109 monitoring that would not typically occur in the outpatient setting.

Systematic errors as a result of diagnostic coding may impact the validity of both inpatient and outpatient diagnostic data. For example, diseases listed in record linked databases are often coded using the International Classification of Disease (ICD) coding system. Poorly defined diseases are difficult to code using the ICD system and “ruleout” codes are unavailable. It is not clear how healthcare plans deal with “ruleout” diagnoses, i.e., are they included in or excluded from the diagnoses in the physician claims files? In addition, the selection of ICD codes for billing purposes may be influenced by reimbursement standards. The potential for abuse of diagnostic codes, especially outpatient codes, may occur when physicians apply to either an insurance carrier or
the government for reimbursement and would be less likely to occur in staff/group model health maintenance organizations such as Group Health Cooperative or Kaiser Permanente. Lastly, ICD version changes may produce systematic errors, the effects of which were discussed in Chapter 24.

Group Health Cooperative of Puget Sound

The Group Health Cooperative (GHC) inpatient diagnostic database has records for all discharges from GHC owned hospitals as well as those from a GHC operated wing of another community hospital (Chapter 15). Another file contains outside billing information for all admissions to hospitals not affiliated with GHC, especially emergency admissions. The data from this outside claims file are not incorporated into the inpatient database but have been available as an annual utilization dataset since June 1989.

In a very recent study, Newton et al. validated the identification of diabetic complications in GHC’s automated diagnostic databases with that available from medical charts for 471 randomly selected diabetics. The sensitivity varied by complication, with the highest sensitivities for the most severe conditions: 95.2% for myocardial infarction, 94.4% for amputation, 90.3% for ischemic heart disease, 91.2% for stroke, 79.2% for osteomyelitis, and 73.5% for retinal problems, all of which agreed to within ±60 days of the database date.

Psaty et al. conducted a study to determine the effects of combined estrogen and progestin therapy on the incidence of acute myocardial infarction (MI) in postmenopausal women. They identified cases from two sources at GHC: (i) the computerized discharge abstracts for the GHC hospitals; and (ii) the GHC claims databases, which as described previously, includes the bills for all services provided by non-GHC physicians and healthcare facilities. To determine the validity of the MI diagnoses and the completeness of case ascertainment, two substudies were conducted. For the validation substudy, the clinical history, cardiac enzyme levels, and electrocardiograms for 60 women who presented to GHC hospitals with an acute MI were selected for review. The records from 40 women who had elevated levels of cardiac enzymes based on the GHC computerized laboratory data and had a cardiac “non-MI” hospitalization were selected for the case ascertainment substudy. These 100 records (60 from substudy 1 and 40 from substudy 2) were reviewed by Psaty and colleagues, blinded to case ascertainment source, in order to classify the events according to accepted criteria for acute MI events. Among the 60 cases from substudy 1, 58 met standard criteria for probable or definite MI. Among the 40 cardiac “non-MI” events from substudy 2, only 3 met criteria for probable or definite MI. The authors concluded that the MI cases in their study were valid and that the case identification methods were reasonably complete at the GHC hospitals.

Kaiser Permanente

Considerable effort has been undertaken to explore the validity of the diagnosis information in Kaiser Permanente in Northern California Kaiser (see Chapter 16). Evaluating the incidence of diarrhea following the use of clindamycin, the investigators identified the frequency of diarrhea diagnoses in medical records compared to that of computer records for all clindamycin users. Out of the approximately 300 persons who received clindamycin, there were ten cases of diarrhea recorded in the medical charts but only two cases recorded in the computer records. The difference was because some of the clinics that prescribed clindamycin did not have a diagnosis of diarrhea available on their data recording form. For other patients, it seemed that some physicians were satisfied to record this new symptom in their notes and did not feel the need to list it as a diagnosis.

The investigators also tested the adequacy of the within-Kaiser Permanente followup by submitting a sample of subjects from the pharmacy cohort to the SEER program, searching for cases of cancer that had been missed (see Chapter 16). Altogether, 15.1% of cancers were missing from their files.

Using the Outpatient Summary Clinical Record (OSCR) database, Levin and colleagues identified 11,357 patients with acid-related disorders (ARDs) in a 6 month period from December 1994 to May 1995. They selected 1511 of these patients for
medical record review to confirm the diagnosis. Overall, 83% of diagnoses were verified, with 90% verification for peptic ulcer disease, 88% for gastroesophageal reflux disease, and 71% for gastritis or dyspepsia. Patients whose diagnoses could not be verified by medical record review often had some other type of ARD and only 5.2% with an OSCR diagnosis of ARD had no evidence of ARD according to the medical record.

The OSCR database is a relatively new database for Northern California Kaiser Permanente, having been initiated in 1994. As more studies are conducted using this data resource to identify individuals with specific disorders, we can expect to see additional medical record verification studies to assess its usefulness for pharmacoepidemiology research.

Harvard Pilgrim Health Care

The Harvard Pilgrim Health Care is nearly unique in that epidemiologic analyses use the same automated records that are used by healthcare providers to deliver care. Therefore, these records are likely to be more complete than information from databases derived from billing diagnoses only. However, they will also suffer from the problems described above regarding the potential incompleteness of medical records.

Researchers at Harvard Pilgrim often compare the information available from the automated medical record with that available as the full-text medical record as part of their quality control during project initiation.\(^1\)\(^1\)\(^4\) For example, in a recent study of asthma, Donahue and colleagues noted a positive predictive value of 86% when comparing the automated and full-text medical record for the availability of an asthma diagnosis.\(^1\)\(^5\) Of the patients who were dispensed asthma medications but who did not have an asthma diagnosis according to the automated medical record, 79% did not have an asthma diagnosis according to the full-text records. A similar quality control analysis was conducted for a study of herpes zoster where the age-specific positive predictive value for diagnoses between the automated and the full-text medical records ranged from 86 to 100%\(^1\)\(^4\) indicating that the automated medical records were sufficient for ascertaining the occurrence of herpes zoster in most instances.

UnitedHealth Group

To date, there has only been one study that has formally evaluated the usefulness of UnitedHealth Group data for pharmacoepidemiologic research. Quam et al. noted that a combination of medical and pharmacy claims was more productive for identifying hypertensive patients (96%) than medical claims (74%) or pharmacy claims (67%) alone as compared with medical record abstraction.\(^1\)\(^6\) Combining a diagnosis with a marker drug has become a very common technique in pharmacoepidemiologic research to assess the correspondence between a database diagnosis as indicated by an ICD-9 code and actual occurrence of disease.

UnitedHealth Group affiliated health plans are typically independent practice associations but have also offered gatekeeper or capitated models in addition to their open access or discounted fee-for-service models. The different financial incentives for the varying model structures may impact the completeness of the diagnosis data available in the databases. For example, in capitated plans, when billing for reimbursement, the individual’s diagnosis may not be provided and as a result, is not available in the research databases. Alternatively, in a discounted fee-for-service plan, there may be a financial incentive to code diagnoses according to the most profitable reimbursement schedules. In using this data source for research, it would be optimal to restrict the study design to members of one model so that differential incentives and policies do not provide an additional source of potential error when using these databases for conducting observational studies.

Medicaid

As noted previously, an FDA-funded validation study of one of the Medicaid programs was completed a few years ago, comparing claims data from Michigan and Minnesota to its primary sources, i.e., data from hospitals, physicians,
pharmacies, etc.\textsuperscript{107} For medical services, diagnostic agreement to at least three digits of the ICD-9-CM code occurred in only 41%, agreement within a broad diagnostic category in another 16% (i.e., same body system and/or type of illness), no diagnosis was present on the provider record in 12%, a single diagnosis in 3%, and there was no agreement in 28%. Clearly, this study raised important doubts about the validity of the diagnosis data in Medicaid files. However, it is important to recognize that the authors defined agreement simply on the basis of ICD coding. Thus, included as “disagreement” would be situations like a diagnosis of myocardial infarction or chest pain in one of the data sources and a diagnosis of angina pectoris in the other. This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 19.

In the last few years, considerable effort has been expended on exploring the accuracy of the diagnoses in these Medicaid claims files. Some of the results are presented in Chapter 19. Typically, there is 95% agreement for hospital diagnoses between Medicaid claims and discharge diagnoses. The validity of the discharge diagnoses recorded on medical charts is much more uncertain. The validity of laboratory driven diagnoses (e.g., neutropenia) is high. However, for diagnoses that are difficult to make correctly or are defined poorly in the ICD-9-CM system, the validity is much poorer. For this, as well as other reasons, obtaining medical records for Medicaid studies is felt to be mandatory (see Chapter 19). Of great importance, therefore, because of the increasing societal concerns about confidentiality (see Chapter 26), at the time of this writing (August 1999), most of the Medicaid programs will no longer allow access to medical records.

\textit{Saskatchewan Health Plan}

Validation substudies were built into the design of several studies using this database (see Chapter 20). Depending upon the condition under study, the results indicated varying levels of confirmation. Thus, validity should be ascertained with each new condition evaluated. There appears to be a very high correlation between the information on the charts and that coded in the hospital services system. For example, using the computerized records, Guess \textit{et al.} identified 95 hospitalizations with a fatal outcome where gastrointestinal bleeding and/or perforation was coded as a diagnosis. Comparing these hospitalizations to written discharge summaries and autopsy reports, 73 (76.8%) met the study’s case definition for these gastrointestinal events.\textsuperscript{35} Other validation studies of hospital diagnoses using clinical charts have confirmed the very good agreement between these two data sources, supporting the use of the hospital separation database for pharmacoepidemiology (see Chapter 20).

Outpatient data are more problematic to validate, as reimbursement varies with diagnosis, and obtaining medical records is much more difficult and costly (see Chapter 20). A recent study assessed the ability of the database to conduct depression related research by comparing diagnoses from the physician services database to diagnoses abstracted from outpatient charts. The agreement was generally good; there was 77% agreement between the two data sources for depression treated with an antidepressant.\textsuperscript{111}

\textit{Dutch System}

The Dutch system does not have direct access to outpatient diagnosis information at the current time (see Chapter 21). Access to diagnostic data is being obtained in a subset of the database using PHARMO to link drug exposure to hospital data. There is no information available on the validity of such data at the present time.

\textit{The Tayside Medicines Monitoring Unit (MEMO)}

To date, MEMO contains only hospital diagnostic data, not outpatient diagnoses. Researchers have conducted validation studies of this data, comparing the coded diagnoses with the actual medical chart data (see Chapter 22). Because of the discrepancies noted in these studies, quality control measures have been instituted to improve the diagnostic accuracy of the computerized data.
The UK General Practice Research Database

As a database derived from the general practitioner’s primary medical record, one expects very complete documentation of diagnostic information based on visits to these clinicians. Two studies have formally evaluated the usefulness of the GPRD for conducting pharmacoepidemiologic research (see Chapter 23). These studies have focused on an early concern regarding the completeness of the database related to diagnoses made by consultants. Jick and colleagues\textsuperscript{117,118} conducted a validation study to assess whether the consultant diagnoses as documented in letters to the patient’s general practitioner actually appeared in the GPRD. The earlier of the two very similar studies indicated that 87% of these diagnoses appeared in the database; the smaller 1992 study showed that 96% of the consultant diagnoses appeared in the database.

These two studies left unknown what proportion of the remaining 52% of patients might have seen a consultant who did not provide a consultant letter to the patient’s general practitioner.

In a similar assessment, Van Staa and Abenhaim evaluated whether hospitalizations were reflected in the GPRD.\textsuperscript{119} Persons could have been selected for study if they had had a hospitalization for hypoglycemia, a hospitalization for conditions other than hypoglycemia, or if they did not have any hospitalizations in the two-year time period. Of the 553 discharge letters for persons with a hypoglycemic diagnosis and the 510 discharge letters for persons with other hospitalizations, 97.5 and 90.0% were noted in the GPRD, respectively. Although persons without a hospitalization in the two-year time period were selected for study, the authors did not state whether any discharge letters were available for this subgroup. Thus, although two validation studies were performed to evaluate the usefulness of the GPRD for pharmacoepidemiology research, there are still unanswered questions that may impact the results of studies performed using this database.

Conclusions

Formal studies are needed to evaluate the validity and completeness of the diagnostic data present in many of the administrative databases. Until the evaluation research is undertaken, substudies would need to be conducted to ensure that accurate and complete information exists for the association of interest prior to using these databases for research. Publication of the results of such studies with the formal research would establish the credibility of the results and provide assurance that the data are of high quality. Regardless, given the appropriate questions raised about the validity of the diagnoses in these databases, validation of these data through direct access to the relevant medical records is probably needed for virtually all such studies.

THE FUTURE

There is increased awareness in the epidemiologic literature of the need for valid data. Gordis revisited data validity in 1979,\textsuperscript{1} an issue that was raised as early as 1958 by Lilienfeld and Graham on the accuracy of self-reported circumcision.\textsuperscript{120} In review, accuracy has typically been assessed by comparing questionnaire data with data from another source that cannot be considered a gold standard. As a result, “verification” rates determined in these studies measure agreement, not validity. Of course, because truly accurate comparison data sources are not readily available (and would be used for research if they were), a measurement of agreement provides the reviewer with some assessment of the validity of the data analyzed in the study, whether it be derived from a questionnaire or from an administrative database.

How do we use what is known about the validity of drug and diagnosis data from questionnaires and computerized administrative databases in planning future research? As this chapter and the data in Table 25.1 of Chapter 25 indicate, there is substantial variability in the sensitivity and specificity of diagnosis and drug data among the different pharmacoepidemiology data resources. Beginning with diagnosis data from ad hoc studies using questionnaires, because the data are collected by self-report, these studies may have excellent information on the primary illness of interest, but data for other contributory illnesses
may be more questionable. If the only source of disease information for ad hoc studies is the patient completed questionnaire, the literature indicates that the sensitivity and specificity of reported illnesses vary by the type of condition and its embarrassment potential, the terminology used to describe the condition, its impact on lifestyle, and respondent characteristics.

Turning to the validity of drug data from questionnaire studies, it is not clear how well or poorly individuals remember drug exposures other than OCs and replacement estrogens and what influences their recall and reporting of those exposures. Based on the OC and estrogen data, we can expect that significant events will be recalled accurately, such as when a specific therapeutic class was begun and the overall duration of its use. More specifically, the data on OC histories indicate that, although the first OC brand is recalled fairly accurately, changes in brands are not recalled very accurately. To extrapolate this finding to other medications, similar omissions may result in ad hoc studies that attempt to obtain complete drug information for therapeutic classes for which considerable drug switching occurs within the class, e.g., antihypertensives or nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. For example, in the methodologic study by West et al., 31 the sensitivity for recalling any NSAID use was 85% compared to 30% for recalling the name of a specific NSAID. These results suggest that a drug database may be a better source of data for studies that require more precise information on individual drugs and, more specifically, switching within a therapeutic class. In addition, drug databases are very useful for research questions requiring the evaluation of patterns of prescription drug use, either within a class or among several different drug classes.

Those who work with administrative databases are aware of their deficiencies and realize that there needs to be more formal evaluation of the data accuracy. This has not occurred to date, with a few exceptions. Acknowledging the potential for selection bias in the validation study of the Medicaid database (see Chapter 19), Lessler and Harris found that the medication data are complete and accurate, but there are significant problems with the diagnostic data. 107 The results of this validation effort identified the need to incorporate medical record review into the study protocol for those who used Medicaid data for research purposes.

The findings reported by Lessler and colleagues apply for pharmacoepidemiologic research using most of the administrative databases described in this chapter. Prescription drug exposure information, which is based on dispensation records, is accurate but requires one very important assumption: that if a person fills the prescription, he or she ingests the drug. Because it may be easier to fill the prescription and then decide later whether or not to use it, dispensation does not equate with ingestion. Researchers have dealt with this problem by requiring two or more dispensions of the same drug in a defined time interval to indicate exposure. There is also the possibility that the prescription is filled by one person and used by a friend or relative. Although this does happen, there is no way to identify how often this occurs and for whom.

In 1990, Avorn stated in an editorial in the journal Epidemiology that the specification of clinical events on computer processed claims forms is a relatively new aspect of medical care and requirements for documentation are changing rapidly. 121 Third party payers are requiring that physicians justify their services for reimbursement purposes. As a result, Avorn speculated that the validity of claims based data will improve by becoming more detailed. Although the end result will be more accurate descriptions of clinical events, the primary driver is cost control, not research. This may be seen as a positive development by researchers, but there may be negative consequences related to billing according to reimbursement levels; the clinician or administrative staff may code more serious conditions because they result in higher reimbursement.

Since the early 1990s, managed care organizations have been faced with increased pressure to generate clinically informative, patient-level data. The pressure is predominantly from market forces, whereby plans must document quality of care and performance to compete successfully for, and retain, subscribers. Thus, these managed care
organizations are amassing encounter-level data, i.e., visits with associated diagnoses, for external assessments of plan operation and performance, not as an attempt to develop research databases. Plan performance is being measured by “report cards” using indicators such as mammography, cervical screening, cholesterol screening, and immunization rates. The best known of these performance indicators is the Health Plan Employer Data and Information Set (HEDIS). HEDIS requires health plans to capture comprehensive data on all enrolled persons that serve as the denominators for calculating rates; the numerators are derived from the patient-level data. As more managed care plans invest in the development of encounter-level databases that have linkages to enrollment and other services primarily for HEDIS requirements, the end result may be that researchers will have a greater choice of data sources for conducting pharmacoepidemiology studies.

One of the most obvious difficulties identified in the pilot project was the data inconsistencies between plans. Reimbursement is a prime motivator for clinicians who work in a fee-for-service environment to submit claims data. Most claims systems require documentation of the diagnosis or procedure for each visit although some plans do not require such documentation. Some plans also allow claims processing staff, many of whom have no clinical training, to complete diagnostic codes. Data from capitated or salaried physicians have problems as well. Because the encounter-level data are not linked to payment, there is no requirement for their submission, processing, or more importantly, quality control. The end result is that data from capitated plans are probably incomplete.

The incompleteness of data from capitated plans was documented in a study by Dresser et al. In describing whether data from automated systems can be used for measuring clinical quality, they noted dramatic differences in the quality measures under review, i.e., cervical, cholesterol, and mammography screening; immunizations; and prenatal care visits as determined by the computerized patient record, manual chart abstraction, and claims based data. In seeking reasons for these discrepancies, the authors suggested that in capitated plans, prenatal care was probably handled as one event rather than as multiple physician visits, which made it seem as if the women in capitated plans did not receive adequate prenatal care. Similarly, under capitation, pediatric immunizations were administered during “well child visits” and, as a result, were not documented as separate events. The healthcare system is undergoing constant change in an effort to reduce costs and improve access. If these changes are in the direction of capitated systems, the data that we have traditionally used for research may become more variable than it currently is with regard to completeness, threatening its usefulness for conducting pharmacoepidemiology studies.

The future of pharmacoepidemiology rests in thoughtful study design using valid data. However, the accessibility of valid data may be variable as a result of the rapidly changing healthcare system and the demands put upon the system. Researchers must carefully consider which data source will be most appropriate with respect to its sensitivity and specificity for evaluating the study question. Recently, there has been a greater focus on data validity, as is evident from reviewing the major epidemiology journals, searching for studies that compare two different data sources for comparison of information on key variables. For studies that use computerized claims, it is incumbent on the researcher to justify the usefulness of the database for the research question under study. As epidemiologists, we must remember that the quality of our results is dependent on the validity of our data.
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INTRODUCTION

Vaccines are among the most cost-effective of public health interventions. Where vaccination is widely practiced, morbidity and mortality attributable to vaccine preventable diseases have declined considerably. No vaccine is perfectly safe or effective, however. With high rates of vaccinations and a low incidence of vaccine preventable diseases, adverse events after vaccination are understandably of concern, and have received increasing attention from the medical community and the public. Unfortunately, this concern has often affected the stability of vaccination programs.

For example, widespread publicity raising questions about the safety of pertussis vaccine in Sweden, the United Kingdom, and Japan during the 1970s led to fewer pertussis vaccinations, which were followed by epidemics of pertussis. Similar concerns in the United States during the early 1980s led to more lawsuits, substantial increases in the price of vaccines, the loss of vaccine manufacturers, and potential deterrence to the development of new vaccines. As other nations reach high vaccine coverages and lower the rates of diseases, vaccine safety issues may also threaten the stability of their programs. Concerns about potential associations between measles–mumps–rubella (MMR) vaccine and inflammatory bowel disease and autism, and between demyelinating disease and hepatitis B vaccine, have recently affected public acceptance of these vaccines in the United Kingdom and France, respectively.

However, as noted in an extensive review in the early 1990s by the Institute of Medicine (IOM) in the United States, current knowledge about vaccine safety is incomplete and the current research capability is limited. Specifically, the IOM identified the following limitations: (i) inadequate understanding of biologic mechanisms underlying adverse events; (ii) insufficient or
inconsistent information from case reports and case series; (iii) inadequate size or length of follow-up of many population based epidemiologic studies; (iv) limitations of existing surveillance systems to provide persuasive evidence of causation; and (v) few experimental studies published relative to the total number of epidemiologic studies published.

The authors of the report concluded that “if research capacity and accomplishments [are] not improved, future reviews of vaccine safety [will be] similarly handicapped.” In subsequent attempts to overcome these gaps and limitation, epidemiology has been vital in providing the scientific methodology for assessing the safety of vaccines. In this chapter, we discuss the major differences between vaccines and other pharmaceutical products in how epidemiology is applied, with respect to both policy and methodology.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED USING PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

**POLICY ISSUES**

Vaccines share many characteristics with other pharmaceutical products, such as their phased development and licensure, but differ fundamentally in many ways. Understanding these differences is important in appreciating the policy context of vaccine safety.

First, a higher standard of safety is generally expected of vaccines. In contrast to most pharmaceutical products, most of which are administered to ill persons for curative purposes, vaccines are generally given to healthy persons to prevent disease. As an extension of the medical maxim “first do no harm,” tolerance of adverse reactions to products given to healthy persons—especially healthy infants—is substantially lower than that to products administered to persons who are already sick. This lower risk tolerance for vaccines may translate into a need to investigate the possible causes of much rarer adverse events following vaccinations than would be acceptable for other pharmaceutical products. For example, events occurring at $\sim 1/10^7$–$1/10^6$ doses like acute encephalopathy after whole-cell pertussis vaccine, Guillain–Barré syndrome (GBS) after swine influenza vaccine, and oral polio vaccine associated paralytic polio (VAPP) are of concern for vaccines, while side-effects are essentially universal for cancer chemotherapy and 10–30% for persons on high dose aspirin therapy experience gastrointestinal symptoms.

The cost and the difficulty of studying events increase with their rarity, however. Furthermore, the ability to provide definitive conclusions from epidemiologic studies of rare events decreases. Attributable risks of the order of $1/10^5$–$1/10^6$ are on the margin of resolution for epidemiologic methods. Perhaps not surprisingly, the bulk of the published literature to date on vaccine safety has been in the form of case reports and case series, rather than controlled studies with adequate power. To assess the possible association between pertussis vaccination and encephalopathy, the British organized a very large case–control study. Enrolled in the study were all children 2 to 35 months of age in England, Scotland, and Wales who were hospitalized for a variety of neurologic illnesses during a 36-month period ($N = 1167$). The finding of a significant association between vaccine and permanent brain damage was based on only seven exposed cases. The validity of this study finding generated much controversy in and out of the courts. Despite considerably more robust data linking GBS with the swine influenza vaccine, subsequent controversy resulted in a court ordered independent reexamination of the data and ultimately partial reperformance of the study, confirming the initial findings.

A higher standard of safety is also required of vaccines because of the large number of persons who are exposed, frequently compelled to do so by law or regulation for public health reasons. Such requirements were implemented by public health authorities in these countries because vaccine preventable diseases are generally highly infectious (e.g., measles, pertussis). Vaccinations protect individual vaccinees and may also confer protection indirectly to other susceptible persons in the
population, by limiting the spread of disease organisms (so called herd immunity). Without such mandates, a “tragedy of the commons” may occur where high vaccine coverage is reached and the individual risk–benefit ratio becomes less than the societal risk–benefit ratio. Persons may attempt to avoid the risks of vaccination while being protected by the herd immunity resulting from others being vaccinated. However, this commons provided by herd immunity may disappear if too many persons avoid vaccination, with the resulting tragedy that outbreaks return. 

Due to the need for almost universal exposure to many vaccines, the medical maxim “first do no harm” applies even more in public health than in clinical medicine, where decisions affect many fewer persons. Inadequately inactivated polio vaccine was administered to about 400,000 persons in the “Cutter incident,” resulting in 260 polio cases. Other incidents similar in tragedy if not in scope have occurred due to errors in production. Recent concerns that polio vaccine contaminated by simian virus 40 may have been received by millions of persons during the 1950s, and that some vaccines may have contained gelatin stabilizers produced in cattle infected with bovine spongiform encephalopathy, further highlight the importance of ensuring the safety of a relatively universal human directed “exposure” such as immunizations. These concerns are the basis for strict regulatory control of vaccines by the FDA.

Very high standards of accuracy and timeliness are needed because vaccine safety studies have extremely narrow margins for error. Unlike many classes of drugs for which other effective therapy may be substituted, vaccines generally have few alternative strains or types (oral and inactivated poliovirus vaccines being the best known exception). The decision to withdraw a vaccine or switch between strains may also have wide ramifications. The circumstances surrounding the use and withdrawal of the 1976 “swine influenza” vaccine have been extensively documented, as have the controversy surrounding the safety of whole-cell pertussis vaccines. In 1992, the United Kingdom withdrew the license of mumps vaccines containing the Urabe strain after studies suggested a high rate of vaccine associated meningitis. The manufacturers subsequently withdrew this product worldwide. This left the countries where the Urabe strain had been the sole mumps vaccine licensed without an alternative vaccine. Therefore, establishing associations of adverse events with vaccines and promptly defining the attributable risks are critical in placing adverse events in the proper risk–benefit perspective. An erroneous association or attributable risk can undermine confidence in a vaccine and have disastrous consequences for vaccine acceptance and disease incidence. On the other hand, denials of association despite accumulating evidence can backfire.

Because many vaccinations are mandated for public health reasons and because no vaccine is perfectly safe, several countries have established compensation programs for persons who may have been injured by vaccination. Accurate assessments of whether adverse events can be caused by specific vaccines is essential to a fair and efficient vaccine injury compensation program. In the United States, for example, the Vaccine Injury Table contains the vaccines, adverse events, and intervals after which no-fault decisions are made in favor of the claimants. Periodic revisions of the Vaccine Injury Table are necessary to reflect the best scientific information on associations between vaccines and adverse events.

Finally, recommendations for use of vaccines represent a dynamic balancing of risks and benefits. Vaccine safety monitoring is necessary to weigh this balance accurately. When diseases are close to eradication, data on complications due to vaccine relative to that of disease may lead to discontinuation or decreased use of the vaccine, as was done with smallpox vaccine and with the shift to either inactivated polio or sequential inactivated/live oral polio vaccine schedules. Few other vaccine preventable diseases are likely to be eradicated in the near future, however. Most immunizations will therefore be needed indefinitely, with their attendant adverse reactions and potential for loss of public confidence. Research in vaccine safety can help to distinguish true vaccine reactions from coincidental events, estimate their attributable risk, identify risk factors that may permit development of valid contraindications, and, if
the pathophysiologic mechanism becomes known, develop safer vaccines.\textsuperscript{42–46} Equally importantly, such research demonstrates a commitment to reducing disease from all causes, vaccine-preventable and vaccine-induced, and may help to maintain public confidence in immunizations and the credibility of immunization programs.

**CLINICAL ISSUES**

Vaccines, like other pharmaceutical products, undergo extensive safety and efficacy evaluations in the laboratory, in animals, and in phased human clinical trials before licensure.\textsuperscript{30} Phase I trials usually number their subjects in the tens and can only detect extremely common adverse events. Phase II trials generally enroll hundreds of subjects. When carefully coordinated, as in the comparative infant DTaP trials, important conclusions such as the relationship between concentration of antigen, number of vaccine components, formulation technique, effect of successive doses, and profile of common reactions (i.e., reactogenicity) can be drawn. Such studies can affect the choice of the candidate vaccine chosen for Phase III.\textsuperscript{47,48} Sample sizes for phase III vaccine trials are generally larger than those for drugs. In the most extreme example, more than 200 000 vaccinees were enrolled in the famous Francis field trial of inactivated Salk poliovirus vaccine.\textsuperscript{49} More recent conjugate *Haemophilus influenzae* type b vaccine trials have enrolled 30 000–50 000 vaccinees.\textsuperscript{30,51} Nevertheless, sample sizes for phase III vaccine trials are principally based on efficacy considerations. Inferences on safety are drawn to the extent possible based on the sample size ($\sim 10^2–10^3$) and the duration of observation (often <30 days).\textsuperscript{47} This usually means that observations of the common local and systemic reactions (e.g., injection site swelling, fever, fussiness) have been possible. Due to the experimental randomized, double-blind, placebo controlled design of clinical trials, inferences on the causal relationship of an adverse event with the vaccine are then relatively straightforward.\textsuperscript{9,10}

Better standardization of safety evaluations in phase III trials is still needed, however, so that safety data across trials and vaccines can be compared. In the recently completed phase III trials for infant DTaP, a standard case definition ironically was developed for efficacy, but not for safety—the main reason for the development of DTaP.\textsuperscript{52} For example, definitions of high fever across trials varied by the temperature (39.5 versus 40.5 °C), the mode of measurement (oral versus rectal), and time after vaccination measured (48 versus 72 hours).\textsuperscript{53} Major differences in detected rates of hypotonic–hyporesponsive episodes after the same whole-cell pertussis vaccine used in the Swedish and Italian trials highlight the difficulty of standardizing assessment of rarer events across cultures and health systems, however.\textsuperscript{54} The finding of delayed excess mortality in some recipients of high titer measles vaccine has also raised difficult questions about design of future vaccine trials.\textsuperscript{55,56} Given the need to better appreciate safety of vaccines given universally to healthy babies and the methodologic difficulties of assessing safety postlicensure, some have argued that larger experimental trials may be needed prelicensure to better assess vaccine safety.\textsuperscript{57,58}

**METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

**SIGNAL GENERATION**

Because vaccines are biologic rather than chemical in nature, variation in rate of adverse events by manufacturer or even lot might be expected.\textsuperscript{59,60} This variation in biologic response suggests that other unusual adverse events cannot be ruled out. Surveillance systems need to detect such potential new aberrations in a timely manner. Some factors make identification of true signals difficult, however. Many vaccines are administered early in life, at a time when the baseline risk is constantly evolving and may be affected by other perinatal events. Second, if vaccination rates are high, by definition, most persons with adverse medical events will have had a history of vaccination. Distinguishing causal from coincidental events on a case-by-case basis may not be possible.
STANDARD DEFINITIONS AND EVALUATIVE PROTOCOLS

Case definitions can be used at the time of reporting or at the time of analysis to improve specificity. Applying definitions at the time of reporting may reduce the number of reports processed and lower the operating cost (e.g., Canadian Vaccine Associated Adverse Event (VAAE)). The sensitivity of surveillance may be lower and the difficulty of assessing misclassification greater, however. Alternatively, if the reporting form is open ended, this may increase the sensitivity of surveillance but only at the cost of sorting through many nonspecific reports (e.g., US Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS)). Definitions can be applied at the time of analysis. But substantial variation in diagnostic workup and description of events makes classification difficult without additional followup information, which in turn is usually costly.

ASSESSMENT OF CAUSALITY

Assessing whether any adverse event was actually caused by vaccine is generally not possible unless a vaccine-specific clinical syndrome (e.g., recurrent injection site abscesses or repeat hair loss with each vaccination) or a vaccine-specific laboratory finding (e.g., isolation of mumps vaccine virus from the cerebrospinal fluid of a patient with meningitis or high tetanus titers in persons with severe local reactions) can be identified. Whenever the adverse event can also occur in the absence of vaccination, epidemiologic studies are necessary to assess whether vaccinated persons are at higher risk than unvaccinated persons. When multiple vaccinations are administered simultaneously, determining whether events are attributable to particular antigens or one of several combinations is frequently difficult if not impossible.

EXPOSURE

Misclassification of exposure status may occur if there is poor documentation of vaccinations. Such misdocumentation is more likely if there is substantial mobility between healthcare providers. Documentation of exposure status has been fairly good through school age, due to entry requirements linked to vaccinations. Substantial difficulty may be encountered in ascertaining vaccination status in older persons, however. In the United States, recent and likely future increases in number of licensed vaccines, combined with high mobility between immunization providers (up to 25% annually) due to changes in health insurance plans, are leading to a potential confusing maze of vaccination history misclassifications.

For example, even though an infant may have actually received the diphtheria–tetanus–acellular pertussis (DTaP) or the combined diphtheria–tetanus–pertussis–haemophilus influenzae type b (DTPH) vaccine, the immunization card recorder may, due to habit, erroneously record “DTP”. An infant may have started their immunization series with one provider who uses DTaP vaccine primarily, but due to change in parental health insurance, switched to another provider to complete the series, who uses DTPH primarily. Add in the complexity of whether other vaccines such as polio or hepatitis B vaccines are administered simultaneously or not, at different dose series in the schedule and at different ages, and the number of permutations of vaccine exposures that need assessment for potential safety concerns quickly becomes formidable.

OUTCOME

Because the events being assessed are frequently extremely rare (e.g., encephalopathy after pertussis vaccination), identifying enough cases for a meaningful interpretation of study findings can be a major challenge. Even when technically feasible, a study may be logistically infeasible or the findings likely to be too inconclusive to justify the resources. This was the conclusion of an Institute of Medicine committee that evaluated whether the UK’s National Childhood Encephalopathy Study should be replicated in the United States. The difficulty with adequate study power is further compounded in assessing rare events in populations less frequently exposed (e.g., vaccines given...
to travelers or subpopulations with special indications). Studies of Guillain–Barré Syndrome (GBS) after influenza vaccination required the active surveillance of over 20 million persons for several months.\textsuperscript{70,71}

Many adverse events hypothesized to be caused by vaccines are poorly defined clinical syndromes that are diagnoses of exclusion (e.g., encephalopathy,\textsuperscript{12} GBS,\textsuperscript{13} chronic fatigue syndrome,\textsuperscript{72} sudden infant death syndrome (SIDS)).\textsuperscript{73} Our scientific understanding of these diseases is frequently limited in the absence of vaccination, let alone with vaccination. This poor understanding plus the lack of diagnostic tools for these syndromes severely limits clinical and epidemiologic studies of these illnesses. Furthermore, in highly vaccinated populations, risk interval analyses may be the only epidemiologic study design possible (see Solutions—Analyses). Determining the onset of illness is critical in calculating the risk interval. For certain hypothesized vaccine adverse events, there is no known biological mechanism to allow definition of the risk interval. Diseases with insidious or delayed onset such as autism,\textsuperscript{74} inflammatory bowel disease,\textsuperscript{74} and multiple sclerosis\textsuperscript{8} do not permit determination of the risk interval and are therefore also difficult to study.

**ANALYSES, CONFOUNDING, AND BIAS**

The possibility that vaccines could be responsible for myriad outcomes leads one to consider cohort studies in which events and person times at risk are enumerated in strata formed by various age group and exposure windows. When outcomes are rare, however, cohort studies can be prohibitively expensive, unless all requisite information is automated and linkable.

Because adverse events are rare, studies typically sample the source population of the cases, assess the exposure status of both groups, and use the ratio of exposure odds among the cases and controls to estimate the risk associated with exposure. Because childhood vaccines are generally administered on schedule and children may have developmental dispositions to particular events, the factor age may confound exposure–outcome relations (e.g., diphtheria–tetanus–pertussis (DTP) vaccine and febrile seizures or SIDS).\textsuperscript{75} Consequently, such factors must be controlled, generally by matching, as well as in the analysis.

More difficult to control are factors leading to delayed vaccination or nonvaccination.\textsuperscript{76} Such factors (e.g., low socioeconomic status) may confound studies of vaccine adverse events and lead to underestimates of the true relative risks. The extent of bias introduced by confounding can be examined as a function of six variables (Table 40.1). Relatively little is known about the nature, frequency, and implications of these variables, however. Vaccination rates are generally high in populations in which vaccine adverse events have become a concern. Those who have not been vaccinated may substantially differ in risks for adverse events from the vaccinated population and thus be unsuitable as a reference group in epidemiologic studies. The unvaccinated may be persons for whom vaccination is medically contraindicated, or they may have other risks (e.g., they may be members of low socioeconomic groups) for the outcome being studied.\textsuperscript{76}

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

**LOGISTICAL APPROACHES**

Spontaneous Reporting Systems

Informal or formal passive surveillance or spontaneous reporting systems (SRS) have been the
cornerstone of most vaccine safety monitoring systems, because of their relative low cost of operations. The national reporting of vaccine adverse events can be done through the same reporting channels as those used for other adverse drug reactions, as is the practice in France, New Zealand, Sweden, and the United Kingdom (see also Chapters 10 and 11). An increasing number of countries are collecting safety data specific to vaccinations either with a reporting forms and/or surveillance systems different from the drug safety monitoring systems. These countries include Australia, Canada, Denmark, India, Italy, Mexico, Netherlands, Sao Paulo State in Brazil, and the United States. Vaccine manufacturers also maintain SRS for their products, which are usually forwarded subsequently to appropriate national regulatory authorities.

Because of their importance in infectious disease control, a significant proportion of vaccines in many countries is purchased or administered by national public health authorities. For example, the public sector (federal, state, and local governments) in coordination with the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDCs), purchases over half of the childhood vaccines administered in the US. In many developing countries, the Ministry of Health in conjunction with WHO’s Expanded Program on Immunizations (EPI) administers almost all vaccines. Potential vaccine adverse events commonly are first reported to the healthcare providers who administered the vaccine. In many countries, such health workers also participate in surveillance for other diseases. These health authorities (e.g., CDCs) therefore commonly lead or collaborate with the vaccine licensure and regulatory agency (e.g., the US FDA) in developing vaccine adverse event reporting systems. A similar model is followed in Canada.

The US Experience

The US National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986 mandated for the first time that health providers report certain adverse events after immunizations (Table 40.2). The Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) was implemented jointly by the CDC and FDA in 1990 to provide an unified national focus for collection of all reports of clinically significant adverse events, including but not limited to those mandated for reporting. The creation of VAERS also provided an opportunity to correct some shortcomings of the predecessor CDC Monitoring System for Adverse Events Following Immunizations (MSAEFI) and FDA Adverse Drug Reaction System.

To increase sensitivity, the VAERS form is designed to permit narrative descriptions of

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaccine/toxoid</th>
<th>Event interval from vaccination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tetanus in any combination; DTaP, DTP, DTP–HiB, DT, Td, TT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Anaphylaxis or anaphylactic shock</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Brachial neuritis</td>
<td>28 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td>See package insert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pertussis in any combination; DTaP, DTP, DTP–HiB, P</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Anaphylaxis or anaphylactic shock</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Encephalopathy (or encephalitis)</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td>See package insert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
Table 40.2.  Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vaccine/toxoid</th>
<th>Event interval from vaccination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Measles, mumps and rubella in any combination; MMR, MR, M, R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Anaphylaxis or anaphylactic shock</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Encephalopathy (or encephalitis)</td>
<td>15 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubella in any combination; MMR, MR, R</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Chronic arthritis</td>
<td>42 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measles in any combination; MMR, MR, M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Thrombocytopenic purpura</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Vaccine-strain measles viral infection in an immunodeficient recipient</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral polio (OPV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Paralytic polio</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—in a nonimmunodeficient recipient</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—in an immunodeficient recipient</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—in a vaccine associated community case</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Vaccine-strain polio viral infection</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—in a nonimmunodeficient recipient</td>
<td>30 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—in an immunodeficient recipient</td>
<td>6 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—in a vaccine associated community case</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inactivated polio (IPV)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Anaphylaxis or anaphylactic shock</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hepatitis B</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Anaphylaxis or anaphylactic shock</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Any sequela (including death) of above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hemophilus influenza type b</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Early-onset Hib disease</td>
<td>7 days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Any sequela (including death) of the above events</td>
<td>No limit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varicella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Events described in manufacturer’s package insert as contraindications to additional doses of vaccine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Reportable Events Table (RET) reflects what is reportable by law (42 USC 300aa-25) to the Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS) including conditions found in the manufacturers package insert. In addition, individuals are encouraged to report any clinically significant or unexpected events (even if you are not certain the vaccine caused the event) for any vaccine, whether or not it is listed on the RET. Manufacturers are also required by regulation (21CFR 600.80) to report to the VAERS program all adverse events made known to them for any vaccine.

Effective 24 March 1997.
adverse events. All persons, including patients or their parents and not just health professionals, are permitted to report to VAERS, especially clinically significant events. (However, as of 2000, <5% of VAERS reports come from parents.) There are no restrictions set on interval between vaccination and onset of illness nor that a patient have medical care to be reported. Annual reminders about VAERS are mailed to physicians likely to administer vaccines. The form is preaddressed and postage paid so that after completion it can be folded and mailed. Report forms, assistance in completing the form, or answers to other questions about the VAERS are available by calling a 24-hour toll-free telephone number (1-800-822-7967) and on the web (www.vaers.org).

A contractor, under CDC and FDA supervision, distributes, collects, codes (using the Coding Symbols for a Thesaurus of Adverse Reaction Terms (COSTART)), and enters VAERS reports into a database. Reporters of selected serious events receive written requests from VAERS (60 days after vaccination and 1 year after vaccination) for information about the patient’s recovery. CDC and FDA have on-line access to the VAERS database and focus their efforts on analytical tasks of interest to the respective agencies. These data (minus personal identifiers) are also available to the public. Since its inception in late 1990, approximately 10,000 VAERS reports have been received annually, ~20% of which are defined as serious (death, life-threatening illness, disability, hospitalization). Due to this volume, followup by a health professional currently occurs on all reports of deaths and only selected serious events of interest.

Other National Experiences

Several other countries also have substantial experience with passive surveillance for vaccine safety. In 1987, Canada developed the Vaccine Associated Adverse Event (VAAE) reporting system. Reporting forms have checkoff boxes for specific events with accompanying case definitions. Provision is also made for an “other” category. To supplement the VAAE, an active, pediatric hospital based surveillance system that searches all admissions for possible relationships to immunizations known as the Immunization Monitoring Program—Active (IMPACT) has been operational since 1990. An Advisory Committee on Causality Assessment, consisting of a panel of experts, has also been formed to review the serious VAAE reports. The Netherlands also convenes an annual panel to categorize their reports, which are then published. The UK and most members of the former Commonwealth use the “yellow card” system, where a reporting form is attached to officially issued prescription pads. Data on adverse drug (including vaccine) events from about 40 nations are compiled by the WHO Collaborating Center for International Drug Monitoring in Uppsala. Preliminary efforts are also underway to “harmonize” collection of postlicensure safety data across nations.

A field guide for implementation of monitoring of Adverse Events Following Immunizations (AEFI) has recently been developed by the WHO. The primary focus is on detection of correctable programmatic errors such as injection site abscesses (suggestive of inadequate sterilization) and development of a rapid response/assessment team for clusters of more serious events (e.g., toxic shock syndrome from contamination of vaccine vials or deaths from confusing other medications for vaccines). As of 1997, however, only 12 (14%) of 88 national EPIs had such a system in place.

Classifications, Case Definitions, and Evaluative Protocols

Vaccine adverse events can be classified by frequency (common, rare), extent (local, systemic), severity (hospitalization, disability, death), causality, and preventability (intrinsic to vaccine, faulty production, faulty administration). Wilson developed the first classification system with focus on errors of production (e.g., bacterial, viral, toxin contamination) and administration (e.g., nonsterile apparatus). A more recent classification divides adverse events after vaccinations into the following groups:

(i) vaccine induced, due to the intrinsic characteristic of the vaccine preparation and the individual response of the vaccinee,
these events would not have occurred without vaccination (e.g., vaccine associated paralytic poliomyelitis); (ii) vaccine poteniated, would have occurred anyway, but were precipitated by the vaccination (e.g., first febrile seizure in a predisposed child); (iii) programmatic error, due to technical errors in vaccine preparation, handling, or administration; (iv) coincidental, associated temporally with vaccination by chance or due to underlying illness. The distinction between vaccine induced and vaccine poteniated has recently been clarified for DTP and DT vaccine and infantile spasm, perhaps best observed in Figure 40.1.104

Definitions of certain vaccine adverse events have been developed in Brazil,90 Canada,105 India,87 and the Netherlands.93 To improve comparability of data across reporting systems, the Workshop on Standardization of Definitions for Post-Marketing Surveillance of Adverse Vaccine Reactions was held in October 1991. Definitions for approximately 20 local, central nervous system, and other adverse reactions were adopted by the workshop participants.105 These case definitions are printed on the Canadian VAAE form as guidance for what should be reported. The proportion of VAAE reports meeting the case definition criteria has increased from 69 to 87%.61 Alternatively, in a more open reporting system such as VAERS, these definitions can be applied to reports to develop a case series for further investigation.

Because the simultaneous administration of vaccines is common and multiple adverse events may be reported, the Dutch system further classifies reports as (i) simple—a single vaccine injection and a single major reaction, (ii) compound—a single vaccine injection and more than one major reaction (each major reaction is counted separately), (iii) multiple—>1 vaccine injection in the same person and one major reaction, or (iv) compound-multiple—>1 vaccine injection in the same person and >1 major reaction.89

To further improve the quality of SRS data and maximize its utility as a potential disease registry, protocols for the clinical evaluation of selected reported serious events of interest (e.g., deaths) can be developed. Such protocols could then be sent to the physicians who report such events to help standardize the evaluation of these patients. In time, a “case series” might then be available for further review that might aid our understanding of the event.52

Assessment of Causality

The formal process of assessing causality of an adverse event and an exposure (e.g., vaccine) is a complex process that can be considered in terms of the answers to three questions: (i) can it?, (ii) did it?, and (iii) will it?.106 The answer to can it? was the focus of the Institute of Medicine reviews.9,10 It is usually based on population level inferences drawn from epidemiologic studies and the following considerations: (i) strength of association, (ii) analytic bias, (iii) biologic gradient/dose–response, (iv) statistical significance, (v) consistency, and (vi) biologic plausibility/coherence.107

For individual case reports, the did it? question is more relevant. If the answer is yes, then can it? is also answered in the affirmative. It is natural to suspect vaccine to be the cause when an adverse event occurs in temporal association following vaccination. To base causal inference purely on temporal association, however, is to fall for the logical fallacy of post hoc ergo propter hoc (“after this, therefore because of this”).10 Information

---

**Figure 40.1.** Three theoretical models of the temporal relationship between immunization and an adverse effect: (i) association, the risk exceeds 1 at all time windows postimmunization; (2) temporal shift, the risk exceeds 1 initially then falls below 1 but comes back to 1 eventually, such that the area under the curve above and below 1 is similar; and (3) no effect, the risk stays around 1.104
useful for assessing causality in individual case reports include (i) previous general experience with vaccine (e.g., duration of licensure, number of vaccinees, has similar events been observed among other vaccinees or nonvaccinees, do animal models exist to test vaccine as a cause), (ii) alternative etiologies, (iii) individual characteristics of the vaccinee that may increase the risk of the adverse event, (iv) timing of events, (v) characteristics of the event (e.g., laboratory findings), (vi) rechallenge\textsuperscript{108,109} (see also Chapter 32).

When a vaccine \textit{can} cause an adverse event, the \textit{will it?} refers to the probability that an individual will experience the event, or for populations, the proportion that will experience it (i.e., the attributable risk). These data are critical for developing valid contraindications for the individuals at high risk and risk–benefit policy decisions for the population. The \textit{will it?} is usually very difficult to answer, however, as it can only be answered based on epidemiologic studies.\textsuperscript{10} Furthermore, the sample sizes of such studies may be large enough to establish whether vaccine can cause a given event but yet inadequate to stratify by subgroups to examine risk factors that can help delineate potential contraindications.

Specific adverse events can usually be said to be caused by a specific vaccine if the event is associated with an unique (i) laboratory finding and/or (ii) clinical syndrome. For example, Urabe mumps vaccine virus was implicated as a cause of aseptic meningitis because mumps virus was isolated from the cerebrospinal fluid (a normally sterile body site) and was shown to be vaccine and not wild strain by genetic sequencing.\textsuperscript{10} Demonstrations that severe local swelling following tetanus toxoid tended to occur in persons with extremely high levels of circulating antitoxin (due to excessive tetanus boosters) support the proposed mechanism of an Arthus reaction.\textsuperscript{56} Acute flaccid paralysis is almost pathognomonic of polio. In countries such as the US, where wild polio virus is unlikely to be circulating, someone who develops an illness clinically compatible with polio shortly after receipt (or contact with a recipient) of oral polio vaccine is likely to be a case of vaccine associated paralytic polio.\textsuperscript{14,111} Causality can also usually be inferred if a specific clinical finding occurs after each vaccination (i.e., challenge–rechallenge), as in cases of alopecia after hepatitis B vaccination.\textsuperscript{64}

If the adverse event is known to be associated with the wild vaccine preventable disease (e.g., acute arthritis and idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura after rubella), its association with the attenuated vaccine at a lesser frequency is not surprising.\textsuperscript{9} This relationship is not universal, however, as pregnant women who receive rubella vaccine, unlike those exposed to wild rubella, have not been shown to have illness compatible with congenital rubella syndrome.\textsuperscript{112} Clustering of events in time after vaccination can also suggest causation if “reporting bias” can be ruled out. Such bias may occur as parents and doctors are more likely to link adverse events with vaccinations the shorter the time interval between the two. Febrile seizures associated with killed bacterial vaccines tend to occur within a day of vaccination while those due to live viral vaccines are delayed by about a week due to viral replication.\textsuperscript{40,113} Onset of GBS after the swine influenza vaccination was delayed up to 6 weeks as autoimmune demyelination is a slower process.\textsuperscript{71} The pattern of the risk by time since vaccination may suggest that the relationship to vaccination is more one of temporal shift or triggering of an underlying susceptibility (Figure 40.1).\textsuperscript{104,114}

Unfortunately, most serious reported vaccine adverse events lack these unique features that permit easy inferences on causality. Adverse events such as autism, chronic fatigue syndrome, sudden infant death syndrome, seizures, and GBS either have multiple or as yet unknown etiologies. For these outcomes, vaccination is clearly never the principal “cause” \textit{per se}. Otherwise, given the large number of vaccinations, we would see many more such cases. The question is more whether the association with vaccination can either potentiate the outcome or induce it in a “high risk” subpopulation; or alternatively, is association purely coincidental and vaccination is blamed because it is a highly distinctive, painful, and memorable event usually followed by some true local and systemic vaccine reactions like injection site swelling and fever. For such adverse events, possible link with vaccination is usually based on a
process of elimination, ruling out all other possible causes. Unfortunately, even after this is done, only a relatively unsatisfying nondefinitive conclusion can be drawn on any individual case report because other etiologies may not yet be discovered. The uncertainty in attributing vaccine as a cause of individual cases of illness has led to much confusion, controversy, and litigation. With nonunique clinical syndromes or laboratory findings, epidemiologic studies have to be relied upon to ascertain likelihood of association and attributable fraction.

Another approach to causality is to assume that adverse events that occur within particular periods after vaccination are caused by the vaccine, irrespective of whether they were truly causal or just coincidental. This approach to causality is used in some vaccine injury compensation programs to simplify the proceedings. In some countries, expert committees of specialists in relevant disciplines (e.g., pediatrics, infectious disease, neurology) review reports. This “global introspection” approach has been used in both Canada and the Netherlands to classify reports of adverse events in gradations of probable association to vaccination (see also Chapter 32). Classifications are based on the reported symptoms, the interval between vaccination and onset of symptoms, and a set of case definitions. Because opinions of experts play such a major role in this form of causality assessment, the results are less satisfying than results obtained from rigorously conducted scientific studies.

The global introspection method can be improved by the use of branched logic tree algorithms or the Bayesian analysis (see also Chapter 32). In both, each expert’s degree of belief in the key considerations of the plausibility of vaccine causation is made explicit and measured quantitatively. The algorithm requires the assessor to answer a series of questions which are then scored. The Bayesian analysis calculates the posterior probability of vaccine causation based on applying prior probability that the vaccine can cause the adverse event to the facts of an individual case. Advantages of these approaches include accountability and the possibility of recalculating the probability of causation if the quality of data improves. Disadvantages include, however, the resources required and the frequent lack of information to construct the prior probabilities. This approach was piloted in a review of MSAEFI cases and used by the Institute of Medicine to review case reports, but has not yet been adopted for routine use.

**Signal Detection**

Identifying a potential new vaccine safety problem (“signal”) requires a mix of clinical intuition and epidemiologic expertise. As indicated above, unusual clinical features and/or clustering by time or space usually tip off that something may be awry. For example, report by a concerned mother of recurrent alopecia after successive hepatitis B vaccinations in her child led to a review of VAERS data that showed several other similar reports. No illness other than GBS was reported more commonly in the second and third week than in the first week after swine influenza vaccination, leading to further validation studies. Efforts are under way to explore whether use of artificial intelligence/neural networks may aid signal detection.

Mass immunization campaigns may make it easier to detect adverse events following vaccination than routine immunization activities. The very large number of doses administered over a well defined short time result either in more prominent clusters of vaccine adverse events, or by their absence demonstrate their safety. Surveillance of vaccine adverse events around the time of mass immunization campaigns have therefore been extremely useful in generating signals, either positive (e.g., GBS with swine influenza vaccine, GBS after oral polio vaccine, allergic reactions after Japanese encephalitis vaccine, neuropathy after rubella vaccine) or negative (e.g., events after meningococcal vaccine, events after measles–rubella vaccine, GBS after measles).

Such signals still require validation, however, since some, after more careful scientific studies, turn out to be incorrect (e.g., GBS after oral polio vaccine). The above situations aside, ascertaining “signals” from spontaneous reports requires taking an epidemiologic approach. Various means
to automate “screening for signals” using spontaneous reports have been tried to date without great success,\(^{128,129}\) largely due to inherent methodologic problems of spontaneous reports (see above, and Chapters 10 and 11).

Lessons Learned to Date

Several lessons are beginning to emerge from spontaneous reporting systems such as VAERS.\(^{130}\) VAERS has successfully detected unrecognized potential reactions and obtained data to evaluate whether these events are causally linked to vaccines.\(^{131}\) VAERS has also successfully served as a source of cases for further investigation of idiopathic thrombocytopenic purpura after MMR,\(^{131}\) anaphylaxis after MMR,\(^{132}\) syncope after immunization,\(^{133}\) and intussusception after rotavirus vaccine.\(^{134}\) VAERS has been of great value for answering routine public queries such as “has adverse event X ever been reported after vaccine Y?” When denominator data on doses are available from other sources, VAERS can be used to evaluate changes in reporting rates over time or when new vaccines replace old vaccines. For example, VAERS showed that after millions of doses had been distributed, reporting rates for serious events such as hospitalization and seizures after DTap in toddlers was one-third that after DTP.\(^{135}\) VAERS is also currently the only surveillance system which covers the entire US population with data available on a relatively timely basis. It is, therefore, the major means available currently to detect possible new, unusual, or extremely rare adverse events, including whether certain lots of vaccines are associated with unusually high rates of adverse events.\(^{63,136}\) VAERS’ predecessor system collected information on personal and family history of convulsions and neurologic illness on all reports. This permitted comparison of the relative proportion of such histories in persons reporting convulsions versus those reporting other nonneurologic adverse events in a crude case–control study.\(^{41}\)

The reporting efficiency or sensitivity of a spontaneous reporting system can be estimated if expected rates of adverse events generated from carefully executed studies are available. A higher proportion of serious events such as seizures that follow vaccinations are more likely to be reported to VAERS than milder events such as rash or delayed events requiring laboratory assessment such as thrombocytopenic purpura after measles–mumps–rubella vaccination (Table 40.3).\(^{137}\) Although formal evaluation has been limited, the probability that a serious event reported to VAERS has been accurately diagnosed (i.e., predictive value positive) is likely to be high. Of 26 patients reported to VAERS who developed GBS after influenza vaccination during the 1990–1991 season, whose hospital charts were reviewed by an independent panel of neurologists blinded to immunization status, the diagnosis of GBS was confirmed in 22 (85%).\(^{70}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 40.3. Reporting efficiencies for selected outcomes: two passive surveillance systems for vaccine adverse events, US</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adverse event</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccine associated polio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seizures</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypotonic–hyporesponsive episodes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thrombocytopenia</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) MSAEF = Monitoring System for Adverse Events Following Immunizations; VAERS = Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System.

\(^{b}\) Public and private sector information is missing on these cases.

Source: \(^{137}\)
Despite the above uses, spontaneous reporting systems for drug and vaccine safety have a number of major methodologic weaknesses (see also Chapters 10 and 11). Under-, biased, and incomplete reporting are inherent to all such spontaneous reporting systems and potential safety concerns may be missed.\textsuperscript{118,137} Aseptic meningitis associated with the Urabe mumps vaccine strain, for example, was not detected by spontaneous reporting systems in most countries.\textsuperscript{34,40} Most importantly, however, such spontaneous reports represent less than one-fourth of the information necessary to complete an epidemiologic analysis of a vaccine adverse event.\textsuperscript{3}

Use of data from spontaneous reporting systems are further complicated by lack of specific clinical syndromes being evaluated, absence of laboratory confirmation of many of the events, and simultaneous vaccinations which make determination of which vaccine might have caused the event difficult.

Current spontaneous reporting systems are also prone to detecting increases in adverse events that are not true increases. Instead, they may be due to an increase in (i) reporting efficiency, (ii) vaccine coverage, or (iii) other causes of the adverse event. Spontaneous reporting systems are usually unable to sort out causally related from coincidentally related adverse events because of inherent methodologic weaknesses. For example, an increase in GBS reports after 1993–94 influenza vaccination was found to be due to improvements in vaccine coverage and increases in GBS independent of vaccination.\textsuperscript{71} An increased reporting rate of an adverse event following one hepatitis B vaccine compared to a second brand was likely due to differential distribution of brands in the public versus private sectors, which have differential VAERS reporting rates (higher in the public sector).\textsuperscript{138}

These studies highlight the crude nature of the “signal” generated by VAERS and the difficulty in ascertaining which vaccine safety concerns warrant further investigation. Not only are there problems with reporting efficiency and potentially biased reporting, but also precise denominators for calculating true rates are usually not available. Instead, crude measures such as doses distributed must often be used as surrogates for doses administered. Due to these difficulties, the requirement for manufacturers to notify FDA whenever they receive increased number of reports has recently been dropped.\textsuperscript{139}

Historically, most countries have relied on spontaneous reporting systems alone for post-licensure vaccine safety monitoring. The inadequacy of scientific information on vaccine safety found by the Institute of Medicine is related to these methodologic weaknesses inherent to spontaneous reporting systems. The establishment of new population based immunization registries, in which all vaccines administered are entered, may provide more timely submission of spontaneous reports as well as more accurate and specific denominators for doses administered, providing information necessary to calculate more accurate adverse event rates.\textsuperscript{140–142}

**Clinical Trials**

**Post Licensure Clinical Trials**

Immunization programs are in a dynamic relationship with their target diseases.\textsuperscript{143} To optimize vaccine use, clinical trials may be conducted after vaccine licensure to assess the effects of changes in vaccine formulation,\textsuperscript{144} vaccine strain,\textsuperscript{145} age at vaccination,\textsuperscript{146} the number and timing of vaccine doses,\textsuperscript{147} simultaneous administration,\textsuperscript{148} and interchangeability of vaccines from different manufacturers\textsuperscript{149} on vaccine safety and immunogenicity. The importance of such trials was demonstrated when studies showed an unanticipated differential mortality among recipients of high and regular titer measles vaccine in developing countries,\textsuperscript{56} albeit lower than that among unvaccinated children.\textsuperscript{150} This finding resulted in a change in recommendations by WHO for the use of such vaccines.\textsuperscript{151} The development of automated large linked databases (see below) may permit improved ability to monitor the safety of such postlicensure changes in vaccine use without necessarily conducting such clinical trials.
Phase IV Surveillance Studies

To improve the ability to detect adverse events that are not detected during prelicensure trials, most recently licensed vaccines in developed countries have undergone formal phase IV surveillance studies on populations with sample sizes of \( \sim 10^6 \). These studies have usually used cohorts in health maintenance organizations supplemented by diary or telephone interview. These methods were first extensively used after the licensure of polysaccharide and conjugated Hib vaccines.\(^{152-154}\) Postlicensure studies on safety and efficacy of infant DTaP are also continuing.\(^{53}\) Extensive phase IV evaluation of varicella vaccine includes multiyear evaluation for disease incidence, herpes zoster, and a pregnancy registry.\(^{155,156}\) Requirements for phase IV evaluation have even been extended to less frequently used vaccines, such as Japanese encephalitis vaccine.\(^{157}\) A large postlicensure randomized trial for this vaccine was also completed in China recently to improve the available data on its short term safety.\(^{158}\) Phase IV data, combined with VAERS to signal the association between rotavirus vaccination and intussusception.\(^{134}\)

Ad Hoc Epidemiologic Studies

Historically, ad hoc epidemiologic studies have been employed to assess signals of potential adverse events generated by spontaneous reporting systems, the medical literature, or other mechanisms. Traditional analyses of secular trends (ecologic studies), cohort, and case-control studies have been used to gather information necessary to measure or compare risks of an adverse event following vaccination with risk in the absence of vaccination. Occasionally, data collected for other study outcomes may be reanalyzed to see whether vaccine was causally related or not.\(^{159,160}\) Examples of ad hoc followup studies to signals of vaccine safety issues are the investigations of poliomyelitis after inactivated\(^{26}\) and oral polio vaccines,\(^{111}\) SIDS after DTP vaccination,\(^{9,73,161-163}\) encephalopathy after DTP vaccination,\(^{17,164}\) meningoencephalitis after mumps vaccination,\(^{33,65}\) injection site abscesses postvaccination,\(^{165}\) GBS after influenza vaccine,\(^{13,70,71}\) and intussusception after rotavirus vaccine.\(^{134}\) Many such studies have been compiled and reviewed recently by the Institute of Medicine,\(^{9,10}\) While automated large linked databases (see below) provide a more cost-effective and flexible framework for hypothesis testing, ad hoc epidemiologic studies may still be needed in countries without automated large linked databases, or where the power of the automated large linked databases may be inadequate to answer a question in a timely manner.\(^{71,113}\)

Automated Large-Linked Databases

Ad hoc epidemiologic studies of vaccine safety, while potentially informative about vaccine causality, are costly, time consuming, and usually limited to assessment of a single event. As with drug safety research, efforts have increasingly turned to record linkage between automated exposure (immunization records in lieu of pharmacy) files and outcome medical files. The CDC participated in two pilot vaccine safety studies using automated large linked databases in Medicaid and HMO populations, respectively, during the late 1980s.\(^{166-169}\) While validating this approach for vaccine safety studies and providing scientifically rigorous results, these studies were limited by their relatively small sample sizes, retrospective design, and focus on the most severe reactions.\(^9\) These limitations, the constraints of VAERS, and the recognition of the need for improved monitoring of vaccine safety, prompted the CDC to initiate the Vaccine Safety Datalink (VSD) project in 1990.\(^{113}\) To help overcome the previously identified shortcomings, the VSD study prospectively collects vaccination, medical outcome (e.g., hospital discharge, outpatient visits, emergency room visits, and deaths), and covariate data (e.g., birth certificates, census) under joint protocol at multiple HMOs. Selection of staff model prepaid health plans also minimized potential biases for more severe outcomes resulting from data generated from fee-for-service claims.

The VSD has conducted active surveillance on approximately 500 000 children from birth through 6 years of age (75 000 birth cohort, approximately 2% of US population in these age groups) whose parents (or legal guardians) were enrolled in one of four staff model HMOs.\(^{113}\)
Expansion to include all age groups in the study is now complete. Each site encodes their patients’ clinical data with unique study identifiers before sending data to CDC annually for merging and analysis, thereby preserving patient confidentiality. Depending on the background incidence of the medical event, the frequency of specific vaccinations, and their relative risk, events attributable to vaccinations as rare as one per 100,000 doses should be detectable within five years.

The VSD focused its initial efforts on examining potential associations between immunizations and 34 serious neurologic, allergic, hematologic, infectious, inflammatory, and metabolic conditions. The VSD is also being used to test new ad hoc vaccine safety hypotheses. These may arise from the medical literature, from VAERS, from changes in immunization schedules, or introduction of new vaccines. The diversity in vaccination practices at the four HMOs permit useful contrasts in safety experiences. The size of the VSD population may also permit separation of the risks associated with individual vaccines from those associated with vaccine combinations, whether given in the same syringe or simultaneously at different body sites. Such studies will be especially valuable in view of the new combined pediatric vaccines currently in development.

Should the VSD identify an adverse event as being caused by vaccine, data on the incidence rate attributable to vaccine will be available, permitting accurate risk–benefit assessment by both the public and policymakers. Subgroup analyses may permit identification of risk factors for adverse events, which may be useful in identifying contraindications to vaccinations. Data from VSD should be useful in calculating background rates of illnesses in the absence of vaccination that can serve as expected rates when comparing rates of vaccine associated events in SRS. Also, incidence rates of vaccine associated adverse event derived from VSD can be used to evaluate the sensitivity of passive reporting systems. The VSD data can also

Table 40.4. Example of method for risk interval analysis of association between a universally recommended three-dose vaccine (with few unvaccinated persons for comparison) and adverse event

1. Define “risk interval” for adverse event after vaccination (e.g., 30 days after each dose).
2. Partition observation time for each child in the study into periods within and outside of risk intervals, and sum respectively (e.g., for a child observed for 365 days during which three doses of vaccine were received, total risk interval time = 3 × 30 person days = 90 person days; total nonrisk interval time = 365 – 90 = 275 person days).

-o--------x-=======-x-======-x-========-/------>
Birth Dose 1 Dose 2 Dose 3 365 days

3. Add up (i) total risk interval and non-risk interval observation times for each child in the study (= person time observed; for mathematical convenience, the example below uses 100 and 1000 person months of observation), and (ii) adverse events occurring in each time period to complete a 2 × 2 table (for illustration, the example below uses three and 10 cases):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adverse event yes</th>
<th>Person time observed (months)</th>
<th>Incidence rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vaccinated in risk interval yes</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vaccinated in risk interval no</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Incidence rate adverse event\_vaccinated = 3/100 = 0.03
Incidence rate adverse event\_unvaccinated = 10/1000 = 0.01
Relative risk vaccinated : unvaccinated = 0.03/0.01 = 3.0
Probability finding due to chance: <5/100
Conclusion: there is a threefold increase in risk for developing the adverse event within the interval following vaccination
aid the FDA in their evaluation of VAERS data and the Vaccine Injury Compensation Program in determinations of what events should be compensated as vaccine “injuries.”

Amid these promises, a few caveats are appropriate. While diverse, the population in the four HMOs currently in the VSD is not wholly representative of the US in terms of geography or socioeconomic status. More importantly, due to the high coverage attained in the HMOs for most vaccines, few nonvaccinated controls are available. The VSD must therefore rely predominantly on some type of “risk interval” analysis (Table 40.4). The capability of this approach to assess associations between vaccination and adverse events with delayed or insidious onset (e.g., autism) is limited. The VSD also cannot easily assess adverse events not currently captured in existing HMO databases, either because they do not result in a healthcare consultation (e.g., fever) or because the data are not automated (e.g., x-ray results). The current VSD is also not large enough to examine the risk of extremely rare events such as Guillain–Barré syndrome after each season’s influenza vaccine. Finally, because the VSD relies on epidemiologic methods, it may not successfully control for confounding and bias in each analysis and inferences on causality may be limited.

Despite these potential shortcomings, the VSD provides a new, essential, powerful, and cost-effective complement to our ongoing evaluations of vaccine safety in the US. In view of the methodologic and logistical advantages offered by automated large linked databases, the UK and Canada have also developed automated large linked databases linking immunization registries with medical files. Because of the relatively limited number of vaccines used worldwide and the costs associated with establishing and operating them, it is unlikely that all countries will be able to or need to establish their own automated large linked databases. However, they should be able to draw upon the scientific base established by the existing automated large linked databases for vaccine safety and, if the need arises, conduct ad hoc epidemiologic studies.

**METHODOLOGIC APPROACHES**

**Exposures**

In countries where vaccinations are required for entry into daycare, kindergarten, schools, and/or colleges, documentation (e.g., vaccination cards or medical records) is usually available and of good quality for most infants and children. In the US, documentation of the vaccine type, date of vaccination, manufacturer, lot number, and vaccine provider in a permanent medical record has been required since 1988 for certain routine childhood vaccinations. This requirement, along with improvements in technology, has prompted many organizations to automate their vaccination records.

Although vaccination records can be manually retrieved and reviewed for any study design, automated vaccination records greatly ease the logistics of organizing such studies. Whenever sampling is necessary in the design, automated records also ease the selection of samples that are representative. Assessing the accuracy of such automated data is important in any study. When persons receive their vaccinations from a variety of providers (as they commonly do in the US), their exposure status may be misclassified. This error could be minimized if a centralized National Vaccination Registry were implemented to track all vaccinations from birth. Such a registry has been implemented in most of the UK and regional registries are under development in the US.

The availability and quality of vaccination records generally decrease as people age. Some vaccines for older people (e.g., tetanus–diphtheria boosters in emergency rooms, hepatitis B vaccinations for healthcare workers) may be administered in settings other than primary healthcare. In addition to review of primary medical records, interviews or a review of data from secondary vaccination sites may therefore be necessary to accurately ascertain exposure status in adverse event studies of these vaccines in older populations. To increase the accuracy of exposure data in a study of adverse reactions to plasma derived hepatitis B vaccine among Alaskan natives, medical records
from the village, the hospital, and the regional public health nurse, in addition to the automated vaccination record, were reviewed. Recent studies of GBS and influenza vaccine relied on both patient/family interview and validation with health provider for exposure ascertainment. Interestingly, reliance on provider verification may lead to underascertainment of vaccination status, either due to poor record keeping or to concerns about liability in vaccine safety studies.

To further improve the accuracy and efficiency of transfer of vaccine identification information from the vaccine vial to either automated or paper immunization records, the CDC has organized the Vaccine Identification Standards Initiative (VISI). Working with a coalition of industry, immunization providers, and other federal agencies, the initiative seeks to develop standards for (i) abbreviations for new vaccine antigens and vaccine manufacturers, (ii) peel-off labels, (iii) barcodes, (iv) lot numbers, (v) immunization records, and (vi) presentation of key identifier information on vaccine packaging (à la nutrition label). All of these should contribute to minimizing exposure misclassification for any vaccine related study.

**Outcomes**

To ensure both high sensitivity and specificity, a sequential approach is usually required. The initial screening definition is highly sensitive but less specific. For a study of neurologic illness following DTP immunization, a combination of hospitalization codes and prescriptions of any drug that might have been used to treat such illnesses were used for case finding. The medical records of these patients are then reviewed (sometimes after chart abstraction) to see if they meet the study case definition. In difficult diagnoses such as GBS, a panel of specialists may also be asked to review the charts after exposure status has been masked.

Should the concern be a new previously undescribed syndrome, analyses of existing databases may be inadequate. A recent study of “Gulf War syndrome” and vaccinations relied on a thorough interview of patients meeting a de novo complex case definition before linkage with vaccination history.

**Analyses**

Different analytical strategies are needed depending on how a vaccine is used in the population. For low frequency use vaccines for which the vaccinees are generally no different than the nonvaccinees (e.g., travel vaccines), comparison between the two groups with adequate matching or adjustment is relatively straightforward. For vaccines that are almost universally recommended (e.g., most childhood vaccines), however, too few persons are “unexposed” to compare adverse outcomes among vaccinated and unvaccinated (i.e., typical cohort study) or vaccination among cases and noncases (i.e., typical case–control study). Therefore, an alternative definition of “exposure” is used in most postlicensure vaccine safety studies. A “window of risk” after vaccination for the specific event of interest is defined a priori based on current understanding of the most plausible biologic mechanism should such an association actually exist. Incidence rates inside (“exposed”) and outside (“unexposed”) the risk window (or recent exposures among cases and noncases) are then compared. To allow for the possibility of delayed reactions, multiple risk windows may be defined (e.g., 1, 2–3, 4–7, 8–14, 15–30, 31 or more days; or even longer for autoimmune demyelinating diseases such as GBS), preferably a priori. Several calculations typically should be performed by using different intervals, or windows, to identify the window in which the rate ratio or other estimate of risk is greatest. For evaluating hypothesized causes and for establishing new hypotheses, this information is invaluable.

Conditional logistic regression, which should be used for matched case–control studies, can also be used in case series studies. Unlike conventional analyses of studies involving matching, to which only discordant pairs contribute, all exposed cases contribute to case series analyses, increasing their potential efficiency. Because cases serve as their own controls, moreover, this design controls within-individual variation perfectly.

Most members of populations under active surveillance contribute little to analysis because few experience adverse events, but the per capita cost of information is more or less constant. Thus,
investigators sometimes use the case–cohort method, which requires information only about the cases and samples of the population to which they belong, the latter of which can be used repeatedly with different outcomes (i.e., fewer people must be studied). Efficiency is even further increased for the case crossover method (i.e., there are no controls). Both of these designs are discussed in more detail in Chapter 44).

Confounding and Bias

Once a universally recommended vaccine is licensed, it is usually unethical to withhold the vaccine in subsequent randomized trials as a means to minimize confounding and bias. If further assessment of short term safety is critical, however, it may be possible to do a randomized trial postlicensure in certain settings, as long the controls also receive the vaccine after a relatively short observation period.\textsuperscript{158}

To minimize recall bias, it is best to rely on data sources that gather information on outcomes and vaccine exposure independently. This is one of the major advantages of record linkage studies.\textsuperscript{113,182} In a recent study of GBS and influenza vaccine, for example, all GBS cases meeting predefined case definition were ascertained from statewide hospital discharge datasets.\textsuperscript{71} The cases were then interviewed for a range of risk factors for GBS, including vaccination. Only when patients reported that they were vaccinated were they asked which type. The patients are unaware of the specific hypothesis being evaluated (influenza vaccine and GBS) throughout the interview. A separate random digit dialing survey was conducted to ascertain the comparison influenza vaccination rate in the general population.

Control for potential confounders may be addressed routinely by obtaining the necessary information and adjusting for them at the time of analysis. For the CDC Vaccine Safety Datalink project, sources of covariates include birth certificates and the decennial census (linked via postal zip codes of the children). Alternatively, the case series design\textsuperscript{181} or assessment of unusual clustering in onset intervals may provide additional information on possible causal association with minimal confounding. The case series design focuses on changes in disease events through time within individuals, with measured changes pooled over individuals. It has nearly as much statistical power as the full cohort approach if a high percentage of the population has been vaccinated. Since only known vaccinated cases are used in the analysis, there is no exposure misclassification bias. On the negative side, the case series design is still subject to confounding by “within-person” variables that change through time. For example, no epidemiologic method yet can address the “healthy child” bias resulting from avoiding vaccinations during transient illness. Also, research questions may not be limited to events that are time varying (e.g., gender, race/ethnicity).\textsuperscript{182}

THE FUTURE

Many persons look to vaccines as the “magic bullet” solution to a number of public health problems that range from acquired immunodeficiency syndrome (AIDS) to malaria. Rapid advances in biotechnology have brought the promise of these new vaccines closer to reality.\textsuperscript{183} Novel delivery technologies such as DNA vaccines and new adjuvants are being explored to permit more antigens to be combined, reducing the number of injections.\textsuperscript{172} These changes in vaccines and vaccine delivery will continue to provide additional challenges in proving their safety to an increasingly skeptical and risk averse public, however. Combined with methodologic difficulties associated with studying rare, delayed, or insidious vaccine safety allegations, well organized anti-vaccine organizations, media eagerness for controversy,\textsuperscript{184} and relatively rare individual encounters with VPD, vaccine safety concerns are unlikely “to go away” in mature immunization programs.\textsuperscript{185}

Concomitantly, vaccine safety concerns have also “emerged” as an issue in EPI’s developing countries.\textsuperscript{100} The EZ measles vaccine mortality experience highlighted the importance of improving the quality control and evaluating the safety of vaccines used in developing countries.\textsuperscript{56,186} Plans to eliminate neonatal tetanus and measles via National Immunization Days where millions of
persons receive parenteral immunizations over a period of days\textsuperscript{187} pose substantial challenges to ensuring injection safety.\textsuperscript{188}

The increasing computerization and centralization of healthcare services may facilitate epidemiologic studies to reassure the public about the safety of future vaccines. Like other arenas concerned with safety (e.g. aviation, food, blood), a comprehensive “systems” design approach to minimize risk and promote safety is needed. Developments in biotechnology may continue to offer better safer vaccines. The availability of computerized immunization registries may permit optimal implementation of immunization policies at the individual level, ensuring receipt of indicated vaccines, avoiding extra vaccinations, and assuring appropriate observance of valid contraindications to vaccinations. On a longer horizon, vaccine safety research combined with genetic epidemiology may permit better characterization of risk groups for vaccine reactions.\textsuperscript{189,190} Integrated with immunization registries for both children and adults, this may ultimately offer the possibility for better prevention of both vaccine preventable and vaccine induced diseases.

REFERENCES


41

Special Methodological Issues in Pharmacoepidemiology Studies of Devices*

ROSELIE A. BRIGHT
Epidemiology Branch, Division of Postmarket Surveillance, Office of Surveillance and Biometrics, Center for Devices and Radiological Health, Food and Drug Administration, USA

INTRODUCTION

Early in 1990, the FDA Center for Devices and Radiological Health (CDRH) received reports of two rapid deaths associated with barium enemas (used to provide x-ray contrast media for colon imaging). The interesting feature was that the middle-aged women, in different parts of the country, had suffered their reactions after the barium enema cuffs were put in place, but before barium had been introduced. The reactions were clearly consistent with anaphylaxis, although in one instance the reporter called it a vasovagal reaction. The medical community was already familiar with allergy to barium, and the Center for Drug Evaluation and Research (CDER) already had many such reports on hand. However, in these two cases, the only potential allergens were the lubricants or the cuffs.

The scope of investigation was widened to look at all reports associated with barium enemas in the files of both centers and the manufacturer of the cuff, which held most of the market. FDA had received, from all sources, reports of five deaths and 28 very serious reactions, all of an allergic nature (except for one death due to aspiration of oral barium). All of the deaths occurred in 1989 or 1990. There was a preponderance of middle-aged female victims.

A literature search found a fatality immediately after and attributed to a single contrast colonic infusion reported in 1989,¹ and a 1990 publication reporting seven reactions among 6918 barium enema infusions at one hospital from January

---

* The opinions expressed in this chapter are those of the author and do not necessarily represent the official policies of the US Food and Drug Administration.

1987 to March 1989, attributed to some unknown new additive in the barium enema infusion.²

At this point, the evidence implicated the cuff rather than the lubricant. However, there were still many other questions to consider:

- **Was the problem specific to the manufacturer, the cuff, or the material?**
- **Could the problem be mitigated by changing manufacturing procedures?**
- **If the cuff were to be recalled, would substitute products be available?**
- **Was this a trend or an isolated, fixable problem?**
- **What were the public health implications?**

During the 1990s, it became apparent that the culprit was latex, which is more or less allergenic depending on the manufacturing process.³ Humans contact latex in many different devices, including condoms, diaphragms, anesthetic gas masks (many reactions attributed to gas may have been to latex, instead), airway tubes, catheter tip occluders, dental dams, tympanostomy tubes, and gloves. Allergic particles have readier access to immune cells through surgical wounds or mucous membranes than through intact skin, and one can see that many of the listed devices have direct contact with the former.³ Furthermore, the healthcare profession and patient population had been experiencing greater latex exposure throughout the 1980s with the introduction of universal precautions⁴ and promotion of condom use. The stage had been set for a serious latex allergy problem.

So, where are the numbers? How many people are or were exposed to latex? What is or was the extent of exposure? Does anatomical site of exposure matter in the way that was hypothesized? What are the rates of mild, moderate, severe, and fatal reactions? Are recommendations that have been made (elimination of powder from gloves, reduction of latex in parts of devices that have body contact) having a mitigating effect? Medical device epidemiology has begun to answer these questions.³⁴⁸ The rest of this chapter will present some of the challenges to, and successes of, good medical device epidemiology, emphasizing features that differ from medications epidemiology.

### CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

### WHAT ARE MEDICAL DEVICES?

The term “medical devices” covers such a broad range of entities that it is difficult to define simply. However, in a regulated environment, one way of defining medical devices is to resort to a legal definition. The definition, for example, given by the United States Congress is:

> The term “device”... means an instrument, apparatus, implement, machine, contrivance, implant, in vitro reagent, or other similar or related article, including any component, part, or accessory, which is—recognized in the official National Formulary, or the United States Pharmacopeia, or any supplement to them, intended for the use in the diagnosis of disease or other conditions, or in the cure, mitigation, treatment, or prevention of disease, in man or other animals, or intended to affect the structure or function of the body of man or other animals, and which does not achieve its primary intended purposes through chemical action within or on the body of man or other animals and which is not dependent upon being metabolized for the achievement of its primary intended purposes.⁹

The definition offered by the European Union is somewhat different:

(a) “medical device” means any instrument, apparatus, appliance, material or other article, whether used alone or in combination, including the software necessary for its proper application intended by the manufacturer to be used for human beings for the purpose of:

- **diagnosis, prevention, monitoring, treatment or alleviation of disease,**
- **diagnosis, monitoring, treatment, alleviation of or compensation for an injury or handicap,**
● investigation, replacement or modification of the anatomy or of a physiological process,
● control of conception,
and which does not achieve its principal intended action in or on the human body by pharmacological, immunological or metabolic means, but which may be assisted in its function by such means;
(b) “accessory” means an article which whilst not being a device is intended specifically by its manufacturer to be used together with a device to enable it to be used in accordance with the use of the device intended by the manufacturer of the device;
(c) “device used for in vitro diagnosis” means any device which is a reagent, reagent product, kit, instrument, equipment or system, whether used alone or in combination, intended by the manufacturer to be used in vitro for the examination of samples derived from the human body with a view to providing information on the physiological state, state of health or disease, or congenital abnormality thereof...

The Canadian government’s definition of a medical device is

any article, instrument, apparatus, or contrivance, including a component, part or accessory of one, that is manufactured, sold or represented for use in:
(a) the diagnosis, treatment, mitigation, or prevention of a disease, disorder or abnormal physical state, or its symptoms, in a human being;
(b) the restoration, correction or modification of a body function or the body structure of a human being;
(c) the diagnosis of pregnancy in human beings, or
(d) the care of a human being during pregnancy and at and after the birth of the child including care of the child.

It includes a contraceptive device but does not include a drug ...

In Australia, the regulatory definition is

...therapeutic goods consisting of an instrument, apparatus, appliance material or other article (whether used alone or in combination), together with any accessories or software required for its proper function, which does not achieve its principal intended action by pharmacological, chemical immunological or metabolic means though it may be assisted in its function by such means.

The Japanese government’s definition is

...instruments and apparatus which are intended for use in the diagnosis, cure or prevention of diseases in man or animals, or intended to affect the structure or any function of the body of man or other animals, and which are designated by Cabinet Order.

Although the wording and level of detail is quite different for these five definitions, the overall meaning is obviously quite similar.

The main regulatory purpose of categorizing medical devices is to vary the level of premarket information required before marketing may begin, according to the potential risk posed by the particular device. This is an approach used in the European Union, Japan, United States, Canada, and Australia, and encouraged by the Global Harmonization Task Force. The highest level of control is to require randomized controlled clinical trials before applying for approval to market the device. This is, obviously, similar to the expectations for a new drug. In contrast, if a new device is very similar to several that have already been cleared for marketing, then the device sponsor may need to demonstrate equivalence to the earlier devices, or attest that the device conforms with an international standard recognized by the regulatory agency. Further, a very large category of devices receives minimal regulation; the sponsor simply must register itself and the device with the agency and is expected to follow general guidelines. Devices may be moved to less regulated categories over time as clinical experience with its use expands, depending on the comfort of the agency with the regulatory history of the device.

Once a device is marketed, sponsors must follow Good Manufacturing Practices and monitor the safety of their products. They are subject to inspections by the regulatory agency or a proxy. The safety of most devices is monitored by keeping
a complaint file and forwarding the worst types of adverse event to the regulatory agency. More intensive efforts involve bench testing returned products, offering free replacements for returned products, and sponsoring of registries of users.

Regulatory agencies participating in the Global Harmonization Task Force monitor the safety of devices by reviewing adverse event reports from users, sponsors, or the scientific literature. The US FDA also has a regulatory tool unique among members of the Global Harmonization Task Force; it may require the sponsor of a marketed device to conduct a “postmarketing surveillance study” of safety and/or effectiveness, if warranted by public health considerations.

The nature of the medical device manufacturers themselves also varies extensively, from ownership by large pharmaceutical companies, to long term establishment as large developers of cutting-edge technology, to very small entrepreneurial operations. This variation in size naturally results in variations in safety and epidemiology expertise, as well. The large number of small companies involved is reflected organizationally at the US FDA by the Division of Small Manufacturers’ Assistance in the Center for Devices and Radiological Health, which is charged with helping small companies understand regulatory requirements.

While governments classify medical devices for the sake of varying the level of control over different categories, epidemiologists may find other classification schemes to be more useful, e.g., the different use patterns of devices (see Table 41.1). Distinct epidemiologic problems, in the sense of hypotheses to be tested and challenges to study validity, derive from each of these categorizations. Table 41.2 shows a classification scheme that combines elements of the use patterns above, with consequent study hypotheses that might be entertained, challenges to validity, and example devices. There are several types of study hypothesis that are appropriate for epidemiologic studies of medical devices. Short term safety and efficacy issues apply to all the device categories listed in Table 41.2, except for diagnostics. Long term safety and efficacy hypotheses readily apply to reused and durable equipment, and long term implants. Human error issues related to proper use, and perhaps maintenance, pertain to all types of device except long term implants. The consequences of device reuse are worth studying for equipment (whether designed to be reused or durable, or reused in spite of being designed for single use only). Finally, hypotheses regarding the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 41.1. Spectrum of different use patterns for devices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>—Number of patients exposed to a particular device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• one</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Number of times a particular device is used</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• once</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• multiple times</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Extent of direct patient exposure to the device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• none (as in laboratory analysis of a specimen)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• intact skin contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• intact mucous membrane contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• intact endothelium contact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• penetration of tissue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• penetration by energy or particles emitted by the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>device (such as ultrasound or x-rays)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Nature of device effect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• mechanical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• electronic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• chemical (e.g., diagnostic devices)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Permanence of a particular device</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• used for a few minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• used for a few days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• used up to a year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• used several years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• “permanent” (used over 10 years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Setting of device use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• emergency vehicle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• long term care facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• private home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>—Device user</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• doctoral care provider such as physician or dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• nurse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• other allied health professional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• family member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• patient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
validity of the test result are appropriate for diagnostic devices.

**INDIVIDUAL SAFETY**

Because randomized clinical trials have the power to demonstrate clinically significant effi-
cacy (a positive effect must be demonstrated in a substantial proportion of patients), but little
test power to assure safety (because adverse effects affect a much smaller fraction of patients), safety
has become largely the domain of epidemiology. The body of safety data includes private studies
by the device manufacturer, adverse event...
reports (redacted portions are publicly available), and epidemiologic studies reported in the scientific literature. Only high risk and some other new devices are subject to a clinical trial requirement. Devices that are similar to well established devices only have to be demonstrated as meeting a standard, or being similar to a marketed device; if the predicate device was never subjected to a randomized clinical trial (in the US, many devices marketed before the 1976 Medical Device Amendment have never been subjected to the requirement), gaps in human safety and efficacy data exist. Furthermore, the definition of “similar” is such that incremental changes are allowed; after an accumulation of such changes, the latest device may be quite different from the original predicate device.

PUBLIC HEALTH IMPACT

If epidemiologic evidence points to a safety problem with a device, further information is then required to evaluate the public health impact of various options, such as doing nothing, taking an action, or perhaps taking an alternative action. Available epidemiologic evidence of both the effectiveness and extent of device use, as well as the availability of alternative therapies, have a bearing on the decision. For example, gloves are made of either latex or vinyl; vinyl is less likely to cause allergic reactions, but latex is far more flexible and durable and is still used in most situations.20

DIFFERENTIAL EFFECTS

Another problem that is amenable to epidemiology is the study of the differential effects of devices by some cofactor, such as gender or a concomitant therapy. In other words, epidemiology can help identify patients at higher risk of complications from a device. Two examples are the higher risk of ventilator-associated pneumonia in men and in patients receiving a paralyzing agent.20

METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE SOLVED BY PHARMACOEPIEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

RECOGNITION AND CHARACTERIZATION OF NEW SYNDROMES OR ADVERSE EVENTS

Sometimes, as with the latex barium enema cuff example, the discovery of a device’s role in causing a well recognized outcome is difficult, partly because devices are generally taken to be benign. At other times, a new outcome must be defined. An example is First Use Syndrome occurring during hemodialysis. As the name implies, this syndrome only occurs when a device, such as a dialysis membrane (which may be routinely reused many times), is brand new.21,22 Where controversy exists over the establishment of a definition of a new syndrome, as is the case with the possibility of a new connective tissue disease that may be associated with silicone gel breast implants, the situation is even murkier.23 In all of these circumstances, epidemiologists can contribute to improved methodology to detect and characterize adverse events and syndromes.

INDIVIDUAL EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT

For epidemiologists, it is a given that a determination of exposure and outcome status at the level of the individual study subject is critical to making confident assessments of the relationship between the two. The general ways to do this for medical device studies are to consult a medical record or to ask the subject.

Almost all of the challenges to medical device study validity that are listed in Table 41.2 relate to individual exposure assessment. The brand, model, or exact unit used for a particular patient are generally not explicitly written for disposable or durable equipment or short term implants, but the type of device can generally be inferred from the recorded procedures and knowledge of standard care. For instance, a barium enema cuff is likely to have been used for a barium enema procedure, but the brand and model will not have been recorded.
In the case of durable equipment, if only one was available at the facility, it is possible to obtain detailed information on the device. Equipment reused by the same patient may be well recorded in a clinic setting and less well recorded in a home setting. Another problem to be considered with equipment and short term implants is that device systems (such as for hemodialysis or ventilation) are constructed of many different components, and may include disposable, reused, or durable equipment, a diagnostic device, or a short term implant. These components may or may not be the same brand; this is relevant because the performance of a particular component may be affected by the brands of other components. Assessing the critical device for the study hypothesis may require accounting for all the other components in the device system. A piece of durable equipment may present this exposure assessment dilemma in itself; over time, it may have acquired updated parts from the same or a different manufacturer during repair or refurbishment.

For long term implants, operating room notes and patient data generally have detailed data on the implant. Registries have been formed for a variety of implants, although patients may resist registration if the implant is of a socially sensitive nature. Long term followup, furthermore, can be challenging, especially if the physician following the patient is not the physician inserting the implant.

In the case of diagnostic devices, patient charts generally record the results but not the device used. Depending on the test, home test kit use may go unrecorded.

Prospective studies to confirm the methodology of inferring the particulars of device use need to be conducted, especially in light of the fact that there is no national or international nomenclature for devices that is comparable to the National Drug Code for drugs. The current schemes, FDA’s Medical Device Product Code and ECRI’s Universal Medical Device Nomenclature System™, are based on intended use and do not specify brand, model, or other details that may be relevant, such as size or material.

When asking the subject about medical device use, recall can be a problem because the patient may not have taken particular note of many of the details. Furthermore, some devices, such as breast implants or erectile dysfunction devices, are associated with social discomfort, so may be underreported. The interviewer must take special care to encourage full disclosure.

As an example of some of these methodologic problems, consider the case of extended use of soft contact lenses. Because these lenses are relatively inexpensive, they may be purchased out of pocket from a source outside of the subject’s normal health plan. Consequently, full contact lens information is often not available in the subject’s main medical records, making exposure status difficult to measure from records alone. In their studies of corneal ulcer, exposure was assessed by Poggio et al. with a population survey, and by Schein et al. with a structured interview of all cases and controls. The different methods used in each study were probably valid because they resulted in similar effect estimates: relative risks of 5.2 (95% confidence interval of 3.5 to 7.7) by Poggio et al. and 3.9 (95% confidence interval of 2.4 to 6.5) by Schein et al.

NATIONAL POPULATION EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT

Once a regulator has discovered a likely relationship between exposure and outcome, he or she needs to determine the extent of population exposure. Public sources of device exposure data include market, medical care claims, medical records, and population survey data. Market data firms derive their information in various ways, from polling health care providers to collecting device purchase information from a nationally representative set of health care facilities and providers. Market data may express incident or prevalent exposure data. A nationally representative hospital claims database provides national incidence estimates for devices that can be adequately measured by hospital procedure codes. Other medical care claims records can also be a source of procedure codes that may be used to infer device use. Exposure estimates can also be made by consulting a sample of medical records or by surveying the population. The
limitations of measuring device exposure with medical data sources that are discussed above in the section on individual exposure assessment also apply to these methodologies. The Medical Device Implant Supplement to the 1988 National Health Interview Survey of households provided the first population prevalence assessment of a variety of implants.\textsuperscript{25} In general, these information sources are much less abundant, reliable, or detailed than comparable types of drug exposure information.

**CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS**

This section describes observational and descriptive epidemiologic tools currently available for studying medical device use.

**SAFETY SURVEILLANCE**

In the US, general safety surveillance is done by FDA through voluntary and mandatory reporting of suspected adverse events due to devices. Manufacturers must report malfunctions, serious injuries, and deaths. Health care facilities must report deaths.\textsuperscript{35} Anyone can make a voluntary report. The FDA receives reports of about 100,000 adverse device events per year\textsuperscript{36} (compared to about 160,000 for drugs).\textsuperscript{37} They are recorded and reviewed in a manner similar to drug reports, although the reviewers are largely nurses, as opposed to pharmacists, because nurses generally have the most extensive clinical experience with devices. Reports are assigned to individual reviewers based largely on the organ system related to the device’s intended use, so that each reviewer is responsible for a large variety of types of device. Reviewers may ask the reporters for more information. FDA has taken actions that include recalls, public alerts, required changes to device labeling, and required epidemiologic studies.

Although medical device adverse event reporting is also required by Canada, Japan, Australia, and the European Union, very little public information is available about these systems, besides what is specified in their regulations. All of these countries have mandatory reporting by device sponsors and voluntary reporting by anyone. The types of reportable event are very similar to those in the US. None of these other countries require reporting by health care facilities.\textsuperscript{31}

The general discussions of this type of system found elsewhere in this book also apply to adverse device event reports. Whether adverse events due to medical devices are more or less likely to be reported than those due to medications is unknown.

**SURVEYS**

The population-based surveys conducted by the US National Center for Health Statistics have provided a variety of data on medical devices, including the Medical Device Implant Supplement to the 1988 National Health Interview Survey\textsuperscript{38} mentioned above, the 1988 National Maternal and Infant Health Survey,\textsuperscript{39} the National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey series,\textsuperscript{40} the 1993 Mortality Followback Survey,\textsuperscript{41} and the 1996 National Home and Hospice Care Survey.\textsuperscript{42} These are summarized in Table 41.3.

The Medical Device Implant Supplement to the 1988 National Health Interview Survey\textsuperscript{38} mentioned above was used to generate the first overall national prevalence estimates of implants.\textsuperscript{33} More extensive reports were generated for the particular devices. Examples include one on breast implants,\textsuperscript{35} which demonstrated that using a general medically oriented screening question asked of a household representative may not elicit all socially sensitive or cosmetic implants for all household members. Another example was an analysis of pacemakers,\textsuperscript{34} showing that there were about 456,000 noninstitutionalized implant recipients; about 15% of the prevalent implants were replacements. Prevalence rose steeply with recipient age and was higher for men, whites, and those reporting an activity limitation. Geographic region, income, and educational level were not related to pacemaker prevalence.

The 1988 National Maternal and Infant Health Survey was used to generate national statistics on home pregnancy test use among women who carried their pregnancies to term.\textsuperscript{45} It was estimated that a third of such women used the test,
Table 41.3. Some surveys conducted by the US National Center for Health Statistics that include medical device information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Device information</th>
<th>Sample size</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medical Device Implant Supplement to the 1988 National Health Interview Survey</td>
<td>“The National Health Interview Survey is a [periodic] cross-sectional household interview survey. Sampling and interviewing are continuous throughout each year. The sampling plan follows a multistage area probability design that permits the representative sampling of households.” The survey collects data on demographics and health conditions. The MDIS was administered only in 1988, and collected information on medical implants in all household members.</td>
<td>The sample included 122 000 members of about 47 000 households. The net MDIS response rate was 92%.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988 National Maternal and Infant Health Survey</td>
<td>“The NMHIS is based on questionnaires administered to nationally representative samples of mothers with live births, stillbirths, and infant deaths during 1988 and to physicians, hospitals, and other medical care providers associated with those outcomes.” Data from the mothers and care providers include prenatal and perinatal tests and procedures, such as ultrasound examination. “A 1991 longitudinal followup to the NMHIS was conducted to obtain additional information about respondents from the 1988 survey.” Information about some devices, such as home apnea monitors, is included.</td>
<td>“The survey is based on 10 000 live births, 4000 fetal deaths, and 6000 infant deaths.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey series</td>
<td>“The survey consists of standardized physical examinations, health interviews, and laboratory testing to provide data on the health and nutritional status of the population. The survey produces data on a wide range of diseases and conditions, risk factors and health behaviors, physiological and body measurements, and environmental exposures...The latex allergy test was measured on a nationally representative sample of persons aged 17–60 years during the 1988–91 (phase 1) portion of the NHANES III survey. Although NHANES survey data does not include specific information on symptoms due to latex, participants will be classified as sensitized or not sensitized based on the level of detectable latex-specific IgE in sera, using cutoffs designated by the manufacturers.”</td>
<td>30 000 adults and children participated in the most recent survey, NHANES III.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993 Mortality Followback Survey</td>
<td>The subjects were a random sample of deaths that occurred in 1993 in the US (except South Dakota), stratified by age, race, and cause of death. This survey was “the first study since the 1980’s to examine detailed patterns of mortality by supplementing the information provided through death certificates with interviews of next of kin. The survey allows for the examination of trends in mortality, differences by income and education, risk factors and causes of death, and health care utilization in the last year of life...” “[O]ver 1100 data items [were] collected on such topics as: underlying and multiple cause of death; utilization of health care services; health care payment sources; access to care; health conditions; use of assistive devices; medical implants; sociodemographic information; place of death and circumstances of injury; life events and activities; problem behaviors; income and assets; and respondent background characteristics.” It provides information on devices used in the home (blood glucose meters, dialysis machines, etc.).</td>
<td>Almost 23 000 subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 National Home and Hospice Care Survey</td>
<td>“The sampling frame for the 1996 National Home and Hospice Care Survey (NHCHS) consisted of 16 700 agencies classified as agencies providing home health and hospice care.” The survey asked about various devices used in home care, including assistive (such as wheelchairs), therapeutic (such as oxygen delivery systems), and diagnostic (such as blood glucose meters) devices.</td>
<td>The sample consisted of 1091 “agencies providing home health or hospice care services at the time of the survey...Of [these], 1053 (97 percent) agreed to participate...”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
and that they were more likely to be white, married, older, more educated, and wealthier than the other mothers.

Hefflin used the 1993 Mortality Followback Survey to conclude that “older persons who had initial pacemakers implanted during their final year of life...[were] relatively independent, physically functional candidates who frequently died unexpectedly,” indicating that expert guidelines for pacemaker implantation were generally followed. Eighteen percent of the estimated 79 000 elderly recipients of pacemakers who had died in 1993 had received the implant for the first time during their final year of life.44

Ad hoc surveys are also used to study specific devices, such as latex gloves. Table 41.4 shows the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author and year of study</th>
<th>Surveyed population</th>
<th>Latex sensitivity assessment method</th>
<th>Sensitivity rate</th>
<th>Sensitivity predictors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Turjanmaa 1987</td>
<td>All operating room and laboratory employees in a Finnish hospital. Also, 130 consecutive patients who were due for routine scratch testing.</td>
<td>Scratch test for latex, vinyl, 20 common inhalant allergens with histamine, and diluent. Glove use test with latex and with vinyl.</td>
<td>Employees: 2.8%. Patients: 0.8%. p &lt; 0.01</td>
<td>Atopy, hand eczema, operating room work, physician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussman et al. 1995</td>
<td>All 71 housekeeping staff in a Canadian hospital. 70% participated. All wore unpowdered, unflocked latex gloves for 25 to 30 hours per week.</td>
<td>Questionnaire screen; positives were skin tested with latex, eight common inhalant and food allergens, and histamine.</td>
<td>8%.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaczmarek et al. 1996</td>
<td>915 emergency room workers (nurses, physicians, emergency medical technicians) in nine hospitals. 42% completed all sensitivity measures.</td>
<td>Questionnaire and test of serum for IgE antibodies to latex.</td>
<td>6%, by serum test.</td>
<td>Any allergy history, nonwhite race.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown et al. 1998</td>
<td>All 171 health care employees of an anesthesiology and critical care department of a hospital. Excluded provocation tests for those with recent unstable asthma or interfering medications, or pregnancy. 168 provided history and blood; 154 provided the skin test.</td>
<td>History; blood test for latex, three fruits, and a combination of eight common allergens; skin test to latex, glycerinated saline, histamine, and nonammoniated latex; and glove provocation test.</td>
<td>20% by history.</td>
<td>Atopy; food allergies; specific allergies to banana, kiwi, or avocado.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussman et al. 1998</td>
<td>Phase 1: 2062 health care workers at two sites of a hospital. 1351 participated. Phase 2: introduction of powder-free gloves at one site; continuance of powdered gloves at the other. Of 479 eligible workers negative at baseline, 435 completed followup.</td>
<td>1 year prospective followup. Skin test with latex, noncompounded ammoniated latex, several food and inhalant allergens, and saline used to measure new sensitivity.</td>
<td>1.0% in powdered; 0.9% in nonpowdered glove group.</td>
<td>Atopy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
features of five example studies. All of these latex studies were occupationally based, on the assumption that sensitivity rates are higher in these groups. Studies directed to understanding risk factors and testing candidate interventions are statistically relatively powerful in these occupational groups, and the results presumably apply to patients.

As described in an earlier section of this chapter, ad hoc surveys were required to measure the use and complications from extended wear soft contact lenses. Poggio et al. surveyed the general population to measure exposure to extended wear soft contact lenses and combined the results with their survey of all ophthalmologists to estimate corneal ulcer rates.

REGISTRIES

Registries are sometimes formed to establish cohorts of patients with particular device exposures. Several registries form the basis of pacemaker studies. Examples include the Implantable Lead Registry, formed by six North American hospitals in 1979, the Fyn County registry in Denmark formed in 1964, and the Danish Pacemaker Register for all of Denmark begun in 1982. In addition, Kawanishi et al. used data from four registries: the Bilich Registry of pacemaker pulse generators, operating from 1973 to 1993, with three to six sites, 22 786 devices, and 16 903 patients; the Implantable Lead Registry of pacemaker leads, operating from 1979 to 1989, with the same sites as the Bilich Registry and 7311 patients; the United States Veterans Administration Registry of Pacemaker Leads, still operating in 1992 at 182 facilities, with 8612 patients; and the Cleveland Clinic Lead Registry, operating from 1980 to 1991. Device life can be estimated by type, brand, model, and reason for replacement. The registry is population based, the incidence of device implantation, prevalence of implant recipients, and relative mortality rates for recipients can also be calculated.

MEDICAL CARE CLAIMS

An example of a large medical care claims database suitable for medical device epidemiology is the Healthcare Cost and Utilization Project (HCUP) Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS), which has been made available by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (formerly the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research). This database is updated periodically.

The HCUP Nationwide Inpatient Sample (NIS) contains all-payer data on hospital inpatient stays from selected States. Each year of the NIS provides information on approximately 5 million to 7.1 million inpatient stays from over 900 hospitals. All discharges from sampled hospitals are included in the NIS database.

The NIS contains patient-level clinical and resource use information included in a typical discharge abstract. The NIS can be linked directly to hospital-level data from the American Hospital Association (AHA) Annual Survey of Hospitals and to county-level data from the Health Resources and Services Administration Bureau of Health Professions’ Area Resource File (ARF), except for hospitals from Georgia, Hawaii, Kansas, South Carolina, and Tennessee.

The NIS is designed to approximate a 20-percent sample of U.S. community hospitals.

NIS data are available for 1988 through 1996. Since the data consist of discharge claims, studies of devices depend on the adequacy of procedure codes for capturing device exposure. Within this limitation, studies of the extent of use, adverse events in the same hospitalization, or longitudinal trends can be performed, as was recently done for pacemaker implantations. US census data adjusted to the year 1992 was used along with the national pacemaker implantation estimates from NIS, to calculate 5 year age group and gender specific implantation rates for the US. The investigators were also able to analyze the principal diagnoses, associated diagnoses, whether the implant was a replacement, and death before discharge.

MEDICAL RECORDS

Medical records are a resource for medical device epidemiology to the extent that they note the use of devices. Medical record systems vary from entirely paper based, to partially systematized, to fully automated.
Paper based medical record systems were used to measure outcomes for some pacemaker studies. Rubin et al. reported their retrospective review of 287 patients at one clinic in the southeastern US who had been actively followed. They calculated generator life, complications, replacements, and patient mortality. Another example is from Mueller et al., who reported on patients who had been implanted and regularly followed at an Austrian cardiology department. They were able to analyze by gender, age at implantation, indication, patient survival (compared to the general Austrian population), and cause of death.

A partially systematized structure is used at the Mayo Clinic, where another pacemaker survival study was conducted. The Mayo Clinic has access to all data regarding medical care provided in Olmsted County, MN, USA. A card system was available to identify pacemaker recipients, but other medical information was obtainable from the full paper medical record. Shen et al. defined a group of patients and followed them through time with the medical records and death certificates. Patient survival was calculated in comparison to the North Central white population at a comparable time, and stratified by demographics, clinical history, heart disease type, and some comorbidities. Another Mayo Clinic study with a similar data collection strategy investigated transtracheal oxygen catheters. Records of patients receiving the device were reviewed for demographics, reason for placement, complications, reason for removal, and duration of use.

Harvard Pilgrim Health Care is a managed care provider with a fully automated patient record system (see Chapter 17).

As demonstrated by the examples, the assessment of medical device exposure depends on the nature of facility-specific practices regarding the extent of notes or logs.

NEW DATA COLLECTION

New study-specific data collection is also an option that may be crucial to study success. It is often the only option for studies of devices used in the home, because broad surveys may not sample enough device users to be informative and medical records may not capture the information that is required. A case in point is soft contact lens use, as described earlier in this chapter, where only the subject can reliably provide the exposure (length of wear times) and some covariate information (such as cleaning practices).

COMBINATIONS OF TECHNIQUES

At times, as for other epidemiologic situations, a combination of study techniques may be used to strengthen the design. In a study of pacemaker use, Greenspan et al. presumably used Medicare claims obtained by a Professional Standards Review Organization in the US to identify patients; the remainder of the information was collected via extensive chart review. The authors evaluated the appropriateness of implantation of Medicare reimbursable pacemakers.

Another example of multiple techniques is the use of different survey types as well as complementary study designs (case–control and cohort) to address the same primary and complementary secondary questions. During the 1980s, the ophthalmology and regulatory communities became suspicious that long term wear of extended wear soft contact lenses increased the risk of corneal ulcer. The complementary epidemiologic studies were designed together and incorporated both a random sample survey of a population and of all ophthalmologists serving the population, as well as case selection with both hospital and population controls. The first study established the incidence rate of corneal ulcer and the second demonstrated several risk factors. It appeared that risk rises with each day of wear but varies among individuals (some people cannot tolerate even one night of extended wear, while others experience no trouble with a week). Based on these studies, FDA found it prudent to have eye care professionals set individual patient maximum wear times, subject to an overall limit of 7 days.
THE FUTURE

TRENDS IN MEDICAL DEVICE TECHNOLOGY

Medical devices are becoming more sophisticated, smaller, more precise, and easier to use in the home. As applications increase, current medical device nomenclatures that are based on intended use are becoming cumbersome. An international effort is currently under way to standardize and update the nomenclature. A useful future step would be to use this nomenclature in individual patient records to help define device exposure.

Another trend is the ever speedier introduction of new generations of devices. In some cases, new technology is in use before an epidemiologic study of the older technology can be completed. This problem will need to be addressed by faster techniques, such as quicker assemblage of an exposed cohort after a device is introduced to the market, for observing long-term safety and effectiveness.

TRENDS IN EPIDEMIOLOGIC RESOURCES

Increasing uniformity and automation of medical records will improve the prospects for medical device epidemiology. Some observers believe the Internet will enhance the conduct of records based studies. However, proposed privacy laws could greatly restrict access by researchers. Acceptable standard methods may be developed to address confidentiality concerns while allowing rigorous epidemiologic research.

TRENDS IN MEDICAL DEVICE EPIDEMIOLOGY

Awareness of medical devices as an object of epidemiologic study has been growing. It is my hope that as the field grows, recognition of medical devices as an influence on health will expand, allowing major advances in methodology.
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Special Considerations in Studies of Drug-induced Birth Defects
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INTRODUCTION

Teratogenesis is a very different phenomenon from other drug-induced hazards, and it therefore requires special consideration. Although the fetus may experience a wide range of adverse effects as a result of antenatal drug exposure, such as mental/motor deficits and learning and behavioral problems, this chapter will confine itself to issues surrounding drug-induced physical malformations.

THE NATURE OF BIRTH DEFECTS AND THEIR RELATION TO DRUGS

Birth defects are part of the human condition, having been observed throughout history. Major birth defects, typically defined as those that are life threatening, require major surgery, or present a significant disability, affect approximately 3–4% of liveborn infants. Minor malformations are of lesser clinical importance, and estimates of their prevalence vary considerably because of substantial differences in definition and detection.

Over the centuries, the “deformities” that characterize most birth defects have been viewed as a punishment to the mother or family for some fault on their part. This view was undoubtedly reinforced by the rarity of birth defects, their unpredictable occurrence, and the absence of known causes. Perhaps because these factors have not changed very much over time, elements of this primitive view persist today, largely in the form of guilt. Parents tend to search their memories to identify some factor—any factor—that might account for their misfortune. In developed societies, attention often focuses on drugs taken in pregnancy.

This concern, of course, is not without foundation. Less than 60 years ago, it was believed that the placenta protected the fetus from noxious agents. That belief was shattered in 1941 by the recognition that maternal rubella infection in pregnancy produced a distinctive pattern of birth defects among exposed infants. Two decades later, the thalidomide disaster demonstrated that drugs, too, could be teratogenic. Many thousands
of infants were born with major limb reductions and other defects, and the tragedy of this epidemic was etched into the consciousness of medical practitioners and the public alike. In the years that followed, other drugs were shown to be teratogenic, ranging from phenytoin to isotretinoin. Many additional drugs were alleged to be teratogenic, and although most of those allegations were unsupported by subsequent studies, they served to reinforce the general concern about the teratogenic effects of marketed drugs.

Teratogenesis is a unique kind of adverse drug effect, since it affects an organism (the fetus) other than the one for whom the drug was intended (the mother). In a benefit/risk consideration, the fetus may at best indirectly benefit from a medication given to its mother (e.g., by an improvement in the mother’s health), but the fetus alone is at risk for birth defects. That “innocent bystander” status of the fetus raises profound medical, moral, and legal issues (see also Chapters 5 and 9). It also poses serious concerns about the consequences of allegations that a given drug may be teratogenic.

CAN TERATOGENESIS BE PREDICTED PRIOR TO MARKETING A DRUG?

Under ideal circumstances, one would identify the teratogenic potential of drugs before they were used in humans. Unfortunately, our ignorance about the basic mechanisms of organ formation has constrained development of predictive in vitro tests. Testing in animals may be helpful in certain circumstances; for example, vitamin A and its congeners produce consistent patterns of malformations across many different species. However, for most known human teratogens (including thalidomide), the results of animal tests vary so much as to seriously limit their predictive value.\(^5\) Further, understanding of the structure/activity relationships of a particular agent can help predict that drug’s efficacy and adverse reactions, but it does not necessarily help predict its teratogenic potential. Because there are no theoretical, in vitro, or animal models that can reliably provide meaningful information about the likelihood of fetal risk, we are usually completely unaware of a given drug’s teratogenic potential when it is first used in humans.

Clinical premarking studies cannot be expected to provide this information either. Until recently, women of childbearing age were excluded from early clinical studies, specifically because of concerns about potential teratogenicity. Newer guidelines are designed to reverse these exclusions, but women chosen to be enrolled in clinical studies will, appropriately, be those at minimal risk of becoming pregnant. Information derived from experience among nonpregnant adult women is not informative when the concern is teratogenesis, and might even provide a false sense of reassurance—recall that thalidomide was used as a sedative in pregnant women specifically because of its “safety profile” in nonpregnant adults.

A Note about Nonprescription Drugs

Nonprescription (or over-the-counter, OTC) drugs present a unique situation. Whatever caution physicians might exercise in their prescribing of drugs to pregnant women, they have little control over what consumers purchase over the counter or obtain from their friends, relatives, and neighbors. It can reasonably be assumed that women, like their physicians, perceive nonprescription drugs as being safer than prescription products, and therefore may be more willing to use OTC agents in pregnancy. This perception is based on the fact that a switch from prescription to OTC status implies a history of wide use and safety. However, because there is little systematic information available on the human teratogenicity of most prescription drugs, the process of switching to OTC availability rarely takes account of a drug’s risk or safety with respect to the fetus. This is particularly the case for drugs that have been available OTC for many years. As noted below, teratogenicity is more difficult to assess when a drug is used without prescription, and it is ironic that we may know less about the teratogenic hazard of drugs available OTC than we do about drugs available only by prescription.

Thus, when prescription drugs are first licensed for general use, and for most OTC drugs, we lack an understanding of their teratogenic effects and we typically lack an understanding even of their teratogenic potential; the opportunity to gain
such knowledge comes (if it comes at all) from postmarketing experience, where pharmacopédiology can and must play a crucial role.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

Like other adverse drug effects, teratogenesis is a critical aspect of a drug’s benefit/risk profile, and such information obviously should be available to prescribers and consumers. Unlike other adverse drug effects, however, teratogenesis raises uniquely important and controversial clinical issues. First, the fetus is the “innocent bystander” with respect to its mother’s therapy. Second, teratogenesis is not a concern limited to women who are pregnant when drug treatment is initiated; it must also be a concern among women who might become pregnant after a drug is prescribed. Finally, unlike other adverse outcomes, teratogenic effects can be prevented by avoidance of pregnancy, and the birth of a malformed infant can be avoided by termination of pregnancy. Our understanding of a drug’s teratogenic risk therefore has important consequences for how a given drug is used clinically.

**DRUGS KNOWN TO BE TERATOGENIC**

Broadly, there are three approaches applied to the few drugs known to be teratogenic. In rare instances, such as was the case for thalidomide in most countries, the drug was prohibited from the general market; this approach was justified by the large absolute risk to the fetus, and is feasible in instances where the drug does not offer important or unique therapeutic benefits.

For most known teratogens, such as phenytoin and valproic acid, the absolute risk to the fetus is modestly elevated and the drug is felt to fill an important clinical need. For such drugs, information about teratogenicity is provided to physicians, who are expected to discuss the benefits and risks with their patients, who then can make informed decisions about their drug treatment. In some settings, a drug may be restricted to prescription by selected physicians. However, until followup data are available, the effectiveness of this approach remains unclear. It should be noted that considerations in these doctor–patient discussions might differ according to each woman’s risk of becoming pregnant while on the drug.

The third approach involves a formal program of physician and patient education combined, in some cases, with restricted access to the drug. The educational component is intended to assure that physicians and their patients are informed about the drug’s teratogenicity and the importance of avoiding pregnancy. The first such effort, in the US, was initiated in late 1988 by the manufacturer of isotretinoin (Accutane®), a drug which has a high absolute risk to the fetus and which, at the same time, is uniquely effective in the treatment of severe acne. Preliminary data from this voluntary “pregnancy prevention program” suggest a high degree of success in achieving both educational objectives, thereby keeping to a minimum the number of malformed infants born as a result of exposure to this agent. More recently, newly identified uses for thalidomide prompted the US Food and Drug Administration to approve marketing of the drug (as Thalomid®) in July 1998, but only with an unprecedented FDA regulated program sponsored by the drug’s manufacturer. This program includes an educational component similar to that used for Accutane, but also restricts prescription and distribution of the drug to registered prescribers and pharmacists, respectively. It also mandates that all patients who are prescribed the drug participate in a followup survey designed to monitor and enhance compliance with the manufacturer’s “System for Thalidomide Education and Prescribing Safety (STEPS).” The results of these efforts will help determine how best to balance the therapeutic benefits of known human teratogens against the risks of fetal exposure.

**DRUGS FOR WHICH TERATOGENIC RISK IS UNKNOWN**

For reasons described above, the vast majority of prescription drugs and virtually all nonprescription drugs fall into this category. Regulatory
agencies or manufacturers in various countries may offer a general warning against unnecessary use in pregnancy, but such cautions hardly contribute to rational drug therapy. In settings where the true teratogenic risk is nil, these warnings serve to deny potentially useful drug therapy. Where the true risk is elevated for a particular drug, the nonspecific and “standard” warnings offer little practical discouragement to its use in pregnancy.

**DRUGS FOR WHICH TERATOGENESIS IS ALLEGED... AND CLINICAL CONSEQUENCES**

At one time or another, a large number of drugs are alleged to be teratogenic, and the clinical consequences can be profound. In one notorious situation, allegations of teratogenicity resulted in a widely used drug being withdrawn from the market. In the late 1970s and early 1980s, the antinausea drug Bendectin® (Debendox®, Lenoten®), used widely to treat nausea and vomiting of pregnancy, was alleged to cause of variety of birth defects; the history of this experience has been reviewed elsewhere.8 Ironically, the aggregate data on the teratogenic hazards of Bendectin® have ultimately provided the strongest evidence of safety for any medication used in pregnancy. Despite that evidence, however, the manufacturer withdrew the drug from the market as a result of active and potential litigation. At least one study suggests that hospital admissions for hyperemesis gravidarum increased significantly following the drug’s withdrawal,9 and there is concern that, in the absence of Bendectin, women may be treated with other antinausea drugs, although the risk of those drugs to the fetus is unknown.

There are other clinical aspects of unproven allegations, and these are too often ignored. Upon learning that a drug they took in pregnancy might be teratogenic, women who have given birth to malformed infants may become overwhelmed with feelings of guilt. Further, women who are currently pregnant may develop considerable anxiety. That anxiety can lead to a number of clinical consequences, ranging from consultations with physicians to diagnostic procedures (e.g., amniocentesis) to elective termination of the pregnancy. An experience in the mid-1970s involving a nondrug exposure is instructive. Following widely publicized allegations that spray glue adhesives (typically used to make Christmas decorations) were teratogenic, a US regulatory agency withdrew the product from the market. Although the allegations were subsequently found to be without basis, a survey conducted among genetic counseling centers identified 1100 inquiries from pregnant women prompted by concern about exposure to these agents. Moreover, 11 underwent amniocentesis, and because of this exposure nine women had therapeutic abortions (one had vague evidence of chromosomal damage and eight had no evidence of malformation).10 These unique and potentially serious clinical consequences argue for heightened attention to scientific rigor and caution in the teratologic assessment of drugs.

**THE FALLACY OF “CLASS ACTION” TERATOGENESIS**

Another clinically important concern specific to teratogenesis is the issue of “class action”. It is widely recognized that an understanding of structure/activity relationships shared by members of a given drug class can be helpful in predicting a given class member’s efficacy and adversity (indeed, this view is incorporated into regulatory action in the form of class labeling). However, these predictors cannot be assumed to hold when the adversity at issue is teratogenesis. Given our ignorance about the causes of most birth defects, we cannot know whether it is the chemical structure common to the class that is responsible for teratogenesis or whether the responsible component is that part of the structure that differentiates one class member from another. For example, thalidomide is derived from glutethimide (Doriden® and other brands). Both are glutamides, and both are sedative/hypnotics. Despite their structural and clinical similarities, thalidomide is clearly a major teratogen and glutethimide is not.11 Thus, we cannot assume that if one drug is a major teratogen, all other members of its class will share that effect. Conversely, we cannot assume that reassurance
about the safety of one drug can be shared by other members of that drug’s class.

**METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

In many ways, the epidemiologic issues involved in the study of birth defects are similar to those of other adverse outcomes; these are considered in detail elsewhere in this text. However, there are a number of considerations that are unique to birth defects or are sufficiently important to warrant particular attention. These have to do with sample size considerations, definitions of exposure and outcome, confounding, and biologic plausibility.

Although serious birth defects occur in approximately three to 4% of liveborn infants, we cannot consider “birth defects” as a single, homogeneous outcome. In fact, physical birth defects include a wide range of malformations that vary in many ways, including their gestational timing, embryologic tissue of origin, and mechanism of development. As examples of variations in timing of occurrence, chromosomal abnormalities generally predate conception; neural tube defects occur in the earliest weeks of gestation; cleft palate occurs toward the end of the first trimester; and microcephaly can occur relatively late in pregnancy. As an illustration of variations in embryologic tissue of origin, some cardiovascular malformations, but not others, are derived from the neural crest cells that migrate from the area surrounding the primitive neural tube. Variations in mechanisms of development include inhibition, disruption, or alteration of the embryologic tissue that is responsible for normal structural development. From a theoretical perspective, then, one would predict that the malformations produced by a drug usually would vary according to the timing of exposure, the sensitivity of the end organ (i.e., embryologic tissue), and the mechanism of its teratogenesis.

Experience supports what would be predicted from biology. Even a brief review of known teratogens reveals a fact that is highly relevant in pharmacoepidemiology studies: most teratogens do not *uniformly* increase the rates of *all* birth defects, but rather increase rates of *selected* defects. Thus, the “classic” teratogen thalidomide produces defects in about 20–50% of exposed infants, but that increased risk is largely due to increases in limb, spine, and central nervous system malformations. Isotretinoin affects a similar proportion of liveborn infants, but again, that risk is the result of increases in rates of selected specific defects (ear, central nervous system, and cardiac). Less powerful teratogens behave similarly; valproic acid increases rates of neural tube defects, warfarin increases the rate of cartilage defects, and acetylcholinesterase inhibitors increase rates of renal defects.

**SAMPLE SIZE CONSIDERATIONS**

The fact that pharmacoepidemiology studies must consider rates of *specific* birth defects has a dramatic effect on sample size requirements, both for estimating risk and for providing assurances of safety. With respect to risk in a population of women taking a given drug, a cohort study with a sample size of a few hundred exposed pregnancies might be sufficient to identify a doubling of the three to four percent overall rate of birth defects. Ruling out a doubling of the overall rate would require larger numbers, but these would still be within the same order of magnitude. However, each of the specific defects which together form the overall category of “birth defects” occurs with far less frequency, ranging from about 1 per 1000 livebirths for oral clefts to 1 or fewer per 10 000 for hemimelia/phycomelia. To detect a doubling of risk for a relatively common specific birth defect (e.g., 1/1000) would require a sample size of over 20 000 exposed pregnancies (see Appendix Table A.5). To *rule out* a doubling of risk for the same defect, one would need a far larger sample size of exposed pregnancies.

**EXPOSURE**

There are two concerns regarding drug exposure that require special consideration in birth defects studies. One is the importance of nonprescribed drugs and the other is the issue of recall of drug exposure.
Nonprescribed Drugs

Most epidemiologic research focuses attention on prescribed drugs, in part because many studies utilize data sources with inadequate information on nonprescribed drugs and in part because of the view that prescribed drugs pose the greater potential for risk. As noted earlier, there is no basis for believing that this is the case. Although the effects of nonprescription drugs on the fetus are largely unstudied, it is noteworthy that these agents comprise a substantial proportion of drug exposures in pregnancy.\textsuperscript{17,18} Of potential importance in this category is the increasing use of herbal and other complementary medications whose teratologic effects are completely unknown. It is therefore important that research include consideration of nonprescribed drugs. In this context, nonprescribed can include not only OTC drugs (including complementary agents), but also prescription drug products that were not intended for the study subject but rather were obtained from friends, neighbors, and relatives: depending on the specific drug, we have found that more than 20% of exposure to prescription drugs can come from such “nonprescribed” sources.\textsuperscript{19} Although one might argue about the validity of prescription drug exposure information derived from records (medical, billing, insurance, etc.) versus that derived from patient interviews (see Chapters 13 and 39), there is little question that information on the use of OTC or nonprescribed prescription drugs must be obtained directly from the patient.

I illicit drugs represent a distinct but important subset of nonprescribed drugs. Use of these drugs is seriously under-reported, whether information is drawn from records or interviews. Except in rare settings where exposure may be identified through systematic screening of biologic samples (e.g., urine, blood), epidemiologic studies have major limitations in identifying teratogenic (and confounding) effects of illicit drug use in pregnancy.

Recall Bias

Because of the sample size demands described above, many researchers have turned to the case–control approach for the study of birth defects. Such studies generally (though not always) rely on maternal interviews for exposure information, and this approach raises concern both about the overall accuracy of recall (see also Chapters 13 and 39) and its susceptibility to bias. More than other drug-induced adverse outcomes, the birth of a malformed child carries an emotional burden and guilt that may affect recall of exposures in pregnancy. When compared to a mother of a normal child, the mother of a malformed infant may be more likely to recall carefully every possible act, event, and drug exposure in pregnancy.\textsuperscript{20} This tendency is reinforced by repeated inquiries from physicians, nurses, genetic counselors, and relatives, as well as by media and legal attention on the subject of drug-induced birth defects. Thus, in a setting where drug exposure is in fact similar among mothers of normal and malformed infants, one might predict that recall of exposure will be more complete among the latter than among the former. Concern about recall bias is more than theoretical—such bias may well explain a number of drug–defect associations\textsuperscript{21,22} that have subsequently been refuted.\textsuperscript{23,24} On the other hand, evidence supporting the role of recall bias is inconsistent, and the issue of when and to what extent recall bias is present remains an unresolved controversy.

Despite this concern, the simple possibility of recall bias does not invalidate interview-based studies, and there are a number of approaches to reducing and dealing with this problem. These include the choice of controls, the design of the questions, and direct attempts to identify potentially biased recall.

There are differing schools of thought regarding what constitutes an appropriate control for a malformed infant. Some argue that normal infants should be used because of the possibility that a drug might increase the risk of all malformations.\textsuperscript{25} Since no known teratogen uniformly increases the risk of all malformations, normal controls may be unnecessary. At the same time, use of normal controls might increase the opportunity for differential recall of exposure between mothers of normal and malformed infants. The alternative approach is to use a control group
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... comprised of infants with a wide range of malformations other than the ones in the case series. By assuring that the controls include a wide range of malformations, one reduces the likelihood that the control series will be biased by inclusion of a large proportion of defects that might be associated with the exposure under study. By restricting comparisons of exposures to those reported by mothers of malformed infants (whether cases or controls), one limits the likelihood of recall bias.

Both approaches are imperfect. Although no teratogen has yet been identified that uniformly increases the risk of all malformations, the history of teratology is replete with examples of assumptions that proved to be false. About 60 years ago it was thought that the fetus was protected by the placenta from noxious agents, and only 30 years ago it was inconceivable to some that a drug (diethylstilbestrol) could produce cancers in the adult offspring of exposed mothers, or birth defects in the children of women exposed to the drug in utero. In an effort to avoid such hubris, some researchers, including ourselves, have elected to use two control series, one of malformed and one of normal infants. Since we believe that concern about recall bias exceeds concern about failing to identify an “across-the-board” teratogen, we give primary consideration to findings derived from comparisons with malformed controls.

By definition, recall bias cannot exist if reporting of drug exposure is complete among cases and controls. The closer one comes to that ideal, the less the likelihood of recall bias. It thus becomes critical how one elicits exposure information. Studies that use open-ended questions about drug exposure invite differential recall between mothers of malformed and normal infants. As might be predicted, the more specifically one asks questions about drug use, the more likely is one to obtain complete information (see also Chapter 39). Recall is also substantially increased when women are asked about use according to various indications, and it is further increased when drugs are asked by specific names. This approach is not likely to result in exaggerated recall (i.e., false positives), as demonstrated by the fact that use of a specific drug ascertained by such a questionnaire was the same as that estimated from the manufacturer’s marketing data; in addition, women did not report exposure when asked about a fictitious drug. In short, by improving ascertainment of drug exposure among both cases and controls, a carefully designed questionnaire can substantially reduce the opportunity for recall bias.

Unfortunately, the possibility of recall bias cannot be completely eliminated either by the use of a malformed control group or by asking specific questions about drug use. In an effort to identify women who might be at risk for biased recall, we began in 1976 to routinely ask whether a woman had heard that any drug affects the risk of any defect. (This question is asked at the end of the interview, so as not to itself affect reporting of exposures and events.) Our a priori assumption is that a woman who acknowledges that a particular drug causes (or prevents) a particular defect is more at risk for differential recall than one who does not. This approach has enabled us to identify indirect evidence of biased recall: in our study of the possible protective effects of folic acid on the development of neural tube defects, we observed different risk estimates when we stratified subjects according to their knowledge of the hypothesis. By simply asking women about their perceptions of the teratogenic effects of drugs, one might obtain insight into the nature of biased recall in the study population.

OUTCOME
Given the etiologic heterogeneity of malformations, some have attempted to classify birth defects according to specific categories. We were among those who, more than two decades ago, classified defects by organ system, such as “musculoskeletal” or “cardiovascular.” However, classification in this way has little embryologic or teratologic basis, and a more appropriate approach is to create categories that reflect the embryologic tissue of origin. For example, neural crest cells in the earliest stages of embryogenesis migrate to form a variety of structures, including those of the face/ears, parts of the heart, and the neural tube. Interference with the normal development of the...
neural crest would therefore lead to malformations of tissues derived from neural crest, and that is indeed what has been observed in a number of animal experiments. In fact, these patterns have been observed for certain human teratogens, the most striking example of which is the retinoid isotretinoin, which interferes with neural crest cell migration/development and leads to specific malformations of the ear, heart, and neural tube. Similarly, certain defects are believed to result from disruption of the embryonic vasculature. Although our ignorance about the origins of most birth defects may limit our ability to create categories which share a common etiology, it is preferable, whenever possible, to classify birth defects according to an understanding of their embryologic origins.

CONFOUNDING

As with any other aspect of pharmacoepidemiology research (see Chapter 2), confounding must be taken into account in studies focused on birth defects. Among those variables that require routine consideration are maternal age, race, geography, and socioeconomic status. An understanding of the epidemiology of a given defect or exposure often identifies other variables that may act as confounders in a specific analysis. For example, ethnic background is strongly related to the risk of neural tube defects, maternal age is a strong risk factor for gastroschisis, and alcohol consumption has been associated with defects derived from neural crest. Since medication use may be associated with various other health behaviors (e.g., vitamin use is more common among nonsmokers than smokers), one may need to consider health behaviors, and even nutrition, in studies of certain exposures and outcomes. Further, it may be critically important to separate the teratogenic risk of a drug from the underlying risk associated with the condition for which the drug is taken, something called "confounding by indication" (see also Chapters 34 and 43).

Finally, an issue unique to the epidemiologic study of birth defects is the possibility of pregnancy termination. As more malformations become detectable at earlier stages of pregnancy (and as more such pregnancies are terminated), studies of liveborn and stillborn infants will increasingly underestimate the prevalence of such defects. In addition, there are a number of instances where this factor must be considered as a potential confounder (e.g., periconceptional vitamin exposure and neural tube defects).

BIOLOGIC PLAUSIBILITY

Our ignorance about the biologic mechanisms by which most human birth defects occur complicates our ability to determine when a finding may be biologically plausible. There are a few associations for which in vitro and animal experiments support their biologic plausibility: these include the increased risk of defects derived from neural crest cells among infants exposed to retinoids, the decreased risk of neural tube defects among infants exposed to folic acid, and the increased risk of defects resulting from vascular disruption among infants exposed to cocaine. However, biologic mechanisms remain unknown for most well accepted drug–defect associations.

In light of this inconsistency, how does one evaluate the importance of biologic plausibility in relation to newly observed associations? On the one hand, a requirement that every association have an identifiable biologic mechanism would have led to dismissal of virtually every accepted human teratogen. On the other hand, some aspects of biologic plausibility must be met. For example, it is implausible that a defect could be caused by an exposure if that exposure first occurs after the gestational development of the defect has been completed. While less absolute, it is unlikely to expect that an exposure would produce a range of defects which span gestational timing from preconception to late pregnancy and which do not share embryologic tissue of origin. Thus, we cannot dismiss hypotheses simply because they lack a biologically plausible explanation. However, until they are supported by subsequent studies, such hypotheses must be considered more speculative than hypotheses for which there is a strong biologic basis.
CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

There are a variety of approaches used to generate and test hypotheses regarding drugs and birth defects. The purpose of this section is not to list every available data set, but rather to describe the types of resources and their respective strengths and weaknesses. For convenience, these may be divided into cohort and case-control designs. Approaches that involve the monitoring of birth defects without the systematic collection of exposure information are not directly applicable to pharmacoepidemiologic study, and are not considered in this chapter; interested readers are referred to an excellent review.33

COHORTS

Broadly speaking, there are three types of cohorts relevant to the pharmacoepidemiologic study of birth defects. These are: (i) studies designed to follow large populations exposed to various agents; (ii) the use of data sets created for other purposes; and (iii) followup studies of selected exposures.

Studies Designed to Follow Large Populations Exposed to Various Agents

This approach involves the identification of a population of pregnant women to be followed, with periodic collection of information on demographic characteristics, exposures, and potential confounders, as well as formal evaluation of the offspring at birth and perhaps at some years later as well. A number of studies of this kind have been conducted in various countries.34-37 An example is the US Collaborative Perinatal Project (CPP), which enrolled over 58 000 women between 1959 and 1965, obtained detailed information on their pregnancies, and followed the children until age 7.1 The strength of this type of approach lies in the prospective, systematic, and repeated collection of information that includes exposure to a wide variety of medications taken by a diverse population, many potential confounding variables, and good outcome information.

For commonly used drugs (such as aspirin), there were sufficient data to assess risks for malformations overall as well as for certain subgroups of malformations.38 However, despite the overall size of the database, one major weakness of such a design is the small sample sizes of infants with specific malformations. For example, there were approximately 2200 malformed infants in over 50 000 pregnancies followed by the CPP. Among these, there were only 31 with cleft palate (CP) and 11 with tracheoesophageal fistula (TEF). This weakness is further compounded by limited numbers of women exposed to most drugs. If a drug were used by as many as 10% of the women, the expected number of exposed infants with CP and TEF would be three and one, respectively; if a drug were used by 3% of pregnant women, the expected intercepts would be 1 and 0.3. Clearly, these intercepts are so small as to make it infeasible for even so large a cohort to identify any but the most dramatic increases in risk associated with commonly used drugs.

Further, the inordinate costs of such an intensive effort limit enrollment and data collection to a study period of no more than a few years. Because of changing patterns of drug use over time, the clinical relevance of the available data diminishes.

Use of Datasets Created for Other Purposes

In recent years, researchers have focused increasing attention on cohorts identified from databases produced for various purposes (other than for epidemiologic research) by organizations or governments involved in medical care. The strengths and weaknesses vary with the nature of the specific dataset. All have the advantage of identifying exposures prospectively, some may have good reporting of malformations, and some may be derived from large populations. Like most other cohorts, studies based on data from health maintenance organizations (HMOs) may be limited by their small samples of specific malformations. For example, among almost 7000 pregnancies in which 33% of women filled a prescription for Bendectin®, there were a total of
80 malformations identified, and only 24 affected infants were exposed to the drug in utero.\textsuperscript{30} For the more typical situation where a given drug exposure is far less prevalent, sample size constraints are even more striking: researchers reviewed 15 years of data and identified 215 women who delivered liveborn infants after presumed exposure to topical tretinoin, among whom there were four infants with a variety of malformations.\textsuperscript{40} In both examples, the numbers of exposed infants with specific birth defects were too few to identify even substantial increases in the risk of these outcomes. Further, the definition of exposure was limited to receipt of a prescription for the drug during a given interval, birth defect rates among unexposed subjects were lower than expected, and information on confounding variables was largely absent.

In an effort to overcome sample size limitations, researchers have studied larger datasets. Among these are health insurance data available in the US through the government Medicaid program. In a study of benzodiazepine abuse in pregnancy, researchers reviewed over 100,000 pregnancies and identified 80 women who received numerous prescriptions for the drugs of interest.\textsuperscript{41} Unfortunately, records for the offspring could not be found for a substantial proportion of the study subjects, a problem not uncommon in such data sets (see Chapter 19).

Other datasets (and particularly the newer record linkage systems from Scandinavia) offer promise of better information on exposure and outcome variables, but without direct interviews of study subjects they are unlikely to provide reliable information on potential confounding variables (e.g., smoking, alcohol consumption, diet). They are also unlikely to identify exposures to nonprescription drugs, which may be of importance as potential confounders or as primary exposures.

Followup of Selected Exposures

The various mechanisms used to identify cohorts of women exposed to specific drugs include spontaneous reports to manufacturers or government agencies (see Chapters 10 and 11) and registries established by manufacturers and teratogen information services. The strength of such approaches lies in the ability to identify women exposed to a drug of interest early in pregnancy and, most importantly, to identify and enroll the woman before the outcomes are known. There is the additional advantage of having an opportunity to collect other information prospectively, such as data relating to potential confounding variables. Although the findings from many of these cohorts have been reported in recent years, perhaps the most dramatic—and informative—result was the experience observed among only 36 women who were followed after first-trimester exposure to isotretinoin:\textsuperscript{11} among the 28 liveborn infants, five (18\%) were malformed. More striking than the overall rate of malformation was the distribution of defects: each of the five infants had at least one of the specific malformations hypothesized (from premarketing animal studies) to result from isotretinoin exposure (ear, palate, chin, certain heart, and certain brain defects). These findings have been supported by a subsequent study of 94 prospectively identified exposed pregnancies that resulted in livebirths.\textsuperscript{42}

While the above example provides evidence of the value of even small cohorts in detecting dramatic increases in the risk of specific defects, such cohorts are quite limited in their ability to provide assurance of safety. Two examples illustrate this point. In one, the manufacturer followed 276 prospectively identified pregnancies that had been exposed to alprazolam in the first trimester and resulted in a livebirth; 13 malformations were found (4.7\%), a rate comparable to that in the general population. The authors pointed out that their sample lacked power to detect even 10–15-fold increases in specific common defects.\textsuperscript{43} Similar issues surround data drawn from teratogen information services. For example, researchers from four such services identified 128 women who sought counseling because of first trimester exposure to fluoxetine. Among the 98 liveborn infants, there were two with major malformations.\textsuperscript{44}

Registries are often limited by problems of self-referral bias and losses to followup (with possible bias based on whether response to followup is related to whether the infant is malformed or normal). In addition, there are limitations inherent
in comparisons between the drug-exposed cohort and the “unexposed.” Some compare observed rates of defects to rates reported in various other populations, and others compare the observed rates to those among pregnancies with exposures to no drugs or to other drugs. Both are imperfect, and comparisons rarely if ever adequately take into account the risk of birth defects due to the condition for which the drug in question was taken.\textsuperscript{32}

These methodologic concerns aside, all cohort studies have a common limitation. As is clear from the earlier discussion, it is extremely difficult for such a study to achieve sample sizes sufficiently large to provide meaningful reassurance about the safety of a drug. Such reassurance requires information not simply on the overall rate of all birth defects, but also on specific defects, most of which have background rates ranging from 1 per 1000 to 1 per 10 000. Thus, while a cohort of 100 or even 1000 exposed pregnancies might provide reassurance that the drug is not another thalidomide or isotretinoin, such a cohort cannot assure us that a drug is safe with respect to oral clefts, gastrochisis, or other specific birth defects.

CASE–CONTROL STUDIES

The rarity of birth defects in general, and of specific defects in particular, argues for the use of the case–control design in pharmacoepidemiology studies of birth defects. Of course, the strengths and limitations of these studies are similar to those for case–control studies of other outcomes (see Chapter 2), and will not be reviewed here. Such studies may be conducted on an ad hoc basis or within the context of case–control surveillance (see Chapter 13). Examples of the latter are few; in North America, two current examples include the longstanding “Birth Defects Study” conducted by our own group,\textsuperscript{23} and the more recently established National Birth Defects Prevention Study, involving eight statewide birth defects surveillance programs and coordinated by the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

From the unique perspective of birth defects, case–control studies can have the statistical power required for the assessment of both risk and safety. At the same time, however, they have the potential limitation of biased recall. There are numerous examples that illustrate both issues, but the following are among the most instructive.

In a cohort study of spermicidal contraceptives, researchers using data from an HMO found the prevalence of birth defects among 763 infants born to exposed mothers to be 2.2\% (\( n = 17 \)), whereas the rate among infants born to non-exposed mothers was 1.0\%. The excess was attributed to four different defects (including chromosomal defects, limb reduction defects, hypospadias, and neoplasms).\textsuperscript{45} Other investigators used different cohorts to test the hypothesis. Although two analyses involving populations of about 35 000 and 50 000 pregnant women failed to confirm an overall increase in malformation risk,\textsuperscript{46,47} neither study had sufficient power to rule out, with reasonable confidence, an increased risk for each of the specific defects identified in the first study. Therefore, two case–control studies were mounted specifically to test the hypothesis. One identified about 100–400 cases of each of the outcomes of interest, and for a variety of exposure intervals found odds ratios close to unity; more importantly, the upper 95\% confidence intervals were 2.2 or lower.\textsuperscript{48} The other identified 151 fetuses with trisomy, including 92 with trisomy 21. Point estimates for various exposure intervals approximated unity, and the study had sufficient power to rule out more than a twofold increase in the risk of trisomy in relation to spermicide use.\textsuperscript{49}

While statistical power is a major strength of the case–control approach, power does not assure validity. There are numerous issues that relate to validity (see Chapters 2, 13, and 39). In studies of birth defects, the one that requires particular consideration is recall bias. We previously cited a study of the protective effects of folic acid supplements in relation to neural tube defects, in which we found different risk estimates among women who reported, at the end of the interview, that they were aware of the hypothesis under study.\textsuperscript{28} We believe that this study supports concern about recall bias. As stated above, however, the simple possibility of such bias does not necessarily invalidate a case–control study.
Rather, it requires that investigators consider its existence and make reasonable attempts to identify it in their study population.

We cannot review issues in the epidemiologic study of birth defects without alluding to a concern that cuts across all study designs. Birth defects are complex outcomes, and the study of medications in relation to birth defects only adds to this complexity. For all the reasons described in the introduction to this chapter, the rigorous pharmacoepidemiologic evaluation of birth defects requires considerable understanding and experience not only of epidemiology, but also of related disciplines (e.g., pharmacology, embryology, teratology).

AN INTEGRATED APPROACH

From a pharmacoepidemiologic perspective, there are two broad concerns regarding teratogenesis. The first, both in theory and in practice, is to identify major teratogens (exemplified by thalidomide and isotretinoin). The second is to identify teratogens with more modest risks (exemplified by phenytoin and valproic acid). Although not widely recognized, a combination of the approaches described above can provide much of the information needed to respond to both concerns. Cohorts of exposed subjects, whether in the form of registries or record linkage studies, can identify major teratogens in a relatively timely way. In most instances, the extremely large risks associated with drugs such as thalidomide or isotretinoin tend to overwhelm the distinct methodologic limitations inherent in these approaches. If a drug makes it past that first line of defense, case–control surveillance (or focused case–control studies) can provide the power and rigor necessary to identify more modest teratogens. Simple sample size considerations will continue to limit our ability to demonstrate safety with respect to relatively rare exposures or outcomes, but an integrated approach that combines cohort and case–control studies offers an effective step towards resolving these two teratogenic concerns.

THE FUTURE

Studies of birth defects in the future will undoubtedly focus increased attention on issues of statistical power, validity, and secular changes in exposures. The recent approval of thalidomide in the US will, one hopes, focus renewed attention on the teratogenic potential of drugs and how best to identify it. While the effectiveness of newer regulatory approaches (e.g., isotretinoin and thalidomide) remains to be determined, there appears to be growing acceptance of the notion that proven human teratogens may require a unique form of regulatory attention and control if they are to be used with relative safety.

There are two issues that warrant particular attention. These are the increasing integration of epidemiology and biology and the legal climate in which epidemiologists will operate.

INTEGRATION OF EPIDEMIOLOGY AND BIOLOGY

A major frustration among those who conduct epidemiologic studies of congenital malformations is the dearth of understanding of the mechanisms, both structural and molecular, by which defects occur. Rapid advances (such as those related to retinoic acid) will markedly enhance our ability to classify defects in biologically meaningful categories. Advances can also be expected in the identification of drug exposures in human tissue. Blood and urine have long been available for this purpose, but detection is largely limited to the interval shortly following exposure. For case–control studies in particular, where the mother is typically identified some time after delivery, such sampling is of no use for detecting exposures in early pregnancy. In recent years, however, researchers have explored the usefulness of other tissues in which drugs or their metabolites may persist and accumulate, such as meconium and hair. Although these techniques are still under evaluation and currently lack the ability to estimate timing precisely, they may enable researchers at least to confirm the presence or absence of certain exposures during pregnancy.
With respect to the role of drugs in the etiology of birth defects, there is no question that the most exciting biologic development is the rapidly expanding field focused on genetic markers of susceptibility to teratogenesis. It has puzzled many that known human teratogens do not produce malformations in all (or even most) exposed fetuses. It was widely believed that this phenomenon was due to differences in host susceptibilities, and in 1985 researchers demonstrated that such a phenomenon was likely to account for the inconsistent effect of at least one such teratogen—phenytoin.52 These workers found that a genetic defect in the detoxification of arene oxide (a radical metabolite of phenytoin) was strongly related to the risk of the major defects associated with phenytoin in numerous studies. Such genetically determined variations in drug metabolism (“genetic polymorphisms”) have been described for other drugs (such as sulfonamides and alcohol), and no doubt more will be identified in the future. In anticipation, we and others are adding databanks of buccal cells or blood samples to ongoing studies of risk factors for birth defects. An understanding of genetic polymorphisms will dramatically enhance the identification of subsets of the population who are at increased risk for certain birth defects and the identification of drugs that might warrant particular study.

By analogy with the process of screening for rubella susceptibility or for genetic diseases, it is not unreasonable to look forward to a time when women of childbearing age can be screened for drug-specific genetic polymorphisms that place them at particular risk for having a malformed infant. Information of this kind has obvious usefulness in selecting (and avoiding) specific drugs for the treatment of women who are pregnant or at risk for becoming pregnant.

THE LEGAL CLIMATE

Whatever their design, studies of exposures in pregnancy in relation to birth defects ultimately depend on the ability to link exposure and outcome information. To accomplish such linkage, researchers require access to information which identifies women who have become pregnant, the outcomes of those pregnancies (including spontaneous and therapeutic abortions), and details as to the presence or absence of malformations. The issue of whether and how such information might be disclosed to researchers has become highly contentious in many countries (see also Chapter 26). For case-control studies in particular, the enrollment of malformed and/or normal subjects requires that hospitals, other health providers, or government agencies make identifying information available to researchers, who then contact eligible subjects in order to invite them to participate in an interview. At present, there is considerable public anxiety—and even anger—regarding the erosion of confidentiality, especially with respect to financial and related data. While adults with cancer or heart disease are unlikely to view being approached to participate in research as an invasion of privacy, parents of children with birth defects, and particularly those who have undergone therapeutic abortions, are exquisitely sensitive to the disclosure of information on their pregnancy and its outcome.

We are unaware of any evidence to suggest that medical researchers have compromised confidentiality. Nonetheless, there is a real possibility that epidemiologic research into drug-induced birth defects may be constrained or even eliminated by actions and laws intended to protect confidentiality, without consideration to the substantially different needs filled by medical research and commercial interests.53 It is therefore critical that the public be educated about the extent to which epidemiologic research serves the public health, and that they recognize that this benefit can only be accomplished by the provision of confidential medical information to legitimate researchers. At the same time, the public must be reassured—and researchers must accept—that violations of this shared trust will be accompanied by serious penalties.
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INTRODUCTION

A major objective of pharmacoepidemiology is to estimate the effects of drugs when they are prescribed after marketing. This is difficult because drug exposure is not a stable phenomenon and may be associated with factors that may also be related to the outcome of interest, such as indication for prescribing. Other examples of factors that must be taken into account include compliance, publicity, and the natural course of the disease. The great challenge of pharmacoepidemiology is thus to obtain an accurate estimate, i.e., “without error,” of the relationship between drug exposure and health status. There are two types of error: random error relates to the concepts of precision and reliability, while systematic error is related to the concepts of validity and bias. Accuracy itself is the absence of both random and systematic error. The question of measurement has always represented a key point in epidemiology; Rothman wrote that “an epidemiologic study is properly viewed as an exercise in measurement, with accuracy as the goal.”

CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH

In 1981 Alderslade and Miller presented the results of the National Childhood Encephalopathy Study (NCES), a nationwide case–control study conducted in the UK initiated to answer the question of a possible association between diphtheria–tetanus–pertussis (DTP) vaccine and the subsequent development of neurologic disorders. This report received tremendous publicity because of the importance of the question, but it also raised a large international controversy because several potential biases affected the credibility of the results.
In the NCES, physicians of England, Scotland, and Wales reported 1182 cases of severe acute neurologic illnesses in infants and children aged 2–35 months; two controls were selected for each case, matched on age, gender, and residential area. The NCES found that the risk of severe acute neurologic event was significantly increased within the seven days following DTP vaccine (relative risk (RR) = 2.3; 95% confidence interval = 1.4–3.2), and that, one year after the vaccine, seven of the 241 cases (2.9%) who had died or had a developmental deficit had begun their disease within the seven days following a DTP vaccine compared to only three of 478 controls (0.6%), yielding a relative risk of 4.7 (95% confidence interval = 1.1–28.0). The results have been used in many court trials by parents of disabled children seeking compensation.

It was, however, the beginning of an important controversy. First, the NCES’s results were not confirmed in several other, smaller, studies. In addition, several biases were considered possible explanations, partial or total, for what was observed. The following problems, in particular, were discussed.

- The fact that the participating physicians knew the objectives of the study may have increased the reporting of cases that occurred shortly after vaccination. This referral bias would have increased the apparent relative risk.
- Information bias was also considered possible. The exact date of onset of the neurological problem was occasionally difficult to ascertain precisely. Also, the interviewers and data collectors were not blinded to the study’s objectives, nor to the participants’ clinical status. It is thus possible that the date of onset was sometimes shifted toward a shorter post-vaccine time window. The fact that the immediate high risk post-vaccine period was followed by a subsequent low risk period has been considered as evidence that this bias actually occurred.
- The main concern was selection bias. Children who had previous neurologic disorders (e.g., seizures) were more likely to go unvaccinated and were also more likely to develop permanent brain damage. This selection bias would have favored the inclusion of nonvaccinated individuals in the case group, reducing the apparent relative risk. It is also possible that the previous neurologic disorder was present and occasionally the case “event” was the first expression of the disease. In that case, these children should have been excluded from the study because the disease in fact preceded the exposure (see “protopathic bias” below). Of course, in this situation the subclinical neurologic disease could not have biased the choice of whether or not to vaccinate.
- Several other issues were also of concern in the interpretation of the NCES results. These include, for example, the lack of precision of the disease definitions as well as the inclusion of cases which were not thought to be plausibly related to DTP vaccine (such as Reye’s syndrome, hypsarhythmia, or acute viral encephalopathies), with a possible dilution of any vaccine-specific association. The fact that the odds ratio for the risk of permanent brain damage was based on only seven cases and three controls was of particular concern, because among the seven cases there was one case of Reye’s syndrome and two cases of well identified viral encephalitis.

The NCES represents an example of how pharmacoepidemiology studies may contribute to data needed by clinicians, public health administrators, and lawyers. The controversy surrounding it, however, shows that a well thought out and designed pharmacoepidemiology study can raise many questions and lose an important part of its credibility because of the possibility of biases. Once a study is completed, some biases can only be discussed in term of likelihood and importance, and cannot be estimated precisely, nor controlled at the analysis stage. The possibility of biases in a study raises doubts about its results, and provides an opportunity for subsequent debate based upon convictions rather than evidence.
Generally speaking, questions raised about the quality of studies, as exemplified above, have important implications for clinicians, regulators, public health administrators, and health economists. For example, when a case-control study shows that the risk of a severe adverse event is different in patients treated, respectively, with drugs A and B, the following questions should be raised.

- Was the clinical indication that led to the prescription of drug A or B considered in the analysis? Different drugs are likely to be prescribed to different types of patient, with different diseases or different degrees of severity or clinical expression of the same disease; such differences in baseline characteristics may lead to the patients being at different risks of developing an adverse outcome, independently of the prescription of drug A or B.
- Were all eligible cases included? Was the exclusion of some patients related to drug exposure?
- How precisely was exposure measured? Exposure is often reduced to a dichotomous classification, which is not very precise.
- Could previous knowledge of the problem have influenced the reporting of cases or the recall of previous exposure?
- Was the exposure time window defined in relation to the onset of outcome or in relation to the onset of drug exposure?
- Was temporal information about drug exposure included in the analysis? This information is very important because the risk is probably very different in new users, in long term chronic users of the same drug, and in those who have shifted from one drug to another.
- Was the strength of the association constant in all categories of patients (i.e., independent of age, co-morbidity, co-prescription, different forms of the disease, etc.):

The study of the sources of bias and the different approaches to preventing bias is thus a fundamental aspect of pharmacoepidemiology. The question of bias in epidemiology has been covered in several good classical epidemiology textbooks (e.g.,1,7-11), and discussed in some important articles.12-16 Pharmacoepidemiology studies, however, may be affected more often by some particular biases than other epidemiologic studies. Moreover, the dynamic of bias occurrence over time seems to represent a particularly important phenomenon in pharmacoepidemiology. In this chapter, we will first describe the most important biases that may affect pharmacoepidemiology studies. We will then focus on confounding and show that it is sometimes not very easy to separate this category from other types of bias (especially selection bias). We will also discuss the dynamics of bias in pharmacoepidemiology and finally, we will show how to deal with the problem of bias and confounding at the design and the analysis stage.

**METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGIC RESEARCH**

**BIASES IN PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY**

Several potential biases are likely to affect pharmacoepidemiology studies, such as referral bias, recall bias, nondifferential or differential follow-up bias, protopathic bias, and prevalence study bias. For the purpose of our discussion, however, we will classify these biases into three groups: selection bias, information bias, and confounding. Figure 43.1 shows that selection bias is related to the recruitment of study subjects or losses to follow-up. Information bias is related to the accuracy of the information that is collected on exposure, health status, and also covariates such as confounding variables or effect modifiers. Confounding is related to the pathophysiological mechanisms of disease development, which may be affected by several factors acting together; what is observed is due not to the exposure of interest, but to other factors. Confounding variables may also represent risk factors.
for the outcome (for example, age), without being causal factors.

Selection Bias

Selection bias is a distortion of the measurement of an estimate of effect, which is due to the selection into the study of groups of subjects who have an unusual and unequal relationship between drug exposure and outcome. Hence, the estimate of the association in the study group differs from the estimate in the target population (this bias is also called sample distortion bias). In pharmacoepidemiology, four types of selection bias seem particularly important: referral bias, self-selection, and prevalence study bias, with the special case of "protopathic bias."

Referral Bias

Referral bias can occur if the reasons for referring a patient, to the hospital for instance, may be related to the drug exposure status, e.g., when the use of the drug contributes to the diagnostic process. This is a particular problem when an illness presents in a manner such that an accurate diagnosis is not always obtained. For instance, a patient taking nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and presenting with abdominal pain may be more likely to be suspected as having a gastric ulcer. This patient is therefore more likely to be sent to the hospital for tests for this diagnosis than other patients with similar pain, who are not using nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. A study using patients in the hospital may thus show a
strong, but biased, association between mild nonbleeding gastric ulcers and the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. On the other hand, if one were studying serious gastrointestinal bleeding, this might not be a problem.

The same problem may occur with diagnoses of deep venous thrombosis in women using oral contraceptives who present with leg pain. Knowledge of a well established association between the disease and the drug makes the use of an oral contraceptive a key element in the diagnosis, such that these women may be more likely to be subjected to diagnostic tests for venous thrombosis.

This referral bias problem may even be more generalized. It is possible, for instance, that in older people taking many drugs, the occurrence of “any change in health status” or “any suspicious side effect” may lead to hospitalization just because of exposure to a large number of drugs. In these circumstances, there will be a positive association between drug use in general and any health condition.

Appreciating the potential for referral bias helps in interpreting the results of successive epidemiologic studies conducted at different points in time. We can imagine a situation in which only the first study was unbiased because the association was not yet known. When the first publication shows a positive association between drug and disease, the referral bias phenomenon begins and is likely to increase after each new report of a positive association. In this context, we may observe an increase in the strength of the association over time, even if the true association remains constant and even if it is actually null.

This phenomenon of referring “exposed cases” may occasionally have a very large impact in pharmacoepidemiology. It has been shown, for example, that the publication of a letter in a medical journal may affect a physician’s ability to find new cases of the condition and increase the probability of his or her reporting them. This type of alert is also likely to increase the referral of these “interesting” patients to the hospital; hospitalized patients will then represent a biased group with a strong positive association between drug exposure and health event. Reports on side effects of triazolam, for example, are likely to have been affected by referral bias: after the first publication, several authors reported other single case experiences, and then Sunter reported a series of cases in 1988. While these were all spontaneous reports of adverse reactions, not formal epidemiologic studies, one could speculate that subsequent formal studies could have been affected by referral bias.

One mechanism to prevent this type of publicity bias would consist of keeping confidential the reports of single cases of possible adverse events until a good epidemiologic study has confirmed them. From this perspective, confidentiality related to the publication of a single case report should not be viewed as a protection of the manufacturer but as a protection of the scientific truth. This is because once the first case report has been “mediatized,” the situation is intrinsically biased and, in some situations, the question can no longer be answered, or can only be answered with a great deal of difficulty. Of course, whether such a confidential treatment of case reports would be appropriate from a public health perspective can be debated. A general solution to the question of referral bias is to restrict the study to more serious cases of the disease. It can be expected that, for most diseases, all serious cases will eventually be diagnosed correctly.

**Self-selection**

When patients decide themselves to participate or to leave a study, a type of selection bias may occur, because this decision may be related both to drug exposure and to change in health status. Hence, the association observed in the study sample may not be representative of the real association in the source population. This problem is particularly important in interview-based historical case-control studies, because both outcome and exposure are already manifest when study subjects are recruited. It could be the case, for instance, when studying birth defects; we can easily imagine that mothers of affected children who also have “something to report” (i.e., use of medications) may be more (or less) likely to participate. Such a situation is not unusual in pharmacoepidemiology. The problem must be controlled at the design level.
by incorporating systematically all the cases suffering from the condition. Having a registry is an excellent way to cope with this problem of selection. A similar problem may occur in historical cohort studies relying on volunteers. Losses to followup may also bias the results similarly in cohort studies, if those who drop out belong to a special disease–exposure category.

Prevalence Bias

Another type of selection bias may occur in case–control studies when prevalent cases rather than new cases of a condition are selected for a study. An association with prevalence may be related to the duration of the disease rather than to its incidence, because prevalence is proportional to both incidence and duration of the disease. An association between drug use and prevalent cases could thus reflect an association with a prognostic factor rather than with incidence. It is possible that a positive association with “good prognosis prevalent cases” might not be confirmed in the whole group of patients defined by incidence. The situation could even be worse if only one group of patients defined by their disease duration receives the medication. It would be the case, for example, if only survivors receive the medication; there will obviously be a positive association between drug use and outcome.

Another similar bias may occur when patients are recruited through a screening procedure. The population selected by screening may be different from the one identified by clinically manifest symptoms. There may be different relationships between drug exposure and adverse effects in these two subpopulations.

Generally speaking, criteria for inclusion, even those not clearly stated, must be considered with the highest attention when interpreting the results from nonexperimental studies; preventing selection bias or dealing with it is an essential stage in the development of a protocol in pharmacoepidemiology.

“Protopathic Bias”

The term “protopathic bias” was first used by Feinstein.8 It may occur “if a particular maneuver was started, stopped, or otherwise changed because of the baseline manifestation caused by a disease or other outcome event...” Confusion between cause and effect may then arise. For instance, people could stop taking aspirin because of the presence of blood in their stools. If the presence of blood were the first expression of colon cancer, we would find a negative association between current aspirin use and colon cancer. This type of bias is a consequence of selecting only clinically manifest cases, and of the difficulty of precisely ascertaining exposure that occurred in the past. This situation may occur in pharmacoepidemiology because diseases are often identified late after their first clinical expression and exposure to drugs may change from day to day. Such possibilities demonstrate the paramount importance of as full an understanding as possible of the pathophysiologic mechanism of disease development in designing pharmacoepidemiologic studies.

Information and Misclassification Bias

Each time participants in a study are classified with regard to their exposure and disease status, there is a possibility of error, i.e., unexposed people may be considered exposed, and sick people may be considered normal (and the reverse). This type of error may lead to a misclassification bias. It may equally affect case–control and cohort studies. When the error occurs randomly (i.e., independently of the exposure–outcome relationship), it leads to what is referred to as nondifferential misclassification. When the degree of error in measuring disease or exposure is influenced by knowledge of the exposure or the outcome status, the misclassification that results is said to be differential misclassification, which means systematically biased. For example, this may occur in cohort studies during the process of data collection, when knowledge of the exposure influences systematically the quality of the information collected about disease outcome. Alternatively, this may occur in case–control studies when knowledge of the disease status influences the quality of the information collected about exposure. This differential misclassification is also
called *information bias*. We will describe these two types of misclassification bias in more detail.

**Nondifferential Misclassification**

When the degree of misclassification is similar for all patients and independent of both exposure and health status conditions (because the instrument is not very reliable, for instance), it is called nondifferential or random misclassification. It may lead to a decrease in the strength of the association between drug and outcome (bias toward the null value). In extreme circumstances, it may even reverse the measure of effect. This tendency is very important to consider when the conclusion of the study is that there is "no statistically significant association." This may merely be due to important random misclassification. In pharmacoepidemiology, the assessment of drug exposure is likely to be affected by an important rate of nondifferential misclassification because it is related to many factors that are difficult to control. Figure 43.2 shows the different possibilities for misclassifying drug exposure. This is also discussed in more detail in Chapter 39.

Another important misclassification may occur when dichotomizing a patient's exposure as "exposed/not exposed" without taking into account the timing of the exposure. The International Agranulocytosis and Aplastic Anemia Study (IAAAS)\(^\text{22}\) was criticized because the authors defined their time window only in relation to the occurrence of outcome and not in relation to the onset of drug exposure, ignoring patients' history of previous exposure.\(^\text{22}\) The fact that previous, especially long term, exposure to the drug was likely to be associated with a lower risk of severe events could have distorted the results. This lack of accuracy in defining exposure may result in an important information bias, which may lead to a nonsignificant association overall while, in fact, within a specific time window, there is a very strong association between the drug and the outcome.
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**Figure 43.2.** Factors influencing drug exposure.
Figure 43.3 shows different hazard functions related to drug exposure. Anaphylactic reactions occur rapidly after drug exposure, the risk being very high during a short period of time and null after this period. For other outcomes, the risk is likely to decrease with time. For instance, chronic long term users of a given anti-inflammatory drug are likely to be at a lower risk of gastrointestinal bleeding than new users. It is also possible that in some circumstances the risk steadily increases with time, due for instance to the cumulative effect of drug exposure (e.g., risk of myocardial toxicity after the use of doxorubicin). In the example shown in Figure 43.3, the instantaneous risk is completely different in each situation but the average risk for the full period is similar. The
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**Figure 43.3.** Hazard functions related to drug exposure.
average risk for the total period of follow-up does not represent the real risk faced by the patients. This mismeasurement is likely to decrease the strength of the association between drug exposure and adverse event.

**Differential Misclassification**

When misclassification is related to the exposure–outcome association, we refer to it as differential or systematic misclassification. This possibility occurs each time the knowledge about the outcome status in a case–control study, or the exposure status in a cohort study, influences the validity of the information collected. In pharmacoepidemiology, two situations are commonly responsible for this type of bias: “differential recall” and “differential detection.”

- **Recall bias** is an important concern in retrospective studies, e.g., in case–control studies cases and controls may have a different memory of their past exposures. In studies of birth defects, for example, mothers with an impaired child may give a more valid and complete report of their exposure to drugs during pregnancy. This has nothing to do with deliberate lies or a desire to mislead, but to memory being better when there is good reason for it. This problem must be controlled at the design level by choosing, for instance, a control group likely to have the same memory of the past, if possible, e.g., alternative birth defects (see also Chapter 42).

- **Detection bias** can affect either cohort or case–control studies. It occurs in case-control studies when the procedures for exposure assessment are not similar in cases and controls (e.g., more attention is given to accessing exposure in the cases). In cohort studies, it occurs when the follow-up procedures for detecting adverse events differ according to the exposure status of the participants. For instance, women taking postmenopausal hormonal supplements are likely to see their doctors more often than other women. These women are therefore more likely to be examined for breast or endometrial cancer, or for the risk of cardiovascular disease.

This differential follow-up may lead to an excess number of diagnosed diseases in the treated group and a falsely elevated risk, or to more complete preventive care, leading to a decreased risk. Differential follow-up may sometimes be very subtle. For instance, if a drug is responsible for the development of side-effects that require specific care (e.g., abdominal pain requiring radiologic examination or medical visits), the differential follow-up induced by this condition may be responsible for an excess of diagnoses of several other already prevalent conditions that would otherwise have not been identified (e.g., cholelithiasis).

**CONFOUNDING**

**Confounding** occurs when the estimate of a measure of association between drug exposure and health status is distorted by the effect of one or several other variables that are also risk factors for the outcome of interest. Confounding occurs when the distribution of these risk factors is unbalanced across the different levels of the drug exposure. In this case, the occurrence of the outcome is changing from one level of the drug exposure to the other in relation (partly or totally) to the cofactors. Without good information on the other risk factors, i.e., valid and precise measurement of their magnitude, it is not possible to separate the respective effect of each component. The estimate measured in this condition is said to be “confounded” by the other cofactors.

In this section of the chapter, we shall present some numerical examples aimed at showing the mechanism of confounding and the statistical principles for correcting its effect. We shall also describe some important confounders in pharmacoepidemiology and we shall show that it is sometimes difficult to distinguish confounding and selection bias.

**Mechanism of Confounding**

For a variable to be a confounder, it must be associated with both the drug exposure and the outcome of interest, without being in the causal pathway between the drug exposure and the
outcome. In other words, it must represent an independent risk factor. Figure 43.4 shows the classical relationship between the three variables. For example, when studying the relationship between the use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and the occurrence of a gastric ulcer, personal history of gastric problems can be a confounder, because (i) personal history of gastric problems is a risk factor for gastric ulcers and (ii) a history of gastric problems will modify the probability of physicians’ prescribing nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs.

In such a situation, the measure of association between nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and gastric ulcers can be affected by the confounder. In the extreme situation, physicians could decide never to use nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in patients with a history of gastric problems. These drugs could then appear as protective for peptic ulcer. The result in this case would obviously be biased. A confounder may be responsible for a part or all of the effect observed. It may exaggerate, mitigate, or reverse a true effect. The existence of confounding is generally established by comparing the crude estimate of the association with the estimate obtained after controlling for the potential confounder.

Table 43.1 presents a fictitious example of confounding. A cohort study of deaths associated with the use of drug A was conducted. The comparison group consisted of patients treated with drug B. When data for all patients were considered together, the following results were observed: the risk of death was 202/1100 = 18% among patients using drug A, and it was 8/110 = 7% among drug B users. The relative risk was therefore 18%/7% = 2.5, indicating a harmful effect of drug A. The study population was then subdivided into two strata: subjects with a severe form of the disease being treated, and those with a more benign form of the disease. When the analysis was conducted within each of these two strata, the direction of the effect was reversed. Among subjects with severe disease, the risks of death were 20 and 40%, respectively, for drugs A and B, for a relative risk of 0.5. The risks of death were lower for subjects with a benign form of the disease, but the relative risk was also 0.5.

These data represent an extreme example of confounding. Obviously, if the estimate of the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe disease</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benign disease</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 43.4. Mechanism of confounding.
measure of effect, i.e., the relative risk, is 0.5 among subjects with severe disease and also 0.5 among those with benign disease, the overall estimate of effect, when the data for all subjects are pooled, should also be 0.5. The estimate of 2.5 is not valid, because of confounding by the severity of the disease. An inspection of Table 43.1 shows that subjects with severe disease experience a death rate that is much higher than the rate among those with benign disease. In addition, however, the distribution of study subjects by drug category is not balanced. One thousand subjects with severe disease received drug A. The numbers of subjects in the other subsets of the study population are much smaller. Because of this, the crude estimate of relative risk obtained when the data from the two strata are pooled is heavily influenced by the mortality experience among the 1000 subjects, and this results in the distorted estimate of 2.5.

Table 43.2 gives another example of confounding. In this cohort study, the association between the use of a drug and the risk of allergy was determined. Subjects with and subjects without drug treatment were compared. These data show confounding due to age. Older subjects experienced a high risk of allergy, and a very large group of old subjects without drug treatment was included in the study. Because of this, the overall relative risk was less than the relative risk among young subjects, and also less than the relative risk among old subjects. The confounding was, however, weaker than in the previous example. In the present example, the direction of the association was the same for the overall study population and for the two strata. In the previous example, there was a reversal of effect.

Table 43.2 shows another phenomenon. The estimate of relative risk is not the same for young and for old subjects (4 and 2, respectively). This represents effect modification or interaction: the magnitude of the drug effect on the risk of allergy varies between strata. A statistical test is usually used to assess whether such variation between strata can be attributed to random fluctuations, or whether it represents a true effect.

### Important Confounders in Pharamacoepidemiology

#### Confounding by the Reason for Prescription

The indication for a prescription is probably the most important confounding factor in pharmacoepidemiology since, theoretically, there is always a reason for prescription and because the reason is often associated with the outcome of interest. The situation has been the object of important considerations in the discussion of study results (see also Chapter 34). It has also received several different names such as “indication bias,” “channeling,” or “confounding by severity.” All these labels, as well as others such as “contra-indication bias,” just represent the fact that there is a reason for prescribing a drug.

The problem of confounding by indication can be considered in the same perspective as selection bias, because the decision to prescribe can be viewed as one way to select a group of patients. If this selection process is also related to the outcome (which is often the case, especially when considering drug efficacy—see Chapter 34), there is a bias. This perspective shows that, for a given drug, the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stratum</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Allergy</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All</td>
<td>drug</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>14%/9% = 1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no drug</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>drug</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8%/2% = 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no drug</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old</td>
<td>drug</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>20%/10% = 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no drug</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
possibility of bias is not universal, but is directly related to the outcome studied and may also change over time, or from one country to another. It also shows the extreme difficulty of adjusting for this type of confounding. Miettinen has discussed this problem in the context of a study of intended effects.24 “Thus, perceived high risk or poor prognosis tends to constitute an indication for intervention…. Where such an indication does guide the use of intervention, it constitutes a confounder: it is, by definition, a correlate of the determinant at issue, the intervention, and it is a predictor of the null outcome in so far as it indeed does imply the presumed high risk or poor prognosis.”

The term “confounding by indication” implies that we could control for the reason for the prescription at the analysis stage. Although this is theoretically possible, it is in practice often impossible to obtain a sufficiently accurate estimate of the effect of this confounder, even when the reason for prescribing seems very straightforward. That is because “indication” is a very complex and multifactorial phenomenon involving the physician’s knowledge and many factors, sometimes not rational, which act in different directions. Miettinen provided an example that the preventive use of warfarin can be associated with a 27-fold increase in the risk of thrombotic events, a condition that should actually be prevented by anticoagulation.24 This paradoxical result was explained by a strong negative confounding effect, i.e., only highly susceptible patients, or those already presenting the first symptoms of thrombosis (see protopathic bias) were receiving the therapy. Miettinen showed further in that example that controlling for the information available related to the reasons for the prescription, e.g., previous history of blood clotting, reduced the bias but could not change the direction of the association: after adjustment the risk in treated patients was still four times higher than in nontreated patients.

The example illustrates that it can be very difficult to measure accurately the reasons for prescribing. This rather pessimistic conclusion has two consequences. The first one is related to the scope of research in pharmacoepidemiology, in which the study of the determinants of prescribing is a domain requiring much attention. The second is related to the desirability of randomized clinical trials, rather than nonexperimental studies, whenever the results from nonexperimental studies are likely to be biased and “inconclusive” because of confounding by the indication. A more positive view of this situation would, on the other hand, consider that, even when confounding by indication is present, the resulting information can be useful for other purposes. For example, it has been postulated that the reported association between β-agonists and asthma mortality was confounded by disease severity.25 Even in the presence of such a bias, however, the fact that β-agonists were positively correlated with asthma deaths can be very useful information for physicians, as the amount of drug use becomes a good indicator of prognosis.

Confounding by Comedication and Other Cofactors

Patients often take more than one drug at a time and it is sometimes difficult to isolate the effect of a specific drug. This question was discussed in the analysis of the Coronary Drug Project,27 which showed that in the placebo group the risks of death in the five years following randomization were 15% and 28.2%, respectively, among compliant patients and noncompliant patients. Beyond a possible selection bias that would relate the better survival to some hypothetical and undetermined factors, the main reason postulated as an explanation for this difference was the fact that patients who were compliant with one drug were also very likely to be compliant with other interventions (e.g., other very effective drugs, diet, physical exercise, etc.). As in the problem of confounding by indication, it is possible to control in part the effect of all other cofactors, but the feasibility of doing so is limited (it is for instance very difficult to quantify compliance precisely), and residual bias is likely to remain.

Confounding and Effect Modification

Confounding and effect modification (or interaction) are both “multivariable phenomena,” i.e.,
there is a third variable, or group of variables, that plays a role in the observed effect between the drug exposure and the outcome of interest. It is, however, very important to distinguish between the two phenomena, as they have different consequences and require different strategies to be controlled for. As we have seen, Tables 43.1 and 43.2 present two hypothetical examples, one with confounding (Table 43.1) and the other one with interaction (Table 43.2). We can see that, as already defined, a third variable (or covariate) is a confounder when it is responsible for part or all of the observed effect. Table 43.1 shows that the “harmful effect of drug A” was in fact due to the selective exposure of patients with the most severe cases of the disease to drug A, while patients with benign disease were more likely to be exposed to drug B. In this situation, the crude estimate of the drug effect represents a combination of two effects: (drug A + severe disease) versus (drug B + benign disease). Table 43.1 also shows that the relative risks for drugs A and B remained constant across the different strata of the confounder. The relative effects of drug A and B were not modified by the severity of the disease. In this situation, severity is said to be a confounder, but not an effect modifier. It is possible to adjust for the difference in distribution of disease severity among the two groups of drug users, and obtain an overall relative risk which in this case will be 0.5, instead of 2.5, the unadjusted crude relative risk.

Table 43.2 shows another example of confounding, but it also shows that the drug effect (measured by the relative risk) varies across the different strata of age. In this situation, age is said to be both a confounder and an effect modifier. It would be possible, as in the previous example, to combine the stratum-specific effects into an overall measure of effect, adjusted for the difference in age distribution. This overall adjusted result, however, is meaningless and may be misleading, as the average result represents a combination of a positive effect for certain patients and negative effects for others. When there is effect modification, the stratum-specific effect provides more information, and is also more interpretable than the single summary figure.

Effect modification corresponds to the statistical concept of interaction. An important point related to interaction is that it is model dependent: interaction may exist with one parameter measuring the effect, the risk ratio for instance, but not with another parameter, such as the risk difference. Moreover, interaction is often a finding at the time of the analysis, as there is generally not enough information for suspecting and quantifying a priori its presence. Effect modification, thus, is often useful for generating new hypotheses and is generally presented as a finding that may be worth being further studied.

Through these considerations it appears that confounding is a nuisance and a threat in pharmacoepidemiology because it may affect the validity of the results. On the other hand, effect modification indicates a variation in the drug effect, according to different levels of a third variable. If it is confirmed, this change of effect may be the source of important findings regarding the use of the drug and its mechanism of action. Effect modification is thus an important piece of information that deserves high consideration, adequate study, and careful interpretation.

Effect Modification by Dose or Drug Potency

Different dosages and potencies are likely to have different effects that should be presented in the analysis. Reducing the information related to exposure into a dichotomous expression, i.e., exposed versus not exposed, increases the rate of misclassification and biases the results toward the null. Spitzer et al., for instance, concluded that use of both fenoterol and albuterol were associated with an excess risk of death in asthmatic patients, probably in relation to the severity of the patient’s condition. Table 43.3 shows that the dichotomous classification of drug exposure was associated with a threefold excess risk of death with fenoterol compared to albuterol. However, taking into account (1) the number of inhalers used, and also (2) the concentration of drug per inhalation (100 μg for albuterol and 200 μg for fenoterol), completely modified the results, such that the risk of death appear similar with the two drugs. This demonstrates the importance in pharmacoepide-
Table 43.3. Risk of death in asthmatic patients treated by fenoterol and albuterol: change in study results with change in measurement of drug exposure.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Odds ratio</th>
<th>95% confidence interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crude association exposed vs not exposed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenoterol</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.0–0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albuterol</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.0–7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results per number of inhalers dispensed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenoterol: 0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–12</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>1.1–20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–24</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>5.1–319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>17.0–754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albuterol: 0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>reference group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–12</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.9–13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13–24</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.1–46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>5.1–171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model of continuous exposure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fenoterol 100 µg</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6–3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>albuterol 100 µg</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5–3.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* From reference 23, with permission

pharmacology research of considering the possibility of differences in drug dose and drug potency in studying drug effects (see also Chapter 4).

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

HOW CAN ONE DEAL WITH SELECTION BIAS?

Selection bias must be prevented at the design stage, because it cannot be corrected at the analysis stage. The objective is to prevent over- or under-representation of the people who have a particular drug exposure–outcome relationship. This can be achieved in several ways, which all result in selecting a study population that accurately represents the target population concerning the drug exposure–outcome relationship.

- Random sampling of the cases and controls (or exposed and nonexposed patients) to be included in the study from the source population.
- Systematically recruiting a series of consecutive patients (to prevent self-selection).
- Adopting a well codified accrual procedure (to be adapted according to the nature and severity of the disease). Having a geographic definition of the incident cases goes a long way toward reducing referral bias.
- Minimizing the number of subjects lost to follow-up in cohort studies.
- Implementing a tracking procedure for those who drop out of the study, in order to establish the reason and, if possible, to measure their health status.
- Selecting only incident cases of the condition.
- Random allocation of drug exposure, which prevents both self-selection and referral bias. This “perfect” situation, however, is very difficult to implement, and is generally limited to a small number of people who are followed for a short period of time. Besides ethical, cost, and logistic problems, the experimental design often also creates situations far from real life (see also Chapter 2).

HOW CAN ONE DEAL WITH INFORMATION BIAS?

As with selection bias, the problem of information bias must be resolved at the design stage, since its presence irremediably affects the study validity. Several techniques facilitate an unbiased collection of information.
BIAS AND CONFOUNDING IN PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY

- **Blinding** is the most important strategy, as it is easier to be neutral when it is not known who is exposed, who is sick, and what are the objectives of the study. In a cohort study, the data collector should be blind as to the patient's exposure status and the patient should be unaware of the study objectives. In a case-control study, the data collector should be blind to the disease status and, if possible, the information related to the past exposure should be collected without knowing the specific objectives of the study. Blinded assessment of the information is often difficult, however, in nonexperimental designs.

- **Standardization of the measurement process** for both cases and controls, or exposed and unexposed people, is an essential step when implementing a pharmacoepidemiology study. It includes, for instance, the use of standard structured questionnaires, specific training of interviewers, the participation of different observers for different measurements, etc.

- The choices of the criteria for defining drug exposure and disease outcomes are important. Priority should be given to objective, previously defined, standardized criteria.

**HOW CAN ONE DEAL WITH CONFOUNDING?**

In contrast with information bias and selection bias, it is possible to control the effect of confounding at both the design and the analysis levels. We will present an overview of the different strategies that may be used; we will also describe several approaches that have been developed to deal with confounding when working with large although incomplete (no information on confounding) databases, a frequent condition in pharmacoepidemiology.

Dealing with Confounding at the Design Level

There are several ways of controlling for confounding when preparing the design of pharmacoepidemiology studies: randomization, matching, and restriction will successively be described.

**Randomization**

Random allocation of exposure should equalize the distribution of all potential confounders, even unknown ones, across the different levels of drug exposure. Randomization is thus aimed at making the two groups perfectly similar apart from the independent intervention variable under assessment as exposure. This shows that the problem of confounding is in this way similar to selection bias. The distinction between the two situations may be subtle and, as Rothman wrote, a practical distinction between confounding and other biases is to consider bias as confounding if it can be controlled in the data analysis.¹

**Matching**

Matching is another way to control for confounding at the design stage. The objective of matching for both cohort or case-control studies is to make the two compared groups similar with regard to the distribution of selected known extraneous factors. A matched design requires a matched analysis if the matching variable was truly a confounder. In practice, matching may be difficult, especially when there are several factors to match for; it may then become costly and time consuming. In case-control studies matching may also lead to a new distorting phenomenon called "overmatching:" similarity with regard to exposure may also be related to disease status. In this case, there is artificially no apparent difference between the exposure level of cases and controls (with regard to the exposure of interest) because of the matching.

**Restriction**

Restriction of the design to only one level of the confounding factor is the simplest, but also the most reductive, way of dealing with confounding. For instance, studying the effect of a drug in only one category of age will protect against the occurrence of confounding by age. The generalizability of the study, however, may be confined to this age group.
Dealing with Confounding at the Analysis Level

**Standardization** represents a classical method of controlling for confounding; it is often used for comparing vital statistics from populations that have different age or sex distributions, especially in occupational epidemiology. A standardized (or summary) rate is thus a weighted average of stratum-specific rates.

Standardized rate \( = \frac{\sum_i W_i I_i}{\sum_i W_i} \) where \( W_i \) and \( I_i \) represent, respectively, the stratum-specific weight and the stratum-specific incidence rate. The ratio of standardized rates gives one an estimate of the effect of the exposure, where the ratio of standardized rates \( = \frac{\sum_i W_i (a_i/N_{i1})}{\sum_i W_i (b_i/N_{i0})} \) and \( N_{i1} \) and \( N_{i0} \) represent, respectively, the stratum-specific size of the populations which are exposed \( (N_{i1}) \) and not exposed \( (N_{i0}) \) to the drug; and \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) represent the number of cases in each stratum that are, respectively, exposed \( (a_i) \) and not exposed \( (b_i) \) to the drug.

There are two methods of standardization: direct and indirect. Table 43.4 shows the principle of each method and the requirements for their computation. The number of factors that can be managed by standardization is limited (i.e., two or three). Pharmacoepidemiology research usually requires the manipulation of more than three factors and often, therefore, requires the use of other techniques such as modeling.

**Stratification**

*Stratification* is another way of obtaining a summary rate ratio. It is performed in two stages: the first stage requires the computation of a stratum-specific rate ratio for each level of the stratifying (confounding) variable. The second stage involves pooling the results into a single estimate that represents the “overall” effect of the drug, adjusted for the effect of the confounding factor. Standardization and stratification both pursue the same objective of obtaining a pooled estimate of the drug effect.

There are several ways of pooling the stratum-specific measures of effect into an overall estimate.1,7–10 A classic approach consists of defining the weights as proportional to the inverse of each stratum’s variance, i.e., weighting the contribution of each stratum by its statistical stability. The most popular approach to this has been proposed by

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Methods of standardization</th>
<th>Requirements</th>
<th>Principles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct</td>
<td>age-specific rates in each age stratum(^1)</td>
<td>The age-specific rates for the two compared groups are applied to the standard population. For each age stratum of the standard population an expected number of events is obtained for each observed group; it is the one that would have been observed if the standard population had the age-specific rates of the observed groups. The sum of these expected cases in each group is then divided by the size of the standard population. This provides one age-adjusted mortality rate for each group, which may then be compared.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>a standard population with its age distribution(^2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect</td>
<td>distribution by age in each of the two compared groups</td>
<td>The population of each stratum of the two compared groups is multiplied by the age-specific rate of a standard population. The computation gives an expected number of events in each group, which is the number that would have occurred if these groups had the age-specific rates of the standard population. In each studied population the expected number is then divided by the observed number of events. The values are called standardized mortality (or incidence) ratios.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>age-specific rates of a standard population</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mantel and Haenszel for the odds ratio in case–control studies, and provides a formula which is easy to compute:

\[
\text{adjusted rate ratio} = \frac{\sum_i W_i (a_i / N_{ii}) / (b_i / N_{ii})}{\sum_i W_i}
\]

Mantel–Haenszel odds ratio = \( \sum_i a_i (N_{0i} / T_i) / \sum_i b_i (N_{ii} / T_i) \) where \( T_i, N_{0i} \) and \( N_{ii} \) represent, respectively, the stratum sample size, the number of unexposed controls, and the number of exposed controls; \( a_i \) and \( b_i \) represent the number of cases in, respectively, the exposed and the unexposed groups.

Stratification is performed in order to have very little or no variation of the confounder within each stratum of the confounding variable. When this is the case, no or very little confounding remains in each stratum. Stratification, therefore (like “adjustment,” described below), requires an accurate measurement of the confounding variable to fulfill its objective. Nondifferential misclassification of a confounder may lead to the persistence of some confounding.

The limitation of stratified analysis is that, each time a new factor is added, stratum-specific cell sizes become smaller, and the probability of having people not exposed or not sick in each stratum becomes larger. The stratum-specific estimate of the measure of association cannot then be computed, and the stratum does not provide any statistical information. In this situation, it is better to use a multivariate approach, modeling the relationship between exposure to all factors of interest and the outcome.

**Multivariate Analysis and Modeling**

Determining the relationship between risk factors and outcomes using a mathematical model allows the assessment of many factors at the same time. According to the pre-specified model of relationship (this choice is a crucial one), a parameter of effect will be estimated for each risk factor. This estimate represents the individual contribution of the factor for the risk of the outcome, adjusted for all other factors in the model. Modeling is a very powerful technique, which requires sophisticated skills in biostatistics and epidemiology. Most of the important models are derived from the general linear model.

**Dealing with Confounding When Working with Large Drug Databases**

Standardization, stratification, and modeling all require an accurate measurement of the confounding variable. Recently, a large number of pharmacoepidemiology studies have been performed using large databases of previously collected data (see also Chapters 15–23). One of the major limitations of these studies is the impossibility of adjusting for potential confounders not included in the database. An example would be a study of the relationship between low-dose oral contraceptives and the risk of myocardial infarction. Databases are likely to provide accurate figures for oral contraceptive (OC) prescription and the occurrence of myocardial infarction, for example, but are very unlikely to provide any information on smoking habits, a strong risk factor for myocardial infarction, which is also related to OC use. Not being able to control for such an important confounder prevents studying this association, because the results will obviously be biased: OC users are also heavy smokers. When information on the confounder is available for the cases only, Ray showed how to use this information to assess the presence of confounding. If it can be assumed there is no effect modification then, if there is no association between the confounder and exposure among the cases, there is no confounding, and a valid analysis can be carried out. This suggestion is interesting because pharmacoepidemiologists often have more information for the cases (because of hospitalization records) than for the controls (see also Chapter 44).

When information on confounders is not available, it is possible to simulate the effect that the confounder could have by incorporating into a model the information related to the strength of the association of the confounding variable with both the outcome and the exposure of interest, as well as the proportion of people exposed to the confounder. Fine and Chen, for instance, reconsidered the relationship between the risk of pertussis vaccine and the occurrence of sudden
infant death syndrome (SIDS). Most studies have shown a significant protective effect of the vaccine, with relative risks as low as 0.15 and a 95% confidence interval of 0.05 to 0.45.31 Despite the strength of this association, almost no causal inference has been drawn from these results; it is generally assumed that other external factors might be responsible for either avoidance or delay of vaccination, and further development of SIDS. Fine and Chen identified a list of seven potential confounders that had been shown to be related to “failure or delay in receiving vaccines,” and also were risk factors for SIDS. They further focused on what they identified as “contraindications to vaccine” and built a model for correcting the crude relative risk. They could study the variation of the adjusted relative risk for different values of (i) the percentage of children with vaccination, (ii) the relative risk of SIDS associated with vaccination, and (iii) the percentage of vaccination among children with and without contraindications, respectively. These models are certainly interesting for assessing the magnitude of the problem; they are, however, limited for providing an accurate adjusted figure.

In 1982, White32 and Walker33 suggested sampling a fraction of the study population to gather information about confounding variables, and using this information in the analysis to obtain covariate-adjusted estimates of the parameters of interest. This approach, referred to as “two stage sampling,”34,35 was further developed by Cain and Breslow36 for multivariate analysis. Efficiency is the essence of this approach, motivated by the desire to use resources optimally. In this approach, stage 1 represents the study population, for example the cases and controls in a case–control study. Individuals for stage 2 are selected according to their disease–exposure characteristics. The balanced design is often more efficient than random and disease- or exposure-based sampling; it consists in having an equal number of individuals in each cell of the second stage $2 \times 2$ table. This strategy decreases the occurrence of small cells (responsible for large variance) by forcing an over-representation of individuals who belong to small groups in the exposure–disease cross classification. The sampling fractions that lead to the second stage sample are typically different for each exposure–disease category, creating a selection bias which must be corrected in the analysis. The two-stage design permits the detection of, and adjustment for, confounding. Interaction can also be evaluated. Recently, Schaubel et al. proposed software for sample size estimation for two-stage sampling.37

THE FUTURE

One great challenge facing the future in pharmacoepidemiology is the ability to control adequately for “indication for prescribing” at the analysis stage. This requires obtaining a valid and complete ascertainment of the reasons for prescribing drugs. This could be accomplished by adopting very strict, standardized, and measurable criteria for prescribing drugs. Whenever it is not possible to clearly differentiate the respective effects of the drug and the underlying medical conditions, implementing randomized clinical trials in the postmarketing phase should be considered.

It is also interesting to consider bias and confounding in pharmacoepidemiology under a dynamic perspective. We have already described the change in referral patterns after the publication of a single case report. Confounding is susceptible to change with time as well, as the decision to prescribe depends directly on the physician. We could even conceptualize the ultimate objective of research in medicine and pharmacoepidemiology as to bias the prescribing of physicians, as only patients who may benefit from the drug should receive it. With this perspective, identification of a change in efficacy or variability in drug effect according to a patient’s characteristics or other factors (i.e., the presence of effect modification) should subsequently induce a change in physicians’ prescribing to take into account this information. This change is normal and expected, as obtaining a more accurate definition of the treatment target population is an objective of pharmacoepidemiology research.38 Any further studies of the effect of the drug may then be biased by this new reason for prescribing. We may therefore view confounding by indication as a natural and positive conse-
sequence of integrating the results of research into medicine, rather than simply a nuisance while estimating the real effect of a drug.

Another important issue facing pharmacoepidemiology is the ability to measure drug exposure more accurately (see also Chapter 39). This should be accomplished by more accurately defining exposure time windows, by better considering dosage and potency, and by accurately measuring drug use; the study of compliance represents thus a highly promising domain of research with regard to the study of drug effects. The development of population pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics, as well as pharmacogenetics, should also provide useful information for interpreting pharmacoepidemiology results with regard to drug exposure.
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INTRODUCTION

The last two decades have witnessed an explosion of methodological advances in the design and analysis of epidemiological studies. Several of these contributions have been fundamental to the field of epidemiology in general, thus transcending precise applications, such as cancer, cardiovascular, occupational, or infectious disease epidemiology, to name a few. Further methodological advances have, on the other hand, arisen specifically from questions posed by pharmacoepidemiology applications or simply found a niche in pharmacoepidemiology because of the distinct nature of the available (and unavailable) data in this field, as well as its specific needs. Several of these advances have already played an important role in the conduct of research on drug effects, and will certainly take a greater place in future applications. In this chapter, we introduce some of these approaches.

First, we present various strategies of sampling within a large cohort, as an alternative to analyzing the full cohort. These sampling schemes are crucial in pharmacoepidemiology, where cohorts are necessarily large and the related expense and time of data collection and analysis for every single member of the cohort can be prohibitive. Even if all the data are available, the fact that exposure, namely drug use, varies over time, and often involves multiple uses, implies very complex measures of exposure and formidable technical challenges in data analysis. Consequently, it becomes indispensable to use strategies based on the collection and analysis of data for a sample of the cohort. The nested case–control and case–cohort techniques are discussed for both internal and external comparisons of adverse event rates. We also discuss the role of time in sampling within the cohort.

Second, we describe techniques of design and analysis for situations where only partial data are
available on confounders. The first, an approach developed around specific problems in pharmacoepidemiology, is a practical method that permits the investigator to assess whether a factor is a confounder, and to adjust for this confounder, when data on this factor are only available in the cases and not in the controls of a case–control study. This situation is commonly encountered in pharmacoepidemiology, particularly when using computerized databases where data, in both quantity and quality, are more readily available for the cases than noncases. We also briefly introduce the two-stage sampling technique, which deals with confounder data available on a sample of the cases and controls of the study population.

Third, we describe new designs that use within-subject comparisons to estimate risk, namely the case-crossover and case-time-control designs. These designs, dealing with the study of transient drug effects on the risk of acute adverse events, are useful when there is uncertainty about the proper selection of controls under the traditional case–control approach or when unmeasured confounders are deemed to be important. We also briefly describe methods based solely on prescription drug databases, namely prescription sequence analysis and prescription sequence symmetry analysis, to assess the risk of a drug as well as the phenomenon of channeling of drugs.

**CLINICAL PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY RESEARCH**

Pharmacoepidemiology deals with several facets of drug research, including the utilization, benefits, and risks of drugs. The primary focus of pharmacoepidemiology, however, and the one that receives the greatest attention and interest, is that of assessing the risk of uncommon, at times latent, and often unexpected adverse conditions resulting from the use of medications. Whereas the more common conditions are usually studied prior to drug marketing using experimental research designs such as randomized clinical trials, for the study of uncommon adverse conditions, the mainstay of pharmacoepidemiology, we must rely on methods based on nonexperimental designs. The greatest challenge of this field is then to quantify the risk of a drug accurately, relative to one or a variety of alternatives. Three features of nonexperimental research methods, affecting the degree of uncertainty in this risk assessment process, have recently been the object of methodological development and are the subject of this chapter.

First, because of the rarity of the adverse conditions under study, source populations and study cohorts must be extremely large to permit the control of statistical uncertainty arising from random error. It is not unusual to require population or cohort sizes in the tens or even hundreds of thousands of subjects to identify a sufficiently large number of subjects with the adverse condition under study to yield stable results. For example, the Cancer Prevention Study II cohort used 1.2 million persons to assess the effect of aspirin use on the risk of colon cancer, while the Nurses’ Health Study cohort used 121,700 subjects to study the effect of oral contraceptives on the risk of cardiovascular diseases. As described in Part III of this book, hurdles in forming these massive cohorts have been reduced by the use of computerized databases. Such databases have in fact revolutionized risk assessment research in pharmacoepidemiology, where conclusive information about a drug’s potential risks cannot be delayed by the lengthy process of classical epidemiologic methods. Nevertheless, even if many of these data are already computerized, they remain expensive and time-consuming to collect in such mega-sized cohorts. Moreover, drug exposure often varies over time and involves multiple agents, which complicates the analysis of cohort data. Accordingly, efficient designs to sample a manageable number of study subjects within such cohorts have been devised and can be used effectively in pharmacoepidemiology, providing accurate results more rapidly and at less expense. The first part of this chapter deals with these more efficient designs.

The second source of uncertainty is related to the presence of confounding factors, which may possibly bias risk estimates and distort
corresponding conclusions. For example, most epidemiologists accept unconditionally the finding that cervical clear-cell carcinoma in young women is caused by the use of diethylstilbestrol (DES) by their mothers during pregnancy.\textsuperscript{3} A few, however, still suggest that this is still an unresolved issue, as the association may be confounded by the mother’s history of spontaneous abortions and of bleeding during pregnancy.\textsuperscript{4} Analysis of such crucial studies requires a thorough knowledge and accurate measurements of the potential clinical confounders. Since data on confounders may be difficult to obtain on all subjects, a novel approach based on confounder data measured only on cases has been proposed and applied successfully in several studies. Moreover, a formula to estimate the corresponding adjusted rate ratios has been devised. We describe this technique here, since it is particularly suited to pharmacoepidemiology, where this problem is most often met. In addition, the two-stage sampling technique, which measures confounders on a sample of the case–control study population, will also be introduced as an alternative tool to address this challenge.

Third, pharmacoepidemiology is frequently faced with the assessment of the risk of rare acute adverse events resulting from transient drug effects. For example, we may wish to study the risk of ventricular tachycardia in association with the use of inhaled \(\beta\)-agonists in asthma. This possible effect has been hypothesized on the basis of clinical study observations of hypokalemia and prolonged Q–T intervals in patients after \(\beta\)-agonist exposure.\textsuperscript{5} These unusual cardiac deviations were observed only in the 4 hour period following drug absorption. Although the case–control approach can be used to address this question, the acuteness of the adverse event and the length of the drug’s effect, as well as difficulties in determining the timing of drug exposure, induce uncertainty about the proper selection of controls. Moreover, confounding by indication may often be a problematic issue in such a design. We will review a recently proposed approach that addresses these difficulties, the case-crossover design. We also review the case-time-control design, which was devised to counter the time-trend biases inherent in the case-crossover design. The concept of comparing exposures within subjects used by these approaches also led to the development of several techniques applied to prescription drugs database studies. These techniques, useful to describe drug use patterns and assess risk, are briefly discussed.

**METHODOLOGIC PROBLEMS TO BE ADDRESSED BY PHARMACOEPISTEMOLOGY RESEARCH**

**SAMPLING WITHIN A COHORT**

Cohort studies are essential to pharmacoepidemiology, as they form the basis for the quantification of drug risk assessment. By following users of the drug under investigation who are originally free of the adverse condition of concern until the occurrence of the adverse condition, a cohort enables the estimation of the rate of occurrence of this adverse event. Because of the usual rarity of the adverse events under study, the cohort must be composed of very large numbers of subjects (see also Chapter 3). For example, to quantify the risk of an adverse event occurring at the rate of 2 per 10 000 per year with a precision of \(\pm1\) per 10 000 with 95% probability necessitates a cohort of close to 80 000 subjects followed for 1 year (or 160 000 subjects followed for 6 months). This type of requirement explains the infrequent use of the cohort design in pharmacoepidemiology. Examples of authentic cohorts are scant. The Cancer Prevention Study II cohort of 1.2 million persons enrolled in 1982 was used to assess the effect of aspirin use on the risk of colon cancer.\textsuperscript{1} The Nurses’ Health Study cohort of 121 700 female nurses established in 1976 evaluated several associations, notably the effect of oral contraceptives on the risk of cardiovascular diseases.\textsuperscript{2} The McGill Hodgkin’s Disease cohort of 10 472 patients was formed to assess the effects of chemotherapy on the risk of second cancers\textsuperscript{9} and of coronary artery disease.\textsuperscript{7} The Oxford Family Planning Association cohort of 17 032 women assessed mortality associated with oral
contraceptive use.\textsuperscript{8} Other examples exist, but the list is short.

Complementing such authentic cohorts formed from actually following a group of “live” subjects over time, the “computerized” cohort has become a popular alternative. Most of Part III of this book is devoted to the description of national and regional computerized health databases, frequently used to form cohorts for drug risk assessment, from which we derive the distinguishing designation “computerized” cohort. In fact, because of the urgent nature of several drug risk assessment situations, the “live” cohort approach, with its prospective nature, cannot address the problem sufficiently rapidly in a majority of instances, unless of course if it happens to have been already formed and followed up for another purpose. Accordingly, the “computerized” cohort has become an indispensable instrument in the armamentarium of many investigators in pharmacoepidemiology.

In any cohort study, the cost, time, and resources necessary to collect data on all cohort members can be prohibitive. Moreover, even with computerized cohorts, most studies will need to supplement and validate data obtained from the computer databases with data from hospital records, medical records, and physician or patient interview questionnaires. When, as in the majority of instances, the cohort size is considerable, such additional data gathering can become a formidable task, if not next to impossible. More importantly, however, is when the exposure varies over time and includes several drugs. The analysis of such a cohort with time-dependent exposure measures can be infeasible, if not impossible. To counter these obvious cost, time, and feasibility constraints, designs based on sampling subjects within a cohort have been proposed and recently applied successfully in pharmacoepidemiology. These designs are based on the selection of all cases with an adverse event in the cohort, but differ in the selection of a small subset of noncases. Generally, they permit the precise estimation of relative risk measures with negligible losses in precision. Below, we discuss structural aspects of cohorts and present two sampling designs within a cohort, the nested case–control and case–cohort designs.

**PARTIAL CONFOUNDER DATA**

The most important limitation of the nonexperimental research methods frequently used in pharmacoepidemiology is the reservation about error in the final risk estimate. Invariably, questions are posed as to whether an important confounding factor which was not considered in the study design is biasing the reported results. A factor is considered a confounder if it is associated with the adverse event irrespective of exposure to the drug under study, and with exposure to the drug itself. Chapter 43 addresses this issue.

Essentially, two classical solutions exist to address the problem of confounding variables in nonexperimental studies, once all such potential confounders have been identified \textit{a priori}. We will use the case–control design to illustrate the problem, although the principles discussed in this section apply equally well to a cohort design. The first solution is to design the study to account for the confounder, e.g., selecting controls that are matched to the cases with respect to all these confounding factors and then using the appropriate corresponding techniques of analysis for matched data. The second solution is to select controls unmatched with respect to these confounding factors, but to measure these confounders in the course of the study for all subjects and use statistical techniques, based on either stratification or regression, permitting one to remove their effect on the risk from the effect of the drug under study. The advantage of the first approach over the second is that, for strong confounders, fewer subjects will be needed to attain a desired level of power and simpler techniques of data analysis will be necessary. The second approach will permit one to assess the relative contribution of the confounders to the risk, which is impossible with the first approach. Irrespective, both standard approaches require the measurement of each confounding factor for each subject in the study, case and control, whether at the design stage for the first or at the analysis phase for the second solution.

However, it is at times impossible to obtain data on certain important confounding variables. This limitation could be fatal to a study that is already
based on fragile nonexperimental methodology. A frequent situation encountered in pharmacoepidemiology research is the availability of a wealth of data for the cases but a shortage of data for the controls. This is particularly true for “computerized” studies based on administrative databases, where cases have likely been hospitalized, and thus have an extensive medical chart, or died and have lengthy coroner or autopsy reports. For these cases, the investigator will have access to abundant information on potential confounding variables. However, if the controls are population based, as is usually the practice with “computerized” studies, it is unlikely they were hospitalized and, even if they were, probably not as extensively as the cases. The controls will therefore not be able to provide comparable data on confounders on the basis of medical charts only. Since, in such studies, we rarely contact subjects directly but rather rely exclusively on charts and records to supplement the computerized information, confounder data will typically only be available in the cases, and not in the controls. This chapter will describe a strategy of analysis to assess whether a factor is a confounder based on data available uniquely for the cases and the formula to estimate the rate ratio adjusted for this partially available confounder. Another closely related situation is when the confounders can be measured on both cases and controls, but resources only allow this measure for a sample of subjects. The two-stage sampling approach has been advanced as a strategy to efficiently select this sample and obtain adjusted estimates of the rate ratio. This approach will also be briefly described.

WITHIN-SUBJECT DESIGNS

When conducting a conventional case–control study (as distinct from the one nested within a cohort), the selection of controls is usually the most challenging task. The fundamental principle used in this process is that selected controls should be representative of the source population which gave rise to the cases, a principle which derives from the case-base paradigm. Although elementary in theory, the principle is often extremely complex to implement in practice, irrespective of whether one decides to select population or hospital controls.

For population controls, specific hurdles make it difficult to apply the principle. First, we can often expect significant nonresponse or nonacceptance rates in the control group, particularly if the data collection instrument is burdensome, as it frequently is. This is rarely acceptable since the reasons for acceptance of participation as a control are not easily known and could be associated with exposure to the drug of interest, while the corresponding case selection is usually comprehensive with essentially complete response and acceptance rates. Consequently, the source population could have been well identified on theoretical grounds, but the practical results of the sampling exercise could result in a control population unrepresentative of this source population.

Second, when dealing with acute adverse events, the timing of the interview or data collection is crucial. For our example of the risk of ventricular tachycardia in association with the use of inhaled β-agonists in asthma, which was conjectured after observations of hypokalemia and prolonged Q–T intervals in patients within the 4 hour period following β-agonist absorption, a case–control study may be attempted. Indeed, one would first select cases with this adverse event and easily probe whether they took the drug during the 4 hour span preceding the event. For controls, on the other hand, the investigator must define a time point of reference for which to ask the question about use of this drug in the “past 4 hours.” If, as a simple example, the drug is more likely to be required during the day, but controls can only be reached in the evening, the questioning process may become invalid since it will produce differential response patterns for cases and controls.

For hospital controls, similar obstacles could invalidate the study. Choosing an array of diagnoses suitable for control subjects is not simple. Acute conditions could be associated with an elevated prevalence of use of the drug under study. Alternatively, hospitalizations for chronic diseases could be planned with specific contraindications against use of the drug. In addition, problems related to timing as discussed above can be as or more complicated in this context.
Consequently, when dealing with the study of transient drug effects on the risk of acute adverse events, the case-crossover design will be presented as a solution to these obstacles, along with the case-time-control design, which adjusts for exposure time trends. Moreover, other within-subject techniques based solely on prescription drug databases will also be discussed.

CURRENTLY AVAILABLE SOLUTIONS

SAMPLING WITHIN A COHORT

A cohort is defined by subjects meeting a set of eligibility criteria and by entry and exit time points. Consider, for example, the 13 year cohort study, spanned by the period 1978–1990, of the risks of human insulin in diabetes. For illustrative purposes, consider the subcohort of newly diagnosed diabetics only. The eligibility criteria may be one or more of disease status (insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus), age (diabetics less than 40 years of age), drug use (regular users of insulin), geographical location (urban/rural residence), etc. Entry into the cohort may be defined by calendar time (spanned by the study, e.g., any time after 1 January 1978), by age (any age before 40th birthday), by events (the first use of a certain form of insulin), or by disease status (the date of diagnosis of diabetes). Exit from the cohort may be defined by the first occurrence of calendar time (e.g., 31 December 1990), age (exit at 40th birthday), events (death; exit from the study; the first use of an oral hypoglycemic agent), or disease status (onset of nephropathy).

Types and Structures of Cohorts

This cohort of newly diagnosed diabetics may be illustrated graphically as in Figure 44.1. This figure, based on 21 subjects, is plotted in terms of calendar time, with subjects ranked according to their date of entry into the cohort, which corresponds to disease diagnosis. Cohorts with this form of illustration, where the time axis of interest is calendar time (zero time is 1 January 1978), depicting the chronological nature of the

![Figure 44.1. Illustration of a variable-entry cohort of 21 subjects followed from 1978 to 1990 with four cases (●) occurring and related risk-sets (---).](image-url)
cohort, may be called *variable-entry cohorts*. An alternative depiction could be based on duration of disease (i.e., time since diagnosis or first exposure to insulin), which may be more relevant to the risk factor under study. In this instance, the illustration given in Figure 44.2 for the same cohort, using duration of disease as the new time axis, is significantly different from the previous one. Here, the subjects are ranked according to the length of follow-up time in the study and zero-time is the time of diagnosis. Such cohorts may be called *fixed-entry cohorts*. Alternatively, if a specific drug is of interest, zero time can be redefined as the start of exposure to that drug, irrespective of when this occurs with respect to the time of disease diagnosis.

The question as to which of the two forms one should use for the purposes of data analysis rests on one’s judgment of the more relevant of the two time axes, called the primary time axis, with respect to risk and drug exposure. This decision is important, since it affects the demarcation of “risk sets,” which are fundamental to the analysis of data from cohorts and consequently the sampling designs within cohorts. A risk set is formed by the members of the cohort who are at risk of the adverse event at a given point in time, that is they are free of the adverse event and are members of the cohort at that point in time. The only relevant risk sets for data analysis are those defined by the time of occurrence of each case. It is clear that Figures 44.1 and 44.2 produce distinct risk sets for the same cases in the same cohort, as illustrated by the different sets of subjects crossed by the vertical broken line for the same case under the two forms of the cohort. In Figure 44.1, for example, case 1 has in its risk set only the first six subjects to enter the cohort, while in Figure 44.2, all 21 cohort members belong to its risk set. In classical epidemiology, the second form (fixed entry) based on disease duration is used almost exclusively in these situations, primarily because this time axis is the more important determinant of risk and exposure is assumed to be stable in time. In pharmacoepidemiology, on the other hand, drug exposure can vary substantially over calendar time, thus adding a “cohort effect.” Consequently, the first form (variable entry) may be as relevant
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Figure 44.2. Illustration of fixed-entry cohort representation of the cohort in Figure 44.1, with new risk-sets (---) for the four cases.
for the formation of risk sets and the second form for data analysis. Regardless, an advantage of having data on the full cohort is that we can change the primary time axis according to the question being posed, using calendar time for one analysis, duration of disease for another.

This “cohort effect,” important as a result of potentially significant drug exposure variation over calendar time, can be sufficiently accounted for by simply partitioning the cohort into several subcohorts, each having their own zero time defined by entry date, analyzing duration within each subcohort. We could, for example, partition the cohort displayed in Figures 44.1 and 44.2 into four subcohorts, according roughly to 3 year intervals, to combine the two alternative forms of variable-entry and fixed-entry cohorts illustrated in Figures 44.1 and 44.2. The risk sets from such a partition will necessarily depend on both disease duration and calendar time. Arguments for variable-entry cohorts can then be made by repeating the fixed-entry argument, conditional on each subcohort, and combining the results by stratification or regression methods. This would correspond to analyses controlling for calendar year. Because of the possibility of analyzing a variable-entry cohort as several fixed-entry subcohorts, we will focus the remaining presentation on a single fixed-entry cohort.

The Nested Case–Control Design

The idea of a nested case–control design within a cohort was first introduced by Mantel,12 who proposed an unmatched selection of controls and called it a synthetic retrospective study. It was developed further and formalized by Liddell et al.,13 in the context of a cohort study of asbestos exposure and the risks of lung cancer and mortality. The nested case–control design involves three steps:

1. defining the cohort’s time axis;
2. selecting all cases in the cohort, i.e., all subjects with an adverse event;
3. forming all risk sets corresponding to the cases; and
4. randomly selecting one or more controls from each risk set.

Figure 44.3 illustrates the selection of a nested case–control sample from a cohort, with one control per case (1:1 matching). It is clear from the definition of risk sets that a future case is eligible to be a control for a prior case, as illustrated in the figure for the fourth case, and that a subject may be selected as a control more than once. If, instead, controls are forced to be selected only from the noncases and subjects are not permitted to be used more than once in the nested case–control sample, a bias is introduced in the estimation of the relative risk.14 The magnitude of the bias depends on the frequency of the adverse event in the cohort; the more frequent the event the larger the potential for bias.

This property leading to subjects possibly being selected more than once in the sample may be problematic when the exposure and covariate factors are time-dependent. We faced this problem in a study of the risks of severe adverse events in asthma associated with the use of inhaled β-agonists.15 A cohort of 12 301 asthmatics spanning the period 1978–87 was identified from the Saskatchewan Health computerized databases, of whom 129 were cases (death or near-death from asthma). To permit the feasible collection of additional data from hospital charts and questionnaires sent to all physicians who saw these patients, it was necessary to sample from the cohort. These additional data were specifically focusing on the two-year period prior to the risk set date. A standard nested case–control sample of six controls per case, as described above, would have produced several subjects with more than one occurrence in the sample. This would have been problematic vis-à-vis the questioned physicians, for example, who would have had to respond to questions about the same patient’s asthma severity in different two-year periods, a clearly confusing and potentially unreliable data collection scheme. To circumvent this difficulty, we stratified the cohort according to various potential confounding factors, namely age, area of residence, social assistance, prior asthma hospitalization, and, of course, calendar date of entry into the cohort. This extremely fine stratification resulted in 129 subcohorts, one for each case. We thus selected between two and eight controls per case (some
risk sets contained only two eligible controls, mostly because of the matching by prior hospitalization). Since each subcohort contained a single risk set (only one case) and the subcohorts were mutually exclusive, a selected subject was guaranteed to appear only once in the nested case-control sample. This stratified nested case-control design strategy is commonly needed in pharmacoepidemiology since calendar time matching for cohort entry is often essential to account for disease duration and drug exposure time trends.

The analysis of data from a nested case-control study must conserve the matched nature of the selection of cases and controls, particularly if the risk of the adverse event changes with disease duration and drug exposure varies in calendar time. This also applies to the stratified nested case-control design, which is based on other matching criteria as well. The method of analysis is identical to that of a conventional matched case-control study, not nested within a cohort. The conditional logistic regression method for this design is appropriate, as it uses the risk set as the fundamental unit of analysis, in agreement with the proportional hazards model of the full cohort. Simple formulae exist to estimate the relative risk for 1:1 matching. When more than one control is matched to each case, however, sophisticated computer packages such as EGRET are required to fit the necessary conditional logistic regression model. This technique was used in our nested case-control study of \( \beta \)-agonist risks in asthma, where the number of controls per case varied between two and eight.

The question of the required number of controls per case is important. Although selecting one control per case will greatly simplify the data analysis, a large number of cases will be required to attain an acceptable level of power. Since the number of cases in the cohort is fixed and cannot be increased to satisfy this requirement, the only remaining alternative is to increase the control-to-case ratio. Tables are given by Breslow and Day. It can be readily seen from these sample size tables that the gain in power is significant for every additional control up to four controls per case, but becomes negligible beyond this ratio. For example, if we consider an exposure prevalence in the controls to 30% and target a relative risk of 2 with 5% significance and 80% power, the required

Figure 44.3. Nested case-control sample of one control (□) per case (●) from the cohort in Figure 44.2.
numbers of cases are 122, 90, 74, 65, and 62 respectively, for 1:1, 2:1, 4:1, 10:1, and 20:1 control-to-case ratios. These translate to total study sizes (cases and controls) of 244, 270, 370, 715, and 1302, with clear cost implications and related optimality decisions. Of course, the number of cases in a cohort is frequently fixed a priori by the study constraints, thus eliminating this option to increase the number of cases. However, although this general rule of an optimal 4:1 control-to-case ratio is appropriate in the majority of instances, one should be prudent when exposure to the drug under study is infrequent, when the hypothesized relative risk moves further from unity, or when several factors or other drugs are being assessed simultaneously. In these situations, the ratio could easily be required to increase to ten or more controls per case. This is the case in two recent studies. In our study of the risks of fatal or near-fatal asthma associated with the use of inhaled β-agonists,15 the low rate of use of fenoterol, believed to be around 5%, dictated the selection of up to eight controls per case. In a proposed study of the cardiovascular risks of oral contraceptives,19 the relative infrequency of newer oral contraceptives with lower estrogen dose and new progestins, coupled with the strong confounding effect of age, led to a requirement of ten controls per case.

Like the cohort, the nested case–control design is used primarily to conduct internal comparisons (within the cohort) between exposures to different drugs. At times, however, it is of interest to contrast exposure to a drug to no exposure, or to some average exposure. This is not possible using methods for internal comparisons when all subjects in the cohort are exposed to the drug under study. Instead, external comparisons are performed, comparing the rate of adverse experience in the cohort to that of an external population, with appropriate adjustment for only a few available key factors, such as age, sex, and calendar time. The result is usually called the standardized mortality rate (SMR) when the adverse event is death, or the standardized incidence rate (SIR) when it is not. Techniques to estimate these measures using the full cohort are described in most textbooks of epidemiology.9,10

The nested case–control design, however, is not a simple random sample from the cohort and thus cannot use the same techniques to estimate these measures. Indeed, it is evident from Figure 44.3 that those cohort members with the longest follow-up have a greater chance of being selected in the nested case–control sample, since they belong to all the risk sets. If their drug exposure pattern is different from that of other cohort members, the members of the nested case–control sample will not be representative of the cohort, which may substantially bias the resulting analyses. The appropriate method to perform external comparisons using data from a nested case–control design has been described.20 It uses knowledge about the sampling structure to yield an unbiased estimate of the adverse event rate in the full cohort, thus permitting the estimation of the necessary standardized relative measure with respect to the selected external population.

The Case–Cohort Design

The first recognized application of a sampling design we currently call case–cohort was made by Hutchison,21 in performing external comparisons of leukemia rates in patients treated by radiation for cervical cancer. It was ultimately developed and formalized by Prentice,22 who coined the name case–cohort. Although recent, this design has already been used effectively in some drug risk studies.23–26 The case–cohort design involves two steps: (1) selecting all cases in the cohort, i.e., all subjects with an adverse event; and (2) randomly selecting a sample of predetermined size of subjects from the cohort. Figure 44.4 depicts the selection of a case–cohort sample of six subjects from the illustrative cohort. Note that it is possible that some cases selected in step 1 are also selected in the step 2 sample, as illustrated in the figure for the third case.

The case–cohort design resembles a reduced version of the cohort, with all cases added. It can also be perceived as an unmatched version of the nested case–control design. Although these aspects suggest a possible resemblance of the data analysis approach to either the established cohort or case–control methods, the techniques are in
Figure 44.4. Case–cohort sample with six controls (●) from the cohort in Figure 44.2.

The first advantage of the case–cohort design is its capacity to use the same sample to study several different events. Indeed, the cases can be split into several subcategories and each can be analyzed with the same "control" subcohort. In contrast, the nested case–control design requires different control groups for each type of event because the selection depends on event times. For example, the β-agonist risk nested case–control study had two distinct control groups, one of size 233 for the 44 asthma deaths, the other of size 422 for the 85 asthma near-deaths.\(^{15}\) Another useful advantage is that the case–cohort design permits one to change the primary time axis of analysis from calendar to disease time and vice versa, depending on either the assumed model or the targeted outcome. This is not possible with the nested case–control study, where the primary time axis must be set \textit{a priori} to permit the risk-set construction. This is less of a problem in pharmacoepidemiology, however, where the cohort can be divided into subcohorts of successive calendar time, as was discussed earlier. Yet another example is its simplicity in sampling, which has advantages in both comprehensibility and computer programming. Finally, external comparisons are simple to perform with the case–cohort approach.\(^{29}\)

The nested case–control design does have some advantages. The first is the simplicity of power calculation, or equivalently sample size determination. The nested case–control design is independent of the size of the cohort, while for the case–cohort design knowledge about overlap in risk sets...
is essential, thus greatly complicating these calculations. Second, data on time-dependent exposure and covariates need only be collected up to the time of the risk set for the nested case–control study, while the collection must be exhaustive for the case–cohort. Finally, despite the accessibility of software for data analysis of case–cohort data, these can quickly become surpassed and even infeasible with larger sample sizes and time-dependent exposures. In this situation, the nested case–control design, with its single risk set per case, is not only advantageous but also the only solution. A recent study of benzodiazepine use and motor vehicle crashes, initially designed as a case–cohort study, had to be analyzed as a nested case–control study because of technical limitations of the case–cohort analysis software and hardware.  

PARTIAL CONFOUNDER DATA

A strategy of analysis exists, on the basis of data available solely for the cases of a case–control or a cohort study, to assess whether a factor is a confounder or not. The rationale is that, if the factor is not found to be a confounder by this method, the final analysis will not need to adjust for its effect when estimating the risk of the drug under study. The approach is described by Ray and Griffin and was used in the context of a study of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and the risk of fatal peptic ulcer disease. The strategy is based on the definition of a confounder (C+ and C− denote presence and absence) in the assessment of the association between a drug exposure E (E+ and E− denote exposure or not to the drug) and an adverse condition D (D+ and D− denote presence and absence). Confounding is present if both of the following conditions are satisfied:

1. C and E are associated in the control group (in D−);
2. C and D are associated in E+ and in E−.

Because confounding assumes a common E:D odds ratio in C+ and in C−, condition 1 becomes equivalent to “C and E are associated in the case group (in D+).” Thus, if in the cases we find no association between the potential confounder and drug exposure, confounding by this factor can be excluded outright, without having to verify the second condition. In this instance, the analysis involving drug exposure in cases and controls can be performed directly without any concern for the confounding variable. If, on the other hand, an association is found between C and E in the cases, confounding is not necessarily confirmed (since condition 2 must also be satisfied), but is very likely since a potential confounder is usually selected for its property of being a known risk factor for D.

As an example of this approach, we use data from a case–control study of estrogen use and the risk of endometrial cancer. These data, restricted to the effect of former estrogen exposure, were used previously to illustrate confounding by simulating hypothetical stratifications by a third factor. They are displayed in Figure 44.5. The crude odds ratio between estrogen use and endometrial cancer is 3.3 in this study of 17 cases and 60 controls. When the study population is partitioned according to the hypothetical potential confounding factor parity, the odds ratios are 1.1 in the low parity group and 1.0 in the high parity group, indicating a strong confounding effect of parity. This is a result of the strong association, using the odds ratio as the measure of association, between parity and estrogen exposure in the control group (OR = 8 × 39/(3 × 10) = 10.4) and the strong association between parity and endometrial cancer in subjects exposed to estrogen (OR = 11.3) and subjects not exposed (OR = 9.8). The bottom section of the figure displays the data for the cases only, where the odds ratio between estrogen exposure and parity is 12, demonstrating analogously the strong confounding role of parity. If the parity data were only available in the cases, this finding would invalidate the crude odds ratio of 3.3. Conversely, the same example could be used with smoking as another hypothetical confounder, as displayed in Figure 44.6. It is clear that the crude odds ratio of 3.3 is not affected by stratification by smoking, which is therefore not a confounder. This is confirmed by the lack of association between estrogen exposure and smoking in the cases only, with an odds ratio of 1.1.
### NOVEL APPROACHES TO PHARMACOEPIDEMIOLOGY STUDY DESIGN AND STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

#### Figure 44.5
Data from case–control study of former estrogen use and endometrial cancer with hypothetical stratification by parity (confounding present).\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonuser</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ OR = 3.3 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low parity</th>
<th>High parity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonuser</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ OR = 1.1 \]

\[ OR = 1.0 \]

#### In cases only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonuser</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ OR = 12 \]

#### Figure 44.6
Data from case–control study of former estrogen use and endometrial cancer with another hypothetical stratification by parity (no confounding).\(^3\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonuser</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ OR = 3.3 \]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low parity</th>
<th>High parity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Case</td>
<td>Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonuser</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ OR = 3.3 \]

\[ OR = 3.3 \]

#### In cases only:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonuser</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ OR = 1.1 \]
This strategy to assess confounding is extremely valuable for several case-control studies in pharmacoepidemiology since, if confounding is excluded by this technique, crude methods of analysis can be used to obtain a valid estimate of the odds ratio. However, if confounding is found to be present, the crude estimate is biased. A new method was recently developed to obtain an adjusted estimate of the rate ratio in the absence of confounder data among the controls.\[^{35}\] The adjusted odds ratio is given by

\[
\text{OR}_{\text{adj}} = \frac{P_0(w - y) \div [(1 - P_0)y]}
\]

where \( y = \{v - [v^2 - 4(r - 1)w x]^{1/2}\} / [2(r - 1)] \), \( v = 1 + (r - 1)(w + x) \) when \( r \neq 1 \) and \( y = wx \) when \( r = 1 \), \( r \) is the odds ratio between exposure and confounder among the cases, \( x \) is the probability of exposure among the controls and \( w \) is the prevalence of the confounder among the controls. The latter (\( w \)) is the only unknown and must be estimated from external sources. An estimate of the variance of \( \text{OR}_{\text{adj}} \) exists.\[^{35}\]

As an example, we use data from a case-control study conducted using the Saskatchewan computerized databases to assess whether theophylline, a drug used to treat asthma, increases the risk of acute cardiac death.\[^{36}\] In this study, the 30 cases provided data on theophylline use, as well as on smoking, possibly an important confounder. On the other hand, the 4080 controls only had data available on theophylline use and not on smoking. Table 44.1 displays the data from this study. The crude odds ratio between theophylline use and cardiac death is 4.3 ((17/13)/(956/3124)). Because of the missing data on smoking, it is only possible to partition the cases, but not the controls, according to smoking. The odds ratio between theophylline use and smoking among the cases is estimable and found to be 7.5 ((14/5)/(3/8)), thus indicating that smoking is indeed a strong confounder. An external estimate of smoking prevalence among asthmatics, obtained from a Canadian general population health survey, is 24%. Using this estimate, the adjusted odds ratio is 2.4, much lower than the crude estimate of 4.3, with 95% confidence limits 1.0 – 5.8.

An alternative approach is available when the confounders can be measured on both cases and controls, albeit only for a sample of subjects. This technique, developed more than a decade ago but not widely used, is the two-stage sampling approach, in which stage 1 is the collection of information on drug exposure and outcomes, and stage 2 is the collection of confounder data on a subset of the stage 1 sample. This situation is common with database studies, where the database provides data on exposure and outcome for all subjects, but confounders are missing and need to be obtained directly on a subset of subjects. The balanced design, wherein an equal number of individuals is selected from each exposure/outcome category, is usually the most efficient strategy by which to select the stage 2 sample. This method has recently been used in pharmacoepidemiology.\[^{37}\] An analogous method has been devised in the context of verifying the validity of the case status in studies where both outcome and exposure are rare. In this instance, validating the case status of all cases would be inefficient when most cases are unexposed. Validating all exposed cases and a sample of the unexposed cases turns out to be an efficient means of estimating the rate ratio.\[^{38}\]

### Table 44.1. Data from a case-control study of theophylline use and cardiac death in asthma, with the smoking confounder data missing for controls.\[^{36}\]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Controls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use</td>
<td>Non use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All subjects</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratified by smoking:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>smokers</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-smokers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*These frequencies are missing for controls.

### WITHIN-SUBJECT DESIGNS

When dealing with the study of transient drug effects on the risk of acute adverse events, Maclure\[^{39}\] submits that the best representatives of the source population that produced the cases would be the cases themselves: this is the premise of the case-crossover design. This is a design where...
comparison between exposures are made within subjects. Other within-subject methods such as the case-time-control design and prescription symmetry analysis have been proposed and are also briefly presented here.

The Case–Crossover Design

To carry out a case-crossover study, three critical points must be considered. First, the study must necessarily be dealing with an acute adverse event that is alleged to be the result of a transient drug effect. Thus, drugs with regular patterns of use which vary only minimally between and within individuals are not easily amenable to this design. Nor are latent adverse events, which only occur long after exposure. Second, since a transient effect is under study, the effect period (or time window of effect) must be precisely determined. For example, in our hypothetical study of the possible acute cardiotoxicity of inhaled β-agonists in asthmatics (see above), we identified this effect period to be 4 hours after having taken the usual dose of two inhalations of 100 mcg of the product. An incorrect specification of this time window can have important repercussions on the risk estimate, as we will show below in the example. Third, one must be able to obtain reliable data on the usual pattern of drug exposure for each case, over a sufficiently long period of time. For our example, we could seek the frequency of use of β-agonists during the year preceding the adverse event.

The case-crossover study is simply a crossover study in the cases only. The subjects alternate at varying frequencies between exposure and non-exposure to the drug of interest, until the adverse event occurs, which happens for all subjects in the study, since all are cases by definition. With respect to the timing of the adverse event, each case is investigated to determine whether exposure occurred within the predetermined effect period, namely within the previous 4 hours in our example. This occurrence is then classified as having arisen either under drug exposure or non-exposure on the basis of the effect period. Thus for each case, we have either an exposed or unexposed status which represents for data analysis the first column of a $2 \times 2$ table, one for each case. Since each case will be matched to itself for comparison, the analysis is matched and thus we must create separate $2 \times 2$ tables for each case.

With respect to control information, the data on the average drug use pattern are necessary to determine the typical probability of exposure to the time window of effect. This is done by obtaining data for a sufficiently stable period of time. In our example, we may find out the average number of times a day each case has been using β-agonists (two inhalations of 100 mcg each) in the past year. Note that there are six 4 hour periods (the duration of the effect period) in a day. Such data will determine the proportion of time that each asthmatic is usually spending time in the effect period and thus potentially “at risk” of ventricular tachycardia. This proportion is then used to obtain the number of cases expected on the basis of time spent in these “at risk” periods, for comparison with the number of cases observed during such periods. This is done by forming a $2 \times 2$ table for each case, with the corresponding control data as defined above, and combining the tables using the Mantel–Haenszel technique as described in detail by McInnis.39

We generated data for a hypothetical case-crossover study of ten asthmatics who experienced ventricular tachycardia. These were all queried regarding their use of two puffs of inhaled β-agonist in the last 4 hours and on average over the past year. The data are displayed in Table 44.2. The fact of drug use within the effect period for the event classification is straightforward. The usual frequency of drug use per year is converted to a ratio of the number of “at risk” periods to the number of “no risk” periods, the total number of 4 hour periods being 2190 in one year. Thus, for example, the content of the $2 \times 2$ table for the first case, who is not found to have been exposed in the prior 4 hour period, is (0, 1, 365, 1825), while for the second case, who is exposed, it is (1, 0, 6, 2184). Using the Mantel–Haenszel technique to combine the ten $2 \times 2$ tables, the estimate of relative risk is 3.0 (95% CI: 1.2–7.6).

This method is sensitive to the specification of the time window of effect. For example, if this
effect period is in fact only 2 hours, then the data of Table 44.2 would be affected in two ways: some cases may no longer be considered exposed, and the exposure probabilities will change. By considering as unexposed cases 2 and 4, for instance, who may have been exposed 3 hours before ventricular tachycardia, and recalculating the appropriate exposure probabilities, the relative risk becomes 2.0 (95% CI: 0.3–12.0). On the other hand, if this effect period is in fact 6 hours long, then the data of Table 44.2 would be affected in two ways: some new cases may now be considered exposed, and the exposure probabilities will change. By considering as exposed cases 3 and 5, for instance, who may have been exposed 5 hours before ventricular tachycardia, and recalculating the appropriate exposure probabilities, the relative risk becomes 5.0 (95% CI: 2.0–12.2). The difference in the magnitude of the risk and the corresponding statistical significance between the various scenarios is indicative of the importance of the need for an accurate specification of the length of the effect period.

This method is extremely valuable when studying an acute adverse event that is alleged to be the result of a transient drug effect. Consequently, it excludes drugs with regular patterns of use, which vary minimally between and within individuals, or adverse events that can only result from long extended exposure. Moreover, the case-crossover design requires precise knowledge about the effect period (or time window of effect), although the latter can be varied to investigate the optimum window to use. The design is also very useful when the selection of controls in the usual sense is uncertain. A significant advantage of this design is that it eliminates the problem of confounding by factors that do not change over time. It cannot, however, easily address the problem of confounding by factors that do change over time. In this instance, time-dependent data will be required for such confounders, a possibly difficult task. The case-crossover design is automatically free of selection bias, which occurs when controls are not representative of the base population from which the cases arose. However, although such control selection bias (in the usual control sense) is eliminated, case selection bias could be present if case selection is related to the exposure under study. Finally, information bias resulting from the differential quality of recent and past drug exposure data can be problematic if the exposure collection system is not robust. This source of bias can, however, be dismissed if one uses, for example, drug exposure data from computerized databases. Greenland presented examples where the odds-ratio estimates from this approach can be biased. Nevertheless, this approach is being used successfully in several studies. It has also been adapted for application to the risk assessment of vaccines.

Table 44.2. Hypothetical data for a case-crossover study of β-agonist exposure in last 4 hours and the risk of ventricular tachycardia in asthma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case No.</th>
<th>β-agonist use* in last 4 hours (a)</th>
<th>Usual β-agonist use in last year</th>
<th>Periods of risk (N₁₁)</th>
<th>Period of no-risk (N₁₀)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/day</td>
<td>365</td>
<td>1825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6/year</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/day</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1/month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4/week</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/week</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1/month</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2/month</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/day</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2/week</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>2086</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Inhalations of 200 mcg: 1 = yes, 0 = no. RR = ΣaᵣNᵣᵣ/Σ(1 – aᵣ)Nᵣᵣ.
The Case-Time-Control Design

One of the limitations of the case-crossover design is the assumption of an exposure time trend. An approach that adjusts for such time trends is the case-time-control method. By using cases and controls of a conventional case–control study as their own referents, the case-time-control design eliminates the biasing effect of unmeasured confounding factors, such as drug indication, while addressing the time trend assumption. In fact, the method is an extension of the case-crossover analysis that uses, in addition to the case series, a series of controls to adjust for exposure time trends.

The approach is illustrated with data from the Saskatchewan Asthma Epidemiologic Project, a study conducted to investigate the risks associated with the use of inhaled \( \beta \)-agonists in the treatment of asthma. Using a cohort of 12,301 asthmatics followed during 1980–87, 129 cases of fatal or near-fatal asthma and 655 controls were identified. The amount of \( \beta \)-agonist used in the year prior to the index date was used for exposure. Table 44.3 displays the data comparing low (12 or fewer canisters per year) with high (more than 12) use of \( \beta \)-agonists. The crude odds ratio for high \( \beta \)-agonist use is 4.4 (95% CI: 2.9–6.7). Adjustment for all available markers of severity, such as oral corticosteroids and prior asthma hospitalizations as confounding factors, lowers the odds ratio to 3.1 (95% CI: 1.8–5.4), the “best” estimate one can derive from these case–control data using conventional tools.

To apply the case-time-control design, exposure to \( \beta \)-agonists was obtained for the 1-year current period and the 1-year reference period prior to the current period. First, a case-crossover analysis is performed using the discordant subjects among the 129 cases, namely the 29 who were current high users of \( \beta \)-agonists and low users in the reference period and the nine cases who were current low users of \( \beta \)-agonist and high users previously. This analysis is repeated for the 655 controls, of which there were 90 discordant in exposure, that is 65 were current high users of \( \beta \)-agonists and low users in the reference period and 25 were current low users of \( \beta \)-agonists and high users previously. The case-time-control odds ratio, using these discordant pairs frequencies for a pair-matched analysis, is given by \((29/9)/(65/25) = 1.2\) (95% CI: 0.5–3.0). This estimate, which excludes the effect of unmeasured confounding by disease severity, indicates a minimal risk for these drugs.

The case-time-control approach provides an unbiased estimate of the odds ratio in the presence of confounding by indication, despite the fact that the indication for drug use (in our example, disease severity) is not measured, because of the within-subject analysis. It also controls for time trends in drug use. Nevertheless, its validity is subject to several strict assumptions so caution is recommended in its use.

**Drug Database Designs**

One of the distinguishing features of pharmacoepidemiology is the use of computerized administrative health databases to answer research questions reliably with sufficient rapidity. The usual urgency of concerns related to drug safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cases</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>OR</th>
<th>Adjusted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>OR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current ( \beta )-agonist use</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant use (case crossover)</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discordant use (control crossover)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.6–4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case time control</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.5–3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Discordant from exposure level during reference time period.
makes these databases essential to perform such risk assessment studies. Some databases contain only information on prescriptions dispensed to patients, and no outcome information on disease diagnoses, hospitalizations, or vital status. These standalone prescription drug databases are more numerous and usually more easily accessible than the fully linked databases. They have been the object of recent methodological developments.

A technique that was developed specifically for the drug databases is prescription sequence analysis.\textsuperscript{48} Prescription sequence analysis is based on the situation when a certain drug A is suspected to cause an adverse event that itself is treated by a drug B. To apply this technique, the computerized drug database is searched for all patients with a drug history who used drug A. For these subjects, all patients prescribed drug B in the course of using drug A are identified and counted. Under the null hypothesis that drug A does not cause the adverse event treated by drug B, this number of subjects should be proportional to the duration of use of drug A relative to the total period of observation. This extremely rapid method of assessing the association between drug A and drug B is assessed for its random error with a Monte Carlo simulation analysis. This technique was applied to assess whether the anti-vertigo or anti-migraine drug flunarizine (drug A) causes mental depression, as measured by the use of anti-depressant drugs (drug B). The authors found that the number of patients starting on anti-depressant drugs during flunarizine use was in fact lower than expected.\textsuperscript{48} They thus concluded, using this rapid approach based solely on drug prescription data, that this drug probably does not cause mental depression. An extension of prescription sequence analysis, called prescription sequence symmetry analysis, was recently proposed.\textsuperscript{49} Using a population of new users of either drug A or B, this approach compares the number of subjects who used drug A before drug B to that who used B before A. Under the null hypothesis, this distribution should be symmetrical and the numbers should be equal. It has recently been applied to the question of screening for drug-related dyspepsia.\textsuperscript{50}

Another function of these databases is to use the prescriptions as covariate information to explain possible confounding patterns. The concept of channeling of drugs was put forward as an explanation of unusual risk findings.\textsuperscript{51} For example, a case–control study conducted in New Zealand found that fenoterol, a \(\beta\)-agonist bronchodilator used to treat asthma attacks, was associated with an increased risk of death from asthma.\textsuperscript{52} Using a prescription drug database, Petri \textit{et al.} found that severe asthmatics, as deemed from their use of other asthma medications prescribed for severe forms of the disease, were in fact channeled to fenoterol, probably because fenoterol was felt by prescribers to be a more potent bronchodilator than other \(\beta\)-agonists.\textsuperscript{53} This phenomenon of channeling can be assessed rapidly in such databases, provided medications can be used as proxies for disease severity. This approach can be subject to bias, however, as it has been used with cross-sectional designs that cannot differentiate the directionality of the association.

An application of channeling using a longitudinal design was recently presented.\textsuperscript{54} It indicated that channeling can vary according to the timing of exposure, namely that disease severity was not associated with first-time use of a drug, but subsequently severe patients were more likely to be switched to that drug. This type of research into patterns of drug prescribing and drug use can be very useful in understanding the results of case–control studies with limited data on drug exposures and subject to confounding by indication.

**THE FUTURE**

The growing importance and awareness of pharmacoepidemiology in the medical, regulatory, and industry settings have led to a greater need and emphasis on solid methodology. As well, specific situations have induced the development of significant advances in the design and analysis of epidemiological studies of drug effects. We have described three recently developed methodologic approaches that facilitate the conduct of research in pharmacoepidemiology. First, we presented three strategies of sampling within a large cohort, as alternatives to analyzing the full cohort, namely the nested case–control and
case–cohort techniques, as well as the extreme-stratified nested case–control approach, which has been proposed specifically to circumvent a restriction inherent in the nested case–control strategy. Future developments in this area will provide user-friendly tools to facilitate the estimation of risk difference or excess risk measures, in addition to the standard risk ratio measures routinely produced by these sampling schemes.

As well, we can anticipate statistical models of analysis which take into account two or more time axes simultaneously, for example calendar time and disease duration, so that we do not have to resort to schemes based on cohort stratification. Finally, techniques to provide the optimal number of controls for each case are being devised.55

We also described methods useful in dealing with confounders when data on this factor are only available in the cases of a case–control study or in a sample of subjects. Development in this area is crucial in view of the limitations of databases. It should be directed to the situation of multiple confounders and should address the issue of effect modification, which eludes current techniques.

Lastly, we described the case-crossover and case-time-control designs, alternatives to the classical case–control design, which are valuable when dealing with the study of transient drug effects on the risk of acute adverse events. Extensions and refinements of these designs should address their assumptions, as well as modifications for chronic effects and latent events. We also introduced novel techniques devised for standalone prescription drug databases. Such innovative methods should be given priority in view of the importance of these databases in pharmacoepidemiology.

When used judiciously these approaches can expand the limits inherent in the more traditional methods of epidemiology and generally optimize the conduct of research in pharmacoepidemiology. In the future, we can expect further enhancements of these methods and yet more effective tools in pharmacoepidemiology’s unique search for the balance between high quality research and rapid results. This balance is fundamental to sound decision making around the management of drugs by clinicians, patients, industry, and regulators.
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Part V

CONCLUSION
The Future of Pharmacoepidemiology

BRIAN L. STROM
Center for Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA

We should all be concerned about the future because we will have to spend the rest of our lives there.

Charles Franklin Kettering, 1949

Speculating about the future is risky and, some might say, foolish. Nevertheless, based on events occurring today, in many ways the future of pharmacoepidemiology is probably apparent. Interest in the field is exploding, as is realization of what it can contribute. As science, industry, and government become increasingly international, so does the field of pharmacoepidemiology. The number of individuals attending the annual International Conference on Pharmacoepidemiology has increased from 50 to over 500. The International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology, only a decade old, has grown to over 1200 members from 57 countries. Many national societies are being formed as well. The journal Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics, the major US academic clinical pharmacology journal, is actively soliciting pharmacoepidemiology manuscripts, as is the Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. There are also at least two journals (down from five) which explicitly consider themselves pharmacoepidemiology journals: the Journal of Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacoepidemiology and Drug Safety, the latter being the official journal of the International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology and the European Society for Pharmacovigilance. The number of individuals seeking to enter the field is rapidly increasing. The number of courses in pharmacoepidemiology is increasing, in schools of medicine, public health, and pharmacy. In fact, a decade ago, a paper expressed the belief that all doctor of pharmacy students should receive some instruction in pharmacoepidemiology. While in past years the single summer short course in pharmacoepidemiology had to be cancelled due to lack of US enrollees, more recently the University of Michigan course in pharmacoepidemiology has attracted 10% of the entire program, the Boston summer program established a course at the identical time, McGill University provides well attended short courses in pharmacoepidemiology all around the world, and many other ad hoc short courses are given as well. Regulatory bodies have expanded their internal programs. The number of pharmaceutical companies forming their own
pharmacoepidemiology units has also increased, along with their funding of academic units. Requirements that a drug be proven to be cost-effective (see Chapter 35) have been added to many national healthcare systems, provincial healthcare systems, or managed care organizations, either to justify reimbursement or even to justify drug availability. Drug utilization review is being widely applied, and hospitals are becoming mini pharmacoepidemiology laboratories (see Chapter 31).

Thus, although some important obstacles remain, the future of the field looks extraordinarily bright. In this chapter, I will briefly risk giving my views on where I see the future of the field heading. I will follow the format of Part II of the book, that is I will explore the future of the field from the perspective of academia, then from the perspective of the pharmaceutical industry, then from the perspective of a regulatory agency, and last from the perspective of the law.

THE VIEW FROM ACADEMIA

SCIENTIFIC DEVELOPMENTS

Methodologic Advances

Methodologically, it appears likely that the number of approaches available for performing pharmacoepidemiology studies will continue to increase. Each of the methodologic issues discussed in Part IV can be expected to be the subject of more development. The future is likely to see ever more sophisticated ways of performing and analyzing classical epidemiologic studies, as the field of epidemiology continues to expand and develop. Some of these new techniques will, of course, be useful to investigators in pharmacoepidemiology (see Chapters 43 and 44). Some new methodologies likely to emerge as of importance to pharmacoepidemiology over the next few years will be the use of instrumental variables, neural networks, propensity scores, recursive partitioning, and sensitivity analysis. In addition, I think we will see increasing use of pharmacoepidemiology studies and approaches, to improve the conduct of clinical trials.

The analysis of spontaneous reports of adverse drug effects, and the process of deciding whether a drug really caused any given adverse outcome observed in a case report, can be expected to continue to develop (see Chapters 10, 11, and 32). The need for new methods to screen for adverse drug effects is clear. It is likely that systems for screening for unexpected drug effects will emerge, both using spontaneous reporting systems and otherwise.

We can expect to see increasing cross-fertilization between new developments in clinical pharmacology and pharmacoepidemiology, with more use of therapeutic drug monitoring in pharmacoepidemiology studies (see Chapter 4) and more input from pharmacoepidemiologists into policy questions about drug availability (see Chapter 27). More emphasis will be placed on studies of predictors of who is at risk of adverse reactions, rather than just whether a drug causes an adverse reaction, as, if risk factors for an adverse reaction can be better understood, early in the course of a crisis, a drug is more likely to be able to be repositioned in the market, rather than withdrawn, saving good drugs.

With the development of the techniques of molecular biology, and their application to the study of pharmacogenetics, recent years have seen exciting developments in the ability of researchers to determine the genetic basis for adverse drug reactions previously thought to be idiosyncratic. This has evolved from earlier measures of slow drug metabolism as a cause of adverse reactions to more recent molecular genetic markers. This has been aided by the development of new methods to collect DNA, making population based genetic studies feasible. There are even studies under way now that could be called molecular pharmacoepidemiology, e.g., the author is leading a pair of large scale population-based case–control studies examining the genetic basis of susceptibility to hormone-induced cancers, using cheek swabs to collect DNA specimens.

Advances can also be expected in the identification of drug exposures in human tissue. Blood and urine have long been available for this purpose,
but detection is largely limited to the interval shortly following exposure. For case-control studies in particular, where the outcome is typically identified some time after exposure, such sampling is of no use for detecting earlier exposures. In recent years, however, researchers have explored the usefulness of other tissues in which drugs or their metabolites may persist and accumulate, such as hair.

Future years are likely to see much more of this cross-fertilization between pharmacoepidemiology and the new biology. By analogy with the process of screening for rubella susceptibility or for genetic diseases, it is not unreasonable to look forward to a time when patients can be screened for drug-specific genetic polymorphisms which place them at particular risk for having an adverse reaction. Information of this kind has obvious usefulness in selecting (and avoiding) specific drugs for the treatment of specific individuals. We could easily see individual pharmacogenetic studies added to the process of following up on spontaneous reports of adverse reactions.

New Content Areas of Interest

In addition, there are a number of new content areas that are likely to be explored more and developed more. Studies of drug utilization will continue to grow and become more sophisticated. As the healthcare industry becomes more sensitive to the possibility of overutilization, underutilization, and inappropriate utilization of drugs, and the risks associated with each, one would expect to see an increased frequency of and sophistication in drug utilization review programs. This is likely to be the case especially with studies of antibiotic misuse, as society becomes ever more concerned about the evolution of organisms resistant to our currently available drugs. Drug utilization studies will continue to increase (see Chapter 29), and drug utilization review programs will expand enormously, as attempts to improve physician prescribing continue to expand (see Chapter 31). In fact, drug utilization review programs are already required in every US hospital, are required of every US state Medicaid program, have voluntarily been initiated by many US Health Maintenance Organizations, and are likely to be written into the law establishing the new US Medicare drug benefit, should it be passed.

The US Joint Commission on Accreditation of Healthcare Organizations is revolutionizing US hospital pharmacoepidemiology through its new standards requiring adverse reaction monitoring and drug use evaluation programs in every hospital, (see Chapters 12, 29, 30, and 31). The initial Joint Commission plan for an Indicator Measurement System has now evolved into its ORYX system, as a means of collecting ongoing quantitative data on a hospital’s performance. Hospitals are now experimenting with different methods of organizing their drug delivery systems to improve their use of drugs, e.g., use of computerized physician order entry and the addition of pharmacists to ward teams. The US Health Care Financing Administration, the branch of the federal government that manages the Medicaid and Medicare programs, is now proposing new rules, which will require increasing attention in hospitals to drug safety issues. This is likely to revolutionize hospital pharmacoepidemiology in the US, and it is likely that the next edition of this book will require a separate, new chapter describing the results of these initiatives.

Interest in the new field of “pharmacoeconomics,” that is the application of the principles of health economics to the study of drug effects, is continuing to explode (see Chapter 35). Society is realizing that the actual cost of drugs is a very minor part of their economic impact, and that their beneficial and harmful effects are vastly more important. On the other hand, more countries and insurance programs within countries are requiring economic justification before permitting reimbursement for a drug. The number of studies exploring this is increasing dramatically. As the methods of pharmacoeconomics become increasingly sophisticated, and its applications clear, this could be expected to continue to be a fruitful and popular field of inquiry.

More studies of beneficial drug effects, particularly of drug effectiveness, can be expected, as the field becomes more aware that they are possible (see Chapter 34). This is being aided by the rapid increase in the use of propensity scores to adjust
for confounding by indication, although often placing more confidence in that technique than is warranted, not recognizing that its use is still dependent on one’s ability to measure the true determinants of the indication (see Chapter 34).

We will also see more use of pharmacoepidemiology approaches prior to drug marketing, e.g., in order to understand the adverse events that one can expect to see in patients to be treated with a new drug (see Chapters 7 and 28).

Recent years have seen an explosion in the use of herbal medications, worldwide. These are essentially pharmaceuticals that are being marketed without conventional standardization, and with no premarketing testing of safety or efficacy. In a sense, for these products, this is a return to a prer egulatory era. As such, it is quite likely that the next few years will see a comparable set of safety disasters associated with their use, and pharmacoepidemiologists will be turned to, to help evaluate them.

Research interest in the whole topic of patient noncompliance with prescribed drug regimens goes back to about 1960, but little could be done until about a decade ago because the methods for ascertaining drug exposure in individual ambulatory patients were grossly unsatisfactory. The methodologic impasse was broken by two quite different developments. One was to use very low doses of a very long half-life agent, phenobarbital, as a chemical marker; a single measurement of phenobarbital in plasma is indicative of aggregate drug intake during the prior two weeks. The other has been to incorporate time-stamping microcircuitry into pharmaceutical packages, which creates a timed, dated record of each time maneuvers are made with the package that are necessary to remove a dose of drug. Perhaps as a consequence of its inherent simplicity and economy, electronic monitoring is increasingly emerging as the de facto gold standard for compiling dosing histories of ambulatory patients, from which one can judge the extent of compliance with the prescribed drug regimen. Future years are likely to see a dramatic increase in the use of this technique.

Finally, the next few years are also likely to see the increasing ability to target drug therapy to the proper patients. This will involve both increasing use of statistical methodologies, and increasing use of techniques from laboratory sciences, as described above. The former will allow us to use predictive modeling to study, from a population perspective, who is statistically most likely to benefit from a drug, and who is at greatest risk of an adverse outcome. The latter will enable us, as noted above, to test individuals genetically, to determine their likely responses to drug therapy. From a drug testing point of view, these developments will allow researchers to target for enrollment into their studies those subjects most likely to succeed with a drug. From a clinical perspective, it will enable healthcare prescribers to individualize our choice of therapies.

Logistical Advances

Logistically, with the increased computerization of society in particular and the health care industry, in particular, and the increased emphasis on using computerized databases for pharmacoepidemiology (see Part III), some data resources will disappear (e.g., The Rhode Island Drug Use Reporting System and the inpatient databases discussed in prior editions of this book have disappeared), and a number of new computerized databases will undoubtedly emerge as major resources for pharmacoepidemiology research (e.g., see Chapters 16–24). Others may well follow. A few have even disappeared and then re-emerged (see Chapters 20 and 23). The importance of these databases to pharmacoepidemiology is now clear: they are able to address, quickly and relatively inexpensively, questions about drug effects that require large sample sizes, with excellent quality data on drug exposures.

Nevertheless, as the field continues to evolve toward the increased use of databases, it is important to keep in mind the vital importance of resources that collect their data de novo. Each approach to pharmacoepidemiology has its advantages and its disadvantages, as described in Chapters 10–25. No approach is ideal, and often a number of complementary approaches must be used to answer any given research question. To address some of the problems of the databases, we
must always maintain the ability to test their findings using data collected in ad hoc studies, as well. Preferably other, perhaps better, less expensive, and complementary approaches to ad hoc data collection in pharmacoepidemiology will be developed. For example, a potential approach that has not been used is the network of regional and national poison control centers10 (also see Chapter 24). In particular, poison control centers would be expected to be a useful source of information about dose-dependent adverse drug effects. Others will probably be developed as well.

It is likely that other new types of opportunity for research will emerge. For example, as the US discusses the expansion of Medicare, its health program for the elderly, it appears likely that one component will be the reimbursement of individuals for the costs of their prescription medications. This should generate an enormous new data resource that potentially could be useful for pharmacoepidemiology research. Outside the US, as well, many different opportunities to form databases are being sought (e.g., see Chapters 20–24). There is also an increased interest in the importance of pharmacoepidemiology in the third world. Many third world countries spend a disproportionate amount of their health care resources on drugs,15 yet these drugs are being used inappropriately.16 There have been a number of initiatives in response to this, including the World Health Organization’s development of its list of “essential drugs,”17,18 the International Clinical Epidemiology Network (INCLEN), with the support of The Rockefeller Foundation, embarked on a major initiative to develop more pharmacoepidemiology interest and expertise in the third world.19

FUNDING

For a number of years, academic pharmacoepidemiology suffered from limited research funding opportunities. With the increasing interest in the field, this seems to be in the process of changing, in the US at least. Much more industry funding is available, as industry sees the need for the field (see below). It appears this is likely to increase, especially as the FDA rebuilds its own pharmacoepidemiology program, and more often requires “phase IV” studies. This will be particularly true, if these new “phase IV” studies are used to shorten phase III and permit earlier drug marketing, as has been proposed for drugs used to treat life threatening illnesses and has been operationalized in selected situations, e.g., zidovudine.20 In fact, one could argue that postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology studies should be performed for all newly marketed drugs that are used for chronic diseases, or expected to be either novel or blockbusters, because of the risks which these present.

There is, of course, a risk associated with academic groups becoming too dependent on industry funding, both in terms of independence and credibility. Fortunately, in the US FDA’s funding for extramural pharmacoepidemiology contracts and cooperative agreements has continued, although it has not been increased, and therefore the number of funded programs has in fact been reduced. The US Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR) has begun to fund pharmacoepidemiology research as well, as part of an initiative in pharmaceutical outcomes research. In particular, the AHCPR CERT program (Centers for Education and Research in Therapeutics) appears particularly promising, to begin to provide federal support for ongoing pharmacoepidemiology activities.

Even the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has begun to fund pharmacoepidemiology projects more often, including a small program in pharmacology in the National Institute on Aging. NIH is the logical source for most such support, as it is the major funding source for most US biomedical research. Its funds are also accessible to investigators outside the US, via the same application procedures. However, NIH’s current organizational structure represents an obstacle to pharmacoepidemiology support. In general, the institutes within NIH are organized by organ system. Earlier in the development of pharmacoepidemiology, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences provided most of the support for our field. It remains the most appropriate source of such support: it is the institute intended to fund projects that cross organ systems, and it is the institute that
funds clinical pharmacology research. However, over the past few years it has declined to fund any epidemiology research, as it is focusing much of its resources on molecular biology. This remains a problem for the field of pharmacoepidemiology, a problem that badly needs to be addressed. In the meantime, NIH funding is available now if one tailors a project to fit an organ system or the priorities of another one of the individual institutes.

If the US government begins to pay for drugs as part of Medicare, and therefore becomes concerned about the use of, effects of, and costs of drugs, it is possible that there will be substantial new funding for pharmacoepidemiology available.

Finally, but of critical importance, there is increasing concern about confidentiality in many countries throughout the world (see Chapter 26). The regulatory framework for human research is actively changing, in the process. As discussed elsewhere, this is already beginning to interfere with pharmacoepidemiology research, whether it is access to medical records in database studies, or access to a list of possible cases with a disease to enroll in ad hoc case-control studies. This will be an area of great interest and rapid activity over the next few years, and one in which the field of pharmacoepidemiology will need to remain very active, or risk considerable interference with its activities.

PERSONNEL

With the major increase in interest in the field of pharmacoepidemiology, accompanied by an increased number of funding opportunities, a major remaining problem, aggravated by the other trends, is one of inadequate manpower. There is a crying need for more people in the field, with opportunities available in academia, industry, and FDA. Some early attempts have been made to address this. The Burroughs Wellcome Foundation developed the Burroughs Wellcome Scholar Award in Pharmacoepidemiology, a faculty development award designed to bring new people into the field. This program, now discontinued, did not provide an opportunity for fellowship training of entry-level individuals, but was designed for more experienced investigators. Unfortunately, it is no longer an active program.

Outside of government, training opportunities are limited. In the US, the NIH is the major source of support for scientific training but, as noted above, the National Institute of General Medical Sciences, which funds training programs in clinical pharmacology, has refused to support epidemiology. This results in the dependence of interdisciplinary training on nonfederal sources of funds. There are a few institutions now capable of carrying out such training, for example schools of public health that have a faculty member interested in pharmacoepidemiology and institutions that have developed clinical epidemiology training programs with support from, for example, the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation and The Rockefeller Foundation. Young scientists interested in receiving training in pharmacoepidemiology, however, can only do so if they happen to qualify for support from one of these other programs. No ongoing support is normally available from these programs for training in pharmacoepidemiology per se. Attempts are under way to try to address this, however, primarily through the leadership and generosity of selected pharmaceutical manufacturers. Much more is needed, however.

THE VIEW FROM INDUSTRY

It appears that the role of pharmacoepidemiology in industry is and will continue to be expanding rapidly. All of what was said above about the future of pharmacoepidemiology scientifically, as it relates to academia, obviously relates to industry, as well. The utility of pharmacoepidemiology to industry has become apparent (see Chapters 5 and 7). In addition to being useful for exploring the effects of their drugs, manufacturers are beginning to realize that the field can not only find problems, but it can document drug safety. An increasing number of manufacturers are mounting pharmacoepidemiology studies prophylactically, to have data available in advance when crises occur. Proper practice would argue for phase IV observational studies for all newly marketed
drugs used for chronic diseases, and all drugs expected to be either novel or blockbusters, because of the risks these present. Pharmacoepidemiology also can be used for quantitating beneficial drug effects (see Chapter 34) and even for marketing purposes, both marketing research and direct marketing efforts. Perhaps most importantly, pharmacoepidemiology studies can be used to protect the major investment made in developing a new drug against inappropriate accusations of adverse effects.

In light of these advantages, most major pharmaceutical firms have formed their own in-house pharmacoepidemiology units. Of course, this then means that industry confronts and, in fact, exaggerates the problem of insufficient trained personnel, which was described above. Many pharmaceutical companies are also increasing their investment in external pharmacoepidemiology resources, so they will be available when crises arise. All of this is likely to continue. The risk of the growth of pharmacoepidemiology for industry is the generation of an increased number of false signals about harmful drug effects. This can only be addressed by having adequately trained individuals in the field to minimize this risk, and by having personnel and resources available to address these questions quickly, responsibly, and effectively, if or when they are raised.

THE VIEW FROM REGULATORY AGENCIES

It appears that the role of pharmacoepidemiology in regulatory agencies is also expanding (see Chapter 8). Again, all of what was said above about the future of pharmacoepidemiology scientifically, as it relates to academia, obviously relates to regulatory agencies, as well. In addition, there have been a large series of major drug problems that have occurred, detailed throughout this book. Many of these resulted in the removal of the drug from the market. The need for and importance of pharmacoepidemiology studies have become clear. Again, this can be expected to continue in the future. It has even been suggested that postmarketing pharmacoepidemiology studies might replace some premarketing phase III studies in selected situations, as was done with zidovudine. We are also seeing increasing governmental activity and interest in pharmacoepidemiology, outside the traditional realm of regulatory bodies. For example, in the US, pharmacoepidemiology now plays an important role in the Agency for Healthcare Policy and Research, the Centers for Disease Control, and the National Institutes of Health, and there is increasing debate about the need to develop an independent new Center for Drug Surveillance.

THE VIEW FROM THE LAW

Finally, as explored in Chapter 9, the importance of pharmacoepidemiology to the law has also been increasing. The number of lawsuits relating to pharmacoepidemiology questions is very large. There are an increasing number of drugs on the market, an increasing sensitivity to the adverse effects they can have, and an increasing awareness of the legal system’s ability to obtain substantial remuneration for those who suffered from those adverse effects. Thus, I would predict that the issues in future litigation will shift, from say pelvic inflammatory disease caused by intrauterine devices to the cardiac valvular effects of diet drugs. However, it is probable that the number of issues subject to litigation will only increase. The interest in the field and the need for more true experts in the field will, therefore, increase accordingly.

CONCLUSION

There are no really “safe” biologically active drugs. There are only “safe” physicians.

Harold A. Kaminetzky, 1963

All drugs have adverse effects. Pharmacoepidemiology will never succeed in preventing them; it can only detect them and, thereby, educate physicians so that they can be better prescribers. The result will be better for industry and academia but, most importantly, for public health. The next
“thalidomide disaster” cannot be prevented by pharmacoepidemiology. However, pharmacoepidemiology can minimize its adverse public health impact. At the same time, it can rationalize the use of drugs that belong on the market, and protect against the inappropriate loss of useful drugs. The past few decades have demonstrated the utility of this new field. They also have pointed out some of its problems. With luck, the next few years will see the former accentuated and the latter solved.
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Appendix A

Sample Size Tables
Table A1. Sample sizes for cohort studies^{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1970717</td>
<td>278497</td>
<td>6306290</td>
<td>29429320</td>
<td>37837603</td>
<td>10510431</td>
<td>3153120</td>
<td>1634946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>394133</td>
<td>557684</td>
<td>1261219</td>
<td>588657</td>
<td>7567179</td>
<td>2101980</td>
<td>630585</td>
<td>326965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>197060</td>
<td>278832</td>
<td>630585</td>
<td>2942699</td>
<td>3783376</td>
<td>1050923</td>
<td>315268</td>
<td>163467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>39401</td>
<td>55751</td>
<td>126078</td>
<td>588332</td>
<td>756333</td>
<td>210078</td>
<td>63015</td>
<td>32669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>19694</td>
<td>27865</td>
<td>63015</td>
<td>294037</td>
<td>377953</td>
<td>104973</td>
<td>31483</td>
<td>16320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>3928</td>
<td>5557</td>
<td>12564</td>
<td>58600</td>
<td>75249</td>
<td>20888</td>
<td>6257</td>
<td>3240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1957</td>
<td>2769</td>
<td>6257</td>
<td>29170</td>
<td>37411</td>
<td>10378</td>
<td>3104</td>
<td>1605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>5627</td>
<td>7140</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>2684</td>
<td>3357</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>1703</td>
<td>2095</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>1212</td>
<td>1465</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>918</td>
<td>1086</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>722</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>654</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>477</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^{a} = 0.05 (two tailed), \( \beta = 0.10 \) (power = 90%), control: exposed ratio = 1:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
### Table A1: Sample sizes for cohort studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>incidence in control group</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00003</td>
<td>1051</td>
<td>1834</td>
<td>593</td>
<td>904</td>
<td>394</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>1004</td>
<td>1789</td>
<td>546</td>
<td>768</td>
<td>328</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1783</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>764</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1778</td>
<td>538</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>914</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1774</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>913</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1770</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>324</td>
<td>912</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1766</td>
<td>529</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>911</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1762</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1758</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>909</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>373</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1754</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>756</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1751</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>907</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1747</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>754</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>370</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sample size is calculated as: $n = \frac{\log(1 - \beta) - \log(\alpha)}{\log(1 - \pi) - \log(\pi)}$, where $\pi = \frac{1}{2}$ (prevalence), control:exposed ratio = 1:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
Table A2. Sample sizes for cohort studies\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>2153</td>
<td>4825</td>
<td>2279</td>
<td>2814</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>2302</td>
<td>1183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>430</td>
<td>965</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>445</td>
<td>562</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>776</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>927</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>531</td>
<td>1456</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>2030</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>1287</td>
<td>1561</td>
<td>421</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>916</td>
<td>1092</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>693</td>
<td>811</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>359</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(\alpha = 0.05\) (two tailed), \(\beta = 0.10\) (power = 90%), control : exposed ratio = 2:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A2. Sample sizes for cohort studies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>528</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.10 (power = 90%), control: exposed ratio = 2 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A3. Sample sizes for cohort studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1369471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>273886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>136938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>27380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>13685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a: 0.05 (two-tailed), β = 0.10 (power = 90%), control : exposed ratio = 3 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A3. Sample sizes for cohort studies<sup>a</sup> (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td></td>
<td>653</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td></td>
<td>130</td>
<td>673</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>445</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>619</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>055</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>646</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>03</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>640</td>
<td>455</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>117</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.10 (power = 90%), control: exposed ratio = 3:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A4. Sample sizes for cohort studies\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>1 285</td>
<td>1 815</td>
<td>4 068</td>
<td>18 690</td>
<td>23 293</td>
<td>6 381</td>
<td>1 869</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>363</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>3 737</td>
<td>4 658</td>
<td>1 276</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>1 868</td>
<td>2 329</td>
<td>638</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>373</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1 276</td>
<td>1 802</td>
<td>4 035</td>
<td>18 523</td>
<td>23 035</td>
<td>6 303</td>
<td>1 842</td>
<td>934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>781</td>
<td>3 571</td>
<td>4 399</td>
<td>1 198</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>374</td>
<td>1 702</td>
<td>2 070</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>1 079</td>
<td>1 294</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>767</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>456</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a}\alpha = 0.05 (two tailed), \beta = 0.10 (power = 90\%). control : exposed ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A4. Sample sizes for cohort studies* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>601 217</td>
<td>427 061</td>
<td>325 766</td>
<td>215 895</td>
<td>112 429</td>
<td>74 554</td>
<td>30 945</td>
<td>11 048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>120 234</td>
<td>85 404</td>
<td>65 147</td>
<td>43 174</td>
<td>22 482</td>
<td>14 907</td>
<td>6 186</td>
<td>2 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>60 111</td>
<td>42 697</td>
<td>32 569</td>
<td>21 583</td>
<td>11 238</td>
<td>7 451</td>
<td>3 091</td>
<td>1 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>12 013</td>
<td>8 532</td>
<td>6 507</td>
<td>4 311</td>
<td>2 244</td>
<td>1 487</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>6 000</td>
<td>4 261</td>
<td>3 249</td>
<td>2 152</td>
<td>1 119</td>
<td>741</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1 190</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>643</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>589</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.10 (power = 90%), control: exposed ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A5. Sample sizes for cohort studies\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1472091</td>
<td>2082958</td>
<td>4710686</td>
<td>21983178</td>
<td>28264016</td>
<td>7851105</td>
<td>2355325</td>
<td>1221276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>294411</td>
<td>416580</td>
<td>942108</td>
<td>4396481</td>
<td>5652548</td>
<td>1570142</td>
<td>471036</td>
<td>244238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>147201</td>
<td>208283</td>
<td>471036</td>
<td>2198144</td>
<td>2826115</td>
<td>785022</td>
<td>235500</td>
<td>122108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>29433</td>
<td>41645</td>
<td>94178</td>
<td>439474</td>
<td>564968</td>
<td>156925</td>
<td>47071</td>
<td>24040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>14711</td>
<td>20816</td>
<td>47071</td>
<td>219641</td>
<td>282325</td>
<td>78413</td>
<td>23518</td>
<td>12191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>29335</td>
<td>4152</td>
<td>9385</td>
<td>43774</td>
<td>56210</td>
<td>15604</td>
<td>4675</td>
<td>2421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1463</td>
<td>2069</td>
<td>4675</td>
<td>21790</td>
<td>27946</td>
<td>7752</td>
<td>2319</td>
<td>1199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>4204</td>
<td>5334</td>
<td>1471</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2508</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>1273</td>
<td>1566</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>906</td>
<td>1095</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>686</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>623</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>295</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) \(\alpha = 0.05\) (two-tailed), \(\beta = 0.20\) (power = 80%), control : exposed ratio = 1:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
Table A5. Sample sizes for cohort studies* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control : exposed ratio = 1 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
Table A6. Sample sizes for cohort studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>1 190 356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>238 065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>119 028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>23 799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>11 895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2 372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1 182</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a α = 0.05 (two-tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control: exposed ratio = 2:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A6. Sample sizes for cohort studiesa (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

aα = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control : exposed ratio = 2 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A7. Sample sizes for cohort studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1088323</td>
<td>1516254</td>
<td>3330831</td>
<td>15057392</td>
<td>18412768</td>
<td>5014203</td>
<td>1456566</td>
<td>736622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>217658</td>
<td>303242</td>
<td>666145</td>
<td>3011370</td>
<td>3682391</td>
<td>1002792</td>
<td>291297</td>
<td>147315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>108825</td>
<td>151615</td>
<td>333059</td>
<td>1505617</td>
<td>1841094</td>
<td>501566</td>
<td>145638</td>
<td>73651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>21759</td>
<td>30314</td>
<td>66590</td>
<td>301015</td>
<td>368057</td>
<td>100225</td>
<td>29111</td>
<td>14721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1080</td>
<td>1505</td>
<td>3304</td>
<td>14922</td>
<td>18210</td>
<td>4954</td>
<td>1436</td>
<td>725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>2876</td>
<td>3480</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>1370</td>
<td>1638</td>
<td>441</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>868</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>534</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>411</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control: exposed ratio = 3:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A7. Sample sizes for cohort studies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>464 207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>92 835</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>46 413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>9 276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4 634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*$\alpha = 0.05$ (two-tailed), $\beta = 0.20$ (power = 80%), control : exposed ratio = 3 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A8. Sample sizes for cohort studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1034.606</td>
<td>1440.316</td>
<td>3154.116</td>
<td>14188.116</td>
<td>17178.604</td>
<td>4657.092</td>
<td>1342.104</td>
<td>674.194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>206.915</td>
<td>288.054</td>
<td>630.802</td>
<td>2837.520</td>
<td>3435.570</td>
<td>931.374</td>
<td>268.406</td>
<td>134.830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>103.454</td>
<td>144.022</td>
<td>315.388</td>
<td>1418.696</td>
<td>1717.691</td>
<td>465.659</td>
<td>134.194</td>
<td>67.410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1033.8</td>
<td>1439.2</td>
<td>3151.5</td>
<td>1417.54</td>
<td>1715.99</td>
<td>465.16</td>
<td>134.02</td>
<td>67.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2061</td>
<td>2870</td>
<td>6282</td>
<td>2824.8</td>
<td>3416.9</td>
<td>9259</td>
<td>2665</td>
<td>1338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10327</td>
<td>1429</td>
<td>3128</td>
<td>1405.9</td>
<td>1699.0</td>
<td>4601</td>
<td>1323</td>
<td>663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>2709</td>
<td>3247</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>1290</td>
<td>1529</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>957</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>581</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>344</td>
<td>384</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control: exposed ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A8. Sample sizes for cohort studies* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incidence in control group</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>422 454</td>
<td>297 814</td>
<td>225 764</td>
<td>148 182</td>
<td>76 019</td>
<td>49 975</td>
<td>20 438</td>
<td>7 223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>84 485</td>
<td>59 558</td>
<td>45 149</td>
<td>29 633</td>
<td>15 201</td>
<td>9 993</td>
<td>4 086</td>
<td>1 443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>42 238</td>
<td>29 776</td>
<td>22 572</td>
<td>14 815</td>
<td>7 599</td>
<td>4 995</td>
<td>2 042</td>
<td>721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>8 442</td>
<td>5 950</td>
<td>4 510</td>
<td>2 960</td>
<td>1 518</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4 217</td>
<td>2 972</td>
<td>2 253</td>
<td>1 478</td>
<td>757</td>
<td>497</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>837</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>446</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control: exposed ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the exposed group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A9. Sample sizes for case–control studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>1,970,728</td>
<td>2,788,519</td>
<td>6,306,363</td>
<td>29,429,793</td>
<td>37,838,497</td>
<td>10,510,715</td>
<td>3,153,225</td>
<td>1,635,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>394,143</td>
<td>557,705</td>
<td>1,261,292</td>
<td>5,886,130</td>
<td>7,568,072</td>
<td>2,102,264</td>
<td>630,690</td>
<td>327,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>197,070</td>
<td>278,853</td>
<td>630,659</td>
<td>2,943,172</td>
<td>3,784,269</td>
<td>1,051,207</td>
<td>315,373</td>
<td>163,532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>39,412</td>
<td>55,772</td>
<td>126,151</td>
<td>588,806</td>
<td>757,227</td>
<td>210,362</td>
<td>63,120</td>
<td>32,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>19,704</td>
<td>27,887</td>
<td>63,088</td>
<td>294,510</td>
<td>378,847</td>
<td>105,257</td>
<td>31,588</td>
<td>16,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3,939</td>
<td>5,579</td>
<td>12,638</td>
<td>59,074</td>
<td>76,145</td>
<td>21,173</td>
<td>6,363</td>
<td>3,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1,968</td>
<td>2,790</td>
<td>6,331</td>
<td>29,646</td>
<td>38,309</td>
<td>10,663</td>
<td>3,210</td>
<td>1,669</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \alpha = 0.05 \text{ (two-tailed), } \beta = 0.10 \text{ (power = 90%), control : case ratio = 1 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.} \]
Table A9. Sample sizes for case–control studies\(^a\) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1 051 081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>210 236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>105 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>21 046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>10 535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2 127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1 076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>635</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(\alpha = 0.05\) (two-tailed), \(\beta = 0.10\) (power = 90\%), control : case ratio = 1 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
Table A10. Sample sizes for case–control studiesa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1529 065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>305 811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>152 904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>30 578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>15 288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>3 055</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1 526</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.10 (power = 90%), control : case ratio = 2:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the control group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A10. Sample sizes for case–control studies\(^a\) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>755</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>348</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>552</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>833</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1.530</td>
<td>1.097</td>
<td>844</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>775</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(\alpha = 0.05\) (two tailed), \(\beta = 0.10\) (power = 90%), control : case ratio = 2 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A11. Sample sizes for case–control studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1369478</td>
<td>1930861</td>
<td>4322663</td>
<td>19888975</td>
<td>24913964</td>
<td>6843813</td>
<td>2014824</td>
<td>1029056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>273893</td>
<td>386172</td>
<td>864545</td>
<td>3977907</td>
<td>4983044</td>
<td>1368844</td>
<td>402996</td>
<td>205830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>136945</td>
<td>193086</td>
<td>432280</td>
<td>1989023</td>
<td>2491679</td>
<td>684473</td>
<td>201517</td>
<td>102927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>27387</td>
<td>38617</td>
<td>86468</td>
<td>39917</td>
<td>498587</td>
<td>136977</td>
<td>40334</td>
<td>20604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1367</td>
<td>1931</td>
<td>4338</td>
<td>20303</td>
<td>25231</td>
<td>6947</td>
<td>2054</td>
<td>1053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>387</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>4125</td>
<td>5313</td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>2145</td>
<td>2841</td>
<td>799</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>1491</td>
<td>2031</td>
<td>577</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>1171</td>
<td>1639</td>
<td>471</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>984</td>
<td>1417</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>865</td>
<td>1281</td>
<td>376</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>786</td>
<td>1197</td>
<td>355</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>734</td>
<td>1149</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>1131</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>679</td>
<td>1156</td>
<td>357</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>689</td>
<td>1207</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>715</td>
<td>1289</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>1414</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1602</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>968</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>616</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>1194</td>
<td>2413</td>
<td>789</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>1664</td>
<td>3459</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>3100</td>
<td>6632</td>
<td>2208</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>569</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a = 0.05 (two tailed), b = 0.10 (power = 90%), control : case ratio = 3 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A11. Sample sizes for case–control studies$^a$ (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>653 448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>130 703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>65 360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>13 086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>6 551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1 324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>438</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a\alpha = 0.05$ (two tailed), $\beta = 0.10$ (power = 90%), control : case ratio = 3 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A12. Sample sizes for case–control studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1285573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>257112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>128555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>25709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>12853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>25568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \alpha = 0.05 \) (two-tailed), \( \beta = 0.10 \) (power = 90\%). control: case ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A12. Sample sizes for case–control studies* (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>601 245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>120 262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>60 139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>12 041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>6 028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1 219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>618</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>412</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.10 (power = 90%), control: case ratio = 4 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A13. Sample sizes for case–control studies\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1 472 099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>294 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>1 472 099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>294 418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>1 472 099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>2 943 2 416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1 470 2 085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>293 419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>146 211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>97 142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>73 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>58 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>49 74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>42 65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>37 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>33 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>31 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>29 47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>27 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>26 45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>26 46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>27 48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>28 53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>32 62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>41 81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>70 142</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)\(\alpha = 0.05\) (two tailed), \(\beta = 0.20\) (power = 80%), control : case ratio = 1 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
Table A13. Sample sizes for case–control studies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00001</td>
<td>785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.00005</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control : case ratio = 1 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. An equivalent number would be included in the control group.
Table A14. Sample sizes for case–control studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1190</td>
<td>1663</td>
<td>3680</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>1683</td>
<td>859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>332</td>
<td>736</td>
<td>3358</td>
<td>4176</td>
<td>1145</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>1679</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>5726</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*α = 0.05 (two tailed), \( \beta = 0.20 \) (power = 80%), control : case ratio = 2 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A14. Sample sizes for case–control studies$^a$ (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>546 235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>109 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>54 637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>10 939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>5 477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1 107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>376</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control : case ratio = 2 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Double this number would be included in the control group.
Table A15. Sample sizes for case–control studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1 088 329</td>
<td>1 516 265</td>
<td>3 330 869</td>
<td>15 057 631</td>
<td>18 413 208</td>
<td>5 014 341</td>
<td>1 456 616</td>
<td>736 652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000015</td>
<td>217 664</td>
<td>303 253</td>
<td>666 182</td>
<td>3 011 608</td>
<td>3 682 831</td>
<td>1 002 930</td>
<td>291 347</td>
<td>147 345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>108 831</td>
<td>151 626</td>
<td>333 096</td>
<td>1 505 856</td>
<td>1 841 534</td>
<td>501 504</td>
<td>145 688</td>
<td>73 681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>21 764</td>
<td>30 325</td>
<td>66 628</td>
<td>301 253</td>
<td>368 496</td>
<td>100 363</td>
<td>29 161</td>
<td>14 751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>10 881</td>
<td>15 162</td>
<td>33 319</td>
<td>150 678</td>
<td>184 367</td>
<td>50 220</td>
<td>14 595</td>
<td>7 384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>21 74</td>
<td>3 032</td>
<td>6 672</td>
<td>30 218</td>
<td>37 064</td>
<td>10 107</td>
<td>2 943</td>
<td>1 491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>1 086</td>
<td>1 516</td>
<td>3 342</td>
<td>15 161</td>
<td>18 652</td>
<td>5 093</td>
<td>1 486</td>
<td>755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>3 120</td>
<td>3 932</td>
<td>1 085</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>1 125</td>
<td>1 507</td>
<td>426</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>1 218</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>954</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>857</td>
<td>257</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>525</td>
<td>843</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>846</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>533</td>
<td>967</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>1 061</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>1 204</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>718</td>
<td>1 429</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>1 817</td>
<td>598</td>
<td>235</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>1 230</td>
<td>2 607</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>2 288</td>
<td>5 002</td>
<td>1 678</td>
<td>678</td>
<td>442</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control : case ratio = 3 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A15. Sample sizes for case–control studies\(^a\) (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>3.0</th>
<th>3.5</th>
<th>4.0</th>
<th>5.0</th>
<th>7.5</th>
<th>10.0</th>
<th>20.0</th>
<th>50.0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>464 229</td>
<td>328 865</td>
<td>250 357</td>
<td>165 463</td>
<td>85 879</td>
<td>56 868</td>
<td>23 570</td>
<td>8 415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>92 856</td>
<td>65 782</td>
<td>50 079</td>
<td>33 098</td>
<td>17 180</td>
<td>11 377</td>
<td>4 717</td>
<td>1 685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>46 435</td>
<td>32 896</td>
<td>25 044</td>
<td>16 553</td>
<td>8 592</td>
<td>5 691</td>
<td>2 360</td>
<td>844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>9 298</td>
<td>6 588</td>
<td>5 016</td>
<td>3 316</td>
<td>1 723</td>
<td>1 141</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>4 655</td>
<td>3 299</td>
<td>2 513</td>
<td>1 662</td>
<td>864</td>
<td>573</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\alpha = 0.05 \text{ (two tailed)}, \beta = 0.20 \text{ (power = 80\%), control : case ratio = 3 : 1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Triple this number would be included in the control group.}\)
Table A16. Sample sizes for case–control studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>0.2</th>
<th>0.3</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>0.75</th>
<th>1.25</th>
<th>1.5</th>
<th>2.0</th>
<th>2.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>1 034 611</td>
<td>1 440 327</td>
<td>3 154 151</td>
<td>14 188 340</td>
<td>17 179 015</td>
<td>4 657 221</td>
<td>1 342 151</td>
<td>674 222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>206 920</td>
<td>288 065</td>
<td>630 838</td>
<td>2 837 745</td>
<td>3 435 981</td>
<td>931 503</td>
<td>268 452</td>
<td>134 858</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>103 459</td>
<td>144 032</td>
<td>315 424</td>
<td>1 418 920</td>
<td>1 718 102</td>
<td>465 788</td>
<td>134 240</td>
<td>67 438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>20 690</td>
<td>28 806</td>
<td>63 092</td>
<td>283 861</td>
<td>343 799</td>
<td>93 216</td>
<td>26 870</td>
<td>13 501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>10 344</td>
<td>14 403</td>
<td>31 551</td>
<td>141 978</td>
<td>172 011</td>
<td>46 645</td>
<td>13 449</td>
<td>6 759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>1 032</td>
<td>1 440</td>
<td>3 164</td>
<td>14 285</td>
<td>17 404</td>
<td>4 731</td>
<td>1 370</td>
<td>691</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>2 938</td>
<td>3 670</td>
<td>1 009</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>1 525</td>
<td>1 966</td>
<td>547</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>1 059</td>
<td>1 408</td>
<td>397</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>1 138</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>696</td>
<td>985</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>611</td>
<td>892</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>554</td>
<td>836</td>
<td>248</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>803</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>790</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>793</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>475</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>849</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>997</td>
<td>319</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>583</td>
<td>1 131</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>1 343</td>
<td>439</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>1 708</td>
<td>564</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>1 148</td>
<td>2 452</td>
<td>817</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>2 133</td>
<td>4 707</td>
<td>1 583</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control: case ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A16. Sample sizes for case-control studies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prevalence in control group</th>
<th>Relative risk to be detected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000001</td>
<td>422 474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.000005</td>
<td>84 505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>42 259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.0005</td>
<td>8 462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>4 237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*α = 0.05 (two tailed), β = 0.20 (power = 80%), control: case ratio = 4:1. The sample size listed is the number of subjects needed in the case group. Quadruple this number would be included in the control group.
Table A17. Tabular values of 95 percent confidence limit factors for estimates of a Poisson distributed variable*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed number on which estimate is based (n)</th>
<th>Lower limit factor (L)</th>
<th>Upper limit factor (U)</th>
<th>Observed number on which estimate is based (n)</th>
<th>Lower limit factor (L)</th>
<th>Upper limit factor (U)</th>
<th>Observed number on which estimate is based (n)</th>
<th>Lower limit factor (L)</th>
<th>Upper limit factor (U)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0253</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0.833</td>
<td>1.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.627</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>0.844</td>
<td>1.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.634</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0.854</td>
<td>1.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0.641</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>0.862</td>
<td>1.160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.324</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0.647</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>1.151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.367</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.653</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>1.134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0.659</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>1.121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0.665</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>0.899</td>
<td>1.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.458</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0.670</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0.906</td>
<td>1.104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.480</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.675</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>1.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0.697</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0.915</td>
<td>1.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.517</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>0.922</td>
<td>1.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.532</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0.729</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>0.928</td>
<td>1.078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.546</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>0.932</td>
<td>1.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.560</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0.770</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>0.936</td>
<td>1.068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.572</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>0.785</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>0.939</td>
<td>1.064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0.798</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0.593</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>0.809</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0.602</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.818</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.611</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Appendix B

Glossary

The accuracy of a measurement is the degree to which the measurement approximates the truth.

An adverse drug event or adverse drug experience is an adverse outcome that occurs during or following clinical use of a drug.

An adverse drug reaction is an adverse drug event that is judged to be caused by the drug.

Studies of adverse effects examine case reports of adverse drug reactions, attempting to judge subjectively whether the adverse events were indeed caused by the antecedent drug exposure.

Studies of adverse events explore any medical events experienced by patients and use epidemiologic methods to investigate whether any given event occurs more often in those who receive a drug than in those who do not receive the drug.

An adverse experience is any adverse event associated with the use of a drug or biological product in humans, whether or not considered product related, including the following: an adverse experience occurring in the course of the use of the product in professional practice; an adverse experience occurring from overdose of the product whether accidental or intentional; an adverse experience occurring from abuse of the product; an adverse experience occurring from withdrawal of the product; and any failure of expected pharmacological action.

Agreement is the degree to which different methods or sources of information give the same answers. Agreement between two sources or methods does not imply that either is valid or reliable.

Analyses of secular trends examine trends in disease events over time or across different geographic locations and correlate them with trends in putative exposures, such as rates of drug utilization. The unit of observation is a subgroup of a population, rather than individuals.

Analytic studies are studies with control groups, namely case-control studies, cohort studies, and randomized clinical trials.

Anticipated beneficial effects of drugs are desirable effects that are known to be caused by the drug. They represent the reason for prescribing or ingesting the drug.

Anticipated harmful effects of drugs are unwanted effects that could have been predicted on the basis of existing knowledge.

An association is when two events occur together more often than one would expect by chance.

Autocorrelation is where any individual observation is to some extent a function of the previous observation.

Bias is a systematic manner in which the two study groups have been treated differently. The presence of a bias causes a study to yield incorrect results.

Biological inference is the process of generalizing from a statement about a population, that is an association, to a causal statement about biological theory.

Case-control studies are studies that compare cases with a disease to controls without the disease, looking for differences in antecedent exposures.
Case reports are reports of the experience of single patients. As used in pharmacoepidemiology, a case report describes a single patient who was exposed to a drug and experiences a particular, usually adverse, outcome.

Case series are reports of collections of patients, all of whom have a common exposure, examining what their clinical outcomes were. Alternatively, case series can be reports of patients who have a common disease, examining what their antecedent exposures were. No control group is present.

An exposure causes a health event when it truly increases the probability of that event.

Changeability is the ability of an instrument to measure a difference in score in patients who have improved or deteriorated.

Channeling bias occurs when a drug that is claimed to be very safe may first be tried on patients who do not tolerate the previous drug products. It is a type of selection bias.

Drug clearance is the proportion of the “apparent” volume of distribution that is cleared of drug in a specified time. The total body clearance is the sum of clearances by different routes, e.g., renal, hepatic, pulmonary, etc.

Clinical pharmacology is the study of the effects of drugs in humans.

Cohort studies are studies that identify defined populations and follow them forward in time, examining their rates of disease. Cohort studies generally identify and compare exposed patients to unexposed patients or to patients who receive a different exposure.

Confidence intervals are a range of values within which the true population value probably lies.

Confidentiality is the right to limit the transfer of private information.

A confounding variable, or confounder, is a variable other than the risk factor and outcome variable under study that is related independently both to the risk factor and to the outcome. A confounder can create an apparent association between the risk factor and the outcome or mask a real one.

Construct validity refers to the extent to which results from a given instrument are consistent with those from other measures in a manner consistent with theoretical hypotheses.

A cost is the consumption of a resource that could otherwise be used for another purpose.

Cost–benefit analysis of medical care compares the cost of a medical intervention to its benefit. Both costs and benefits must be measured in the same monetary units (e.g., dollars).

Cost–effectiveness analysis of medical care compares the cost of a medical intervention to its effectiveness. Costs are determined in monetary units, while effectiveness is determined independently and may be measured in terms of any clinically meaningful unit.

Cost-identification analysis enumerates the costs involved in medical care, ignoring the outcomes that result from that care.

Criterion validity refers to the ability of an instrument to measure what it is supposed to measure, as judged by agreement with a gold standard.

Cross-sectional studies examine populations at one point in time; they have no time sense.

Descriptive studies are studies that do not have control groups, namely case reports, case series, and analyses of secular trends. They contrast with analytic studies.

Detection bias is an error in the results of a study due to a systematic difference between the study groups in the procedures used for ascertainment, diagnosis, or verification of disease.
**Differential misclassification** occurs when the misclassification of one variable (e.g., drug usage) varies according to the level of another variable (e.g., disease status).

The **direct medical costs** of medical care are the costs that are incurred in providing the care.

**Direct nonmedical costs** are nonmedical care costs incurred because of an illness or the need to seek medical care. They can include the cost of transportation to the hospital or physician’s office, the cost of special clothing needed because of the illness, and the cost of hotel stays and special housing (e.g., modification of the home to accommodate the ill individual).

**Discriminative instruments** are those that measure differences among people at a single point in time.

A **drug** is any exogenously administered substance that exerts a physiologic effect.

**Drug utilization**, as defined by the World Health Organization (WHO), is the “marketing, distribution, prescription and use of drugs in a society, with special emphasis on the resulting medical, social, and economic consequences.”

**Drug utilization evaluation (DUE) programs** are ongoing structured systems designed to improve drug use by intervening when inappropriate drug use is detected.

**Drug utilization evaluation studies** are studies that assess the appropriateness of drug use. They are designed to detect and quantify the frequency of drug use problems.

**Drug utilization review programs** are ongoing structured systems designed to improve drug use by intervening when inappropriate drug use is detected.

**Drug utilization review studies** are studies that assess the appropriateness of drug use. They are designed to detect and quantify any drug use problems.

**Drug utilization studies** are descriptive studies that quantify the use of a drug. The objective of the study is to quantify the present state, the developmental trends, and the time course of drug usage at various levels of the health care system, whether national, regional, local, or institutional.

**Ecological studies** examine trends in disease events over time or across different geographic locations and correlate them with trends in a putative exposure, such as rates of drug utilization. The unit of observation is a subgroup of a population, rather than individuals.

**Effect modification** occurs when the magnitude of effect of a drug in causing an outcome differs according to the level of a variable other than the drug or the outcome.

A study of drug **effectiveness** is a study of whether, in the usual clinical setting, a drug in fact achieves the effect intended when prescribing it.

A study of drug **efficacy** is a study of whether, under ideal conditions, a drug has the ability to bring about the effect intended when prescribing it.

A study of drug **efficiency** is a study of whether a drug can bring about its desired effect at an acceptable cost.

**Epidemiology** is the study of the distribution and determinants of diseases in populations.

**Evaluative instruments** are those designed to measure changes within individuals over time.

**Experimental studies** are studies in which the investigator controls the therapy that is to be received by each participant, generally using that control to randomly allocate patients among the study groups.

**Face validity** is a judgement about the validity of an instrument, based on an intuitive assessment of the extent to which an instrument meets a number of criteria including applicability, clarity and
simplicity, likelihood of bias, comprehensiveness, and whether redundant items have been included.

**Fixed costs** are costs incurred regardless of the volume of activity.

**Generic quality of life instruments** cover (or at least aim to cover) the complete spectrum of function, disability, and distress of the patient, and are applicable to a variety of populations.

**Half-life** \( T_{1/2} \) is the time taken for the drug concentration to decline by half. \( T_{1/2} \) is a function of both the volume of distribution and clearance of the drug.

**Health profiles** are single instruments that measure multiple different aspects of quality of life.

**Health-related quality of life** is a multifactorial concept that, from the patient’s perspective, represents the end result of all the physiological, psychological, and social influences of the therapeutic process. Health-related quality of life may be considered on different levels: overall assessment of well-being; several broad domains—physiological, functional, psychological, social, and economic status; and subcomponents of each domain—for example, pain, sleep, activities of daily living, sexual function within physical and functional domains.

A **human research subject** is “a living individual, about whom an investigator (whether professional or student) conducting research obtains either: 1) data through intervention or interaction with the individual, or 2) identifiable private information.”

**Hypothesis-generating studies** are studies that give rise to new questions about drug effects to be explored further in subsequent studies.

**Hypothesis-strengthening studies** are studies that reinforce, although they do not provide definitive evidence for, existing hypotheses.

**Hypothesis-testing studies** are studies that evaluate in detail hypotheses raised elsewhere.

**Incidence/prevalence bias**, a type of selection bias, may occur in studies when prevalent cases rather than new cases of a condition are selected for a study. A strong association with prevalence may be related to the duration of the disease rather than to its incidence, because prevalence is proportional to both incidence and duration of the disease.

The **incidence rate** of a disease is a measure of how frequently the disease occurs. Specifically, it is the number of new cases of the disease that develop over a defined time period in a defined population at risk, divided by the number of people in that population at risk.

**Indirect costs** are costs that do not stem directly from transactions for goods or services, but represent the loss of opportunities to use a valuable resource in alternative ways. They include the cost of morbidity (e.g., time lost from work) or mortality (e.g., premature death leading to removal from the work force).

**Information bias** is an error in the results of a study due to a systematic difference between the study groups in the accuracy of the measurements being made of exposure or outcome.

**Intangible costs** are those of pain, suffering, and grief.

**Interaction**, see effect modification.

**Interrupted time-series designs** include multiple observations (often ten or more) of study populations before and after an intervention.

**Meta-analysis** is the formal statistical analysis of a collection of analytic results for the purpose of integrating the findings. Meta-analysis is used to identify sources of variation among study findings and, when appropriate, to provide an overall measure of effect as a summary of those findings.

**Misclassification bias** is the error resulting from classifying study subjects as exposed when they truly are unexposed, or vice versa. Alternatively, misclassification bias can result from classifying
study subjects as diseased when they truly are not diseased, or vice versa.

*Molecular pharmacoepidemiology* is the application of the methods of molecular biology in a pharmacoepidemiology study.

An *N-of-1 RCT* is a randomized controlled trial in an individual patient.

*Nondifferential misclassification* occurs when the misclassification of one variable does not vary by the level of another variable. The measure of association is usually biased toward the null.

*Nonexperimental studies* are studies in which the investigator does not control the therapy, but observes and evaluates the results of ongoing medical care. The study designs that are used are those that do not involve random allocation, namely case reports, case series, analyses of secular trends, case–control studies, and cohort studies.

*Observational studies* are studies in which the investigator does not control the therapy, but observes and evaluates the results of ongoing medical care. The study designs that are used are those that do not involve randomization, namely case reports, case series, analyses of secular trends, case–control studies, and cohort studies.

The *odds ratio* is the odds of exposure in the diseased group divided by the odds of exposure in the nondiseased group. It provides an estimate of the relative risk when the disease under study is relatively rare.

*One-group, post-only study design* consists of making only one observation on a single group that has already been exposed to a treatment.

An *opportunity cost* is the value of a resource’s next best use, a use no longer possible once the resource has been used.

A *p-value* is the probability that a difference as large as the one observed could have occurred purely by chance.

*Pharmacodynamics* is the study of the relationship between drug level and drug effect. It involves the study of the response of the target tissues in the body to a given concentration of drug.

*Pharmacoepidemiology* is the study of the use of and the effects of drugs in large numbers of people.

*Pharmacogenetics* is the study of genetic determinants of responses to drugs.

A *pharmacokinetic compartment* is a theoretical space into which drug molecules are said to distribute, and is represented by a given linear component of the log concentration versus time curve. It is not an actual anatomic or physiologic space, but is sometimes thought of as a tissue or group of tissues that have similar blood flow and drug affinity.

*Pharmacokinetics* is the study of the relationship between the dose of a drug administered and the serum or blood level achieved. It includes the study of the processes of drug absorption, distribution, metabolism, and excretion.

*Pharmacology* is the study of the effects of drugs in a living system.

*Pharmacotherapeutics* is the application of the principles of clinical pharmacology to rational prescribing, the conduct of clinical trials, and the assessment of outcomes during real-life clinical practice.

*Postmarketing surveillance* is the study of drug use and drug effects after release onto the market. This term is sometimes used synonymously with “pharmacoepidemiology,” but the latter can be relevant to premarketing studies, as well. Conversely, the term “postmarketing surveillance” is sometimes felt to apply to only those studies conducted after drug marketing which systematically screen for adverse drug effects. However, this is a more restricted use of the term than that used in this book.

*Potency* refers to the amount of drug that is required to elicit a given response.
The power of a study is the probability of detecting a difference in the study if one really exists.

Precision is the degree of absence of random error.

Pre–post with comparison group design includes a single observation both before and after treatment in a nonrandomly selected group exposed to a treatment (e.g., physicians receiving feedback on specific prescribing practices), as well as simultaneous before and after observations of a similar (comparison) group not receiving treatment.

The prevalence rate of a disease is a measurement of how common the disease is. Specifically, it is the number of existing cases of the disease in a defined population at a given point in time or over a defined time period, divided by the number of people in that population.

Prevalence study bias, a type of selection bias, may occur in studies when prevalent cases rather than new cases of a condition are selected for a study. A strong association with prevalence may be related to the duration of the disease rather than to its incidence, because prevalence is proportional to both incidence and duration of the disease.

Privacy, in the setting of research, refers to each individual's right to be free from unwanted inspection of, or access to, personal information.

Prospective drug utilization review is designed to detect drug therapy problems before an individual patient receives the drug.

Prospective studies are studies performed simultaneously with the events under study.

Protopathic bias is interpreting as a result of an exposure a variable that is in fact its determinant.

Publication bias occurs when publication of a study's results is related to the study’s findings.

Qualitative drug utilization studies are studies that assess the appropriateness of drug use.

Quality of life is the description of aspects (domains) of physical, social, and emotional health that are relevant and important to the patient.

Quantitative drug utilization studies are descriptive studies of frequency of drug use.

Random allocation is the assignment of subjects who are enrolled in a study into study groups in a manner determined by chance.

Random error is error due to chance.

Random selection is the selection of subjects into a study from among those eligible in a manner determined by chance.

Randomized clinical trials are studies in which the investigator controls the therapy that is to be received by each participant and uses that control to allocate patients among the study groups randomly.

Recall bias is an error in the results of a study due to a systematic difference between the study groups in the accuracy or completeness of their memory of their past exposures or health events.

Referral bias is error in the results of a study that occurs when the reasons for referring a patient for medical care are related to the exposure status, e.g., when the use of the drug contributes to the diagnostic process.

Regression to the mean is the tendency for observations on populations selected on the basis of an abnormality to approach normality on subsequent observations.

The relative risk is the ratio of the incidence rate of an outcome in the exposed group to the incidence rate of the outcome in the unexposed group.

Reliability is the degree to which the results obtained by a measurement procedure can be replicated. The measurement of reliability does not require a gold standard, since it assesses only the concordance between two or more measures.
**Reproducibility** is the ability of an instrument to obtain more or less the same scores upon repeated measurements of patients who have not changed.

**Research** is any activity designed to “develop or contribute to generalizable knowledge.”

**Responsiveness** is an instrument’s ability to detect change.

**Retrospective drug utilization review** compares past drug use against predetermined criteria to identify aberrant prescribing patterns or patient-specific deviations from explicit criteria.

**Retrospective studies** are studies conducted after the events under study.

**Risk** is the probability that something will happen.

A judgement about **safety** is a personal and/or social judgement about the degree to which a given risk is acceptable.

**Sample distortion bias** is another name for selection bias.

**Scientific inference** is the process of generalizing from a statement about a population, that is an association, to a causal statement about scientific theory.

**Selection bias** is error in a study that is due to systematic differences in characteristics between those who are selected for the study and those who are not.

**Sensibility** is a judgement about the validity of an instrument, based on an intuitive assessment of the extent to which an instrument meets a number of criteria including applicability, clarity and simplicity, likelihood of bias, comprehensiveness, and whether redundant items have been included.

**Sensitivity** is the proportion of persons who truly have a characteristic who are correctly classified as having it.

**Sensitivity analysis** is a set of procedures in which the results of a study are recalculated using alternate values for some of the study’s variables, in order to test the sensitivity of the conclusions to altered specifications.

A **serious adverse experience** is any adverse experience occurring at any dose that results in any of the following outcomes: death, a life-threatening adverse experience, inpatient hospitalization or prolongation of existing hospitalization, a persistent or significant disability/incapacity, or congenital anomaly/birth defect.

**Specific quality of life instruments** are focused on disease or treatment issues specifically relevant to the question at hand.

**Specificity** is the proportion of persons who truly do not have a characteristic, who are correctly classified as not having it.

**Statistical inference** is the process of generalizing from a sample of study subjects to the entire population from which those subjects are theoretically drawn.

**Statistical interaction**, see effect modification.

A **statistically significant difference** is a difference between two study groups that is unlikely to have occurred purely by chance.

Within pharmacokinetics, **steady state** is the situation when the amount of drug being administered is equal to the amount of drug being eliminated from the body.

**Systematic error** is error introduced into a study by its design, rather than due to random variation.

The **therapeutic ratio** is the ratio of the drug concentration that produces toxicity to the concentration that produces the desired therapeutic effect.

**Therapeutics** is the application of the principles of clinical pharmacology to rational prescribing, the
conducted during clinical trials, and the assessment of outcomes during real-life clinical practice.

**Type A adverse reactions** are those that are the result of an exaggerated but otherwise predictable pharmacological effect of the drug. They tend to be common, dose-related, and less serious than type B reactions.

**Type B adverse reactions** are those which are aberrant effects of the drug. They tend to be uncommon, not dose-related, and unpredictable.

A type I error is concluding there is an association when in fact one does not exist.

A type II error is concluding there is no association when in fact one does exist.

Unanticipated beneficial effects of drugs are desirable effects that could not have been predicted on the basis of existing knowledge.

Unanticipated harmful effects of drugs are unwanted effects that could not have been predicted on the basis of existing knowledge.

An unexpected adverse experience means any adverse experience that is not listed in the current labeling for the product. This includes events that may be symptomatically and pathophysiologically related to an event listed in the labeling, but differ from the event because of greater severity or specificity.

Utility measures of quality of life are measured holistically as a single number along a continuum, e.g., from death (0.0) to full health (1.0). The key elements of a utility instrument are first, that it is preference based, and second, that scores are tied to death as an outcome.

Validity is the degree to which an assessment measures what it purports to measure.

Variable costs are costs that increase with increasing volume of activity.

Apparent volume of distribution \( (V_D) \) is the “apparent” volume that a drug is distributed in after complete absorption. It is usually calculated from the theoretical plasma concentration at a time when all of the drug was assumed to be present in the body and uniformly distributed. This is calculated from back-extrapolation to time zero of the plasma concentration time curve after intravenous administration.

Voluntariness is the concept in research ethics that investigators must tell subjects that participation in the research study is voluntary, and that subjects have the right to discontinue participation at any time.