



Public Health

Title : *Epidemiological studies 2*

Lec no : *13*

Done By : *Alawneh*

وَقُلْ رَبِّ زِدْنِي عِلْمًا



Public Health
Prevent. Promote. Protect.

Epidemiological studies II

Cohort Study

L13

Associate Professor Dr. Eman A. Al-Kamil
Dep. Of Community Medicine
Collage of Medicine
Hashemite University



● In cohort studies, the **starting point** is **people who are free from the disease**. Such people are **identified and followed up** for a defined **period of time** (prospective).

we mentioned previously that we start with diseased individuals and ask about previous exposure in case control study (retrospective study)

● During the follow up, **new cases or deaths** that result from the disease under study are recorded and related to **different levels of exposure to risk factors** (exposure) under evaluation.


● We always start with at least **two groups**: the study **cohort** which consists of those:

1. **exposed to the risk factor** and
2. the control cohort which consists of those **not exposed to the risk factor**.

:Cohort study has 2 types

- **Prospective cohort study:** All data will be collected in the future (we have a group of people who are exposed but do not have the disease, and we are going to follow up in the future to see the development of the change)
- **Retrospective prospective study:** where part is carried out retrospectively by collecting existing data then the cohort is followed till the outcome under study is developed.

the difference between cohort and case control study:




Concept of a cohort


In epidemiology the word cohort is defined as a group of people who share a common characteristic or experience within a defined period of time (e.g. age, occupation, exposure to drug, vaccine, pregnancy, birth or marriage cohorts). for example, the first year medical student are cohort group

The comparison group may be the general population from which the cohort is drawn or may be another cohort of persons thought to have had little or no exposure to the substance in question.


Group of interest
(e.g. smokers)




Follow
over time



Comparison group
(e.g. non-smokers)



Follow
over time



(we are going to see how many individuals from the exposed developed the disease compared to individuals who are not exposed who also developed the health problem)

Compare
outcomes

Cohort Studies



Elements of a cohort study

there are different types of cohort groups according to the kind of exposure.
the period of time for follow-up depends on the outcome that you want to study. for example, in Framingham study (which is a well-known study) requires a long time for the follow-up to study the risk factors for cardiovascular diseases

1- Selection of the study subjects:

General population (when exposure or the cause of the disease) is fairly frequent in the population. The cohort residing in the same geographical area as in (Framingham study)

Selected groups as professional group

Exposure group: cohorts selected with special exposure to physical, chemical or other disease agents.

2- Obtaining data on exposure from:

- Cohort members, questionnaire through personal interviews, or mailed questionnaire in large cohorts.
- Review of records: dose of radiation, number of surgeries, details of medical treatment,
- Medical examination or special tests e.g. BP measurement, serum cholesterol..... etc.

3- Selection of comparison group:

- **Internal comparison:** the same cohort that enters the study may be classified into several comparison groups according to the degree of exposure (smoking, cholesterol) before the development of the disease in question. for example, when we apply a study on smokers from college students, the comparison group is non-smokers from the same college students.
- **External comparison:** if all of my cohort is exposed to the risk factor (radiologist, so we compare with ophthalmologist, this would make external comparison). here the comparison group is students from other college for example

- Comparison with the rates of the general population e.g. mortality experience of the exposed group is compared with mortality experience in the general population (comparing the mortality rate of asbestos workers with the mortality rate in the general population).

4- Follow up:

we determine the period of follow-up according to the type of the disease and factors we want to study. for example, if we want to study the effect of long exposure to asbestos, we need a long follow-up period

- Periodic medical examination
- Reviewing physicians and hospital records
- Routine surveillance of death records
- Mailed questionnaires
- Telephone calls
- Home visits.

5- Analysis of Cohort study:

The data obtained are analyzed in terms of :

- Incidence rate** of occurrence of outcome among exposed and non exposed groups.
- Estimation of risk

Benefits of cohort study:

- It is of value when the **exposure is rare**. but it needs long time and this is one of the disadvantages
- Can examine **multiple effects of single exposure** .
- It estimates :
 - **Incidence** of disease among exposed & non exposed.
 - **Relative & attributable risk**. to measure the strength of association between the exposure and the disease
 - **Dose response relationship** .
- It allows **testing the hypothesis**. cohort study is also important in assessing the temporality (time sequence) which means: exposure at first, then the occurrence of the disease
- **No selection bias** since the exposure is assessed prior to the occurrence of the disease, the outcomes could not influence the selection of the exposure.

? *The limitations of the prospective cohort study:*

- ❑ Not suitable for studying **rare diseases**.
- ❑ Loss of experienced staff, loss of funds.
 - ❑ Change in the **environmental factors**.
- ❑ Change in **standard diagnostic methods** or **diagnostic criteria of diseases**.
- ❑ The study itself may alter the **participants behavior**.
- ❑ **Attrition** problem: Drop-outs.
 - ❑ **Ethical** problems.
 - ❑ **Expensive**.
- ❑ **Time consuming** (20-30 years in cancer studies).

attrition: some people may be no longer involved in the study (die, migrate, don't want to participate for longer period...)

Example

A study was carried out to ascertain the **relationship of parental smoking to the risk of acute respiratory infection** among children aged less than five years.

we are going to start with healthy children, but their parents are smokers. then we are going to compare them with children with no history of smoking among their parents

A total of **800 children of smoking parents** and **1200 of nonsmoking parents** were followed up for **six months**.


During the follow up period, 592 of the first group and 636 of the second group **developed at least one attack of acute respiratory infection**.

Do these results suggest that parental smoking predisposes children to acute respiratory infection?



First construct 2x2 table

Exposure to Risk Factor	Develop a disease	Did not Develop a disease	Total
Exposed (Smoker parents)	592 a	308 b	800 a + b
Non Exposed (Non Smoker parents)	636 c	564 d	12 00 c + d

The table is a 2x2 contingency table. The first row is 'Exposed (Smoker parents)' with values 592 (a), 308 (b), and 800 (a + b). The second row is 'Non Exposed (Non Smoker parents)' with values 636 (c), 564 (d), and 12 00 (c + d). A red arrow points from the 'Exposed' row to the 'Total' column. A yellow arrow points from the 'Non Exposed' row to the 'Total' column.

a= individuals exposed to the risk factor and develop the disease

b= individuals exposed to the risk factor and do not develop the disease

c= individuals do not expose to the risk factor and develop the disease

d= individuals exposed to the risk factor and do not develop the disease

The analysis

The first step is to calculate the incidence rate of infection in the two cohorts.

Incidence rate among children **exposed** to parental smoking

$$\begin{aligned} & 592 \text{ (a)} \\ & = \frac{\text{-----}}{800(a+b)} \times 1000 = \mathbf{740/1000} \end{aligned}$$

Incidence rate among children **not exposed** to parental smoking

$$\begin{aligned} & 636 \text{ (c)} \\ & = \frac{\text{-----}}{1200 \text{ (c+d)}} \times 1000 = \mathbf{530/1000} \end{aligned}$$

Interpretation

It is clear that the incidence rate of acute respiratory infection is greater among the exposed group than the non exposed group

The **second step** is to measure the **strength of association** between parental smoking and infection by calculating the **relative and attributable risk**.

The **relative risk (RR)** =
$$\frac{\text{Incidence rate among exposed}}{\text{Incidence rate among non exposed}}$$
$$= \frac{740}{530} = 1.4$$

Interpretation
↓

This means that the **risk of infection** among children **exposed** to parental smoking is **1.4 times greater** than the risk of infection among children **not exposed** to parental smoking.



In addition to the **relative risk**, we also measure the **attributable risk** which represents the **fraction of risk that could be attributed to the exposure under study**.

Attributable risk = Incidence rate among exposed – incidence rate among non exposed.

AR = 740 – 530 = 210 / 1000 (if parental smoking is removed the incidence of infection is decreased in nearly 210 /1000).

Attributable risk reduction = $\frac{\text{AR}}{\text{I among Exp}} \times 100 = \frac{210}{740} \times 100 = 28.3\%$

Sources of controls in cohort studies

In **cohort studies** the main sources are:

1. Built in comparative cohorts as for example in studying the relationship of lung cancer to smoking, people may be categorized into subgroups of heavy smokers, moderate smokers, light smokers and nonsmokers

2. Relatives and neighbors.

3. The total population provided that the level of exposure is ascertained at population level at the start of the study.

4. Special occupational groups.

Comparison of case – control and cohort studies

Item of comparison	Case-control	Cohort
No. of subjects	Small	Large
Time	Short <small>because we already had the cases and we ask them about previous exposure</small>	Long
Cost	Lower	Higher
Organization	Easier	More difficult
Interpretation of results	More difficult	Easier
Usefulness for rare disease	Useful	Not useful
Usefulness for risk measurement	Less useful	More useful
Usefulness for causal criteria	Less useful	Very useful
Risk to subjects	Usually none	Risk of not removing exposure

Which Kind of Study is Better?

- Case-control studies are more common, but cohort studies are generally more convincing.
- Case-control studies are more common than cohort studies because they are faster and cheaper.



Cohort studies are more convincing for two reasons:

1. they provide much better opportunity to establish a cause-effect relationship because they begin with the exposure (cause) and move forward in time to the disease (effect).

In contrast, case-control studies begin with the disease (effect) and look back to the exposure (cause). It is not always clear that the identified cause actually did come first.

2. case-control studies are more prone to certain study design problems, such as bias or chance .

But cohort studies have their own drawbacks:

1. they are very **expensive**.
2. they take a **long time** (because they start with well people and wait for them to get sick).
3. they are **difficult** to conduct properly because study subjects tend to **drop out of the study over time**. and this will lead to misreporting of the cases and the disease

For the reason of drop out , the denominator is calculated according to the no. of years of follow up for each person. This is called person -year. drop out affect the denominator, so it is better to use person-year in denominator

Person -year:

The number of people in the study and the amount of time each **person** spends in the study.

Experimental Studies (we are introducing the exposure)

✚ The goal of public health as well as clinical medicine is to essentially **modify natural history of disease to decrease morbidity and mortality.**

✚ The question then becomes, how do we **know which preventive and therapeutic measures are most effective to achieve this goal?**

✚ To do that, researchers carry out formal studies. Specifically **experimental studies** for the purposes of this presentation to determine the value of various measures.

✚ Experimental studies **sit at the top of the hierarchy of epidemiologic study design and produce the most valid results but come at a very high cost.**

they are the best studies according to epidemiological studies because they produce more valid result

✚ It can be viewed as **prospective cohort study.**

because we apply certain intervention and then follow-up the development



Advantages

- Gold standard of epidemiological research.
- High status and validity and can pick up small and modest effects.
- James Lind identified symptoms of scurvy among sailors at sea after as little as a month.
- Conducted early experimental study on treatment of scurvy in mid-1700's among British sailors.
- Small sample size.
- Group eating oranges and lemons were fit for duty in 6 days

Potential Uses

- Evaluate new drugs and other treatments for diseases.
- Evaluate new medical and health care technology.
- Evaluate new screening programs or techniques
- Evaluate new ways of organizing or delivering health services (e.g. home v. hospital care following myocardial infarction)

Ethical points must be considered:

Non-Maleficence

www.emmassyng.com

- it should have beneficial effect to patients, not to harm anyone by intervention
- participants should know what the experiment is and have the right to refuse
(it needs informed consent from the individuals)
- if any unplanned complications occur to any participant he should be excluded from the trial and treated.

INFORMED



CONSENT

we must apply (confidentiality) which means keeping secrets of individuals participating in the study


Types of experimental studies:

a) Clinical trials:

we divide the participants into two groups, the first group with standard treatment and the other group with the new treatment

- It is usually used to assess efficacy of a new line of ttt (a new drug for example) or to compare 2 types of ttts: surgical or medical.
- Diseased subjects are randomly allocated into 2 groups, "ttt" group (who are given the new drug) and "control group" (who are given the usual ttt or no ttt in placebo).
- Results are assessed by comparing health improvement of the 2 groups at end of trial.
- Example: surgical or medical treatment of peptic ulcer

EXPERIMENTAL STUDY



Advantages and Disadvantages of Experimental Studies

Advantages

- Prospective direction
- Ability to randomize subjects
- Temporal sequence of cause and effect
- Can control extraneous variables
- Best evidence of causality

Disadvantages

- Impossible to control human behavior.
- Ethical Constraints
- Expensive

Thank You!

