WEBVTT

1 00:00:02.010 --> 00:00:03.840 <v Maria>My name is Maria Ciarleglio</v>

2 00:00:03.840 --> 00:00:05.460 and I'm a faculty member

 $3\ 00:00:05.460 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.740$ in the Department of Biostatistics

400:00:07.740 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:00:10.023 at the Yale School of Public Health.

5 00:00:10.890 --> 00:00:14.250 In this video series I will introduce the clinical research

 $6~00{:}00{:}14.250$ --> $00{:}00{:}18.873$ process to prepare you to collaborate with a statistician.

7 00:00:20.490 --> 00:00:23.550 In this first video we'll discuss what is often

 $8\ 00:00:23.550 \longrightarrow 00:00:26.310$ the first step of the research process,

9 00:00:26.310 \rightarrow 00:00:28.593 formulating a research question.

10 00:00:30.720 --> 00:00:32.880 The first step in the research process

11 00:00:32.880 --> 00:00:35.700 is to convert the need for information

 $12\ 00:00:35.700 \longrightarrow 00:00:40.350$ into an answerable question or hypothesis.

13 00:00:40.350 --> 00:00:45.350 A well formulated research question is specific and precise.

14 $00:00:45.360 \dashrightarrow 00:00:48.540$ The research question guides the study design

 $15\ 00:00:48.540 \longrightarrow 00:00:52.200$ and other design-related study characteristics,

16 $00:00:52.200 \rightarrow 00:00:55.920$ the data that are collected, the data analysis

17 $00{:}00{:}55{.}920$ --> $00{:}00{:}58{.}830$ and ultimately determines what you can conclude

 $18\ 00:00:58.830 \longrightarrow 00:01:00.303$ at the end of the study.

 $19\ 00:01:02.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:05.310$ The PICO criteria can be used to guide you

 $20\ 00:01:05.310 \longrightarrow 00:01:08.910$ in framing a comparative research question.

21 00:01:08.910 --> 00:01:12.450 The PICO framework begins by specifying the population

 $22\ 00:01:12.450 \longrightarrow 00:01:16.260$ of interest, then the intervention being studied,

 $23\ 00:01:16.260 \longrightarrow 00:01:19.170$ the control or comparator group,

 $24\ 00:01:19.170 \longrightarrow 00:01:21.183$ and the outcomes of interest.

 $25\ 00:01:23.340 \longrightarrow 00:01:26.280$ Begin by specifying the population of interest.

 $26\ 00:01:26.280 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.360$ For example,

27 00:01:27.360 --> 00:01:31.290 patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. 28 00:01:31.290 --> 00:01:34.050 The target population is the group of patients 29 00:01:34.050 --> 00:01:38.460 to which you would like to generalize your study findings.

 $30\ 00:01:38.460 \longrightarrow 00:01:40.350$ The study population is the group

 $31\ 00:01:40.350 \longrightarrow 00:01:43.053$ of patients to which you have access.

 $32\ 00:01:44.340 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.370$ The study population may be a subset

 $33\ 00:01:47.370 \longrightarrow 00:01:49.293$ of the target population.

 $34\ 00:01:50.190 \longrightarrow 00:01:52.980$ For example, your goal may be to generalize

35 00:01:52.980 --> 00:01:54.990 to all adult Americans

36 00:01:54.990 --> 00:01:58.290 with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease.

37 00:01:58.290 --> 00:02:01.800 However, you may be limited to a patient population

38 $00{:}02{:}01.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}06.120$ from a certain state or medical center.

 $39\ 00:02:06.120 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.970$ In our case, we may only have access to patients

40 00:02:08.970 \rightarrow 00:02:12.030 with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease

41 00:02:12.030 --> 00:02:17.030 followed in the liver clinic from 2015 to 2020.

 $42\ 00:02:17.700 \longrightarrow 00:02:20.160$ In this case, you could either collect data

43 00:02:20.160 --> 00:02:23.610 from all individuals in the available study population

44 00:02:23.610 --> 00:02:26.100 if it's feasible to do that.

 $45\ 00:02:26.100 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.400$ Otherwise, if the study population is too large

 $46\ 00:02:29.400 \longrightarrow 00:02:31.710$ you could select a random sample

 $47\ 00:02:31.710 \longrightarrow 00:02:34.830$ from that available study population.

48 00:02:34.830 --> 00:02:38.550 If you choose a representative random sample 49 00:02:38.550 --> 00:02:42.603 your results are generalizable to that study population.

50 00:02:45.480 --> 00:02:48.600 Next, specify the main intervention,

 $51\ 00:02:48.600 \longrightarrow 00:02:52.320$ which is the exposure test treatment

 $52\ 00:02:52.320 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.390$ or the main prognostic factor

53 00:02:54.390 \rightarrow 00:02:57.000 that you are interested in studying.

54 00:02:57.000 --> 00:03:01.830 For example, lifestyle modification to achieve weight loss

 $55\ 00:03:01.830 \longrightarrow 00:03:04.470$ or if studying liver cancer,

 $56\ 00:03:04.470 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.350$ your intervention of interest could be serafenib

 $57\ 00:03:07.350 \longrightarrow 00:03:09.033$ to prolonged survival.

58 00:03:12.180 --> 00:03:15.330 If you're interested in performing a comparison,

 $59\ 00:03:15.330 \longrightarrow 00:03:18.240$ the next step is to specify a control

 $60\ 00:03:18.240$ --> 00:03:22.500 or comparison intervention or exposure.

61 00:03:22.500 --> 00:03:23.940 This can be, for example,

 $62\ 00{:}03{:}23{.}940$ --> $00{:}03{:}28{.}533$ a placebo control or the current standard of care.

63 00:03:30.240 --> 00:03:33.480 Finally, we must specify the clinical outcome

64 00:03:33.480 --> 00:03:36.510 or primary endpoint of your study.

 $65\ 00{:}03{:}36{.}510$ --> $00{:}03{:}40{.}380$ This includes the element of time, if that's appropriate,

 $66\ 00:03:40.380 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.270$ and this would apply if you're looking

 $67\ 00{:}03{:}42.270$ -> $00{:}03{:}46.770$ at a fixed follow up time period post-intervention.

 $68\ 00:03:46.770 \longrightarrow 00:03:50.790$ Say three month survival following surgery

69 00:03:50.790 --> 00:03:54.420 or NAFLD resolution one year following

70 00:03:54.420 --> 00:03:58.353 a certain percentage reduction in total body weight.

71 00:04:00.570 --> 00:04:03.420 Let's run through an example of the type of study

 $72\ 00:04:03.420$ --> 00:04:07.230 we often perform using medical record data.

73 00:04:07.230 --> 00:04:09.510 The research question asks

74 00:04:09.510 --> 00:04:12.480 among Hepatitis B infected persons,

 $75\ 00:04:12.480 \longrightarrow 00:04:16.560$ what factors tests best identify individuals

 $76\ 00:04:16.560 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.930$ at highest risk of progression,

77 00:04:18.930 $\rightarrow 00:04:22.233$ as well as those at low risk of progression?

78 00:04:23.370 --> 00:04:27.990 The population studied is Hepatitis B infected persons

79 00:04:27.990 --> 00:04:32.280 treated at the Yale Liver Center between 2011 and 2021.

 $80\ 00:04:34.920 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.540$ The interventions of interest

 $81\ 00:04:36.540 \longrightarrow 00:04:39.480$ are different patient characteristics.

 $82\ 00{:}04{:}39{.}480$ --> $00{:}04{:}42{.}870$ Specifically, the study will look at different permutations

 $83\ 00:04:42.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:46.740$ of key baseline exposures or risk factors

84 00:04:46.740 --> 00:04:51.740 identified in previous studies of Hepatitis B prognosis.

8500:04:51.780 $\operatorname{-->}$ 00:04:54.990 Here, the investigators will look at age

86 00:04:54.990 --> 00:04:58.410 presence of fibrosis, presence of cirrhosis,

 $87\ 00:04:58.410$ --> 00:05:02.433 elevated ALT, and detectable viral load.

 $88\ 00:05:04.590 \dashrightarrow 00:05:07.500$ The comparator group for each of these factors

89 $00:05:07.500 \dashrightarrow 00:05:10.323$ is absence of the baseline factor.

90 00:05:12.120 --> 00:05:15.540 The outcomes of interest are liver related morbidity,

91 00:05:15.540 --> 00:05:17.370 progression of liver disease

92 00:05:17.370 --> 00:05:20.943 and mortality during up to 10 years of follow up.

93 00:05:22.380 \rightarrow 00:05:25.170 Now, this is more of an exploratory study

 $94\ 00:05:25.170 \longrightarrow 00:05:28.740$ looking for signals of association, but even still,

 $95\ 00:05:28.740 \longrightarrow 00:05:31.440$ it has a clearly defined population,

96 00:05:31.440 --> 00:05:34.080 intervention or exposures of interest,

 $97\ 00:05:34.080 \longrightarrow 00:05:37.350$ control or reference levels of the exposures

98 00:05:37.350 --> 00:05:39.840 and outcomes of interest.

99 00:05:39.840 --> 00:05:43.320 Sitting down and thinking through the PICO criteria

 $100\ 00:05:43.320 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.480$ forces you to make decisions

101 00:05:45.480 --> 00:05:49.443 and pre-specify important aspects of your study.

 $102\ 00:05:51.240 \longrightarrow 00:05:53.160$ As we saw in the last example,

103 00:05:53.160 --> 00:05:57.120 there are often multiple clinical endpoints of interest.

104 00:05:57.120 --> 00:06:01.473 Endpoints are classified as clinical or nonclinical.

105 00:06:02.520 --> 00:06:04.740 Clinical endpoints describe outcomes

 $106\ 00{:}06{:}04.740\ -->\ 00{:}06{:}09.540$ involving how a patient feels, functions or survives.

 $107\ 00:06:09.540 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.610$ They may be assessed by a clinician

 $108\ 00:06:11.610 \longrightarrow 00:06:13.920$ and involve clinical judgment,

 $109\ 00:06:13.920 \longrightarrow 00:06:16.293$ such as the occurrence of stroke or MI.

110 00:06:17.460 --> 00:06:20.760 They may also be measured by a standard performance measure

111 00:06:20.760 --> 00:06:23.190 such as a pulmonary function test

 $112\ 00:06:23.190 \longrightarrow 00:06:25.170$ or they can be patient-reported,

113 00:06:25.170 --> 00:06:28.863 such as self-reported symptoms or quality of life.

114 $00:06:30.420 \rightarrow 00:06:33.150$ Nonclinical endpoints include biomarkers

115 00:06:33.150 --> 00:06:36.660 that may not directly relate to how a patient feels,

116 $00{:}06{:}36.660$ --> $00{:}06{:}38.880$ however they're thought to be important indicators

 $117\ 00:06:38.880 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.160$ of the disease process.

118 $00{:}06{:}41.160 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}44.580$ These endpoints can include blood tests, imaging

119 $00{:}06{:}44.580 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}47.883$ or other physiological measures such as blood pressure.

 $120\;00{:}06{:}48.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}51.900$ A good primary outcome should directly align

 $121\ 00:06:51.900 \longrightarrow 00:06:54.510$ with the primary aim of the study.

122 00:06:54.510 --> 00:06:56.850 The endpoint should be accurate

 $123\ 00:06:56.850\ -->\ 00:07:01.850$ and precise, quantifiable, validated, and reproducible.

124 00:07:02.070 --> 00:07:06.270 We generally include a single primary endpoint.

125 00:07:06.270 --> 00:07:08.700 The goal should be to choose a primary endpoint

 $126\ 00:07:08.700 \longrightarrow 00:07:12.630$ that will influence decision making in practice.

127 00:07:12.630 --> 00:07:17.010 The most significant and impactful endpoint that addresses

128 00:07:17.010 --> 00:07:20.940 the research question is chosen as the primary endpoint

129 00:07:20.940 --> 00:07:24.540 and additional important endpoints may be designated

 $130\ 00:07:24.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:26.943$ as secondary or tertiary.

131 00:07:28.200 --> 00:07:32.040 Secondary endpoints may not be considered sufficient

 $132\ 00:07:32.040 \longrightarrow 00:07:34.590$ to influence decision making alone,

133 00:07:34.590 $\rightarrow 00:07:37.920$ but may help support the claim of efficacy.

134 00:07:37.920 --> 00:07:39.180 Tertiary endpoints

 $135\ 00:07:39.180 \longrightarrow 00:07:42.870$ are sometimes called exploratory endpoints.

 $136\ 00:07:42.870 \longrightarrow 00:07:45.360$ If included, they are generally used

 $137\ 00:07:45.360 \longrightarrow 00:07:48.063$ to test exploratory hypotheses.

138 00:07:49.650 --> 00:07:53.940 Again, we generally use a single primary outcome.

139 $00:07:53.940 \rightarrow 00:07:56.820$ Using multiple primary endpoints may lead

140 00:07:56.820 --> 00:08:01.440 to an unfocused research question and can present problems

141 00:08:01.440 --> 00:08:04.320 with interpretation if the treatment effect is observed

 $142\ 00:08:04.320$ --> 00:08:07.860 to differ across the multiple outcomes.

143 00:08:07.860 --> 00:08:10.830 However, multiple endpoints may be needed

 $144\ 00:08:10.830 \longrightarrow 00:08:12.750$ when a clinical benefit depends

 $145\ 00:08:12.750 \longrightarrow 00:08:15.960$ on more than one aspect of the disease.

146 00:08:15.960 --> 00:08:19.620 For example, in Alzheimer's, we may require an effect

 $147\ 00:08:19.620 \longrightarrow 00:08:22.830$ on both cognition and function,

148 00:08:22.830 --> 00:08:25.560 so there may be situations where multiple endpoints

 $149\ 00:08:25.560 \longrightarrow 00:08:29.670$ are necessary for demonstrating efficacy.

 $150\ 00:08:29.670 \longrightarrow 00:08:32.460$ The statistical issue with multiple endpoints

 $151\ 00:08:32.460 \longrightarrow 00:08:35.520$ is what we call multiplicity.

152 00:08:35.520 --> 00:08:37.800 When we conduct statistical analysis

153 00:08:37.800 --> 00:08:40.470 and perform hypothesis tests,

154 00:08:40.470 --> 00:08:42.390 there's a chance that we conclude

 $155\ 00:08:42.390$ --> 00:08:46.530 a significant difference exists between the arms tested

 $156\ 00:08:46.530 \longrightarrow 00:08:49.260$ when in truth, there is no difference.

 $157\ 00:08:49.260 \longrightarrow 00:08:52.230$ This is due to random variation in the data

158 00:08:52.230 --> 00:08:56.250 that we can observe, but this is a mistake in error,

159 00:08:56.250 --> 00:09:01.250 and we refer to this type of error as a type one error

 $160\ 00:09:01.500 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.530$ or the alpha level of the test.

161 00:09:04.530 --> 00:09:07.650 We like to keep this type of error low,

162 00:09:07.650 --> 00:09:12.650 so we typically set the type one error of our tests at 5%.

 $163\ 00:09:13.350 \longrightarrow 00:09:15.660$ So when you're testing a single endpoint,

 $164\ 00:09:15.660 \longrightarrow 00:09:19.530$ you can maintain a type one error of 5%.

165 00:09:19.530 --> 00:09:23.190 However, suppose we're testing two primary endpoints

 $166\ 00:09:23.190 \longrightarrow 00:09:26.160$ and success on either endpoint would lead

167 $00:09:26.160 \rightarrow 00:09:29.610$ to a conclusion of a treatment difference.

168 00:09:29.610 --> 00:09:33.510 The type one error rate on each endpoint compounds

169 $00{:}09{:}33{.}510$ --> $00{:}09{:}36{.}390$ and there's an inflation of the overall type one error

170 00:09:36.390 --> 00:09:39.113 probability above 5%.

171 $00:09:39.960 \dashrightarrow 00:09:42.960$ This increases the chance of false conclusions

 $172\ 00:09:42.960 \longrightarrow 00:09:46.470$ regarding the efficacy of the intervention.

173 00:09:46.470 \rightarrow 00:09:48.930 Special statistical testing procedures

174 00:09:48.930 --> 00:09:52.380 need to be used to control the type one error rate

175 00:09:52.380 $\rightarrow 00:09:54.993$ for the study with multiple endpoints.

176 00:09:56.460 --> 00:10:00.150 Multiple primary endpoints occur in three ways.

 $177\ 00:10:00.150 \longrightarrow 00:10:02.610$ The first is when there are multiple endpoints

178 00:10:02.610 --> 00:10:04.770 and each endpoint could be sufficient

 $179\ 00:10:04.770 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.230$ on its own to establish the efficacy

 $180\ 00:10:07.230 \longrightarrow 00:10:09.510$ of the intervention being tested.

181 00:10:09.510 \rightarrow 00:10:11.370 These multiple endpoints correspond

 $182\ 00:10:11.370 \longrightarrow 00:10:13.560$ to multiple chances of success,

 $183\ 00:10:13.560 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.530$ so failure to adjust for multiplicity

 $184\ 00:10:16.530 \longrightarrow 00:10:19.620$ can lead to type one error rate inflation

 $185\ 00:10:19.620$ --> 00:10:23.490 and a false conclusion of effectiveness.

186 00:10:23.490 --> 00:10:27.210 The second option is when the determination of effectiveness

18700:10:27.210 --> 00:10:30.810 depends on success on all primary endpoints

 $188\ 00:10:30.810 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.960$ when there are two or more primary endpoints.

189 $00{:}10{:}33{.}960 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}37{.}440$ In this setting, there are no multiplicity issues related

 $190\ 00:10:37.440 \longrightarrow 00:10:39.510$ to the primary endpoints

 $191\ 00:10:39.510 \longrightarrow 00:10:41.970$ as there is only one path that leads

 $192\ 00{:}10{:}41.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}45.570$ to a successful outcome for the trial and therefore,

193 $00{:}10{:}45{.}570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}49{.}590$ no concern with type one error rate inflation.

 $194\ 00:10:49.590 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.320$ The third option combines several aspects

 $195\ 00{:}10{:}52.320$ --> $00{:}10{:}56.880$ of effectiveness into a single primary composite endpoint.

196 00:10:56.880 --> 00:11:01.320 This avoids multiple endpoint related multiplicity issues.

197 00:11:01.320 --> 00:11:03.540 In many cardiovascular studies

 $198 \ 00:11:03.540 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.480$ it's common to combine several endpoints.

199 00:11:06.480 --> 00:11:11.010 For example, cardiova
scular death, heart attack and stroke

200 00:11:11.010 --> 00:11:15.030 into a single composite primary endpoint.

201 00:11:15.030 --> 00:11:17.700 In this case, death is considered on its own

 $202\ 00:11:17.700 \longrightarrow 00:11:19.470$ as a secondary endpoint.

203 00:11:19.470 --> 00:11:20.910 If any one of the elements

 $204\ 00:11:20.910 \longrightarrow 00:11:23.400$ of the composite outcome is observed,

 $205\ 00{:}11{:}23{.}400$ --> $00{:}11{:}27{.}090$ then the endpoint has occurred for that patient.

206 $00{:}11{:}27.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}29.430$ It's important that the endpoints included

 $207\ 00:11:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:11:30.960$ in the composite endpoint

 $208\ 00:11:30.960 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.320$ are of similar clinical importance.

209 00:11:34.320 --> 00:11:37.230 Using a composite endpoint is helpful

 $210\ 00:11:37.230 \longrightarrow 00:11:40.650$ when the components are individually rare

211 00:11:40.650 --> 00:11:43.110 so choosing a composite endpoint allows you to

 $212\ 00:11:43.110 \longrightarrow 00:11:45.180$ observe more events.

213 00:11:45.180 --> 00:11:48.810 A limitation of using a composite endpoint is that

214 00:11:48.810 --> 00:11:51.090 given the sample size of the study,

215 00:11:51.090 --> 00:11:55.080 there may not be adequate statistical power 216 00:11:55.080 --> 00:11:59.040 to test each component of the endpoint separately.

 $217\ 00:11:59.040 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.400$ We'll discuss statistical power in a future video $218\ 00:12:02.400 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.160$ on elements of sample size calculations.

219 00:12:05.160 --> 00:12:09.360 We'll also discuss endpoints and variables in general,

220 00:12:09.360 --> 00:12:13.593 from a data collection perspective in a future video.

221 00:12:15.090 --> 00:12:17.670 In this video, we discussed important things 222 00:12:17.670 --> 00:12:21.510 to consider when formulating your research question.

223 00:12:21.510 --> 00:12:23.580 From the research question will flow

224 00:12:23.580 --> 00:12:27.570 the specific statistical hypotheses to be tested,

225 00:12:27.570 --> 00:12:30.990 the design of the study, including the sample size,

226 00:12:30.990 --> 00:12:34.560 the data necessary to answer the research question,

227 00:12:34.560 --> 00:12:37.650 the statistical analysis that will be performed 228 00:12:37.650 --> 00:12:40.530 and the conclusions that can be made.

229 00:12:40.530 --> 00:12:44.550 The next video, which is the second video in this series,

230 00:12:44.550 --> 00:12:46.290 will give you an overview

231 00:12:46.290 --> 00:12:50.790 of study designs commonly used in clinical research.

232 00:12:50.790 --> 00:12:54.780 In video three, we will discuss the data collection process

 $233\ 00:12:54.780 \longrightarrow 00:12:58.260$ and formally define different variable types.

234 00:12:58.260 --> 00:12:59.850 This video will prepare us

235 00:12:59.850 --> 00:13:03.783 for video four on sample size determination.