WEBVTT

1 00:00:02.010 --> 00:00:03.810 <v Maria>My name is Maria Ciarlegio</v>

 $2\ 00:00:03.810 \longrightarrow 00:00:05.430$ and I'm a faculty member

 $3\ 00:00:05.430 \longrightarrow 00:00:07.710$ in the Department of Biostatistics

400:00:07.710 $\dashrightarrow >$ 00:00:10.023 at the Yale School of Public Health.

 $5\ 00:00:10.890 \longrightarrow 00:00:12.240$ In this video series,

 $6\ 00:00:12.240 \longrightarrow 00:00:14.880$ I will introduce the clinical research process

 $7\ 00:00:14.880 \longrightarrow 00:00:19.680$ to prepare you to collaborate with a statistician.

 $8\ 00:00:19.680 \longrightarrow 00:00:21.150$ In the second video,

900:00:21.150 --> 00:00:24.750 we'll discuss some study designs that are commonly used

 $10\ 00:00:24.750 \longrightarrow 00:00:27.180$ in clinical research.

11 00:00:27.180 --> 00:00:30.570 The study design used to answer your research questions

 $12\ 00:00:30.570 \longrightarrow 00:00:33.630$ is determined by the goal of the research

 $13\ 00:00:33.630 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.270$ and the feasibility of different designs,

 $14\ 00:00:36.270 \longrightarrow 00:00:39.240$ including the availability of resources.

 $15\ 00:00:39.240 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.150$ For example, a randomized clinical trial

16 00:00:42.150 --> 00:00:45.990 can require a good amount of administrative support

 $17\ 00:00:45.990 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.650$ in addition to the required clinical involvement.

 $18\ 00:00:49.650 \rightarrow 00:00:53.010$ The first major distinction between study types

 $19\ 00:00:53.010 \longrightarrow 00:00:55.830$ is whether the study investigator decides

 $20\ 00:00:55.830 \longrightarrow 00:00:59.040$ if a participant receives the exposure

21 00:00:59.040 --> 00:01:01.320 or the intervention.

22 00:01:01.320 --> 00:01:04.860 Studies where the investigator assigns the exposure

 $23\ 00:01:04.860 \longrightarrow 00:01:06.990$ are experimental studies,

24 $00:01:06.990 \dashrightarrow 00:01:08.940$ and studies where the investigator

 $25\ 00{:}01{:}08{.}940$ --> $00{:}01{:}13{.}530$ does not assign the exposure are observational studies.

26 00:01:13.530 --> 00:01:15.150 In observational studies,

27 00:01:15.150 $\rightarrow 00:01:18.270$ the investigator observes or documents

 $28\ 00:01:18.270 \longrightarrow 00:01:20.910$ the presence of exposures and outcomes

29 00:01:20.910 --> 00:01:24.903 as they naturally occur in a population or a sample.

 $30\ 00:01:25.740 \longrightarrow 00:01:27.570$ There are both descriptive

31 00:01:27.570 \rightarrow 00:01:30.660 and analytical observational studies.

32 00:01:30.660 --> 00:01:33.060 A descriptive observational study

33 00:01:33.060 \rightarrow 00:01:35.700 is used to describe characteristics

 $34\ 00:01:35.700 \longrightarrow 00:01:38.250$ of a sample or population.

 $35\ 00:01:38.250 \longrightarrow 00:01:40.140$ There's no comparator group

 $36\ 00:01:40.140 \longrightarrow 00:01:42.960$ because the goal is simply to describe,

37 00:01:42.960 --> 00:01:44.790 not formally compare.

 $38\ 00:01:44.790 \longrightarrow 00:01:47.670$ For example, you can use a descriptive study

 $39\ 00:01:47.670 \longrightarrow 00:01:50.220$ to estimate the prevalence of a disease

40 00:01:50.220 --> 00:01:54.570 or report the results of a patient survey of symptoms.

41 00:01:54.570 --> 00:01:56.700 They can also be used to inform the design

 $42\ 00:01:56.700 \longrightarrow 00:02:00.420$ of a future comparative or analytical study.

 $43\ 00:02:00.420 \longrightarrow 00:02:03.210$ For example, you may not have a good estimate

44 00:02:03.210 --> 00:02:05.190 of baseline prevalence of disease

45 00:02:05.190 --> 00:02:10.190 for a future study testing a new treatment on that disease.

46 00:02:10.230 --> 00:02:13.530 A descriptive study can be used to estimate this value

 $47\ 00:02:13.530 \longrightarrow 00:02:16.260$ to help you design that future study.

48 00:02:16.260 --> 00:02:20.070 The first type of descriptive study is the case report,

49 00:02:20.070 --> 00:02:24.570 which usually describes a patient presenting with an unusual

 $50\ 00:02:24.570 \longrightarrow 00:02:26.610$ or complicated disease.

51 $00:02:26.610 \rightarrow 00:02:29.520$ When more than one patient is described,

52 00:02:29.520 --> 00:02:31.650 it becomes a case series.

53 00:02:31.650 --> 00:02:36.090 Case reports and case series are useful for defining cases,

54 00:02:36.090 --> 00:02:39.510 generating hypotheses about the causes of disease,

 $55\ 00:02:39.510 \longrightarrow 00:02:42.420$ or use in clinical education.

56 00:02:42.420 --> 00:02:45.600 Finally, descriptive cross-sectional studies

 $57\ 00:02:45.600$ --> 00:02:50.070 collect information on the presence or the level of one

 $58\ 00:02:50.070 \longrightarrow 00:02:54.210$ or more characteristic at one point in time.

59 00:02:54.210 --> 00:02:56.970 Those characteristics can include risk factors

 $60\ 00:02:56.970 \longrightarrow 00:02:59.700$ or different exposures and outcomes,

 $61\ 00:02:59.700 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.580$ such as the presence of disease.

 $62\ 00{:}03{:}02{.}580$ --> $00{:}03{:}05{.}010$ If the goal is to report the distribution

 $63 \ 00:03:05.010 \longrightarrow 00:03:07.320$ of one or more of the characteristics,

 $64\ 00:03:07.320 \longrightarrow 00:03:10.530$ then the cross-sectional study is descriptive.

 $65\ 00:03:10.530 \rightarrow 00:03:13.440$ However, if the goal is to assess the relationship

 $66\ 00:03:13.440 \longrightarrow 00:03:16.110$ between say presence of an exposure

67 00:03:16.110 --> 00:03:17.760 and presence of disease,

 $68\ 00:03:17.760 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.940$ then the cross-sectional study is analytical.

 $69\ 00:03:20.940 \longrightarrow 00:03:23.610$ And we'll talk about analytical studies next.

 $70\ 00:03:23.610 \longrightarrow 00:03:25.740$ But the takeaway on cross-sectional studies

 $71\ 00:03:25.740 \longrightarrow 00:03:28.200$ is that they provide a snapshot

 $72\ 00{:}03{:}28{.}200$ --> $00{:}03{:}31{.}530$ of the frequency of disease and patient characteristics

 $73\ 00:03:31.530 \longrightarrow 00:03:33.363$ at one point in time.

74 00:03:35.100 --> 00:03:38.640 Analytical observational studies include a comparator

 $75\ 00:03:38.640 \longrightarrow 00:03:40.410$ or control group.

 $76\ 00:03:40.410 \longrightarrow 00:03:42.540$ The goal is to formally establish

 $77\ 00{:}03{:}42.540$ --> $00{:}03{:}46.800$ or quantify an association between exposures and outcomes.

 $78\ 00:03:46.800 \longrightarrow 00:03:49.230$ Again, the exposures are naturally determined

79 00:03:49.230 --> 00:03:50.910 in observational studies,

 $80\ 00:03:50.910 \longrightarrow 00:03:52.650$ unlike experimental studies

 $81\ 00:03:52.650 \longrightarrow 00:03:55.860$ where the investigator assigns exposure usually

 $82\ 00:03:55.860 \longrightarrow 00:03:58.320$ in the form of different treatments

 $83\ 00:03:58.320 \longrightarrow 00:04:00.870$ the temporal direction of the study determines

 $84\ 00:04:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:04:03.990$ the type of analytical observational study.

 $85\ 00:04:03.990 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.150$ If the study assesses exposures

 $86\ 00:04:06.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:08.370$ and outcomes at the same point in time,

 $87\ 00:04:08.370 \longrightarrow 00:04:10.170$ the study is cross-sectional.

88 00:04:10.170 --> 00:04:12.360 Analytical cross-sectional studies

 $89\ 00:04:12.360 \dashrightarrow 00:04:15.570$ as opposed to descriptive cross-sectional studies, again,

 $90\ 00:04:15.570 \longrightarrow 00:04:17.700$ are used to assess the relationship

91 00:04:17.700 --> 00:04:20.403 between exposure and disease.

92 00:04:21.408 --> 00:04:25.710 An analytical cross-sectional study was conducted in Japan

 $93\ 00:04:25.710 \longrightarrow 00:04:27.150$ to assess the relationship

94 00:04:27.150 --> 00:04:30.150 between non-alcoholic fatty liver disease

 $95\ 00:04:30.150 \longrightarrow 00:04:31.980$ and periodontal disease.

96 00:04:31.980 --> 00:04:34.110 Magnetic resonance elastography

 $97\ 00:04:34.110 \longrightarrow 00:04:36.270$ was used to measure liver stiffness

98 00:04:36.270 --> 00:04:38.460 in these patients with NAFLD.

99 00:04:38.460 --> 00:04:42.450 They found an association between P. gingivalis positivity

 $100\ 00{:}04{:}42{.}450$ --> $00{:}04{:}46{.}350$ and number of periodontal pockets and liver stiffness.

101 00:04:46.350 --> 00:04:48.900 The idea here is that the investigators

102 00:04:48.900 --> 00:04:52.290 are looking at these patients at a snapshot in time,

 $103\ 00:04:52.290 \longrightarrow 00:04:55.323$ not over time, in this cross-sectional study.

104 00:04:56.340 --> 00:04:59.910 A cohort study follows patients forward in time

 $105\ 00:04:59.910 \longrightarrow 00:05:03.540$ for development or occurrence of the outcome.

106 00:05:03.540 --> 00:05:06.240 Investigators identify a group of patients

 $107\ 00:05:06.240 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.030$ without the outcome or disease of interest.

 $108\ 00:05:09.030 \longrightarrow 00:05:10.350$ And of these patients,

 $109\ 00:05:10.350 \longrightarrow 00:05:13.380$ some are exposed to an exposure of interest

 $110\ 00:05:13.380 \longrightarrow 00:05:15.990$ and some are unexposed.

111 00:05:15.990 --> 00:05:20.280 We follow the exposed and unexposed groups forward in time

 $112\ 00:05:20.280 \longrightarrow 00:05:22.470$ for development of the outcome.

 $113\ 00:05:22.470 \longrightarrow 00:05:25.620$ If we observe a higher incidence of the outcome

 $114\ 00:05:25.620 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.790$ in the exposed,

115 $00{:}05{:}26.790 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}29.010$ then the exposure is associated

116 $00:05:29.010 \dashrightarrow 00:05:32.370$ with an increased risk of the outcome.

117 00:05:32.370 --> 00:05:34.080 A strength of the cohort study

118 00:05:34.080 --> 00:05:37.410 is that we know the exposure preceded the outcome.

119 $00{:}05{:}37{.}410 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}40{.}260$ However, it's necessary to wait for the development

 $120\ 00:05:40.260 \longrightarrow 00:05:43.080$ of the outcome in prospective cohort studies.

 $121\ 00:05:43.080 \longrightarrow 00:05:45.840$ So they can be slow to conduct,

 $122\ 00:05:45.840 \longrightarrow 00:05:48.783$ especially in the case of rare outcomes.

 $123\ 00:05:50.310 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.000$ We often perform retrospective cohort studies.

 $124\ 00:05:54.000 \longrightarrow 00:05:56.490$ Here, the start of the study can occur

 $125\ 00:05:56.490 \longrightarrow 00:05:58.710$ after some patients have already developed

 $126\ 00:05:58.710 \longrightarrow 00:06:00.300$ the outcome of interest.

 $127\ 00:06:00.300 \longrightarrow 00:06:02.580$ Exposure status in the past

128 00:06:02.580 --> 00:06:07.560 is established using existing data, such as medical records.

 $129\ 00:06:07.560 \longrightarrow 00:06:10.830$ The goal is to establish a cohort of individuals

130 00:06:10.830 --> 00:06:14.370 without the outcome at a fixed point in the past

131 00:06:14.370 --> 00:06:18.420 and determine their exposure status at that point in time.

 $132\ 00:06:18.420 \longrightarrow 00:06:20.340$ Then determine if the patient

133 00:06:20.340 $\rightarrow 00:06:23.220$ subsequently develops the outcome.

134 00:06:23.220 $\rightarrow 00:06:26.460$ A limitation of retrospective cohort studies

 $135\ 00:06:26.460 \longrightarrow 00:06:29.430$ is that exposure status is not assessed

 $136\ 00:06:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:06:31.140$ by the study investigators

 $137\ 00:06:31.140 \longrightarrow 00:06:33.570$ because we often rely on medical records.

138 00:06:33.570 --> 00:06:37.083 So the desired exposure data may not be available.

139 00:06:38.070 \rightarrow 00:06:41.580 A case control study is an alternative design

140 00:06:41.580 --> 00:06:44.850 that begins by identifying a group of individuals

141 00:06:44.850 --> 00:06:47.130 with the outcome of interest.

142 00:06:47.130 --> 00:06:50.160 A similar control group without the outcome

143 00:06:50.160 --> 00:06:52.290 is also identified.

144 00:06:52.290 --> 00:06:54.540 Through chart reviews or interviews,

 $145\ 00:06:54.540$ --> 00:06:58.620 the investigator then determines past exposure status.

146 00:06:58.620 --> 00:07:01.260 Unlike a retrospective cohort study

147 $00:07:01.260 \rightarrow 00:07:04.530$ that begins by identifying study participants

148 00:07:04.530 --> 00:07:07.980 based on the exposure and then assesses outcomes,

149 00:07:07.980 --> 00:07:11.730 the case control study begins by assessing the outcome

 $150\ 00:07:11.730$ --> 00:07:14.550 and then determines past exposures.

151 00:07:14.550 --> 00:07:18.510 Case control studies are useful when studying rare outcomes

152 00:07:18.510 --> 00:07:21.330 or diseases with long latency.

153 00:07:21.330 --> 00:07:24.480 However, limitations include recall bias

154 00:07:24.480 --> 00:07:26.310 in recalling exposure,

 $155\ 00:07:26.310 \longrightarrow 00:07:29.430$ problems with selecting comparable controls,

 $156\ 00:07:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:07:31.713$ as well as some analytical issues.

157 00:07:33.150 --> 00:07:35.670 The other major arm of study designs

 $158\ 00:07:35.670 \longrightarrow 00:07:37.770$ are the experimental studies.

159 00:07:37.770 --> 00:07:41.250 The gold standard of evidence is the clinical trial,

 $160\ 00:07:41.250 \longrightarrow 00:07:44.340$ in particular, the randomized clinical trial.

161 00:07:44.340 --> 00:07:47.520 Here, the investigator randomly assigns participants

 $162\ 00:07:47.520 \longrightarrow 00:07:50.100$ to different exposures, for example,

 $163\ 00:07:50.100$ --> 00:07:54.540 sorafenib or place bo in patients with advanced liver cancer.

 $164\ 00:07:54.540 \longrightarrow 00:07:57.510$ Usually each participant has an equal chance

 $165\ 00:07:57.510 \longrightarrow 00:07:59.700$ of being assigned to the two groups,

166 00:07:59.700 --> 00:08:01.050 although the allocation ratio

167 00:08:01.050 --> 00:08:02.913 does not have to be one-to-one.

168 00:08:03.870 --> 00:08:07.380 Here we have an example of a randomized control trial.

 $169\ 00:08:07.380 \longrightarrow 00:08:09.480$ This study randomly assigned patients

 $170\ 00:08:09.480\ -->\ 00:08:12.873$ with liver cancer to sorafenib or placebo.

171 00:08:13.830 --> 00:08:17.430 A traditional parallel group randomized clinical trial

172 00:08:17.430 --> 00:08:19.740 resembles a prospective cohort study,

173 00:08:19.740 --> 00:08:23.700 except for the important difference of randomization.

174 00:08:23.700 --> 00:08:26.460 Randomization is an important element

175 00:08:26.460 --> 00:08:27.510 of clinical trials

176 00:08:27.510 --> 00:08:30.240 because it protects against selection bias

177 00:08:30.240 --> 00:08:32.460 and should balance both known

178 00:08:32.460 --> 00:08:36.573 and unknown confounding factors between the exposure groups.

179 00:08:37.650 --> 00:08:40.710 Additional commonly used randomized trial designs

180 00:08:40.710 --> 00:08:44.610 include crossover designs, factorial designs,

 $181\ 00:08:44.610$ --> 00:08:47.343 and cluster randomized clinical trials.

182 00:08:48.960 --> 00:08:51.420 In non-randomized control trials,

183 00:08:51.420 --> 00:08:54.420 participants are assigned to different interventions

 $184\ 00:08:54.420 \longrightarrow 00:08:57.060$ without following a random procedure.

185 00:08:57.060 --> 00:08:59.850 For example, assignment may be made according

186 00:08:59.850 --> 00:09:01.740 to investigator preference.

 $187\ 00:09:01.740 \longrightarrow 00:09:04.140$ This design is susceptible to bias

 $188\ 00:09:04.140 \longrightarrow 00:09:05.910$ due to the potential differences

189 00:09:05.910 --> 00:09:08.793 in patient characteristics between the two groups.

 $190\ 00:09:09.780 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.080$ Another type of study is the systematic review.

191 00:09:13.080 --> 00:09:15.120 The goal here is to review

192 $00:09:15.120 \dashrightarrow 00:09:17.820$ and synthesize all available evidence

193 00:09:17.820 --> 00:09:20.430 on a specific research question.

194 00:09:20.430 --> 00:09:23.250 Systematic reviews are carried out according to

195 $00{:}09{:}23.250 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}27.060$ a pre-specified protocol that defines the question,

 $196\ 00:09:27.060 \longrightarrow 00:09:29.220$ describes the scope of the review,

197 00:09:29.220 --> 00:09:32.520 and the criteria and methodology that will be used.

 $198\ 00:09:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:09:35.670$ Begin by specifying the review question,

199 00:09:35.670 --> 00:09:37.770 the population you're studying,

200 $00:09:37.770 \dashrightarrow 00:09:41.040$ the interventions or exposures of interest,

 $201 \ 00:09:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.420$ outcomes of interest,

 $202\ 00:09:42.420$ --> 00:09:46.170 and study designs that should be included in the review.

 $203\ 00:09:46.170 \longrightarrow 00:09:48.840$ Then you'll list the eligibility criteria

204 00:09:48.840 --> 00:09:50.850 for the studies to be included.

205 00:09:50.850 --> 00:09:54.150 For example, you may only want to include evidence

 $206\ 00:09:54.150 \longrightarrow 00:09:56.160$ from randomized control trials

207 00:09:56.160 --> 00:09:58.830 or large scale observational studies.

208 00:09:58.830 --> 00:10:02.610 You'll then search PubMed and other databases

 $209\ 00{:}10{:}02.610$ --> $00{:}10{:}07.080$ for articles or studies that meet these criteria.

210 00:10:07.080 --> 00:10:10.800 An important step is assessing the quality of the studies

211 00:10:10.800 --> 00:10:13.740 and critically assessing how well the studies were done.

212 00:10:13.740 --> 00:10:17.700 Any potential issues with the design may introduce bias,

213 00:10:17.700 --> 00:10:21.210 so it's important to critique the strengths and weaknesses

 $214\ 00:10:21.210 \longrightarrow 00:10:23.370$ of the evidence you've accumulated.

 $215\ 00:10:23.370 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.203$ At this stage,

216 00:10:24.203 --> 00:10:26.850 you can also comment on gaps in the evidence,

217 00:10:26.850 --> 00:10:30.720 such as patient populations not represented in the research.

 $218\ 00:10:30.720 \longrightarrow 00:10:33.660$ Then you extract the data or the study results

219 00:10:33.660 $\rightarrow 00:10:35.520$ that are summarized in the manuscripts

 $220\ 00:10:35.520 \longrightarrow 00:10:37.230$ and the supplemental materials.

221 00:10:37.230 --> 00:10:40.470 And a final step involves synthesizing the results,

 $222\ 00:10:40.470 \longrightarrow 00:10:43.230$ or combining and analyzing the results

 $223\ 00:10:43.230 \longrightarrow 00:10:44.910$ from multiple studies.

 $224\ 00:10:44.910 \longrightarrow 00:10:47.580$ This can be a qualitative synthesis

 $225\ 00:10:47.580 \longrightarrow 00:10:48.960$ in which you summarize

 $226\ 00:10:48.960 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.350$ how the research you found fit together,

 $227\ 00:10:52.350 \longrightarrow 00:10:54.420$ describe the strengths and the weaknesses

 $228\ 00:10:54.420 \longrightarrow 00:10:55.740$ of the body of evidence,

229 00:10:55.740 --> 00:10:59.100 identify gaps in areas of future research,

 $230\ 00:10:59.100 \longrightarrow 00:11:02.343$ or it can be a quantitative synthesis.

 $231\ 00:11:03.270 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.240$ Quantitative synthesis is usually in the form

 $232 \ 00:11:06.240 \longrightarrow 00:11:08.610$ of a meta-analysis.

233 00:11:08.610 --> 00:11:13.610 A meta-analysis is an analytical way of formally combining

 $234\ 00:11:13.770 \longrightarrow 00:11:17.160$ or pooling results from different sources.

235 00:11:17.160 --> 00:11:19.710 In this study, the goal was to estimate the effect

 $236\ 00:11:19.710 \longrightarrow 00:11:22.620$ of antiviral therapy on liver stiffness

 $237\ 00:11:22.620 \rightarrow 00:11:25.380$ in patients with hepatitis B at six months,

238 00:11:25.380 --> 00:11:27.690 one year, two years, three years,

 $239\ 00:11:27.690 \longrightarrow 00:11:30.690$ and five years after beginning treatment.

240 00:11:30.690 --> 00:11:34.380 This flow chart shows the process of study collection.

241 00:11:34.380 --> 00:11:38.043 In the end, 24 studies were included in the analysis.

242 00:11:38.910 --> 00:11:40.830 Typically, a forest plot,

 $243\ 00:11:40.830 \longrightarrow 00:11:43.020$ which is the graph shown here on the right,

244 00:11:43.020 --> 00:11:44.670 displays the point estimates

245 00:11:44.670 --> 00:11:48.150 and 95% confidence intervals from each study,

 $246\ 00:11:48.150 \longrightarrow 00:11:50.550$ along with the pooled estimate.

 $247\ 00:11:50.550 \longrightarrow 00:11:52.740$ At six months from the start of therapy,

248 00:11:52.740 --> 00:11:54.990 data pooled from eight studies

249 00:11:54.990 --> 00:11:59.040 with 968 patients showed a significant decline

 $250\ 00:11:59.040 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.850$ in liver stiffness by 2.21 kilopascals

 $251\ 00:12:02.850 \longrightarrow 00:12:05.493$ as compared to pre-treatment LSM.

252 00:12:07.110 --> 00:12:10.500 In this video, we discussed some commonly used designs

253 00:12:10.500 --> 00:12:13.800 in clinical research, including observational studies,

254 00:12:13.800 --> 00:12:17.400 experimental studies, and systematic reviews.

255 00:12:17.400 --> 00:12:20.790 The next video, which is the third video in this series,

256 00:12:20.790 --> 00:12:25.260 will discuss the data collection process and variable types.

257 00:12:25.260 --> 00:12:28.110 Understanding variable types will prepare us

258 00:12:28.110 --> 00:12:30.420 for the fourth video in this series

 $259\ 00:12:30.420 \longrightarrow 00:12:32.493$ on sample size determination.