
Why we need guidance documents for the design and analysis of observational studies

Doug Altman

***EQUATOR Network
Centre for Statistics in Medicine
University of Oxford, UK***

Obligation

“In return for the altruism and trust that make clinical research possible, the research enterprise has an obligation to **conduct research ethically and to **report** it honestly.”** [i.e. transparently and completely]
[International Committee of Medical Journal Editors, 2004]



-
- **Medical research is very important – it affects people's lives**
 - **Researchers have an obligation to do high quality research**
 - Scientific, ethical, financial considerations
 - **These issues are most obvious for RCTs but apply also to observational studies**



Observational studies

- **Most published research articles (towards 90%) report observational studies**
- **Evidence from numerous reviews of publications shows that design, analysis and reporting are often substandard**

The image shows the front cover of the British Medical Journal (BMJ) from Saturday, 29 January 1994. The cover features the large, bold letters 'BMJ' in the center. To the right of the letters, it says 'LONDON, SATURDAY 29 JANUARY 1994'. At the bottom left, the headline reads 'The scandal of poor medical research'. Below the headline is the sub-headline: 'We need less research, better research, and research done for the right reasons'. In the bottom right corner of the cover, there is a small globe showing the Americas.

BMJ LONDON, SATURDAY 29 JANUARY 1994

The scandal of poor medical research

We need less research, better research, and research done for the right reasons



Ecological studies

Review of 125 articles in 6 major epidemiology journals [Dufault & Klar, *Am J Epidemiol* 2011]

- 18% prespecification of ecologic units
- in 23 of 36 papers, the investigators failed to adjust covariates for age or sex when the outcomes had been standardized for these potential confounders
- Investigators did not sufficiently inform the reader about the possibility of crosslevel bias; in 55 articles (44%), authors tempered their results in some fashion, whereas in 61 (49%) they did not



EDITORIAL

***Post hoc* decision-making in observational epidemiology—is there need for better research standards?**

Mika Kivimäki,^{1*} Archana Singh-Manoux,^{1,2} Jane E Ferrie^{1,3} and G David Batty^{1,4}



Why we need guidelines for study methods

- **Frequent use of weak or incorrect methods**
- **Most analyses are done by non-experts**
- **Rapid development of new methods**
- **Issues are common across wide areas of application**

- **More controversial than reporting guidelines**
- **Not saying how research *should* be done**
- **Rather:**
 - Issues to consider (options, with advantages and disadvantages)
 - Some things to avoid



Guidelines and Guidance

Guidance for Developers of Health Research Reporting Guidelines

David Moher^{1,2*}, Kenneth F. Schulz³, Iveta Simera⁴, Douglas G. Altman⁴

1 Ottawa Methods Centre, Clinical Epidemiology Program, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, **2** Department of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada, **3** Family Health International, Research Triangle Park, North Carolina, United States of America, **4** Centre for Statistics in Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, United Kingdom



“Developing a reporting guideline is complex and time consuming, so a compelling rationale is needed. Most reporting guidelines have been developed because researchers are convinced of the need to improve the quality of reporting of a certain type of health research. For some study aspects there may be direct evidence that inadequate reporting is associated with biased reports or harmful consequences. At this early stage, the executive group needs to set out clearly and explicitly their objectives and consider the scope of recommendations.”

Moher et al *PLoS Med* 2010



“Developing a **conduct** guideline is complex and time consuming, so a compelling rationale is needed. Most **conduct** guidelines have been developed because researchers are convinced of the need to improve the quality of **conduct** of a certain type of health research. For some study aspects there may be direct evidence that inadequate **conduct** is associated with biased **results** or harmful consequences. At this early stage, the executive group needs to set out clearly and explicitly their objectives and consider the scope of recommendations.”

Moher et al *PLoS Med* 2010



Guidelines for observational studies

- **Several guidelines have outlined the essential elements of reporting observational studies of different designs (see equator-network.org)**
 - STROBE (epidemiological cohort, case-control, cross-sect)
 - Extensions STREGA, STROBE-ME,...
 - REMARK (tumour marker prognostic studies)
 - TRIPOD (multivariable prediction models)
 - GRIPS (genetic risk prediction studies)
- **There is a clear need for companion guidelines for research conduct**
 - Would be of particular benefit to those without formal training or limited experience



The example of SPIRIT

SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining Standard Protocol Items for Clinical Trials

Ann Intern Med. 2013;158:200-207.

An-Wen Chan, MD, DPhil; Jennifer M. Tetzlaff, MSc; Douglas G. Altman, DSc; Andreas Laupacis, MD; Peter C. Gøtzsche, MD, DrMedSci; Karmela Krleža-Jerić, MD, DSc; Asbjørn Hróbjartsson, PhD; Howard Mann, MD; Kay Dickersin, PhD; Jesse A. Berlin, ScD; Caroline J. Doré, BSc; Wendy R. Parulekar, MD; William S.M. Summerskill, MBBS; Trish Groves, MBBS; Kenneth F. Schulz, PhD; Harold C. Sox, MD; Frank W. Rockhold, PhD; Drummond Rennie, MD; and David Moher, PhD

SPIRIT 2013 explanation and elaboration: guidance for protocols of clinical trials

An-Wen Chan,¹ Jennifer M Tetzlaff,² Peter C Gøtzsche,³ Douglas G Altman,⁴ Howard Mann,⁵ Jesse A Berlin,⁶ Kay Dickersin,⁷ Asbjørn Hróbjartsson,³ Kenneth F Schulz,⁸ Wendy R Parulekar,⁹ Karmela Krleža-Jeric,¹⁰ Andreas Laupacis,¹¹ David Moher^{2,10}

BMJ 2013;346:e7586



SPIRIT

Preliminary activities

- Two systematic reviews were performed:
 - to identify existing protocol guidelines
 - To find empirical evidence supporting the importance of specific (potential) checklist items
- Delphi consensus survey (n=96)
- 2 face-to face consensus meetings



What should be our scope?

- **Observational studies cover a wide variety of research questions**
 - Effects of interventions
 - Incidence, Aetiology, Prognosis, Diagnosis, ...
- **... and study designs**
 - Cohort, Case-control, Cross-sectional
 - Interrupted time series, Ecological, ...
- **... and data sources**
 - Prospective planned studies
 - Routinely collected data
- **Guidance can be generic (e.g. missing data) or specific (e.g. design of case-control studies)**



