



EUROPEAN MEDICINES AGENCY
SCIENCE MEDICINES HEALTH



13 May 2011
EMA/95098/2010 (amended)

European Network of Centres for
Pharmacoepidemiology and
Pharmacovigilance

The European Network of Centres for Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance (ENCePP)

Guide on Methodological Standards in Pharmacoepidemiology

Steps taken	Date
First draft agreed by ENCePP Working Group 1	4 th Oct 2010
Peer Review	4 th – 15 th October 2010
Draft adopted by ENCePP Steering Group for release for consultation	21 st October 2010
Public consultation	5 th November 2010 – 3 rd January 2011
Adoption of final draft by ENCePP Steering Group	3 rd May 2011
<i>Amendment:</i> The wording 'Checklist of Methodological Standards for ENCePP Study Protocols' has been replaced throughout the document with 'ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols'	23 August 2011

KEYWORDS	<i>methodological standards, pharmacoepidemiology, pharmacovigilance, ENCePP, research, guidance</i>
-----------------	--

7 Westferry Circus • Canary Wharf • London E14 4HB • United Kingdom

Telephone +44 (0)20 7418 8400 **Facsimile** +44 (0)20 7418 8660

E-mail info@ema.europa.eu **Website** www.ema.europa.eu

An agency of the European Union



Table of Contents

List of Acronyms	3
1. Introduction	5
2. Governance	5
2.1. General Principles for ENCePP studies	6
2.2. Scientific standards, review and approval	6
2.3. Ethical conduct, patient and data protection	6
3. General aspects of study protocol	7
4. Research question	9
5. Study Design and Methods	10
5.1. General considerations.....	10
5.2. Challenges and lessons learned.....	11
5.2.1. Drug exposure/outcome definition and validation	11
5.2.2. Use of automated health databases.....	11
5.2.3. Bias and confounding.....	13
5.2.4. Methods to handle bias and confounding.....	16
5.3. Integrating and pooling studies	18
6. Data Sources	19
6.1. Use of available data	19
6.2. De novo data collection.....	20
6.3. Signal detection methodology and application	21
6.4. Hybrid studies	22
6.4.1. Large simple trials.....	22
6.4.2. Randomised database studies	23
6.5. Research networks	23
7. Statistical Analysis Plan	26
8. Quality Control and Quality Assurance	27
9. Safety reporting (Adverse Events)	29
10. Communication	30
11. Update of the Guide	32
12. References	32
13. Authors	39
14. Acknowledgements	40

List of Acronyms

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ)

Case Report Form (CRF)

Confidence Interval (CI)

Consolidated Standards for Reporting Trials (CONSORT)

Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS)

Disease Risk Score (DRS)

Empirical Bayes Geometric Mean (EBGM)

Enhancing the Quality and Transparency of Health Research (EQUATOR)

EuroDrug Quality Indicator Meeting (DURQUIM)

European Commission (EC)

European Medicines Agency (EMA)

European Network of Centres for Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance (ENCePP)

European Surveillance of Antimicrobial Consumption (ESAC)

European Union (EU)

Exposure Propensity Score (EPS)

Food and Drug Administration (FDA)

General Practice Research Database (GPRD)

German Society for Epidemiology (DGEpi)

German Society for Social Medicine and Prevention (DGSPM)

High Dimension Propensity Score (HDPS)

Individual Case Safety Report (ICSR)

Information Component (IC)

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICJME)

International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH)

International Epidemiological Association (IEA)

IEA Good Epidemiological Practice Guidelines (GEP)

Instrumental Variables (IV)

International Society for Pharmacoconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR)

International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE)

International Society of Pharmacovigilance (ISOP)

ISPE Good Pharmacovigilance Practice Guidelines (GPP)

Large Simple Trials (LST)
Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE)
Non-Steroidal Anti-Inflammatory Drugs (NSAIDs)
Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA)
Propensity Score Calibration (PSC)
Proportional Reporting Ratio (PRR)
Quality Assurance (QA)
Quality control (QC)
Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses (QUORUM)
Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT)
Reporting Odds Ratio (ROR)
Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS)
Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology (STROBE)
United States (US)
Working Group for the Survey and Utilisation of Secondary Data (AGENS)

All hyperlinks in the document were last accessed on-line on 12 May 2011.

1. Introduction

This guide seeks to review existing methodological guidance for research in pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance. By providing a structured architecture for thinking and learning, the aim is to support high quality pharmacoepidemiological studies and to stimulate innovation that benefits patients and public health at large. The intention is not to duplicate the text from existing guidelines and textbooks, but rather to offer the researcher a single overview document and web resource. For each topic covered in this guide, readers are referred to specific existing guidance after a brief introduction or overview of the relevant text.

The identification and compilation of existing guidelines in the fields of pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance is a goal of the [European Network of Centres for Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance \(ENCEPP\)](#). In acknowledgement of the diverse nature and levels of expertise among present researchers in Europe, ENCEPP aims at encouraging participation across the spectrum of researchers. It considers the current overview document appropriate to serve both experienced and relatively new researchers in pharmacoepidemiology.

Readers are also referred to the ENCEPP [Checklist for Study Protocols](#), which objective is to increase the awareness about scientific and methodological developments in the field of pharmacoepidemiology, and the ENCEPP [Code of Conduct](#) that seeks to provide a set of rules and principles for studies

In order to develop this inventory, the first step was to identify and review [a list of existing English language guidances](#). The review consisted of documenting the objective, scope, target audience, content and relevance of each guidance. Gaps in guidance in areas important to collaborative pharmacoepidemiology research were also identified. Where considered relevant, such gaps have been addressed with what ENCEPP considers as good practice, in line with the intention from the outset to go further than compile an inventory of existing guidelines. This guide focuses on scientific rather than regulatory guidance.

The scope of the inventory is to be dynamic. It will be updated and expanded by structured review and also on an ad-hoc basis in response to comments received. New guidance may appear and new sections may be developed specifically targeted to the needs of collaborative research. Researchers are kindly requested to refer any additional guidance document (with an electronic link, where possible) they may be aware of, and that is considered relevant, to the [ENCEPP Secretariat](#) to assist in future updates. In the interim, to facilitate access to methodological aspects that are not specifically covered in textbooks or existing guidance, the researcher is referred to a list of references addressing a number of methodological challenges and lessons learned (see Section 5.2).

Researchers are also requested to self-refer to standard textbooks in epidemiology and pharmacoepidemiology research, in addition to those cited in the present document.

2. Governance

In Europe, European Union (EU) and national laws are the keys to what may and may not be done with regard to data access, data linkage and consent issues, including such domains as human rights and duty of confidentiality. While differing data custodians currently have

differing requirements related to what approvals are needed before data can be released, the requirements will fit within the overall need to meet all applicable EU and national laws and guidelines for the actual study. This includes situations where multi-country studies are being conducted and there may be transfer of data or information. In addition to meeting legislative requirements, studies also need to adhere to a set of principles that meet with the requirements of scientific and ethical reviews.

2.1. General Principles for ENCePP studies

The objective of the [ENCePP Code of Conduct](#) is to promote scientific independence. It aims to do so by providing a set of rules and principles for best practice of the investigator-study funder relationship as well as transparency in pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance studies.

By applying the principles of transparency and scientific independence, the Code aims to strengthen the confidence of the general public, researchers and regulators in the integrity and value of research. To this end, the Code addresses critical areas in the planning, conduct and reporting of studies and the interaction of investigators and study funders. At its core is the requirement to register studies before they start (see [ENCePP E-Register of Studies](#)) and the obligation to publish all study findings irrespective of positive or negative results.

The Code is an integral part of the '[ENCePP Study](#)' concept. 'ENCePP studies' need to comply with the provisions of the Code in their entirety and investigators seeking the ENCePP study seal need to confirm their intention to do so by submitting a completed and signed [Checklist](#) and [Declaration on compliance](#) as part of their application.

2.2. Scientific standards, review and approval

The standards for designing a pharmacoepidemiological and pharmacovigilance study are captured in the [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#).

Many research organisations (including those owning or hosting databases) have scientific review boards that ensure scientific standards are met. Some national competent authorities also have their own review board for registering/approving studies. In addition, it is good practice to invite experts to review the study results, as well as the protocol and any publications and/or communications thereof. The role of scientific committees in governance is also emphasised as being of particular importance.

2.3. Ethical conduct, patient and data protection

The [Declaration of Helsinki](#) and the provisions on processing of personal data and the protection of privacy as laid down in [Directive 95/46/EC](#) and [Regulation 45/2001](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council need to be followed in terms of the ethical conduct of studies. For interventional research, the [Clinical Trial Directive \(Directive 2001/20/EC\)](#) applies.

As post-authorisation studies are carried out with authorised medicinal products, relevant European and national legislation applies. Specifically, Marketing Authorisation Holders will need to comply with [Directive 2001/83/EC](#) and [Regulation \(EC\) No 726/2004](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council. The guidance in [Volume 9A](#) of the Rules Governing Medicinal Products in the EU and, for clinical trials, the [Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice \(Commission Directive 2005/28/EC\)](#) should also be followed.

Consideration of ethical issues, data ownership and privacy is an important part of the [International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology \(ISPE\) guideline for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices \(GPP\)](#), section IV. It includes a sub-section (IV.A) on protection of human subjects and a reference to the ISPE guidelines on [Data Privacy, Medical Record Confidentiality, and Research in the Interest of Public Health](#). The GPP also recommends a stand-alone section within the protocol containing a description of plans for protecting human subjects that includes consideration of the need for submitting the protocol to an Institutional Review Board/Independent Ethics Committee and the requirement of informed consent in accordance with local law.

The main scope of the [International Epidemiological Association \(IEA\) Good Epidemiological Practice \(GEP\)](#) guideline for proper conduct in epidemiological research is on the ethical principles of pharmacoepidemiological field studies, which could also apply to interventional studies, such as the role of ethics committees, patients' informed consent, use and storage of personal data and publication of results.

The [Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences \(CIOMS\) 2009 International Ethical Guidelines for Epidemiological Studies](#) have as their objective the preparation of guidelines to indicate how the ethical principles that should govern the conduct of biomedical research involving human subjects could be effectively applied. The Guidelines set forth ethical guidance on how epidemiologists - as well as those who sponsor, review, or participate in the studies they conduct - should identify and respond to the ethical issues that are raised by the process of producing this information.

The [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\)](#) of the United States has published [Registries to Evaluate Patient Outcomes: a User's guide, Second Edition](#), which is a reference for establishing, maintaining and evaluating the success of registries created to collect data about patient outcomes. In Section 1: 'Creating a registry' is a specific chapter dedicated to ethics, data ownership, and privacy. The concepts are useful although the authors indicate that this section focuses solely on United States (US) law.

The [Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals](#) by the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICJME\)](#) includes clear statements on ethical principles related to publication in biomedical journals addressing authorship and contributorship, editorship, peer review, conflicts of interest, privacy and confidentiality and protection of human subjects and animals in research.

From the examples provided above, it may be seen that there is a wide range of documents for protection of human subjects. The applicability of ethical requirements, however, varies based on the nature of the inquiry and the studies to be conducted. Certain human subject protections applicable to clinical studies (e.g. full informed consent) would not apply to other kinds of research (e.g. review of data from de-identified medical records). Furthermore, while protection of privacy is paramount, there may be situations in which the use of data for secondary analyses has public health benefits.

3. General aspects of study protocol

The study protocol is the core document of a study. A protocol should be drafted as one of the first steps in any research project, and should be amended and updated as needed throughout its course. Amendments should be justified. It must precisely describe everything that will be done in the study, so that the study can be reproduced. It is usually and profitably based on standard protocol outlines, which could be prepared for different

types of studies (e.g. cohort or case-control studies based on field data or database studies that include different information according to study type).

Chapter II of the [ISPE GPP](#) provides guidance on what is expected of a pharmacoepidemiology study protocol. The guideline states that the protocol should include a description of the data quality and integrity, including, for example, abstraction of original documents, extent of source data verification, and validation of endpoints. As appropriate, certification and/or qualifications of any supporting laboratory or research groups should be included, as well as validation steps taken or considered to standardise laboratory methods proposed. The guidelines recommend description of data management, statistical software programs and hardware to be used in the study, description of data preparation and analytical procedures, as well as the methods for data retrieval and collection. It should be borne in mind that, as stated in the GPP, adherence to guidelines will not guarantee valid research. The [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#) also seeks to stimulate researchers to consider important epidemiological principles when designing a pharmacoepidemiological study and writing a study protocol.

The protocol should cover at least the following aspects:

- The research question the study is designed to answer, which might be purely descriptive, exploratory or explanatory (hypothesis driven). The protocol should include a background description that expounds the origin (scientific, regulatory, etc.) and the state of present knowledge of the research question. It will also explain the context of the research question, including what data are currently available and how this data can or cannot contribute to answering the question. The context will also be defined in terms of what information sources can be used to generate appropriate data, and how the proposed study methodology will be shaped around these.
- The main study objective and possible secondary objectives, which are operational definitions of the research question. In defining secondary objectives, consideration could be given to time and cost, which may impose constraints and choices, for example in terms of sample size, duration of follow-up or data collection.
- The source and study populations to be used to answer the research question. The protocol should describe whether this population is already available (such as, in a database) or whether it needs to be recruited *de novo*. The limits of the desired population will be defined, including inclusion/exclusion criteria, timelines (such as index dates for inclusion in the study) and any exposure criteria and events defining cases and exposed study groups.
- Exposures of interest that need to be pre-specified, defined and described unambiguously, including duration of exposure or follow-up, visits or time-dependent appraisals and details of which data are collected when, using what methods.
- Outcomes of interest that need to be pre-specified, defined and described unambiguously, including data sources, operational definitions and methods of ascertainment such as data elements in field studies or appropriate codes in database studies.
- The covariates and potential confounders that need to be retrieved and measured.
- The statistical analysis of the resulting data, including statistical methods and software, adjustment strategies, and how the results are going to be presented.
- The identification of possible biases.

- Major assumptions, critical uncertainties and challenges in the design, conduct and interpretation of the results of the study given the research question and the data used.
- Ethical considerations, as described in the section on governance of the current document.
- The various data collection forms including the Case Report Form (CRF) or descriptions of the data elements may be appended to the protocol, allowing having an exact representation of the data collection. The study protocols could include a section specifying ways in which the CRF will be piloted, tested and finalised. Amendments of final CRFs should be justified. For field studies, physician or patient forms would be included depending on data collection methodology. Other forms may be included as needed, such as patient information, patient-oriented summaries, etc.

4. Research question

The research question and the associated objectives describe the knowledge or information to be gained from the study. It is important that current knowledge gaps are properly identified. Existing guidance on this aspect includes the [ISPE GPP](#) and the [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#).

These guidance documents emphasise that it should be clearly explained why the study is to be conducted (e.g. to answer an important public health concern, to confirm or further characterise a risk identified in a Risk Management Plan, to assess a new or emerging safety issue or to determine health outcomes or the benefit/risk profile). It should also be clear whether the results that will be reported represent *a priori* (pre-formed) hypotheses or exploratory analyses. If there is no *a priori* hypothesis, this should be clearly stated. The [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#) also suggests that the research objective should briefly state the target population, primary endpoints, questions of dose-dependency and the main outcome measures.

A critical and thorough review of the literature usually forms the basis for the background description and theoretical framework of the research question and should be included in a protocol. Such review aims at evaluating the pertinent information and at identifying gaps in knowledge. According to the [ISPE GPP](#), the review should include findings of relevant animal and human experiments, clinical studies, vital statistics and previous epidemiological studies. The findings of similar studies should be mentioned and gaps in knowledge that the study is intended to fill should be described.

In addition, previous findings are useful for the methodological planning of the current study. They may be used to discuss how the findings of the previous research may support the background, significance, research question, hypotheses, and/or design of the proposed study. They may also serve to determine the expected magnitude of the event(s) under study and, if available, in the target population, to characterise the various risk factors for the event and to identify the outcomes and measures that have been used in previous studies. The review assists in providing an assessment of the feasibility of the proposed study.

In addition to seeking information, the review should be a critical appraisal of the evidence in order to assess, analyse and synthesise previous research, and place it in its current context. Several methods for reviewing and synthesising findings from the literature exist, including narrative review, for which guidance is available in [Writing narrative literature reviews](#) (Baumeister RF, Leary MR. Rev of Gen Psychol 1997; 1 (3): 311-320).

5. Study Design and Methods

There exists a number of evolving methodological challenges that recur in pharmacoepidemiological research, that are still in development or that to date have not been adequately covered by recommendations, particularly in terms of how to deal with them. The following section presents such methodological challenges relating to study design, use of automated health data, bias and confounding and methods for controlling for confounding. It is reminded that these are not basic methodologies that are well covered in the textbooks cited. Furthermore, the granularity in the description of some of the methods is in line with the extent to which the issue is considered covered in existing guidance.

5.1. General considerations

The choice of study design and methods is a crucial part in every pharmacoepidemiological study and starts with the formulation of a relevant research question (whether non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs [NSAIDs] increase the risk of gastro-intestinal bleeding is cited throughout the present document as an illustrative working example). The study design and methods should follow the research question and are naturally interrelated.

The research question drives three key sequentially structured phases in the conduct of an epidemiological study: (1) the design of the 'occurrence relation' as defined in *Theoretical Epidemiology* (Miettinen O.S. John Wiley & Sons, 1985) as the relation of a parameter of occurrence to a determinant or a set of determinants, (e.g. the incidence rate ratio of gastro-intestinal bleeds among users and non-users of NSAIDs), (2) the design of the data collection to document empirically the occurrence relation (e.g. collection from a database of exposure [use of NSAIDs] and outcomes data [gastro-intestinal bleeding] in a cohort of patients that are/have been NSAIDs users), and (3) the design of the data analysis (from raw data to quantification of associations). These three phases are not independent. A hypothesised occurrence relation may lead to a certain array of designs for data collection given, in this example, the multi-source availability of data on use of NSAIDs (exposure) and on occurrence of gastro-intestinal bleeds in patients (outcomes). Finally, each design for data collection, given a well-defined occurrence relation, will be followed by only a few appropriate designs of data analysis. Note the selection of appropriate electronic health data sources is an important aspect of the design of data collection. Depending on the research question, other sources of data may be needed e.g. some claims databases may not have a 'reason for stopping' a NSAID whereas another may have (see Section 6).

The choice of epidemiological methods to answer a research question is not always carved in stone, but is rather based on principles than on rules. These principles may provide opportunities for creativeness and new innovative methods, when appropriate and needed. However, there are certain 'dos and don'ts' and certain standards in order to assure validity and robustness of the study results.

General aspects of study designs, their relevance to types of research question and issues relating to internal and external validity, including biases and confounding, are covered by many textbooks on epidemiology and pharmacoepidemiology. The following list proposes a list of textbooks recommended for consultation. Researchers may find other textbooks more appropriate to their specific needs.

- *Epidemiology: Principles and Methods 2nd Edition* (B. MacMahon, D. Trichopoulos. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1996) offers an introductory understanding of

epidemiological methods and processes, including on study designs and control for confounding.

- *Modern Epidemiology 3rd Edition* (K. Rothman, S. Greenland, T. Lash. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008) serves as a comprehensive textbook on methods in epidemiology. Chapter 8 deals with validity but rather than dichotomise validity into the two components, internal and external, details a view in which the essence of scientific generalisation is the formulation of abstract concepts relating the study factors.
- *Pharmacoepidemiology 4th Edition* (B.L. Strom. Wiley, 2005) provides a complete review of epidemiological methods applied to the study of drugs. In Chapters 45 – 46, it emphasises that, whatever the source of the data, the veracity of a study's conclusion rests on the validity of the data.
- *Pharmacoepidemiology and Therapeutic Risk Management 1st Edition* (A.G. Hartzema, H.H. Tilson and K.A. Chan, Editors. Harvey Whitney Books Company, 2008). In addition to a general review of drug-specific methodologies, this textbook illustrates practical issues with a large number of real life examples.
- *Encyclopedia of Epidemiologic Methods* (M.H. Gail, J. Benichou, Editors. Wiley, 2000). This compilation of articles complements existing textbooks by providing a large coverage of specialised topics in epidemiological and statistical methods.
- *Practical Statistics for Medical Research* (D. Altman. Chapman & Hall, 1990) presents a problem-based statistical text for medical researchers.

5.2. Challenges and lessons learned

5.2.1. Drug exposure/outcome definition and validation

Physicians rely on patient-supplied information on past drug use and illness to assist with the diagnosis of current disease. Chapter 45 of *Pharmacoepidemiology* (B. Strom, 4th Edition. Wiley, 2005) presents a literature review of the studies that have evaluated the validity of drug, diagnosis and hospitalisation data and the factors that influence the accuracy of these data. It presents information on the two primary information sources available for pharmacoepidemiology studies: questionnaires and administrative databases and concludes with a summary of the current knowledge in the field as well as directions for future research.

5.2.2. Use of automated health databases

The use of technology including administrative databases for pharmacoepidemiological research has limitations including the following:

- concordance of what is in the database with actual clinical reality. [Discordance of databases designed for claims payment versus clinical information systems: implications for outcomes research](#) (Jollis JG, Ancukiewicz M, DeLong ER, Pryor DB, Muhlbaier LH, Mark DB. *Ann Intern Med* 1993; 119: 844-850) was a comparative study of a clinical versus an insurance claims database for predictors of prognosis in patients with ischaemic heart disease. A finding was that claims data failed to identify more than half of the patients with prognostically important conditions when compared with the clinical information system.

- consistency and totality of data capture i.e. does the database reliably capture all of the patient's health care interactions or are there known gaps in coverage, capture, longitudinality or eligibility? Researchers using claims data rarely have the opportunity to carry out quality assurance of the whole data set. An example is provided in [Descriptive analyses of the integrity of a US Medicaid Claims Database](#) (Hennessy S, Bilker WB, Weber A, Strom B. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2003; 12: 103–111), This article concludes that performing such analyses can reveal important limitations of the data and whenever possible, researchers should examine the 'parent' data set for apparent irregularities.
- bias in assessment of drug exposure from an administrative database. The relevance of these biases for quality control in more clinical databases are explored in [European Surveillance of Antimicrobial Consumption \(ESAC\): Data Collection Performance and Methodological Approach](#) (Vander Stichele RH, Elseviers MM, Ferech M, Blot S, Goossens H; ESAC Project Group. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2004; 58: 419-28). This article describes the performance and methodological approach in a retrospective data collection effort (1997–2001) through an international network of surveillance systems, aiming to collect publicly available, comparable and reliable data on antibiotic use in Europe. The data collected were screened for bias, using a checklist focusing on detection bias in sample and census data; errors in assigning medicinal product packages to the [Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical Classification System](#); errors in calculations of [Defined Daily Doses](#) per package; bias by over-the-counter sales and parallel trade; and bias in ambulatory/hospital care mix. The authors conclude that methodological rigour is needed to assure data validity and to ensure reliable cross-national comparison.
- validity of the data and the definitions used, which is not simply about source record validation of a particular endpoint. There are many possible ways to define endpoints and researchers that do validate may only seek to validate their choice. The following study investigated the range of methods used to validate diagnoses in a primary care database: [Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database \(GPRD\): a systematic review](#) (Herrett E, Thomas SL, Schoonen WM, Smeeth L, Hall AJ. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2010; 69: 4-14). The findings concluded that a number of methods had been used to assess validity and that overall, estimates of validity were high. The quality of reporting of the validations was, however, often inadequate to permit a clear interpretation. Not all methods provided a quantitative estimate of validity and most methods considered only the positive predictive value of a set of diagnostic codes in a highly selected group of cases.

Another example of the hazards of using large linked databases is provided in [Vaccine safety surveillance using large linked databases: opportunities, hazards and proposed guidelines](#) (Verstraeten T, DeStefano F, Chen RT, Miller E. *Expert Rev Vaccines* 2003; 2(1): 21-9).

In general it is clear that the quality of pharmacoepidemiological studies that rely heavily on clinical databases from medical practice could be greatly enhanced by stimulating the quality of medical registration in electronic health records, through the provision of elaborate end-user terminologies and classification aides at the point-of-care. The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) Amendments Act of 2007 mandated that the FDA develop a system for using automated health care data to identify risks of marketed drugs and other medical products. The [Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership](#) is an initiative to research methods that are feasible and useful to analyse existing healthcare databases to identify and evaluate safety and benefit of drugs already on the market. The article [Advancing the](#)

[Partnership](#) (Stang PE, Ryan PB, Racossin JA, Overhage JM, Hartzema AG, Reich C, Welebob E, Scarnecchia T, Woodcock J. *Ann Intern Med* 2010; 153: 600-606) describes the governance structure, data-access model, methods-testing approach, and technology development of this effort, as well as the work that has been initiated.

Quality control and assurance are further addressed in section 8 of the present document.

5.2.3. Bias and confounding

5.2.3.1. Choice of time windows

The paper [A study of the effects of exposure misclassification due to the time-window design in pharmacoepidemiologic studies](#) (van Staa TP, Abenhaim L, Leufkens H. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1994; 47(2): 183 – 189) considers the effects of the time-window design on the validity of risk estimates in record linkage studies. With longer windows, a substantive attenuation of incidence rates of therapy was observed. The choice of prescription time windows can, therefore, influence the estimate of exposure risks. Time windows should cover the period with potential excess risk and be validated, accordingly.

5.2.3.2. Immortal time bias

Immortal time in epidemiology refers to a period of cohort follow-up time during which death (or an outcome that determines end of follow-up) cannot occur. It is defined in the book *Modern Epidemiology* (K. Rothman, S. Greenland, T. Lash. 3rd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008 p. 106-107).

Bias from immortal time was first identified in the 1970s in epidemiology in the context of cohort studies of the survival benefit of heart transplantation. It recently resurfaced in pharmacoepidemiology, with several observational studies reporting that various medications can be extremely effective at reducing morbidity and mortality. These studies, while using different cohort designs, all involved some form of immortal time and the corresponding bias.

Immortal time bias can arise when the period between cohort entry and date of first exposure, e.g., to a drug, during which death has not occurred, is either misclassified or simply excluded and not accounted for in the analysis. [Immortal time bias in observational studies of drug effects](#) (Suissa S. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16: 241-249) demonstrates how several observational studies used a flawed approach to design and data analysis, leading to immortal time bias, which can generate an illusion of treatment effectiveness. Observational studies with surprisingly beneficial drug effects should, therefore, be re-assessed to account for this bias.

[Immortal time bias in Pharmacoepidemiology](#) (Suissa S. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008; 167: 492-499) describes various cohort study designs leading to this bias, quantifies its magnitude under different survival distributions, and illustrates it by using data from a cohort of lung cancer patients. The author shows that for time-based, event-based, and exposure-based cohort definitions the bias in the rate ratio resulting from misclassified or excluded immortal time increases proportionately to the duration of immortal time. The findings support the conclusion that observational studies of drug benefit in which computerised databases are used must be designed and analysed properly to avoid immortal time bias.

[The Secret of Immortal Time Bias in Epidemiologic Studies](#) (Shariff SZ, Cuerden MS, Jain AK, Garg AX. J Am Soc Nephrol 2008; 19: 841-843) proposes two methods to account for immortal time with an example in nephrology i.e. comparing patients who had chronic kidney disease and attended multidisciplinary care clinics with those who received usual care. The first solution is *matching*. At the design stage, an extra criterion is added to the matching procedure; a non-multidisciplinary care clinic patient must be alive at the time when their matched patient attends the multidisciplinary care clinic. In this situation, cohort entry becomes the date of the multidisciplinary care clinic visit, and any time between a baseline serum creatinine test and the multidisciplinary care clinic visit is not counted in either of the groups. The other solution is to perform an analysis using *time-dependent covariates*. A time-dependent covariate is a predictor whose value may change over time. Immortal time bias can be avoided by acknowledging a change in exposure status using a time-dependent covariate. For example, a multidisciplinary care clinic patient would be considered unexposed from the date of study entry until he or she visits the multidisciplinary care clinic and exposed from that point forward.

5.2.3.3. Depletion of susceptibles

Depletion of susceptibles is the effect whereby patients who remain on a drug are those who can tolerate the product while those who are susceptible to an adverse event select themselves out of the population at risk. The following article [Evidence of the depletion of susceptibles effect in non-experimental pharmacoepidemiologic research](#) (Moride Y, Abenheim L. J Clin Epidemiol 1994; 47 (7): 731-7) provides empirical evidence of this effect. It describes a hospital-based case-control study on NSAIDs and the risk of upper gastrointestinal bleeding. Recent use (within 30 days prior to admission) of non-aspirin NSAIDs increased the risk of upper gastrointestinal bleeding whereas use in the previous 3 years was associated with a lower risk. The estimate of relative risk for first-time users was 22.7 (CI 2.8-200.0) vs. 3.0 (CI 1.9-4.7) for those who had used the drugs at least once in the past 3 years. Thus, past use should be considered as a potential risk modifier in non-experimental risk assessment of events associated with drug use.

5.2.3.4. Confounding by indication

Confounding by indication refers to an extraneous determinant of the outcome parameter that is present if a perceived high risk or poor prognosis is an indication for intervention. This means that differences in care, for example, between cases and controls may partly originate from differences in indication for medical intervention such as the presence of risk factors for particular health problems. The latter has frequently been reported in studies evaluating the efficacy of pharmaceutical interventions.

A good example can be found in [Confounding and indication for treatment in evaluation of drug treatment for hypertension](#) (Grobbee DE, Hoes AW. BMJ 1997; 315: 1151-1154). The article [Confounding by indication: the case of the calcium channel blockers](#) (Joffe MM. Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2000; 9: 37-41) reviews conceptual issues regarding confounding by indication. It demonstrates that studies with potential confounding by indication can benefit from appropriate analytic methods, including separating the effects of a drug taken at different times, sensitivity analysis for unmeasured confounders, instrumental variables and G-estimation.

With the more recent application of pharmacoepidemiological methods to assess effectiveness, confounding by indication is a greater challenge and the article [Approaches to](#)

(McMahon AD. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2003; 12: 551-8) focuses on its possible reduction in studies of intended effects.

5.2.3.5. Channelling

Channelling is a form of allocation bias, where drugs with similar therapeutic indications are prescribed to groups of patients with prognostic differences. Claimed advantages of a new drug may channel it to patients with special pre-existing morbidity, with the consequence that disease states can be incorrectly attributed to use of the drug. How channelling towards high risk gastrointestinal patients occurred in the prescribing of newer NSAIDs is well demonstrated in [Channelling bias and the incidence of gastrointestinal haemorrhage in users of meloxicam, coxibs, and older, non-specific NSAIDs](#) (MacDonald TM, Morant SV, Goldstein JL, Burke TA, Pettitt D. *Gut* 2003; 52: 1265–70). In situations where indication or contraindication biases exist, and complex channelling effects can be expected, only randomised trials can be relied upon to provide unbiased treatment comparisons.

5.2.3.6. Unmeasured confounding

Large health care utilisation databases are frequently used to analyse unintended effects of prescription drugs and biologics. Confounders that require detailed information on clinical parameters, lifestyle, or over-the-counter medications are often not measured in such datasets, causing residual confounding bias. [Sensitivity analysis and external adjustment for unmeasured confounders in epidemiologic database studies of therapeutics](#) (Schneeweiss S. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2006; 15 (5) 291-303) provides a systematic approach to sensitivity analyses to investigate the impact of residual confounding in pharmacoepidemiological studies that use health care utilisation databases. In the article, four basic approaches to sensitivity analysis were identified: (1) sensitivity analyses based on an array of informed assumptions; (2) analyses to identify the strength of residual confounding that would be necessary to explain an observed drug-outcome association; (3) external adjustment of a drug-outcome association given additional information on single binary confounders from survey data using algebraic solutions; (4) external adjustment considering the joint distribution of multiple confounders of any distribution from external sources of information using propensity score calibration. The author concludes that sensitivity analyses and external adjustments can improve our understanding of the effects of drugs and biologics in epidemiological database studies. With the availability of easy-to-apply techniques, sensitivity analyses should be used more frequently, substituting qualitative discussions of residual confounding.

There has also been discussion about the amount of bias in exposure effect estimates that can plausibly occur due to residual or unmeasured confounding. In [The impact of residual and unmeasured confounding in epidemiologic studies: a simulation study](#) (Fewell Z, Davey Smith G, Sterne JAC. *Am J Epidemiol* 2007; 166: 646–55), the authors considered the extent and patterns of bias in estimates of exposure-outcome associations that can result from residual or unmeasured confounding, when there is no true association between the exposure and the outcome. The conclusion was that the validity of an epidemiological study may be threatened by both residual and unmeasured confounding. With plausible assumptions about residual and unmeasured confounding, effect sizes of the magnitude frequently reported in observational epidemiological studies can be generated. This study highlights the need to perform sensitivity analyses to assess whether unmeasured and residual confounding are likely problems.

5.2.4. Methods to handle bias and confounding

5.2.4.1. New-user designs

The practice of most observational studies to include many prevalent users, i.e. patients taking a therapy for some time before study follow-up began, can cause two types of bias. First, prevalent users are “survivors” of the early period of pharmacotherapy, which can introduce substantial bias if risk varies with time. Second, covariates for drug users at study entry often are plausibly affected by the drug itself. Failure to adjust for these factors on the causal pathway may introduce confounding. [Evaluating medication effects outside of clinical trials: new-user designs](#) (Ray WA. Am J Epidemiol 2003; 158 (9): 915 – 920) reviews new-user designs, which avoid these biases by restricting the analysis to persons under observation at the start of the current course of treatment. In addition to defining new-user designs the article explains how they can be implemented as case-control studies and describes the logistical and sample size limitations involved.

5.2.4.2. Disease risk scores

An approach to controlling for confounding is to construct a multivariable confounder score which summarises potential confounding factors in a single score. [Stratification by a multivariate confounder score](#) (Miettinen OS. Am J Epidemiol 1976; 104: 609-20) demonstrates how the control of confounding may be based on stratification by the score, with stratum-specific contingency tables obtained and analysed in the usual manner. An example is a disease risk score (DRS) that estimates the probability or rate of disease occurrence conditional on being unexposed. The association between exposure and disease is then estimated, adjusting for the disease risk score in place of the individual covariates. [Use of disease risk scores in pharmacoepidemiologic studies](#) (Arbogast P. Stat Methods Med Res 2009; 18: 67-80) includes a brief discussion of the DRS history, a more detailed description of their construction and use, a summary of simulation studies comparing their performance to traditional models, a comparison of their utility with that of propensity scores, and some further topics for future research.

5.2.4.3. Propensity scores

Databases used in pharmacoepidemiologic studies often include records of prescribed medications and encounters with medical care providers, from which one can construct very detailed surrogate measures for both drug exposure and covariates that are potential confounders. It is often possible to track day-by-day changes in these variables. However, while this information can be critical for study success, its volume can pose challenges for statistical analysis. A propensity score is analogous to the disease risk score in that it combines a large number of possible confounders into a single variable (the score). The exposure propensity score (EPS) is the conditional probability of exposure to a treatment given observed covariates. In a cohort study, matching or stratifying treated and control subjects on EPS tends to balance all of the observed covariates. However, unlike random assignment of treatments, the propensity score may not also balance unobserved covariates. [Invited Commentary: Propensity Scores](#) (Joffe MM, Rosenbaum PR. Am J Epidemiol 1999; 150: 327–33) reviews the uses and limitations of propensity scores and provide a brief outline of the associated statistical theory. The authors present results of adjustment by matching or stratification on the propensity score. The following article discusses the emerging high dimension propensity score (HDPS) model approach [High-dimensional Propensity Score Adjustment in Studies of Treatment Effects Using Health Care Claims Data](#) (Schneeweiss S, Rassen JA, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Mogun H, Brookhart MA. Epidemiol 2009;

20(4): 512-22). In doing so it addresses a frequent problem in propensity score adjustment and proposes a practical solution.

[Analytic Strategies to Adjust Confounding using Exposure Propensity Scores and Disease Risk Scores](#) (Stürmer T, Schneeweiss S, Brookhart MA, Rothman KJ, Avorn J, Glynn RJ. *Am J Epidemiol* 2005; 161(9): 891-898) illustrates the different ways that both EPS and DRS methods can be used to control for confounding in a large cohort study. The authors conclude that in the setting of claims data on an elderly population, various ways to apply EPSs and DRSs to control for confounding were not generally superior to “conventional” multivariable outcome modelling. Differences in effect estimates between analytic strategies became more pronounced with smaller study size. More recently in [Performance of propensity score calibration – a simulation study](#) (Stürmer T, Schneeweiss S, Rothman KJ, Avorn J, Glynn RJ. *Am J Epidemiol* 2007; 165(10): 1110-8) introduced ‘propensity score calibration’ (PSC). This technique combines propensity score matching methods with measurement error regression models to address confounding by variables unobserved in the main study by using variables observed in a validation study. Their analyses demonstrated that PSC greatly improves inference when the critical assumption of surrogacy holds, but when surrogacy does not hold, PSC estimation can exacerbate bias relative to uncorrected propensity score models.

5.2.4.4. Instrumental variables

Instrumental variable (IV) methods were invented over 70 years ago, but remained uncommon in epidemiology for a long time. Over the past decade or so, non-parametric versions of IV methods have appeared that connect IV methods to causal and measurement-error models important in epidemiological applications. [An introduction to instrumental variables for epidemiologists](#) (Greenland S. *Int J of Epidemiol* 2000; 29:722-729) presents those developments, illustrated by an application of IV methods to non-parametric adjustment for non-compliance in randomised trials. The author mentions a number of caveats, but concludes that IV corrections can be valuable in many situations. Including when IV assumptions are questionable, the corrections can still serve as part of the sensitivity analysis or external adjustment. When, however, the assumptions are more defensible, as in field trials and in studies that obtain validation or reliability data, IV methods can form an integral part of the analysis.

The complexity of the issues associated with confounding by indication, channelling and selective prescribing is explored in [Evaluating short-term drug effects using a physician-specific prescribing preference as an instrumental variable](#) (Brookhart MA, Wang P, Solomon DH, Schneeweiss S. *Epidemiology* 2006; 17(3): 268-275). This article also proposes a potential approach to control confounding by indication in non-experimental studies of treatment effects. The use of this instrument is illustrated in a study comparing the effect of exposure to COX-2 inhibitors with non-selective NSAIDs on gastrointestinal complications. Contrary to randomised controlled trial (RCT) results showing that COX-2 inhibitors lead to a reduced risk of gastro-intestinal toxicity relative to non-selective NSAIDs, the author’s conventional multivariable analysis found no evidence of a gastro-protective effect attributable to COX-2 inhibitor use. In contrast to the conventional analysis, a physician-level instrumental variable approach (a time-varying estimate of a physician’s relative preference for a given drug, where at least two therapeutic alternatives exist) yielded evidence of a clinically significant protective effect due to COX-2 exposure, particularly for shorter term drug exposures. The authors also point out the possibility that a physician can influence the outcome in ways other than through the prescribing of an NSAID. For example,

physicians who frequently prescribe COX-2 inhibitors may also be more likely to co-prescribe proton pump inhibitors for additional gastro-protection. In such a situation, the protective effect due to COX-2 exposure is partly attributable to the use of a proton pump inhibitor.

5.2.4.5. G-estimation

G-estimation is a method for estimating the joint effects of time-varying treatments using ideas from instrumental variables methods. The article [G-estimation of Causal Effects: Isolated Systolic Hypertension and Cardiovascular Death in the Framingham Heart Study](#) (Witteaman JCM, D'Agostino RB, Stijnen T, Kannel WB, Cobb JC, de Ridder MAJ, Hofman A, Robins JM. Am J Epidemiol 1998; 148(4) 390-401) demonstrates how the G-estimation procedure allows for appropriate adjustment of the effect of a time-varying exposure in the presence of time-dependent confounders that are themselves influenced by the exposure.

5.2.4.6. Marginal Structural Models

In observational studies with exposures or treatments that vary over time, standard approaches for adjustment for confounding are biased when time-dependent confounders, which are also affected by previous treatment, exist. [Marginal Structural Models and Causal Inference in Epidemiology](#) (Robins JM, Hernán MA, Brumback B. Epidemiology 2000; 11(5): 550-560) introduces marginal structural models, a class of causal models that allow for improved adjustment for confounding in these situations.

5.3. Integrating and pooling studies

Often more than one study is available for a research question so it is important to identify and integrate the evidence. In epidemiology, the focus of this activity is often not to obtain an estimate but to learn from the diversity of designs, results and associated gaps in knowledge.

A systematic review is a review of the literature aiming to answer a specific and clearly formulated research question. Systematic reviews use systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, critically appraise relevant research, and to collect and analyse data from the studies that are included in the review. The key characteristics are that the methods used to minimise bias are explicit and the findings are reproducible as stated in the [Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Review of Interventions](#).

For example, it has long been recognised that persons using NSAIDs are at a significantly increased risk of gastrointestinal complications, for instance, injury to the intestinal lining that can result in ulcers and/or gastrointestinal bleeding. To reduce the morbidity associated with NSAIDs, specific estimates for individual drugs and individual groups of patients with different risk profiles are needed. Therefore, a systematic review of a number of studies is appropriate to determine specific pharmacologic features of NSAID-associated gastrointestinal toxicity and to explore multi-factorial determinants in the risk of gastro-intestinal bleeding among NSAID users, including clinical background, use of concomitant medications or a possible genetic susceptibility.

Frequently, a statistical technique known as meta-analysis is used to analyse and summarise the findings of a systematic review by quantitative pooling of the data from individual studies addressing the same question included in the systematic review. How meta-analysis can provide more precise estimates of the effects of health care than those derived from the individual studies included within a systematic review is demonstrated in [Quantitative](#)

(Lau J, Ioannidis JP, Schmid CH. *Ann Intern Med* 1997; 127: 820-826). In addition meta-analysis evaluates the consistency of results across studies and facilitates the exploration of the heterogeneity (clinical, methodological and/or statistical). Indeed, as shown in [Investigating causes of heterogeneity in systematic reviews](#) (Glasziou PP, Sanders SL. *Stat Med* 2002; 21: 1503-11), when very significant heterogeneity exists, the heterogeneity itself may deserve more emphasis than the pooled summary estimates.

Systematic review and meta-analysis can be conducted with different sources of information including clinical trials or epidemiological studies for the assessment of safety and tolerability profiles of therapeutic interventions. An example of a meta-analysis addressing confounding to determine a safety profile is provided in [Risk of venous thromboembolism from oral contraceptives containing gestodene and desogestrel versus levonorgestrel: a meta-analysis and formal sensitivity analysis](#) (Hennessy S, Berlin JA, Kinman JL, Margolis DJ, Marcus SM, Strom BL. *Contraception* 2001; 64: 125-133). Any systematic review and meta-analysis will, however, have the same limitations as the sources of information they use. There are also additional limitations pertaining to the actual statistical combination of data via a meta-analytic approach.

RCTs are considered the gold standard for establishing causal association for therapeutic interventions. They frequently have limitations relating to sample size, narrow population characteristics and indications, and short follow-up duration. Therefore RCTs alone and subsequent systematic review or meta-analysis of RCTs will not address issues relating to the incidence of diseases and will have little value in detecting rare events and in the evaluation of outcomes that are far in the future. Systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies and other epidemiological sources are becoming as common as systematic review of published clinical trials and [Challenges in systematic reviews that assess treatment harms](#) (Chou R, Helfand M. *Ann Intern Med* 2005; 142:1090-9) shows why for different reasons both provide relevant information and knowledge for pharmacovigilance. It is emphasised that the limitations of data sources will not be compensated for by a systematic review and/or meta-analysis.

Section 6.4 further describes different approaches to integrating studies and pooling data.

6. Data Sources

There are two basic approaches for data collection. One is to use data already collected as part of administrative records or patient health care. The second option is *de novo* data collection, which is collection of primary data specifically for the study. Increasingly often, a combination of both approaches is used.

6.1. Use of available data

The use of already available electronic patient health care data in automated health databases for research has had a marked impact on pharmacoepidemiology research. The last two decades have witnessed the development of key data resources, expertise and methodology that have allowed the conduct of landmark studies in the field. Electronic medical records and record linkage of administrative health records are the main types of databases from a data structure and origin perspective. Examples of the first and second are the GPRD in the UK and the national or regional databases in the Nordic countries, Italy, Netherlands and other countries, respectively. The [ENCePP Inventory of Databases](#) contains key information on the databases that are registered in the ENCePP Network.

A comprehensive description of the main features and applications of frequently used databases for pharmacoepidemiology research in the United States and in Europe appears in the book *Pharmacoepidemiology* (B. Strom, 4th Edition, Wiley, August 2005, Chap. 13-22). As an increasing number of databases are now being made available for pharmacoepidemiological research, this list is inherently incomplete. It should be noted, however, that limitations exist in relation to pharmacoepidemiologic research using electronic health care utilisation databases, as detailed in [A review of uses of health care utilization databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics](#) (Schneeweiss S, Avorn J. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005; 58: 323-337).

General guidance for studies including those conducted in databases can be found in the [ISPE GPP](#), in particular sections IV-B (Study conduct, Data collection). This guidance emphasises the paramount importance of patient data protection.

The Working Group for the Survey and Utilisation of Secondary Data (AGENS) with representatives from the German Society for Social Medicine and Prevention (DGSPM) and the German Society for Epidemiology (DGEpi) developed a [Good Practice in Secondary Data Analysis Version 2](#) aiming to establish a standard for planning, conducting and analysing studies on the basis of secondary data, i.e. data collected for other purposes such as population-based disease registers. It is also aimed to be used as the basis for contracts between data owners (so-called primary users) and secondary users. It is divided in 11 sections addressing, among other aspects, the study protocol, quality assurance and data protection.

The [International Society for Pharmacoconomics and Outcome Research \(ISPOR\)](#) working group on databases has published a [Checklist for Retrospective Database Studies](#) to assist decision makers in evaluating the quality of reporting in published studies that use health-related databases. It should be noted that the checklist focuses (in discussed problems and examples) on claims and encounter-based databases. It is meant to serve as a supplement to already available checklists for economic evaluations and will be most useful for health insurers (public or private). Of note, some important aspects for pharmacoepidemiological studies, such as outcome definition and validity, evaluation of biases, sensitivity analyses, ethical issues, data ownership and privacy, are not covered in the ISPOR guideline.

6.2. De novo data collection

Hospital or community based case-control studies using de novo data collection have allowed the evaluation of drug-disease associations for rare complex conditions that require very large base populations over several countries and in depth case assessment by clinical experts. Examples are [Appetite-Suppressant Drugs and the Risk of Primary Pulmonary Hypertension](#) (Abenhaim LA, Moride Y, Brenot F, Rich S, Benichou J, Kurz X, Higenbottam T, Oakley C, Wouters E, Aubier M, Simonneau G, Bégaud B. for the International Primary Pulmonary Hypertension Study Group. *N Engl J Med* 1996; 335: 609-616); [The design of a study of the drug etiology of agranulocytosis and aplastic anemia](#) (Shapiro S. for the International Agranulocytosis and Aplastic Anemia Study. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1983; 24: 833-6); [Medication Use and the Risk of Stevens–Johnson Syndrome or Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis](#) (Roujeau JC, Kelly JP, Naldi L, Rzany B, Stern RS, Anderson T, Auquier A, Bastuji-Garin S, Correia O, Locati F, Maja Mockenhaupt M, Paoletti C, Shapiro S, Shear N, Schöpf E, Kaufman DW. *N Engl J Med* 1995; 333: 1600-1608).

For some conditions, case-control surveillance networks have been developed that can be used for selected studies and for signal generation and clarification e.g. [Signal generation](#)

(Kaufman DW, Rosenberg L, Mitchell AA. *Pharmacoepi Drug Safety* 2001; 10: 197-203).

General guidance on proper conduct of prospective patient-based studies can be found in the [ISPE GPP](#) and the [IEA GEP](#). The GPP is especially useful for its recommendations on aspects rarely covered by guidelines, such as data quality issues and archiving. Both guidelines address the importance of patient data protection and the ethical principles of research using patient health care and personal data.

Patient registers are sometimes requested by regulators at the time of authorisation of a medicinal product in order to determine clinical effectiveness and monitor safety. A registry should be considered a structure within which studies can be performed, i.e. a data source, where entry is defined either by diagnosis of a disease (disease registry) or prescription of a drug (exposure registry). AHRQ has published a comprehensive document on 'good registry practices' entitled [Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide. Second Edition](#), the purpose of which is to guide the planning, design, implementation, analysis, interpretation, and evaluation of the quality of a registry. A section also covers linking of registries to other data sources. This section is, however, focused on the US. References to research review, funding and regulatory bodies are, therefore, US centric and specific recommendations, in particular on ethical, privacy ownership and regulatory aspects, cannot be transferred to the European situation.

Surveys in pharmacoepidemiology, in the areas of disease epidemiology and risk minimisation evaluation efforts, are increasing. Such surveys require a sampling strategy that allows for external validity and maximised response rates. Useful textbooks on these aspects are *Survey Sampling* (L. Kish, Wiley, 1995) and *Survey Methodology* (R.M. Groves, F.J. Fowler, M.P. Couper, J.M. Lepkowski, E. Singer, R. Tourangeau, 2nd Edition, Wiley 2009). Depending on the purpose of the survey, questionnaires are often used. They should be validated based on accepted measures including, if appropriate, construct, criterion and content validity, inter-rater and test-retest reliability, sensitivity and responsiveness. Although primarily focused on quality of life research, the book *Quality of Life: the assessment, analysis and interpretation of patient-related outcomes* (P.M. Fayers, D. Machin, 2nd Edition, Wiley, 2007) offers a comprehensive review of the theory and practice of developing, testing and analysing questionnaires in different settings. *Health Measurement Scales: a practical guide to their development and use* (D. L. Streiner, G. R. Norman, 4th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2008) is a very helpful guide to those involved in measuring subjective states such as attitudes, feelings, quality of life, educational achievement and aptitude, and learning style in patients and healthcare providers. Many other examples of the development and testing of questionnaires have also been published in the scientific literature.

RCTs are a form of *de novo* data collection. There are numerous textbooks and publications on methodological and operational aspects of clinical trials, although they are not covered here. An essential guideline on clinical trials is the European Medicines Agency [Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice](#), which specifies obligations for the conduct of clinical trials to ensure that the data generated in the trial is valid.

6.3. Signal detection methodology and application

Quantitative analysis of spontaneous adverse drug reaction reports is increasingly used in drug safety research. [Quantitative signal detection using spontaneous ADR reporting](#) (Bate A, Evans SJW. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2009; 18: 427-436) describes the core concepts

behind the most common methods, the proportional reporting ratio (PRR), reporting odds ratio (ROR), information component (IC) and empirical Bayes geometric mean (EBGM). The authors also discuss the role of Bayesian shrinkage in screening spontaneous reports and the importance of changes over time in screening the properties of the measures. Additionally they discuss three major areas of controversy and ongoing research: stratification, method evaluation and implementation in addition to giving some suggestions as to where emerging research is likely to lead.

The 2010 report of [Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences \(CIOMS\) Working Group VIII Practical Aspects of Signal Detection in Pharmacovigilance](#) provides a comprehensive resource for those considering how to strengthen their pharmacovigilance systems and practices in terms of signal management.

The [Guideline on the use of statistical signal detection methods in the Eudravigilance data analysis system](#) describes quantitative methods implemented in signal detection by the EMA together with the elements for their interpretation and their potential limitations in the frame of pharmacovigilance. It encompasses the use of quantitative methods in [EudraVigilance](#) applied to the evaluation of Individual Case Safety Reports (ICSRs) originating from health care professionals and involving authorised medicinal products.

Other large observational databases such as claims databases are potentially useful as part of a larger signal detection strategy. In addition, there are a number of ongoing initiatives to develop observational data as electronic systems that will complement existing methods of safety surveillance e.g. the [IMI PROTECT](#), [EU-ADR](#) and [Mini-Sentinel](#) projects (see Section 6.4).

Useful commentary and points of caution to consider before incorporating data mining as a routine component of any pharmacovigilance program is provided in [Data mining for signals in spontaneous reporting databases: proceed with caution](#) (Stephenson WP, Hauben M. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16: 359–365), which also includes a review of data mining methodologies employed and their limitations.

6.4. Hybrid studies

The use of the term 'hybrid studies' in the current document relates to efforts at bridging the pharmacoepidemiological principles and practices of interventional and non-interventional study design, conduct and analysis. One of the primary aims for doing this is to better reflect 'real life' populations and circumstances.

6.4.1. Large simple trials

RCT are considered the gold standard for demonstrating the efficacy of medicinal products. This design can also be used to obtain unbiased estimates of the risk for adverse outcomes. However, large sample sizes are required when the risk is small or delayed (with a large expected attrition rate), when the population exposed to the risk is heterogeneous (e.g. different indications and age groups), when several risks need to be assessed in the same trial (e.g. risks of stroke and of myocardial infarction) or when many confounding factors need to be balanced between treatment groups. In such circumstances, the cost and complexity of a RCT may outweigh its advantages over observational studies. A study design which, ethical considerations permitting, allowed drug allocation to be randomised in an otherwise normal clinical setting, and which relied upon the routine collection of primary and secondary health care records, could overcome the size limitations and atypical settings of

conventional clinical trials. It would also avoid the channelling bias that may, in some cases, make it impossible to interpret the results of purely observational studies. A Large Simple Trial (LST) is such a study design that keeps the volume and complexity of data collection to a minimum. Outcomes that are simple and objective can be measured from the routine process of care using epidemiological follow-up methods, for example by using questionnaires or hospital discharge records. LST methodology is discussed in Chapter 39 of the book *Pharmacoepidemiology* (B. Strom, 4th Edition, Wiley, August 2005), which includes a list of conditions appropriate for the conduct of a LST and a list of conditions which make a LST feasible. Examples of LSTs are [Assessment of the safety of paediatric ibuprofen: a practitioner based randomised clinical trial](#) (Lesko SM, Mitchel AA. *JAMA* 1995; 279: 929-933) and [Comparative mortality associated with ziprasidone and olanzapine in real-world use among 18,154 patients with schizophrenia: The Zodiac Observational Study of Cardiac Outcomes \(ZODIAC\)](#) (Strom BL, Eng SM, Faich G, Reynolds RF, D'Agostino RB, Ruskin J, Kane JM. *Am J Psychiatry* 2011; 168(2): 117-9).

Note that the use of the term 'simple' in the expression 'LST' refers to data structure and not data collection. It is used in relation to situations in which a small number of outcomes are measured. The term may not adequately reflect the complexity of the studies undertaken.

6.4.2. Randomised database studies

Randomised database studies can be considered a special form of an LST where patients included in the trial are enrolled in a health care system with electronic records. Randomised database studies attempt to combine the advantages of randomisation and observational database studies. In a randomised database study, eligible patients may be identified and flagged automatically by the software, with the advantage of allowing comparison of included and non-included patients. Database screening or record linkage can be used to detect and measure outcomes of interest otherwise assessed through the normal process of care. Patient recruitment, informed consent and proper documentation of patient information are hurdles that still need to be addressed in accordance with the applicable legislation for RCTs. These and other aspects of randomised database studies are discussed in Chapter 17 of the book *Pharmacoepidemiology and Therapeutic Risk Management* (A.G. Hartzema, H.H. Tilson and K.A. Chan, Editors, 1st Edition, Harvey Whitney Books Company, 2008), which illustrates with examples the practical implementation of randomised studies in general practice databases. Another use of databases in RCT is the long-term follow-up of patients in observational studies after RCT termination, for example to assess long-term safety and effectiveness at regular intervals using objective outcomes. There are few published examples of randomised database studies, but this design could become more common in the near future with the increasing computerisation of medical records.

6.5. Research networks

Networks of centres active in pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance are rapidly changing the landscape of drug safety research in Europe. Although collaborations for multinational studies are not new, they have been strongly encouraged over the last years by the drug safety research funded by the European Commission (EC). The funding resulted in the conduct of groundwork necessary to overcome the hurdles of data sharing across countries.

Networking implies collaboration between investigators, which is based on trust and willingness to share and to maximise the advantage of bundling expertise. The [ENCePP](#)

_____ may facilitate such collaborations by providing an inventory of research centres and data sources available for specific pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance studies in Europe. It allows the identification of centres and data sets by country, type of research and other relevant fields. In addition, an important component of ENCePP is the potential for meta-analyses to maximise the information gathered for an issue that is addressed in different databases. ENCePP also provides opportunities to perform pooling of person level analytical datasets of individual studies (person level meta-analysis). In the US, [the HMO Research Network](#) is a consortium of health maintenance organisations that have formal, recognised research capabilities.

From a methodological point of view, research networks have many advantages:

- By increasing the size of study populations, networks may shorten the time needed for obtaining the desired sample size. Hence, networks can facilitate research on rare events and accelerate investigation of drug safety issues;
- Heterogeneity of drug exposure across countries allows studying the effect of more individual drugs;
- Multinational studies may provide additional knowledge on whether a drug safety issue exists in several countries and on reasons for any differences between countries, which can lead to important information for regulators and marketing authorization holders;
- Involvement of experts from various countries addressing case definitions, terminologies, coding in databases and research practices provides opportunities to increase consistency of observational studies;
- Requirement to share data forces harmonisation of data elaboration and transparency in analyses, and benchmarking of data management.

Different models have been applied for combining data from various countries ranging from a very disparate to a more integrated approach:

- Meta-analysis of results of individual studies with potentially different design e.g. [Variability in risk of gastrointestinal complications with individual NSAIDs: results of a collaborative meta-analysis](#) (Henry D, Lim Lynette L-Y, Garcia Rodriguez LA, Perez Gutthann S, Carson JL, Griffin M, Savage R, Logan R, Moride Y, Hawkey C, Hill S, Fries JT. *BMJ* 1996; 312 :1563-1566), which compared the relative risks of serious gastrointestinal complications reported with individual NSAIDs by conducting a systematic review of twelve hospital and community based case-control and cohort studies, found a relation between use of the drugs and admission to hospital for haemorrhage or perforation.
- Pooling of results from common protocol studies conducted in different databases, allowing assessment of database/population characteristics and of choices of study design and analysis as determinants of variability (e.g. [IMI PROTECT](#) project).
- Distributed data approach in which data partners maintain physical and operational control over electronic data in their existing environments (e.g. [Mini-Sentinel](#) project). A common data model standardises administrative and clinical information across data partners, whom execute standardised programs provided by an operations centre or project workgroups and typically share the output of these programs in summary form. The Mini-Sentinel pilot focuses on drugs, vaccines, other biologics,

and medical devices (the vaccine safety activities together constitute the [Post-Licensure Rapid Immunization Safety Measurement \(PRISM\) Program](#)).

- Pooling of aggregated data (person-time based) extracted locally from databases or electronic health records using a common data model and common software, and transmitted electronically to a central data warehouse for further analysis (e.g. [EU-ADR](#) project).
- Pooling of properly non-identifiable individual level data gathered locally (either from databases or field studies) to a central data warehouse for statistical analysis (e.g. [VAESCO](#) project).
- Pooling of elaborated individual-level data extracted locally from databases or electronic health records using common software and transmitted electronically to a central location for further analysis by multiple collaborators (e.g. [SOS-NSAIDS](#) project).

These different models have different strengths and weaknesses and present different challenges. These may include:

- Differences in culture and experience between academia, public institutions and private partners;
- Different ethical and governance requirements in each country regarding processing of anonymised or pseudo-anonymised health care data;
- Mapping of differing disease coding systems (ICD-9, ICD10, READ, ICPC) and languages of narrative medical information.
- Choice of data sharing model and access rights of partners;
- Validation of diagnoses and access to source documents for validation;
- Issues linked to intellectual property and authorship;
- Sustainability and funding mechanisms, especially when private funding (e.g. from pharmaceutical companies) is involved and when the study receives funding from several sponsors.

Experience has shown that many of these difficulties can be overcome by full involvement and good communication between partners, and a project agreement between network members defining roles and responsibilities and addressing issues of intellectual property and authorship.

Technical solutions also exist for data sharing and mapping of terminologies. A distributed data model and a JAVA (freely available) based data elaboration software was developed by the [EU-ADR](#) project to allow for pooling of data from drug safety studies across borders. This distributed data model and way of data sharing has been shown to be feasible, fast and to deal effectively with ethical and governance issues. It has been used in several other EC funded projects and in the United-States.

Many of the current research networks have operated mainly with EC funds and under EC grant agreements. The coming years should demonstrate whether and how the expertise and infrastructures can be maintained and used in the conduct of regulatory post-authorisation studies.

7. Statistical Analysis Plan

There is a considerable body of literature explaining statistical methods for observational studies but very little addressing the statistical analysis plan. Planning analyses for randomised clinical trials is covered in a number of publications and much of this applies equally to non-randomised design. A good reference in this respect is the [International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use \(ICH\) ICH E9 'Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials'](#). While specific guidance on the statistical analysis plan for epidemiological studies is sparse, the following principles will apply to most of the studies.

A study is generally designed with the objective of addressing a set of research questions. However, the initial product of a study is a set of numerical and categorical observations that do not usually provide a direct answer to the questions that the study is designed to address. The statistical analysis plan details the mathematical transformations that will be performed on the observed data in the study and the patterns of results that will be interpreted as supporting alternative answers to the questions. It will also explain the rationale behind this decision making process and the way that this rationale has influenced the study design. An important part of the statistical analysis plan will explain how problems in the data will be handled in such calculations, for example missing or partial data.

The statistical analysis plan should be sufficiently detailed so that it can be followed in the same way by any competent analyst. Thus it should provide clear and complete templates for each analysis.

Pre-specified statistical analyses can be challenging for data that are not collected specifically to answer the study questions. This is usually the case in retrospective observational studies. However, thoughtful specification of the way missing values will be handled or the use of a small part of the data as a pilot set to guide analysis can be useful techniques to overcome such problems. A feature common to most studies is that some not pre-specified analyses will be performed in response to chance observations in the data. It is important to distinguish between such data-driven analyses and the pre-specified findings. Post-hoc modifications to the analysis strategy should be noted and explained. The statistical analysis plan provides a confirmation of this process.

A particular concern in retrospective studies is that decisions about the analysis should be made blinded to any knowledge of the results. This should be a consideration in the study design, particularly when feasibility studies are to be performed to inform the design phase. Feasibility studies should be independent of the main study results.

The statistical analysis plan is usually structured to reflect the protocol and will address, where relevant, the following points:

1. The statistical model used to address each primary and secondary objective.
2. Formal definitions of any outcomes e.g. 'fatal myocardial infarction' might be defined as 'death within 30 days of a myocardial infarction'.
3. Formal definitions for other variable – e.g. thresholds for abnormal levels of blood parameters.
4. Sample size considerations making explicit the data source from which the expected variation of relevant quantities and the clinically relevant differences are derived should be presented. It should be noted that in retrospective observational studies

where no additional data can be collected sample size is not a relevant consideration and the ethical injunction against 'underpowered' studies has no obvious force provided the results, in particular the 'absence of effect' and 'insufficient evidence', are properly presented and interpreted.

5. Blinding to exposure variables of evaluators making subjective judgements about the study.
6. Methods of adjusting for confounding, including
 - 6.1 Which confounders will be considered;
 - 6.2 Criteria for any selection of a subset of confounders.
7. Handling of missing data, including
 - 7.1 How missing data will be reported;
 - 7.2 Methods of imputation;
 - 7.3 Sensitivity analyses for handling missing data;
 - 7.4 How censored data will be treated, with rationale.
8. Fit of the model, including
 - 8.1 Criteria for assessing fit;
 - 8.2 Alternative models in the event of clear lack of fit.
9. Interim analyses – if considered:
 - 9.1 Criteria, circumstances and possible drawbacks for performing an interim analysis and possible actions (including stopping rules) that can be taken on the basis of such an analysis.
10. Description of achieved patient population:
 - 10.1 Description of target population;
 - 10.2 Departures from targeted population.
11. Treatment of multiplicity issues not elsewhere covered.

8. Quality Control and Quality Assurance

Although quality assurance is the rule for RCTs, the practice is less well established for observational studies, which may also be used to assess the safety and effectiveness of specific pharmacologic interventions. In an RCT the vast majority of data is quality assured but it may not be feasible to do the same for large pharmacoepidemiological studies making secondary use of data collected for another purpose. However, use of the results of such studies in outcomes research requires knowledge of the quality and validity of the data and of the studies themselves. In particular, there ideally needs to be some level of validation of the recording and coding for electronic data sets. It is considered the responsibility of database owners to provide researchers with the minimal level of validity and sensitivity of the coded data. It is also acknowledged that there is a need to move towards better quality control/assurance in terms of data quality assurance and study methodology. Quality should be mentioned in the study protocol in terms of quality assurance but this may, for example, lead to sensitivity analyses.

Quality control (QC) is the observation techniques and activities that are used to fulfill requirements for quality. Quality Assurance (QA) is defined as the planned and systematic activities implemented in a quality system so that quality requirements for a product or service will be fulfilled. In general, QA defines the standards to be followed in order to meet the requirements, whereas QC ensures that these defined standards are followed at every step.

Aspects of research quality control that require close attention include data collection, data recording, numbers and qualifications of people making measurements and recording data, numbers. It also includes QC measures that are necessary to verify accuracy and consistency of the collected data, data entry into computer files, storage of originals and copies of data sheets and computer files, assignment of tasks and responsibilities, and data analyses. Quality criteria specific to a study should be defined to ensure scientific validity of the results. These criteria may involve the following items: independent scientific committee, sampling investigator recruitment, study organisation and quality control of the collected data and may include on-site control visits to participating researchers.

In general, the following are the steps to implement QA in the research plan: identifying the expectations; determining the standards; measuring and comparing performances; analysing; planning and controlling.

The two following articles are examples of quality control implementations in pharmacovigilance/pharmacoepidemiological studies. The [Norwegian Prescription Database \(NorPD\)](#) (Karu F. Norsk epidemiologi 2008; 18(2): 129-136) details the quality checks applied to the database. The article [Feasibility study and methodology to create a quality-evaluated database of primary care data](#) (Bourke A, Dattani H, Robinson M. Inform Prim Care 2004; 12(3): 171-7) details the study conducted to build and test a model for collection of computerised retrospective primary care data in the UK, to assess its quality for use in medical and pharmaceutical research. The main quality outcome measures were indicators of the completeness of data recording. It was concluded that in the group of practices studied, levels of recording were generally assessed to be of sufficient quality to enable a database of quality-evaluated, anonymised primary care records to be created.

Section II 'Operating Registries' of the AHRQ [Registries to Evaluate Patient Outcomes: a User's guide, Second Edition](#) provides a practical guide to the day-to-day operational issues and decisions for producing and interpreting high-quality registries. It is a very good reference, albeit US focused. Chapter 10 'Data Collection and Quality Assurance' reviews key areas of data collection, cleaning, storing, and quality assurance for registries. It contains a practical example of a performance-linked access system that ensures that only appropriate patients receive a treatment. It also details how these systems can help sponsors to monitor the patient population, and to learn more about adverse events and the frequency of these events

Section VII 'Archiving' in the [ISPE GPP](#) points out that copies of all quality assurance reports and audits should be included within the archived documents.

The [EuroDrug Quality Indicator Meeting \(DURQUIM\) Indicators of prescribing quality in drug utilisation research](#) is a report of a meeting at which a first draft of a database of prescribing quality indicators, already subjected to validation procedures, was made.

The following study [A systematic literature review: Prescribing quality indicators for type 2 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular risk management](#) (Martirosyan L, Voorham J, Haaijer-Ruskamp FM, Wolffenbuttel BHR, Denig P. Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2010; 19(4): 319-

34) describes the validity of existing prescribing indicators for type 2 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular risk management.

The authors of [Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database \(GPRD\): a systematic review](#) (Herrett E, Thomas SL, Schoonen WM, Smeeth L, Hall AJ. Br J Clin Pharmacol 2010; 69: 4-14) assessed the quality of the methods used to validate diagnoses in the GPRD, a primary care database containing anonymised patient records for about 6% of the UK population that has been widely used for observational studies. The article contains methodological and reporting recommendations to further strengthen the use of the GPRD in research that are potentially applicable to other databases.

The following references are also useful guidance in terms of ensuring quality in pharmacoepidemiological research: the CIOMS [International Ethical Guidelines for Epidemiological Studies](#), the AGENS, DGSM and DGEpi [Good Practice in Secondary Data Analysis Version 2](#) and the [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#).

9. Safety reporting (Adverse Events)

Observational studies or registers can provide the initial evidence leading to the identification of a new safety concern that may impact on patients and require a regulatory action to minimise the risk. Follow-ups of large numbers of persons using a structured data collection system may identify and characterise adverse reactions within the limits of study design, objectives, sample size and duration. Therefore, consideration should be given to the expedited reporting of adverse reactions to competent authorities when designing a study and writing a protocol.

Chapter VI of the [ISPE GPP](#) provides general recommendations for adverse event reporting from pharmacoepidemiology studies. This text should be consulted by investigators when designing a non-interventional study. It specifies six conditions which, if obtained, generally require expedited individual case reporting: 1) the study prospectively gathers data on individual patients, 2) the study involves direct contact with patients, 3) study personnel are trained on gathering and reporting adverse events and determining whether events might be considered "expected" for a specific product, 4) a serious event is identified by someone who has direct contact with the patient, 5) the event is considered unexpected, and 6) the reporter believes there is a causal association with the product or that causality cannot be ruled out. The GPP further specify that analyses of database studies can identify an unexpected increase in risk associated with a particular exposure but such studies typically do not require reporting of individual cases. While these ISPE recommendations are helpful, the EU obligations to companies sponsoring a post-authorisation study are specified in [Volume 9A](#).

The following general recommendations should be followed for studies carried out in the EU:

- For a company-sponsored non-interventional post-authorisation study, the provisions included in Part I (Guidelines for Marketing Authorisation Holders), Chapter 7.4.2. (Reporting of Adverse Reactions) of [Volume 9A](#) (page 93 for the version dated September 2008) should be followed. These provisions specify that the usual regulatory requirements for reporting of adverse reactions should be fulfilled. This means that marketing authorisation holders should ensure that they are notified by the investigator of serious adverse reactions and, if specified in the protocol, of events. However, it is acknowledged that for certain study designs, such as case-

control or retrospective cohort studies, it is not feasible or appropriate to make a causality assessment at the individual case level, and therefore expedited reporting is not required. In case of doubt, the reporting requirements for a specific study should be clarified with the competent authority. Marketing authorisation holders should check whether additional national requirements apply in countries where the study will be carried-out.

- For a non-interventional post-authorisation study which is not sponsored by a company, there are no legal reporting obligations at the European level. Investigators should however enquire whether national obligations exist. Obligations or recommendations may also be specified by an ethical committee or a data safety monitoring board.
- If the study qualifies as an interventional trial, the reporting criteria laid down in Directive 2001/20/EC and related guidance ([Volume 10 of the Rules Governing Medicinal Products in the European Union](#)) should be followed.

Any update of the Rules Governing Medicinal Products in the EU can be found on the [Eudralex website](#).

Chapter 12 of the AHRQ [Registries to Evaluate Patient Outcomes: a User's guide, Second Edition](#) addresses the identification, processing, and reporting of adverse events detected in situations in which a registry has individual patient contact. This chapter should be read in the context of the regulatory requirements applicable in the US. It also presents the enforceable framework established by the FDA for risk management of products with known safety concerns, called Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategies (REMS).

10. Communication

Aspects of research communication include, but are not limited to, reports to health authorities, sponsors, presentations in scientific fora, scientific publications, patient focused communications and websites. For marketing authorisation holders, study results should also be reflected in regulatory documents such as the risk management plan and the periodic safety update report.

The [ISPE GPP](#) contain a section on communication (section V) which includes a statement that there is an ethical obligation to disseminate findings of potential scientific or public health importance and that research sponsors (government agencies, private sector, etc.) shall be informed of study results in a manner that complies with local regulatory requirements.

The [Guidelines for Submitting Adverse Event Reports for Publication](#) endorsed by ISOP and ISPE aim to introduce readers to the key elements that have to be included when someone wishes to report and publish results about adverse drug events. The information is clearly and coherently presented in the cited guideline. The required data are divided based on three levels of requests: 'required', 'highly desirable' and 'if relevant'.

The [Enhancing the Quality and Transparency of Health Research \(EQUATOR\)](#) network is an international initiative that aims to enhance the reliability and value of the published health research literature. The article [A catalogue of reporting guidelines for health research](#) (Simera I, Moher D, Hoey J, Schulz KF, Altman DG. Eur J Clin Invest 2010; 40(1): 35-53) presents a collection of tools and guidelines available on the [EQUATOR website](#) relating to resources, education and training to facilitate good research reporting and the development,

dissemination and implementation of robust reporting guidelines to increase the accuracy and transparency of health research reporting.

The [Strengthening the Reporting of Observational studies in Epidemiology \(STROBE\) Statement Guidelines for reporting observational studies](#) has established recommendations for improving the quality of reporting of observational studies and seeks to ensure a clear presentation of what was planned, done, and found. Of note, the aim of these guidelines was not to prescribe the reporting of observational research in a rigid format, but to address what should be the critical information that a publication on an observational study should contain. In this regard, the guidance provided is complete, with practical examples that facilitate interpretation and understanding of the recommendations, though it is of limited usefulness for the design and conduct of epidemiological research projects. The recommendations are limited to cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies, though other types of epidemiological studies might benefit from most of the recommendations at the time of drafting the manuscript. No recommendation on ethical considerations, ownership of data and criteria for establishing the authorship are given. This is a major limitation of these recommendations, since these aspects are highly relevant for the reporting and publishing of studies.

The [Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(MOOSE\) group](#) has developed [a consensus statement](#) and recommendations for reporting meta-analyses of observational studies in epidemiology. It is equivalent to the [STROBE Statement Guidelines for reporting observational studies](#) and the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials [Consolidated Standards for Reporting Trials \(CONSORT\) 2010 Statement](#) for RCTs, in that they have communication as their primary objective and take the form of a list of minimum requirements for adequate reporting. The MOOSE article is quite similar to the others in its structure, scope, length and depth of detail and is useful for the declared audience of researchers, readers, reviewers and editors. The structure of the article is slightly confusing though, as the formal 'Results' includes subheadings such as 'background', 'search strategy', 'results' and 'discussion'. The authors recommend a broad inclusion of studies and to conduct post-hoc sensitivity on the dependence of the results on factors, such as quality of underlying papers, design, accounting for confounders etc. The authors comment on the particular problems in merging observational studies with highly variable sets of confounders that were or were not controlled for, but they do not suggest any solution or give any references to possible ways to address it.

The [Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses \(PRISMA\) Statement](#) is an evidence-based minimum set of items for reporting in systematic reviews and meta-analyses consisting of a 27-item checklist and a flow diagram. While focused on randomised trials, PRISMA can also be used as a basis for reporting systematic reviews of other types of research, particularly evaluations of interventions. PRISMA may also be useful for critical appraisal of published systematic reviews, although it is not a quality assessment instrument to gauge the quality of a systematic review. PRISMA is a successor to the [Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses \(QUORUM\) Statement](#) and the associated QUORUM flow chart.

Additional guidance is provided in the ENCePP [Checklist for Study Protocols](#) and [Code of Conduct](#) and the [IEA GEP](#) guideline that have been reviewed elsewhere in the present document.

Some of the points that are emphasised by the cited guidelines are:

- Sources of research funding should always be disclosed whether in oral or written presentation.

- A dissemination and communication strategy should be predefined as part of the funding contract.
- All results with a scientific or public health impact must be made publicly available without undue delay.
- Quantitative measures of association should be reported rather than just results of testing.
- Authorship should conform to the guidelines established by the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICJME\)](#) 'Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals'.
- For a case report (or series) on suspected adverse drug reactions, minimum requirements include an account of the patients medical history and disposition, a detailed account of the dispensed product (substances, brand, route of administration) and a detailed account of the adverse event (nature, timing, severity, outcome).

11. Update of the Guide

In line with the scope of the present inventory to be dynamic, researchers are kindly requested to refer any additional guidance document (with an electronic link, where possible) that they may be aware of, and that is considered relevant, to the [ENCePP Secretariat](#) for possible inclusion in future updates.

Systematic updates of this electronic document will be performed every year. More frequent amendments may be performed for important modifications. An open access, interactive platform for comments is under consideration.

12. References

All hyperlinks in the document were last accessed on-line on 12 May 2011.

Abenham LA, Moride Y, Brenot F, Rich S, Benichou J, Kurz X, Higenbottam T, Oakley C, Wouters E, Aubier M, Simonneau G, Bégaud B. for the International Primary Pulmonary Hypertension Study Group. [Appetite-Suppressant Drugs and the Risk of Primary Pulmonary Hypertension](#) N Engl J Med 1996; 335: 609-616.

AGENS, DGSM and DGEpi [Good Practice in Secondary Data Analysis Version 2](#)
<http://www.dgepi.de/pdf/infoboard/stellungnahme/gps-version2-final%20ENG.pdf>

Altman D. *Practical Statistics for Medical Research*. Chapman & Hall, 1990.

WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology [Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical Classification System](#) http://www.whocc.no/atc/structure_and_principles/

[Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\)](#) <http://www.ahrq.gov/>

AHRQ [Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide. Second Edition](#)
<http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/74/531/Registries%202nd%20ed%20final%20to%20Eisenberg%209-15-10.pdf>

Arbogast P. [Use of disease risk scores in pharmacoepidemiologic studies](#) Stat Methods Med Res 2009; 18: 67-80.

Bate A, Evans SJW. [Quantitative signal detection using spontaneous ADR reporting](#) Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2009; 18: 427 – 436.

Baumeister RF, Leary MR. [Writing narrative literature reviews](#) Rev of Gen Psychol 1997; 1 (3): 311-320.

Bourke A, Dattani H, Robinson M. [Feasibility study and methodology to create a quality-evaluated database of primary care data](#) Inform Prim Care 2004; 12(3): 171-7.

Brookhart MA, Wang P, Solomon DH, Schneeweiss S. [Evaluating short-term drug effects using a physician-specific prescribing preference as an instrumental variable](#) Epidemiology 2006; 17(3): 268-275.

[ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#)

http://www.encepp.eu/standards_and_guidances/index.html

Chou R, Helfand M. [Challenges in systematic reviews that assess treatment harms](#) Ann Intern Med 2005; 142:1090-9.

[Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences \(CIOMS\)](#) <http://www.cioms.ch/>

CIOMS [International Ethical Guidelines for Epidemiological Studies](#)

http://www.cioms.ch/frame_ethical_guidelines_2009.htm

CIOMS Working Group VIII [Practical Aspects of Signal Detection in Pharmacovigilance](#)

http://www.cioms.ch/frame_WGVIIIblurbDRAFT.htm

[Clinical Trial Directive \(Directive 2001/20/EC\)](#)

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CELEX:32001L0020:EN:HTML>

[ClinicalTrials.gov](#) <http://www.clinicaltrials.gov/>

[Cochrane Collaboration](#) <http://ukcc.cochrane.org/>

[Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions](#) <http://www.cochrane-handbook.org/>

[CONSORT statement](#) <http://www.consort-statement.org/>

[Declaration of Helsinki](#) <http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html>

[Directive 2001/83/EC](#)

[http://eur-](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2001L0083:20070126:en:PDF)

[lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2001L0083:20070126:en:PDF](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2001L0083:20070126:en:PDF)

[Directive 95/46/EC](#) http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/95-46-ce/dir1995-46_part1_en.pdf

DURQUIM [Indicators of prescribing quality in drug utilisation research](#)

<http://www.springerlink.com/content/a3ccdbuey2ed7cc>

[European Network of Centres for Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance \(ENCePP\)](#)

<http://www.encepp.eu/structure/index.html>

[ENCePP Code of Conduct](#) http://www.encepp.eu/code_of_conduct/index.html

[ENCePP Declaration on compliance](#)

[http://www.encepp.eu/documents/code_of_conduct/ENCePP Code of Conduct_Declaration on compliance.doc](http://www.encepp.eu/documents/code_of_conduct/ENCePP%20Code%20of%20Conduct_Declaration%20on%20compliance.doc)

[ENCePP E-Register of Studies](#) http://www.encepp.eu/encepp_studies/e_register.html

[ENCePP Inventory of Databases](#) <http://www.encepp.eu/encepp/resourcesDatabase.jsp>

[EQUATOR Network](#) <http://www.equator-network.org/>

[EU-ADR](#) <http://www.euadr-project.org/>

[Eudralex website](#)

http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/pharmaceuticals/documents/eudralex/index_en.htm

[EudraVigilance](#) <http://eudravigilance.ema.europa.eu/highres.htm>

[EuroDrug Quality Indicator Meeting \(DURQUIM\)](#)

<http://www.pharmacoepi.org/eurodrug/durquim.cfm>

Fayers PM, Machin D. *Quality of Life: the assessment, analysis and interpretation of patient-related outcomes*. 2nd Edition, Wiley, 2007.

Fewell Z, Davey Smith G, Sterne JAC. [The impact of residual and unmeasured confounding in epidemiologic studies: a simulation study](#) *Am J Epidemiol* 2007; 166: 646–55.

Gail MH, Benichou J, Editors. *Encyclopedia of Epidemiologic Methods*. Wiley, 2000.

Glasziou PP, Sanders SL. [Investigating causes of heterogeneity in systematic reviews](#) *Stat Med* 2002; 21: 1503-11.

Greenland S. [An introduction to instrumental variables for epidemiologists](#) *Int J of Epidemiol* 2000; 29: 722-729.

Grobbbee DE, Hoes AW. [Confounding and indication for treatment in evaluation of drug treatment for hypertension](#) *BMJ* 1997; 315: 1151-1154.

Groves RM, Fowler FJ, Couper MP, Lepkowski JM, Singer E, Tourangeau R. *Survey Methodology*. 2nd Edition, Wiley, 2009.

[Guideline on the use of statistical signal detection methods in the Eudravigilance data analysis system](#)

http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Regulatory_and_procedural_guideline/2009/11/WC500011434.pdf

Hartzema AG, Tilson HH and Chan KA, Editors. *Pharmacoepidemiology and Therapeutic Risk Management*. 1st Edition, Harvey Whitney Books Company, 2008.

Hennessy S, Bilker WB, Weber A, Strom B. [Descriptive analyses of the integrity of a US Medicaid Claims Database](#) *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2003; 12: 103–111.

Henry D, Lim Lynette L-Y, Garcia Rodriguez LA, Perez Gutthann S, Carson JL, Griffin M, Savage R, Logan R, Moride Y, Hawkey C, Hill S, Fries JT. [Variability in risk of gastrointestinal complications with individual NSAIDs: results of a collaborative meta-analysis](#) *BMJ* 1996; 312: 1563-1566.

Herrett E, Thomas SL, Schoonen WM, Smeeth L, Hall AJ. [Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database \(GPRD\): a systematic review](#) *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2010; 69: 4-14.

[International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use \(ICH\)](#) <http://www.ich.org/home.html>

[ICH E9 'Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials'](#)

http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2009/09/WC50002928.pdf

[International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICJME\)](#) <http://www.icmje.org/>

ICMJE [Uniform Requirements for Manuscripts Submitted to Biomedical Journals](#)

http://www.icmje.org/urm_main.html

[International Epidemiological Association \(IEA\)](#) <http://www.ieaweb.org/>

[IEA Good Epidemiological Practice Guideline](#)

http://www.ieaweb.org/index.php?view=article&catid=20:good-epidemiological-practice-gep&id=15:good-epidemiological-practice-gep&format=pdf&option=com_content&Itemid=43

[IMI PROTECT](#) <http://www.imi-protect.eu/wp2.html>

[International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology \(ISPE\)](#) <http://www.pharmacoepi.org/>

[ISPE Guidelines on Data Privacy, Medical Record Confidentiality, and Research in the Interest of Public Health](#) <http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/privacy.cfm>

[ISPE Guidelines for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices](#)

http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines_08027.cfm

[International Society of Pharmacovigilance \(ISOP\)](#) <http://www.isoonline.org/>

ISPE/ISOP [Guidelines for Submitting Adverse Event Reports for Publication](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19804709)
http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19804709

[International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research \(ISPOR\)](http://www.ispor.org/)
http://www.ispor.org/

ISPOR [Checklist for Retrospective Database Studies](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1524-4733.2003.00242.x/pdf)
http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1046/j.1524-4733.2003.00242.x/pdf

Joffe MM. [Confounding by indication: the case of the calcium channel blockers](#)
Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2000; 9: 37-41.

Joffe MM, Rosenbaum PR. [Invited Commentary: Propensity Scores](#) Am J Epidemiol 1999;
150: 327–33.

Jollis JG, Ancukiewicz M, DeLong ER, Pryor DB, Muhlbaier LH, Mark DB. [Discordance of databases designed for claims payment versus clinical information systems: implications for outcomes research](#) Ann Intern Med 1993; 119: 844-850.

Karu F. [Norwegian Prescription Database \(NorPD\)](#) Norsk epidemiologi 2008; 18 (2): 129-136.

Kaufman DW, Rosenberg L, Mitchell AA. [Signal generation and clarification: use of case-control data](#) Pharmacoepi Drug Safety 2001; 10: 197-203.

Kish L. *Survey Sampling*. Wiley, 1995.

Lesko SM, Mitchell AA. [Assessment of the safety of paediatric ibuprofen: a practitioner based randomised clinical trial](#) JAMA 1995; 279: 929-933.

Lau J, Ioannidis JP, Schmid CH. [Quantitative synthesis in systematic reviews](#) Ann Intern Med 1997; 127: 820-826.

MacDonald TM, Morant SV, Goldstein JL, Burke TA, Pettitt D. [Channelling bias and the incidence of gastrointestinal haemorrhage in users of meloxicam, coxibs, and older, non-specific NSAIDs](#) Gut 2003; 52: 1265–70.

MacMahon B, Trichopoulos D. *Epidemiology: Principles and Methods*. 2nd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1996

Martirosyan L, Voorham J, Haaijer-Ruskamp FM, Wolffenbuttel BHR, Denig P. [A systematic literature review: Prescribing quality indicators for type 2 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular risk management](#) Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2010; 19(4): 319-34.

McMahon AD. [Approaches to combat with confounding by indication in observational studies of intended drug effects](#) Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2003; 12: 551-8.

Miettinen OS. [Stratification by a multivariate confounder score](#) Am J Epidemiol 1976; 104: 609-20.

Miettinen OS. *Theoretical Epidemiology*. John Wiley & Sons, 1985.

Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF, for the QUORUM Group. [Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the Quorum statement](#) Lancet 1999; 354(9193): 1896-1900.

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. [Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement](#) BMJ 2009; 339: b2535.

Moride Y, Abenhaim L. [Evidence of the depletion of susceptibles effect in non-experimental pharmacoepidemiologic research](#) J Clin Epidemiol 1994; 47 (7): 731-7.

[Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice](#)

<http://www.ema.europa.eu/pdfs/human/ich/013595en.pdf>

[Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership](#) <http://omop.fnih.org/node/22>

[PRISMA](#) <http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

Ray WA. [Evaluating medication effects outside of clinical trials: new-user designs](#) Am J Epidemiol 2003; 158 (9): 915 – 920.

[Regulation \(EC\) No 726/2004](#)

http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-1/reg_2004_726_cons/reg_2004_726_cons_en.pdf

[Regulation \(EC\) 45/2001](#) [http://eur-](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:008:0001:0022:EN:PDF)

[lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:008:0001:0022:EN:PDF](http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:008:0001:0022:EN:PDF)

Robins JM, Hernán MA, Brumback B. [Marginal Structural Models and Causal Inference in Epidemiology](#) Epidemiology 2000; 11(5): 550-560.

Rothman K, Greenland S, Lash T. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.

Roujeau JC, Kelly JP, Naldi L, Rzany B, Stern RS, Anderson T, Auquier A, Bastuji-Garin S, Correia O, Locati F, Maja Mockenhaupt M, Paoletti C, Shapiro S, Shear N, Schöpf E, Kaufman DW. [Medication Use and the Risk of Stevens–Johnson Syndrome or Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis](#) N Engl J Med 1995; 333: 1600-1608.

Schneeweiss S. [Sensitivity analysis and external adjustment for unmeasured confounders in epidemiologic database studies of therapeutics](#) Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2006; 15: 291-303.

Schneeweiss S, Avorn J. [A review of uses of health care utilization databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics](#) J Clin Epidemiol 2005; 58: 323-337.

Schneeweiss S, Rassen JA, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Mogun H, Brookhart MA. [High-dimensional Propensity Score Adjustment in Studies of Treatment Effects Using Health Care Claims Data](#) *Epidemiol* 2009; 20(4): 512-22.

Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, for the CONSORT Group. [Consort 2010 Statement: Updated Guidelines for Reporting Parallel Group Randomized Trials](#) *BMJ* 2010; 340: c332.

Shariff SZ, Cuerden MS, Jain AK, Garg AX. [The Secret of Immortal Time Bias in Epidemiologic Studies](#) *J Am Soc Nephrol* 2008; 19: 841-843.

Shapiro S. for the International Agranulocytosis and Aplastic Anemia Study. [The design of a study of the drug etiology of agranulocytosis and aplastic anemia](#) *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 1983; 24: 833-6.

Simera I, Moher D, Hoey J, Schulz KF, Altman DG. [A catalogue of reporting guidelines for health research](#) *Eur J Clin Invest* 2010; 40(1): 35-53.

[SOS-NSAIDS](http://www.sos-nsaids-project.org/) <http://www.sos-nsaids-project.org/>

Stang PE, Ryan PB, Racossin JA, Overhage JM, Hartzema AG, Reich C, Welebob E, Scarnecchia T, Woodcock J. [Advancing the science of active surveillance: rationale and design for the Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership](#) *Ann Intern Med* 2010; 153: 600-606.

Stephenson WP, Hauben M. [Data mining for signals in spontaneous reporting databases: proceed with caution](#) *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16: 359–365.

Streiner DL, Norman GR. *Health Measurement Scales: A practical guide to their development and use*. 4th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2008.

[STROBE Statement](http://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists) <http://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=available-checklists>

Strom BL. *Pharmacoepidemiology*. 4th Edition, Wiley, 2005.

Strom BL, Eng SM, Faich G, Reynolds RF, D'Agostino RB, Ruskin J, Kane JM. [Comparative mortality associated with ziprasidone and olanzapine in real-world use among 18,154 patients with schizophrenia: The Zodiac Observational Study of Cardiac Outcomes \(ZODIAC\)](#) *Am J Psychiatry* 2011; 168(2): 117-9.

Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson D, Rennie D, Moher D, Becker BJ, Sipe TA, Thacker SB, for the MOOSE Group. [Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology](#) *JAMA* 2000; 283(15): 2008-2012.

Stürmer T, Schneeweiss S, Brookhart MA, Rothman KJ, Avorn J, Glynn RJ. [Analytic Strategies to Adjust Confounding using Exposure Propensity Scores and Disease Risk Scores](#) *Am J Epidemiol* 2005; 161(9):891-898.

Stürmer T, Schneeweiss S, Rothman KJ, Avorn J, Glynn RJ [Performance of propensity score calibration – a simulation study](#). *Am J Epidemiol* 2007; 165(10): 1110-8.

Suissa S. [Immortal time bias in observational studies of drug effects](#) *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16: 241-249.

Suissa S. [Immortal time bias in Pharmacoepidemiology](#) *Am J Epidemiol* 2008; 167: 492-499.

van Staa TP, Abenham L, Leufkens H. [A study of the effects of exposure misclassification due to the time-window design in pharmacoepidemiologic studies](#) *J Clin Epidemiol* 1994; 47(2): 183 – 189.

Vander Stichele RH, Elseviers MM, Ferech M, Blot S, Goossens H; ESAC Project Group. [European Surveillance of Antimicrobial Consumption \(ESAC\): Data Collection Performance and Methodological Approach](#) *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2004; 58: 419-28.

[VAESCO](#) <https://brightoncollaboration.org/vaesco.html>

[Volume 9A of the Rules Governing Medicinal Products in the European Union](#)
http://ec.europa.eu/enterprise/sectors/pharmaceuticals/files/eudralex/vol-9/pdf/vol9a_09-2008_en.pdf

[Volume 10 Clinical trials guidelines](#)
<http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/eudralex/vol-10/>

von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, Pocock SJ, Gøtzsche PC, Vandenbroucke JP, STROBE Initiative. [The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(STROBE\) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies](#) *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61(4): 344-9.

[World Health Organisation \(WHO\)](#) <http://www.who.int/en/>

WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology [Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical Classification System](#) http://www.whocc.no/atc/structure_and_principles/

WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology [Defined Daily Dose](#)
http://www.whocc.no/ddd/definition_and_general_considera/

Witteman JCM, D'Agostino RB, Stijnen T, Kannel WB, Cobb JC, de Ridder MAJ, Hofman A, Robins JM. [G-estimation of Causal Effects: Isolated Systolic Hypertension and Cardiovascular Death in the Framingham Heart Study](#) *Am J Epidemiol* 1998; 148(4) 390-401.

13. Authors

Ana Marta Anes

Alejandro Arana

Kevin Blake

Stephen Evans

Annie Fourrier-Réglat

Jesper Hallas

Xavier Kurz

Hubert Leufkens

Nicholas Moore

Yola Moride

John Parkinson

Susana Perez-Gutthann

Jim Slattery

Miriam Sturkenboom

Milena Jadrijevic-Mladar Takac

Michael Theodorakis

Robert Vander Stichele

14. Acknowledgements

Peter Arlett

Ulf Bergman

Gonzalo Calvo

Olaf Klungel

Herve Le Louet

Consuelo Pedros

Stefanie Prilla

Annalisa Rubino

Ivana Silva

Camilla Stephens