



EUROPEAN MEDICINES AGENCY  
SCIENCE MEDICINES HEALTH



European Network of Centres for  
Pharmacoepidemiology and  
Pharmacovigilance

EMA/95098/2010 Rev.4

## The European Network of Centres for Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance (ENCEPP)

### Guide on Methodological Standards in Pharmacoepidemiology (Revision 4)

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

**This document should be cited as follows:** The European Network of Centres for Pharmacoepidemiology and Pharmacovigilance (ENCEPP). Guide on Methodological Standards in Pharmacoepidemiology (Revision 4). EMA/95098/2010. Available at [http://www.encepp.eu/standards\\_and\\_guidances](http://www.encepp.eu/standards_and_guidances)



# Table of Contents

<b>1. General aspects of study protocol</b> .....	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Research question</b> .....	<b>6</b>
<b>3. Approaches to data collection</b> .....	<b>7</b>
3.1. Primary data collection .....	7
3.2. Secondary use of data .....	8
3.3. Research Networks .....	10
3.4. Spontaneous report database .....	12
<b>4. Study design and methods</b> .....	<b>12</b>
4.1. General considerations .....	13
4.2. Challenges and lessons learned .....	14
4.2.1. Definition and validation of drug exposure, outcomes and covariates.....	14
4.2.1.1. Assessment of exposure.....	14
4.2.1.2. Assessment of covariates .....	15
4.2.1.3. Assessment of outcomes .....	15
4.2.1.4. Validation .....	15
4.2.1.5. Drug consumption databases .....	16
4.2.2. Bias and confounding.....	16
4.2.2.1. Choice of exposure risk-windows .....	16
4.2.2.2. Time-related bias .....	17
4.2.2.3. Confounding by indication .....	18
4.2.2.4. Protopathic bias .....	19
4.2.2.5. Unmeasured confounding .....	19
4.2.3. Methods to handle bias and confounding.....	19
4.2.3.1. New-user designs.....	19
4.2.3.2. Case-only designs .....	20
4.2.3.3. Disease risk scores .....	21
4.2.3.4. Propensity scores .....	21
4.2.3.5. Instrumental variables .....	23
4.2.3.6. Handling time-dependent confounding in the analysis .....	24
4.2.4. Effect modification.....	25
4.3. Ecological analyses and case-population studies .....	26
4.4. Hybrid studies .....	26
4.4.1. Large simple trials.....	26
4.4.2. Randomised database studies.....	27
4.5. Systematic review and meta-analysis .....	28
4.6. Signal detection methodology and application.....	29
<b>5. The statistical analysis plan</b> .....	<b>31</b>
5.1. General considerations .....	31
5.2. Statistical plan.....	31
5.3. Handling of missing data.....	33

<b>6. Quality management</b> .....	<b>33</b>
<b>7. Communication</b> .....	<b>35</b>
7.1. Principles of communication .....	35
7.2. Guidelines on communication .....	36
<b>8. Legal context</b> .....	<b>37</b>
8.1. Ethical conduct, patient and data protection .....	37
8.2. Pharmacovigilance legislation .....	39
8.3. Reporting of adverse events/reactions .....	39
<b>9. Specific topics</b> .....	<b>39</b>
9.1. Comparative effectiveness research .....	40
9.1.1. Introduction .....	40
9.1.2. General aspects .....	40
9.1.3. Prominent issues in CER.....	41
9.1.3.1. Randomised clinical trials vs. observational studies.....	41
9.1.3.2. Use of electronic healthcare databases.....	42
9.1.3.3. Bias and confounding in observational CER.....	42
9.2. Vaccine safety and effectiveness.....	43
9.2.1. Vaccine safety .....	43
9.2.1.1. General aspects .....	43
9.2.1.2. Signal detection .....	43
9.2.1.3. Signal refinement.....	44
9.2.1.4. Hypothesis testing studies.....	45
9.2.1.5. Meta-analyses.....	46
9.2.1.6. Studies on vaccine safety in special populations .....	46
9.2.2. Vaccine effectiveness.....	47
9.2.2.1. Definitions.....	47
9.2.2.2. Traditional cohort and case-control studies .....	47
9.2.2.3. Screening method .....	47
9.2.2.4. Indirect cohort (Broome) method .....	47
9.2.2.5. Density case-control design .....	48
9.2.2.6. Test negative design.....	48
9.2.2.7. Case coverage design .....	48
9.2.2.8. Impact assessment.....	49
9.2.2.9. Methods to study waning immunity .....	49
9.3. Design and analysis of pharmacogenetic studies .....	49
9.3.1. Introduction .....	49
9.3.2. Identification of genetic variants .....	50
9.3.3. Study designs.....	50
9.3.4. Data collection.....	52
9.3.5. Data analysis.....	52
9.3.6. Reporting.....	53
9.3.7. Clinical practice guidelines.....	53
9.3.8. Resources .....	53

**References .....54**  
**ENCePP Guide, Revision 4 - Authorship.....76**

# 1. General aspects of study protocol

The study protocol is a core document of a study. A protocol should be drafted as one of the first steps in any research project. The final version must precisely describe everything being done in the study so that the study can be reproduced. It should be amended and updated as needed. Amendments should be justified.

The EU [Guidance on the format and content of the protocol of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies](#) (PASS) provides a template which may be applied to all non-interventional PASS, including meta-analyses and systematic reviews. Chapter II of the [ISPE GPP](#) provides guidance on what is expected from a pharmacoepidemiology study protocol and on the different aspects to be covered. It states that the protocol should include a description of the data quality and integrity, including abstraction of original documents, extent of source data verification, and validation of endpoints. The [FDA's Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets](#) includes a description of the elements that should be addressed in the protocols of such studies, including the choice of data sources and study population, the study design and the analyses. The [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#) seeks to stimulate researchers to consider important epidemiological aspects when designing a pharmacoepidemiological study and writing a study protocol. The [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\)](#) published [Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide](#) including best practice principles and checklists on a wide range of topics that are also applicable to observational studies outside the scope of comparative effectiveness research. It should be borne in mind that, as stated in the ISPE GPP, adherence to guidelines will not guarantee valid research.

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 explains the origin (scientific, regulatory, etc.) and current knowledge on the research question. It will also explain the context of the research question, including what data are currently available and how these 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 identified, and whether data are already available (allowing a secondary data collection from 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 and defined, including duration of exposure or follow-up, visit or time-dependent appraisals and details of which data are collected when, using what methods.

- Outcomes of interest that need to be pre-specified and defined, 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 pre-specified and defined, including how they will be measured.
- The statistical plan for the 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.
- Adverse events/reactions that will or will not be collected and reported and the procedures put in place for this purpose.
- 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, providing an exact representation of how the data will be collected. 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 the data collection methodology. Other forms may be included as needed, such as patient information, patient-oriented summaries, etc.

## 2. Research question

The research question and the associated objectives address the knowledge or information to be gained from the study. Existing guidance on this aspect includes the EU [Guidance on the format and content of the protocol of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies](#), the [ISPE GPP](#) and the [ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols](#). These 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 also should be clear whether the results that will be reported represent pre-formed hypotheses or research questions or are data driven. If there is no pre-formed hypothesis, this should be clearly stated.

A critical and thorough review of the literature usually forms the basis for the theoretical framework of the research question and should be included in the background description of a protocol. Such a review aims to evaluate information that is pertinent and to identify gaps in knowledge. The review should include findings of relevant animal studies, clinical trials and previous epidemiological studies. The findings of similar studies should be mentioned and gaps in knowledge that a 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 they support the background, significance, research question, hypotheses and 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, to identify the outcomes and measures that have been used in previous studies and to assess the feasibility of the proposed study. Chapter 4.5. presents methods for reviewing and synthesising findings from the literature.

### 3. Approaches to data collection

There are two main approaches for data collection. One is primary collection of data specifically for a study. Another option is to use data already collected for another purpose, e.g. as part of administrative records of patient health care ("secondary data collection"). [Module VIII Post-authorisation safety studies](#) of the Good pharmacovigilance practice distinguishes between studies that involve either approach.

Increasingly often, a combination of approaches is used. In addition, networking among centres active in pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance is rapidly changing the landscape of drug safety research in Europe, both in terms of data networks and networks of interested researchers who may have data sources that they can contribute to a particular study.

#### 3.1. Primary data collection

Primary data collection has an important role in pharmacoepidemiology. Case-control studies using hospital or community-based primary data collection have allowed the evaluation of drug-disease associations for rare complex conditions that require very large source populations and in-depth case assessment by clinical experts. Classic examples are [Appetite-Suppressant Drugs and the Risk of Primary Pulmonary Hypertension](#) (N Engl J Med 1996; 335: 609-16), [The design of a study of the drug etiology of agranulocytosis and aplastic anemia](#) (Eur J Clin Pharmacol 1983; 24: 833-6) and [Medication Use and the Risk of Stevens–Johnson Syndrome or Toxic Epidermal Necrolysis](#) (N Engl J Med 1995; 333: 1600-8).

For some conditions, case-control surveillance networks have been developed and used for selected studies and for signal generation and clarification, e.g. [Signal generation and clarification: use of case-control data](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2001; 10: 197-203).

General guidance on the conduct of prospective pharmacoepidemiology studies can be found in the [ISPE Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices \(GPP\)](#) and the [IEA Good Epidemiology Practice \(GEP\)](#). 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 healthcare and personal data.

Patient registries 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](#), 3rd Edition, which guides 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. The [FDA's Guidance for Industry-Establishing Pregnancy Exposure Registries](#) advises on good practice for designing a pregnancy registry with a description of research methods and elements for to be addressed. The [Systematic overview of data sources for drug safety in pregnancy research](#) provides an inventory of pregnancy exposure registries and alternative data sources on safety of prenatal drug exposure and discusses their strengths and limitations.

Surveys are increasingly used in pharmacoepidemiology, especially in the areas of disease epidemiology and risk minimisation evaluation. They 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, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition, Wiley 2009). Questionnaires used in surveys should be validated based on accepted measures including 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, 2<sup>nd</sup> 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, 4<sup>th</sup> Edition, Oxford University Press, 2008) is a very helpful guide to those involved in measuring subjective states and learning style in patients and healthcare providers.

Randomised clinical trials (RCTs) are a form of primary data collection. There are numerous textbooks and publications on methodological and operational aspects of clinical trials; they are not covered here. An essential guideline on clinical trials is the European Medicines Agency (EMA) [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 are valid.

### **3.2. Secondary use of data**

The use of already available electronic patient healthcare data 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. Examples of the first and second are the [CPRD](#) 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 ENCePP. Section 3.3 of this Guide also describes databases and healthcare records used by research networks.

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, S.E. Kimmel, S. Hennessy. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Wiley, 2012, Chapters 11 - 18). It should be noted that limitations exist in using electronic healthcare databases, as detailed in [A review of uses of healthcare utilisation databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 2005; 58: 23-337).

The primary purpose of the ISPE-endorsed [Guidelines for Good Database Selection and use in Pharmacoepidemiology Research](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012;21:1-10) is to assist in the selection and use of data resources in pharmacoepidemiology by highlighting potential limitations and recommending tested procedures. Although it refers in the title and objective to data resources or databases, it mainly refers to databases of routinely collected healthcare information and does not include spontaneous report databases. It is a simple, well-structured guideline that will help investigators when selecting databases for their research. If used, it will help database custodians to describe their database in a useful manner. A section is entirely dedicated to the use of multi-site studies. The entire document contains references to data quality and data processing/transformation issues and there are sections dedicated to quality and validation procedures. There are also separate sections on privacy and security.

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. 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 [FDA's Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets](#) provides criteria for best practice that apply to design, analysis, conduct and documentation. It emphasizes that investigators should understand potential limitations of electronic

healthcare data systems, make provisions for their appropriate use and refer to validation studies of safety outcomes of interest in the proposed study and captured in the database.

General guidance for studies including those conducted with electronic healthcare databases can also 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 [International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcome Research \(ISPOR\)](#) established a task force to recommend good research practices for designing and analysing retrospective databases for comparative effectiveness research (CER). The Task Force has subsequently published three articles ([Part I](#), [Part II](#) and [Part III](#)) that review methodological issues and possible solutions for CER studies based on secondary data analysis (see also section 9.1 on comparative effectiveness research). Many of the principles are applicable to studies with other objectives than CER, but aspects of pharmacoepidemiological studies based on secondary use of data, such as data quality, ethical issues, data ownership and privacy, are not covered.

Particular issues of note in the use of electronic patient healthcare data for pharmacoepidemiological research include the following :

- Consistency and totality of data capture i.e. does the database reliably capture all of the patient's healthcare 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 on the whole data set. [Descriptive analyses of the integrity of a US Medicaid Claims Database](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2003; 12: 103–11) 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 is explored in [European Surveillance of Antimicrobial Consumption \(ESAC\): Data Collection Performance and Methodological Approach](#) (Br J Clin Pharmacol 2004; 58: 419-28). This article describes a retrospective data collection effort (1997–2001) through an international network of surveillance systems, aimed at collecting 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 describe the methodological rigour 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 may only seek to validate their choice. [Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database \(GPRD\): a systematic review](#) (Br J Clin Pharmacol 2010; 69: 4-14) investigated the range of methods used to validate diagnoses in a primary care database and 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.
- Discordance between data sources, such as in [Discordance of databases designed for claims payment versus clinical information systems: implications for outcomes research](#) (Ann Intern Med 1993; 119: 844-50), 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 conditions important for prognosis when compared with the clinical information system.

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](#) (Expert Rev Vaccines 2003; 2(1): 21-9).

Quality management is further addressed in [section 6](#) of the Guide.

### **3.3. Research Networks**

Collaborations for multinational studies are not new and 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 in sharing expertise and resources.. The [ENCePP Database of Research Resources](#) may facilitate such networking by providing an inventory of research centres and data sources that might collaborate on 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 collaboration among researchers is the potential for pooling of raw data and meta-analyses to maximise the information gathered for an issue that is addressed in different databases. In the US, [the HMO Research Network](#), the [Vaccine Safety Datalink](#) (VSD) and [Sentinel](#) are examples of consortia involving health maintenance organisations that have formal, recognised research capabilities.

From a methodological point of view, data 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 treatment options across countries allows studying the effect of individual drugs.
- Multinational studies may provide additional knowledge on whether a drug safety issue exists in several countries and on the generalisability of the results, the consistency of information and on the impact of biases on estimates.
- Involvement of experts from various countries addressing case definitions, terminologies, coding in databases and research practices provides opportunities to increase consistency of results of observational studies.
- Sharing of data sources facilitates 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](#) (BMJ 1996; 312: 1563-6), 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, and found a relation between use of the drugs and admission to hospital for haemorrhage or perforation.
- Combining 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 of results (e.g. [Pharmacoepidemiological Research on Outcomes of Therapeutics by a European Consortium \(PROTECT\)](#) project).

- Collaborative cross-national pharmacoepidemiological network, such as the one developed by the five Nordic countries with similar healthcare systems and databases and which covers the entire population of 25 million inhabitants ([The Nordic countries as a cohort for pharmacoepidemiological research](#). Basic Clin Pharmacol & Toxicol 2010; 106:86–94). This network has been used for analytical pharmacoepidemiological studies linking drug exposure to other health registries (for example in [Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors during pregnancy and risk of persistent pulmonary hypertension in the newborn: population based cohort study from the five Nordic Countries](#). BMJ 2012; 344:d8012).
- Distributed data approach in which data partners maintain physical and operational control over electronic data in their existing environment (e.g. the [Sentinel](#) project itself and the extension for vaccines [PRISM](#),). A common data model allows standardisation of administrative and clinical information across data partners, execution of standardised programs and sharing of the output of these programs in a summary form. Methods are available to allow multivariate adjusted analyses in multiple databases without violating patient privacy (see [Multivariate-adjusted pharmacoepidemiologic analyses of confidential information pooled from multiple healthcare utilisation databases](#). Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2010; 19: 848-57).
- Pooling of aggregated data (person-time based or person-level 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 (see [Combining electronic healthcare databases in Europe to allow for large-scale drug safety monitoring: the EU-ADR Project](#). Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2011; 20(1): 1-11).

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 healthcare data.
- Mapping of differing disease coding systems (for examples, the [International Classification of Disease, 10<sup>th</sup> Revision \(ICD-10\)](#), [Read codes](#) in the United Kingdom and the [International Classification of Primary Care \(ICPC-2\)](#)) 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.

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, such as those adopted in the [EMIF](#) project.

Many pharmacoepidemiology research networks in the EU have been established under EC grant agreements. The coming years should demonstrate whether and how the expertise and infrastructures involved could be maintained and used in the conduct of post-authorisation studies.

### **3.4. Spontaneous report database**

Spontaneous reports of adverse drug effects remain a cornerstone of pharmacovigilance and are collected from a variety of sources, including healthcare providers, national authorities, pharmaceutical companies, medical literature and more recently directly from patients. [EudraVigilance](#) is the European Union data processing network and management system for reporting and evaluation of suspected adverse drug reactions (ADRs). [The Global Individual Case Safety Reports Database System \(VigiBase\)](#) pools reports of suspected ADRs from the members of the WHO programme for international drug monitoring. These systems deal with the electronic exchange of Individual Case Safety Reports (ICSR), the early detection of possible safety signals and the continuous monitoring and evaluation of potential safety issues in relation to reported ADRs. The report [Characterization of databases \(DB\) used for signal detection \(SD\)](#) of the PROTECT project shows the heterogeneity of spontaneous databases and the lack of comparability of SD methods employed. This heterogeneity is an important consideration when assessing the performance of SD algorithms.

The strength of spontaneous reporting systems is that they cover all types of legal drugs used in any setting. In addition to this, the reporting systems are built to obtain information specifically on potential adverse drug reactions and the data collection concentrates on variables relevant to this objective and directs reporters towards careful coding and communication of all aspects of an ADR. The increase in systematic collection of ICSRs in large electronic databases has allowed the application of data mining and statistical techniques for the detection of safety signals. There are known limitations of spontaneous ADR reporting systems, which include limitations imbedded in the concept of voluntary reporting, whereby known or unknown external factors may influence the reporting rate and data quality. ICSRs may be limited in their utility by a lack of data for an accurate quantification of the frequency of events or the identification of possible risk factors for their occurrence. For these reasons, the concept is now well accepted that any signal from spontaneous reports needs to be verified clinically before further communication.

One challenge in spontaneous report databases is report duplication. Duplicates are separate and unlinked records that refer to one and the same case of a suspected ADR and may mislead clinical assessment or distort statistical screening. They are generally detected by individual case review of all reports or by computerised duplicate detection algorithms. In [Performance of probabilistic method to detect duplicate individual case safety reports](#) (Drug Saf 2014;37(4):249-58) a probabilistic method highlighted duplicates that had been missed by a rule-based method and also improved the accuracy of manual review. In the study, however, a demonstration of the performance of de-duplication methods to improve signal detection is lacking.

[Validation of statistical signal detection procedures in EudraVigilance post-authorisation data: a retrospective evaluation of the potential for earlier signalling](#) (Drug Saf 2010;33: 475 – 87) has shown that the statistical methods applied in EudraVigilance can provide significantly early warning in a large proportion of drug safety problems. Nonetheless, this approach should supplement, rather than replace, other pharmacovigilance methods.

Chapters IV and V of the [Report of the CIOMS Working Group VIII 'Practical aspects of Signal detection in Pharmacovigilance'](#) present sources and limitations of spontaneously-reported drug-safety information and databases that support signal detection. Appendix 3 of the report provides a list of international and national spontaneous reporting system databases.

## **4. Study design and methods**

A number of evolving methodological challenges that are still in development or have not yet been adequately covered by recommendations recur in pharmacoepidemiological research. The following sections present such methodological challenges and related approaches.

## 4.1. General considerations

The choice of study design and methods is a crucial part in every pharmacoepidemiological study that 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.

Pharmacoepidemiological studies involving multiple objectives are common. One approach for a given study might be to consider the whole study population as a cohort in which to implement the most appropriate design for each objective, thus ensuring alignment of each objective to the best possible design and analysis.

In a descriptive study, the research question relates to describing a population with respect to pre-defined parameters. In analytical studies, the research question drives three key sequentially structured phases in the design and conduct of an epidemiological study:

- Relation of a parameter of incidence 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),
- Collection of data to empirically document this 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
- Analysis of data (from raw data to quantification of associations).

These three phases are not independent. A hypothesised relation may lead to an array of designs for data collection based, in this example, on different data sources available on use of NSAIDs (exposure) and occurrence of gastro-intestinal bleeds in patients (outcomes). Each design for data collection will be followed by only a few appropriate designs of data analysis. If applicable, the selection of appropriate electronic health data sources will be an important aspect of the design of data collection, but 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).

The choice of epidemiological methods to answer a research question is based on principles rather 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.

Many research organisations (including those owning or hosting databases) have scientific review boards ensuring 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 protocol and study report, and any publications and/or communications thereof. The role of scientific committees in governance is of particular importance in any study.

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 2<sup>nd</sup> 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 3<sup>rd</sup> 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 5<sup>th</sup> Edition* (B. Strom, S.E. Kimmel, S. Hennessy. Wiley, 2012) provides a complete review of epidemiological methods applied to the study of drugs. In Chapter 41, 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 1<sup>st</sup> 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.
- *A Dictionary of Epidemiology 5<sup>th</sup> Edition* (M Porta, Editor. J.M. Last S. Greenland, Associate Editors. Oxford University Press, 2008), sponsored by the International Epidemiological Association (IEA), provides a definition and concise explanation of epidemiologic terms and is a key to understanding epidemiological concepts.
- *Dictionary of Pharmacoepidemiology* (Bernard Bégaud. Wiley, 2000) illustrates definitions with practical examples. It is very useful for pharmacovigilance aspects of pharmacoepidemiology.

## **4.2. Challenges and lessons learned**

### **4.2.1. Definition and validation of drug exposure, outcomes and covariates**

Historically, physicians relied on patient-supplied information on past drug use and illness to assist with the diagnosis of current disease. This reliance has been reduced with the rapid expansion of access to electronic health records.

Chapter 41 of *Pharmacoepidemiology* (B. Strom, S.E. Kimmel, S. Hennessy. 5th Edition, Wiley, 2012) includes 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. The book presents information on primary information sources available for pharmacoepidemiology studies including questionnaires and administrative databases. It concludes with a summary of current knowledge in the field and directions for future research.

In pharmacoepidemiology studies, covariates are often selected or created for selecting and matching study subjects, comparing characteristics of the cohorts, developing propensity scores, creating stratification variables and evaluating confounding variables and effect modifiers. Reliable assessment of covariates is therefore needed for the validity of results.

#### **4.2.1.1. Assessment of exposure**

Exposure data originate mainly from four sources: data on prescribing (e.g. [CPRD](#)), data on dispensing (e.g. [PHARMO](#)), data on payment for medication (namely claims data, e.g. [IMS LifeLink PharMetrics Plus](#)) or from interview. The population included in these data sources follows a process of attrition: drugs that are prescribed are not necessarily dispensed, and drugs that are dispensed are not necessarily ingested. [In Primary non-adherence in general practice: a Danish register study](#) (Eur J Clin Pharmacol

2014;70(6):757–63), 9.3% of all prescriptions for new therapies were never redeemed at the pharmacy, although with some differences between therapeutic groups. The attrition from dispensing to ingestion is more difficult to measure, as it involves uncertainties about what dispensed drugs are actually taken by the patients and about the patients' ability to account accurately for their intake. [In Accuracy of patient interviews and estimates by clinical staff in determining medication compliance](#) (Soc Sci Med [E] 1981; 15 (1):57–61), it is also demonstrated that interview may be a highly inaccurate source of data on actual drug intake.

#### **4.2.1.2. Assessment of covariates**

Patient characteristics and other key covariates that could be confounding variables need to be evaluated using all available data. A given database may or may not be suitable for studying a research question depending on the availability of these confounding factors.

Some patient characteristics and some covariate statuses vary with time and accurate assessment is time dependent. The timing of assessment of the covariates is an important factor for the correct classification of the subjects. Assessment of covariates can be done using different periods of time (look-back periods). Fixed look-back periods are used when there are changes in coding methods or in practices. [Estimation using all available covariates information versus a fixed look-back window for dichotomous covariates](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf. 2013; 22(5); 10.1002/pds.3434) establishes that defining covariates based on all available historical data, rather than on data observed over a commonly shared fixed historical window will result in estimates with less bias.

#### **4.2.1.3. Assessment of outcomes**

A case definition compatible with the observational database should be developed for each outcome of a study at the design stage. This description should include how events will be identified and classified as cases, whether cases will include prevalent as well as incident cases, exacerbations and second episodes (differentiated from repeat codes) and all other inclusion or exclusion criteria. The reason for the data collection and the nature of the healthcare system that generated the data should also be described as they can impact on the quality of the available information and the presence of potential biases. Published case definitions of outcomes, such as those developed by the [Brighton Collaboration](#) in the context of vaccinations, are not necessarily compatible with the information available in a given observational data set. For example, information on the duration of symptoms may not be available.

Search criteria to identify outcomes should be defined and the list of codes should be provided. Generation of code lists requires expertise in both the coding system and the disease area. Researchers should also consult clinicians who are familiar with the coding practice within the studied field. Suggested methodologies are available for some coding systems (see [Creating medical and drug code lists to identify cases in primary care databases](#), Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2009; 18 (8):704-07). Coding systems used in some commonly used databases are updated regularly so sustainability issues in prospective studies should be addressed at the protocol stage. Moreover, great care should be given when re-using a code list from another study as code lists depend on the study objective and methods. In some circumstances, chart review or text entries in electronic format linked to coded entries can be useful for outcome identification. Such identification may involve an algorithm with use of multiple code lists (for example disease plus therapy codes). In some cases, initial plausibility checks or subsequent medical chart review will be necessary. Where databases have prescription data only, therapy exposure may be used as a marker for an outcome, or linkage to different databases is required.

#### **4.2.1.4. Validation**

In healthcare databases, the correct assessment of drug exposure, outcome and covariate is crucial to the validity of research. [The role of automated record linkage in the postmarketing surveillance of drug](#)

[safety: a critique](#) (Clin Pharmacol Ther 1989;46:371-86) evaluates the validity of research conducted in automated databases according to a standard set of criteria, including validity of exposure, outcome and confounding. It points out that diagnoses obtained from a review of codes of electronic record systems require validation. The validation of electronic information on drug exposure, outcome or covariate definitions should also be included in the technical handbook of every database. [Validity of diagnostic coding within the General Practice Research Database: a systematic review](#) (Br J Gen Pract 2010;60:e128-36) and the book Pharmacoepidemiology (B. Strom, S.E. Kimmel, S. Hennessy. 5th Edition, Wiley, 2012) contain examples.

Completeness and validity of all variables used as exposure, outcomes, potential confounders and effect modifiers should be considered. Assumptions included in case definitions or other algorithms may need to be confirmed. For databases routinely used in research, documented validation of key variables may have been done previously by the data provider or other researchers. Any extrapolation of previous validation should, however, consider the effect of any differences in variables or analyses and subsequent changes to health care, procedures and coding. A full understanding of both the health care system and procedures that generated the data is required. External validation against chart review or physician / patient questionnaire is possible with some resources. While false positives are more easily measured than false negatives (unless the outcome is extremely common in the study population), specificity of an outcome is more important than sensitivity when considering bias in relative risk estimates ( see [A review of uses of health care utilization databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics](#). J Clin Epidemiol 2005;58(4):323-37). Alternatively, internal logic checks can test for completeness and accuracy of variables. For example, one can investigate whether an outcome was followed by (or preceded from) appropriate exposure or procedures.

Concordance between datasets such as comparison of cancer or death registries with clinical or administrative records can validate overall incidence or prevalence rates.

#### **4.2.1.5. Drug consumption databases**

The [Inventory of Drug Consumption Databases in Europe](#) reviews, compiles and updates knowledge about European sources of data on drug utilisation in the out- and inpatient healthcare sector. The inventory describes information available from non-commercial drug consumption data providers in 27 European countries and methods to retrieve this information. It examines the validity of these European national drug consumption databases and explores the availability of inpatient drug consumption data at national level.

## **4.2.2. Bias and confounding**

The overall goal of an epidemiological study is accuracy in the estimation of the value of the parameter that is the object of measurement, i.e. a measurement without bias. Nearly all types of bias can be categorised as either selection bias, misclassification bias or confounding. Selection bias entails the selective recruitment into the study of subjects that are not representative of the exposure or outcome pattern in the source population. Misclassification bias arises by incorrect information about either exposure or outcome or covariates for the study participants. Confounding is a bias in estimating an epidemiologic measure of effect resulting from an imbalance of other determinants of disease (or their proxies) in the compared groups.

### **4.2.2.1. Choice of exposure risk-windows**

The choice of the exposure risk window can influence risk comparisons due to misclassification of drug exposure possibly associated with risks. [A study of the effects of exposure misclassification due to the time-window design in pharmacoepidemiologic studies](#) (Clin Epidemiol 1994;47(2):183–89) considers the impact of the time-window design on the validity of risk estimates in record linkage studies. In adverse

drug reaction studies, an exposure risk-window constitutes the number of exposure days assigned to each prescription. The ideal design situation would occur when each exposure risk-window would only cover the period of potential excess risk. The estimation of the time of drug-related risk is however complex as it depends on the duration of drug use and the onset and persistence of drug toxicity. With longer windows, a substantive attenuation of incidence rates may be observed. The choice of prescription risk windows can, therefore, influence the estimate of exposure risks. Risk windows should be validated or a sensitivity analysis should be conducted.

#### **4.2.2.2. Time-related bias**

Time-related bias in observational studies can produce illusory results in favour of the treatment group and may affect both cohort and case-control studies, mostly database studies. They are most often a form of differential misclassification bias and should be recognised as they can be generally avoided by appropriate accounting of follow-up time and exposure status in the design and analysis of such studies.

##### **4.2.2.2.1. 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. 106-7).

Immortal time bias can arise when the period between cohort entry and date of first exposure 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](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2007; 16: 241-9) 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. This is frequently found in studies that compare against 'non-users'. Observational studies with surprisingly beneficial drug effects should therefore be re-assessed to account for this bias.

[Immortal time bias in Pharmacoepidemiology](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2008; 167: 492-9) describes various cohort study designs leading to this bias, quantifies its magnitude under different survival distributions and illustrates it with data from a cohort of lung cancer patients. 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.

[Survival bias associated with time-to-treatment initiation in drug effectiveness evaluation: a comparison of methods](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2005; 162: 1016-23) describes five different approaches to deal with immortal time bias. The use of a time-dependent approach had several advantages: no subjects were excluded from the analysis and the study allowed effect estimation at any point in time after discharge. However, changes of exposure might be predictive of the study endpoint and need adjustment for time-varying confounders using complex methods. [Problem of immortal time bias in cohort studies: example using statins for preventing progression of diabetes](#) (BMJ 2010; 340: b5087) describes how immortal time in observation studies can bias the results in favour of the treatment group and how they consider it not difficult to identify and avoid. It is recommended that all cohort studies should be assessed for the presence of immortal time bias using appropriate validity criteria. However, [Re. 'Immortal time bias on pharmacoepidemiology'](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2009; 170: 667-8) argues that sound efforts at minimising the influence of more common biases should not be sacrificed to that of immortal time bias.

##### **4.2.2.2.2. Other forms of time-related bias**

[Time-window Bias in Case-control Studies. Statins and Lung Cancer](#) (Epidemiology 2011; 22 (2): 228-31) describes a case-control study which reported a 45% reduction in the rate of lung cancer with any statin use. A differential misclassification bias arose from the methods used to select controls and measure their exposure, which resulted in exposure assessment to statins being based on a shorter time-span for cases

than controls and an over-representation of unexposed cases. Properly accounting for time produced a null association.

In many database studies, exposure status during hospitalisations is unknown. Exposure misclassification bias may occur with a direction depending on whether exposure to drugs prescribed preceding hospitalisations are continued or discontinued and if days of hospitalisation are considered as gaps of exposure or not, especially when several exposure categories are assigned, such as current, recent and past. The differential bias arising from the lack of information on (or lack of consideration of) hospitalisations that occur during the observation period (called "immeasurable time bias" in [Immeasurable Time Bias in Observational Studies on Drug Effects on Mortality](#). Am J Epidemiol 2008;168 (3):329-35) can be particularly problematic when studying serious chronic diseases that require extensive medication use and multiple hospitalisations. In the example of use of inhaled corticosteroids and death in chronic obstructive pulmonary disease patients, no clearly valid approach to data analysis could circumvent this bias. Further research is needed on this bias.

In cohort studies where a first-line therapy (such as metformin) has been compared with second- or third-line therapies, patients are unlikely to be at the same stage of the disease (e.g. diabetes), which can induce confounding of the association with an outcome (e.g. cancer incidence) by disease duration. An outcome related to the first-line therapy may also be attributed to the second-line therapy if it occurs after a long period of exposure. Such situation requires matching on disease duration and consideration of latency time windows in the analysis (example drawn from [Metformin and the Risk of Cancer. Time-related biases in observational studies](#). Diabetes Care 2012;35(12):2665-73).

#### **4.2.2.3. Confounding by indication**

Confounding by indication refers to a 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](#) (BMJ 1997;315:1151-4).

The article [Confounding by indication: the case of the calcium channel blockers](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2000;9:37-41) 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 combat with confounding by indication in observational studies of intended drug effects](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2003;12:551-8) focusses on its possible reduction in studies of intended effects. An extensive review of these and other methodological approaches discussing their strengths and limitations is discussed in [Methods to assess intended effects of drug treatment in observational studies are reviewed](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 2004;57:1223-31).

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 (channelling). 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](#) (Gut 2003;52:1265–70).

#### **4.2.2.4. Protopathic bias**

Protopathic bias arises when the initiation of a drug (exposure) occurs in response to a symptom of the (at this point undiagnosed) disease under study (outcome). For example, use of analgesics in response to pain caused by an undiagnosed tumour might lead to the erroneous conclusion that the analgesic caused the tumour. Protopathic bias thus reflects a reversal of cause and effect ([Bias: Considerations for research practice](#), Am J Health Syst Pharm 2008;65:2159-68).

#### **4.2.2.5. Unmeasured confounding**

Large healthcare 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. [Using directed acyclic graphs to detect limitations of traditional regression in longitudinal studies](#) (Int J Public Health 2010;55:701-3) reviews confounding and intermediate effects in longitudinal data and introduces causal graphs to understand the relationships between the variables in an epidemiological study.

[Sensitivity analysis and external adjustment for unmeasured confounders in epidemiologic database studies of therapeutics](#) (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 healthcare 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 paper concludes that sensitivity analyses and external adjustments can improve our understanding of the effects of drugs in epidemiological database studies. With the availability of easy-to-apply spreadsheets (for download, e.g. at <http://www.drugepi.org/dope-downloads/>), sensitivity analyses should be used more frequently, substituting qualitative discussions of residual confounding.

The amount of bias in exposure-effect estimates that can plausibly occur due to residual or unmeasured confounding has been debated. [The impact of residual and unmeasured confounding in epidemiologic studies: a simulation study](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2007;166:646-55) considers 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. With plausible assumptions about residual and unmeasured confounding, effect sizes of the magnitude frequently reported in observational epidemiological studies can be generated. This study also highlights the need to perform sensitivity analyses to assess whether unmeasured and residual confounding are likely problems. Another important finding of this study was that when confounding factors (measured or unmeasured) are interrelated (e.g. in situations of confounding by indication), adjustment for a few factors can almost completely eliminate confounding.

### **4.2.3. Methods to handle bias and confounding**

#### **4.2.3.1. 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. Firstly, prevalent users are “survivors” of the early period of pharmacotherapy, which can introduce substantial bias if risk varies with time. Secondly, covariates for drug users at study entry are often plausibly affected by the drug

itself. New user designs help avoid the mistake of adjusting for factors on the causal pathway which may introduce bias towards the null. [Evaluating medication effects outside of clinical trials: new-user designs](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2003; 158 (9): 915–20) reviews 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.

#### **4.2.3.2. Case-only designs**

Case-only designs reduce confounding by using the exposure history of each case as its own control and eliminate between-person confounding by constant characteristics, including chronic diseases.

A simple form of a case-only design is the symmetry analysis (initially described as prescription sequence symmetry analysis), introduced as a screening tool in [Evidence of depression provoked by cardiovascular medication: a prescription sequence symmetry analysis](#) (Epidemiology 1996; 7(5): 478-84). In this study, the risk of depression associated with cardiovascular drugs was estimated by analysing the nonsymmetrical distribution of prescription orders for cardiovascular drugs and antidepressants.

The case-crossover design studies transient exposures with acute effects ([The Case-Crossover Design: A Method for Studying Transient Effects on the Risk of Acute Events](#), Am J Epidemiol 1991; 133: 144-53). [The case-time-control design](#) (Epidemiology 1995; 6(3): 248-53) is an elaboration of the case-crossover design. It uses exposure history data from a traditional control group to estimate and adjust for the bias from temporal changes in prescribing ([Case-crossover and Case-Time-Contrxol Designs as Alternatives in Pharmacoepidemiologic Research](#), Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 1997; Suppl 3. S51-S59). However, if not well matched, the control group may reintroduce selection bias. In this situation, a 'case-case-time-control' method may be helpful as explained in [Future cases as present controls to adjust for exposure trend bias in case-only studies](#) (Epidemiology 2011; 22: 568–74).

The self-controlled case series (SCCS) design was primarily developed to investigate the association between a vaccine and an adverse event but is increasingly used to study drug exposure. In this design, the observation period following each exposure for each case is divided into risk period(s) (e.g. number(s) of days immediately following each exposure) and a control period (e.g. the remaining observation period). Incidence rates within the risk period after exposure are compared with incidence rates within the control period, using a conditional maximum likelihood estimator. An SCCS analysis has the advantage of implicit control for any known or unknown confounders which are stable over time. The [Tutorial in biostatistics: the self-controlled case series method](#) (Stat Med 2006; 25(10): 1768-97) and the associated website <http://statistics.open.ac.uk/sccs> explain how to fit SCCS models using standard statistical packages. Like cohort or case-control studies, the SCCS method remains, however, susceptible to bias if exposure is timed to minimise the risk of an adverse event. Relevant time intervals for the risk and control periods need also to be defined and this may become complex, e.g. with primary vaccination with several doses. The bias introduced by inaccurate specification of the risk window is discussed and a data-based approach for identifying the optimal risk windows is proposed in [Identifying optimal risk windows for self-controlled case series studies of vaccine safety](#) (Stat Med 2011; 30(7): 742-52). The SCCS assumes that the event itself is not a contra-indication for the exposure. The pseudolikelihood method developed to address this possible issue is described in [Cases series analysis for censored, perturbed, or curtailed post-event exposures](#) (Biostatistics 2009; 10(1): 3-16). Based on a review of 40 vaccine studies, [Use of the self-controlled case-series method in vaccine safety studies: review and recommendations for best practice](#) (Epidemiol Infect 2011; 139(12): 1805-17) assesses how the SCCS method has been used, highlights good practice and gives guidance on how the method should be used and reported. Using several methods of analysis is recommended, as it can reinforce conclusions or shed light on possible sources of bias when these differ for different study designs.

[Within-person study designs had lower precision and greater susceptibility to bias because of trends in exposure than cohort and nested case-control designs](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 2012; 65(4): 384-93) compares cohort, case-control, case-cross-over and SCCS designs to explore the association between thiazolidinediones and the risks of heart failure and fracture and anticonvulsants and the risk of fracture. The self-controlled case-series and case-cross over designs were more susceptible to bias, but this bias was removed when follow-up was sampled both before and after the outcome, or when a case-time-control design was used.

[When should case-only designs be used for safety monitoring of medicinal products?](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012; 21(Suppl. 1):50-61) compares the SCCS and case-crossover methods as to their use, strength and major difference (directionality). It concludes that case-only analyses of intermittent users complement the cohort analyses of prolonged users because their different biases compensate for one another. It also provides recommendations on when case-only designs should and should not be used for drug safety monitoring. [Empirical performance of the self-controlled case series design: lessons for developing a risk identification and analysis system](#) (Drug Saf 2013; 36(Suppl. 1):S83-S93) evaluates the performance of the SCCS design using 399 drug-health outcome pairs in 5 observational databases and 6 simulated datasets. Four outcomes and five design choices were assessed.

#### **4.2.3.3. Disease risk scores**

An approach to controlling for a large number of confounding variables is to summarise them in a single multivariable confounder score. [Stratification by a multivariate confounder score](#) (Am J Epidemiol 1976; 104: 609-20) shows how control for confounding may be based on stratification by the score. 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 with adjustment for the disease risk score in place of the individual covariates.

DRSs are however difficult to estimate if outcomes are rare. [Use of disease risk scores in pharmacoepidemiologic studies](#) (Stat Methods Med Res 2009; 18: 67-80) includes a 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. [Disease risk score as a confounder summary method: systematic review and recommendations](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013; 22(2): 122-29), examines trends in the use and application of DRS as a confounder summary method and shows large variation exists with differences in terminology and methods used.

In [Role of disease risk scores in comparative effectiveness research with emerging therapies](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf. 2012 May; 21 Suppl 2: 138-47) it is argued that DRS may have its place when studying drugs that are recently introduced to the market. In such situations, as characteristics of users change rapidly, exposure propensity scores (see below) may prove highly unstable. DRSs based mostly on biological associations would be more stable.

#### **4.2.3.4. Propensity scores**

Databases used in pharmacoepidemiological studies often include records of prescribed medications and encounters with medical care providers, from which one can construct 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 (PS) 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 comparison subjects on EPS tends to balance all of the observed covariates.

However, unlike random assignment of treatments, the propensity score may not balance unobserved covariates. [Invited Commentary: Propensity Scores](#) (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.

[High-dimensional Propensity Score Adjustment in Studies of Treatment Effects Using Healthcare Claims Data](#) (Epidemiol 2009; 20(4): 512-22) discusses the high dimensional propensity score (hd-PS) model approach. It attempts to empirically identify large numbers of potential confounders in healthcare databases and, by doing so, to extract more information on confounders and proxies. [Covariate selection in high-dimensional propensity score analyses of treatment effects in small samples](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2011; 173: 1404-13) evaluates the relative performance of hd-PS in smaller samples. [Confounding adjustment via a semi-automated high-dimensional propensity score algorithm: an application to electronic medical records](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012; 20: 849-57) evaluates the use of hd-PS in a primary care electronic medical record database. In addition, the article [Using high-dimensional propensity score to automate confounding control in a distributed medical product safety surveillance system](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012; 21(S1): 41-9) summarises the application of this method for automating confounding control in sequential cohort studies as applied to safety monitoring systems using healthcare databases and also discusses the strengths and limitations of hd-PS.

Most cohort studies match patients 1:1 on the propensity score. Increasing the matching ratio may increase precision but also bias. [One-to-many propensity score matching in cohort studies](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf. 2012; 21(S2): 69-80) tests several methods for 1:*n* propensity score matching in simulation and empirical studies and recommends using a variable ratio that increases precision at a small cost of bias. [Matching by propensity score in cohort studies with three treatment groups](#) (Epidemiology 2013; 24(3): 401-9) develops and tests a 1:1:1 propensity score matching approach offering a way to compare three treatment options.

The use of several measures of balance for developing an optimal propensity score model is described in [Measuring balance and model selection in propensity score methods](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2011; 20: 1115-29) and further evaluated in [Propensity score balance measures in pharmacoepidemiology: a simulation study](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2014; Epub 2014 Jan 29). In most situations, the standardised difference performs best and is easy to calculate (see [Balance measures for propensity score methods: a clinical example on beta-agonist use and the risk of myocardial infarction](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2011; 20(11): 1130-7) and [The standardized difference is the most commonly used balanced measure in medical research](#) (J Clin Epidemiol. 2015; 68(2): 112-21)). [Metrics for covariate balance in cohort studies of causal effects](#) (Stat Med 2013; 33: 1685-99) shows in a simulation study that the c-statistics of the PS model after matching and the general weighted difference perform as well as the standardized difference and are preferred when an overall summary measure of balance is requested.

[Performance of propensity score calibration – a simulation study](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2007; 165(10): 1110-8) introduces '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. This is done by using additional covariate measurements observed in a validation study, which is often a subset of the main study.

[Treatment effects in the presence of unmeasured confounding: dealing with observations in the tails of the propensity score distribution--a simulation study](#) (Am J Epidemiol. 2010; 1; 172(7): 843–54) demonstrates how "trimming" of the propensity score eliminates subjects who are treated contrary to prediction and their exposed/unexposed counterparts, thereby reducing bias by unmeasured confounders.

Although in most situations propensity score models, with the exception of hd-PS, do not have any advantages over conventional multivariate modelling in terms of adjustment for identified confounders,

several other benefits may be derived. Propensity score methods may help to gain insight into determinants of treatment including age, frailty and comorbidity and to identify individuals treated against expectation. A statistical advantage of PS analyses is that if exposure is not infrequent it is possible to adjust for a large number of covariates even if outcomes are rare, a situation often encountered in drug safety research. Furthermore, assessment of the PS distribution may reveal non-positivity.

#### **4.2.3.5. Instrumental variables**

Instrumental variable (IV) methods were invented over 70 years ago but were used by epidemiologists only recently. 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](#) (Int J Epidemiol 2000;29:722-9) 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. Where IV assumptions are questionable, the corrections can still serve as part of the sensitivity analysis or external adjustment. Where 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. A review of IV analysis for observational comparative effectiveness studies suggested that in the large majority of studies, in which IV analysis was applied, one of the assumption could be violated ([Potential bias of instrumental variable analyses for observational comparative effectiveness research](#), Ann Intern Med. 2014;161(2):131-8).

A proposal for reporting instrumental variable analyses has been suggested in [Commentary: how to report instrumental variable analyses \(suggestions welcome\)](#) (Epidemiology. 2013;24(3):370-4). In particular the type of treatment effect (average treatment effect/homogeneity condition or local average treatment effect/monotonicity condition) and the testing of critical assumptions for valid IV analyses should be reported. In support of these guidelines, the standardized difference has been proposed to falsify the assumption that confounders are not related to the instrumental variable ([Quantitative falsification of instrumental variables assumption using balance measures](#), Epidemiology. 2014;25(5):770-2).

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](#) (Epidemiology 2006;17(3):268-75). This article also proposes a potential approach to controlling for confounding by indication in non-experimental studies of treatment effects. It illustrates this in a study comparing the effect of exposure to COX-2 inhibitors with non-selective NSAIDs on gastrointestinal complications. Contrary to results from randomised controlled trials 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 protective effect due to COX-2 exposure, particularly for shorter term drug exposures. The authors however point out to the possibility that a physician can influence the outcome in ways other than through the prescribing of 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.

[Instrumental variable methods in comparative safety and effectiveness research](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2010;19:537-54) is a practical guidance on IV analyses in pharmacoepidemiology. [Instrumental variable methods for causal inference](#) (Stat Med. 2014;33(13):2297-340) is a tutorial, including statistical code for performing IV analysis.

An important limitation of IV analysis is that weak instruments (small association between IV and exposure) lead to decreased statistical efficiency and biased IV estimates as detailed in [Instrumental variables: application and limitations](#) (Epidemiology 2006;17:260-7). For example, in the above mentioned study on non-selective NSAIDs and COX-2-inhibitors, the confidence intervals for IV estimates were in the order of five times wider than with conventional analysis. [Performance of instrumental variable methods in cohort and nested case-control studies: a simulation study](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2014; 2014;23(2):165-77) demonstrated that a stronger IV-exposure association is needed in nested case-control studies compared to cohort studies in order to achieve the same bias reduction. Increasing the number of controls reduces this bias from IV analysis with relatively weak instruments.

[Selecting on treatment: a pervasive form of bias in instrumental variable analyses](#) (Am J Epidemiol. 2015;181(3):191-7) warns against bias in IV analysis by including only a subset of possible treatment options.

#### **4.2.3.6. Handling time-dependent confounding in the analysis**

##### **4.2.3.6.1. Overview**

[Methods for dealing with time-dependent confounding](#) (Stat Med. 2013;32(9):1584-618) provides an overview of how time-dependent confounding can be handled in the analysis of a study. It provides an in-depth discussion of marginal structural models and g-computation.

##### **4.2.3.6.2. G-estimation**

G-estimation is a method for estimating the joint effects of time-varying treatments using ideas from instrumental variables methods. [G-estimation of Causal Effects: Isolated Systolic Hypertension and Cardiovascular Death in the Framingham Heart Study](#) (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.

##### **4.2.3.6.3. Marginal Structural Models (MSM)**

The use of Marginal Structural Models can be an alternative to G-estimation. [Marginal Structural Models and Causal Inference in Epidemiology](#) (Epidemiology 2000;11:550-60) introduces MSM, a class of causal models that allow for improved adjustment for confounding in situations of time-dependent confounding.

MSMs have two major advantages over G-estimation. Even if it is useful for survival time outcomes, continuous measured outcomes and Poisson count outcomes, logistic G-estimation cannot be conveniently used to estimate the effect of treatment on dichotomous outcomes unless the outcome is rare. The second major advantage of MSMs is that they resemble standard models, whereas G-estimation does not (see [Marginal Structural Models to Estimate the Causal Effect of Zidovudine on the Survival of HIV-Positive Men](#). Epidemiology 2000;11:561–70).

[Effect of highly active antiretroviral therapy on time to acquired immunodeficiency syndrome or death using marginal structural models](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2003;158:687-94) provides a clear example in which standard Cox analysis failed to detect a clinically meaningful net benefit of treatment because it does not appropriately adjust for time-dependent covariates that are simultaneously confounders and intermediate variables. This net benefit was shown using a marginal structural survival model. In [Time-dependent propensity score and collider-stratification bias: an example of beta\(2\)-agonist use and the risk of coronary heart disease](#) (Eur J Epidemiol 2013;28(4):291-9), various methods to control for time-dependent confounding are compared in an empirical study on the association between inhaled beta-2-agonists and the risk of coronary heart disease. MSMs resulted in slightly reduced associations compared to standard Cox-regression.

Beyond the approaches proposed above, traditional and efficient approaches to deal with time dependent variables should be considered in the design of the study, such as nested case control studies with assessment of time varying exposure windows.

#### 4.2.4. Effect modification

An important question that may arise when studying the effects of medicines is whether such effects differ between subgroups of patients (effect modification). To answer this question, one can stratify the study population, e.g. by gender, and compare the effects in these subgroups. In [CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 2010;63(8):e1-37) and [Interaction revisited: the difference between two estimates](#) (BMJ 2003;326:219), it is recommended to perform a formal statistical test to assess if there are statistically significant differences between subgroup for these effects. The study report should explain which method was used to examine these differences and specify which subgroup analyses were predefined in the study protocol and which ones were performed while analysing the data ([Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(STROBE\): explanation and elaboration](#). Epidemiology 2007;18:805-35).

Effect modification can be measured in two ways: on an additive scale (based on risk differences [RD]), or on a multiplicative scale (based on relative risks [RR]). From the perspective of public health and clinical decision making, the additive scale is usually considered most appropriate. The standard measure for interaction on the additive scale is the relative excess risk due to interaction (RERI), as explained in the textbook *Modern Epidemiology* (K. Rothman, S. Greenland, T. Lash. 3rd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008). Other measures of interaction include the attributable proportion (A) and the synergy index (S). With sufficient sample size, most interaction tests perform similarly with regard to type 1 error rates and power according to [Exploring interaction effects in small samples increases rates of false-positive and false-negative findings: results from a systematic review and simulation study](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 2014; 67(7):821-9). In small samples (<250), the Breslow-Day and Tarone test performed best for interactions on the odds-ratio scale, whereas Likelihood Ratio and RERI-based tests performed better on RD scale. When exposure prevents outcome, in small samples the RERI-based test is relatively underpowered compared to other tests. Possible solutions include choosing an alternative interaction test, or recoding exposure categories taking the category with the lowest risk as reference.

[Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology \(STROBE\): explanation and elaboration](#) (Epidemiology 2007;18:805-35) and [Recommendations for presenting analyses of effect modification and interaction](#) (Int J Epidemiol 2012;41:514-20) recommend that effect modification should be reported as follows:

1. separate effects (RRs, odds ratios or RDs, with confidence intervals) of the exposure of interest (e.g. drug), of the effect modifier (e.g. gender) and of their joint effect using one single reference category (preferably the stratum with the lowest risk of the outcome as suggested in [Estimating measures of interaction on an additive scale for preventive exposures](#). Eur J Epidemiol 2011;26(6):433-8) as this gives enough information to the reader to calculate effect modification on an additive and multiplicative scale;
2. effects of the exposure within strata of the potential effect modifier;
3. measures of effect modification on both additive (e.g. RERI) and multiplicative (e.g. S) scales with confidence intervals;
4. confounders for which the association between exposure and outcome was adjusted for.

It should be kept in mind that past drug use should be considered as a potential effect modifier in studies assessing the risk of occurrence of events associated with recent drug use. This is shown in [Evidence of](#)

[the depletion of susceptibles effect in non-experimental pharmacoepidemiologic research](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 1994;47(7):731-7) in the context of a hospital-based case-control study on NSAIDs and the risk of upper gastrointestinal bleeding.

### **4.3. Ecological analyses and case-population studies**

Ecological analyses should not be considered hypothesis testing studies. As explained in [Control without separate controls: evaluation of vaccine safety using case-only methods](#) (Vaccine 2004; 22(15-16):2064-70), they assume that a strong correlation between the trend in an indicator of vaccine coverage (in this example) and the trend in incidence of a disease that is a presumed effect of the vaccine (trends calculated over time or across geographical regions) is consistent with a causal relationship. Such comparisons at the population level may only generate hypotheses as they do not allow controlling for time-related confounding variables, such as age and seasonal factors. Moreover, they do not establish that the vaccine effect occurred in the vaccinated individuals.

Case-population studies are a form of ecological studies where cases are compared to an aggregated comparator consisting of population data. [The case-population study design: an analysis of its application in pharmacovigilance](#) (Drug Saf 2011; 34(10):861-8) explains its design and its application in pharmacovigilance for signal generation and drug surveillance. An example is a multinational case-population study aiming to estimate population rates of a suspected adverse event using national sales data ([Transplantation for Acute Liver Failure in Patients Exposed to NSAIDs or Paracetamol \(Acetaminophen\)](#) Drug Saf 2013; 36: 135–44). Based on the same study, [Choice of the denominator in case population studies: event rates for registration for liver transplantation after exposure to NSAIDs in the SALT study in France](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013; 22(2): 160-7) compares sales data and healthcare insurance data as denominators to estimate population exposure and found large differences in the event rates. Choosing the wrong denominator in case population studies might, therefore, give erroneous results. The choice of the right denominator will depend on the hazard function of the adverse event.

A practical attitude towards case-population studies is recommended: in situations where nation-wide or region-wide electronic health records (EHR) are available that allow assessing the outcomes and confounders with sufficient validity, a case-population approach is not necessary nor wanted, as one can perform a population-based cohort or case-control study with adequate control for confounding. In situations where outcomes are difficult to ascertain in EHRs (or where such databases do not exist), the case-population design might give an approximation of the absolute and relative risk when both events and exposures are rare. This is limited by the ecological nature of the reference data that restricts the ability to control for confounding to some basic variables, such as sex and age, and precludes an exhaustive control for confounding.

### **4.4. Hybrid studies**

The term 'hybrid studies' refers to efforts at bridging the 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.

#### **4.4.1. Large simple trials**

Randomised clinical trials (RCTs) 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 of 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, allows drug allocation to be randomised in an otherwise normal clinical setting, and which relies upon the routine collection of primary and secondary healthcare 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 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 Chapters 36 and 37 of the book *Pharmacoepidemiology* (Strom BL, Kimmel SE, Hennessy S. 5<sup>th</sup> Edition, Wiley, 2012), 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 published LSTs are [Assessment of the safety of paediatric ibuprofen: a practitioner based randomised clinical trial](#) (JAMA 1995;279:929-33) 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 \(ZODIAC\)](#) (Am J Psychiatry 2011;168(2):193-201).

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.

#### 4.4.2. 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 healthcare system with electronic records. 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. Randomised database studies attempt to combine the advantages of randomisation and observational database studies. These and other aspects of randomised database studies are discussed in [The opportunities and challenges of pragmatic point-of-care randomised trials using routinely collected electronic records: evaluations of two exemplar trials](#) (Health Technol Assess. 2014;18(43):1-146) which illustrates the practical implementation of randomised studies in general practice databases.

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. [Pragmatic randomised trials using routine electronic health records: putting them to the test](#) (BMJ 2012;344:e55) describes a project to implement randomised trials in the everyday clinical work of general practitioners, comparing treatments that are already in common use, and using routinely collected electronic healthcare records both to identify participants and to gather results.

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. The TASTE trial is an example of trial that followed patients long-term using routinely collected data ([Thrombus aspiration during ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction](#). N. Engl J Med. 2013;369(17):1587-97).

## 4.5. Systematic review and meta-analysis

Several studies may be available to answer a research question, and it is important to identify and integrate this evidence. In epidemiology, the focus of this activity is often more to learn from the diversity of designs, results and associated gaps in knowledge than to obtain pooled risk estimates. As explained by [The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration](#) (PLoS Med 2009; 6(7)), a systematic review (SR) attempts to collate all empirical evidence that fits pre-specified eligibility criteria to answer a specific research question. It uses explicit, systematic methods that are selected with a view to minimising bias, thus providing reliable findings from which conclusions can be drawn and decisions made. A meta-analysis (MA) is defined as the use of statistical techniques to integrate and summarise the results of included studies. Many SR contain a MA, but not all. By combining information from all relevant studies, a MA can provide estimates of the effects of health care with greater precision and reduced bias than those derived from the individual studies included within a review.

[Quantitative synthesis in systematic reviews](#) (Ann Intern Med 1997; 27:820-6) shows how a MA can provide more precise estimates of the effects of healthcare than those derived from the individual studies. In addition, a MA evaluates the consistency of results across studies and facilitates the exploration of their heterogeneity (clinical, methodological and/or statistical). Indeed, as shown in [Investigating causes of heterogeneity in systematic reviews](#) (Stat Med 2002; 21:1503-11), when very significant heterogeneity exists, the heterogeneity itself may deserve more emphasis than the pooled summary estimates.

Methods for the SR and MA of published and unpublished randomised controlled studies are well developed and described in the [Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews of Interventions](#) (2011). In Chapter 13, the Handbook also includes general guidance on adapting methods from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) to non-interventional studies of all types.

The ability to conduct high quality SR and MA of pharmacoepidemiological studies is important to assess the safety of drugs from observational data that reflects everyday clinical practice. However, methods for the SR and MA of pharmacoepidemiological studies, in which biases and variation in risk estimates between studies take central importance, are less well developed.

An important element to consider is the source of information used in MA, namely aggregate or individual-person data. This may be one or a partial explanation for the different results found for the risk of adverse events associated with Cox-2 inhibitors in [Vascular and upper gastrointestinal effects of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: meta-analyses of individual participant data from randomised trials](#) (Lancet 2013; 382: 769-79), which used individual-participant data from RCTs, and [Myocardial infarction and individual nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs meta-analysis of observational studies](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013; 22(6):559-70), which used summary-level data from publications. There is some evidence that MA of epidemiological studies may concur with meta-analyses of RCTs for adverse events ([Meta-analyses of Adverse Effects Data Derived from Randomised Controlled Trials as Compared to Observational Studies: Methodological Overview](#). PLoS Med 2011;8(5)).

In a [Journal of Clinical Epidemiology series of articles](#), the [Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation \(GRADE\) working group](#) offers a structured process for rating quality of evidence and grading strength of recommendations in SR, health technology assessment and clinical practice guidelines. The GRADE group recommends individuals new to GRADE to first read the [6-part 2008 BMJ series](#). The authors emphasise that GRADE addresses questions of alternative management strategies, interventions or policies but has not been developed for questions about risks or prognosis. [Section 3.3](#) further describes different approaches to integrating studies and pooling data.

#### 4.6. Signal detection methodology and application

A general overview of methods for signal detection and recommendations for their application are provided in the report of the CIOMS Working Group VIII [Practical Aspects of Signal Detection in Pharmacovigilance](#).

Quantitative analysis of spontaneous adverse drug reaction reports is increasingly used in drug safety research. [The role of data mining in pharmacovigilance](#) (Expert Opin Drug Saf 2005; 4(5):929-48) explains how signal detection algorithms work and addresses questions regarding their validation, comparative performance, limitations and potential for use and misuse in pharmacovigilance. [Quantitative signal detection using spontaneous ADR reporting](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2009; 18:427-36) 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 major areas of controversy (such as stratification and evaluation and implementation of methods) and give some suggestions as to where emerging research is likely to lead. [Data mining for signals in spontaneous reporting databases: proceed with caution](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2007; 16:359–65) reviews data mining methodologies and their limitations and provides useful points to consider before incorporating data mining as a routine component of any pharmacovigilance program. An empirical evaluation of several disproportionality methods in a number of different spontaneous reporting databases is given in [Comparison of Statistical Detection Methods within and across Spontaneous Reporting Databases](#) (Drug Saf 2015; 38(6): 577-87).

Methods such as multiple logistic regression (that may use propensity score-adjustment) have the theoretical capability to reduce masking and confounding by co-medication and underlying disease. [Performance of Pharmacovigilance Signal Detection Algorithms for the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System](#) (Clin Pharmacol Ther 2013; 93(6):539-46) describes the performance of signal-detection algorithms for spontaneous reports in the US FDA adverse event reporting system against a benchmark constructed by the [Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership OMOP](#). It concludes that logistic regression performs better than traditional disproportionality analysis. Other studies have addressed similar or related matters, for example, [Large scale regression-based pattern discovery: the example of screening the WHO global drug safety database](#) (Stat. Anal. Data Min 2010; 3, 197–208), [Are all quantitative postmarketing signal detection methods equal? Performance characteristics of logistic regression and Multi-item Gamma Poisson Shrinker](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol. Drug Saf. 2012; 21, 622–630) and [Data-driven prediction of drug effects and interactions](#) (Sci. Transl. Med. 2012 4, 125ra31). The letter [Logistic regression in Signal detection: Another Piece added to the Puzzle](#) (Clin Pharmacol Ther 2013; 94 (3):312) highlights the variability of results obtained in different studies based on this method and the daunting computational task it requires. More work is needed on its value for pharmacovigilance in the real world.

A more recent proposal involves a broadening of the basis for computational screening of individual case safety reports, by considering multiple aspects of the strength of evidence in a predictive model. This approach combines disproportionality analysis with features such as the number of well-documented reports, the number of recent reports and geographical spread of the case series ([Improved statistical signal detection in pharmacovigilance by combining multiple strength-of-evidence aspects in vigiRank](#). Drug Saf 2014; 37(8): 617–28). In a similar spirit, logistic regression has been proposed to combine a disproportionality measure with a measure of unexpectedness for the time-to-onset distribution ([Use of logistic regression to combine two causality criteria for signal detection in vaccine spontaneous report data](#), Drug Saf 2014; 37(12):1047-57).

Masking is a statistical issue by which true signals of disproportionate reporting are hidden by the presence of other products in the database. While it is not currently perfectly understood, publications

have described methods assessing the extent and impact of the masking effect of measures of disproportionality. They include [A conceptual approach to the masking effect of measures of disproportionality](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2014;23(2):208-17), with an application described in [Assessing the extent and impact of the masking effect of disproportionality analyses on two spontaneous reporting systems databases](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2014;23(2):195-207), [Outlier removal to uncover patterns in adverse drug reaction surveillance - a simple unmasking strategy](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013;22(10):1119-29) and [A potential event-competition bias in safety signal detection: results from a spontaneous reporting research database in France](#) (Drug Saf 2013;36(7):565-72). The value of these methods in practice needs to be further investigated.

The [Guideline on the use of statistical signal detection methods in the Eudravigilance data analysis system](#) describes quantitative methods of disproportionality implemented in signal detection by the European Medicines Agency (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 healthcare professionals and involving authorised medicinal products.

A time-consuming step in signal detection of adverse reactions is the determination of whether an effect is already recorded in the product information. A database which can be searched for this information allows filtering or flagging reaction monitoring reports for signals related to unlisted reactions, thus improving considerably the efficiency of the signal detection process by allowing a comparison only to drugs for which the adverse event was not considered to be causally related. In research, it permits an evaluation of the effect of background restriction on the performance of statistical signal detection. An example of such database is the [PROTECT Database of adverse drug reactions \(EU SPC ADR database\)](#), a structured Excel database of all adverse drug reactions (ADRs) listed in section 4.8 of the Summary of Product Characteristics (SPC) of medicinal products authorised in the European Union (EU) according to the centralised procedure, based exclusively on the [Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities \(MedDRA\)](#) terminology.

Other large observational databases such as claims and electronic medical records databases are potentially useful as part of a larger signal detection and refinement strategy. [Modern methods of pharmacovigilance: detecting adverse effects of drugs](#) (Clin Med 2009;9(5):486-9) describes the strengths and weaknesses of different data sources for signal detection (spontaneous reports, electronic patient records and cohort-event monitoring). A number of studies have considered the use of observational data in electronic systems that complement existing methods of safety surveillance e.g. the [PROTECT](#), [EU-ADR](#), [OMOP](#) and [Sentinel](#) projects.

The EU [Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices \(GVP\) Module IX - Signal Management](#) defines signal management as the set of activities performed to determine whether, based on an examination of individual case safety reports (ICSRs), aggregated data from active surveillance systems or studies, literature information or other data sources, there are new risks associated with an active substance or a medicinal product or whether risks have changed. Signal management covers all steps from detecting signals (signal detection), through their validation and confirmation, analysis, prioritisation and assessment to recommending action, as well as the tracking of the steps taken and of any recommendations made.

The FDA's [Guidance for Industry-Good Pharmacovigilance Practices and Pharmacoepidemiologic Assessment](#) provides best practice for documenting, assessing and reporting individual case safety reports and case series and for identifying, evaluating, investigating and interpreting safety signals, including recommendations on data mining techniques and use of pharmacoepidemiological studies.

## 5. The statistical analysis plan

### 5.1. General considerations

There is a considerable body of literature explaining statistical methods for observational studies but very little addressing the statistical analysis plan. A clear guide to general principles and the need for a plan is given in *Design of Observational Studies* (P.R. Rosenbaum, Springer Series in Statistics, 2010.

Chapter18), which also gives useful advice on how to plan complex hypotheses in a way that controls the chances of drawing incorrect conclusions.

Planning analyses for randomised clinical trials is covered in a number of publications. These often give checklists of the component parts of an analysis plan 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-specification of statistical and epidemiological analyses can be challenging for data that are not collected specifically to answer the study questions. This is often the case in 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.

### 5.2. Statistical plan

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

1. A description of the study data sources, linkage methods, intended study population and study design with discussion of strengths and weaknesses.
2. The effect measures and statistical models used to address each primary and secondary objective.

3. Formal definitions of exposure including transformations to determine duration and quantity of exposure.
4. Formal definitions of any outcomes, for example 'fatal myocardial infarction' that might be defined as 'death within 30 days of a myocardial infarction'. Outcome variables based on historical data may involve complex transformations to approximate clinical variables not explicitly measured in the dataset used. These transformations should be discriminated from those made to improve the fit of a statistical model. In either case the rationale should be given. In the latter case this will include which tests of fit will be used and under what conditions a transformation will be used.
5. Formal definitions for other variables – e.g. thresholds for abnormal levels of blood parameters. When values of variables for a subject vary with time, care should be given to explaining how the values will be determined at each time point and recorded in the dataset for use in a statistical model.
6. Sample size considerations should be presented, making explicit the data source from which the expected variation of relevant quantities and the clinically relevant differences are derived. It should be noted that in observational studies on data that already exist and 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.
7. Blinding to exposure variables of evaluators making subjective judgments about the study.
8. Methods of dealing with confounding, including
  - 8.1. Prevention of confounding
    - 8.1.1. Restriction in analysis
    - 8.1.2. Matching, including PS matching
    - 8.1.3. Case-crossover designs
  - 8.2. Adjustment for confounders in statistical models
  - 8.3. Which confounders will be considered
  - 8.4. Criteria for any selection of a subset of confounders
  - 8.5. Methods for assessing the level of confounding adjustment achieved
  - 8.6. Sensitivity analyses for residual confounding
9. Handling of missing data, including
  - 9.1. How missing data will be reported;
  - 9.2. Methods of imputation;
  - 9.3. Sensitivity analyses for handling missing data;
  - 9.4. How censored data will be treated, with rationale.
10. Fit of the model – if considered for a predictive model, including
  - 10.1. Criteria for assessing fit;
  - 10.2. Alternative models in the event of clear lack of fit.
11. Interim analyses – if considered:
  - 11.1. 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.
12. How the achieved patient population will be characterised:
  - 12.1. Description of target population;
  - 12.2. Description of the analysis population if different, e.g. after PS matching or in IV analyses.
13. Treatment of multiplicity issues not elsewhere covered.

### 5.3. Handling of missing data

Missing data, or missing values, occur when no data value is stored for the variable in the current observation. Missing data are a common occurrence and can have a significant effect on the conclusions that can be drawn from the data.

The book *Statistical analysis with missing data* (Little RJA, Rubin DB. 2nd ed., Wiley 2002) describes many aspects of the handling of missing data. The section "Handling of missing values" in Rothman's *Modern Epidemiology*, 3rd ed. (K. Rothman, S. Greenland, T. Lash. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008) is a summary of the state of the art, focused on practical issues for epidemiologists. Ways of dealing with such data include complete subject analysis (subjects with missing values are deleted from the analyses) and imputation methods (missing data are predicted based on the observed values and the pattern of missingness). A method commonly used in epidemiology is to create a category of the variable, or an indicator, for the missing values. This practice can be invalid even if the data are missing completely at random and should be avoided ([Indicator and Stratification Methods for Missing Explanatory Variables in Multiple Linear Regression](#). J Am Stat Assoc 1996; 91(433): 222–230).

A concise review of methods to handle missing data is also provided in the section "Missing data" of the *Encyclopedia of Epidemiologic Methods* (Gail MH, Benichou J, Editors. Wiley 2000). The relevance of defining the pattern of missing data is outlined as some methods for handling missing data assume a defined pattern of missingness. Biased results may be obtained if it is assumed that data are missing at random. In general, it is desirable to show that conclusions drawn from the data are not sensitive to the particular strategy used to handle missing values. To investigate this, it may be helpful to repeat the analysis with a variety of approaches.

Other useful references on handling of missing data include the books *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys* (Rubin DB, Wiley, 1987) and *Analysis of Incomplete Multivariate Data* (Schafer JL, Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1997), and the articles [Using the outcome for imputation of missing predictor values was preferred](#) (J Clin Epi 2006; 59(10): 1092-101) and [Recovery of information from multiple imputation: a simulation study](#) (Emerg Themes Epidemiol 2012; 9(1): 3).

## 6. Quality management

Biomedical research is characterised by a tremendous expansion of knowledge in recent years and it is in the focus of public interest and discussions since the quality in biomedical research will result in quality of patient care. Quality is a measure of excellence or a state of being free from defects, deficiencies and significant variations and the quality management includes all the activities that organizations use to direct, control and coordinate quality (International Standards Organization, [ISO 9000](#)) and that managers carry out in effort to implement their quality policy. Quality management implies and consists in activities of quality planning, quality assurance, quality control and quality improvement.

Quality planning is defined as a set of activities whose purpose is to define quality system policies, objectives, and requirements, and to explain how these policies will be applied and achieved, and how these requirements will be met. Quality assurance (QA) defines the standards to be followed in order to meet the quality requirements for a product or service, whereas quality control (QC) ensures that these defined standards are followed at every step. Quality improvement refers to anything that enhances an organisation's ability to meet quality requirements. A further element of the quality of research is the introduction of an independent and objective audit of the QA/QC system and its outcomes. [Modern Approaches to Quality Control](#) (A.B. Eldin, Editor. Croatia: InTech Open Access, 2011) presents quality control processes in a variety of domains including, in Chapter 14, medical processes.

Rules, procedures, roles and responsibilities of QA and QC for clinical trials and biomedical research are well defined and described in many documents, such as Chapter 11 of the book [Principles of Good Clinical Practice](#) (M.J. McGraw, AN George, SP Shearn, eds., Pharmaceutical Press, London, 2010), the [ICH](#)

[Guideline for Good Clinical Practice E6\(R1\)](#), the [European Forum for Good Clinical Practice \(EFCGP\) Guidelines](#), the Imperial College Academic Health Science Centre (AHSC)'s [Quality Control and Quality Assurance SOP](#), the article [Quality by Design in Clinical Trials: A Collaborative Pilot With FDA](#) (Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science 2013; 47;161-6), or the article [Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Multicenter Trials: A Position Paper](#) (Control Clin Trials 1998;19(5);477-93).

For post-authorisation safety studies, Article 36 of the [Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) No 520/2012](#) states that the marketing authorisation holder conducting a post-authorisation safety study shall ensure that all study information is handled and stored so as to allow for accurate reporting, interpretation and verification of that information. It also requires that the analytical dataset and statistical programmes used for generating the data included in the final study report are kept in electronic format and are available for auditing and inspection. The [FDA's Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets](#) specifies that investigators should ensure that they are aware of the QA and QC procedures used by data holders and how procedures could affect data integrity and the study. It includes a list of topics which investigators should address in the design and conduct of the study. The article [Quality Assurance and Quality Control in Longitudinal Studies](#) (Epidemiol Rev 1998, 20(1);71-80) provides a comprehensive overview of components of QA and QC in multi-centre cohort studies with primary data collection. Such studies typically involve collection of an extensive amount of data for processing over an extended period of time and at several centres, with quality depending on a variety of factors relating to study personnel and equipment. It emphasises that the magnitude of the QC process in such studies should be considered an integral part of the design of the study and a condition for the validity of its results. [Quality assurance in non-interventional studies](#) (Ger Med Sci 2009; 7:Doc29: 1-14) proposes measures of quality assurance that can be applied at different stages of non-interventional studies without compromising the character of non-intervention. Chapter 11 'Data Collection and Quality Assurance' of the [AHRQ Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide](#), 3rd Edition, reviews key areas of data collection, cleaning, storing, and quality assurance for registries, with practical examples.

Relevant guidance also includes the [ISPE GPP](#), which points out ('Archiving' section) that copies of all quality assurance reports and audits should be included within the archived documents, the CIOMS [International Ethical Guidelines for Epidemiological Studies](#) and the AGENS, DGSMP and DGEpi [Good Practice in Secondary Data Analysis Version 2](#).

The following articles are practical examples of quality control implementation in pharmacovigilance and pharmacoepidemiological studies:

- [Training, Quality Assurance, and Assessment of Medical Record Abstraction in a Multisite Study](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2003;157:546-51) describes a practical approach to assurance of good quality control in a large multi-site study. It highlights that use of results of pharmacoepidemiological studies requires at least some consideration to and knowledge of the quality and validity of the data, ideally including some level of validation of the recording and coding for electronic data sets. It recommends that quality assurance should be mentioned in the study protocol and this may lead to proposals of sensitivity analyses.
- [Interviewer Variability – Quality Aspects in a Case–Control Study](#) (Eur J Epidemiol 2006;21(4);267-77) describes the procedures used to reduce interviewer variability, including procedures of quality assurance (i.e. education and training of interviewers and data validity checks) and quality control (i.e. a classification test, annual test interviews, expert case validation and database validation). It concludes that variability in interviewers' ability to ascertain and code information is a possible source of bias in interview-based case–control studies when blinding cannot be achieved.
- [Establishment of the nationwide Norwegian Prescription Database \(NorPD\) – new opportunities for research in pharmacoepidemiology in Norway](#). (Norsk epidemiologi 2008;18(2):129-36) describes the quality checks applied to the database.

- [Feasibility study and methodology to create a quality-evaluated database of primary care data](#) (Inform Prim Care 2004; 12(3): 171-7) describes a 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.
- [Validation and validity of diagnoses in the General Practice Research Database \(GPRD\): a systematic review](#) (Br J Clin Pharmacol 2010; 69: 4-14) assesses the quality of the methods used to validate diagnoses in the GPRD. The article contains methodological and reporting recommendations to further strengthen the use of the GPRD in research that are potentially applicable to other databases.
- [EuroDURG Quality Indicator Meeting \(DURQUIM\)](#) presents a report of a meeting which recommended indicators of prescribing quality in drug utilisation research [report published in full in [Indicators of prescribing quality in drug utilisation research: report of a European meeting \(DURQUIM, 13-15 May 2004\)](#) (Eur J Clin Pharmacol. 2005; 60(11):831-4)].
- [Data quality management in pharmacovigilance](#) (Drug Saf 2004; 27(12): 857-70) focusses on three first steps of data processing cycle (collection and data entry; storage and maintenance; selection, retrieval and manipulation), the different quality dimensions associated with these steps together with examples relevant to pharmacovigilance data.
- [A systematic literature review: Prescribing quality indicators for type 2 diabetes mellitus and cardiovascular risk management](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2010; 19(4): 319-34) provides an example of the assessment of validity of existing prescribing indicators.

## 7. Communication

### 7.1. Principles of communication

Aspects of research communication and reporting include, but are not limited to, reports to health authorities, sponsors, presentations in scientific fora, scientific publications, patient focused communications and websites.

The [Declaration of Helsinki](#) includes a section on Research Registration and Dissemination and Communication of Results stating that:

- Every research study involving human subjects must be registered in a publicly accessible database before recruitment of the first subject.
- Researchers, authors, sponsors, editors and publishers all have ethical obligations with regard to the publication and dissemination of the results of research. Researchers have a duty to make publicly available the results of their research on human subjects and are accountable for the completeness and accuracy of their reports.
- All parties should adhere to accepted guidelines for ethical reporting. Negative and inconclusive as well as positive results must be published or otherwise made publicly available. Sources of funding, institutional affiliations and conflicts of interest must be declared in the publication.
- Reports of research not in accordance with the principles of this Declaration should not be accepted for publication.

One of the objectives of the new EU pharmacovigilance legislation is to increase transparency as regards drug-safety issues. [Regulation \(EU\) No. 1235/2010](#) (Art. 26) obliges the European Medicines Agency (EMA) to publish on-line protocols and public abstracts of post-authorisation safety studies (PASS) concerning centrally-authorized medicinal products and imposed as an obligation to the marketing authorisation.

[Directive 2010/84/EC](#) (Art 102) specifies that Member States shall ensure that the public is given important information on pharmacovigilance concerns relating to the use of a medicinal product. Such information may include protocols and results of PASS. The [Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices \(GVP\) Module VIII - Post-authorisation safety studies](#) also recommends, for all PASS, registration of study information (including the protocol, amendments to the protocol, progress reports and final study report) in the public register of PASS maintained by the EMA ([EU PAS Register](#) - currently the ENCePP E-Register).

The purposes of the register are to increase transparency, reduce publication bias, facilitate collaborations within the scientific community and facilitate optimal use of pharmacoepidemiology and pharmacovigilance expertise in Europe by preventing unnecessary duplication of research. Registration of studies in the register is mandatory for studies seeking an '[ENCePP Study Seal](#)'.

## **7.2. Guidelines on communication**

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 [Guidance on the format and content of the final study report of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies](#) (PASS) provides a template for final study reports that may be applied to all non-interventional PASS, including meta-analyses and systematic reviews. The [FDA's Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets](#) includes a description of all the elements that should be addressed and included in the final study report of such studies.

The [Guidelines for Submitting Adverse Event Reports for Publication](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2007;16(5): 581–7) 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 and the 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](#) (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 considered a major limitation as 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 this Guide.

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 pre-defined 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 \(ICJME\) 'Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly work in Medical 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). [Module VI of the good pharmacovigilance practices](#) covers the requirements for management and reporting of adverse reactions to medicinal products to regulators in the EU.

## 8. Legal context

### **8.1. Ethical conduct, patient and data protection**

In Europe, EU and national laws determine what may and may not be done with regard to patient data access, data linkage and consent issues, including such domains as human rights and duty of confidentiality. Therefore, while individual data custodians may have differing requirements related to

what approvals are needed before data can be released, their requirements must fit within the overall need to meet all applicable EU and national legislation for the actual study. This includes situations where multi-country studies are being conducted and there may be transfer of data or information.

The [Declaration of Helsinki](#) and the provisions of the legislation on the protection of individuals with regard to the processing of personal data and on free movement of such data, as laid down in [Directive 95/46/EC](#) and [Regulation \(EC\) No 45/2001](#) of the European Parliament and of the Council, need to be followed in the EU in terms of the ethical conduct of studies. For interventional research, the [Directive 2001/20/EC](#) and the [Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice \(Commission Directive 2005/28/EC\)](#) apply. Directive 2001/20 EC will be repealed on the day of entry into application of the new Clinical Trials Regulation ([Regulation \(EU\) No 536/2014](#)). Marketing authorisation holders and investigators must also follow relevant national legislation and guidance of those Member States where the study is being conducted ([Directive 2001/83/EC](#) and [Directive 95/46/EC](#)).

Article 36 of the [Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) No. 520/2012](#) specifies that for post-authorisation safety studies (PASS) imposed as an obligation, marketing authorisation holders shall ensure that all study information is handled and stored so as to ensure that the confidentiality of the records of the study subjects remains. The [GVP Module VIII - Post-authorisation safety studies](#) recommends that these provisions should also be applied to PASS voluntarily initiated, managed or financed by a marketing authorisation holder.

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 ISPE GPP also recommends a stand-alone section within a study protocol that contains a description of plans for protecting human subjects. Such a section should include consideration of the need for submitting the protocol to an Institutional Review Board/Independent Ethics Committee and the requirement of informed consent. The main scope of the [International Epidemiological Association \(IEA\)](#) [Good Epidemiological Practice \(GEP\)](#) guideline 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 Organisations of Medical Sciences \(CIOMS\) 2002 International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects](#) prepared in collaboration with the World Health Organisation (WHO) consist of a statement of general ethical principles, a preamble and guidelines indicating how the ethical principles that should govern the conduct of biomedical research involving human subjects could be effectively applied. The CIOMS 2009 [International Ethical Guidelines for Epidemiological Studies](#) set forth ethical guidance on how investigators - 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 such research.

The [Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality \(AHRQ\)](#) published [Registries to Evaluate Patient Outcomes: a User's guide, Third Edition, 2014](#), which is a reference for establishing, maintaining and evaluating the success of registries created to collect data about patient outcomes. Section II: 'Legal and Ethical Considerations for Registries' is a specific chapter dedicated to ethics, data ownership, and privacy. The concepts within are useful although focused on US law.

The [Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly work in Medical Journals](#) by the [International Committee of Medical Journal Editors \(ICJME\)](#) include clear statements on ethical principles related to publication in biomedical journals. Authorship and contributorship, editorship, peer review, conflicts of interest, privacy and confidentiality and protection of human subjects and animals in research are addressed.

It should be kept in mind that the applicability of ethical requirements 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).

## **8.2. Pharmacovigilance legislation**

New pharmacovigilance legislation has been implemented in the European Union (EU) since July 2012 ([Regulation \(EU\) No. 1235/2010](#) and [Directive 2010/84/EC](#)). This legislation includes the possibility for regulatory authorities to impose on marketing authorisation holders the conduct of post-authorisation safety studies (PASS) as a condition of the marketing authorisation, a PASS being defined as *“any study relating to an authorised medicinal product conducted with the aim of identifying, characterising or quantifying a safety hazard, confirming the safety profile of the medicinal product, or of measuring the effectiveness of risk management measures.* Annex III of the [Commission Implementing Regulation \(EU\) No 520/2012](#) provides the format of protocols, abstracts and final study reports for such PASS imposed as an obligation by a competent authority. Based on these formats, the European Medicines Agency (EMA) published detailed templates for the format and content of the [protocol](#) and [final study report](#) which it recommends to be used for all PASS.

The [Guideline of good pharmacovigilance practices \(GVP\) Module VIII - Post-authorisation safety studies](#) describes practical aspects for the implementation of the new legislation and the operation of the EU medicines regulatory network. It provides a general guidance on the development, conduct and reporting of PASS conducted by marketing authorisation holders, voluntarily or pursuant to an obligation. Of note, the legislation provides legal definitions of the *start of data collection* (the date from which information on the first study subject is first recorded in the study dataset, or, in the case of secondary use of data, the date from which data extraction starts) and of the *end of data collection* (the date from which the analytical dataset is completely available). These dates provide timelines for the commencement of the study and the submission of the final study report to the competent authorities.

## **8.3. Reporting of adverse events/reactions**

The European Union (EU) obligations to companies sponsoring a post-authorisation study are specified in [Module VI of the Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practice \(GVP\) - Management and reporting of adverse reactions to medicinal products](#). For a non-interventional post-authorisation study which is not sponsored by a marketing authorisation holder, 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. In all circumstances, the adverse events/adverse reactions reported during the study should be summarised in the study report.

If the study qualifies as an interventional trial, the reporting criteria laid down in [Directive 2001/20/EC](#) and [Volume 10 of the Rules Governing Medicinal Products in the European Union](#) should be followed.

## **9. Specific topics**

A number of specific topics have been proposed by the ENCePP network for inclusion in this Guide as it is considered that they rapidly evolving and as such need highlighting. The following sections present such topics.

## 9.1. Comparative effectiveness research

### 9.1.1. Introduction

Comparative effectiveness research (CER) is designed to inform health-care decisions at the level of both policy and the individual by comparing the benefits and harms of therapeutic strategies available in routine practice, for the prevention, the diagnosis or the treatment of a given health condition. The interventions under comparison may be related to similar treatments, such as competing drugs, or different approaches, such as surgical procedures and drug therapy. The comparison may focus only on the relative medical benefits and risks of the different options or it may weigh both their costs and their benefits. [The methods of comparative effectiveness research](#) (Annu Rev Public Health 2012; 33: 425-45) defines the key elements of CER as (a) head-to-head comparison of active treatments, (b) study populations typical of day-to-day clinical practice, and (c) a focus on evidence to inform health care tailored to the characteristics of individual patients. In [What is Comparative Effectiveness Research](#), the Agency for Health Care Research (AHRQ) highlights that CER requires the development, expansion and use of a variety of data sources and methods to conduct timely and relevant research and disseminate the results in a form that is quickly usable. The evidence may come from a review and synthesis of available evidence from existing clinical trials or observational studies or from the conduct of studies that generate new evidence. In [Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide](#), AHRQ also highlights that CER is still a relatively new field of enquiry that has its origin across multiple disciplines and is likely to evolve and be refined over time.

Among resources for keeping up with the evolution in this field, the [US National Library of Medicine](#) provides a web site for queries on CER.

The terminology 'Relative effectiveness assessment (REA)' is also used when comparing multiple technologies or a new technology against standard of care, while "rapid" REA refers to performing an assessment within a limited timeframe in the case of a new marketing authorisation or a new indication granted for an approved medicine ([What is a rapid review? A methodological exploration of rapid reviews in Health Technology Assessments](#). Int J Evid Based Healthc. 2012;10(4):397-410).

### 9.1.2. General aspects

Several initiatives have promoted the conduct of CER and REA and proposed general methodological guidance to help in the design and analysis of such studies.

The [Methodological Guidelines for Rapid Relative Effectiveness Assessment of Pharmaceuticals](#) developed by [EUnetHTA](#) cover a broad spectrum of issues on REA. They address methodological challenges that are encountered by health technology assessors while performing rapid REA and provide and discuss practical recommendations on definitions to be used and how to extract, assess and present relevant information in assessment reports. Specific topics covered include the choice of comparators, strengths and limitations of various data sources and methods, internal and external validity of studies, the selection and assessment of endpoints (including composite and surrogate endpoints and Health Related Quality of Life [HRQoL]) and the evaluation of relative safety.

AHRQ's [Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide](#) identifies minimal standards and best practices for observational CER. It provides principles on a wide range of topics for designing research and developing protocols, with relevant questions to be addressed and checklists of key elements to be considered. The [GRACE Principles](#) provide guidance on the evaluation of the quality of observational CER studies to help decision-makers in recognizing high-quality studies and researchers in study design and conduct. A checklist to evaluate the quality of observational CER studies is also provided. [The International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research \(ISPOR\)](#) addressed several key issues of CER in three publications: [Part I](#) includes the selection of study

design and data sources and the reporting and interpretation of results in the light of policy questions; [Part II](#) relates to the validity and generalisability of study results, with an overview of potential threats to validity; [Part III](#) includes approaches to reducing such threats and, in particular, to controlling of confounding. The [draft Methodological Report](#) of the [Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute \(PCORI\)](#) provides standards for patient-centred outcome research that aims to improve the way research questions are selected, formulated and addressed, and findings reported. In a [Journal of Clinical Epidemiology series of articles](#), the [Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation \(GRADE\) working group](#) offers a structured process for rating quality of evidence and grading strength of recommendations in systematic reviews, health technology assessment and clinical practice guidelines. The GRADE group recommends individuals new to GRADE to first read the [6-part 2008 BMJ series](#).

A guideline on methods for performing systematic reviews of existing comparative effectiveness research has been published ([Methods Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews](#)).

### 9.1.3. Prominent issues in CER

#### 9.1.3.1. *Randomised clinical trials vs. observational studies*

While randomised clinical trials (RCT) are considered to provide the most robust evidence of the efficacy of therapeutic options, they are affected by well-recognised qualitative and quantitative limitations that may not reflect how the drug of interest will perform in real-life. Moreover, relatively few RCTs are traditionally designed using an alternative therapeutic strategy as a comparator, which limits the utility of the resulting data in establishing recommendations for treatment choices. For these reasons, other research methodologies such as pragmatic trials and observational studies may complement traditional explanatory RCTs in CER.

[Explanatory and Pragmatic Attitudes in Therapeutic Trials](#) (J Chron Dis 1967; republished in J Clin Epidemiol. 2009; 62(5):499-505) distinguishes between two approaches in designing clinical trials: the 'explanatory' approach, which seeks to understand differences between the effects of treatments administered in experimental conditions, and the 'pragmatic' approach which seeks to answer the practical question of choosing the best treatment administered in normal conditions of use. The two approaches affect the definition of the treatments, the assessment of results, the choice of subjects and the way in which the treatments are compared. [A pragmatic-explanatory continuum indicator summary \(PRECIS\): a tool to help trial designers](#) (CMAJ 2009; 180 (10):E47-57) quantifies ten distinguishing characteristics between pragmatic and explanatory trials to assist researchers in achieving the primary purpose of a trial. A checklist of eight items for the reporting of pragmatic trials was also developed as an extension of the CONSORT statement to facilitate the use of results from such trials in decisions about health-care ([Improving the reporting of pragmatic trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement](#). BMJ 2008; 337 (a2390):1-8).

The article [Why we need observational studies to evaluate effectiveness of health care](#) (BMJ 1996; 312(7040):1215-18) documents situations in the field of health care intervention assessment where observational studies are needed because randomised trials are unnecessary, inappropriate, impossible or inadequate. In a review of five interventions, [Randomized, controlled trials, observational studies, and the hierarchy of research designs](#) (N Engl J Med 2000; 342(25):1887-92) found that the results of well-designed observational studies (with either a cohort or case-control design) did not systematically overestimate the magnitude of treatment effects. [In defense of Pharmacoepidemiology- Embracing the Yin and Yang of Drug Research](#) (N Engl J Med 2007; 357(22):2219-21) shows that strengths and weaknesses of RCTs and observational studies make both designs necessary in the study of drug effects. However, [When are observational studies as credible as randomised trials](#) (Lancet 2004; 363(9422):1728-31) explains that observational studies are suitable for the study of adverse (non-

predictable) effects of drugs but should not be used for intended effects of drugs because of the potential for selection bias.

### **9.1.3.2. Use of electronic healthcare databases**

[A review of uses of health care utilization databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics](#) (J Clin Epidemiol. 2005;58(4):323-37) considers the application of health care utilisation databases to epidemiology and health services research, with particular reference to the study of medications. Information on relevant covariates and in particular on confounding factors may not be available or adequately measured in electronic healthcare databases. To overcome this limit, CER studies have integrated information from health databases with information collected ad hoc from study subjects (or from a subsample). [Enhancing electronic health record measurement of depression severity and suicide ideation: a Distributed Ambulatory Research in Therapeutics Network \(DARTNet\) study](#) (J Am Board Fam Med. 2012;25(5):582-93) shows the value of adding direct measurement methods and pharmacy claims data to data from electronic healthcare records participating in [DARTNet. Assessing medication exposures and outcomes in the frail elderly: assessing research challenges in nursing home pharmacotherapy](#) (Med Care 2010;48(6 Suppl):S23-31) describe how merging longitudinal electronic clinical and functional data from nursing home sources with Medicare and Medicaid claims data can support unique study designs in CER but pose many challenging design and analytic issues. [Pragmatic randomized trials using routine electronic health records: putting them to the test](#) (BMJ 2012;344:e55) discusses opportunities for using electronic healthcare records for conducting pragmatic trials.

### **9.1.3.3. Bias and confounding in observational CER**

Methodological issues and principles of Section 4 (Study design and methods) of the ENCePP Guide apply to CER as well as to research on safety and the textbooks cited in that chapter are recommended for consultation.

[Methods to assess intended effects of drug treatment in observational studies are reviewed](#) (J Clin Epidemiol 2004;57(12):1223-31) provides an overview of methods that seek to adjust for confounding in observational studies when assessing intended drug effects. [Developments in post-marketing comparative effectiveness research](#) (Clin Pharmacol Ther 2007;82(2):143-56) also reviews the roles of propensity scores (PS), instrumental variables and sensitivity analyses to reduce measured and unmeasured confounding in CER. Use of propensity scores and disease risk scores in the context of observational health-care programme research is described in [Summary Variables in Observational Research: Propensity Scores and Disease Risk Scores](#). More recently, high-dimensional propensity score (hd-PS) has been suggested as a method to further improve control for confounding as these variables may collectively be proxies for unobserved factors. Results presented in [High-dimensional propensity score adjustment in studies of treatment effects using health care claims data](#) (Epidemiology 2009;20(4):512-22) show that in a selected empirical evaluation, hd-PS improved confounding control compared to conventional PS adjustment when benchmarked against results from randomized controlled trials. See section 4.2.3.3 of the Guide for an in-depth discussion of propensity scores. Several methods can be considered to handle cofounders in non-experimental CER ([Confounding adjustment in comparative effectiveness research conducted within distributed research networks](#) (Med Care 2013 ; 51 : S4-S10); [Disease Risk Score \(DRS\) AS A Confounder Summary Method: Systematic Review and Recommendations](#) ( Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013; 22: 122–129). [Strategies for selecting variables for adjustment in non-experimental CER](#) have also been proposed (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013; 22: 1139–1145).

A reason for discrepancies between results of randomised trials and observational studies may be the use of prevalent drug users in the latter. [Evaluating medication effects outside of clinical trials: new-user designs](#) (Am J Epidemiol. 2003;158(9):915-20) explains the biases introduced by use of prevalent drug users and how a new-user (or incident user) design eliminate these biases by restricting analyses to

persons under observation at the start of the current course of treatment. [The Incident User Design in Comparative Effectiveness Research](#) reviews published CER case studies in which investigators had used the incident user design, discusses its strength (reduced bias) and weakness (reduced precision of comparative effectiveness estimates) and provides recommendations to investigators considering to use this design. [The value of incident user design and exceptions has been reviewed](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2013; 22: 1–6).

## **9.2. Vaccine safety and effectiveness**

### **9.2.1. Vaccine safety**

#### **9.2.1.1. General aspects**

Specific aspects of vaccines to be considered in pharmacovigilance and pharmacoepidemiology have been highlighted in several documents. The [report of the CIOMS/WHO Working Group on Definition and Application of Terms for Vaccine Pharmacovigilance \(2012\)](#) emphasises that characteristics of the vaccine and the vaccinated population, settings and circumstances of vaccine administration and data analysis issues are worthy of special attention in vaccine safety monitoring. It also provides definitions and explanatory notes for the terms 'vaccine pharmacovigilance', 'vaccination failure' and 'adverse event following immunisation (AEFI)'. Recommendations on vaccine-specific aspects of the EU pharmacovigilance system, including on risk management, signal detection and post-authorisation safety studies (PASS) are presented in the [Module P.I: Vaccines for prophylaxis against infectious diseases](#) of the Good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP).

Methods for vaccine pharmacovigilance have been developed by the [Brighton Collaboration](#), which provides [resources](#) to facilitate and harmonise collection, analysis and presentation of vaccine safety data, including case definitions, an electronic tool to help the classification of reported signs and symptoms, template protocols and guidelines. [Module 4 \(Surveillance\)](#) of the e-learning training course [Vaccine Safety Basics](#) of the World Health Organization describes pharmacovigilance principles, causality assessment procedures, surveillance systems and factors influencing the risk-benefit balance of vaccines.

#### **9.2.1.2. Signal detection**

The GVP [Module P.I: Vaccines for prophylaxis against infectious diseases](#) describes issues to be considered when applying methods for disproportionality analyses for vaccines, including the choice of the comparator group and the use of stratification. [Effects of stratification on data mining in the US Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System \(VAERS\)](#) (Drug Saf 2008; 31(8):667-74) demonstrates that stratification can reveal and reduce confounding and unmask some vaccine-event pairs not found by crude analyses. However, [Stratification for Spontaneous Report Databases](#) (Drug Saf 2008; 31(11):1049-52) highlights that extensive use of stratification in signal detection algorithms should be avoided. [Vaccine-Based Subgroup Analysis in VigiBase: Effect on Sensitivity in Paediatric Signal Detection](#) (Drug Saf 2012; 35(4)335-346) further examines the effects of subgroup analyses based on the relative distribution of vaccine/non-vaccine reports in paediatric ADR data.

Four techniques are compared in [Comparing data mining methods on the VAERS database](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2005; 14(9):601-9: empirical Bayes geometric mean (EBGM), lower-bound of the EBGM's 90% confidence interval (EB05), proportional reporting ratio (PRR), and screened PRR (SPRR) and concludes the value of each method varies according to the situation.

The article [Adverse events associated with pandemic influenza vaccines: comparison of the results of a follow-up study with those coming from spontaneous reporting](#) (Vaccine 2011; 29(3):519-22) reported different patterns of reactions observed with two methods compared for first characterisation of the post-marketing safety profile of a new vaccine, which may impact on signal detection.

### 9.2.1.3. Signal refinement

When prompt decision-making about a safety concern is required and there is insufficient time to review individual cases, the GVP [Module P.I: Vaccines for prophylaxis against infectious diseases](#) suggests the conduct of observed vs. expected (O/E) analyses for signal validation and preliminary signal evaluation. The module discusses key requirements of O/E analyses: the observed number of cases detected in a passive or active surveillance systems, near real-time exposure data, appropriately stratified background incidence rates (to calculate the expected number of cases) and sensitivity analyses around these measures.

[Human papilloma virus immunization in adolescents and young adults: a cohort study to illustrate what events might be mistaken for adverse reactions](#) (Pediatr Infect Dis J 2007; 26(11):979-84) and [Health problems most commonly diagnosed among young female patients during visits to general practitioners and gynecologists in France before the initiation of the human papillomavirus vaccination program](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012; 21(3):261-80) illustrate the importance of collecting background rates by estimating risks of coincident associations of emergency consultations, hospitalisations and outpatients consultations with vaccination. Rates of selected disease events for several countries also vary by age, sex, method of ascertainment and geography, as shown in [Importance of background rates of disease in assessment of vaccine safety during mass immunisation with pandemic H1N1 influenza vaccines](#) (Lancet 2009; 374(9707):2115-22).

Simple “snapshot” O/E analyses are easy to perform but may not be appropriate for continuous monitoring due to inflation of type 1 error rates when multiple tests are performed. [Safety monitoring of Influenza A/H1N1 pandemic vaccines in EudraVigilance](#) (Vaccine 2011; 29(26):4378-87) illustrates that simple “snapshot” O/E analyses are also affected by uncertainties regarding the numbers of vaccinated individuals and age-specific background incidence rates.

Sequential methods, as described in [Early detection of adverse drug events within population-based health networks: application of sequential methods](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2007; 16(12):1275-1284), allow O/E analyses to be performed on a routine (e.g. weekly) basis using cumulative data with adjustment for multiplicity. Such methods are routinely used for near-real time surveillance in the [Vaccine Safety Datalink](#) (VSD) ([Near real-time surveillance for influenza vaccine safety: proof-of-concept in the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project](#). Am J Epidemiol 2010; 171(2):177-88). Potential issues are described in [Challenges in the design and analysis of sequentially monitored postmarket safety surveillance evaluations using electronic observational health care data](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012; 21(S1):62-71). A review of signals detected over 3 years with these methods in VSD concluded that care with data quality, outcome definitions, comparison groups and length of surveillance is required to enable detection of true safety problems while controlling error rates ([Active surveillance for adverse events: the experience of the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project](#) (Pediatrics 2011; 127(S1):S54-S64). Sequential methods are, therefore, more robust but also more complex to perform, understand and communicate to a non-statistical audience.

[A new self-controlled case series method for analyzing spontaneous reports of adverse events after vaccination](#) (Am J Epidemiol 2013; 178(9):1496-504) extends the self-controlled case series approach to explore and quantify vaccine safety signals from spontaneous reports. It uses parametric and nonparametric versions with different assumptions to account for the specific features of the data (large amount of underreporting and variation of reporting with time since vaccination). The method should be seen as a signal strengthening approach for exploring a signal based on spontaneous reports prior to a pharmacoepidemiologic study, if any. It was used to document the risk of intussusception after rotavirus vaccines (see [Intussusception after Rotavirus Vaccination — Spontaneous Reports](#); N Engl J Med 2011; 365:2139).

#### 9.2.1.4. Hypothesis testing studies

Traditional study designs such as cohort and case-control studies may be difficult to implement for vaccines where studies involve populations with high vaccine coverage rates, an appropriate unvaccinated group is lacking or adequate information on covariates at the individual level is not available. Frequent sources of confounding to be considered are socioeconomic status, underlying health status and other factors influencing the probability of being vaccinated. [Control without separate controls: evaluation of vaccine safety using case-only methods](#) (Vaccine 2004; 22(15-16):2064-70) describes and illustrates epidemiological methods that are useful in such situations as they only involve cases:

- The case-coverage method uses exposure information on cases and population data on vaccination coverage to serve as control. It requires reliable and detailed vaccine coverage data corresponding to the population from which cases are drawn and permitting control of confounding by stratified analysis. During vaccine introduction, it is also particularly important to address selection bias introduced by awareness of possible occurrence of an outcome. An example of a study using a case-coverage method is [Risk of narcolepsy in children and young people receiving AS03 adjuvanted pandemic A/H1N1 2009 influenza vaccine: retrospective analysis](#) (BMJ 2013; 346:f794).
- The case-crossover method requires the strong assumption that the underlying probability of vaccination should be the same in all defined time intervals, but this is unlikely to hold for paediatric vaccines administered according to strict schedules or for seasonally administered vaccines.
- The self-controlled case series (SCCS) design is described in section 4.2.3 of the Guide.

The study [Control without separate controls: evaluation of vaccine safety using case-only methods](#) (Vaccine 2004; 22(15-16):2064-70) concludes that properly designed and analysed epidemiological studies using only cases may provide, especially the SCCS method, stronger evidence than large cohort studies as they control completely for individual-level confounders and typically have similar, sometimes better, power. Three factors are however critical in making optimal use of such methods: access to good data on cases, computerised vaccination records with the ability to link them to cases and availability of appropriate analysis techniques.

Several studies on vaccines have compared traditional and case-only study designs:

- [Epidemiological designs for vaccine safety assessment: methods and pitfalls](#) (Biologicals 2012; 40(5): 389-92) used three study designs (cohort, case-control and self-controlled case series) to illustrate the issues that may arise when designing an epidemiological study, such as understanding the vaccine safety question, case definition and finding, limitations of data sources, uncontrolled confounding, and pitfalls that apply to the individual designs.
- [Comparison of epidemiologic methods for active surveillance of vaccine safety](#) (Vaccine 2008; 26(26):3341-3345) performed a simulation study to compare four designs (matched-cohort, vaccinated-only (risk interval) cohort, case-control and self-controlled case series) in the context of vaccine safety surveillance. The cohort study design allowed for the most rapid signal detection, the least false-positive error and highest statistical power in performing sequential analysis. The authors highlight, however, that the chief limitation of this simulation is the exclusion of confounding effects and the lack of chart review, which is a time and resource intensive requirement.
- Another simulation study ([Four different study designs to evaluate vaccine safety were equally validated with contrasting limitations](#). J Clin Epidemiol 2006; 59(8):808-818) compared four study designs (cohort, case-control, risk-interval and SCCS) with the conclusion that all the methods were valid designs, with contrasting strengths and weaknesses. The SCCS method, in particular, proved to be an efficient and valid alternative to the cohort method.

- [Hepatitis B vaccination and first central nervous system demyelinating events: Reanalysis of a case-control study using the self-controlled case series method](#). Vaccine 2007; 25(31):5938-43) describes how the SCCS found similar results as the case-control study but with greater precision as it used cases without matched controls excluded from the case-control analysis. This is at the cost of the assumption that exposures are independent of earlier events. The authors recommended that, if case-control studies of vaccination and adverse events are undertaken, parallel case-series analyses should also be conducted, where appropriate.

In situations where primary data collection is needed (e.g. a pandemic), the SCCS may not be timely since follow-up time needs to be accrued. In such instances, the Self-controlled Risk Interval (SCRI) method can be used to shorten the observation time (see [The risk of Guillain-Barre Syndrome associated with influenza A \(H1N1\) 2009 monovalent vaccine and 2009-2010 seasonal influenza vaccines: Results from self-controlled analyses](#). Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Safety 2012; 21(5):546-52), historical background rates can be used for an O/E analysis (see [Near real-time surveillance for influenza vaccine safety: proof-of-concept in the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project](#). Am J Epidemiol 2010; 171(2):177-88) or a case-control study can be performed, as used in [Guillain-Barré syndrome and adjuvanted pandemic influenza A \(H1N1\) 2009 vaccine: multinational case-control study in Europe](#). BMJ 2011; 343:d3908).

Ecological analyses should not be considered hypothesis testing studies. See [section 4.4](#) of this Guide.

#### **9.2.1.5. Meta-analyses**

[A systematic review evaluating the potential for bias and the methodological quality of meta-analyses in vaccinology](#) (Vaccine 2007; 25(52):8794-806) provides a comprehensive overview of the methodological quality and limitations of 121 meta-analyses of vaccine studies. [Association between Guillain-Barré syndrome and influenza A \(H1N1\) 2009 monovalent inactivated vaccines in the USA: a meta-analysis](#) (Lancet 2013; 381(9876):1461-8) describes a self-controlled risk-interval design in a meta-analysis of six studies at the patient level with a reclassification of cases according to the Brighton Collaboration classification.

#### **9.2.1.6. Studies on vaccine safety in special populations**

The article [Vaccine safety in special populations](#) (Hum Vaccin 2011; 7(2):269-71) highlights common methodological issues that may arise in evaluating vaccine safety in special populations, especially infants and children, who often differ in important ways from healthy individuals and change rapidly during the first few years of life.

Observational studies on vaccine adverse effects during pregnancy (especially on pregnancy loss), which often use pregnancy registries or healthcare databases, are faced with three challenges: embryonic and early foetal loss are often not recognised or recorded, data on the gestational age at which these events occur are often missing, and the likelihood of vaccination increases with gestational age whereas the likelihood of foetal death decreases. [Assessing the effect of vaccine on spontaneous abortion using time-dependent covariates Cox models](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2012; 21(8):844-850) demonstrates that rates of spontaneous abortion can be severely underestimated without survival analysis techniques using time-dependent covariates to avoid immortal time bias and shows how to fit such models. [Risk of miscarriage with bivalent vaccine against human papillomavirus \(HPV\) types 16 and 18: pooled analysis of two randomised controlled trials](#) (BMJ 2010; 340:c712) explains methods to calculate rates of miscarriage, address the lack of knowledge of time of conception during which vaccination might confer risk and perform subgroup and sensitivity analyses. The [Systematic overview of data sources for drug safety in pregnancy research](#) provides an inventory of pregnancy exposure registries and alternative data sources useful to assess the safety of prenatal vaccine exposure.

Few vaccine studies are performed in immunocompromised subjects. [Influenza vaccination for immunocompromised patients: systematic review and meta-analysis by etiology](#) (J Infect Dis

2012;206(8):1250-9) illustrates the importance of performing stratified analyses by aetiology of immunocompromise and possible limitations due to residual confounding, differences within and between etiological groups and small sample size in some etiological groups. Further research is needed on this topic.

## **9.2.2. Vaccine effectiveness**

### **9.2.2.1. Definitions**

[Vaccine effects and impact of vaccination programmes in post-licensure studies](#) (Vaccine 2013; 31(48):5634-42) reviews and delineates, among the various evaluations of vaccine intervention, what applies to the effectiveness of vaccine and to the impact of vaccination programmes, proposes epidemiological measures of public health impact, describes relevant methods to measure these effects and discusses the assumptions and potential biases involved.

### **9.2.2.2. Traditional cohort and case-control studies**

Generic protocols for [retrospective case-control studies](#) and [retrospective cohort studies](#) to assess the effectiveness of rotavirus vaccination in EU Member States based on computerised databases were published by the European Centre for Disease Prevention and Control ([ECDC](#)). They describe the information that should be collected by country and region in vaccine effectiveness studies and the data sources that may be available to identify virus-related outcomes a vaccine is intended to avert, including hospital registers, computerised primary care databases, specific surveillance systems (i.e. laboratory surveillance, hospital surveillance, primary care surveillance) and laboratory registers. Based on a meta-analysis comprising 49 cohort studies and 10 case-control studies, [Efficacy and effectiveness of influenza vaccines in elderly people: a systematic review](#) (Lancet 2005; 366(9492): 1165-74) highlights the heterogeneity of outcomes and study populations included in such studies and the high likelihood of selection bias.

Non-specific effects of vaccines, such as a decrease of mortality, have been claimed in observational studies but generally result from bias and confounding. [Data collection in observational studies](#) (Trop Med Int Health 2009; 14(9):969-76.) and [Methodological issues in the design and analysis of cohort studies](#) (Trop Med Int Health 2009; 14(9):977-85) provide recommendations for vaccine observational studies conducted in countries with high mortality; these recommendations have wider relevance.

### **9.2.2.3. Screening method**

The screening method estimates vaccine effectiveness (VE) by comparing vaccination coverage in positives cases of a disease (e.g. influenza) with the vaccination coverage in the population where the cases derived from (e.g., the same age group). If representative data on cases and vaccination coverage are available, it can provide an inexpensive and ready-to-use method that can be useful in providing early VE estimates or identifying changes over time. However, [Application of the screening method to monitor influenza vaccine effectiveness among the elderly in Germany](#) (BMC Infect Dis. 2015; 15(1):137) emphasises that accurate and age-specific vaccine coverage rates are crucial to provide valid VE estimates. Since adjusting for important confounders and the assessment of product-specific VE is generally not possible, this method should be considered only a supplementary tool for assessing crude VE.

### **9.2.2.4. Indirect cohort (*Broome*) method**

The indirect cohort method is a case-control type design which uses cases caused by non-vaccine serotypes as controls. [Use of surveillance data to estimate the effectiveness of the 7-valent conjugate pneumococcal vaccine in children less than 5 years of age over a 9 year period](#) (Vaccine

2012;30(27):4067-72) applied this method to evaluate the effectiveness of a pneumococcal conjugate vaccine against invasive pneumococcal disease (IPD) and compared the results to the effectiveness measured using a standard case-control study conducted during the same time period. The authors considered the method would be most useful shortly after vaccine introduction, and less useful in a setting of very high vaccine coverage and fewer vaccine-type cases. [Using the Indirect Cohort Design to Estimate the Effectiveness of the Seven Valent Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine in England and Wales](#) (PLoS ONE 6(12):e28435. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0028435) describes how the method was used to estimate effectiveness of various numbers of doses as well as for each vaccine serotype.

#### **9.2.2.5. Density case-control design**

[Effectiveness of live-attenuated Japanese encephalitis vaccine \(SA14-14-2\): a case-control study](#) (Lancet 1996;347(9015):1583-6) describes a case control study of incident cases in which the control group consisted of all village-matched children of a given age who were at risk of developing disease at the time that the case occurred (density sampling). The effect measured is an incidence density rate ratio.

#### **9.2.2.6. Test negative design**

The article [The test-negative design for estimating influenza vaccine effectiveness](#) (Vaccine 2013;31(17):2165-8) explains the rationale, assumptions and analysis of the test-negative study as applied to influenza VE. Study subjects are all persons who seek care for an acute respiratory illness and influenza VE is estimated from the ratio of the odds of vaccination among subjects testing positive for influenza to the odds of vaccination among subject testing negative. This design is less susceptible to bias due to misclassification of infection and the confounding by health care-seeking behaviour, at the cost of difficult-to-test assumptions.

[Effectiveness of rotavirus vaccines in preventing cases and hospitalizations due to rotavirus gastroenteritis in Navarre, Spain](#) (Vaccine 2012;30(3):539-43) evaluates effectiveness using a test negative case-control design based on electronic clinical reports. Cases were children with confirmed rotavirus and controls were those who tested negative for rotavirus in all samples. The test-negative design was based on an assumption that the rate of gastroenteritis caused by pathogens other than rotavirus is the same in both vaccinated and unvaccinated persons. This approach may rule out differences in parental attitude when seeking medical care and of physician differences in making decisions about stool sampling or hospitalisation. A limitation is sensitivity of antigen detection which may underestimate vaccine effectiveness. In addition, if virus serotype is not available, it is not possible to study the association between vaccine failure and a possible mismatch of vaccine strains and circulating strains of virus.

The article [2012/13 influenza vaccine effectiveness against hospitalised influenza A\(H1N1\)pdm09, A\(H3N2\) and B: estimates from a European network of hospitals](#) (EuroSurveill 2015;20(2):pii=21011) illustrates a multicentre test-negative case-control study to estimate influenza VE in 18 hospitals. It is believed that confounding due to health-seeking behaviour is minimised since, in the study sites, all people needing hospitalisation are likely to be hospitalised. The study [Trivalent inactivated seasonal influenza vaccine effectiveness for the prevention of laboratory-confirmed influenza in a Scottish population 2000 to 2009](#) (EuroSurveill 2015;20(8):pii=21043) applied this method using a Scotland-wide linkage of patient-level primary care, hospital and virological swab data over nine influenza seasons and discusses strengths and weaknesses of the design in this context.

#### **9.2.2.7. Case coverage design**

This design is described in [section 9.2.1.4](#).

#### **9.2.2.8. Impact assessment**

A generic study protocol to assess [the impact of rotavirus vaccination](#) in EU Member States has been published by the ECDC. It recommends the information that needs to be collected to compare the incidence/proportion of rotavirus cases in the period before the introduction of the vaccine to the incidence/proportion of rotavirus cases in the period following the introduction of the vaccine. These generic protocols need to be adapted to each country/regions and specific situation.

The impact of vaccination can be quantified in children in the age group targeted for the vaccine (overall effect) or in children of other age groups (indirect effect). The direct effect of a vaccine, however, needs to be defined by the protection it confers given a specific amount of exposure to infection and not just a comparable exposure. [Direct and indirect effects in vaccine efficacy and effectiveness](#) (Am J Epidemiol 1991; 133(4):323-31) describes how parameters intended to measure direct effects must be robust and interpretable in the midst of complex indirect effects of vaccine intervention programmes.

[Impact of rotavirus vaccination in regions with low and moderate vaccine uptake in Germany](#) (Hum Vaccin Immunother 2012; 8(10):1407-15) describes an impact assessment of rotavirus vaccination comparing the incidence rates of hospitalisations before, and in seasons after, vaccine introduction using data from national mandatory disease reporting system.

[First year experience of rotavirus immunisation programme in Finland](#) (Vaccine 2012; 31(1):176-82) estimates the impact of a rotavirus immunisation programme on the total hospital inpatient and outpatient treated acute gastroenteritis burden and on severe rotavirus disease burden during the first year after introduction. The study may be considered as a vaccine-probe-study, where unspecific disease burden prevented by immunisation is assumed to be caused by the agent the vaccine is targeted against.

#### **9.2.2.9. Methods to study waning immunity**

The study of vaccine effectiveness against diseases where immunity wanes over time requires consideration of both the within-host dynamics of the pathogen and immune system as well as the associated population-level transmission dynamics. [Implications of vaccination and waning immunity](#) (Proc Biol Sci 2009; 276(1664):2071-80) seeks to combine immunological and epidemiological models for measles infection to examine the interplay between disease incidence, waning immunity and boosting.

### **9.3. Design and analysis of pharmacogenetic studies**

#### **9.3.1. Introduction**

Individual variation in the response to drugs is an important clinical issue and may range from a lack of therapeutic effect to serious adverse drug reactions.

Pharmacogenetics is defined as the study of genetic variation as a determinant of drug response. It can complement information on clinical factors and disease sub-phenotypes to optimise the prediction of treatment response.

This heterogeneity of response has important policy implications if individual patients not responding to conventional agents are denied access to other agents based on clinical trial evidence and systematic reviews that show no overall benefit. While clinical variables such as disease severity, age, concomitant drug use and illnesses are potentially important determinants of the response to drugs, heterogeneity in drug disposition (absorption, metabolism, distribution, and excretion) and targets (such as receptors and signal transduction modulators) may be an important cause of inter-individual variability in the therapeutic effects of drugs (see [Pharmacogenomics: translating functional genomics into rational therapeutics](#). Science 1999; 286(5439):487-91). Identification of variation in genes which modify the response to drugs provides the opportunity to optimise safety and effectiveness of the currently available

drugs and develop new drugs (see [Drug discovery: a historical perspective](#). Science 2000;287(5460):1960-4).

### 9.3.2. Identification of genetic variants

Identification of genetic variation associated with important drug or therapy-related outcomes can follow two main approaches.

The first approach is the candidate gene approach in which as many as dozens to thousands of genetic variations within one or several genes, including a common form of variations known as single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), are genotyped, including the coding and noncoding sequence. Generally they are chosen on the grounds of biological plausibility, which may have been proven before in previous studies, or of knowledge of functional genes known to be involved in pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamics pathways or related to the disease or intermediate phenotype. [Methodological and statistical issues in pharmacogenomics](#) (J Pharm Pharmacol 2010;62(2):161-6) discusses pros and cons of a candidate gene approach and a genome-wide scan approach (see below), and [A tutorial on statistical methods for population association studies](#) (Nat Rev Genet 2006;7(10):781-91) gives an outline of key methods that can be used. The advantage of the candidate gene approach is that resources can be directed to several important genetic polymorphisms and the higher a priori chance of relevant drug-gene interactions. This approach, however, requires a priori information about the likelihood of the polymorphism, gene, or gene-product interacting with a drug or drug pathway. [Moving towards individualized medicine with pharmacogenomics](#) (Nature 2004;429:464-8) explains that lack or incompleteness of information on genes from previous studies may result in the failure in identifying every important genetic determinant in the genome.

The second approach is hypothesis-generating or hypothesis-agnostic, known as genome-wide, which identifies genetic variants across the whole genome. By comparing the frequency of genetic or SNP markers between drug responders and non-responders, or those with or without drug toxicity, important genetic determinants are identified. In this approach, no previous information or specific gene/variant hypothesis is needed. Because of the concept of linkage disequilibrium, whereby certain genetic determinants tend to be co-inherited together, it is possible that the genetic associations identified through a genome-wide approach may not be truly biologically functional polymorphisms, but instead may simply be a linkage-related marker of another genetic determinant that is the true biologically relevant genetic determinant. Thus, this approach is considered discovery in nature. It may detect the SNPs in genes, which were previously not considered as candidate genes, or even SNPs outside of the genes. Nonetheless, failure to cover all relevant genetic risk factors can still be a problem, though less than with the candidate gene approach. It is therefore important to conduct replication and validation studies (in vivo and in vitro) to ascertain the generalisability of findings to populations of patients, to characterise the mechanistic basis of the effect of these genes on drug action, and to identify true biologic genetic determinants. This approach is useful for studying complex diseases where multiple genetic variations contribute to disease risk, but are applicable to disease and treatment outcomes. Various genome-wide approaches are currently available including genome and exome sequencing, and application of various chips that type hundreds of thousands to billions of SNPs (e.g. exome chip). Finally, power is usually limited to detect only common variants with a large effect, and therefore large sample sizes should be considered, e.g. through pooling of biobanks.

### 9.3.3. Study designs

Several options are available for the design of pharmacogenetic studies. Firstly, randomised controlled clinical trials (RCTs), both pre- and post-authorisation, provide the opportunity to address several pharmacogenetic questions. [Pharmacogenetics in randomized controlled trials: considerations for trial design](#) (Pharmacogenomics 2011;12(10):1485-92) describes three different trial designs differing in the

timing of randomization and genotyping, and [Promises and challenges of pharmacogenetics: an overview of study design, methodological and statistical issues](#) (JRSM Cardiovasc Dis 2012 5;1(1)) discusses outstanding methodological and statistical issues that may lead to heterogeneity among reported pharmacogenetic studies and how they may be addressed. Pharmacogenetic trials can be designed (or post hoc analysed) with the intention to study whether a subgroup of patients, defined by certain genetic characteristics, respond differently to the treatment under study. Alternatively, a trial can verify whether genotype-guided treatment is beneficial over standard care. Obvious limitations with regard to the assessment of rare adverse drug events are the large sample size required and its related high costs. In order to make a trial as efficient as possible in terms of time, money and/or sample size, it is possible to opt for an adaptive trial design, which allows prospectively planned modifications in design after patients have been enrolled in the study. Such a design uses accumulating data to decide how to modify aspects of the study during its progress, without undermining the validity and integrity of the trial. An additional benefit is that the expected number of patients exposed to an inferior/harmful treatment can be reduced (see [Potential of adaptive clinical trial designs in pharmacogenetic research](#). Pharmacogenomics 2012;13(5):571-8).

Observational studies are the alternative and can be family-based (using twins or siblings) or population-based (unrelated individuals). The main advantage of family-based studies is the avoidance of bias due to population stratification. A clear practical disadvantage for pharmacogenetic studies is the requirement to study families where patients have been treated with the same drugs (see [Methodological quality of pharmacogenetic studies: issues of concern](#). Stat Med 2008;27(30):6547-69).

Population-based studies may be designed to assess drug-gene interactions as cohort (including exposure-only), case-cohort and case-control studies (including case-only, as described in [Nontraditional epidemiologic approaches in the analysis of gene-environment interaction: case-control studies with no controls!](#) Am J Epidemiol 1996;144(3):207-13). Sound pharmacoepidemiological principles as described in the current Guide also apply to observational pharmacogenetic studies. A specific type of confounding due to population stratification needs to be considered in pharmacogenetic studies, and, if present, needs to be dealt with. Its presence may be obvious where the study population includes more than one immediately recognisable ethnic group; however in other studies stratification may be more subtle. Population stratification can be detected by [Pritchard and Rosenberg's method](#), which involves genotyping additional SNPs in other areas of the genome and testing for association between them and outcome. In genome-wide association studies, the data contained within the many SNPs typed can be used to assess population stratification without the need to undertake any further genotyping. Several methods have been suggested to control for population stratification such as genomic control, structure association and EIGENSTAT. These methods are discussed in [Methodological quality of pharmacogenetic studies: issues of concern](#) (Stat Med 2008;27(30):6547-69) and [Softwares and methods for estimating genetic ancestry in human populations](#) (Hum Genomics 2013;7:1).

The main advantage of exposure-only and case-only designs is the smaller sample size that is required, at the cost of not being able to study the main effects of drug exposure (case-only) or genetic variant (exposure-only) on the outcome. Furthermore, interaction can be assessed only on a multiplicative scale, whereas from a public health perspective additive interactions are very relevant. An important condition that has to be fulfilled for case-only studies is that the exposure is independent of the genetic variant, e.g. prescribers are not aware of the genotype of a patient and do not take this into account, directly or indirectly (by observing clinical characteristics associated with the genetic variant). In the exposure-only design, the genetic variant should not be associated with the outcome, for example variants of genes coding for cytochrome p-450 enzymes. When these conditions are fulfilled and the main interest is in the drug-gene interaction, these designs may be an efficient option. In practice, case-control and case-only studies usually result in the same interaction effect as empirically assessed in [Bias in the case-only design applied to studies of gene-environment and gene-gene interaction: a systematic review and meta-analysis](#) (Int J Epidemiol 2011;40(5):1329-41). The assumption of independence of genetic and exposure

factors can be verified among controls before proceeding to the case-only analysis. [Further development of the case-only design for assessing gene-environment interaction: evaluation of and adjustment for bias](#) (Int J Epidemiol 2004;33(5):1014-24) conducted sensitivity analyses to describe the circumstances in which controls can be used as proxy for the source population when evaluating gene-environment independence. The gene-environment association in controls will be a reasonably accurate reflection of that in the source population if baseline risk of disease is small (<1%) and the interaction and independent effects are moderate (i.e. risk ratio<2), or if the disease risk is low (e.g. <5%) in all strata of genotype and exposure. Furthermore, non-independence of gene-environment can be adjusted in multivariable models if non-independence can be measured in controls.

#### 9.3.4. Data collection

The same principles and approaches to data collection as for other pharmacoepidemiological studies can be followed (see section 3 of this Guide on Approaches to Data Collection). An efficient approach to data collection for pharmacogenetic studies is to combine secondary use of electronic health records with primary data collection (e.g. biological samples to extract DNA).

Examples are given by [SLCO1B1 genetic variant associated with statin-induced myopathy: a proof-of-concept study using the clinical practice research datalink](#) (Clin Pharmacol Ther 2013;94(6):695-701), [Diuretic therapy, the alpha-adducin gene variant, and the risk of myocardial infarction or stroke in persons with treated hypertension](#) (JAMA 2002;287(13):1680-9) and [Interaction between the Gly460Trp alpha-adducin gene variant and diuretics on the risk of myocardial infarction](#) (J Hypertens 2009 Jan;27(1):61-8). Another approach to enrich electronic health records with biological samples is record linkage to biobanks as illustrated in [Genetic variation in the renin-angiotensin system modifies the beneficial effects of ACE inhibitors on the risk of diabetes mellitus among hypertensives](#) (Hum Hypertens 2008;22(11):774-80). A third approach is to use active surveillance methods to fully characterise drug effects such that a rigorous phenotype can be developed prior to genetic analysis. This approach was followed in [Adverse drug reaction active surveillance: developing a national network in Canada's children's hospitals](#) (Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf 2009;18(8):713-21) and [EUDRAGENE: European collaboration to establish a case-control DNA collection for studying the genetic basis of adverse drug reactions](#) (Pharmacogenomics 2006;7(4):633-8).

#### 9.3.5. Data analysis

The focus of data analysis should be on the measure of effect modification (see section 4.2.4 of this Guide on Effect Modification). Attention should be given to whether the mode of inheritance (e.g. dominant, recessive or additive) is defined a priori based on prior knowledge from functional studies. However, investigators are usually naïve regarding the underlying mode of inheritance. A solution might be to undertake several analyses, each under a different assumption, though the approach to analysing data raises the problem of multiple testing (see [Methodological quality of pharmacogenetic studies: issues of concern](#). Stat Med 2008;27(30):6547-69). The problem of multiple testing and the increased risk of type I error is in general a problem in pharmacogenetic studies evaluating multiple SNPs, multiple exposures and multiple interactions. The most common approach to correct for multiple testing is to use the Bonferroni correction. This correction may be considered too conservative and runs the risk of producing many pharmacogenetic studies with a null result. Other approaches to adjust for multiple testing include permutation testing and false discovery rate (FDR) control, which are less conservative. The FDR, described in [Statistical significance for genomewide studies](#) (Proc Natl Acad Sci USA 2003;100(16):9440-5), estimates the expected proportion of false-positives among associations that are declared significant, which is expressed as a q-value.

Alternative innovative methods are under development and may be used in the future, such as the systems biology approach, a Bayesian approach, or data mining (see [Methodological and statistical issues in pharmacogenomics](#). J Pharm Pharmacol 2010;62(2):161-6).

Important complementary approaches include the conduct of individual patient data meta-analyses and/or replication studies to avoid the risk of false-positive findings.

An important step in analysis of genome-wide association studies data that needs to be considered is the conduct of rigorous quality control procedures before conducting the final association analyses. Relevant guidelines include [Guideline for data analysis of genomewide association studies](#) (Cancer Genomics Proteomics 2007;4(1):27-34) and [Statistical Optimization of Pharmacogenomics Association Studies: Key Considerations from Study Design to Analysis](#) (Curr Pharmacogenomics Person Med 2011;9(1):41-66).

### **9.3.6. Reporting**

The guideline [Strengthening the REporting of Genetic Association studies \(STREGA\)--an extension of the STROBE statement](#) (Eur J Clin Invest 2009;39(4):247-66) should be followed for reporting findings of genetic studies.

### **9.3.7. Clinical practice guidelines**

An important step towards the implementation of the use of genotype information to guide pharmacotherapy is the development of clinical practice guidelines. Several initiatives have been developed to provide these guidelines such as the [Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium](#). Furthermore, several clinical practice recommendations have been published, for example [Recommendations for HLA-B\\*15:02 and HLA-A\\*31:01 genetic testing to reduce the risk of carbamazepine-induced hypersensitivity reactions](#) (Epilepsia 2014;55(4):496-506) or [Clinical practice guideline: CYP2D6 genotyping for safe and efficacious codeine therapy](#) (J Popul Ther Clin Pharmacol 2013;20(3):e369-96).

### **9.3.8. Resources**

An important pharmacogenomics knowledge resource is available through [PharmGKB](#) that encompasses clinical information including dosing guidelines and drug labels, potentially clinically actionable gene-drug associations and genotype-phenotype relationships. PharmGKB collects curates and disseminates knowledge about the impact of human genetic variation on drug responses.

# References

All hyperlinks in the document were last accessed on-line on 18 June 2015.

## References – Chapter 1

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ).

<http://www.ahrq.gov/>

AHRQ. Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide.

<http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productid=1166>

ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols

[http://www.encepp.eu/standards\\_and\\_guidances/checkListProtocols.shtml](http://www.encepp.eu/standards_and_guidances/checkListProtocols.shtml)

Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff. Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets. May 2013.

<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM243537.pdf>

Guidance on the format and content of the Protocol of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Other/2012/10/WC500133174.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2012/10/WC500133174.pdf)

ISPE Guidelines for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices

[http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines\\_08027.cfm](http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines_08027.cfm)

## References – Chapter 2

ENCePP Checklist for Study Protocols

[http://www.encepp.eu/standards\\_and\\_guidances/checkListProtocols.shtml](http://www.encepp.eu/standards_and_guidances/checkListProtocols.shtml)

Guidance on the format and content of the Protocol of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Other/2012/10/WC500133174.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2012/10/WC500133174.pdf)

ISPE Guidelines for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices

[http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines\\_08027.cfm](http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines_08027.cfm)

## References – Chapter 3

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: 609-16.

<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJM199608293350901>

AGENS, DGSMP and DGEpi Good Practice in Secondary Data Analysis Version 2

[http://dgepi.de/fileadmin/pdf/leitlinien/gps-version2-final\\_ENG.pdf](http://dgepi.de/fileadmin/pdf/leitlinien/gps-version2-final_ENG.pdf)

AHRQ. Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide: 3rd Edition.

<http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productID=1897>

Alvarez Y, Hidalgo A, Maignen F, Slattery J. Validation of statistical signal detection procedures in EudraVigilance post-authorisation data: a retrospective evaluation of the potential for earlier signalling Drug Saf 2010; 33: 475-87.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20486730>

Berger ML, Mamdani M, Atkins D, Johnson ML. The Good research practices for comparative effectiveness research: defining, reporting and interpreting non-randomised studies of treatment effects using secondary data sources: ISPOR good research practices for retrospective database analysis task force report - Part I. Value Health 2009; 12: 1044-52.

<http://www.ispor.org/TaskForces/documents/RDPartI.pdf>

Charlton R, de Vries C, prepared for the European Medicines Agency, Consultancy EMA/2010/29/CN. Systematic overview of data sources for drug safety in pregnancy research.

[http://www.encepp.eu/structure/documents/Data\\_sources\\_for\\_medicines\\_in\\_pregnancy\\_research.pdf](http://www.encepp.eu/structure/documents/Data_sources_for_medicines_in_pregnancy_research.pdf)

CIOMS. Working Group VIII Practical Aspects of Signal Detection in Pharmacovigilance

<http://www.cioms.ch/index.php/2012-06-10-08-47-53/working-groups/working-group-viii>

Clinical Practice Research Datalink

<http://www.cprd.com/intro.asp>

Coloma PM, Schuemie MJ, Trifirò G, Gini R, Herings R, Hippisley-Cox J, Mazzaglia G, Giaquinto C, Corrao G, Pedersen L, van der Lei J, Sturkenboom M; EU-ADR Consortium. Combining electronic healthcare databases in Europe to allow for large-scale drug safety monitoring: the EU-ADR Project. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2011; 20(1):1-11.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21182150>

Cox E, Martin BC, Van Staa T, Garbe E, Siebert U, Johnson ML. Good research practices for comparative effectiveness research: approaches to mitigate bias and confounding in the design of non-randomised studies of treatment effects using secondary data sources: The ISPOR good research practices for retrospective database analysis task force–Part II. *Value Health* 2009; 12: 1053-61.

<http://www.ispor.org/TaskForces/documents/RDPartII.pdf>

EMIF Project

<http://www.emif.eu/>

ENCePP Database of Research Resources

<http://www.encepp.eu/encepp/resourcesDatabase.jsp>

ENCePP Inventory of Databases

<http://www.encepp.eu/encepp/resourcesDatabase.jsp>

EudraVigilance

<http://eudravigilance.ema.europa.eu/highres.htm>

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

Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff. Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets. May 2013.

<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM243537.pdf>

Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry–Establishing Pregnancy Exposure Registries. August 2002.

<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM071639.pdf>

Furu K, Wettermark B, Andersen M, Martikainen JE, Almarsdottir AB, Sorensen HT. The Nordic countries as a cohort for pharmacoepidemiological research *Basic Clin Pharmacol & Toxicol* 2010; 106:86–94.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19961477>

Good Practice in Secondary Data Analysis Version 2.

[http://dgepi.de/fileadmin/pdf/leitlinien/gps-version2-final\\_ENG.pdf](http://dgepi.de/fileadmin/pdf/leitlinien/gps-version2-final_ENG.pdf)

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

Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP) Module VIII - Post-authorisation safety studies.

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document\\_listing/document\\_listing\\_000345.jsp&mid=WCOB01ac058058f32c](http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000345.jsp&mid=WCOB01ac058058f32c)

Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice (Commission Directive 2005/28/EC)

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:091:0013:0019:en:PDF>

Hall GC, Sauer B, Bourke A, Brown GS, Reynolds MW, Casale RL. Guidelines for Good Database Selection and use in Pharmacoepidemiology Research *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012; 21: 1-10.

<http://www.pharmacoepi.org/pub/1c2a306e-2354-d714-5127-9fd12e69fa66>

Hennessy S, Bilker WB, Weber A, Strom B. Descriptive analyses of the integrity of a US Medicaid Claims Database *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2003; 12: 103–11.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.765/pdf>

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: 1563-6.

<http://www.bmj.com/content/312/7046/1563>

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.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2125.2009.03537.x/full>

HMO Research Network

<http://www.hmoresearchnetwork.org/en>

IEA Good Epidemiological Practice Guideline (GEP)  
<http://ieaweb.org/good-epidemiological-practice-gep/>

International Classification for Primary Care (ICPC-2)  
<http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/adaptations/icpc2/en/>

International Classification of Diseases (ICD)  
<http://www.who.int/classifications/icd/en/>

International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR)  
<http://www.ispor.org/>

ISPE Guidelines for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices  
[http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines\\_08027.cfm](http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines_08027.cfm)

Johnson ML, Crown W, Martin BC, Dormuth CR, Siebert U. Good research practices for comparative effectiveness research: analytic methods to improve causal inference from non-randomised studies of treatment effects using secondary data sources: The ISPOR good research practices for retrospective database analysis task force report—Part III. *Value Health* 2009; 12:1062-73.  
<http://www.ispor.org/TaskForces/documents/RDPartIII.pdf>

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: 844-50.  
<http://annals.org/article.aspx?articleid=706784>

Kaufman DW, Rosenberg L, Mitchell AA. Signal generation and clarification: use of case-control data *Pharmacoepi Drug Safety* 2001; 10:197-203.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11501331>

Kieler H, Artama M, Engeland A, Ericsson Ö, Furu K, Gissler M, Nielsen RB, Nørgaard, Stephansson O, Valdimarsdottir U, Zoega H, Haglund B. Selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors during pregnancy and risk of persistent pulmonary hypertension in the newborn: population based cohort study from the five Nordic Countries *BMJ* 2012;344:d8012.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/344/bmj.d8012>

Kish L. *Survey Sampling*. Wiley, 1995.  
Lindquist M. VigiBase, the WHO Global ICSR Database System: Basic Facts. *Drug Information Journal* 2008; 42(5):409-19.  
<http://dij.sagepub.com/content/42/5/409.short>

Note for Guidance on Good Clinical Practice  
[http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Scientific\\_guideline/2009/09/WC500002874.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2009/09/WC500002874.pdf)

PRISM (Post-licensure Rapid Immunization Safety Monitoring)  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24331080>

PROTECT  
<http://www.imi-protect.eu/>

Rassen JA, Avorn J, Schneeweiss S. Multivariate-adjusted pharmacoepidemiologic analyses of confidential information pooled from multiple healthcare utilisation databases. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2010;19: 848-57.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2914827/?tool=pubmed>

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;333:1600-8.  
<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJM199512143332404>

Schneeweiss S, Avorn J. A review of uses of healthcare utilisation databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58:323-37.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15862718>

Sentinel  
<http://www.fda.gov/Safety/FDAsSentinelInitiative/ucm149341.htm>

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.  
<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2FBF00607096>

Streiner DL, Norman GR. *Health Measurement Scales: A practical guide to their development and use*. 4th Edition, Oxford University Press, 2008.  
Strom BL, Kimmel SE, Hennessy S. *Pharmacoepidemiology*. 5th Edition, Wiley, 2012.

Tregunno PM, Fink DB, Fernandez-Fernandez C, Lázaro-Bengoia E, Norén GN. Performance of probabilistic method to detect duplicate individual case safety reports. *Drug Saf* 2014; 37(4):249-58.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24627310>

UK Terminology Centre. Read codes.  
<http://systems.hscic.gov.uk/data/uktc/readcodes>

Vaccine Safety Datalink (VSD)  
<http://www.cdc.gov/vaccinesafety/Activities/VSD.html>

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.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2125.2004.02164.x/abstract>

Verstraeten T, DeStefano F, Chen RT, Miller E. Vaccine safety surveillance using large linked databases: opportunities, hazards and proposed guidelines. *Expert Rev Vaccines* 2003 Feb; 2(1):21-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12901594>

WHO Collaborating Centre for Drug Statistics Methodology. Anatomical Therapeutic Chemical Classification System.  
[http://www.whocc.no/atc/structure\\_and\\_principles/](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/](http://www.whocc.no/ddd/definition_and_general_considera/)

Wisniewski AFZ, Juhlin K, Vestergaard Laursen M, Macia MM, Manlik M, Pinkston VK, Seabroke S and Slattery J. Characterization of databases (DB) used for signal detection (SD): Results of a survey of IMI PROTECT work package (WP)3 participants.  
<http://www.imi-protect.eu/documents/WisniewskietalCharacterisationofdatabasesusedorsignaldetectionposterfinalCPE2012.pdf>

## References – Chapter 4

Ali MS, Groenwold RH, Belitser SV, Pestman WR, Hoes AW, Roes KC, Boer Ad, Klungel OH. Reporting of covariate selection and balance assessment in propensity score analysis is suboptimal: a systematic review. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015 Feb; 68(2): 112-21. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.08.011. Epub 2014 Nov 26.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25433444>

Ali MS, Groenwold RH, Pestman WR, Belitser SV, Roes KC, Hoes AW, de Boer A, Klungel OH. Propensity score balance measures in pharmacoepidemiology: a simulation study. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2014; doi: 10.1002/pds.3574. Epub ahead of print.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24478163>

Ali MS, Uddin MJ, Groenwold RH, Pestman WR, Belitser SV, Hoes AW, de Boer A, Roes KC, Klungel OH. Quantitative falsification of instrumental variables assumption using balance measures. *Epidemiology* 2014 Sep; 25(5):770-2. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0000000000000152.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25076152>

Altman DG, Bland JM. Interaction revisited: the difference between two estimates. *BMJ* 2003; 326: 219.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12543843>

Arbogast P. Use of disease risk scores in pharmacoepidemiologic studies *Stat Methods Med Res* 2009; 18:67-80.  
<http://smm.sagepub.com/content/18/1/67.short>

Baiocchi M, Cheng J, Small DS. Instrumental variable methods for causal inference. *Stat Med* 2014 Jun 15; 33(13):2297-340. doi: 10.1002/sim.6128. Epub 2014 Mar 6.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24599889>

Bate A, Evans SJW. Quantitative signal detection using spontaneous ADR reporting *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2009; 18: 427-36.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.1742/abstract>

Belitser SV, Martens EP, Pestman WR, Groenwold RH, de Boer A, Klungel OH. Measuring balance and model selection in propensity score methods *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2011; 20: 1115-29.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21805529>

Berlin C, Blanch C, Lewis DJ, Maladorno DD, Michel C, Petrin M, Sarp S, Close P. Are all quantitative postmarketing signal detection methods equal? Performance characteristics of logistic regression and Multi-item Gamma Poisson Shrinker. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012 Jun; 21(6): 622-30. doi: 10.1002/pds.2247. Epub 2011 Oct 12.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21994119>

Brighton Collaboration

<https://brightoncollaboration.org/public>

Brookhart MA, Rassen JA, Schneeweiss S. Instrumental variable methods in comparative safety and effectiveness research *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2010; 19:537–54.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.1908/abstract>

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):268-75.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2715942/>

Brunelli SM, Gagne JJ, Huybrechts KF, Wang SV, Patrick AR, Rothman KJ, and Seeger JD. Estimation Using All Available Covariate Information Versus a Fixed Look-back Window for Dichotomous Covariates. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013 May; 22(5): 10.1002/pds.3434.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3653131/>

Candore G, Juhlin K, Manlik K, Thakrar B, Quarcio N, Seabroke S, Wisniewski A, Slattery J. Comparison of Statistical Signal Detection Methods Within and Across Spontaneous Reporting Databases. *Drug Safety* June 2015, Volume 38, Issue 6, pp 577-587

<http://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs40264-015-0289-5>

Caster O, Juhlin K, Watson S, Norén GN. Improved statistical signal detection in pharmacovigilance by combining multiple strength-of-evidence aspects in *vigiRank*. *Drug Saf* 2014 Aug; 37(8):617-28. doi: 10.1007/s40264-014-0204-5.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25052742>

Caster O, Norén GN, Madigan D, Bate A. Logistic regression in signal detection: another piece added to the puzzle. *Clin Pharmacol Ther*. 2013 Sep; 94(3): 312.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23695184>

Caster, O., Norén, G. N., Madigan, D. and Bate, A. (2010), Large-scale regression-based pattern discovery: The example of screening the WHO global drug safety database. *Statistical Analy Data Mining*, 3: 197–208. doi: 10.1002/sam.10078

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sam.10078/abstract>

CIOMS. Working Group VIII Practical Aspects of Signal Detection in Pharmacovigilance

<http://www.cioms.ch/index.php/2012-06-10-08-47-53/working-groups/working-group-viii>

Clinical Practice Research Datalink

<http://www.cprd.com/intro.asp>

Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions

<http://www.cochrane-handbook.org/>

Cole SR, Hernan MA, Robins JM, Anastos K, Chmiel J, Detels R, Ervin C, Feldman J, Greenblatt R, Kingsley L, Lai S, Young M, Cohen M, Munoz A. Effect of highly active antiretroviral therapy on time to acquired immunodeficiency syndrome or death using marginal structural models *Am J Epidemiol* 2003; 158:687-94.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/14507605>

Coxib and traditional NSAID Trialists' (CNT) Collaboration, Bhala N, Emberson J, Merhi A, Abramson S, Arber N, Baron JA, Bombardier C, Cannon C, Farkouh ME, FitzGerald GA, Goss P, Halls H, Hawk E, Hawkey C, Hennekens C, Hochberg M, Holland LE, Kearney PM, Laine L, Lanos A, Lance P, Laupacis A, Oates J, Patrono C, Schnitzer TJ, Solomon S, Tugwell P, Wilson K, Wittes J, Baigent C. Vascular and upper gastrointestinal effects of non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs: meta-analyses of individual participant data from randomised trials. *Lancet* 2013; 382:769-79.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23726390>

Daniel RM, Cousens SN, De Stavola BL, Kenward MG, Sterne JA. Methods for dealing with time-dependent confounding. *Stat Med* 2013 Apr 30; 32(9):1584-618. doi: 10.1002/sim.5686. *Epub* 2012 Dec 3.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23208861>

Davé S, Petersen I. Creating medical and drug code lists to identify cases in primary care databases. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2009 Aug; 18(8):704-7. doi: 10.1002/pds.1770.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19455565>

Division of Pharmacoepidemiology & Pharmacoeconomics Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital, Harvard Medical School. Boston, MA.

<http://www.drugepi.org/dope-downloads/>

EU-ADR

<http://euadr-project.org/>

EudraVigilance

<http://eudravigilance.ema.europa.eu/highres.htm>

- Farrington CP, Whitaker HJ, Hocine MN. Cases series analysis for censored, perturbed, or curtailed post-event exposures. *Biostatistics* 2009; 10(1): 3-16.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18499654>
- Farrington CP. Control without separate controls: evaluation of vaccine safety using case-only methods. *Vaccine* 2004; 22(15-16):2064-70.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15121324>
- Ferrer P, Ballarín E, Sabaté M, Petri H, Goh KL, Yeboa S, Solari P and Ibáñez L., on behalf of the PROTECT project. Drug Consumption Databases in Europe.  
<http://www.imi-protect.eu/drugConsumption.shtml>
- 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.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/166/6/646.full?ijkey=cd9eebd0b1e1cb0cb5c027d7c17069f5f7c9e526>
- Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry-Good Pharmacovigilance Practices and Pharmacoepidemiologic Assessment. March 2005.  
<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/ucm071696.pdf>
- Franklin JM, Rassen JA, Ackermann D, Bartels DB, Schneeweiss S. Metrics for covariate balance in cohort studies of causal effects. *Stat Med* 2014 May 10; 33(10):1685-99. doi: 10.1002/sim.6058. Epub 2013 Dec 9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24323618>
- Fröbert O et al. Thrombus Aspiration during ST-Segment Elevation Myocardial Infarction. *N Engl J Med* 2013; 369:1587-1597. October 24, 2013  
<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMoa1308789>
- Gail MH, Benichou J, Editors. *Encyclopedia of Epidemiologic Methods*. Wiley, 2000.
- Garabedian LF, Chu P, Toh S, Zaslavsky AM, Soumerai SB. Potential bias of instrumental variable analyses for observational comparative effectiveness research. *Ann Intern Med* 2014 Jul 15; 161(2):131-8. doi: 10.7326/M13-1887.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25023252>
- Gerhard T. Bias: Considerations for research practice *Am J Health Syst Pharm* 2008; 65:2159-68.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18997149>
- Glasziou PP, Sanders SL. Investigating causes of heterogeneity in systematic reviews *Stat Med* 2002; 21: 503-11.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/sim.1183/abstract>
- Glynn RJ, Gagne JJ, Schneeweiss S. Role of disease risk scores in comparative effectiveness research with emerging therapies. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012 May; 21 Suppl 2: 138-47. doi: 10.1002/pds.3231.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22552989>
- Golder S, Loke YK, Bland M (2011) Meta-analyses of Adverse Effects Data Derived from Randomised Controlled Trials as Compared to Observational Studies: Methodological Overview. *PLoS Med* 8(5): e1001026.  
<http://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1001026>
- GRADE working group. 6-part 2008 BMJ series.  
<http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/index.htm#BMJ2008>
- GRADE working group. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology series of articles.  
[http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/JCE\\_series.htm](http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/JCE_series.htm)
- Greenland S. An introduction to instrumental variables for epidemiologists *Int J of Epidemiol* 2000; 29: 722-729.  
<http://ije.oxfordjournals.org/content/29/4/722.full?eaf>
- Grobee DE, Hoes AW. Confounding and indication for treatment in evaluation of drug treatment for hypertension *BMJ* 1997; 315: 1151-4.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/315/7116/1151>
- Groenwold RH, de Vries F, de Boer A, Pestman WR, Rutten FH, Hoes AW, Klungel OH. Balance measures for propensity score methods: a clinical example on beta-agonist use and the risk of myocardial infarction. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2011 Nov; 20(11): 1130-7.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21953948>
- Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP) Module IX - Signal Management.  
[http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document\\_listing/document\\_listing\\_000345.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058f32c](http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000345.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058f32c)
- 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](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Regulatory_and_procedural_guideline/2009/11/WC500011434.pdf)

Gulmez SE, Larrey D, Pageaux GP, Lignot S, Lassalle R, Jové J, Gatta A, McCormick PA, Metselaar HJ, Monteiro E, Thorburn D, Bernal W, Zouboulis-Vafiadis I, de Vries C, Perez-Gutthann S, Sturkenboom M, Bénichou J, Montastruc JL, Horsmans Y, Salvo F, Hamoud F, Micon S, Droz-Perroteau C, Blin P, Moore N. Transplantation for Acute Liver Failure in Patients Exposed to NSAIDs or Paracetamol (Acetaminophen) (*Drug Saf* (2013) 36:135–144).  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23325533>

Hallas J. Evidence of depression provoked by cardiovascular medication: a prescription sequence symmetry analysis. *Epidemiology* 1996 Sep; 7(5): 478-84.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8862977>

Harpaz R, DuMouchel W, LePendou P, Bauer-Mehren B, Ryan P, Shah NH. Performance of Pharmacovigilance Signal Detection Algorithms for the FDA Adverse Event Reporting System. *Clin Pharmacol Ther.* 2013 Jun; 93(6):539-46.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3857139/>

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

Hauben M, Madigan D, Gerrits CM, Walsh L & Van Puijenbroek E. The role of data mining in pharmacovigilance. *Expert Opin. Drug Saf* 2005; 4(5):929-48.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16111454>

Hernán MA, Brumback B, Robins JM Marginal Structural Models to Estimate the Causal Effect of Zidovudine on the Survival of HIV-Positive Men *Epidemiology* 2000; 11:561–70.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10955409>

IMS LifeLink PharMetrics Plus  
[http://www.imshealth.com/portal/site/imshealth/menuitem\\_a90cc6f1ddde5d4d170417041ad8c22a/?vgnnextoid=7226e590cb4dc310VgnVCM100000a48d2ca2RCRD&vgnnextfmt=default](http://www.imshealth.com/portal/site/imshealth/menuitem_a90cc6f1ddde5d4d170417041ad8c22a/?vgnnextoid=7226e590cb4dc310VgnVCM100000a48d2ca2RCRD&vgnnextfmt=default)

Joffe MM, Rosenbaum PR. Invited Commentary: Propensity Scores *Am J Epidemiol* 1999; 150: 327–33.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/150/4/327.abstract>

Joffe MM. Confounding by indication: the case of the calcium channel blockers *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2000; 9: 37-41.  
[http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1557\(200001/02\)9:1%3c37::AID-PDS471%3e3.0.CO;2-U/abstract](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1557(200001/02)9:1%3c37::AID-PDS471%3e3.0.CO;2-U/abstract)

Juhlin K, Ye X, Star K, Norén GN. Outlier removal to uncover patterns in adverse drug reaction surveillance - a simple unmasking strategy. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013; 22(10): 1119-29.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23832706>

Khan NF, Harrison SE, Rose PW. Validity of diagnostic coding within the General Practice Research Database: a systematic review Kahn NF, Harrison SE, Rose PW. *Br J Gen Pract* 2010; 60: e128–36.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20202356>

Kiri VA, MacKenzie G. 'Re. Immortal time bias in pharmacoepidemiology' (letter) *Am J Epidemiol* 2009; 170: 667–668.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/170/5/667.full>

Klungle OH, Martens EP, Psaty BM, Grobbee DE, Sullivan SD, Stricker BH, Leufkens HG, de Boer A. Methods to assess intended effects of drug treatment in observational studies are reviewed. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004; 57(12): 1223-31.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15617947>

Knol MJ, VanderWeele TJ, Groenwold RH, Klungle OH, Rovers MM, Grobbee DE. Estimating measures of interaction on an additive scale for preventive exposures. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2011; 26(6): 433-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21344323>

Knol MJ, VanderWeele TJ. Recommendations for presenting analyses of effect modification and interaction. *Int J Epidemiol* 2012; 41: 514-20.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22253321>

Lau J, Ioannidis JP, Schmid CH. Quantitative synthesis in systematic reviews. *Ann Intern Med* 1997; 127: 820-26.  
<http://annals.org/article.aspx?articleid=710939>

Lesko SM, Mitchel AA. Assessment of the safety of paediatric ibuprofen: a practitioner based randomised clinical trial. *JAMA* 1995; 279: 929-33.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7884951>

Lévesque LE, Hanley JA, Kezouh A, Suissa S. Problem of immortal time bias in cohort studies: example using statins for preventing progression of diabetes. *BMJ* 2010; 340: b5087.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/340/bmj.b5087>

- Lévesque LE, Hanley JA, Kezouh A, Suissa S. Problem of immortal time bias in cohort studies: example using statins for preventing progression of diabetes. *BMJ* 2010; 340:b5087  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/340/bmj.b5087>
- Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gøtzsche PC, Ioannidis JPA, et al. (2009) The PRISMA Statement for Reporting Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses of Studies That Evaluate Health Care Interventions: Explanation and Elaboration. *PLoS Med* 6(7): e1000100. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100  
<http://journals.plos.org/plosmedicine/article?id=10.1371/journal.pmed.1000100>
- 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.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1773795/>
- Maclure M, Fireman B, Nelson JC, Hua W, Shoaibi A, Paredes A, Madigan D. When should case-only designs be used for safety monitoring of medical products? *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012 Jan;21 Suppl 1:50-61.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22262593>
- Maclure M. The Case-Crossover Design: A Method for Studying Transient Effects on the Risk of Acute Events. *Am J Epidemiol* 1991; 133:144-53.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/133/2/144.abstract>
- MacMahon B, Trichopoulos D. *Epidemiology: Principles and Methods*. 2nd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 1996.
- Maignen F, Hauben M, Hung E, Holle LV, Dogne JM. A conceptual approach to the masking effect of measures of disproportionality. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2014;23(2):208-17.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24243699>
- Maignen F, Hauben M, Hung E, Van Holle L, Dogne JM. Assessing the extent and impact of the masking effect of disproportionality analyses on two spontaneous reporting systems databases. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2014 Feb;23(2):195-207.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24243665>
- Martens EP, Pestman WR, de Boer A, Belitser SV, Klungel OH. Instrumental variables: application and limitations. *Epidemiology* 2006;17:260-7.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16617274>
- McMahon AD. Approaches to combat with confounding by indication in observational studies of intended drug effects. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2003;12:551-8.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.883/pdf>
- Medical Dictionary for Regulatory Activities (MedDRA)  
<http://www.meddra.org>
- Miettinen OS. Stratification by a multivariate confounder score. *Am J Epidemiol* 1976;104:609-20.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/104/6/609.short>
- Moher D, Hopewell S, Schulz KF, Montori V, Gøtzsche PC, Devereaux PJ, Elbourne D, Egger M, Altman DG. CONSORT 2010 Explanation and Elaboration: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2010;63(8):e1-37.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20346624>
- Moodie EE, Stephens DA. Using directed acyclic graphs to detect limitations of traditional regression in longitudinal studies. *Int J Public Health* 2010;55:701-03.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20838848>
- Moore N, Gulmez SE, Larrey D, Pageaux GP, Lignot S, Lassalle R, Jové J, Pariente A, Blin P, Bénichou J, Bégaud B. Choice of the denominator in case population studies: event rates for registration for liver transplantation after exposure to NSAIDs in the SALT study in France. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013;22(2):160-7.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23166053>
- Moride Y, Abenheim L. Evidence of the depletion of susceptibles effect in non-experimental pharmacoepidemiologic research. *J Clin Epidemiol* 1994; 7 (7): 731-7.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7722586>
- Nicholas JM, Grieve AP, Gulliford MC. Within-person study designs had lower precision and greater susceptibility to bias because of trends in exposure than cohort and nested case-control designs. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2012 Apr;65(4):384-93.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22197519>
- Norell SE. Accuracy of patient interviews and estimates by clinical staff in determining medication compliance. *Soc Sci Med E* 1981 Feb; 15(1):57-61.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7271967>

Norén N, Edwards RI. Modern methods of pharmacovigilance: detecting adverse effects of drugs. *Clin Med* 2009;9(5):486-89.  
<http://www.clinmed.rcpjournals.org/content/9/5/486.full>

OMOP Observational Medical Outcomes Partnership  
<http://omop.org/>

PHARMO Institute  
<http://www.pharmo.nl/>

Pottegård A, Christensen Rd, Houji A, Christiansen CB, Paulsen MS, Thomsen JL, Hallas J. Primary non-adherence in general practice: a Danish register study. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol* 2014 Jun;70(6):757-63. doi: 10.1007/s00228-014-1677-y.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24756147>

PROTECT  
<http://www.imi-protect.eu/>

PROTECT Database of adverse drug reactions (EU SPC ADR database)  
<http://www.imi-protect.eu/adverseDrugReactions.shtml>

Rassen JA, Glynn RK, Brookhart A, Schneeweiss S. Covariate selection in high-dimensional propensity score analyses of treatment effects in small samples. *Am J Epidemiol* 2011;173:1404-13.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/173/12/1404.short>

Rassen JA, Schneeweiss S. Using high-dimensional propensity score to automate confounding control in a distributed medical product safety surveillance system. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012;21(S1):41-9.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.2328/abstract>

Rassen JA, Shelat AA, Franklin JM, Glynn RJ, Solomon DH, Schneeweiss S. Matching by propensity score in cohort studies with three treatment groups. *Epidemiology* 2013;24(3):401-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23532053>

Rassen JA, Shelat AA, Myers J, Glynn RJ, Rothman KJ, Schneeweiss S. One-to-many propensity score matching in cohort studies. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012;21(S2):69-80.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22552982>

Ray WA. Evaluating medication effects outside of clinical trials: new-user designs *Am J Epidemiol* 2003;158 (9):915–20.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/158/9/915.long>

Robins JM, Hernán MA, Brumback B. Marginal Structural Models and Causal Inference in Epidemiology. *Epidemiology* 2000;11(5):550-60.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10955408>

Rothman K, Greenland S, Lash T. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.  
Salvo F, Leborgne F, Thiessard F, Moore N, Bégaud B, Pariente A. A potential event-competition bias in safety signal detection: results from a spontaneous reporting research database in France. *Drug Saf* 2013;36(7):565-72.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23673817>

Sanni Ali M, Groenwold RH, Pestman WR, Belitser SV, Hoes AW, de Boer A, Klungel OH. Time-dependent propensity score and collider-stratification bias: an example of beta(2)-agonist use and the risk of coronary heart disease. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2013, 2013 Apr;28(4):291-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23354982>

Schmidt AF, Groenwold RH, Knol MJ, Hoes AW, Nielen M, Roes KC, de Boer A, Klungel OH. Exploring interaction effects in small samples increases rates of false-positive and false-negative findings: results from a systematic review and simulation study. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014 Jul;67(7):821-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24768005>

Schneeweiss S, Avorn J. A review of uses of healthcare utilisation databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005;58:323-37.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15862718>

Schneeweiss S, Rassen JA, Glynn RJ, Avorn J, Mogun H, Brookhart MA. High-dimensional Propensity Score Adjustment in Studies of Treatment Effects Using Healthcare Claims Data. *Epidemiol* 2009;20(4):512-22.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19487948>

Schneeweiss S, Sturmer T, Maclure M. Case-crossover and Case-Time-Control Designs as Alternatives in Pharmacoepidemiologic Research. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 1997;Suppl 3: S51-S59.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15073755>

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

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.1200/abstract>

Sentinel

<http://www.fda.gov/Safety/FDAsSentinelInitiative/ucm149341.htm>

Shapiro S. The role of automated record linkage in the postmarketing surveillance of drug safety: a critique. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 1989; 46:371-86.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/2535647>

Stephenson WP, Hauben M. Data mining for signals in spontaneous reporting databases: proceed with caution. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16:359-65.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.1323/abstract>

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): 193-201.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21041245>

Strom BL, Kimmel SE, Hennessy S. *Pharmacoepidemiology*. 5th Edition, Wiley, 2012.

Stürmer T, Rothman KJ, Avorn J, Glynn RJ. Treatment effects in the presence of unmeasured confounding: dealing with observations in the tails of the propensity score distribution--a simulation study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2010 Oct 1; 172(7):843-54. doi: 10.1093/aje/kwq198. Epub 2010 Aug 17.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20716704>

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.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17395595>

Suchard MA, Zorych I, Simpson SE, Schuemie MJ, Ryan PB, Madigan D. Empirical performance of the self-controlled case series design: lessons for developing a risk identification and analysis system. *Drug Saf* 2013 Oct; 36 Suppl 1:S83-93.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24166226>

Suissa S, Dell'aniello S, Vahey S, Renoux C. Time-window Bias in Case-control Studies. *Statins and Lung Cancer. Epidemiology* 2011; 22(2):228-31.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21228697>

Suissa S. Immeasurable Time Bias in Observational Studies on Drug Effects on Mortality. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008; 168(3):329-35.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18515793>

Suissa S. Immortal time bias in observational studies of drug effects *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16:241-49.

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.1357/abstract>

Suissa S. Immortal time bias in *Pharmacoepidemiology*. *Am J Epidemiol* 2008; 167:492-9.

<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/167/4/492.abstract>

Suissa S. The case-time-control design. *Epidemiology* 1995; 6(3):248-53.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7619931>

Suissa S., Azoulay L. Metformin and the Risk of Cancer. Time-related biases in observational studies. *Diabetes Care* 2012; 35(12):2665-73

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23173135>

Swanson SA, Hernán MA. Commentary: how to report instrumental variable analyses (suggestions welcome). *Epidemiology* 2013 May; 24(3):370-4. doi: 10.1097/EDE.0b013e31828d0590.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23549180>

Swanson SA, Robins JM, Miller M, Hernán MA. Selecting on Treatment: A Pervasive Form of Bias in Instrumental Variable Analyses. *Am. J. Epidemiol* (2015) doi: 10.1093/aje/kwu284

<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/01/21/aje.kwu284.abstract>

Tadrous M, Gagne JJ, Stürmer T, Cadarette SM. Disease risk score as a confounder summary method: systematic review and recommendations. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013 Feb; 22(2):122-9.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23172692>

Tatonetti NP, Ye PP, Daneshjou R, Altman RB. Data-Driven Prediction of Drug Effects and Interactions. *Science Translational Medicine* 14 Mar 2012 : 125ra31

<http://stm.sciencemag.org/content/4/125/125ra31>

- Théophile H, Laporte JR, Moore N, Martin KL, Bégaud B. The case-population study design: an analysis of its application in pharmacovigilance. *Drug Saf* 2011 Oct 1;34(10):861-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21879780>
- Toh S, Garcia Rodriguez LA, Herman MA. Confounding adjustment via a semi-automated high-dimensional propensity score algorithm: an application to electronic medical records. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012;20:849-57.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21717528>
- Uddin MJ, Groenwold RH, de Boer A, Belitser SV, Roes KC, Hoes AW, Klungel OH. Performance of instrumental variable methods in cohort and nested case-control studies: a simulation study. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2014 Feb;23(2):165-77. doi: 10.1002/pds.3555.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.3555/abstract>
- Van Holle L, Bauchau V. Use of logistic regression to combine two causality criteria for signal detection in vaccine spontaneous report data. *Drug Saf* 2014 Dec;37(12):1047-57. doi: 10.1007/s40264-014-0237-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25395263>
- van Staa T, Goldacre B, Gulliford M, Cassell J, Pirmohamed M, Taweel A, Delaney B, Smeeth L. Pragmatic randomised trials using routine electronic health records: putting them to the test *BMJ* 2012;344:e55.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/344/bmj.e55>
- van Staa TP, Abenhaim 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):183-89.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8113827>
- van Staa TP, Dyson L, McCann G, Padmanabhan S, Belatri R, Goldacre B, Cassell J, Pirmohamed M, Torgerson D, Ronaldson S, Adamson J, Taweel A, Delaney B, Mahmood S, Baracaia S, Round T, Fox R, Hunter T, Gulliford M, Smeeth L. The opportunities and challenges of pragmatic point-of-care randomised trials using routinely collected electronic records: evaluations of two exemplar trials. *Health Technol Assess* 2014 Jul;18(43):1-146. doi: 10.3310/hta18430.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25011568>
- Vandenbroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Mulrow CD, Pocock SJ, Poole C, Schlesselman JJ, Egger M; STROBE Initiative. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *Epidemiology* 2007;18:805-35.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18049195>
- Varas-Lorenzo C, Riera-Guardia N, Calingaert B, Castellsague J, Salvo F, Nicotra F, Sturkenboom M, Perez-Gutthann S. Myocardial infarction and individual nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs meta-analysis of observational studies. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013;22(6):559-70.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23616423>
- Wang S, Linkletter C, Maclure M, Dore D, Mor V, Buka S, Wellenius GA. Future cases as present controls to adjust for exposure trend bias in case-only studies. *Epidemiology* 2011;22:568-74.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21577117>
- Weldeselassie YG, Whitaker HJ, Farrington CP. Use of the self-controlled case-series method in vaccine safety studies: review and recommendations for best practice. *Epidemiol Infect* 2011;139(12):1805-17.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21849099>
- Whitaker HJ, Farrington CP, Spiessens B, Musonda P. Tutorial in biostatistics: the self-controlled case series method. *Stat Med* 2006; 25(10):1768-97.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16220518>
- 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.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9717884>
- Xu S, Zhang L, Nelson JC, Zeng C, Mullooly J, McClure D, Glanz J. Identifying optimal risk windows for self-controlled case series studies of vaccine safety. *Stat Med* 2011; 30(7):742-52.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21394750>
- Zhou Z, Rahme E, Abrahamowicz M, Pilote L. Survival bias associated with time-to-treatment initiation in drug effectiveness evaluation: a comparison of methods. *Am J Epidemiol* 2005 Nov 15;162(10):1016-23.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?term=PMID%3A%20%20%20%20%2016192344>

## References – Chapter 5

- AHRQ. Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide: 3rd Edition.  
<http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productID=1897>

- Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 520/2012 of 19 June 2012.  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:159:0005:0025:EN:PDF>
- Eldin AB, Ed. *Modern Approaches to Quality Control*. InTech Open Access, 2011.  
<http://www.intechopen.com/books/modern-approaches-to-quality-control>
- European Forum for Good Clinical Practice (EFGCP) Guidelines  
<http://www.efgcp.eu/Publications.asp?Type=EFGCP%20publications&L1=13&L2=1>
- Food and Drug Administration. Guidance for Industry and FDA Staff. Best Practices for Conducting and Reporting Pharmacoepidemiologic Safety Studies Using Electronic Health Care Data Sets. May 2013.  
<http://www.fda.gov/downloads/Drugs/GuidanceComplianceRegulatoryInformation/Guidances/UCM243537.pdf>
- Gail MH, Benichou J, Editors. *Encyclopedia of Epidemiologic Methods*. Wiley, 2000.
- Greene SK, Kulldorff M, Yin R, Yih WK, Lieu TA, Weintraub ES, Lee GM. Near real-time surveillance for influenza vaccine safety: proof-of-concept in the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project. *Am J Epidemiol* 2010; 171(2): 177-88.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21538670>
- ICH E6(R1) Guideline for Good Clinical Practice  
[http://www.ich.org/fileadmin/Public\\_Web\\_Site/ICH\\_Products/Guidelines/Efficacy/E6/E6\\_R1\\_Guideline.pdf](http://www.ich.org/fileadmin/Public_Web_Site/ICH_Products/Guidelines/Efficacy/E6/E6_R1_Guideline.pdf)
- ICH E9 'Statistical Principles for Clinical Trials'  
[http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Scientific\\_guideline/2009/09/WC500002928.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Scientific_guideline/2009/09/WC500002928.pdf)
- Imperial College Academic Health Science Centre (AHSC). Quality Control and Quality Assurance SOP JRCO/SOP/025.  
[http://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/clinicalresearchgovernanceoffice/Public/JRCO\\_SOP\\_025\\_QCOA%20Final%202012.pdf](http://workspace.imperial.ac.uk/clinicalresearchgovernanceoffice/Public/JRCO_SOP_025_QCOA%20Final%202012.pdf)
- International Conference on Harmonisation of Technical Requirements for Registration of Pharmaceuticals for Human Use (ICH)  
<http://www.ich.org/home.html>
- International Standards Organization, ISO 9000  
<http://www.iso.org/iso/home.html>, [http://www.iso.org/iso/iso\\_9000\\_selection\\_and\\_use-2009.pdf](http://www.iso.org/iso/iso_9000_selection_and_use-2009.pdf)
- Jones MP. Indicator and Stratification Methods for Missing Explanatory Variables in Multiple Linear Regression. *J Am Stat Assoc* 1996; 91(433): 222-230.  
[http://www.jstor.org/stable/2291399?seq=1#page\\_scan\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/2291399?seq=1#page_scan_tab_contents)
- Knatterud GL, Rockhold FW, George SL, Barton FB, Davis CE, Fairweather WR, Honohan T, Mowery R, O'Neill R. Guidelines for Quality Assurance in Multicenter Trials: A Position Paper. *Control Clin Trials* 1998; 19(5): 477-93.  
<http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0197245698000336>
- Lee KJ, Carlin JB. Recovery of information from multiple imputation: a simulation study. *Emerg Themes Epidemiol* 2012; 9(1): 3 doi: 10.1186/1742-7622-9-3.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22695083>
- McGraw, Michael J; George, Adam N; Shearn, Shawn P; Hall, Rigel L; Haws, Jr, Thomas F. First Edition, Principles of Good Clinical Practice. Pharmaceutical Press, 2010.  
<http://www.pharmpress.com/product/9780853697909/principles-of-good-clinical-practice>
- Moons K, Donders R, Stijnen T, Harrell F. Using the outcome for imputation of missing predictor values was preferred. *J Clin Epi* 2006; 59(10): 1092-101.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16980150>
- Rosenbaum PR. *Design of Observational Studies*. Springer, 2010.
- Rothman K, Greenland S, Lash T. *Modern Epidemiology*. 3rd Edition, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.
- Rubin DB. *Multiple Imputation for Nonresponse in Surveys*. Wiley, 1987.
- Schafer JL. *Analysis of Incomplete Multivariate Data*. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 1997.
- Sprenger K, Nickerson D, Meeker-O'Connell D, Morrison BW. Quality by Design in Clinical Trials: A Collaborative Pilot With FDA. *Therapeutic Innovation & Regulatory Science* 2013; 47: 161-66.  
<http://dij.sagepub.com/content/early/2012/10/25/0092861512458909.abstract>
- Theobald K, Capan M, Herbold M, Schinzel S, Hundt F. Quality assurance in non-interventional studies, *Ger Med Sci* 2009; 7: Doc29: 1-14.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2778825/>

Whitney CW, Lind BK, Wahl PW. Quality Assurance and Quality Control in Longitudinal Studies. *Epidemiol Rev* 1998;20(1):71-80.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9762510>

## References – Chapter 6

Lindquist M. Data Quality management in pharmacovigilance, *Drug Safety* 2004; 27 (12): 857-870.  
[http://www.pvtoolkit.net/toolkit/readers/data\\_quality\\_management\\_in\\_pv.pdf](http://www.pvtoolkit.net/toolkit/readers/data_quality_management_in_pv.pdf)

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.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/pds.1894/abstract>

Reisch LM, Fosse JS, Beverly K, Yu O, Barlow WE, Harris E L, Rolnick S, Barton MB, Geiger AM, Herrinton LJ, Greene SM, Fletcher SW, Elmore JG. Training, Quality Assurance, and Assessment of Medical Record Abstraction in a Multisite Study. *Am J Epidemiol* 2003;157:546-51.  
<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/157/6/546>

## References – Chapter 7

Kelly WN, Arellano FM, Barnes J, Bergman U, Edwards IR, Fernandez AM, Freedman SB, Goldsmith DI, Huang K, Jones JK, McLeay R, Moore N, Stather RH, Trenque T, Troutman WG, van Puijenbroek E, Williams F, Wise RP; ISPE, ISOP. Guidelines for Submitting Adverse Event Reports for Publication *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007;16(5):581–7.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17471601>

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):1896-900.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10584742>

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *BMJ* 2009;339:b2535.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/339/bmj.b2535?view=long&pmid=19622551>

PRISMA  
<http://www.prisma-statement.org/>

Regulation (EU) No. 1235/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010.  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:348:0001:0016:EN:PDF>

Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D, for the CONSORT Group. Consort 2010 Statement: Updated Guidelines for Reporting Parallel Group Randomised Trials. *BMJ* 2010;340:c332.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/340/bmj.c332>

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.  
<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1365-2362.2009.02234.x/full>

STROBE Statement  
<http://www.strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=strobe-home>

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):2008-12.  
<http://jama.jamanetwork.com/article.aspx?articleid=192614>

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.  
<http://strobe-statement.org/index.php?id=strobe-publications>

## References – Chapter 8

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

AHRQ. Registries for Evaluating Patient Outcomes: A User's Guide: 3rd Edition.  
<http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productID=1897>

CIOMS. International Ethical Guidelines for Biomedical Research Involving Human Subjects.

[http://www.cioms.ch/publications/layout\\_guide2002.pdf](http://www.cioms.ch/publications/layout_guide2002.pdf)

CIOMS. International Ethical Guidelines for Epidemiological Studies

<http://www.cioms.ch/index.php/publications/available-publications?task=view&id=17&catid=53>

Commission Implementing Regulation (EU) No. 520/2012 of 19 June 2012.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2012:159:0005:0025:EN:PDF>

Council for International Organisations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS)

<http://www.cioms.ch/>

Declaration of Helsinki

<http://www.wma.net/en/30publications/10policies/b3/index.html>

Directive 2001/20/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 4 April 2001.

[http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-1/dir\\_2001\\_20/dir\\_2001\\_20\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/health/files/eudralex/vol-1/dir_2001_20/dir_2001_20_en.pdf)

Directive 2001/83/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 6 November 2001.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=CONSLEG:2001L0083:20070126:en:PDF>

Directive 2010/84/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:348:0074:0099:EN:PDF>

Directive 95/46/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 24 October 1995.

[http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/95-46-ce/dir1995-46\\_part1\\_en.pdf](http://ec.europa.eu/justice/policies/privacy/docs/95-46-ce/dir1995-46_part1_en.pdf)

Guidance on the format and content of the final study report of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies.

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Regulatory\\_and\\_procedural\\_guideline/2013/01/WC500137939.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Regulatory_and_procedural_guideline/2013/01/WC500137939.pdf)

Guidance on the format and content of the Protocol of non-interventional post-authorisation safety studies.

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en\\_GB/document\\_library/Other/2012/10/WC500133174.pdf](http://www.ema.europa.eu/docs/en_GB/document_library/Other/2012/10/WC500133174.pdf)

Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP) Module VI – Management and reporting of adverse reactions to medicinal products.

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document\\_listing/document\\_listing\\_000345.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058f32c](http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000345.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058f32c)

Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP) Module VIII - Post-authorisation safety studies.

[http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document\\_listing/document\\_listing\\_000345.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058f32c](http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000345.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058058f32c)

Guidelines for Good Clinical Practice (Commission Directive 2005/28/EC)

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2005:091:0013:0019:en:PDF>

ICMJE Recommendations for the Conduct, Reporting, Editing, and Publication of Scholarly work in Medical Journals.

<http://www.icmje.org/recommendations/>

IEA Good Epidemiological Practice Guideline (GEP)

<http://ieaweb.org/good-epidemiological-practice-gep/>

International Committee of Medical Journal Editors (ICMJE)

<http://www.icmje.org/>

International Epidemiological Association (IEA)

<http://www.ieaweb.org/>

International Society for Pharmacoepidemiology (ISPE)

<http://www.pharmacoepi.org/>

ISPE Guidelines for Good Pharmacoepidemiology Practices

[http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines\\_08027.cfm](http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/guidelines_08027.cfm)

ISPE Guidelines on Data Privacy, Medical Record Confidentiality, and Research in the Interest of Public Health.

<http://www.pharmacoepi.org/resources/privacy.cfm>

Regulation (EC) No. 45/2001 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 18 December 2000.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2001:008:0001:0022:EN:PDF>

Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, and repealing Directive 2001/20/EC.

<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:32014R0536&rid=1>

Regulation (EU) No. 1235/2010 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 15 December 2010.  
<http://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2010:348:0001:0016:EN:PDF>

Volume 10 Clinical trials guidelines  
<http://ec.europa.eu/health/documents/eudralex/vol-10/>

## References – Chapter 9.1

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

AHRQ. Developing a Protocol for Observational Comparative Effectiveness Research: A User's Guide.  
<http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?pageaction=displayproduct&productid=1166>

AHRQ. Methods Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews.  
<http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/search-for-guides-reviews-and-reports/?productid=318&pageaction=displayproduct>

AHRQ. Summary Variables in Observational Research: Propensity Scores and Disease Risk Scores. Effective Health Care Program Research Report No. 33. May 2012.  
[http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/441/1084/Decide33\\_SummaryVariables\\_FinalReport\\_20120515.pdf](http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/441/1084/Decide33_SummaryVariables_FinalReport_20120515.pdf)

AHRQ. The Incident User Design in Comparative Effectiveness Research. Effective Health Care Program Research Report No. 33. May 2012.  
[http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/442/1086/Decide32\\_IncidentUserDesign\\_FinalReport\\_20120515.pdf](http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/442/1086/Decide32_IncidentUserDesign_FinalReport_20120515.pdf)

AHRQ. What Is Comparative Effectiveness Research.  
<http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/what-is-comparative-effectiveness-research1/>

Avorn J. In defense of Pharmacoepidemiology-Embracing the Yin and Yang of Drug Research. N Engl J Med 2007; 357(22):2219-21.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18046025>

Berger ML, Mamdani M, Atkins D, Johnson ML. The Good research practices for comparative effectiveness research: defining, reporting and interpreting non-randomised studies of treatment effects using secondary data sources: ISPOR good research practices for retrospective database analysis task force report - Part I. Value Health 2009; 12:1044-52.  
<http://www.ispor.org/TaskForces/documents/RDPartI.pdf>

Black N. Why we need observational studies to evaluate effectiveness of health care. BMJ 1996; 312(7040):1215-18.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8634569>

Concato J, Shah N, Horwitz RI. Randomized, controlled trials, observational studies, and the hierarchy of research designs. N Engl J Med 2000; 342(25):1887-92.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10861325>

Cox E, Martin BC, Van Staa T, Garbe E, Siebert U, Johnson ML. Good research practices for comparative effectiveness research: approaches to mitigate bias and confounding in the design of non-randomised studies of treatment effects using secondary data sources: The ISPOR good research practices for retrospective database analysis task force–Part II. Value Health 2009; 12:1053-61.  
<http://www.ispor.org/TaskForces/documents/RDPartII.pdf>

Crystal S, Gaboda D, Lucas J, Gerhard T, Chakravarty S. Assessing medication exposures and outcomes in the frail elderly: assessing research challenges in nursing home pharmacotherapy. Med Care. 2010 Jun; 48(6 Suppl):S23-31.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20473191>

DARTNet Institute  
<http://www.dartnet.info>

EUnetHTA. Methodological Guidelines for Rapid Relative Effectiveness Assessment of Pharmaceuticals.  
<http://www.eunetha.eu/news/final-version-hta-core-model-and-methodological-guidelines-rapid-real-pharmaceuticals-now-availa>

GRACE Principles  
<http://www.graceprinciples.org/>

GRADE working group. 6-part 2008 BMJ series.  
<http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/index.htm#BMJ2008>

GRADE working group. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology series of articles.

[http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/JCE\\_series.htm](http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/publications/JCE_series.htm)

Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE) working group.

<http://www.gradeworkinggroup.org/index.htm>

Harker J, Kleijnen J. What is a rapid review? A methodological exploration of rapid reviews in Health Technology Assessments. *Int J Evid Based Healthc* 2012; 10(4):397-410.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23173665>

International Society for Pharmacoeconomics and Outcomes Research (ISPOR)

<http://www.ispor.org/>

Johnson ES, Bartman BA, Briesacher BA, Fleming NS, Gerhard T, Kornegay CJ, Nourjah P, Sauer B, Schumock GT, Sedrakyan A, Stürmer T, West SL, Schneeweiss S. The incident user design in comparative effectiveness research. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*. 2013 Jan; 22(1):1-6.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23023988>

Johnson ML, Crown W, Martin BC, Dormuth CR, Siebert U. Good research practices for comparative effectiveness research: analytic methods to improve causal inference from non-randomised studies of treatment effects using secondary data sources: The ISPOR good research practices for retrospective database analysis task force report—Part III. *Value Health* 2009; 12:1062-73.

<http://www.ispor.org/TaskForces/documents/RDPartIII.pdf>

Klungel OH, Martens EP, Psaty BM, Grobbee DE, Sullivan SD, Stricker BH, Leufkens HG, de Boer A. Methods to assess intended effects of drug treatment in observational studies are reviewed. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004; 57(12):1223-31.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15617947>

Patient-Centered Outcome Research Institute (PCORI)

<http://www.pcori.org/>

PCORI. Patient Centered Outcomes Research Institute. Draft Methodological Report.

<http://www.pcori.org/assets/PCORI-Methodology-Standards.pdf>

Ray WA. Evaluating medication effects outside of clinical trials: new-user designs *Am J Epidemiol* 2003; 158 (9):915–20.

<http://aje.oxfordjournals.org/content/158/9/915.long>

Sauer BC, Brookhart A, Roy J, Vanderweele T. A Review of Covariate Selection for Nonexperimental Comparative Effectiveness Research. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013 Nov; 22(11): 1139–1145.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4190055/>

Schneeweiss S, Avorn J. A review of uses of healthcare utilisation databases for epidemiologic research on therapeutics. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005; 58:323-37.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15862718>

Schneeweiss S. Developments in post-marketing comparative effectiveness research (*Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2007; 82(2): 143-56).

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2905665/>

Schwartz D, Lellouch J. Explanatory and Pragmatic Attitudes in Therapeutic Trials *J. Clin Epidemiol* 2009; 62(5): 499-505.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19348976>

Sebastian Schneeweiss, Jeremy A. Rassen, Robert J. Glynn, Jerry Avorn, Helen Mogun and M. Alan Brookhart. High-dimensional propensity score adjustment in studies of treatment effects using health care claims data. *Epidemiology*. 2009 July ; 20(4): 512–522.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3077219/pdf/nihms282669.pdf>

Sox HC, Goodman SN. The methods of comparative effectiveness research. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2012; 33: 425-45.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22224891>

Tadrous M, Gagne JJ, Sturmer T, Cadarette SM. Disease Risk Score (DRS) as a Confounder Summary Method; Systematic Review and Recommendations. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2013; 22: 122–129.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3691557/>

Thorpe KE, Zwarenstein M, Oxman AD, Treweek S, Furberg CD, Altman DG, Tunis S, Bergel E, Harvey I, Magid DJ, Chalkidou K. A pragmatic-explanatory continuum indicator summary (PRECIS): a tool to help trial designers. *CMAJ* 2009; 180 (10):E47-57.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19372436>

Toh S, Gagne JJ, Rassen JA, Fireman BH, Kulldorff M, Brown JS. Confounding adjustment in comparative effectiveness research conducted within distributed research networks. *Med Care*. 2013 Aug; 51(8 Suppl 3):S4-10.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23752258>

US National Library of Medicine  
<http://www.nlm.nih.gov/>

Valuck RJ, Anderson HO, Libby AM, Brandt E, Bryan C, Allen RR, Staton EW, West DR and Pace WD. Enhancing electronic health record measurement of depression severity and suicide ideation: a Distributed Ambulatory Research in Therapeutics Network (DARTNet) study. *J Am Board Fam Med* 2012; 25(5):582-93.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22956694>

van Staa T, Goldacre B, Gulliford M, Cassell J, Pirmohamed M, Taweel A, Delaney B, Smeeth L. Pragmatic randomised trials using routine electronic health records: putting them to the test *BMJ* 2012; 344:e55.  
<http://www.bmj.com/content/344/bmj.e55>

Vandenbroucke P. When are observational studies as credible as randomised trials. *Lancet* 2004; 363(9422):1728-31.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15158638>

Zwarenstein M, Treweek S, Gagnier JJ, Altman DG, Tunis S, Haynes B, Oxman AD, Moher D, for the CONSORT and Pragmatic Trials in Healthcare (Practihc) groups. Improving the reporting of pragmatic trials: an extension of the CONSORT statement. *BMJ* 2008; 337 (a2390) :1-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19001484>

## References – Chapter 9.2

Andrews N, Waight PA, Borow R, Ladhani S, George RC, Slack MPE, Miller L. Using the Indirect Cohort Design to Estimate the Effectiveness of the Seven Valent Pneumococcal Conjugate Vaccine in England and Wales. *PLoS ONE* 6(12): e28435. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0028435.  
<http://www.plosone.org/article/info%3Adoi%2F10.1371%2Fjournal.pone.0028435>

Andrews N. Epidemiological designs for vaccine safety assessment: methods and pitfalls. *Biologicals* 2012; 40(5): 389-92.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21985898>

Banks D, Woo EJ, Burwen DR, Perucci P, Braun MM, Ball R. Comparing data mining methods on the VAERS database. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2005; 14(9): 601-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15954077>

Beck CR, McKenzie BC, Hashim AB, Harris RC; University of Nottingham. Influenza and the ImmunoCompromised (UNIIC) Study Group, Nguyen-Van-Tam JS Influenza vaccination for immunocompromised patients: systematic review and meta-analysis by etiology. *J Infect Dis* 2012; 206(8): 1250-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22904335>

Black S, Eskola J, Siegrist CA, Halsey N, Macdonald N, Law B, Miller E, Andrews N, Stowe J, Salmon D, Vannice K, Izurieta HS, Akhtar A, Gold M, Oselka G, Zuber P, Pfeifer D, Vellozzi C. Importance of background rates of disease in assessment of vaccine safety during mass immunisation with pandemic H1N1 influenza vaccines. *Lancet* 2009; 374(9707): 2115-22.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19880172>

Brighton Collaboration  
<https://brightoncollaboration.org/public>

Brighton Collaboration. Resources to facilitate and harmonise collection, analysis and presentation of vaccine safety data.  
<https://brightoncollaboration.org/public/resources.html>

Broome CV, Facklam RR, Fraser DW. Pneumococcal Disease after Pneumococcal Vaccination — An Alternative Method to Estimate the Efficacy of Pneumococcal Vaccine. *N Engl J Med* 1980; 303: 549-552.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/6995835>

Brown JS, Kulldorff M, Chan KA, Davis RL, Graham D, Pettus PT, Andrade SE, Raebel MA, Herrinton L, Roblin D, Boudreau D, Smith D, Gurwitz JH, Gunter MJ, Platt R. Early detection of adverse drug events within population-based health networks: application of sequential methods. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2007; 16(12):1275-1284.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17955500>

Carvajal A, Ortega PG, Sáinz M, Velasco V, Salado I, Arias LH, Eiros JM, Rubio AP, Castrodeza J. Adverse events associated with pandemic influenza vaccines: comparison of the results of a follow-up study with those coming from spontaneous reporting. *Vaccine* 2011 Jan 10; 29(3):519-22. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2010.10.067. Epub 2010 Nov 26.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21112311>

Castilla J, Beristain X, Martínez-Artola V, Navascués A, García Cenoz M, Alvarez N, Polo I, Mazón A, Gil-Setas A, Barricarte A. Effectiveness of rotavirus vaccines in preventing cases and hospitalizations due to rotavirus gastroenteritis in Navarre, Spain. *Vaccine* 2012; 30(3):539-43.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22122860>

Charlton R, de Vries C, prepared for the European Medicines Agency, Consultancy EMA/2010/29/CN. Systematic overview of data sources for drug safety in pregnancy research.  
[http://www.encepp.eu/structure/documents/Data\\_sources\\_for\\_medicines\\_in\\_pregnancy\\_research.pdf](http://www.encepp.eu/structure/documents/Data_sources_for_medicines_in_pregnancy_research.pdf)

CIOMS/WHO Working Group on Vaccine Pharmacovigilance. Definition and Application of Terms for Vaccine Pharmacovigilance. Council for International Organizations of Medical Sciences (CIOMS), Geneva 2012.  
[http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789290360834\\_eng.pdf](http://whqlibdoc.who.int/publications/2012/9789290360834_eng.pdf)

De Bie S, Verhamme KMC, Straus SMJM, Stricker BCH and Sturkenboom MCJM, on behalf of the TEDDY European Network of Excellence. Vaccine-Based Subgroup Analysis in VigiBase: Effect on Sensitivity in Paediatric Signal Detection. *Drug Saf* 2012; 35(4):335-346.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22435344>

De Serres G, Pilishvili T, Link-Gelles R, Reingold A, Gershman K, Petit S, Farley MM, Harrison LH, Lynfield R, Bennett NM, Baumbach J, Thomas A, Schaffner W, Beall B, Whitney C, Moore M. Use of surveillance data to estimate the effectiveness of the 7-valent conjugate pneumococcal vaccine in children less than 5 years of age over a 9 year period. *Vaccine* 2012; 30(27):4067-72.  
[http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?cmd=Retrieve&list\\_uids=22525797&dopt=Abstract](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed?cmd=Retrieve&list_uids=22525797&dopt=Abstract)

De Vito C, Manzoli L, Marzuillo C, Anastasi D, Boccia A, Villari P. A systematic review evaluating the potential for bias and the methodological quality of meta-analyses in vaccinology. *Vaccine* 2007; 25(52):8794-806.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18035456>

Dennis J, Hawken S, Krewski D, Birkett N, Gheorghe M, Frei J, McKeown-Eyssen G, Little J. Bias in the case-only design applied to studies of gene-environment and gene-gene interaction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Epidemiol* 2011; 40(5):1329-41.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21729879>

Dudareva-Vizule S, Koch J, An der Heiden M, Oberle D, Keller-Stanislawski B, Wichmann O. Impact of rotavirus vaccination in regions with low and moderate vaccine uptake in Germany. *Hum Vaccin Immunother* 2012; 8(10):1407-15.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22960495>

ECDC Impact of rotavirus vaccination - Generic Study Protocol.  
<http://www.ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/Rotavirus-impact-vaccination-April-2013.pdf>

Effectiveness of rotavirusvaccination – Generic studyprotocol for retrospectivecohort studies based oncomputerised databases  
<http://ecdc.europa.eu/en/publications/Publications/rotavirus-vaccination-cohort-study-april2013.pdf>

Escolano S, Farrington P, Hill C, Tubert-Bitter P. Intussusception after Rotavirus Vaccination — Spontaneous Reports (Correspondence). *N Engl J Med* 2011; 365:2139.  
<http://www.nejm.org/doi/full/10.1056/NEJMc1107771>

Escolano S, Hill C, Tubert-Bitter P. A new self-controlled case series method for analyzing spontaneous reports of adverse events after vaccination. *Am J Epidemiol* 2013; 178(9):1496-504.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24013203>

Evans SJW. Stratification for Spontaneous Report Databases. *Drug Saf* 2008; 31(11):1049-52.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18840024>

Farrington CP, Firth MJ, Moulton LH, Ravn H, Andersen PK, Evans S; Working Group on Non-specific Effects of Vaccines. Epidemiological studies of the non-specific effects of vaccines: II--methodological issues in the design and analysis of cohort studies. *Trop Med Int Health* 2009 Sep; 14(9):977-85.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19531116>

Farrington CP. Control without separate controls: evaluation of vaccine safety using case-only methods. *Vaccine* 2004; 22(15-16):2064-70.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15121324>

Fine PE, Williams TN, Aaby P, Källender K, Moulton LH, Flanagan KL, Smith PG, Benn CS; Working Group on Non-specific Effects of Vaccines. Epidemiological studies of the 'non-specific effects' of vaccines: I--data collection in observational studies. *Trop Med Int Health* 2009 Sep; 14(9):969-76.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19531117>

Glanz JM, McClure DL, Xu S, Hambidge SJ, Lee M, Kolczak MS, Kleinman K, Mullooly JP, France EK. Four different study designs to evaluate vaccine safety were equally validated with contrasting limitations. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006 Aug; 59(8):808-18.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16828674>

Greene SK, Kulldorff M, Yin R, Yih WK, Lieu TA, Weintraub ES, Lee GM. Near real-time surveillance for influenza vaccine safety: proof-of-concept in the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project. *Am J Epidemiol* 2010; 171(2):177-88. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19965887>

Guideline on good pharmacovigilance practices (GVP): Module P.I: Vaccines for prophylaxis against infectious diseases. [http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document\\_listing/document\\_listing\\_000345.jsp&mid=WCOB01ac058058f32c](http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/regulation/document_listing/document_listing_000345.jsp&mid=WCOB01ac058058f32c)

Halloran ME, Haber M, Longini IM Jr, Struchiner CJ. Direct and indirect effects in vaccine efficacy and effectiveness. *Am J Epidemiol* 1991; 133(4):323-31. [http://www.tc.umn.edu/~alonso/Halloran\\_AJE\\_1991.pdf](http://www.tc.umn.edu/~alonso/Halloran_AJE_1991.pdf)

Hanquet G, Valenciano M, Simondon F, Moren A. Vaccine effects and impact of vaccination programmes in post-licensure studies. *Vaccine* 2013; 31(48):5634-42. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23856332>

Heffernan JM, Keeling MJ. Implications of vaccination and waning immunity. *Proc Biol Sci* 2009; 276(1664):2071-80. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2677258/>

Hennessy S, Liu Z, Tsai TF, Strom BL, Wan CM, Liu HL, Wu TX, Yu HJ, Liu QM, Karabatsos N, Bilker WB, Halstead SB. Effectiveness of live-attenuated Japanese encephalitis vaccine (SA14-14-2): a case-control study. *Lancet* 1996; 347(9015):1583-6. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8667866>

Hocine MN, Farrington CP, Touzé E, Whitaker HJ, Fourrier A, Moreau T, Tubert-Bitter P. Hepatitis B vaccination and first central nervous system demyelinating events: Reanalysis of a case-control study using the self-controlled case series method. *Vaccine* 2007; 25(31):5938-43. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17597263>

Jackson ML, Nelson JC. The test-negative design for estimating influenza vaccine effectiveness. *Vaccine* 2013 Apr 19; 31(17):2165-8. doi: 10.1016/j.vaccine.2013.02.053. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23499601>

Jefferson T, Rivetti D, Rudin M, Di Pietrantonio C, Demicheli V. Efficacy and effectiveness of influenza vaccines in elderly people: a systematic review. *Lancet* 2005; 366(9492):1165-74. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16198765>

Klein NP (2011) Vaccine safety in special populations, *Human Vaccines*, 7:2, 269-271, DOI: 10.4161/hv.7.2.13860. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4161/hv.7.2.13860>

Kurz X, Domergue F, Slattery J, Segec A, Szmigiel A, Hidalgo-Simon A. Safety monitoring of Influenza A/H1N1 pandemic vaccines in EudraVigilance. *Vaccine* 2011; 29(26):4378-87. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21501644>

Leino T, Ollgren J, Salo H, Tiihonen P, Kilpi T. First year experience of rotavirus immunisation programme in Finland. *Vaccine* 2012; 31(1):176-82. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23122991>

McClure DL, Glanz JM, Xu S, Hambidge SJ, Mullooly JP, Baggs J. Comparison of epidemiologic methods for active surveillance of vaccine safety. *Vaccine* 2008; 26(26):3341-3345. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18462849>

Miller E, Andrews N, Stellitano L, Stowe J, Winstone AM, Shneerson J, Verity C. Risk of narcolepsy in children and young people receiving AS03 adjuvanted pandemic A/H1N1 2009 influenza vaccine: retrospective analysis. *BMJ* 2013; 346:f794. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23444425>

Module 4 (Surveillance)  
<http://vaccine-safety-training.org/overview-and-outcomes-4.html>

Nelson JC, Cook AJ, Yu O, Dominguez C, Zhao S, Greene SK, Fireman BH, Jacobsen SJ, Weintraub ES, Jackson LA. Challenges in the design and analysis of sequentially monitored postmarket safety surveillance evaluations using electronic observational health care data. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012; 21(S1):62-71. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22262594>

Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Rosenberg NA, Donnelly P. Association mapping in structured populations. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2000. 67(1): 170-171 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1287075/>

Remschmidt C, Rieck T, Bödeker B, Wichmann O. Application of the screening method to monitor influenza vaccine effectiveness among the elderly in Germany. *BMC Infect Dis* 2015; 15: 137. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4371628/>

Salmon DA, Proschan M, Forshee R, Gargiullo P, Bleser W, Burwen DR, Cunningham F, Garman P, Greene SK, Lee GM, Vellozzi C, Yih WK, Gellin B, Lurie N; H1N1 GBS Meta-Analysis Working Group. Association between Guillain-Barré syndrome and influenza A (H1N1) 2009 monovalent inactivated vaccines in the USA: a meta-analysis. *Lancet* 2013 Apr 27; 381(9876):1461-8.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23498095>

Siegrist CA, Lewis EM, Eskola J, Evans SJ, Black SB. Human papilloma virus immunization in adolescents and young adults: a cohort study to illustrate what events might be mistaken for adverse reactions. *Pediatr Infect Dis J* 2007; 26(11):979-84.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17984802>

Simpson CR, Lone NI, Kavanagh K, Ritchie LD, Robertson C, Sheikh A, McMenamin J. Trivalent inactivated seasonal influenza vaccine effectiveness for the prevention of laboratory-confirmed influenza in a Scottish population 2000 to 2009. *Euro Surveill* 2015 Feb 26; 20(8). pii: 21043.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/25742433>

Tokars JI, Lewis P, DeStefano F, Wise M, Viray M, Morgan O, Gargiullo P, Vellozzi C. The risk of Guillain-Barre Syndrome associated with influenza A (H1N1) 2009 monovalent vaccine and 2009-2010 seasonal influenza vaccines: Results from self-controlled analyses. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Safety* 2012; 21(5):546-52.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22407672>

Vaccine Safety Basics e-learning course (World Health Organization)

<http://www.vaccine-safety-training.org/home.html>

Vaccine Safety Datalink (VSD)

<http://www.cdc.gov/vaccinesafety/Activities/VSD.html>

Van Ganse E, Letrilliart L, Borne H, Morand F, Robain M, Siegrist CA. Health problems most commonly diagnosed among young female patients during visits to general practitioners and gynecologists in France before the initiation of the human papillomavirus vaccination program. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012 Mar; 21(3):261-8.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22052698>

Wacholder S, Chen BE, Wilcox A, Macones G, Gonzalez P, Befano B, Hildesheim A, Rodriguez AC, Solomon D, Herrero R, Schiffman M; CVT group. Risk of miscarriage with bivalent vaccine against human papillomavirus (HPV) types 16 and 18: pooled analysis of two randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2010; 340:c712.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20197322>

Woo EJ, Ball R, Burwen DR, Braun MM. Effects of stratification on data mining in the US Vaccine Adverse Event Reporting System (VAERS). *Drug Saf* 2008; 31(8):667-74.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18636785>

Xu R, Lo Y, Chamber C. Assessing the effect of vaccine on spontaneous abortion using time-dependent covariates Cox models. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2012; 21(8):844-850.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22674821>

Yih WK, Kulldorff M, Fireman BH, Shui IM, Lewis EM, Klein NP, Baggs J, Weintraub ES, Belongia EA, Naleway A, Gee J, Platt R, Lieu TA. Active surveillance for adverse events: the experience of the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project. *Pediatrics* 2011; 127(S1):S54-S64.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21502252>

## References – Chapter 9.3

Amstutz U, Shear NH, Rieder MJ, Hwang S, Fung V, Nakamura H, Connolly MB, Ito S, Carleton BC; CPNDS clinical recommendation group. Recommendations for HLA-B\*15:02 and HLA-A\*31:01 genetic testing to reduce the risk of carbamazepine-induced hypersensitivity reactions (*Epilepsia* 2014 Apr; 55(4):496-506).

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24597466>

Balding DJ. A tutorial on statistical methods for population association studies. *Nat Rev Genet* 2006; 7(10):781-91.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16983374>

Bozkurt O, Verschuren WM, van Wieren-de Wijer BM, Knol MJ, de Boer A, Grobbee DE, Geerlings MI, Heerdink ER, Klungel OH. Genetic variation in the renin-angiotensin system modifies the beneficial effects of ACE inhibitors on the risk of diabetes mellitus among hypertensives, *Hum Hypertens* 2008; 22(11):774-80.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18563171>

Carleton B, Poole R, Smith M, Leeder J, Ghannadan R, Ross C, Phillips M, Hayden M. Adverse drug reaction active surveillance: developing a national network in Canada's children's hospitals, *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf* 2009; 18(8):713-21.

<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19507171>

Carr DF, O'Meara H, Jorgensen AL, Campbell J, Hobbs M, McCann G, van Staa T, Pirmohamed M. SLCO1B1 genetic variant associated with statin-induced myopathy: a proof-of-concept study using the clinical practice research datalink. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2013;94(6):695-701.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23942138>

CPIC: Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium  
<https://www.pharmgkb.org/page/cpic>

Dennis J, Hawken S, Krewski D, Birkett N, Gheorghe M, Frei J, McKeown-Eyssen G, Little J. Bias in the case-only design applied to studies of gene-environment and gene-gene interaction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Epidemiol* 2011; 40(5):1329-41.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21729879>

Drews J. Drug discovery: a historical perspective. *Science* 2000; 287(5460):1960-4.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10720314>

Evans WE, Relling MV. Moving towards individualized medicine with pharmacogenomics. *Nature* 2004; 429(6990):464-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15164072>

Evans WE, Relling MV. Pharmacogenomics: translating functional genomics into rational therapeutics. *Science* 1999; 286(5439):487-91.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10521338>

Gatto NM, Campbell UB, Rundle AG, Ahsan H. Further development of the case-only design for assessing gene-environment interaction: evaluation of and adjustment for bias. *Int J Epidemiol* 2004; 33(5):1014-24.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15358745>

Grady BJ, Ritchie MD. Statistical Optimization of Pharmacogenomics Association Studies: Key Considerations from Study Design to Analysis. *Curr Pharmacogenomics Person Med* 2011 Mar 1; 9(1):41-66.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/21887206>

Jorgensen AL, Williamson PR. Methodological quality of pharmacogenetic studies: issues of concern. *Stat Med* 2008; 27(30):6547-69.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18837075>

Khoury MJ, Flanders WD. Nontraditional epidemiologic approaches in the analysis of gene-environment interaction: case-control studies with no controls! *Am J Epidemiol* 1996; 144(3):207-13.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/8686689>

Little J, Higgins JP, Ioannidis JP, Moher D, Gagnon F, von Elm E, Khoury MJ, Cohen B, Davey-Smith G, Grimshaw J, Scheet P, Gwinn M, Williamson RE, Zou GY, Hutchings K, Johnson CY, Tait V, Wiens M, Golding J, van Duijn C, McLaughlin J, Paterson A, Wells G, Fortier I, Freedman M, Zecevic M, King R, Infante-Rivard C, Stewart A, Birkett N. Strengthening the REporting of Genetic Association studies (STREGA)--an extension of the STROBE statement. *Eur J Clin Invest* 2009; 39(4):247-66.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19297801>

Liu Y, Nyunoya T, Leng S, Belinsky SA, Tesfaigzi Y, Bruse S. Softwares and methods for estimating genetic ancestry in human populations (*Hum Genomics*. 2013; 7:1).  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23289408>

Madadi P, Amstutz U, Rieder M, Ito S, Fung V, Hwang S, Turgeon J, Michaud V, Koren G, Carleton BC; CPNDS Clinical Recommendations Group. Clinical practice guideline: CYP2D6 genotyping for safe and efficacious codeine therapy. *J Popul Ther Clin Pharmacol* 2013; 20(3):e369-96.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/?term=Madadi+Amstutz>

Molokhia M, McKeigue P. EUDRAGENE: European collaboration to establish a case-control DNA collection for studying the genetic basis of adverse drug reactions 2006; 7(4):633-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16753010>

Peters BJ, Rodin AS, de Boer A, Maitland-van der Zee AH. Methodological and statistical issues in pharmacogenomics. *J Pharm Pharmacol* 2010; 62(2):161-6.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20487194>

Pharm GKB (The Pharmacogenomics Knowledgebase)  
<https://www.pharmgkb.org/>

Pritchard JK, Stephens M, Rosenberg NA, Donnelly P. Association mapping in structured populations. *Am J Hum Genet*. 2000. 67(1): 170-171  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1287075/>

Psaty BM, Smith NL, Heckbert SR, Vos HL, Lemaitre RN, Reiner AP, Siscovick DS, Bis J, Lumley T, Longstreth WT Jr, Rosendaal FR. Diuretic therapy, the alpha-adducin gene variant, and the risk of myocardial infarction or stroke in persons with treated hypertension. *JAMA* 2002; 287(13): 1680-9.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/11926892>

Ross S, Anand SS, Joseph P, Paré G. Promises and challenges of pharmacogenetics: an overview of study design, methodological and statistical issues. *JRSM Cardiovasc Dis* 2012; 5(1): 1(1).  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/24175062>

Storey JD, Tibshirani R. Statistical significance for genomewide studies. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 2003; 100(16): 9440-5.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/12883005>

van der Baan FH, Klungel OH, Egberts AC, Leufkens HG, Grobbee DE, Roes KC, Knol MJ. Pharmacogenetics in randomized controlled trials: considerations for trial design. *Pharmacogenomics* 2011; 12(10): 1485-92.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22008051>

van der Baan FH, Knol MJ, Klungel OH, Egberts AC, Grobbee DE, Roes KC. Potential of adaptive clinical trial designs in pharmacogenetic research. *Pharmacogenomics* 2012; 13(5): 571-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/22462749>

van Wieren-de Wijer DB<sup>1</sup>, Maitland-van der Zee AH, de Boer A, Kroon AA, de Leeuw PW, Schiffrers P, Janssen RG, Psaty BM, van Duijn CM, Stricker BH, Klungel OH. Interaction between the Gly460Trp alpha-adducin gene variant and diuretics on the risk of myocardial infarction. *J Hypertens* 2009 Jan; 27(1): 61-8.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19145769>

Zhang H, Liu L, Wang X, Gruen JR. Guideline for data analysis of genomewide association studies. *Cancer Genomics Proteomics* 2007; 4(1): 27-34.  
<http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17726238>

# ENCePP Guide, Revision 4 - Authorship

## **Editor**

Xavier Kurz, Veronica Tudor and the ENCePP WG1

## **Design and layout**

Dagmar Vogl

## **Main authors**

- 1. General aspects of study protocol:** Nicholas Moore, Hubert Leufkens, Annie Fourrier-Réglat
- 2. Research question:** Hubert Leufkens, Nicholas Moore, Yola Moride
- 3.1. Primary data collection:** Susana Perez-Gutthann, Hubert Leufkens
- 3.2. Secondary use of data:** Susana Perez-Gutthann, John Parkinson
- 3.3. Research networks:** Miriam Sturkenboom
- 3.4. Spontaneous report databases:** Niklas Norèn, Jim Slattery
- 4.1. General considerations:** Yola Moride, Kevin Blake, Hubert Leufkens
- 4.2.1. Definition and validation of drug exposure, outcomes and covariates:** Alejandro Arana, Gillian Hall, Jesper Hallas, Rachael Boggon
- 4.2.2. Bias and confounding:** Olaf Klungel, Jesper Hallas, Mirko Di Martino, Ursula Kirchmayer, Alejandro Arana
- 4.2.3. Methods to handle bias and confounding:** Rolf Groenwold, Jesper Hallas, Olaf Klungel
- 4.2.4. Effect modification:** Olaf Klungel, Frederica Pisa
- 4.3. Ecological analyses and case-population studies:** Ursula Kirchmayer
- 4.4. Hybrid studies:** Tjeerd van Staa, Olaf Klungel
- 4.5. Systematic review and meta-analysis:** Victor Kiri, Nawab Qizilbash
- 4.6. Signal detection methodology and application:** Niklas Norèn, Jim Slattery
- 5. The statistical analysis plan:** Jim Slattery, Alejandro Arana
- 6. Quality management:** Milena Jadrijević-Mladar Takač
- 7. Communication:** Kevin Blake, Susana Perez-Gutthann
- 8. Legal context:** Xavier Kurz, Kevin Blake
- 9.1. Comparative effectiveness research:** Annie Fourrier-Réglat, Olaf Klungel, Frederica Pisa
- 9.2.1. Vaccine safety:** Xavier Kurz, Phillip Bryan, Alfonso Carvajal, Stephen Evans
- 9.2.2. Vaccine effectiveness:** Kevin Blake, Alain Moren
- 9.3. Design and analysis of pharmacogenetic studies:** Olaf Klungel, Bruce Carleton (in collaboration with the ISPE SIG "Molecular Epidemiology, Biomarkers and Pharmacogenetics")

## ***Acknowledgments***

Peer review of one or several chapters was received from:

Ana Marta Anes

Peter Arlett

Gillian Bartlet

Ulf Bergman

Jan Bonhoeffer

Nada Božina

Gonzalo Calvo

Ann Daly

Martin Daumer

Marina Davoli

Mark de Groot

Frank DeStefano

Nancy Dreyer

Paddy Farrington

Xavier Fournie

Amalia Issa

Hervé Le Louet

Geoff Liu

David Martin

Sarah McFarlane

Consuelo Pedros

Munir Pirmohamed

Elisabetta Poluzzi

Stefanie Prilla

Kenneth J. Rothman

Annalisa Rubino

Sebastian Schneeweiss

Ivana Silva

Gunilla Sjolín-Forsberg

Camilla Stephens

Brian Strom

Samy Suissa

Michael Theodorakis

Lina Titievski

Robert Vander Stichele

Wei Zhou

Patrick Zuber