

# Selecting Controls

## Advantages of general population controls

- Because of selection process, investigator is usually assured that they come from the same base population as the cases.

## Disadvantages of general population controls

- Time consuming, expensive, hard to contact and get cooperation; may remember exposures differently than cases

# Selecting Controls

What illnesses make good hospital controls?

- Those illnesses that have no relation to the risk factor(s) under study

Example: Should respiratory diseases be used as controls for a study of smoking and myocardial infarction? Do they represent the distribution of smoking in the entire population that gave rise to the cases of MI?

- Special control groups like friends, spouses, siblings, and deceased individuals.

# Matching in Epidemiology

## Types

- Individual matching
- Frequency matching

Data are analyzed in terms of case-control pairs rather than for individual subjects

## Odds Ratio: Calculated in Case-Control Studies

---

Odds Ratio=

Odds of exposure in diseased

Odds of exposure in healthy

*or*

Odds of disease in exposed

Odds of disease in unexposed

# Analysis of case-control studies

---

Exposure Status	Disease Status		ODDS
	Yes	No	
Yes	A	B	A/B
No	C	D	C/D

Odds Ratio= $[A/B]/[C/D] = [A \times D]/[B \times C]$

Or  $[A/C]/[B/D] = [A \times D]/[B \times C]$

(Gordis, Epidemiology) 7th Edition by Leon Gordis MD MPH DrPH, Chapter 7

## How would you design a Cohort study?

- First you would recruit people who meet wear hats.  
Here again, you must decide on your “inclusion criteria.”
- Then you would find a control group with people who do not wear hats.
- You would then follow them through time to calculate an incidence rate of colds in the hat wearers vs the non-hat wearers.

# Analysis of cohort studies

- Basic analysis involves calculation of incidence of disease among exposed and unexposed groups.
- Recall set up of 2 x 2 tables.

## Relative Risk: Calculated in a Cohort Study

Relative risk =

$$\frac{\text{Incidence rate (risk) in the exposed}}{\text{Incidence rate (risk) in the non-exposed}}$$



- Relative Risk = 1.0      No Risk

(meaning the rate of poor outcome among those with risk factor is the same as those without)

- Relative Risk > 1      Elevated Risk

(meaning the rate of poor outcome is more common among those with the risk factor present)

- Relative Risk < 1      Reduced Risk

(meaning the rate of poor outcome is less common among those with the risk factor present)

# Use of Placebo and Blinding

Placebos are used to make the groups as comparable as possible (recall laboratory experiment)

Blinding: subjects do not know if they are receiving treatment or placebo (single blind); neither subjects nor investigators know who is receiving treatment or placebo (double blind).

Purpose of blinding: To avoid bias in ascertainment of outcome

Placebo allows study to be blind

# Number Needed to Treat (NNT)

Number of persons who would have to receive an intervention for 1 to benefit.

$$\text{NNT} = 1 / (\text{rate in untreated group} - \text{rate in treated group}) = 1 / \text{Absolute risk reduction})$$

- To determine absolute risk reduction subtract incidence with treatment from incidence without treatment :  $0.0043 - 0.0028 = 0.0015 = \text{Absolute Risk Reduction}$
- The number needed to treat is the inverse of the Absolute risk reduction:  
 $1/0.0015=667$
- This means that if 667 individuals are exposed to the risk factor, 1 case will be prevented (NNT).
- Number Needed to Harm (NNH) is similar but is  $1/\text{attributable risk}$  when you are looking at the harmful side effects of a drug.

## Interaction (Effect Modification)

- When an exposure behaves differently in different groups.
- For example, if you find smoking increases the risk for heart attacks much more in males than females (these are fictional numbers and not based on fact!)

How would you address  
interaction and/or confounding  
in an analysis?

**Stratification!**

Both issues, though very  
different from one another,  
have the same solution

# Selection Bias

- Results from procedures used to select subjects into a study that lead to a result different from what would have been obtained from the entire population targeted for study.

# Recall bias

People with disease remember or report exposures differently (more or less accurately) than those without disease.

Can result in over- or under-estimate of measure of association. (see following slide)

Solutions: Use controls who are themselves sick; use standardized questionnaires that obtain complete information, mask subjects to study hypothesis