

Epidemiology Kept Simple



Chapter 8 Measures of Association & Potential Impact

Important Jargon

- **Exposure (E)** ≡ an explanatory factor; any potential health determinant
- **Disease (D)** ≡ an outcome or response; a health-related outcome
- **Measure of association (syn. measure of effect)** ≡ a statistic that quantifies the relationship between an exposure and a disease
- **Measure of potential impact** ≡ a statistic that quantifies the potential impact of removing a hazardous exposure

Gerstman

Chapter 8

2

Arithmetic (αριθμός) Comparisons

- **Measures of association** are *mathematical comparisons*
- **Mathematic comparisons** can be done in *absolute terms* or *relative terms*
- Let us start with this **ridiculously simple example**:
- I have **\$2**
- You have **\$1**



"For the things of this world cannot be made known without a knowledge of mathematics." - Roger Bacon

Gerstman

Chapter 8

3

Absolute Comparison

- In **absolute terms**, I have
\$2 - \$1
= \$1 more than you
- Note: absolute comparison are based on **subtraction**

It is as simple as that...



Gerstman

Chapter 8

4

Relative Comparison

- Recall that I have \$2 and you have \$1.
- In **relative terms**, I have $\$2 \div \$1 = 2$, or "twice as much as you"
- Note: relative comparison is made by **division**



Gerstman

Chapter 8

5

Applied to Risks

- Suppose, I have a 2% risk of a disease you have a risk of 1% risk of the same disease
- In **absolute terms**, I have $2\% - 1\% = 1\%$ greater risk
- This is the **risk difference**, or absolute measure of effect




Gerstman

Chapter 8

6

Applied to Risks

- Recall that I have a risk of 2% and you have a risk of 1%
- In **relative terms** I have $2\% \div 1\% = 2$, or twice the risk
- This is the **relative risk**, or relative measure of effect



Gerstman Chapter 8 7

Terminology

For economy of language, the term “risk” will be applied to all incidence and prevalence measures.

Gerstman Chapter 8 8

Risk Difference

Risk Difference (RD) \equiv absolute effect associated with exposure

$$RD = R_1 - R_0$$

where
 $R_1 \equiv$ risk in the exposed group
 $R_0 \equiv$ risk in the non-exposed group

Interpretation: *Excess* risk in absolute terms

Gerstman Chapter 8 9

Relative Risk

Relative Risk (RR) \equiv relative effect associated with exposure

$$RR = \frac{R_1}{R_0}$$

where
 $R_1 \equiv$ risk in the exposed group and
 $R_0 \equiv$ risk in the non-exposed group


Interpretation: excess risk in relative terms.

Gerstman Chapter 8 10

Example

Fitness & Mortality (Blair et al., 1995)

- Is improved fitness associated with decreased mortality?
- Exposure \equiv improved fitness (1 = yes, 0 = no)
- Disease \equiv death (1 = yes, 0 = no)
- Mortality rate, group 1:
 $R_1 = 67.7$ per 100,000 p-yrs
- Mortality rate, group 0:
 $R_0 = 122.0$ per 100,000 p-yrs



Gerstman Chapter 8 11

Example

Risk Difference

What is the effect of improved fitness on mortality in absolute terms?

$$RD = R_1 - R_0 = \frac{67.7}{100,000 \text{ p-yrs}} - \frac{122.0}{100,000 \text{ p-yrs}} = \frac{-54.4}{100,000 \text{ p-yrs}}$$

The effect of the exposure (improved fitness) is to decrease mortality by 54.4 per 100,000 person-years

Gerstman Chapter 8 12

Example Relative Risk

What is the effect of improved fitness on mortality in relative terms?


$$RR = \frac{R_1}{R_0} = \frac{67.7 \text{ per } 100,000 \text{ p-yrs}}{122.0 \text{ per } 100,000 \text{ p-yrs}} = 0.55$$

The effect of the exposure is to cut the risk *almost* in half.

Gerstman Chapter 8 13

Designation of Exposure

- Switching the designation of "exposure" does *not* materially affect interpretations
- For example, if we had let "exposure" \equiv failure to improve fitness
- $RR = R_1 / R_0 = 122.0 / 67.7 = 1.80$ (or almost double the risk)



Gerstman Chapter 8 14

2-by-2 Table Format

	Disease +	Disease -	Total
Exposure +	A_1	B_1	N_1
Exposure -	A_0	B_0	N_0
Total	M_1	M_0	N

$R_1 = \frac{A_1}{N_1}$

$R_0 = \frac{A_0}{N_0}$

For true rates: let $N_1 \equiv$ person-time in group 1 and $N_0 \equiv$ person-time in group 0 and ignore cells B_1 and B_0

Gerstman Chapter 8 15

Food borne Outbreak Example

Exposure \equiv eating a particular dish
Disease \equiv gastroenteritis

	Disease +	Disease -	Total
Exposure +	63	25	88
Exposure -	1	6	7
Total	64	31	95

$$R_1 = \frac{A_1}{N_1} = \frac{63}{88} = 0.7159 \quad R_0 = \frac{A_0}{N_0} = \frac{1}{7} = 0.1429$$

Gerstman Chapter 8 17

Food borne Outbreak Data

	Disease +	Disease -	Total
Exposure +	63	25	88
Exposure -	1	6	7
Total	64	31	95

$$RR = \frac{R_1}{R_0} = \frac{63/88}{1/7} = \frac{0.7159}{0.1429} = 5.01$$

Exposed group had 5 times the risk

Gerstman Chapter 8 18

What do you do when you have multiple levels of exposure?

Compare rates to least exposed "reference" group

	LungCA Rate (per 100,000 person-years)	RR
Non-smoker (0)	10	1.0 (ref.)
Light smoker (1)	52	5.2
Mod. smoker (2)	106	10.6
Heavy sm. (3)	224	22.4

$RR_1 = \frac{R_1}{R_0} = \frac{52}{10} = 5.2$

$RR_2 = \frac{R_2}{R_0} = \frac{106}{10} = 10.6$

Gerstman Chapter 8 20

The Odds Ratio

- Similar to a RR, but based on odds (rather than rates or risks)
- Interpretation the *same as a relative risk*, i.e., the relative of incidence associated with exposure
- Used with incidence proportions and prevalence, and a study design known as "case-control"

	D+	D-	Total
E+	A ₁	B ₁	N ₁
E-	A ₀	B ₀	N ₀
Total	M ₁	M ₀	N

$$OR = \frac{A_1/B_1}{A_0/B_0} = \frac{A_1 B_0}{B_1 A_0}$$

"Cross-product ratio"

Gerstman Chapter 8 21

Odds Ratio, Example

Milunsky et al, 1989, Table 4
NTD = Neural Tube Defect

	NTD+	NTD-
Folic Acid+	10	10,703
Folic Acid-	39	11,905


$$OR = \frac{A_1 B_0}{B_1 A_0} = \frac{10 \cdot 11,905}{10,703 \cdot 39} = 0.29$$

Exposed group had *about* quarter the risk

Gerstman Chapter 8 22

Measures of Potential Impact

- Impact of removing a hazardous exposure from the population via statistic known as attributable fraction
- Two types of attributable fractions
 - In exposed cases
 - In the population



Gerstman Chapter 8 23

Attributable Fraction Exposed (AF_e)

Proportion of exposed cases averted with elimination of the exposure

Definitional formula: $AF_e = \frac{R_1 - R_0}{R_1}$

Equivalent formula: $AF_e = \frac{RR - 1}{RR}$

Gerstman Chapter 8 24

Example: AF_e

RR of lung CA associated with moderate smoking is approx. 10.4. Therefore:

$$AF_e = \frac{RR - 1}{RR} = \frac{10.4 - 1}{10.4} = .904$$

Interpretation: 90.4% of lung cancer in moderate smokers would be averted if they had not smoked.

Gerstman Chapter 8 25

Attributable Fraction, Population (AF_p)

Proportion of all cases averted with elimination of exposure *from the population*

Definitional formula: $AF_p = \frac{R - R_0}{R}$

where

- R = overall rate
- R₀ = rate in nonexposed population

Gerstman Chapter 8 26

AF_p for Cancer Mortality,
Selected Exposures

Exposure	Doll & Peto, 1981	Miller, 1992
Tobacco	30%	29%
Dietary	35%	20%
Occupational	4%	9%
Repro/Sexual	7%	7%
Sun/Radiation	3%	1%
Alcohol	3%	6%
Pollution	2%	-
Medication	1%	2%
Infection	10%	-