Journal of the Medical Research Institute

JMRI, 2024; Vol. 45 No. 1: (40-44)

Journal of the Medical Research Institute

Bias in Pharmacoepidemiology: Understanding and Mitigating Challenges.

Ashraf A. Noah [1]

1) Alexandria Clinical Research Administration, Directorate of Health Affairs, Egyptian Ministry of Health and Population, Alexandria, Egypt.

ABSTRACT:

Bias exerts a significant influence on pharmaco-epidemiological research across various phases, affecting study planning, execution, and interpretation. This article comprehensively explores different types of bias in each study phase, encompassing the planning phase (pre-trial), the in-process phase (during trial), and the interpretation phase (post-trial).

Bias in the study planning phase, which involves study design and selection bias, can distort outcomes due to nuances in research outlining and participant selection. Biases in the in-process phase, including interviewer bias, chronology bias, recall bias, transfer bias, and performance bias, present challenges in interpreting findings. Understanding these biases reveals their intricate impact on study validity.

Additionally, interpretation phase biases such as publication bias, selective reporting bias, spin bias, ghostwriting bias, and publication delay bias further complicate interpretations. Recognizing and mitigating bias through rigorous study design, transparent reporting, and proactive measures are essential for robust pharmaco-epidemiological research, ensuring validity and reliability in findings.

Keywords: Bias, Pharmaco-epidemiological research, Study planning biases, In-process biases, Interpretation phase biases

1. INTRODUCTION

Bias, basic concepts:

In academic and clinical research, bias refers to a type of systematic error that can distort measurements and/or affect investigations and their results (Popovic & Huecker, 2021). It is important to distinguish a systematic error, such as bias, from that of random error (Jager et al., 2020). Random error occurs due to the natural fluctuation in the accuracy of any measurement device, the innate differences between humans (both investigators and subjects), and by pure chance (Vetter & Mascha, 2017). Random errors can occur at any point and are more difficult to control (Frost & Alexandrou, 2024). Systematic errors, referred to as bias from here on, occur at one or multiple points during the research process, including the study planning, execution, and interpretation phases (Frampton et al., 2022)

1- Bias in study planning phase:

Bias in the study planning phase of pharmaco-epidemiological research poses significant challenges to result reliability (Vaidyanathan, 2022). Here, we explore key biases encountered, focusing on study design and selection biases.

1.1- Study design bias:

Study design bias refers to systematic errors or distortions that occur during the framing and outlining of a research study, potentially leading to misleading or inaccurate conclusions (Jefferson, 2020). Several factors contribute to study design bias:

- **Definition of Variables:** Inaccurate or ambiguous definitions of variables such as risk factors and outcomes can introduce bias (Navarro et al., 2021). Clear and standardized definitions are essential to ensure consistency and reliability in data collection and analysis (Viswanathan et al., 2018).
- **Subjective Measures:** Reliance on subjective measures, such as subjective grading systems or self-reported data, can introduce bias due to variability in interpretation or reporting by different individuals (Rosenman et al., 2011).
- **Data Collection Methods:** The methods used to collect data, such as questionnaires, interviews, physical exams, or medical chart reviews, can influence the quality and reliability of the data (Sukmawati, 2023). Standardized protocols and training of study personnel are crucial to minimize variability in data collection (Pannucci & Wilkins, 2010).
- **Blinding:** Lack of blinding or masking of study personnel to the exposure or outcome status of participants can introduce bias, particularly in subjective assessments or surgical procedures (Liakos et al., 2024).Blinding helps prevent conscious or unconscious biases

Received: 27-3-2024 Accepted: 4-4-2024
Corresponding author: Ashraf A. Noah

from influencing study results (Anderson & Rowell, 2023).

- **Retrospective Identification of Risk or Exposure:** Relying solely on retrospective data collection, such as medical chart review, without cross-referencing or confirmation from multiple sources, can lead to biased results due to incomplete or inaccurate information (Talari & Goyal, 2020).

To mitigate study design bias, researchers should carefully plan and execute their studies, ensuring clear definitions of variables, standardized data collection methods, and blinding procedures where applicable (Gerhard, 2008). Peer review and transparency in reporting study methods are also essential to identify and address potential biases (Aguinis et al., 2018).

1.2- Selection bias:

Selection bias refers to a systematic error in a study's design that arises when the criteria used to select participants result in a sample that is not representative of the target population (Degtiar & Rose, 2023). This bias can occur when certain groups are more likely to be included or excluded from the study based on factors related to both the exposure and the outcome being studied (Tripepi et al., 2010).

For example, in a study examining the effectiveness of a new treatment for a medical condition, if participants are selected based on their access to healthcare rather than randomly sampled from the population, it could introduce selection bias. This bias can distort the study findings and lead to inaccurate conclusions about the relationship between the exposure and the outcome (Lu et al., 2024).

1.3- Channeling bias:

Channeling bias occurs when patients are more likely to be prescribed a particular treatment based on their underlying characteristics or clinical status rather than randomized assignment (Lobo et al., 2006). This bias can lead to differences in outcomes between treatment groups that are not solely due to the treatment itself but rather to the characteristics of the patients receiving the treatment (Acton et al., 2023).

For example, if patients with more severe symptoms are more likely to receive a new, potentially more effective treatment, it may appear that the treatment is more effective than it is because it is being given to patients who are already at higher risk of poor outcomes. Channeling bias is a common concern in observational studies and can make it challenging to accurately assess the true effectiveness or safety of a treatment (Lu, 2009).

2- Bias in the study execution phase (in process):

Bias during the execution of a study refers to systematic errors or distortions that occur during data collection, intervention administration, or participant follow-up, potentially leading to skewed or inaccurate results (Jager et al., 2020).

2.1- Interviewer bias:

Interviewer bias occurs when the interviewer's characteristics, beliefs, or behavior influence the participant's responses, or the data collected during an interview or survey (Gerson & Damaske, 2020). This bias can affect the reliability and validity of the information obtained, leading to inaccurate or skewed results (Geldsetzer et al., 2024). Interviewer bias can manifest in various ways, such as leading questions, non-verbal cues, or unintentional cues that may influence the participant's responses (Pannucci & Wilkins, 2010).

For example, if an interviewer holds certain stereotypes or prejudices, they may unintentionally communicate these biases through their tone of voice or body language, leading participants to provide responses that align with those biases. To minimize interviewer bias, researchers can use standardized interview protocols, provide training to interviewers, and use techniques such as blinding to reduce the influence of interviewer characteristics on the data collected (Pannucci & Wilkins, 2010).

2.2- Chronology bias:

Chronology bias occurs when the timing of events or observations within a study influences the outcomes or results observed (Tamm & Hilgers, 2014). This bias can arise in various ways, such as when there are changes in diagnostic criteria, treatment protocols, or follow-up procedures over time, leading to differences in outcomes between earlier and later study participants (Pannucci & Wilkins, 2010). Chronology bias can also occur when there are variations in the duration of follow-up or observation periods between study groups, leading to differences in the detection or reporting of outcomes (Paradis, 2008).

For example, if a study comparing the effectiveness of two treatments has a longer follow-up period for one group than the other, it may falsely appear that the treatment with longer follow-up is more effective due to the increased likelihood of detecting outcomes over time.

To mitigate chronology bias, researchers should carefully consider the timing of events and observations within their study design, ensure consistency in follow-up procedures and duration across study groups, and account for changes in diagnostic or treatment practices over time in their analysis (Rückbeil et al., 2019).

2.3- Recall bias:

Recall bias is a type of systematic error that occurs when participants in a study inaccurately remember or report past events, exposures, or experiences (Schmier & Halpern, 2004). This bias can distort the relationship between the exposure and the outcome being studied, leading to inaccurate or misleading results (Sedgwick, 2012). Recall bias often arises when participants are asked to recall past events that may be emotionally charged, stigmatized, or occurred a long time ago (Colombo et al., 2020). Factors such as individual differences in memory, cognitive abilities, and psychological factors can also contribute to recall bias (Brusco & Watts, 2015).

For example, in a case-control study investigating the association between smoking and lung cancer, individuals with lung cancer may be more likely to accurately recall their smoking history compared to healthy individuals, leading to an overestimation of the association between smoking and lung cancer.

To minimize recall bias, researchers can use various strategies such as collecting data prospectively, using objective measures whenever possible, validating self-

reported data against external sources, and minimizing the time between exposure and data collection (Vaidyanathan, 2022).

2.4- Transfer bias:

Transfer bias, also known as the Berkson's bias, is a systematic error that occurs in case-control studies when the controls are selected from a different population than the cases (Pannucci & Wilkins, 2010). This can happen when controls are selected from a hospital or clinic population while cases are drawn from the general population. Because the controls come from a population with a higher prevalence of the exposure or disease being studied due to their hospitalization or clinic visit, this bias can distort the observed association between the exposure and the outcome. Transfer bias can lead to an underestimation or overestimation of the true association, depending on the direction of the bias (Westreich, 2012).

To mitigate transfer bias, researchers should ensure that controls are selected from the same population as the cases or, if not possible, adjust for any differences between the populations in the analysis (Schwartzbaum et al., 2003). Alternatively, researchers may choose to use population-based controls to minimize the impact of transfer bias on study results (Snoep et al., 2014).

2.5- Performance bias:

Performance bias refers to a type of bias that occurs in experimental studies, particularly randomized controlled trials (RCTs), when there are systematic differences in the care provided to participants in different study groups beyond the treatment being investigated (Spieth et al., 2016). This bias can arise if there are variations in the way interventions are delivered or if there are differences in the level of care or attention provided to participants in different study groups (Gold et al., 2012).

For example, in a drug trial where one group receives a new medication and the other receives a placebo, performance bias may occur if healthcare providers or participants are aware of which treatment they are receiving, and this knowledge affects their behavior or perceptions. This could lead to differences in outcomes between the two groups that are not solely attributable to the effects of the treatment itself, but rather to the additional attention or care provided to one group.

To minimize performance bias in RCTs, blinding or masking techniques can be employed to ensure that participants and healthcare providers are unaware of which treatment group they are in (Torgerson & Torgerson, 2003). Blinding helps to prevent conscious or unconscious biases from influencing participant behavior or treatment delivery (Moustgaard et al., 2020).

3- Bias in study interpretation phase:

Bias that occurs in the interpretation phase, also known as post-trial bias, refers to distortions or influences that affect the interpretation, reporting, or dissemination of trial results after the completion of the study (Ho et al., 2018). Several types of bias can occur at this stage:

3.1- Publication Bias:

This occurs when the decision to publish study results is influenced by the direction or statistical significance of the findings (Stanley, 2005). Studies with positive or statistically significant results are more likely to be published, while those with null or negative results are often left unpublished or published with less visibility (van Aert & Niemeyer, 2022). Publication bias can distort the overall evidence base and lead to an overestimation of the true effect of interventions (Marks-Anglin & Chen, 2020).

3.2- Selective Reporting Bias:

Selective reporting bias occurs when only certain outcomes or analyses from a trial are reported, typically those that are favorable or supportive of the study hypothesis (Saini et al., 2014). This can lead to an incomplete or biased portrayal of the study findings, as important outcomes or analyses may be omitted if they do not align with the researchers' or sponsors' interests (Page & Higgins, 2016).

3.3- Spin Bias:

Spin bias involves the use of misleading language or framing to present study results in a more favorable light than warranted by the data (Alsem et al., 2008). This can occur in the abstracts, press releases, or media coverage of trial results, where positive findings may be emphasized while limitations or uncertainties are downplayed or omitted (O'Leary et al., 2023). Spin bias can lead to misinterpretation of study findings by clinicians, policymakers, and the public (Alsem et al., 2008).

3.4- Ghostwriting Bias:

Ghostwriting bias occurs when individuals who contributed significantly to the design, conduct, or analysis of a trial are not acknowledged or listed as authors on the resulting publications (DeTora et al., 2019). This can lead to a distortion of the perceived credibility or independence of the study results if undisclosed conflicts of interest exist among the named authors (Stretton, 2014).

3.5- Publication Delay Bias:

Publication delay bias refers to the phenomenon where there is a delay between the completion of a trial and the publication of its results (Christie et al., 2021). Studies with positive or significant findings may be published more quickly than those with null or negative results, leading to a skewed representation of the evidence over time (Fanelli, 2012). Addressing bias that occurs after a trial requires efforts to promote transparency, openness, and accountability in the reporting and dissemination of research findings (Christie et al., 2021).

Conclusion

In summary, bias is a pervasive challenge in pharmacoepidemiology that can arise at various stages of research, from study planning to interpretation and even in the publication process. Bias in the study planning phase encompasses study design bias, selection bias, and channeling bias, which can distort the relationship between exposures and outcomes.

During the study execution phase, interviewer bias, chronology bias, recall bias, transfer bias, and performance bias can all impact the validity of study findings. Additionally, bias in the interpretation phase, including publication bias, selective reporting bias, spin bias,

ghostwriting bias, and publication delay bias, can further distort the evidence base.

Addressing bias in pharmacoepidemiology requires comprehensive strategies, including careful study design, rigorous data collection and analysis methods, transparency in reporting, and adherence to ethical standards.

By minimizing bias, researchers can enhance the reliability and validity of study findings, ultimately improving the quality of evidence used to inform clinical practice and public health policy

References

1. Acton, E. K., Willis, A. W., & Hennessy, S. (2023). Core concepts in pharmacoepidemiology: key biases arising in pharmacoepidemiologic studies. Pharmacoepidemiology and drug safety, 32(1), 9-18.
2. Aguinis, H., Ramani, R. S., & Alabduljader, N. (2018). What you see is what you get? Enhancing methodological transparency in management research. Academy of Management Annals, 12(1), 83-110.
3. Alsem, K. J., Brakman, S., Hoogduin, L., & Kuper, G. (2008). The impact of newspapers on consumer confidence: does spin bias exist? Applied Economics, 40(5), 531-539.
4. Anderson, T., & Rowell, S. (2023). Blinding: who and how? In Translational Surgery (pp. 359-366). Elsevier.
5. Brusco, N. K., & Watts, J. J. (2015). Empirical evidence of recall bias for primary health care visits. BMC health services research, 15, 1-8.
6. Christie, A. P., White, T. B., Martin, P. A., Petrovan, S. O., Bladon, A. J., Bowkett, A. E., Littlewood, N. A., Mupepele, A.-C., Rocha, R., & Sainsbury, K. A. (2021). Reducing publication delay to improve the efficiency and impact of conservation science. PeerJ, 9, e12245.
7. Colombo, D., Suso-Ribera, C., Fernández-Álvarez, J., Cipresso, P., Garcia-Palacios, A., Riva, G., & Botella, C. (2020). Affect recall bias: Being resilient by distorting reality. Cognitive Therapy and Research, 44, 906-918.
8. Degtiar, I., & Rose, S. (2023). A review of generalizability and transportability. Annual Review of Statistics and Its Application, 10, 501-524.
9. DeTora, L. M., Carey, M. A., Toroser, D., & Baum, E. Z. (2019). Ghostwriting in biomedicine: a review of the published literature. Current medical research and opinion.
10. Fanelli, D. (2012). Negative results are disappearing from most disciplines and countries. Scientometrics, 90(3), 891-904.
11. Frampton, G., Whaley, P., Bennett, M., Bilotta, G., Dorne, J.-L. C., Eales, J., James, K., Kohl, C., Land, M., & Livoreil, B. (2022). Principles and framework for assessing the risk of bias for studies included in comparative quantitative environmental systematic reviews. Environmental evidence, 11(1), 12.
12. Frost, S. A., & Alexandrou, E. (2024). Misclassification and measurement error–planning a study and interpreting results. Nurse Researcher, 32(1).
13. Geldsetzer, P., Chang, A. Y., Meijer, E., Sudharsanan, N., Charu, V., Kramlinger, P., & Haarburger, R. (2024). Interviewer biases in medical survey data: The example of blood pressure measurements. PNAS nexus, pgae109.
14. Gerhard, T. (2008). Bias: considerations for research practice. American journal of health-system pharmacy, 65(22), 2159-2168.
15. Gerson, K., & Damaske, S. (2020). The science and art of interviewing. Oxford University Press.
16. Gold, C., Erkkilä, J., & Crawford, M. J. (2012). Shifting effects in randomised controlled trials of complex interventions: a new kind of performance bias? Acta psychiatrica scandinavica, 126(5), 307-314.
17. Ho, A. M., Phelan, R., Mizubuti, G. B., Murdoch, J. A., Wickett, S., Ho, A. K., Shyam, V., & Gilron, I. (2018). Bias in before–after studies: narrative overview for anesthesiologists. Anesthesia & Analgesia, 126(5), 1755-1762.
18. Jager, K. J., Tripepi, G., Chesnaye, N. C., Dekker, F. W., Zoccali, C., & Stel, V. S. (2020). Where to look for the most frequent biases? Nephrology, 25(6), 435-441.
19. Jefferson, T. (2020). Sponsorship bias in clinical trials: growing menace or dawning realisation? Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine, 113(4), 148-157.
20. Liakos, A., Pagkalidou, E., Karagiannis, T., Malandris, K., Avgerinos, I., Gigi, E., Bekiari, E., Haidich, A.-B., & Tsapas, A. (2024). A Simple Guide to Randomized Controlled Trials. The International Journal of Lower Extremity Wounds, 15347346241236385.
21. Lobo, F. S., Wagner, S., Gross, C. R., & Schommer, J. C. (2006). Addressing the issue of channeling bias in observational studies with propensity scores analysis. Research in Social and Administrative Pharmacy, 2(1), 143-151.
22. Lu, C. Y. (2009). Observational studies: a review of study designs, challenges and strategies to reduce confounding. International journal of clinical practice, 63(5), 691-697.
23. Lu, Y., Chen, H., Wang, W., Huang, Y., Cheng, F., & Daley, E. (2024). Adjustment of selection bias for clinical trials: a simulation study. Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation, 1-18.
24. Marks-Anglin, A., & Chen, Y. (2020). A historical review of publication bias. Research synthesis methods, 11(6), 725-742.
25. Moustgaard, H., Clayton, G. L., Jones, H. E., Boutron, I., Jørgensen, L., Laursen, D. R., Olsen, M. F., Paludan-Müller, A., Ravaud, P., & Savović, J. (2020). Impact of blinding on estimated treatment effects in randomised clinical trials: meta-epidemiological study. Bmj, 368.
26. Navarro, C. L. A., Damen, J. A., Takada, T., Nijman, S. W., Dhiman, P., Ma, J., Collins, G. S., Bajpai, R., Riley, R. D., & Moons, K. G. (2021). Risk of bias in studies on prediction models developed using supervised machine learning techniques: systematic review. Bmj, 375.
27. O'Leary, R., La Rosa, G. R. M., Vernooij, R., & Polosa, R. (2023). Identifying spin bias of nonsignificant findings in biomedical studies. BMC Research Notes, 16(1), 50. https://doi.org/10.1186/s13104-023-06321-2

28. Page, M. J., & Higgins, J. P. (2016). Rethinking the assessment of risk of bias due to selective reporting: a cross-sectional study. Systematic reviews, 5, 1-8.
29. Pannucci, C. J., & Wilkins, E. G. (2010). Identifying and avoiding bias in research. Plastic and reconstructive surgery, 126(2), 619-625.
30. Paradis, C. (2008). Bias in surgical research. Annals of surgery, 248(2), 180-188.
31. Popovic, A., & Huecker, M. R. (2021). Study bias.
32. Rosenman, R., Tennekoon, V., & Hill, L. G. (2011). Measuring bias in self-reported data. International Journal of Behavioural and Healthcare Research, 2(4), 320-332.
33. Rückbeil, M. V., Hilgers, R.-D., & Heussen, N. (2019). Randomization in survival studies: An evaluation method that takes into account selection and chronological bias. Plos one, 14(6), e0217946.
34. Saini, P., Loke, Y. K., Gamble, C., Altman, D. G., Williamson, P. R., & Kirkham, J. J. (2014). Selective reporting bias of harm outcomes within studies: findings from a cohort of systematic reviews. Bmj, 349.
35. Schmier, J. K., & Halpern, M. T. (2004). Patient recall and recall bias of health state and health status. Expert review of pharmacoeconomics & outcomes research, 4(2), 159-163.
36. Schwartzbaum, J., Ahlbom, A., & Feychting, M. (2003). Berkson's bias reviewed. European journal of epidemiology, 18(12), 1109-1112.
37. Sedgwick, P. (2012). What is recall bias? Bmj, 344.
38. Snoep, J. D., Morabia, A., Hernández-Díaz, S., Hernán, M. A., & Vandenbroucke, J. P. (2014). Commentary: A structural approach to Berkson's fallacy and a guide to a history of opinions about it. International journal of epidemiology, 43(2), 515-521.
39. Spieth, P. M., Kubasch, A. S., Penzlin, A. I., Illigens, B. M.-W., Barlinn, K., & Siepmann, T. (2016). Randomized controlled trials–a matter of design. Neuropsychiatric disease and treatment, 1341-1349.
40. Stanley, T. D. (2005). Beyond publication bias. Journal of economic surveys, 19(3), 309-345.
41. Stretton, S. (2014). Systematic review on the primary and secondary reporting of the prevalence of ghostwriting in the medical literature. BMJ open, 4(7), e004777.
42. Sukmawati, S. (2023). Development of quality instruments and data collection techniques. Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran Guru Sekolah Dasar (JPPGuseda), 6(1), 119-124.
43. Talari, K., & Goyal, M. (2020). Retrospective studies–utility and caveats. Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of Edinburgh, 50(4), 398-402.
44. Tamm, M., & Hilgers, R.-D. (2014). Chronological bias in randomized clinical trials arising from different types of unobserved time trends. Methods of Information in Medicine, 53(06), 501-510.
45. Torgerson, D. J., & Torgerson, C. J. (2003). Avoiding bias in randomised controlled trials in educational research. British journal of educational studies, 51(1), 36-45.
46. Tripepi, G., Jager, K. J., Dekker, F. W., & Zoccali, C. (2010). Selection bias and information bias in clinical research. Nephron Clinical Practice, 115(2), c94-c99.
47. Vaidyanathan, A. K. (2022). Controlling bias in research. In (Vol. 22, pp. 312-313): Medknow.
48. van Aert, R. C., & Niemeyer, H. (2022). Publication bias. In Avoiding questionable research practices in applied psychology (pp. 213-242). Springer.
49. Vetter, T. R., & Mascha, E. J. (2017). Bias, confounding, and interaction: lions and tigers, and bears, oh my! Anesthesia & Analgesia, 125(3), 1042-1048.
50. Viswanathan, M., Patnode, C. D., Berkman, N. D., Bass, E. B., Chang, S., Hartling, L., Murad, M. H., Treadwell, J. R., & Kane, R. L. (2018). Assessing the risk of bias in systematic reviews of health care interventions.
51. Westreich, D. (2012). Berkson's bias, selection bias, and missing data. Epidemiology, 23(1), 159-164.