Applied HealthCare Research: How to Get Started

10 components of effective clinical epidemiology



Carl Heneghan

Professor of Evidence-Based Medicine & Director CEBM

University of Oxford



1. What's the problem that interests you?





Department of Health: Chronic Diseases management; the growing challenge and the strategic response



Department of Health: Chronic Diseases management; the growing challenge and the strategic response

Health care professionals may only interact with people with a chronic disease for a few hours a year...

the rest of the time patients care for themselves...

How to get started







2. Systematic overview of the field

ROYAL COLLEGE OF GENERAL PRACTITIONERS SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATION BOARD

Title of Project: What is the impact of self-monitoring in chronic disease management? A systematic overview

The aim is to identify the effects and components of currently evaluated selfmonitoring methods relevant to general practice. We will undertake a systematic overview of current research.





| | | - (- | | | | hear | t-failure- | workbo | ok1 | [Co | mp | atibility Mo | ode] - Micr | osoft Excel | | | | - 🕫 X | : |
|-----|--------------------|-------------------------------------|---|---------------------|--|---|--|-------------------------|--------|-------|--------|----------------------|---|--------------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------|--|---|----------|
| C | Hom | e | Insert Page L | ayout | Formu | las D | ata R | eview | ۷ | ïew | | Developer | | | | | | 🔞 – 📼 🗙 | ε |
| P | aste | Arial B | • 8 <i>I</i> <u>U</u> • [| • A | | | ≫~ f≢ f≢ | ■ ■ • | Ge | enera | 1 % | • €.0 .00 .00 →.0 | Condition Formatti | onal Format ng * as Table * | Cell Styles * | ins ins ins De iiii For | iert ▼ Σ ▼ A lete ▼ ↓ ▼ Z rmat ▼ 2 ▼ Filte | & Find & r * Select * | |
| Cin | K5 | | - (a | fx | Regular | Aligi | mene | | | | - Cum | bei | | Styles | | | | ang s | <u>چ</u> |
| | A | В | C | D | | E | | F | G | Н | 1 | J | К | L | | М | N | 0 | |
| 1 | Heart fa | ilur | e manageme | ent p | rogram | mes ar | nd com | pone | nt i | nte | rve | entions | | | | | | | ٦ |
| 2 | | | | | | | | Mor | nitori | ing c | :om | ponents | | | | | | C | |
| 3 | Study | Sampl e size | Population | Mean age | Key compor | nents of Inf | tervention | Weight | oedema | BP | HR | Signs & Symtoms | Telephone contact | Telemonitoring | Video- monitro | ong | Self management strategy | Other 4 r | |
| | Hanchett 1967 | 239 | Patients with HF attending specialty clinic US | 60–69 media n | Nurse-led pati telephone cor visits | ient educatio htact, regular | on, regular : homełclinic | | | | | | Regular | | | | | | |
| 4 | Rich 1993 | 98 | >70 yrs with HF discharged from hospital, moderate or high risk for readmission US | 79 | Nurse-led pati social service medications b intensive follo | ient educatio s consultatio y geriatric ca w-up at horr | on, dietary and on, review of ardiologist, ar he by study tea | l D am | | | | education | Regular | | | | To contact perosnnel il weight gain greater than 3-5 lbs | Compliance recommendations , Sodium restriction, discharge card | |
| 6 | Naylor 1994 | 276 (142 with CHD or HF | Patients > 70 yrs discharged from a tertiary care hospital with either CHD or HF US | 76 | Discharge pla gerontologic i coordinating of telephone cor with the patier | nning protoc nurse provid care, and ma ntact. APN, i nt's physician | ol with ing education intaining n collaboratio , to individual | n, on ize | | | | education | maintained contact 2 weeks after discharge | | | | | written instruction and medication schedules | |
| 7 | Kostis 1994 | 60 | Patients with CHF NYHA-II or III, US | | Non-pharmac (1) graduated (structured co management; aimed at salt r | ologic treatr exercise train gnitive therap (3) dietary in reduction an | ment program hing; (2) py and stress itervention d weight | 1: | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 8 | Rich 1995 | 282 | >70 yrs with HF discharged from hospital at high risk for readmission US | 79 | Nurse-led pati social service medications b intensive follo | ient educatio s consultatio y geriatric ca w-up at hom | on, dietary and on, review of ardiologist, ar he by study tea | l nd am | | | | | | | | | 1 | Dietary assesment | |
| 9 | Weinberger 1996 | 1396 (504 with HF) | Patients discharged from the general medicine service with HF, diabetes mellitus, or COPD | 63 | Primary care r materials and discharge and telephone foll physician follo | nurse provide coordinated outpatient o ow-up, prima ow-up within | ed education I care betweer Hinics, regular ary care 7 days of | al n | | | | | regular contact | Q | E | | Ī | Patient card with telephone numbers, reminders of appt | |
| 10 | Oddone 1996 | 443 | 443 from the 504 patients in the Weinberger study CHF and LVEF < 40% | 65(10) | Measurement adjustment, m communicatio prescheduled 6mo after disc | ts of daily we redication re on between p clinic appoir charge | ight, diuretic view, increase providers, htments durin | ed <mark>Daili</mark> g | | | | Education | | | | | Individual guidelines for weight change that triggered a phone call to their physician or nurse | | Ŧ |
| H | | neet1 | / Sheet2 / Sh | eet3 | 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rea | ady 🔛 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Ш <mark>Ш</mark> 80% (=)- | | Į |

Hindawi Publishing Corporation Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine Volume 2013, Article ID 945895, 18 pages http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/945895

Review Article

Overview of Systematic Reviews: Yoga as a Therapeutic Intervention for Adults with Acute and Chronic Health Conditions



3. Defining the question – the hardest bit

Figure 1.1 Background and foreground questions.



Patient presenting with MI

Foreground' Questions

About actual patient care decisions and actions

For treatment 4 (or 3) components:

In Patients on oral anticoagulation Does (I) self testing Compared to usual care reduce thormbosis (O)

(7 Types of questions)

| 1. How common is the problem | Prevalence | PO |
|---|------------|------|
| 2. Is early detection worthwhile | Screening | PICO |
| 3. Is the diagnostic test accurate | Diagnosis | PICO |
| 4. What will happen if we do nothing | Prognosis | РО |
| 5. Does this intervention help | Treatment | PICO |
| 6. What are the common harms of an intervention | | PICO |
| 7. What are the rare harms of an intervention | | PICO |

Box 1

FINER criteria for a good research question

F Feasible

- Adequate number of subjects
- Adequate technical expertise
- Affordable in time and money
- Manageable in scope

I Interesting

• Getting the answer intrigues investigator, peers and community

N Novel

• Confirms, refutes or extends previous findings

E Ethical

• Amenable to a study that institutional review board will approve

R Relevant

- To scientific knowledge
- To clinical and health policy
- To future research

Adapted with permission from Wolters Kluwer Health.²

4. Start and end with a systematic review



NIHR DRF 2015 Guidance Notes

Points to consider when preparing an NIHR TCC Training Fellowship Application

NIHR will only fund primary research* where the proposed research is informed by a review of the existing evidence.



THE LANCET

| Online First Current Issue | All Issues Special Issues | Multimedia - Information for | Authors | | | | | | |
|---|---------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| | All Content | Search Advanced Sear | rch | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| < Previous Article | Volume 367, No. 9508, p4 | 04–411, 4 February 2006 | Next Article > | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Articles | | | | | | | | | |
| | found outloop out | | | | | | | | |
| Self-monitoring o | t oral anticoagu | ation: a systematic | review | | | | | | |
| and meta-analysi | S | | | | | | | | |
| Dr C Heneghan, MRCGP 🗹 🖂, P Alonso-Coello, MD, JM Garcia-Alamino, RN, R Perera, PhD, E Meats, BSc, Prof P Glasziou, FRACGP | | | | | | | | | |
| Altmetric 7 | | | | | | | | | |
| DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(06)68139-7 | | | | | | | | | |
| □ Article Info | Article Info | | | | | | | | |
| © 2006 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved. | | | | | | | | | |
| This article can be found in the following collections: Cardiology & vascular-other | | | | | | | | | |
| Summary Full Text Ta | bles and Figures Refere | nces | | | | | | | |
| Summary | | | | | | | | | |



Self-monitoring & thromboembolic events OR 0.45 (0.30-0.68)

| Study or sub-category | Self-management n/N | Control n/N | OR (fixed) 95% Cl | Weight % | OR (fixed) 95% Cl |
|--|---|--|----------------------|--|--|
| 01 Self-adjust* Sawicki 1999 Sidhu 2001 Fitzmaurice 2002 Sunderji 2004 Menendez-Jandula 05 Voller 2005 Subtotal (95% CI) Total event: 7 (self-management), 21 (control) | 1/83 0/34 0/23 0/69 6/368 0/101 678 | 1/82 4/48 1/26 0/70 15/369 0/101 696 | | 2·26 8·39 3·14 33·45 47·24 | 0-99 (0-06-16-06 0-14 (0-01-2-75) 0-36 (0-01-9-32) Not estimable 0-39 (0-15-1-02) Not estimable 0-37 (0-16-0-85) |
| 02 Non-adjust† White 1989 Beyth 2000 Kortke 2001 Gardiner 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total event: 22 (self-management), 26 (control) | 0/26 21/163 0/305 1/29 523 | 0/24 26/162 0/295 0/24 505 | _ , | 51-58 1-18 52-76 | Not estimable 0·77 (0·42–1·44) Not estimable 2·58 (0·10–66·24 0·81 (0·44–1·49) |
| Total (95% CI)‡ Total event: 29 (self-management), 47 (control) | 1201 | 1201 | | 100-00 | 0-61 (0-38–0-98) |

Favours self-manage Favours control

Self-monitoring & death OR 0.61 (0.38 to 0.98)

5. Identify gaps in your skills

Clinical Epidemiology for the uninitiated

| Skills Level | Score |
|---|-------|
| | |
| No idea of the skill | 1 |
| Heard of the skill and would be able to undertake basics | 2 |
| Could undertake the skill but would require considerable help | 3 |
| Could undertake the skill requiring input only for the most difficult tasks | 4 |
| Can teach the skill | 5 |

6. Develop further research questions –

Delivering safe and effective anticoagulation for patients – further questions

- 1. Which subgroups benefit from self-monitoring?
- 2. Can you replicate trial results in practice?
- 3. How useful is time in range as a predictor of adverse events?
- 4. Can we predict successful self monitoring of anticoagulation at the outset?

Which subgroups benefit from self-monitoring?

Executive Summary Prevention of Thromboembolic Events: The Role of Point of Care Management

David Fitzmaurice¹, Dieter Horstkotte²

¹Department of Primary Care and General Practice, The University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK, ²Department of Cardiology, Heart and Diabetes Center North Rhine-Westphalia, Ruhr University Bochum, Bad Oeynhausen, Germany

The Infection, Thrombosis, Embolism and Bleeding Working Group of the Society for Heart Valve Disease (SHVD) held an International Symposium and Workshop, in Berlin, from 28th to 30th September 2006. A total of 80 participants was involved, with attendees from around Europe, Israel and the United States. A range of topics were discussed, from the organization of oral anticoagulation clinics in different countries to The Journal of Heart Valve Disease 2007;16:184-186

Sessions II and III were interactive workshops on the development of registries for valvar patients receiving oral anticoagulation and patient training for self-management of oral anticoagulation. Data were presented from the UK training model, with points of contention

discussed betweer agreement regardi with most countr risk of valve failure, for example, in the first few months following surgery, or in pregnant women.

Sessions IX and X focused on the developments of new POC devices for oral anticoagulation management, including the INRatio (S. Testa, Cremona, Italy), PROTIME (U. Taborski, Ludwigshafen, Germany), SmartCheck (H. Kamlah, Dannenfels, Germany), and the CoaguChek XS (B. Piso, Vienna, Austria). Two reports were made from Oxford, UK, providing data on a meta-analysis of published data for self-testing and management of oral anticoagulation (C. Heneghan), with a call for trialists to collaborate in an individual patient-level meta-analysis (R. Perera).

7. Look for methodological issues

Can you replicate the trial results in practice?

BMJ 2008;336:1472-1474 (28 June), doi:10.1136/bmj.39590.732037.47

Analysis

What is missing from descriptions of treatment in trials and reviews?

Paul Glasziou, professor of evidence based medicine¹, Emma Meats, research assistant¹, Carl Heneghan, senior clinical research fellow¹, Sasha Shepperd, NIHR research scientist in evidence synthesis²

¹ Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Department of Primary Health Care, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7LF, ² Department of Public Health, University of Oxford

What is missing from descriptions of treatment in trials and reviews?

Replicating non-pharmacological treatments in practice depends on how well they have been described in research studies, say Paul Glasziou and colleagues

Have you ever read a trial or review and receiving numerous requests for additional wondered exactly how to carry out treatments such as a "behavioural intervention," "salt reduction," or "exercise programme"? Although CONSORT and related initiatives have focused on the assessment of validity and presentation of results,^{1 2} less attention has been given to the adequacy of the description of the treatment used. For out sufficient details on the components that pharmacological treatments the description would need to include the dose, titration, route, timing, duration, and any monitoring used. For complex treatments the problems are even greater.

Why are full descriptions of treatment

details from doctors and patients, the author of a randomised trial on graded exercise for chronic fatigue syndrome⁶ subsequently published a supplementary article with a more detailed "prescription."7 Similarly, it is not possible to set up a stroke unit, offer low fat diets, or give smoking cessation advice withwere planned and delivered.8

Extent of the problem To assess the extent of problems with descriptions of treatment we prospectively assessed 80 consecutive studies selected for abstrac- Fig2 | Percentage of studies with sufficient



tion in the journal Evidence-Based Medicine description of treatment initially (based only on



TRACKING SWITCHED OUTCOMES IN CLINICAL TRIALS

Outcome switching in clinical trials is a serious problem (read why). We are systematically checking every trial published in the top five medical journals, to see if they have misreported their findings.

First, we compare each clinical trial report against its registry entry. Some trials report their outcomes perfectly. For the others, we count how many of the outcomes specified in the registry were never reported. And we count how many outcomes were silently added.

Second, whenever we detect unreported or added outcomes, we write a letter to the journal pointing them out, so that readers are aware of the problems. We are tracking which journals have published our letters after 4 weeks - and which haven't (see **our approach**).

Here's what we've found so far. Our project is ongoing since October 2015, and these numbers are updated live.



How useful is time in range as a predictor of adverse events?



8. Look for effects in real world populations



Br J Gen Pract. 2015 Jul; 65(636): e428–e437. Published online 2015 Jun 29. doi: <u>10.3399/bjgp15X685633</u>

Cohort study of Anticoagulation Self-Monitoring (CASM): a prospective study of its effectiveness in the community

Aim

To estimate the current levels of control and adverse events in patients self-monitoring OAT, explore the factors that predict success, and determine whether the level of side effects reported from randomised controlled trials are translated to a non-selected population. Design and setting

Prospective cohort study in the UK.

Method

Participants were aged ≥18 years and registered with a GP. Main outcomes were the proportion of participants, over 12 months, who were still self-monitoring, had not experienced adverse events, and had achieved >80% of time in therapeutic range (TTR).

Results

- In total, 296 participants were recruited (median age 61 yrs, 55% male).
- Predominately professional or held a university qualification (83%).
- At 12 months, 267 (90%) were still self-monitoring.
- Mean TTR was 75% (SD 16.9).
- Six serious and two minor adverse events were reported by GPs.
- Only 46% of participants received any in-person training at the outset.
- Increased age (P = 0.027), general wellbeing (EQ-5D visual score, P = 0.020), and lower target INR (P = 0.032) were all associated with high (>80% TTR) levels of control.

Conclusion

The findings show that, even with little training, people on OAT can successfully self-monitor, and even self-manage, their INR. TTR was shown to improve with age. However, widespread use of self-monitoring of INR may be limited by the initial costs, as well as a lack of training and support at the outset.

9. It takes at least two people to do applied heath research

<u>1. Cohort study of Anticoagulation Self-Monitoring (CASM): a prospective study of its effectiveness in the community.</u>**Ward** A, Tompson A, Fitzmaurice D, Sutton S, Perera R, **Heneghan** C. Br J Gen Pract. 2015

2. Supporting patients to self-monitor their oral anticoagulation therapy: recommendations based on a gualitative study of patients' experiences Tompson A, Heneghan C, Fitzmaurice SNCBI Resources How To V Pub Med.gov PubMed heneghan and perera Search 3. Current practice of venous thromboe US National Library of Medicine National Institutes of Health Create RSS Create alert Advanced McFarland L, Murray E, Harrison S, He Article types Summary - 20 per page - Sort by Most Recent -Send to: -Filters: Manage Filters Clinical Trial 4. ExPeKT--Exploring prevention and Review New feature McFarland L, Ward A, Greenfield S, M Customize ... Search results Try the new Display Settings c BMJ Open. 2013 Apr 2;3(4). pii: e0027 Items: 1 to 20 of 53 Text availability << First < Prev Page 1 of 3 Next > Last >> Sort by Relevance Abstract Free full text 5. Optimal loading dose of warf Corticosteroids for the common cold. Full text Mahtani KR, Heneghan CJ, Nu Find related data 1. Hayward G, Thompson MJ, Perera R, Del Mar CB, Glasziou PP, Heneghan CJ. PubMed Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2015 Oct 13;10:CD008116. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008116.pub3. Review. Database: Select Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012 D Commons PMID: 26461493 Reader comments Similar articles Trending articles Self-monitoring of oral anticoagulation Cohort study of Anticoagulation Self-Monitoring (CASM): a prospective study of its effectiveness in Heneghan C, Ward A, Perera R; Self-Publication dates 2. the community. Search details 5 years 2011 Nov 30. Review. Erratum in: Lan 10 years Ward A, Tompson A, Fitzmaurice D, Sutton S, Perera R, Heneghan C. heneghan[All Fields] A perera[All Fields] Custom range ... Br J Gen Pract. 2015 Jul:65(636):e428-37. doi: 10.3399/bigp15X685633. Epub 2015 Jun 15. PMID: 26077267 Free PMC Article 7. Optimal loading dose for the initiatio Species Similar articles Heneghan C, Tyndel S, Bankhead C, Humans Other Animals BMC Cardiovasc Disord. 2010 Apr 19; Search Relationship between altitude and the prevalence of hypertension in Tibet: a systematic review. 3. Mingji C, Onakpoya IJ, Perera R, Ward AM, Heneghan CJ. Clear all Heart, 2015 Jul;101(13);1054-60, doi: 10.1136/heartinl-2014-307158. Epub 2015 May 7, Review. 8. Self-monitoring and self-manageme **Recent Activity** Show additional filters PMID: 25953970 Free PMC Article Garcia-Alamino JM, Ward AM, Alonso Similar articles A heneghan and perera (53 Accuracy of self-monitored blood pressure for diagnosing hypertension in primary care. 9. Individual patient meta-analysis of s 4. Nunan D, Thompson M, Heneghan CJ, Perera R, McManus RJ, Ward A. Endometrial injury in wom Perera R, Heneghan C, Fitzmaurice D, Sein Monitoring mains (SMT) collaboration to mean valverus. 2008 Mar, 17(2):233-6.

<u>10. Self-monitoring of oral anticoagulation: a systematic review and meta-analysis.</u> Heneghan C, Alonso-Coello P, Garcia-Alamino JM, Perera R, Meats E, Glasziou P. Lancet. 2006 Feb 4;367(9508):404-11. Review. 10. Get organized and then get organized a bit more

<u>TEAM</u> Interpersonal

Talk Evaluate Assist Motivate Frame Organize Collect Understand Synthesize

FOCUS

Analytic



What does impact look like?

NIHR Dissemination Centre

NIHR Signal Self-monitoring of war

Published on 21 August 2015

Cost effectiveness

Expert commentary

The NIHR Health Technology assessment adds to a substa anticoagulation.

This review is supplemented by a recent NIHR-funded stuc successfully self-monitor, and even self-manage, in the cor has reported that self-monitoring was effective in the long t

Therefore the evidence clearly supports the adoption of se supports effective strategies to reduce thromboembolic eve Professor Carl Heneghan, Professor of Evidence-Base Sciences University of Oxford

WHO Collaborating Centre for Self-Care

+44 (0)1865 289322 cebm@phc.ox.ac.uk WHO Collaborating Centre for Self-Care

National Institute for

Health Research



The Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences has been designated a World Health Organization (WHO) Collaborating Centre for Self-Care in recognition of its international reputation in patient self-monitoring and self-management of cancer, cardiovascular disease and other non-communicable disease (NCD).

The research, training and education undertaken in collaboration with the WHO aims to embed primary care practice to support NCD patient self-care in low and middle income countries

Over the next four years, the WHO Collaborating Centre for Self-Care will coordinate a network of research centres to promote implementation

OUR TEAM



Alison Ward Director of Postgraduate Studies **KEEP INFC** For the lates newsletter.

NHS

Sign up

Recap

1. What's the problem that interests you?





2. Systematic overview of the field

ROYAL COLLEGE OF GENERAL PRACTITIONERS SCIENTIFIC FOUNDATION BOARD

Title of Project: What is the impact of self-monitoring in chronic disease management? A systematic overview

The aim is to identify the effects and components of currently evaluated selfmonitoring methods relevant to general practice. We will undertake a systematic overview of current research.

3. Defining the question – the hardest bit

Figure 1.1 Background and foreground questions.



4. Start and end with a systematic review



NIHR DRF 2015 Guidance Notes

Points to consider when preparing an NIHR TCC Training Fellowship Application

NIHR will only fund primary research* where the proposed research is informed by a review of the existing evidence.



5. Identify gaps in your skills

Clinical Epidemiology for the uninitiated

| Skills Level | Score |
|---|-------|
| | |
| No idea of the skill | 1 |
| Heard of the skill and would be able to undertake basics | 2 |
| Could undertake the skill but would require considerable help | 3 |
| Could undertake the skill requiring input only for the most difficult tasks | 4 |
| Can teach the skill | 5 |

6. Develop further research questions –

Delivering safe and effective anticoagulation for patients – further questions

- 1. Which subgroups benefit from self-monitoring?
- 2. Can you replicate trial results in practice?
- 3. How useful is time in range as a predictor of adverse events?
- 4. Can we predict successful self monitoring of anticoagulation at the outset?

7. Look for methodological issues

Can you replicate the trial results in practice?

BMJ 2008;336:1472-1474 (28 June), doi:10.1136/bmj.39590.732037.47

Analysis

What is missing from descriptions of treatment in trials and reviews?

Paul Glasziou, professor of evidence based medicine¹, Emma Meats, research assistant¹, Carl Heneghan, senior clinical research fellow¹, Sasha Shepperd, NIHR research scientist in evidence synthesis²

¹ Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Department of Primary Health Care, University of Oxford, Oxford OX3 7LF, ² Department of Public Health, University of Oxford

What is missing from descriptions of treatment in trials and reviews?

Replicating non-pharmacological treatments in practice depends on how well they have been described in research studies, say Paul Glasziou and colleagues

Have you ever read a trial or review and receiving numerous requests for additional wondered exactly how to carry out treatments such as a "behavioural intervention," "salt reduction," or "exercise programme"? Although CONSORT and related initiatives have focused on the assessment of validity and presentation of results,^{1 2} less attention has been given to the adequacy of the description of the treatment used. For out sufficient details on the components that pharmacological treatments the description would need to include the dose, titration, route, timing, duration, and any monitoring used. For complex treatments the problems are even greater.

Why are full descriptions of treatment

details from doctors and patients, the author of a randomised trial on graded exercise for chronic fatigue syndrome6 subsequently published a supplementary article with a more detailed "prescription."7 Similarly, it is not possible to set up a stroke unit, offer low fat diets, or give smoking cessation advice withwere planned and delivered.8

Extent of the problem To assess the extent of problems with descriptions of treatment we prospectively assessed 80 consecutive studies selected for abstrac- Fig2 | Percentage of studies with sufficient



tion in the journal Evidence-Based Medicine description of treatment initially (based only on

8. Look for effects in real world populations



9. It takes at least two people to do applied heath research

<u>1. Cohort study of Anticoagulation Self-Monitoring (CASM): a prospective study of its effectiveness in the community.</u> **Ward** A, Tompson A, Fitzmaurice D, Sutton S, Perera R, **Heneghan** C. Br J Gen Pract. 2015

2. Supporting patients to self-monitor their oral anticoagulation therapy: recommendations based on a qualitative study of patients' experiences. Tompson A, Heneghan C, Fitzmaurice D, Sutton S, Harrison S, Ward A. Br J Gen Pract. 2015

<u>3. Current practice of venous thromboembolism prevention in acute trusts: a qualitative study.</u> McFarland L, Murray E, Harrison S, **Heneghan** C, **Ward** A, Fitzmaurice D, Greenfield S. BMJ Open. 2014

<u>4. ExPeKT--Exploring prevention and knowledge of venous thromboembolism: a two-stage, mixed-method study protocol.</u> McFarland L, **Ward** A, Greenfield S, Murray E, **Heneghan** C, Harrison S, Fitzmaurice D. BMJ Open. 2013 Apr 2;3(4). pii: e002766. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-002766. Print 2013.

5. Optimal loading dose of warf Mahtani KR, Heneghan CJ, Nu Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2012 Dec 12;12:CD008685. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD008685.pub2.

6. Self-monitoring of oral anticoagulation: systematic review and meta-analysis of individual patient data.

Heneghan C, Ward A, Perera R; Self-Monitoring Trialist Collaboration. Lancet. 2012 Jan 28;379(9813):322-34. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(11)61294-4. Epub 2011 Nov 30. Review. Erratum in: Lancet. 2012 Mar 24;379(9821):1102.

7. Optimal loading dose for the initiation of warfarin: a systematic review. Heneghan C, Tyndel S, Bankhead C, Wan Y, Keeling D, Perera R, Ward A. BMC Cardiovasc Disord. 2010 Apr 19;10:18. doi: 10.1186/1471-2261-10-18. Review.

8. Self-monitoring and self-management of oral anticoagulation. Garcia-Alamino JM, Ward AM, Alonso-Coello P, Perera R, Bankhead C, Fitzmaurice D, Heneghan CJ. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2010

<u>9. Individual patient meta-analysis of self-monitoring of an oral anticoagulation protocol.</u> Perera R, **Heneghan** C, Fitzmaurice D; Self Monitoring Trialists (SMT) collaboration. J Heart Valve Dis. 2008 Mar;17(2):233-8.

10. Self-monitoring of oral anticoagulation: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Heneghan C, Alonso-Coello P, Garcia-Alamino JM, Perera R, Meats E, Glasziou P. Lancet. 2006 Feb 4;367(9508):404-11. Review.

Get organized a bit more, and then get organized a bit more, and then get organized a bit more, and then get organized a bit more

and then get organized a bit more and then get organized a bit more and then get organized a bit more and

then get organized a bit more and then get organized a bit more Ohand Get

organized

Applied HealthCare Research: How to Get Started

10 components of effective clinical epidemiology

Thank You

CEBM UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD

Carl Heneghan

Professor of Evidence-Based Medicine & Director CEBM

University of Oxford

