PS2-26:

Recruitment Costs for a Multi-Center, Randomized Clinical Trial for a Behavioral Intervention Study

Sarah Beaton, PhD¹; JoAnn Sperl-Hillen, MD²; Ann Von Worley, BS, RN¹; Omar Fernandes, MPH²; Dorothy Baumer, MS¹; Herbert Davis, PhD¹

¹LCF Research; ²HealthPartners Research Foundation

Background and Aims: The pace of recruitment impacts resources, planned study tasks, timelines, and ultimately, costs. The Journey for Control of Diabetes: the IDEA Study, a randomized trial conducted in two healthcare settings (Minnesota and New Mexico) utilized different recruitment methods at each site. This presentation compares these recruitment methods with respect to recruitment efficiency and costs. **Methods:** Study inclusion criteria were patients with sub-optimally controlled type 2 diabetes, an A1c > 7, and diabetes education-naïve within the last one to two years. Recruitment databases at each site were developed using electronic health data to identify potential participants. All patients were mailed recruitment letters and study brochures inviting them to participate. Site 1 mailed letters with an enclosed response form for the patient, if interested, to return to the study site; Site 2 mailed letters and subsequently attempted to contact all patients by telephone. Six months into the recruitment period, Site 1 also incorporated follow-up calls to potential patients who were mailed recruitment letters. **Results:** The enrolled sample was 623 patients: 147 (Site 1, Method 1), 190 (Site 1, Method 2), and 286 (Site 2). Recruitment efficiency rates based on number of enrolled participants per total recruitment letters mailed were 3.8% (147/3995 for Site 1, Method 1), 3.7% (190/5199 for Site 1, Method 2), and 6.9% (286/4128 for Site 2, Method 3). Cost of enrollment per patient ranged from \$71.45 for Method 1 (\$10,502/147), \$81.90 for Method 2 (\$15562/190), and \$87.57 for Method 3 (\$25,046/286). Total staff hours per patient were 1.58 for Method 1 (232.3/147), 2.51 for Method 2 (477.5/190), and 3.46 for Method 3 (990.4/286). Site 1, when combining data for Methods 1 and 2, recruited more subjects (337) within the 11 month recruitment period than Site 2 (286). **Conclusions:** Although recruitment efficiency rates were higher for Site 2, fewer staff hours were used at Site 1. Using the Site 2 methodology of contacting each patient may be more effective for studies with a higher risk of participation. Future studies should consider including a recruitment response form with the recruitment letter to save time and cost.

Keywords: Recruitment methods, Patient participation, Behavioral intervention

doi:10.3121/cmr.2010.943.ps2-26

PS2-27:

Lifestyle Choice, Education and Risk of Dementia Among Older Americans

Rashmita Basu, PhD; Washington State University

Background: The United States is in the midst of a profound demographic change: the rapid aging of its population. Dementia is one of the most common diseases at this age cohort. The cause of dementia is unknown and there is no effective treatment. Identification of lifestyle related factors that influence the risk of developing dementia, however, may provide insight into its cause and offer potential strategies for prevention. **Aim:** The primary objective of this study is to examine the association between a set of lifestyle characteristics and the likelihood of dementia among older Americans. **Methods:** The Aging Demographics and Memory Study (ADAMS) dataset is used to examine a set of potential protective or risk factors for dementia among older individuals in the U.S. The ADAMS is a cross-sectional data of a stratified random sample of 1,770 individuals of age 70 and above, selected from the Health and Retirement Survey -2000, based on the self-or-proxy reported cognition score. The ADAMS is the first nationally representative sample of individuals with dementia in this country. The generalized ordered logistic model is used to examine the impact of lifestyle related risk factors on the likelihood of dementia and other cognitive impairments not dementia (CIND). **Results:** For one year increase in age the odds of dementia versus

the combined outcomes of CIND and normal increases by 1.11. Compared to all other genotypes, APOE-ε4 is associated with an increased risk of dementia. An each year increase in education, the odds of dementia against the combined outcomes of CIND and normal is decreased by 0.90. Among chronic health conditions, an incidence of stroke is the significant risk factor for dementia. **Conclusion:** The finding that higher education lowers the risk of dementia has important implications as education can be viewed as a 'preventive medicine' for postponing the onset of dementia. From a policy perspective the causal relationship is important in order to evaluate the effectiveness of public expenditures on education. Further research can investigate whether a re-allocation of resources can be welfare improving if the impact of education on dementia risk is larger than the impact of healthcare on dementia.

Keywords: Dementia, Lifestyle factors, Education levels

doi:10.3121/cmr.2010.943.ps2-27

PS2-28:

Online Consenting in the Simulated Diabetes Training (SDT) for Resident Physicians Study

Omar Fernandes, MPH; HealthPartners

Background and Aims: The main purpose of this NIDDK-funded group-randomized trial is to evaluate the effect of teaching resident physicians fundamental principles of diabetes management using an interactive computer simulation program called SimCare. A minimum of 20 primary care residency programs with up to 700 residents total will be randomly assigned to either (a) an early SimCare Diabetes learning program group or (b) a delayed SimCare Diabetes learning program group. This presentation will provide an explanation of and justification for using an online informed consent process to facilitate informed consent for a national trial of this scale. **Methods:** Resident physicians interested in participating in this study will be asked to read an online informed consent form that fully details the study procedures, potential risks and benefits to participating, the study's voluntary nature, and issues surrounding confidentiality. As they move through each page of the online consent form, they will be required to confirm their understanding of the page's content by clicking an "I understand" check box before they can proceed. Reviewing the online consent and enrolling in this study confers their informed consent. **Results:** The online informed consent process for this study has been developed and IRB-approved. To enroll, a resident will create a user name and password and provide contact information to be used to communicate with them during the study. A link to the principal study staffs' contact information will also be clearly posted on each page so that if a resident has a question or concern, they can contact the study staff prior to completing the form. At the end of the form, a resident has the choice to agree to participate and enroll in the study and print a copy of the consent, ask questions to the study staff prior to consenting, or decide not to participate. **Conclusions:** It is difficult to coordinate informed consent for a national trial, but an online informed consenting process such as this provides an efficient avenue that meets internal review board standards.

Keywords: Online consenting process, informed consent, national trial enrollment

doi:10.3121/cmr.2010.943.ps2-28

PS2-29:

Optimal Lifestyle Adherence and 2-Year Incidence of Chronic Conditions

Thomas Kottke, MD, MSPH¹; Nico Pronk, PhD²

¹HealthPartners Research Foundation; ²HealthPartners

Background and Aims: Adherence to an optimal lifestyle, defined as adequate physical activity, no use of tobacco, moderate alcohol use, and eating five servings of fruits and vegetables per day, has been associated with as much as 14 years of increased longevity and improved functional health status. Unfortunately, adherence to these optimal lifestyle behaviors is relatively low among the population. Furthermore, the extent to which adherence to multiple lifestyle behaviors is associated with specific disease

incidence is unclear. Improved understanding of this association may hold significant potential for population health improvement strategies. The purpose of this investigation was to study the association of adherence to varying levels of an optimal lifestyle with the incidence of chronic disease among employed adults (N=35,684). **Methods:** All baseline data were collected as part of a health assessment process during the year 2007. Participants were followed for two years. Descriptive statistics were calculated and reported as the proportion of the sample reporting a newly diagnosed chronic disease (diabetes, heart disease, hyperlipidemia, hypertension, back pain, or cancer) by the number of lifestyle behaviors that they practiced. **Results:** Compared with individuals who practiced no or only 1 optimal lifestyle behavior, the risk of developing a condition for individuals practicing 3 or 4 behaviors was 66% lower for diabetes, 45% lower for heart disease, 17% lower for hyperlipidemia, 15% lower for hypertension, 43% lower for back pain, and 24% lower for cancer. **Conclusions:** Adherence to optimal lifestyle is associated with lower 2-year incidence rates of several chronic conditions. Attention to population-based strategies that improve adherence to these four behaviors appears to positively affect risk of chronic diseases and their risk factors. To the extent that social marketing strategies and systematic measurement and feedback to individual members, patients, and groups (e.g., employer-based) increases adherence to multiple health behaviors, risk of chronic disease may be reduced.

Keywords: Optimal lifestyle adherence, Lifestyle behaviors, Health improvement strategies

doi:10.3121/cmr.2010.943.ps2-29

IRB Issues

C-A2-01:

IRB Review in the Era of ARRA: Streamlining Without Sacrifice

Jeffrey Braff, DrPH, MBA¹; Sarah Greene, MPH²; Karin Johnson, PhD²; Ella Thompson, BS²; Kate Rardin-Leahy, PhD³

¹Kaiser Permanente; ²Group Health Cooperative; ³Health Partners

Background and Aims: In the era of ARRA, we are routinely confronted with compressed timelines and an accelerated pace of research. Concurrently, discussions have intensified over recent months about the HMORN's capacity to conduct comparative effectiveness research on topics of national interest. Building on these unique challenges and opportunities, this interactive session will serve as a forum for conference attendees to discuss recent HMORN efforts to make multi-site IRB review as agile as possible. In particular, we will showcase the HMORN facilitated review process and discuss how it might be further improved or expanded. **Methods:** In early 2008, the HMORN ratified its first Standard Operating Procedure (SOP), which outlines procedures for inter-institutional IRB review of data-only studies. This SOP helped clarify what steps to take and who to contact, both in order to pursue ceding, and when multiple IRBs need to review the same study. This process has now been used in a majority of HMORN member institutions. As its use has increased, researchers and IRB administrators have become more familiar with the process. In September 2009, the HMORN Governing Board identified continuing such work to ensure IRB agility as a key 2010 priority for the HMORN. **Results:** In this session, we will review how to use the facilitated IRB review process outlined in the SOP and learn from attendees how we can further facilitate multi-site IRB review, along with attendant concerns such as HIPAA. In addition, we will give a snapshot of recent and upcoming developments across the Network sites, including human research protection program accreditation efforts and migration to electronic IRB systems. **Conclusions:** This session will enable research investigators, IRB administrators and HMORN leadership to engage in a constructive dialogue about the residual barriers to using the facilitated IRB process for data-only studies, and identify pathways to institutionalize this process in our Network's routine research processes. This session will also introduce how the demands of IRB accreditation and the implementation of new electronic IRB systems may facilitate or impede our progress in this area.

Keywords: IRB review, HMORN, Multicenter Studies

doi:10.3121/cmr.2010.943.c-a2-01

Health and Bioinformatics

C-A4-01:

Providing Care for Cancer Survivors in Integrated Delivery Systems: An Assessment of Current Practices and Future Opportunities

Jessica Chubak, PhD¹; Clarissa Hsu, PhD²; Leah Tuzzio, MPH¹; Beth Kirlin, BA¹; Larissa Nekhlyudov, MD, MPH^{3,4}

¹Group Health; ²Group Health Research Institute; ³Harvard Medical School;

⁴Harvard Vanguard Medical Associates

Background and Aims: There are currently more than 11 million cancer survivors in the United States; for many, cancer is a chronic condition that requires effective management and coordination of care. Little research on cancer survivorship models has been done, and most has focused on care provided in cancer centers. To our knowledge, no research has been conducted within population-based integrated delivery systems. To this end, the Cancer Research Network (CRN) Survivorship Scientific Interest Group (SIG) undertook a project to identify and describe; 1) current practices in cancer survivorship care, 2) goals and/or intentions to create cancer survivorship care programs, and 3) areas for future research in survivorship care models within integrated delivery systems. **Methods:** Semi-structured interviews were conducted with expert informants from 10 of 14 CRN sites. Individuals were selected based on their leadership roles in primary care/internal medicine, oncology, nursing and/or other cancer-related specialties. Interviews were conducted by telephone and were audiotaped, transcribed and coded. Analyses are underway; final results will be available at the HMORN meeting. **Results:** Of the initial 48 persons contacted, interviews were completed with 40 expert informants. Preliminary analyses suggest that in general respondents were supportive of providing cancer survivors with medical services customized to the needs of cancer survivors. At most sites, follow-up care for cancer survivors was provided by an informal collaboration between primary care physicians and oncologists. Respondents reported that the electronic medical records available at their sites appear to facilitate communication between providers caring for cancer survivors. Challenges in providing care to cancer survivors included allocation of time and resources. Few sites have survivorship care-specific guidelines, care plans or other formal tools to assist physicians in creating follow-up care plans for cancer survivors. The interviews identified 2 formal survivorship programs underway and one being pilot tested. **Conclusions:** While there appears to be an awareness of the needs of cancer survivors by the leadership in the integrated health care delivery sites, survivorship programs are generally not formalized. This study enhances our understanding of community-based cancer survivorship care and helps build the foundation for research on the effectiveness of different approaches to improve care.

Keywords: Cancer survivorship, survivorship models, integrated health delivery

doi:10.3121/cmr.2010.943.c-a4-01

C-B5-02:

H1N1 Vaccine Safety Monitoring in the Vaccine Safety Datalink Project: New Challenges and Useful Lessons

Tracy Lieu, MD, MPH¹; Sharon Greene, PhD, MPH¹; Ruihua Yin, MS¹; Rong Li, MS¹; Martin Kulldorff, PhD¹; Eric Weintraub, MPH²; Bruce Fireman, MA³; Roger Baxter, MD³; James Nordin, MD, MPH⁴; Steven Jacobsen, MD, PhD⁵; Edwin Lewis, MPH³; James Baggs, PhD²; Melisa Rett, MPH¹; Richard Platt, MD, MS¹; Grace Lee, MD, MPH¹

¹Harvard Pilgrim Health Care Institute and Harvard Medical School; ²Centers for Disease Control and Prevention; ³Kaiser Permanente Vaccine Study Center, Northern California; ⁴HealthPartners Research Foundation; ⁵Kaiser Permanente Southern California

Background and Aims: The worldwide introduction of influenza A (H1N1) vaccines in fall 2009 has raised widespread public questions about the safety of these new vaccines. The Vaccine Safety Datalink Project, a collaboration among CDC and eight health care systems in the HMORN, began accelerated