WEBVTT

- 1.00:00:00.060 --> 00:00:02.670 < v Presenter>Okay, there we go. Okay.</v>
- $2\ 00:00:02.670 \longrightarrow 00:00:03.503$ All right.
- 3 00:00:03.503 --> 00:00:05.430 And this is where I wanted to start talking right here.
- 4 00:00:05.430 --> 00:00:07.849 So, to put...
- 5~00:00:07.849 --> 00:00:11.880 To put implementation science in sort of the context
- $6\ 00:00:11.880 \longrightarrow 00:00:15.234$ of the whole kind of public health scientific
- 7 00:00:15.234 --> 00:00:20.234 research pipeline, we think about efficacy trials,
- $8\ 00:00:21.420 --> 00:00:25.470$ effectiveness, pragmatic and cost-effectiveness trials,
- 9 00:00:25.470 --> 00:00:29.310 implementation studies and dissemination studies.
- 10 00:00:29.310 --> 00:00:33.210 So things don't always work this way,
- $11\ 00:00:33.210 \longrightarrow 00:00:36.689$ but this is the idealized sort of research pipeline.
- 12 00:00:36.689 --> 00:00:40.080 And in efficacy trials,
- $13\ 00:00:40.080 \longrightarrow 00:00:42.990$ what happens is they're usually kind of phase
- 14 00:00:42.990 --> 00:00:46.139 three individually randomized clinical trials
- $15\ 00:00:46.139 \longrightarrow 00:00:49.740$ of investigational drugs and devices.
- $16\ 00:00:49.740 --> 00:00:54.690$ And they're usually done in very relatively high budget
- $17\ 00:00:54.690 \longrightarrow 00:00:57.690$ research settings with lots of exclusion
- $18\ 00:00:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:01:01.560$ criteria and academic researchers and so forth.
- $19\ 00:01:01.560 \longrightarrow 00:01:04.590$ And they established the biological efficacy
- $20\ 00:01:04.590 \longrightarrow 00:01:07.860$ of a particular drug or device.
- 21 00:01:07.860 --> 00:01:10.553 Should that be found efficacious,
- 22 00:01:10.553 --> 00:01:13.230 then we might move on to
- 23 00:01:13.230 --> 00:01:16.080 what's now called an effectiveness trial,
- $24\ 00:01:16.080 --> 00:01:18.870$ an often a somewhat synonym
- $25\ 00{:}01{:}18.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}23.100$ is a pragmatic trial and sometimes cost-effectiveness,
- $26\ 00:01:23.100 \longrightarrow 00:01:25.830$ it is also studied at the same time,

- $27\ 00:01:25.830 --> 00:01:28.837$ and in effectiveness trials we might take that same
- $28\ 00:01:28.837 \dashrightarrow 00:01:31.680$ drug and device, but now we're kind of interested
- $29\ 00:01:31.680 --> 00:01:34.650$ in how well it works at the community level.
- $30\ 00:01:34.650 \longrightarrow 00:01:37.800$ So oftentimes effectiveness trials and pragmatic
- 31 00:01:37.800 --> 00:01:42.510 trials are cluster-randomized, say, by providers,
- 32 00:01:42.510 --> 00:01:47.510 provider practices, clinics or facilities, villages,
- $33\ 00{:}01{:}48.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}53.780$ neighborhoods and so forth, and on the exclusion criteria,
- $34\ 00{:}01{:}54.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}01{:}57.690$ it's encouraged that they be as minimal as possible
- $35\ 00:01:57.690 --> 00:02:00.300$ to exclude as many people who might be eligible
- $36\ 00:02:00.300 \longrightarrow 00:02:02.640$ for this treatment should it be shown to be
- $37\ 00:02:02.640 \longrightarrow 00:02:04.950$ effective and cost-effective.
- $38\ 00:02:04.950 \longrightarrow 00:02:08.190$ And they tend to be larger and maybe run
- $39\ 00:02:08.190 \longrightarrow 00:02:10.260$ for a longer amount of time.
- $40~00:02:10.260 \dashrightarrow 00:02:13.710$ And then cost may be taken into account as well.
- 41 00:02:13.710 --> 00:02:16.433 Then should a particular intervention,
- 42 00:02:16.433 --> 00:02:19.366 now I've moved from the word drug or device
- $43\ 00{:}02{:}19.366 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 00{:}02{:}24.105$ to intervention because of tentimes a drug or device may
- $44\ 00{:}02{:}24.105 \dashrightarrow 00{:}02{:}27.270$ be embedded within a much more complex program
- $45\ 00:02:27.270 \longrightarrow 00:02:29.640$ at the effectiveness stage,
- $46\ 00:02:29.640 --> 00:02:32.610$ where we'd be looking at not just sort
- $47\ 00:02:32.610 --> 00:02:34.980$ of biological impact or health impact,
- $48~00:02:34.980 \dashrightarrow 00:02:38.133$ but also it's how well it can be delivered.
- 49 00:02:39.930 --> 00:02:41.451 In this classic pipeline,
- 50~00:02:41.451 --> 00:02:45.660 should a programmer intervention be shown to be
- 51 00:02:45.660 --> 00:02:47.910 effective and cost-effective, then we move,

- 52 00:02:47.910 --> 00:02:50.910 might move on to an implementation study.
- 53~00:02:50.910 --> 00:02:54.365 And there we might be taking the program that was
- 54 00:02:54.365 --> 00:02:56.190 the multi-level program
- $55\ 00:02:56.190 --> 00:02:58.823$ that may have been shown to be effective
- $56\ 00:02:58.823 \longrightarrow 00:03:02.709$ and cost-effective at this second level of research
- $57\ 00:03:02.709 --> 00:03:07.224$ and be adapting it contextually, tweaking, adapting,
- $58~00:03:07.224 \longrightarrow 00:03:12.150$ modifying the program for new contexts such as
- $59\ 00:03:12.150 \longrightarrow 00:03:15.540$ from one country to another, from urban to rural, from,
- 60 00:03:15.540 --> 00:03:16.980 say, in the United States,
- $61\ 00:03:16.980 \longrightarrow 00:03:20.100$ from the North to the South and so forth.
- 62 00:03:20.100 --> 00:03:23.520 And then also experimenting potentially
- $63\ 00:03:23.520 \dashrightarrow 00:03:27.930$ with cost-effective ways of implementing it to kind
- $64\ 00:03:27.930 \longrightarrow 00:03:29.820$ of streamline the delivery.
- $65\ 00:03:29.820 \longrightarrow 00:03:31.720$ Also at the implementation phase,
- $66\ 00:03:31.720 \longrightarrow 00:03:35.198$ we'd be looking at scale up and scale out,
- $67\ 00:03:35.198 \longrightarrow 00:03:39.000$ and these things could be done without,
- $68~00:03:39.000 \dashrightarrow 00:03:42.060$ with primary endpoints not even being health outcomes
- $69\ 00:03:42.060 \longrightarrow 00:03:43.050$ at this point.
- 70 00:03:43.050 --> 00:03:45.737 They might purely be things such as adoption,
- $71\ 00:03:45.737 \longrightarrow 00:03:48.330$ reach and so forth.
- $72~00{:}03{:}48.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}03{:}51.900$ And then finally in the last stage, dissemination,
- 73 00:03:51.900 --> 00:03:54.480 that's all again about the scale up stage,
- 74 00:03:54.480 --> 00:03:58.354 the scale up meaning making it more available
- 75 00:03:58.354 --> 00:04:01.860 in the particular context that was studied,
- $76~00{:}04{:}01.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}04.406$ but to every body within that context and every body

- $77\ 00:04:04.406 \longrightarrow 00:04:06.840$ like those who were in that context.
- $78~00:04:06.840 \longrightarrow 00:04:11.840$ And then scale out meaning to everybody, to other places.
- 79 00:04:12.480 --> 00:04:14.130 And again, there could be further
- $80\ 00:04:16.120 \longrightarrow 00:04:18.153$ adaption needed at that point.
- 81 00:04:23.070 --> 00:04:26.130 Okay, so what is implementation science?
- 82 00:04:26.130 --> 00:04:29.036 A number of definitions have been posed.
- $83~00{:}04{:}29.036 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}32.050$ And maybe the one at the bottom is the simplest
- $84\ 00:04:32.050 \longrightarrow 00:04:35.520$ and maybe one that I prefer the best,
- $85\ 00{:}04{:}35.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}38.940$ implementation science is about determining what works
- $86\ 00:04:38.940 \longrightarrow 00:04:41.433$ in real-life, full-scale settings.
- $87\ 00:04:42.570 --> 00:04:46.830$ It can also, say, the blue boxed definition of systematic,
- $88\ 00:04:46.830 \longrightarrow 00:04:49.860$ scientific approach to ask and answer questions
- $89\ 00:04:49.860 \longrightarrow 00:04:51.780$ about how to get what works
- $90\ 00{:}04{:}51.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}04{:}55.052$ to people who need it with greater speed, fidelity,
- 91 00:04:55.052 --> 00:04:59.013 efficiency, quality and relevant coverage.
- 92 00:05:00.210 --> 00:05:02.693 And then the middle definition I think is the one
- 93 $00:05:02.693 \longrightarrow 00:05:06.810$ that's used by the NIH in the dissemination
- $94\ 00:05:06.810 \longrightarrow 00:05:09.000$ and implementation science study section
- $95\ 00:05:09.000 \longrightarrow 00:05:12.510$ that's recently been closed down
- $96\ 00:05:12.510$ --> 00:05:17.510 and Bree issued in with some greater specializations,
- 97 00:05:20.100 --> 00:05:21.690 that that's been defined,
- $98\ 00:05:21.690 \longrightarrow 00:05:23.520$ implementation and prevention science
- $99\ 00:05:23.520 \longrightarrow 00:05:26.520$ there that was defined as the scientific study
- $100\ 00:05:26.520 \longrightarrow 00:05:29.070$ of programs and interventions which promote
- $101\ 00{:}05{:}29.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}32.550$ the systematic uptake of clinical research findings,

- $102\ 00:05:32.550 \longrightarrow 00:05:35.610$ so here it's hearkening to the pipeline I was
- $103\ 00{:}05{:}35.610 \dashrightarrow 00{:}05{:}38.940$ just discussing, and other evidence-based approaches
- $104\ 00:05:38.940 \longrightarrow 00:05:42.540$ into routine clinical practice and public health policy,
- 105 00:05:42.540 --> 00:05:45.450 hence improving the quality, effectiveness,
- 106 00:05:45.450 --> 00:05:48.420 reliability, safety, appropriateness, equity,
- $107\ 00:05:48.420 --> 00:05:51.150$ efficiency of healthcare.
- $108\ 00:05:51.150 --> 00:05:53.100$ So hopefully that gives you some sense
- $109\ 00:05:53.100 \longrightarrow 00:05:54.960$ of what we're talking about here.
- $110\ 00:05:54.960 --> 00:05:59.040$ It's not that there's a single uniform definition
- $111\ 00:05:59.040 \dashrightarrow 00:06:02.580$ that's kind of universally agreed on by everybody,
- $112\ 00:06:02.580 \longrightarrow 00:06:06.780$ but it's definitely getting at not so much showing
- $113\ 00:06:06.780 \longrightarrow 00:06:11.780$ that interventions, programs and so forth
- $114\ 00:06:12.330 \longrightarrow 00:06:15.210$ are effective because that's already been done
- 115 00:06:15.210 --> 00:06:18.570 in these pragmatic and effectiveness trials,
- $116\ 00{:}06{:}18.570 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}06{:}23.430$ but at getting them to the largest populations possible
- 117 00:06:23.430 --> 00:06:25.710 in an efficient way in making sure
- $118\ 00:06:25.710 \longrightarrow 00:06:27.960$ that quality is maintained.
- 119 00:06:27.960 --> 00:06:31.293 So very practical, but also very challenging.
- $120\ 00:06:32.340 \longrightarrow 00:06:35.460$ So another piece of this in implementation science,
- $121\ 00{:}06{:}35.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}38.580$ since we're studying evidence-based interventions
- $122\ 00:06:38.580 \longrightarrow 00:06:41.490$ is that implementation science studies,
- $123\ 00{:}06{:}41.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}06{:}45.750$ we call it the three Rs, Rigorous, Rapid and Relevant.
- 124 00:06:45.750 --> 00:06:48.210 So rigorous has to do with,
- $125\ 00{:}06{:}48.210$ --> $00{:}06{:}51.161$ even though we're studying very practical things,

 $126\ 00{:}06{:}51.161 --> 00{:}06{:}55.290$ like implementation science in some ways is, you know,

 $127\ 00:06:55.290 \longrightarrow 00:06:57.900$ the outgrowth of what had been previously called

128 00:06:57.900 --> 00:07:00.930 program evaluation, that we might,

 $129\ 00:07:00.930 \longrightarrow 00:07:03.360$ we still wanna use state-of-the-art methods.

 $130\ 00:07:03.360 \longrightarrow 00:07:05.063$ The studies use, you know,

 $131\ 00{:}07{:}05.063$ --> $00{:}07{:}10.063$ formal power calculations for cluster-randomized designs.

 $132\ 00:07:10.534 \longrightarrow 00:07:14.501$ They can take into account multiple outcomes

 $133\ 00:07:14.501$ --> 00:07:18.771 and the methodologies can use causal inference methods

 $134\ 00:07:18.771$ --> 00:07:23.771 and all sorts of multi-level analysis methods and so forth.

135 00:07:24.810 --> 00:07:27.890 There's no drop off in the rigor

136 00:07:27.890 --> 00:07:30.690 in implementation science, necessarily.

137 00:07:30.690 --> 00:07:33.336 And in fact it's very challenging to be rigorous

 $138\ 00:07:33.336 \longrightarrow 00:07:36.000$ in these kinds of settings where the data may,

 $139\ 00:07:36.000 \longrightarrow 00:07:40.770$ are imperfect so when we get onto rapid,

 $140\ 00:07:40.770 --> 00:07:42.900$ we also need to get these answers very quickly

141 00:07:42.900 --> 00:07:45.150 'cause we're talking about urgent public health

 $142\ 00{:}07{:}45.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}48.556$ questions and we want to have our implementation

 $143\ 00:07:48.556$ --> 00:07:53.556 science work be informative to policy development

 $144\ 00{:}07{:}53.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}07{:}58.670$ and formulation and promulgation, not coming afterwards.

 $145\ 00:07:59.220 \longrightarrow 00:08:01.020$ So in order to be rapid,

146 00:08:01.020 --> 00:08:03.616 we wanna make use of existing data,

 $147\ 00:08:03.616 \longrightarrow 00:08:08.092$ electronic health records, other sorts of records

148 00:08:08.092 --> 00:08:11.760 and move things along quite rapidly

 $149\ 00:08:11.760 \longrightarrow 00:08:14.893$ even though we're trying to maintain the rigor

 $150\ 00{:}08{:}14.893 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}19.130$ just as we would in a phase III randomized clinical trial

- 151 00:08:19.130 --> 00:08:20.820 in an academic setting.
- 152 00:08:20.820 --> 00:08:23.640 And then relevant, we wanna be answering
- $153\ 00:08:23.640 \longrightarrow 00:08:27.000$ the most important public health questions of the day.
- $154\ 00:08:27.000 \longrightarrow 00:08:31.563$ And those would be decided by public health leaders,
- $155\ 00:08:32.460 \longrightarrow 00:08:37.460$ policy directors and ministry of health officials
- $156\ 00:08:39.376 \longrightarrow 00:08:41.580$ at the different country,
- 157 00:08:41.580 --> 00:08:44.040 district and even community levels as well
- $158\ 00:08:44.040 \longrightarrow 00:08:45.750$ as the community itself.
- 159 00:08:45.750 --> 00:08:48.360 So it's different than in the case of, say,
- $160\ 00{:}08{:}48.360 \dashrightarrow 00{:}08{:}51.439$ academia where somebody is a research oncologist
- $161\ 00:08:51.439 \longrightarrow 00:08:53.610$ and they're working on breast cancer and trying
- $162\ 00{:}08{:}53.610 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}08{:}57.690$ to figure out some new treatments to cure and prolong
- $163\ 00:08:57.690 \longrightarrow 00:09:00.870$ the life and quality of life of people with breast cancer.
- $164\ 00:09:00.870 --> 00:09:04.080$ Implementation scientists wouldn't necessarily be
- $165~00:09:04.080 \dashrightarrow 00:09:06.750$ choosing the topical area of interest.
- 166 00:09:06.750 --> 00:09:09.390 They would let the public health community
- $167\ 00:09:09.390 \longrightarrow 00:09:10.500$ make those choices.
- $168\ 00:09:10.500 \longrightarrow 00:09:13.380$ And then where we might come in is, okay,
- 169 00:09:13.380 --> 00:09:16.140 this is an important policy question,
- $170\ 00{:}09{:}16.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}18.870$ how are we gonna study this and get you some answers,
- 171 00:09:18.870 --> 00:09:20.673 rigorously and rapidly.
- 172 00:09:24.327 --> 00:09:28.323 So given all of what I've said,
- $173\ 00{:}09{:}29.280 \dashrightarrow 00{:}09{:}31.980$ it might be evident that implementation science
- $174\ 00:09:31.980 --> 00:09:34.819$ is somewhat different from epidemiology,
- $175\ 00:09:34.819 --> 00:09:37.620$ clinical research and so forth.

 $176\ 00:09:37.620 \longrightarrow 00:09:40.980$ And at the study design level we have

 $177\ 00:09:40.980 \longrightarrow 00:09:42.930$ these sorts of considerations.

 $178\ 00:09:42.930 --> 00:09:46.680$ So the first one is that implementation science

179 00:09:46.680 --> 00:09:49.410 is guided by implementation science theory

 $180\ 00:09:49.410 \longrightarrow 00:09:51.201$ models and frameworks.

 $181\ 00:09:51.201$ --> 00:09:54.870 What I mean by that are, there are social science

182 00:09:54.870 --> 00:09:59.870 theories of behavioral change such as CFIR,

 $183\ 00{:}09{:}59.910 \dashrightarrow 00{:}10{:}02.907$ the consolidated framework for implementation

184 00:10:02.907 --> 00:10:05.940 research or RE-AIM.

 $185\ 00:10:05.940 \longrightarrow 00:10:07.500$ There's a number of them.

186 00:10:07.500 --> 00:10:11.546 And they guide the work in the sense

 $187\ 00:10:11.546 \longrightarrow 00:10:16.330$ that they help determine where we are in the pipeline

 $188\ 00:10:19.115 \longrightarrow 00:10:24.115$ of identifying barriers to full uptake at high quality

 $189\ 00:10:25.260 \longrightarrow 00:10:28.600$ of a particular intervention and

 $190\ 00:10:30.000 --> 00:10:32.880$ what has been facilitating this so far

 $191\ 00:10:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:10:35.040$ in this particular context.

 $192\ 00:10:35.040 --> 00:10:37.770$ And then figuring out how to expand it,

 $193\ 00:10:37.770 \longrightarrow 00:10:40.980$ how to adapt it in a new setting and so forth.

 $194\ 00:10:40.980 \dashrightarrow 00:10:44.175$ And many of these things in involve behavioral change

 $195\ 00:10:44.175 --> 00:10:47.790$ and other sorts of human factors that are

 $196\ 00:10:47.790 \longrightarrow 00:10:52.790$ not typically the objects of study of clinical researchers,

 $197\ 00:10:53.464 \longrightarrow 00:10:56.890$ epidemiologists and biostatisticians.

 $198\ 00:10:56.890 --> 00:11:01.354$ So implementation science brings in some new team members,

 $199\ 00:11:01.354 \longrightarrow 00:11:06.354$ namely social scientists, who might be psychologists,

200 00:11:07.470 --> 00:11:12.470 social workers, medical anthropologists,

- $201\ 00:11:12.570 \longrightarrow 00:11:15.630$ and then also economists because we still tend
- $202\ 00:11:15.630 \longrightarrow 00:11:18.630$ to be looking at cost from the sustainability
- 203 00:11:18.630 --> 00:11:19.533 point of view.
- $204\ 00:11:20.760 --> 00:11:22.050$ So I think I've already mentioned
- $205\ 00{:}11{:}22.050 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}24.900$ that implementation science tends to intrinsically
- 206 00:11:24.900 --> 00:11:28.831 be multilevel, because in terms of developing
- 207 00:11:28.831 --> 00:11:32.070 and sustaining successful interventions
- $208\ 00:11:32.070 \longrightarrow 00:11:34.950$ to address important public health programs,
- $209\ 00{:}11{:}34.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}11{:}39.230$ we need to engage often the healthcare system policy makers,
- 210 00:11:39.230 --> 00:11:43.050 organizational leaders, healthcare providers,
- $211\ 00:11:43.050 \longrightarrow 00:11:48.050$ clients and their families and social networks.
- $212\ 00:11:48.540 --> 00:11:52.074$ And social networks, I'd like to just say a word about,
- 213 00:11:52.074 --> 00:11:54.450 it's a little throw in here,
- 214 00:11:54.450 --> 00:11:57.810 but actually it's an area of research for my group
- $215\ 00:11:57.810 --> 00:12:00.180$ and maybe other people who are participating
- $216\ 00:12:00.180 \longrightarrow 00:12:02.920$ in this discussion that
- 217 00:12:04.230 --> 00:12:09.230 on the provider and client level, at least,
- 218 00:12:09.740 --> 00:12:12.030 it's quite possible and it's starting
- 219 00:12:12.030 --> 00:12:15.950 to become increasingly documented that interventions
- $220\ 00{:}12{:}15.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}20.056$ that not every body, not all providers and not all
- $221\ 00{:}12{:}20.056 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}23.909$ clients necessarily need to receive an intervention
- 222 00:12:23.909 --> 00:12:27.070 in order for an intervention to spread
- $223\ 00:12:27.070 \longrightarrow 00:12:28.710$ throughout a health system
- 224 00:12:28.710 --> 00:12:31.200 or throughout a community because people have
- $225\ 00{:}12{:}31.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}12{:}35.068$ social relationships and can influence one another

- $226\ 00:12:35.068 --> 00:12:37.902$ in terms of the adoption of new practices
- 227 00:12:37.902 --> 00:12:41.100 at the provider level or the uptake of new
- $228\ 00:12:41.100 --> 00:12:45.360$ interventions at the client and family, neighborhood.
- $229\ 00:12:45.360 \longrightarrow 00:12:47.880$ workforce and so forth level.
- $230\ 00:12:47.880$ --> 00:12:51.300 So we're interested in leveraging these networks
- $231\ 00:12:51.300 \longrightarrow 00:12:54.930$ to perhaps make certain types of public
- $232\ 00:12:54.930 --> 00:12:59.340$ health interventions be more cost-effective and have
- 233 00:12:59.340 --> 00:13:01.653 wider reach and sustainability.
- $234\ 00{:}13{:}03.240 --> 00{:}13{:}06.690$ Another piece is that implementation science studies
- 235 00:13:06.690 --> 00:13:10.020 tend to be dynamic in that many of you,
- 236 00:13:10.020 --> 00:13:12.867 if you've worked in HIV, it's very well known, say,
- $237\ 00:13:12.867 \longrightarrow 00:13:15.930$ the HIV treatment cascade,
- $238\ 00:13:15.930 \longrightarrow 00:13:18.540$ the TB treatment cascade and so forth.
- 239 00:13:18.540 --> 00:13:21.840 And then to say prevent, say,
- $240\ 00{:}13{:}21.840 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}26.443$ HIV or to ensure the highest quality of life of people
- 241 00:13:26.443 --> 00:13:28.470 who are HIV positive,
- $242\ 00{:}13{:}28.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}31.140$ there are all these different steps along the wav
- $243\ 00:13:31.140 \longrightarrow 00:13:34.923$ that involve different types of treatments, interventions,
- $244\ 00:13:34.923 \longrightarrow 00:13:37.320$ actors at different levels.
- $245\ 00{:}13{:}37.320 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}13{:}40.490$ And one of the things we do in implementation science
- 246 00:13:40.490 --> 00:13:43.260 is we might map those cascades and think,
- $247\ 00{:}13{:}43.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}46.110$ figure out where the weak points are and then figure
- $248\ 00{:}13{:}46.110 \dashrightarrow 00{:}13{:}50.159$ out what interventions can we bring in to strengthen

- 249 00:13:50.159 --> 00:13:54.963 the success of the entire cascade by targeting
- $250\ 00:13:56.760 \longrightarrow 00:13:58.650$ its weakest points.
- $251\ 00:13:58.650 \longrightarrow 00:14:01.980$ So the timing of delivery of intervention components,
- $252\ 00:14:01.980 \longrightarrow 00:14:03.750$ can be, along the cascade,
- $253\ 00{:}14{:}03.750 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}06.843$ can be as important as the delivery itself.
- $254\ 00{:}14{:}07.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}11.766$ And then as I mentioned, just as an effectiveness trials,
- $255~00{:}14{:}11.766$ --> $00{:}14{:}14.398$ you know, I can't say for sure there would never be
- $256\ 00:14:14.398 --> 00:14:16.840$ an implementation study that
- $257\ 00:14:17.730 \longrightarrow 00:14:19.980$ wasn't individually randomized.
- 258 00:14:19.980 --> 00:14:23.460 But in general the implication for design
- $259~00{:}14{:}23.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}26.460$ of these sorts of studies is that they tend to be
- $260\ 00{:}14{:}26.460 \dashrightarrow 00{:}14{:}30.180$ group level assignments to study intervention components
- 261 00:14:30.180 --> 00:14:32.820 and they could be at the district, hospital,
- 262 00:14:32.820 --> 00:14:36.475 facility, practice, provider or community levels
- $263\ 00:14:36.475 \longrightarrow 00:14:39.610$ and even clients themselves can be group level.
- 264 00:14:39.610 --> 00:14:42.360 If you think that every client is a member
- $265\ 00{:}14{:}42.360 {\:\dashrightarrow\:} 00{:}14{:}46.230$ of a social network and that by including them
- $266\ 00:14:46.230 \longrightarrow 00:14:48.630$ we're actually indirectly including their entire
- $267\ 00:14:48.630 \longrightarrow 00:14:50.433$ social network as well.
- $268\ 00:14:57.558 --> 00:15:00.000$ Okay. I'm now trying to go on to the next slide.
- $269\ 00:15:00.000 \longrightarrow 00:15:03.843$ It's not behaving. Let me try again.
- 270 00:15:05.370 --> 00:15:07.940 Oh, there we go. So...
- 271 00:15:11.790 --> 00:15:14.040 So there's many study design options
- $272\ 00{:}15{:}14.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}18.090$ in implementation science and they depend on a wide
- $273\ 00:15:18.090 \longrightarrow 00:15:19.363$ range of factors.

 $274\ 00:15:19.363 \longrightarrow 00:15:23.010$ The factors are listed here what the research question is,

 $275\ 00:15:23.010 \longrightarrow 00:15:25.552$ the type of clinical or public health intervention,

 $276\ 00:15:25.552 \longrightarrow 00:15:29.250$ the type of implementation strategy, feasibility,

 $277\ 00:15:29.250 \longrightarrow 00:15:33.780$ cost in personnel, the setting, who are the stakeholders,

 $278\ 00:15:33.780 \longrightarrow 00:15:37.320$ what are the logistics, the target population,

 $279\ 00{:}15{:}37.320 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}40.688$ timeline, ethical issues come up and they in fact can

 $280\ 00:15:40.688 --> 00:15:43.140$ be very different than those that we're used

 $281\ 00:15:43.140 \longrightarrow 00:15:46.517$ to in randomized clinical trials of investigated

 $282\ 00:15:46.517 \longrightarrow 00:15:48.570$ drugs and devices.

 $283~00:15:48.570 \longrightarrow 00:15:50.580$ And that's an area of active development

284 00:15:50.580 --> 00:15:52.950 that I'm quite interested in and there might be

 $285\ 00{:}15{:}52.950 \dashrightarrow 00{:}15{:}55.830$ other people here who are interested in being involved

 $286\ 00:15:55.830 \longrightarrow 00:15:57.359$ in this as well.

287 00:15:57.359 --> 00:16:01.473 And then... And then funding opportunities.

288 00:16:04.050 --> 00:16:07.173 So... There we go.

289 00:16:08.160 --> 00:16:11.460 Okay, so... Sorry, I got this.

 $290\ 00:16:11.460 \longrightarrow 00:16:12.480$ Okay, there we go.

 $291\ 00:16:12.480 --> 00:16:15.746$ So we have a number of to study design options

 $292\ 00{:}16{:}15.746 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}19.710$ in implementation science and the rest of this talk

293 00:16:19.710 --> 00:16:22.523 is actually gonna be focusing on this aspect

294 00:16:22.523 --> 00:16:25.491 of what I, in the first part I kind of set the stage

 $295\ 00:16:25.491 --> 00:16:28.970$ by kind of talking about some of the key issues

 $296\ 00{:}16{:}28.970 \dashrightarrow 00{:}16{:}31.316$ in implementation science and then that of course

 $297\ 00:16:31.316 --> 00:16:34.473$ informs what the study design options are.

298~00:16:35.610 --> 00:16:39.480 And Ike, I'm not monitoring the chat and I do welcome

 $299\ 00:16:39.480 \longrightarrow 00:16:40.680$ questions and comments.

300 00:16:40.680 --> 00:16:44.190 So if any are coming up, Ike, it would be great

301 00:16:44.190 --> 00:16:47.880 if you could throw them in because I'm just,

 $302\ 00:16:47.880 \longrightarrow 00:16:51.210$ I'm not seeing them at the same time I'm seeing my slides.

 $303\ 00:16:51.210 \longrightarrow 00:16:54.690$ So we talked about experimental study design,

 $304\ 00:16:54.690 \longrightarrow 00:16:56.550$ so those are usually,

 $305\ 00:16:56.550 \longrightarrow 00:16:58.743$ are there any questions or comments so far?

306 00:17:01.590 --> 00:17:02.700 <v Speaker>Further you go on,</v>

 $307\ 00:17:02.700 \longrightarrow 00:17:05.040$ we ask the questions at the end of the lecture,

 $308\ 00{:}17{:}05.040$ --> $00{:}17{:}10.040$ let everybody write down the questions or when we open

 $309\ 00:17:10.856 \longrightarrow 00:17:13.650$ for question and answer, we can ask.

 $311\ 00:17:15.450 \longrightarrow 00:17:17.610$ We can do it that way as well.

312 00:17:17.610 --> 00:17:20.880 So experimental, that's kind of also synonym

 $313\ 00:17:20.880 \longrightarrow 00:17:23.067$ for a randomized design.

 $314\ 00:17:23.067 \longrightarrow 00:17:27.600$ So randomization, as many of you probably know,

 $315\ 00{:}17{:}27.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}31.923$ is considered the highest form of, the highest type,

 $316\ 00:17:34.500 \longrightarrow 00:17:37.700$ the strongest form of study design.

 $317\ 00:17:37.700 \longrightarrow 00:17:39.940$ It allows causal inference

 $318\ 00{:}17{:}41.760 \dashrightarrow 00{:}17{:}45.780$ in the simplest ways, with the simplest types of designs,

 $319\ 00:17:45.780 --> 00:17:49.316$ and when we randomize by randomly assigning

320 00:17:49.316 --> 00:17:54.316 the intervention to one group versus another,

 $321\ 00:17:54.616 \longrightarrow 00:17:59.062$ we on average control for all sorts of confounding,

322 00:17:59.062 --> 00:18:01.800 ensuring balance between the two groups,

- 323 00:18:01.800 --> 00:18:05.223 that imbalances might not lead to,
- $324\ 00:18:07.255 \longrightarrow 00:18:12.000$ under the null would not lead to incorrect inferences,
- 325 00:18:12.000 --> 00:18:15.600 and on average will give us valid estimates,
- 326 00:18:15.600 --> 00:18:20.220 it will control for various sorts of selection bias
- $327\ 00:18:20.220 \longrightarrow 00:18:22.920$ and we don't have any measurement error
- $328\ 00{:}18{:}22.920 \longrightarrow 00{:}18{:}27.920$ because we know who we gave who or what groups we gave
- $329\ 00:18:29.220 \longrightarrow 00:18:31.140$ the intervention to or not.
- 330 00:18:31.140 --> 00:18:33.810 So like we have many, several types
- $331\ 00:18:33.810 \longrightarrow 00:18:36.300$ of these experimental designs,
- $332\ 00:18:36.300 \longrightarrow 00:18:38.380$ some of which most people
- 333 00:18:38.380 --> 00:18:41.850 in this symposium would be familiar with RCT
- $334\ 00:18:41.850 \longrightarrow 00:18:43.650$ randomized clinical trials
- $335\ 00:18:43.650 \longrightarrow 00:18:45.780$ which are individually randomized.
- $336\ 00:18:45.780 \longrightarrow 00:18:48.090$ And then that we use the acronym CRT
- 337 00:18:48.090 --> 00:18:50.040 or cluster-randomized trial,
- 338 00:18:50.040 --> 00:18:51.983 they're also group randomized trials,
- $339\ 00{:}18{:}51.983 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}54.570$ very common in implementation science.
- $340\ 00{:}18{:}54.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}18{:}58.680$ And then there's another type of cluster-randomized trial
- 341 00:18:58.680 --> 00:19:00.810 that's become increasingly popular.
- $342\ 00{:}19{:}00.810 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}03.570$ The stepped wedge design and I'm gonna be talking
- $343\ 00{:}19{:}03.570 \dashrightarrow 00{:}19{:}06.630$ in some detail about that and our group has here
- $344\ 00:19:06.630 \longrightarrow 00:19:09.330$ at Yale at the Center for Methods
- 345 00:19:09.330 --> 00:19:12.600 in Implementation and Prevention Science,
- $346\ 00:19:12.600 \longrightarrow 00:19:16.860$ we've done quite a bit of work on extending study design,
- $347\ 00:19:16.860 \longrightarrow 00:19:19.290$ CRTs and stepped wedge designs.

- $348\ 00:19:19.290 --> 00:19:22.830$ There's a very useful design called the MOST design
- 349 00:19:22.830 --> 00:19:26.135 that is becoming increasingly popular
- $350\ 00:19:26.135 \longrightarrow 00:19:29.250$ in implementation science that I'll talk about.
- 351~00:19:29.250 --> 00:19:32.490 And then there's the LAGO design, learn as you go design,
- $352\ 00:19:32.490 --> 00:19:35.100$ which has been developed by our group that I'll also
- $353\ 00:19:35.100 \longrightarrow 00:19:36.419$ talk about briefly.
- $354\ 00:19:36.419 \longrightarrow 00:19:41.419$ And then, in the interest of..
- $355\ 00:19:42.000 --> 00:19:46.581$ Yes. Okay. < v ->He is gone. He is gone. </v>
- 356 00:19:46.581 --> 00:19:48.030 <v Presenter>Okay, sure.</v>
- $357\ 00:19:48.030 \longrightarrow 00:19:53.030$ In the interest of rapid in implementation science,
- $358\ 00:19:53.250 \longrightarrow 00:19:55.890$ there are also quasi experimental designs.
- $359\ 00:19:55.890$ --> 00:19:59.723 So these designs take advantage of certain features
- $360\ 00:19:59.723 \longrightarrow 00:20:03.780$ of the data in order to get sort
- $361\ 00{:}20{:}03.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}06.660$ of under certain circumstances that are very well
- $362\ 00:20:06.660 --> 00:20:09.956$ defined and may or may not be valid, but often are,
- $363~00{:}20{:}09.956 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}12.739$ we can get inference that's almost as strong
- $364\ 00:20:12.739 \longrightarrow 00:20:15.557$ as that in the randomized designs without a having
- $365\ 00{:}20{:}15.557 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}20{:}557$ to randomize, and randomization is an expensive
- $366\ 00:20:20.880 \longrightarrow 00:20:25.410$ and slow process and often may not be,
- $367\ 00:20:25.410 --> 00:20:28.050$ I'm starting to increasingly think myself,
- 368~00:20:28.050 --> 00:20:31.080 the very best way to get the answers that we need
- 369 00:20:31.080 --> 00:20:35.760 in public health rigorously and rapidly.
- $370\ 00:20:35.760 \longrightarrow 00:20:39.510$ So in the group of quasi-experimental designs,
- $371\ 00:20:39.510 \longrightarrow 00:20:41.601$ we have pre-post designs,

- 372 00:20:41.601 --> 00:20:43.620 difference in difference designs,
- $373\ 00:20:43.620 \longrightarrow 00:20:46.122$ interrupted time series designs and controlled
- $374\ 00:20:46.122 \longrightarrow 00:20:48.518$ interrupted time series designs.
- $375\ 00:20:48.518 --> 00:20:51.960$ And I'll talk a little bit about those as well.
- $376\ 00:20:51.960 \longrightarrow 00:20:53.640$ And then finally
- $377\ 00{:}20{:}53.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}20{:}56.760$ there's observational research which in my view has
- $378\ 00:20:56.760 \longrightarrow 00:20:59.760$ been underappreciated and underutilized
- $379\ 00:20:59.760 \longrightarrow 00:21:01.860$ in implementation science because there's such
- 380 00:21:01.860 --> 00:21:04.860 a big emphasis on, I think,
- $381\ 00:21:04.860 --> 00:21:07.312$ probably the rigor and wanting to be able to make
- 382 00:21:07.312 --> 00:21:10.813 causal inference without having to make
- $383\ 00:21:10.813 \longrightarrow 00:21:12.450$ a lot of assumptions.
- $384\ 00{:}21{:}12.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}21{:}15.120$ So there's been a strong emphasis on experimental
- $385\ 00:21:15.120 --> 00:21:19.606$ designs and so far very much less use
- $386\ 00:21:19.606 \longrightarrow 00:21:22.230$ of observational design such as the classic
- $387\ 00:21:22.230 \longrightarrow 00:21:25.800$ cohort cross-sectional and case-control studies
- $388\ 00:21:25.800 --> 00:21:30.123$ that can be embedded in the ongoing practice
- $389\ 00:21:30.123 \longrightarrow 00:21:34.023$ of implementing public health programs
- $390\ 00:21:34.023 \longrightarrow 00:21:37.235$ and simultaneously evaluating them using
- 391 00:21:37.235 --> 00:21:40.680 observational data methods, in particular,
- $392\ 00:21:40.680 \longrightarrow 00:21:42.453$ causal inference methods.
- $393\ 00:21:43.290 --> 00:21:45.840$ And then finally there are some other designs
- 394 00:21:45.840 --> 00:21:47.450 that you may have heard about that have come up
- 395 00:21:47.450 --> 00:21:50.100 in implementation science, hybrid designs
- $396\ 00:21:50.100 \longrightarrow 00:21:51.570$ and mixed methods designs,
- $397\ 00:21:51.570 \longrightarrow 00:21:54.273$ which I'll also mention as we go along.
- $398~00{:}21{:}57.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}01.833$ So, quite a lot of options, actually, as we can see.

- $399\ 00:22:07.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:12.330$ So, okay. All right, there we go.
- $400\ 00:22:12.330 --> 00:22:17.330$ So here, this slide refers to these two citations
- $401\ 00{:}22{:}17.370 --> 00{:}22{:}19.830$ that I have down here at the bottom and it's called
- 402 00:22:19.830 --> 00:22:20.663 the PRECIS,
- $403\ 00{:}22{:}22.770 --> 00{:}22{:}26.580$ Pragmatic-Explanatory Continuum Indicator Summary.
- $404\ 00:22:26.580 \longrightarrow 00:22:31.470$ And it's a way of evaluating how pragmatic your trial is.
- $405\ 00:22:31.470 \longrightarrow 00:22:33.930$ And in some cases in the United States we have
- $406\ 00{:}22{:}33.930 {\:-->\:} 00{:}22{:}36.990$ this pretty important funding mechanism called
- $407\ 00{:}22{:}36.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}22{:}41.990$ PCORI and they explicitly fund pragmatic trials.
- $408\ 00:22:42.480 \longrightarrow 00:22:46.948$ And if your trial is pragmatic, it isn't pragmatic enough,
- 409 00:22:46.948 --> 00:22:50.250 it's very unlikely to be accepted
- $410\ 00:22:50.250 \longrightarrow 00:22:52.770$ for PCORI funding mechanism.
- 411 00:22:52.770 --> 00:22:56.850 And what the PCORI, this pragmatic trial,
- $412\ 00:22:56.850 \longrightarrow 00:22:58.620$ there are these various criteria,
- $413\ 00{:}22{:}58.620 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}23{:}03.620$ I've mentioned some of them already, so eligibility,
- 414 00:23:04.230 --> 00:23:06.240 and these all are on Likert scales,
- $415\ 00:23:06.240 \longrightarrow 00:23:07.320$ so the idea is, again,
- $416\ 00:23:07.320 \longrightarrow 00:23:10.290$ the fewer eligibility requirements, the better,
- $417\ 00:23:10.290 \longrightarrow 00:23:14.310$ recruitment, the more general and open the recruitment is,
- $418\ 00:23:14.310 \longrightarrow 00:23:16.080$ the better, the setting,
- $419\ 00:23:16.080 \longrightarrow 00:23:20.040$ the more community-based population based the setting,
- $420\ 00:23:20.040 \longrightarrow 00:23:23.700$ the better, the organization and so forth.
- $421\ 00:23:23.700 \longrightarrow 00:23:27.302$ So all of these things are used to evaluate
- $422\ 00:23:27.302 \longrightarrow 00:23:32.302$ how pragmatic a trial is and it's worth doing,

- $423\ 00:23:32.495 \longrightarrow 00:23:35.100$ if you're designing a study and
- $424\ 00:23:35.100 \longrightarrow 00:23:39.696$ you're really wanting it to be in the effectiveness,
- 425~00:23:39.696 --> 00:23:43.122 you know, implementation part of the continuum,
- $426\ 00{:}23{:}43.122 \dashrightarrow 00{:}23{:}47.860$ you can get access to these papers and literally rank
- $427\ 00{:}23{:}47.860 {\: -->\:} 00{:}23{:}51.752$ your design and experiment with different possible
- $428\ 00:23:51.752 \longrightarrow 00:23:55.115$ designs and try to get your study to be more
- $429\ 00:23:55.115 \longrightarrow 00:23:56.550$ and more pragmatic.
- 430 00:23:56.550 --> 00:23:59.113 And I highly recommend it because that's what we need
- 431 00:23:59.113 --> 00:24:00.240 in public health.
- $432\ 00{:}24{:}00.240 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}03.690$ We need pragmatic trials that will really tell us
- $433\ 00:24:03.690 --> 00:24:07.356$ how well our interventions will work at broad
- 434 00:24:07.356 --> 00:24:11.253 scale in the full population in the community.
- $435\ 00{:}24{:}17.730 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}21.900$ So, and experimental designs can be pragmatic.
- 436 00:24:21.900 --> 00:24:24.780 That's why I showed the pragmatic slide first.
- 437 00:24:24.780 --> 00:24:27.640 Even a randomized controlled trial, an RCT,
- $438\ 00:24:28.487 --> 00:24:31.260$ can be rated on the precise scale and be
- $439\ 00:24:31.260 \longrightarrow 00:24:32.520$ made more pragmatic.
- $440\ 00:24:32.520 \longrightarrow 00:24:34.020$ And then, as I mentioned,
- $441\ 00{:}24{:}34.020$ --> $00{:}24{:}37.680$ cluster-randomized trials and then stepped wedge designs.
- $442\ 00:24:37.680 \longrightarrow 00:24:40.260$ And here's a paper that was published
- $443\ 00{:}24{:}40.260 \dashrightarrow 00{:}24{:}43.023$ in the Annual Review of Public Health if you wanted to,
- $444\ 00:24:43.023 \longrightarrow 00:24:45.660$ I'll read a little bit more of an overview
- $445\ 00:24:45.660 \longrightarrow 00:24:47.280$ of the study design options
- $446\ 00:24:47.280 \longrightarrow 00:24:50.403$ for dissemination and implementation science.

- $447\ 00{:}24{:}53.850$ --> $00{:}24{:}56.285$ So now I'm gonna talk about cluster-randomized trials
- $448\ 00:24:56.285 \longrightarrow 00:24:59.068$ and I'm gonna give an example of a trial
- $449\ 00:24:59.068 \longrightarrow 00:25:01.353$ that I worked on myself.
- $450\ 00{:}25{:}02.430 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}06.033$ I went a little too far. I think I did again, sorry.
- $451\ 00:25:07.433 \longrightarrow 00:25:08.266$ No, no. Okay, there we go.
- $452\ 00:25:08.266$ --> 00:25:12.335 So cluster-randomized trials, this is like a graphic,
- $453\ 00:25:12.335 \longrightarrow 00:25:14.743$ it gives a graphical view of the difference
- 454 00:25:14.743 --> 00:25:16.950 between cluster-randomized
- $455\ 00:25:16.950 \longrightarrow 00:25:18.810$ and individually randomized trials.
- 456 00:25:18.810 --> 00:25:21.480 So over here on the left hand side we have
- $457\ 00{:}25{:}21.480 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}25.260$ a individually randomized trial and on the right hand
- $458\ 00:25:25.260 \longrightarrow 00:25:27.660$ side we have a cluster-randomized trial.
- $459\ 00:25:27.660 \longrightarrow 00:25:31.140$ You can see that they can have the same amount of people.
- $460\ 00{:}25{:}31.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}25{:}34.200$ So each one of these smiley phases is a participant
- $461\ 00:25:34.200 \longrightarrow 00:25:35.487$ in the study.
- $462\ 00:25:35.487 --> 00:25:40.290$ But in a cluster-randomized trial, we randomized by groups.
- $463\ 00:25:40.290 \longrightarrow 00:25:42.180$ So there were four groups here.
- $464\ 00:25:42.180 \longrightarrow 00:25:44.970$ And then two of them became part of the intervention
- $465\ 00:25:44.970 --> 00:25:47.310$ group and then two of the groups became part
- $466\ 00:25:47.310 \longrightarrow 00:25:48.240$ of the control group.
- $467\,00{:}25{:}48.240 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\,00{:}25{:}51.060$ And then of course every group member within each
- $468\ 00:25:51.060 --> 00:25:53.811$ of those groups became part of the intervention group
- $469\ 00:25:53.811 \longrightarrow 00:25:56.307$ and so forth for the control group.
- $470\ 00:25:56.307 \longrightarrow 00:25:57.600$ And so that's the idea.

- $471\ 00:25:57.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:00.133$ And then when that is done,
- $472\ 00:26:00.133 \longrightarrow 00:26:02.820$ and oftentimes it has to be done
- 473 00:26:02.820 --> 00:26:04.991 because the intervention is actually applied
- $474\ 00:26:04.991 \longrightarrow 00:26:06.481$ at the group level.
- $475~00{:}26{:}06.481 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}10.289$ And even when it doesn't have to be done pragmatically
- $476\ 00:26:10.289 \longrightarrow 00:26:14.430$ and in terms of rapidity, for example,
- $477\ 00:26:14.430 --> 00:26:17.520$ it might make sense to have a study design
- $478\ 00:26:17.520 \longrightarrow 00:26:20.790$ that's cluster-randomized anyway, that's the way
- $479\ 00:26:20.790 \longrightarrow 00:26:23.223$ we would go and that's usually what I see.
- $480\ 00:26:24.600 \longrightarrow 00:26:28.110$ And the study design calculations and so forth are all,
- $481\ 00:26:28.110 --> 00:26:31.200$ and the analysis are somewhat different when we have this.
- $482~00{:}26{:}31.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}35.370$ So now I'm gonna go over a case study that I was
- $483\ 00:26:35.370 \longrightarrow 00:26:36.420$ involved with when I was
- $484\ 00{:}26{:}36{.}420 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}39{.}060$ at the Harvard School of Public Health that was
- $485\ 00{:}26{:}39.060 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}42.150$ in collaboration with Management Development for Health
- $486~00{:}26{:}42.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}45.870$ in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania, an NGO, that's the PEPFAR,
- $487\ 00{:}26{:}45.870 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}49.650$ implementing partner in the greater Dar es Salaam Region.
- $488~00:26:49.650 \longrightarrow 00:26:52.170$ And together we conducted the study called
- $489\ 00{:}26{:}52.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}26{:}57.170$ Familia Salama and it was a 2x2 cluster-randomized trial.
- $490\ 00:26:57.540 \longrightarrow 00:26:59.489$ So 2x2 factorial means,
- 491 00:26:59.489 --> 00:27:02.068 it's another design feature that can be used
- $492\ 00:27:02.068 \longrightarrow 00:27:05.310$ in any ones of these types of studies.
- $493\ 00:27:05.310 \longrightarrow 00:27:10.200$ But where it's a very old idea but it allows us
- $494\ 00:27:10.200 \longrightarrow 00:27:13.300$ to study multiple interventions

- $495\ 00{:}27{:}15.210 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}19.060$ or implementation strategies components at the same
- $496\ 00:27:19.060 \longrightarrow 00:27:21.540$ time in one single study.
- $497\ 00:27:21.540 \longrightarrow 00:27:24.720$ And there's no kind of statistical limit.
- 498 00:27:24.720 --> 00:27:27.600 You don't lose power.
- 499 00:27:27.600 --> 00:27:32.430 You could do a 2x2x2 or a 2x2x2x2 and so forth.
- 500~00:27:32.430 --> 00:27:35.700 The main limitation to how many things we can study
- $501\ 00{:}27{:}35.700 \dashrightarrow 00{:}27{:}39.269$ at one time using this factorial approach is actually
- $502\ 00:27:39.269 --> 00:27:41.820$ just logistics and feasibility.
- 503 00:27:41.820 --> 00:27:44.404 It gets very complicated and confusing
- 504 00:27:44.404 --> 00:27:47.700 when you're trying to run a study at scale
- $505\ 00:27:47.700 \longrightarrow 00:27:51.340$ at a population level and like every group like
- 506 00:27:51.340 --> 00:27:53.100 this one is doing this, this and this,
- $507\ 00:27:53.100 \longrightarrow 00:27:56.670$ and then the next one is doing some other combination,
- $508\ 00:27:56.670 --> 00:27:59.010$ it can start to become unmanageable.
- $509~00{:}27{:}59.010 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}01.200$ But I also would like to bring it up and encourage
- $510~00{:}28{:}01.200 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}05.720$ people like at least if you are conducting a study
- 511 00:28:05.720 --> 00:28:08.450 and you're going and you have like, say, you know.
- 512 00:28:08.450 --> 00:28:11.023 if you have a well-funded study, you know,
- $513\ 00{:}28{:}11.023 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}14.446$ a population-based effectiveness or implementation
- 514~00:28:14.446 --> 00:28:19.446 trial with for very little, for no increased sample size,
- $515\ 00:28:20.880 \longrightarrow 00:28:25.880$ you can basically add another factor and study two things,
- $516\ 00:28:26.310 \longrightarrow 00:28:28.200$ and it's like why not?
- 517~00:28:28.200 --> 00:28:30.966 So just throwing that out 'cause it's under utilized

- $518\ 00:28:30.966 \longrightarrow 00:28:34.653$ as a design approach.
- 519 00:28:35.580 --> 00:28:38.490 But here we did this where we compared,
- $520~00{:}28{:}38.490 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}41.160$ we were looking at an enhanced community health
- $521\ 00:28:41.160 --> 00:28:44.298$ worker versus standard of care
- $522\ 00:28:44.298 --> 00:28:46.290$ to increase uptake
- $523\ 00{:}28{:}46.290 \dashrightarrow 00{:}28{:}49.380$ of the World Health Organization's recommendation
- $524\ 00:28:49.380 --> 00:28:51.780$ that all pregnant women should have at least
- $525\ 00:28:51.780 \longrightarrow 00:28:53.760$ four ANC visits.
- 526~00:28:53.760 --> 00:28:57.930 And then that was crossed with option A versus option
- $527~00{:}28{:}57.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}01.920$ B, which are two approaches to prevention of mother
- $528\ 00:29:01.920 \longrightarrow 00:29:04.440$ to child transmission of HIV.
- $529~00:29:04.440 \longrightarrow 00:29:08.160$ Now option B has been universally adopted among
- 530 00:29:08.160 --> 00:29:10.170 HIV positive mothers.
- $531\ 00:29:10.170 --> 00:29:13.383$ So we had these two things crossed in this trial.
- $532\ 00{:}29{:}16.860 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}21.123$ And here is the name of the paper that's actually
- $533\ 00:29:21.123 --> 00:29:24.570$ recently been submitted, just actually just publishing
- $534\ 00:29:24.570 \longrightarrow 00:29:26.407$ on one of the two factors,
- $535\ 00:29:26.407 --> 00:29:29.250$ "The impact of community health worker intervention
- $536\ 00:29:29.250 --> 00:29:31.183$ on uptake of antenatal care:
- 537 00:29:31.183 --> 00:29:33.330 a cluster-randomized, pragmatic trial..."
- $538\ 00:29:33.330 --> 00:29:35.880$ And see, very, very large trial,
- 539 00:29:35.880 --> 00:29:39.810 almost 250,000 women in Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
- $540\ 00:29:39.810 \longrightarrow 00:29:43.170$ who reported to ANC at least once
- $541\ 00:29:43.170 --> 00:29:44.670$ and were found to be pregnant.

- $542~00{:}29{:}44.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}29{:}47.490$ And you can see that these kinds of big population
- $543\ 00{:}29{:}47.490 --> 00{:}29{:}50.970$ based effectiveness and implementation trials are
- $544\ 00:29:50.970 \longrightarrow 00:29:54.863$ often highly collaborative and they involve a big team,
- $545\ 00:29:54.863 \longrightarrow 00:29:58.260$ if we're working together in an international partnership,
- $546\ 00:29:58.260 \longrightarrow 00:30:01.515$ you can see that there are people you know from different,
- 547~00:30:01.515 --> 00:30:04.740 both from, say, the host country as well as, say,
- $548\ 00:30:04.740$ --> 00:30:08.820 the part technical support partners and so forth.
- $549\ 00:30:08.820 \longrightarrow 00:30:10.800$ In our case we had people involved
- $550~00:30:10.800 \longrightarrow 00:30:13.920$ from Norway, Germany, the United States
- $551\ 00:30:13.920 \longrightarrow 00:30:15.420$ and Tanzania involved
- $552\ 00:30:15.420 --> 00:30:17.235$ in this trial and here's all the different
- $553\ 00:30:17.235 --> 00:30:20.043$ institutions that we all came from.
- $554\ 00:30:22.200 --> 00:30:24.473$ And so here's a schematic of the design.
- $555\ 00{:}30{:}24.473 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}29.473$ And so this sort of an intervention was implemented
- $556\ 00:30:29.760 \longrightarrow 00:30:31.740$ and rolled out at the ward level.
- 557 00:30:31.740 --> 00:30:35.190 So in Dar es Salaam there were two,
- $558\ 00:30:35.190 --> 00:30:37.170$ at that time there were three districts
- $559\ 00:30:37.170 --> 00:30:39.780$ for the whole greater Dar es Salaam region
- $560\ 00:30:39.780 --> 00:30:42.930$ and we included two of the three districts.
- $561\ 00:30:42.930 --> 00:30:44.182$ And as many of you may know,
- $562\ 00:30:44.182 --> 00:30:46.742$ Dar es Salaam is one of the largest cities
- $563\ 00:30:46.742 --> 00:30:49.470$ in Sub-Saharan Africa.
- $564~00{:}30{:}49.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}52.800$ And within those two districts there were 60
- $565~00{:}30{:}52.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}30{:}56.670$ political wards and we randomized them to one of,
- 566 00:30:56.670 --> 00:30:58.140 you could say, four arms,

- 567 00:30:58.140 --> 00:31:00.371 where first the 60 wards were randomly
- $568~00:31:00.371 \longrightarrow 00:31:04.110$ assigned to either the community health
- 569 00:31:04.110 --> 00:31:06.038 worker intervention or not.
- 570 00:31:06.038 --> 00:31:10.083 And 36 were assigned to the community health
- 571 00:31:10.083 --> 00:31:14.370 ward intervention, 24 to standard of care.
- $572\ 00:31:14.370 \longrightarrow 00:31:19.370$ And then of those 36, 22 went to option B, 14 to option A,
- $573\ 00:31:20.670 \longrightarrow 00:31:21.707$ and then among and so forth.
- $574\ 00:31:21.707 \longrightarrow 00:31:24.360$ So you can see how that's divided up.
- 575 00:31:24.360 --> 00:31:25.860 And then you might be wondering, well,
- $576\ 00:31:25.860 --> 00:31:30.028$ it's kind of imbalanced by ward, and why was that?
- 577 00:31:30.028 --> 00:31:34.250 This is a tricky aspect of balanced design
- $578\ 00{:}31{:}34.250 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 00{:}31{:}38.250$ in a cluster-randomized trial because the wards
- 579 00:31:38.250 --> 00:31:40.628 did not have the same populations,
- $580~00{:}31{:}40.628 \dashrightarrow 00{:}31{:}44.250$ and the same expected populations of pregnant women
- 581~00:31:44.250 --> 00:31:47.170 who would be delivering during the study period.
- 582 00:31:47.170 --> 00:31:50.220 So we were trading off both kind of having
- 583 00:31:50.220 --> 00:31:52.761 a sufficient number of wards with having
- $584\ 00:31:52.761 \longrightarrow 00:31:56.040$ a sufficient number of women within the wards.
- $585~00:31:56.040 \dashrightarrow 00:32:01.040$ And so you can see that what ended up happening was
- $586\ 00:32:01.680 \longrightarrow 00:32:04.623$ we expected to have around,
- $587\ 00:32:04.623 \longrightarrow 00:32:07.677$ in the first intervention we expected to have
- 588~00:32:07.677 --> 00:32:12.240 a certain number of pregnant women in option A
- $589\ 00:32:12.240 \longrightarrow 00:32:14.250$ versus option B.
- $590~00:32:14.250 \dashrightarrow 00:32:17.370$ And what we observed was quite different.
- 591 00:32:17.370 --> 00:32:20.460 And then similarly for the community health

- $592\ 00:32:20.460 --> 00:32:24.692$ worker intervention, we did our best to try to balance
- 593 00:32:24.692 --> 00:32:27.120 the number of women,
- 594~00:32:27.120 --> 00:32:29.310 pregnant women who would be in the community health
- $595\ 00:32:29.310 \longrightarrow 00:32:32.910$ worker intervention versus standard of care.
- $596\ 00:32:32.910 \longrightarrow 00:32:36.543$ And then what happened was we saw something very different.
- 597 00:32:37.793 --> 00:32:39.510 And then in addition you might
- 598~00:32:39.510 --> 00:32:41.880 notice something else which some of you who have
- 599~00:32:41.880 --> 00:32:45.210 actually run studies may have also seen that it can
- 600 00:32:45.210 --> 00:32:48.300 be quite challenging to specify what some
- $601\ 00:32:48.300 --> 00:32:52.410$ of these input parameters are before a study is conducted.
- 602 00:32:52.410 --> 00:32:56.010 So one thing that happened was you can see
- $603\ 00:32:56.010 \longrightarrow 00:33:00.870$ that what we expected
- $604\ 00:33:00.870 \longrightarrow 00:33:02.850$ and then what we observed was
- $605\ 00:33:02.850 \longrightarrow 00:33:04.140$ we observed, you know,
- $606\ 00{:}33{:}04.140 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}08.700$ quite a few more pregnancies during the study period
- $607\ 00:33:08.700 \longrightarrow 00:33:09.960$ than were expected.
- $608\ 00:33:09.960 \longrightarrow 00:33:13.430$ We underestimated the fertility rate in this area,
- $609\ 00:33:13.430 \longrightarrow 00:33:16.281$ based on the population level data we had.
- $610\ 00:33:16.281 --> 00:33:18.450$ And then you'll also see a little later
- $611\ 00{:}33{:}18.450 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 00{:}33{:}23.450$ on we also overestimated the HIV transmission rate.
- $612\ 00:33:23.736 \longrightarrow 00:33:27.540$ Or actually what we really overestimated was
- 613 00:33:27.540 --> 00:33:29.460 the proportion of pregnant women who are gonna
- $614\ 00:33:29.460 \longrightarrow 00:33:30.780$ be HIV positive.
- 615 00:33:30.780 --> 00:33:33.693 So as many of you know,

- $616~00{:}33{:}35.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}38.310$ the various programs that have been implemented to kind
- $617\ 00{:}33{:}38.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}41.040$ of end the AIDS epidemic have been quite successful.
- $618\ 00:33:41.040 \longrightarrow 00:33:42.600$ We're not completely there,
- $619\ 00{:}33{:}42.600 \dashrightarrow 00{:}33{:}45.626$ but there were huge improvements that were made.
- 620 00:33:45.626 --> 00:33:47.940 And even during the study period,
- $621\ 00:33:47.940 \longrightarrow 00:33:50.105$ from the time we designed the study to the time
- 622 00:33:50.105 --> 00:33:52.680 the study was actually conducted,
- $623\ 00:33:52.680 \longrightarrow 00:33:57.150$ the HIV positivity rate went down substantially.
- $624~00{:}33{:}57.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}01.454$ I think we predicted that it would be around 12% based
- $625\ 00:34:01.454 \longrightarrow 00:34:04.596$ on data existing at the time when we designed
- 626 00:34:04.596 --> 00:34:08.820 and the study and submitted it for funding.
- $627~00{:}34{:}08.820 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}11.910$ And when we actually ran the study I think it had
- $628\ 00:34:11.910 \longrightarrow 00:34:13.620$ dropped to 6%.
- 629 00:34:13.620 --> 00:34:15.203 So when those kinds of things happen,
- $630\ 00:34:15.203 \longrightarrow 00:34:17.880$ they can really detract from the power
- 631 00:34:17.880 --> 00:34:21.570 of your study unless other types of adaptive study
- $632\ 00:34:21.570 \longrightarrow 00:34:24.723$ designs are brought to bear.
- 633 00:34:24.723 --> 00:34:26.460 But luckily, in our case,
- $634\ 00:34:26.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:31.050$ 'cause we hadn't planned in an adaptive study design,
- 635 00:34:31.050 --> 00:34:33.420 we also had a higher pregnancy rate,
- $636\ 00:34:33.420 \longrightarrow 00:34:37.770$ so we compensated for the lower HIV rate,
- 637 00:34:37.770 --> 00:34:39.840 which of course is a wonderful thing,
- $638\ 00:34:39.840 \longrightarrow 00:34:41.435$ with a higher pregnancy rate,
- $639\ 00:34:41.435 \longrightarrow 00:34:44.460$ so we ended up maybe with around the power

- $640~00:34:44.460 \longrightarrow 00:34:47.520$ that we might have hoped to have had at the start
- $641~00{:}34{:}47.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}34{:}50.400$ with these input parameters being quite different
- $642\ 00:34:50.400 \longrightarrow 00:34:52.203$ than what happened in the reality.
- $643\ 00:34:55.440 \longrightarrow 00:34:57.453$ So the results here,
- $644\ 00{:}34{:}58.920 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}01.530$ intervention significantly increased the likelihood
- 645~00:35:01.530 --> 00:35:06.360 of attending four or more ANC visits by around 42%.
- $646\ 00:35:06.360 \dashrightarrow 00:35:10.290$ And the intervention also had a modest beneficial
- $647\ 00:35:10.290 --> 00:35:12.750$ effect on the total number of ANC visits.
- $648\ 00:35:12.750 \longrightarrow 00:35:14.760$ It increased them by 8%.
- 649 00:35:14.760 --> 00:35:18.510 It wasn't successful in improving the timing
- $650\ 00:35:18.510 \longrightarrow 00:35:19.500$ of the first visit.
- $651~00{:}35{:}19.500 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}22.650$ 'Cause another kind of secondary goal was to hope
- $652\ 00{:}35{:}22.650 {\: -->\:} 00{:}35{:}26.160$ that women might become aware of their pregnancies
- 653 00:35:26.160 --> 00:35:29.430 earlier on and get an initial ANC visit
- $654\ 00:35:29.430 \longrightarrow 00:35:31.740$ even in their first trimester.
- $655~00{:}35{:}31.740 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}34.590$ And so what we concluded was that trained community
- $656\ 00:35:34.590 \dashrightarrow 00:35:38.280$ health workers can increase attendance of ANC visits
- $657\ 00:35:38.280 \longrightarrow 00:35:41.070$ in Dar es Salaam in similar settings.
- $658\ 00:35:41.070 \longrightarrow 00:35:44.160$ However, earlier additional interventions
- $659\ 00:35:44.160 --> 00:35:48.510$ would be necessary to promote early initiation of ANC.
- $660\ 00:35:48.510$ --> 00:35:51.360 And then the study also demonstrates that routine
- $661\ 00:35:51.360 \longrightarrow 00:35:53.171$ health systems data can be leveraged
- $662\ 00{:}35{:}53.171 \dashrightarrow 00{:}35{:}57.300$ for outcome assessment in trials and program evaluation.

- 663 00:35:57.300 --> 00:35:59.820 I neglected to dimension that among
- $664\ 00:35:59.820 \longrightarrow 00:36:04.382$ these 250,000 pregnancies in these 60 wards
- $665~00{:}36{:}04.382 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}08.040$ at that time there really wasn't electronic health
- $666\ 00:36:08.040 \longrightarrow 00:36:10.470$ records in the facilities.
- $667~00{:}36{:}10.470 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}14.784$ So what was there were log books where people,
- $668\ 00{:}36{:}14.784 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}19.170$ intake healthcare providers would be entering certain
- $669~00{:}36{:}19.170 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}22.020$ data elements at the different types of clinics
- 670 00:36:22.020 --> 00:36:23.370 that women were going to.
- 671 00:36:23.370 --> 00:36:27.077 And what we did was at the end of the day we had
- $672\ 00{:}36{:}27.077 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}31.860$ study staff coming in and we had like a database set
- $673\ 00:36:31.860 --> 00:36:34.980$ up that looked just like the log book and they would
- $674~00{:}36{:}34.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}37.320$ come in and they'd enter all the data from the log
- $675\ 00:36:37.320 \longrightarrow 00:36:38.640$ book for that day.
- $676\ 00:36:38.640 \longrightarrow 00:36:40.980$ And we did that for all of those pregnancies.
- $677\ 00{:}36{:}40.980 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}45.106$ Now, ideally, as more and more healthcare systems
- $678\ 00:36:45.106 \longrightarrow 00:36:48.458$ around the world become reliant on electronic
- $679\ 00{:}36{:}48.458 \dashrightarrow 00{:}36{:}51.600$ health records, that wouldn't even be necessary.
- 680 00:36:51.600 --> 00:36:54.327 In a study like this, you know, at full-scale,
- 681 00:36:54.327 --> 00:36:58.170 250,000 pregnancies over a period of around two
- $682\ 00{:}36{:}58.170 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 00{:}37{:}02.100$ years could be conducted rapidly and rigorously
- 683 00:37:02.100 --> 00:37:05.880 with no additional research data collection,
- $684\ 00:37:05.880 \longrightarrow 00:37:07.383$ which is kind of the goal.
- $685\ 00{:}37{:}09.660 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}13.625$ So that's an example of a cluster-randomized trial,

 $686\ 00{:}37{:}13.625 --> 00{:}37{:}17.343$ and that's sort of an effectiveness implementation trial.

687 00:37:21.523 --> 00:37:24.420 And maybe I could say something about that,

688 00:37:24.420 --> 00:37:27.780 that the endpoint of, say, women having, say,

 $689\ 00{:}37{:}27.780 \dashrightarrow 00{:}37{:}31.263$ four or more ANC visits during their pregnancies,

 $690\ 00:37:32.400 \longrightarrow 00:37:34.230$ there's no health outcome there.

691 00:37:34.230 --> 00:37:36.684 It's a pure implementation outcome

692 00:37:36.684 --> 00:37:39.930 where there's an evidence-based intervention,

 $693\ 00:37:39.930 \longrightarrow 00:37:43.230$ the WHO has reviewed the data very carefully,

 $694\ 00:37:43.230 \longrightarrow 00:37:45.509$ they've made this recommendation and presumably

 $695\ 00:37:45.509$ --> 00:37:50.509 the idea would be by having four or more ANC visits

 $696\ 00:37:50.610 \longrightarrow 00:37:53.280$ and of course receiving quality care at those visits,

 $697\ 00:37:53.280 --> 00:37:57.358$ that we would be able to increasingly bring down

698 00:37:57.358 --> 00:37:59.550 the maternal mortality rate,

 $699\ 00:37:59.550 \longrightarrow 00:38:01.710$ which has also happened all around the world,

 $700\ 00:38:01.710 --> 00:38:04.920$ as well as the sort of under five perinatal

 $701\ 00:38:04.920 \longrightarrow 00:38:07.290$ and neonatal mortality rates.

 $702\ 00:38:07.290$ --> 00:38:10.140 But we weren't even measuring those as primary outcomes

 $703\ 00:38:10.140 \longrightarrow 00:38:13.140$ in the study, that's already been established

704 00:38:13.140 --> 00:38:16.456 through effectiveness and efficacy trials.

 $705\ 00:38:16.456 \longrightarrow 00:38:18.390$ And the implementation science we're all

 $706\ 00:38:18.390 \longrightarrow 00:38:21.900$ about studying can we successfully implement

 $707\ 00:38:21.900 \longrightarrow 00:38:26.220$ a proven intervention, and in this case, at scale,

 $708\ 00:38:26.220 \longrightarrow 00:38:27.903$ that's the purpose of the study.

709 00:38:29.070 --> 00:38:30.510 So that's actually, it's, you know,

710 00:38:30.510 --> 00:38:32.730 when I first started doing this,

 $711\ 00:38:32.730 \longrightarrow 00:38:35.460$ having a biostatistics and epidemiology background,

 $712\ 00:38:35.460 \longrightarrow 00:38:37.831$ it's kind of shocking to think that you could propose

713 $00:38:37.831 \longrightarrow 00:38:41.621$ a big study like this and not even have a health outcome.

 $714\ 00:38:41.621 \longrightarrow 00:38:44.730$ just be studying an implementation outcome.

715~00:38:44.730 --> 00:38:48.663 But you come to realize that's really what we need

 $716\ 00:38:48.663 \longrightarrow 00:38:50.250$ for the most part.

717 00:38:50.250 --> 00:38:52.380 And if it's possible to also look at the health

718 00:38:52.380 --> 00:38:55.320 outcome without slowing down the trial,

719 00:38:55.320 --> 00:38:58.590 increasing the expenses greatly, it's a great thing to do.

 $720\ 00:38:58.590 \longrightarrow 00:39:01.290$ And later on I'll talk about hybrid designs.

 $721\ 00:39:01.290 --> 00:39:03.900$ But now we're gonna talk about

 $722\ 00:39:03.900 \dashrightarrow 00:39:07.320$ stepped-wedge cluster-randomized control trials.

 $723\ 00:39:07.320 \longrightarrow 00:39:11.040$ So stepped wedge designs are popular

 $724\ 00:39:11.040 \longrightarrow 00:39:12.810$ for a number of reasons.

 $725\ 00:39:12.810$ --> 00:39:16.047 So let me just explain what this schematic diagram means.

 $726\ 00:39:16.047 --> 00:39:21.047$ So what happens in this particular case is the rows

 $727\ 00:39:21.810 \longrightarrow 00:39:25.690$ are clusters, so we have,

 $728\ 00:39:25.690 \longrightarrow 00:39:29.010$ or they could be groups of clusters, actually.

 $729\ 00:39:29.010 --> 00:39:31.683$ And here there are five groups of clusters.

 $730\ 00:39:32.790 \longrightarrow 00:39:34.933$ The columns are time points.

731 00:39:34.933 --> 00:39:39.630 So what happens, let's just look at this first row.

 $732\ 00:39:39.630 \longrightarrow 00:39:43.770$ So this row, this group one, so there could be one village,

 $733\ 00:39:43.770 \longrightarrow 00:39:45.647$ say, that's in this group or there could be five

 $734\ 00:39:45.647 \longrightarrow 00:39:47.550$ villages in this group,

 $735\ 00:39:47.550 \longrightarrow 00:39:50.520$ but they were randomly assigned to pattern one.

 $736\ 00{:}39{:}50.520 \dashrightarrow 00{:}39{:}54.090$ And what that means is that those villages assigned

 $737\ 00:39:54.090 \longrightarrow 00:39:57.813$ to pattern one, we take baseline data for everybody,

 $738\ 00:39:58.920 \longrightarrow 00:40:03.030$ but then at time two, which could be in six months, a year,

 $739\ 00:40:03.030 \longrightarrow 00:40:05.700$ two years, it's often, in my experience,

740 00:40:05.700 --> 00:40:08.073 something like four months, six months,

741 00:40:09.411 --> 00:40:13.350 all the clusters randomly assigned to pattern

 $742\ 00:40:13.350 \longrightarrow 00:40:16.740$ one transition to the intervention.

 $743\ 00:40:16.740 \longrightarrow 00:40:19.980$ And then for the next 1, 2, 3, 5 periods,

 $744\ 00:40:19.980 \longrightarrow 00:40:22.110$ they're in the intervention group.

745 00:40:22.110 --> 00:40:25.863 Then those clusters assigned to pattern two,

 $746\ 00:40:25.863 \longrightarrow 00:40:30.630$ they stay on control for two time periods and then

 $747\ 00:40:30.630 \longrightarrow 00:40:32.010$ it's at time three,

 $748\ 00:40:32.010 \longrightarrow 00:40:35.430$ at time step three they go onto the intervention group

 $749\ 00:40:35.430 \longrightarrow 00:40:36.270$ and so forth.

 $750\ 00{:}40{:}36.270 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}40{:}743$ And so what you notice is we have baseline date on everybody

 $751\ 00:40:43.500 \longrightarrow 00:40:46.650$ and then at the end of the study we also have,

752 00:40:46.650 --> 00:40:49.304 every cluster and every individual

 $753\ 00{:}40{:}49{:}304 \dashrightarrow 00{:}40{:}53{:}400$ within those clusters are assigned to the intervention.

754 00:40:53.400 --> 00:40:55.560 So two things happen.

 $755\ 00:40:55.560 \longrightarrow 00:40:59.670$ One is that often times in implementation science,

 $756\ 00:40:59.670 \longrightarrow 00:41:02.124$ we're studying evidence-based interventions.

757 00:41:02.124 --> 00:41:03.510 So you could say,

 $758\ 00{:}41{:}03.510$ --> $00{:}41{:}06.556$ how could we with hold having well-trained community $759\ 00:41:06.556 \longrightarrow 00:41:08.568$ health workers from anybody?

760 00:41:08.568 --> 00:41:10.923 Well, you know,

761 00:41:11.970 --> 00:41:15.160 that's not necessarily an optimal thing to do, but

 $762\ 00:41:16.080 \longrightarrow 00:41:20.700$ a sort of compromise is that by the end of this study,

763 00:41:20.700 --> 00:41:23.430 all women living in all of the wards,

 $764\ 00:41:23.430 --> 00:41:26.100$ if it had been a stepped wedge design, which it wasn't,

 $765\ 00{:}41{:}26.100 {\:\raisebox{---}{\text{---}}}> 00{:}41{:}28.770$ would have access to this enhanced community health

 $766\ 00:41:28.770 --> 00:41:31.620$ worker intervention, all the facilities would be

767 00:41:31.620 --> 00:41:35.040 trained to this new evidence-based intervention.

 $768~00{:}41{:}35.040 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}40.040$ So it addresses some of the ethical issues that might

 $769\ 00:41:40.680 --> 00:41:42.990$ come up in implementation science

 $770\ 00{:}41{:}42.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}41{:}46.143$ when we're studying evidence-based interventions.

771 00:41:47.640 --> 00:41:51.030 What's in equipoise is not whether the intervention

772 00:41:51.030 --> 00:41:51.870 works or not,

773 00:41:51.870 --> 00:41:55.565 what's in equipoise is whether this implementation

 $774\ 00:41:55.565 --> 00:41:58.599$ of the evidence-based intervention will work.

775 00:41:58.599 --> 00:42:03.450 So it's a little bit of a subtle difference

 $776\ 00{:}42{:}03.450 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}06.540$ from an ethical point of view and it's also why people

777 00:42:06.540 --> 00:42:08.777 are discussing and writing about new ethics

778 $00:42:08.777 \longrightarrow 00:42:11.130$ for public health.

779 00:42:11.130 --> 00:42:14.520 And then the other thing that I wanna point

 $780\ 00:42:14.520 \longrightarrow 00:42:17.042$ out about stepped wedge designs that make it very,

 $781~00{:}42{:}17.042 \dashrightarrow 00{:}42{:}21.000$ make them very rigorous from a causal inference point

782 00:42:21.000 --> 00:42:24.133 of view is that at each time point,

783 00:42:24.133 --> 00:42:26.940 which clusters and then which individuals

 $784\ 00:42:26.940 \longrightarrow 00:42:30.480$ within the clusters are in the intervention group or not,

 $785\ 00:42:30.480 \longrightarrow 00:42:32.880$ is completely randomly assigned.

 $786\ 00:42:32.880 \longrightarrow 00:42:36.930$ So when you contrast time two, these four to this one,

 $787\ 00:42:36.930 \longrightarrow 00:42:38.640$ it's a random contrast.

788 00:42:38.640 --> 00:42:40.039 And then time three,

 $789\ 00:42:40.039$ --> 00:42:44.021 these three to these two is a random contrast and so forth.

790~00:42:44.021 --> 00:42:48.810 So between clusters at any given time point we have

791 00:42:48.810 --> 00:42:51.060 this fully randomized design.

 $792\ 00:42:51.060 \longrightarrow 00:42:56.060$ And then what we also have is this element of pre-post,

793 00:42:56.220 --> 00:42:59.760 because, say, we could,

794 00:42:59.760 --> 00:43:02.820 even with just this first row,

 $795\ 00:43:02.820 \longrightarrow 00:43:05.250$ we could estimate and test the effect

 $796\ 00:43:05.250 \longrightarrow 00:43:08.880$ of the intervention because we have at time one all

797 00:43:08.880 --> 00:43:12.660 of the villages or clusters assigned to time one are

 $798\ 00:43:12.660 --> 00:43:15.630$ not in the intervention group and then we have

 $799\ 00:43:15.630 \longrightarrow 00:43:17.700$ five periods where they were

 $800\ 00:43:17.700 \longrightarrow 00:43:20.133$ and the before/after can be compared.

 $801\ 00:43:21.270 \longrightarrow 00:43:22.290$ And so what we worry

 $802\ 00:43:22.290 \longrightarrow 00:43:24.360$ about with the before/after design

803 00:43:24.360 --> 00:43:26.790 and why it's called quasi-experimental rather

 $804\ 00:43:26.790 --> 00:43:29.640$ than experimental is because there's one other

805 00:43:29.640 --> 00:43:33.930 thing that's changing, if it's the same villages

806 00:43:33.930 --> 00:43:37.720 clusters and people or comparable people

- $807\ 00:43:39.420 \longrightarrow 00:43:42.330$ in this one row of all the clusters assigned
- $808\ 00:43:42.330 \longrightarrow 00:43:44.212$ to this row at this one time,
- $809\ 00{:}43{:}44.212 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}47.404$ they should be the same with respect to all time
- $810\ 00:43:47.404 \longrightarrow 00:43:49.069$ and variant confounders.
- 811 00:43:49.069 --> 00:43:51.410 But time is happening here,
- $812\ 00:43:51.410 --> 00:43:54.067$ so there could be no intervention effect,
- 813 00:43:54.067 --> 00:43:57.347 but let's say between time one and time two,
- $814\ 00{:}43{:}57.347 \dashrightarrow 00{:}43{:}59.640$ something else happened in the background like
- $815~00{:}43{:}59.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}02.545$ the government instituted a new program or some new
- $816\ 00:44:02.545 \longrightarrow 00:44:05.140$ drug became widely available
- $817\ 00:44:06.090 \longrightarrow 00:44:09.120$ or there is a natural disaster.
- 818 00:44:09.120 --> 00:44:11.190 So then comparing
- 819 00:44:11.190 --> 00:44:15.540 the before/after within the same clusters will be
- $820\ 00:44:15.540 \longrightarrow 00:44:18.177$ biased by these time varying effects.
- 821 00:44:18.177 --> 00:44:23.177 And so without these contemporaneous clusters happening
- $822\ 00{:}44{:}23.310 \dashrightarrow 00{:}44{:}27.030$ at the same time, we can't control for those effects.
- 823 00:44:27.030 --> 00:44:30.177 So it's almost like an enhanced pre-post design
- $824\ 00:44:30.177 \longrightarrow 00:44:33.442$ where we're controlling for time varying effects
- $825\ 00:44:33.442 \longrightarrow 00:44:37.053$ through randomized contrasts.
- 826 00:44:38.160 --> 00:44:40.143 So it's a very strong design,
- $827~00{:}44{:}41.880 \operatorname{--}>00{:}44{:}43.793$ and here's a good paper to read if you wanna learn
- $828\ 00:44:43.793 \longrightarrow 00:44:46.503$ about it a little bit more.
- 829 00:44:48.390 --> 00:44:53.310 Now I'm gonna give an example of a study I worked on
- $830\ 00:44:53.310 \longrightarrow 00:44:56.340$ that was a stepped wedge design.
- 831 00:44:56.340 --> 00:45:00.000 It was called early access or it studied early access

 $832\ 00:45:00.000 --> 00:45:04.122$ to ART in what's now called Eswatini, Swaziland.

833 00:45:04.122 --> 00:45:06.960 Its primary funder was

834 00:45:06.960 --> 00:45:09.090 the Clinton Health Access Initiative.

835 00:45:09.090 --> 00:45:11.250 Other funding sources were brought

 $836\ 00:45:11.250 --> 00:45:15.000$ in, the Dutch Lottery and some other sources.

 $837\ 00{:}45{:}15.000 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}18.480$ And what we were looking at here was the impact

838 00:45:18.480 --> 00:45:22.320 of early initiation of ART versus national standard

839 00:45:22.320 --> 00:45:26.330 of care of antiretroviral therapy in Swaziland's

 $840\ 00:45:26.330 \longrightarrow 00:45:28.737$ public health sector system.

841 00:45:28.737 --> 00:45:31.230 And it's called the MaxART study.

 $842\ 00:45:31.230 \longrightarrow 00:45:35.220$ So what made this study a little bit different

 $843\ 00:45:35.220 \longrightarrow 00:45:37.497$ than the studies of the other big trials

 $844\ 00:45:37.497 \longrightarrow 00:45:39.651$ of early initiation or early access

 $845\ 00{:}45{:}39.651 \longrightarrow 00{:}45{:}43.890$ to ART that were happening around the same time was

 $846\ 00:45:43.890 \longrightarrow 00:45:46.920$ that we were looking at the impact not

847 00:45:46.920 --> 00:45:50.532 of controlling community HIV incidents,

 $848\ 00{:}45{:}50.532 \dashrightarrow 00{:}45{:}53.280$ but we were actually looking at the impact of early

849 00:45:53.280 --> 00:45:56.280 access to ART on the clients themselves,

 $850\,00:45:56.280 --> 00:46:01.280$ the HIV positive participants who would under standard

 $851\ 00:46:02.460 --> 00:46:06.990$ of care not be initiated to ART until later on

852 00:46:06.990 --> 00:46:08.910 in the development of their disease,

 $853\ 00{:}46{:}08.910 --> 00{:}46{:}12.330$ when they started to develop different types of symptoms,

 $854~00{:}46{:}12.330 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}14.356$ which I know many people on this call would be familiar

 $855~00{:}46{:}14.356 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}17.545$ to when CD4 is dropped below 250 and then it was

 $856~00{:}46{:}17.545 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}21.480$ changed to 500 and so forth or certain symptoms

857 00:46:21.480 --> 00:46:23.430 and AIDS-defining conditions developed,

 $858\ 00:46:23.430 \longrightarrow 00:46:25.560$ that was the standard for many,

 $859\ 00{:}46{:}25.560 {\: -->\:} 00{:}46{:}29.160$ many years until early access to ART happened.

860~00:46:29.160 --> 00:46:33.675 And it really wasn't known what the impact would be

 $861\ 00:46:33.675 \longrightarrow 00:46:38.033$ of early access on HIV positive people themselves,

 $862\ 00:46:38.033 \longrightarrow 00:46:41.070$ both in terms of their health outcomes as well

 $863\ 00{:}46{:}41.070 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}44.700$ as even more implementation type outcomes such

864 00:46:44.700 --> 00:46:47.550 as retention in care and this issue of, say,

 $865\ 00{:}46{:}47.550 \dashrightarrow 00{:}46{:}50.696$ developing resistance if people are being initiated

 $866\ 00:46:50.696 \longrightarrow 00:46:53.910$ very early on when they're not showing any signs

 $867\ 00:46:53.910 \longrightarrow 00:46:55.394$ of illness and so forth.

868 00:46:55.394 --> 00:46:58.561 So again, because I think partially both

 $869\ 00:46:58.561 --> 00:47:01.304$ for logistical reasons, which is another reason

 $870\ 00:47:01.304 --> 00:47:03.383$ why we like stepped wedge designs,

871 00:47:03.383 --> 00:47:07.620 it was as Swaziland, Eswatini didn't have early access

 $872\ 00:47:07.620 \longrightarrow 00:47:09.930$ to ART when the study started.

 $873\ 00:47:09.930 \longrightarrow 00:47:13.830$ And so to train the providers to do this,

 $874\ 00{:}47{:}13.830 \dashrightarrow 00{:}47{:}17.591$ to get the medications in at the scale and volume

 $875\ 00:47:17.591$ --> 00:47:21.397 that was needed, to have the testing facilities scaled

876 00:47:21.397 --> 00:47:23.010 up and so forth,

 $877\ 00:47:23.010 \longrightarrow 00:47:26.520$ it wasn't possible to do that all and be ready

 $878\ 00:47:26.520 \longrightarrow 00:47:30.780$ on August 14th when the study started here.

879 00:47:30.780 --> 00:47:33.900 So by phasing it in, it made it possible.

- 880 $00:47:33.900 \longrightarrow 00:47:36.960$ We randomly, in this case there were 14
- $881\ 00:47:36.960 \longrightarrow 00:47:39.570$ facilities included, so two in each one
- $882\ 00:47:39.570 \longrightarrow 00:47:43.881$ of these clusters and we were,
- 883 00:47:43.881 --> 00:47:46.740 randomly rolled them in to early access,
- 884 00:47:46.740 --> 00:47:50.250 giving us time to properly set up each pair
- 885 00:47:50.250 \rightarrow 00:47:53.309 of facilities to be able to implement early access
- $886\ 00:47:53.309 \longrightarrow 00:47:55.260$ in a high quality manner.
- 887 00:47:55.260 --> 00:47:56.475 And then, of course, at the end,
- 888 00:47:56.475 --> 00:47:59.670 all the facilities were in early access.
- 889 00:47:59.670 --> 00:48:02.400 And in fact, what I didn't mention,
- $890~00{:}48{:}02.400 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}05.790$ I mentioned this early on about like this was a high grade,
- 891 00:48:05.790 --> 00:48:07.500 you know, research quality study,
- 892 00:48:07.500 --> 00:48:10.500 there were extra resources put in and so forth,
- 893 00:48:10.500 --> 00:48:12.300 and somewhere in the middle of this,
- 894 00:48:13.160 --> 00:48:17.010 WHO decided everybody should have early access
- $895\ 00{:}48{:}17.010$ --> $00{:}48{:}20.292$ and Eswatini immediately adopted that recommendation
- $896\ 00:48:20.292 \longrightarrow 00:48:22.410$ and that was the end of the standard of care
- $897\ 00:48:22.410 --> 00:48:23.374$ we were studying.
- $898\ 00:48:23.374 --> 00:48:27.449$ So our power was compromised, not fully, luckily,
- 899 00:48:27.449 --> 00:48:31.380 but that's, this issue that I'm mentioning,
- 900 00:48:31.380 \rightarrow 00:48:33.990 that rapid is just such an important aspect
- $901~00{:}48{:}33.990 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}38.040$ in implementation science, I think it's an area of,
- $902\ 00:48:38.040 \longrightarrow 00:48:39.360$ you know, sort of research.
- $903\ 00:48:39.360 --> 00:48:41.730$ We need good examples as well as possibly
- 904 00:48:41.730 --> 00:48:44.366 new methodologies of moving these studies
- $905\ 00{:}48{:}44{:}366 \dashrightarrow 00{:}48{:}49{:}350$ along so that the policy, when policies are being made,

- 906 00:48:49.350 --> 00:48:51.390 the policymakers would actually have data
- $907\ 00:48:51.390 \longrightarrow 00:48:54.990$ from studies like this to inform their decision making,
- $908\ 00:48:54.990 \longrightarrow 00:48:56.643$ which wasn't the case here.
- $909\ 00:48:57.900 \longrightarrow 00:49:00.240$ So here is a published paper on the protocol
- 910 00:49:00.240 --> 00:49:02.190 if you wanted to learn a little bit more
- 911 00:49:02.190 --> 00:49:04.083 about the design of this study.
- $912\ 00:49:06.120 \longrightarrow 00:49:07.680$ And then the results.
- 913 00:49:07.680 \rightarrow 00:49:09.610 So this study was conducted
- 914 00:49:10.470 --> 00:49:13.047 between 2014 and 2017,
- 915 00:49:13.047 --> 00:49:16.893 3,405 participants were enrolled.
- 916 00:49:17.910 --> 00:49:22.910 And the 12 month HIV care retention rates were 80% and 86%.
- $917~00{:}49{:}24.930 \dashrightarrow 00{:}49{:}27.030$ So there was a, you know, it was an improvement,
- 918 00:49:27.030 --> 00:49:31.560 6% retention means alive and remaining in care.
- 919 00:49:31.560 --> 00:49:36.450 So it's a comprehensive outcome that both includes sort
- 920 00:49:36.450 --> 00:49:39.900 of the implementation aspect of not losing people
- 921 00:49:39.900 --> 00:49:42.180 for coming in, getting their medications,
- 922 00:49:42.180 --> 00:49:44.670 being checked to make sure their disease isn't
- $923\ 00:49:44.670 --> 00:49:47.340$ advancing and then also their health outcome,
- 924 00:49:47.340 --> 00:49:48.960 making sure they're still alive.
- 925 00:49:48.960 --> 00:49:53.610 So again, 80% to 86%, it's not huge, but it's still,
- 926 00:49:53.610 --> 00:49:55.350 you know, a nice improvement.
- 927 00:49:55.350 --> 00:49:58.380 And then the 12 month combined retention
- 928 00:49:58.380 --> 00:50:03.380 and viral suppression endpoint rates were 44% versus 80%.
- 929 00:50:04.500 --> 00:50:06.180 So that's very, very big.
- $930\ 00:50:06.180 \longrightarrow 00:50:07.560$ And you know, as we all know,

- 931 00:50:07.560 --> 00:50:10.020 getting people in ART really improves
- 932 $00:50:10.020 \longrightarrow 00:50:11.278$ viral suppression rates.
- 933 00:50:11.278 --> 00:50:14.040 So that was shown to be very beneficial
- $934\ 00:50:14.040 \longrightarrow 00:50:15.602$ and highly significant.
- 935 00:50:15.602 --> 00:50:20.602 So we've considered this to be good news in terms
- 936 00:50:20.640 --> 00:50:24.900 of early access to ART also being strongly beneficial
- 937 $00:50:24.900 \longrightarrow 00:50:29.130$ to the clients themselves, not just society as a whole.
- 938 $00:50:29.130 \longrightarrow 00:50:31.163$ And at the same time we noticed
- 939 00:50:31.163 --> 00:50:33.690 that there were significant gaps
- 940 00:50:33.690 --> 00:50:36.750 in the healthcare system's ability to provide viral
- 941 00:50:36.750 --> 00:50:41.750 load monitoring with 80% participants in standard
- 942 00:50:42.090 --> 00:50:45.900 of care and 60% in early access each having
- 943 $00:50:45.900 \longrightarrow 00:50:48.060$ a missing viral load.
- $944\ 00:50:48.060 \longrightarrow 00:50:50.385$ So that's an example of a stepped-wedge
- 945 00:50:50.385 --> 00:50:53.846 cluster-randomized design that both was looking at kind
- $946\ 00:50:53.846 \longrightarrow 00:50:57.360$ of a combined implementation health outcome
- $947\ 00:50:57.360 \longrightarrow 00:50:59.013$ as its primary outcome.
- 948 00:51:02.520 --> 00:51:05.505 Okay, I think I'm gonna, well, all right,
- 949 00:51:05.505 --> 00:51:10.505 so a little bit about, I wonder, I'm sorry,
- $950\ 00:51:11.070 --> 00:51:13.980\ I$ just thought maybe I can get rid of this.
- 951 00:51:13.980 --> 00:51:16.530 Oh, okay, now I got rid of all these drawings, sorry,
- 952 00:51:16.530 --> 00:51:19.080 there were all these colored pencil things on here.
- $953\ 00:51:20.346 --> 00:51:24.300$ Stepped wedge designs, when are they useful?
- 954 00:51:24.300 --> 00:51:27.060 When there's evidence to support of the intervention
- $955\ 00:51:27.060 \longrightarrow 00:51:29.730$ or resistance to a parallel design where only

- $956\ 00:51:29.730 \longrightarrow 00:51:31.860$ half received the treatment.
- 957 $00:51:31.860 \longrightarrow 00:51:34.350$ Another aspect of stepped wedge designs
- 958 00:51:34.350 \rightarrow 00:51:36.930 it's often believed, and this is on the ethical side,
- 959 00:51:36.930 --> 00:51:40.470 that the treatment is service delivery or policy change.
- 960 00:51:40.470 --> 00:51:41.940 And that it's often believed
- 961 00:51:41.940 --> 00:51:45.540 that when what's being studied is a service delivery
- 962 00:51:45.540 --> 00:51:47.190 issue or policy change,
- $963\ 00:51:47.190 --> 00:51:50.640$ we don't need individual informed consent.
- 964 00:51:50.640 --> 00:51:55.002 And then when the intra-cluster correlation is high
- $965\ 00:51:55.002 \longrightarrow 00:51:57.030$ or the cluster size is high.
- 966 00:51:57.030 --> 00:51:59.970 So I haven't talked about the inter cluster correlation,
- 967 00:51:59.970 --> 00:52:03.330 but that's a very important input parameter
- $968\ 00:52:03.330 \longrightarrow 00:52:06.630$ when we look at cluster-randomized designs.
- $969\ 00:52:06.630 \longrightarrow 00:52:10.530$ And what that measures, we obviously call it
- $970\ 00:52:10.530 --> 00:52:12.990$ the ICC or sometimes you'll see it indicated
- $971\ 00:52:12.990 \longrightarrow 00:52:17.310$ by the Greek letter rho is that it tells us
- 972 00:52:17.310 --> 00:52:20.820 how highly correlated the outcome is,
- 973 00:52:20.820 --> 00:52:22.419 particularly the primary outcome
- 974 00:52:22.419 --> 00:52:25.655 within the clusters compared to between the clusters.
- 975 00:52:25.655 --> 00:52:29.462 So, let's say, if we were, let's say,
- 976 00:52:29.462 --> 00:52:34.462 in the MaxART study in Eswatini, if certain facilities,
- 977 00:52:34.861 --> 00:52:38.100 let's say, had very high mortality rates and then
- $978\ 00:52:38.100 \longrightarrow 00:52:41.160$ other facilities, you know at baseline had low
- 979 00:52:41.160 --> 00:52:44.460 mortality rates, that would suggest a high ICC.

- 980 00:52:44.460 --> 00:52:48.120 And when you have a high ICC, a lot of variability
- 981 00:52:48.120 \rightarrow 00:52:53.120 in the event rate between clusters, you lose power,
- 982 00:52:53.180 --> 00:52:55.500 in a standard cluster-randomized trial,
- $983\ 00:52:55.500 \longrightarrow 00:52:57.350$ you lose a lot of power.
- $984\ 00:52:57.350 \longrightarrow 00:52:59.220$ It's dramatic.
- 985 00:52:59.220 --> 00:53:02.370 In fact, the ICC like any other correlation
- 986 00:53:02.370 --> 00:53:05.755 coefficient ranges from zero to one and when it's one
- $987\ 00:53:05.755 \longrightarrow 00:53:10.080$ that means that the only variation is between facilities,
- 988 $00:53:10.080 \longrightarrow 00:53:11.040$ there's a, you know,
- 989 $00:53:11.040 \longrightarrow 00:53:14.183$ no variation between individuals within a facility,
- 990 $00:53:14.183 \longrightarrow 00:53:16.740$ then your sample, your effective sample size
- 991 00:53:16.740 --> 00:53:19.140 is essentially the number of facilities, say,
- 992 00:53:19.140 --> 00:53:22.534 14 in MaxART, compared to, say,
- 993 00:53:22.534 --> 00:53:26.733 3,205, which would be the effective sample size
- $994\ 00:53:26.733 \longrightarrow 00:53:30.307$ if there was no variation in the event rates
- $995\ 00:53:30.307 \longrightarrow 00:53:33.136$ between facilities and all the variation was
- 996 00:53:33.136 --> 00:53:35.280 just between clients.
- $997\ 00:53:35.280 \longrightarrow 00:53:38.070$ So when the ICC is high,
- 998 00:53:38.070 --> 00:53:41.523 you're gonna need a lot of clusters to get power
- 999 00:53:41.523 --> 00:53:43.620 in a cluster-randomized trial.
- 1000 00:53:43.620 --> 00:53:45.720 Whereas in a stepped wedge design,
- 1001 00:53:45.720 --> 00:53:47.640 because of the feature that I showed you,
- $1002\ 00{:}53{:}47.640 \dashrightarrow 00{:}53{:}51.576$ that stepped wedge designs completely exploit
- $1003\ 00:53:51.576 \longrightarrow 00:53:55.230$ the within facility contrast,
- 1004 00:53:55.230 --> 00:53:58.072 the pre-post contrast within facilities,

 $1005\ 00:53:58.072 \longrightarrow 00:54:02.423$ you lose very little power when you have a high ICC.

1006 00:54:02.423 --> 00:54:05.100 So it's a feasible way of running

1007 00:54:05.100 --> 00:54:07.380 a cluster-randomized trial when there's a lot

 $1008\ 00:54:07.380 \longrightarrow 00:54:10.050$ of heterogeneity between the groups.

 $1009\ 00:54:10.050 \longrightarrow 00:54:12.150$ And then of course because of that it can be

 $1010\ 00:54:12.150 --> 00:54:14.853$ more efficient over the parallel design.

 $1011\ 00:54:16.290 \longrightarrow 00:54:20.610$ I'm gonna skip this point about why there might be caution,

 $1012\ 00{:}54{:}20.610 --> 00{:}54{:}25.380$ but one caution is this piece about clusters not

 $1013\ 00:54:25.380 \longrightarrow 00:54:27.731$ being able to follow the randomization schedule.

 $1014\ 00:54:27.731 \longrightarrow 00:54:30.000$ So, you know, we can say okay,

 $1015\ 00:54:30.000 -> 00:54:32.199$ you start at time two and you start at time three

 $1016\ 00:54:32.199 \longrightarrow 00:54:33.160$ and so forth.

 $1017~00{:}54{:}33.160 --> 00{:}54{:}35.441$ But, you know, we're talking about pragmatic

 $1018\ 00:54:35.441 \longrightarrow 00:54:39.870$ trials embedded often within public health systems,

 $1019\ 00:54:39.870 \longrightarrow 00:54:43.470$ and there's other things that come up, maybe

 $1020\ 00{:}54{:}43.470 -> 00{:}54{:}45.925$ some issues have come up, some people have left.

1021 00:54:45.925 --> 00:54:48.240 it's just not possible to start at time two,

 $1022\ 00:54:48.240 \longrightarrow 00:54:51.150$ they have to start at time three and that sort of thing.

 $1023\ 00{:}54{:}51.150 \dashrightarrow 00{:}54{:}56.150$ And then once the random patterns start to be violated,

1024 00:54:57.330 --> 00:55:00.180 then you no longer have the strength

 $1025\ 00:55:00.180 --> 00:55:02.407$ of the causal inference from the randomization

 $1026\ 00{:}55{:}02.407 \dashrightarrow 00{:}55{:}05.460$ and it becomes more like an observational study,

 $1027\ 00:55:05.460 \dashrightarrow 00:55:08.220$ where the facilities just chose when they were gonna

 $1028\ 00:55:08.220 \longrightarrow 00:55:09.633$ start the intervention.

 $1029\ 00:55:12.300 \longrightarrow 00:55:15.783$ Okay. So how are we doing on time, Ike?

1030 00:55:19.170 --> 00:55:21.543 <
v Speaker>Thank you, Donna, please continue.
</v>

 $1031\ 00:55:22.410 \longrightarrow 00:55:26.224$ We would like to just have what you have prepared for us.

 $1032\ 00:55:26.224 \longrightarrow 00:55:27.141\ \text{I'm sure...}$

1033 00:55:30.753 --> 00:55:32.523 We still, that's, go on.

 $1034\ 00:55:32.523 --> 00:55:35.449$ Please, go on. I'm sure we'll be okay.

 $1035\ 00:55:35.449$ --> 00:55:39.161 We're happy to have you. We're enjoying this.

1036 00:55:39.161 --> 00:55:40.380 <v Presenter>Okay.</v>

 $1037~00:55:40.380 \dashrightarrow 00:55:44.280$ 'Cause I tend to underestimate how quickly I can

1038 00:55:44.280 --> 00:55:49.280 get through a talk and I like to, you know,

1039 00:55:49.283 --> 00:55:51.810 enrich it with things that aren't necessarily

 $1040\ 00:55:51.810 \longrightarrow 00:55:54.860$ on the slides and then it goes a lot more slowly.

 $1041\ 00:55:54.860 \longrightarrow 00:55:58.037$ But just let me know if you feel like I need to wrap up,

 $1042\ 00:55:58.037 \dashrightarrow 00:56:00.544$ otherwise I'll just keep talking about everything

1043 00:56:00.544 --> 00:56:03.720 I've prepared to discuss today.

 $1044\ 00:56:03.720 \longrightarrow 00:56:05.890$ So now we're gonna move from

 $1045\ 00:56:07.050 \longrightarrow 00:56:10.650$ experimental studies to quasi-experimental

 $1046\ 00:56:10.650 --> 00:56:12.753$ and non-experimental studies.

1047 00:56:17.760 --> 00:56:20.703 Next. So observational.

1048 00:56:24.000 --> 00:56:26.670 Okay. Observational study designs.

 $1049\ 00{:}56{:}26.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}56{:}30.600$ So for those of you who have studied biostatistics

 $1050\ 00{:}56{:}30.600 {\:\hbox{--}}{>} 00{:}56{:}34.919$ and epidemiology, we know about these very well.

- 1051 00:56:34.919 --> 00:56:37.560 We're studying and assessing phenomena
- $1052\ 00:56:37.560 \longrightarrow 00:56:39.462$ as they occur naturally.
- $1053\ 00:56:39.462 \longrightarrow 00:56:41.610$ We can look at policy initiatives.
- $1054\ 00:56:41.610 --> 00:56:45.113$ It's hard to think about randomizing a policy initiative.
- 1055 00:56:45.113 --> 00:56:48.062 We're not manipulating.
- $1056\ 00:56:48.062 --> 00:56:50.640$ Cohort studies can be conducted
- $1057\ 00:56:50.640 --> 00:56:54.390$ within electronic health records as well
- $1058\ 00:56:54.390 \longrightarrow 00:56:55.323$ as cross-sectional studies.
- $1059\ 00:56:55.323$ --> 00:56:58.200 And of course we don't necessarily need electronic
- $1060\ 00:56:58.200 \dashrightarrow 00:57:01.797$ health records, but they sure do make it easy to do
- 1061 00:57:01.797 --> 00:57:06.797 very quick evaluations of interventions
- $1062\ 00:57:06.967$ --> 00:57:11.940 and implementation strategies as they're occurring
- $1063\ 00:57:11.940 --> 00:57:15.060$ in the health system in a completely pragmatic manner.
- 1064 00:57:15.060 --> 00:57:16.916 And then here's a bunch of papers
- $1065\ 00{:}57{:}16.916$ --> $00{:}57{:}21.210$ in the implementation science literature about the use
- $1066\ 00:57:21.210 \longrightarrow 00:57:23.013$ of observational studies.
- $1067\ 00:57:28.980 \longrightarrow 00:57:32.401$ And then there's quasi-experimental study designs.
- $1068\ 00:57:32.401 \longrightarrow 00:57:36.570\ I$ listed those out earlier, the before/after design.
- $1069\ 00:57:36.570 \longrightarrow 00:57:39.060$ So when we, I just wanted to see
- $1070\ 00:57:39.060 --> 00:57:40.740$ what I'm gonna do next here.
- 1071 00:57:40.740 --> 00:57:41.573 Oh yeah, okay.
- 1072 00:57:44.790 --> 00:57:46.980 The before after design, that would be,
- $1073\ 00:57:46.980 \dashrightarrow 00:57:49.680$ as I illustrated with the stepped wedge design,
- 1074 00:57:49.680 --> 00:57:51.975 if we just had one of these rows,

 $1075\ 00:57:51.975 \longrightarrow 00:57:56.975$ we could just compare a facility or group of facilities,

 $1076\ 00{:}57{:}57.261 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}}>00{:}58{:}00.877$ what their outcome rates were at baseline compared

 $1077 \ 00:58:00.877 \longrightarrow 00:58:05.040$ to what their outcome rates were after a certain lag,

 $1078\ 00:58:05.040 \longrightarrow 00:58:07.710$ after the intervention was delivered.

 $1079\ 00:58:07.710$ --> 00:58:12.710 And because we're comparing clusters to themselves,

 $1080\ 00:58:15.270 --> 00:58:19.535$ we're controlling for all known and measured risk factors,

 $1081\ 00:58:19.535$ --> 00:58:23.812 which could be potential confounders that are,

 $1082\ 00:58:23.812 --> 00:58:27.870$ time and variant through this pre-post design.

1083 00:58:27.870 --> 00:58:30.300 That's why it's called quasi-experimental

 $1084\ 00:58:30.300$ --> 00:58:33.040 because there's full control of confounding for time

 $1085\ 00:58:33.040 \dashrightarrow 00:58:36.052$ and variant characteristics in a pre-post design.

1086 00:58:36.052 --> 00:58:39.270 And you know, the individual level analog

 $1087\ 00:58:39.270 \longrightarrow 00:58:42.641$ of a pre-post design would be an individual, you know,

1088~00:58:42.641 --> 00:58:46.650 match pair study where we use, say, the paired t test

 $1089\ 00:58:46.650 --> 00:58:50.310$ to evaluate the results and assess the impact

 $1090\ 00:58:50.310 \longrightarrow 00:58:53.370$ of a individually applied intervention.

 $1091\ 00:58:53.370 \longrightarrow 00:58:57.710$ And then there are cluster analogs

 $1092\ 00:58:57.710 --> 00:58:59.670$ to the paired t test

 $1093~00{:}58{:}59.670 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}04.170$ when we conduct a pre-post or before after design

 $1094\ 00:59:04.170 \longrightarrow 00:59:06.450$ in a clustered setting.

1095 00:59:06.450 --> 00:59:09.090 And then the controlled before after design,

 $1096~00{:}59{:}09.090 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}10.890$ which you might have also heard is the difference

- $1097\ 00{:}59{:}10.890 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}15.890$ in difference design is a pre-post design enhanced
- $1098\ 00:59:18.060 \longrightarrow 00:59:21.420$ by having other clusters or groups
- $1099\ 00:59:21.420 \longrightarrow 00:59:26.130$ for which there's no intervention is applied.
- $1100\ 00{:}59{:}26.130 {\: -->\:} 00{:}59{:}28.994$ And so by subtracting the change in the groups
- $1101\ 00:59:28.994$ --> 00:59:33.110 where no intervention was applied from the change
- $1102\ 00:59:33.110 \longrightarrow 00:59:35.376$ in the groups where the intervention was applied,
- $1103\ 00:59:35.376 --> 00:59:37.950$ we can subtract out all the time invariant
- $1104\ 00:59:37.950 \longrightarrow 00:59:39.690$ characteristics as well
- $1105\ 00:59:39.690 \longrightarrow 00:59:42.150$ as the time varying characteristics.
- 1106 00:59:42.150 --> 00:59:46.629 So that's a very nice design, and again,
- $1107\ 00:59:46.629 \longrightarrow 00:59:50.100\ doesn't\ require\ randomization.$
- $1108\ 00:59:50.100 \longrightarrow 00:59:53.261$ Then there's interrupted time series designs
- $1109\ 00:59:53.261 \longrightarrow 00:59:55.800$ where we look at multiple assessments prior
- $1110~00{:}59{:}55.800 \dashrightarrow 00{:}59{:}58.350$ to and following introduction of an intervention
- 1111 00:59:58.350 --> 01:00:01.276 and we might be able to more accurately assess
- $1112\ 01:00:01.276 --> 01:00:05.820$ the outcomes or behaviors than in a single pre-post design.
- 1113 01:00:05.820 --> 01:00:09.540 And it's kind of like a interrupted time series
- $1114\ 01:00:09.540 \longrightarrow 01:00:13.770$ design where time actually becomes a continuous variable,
- $1115\ 01:00:13.770 \dashrightarrow 01:00:17.562$ instead of before/after we've got the whole time sequence.
- 1116 01:00:17.562 --> 01:00:20.430 And I'm gonna illustrate that shortly.
- $1117\ 01{:}00{:}20.430 {\: -->\:} 01{:}00{:}23.040$ And then finally there's another quasi-experimental
- 1118 01:00:23.040 --> 01:00:25.470 design that's been used, again,
- $1119\ 01:00:25.470 --> 01:00:28.813$ to evaluate public health interventions

 $1120\ 01:00:28.813$ --> 01:00:32.130 and implementation strategies without having

 $1121\ 01{:}00{:}32.130 {\: -->\:} 01{:}00{:}34.854$ to randomize the regression discontinuity design

 $1122\ 01:00:34.854 --> 01:00:38.850$ where individuals and groups can be considered

 $1123\ 01:00:38.850 --> 01:00:42.420$ to assign to intervention or control based on some

 $1124\ 01:00:42.420 \dashrightarrow 01:00:45.900$ a priori score or metric that's kind of independent

 $1125\ 01:00:45.900 \longrightarrow 01:00:47.220$ of their outcomes.

 $1126\ 01:00:47.220 \longrightarrow 01:00:49.560$ And then it's sort of in a causal inference perspective,

 $1127\ 01:00:49.560 --> 01:00:54.360$ it's an can be treated as an instrumental variable

 $1128\ 01:00:54.360 \longrightarrow 01:00:56.263$ and causal inference can be made.

 $1129\ 01:00:56.263$ --> 01:00:59.010 And for those of you who are health economists

 $1130\ 01:00:59.010 --> 01:01:01.699$ on this call or have exposure to this,

 $1131\ 01:01:01.699 \longrightarrow 01:01:06.240$ these quasi-experimental designs have been put forward,

1132 01:01:06.240 --> 01:01:08.250 I think they're, putting them forward

 $1133\ 01{:}01{:}08.250 --> 01{:}01{:}12.317$ has been led by health economists as opposed to, say,

 $1134\ 01:01:12.317 \longrightarrow 01:01:15.030$ biostatisticians and clinical researchers.

 $1135\ 01:01:15.030 --> 01:01:18.210$ And so it's a way that I think stepped wedge designs

 $1136\ 01{:}01{:}18.210 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}21.849$ and cluster-randomized trials kind of gain traction.

 $1137\ 01:01:21.849 \longrightarrow 01:01:24.150$ And many of the methodologies were worked

1138 01:01:24.150 --> 01:01:26.820 out in the health sciences,

 $1139\ 01{:}01{:}26.820 \dashrightarrow 01{:}01{:}31.380$ and then these quasi-experimental study designs.

 $1140\ 01{:}01{:}31.380 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 01{:}01{:}34.733$ A lot of the literature arose in health economics

- 1141 01:01:34.733 --> 01:01:38.160 and now has kind of crossed over into clinical
- $1142\ 01:01:38.160 \longrightarrow 01:01:41.523$ research and biostatistics and so forth.
- $1143\ 01:01:43.110 --> 01:01:46.440$ And then here's an article that I can recommend
- $1144\ 01{:}01{:}46.440 {\: -->\:} 01{:}01{:}49.260$ that would talk about these quasi-experimental
- 1145 01:01:49.260 --> 01:01:52.020 designs sort of from a, you know,
- 1146 01:01:52.020 --> 01:01:54.330 in a way that's very accessible, I think,
- $1147\ 01:01:54.330 \longrightarrow 01:01:55.563$ to a large audience.
- $1148\ 01:01:57.210 \longrightarrow 01:02:00.621$ So the interrupted time series design is a way
- $1149\ 01{:}02{:}00.621 \dashrightarrow 01{:}02{:}04.920$ that you can look at it is through the schematic graphic.
- $1150\ 01:02:04.920 \longrightarrow 01:02:07.470$ So it's considered one of the strongest
- $1151\ 01:02:07.470 \dashrightarrow 01:02:10.203$ quasi-experimental designs and it's increasingly
- 1152 01:02:10.203 --> 01:02:12.960 advocated for use in the evaluation of health
- 1153 01:02:12.960 --> 01:02:15.500 system quality improvement interventions,
- 1154 01:02:15.500 --> 01:02:17.730 when randomization is impossible,
- $1155\ 01:02:17.730 \longrightarrow 01:02:21.390$ it can also be used to evaluate other like
- 1156 01:02:21.390 --> 01:02:25.209 population level changes in health policies.
- $1157\ 01:02:25.209$ --> 01:02:30.209 So here what we do is we observe an outcome rate.
- $1158\ 01:02:30.316 --> 01:02:33.660$ You know, it could be, say, HIV incidents rates,
- 1159 01:02:33.660 --> 01:02:38.333 it could be, say, suicide rates,
- $1160\ 01:02:41.400 \longrightarrow 01:02:42.720$ any sort of health outcome
- $1161\ 01:02:42.720 --> 01:02:46.680$ or even an implementation outcome, maternal mortality,
- $1162\ 01:02:46.680 \dashrightarrow 01:02:50.850$ under five mortality, you know, any sort of health outcome.
- $1163\ 01{:}02{:}50.850 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 01{:}02{:}53.670$ You know, ideally, usually that's measured at kind
- $1164\ 01{:}02{:}53.670 {\: -->\:} 01{:}02{:}56.580$ of more of a population level or even measured...

 $1165\ 01:02:56.580 \longrightarrow 01:02:59.370$ And it doesn't have to be measured by everybody like

1166 01:02:59.370 --> 01:03:01.950 say using DSS survey data,

 $1167\ 01{:}03{:}01{.}950 \dashrightarrow 01{:}03{:}05{.}047$ it can be monitored through sampling techniques

 $1168\ 01:03:05.047 \longrightarrow 01:03:06.776$ before the intervention.

 $1169\ 01:03:06.776 \longrightarrow 01:03:11.610$ And so we might expect, in this idealized situation,

1170 01:03:11.610 --> 01:03:13.950 we're seeing that before the intervention,

 $1171\ 01:03:13.950 \longrightarrow 01:03:16.154$ this outcome rate is stable, there's not getting worse,

 $1172\ 01:03:16.154 \longrightarrow 01:03:17.533$ it's not getting better.

1173 01:03:17.533 --> 01:03:18.810 But you could also have,

1174 01:03:18.810 --> 01:03:21.810 it doesn't have to be a flat kind of slope.

1175 01:03:21.810 --> 01:03:23.701 It could be getting worse or better,

 $1176\ 01:03:23.701 \longrightarrow 01:03:25.590$ it could go in either direction.

1177 01:03:25.590 --> 01:03:30.256 And then the idea is that when,

1178 01:03:30.256 --> 01:03:32.640 if the intervention didn't happen,

 $1179\ 01:03:32.640 \longrightarrow 01:03:35.250$ it would just trot along at the same rate

 $1180\ 01:03:35.250 \longrightarrow 01:03:38.640$ that it had prior to the intervention.

1181 01:03:38.640 --> 01:03:40.770 And then when the intervention happens,

 $1182\ 01:03:40.770 \longrightarrow 01:03:44.340$ we might think that the rate drops,

1183 01:03:44.340 --> 01:03:46.508 let's say if this was an adverse health effect,

 $1184\ 01:03:46.508$ --> 01:03:48.900 this would be around the time of the intervention

 $1185\ 01:03:48.900 \longrightarrow 01:03:51.450$ and people can also hypothesize lag.

1186 01:03:51.450 --> 01:03:52.950 So maybe it wouldn't be immediate,

 $1187\ 01:03:52.950 --> 01:03:56.100$ may be it would be six months later or a year later,

 $1188\ 01:03:56.100 \dashrightarrow 01:03:58.320$ you'd see a drop in the rate if this was something

 $1189\ 01:03:58.320 \longrightarrow 01:03:59.910$ to improve health.

- $1190\ 01:03:59.910 \longrightarrow 01:04:02.232$ And then you also might see in addition to the drop
- $1191\ 01:04:02.232 \longrightarrow 01:04:05.130$ we might see a change in the slopes
- $1192\ 01:04:05.130 \longrightarrow 01:04:09.197$ so that it might continue to improve slowly over time.
- $1193\ 01:04:09.197 \longrightarrow 01:04:11.400$ So there could be a trend change.
- 1194 01:04:11.400 --> 01:04:13.772 It could also happen that there's no drop,
- $1195\ 01:04:13.772 \longrightarrow 01:04:17.217$ but that we just see the trend change,
- $1196\ 01{:}04{:}17.217 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}20.809$ or there could be a drop and then no further trend change.
- $1197\ 01:04:20.809 --> 01:04:23.064$ And an interrupted time series design
- $1198\ 01:04:23.064 \longrightarrow 01:04:25.650$ at the analysis stage would allow any
- $1199\ 01:04:25.650 \longrightarrow 01:04:27.063$ of these possibilities.
- $1200\ 01{:}04{:}29.490 \to 01{:}04{:}31.590$ And then with the controlled interrupted time
- $1201\ 01{:}04{:}31.590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}35.400$ series design, we would have other groups that we might
- 1202 01:04:35.400 --> 01:04:38.310 be observing before the intervention,
- $1203\ 01:04:38.310 \longrightarrow 01:04:40.200$ they could be at the same level or a different
- $1204\ 01:04:40.200$ --> 01:04:43.080 level 'cause what we really care about is around
- 1205 01:04:43.080 --> 01:04:44.848 the time that the intervention happened,
- 1206 01:04:44.848 --> 01:04:46.410 we would hope to not,
- $1207\ 01{:}04{:}46.410 \dashrightarrow 01{:}04{:}49.950$ if we see any change in them of a drop in the level
- 1208 01:04:49.950 --> 01:04:51.660 or a change in the slope,
- $1209\ 01:04:51.660 --> 01:04:54.360$ that we'd subtract that out and not attribute
- 1210 01:04:54.360 --> 01:04:57.151 that in the group that had the intervention,
- 1211 01:04:57.151 --> 01:04:59.607 we could attribute that to part of the drop
- 1212 01:04:59.607 --> 01:05:01.348 and that part of the change in slope
- $1213\ 01:05:01.348 \longrightarrow 01:05:03.507$ to these background time effects.
- $1214\ 01:05:03.507 \longrightarrow 01:05:06.390$ And so that's why we like the control group.

 $1215\ 01:05:06.390 --> 01:05:09.120$ And here's an article about if you wanted to learn

 $1216\ 01:05:09.120 \longrightarrow 01:05:12.243$ more about interrupted time series in public health.

 $1217\ 01:05:15.360 \longrightarrow 01:05:16.833$ So a few examples.

1218 01:05:20.670 --> 01:05:24.071 So here, this was a project that I worked

 $1219\ 01:05:24.071 \longrightarrow 01:05:27.220$ on in Mexico, and we were

1220 01:05:28.380 --> 01:05:31.239 thinking about a learning healthcare system

1221 01:05:31.239 --> 01:05:35.590 in Mexico for evaluating

 $1222\ 01:05:38.458 --> 01:05:42.420$ the performance, in Mexico

1223 01:05:42.420 --> 01:05:45.720 there's something like, I think, 34 states,

1224 01:05:45.720 --> 01:05:47.660 just like the United States we have 50 states,

 $1225\ 01:05:47.660 --> 01:05:50.940$ so they have 34, and these are the acronyms for each

 $1226\ 01:05:50.940 \longrightarrow 01:05:52.260$ of the states.

 $1227\ 01:05:52.260 \longrightarrow 01:05:56.493$ And then we use the electronic medical records,

 $1228\ 01:05:57.900 \dashrightarrow 01:06:00.840$ they're trying to use them for chronic disease prevention,

 $1229\ 01:06:00.840 \longrightarrow 01:06:02.250$ screening and care.

 $1230\ 01{:}06{:}02.250 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}05.077$ So here there was almost 2 million patients included

 $1231\ 01:06:05.077 --> 01:06:08.250$ who had at least one clinic visit that included

1232 01:06:08.250 --> 01:06:10.538 a chronic disease diagnosis,

 $1233\ 01:06:10.538 --> 01:06:14.070$ a chronic disease was defined here as hypertension,

1234 01:06:14.070 --> 01:06:17.460 diabetes, dyslipidemia, or obesity,

 $1235\ 01:06:17.460 \longrightarrow 01:06:21.003$ among over 12,000 healthcare facilities.

 $1236\ 01{:}06{:}22.050 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}26.588$ And then there was a implementation outcome developed

 $1237\ 01{:}06{:}26.588 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}30.323$ that was indexed the quality of care being used

 $1238\ 01:06:30.323 \longrightarrow 01:06:32.460$ for the prevention, screening and treatment

 $1239\ 01:06:32.460 \longrightarrow 01:06:35.400$ of diabetes that was called ICAD.

 $1240\ 01:06:35.400 \longrightarrow 01:06:38.176$ And then that was able, through the health records,

 $1241\ 01{:}06{:}38.176 \dashrightarrow 01{:}06{:}43.176$ we were able to score each facility at every month

 $1242\ 01:06:43.440 \dashrightarrow 01:06:46.170$ during the study period as to how well they were

1243 01:06:46.170 --> 01:06:49.680 doing between June, 2016 and July, 2018

1244 01:06:49.680 --> 01:06:52.890 on their quality of care for the prevention,

 $1245\ 01:06:52.890 \longrightarrow 01:06:55.080$ screening and treatment of diabetes.

 $1246\ 01:06:55.080 \longrightarrow 01:06:57.378$ And so what we see here is,

 $1247\ 01:06:57.378 \dashrightarrow 01:06:59.790$ and I apologize 'cause this work was done

 $1248\ 01:06:59.790 --> 01:07:02.910$ in Mexico, so the graph is in Spanish, but I think

 $1249\ 01:07:02.910 \longrightarrow 01:07:06.960$ what you can see graphically is what is the point estimate,

1250 01:07:06.960 --> 01:07:09.930 which is this, the black vertical lines

 $1251\ 01:07:09.930 \longrightarrow 01:07:14.580$ is the mean quality of care ICAT index for the state,

 $1252\ 01:07:14.580 \longrightarrow 01:07:17.550$ and then the 95% confidence intervals

1253 01:07:17.550 --> 01:07:20.820 for how it varied over the study period.

 $1254\ 01:07:20.820 \longrightarrow 01:07:25.820$ And so here actually what happened was that these,

 $1255\ 01:07:27.290 \longrightarrow 01:07:29.550$ there were two,

 $1256\ 01:07:29.550 \longrightarrow 01:07:33.420$ only two states that actually ended up doing worse.

 $1257\ 01:07:33.420 \longrightarrow 01:07:36.118$ And then there were two states that significantly

 $1258~01{:}07{:}36.118$ --> $01{:}07{:}39.288$ worse because the 95% confidence intervals aren't

 $1259\ 01{:}07{:}39.288 \to 01{:}07{:}42.810$ touching the null value, which means no change.

1260 01:07:42.810 --> 01:07:44.550 And then there were two states that,

 $1261\ 01{:}07{:}44.550 \dashrightarrow 01{:}07{:}47.730$ two additional states or three additional states

 $1262\ 01:07:47.730 \longrightarrow 01:07:50.389$ that did worse but not significantly so.

1263 01:07:50.389 --> 01:07:52.290 And then you can see these, you know,

 $1264\ 01:07:52.290 --> 01:07:56.507$ these are sorted by how well they did on this ICAD score.

 $1265\ 01{:}07{:}56.507 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}01.507$ And you can see that there was a huge variation

 $1266\ 01:08:03.060 \longrightarrow 01:08:06.210$ in Mexico among these 34 states.

 $1267\ 01:08:06.210 \longrightarrow 01:08:10.320$ So then, in addition to seeing like who needs help,

1268 01:08:10.320 --> 01:08:13.710 we can also see that, you know, there's big,

 $1269\ 01:08:13.710 --> 01:08:15.750$ often times in the United States we talk a lot

 $1270\ 01{:}08{:}15.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}08{:}20.010$ about disparities, but in many other countries

 $1271\ 01:08:20.010 \longrightarrow 01:08:22.260$ there are big disparities as well.

1272 01:08:22.260 --> 01:08:23.093 And here's, you know,

1273 01:08:23.093 --> 01:08:26.040 sort of a graphical illustration of how big

 $1274\ 01:08:26.040 \longrightarrow 01:08:28.590$ a disparity might be between some of the wealthier,

1275 01:08:28.590 --> 01:08:32.468 more urban, higher SES states and some

1276 01:08:32.468 --> 01:08:34.740 of the poorer, rural states.

 $1277\ 01:08:34.740 \dashrightarrow 01:08:38.160$ So this is a starting point in terms of documenting

 $1278\ 01:08:38.160 --> 01:08:40.140$ what are the issues and then we might wanna g_0

1279 01:08:40.140 --> 01:08:42.570 in and figure out the next steps,

 $1280\ 01:08:42.570 --> 01:08:46.050$ which we would've liked to have gotten to would be,

1281 01:08:46.050 --> 01:08:48.420 let's say, let's take the top five highest

 $1282\ 01{:}08{:}48.420 {\mathrel{\;\;-->}\;} 01{:}08{:}51.360$ performing states, understand what's working

 $1283\ 01:08:51.360 \longrightarrow 01:08:54.538$ there at the facility and client and system level

 $1284\ 01:08:54.538 \longrightarrow 01:08:58.830$ that they're able to achieve these very high ICAD scores.

 $1285\ 01:08:58.830 \longrightarrow 01:09:01.140$ And then what are the barriers to those sorts

 $1286\ 01:09:01.140 --> 01:09:04.950$ of implementation strategies that are happening in some

 $1287\ 01:09:04.950 \dashrightarrow 01:09:08.100$ of these states where there's either no improvement

 $1288\ 01:09:08.100 \longrightarrow 01:09:11.310$ or things have actually gotten worse.

 $1289\ 01{:}09{:}11.310 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}13.680$ And then how can we adapt these implementation

 $1290\ 01:09:13.680 \longrightarrow 01:09:16.931$ strategies to create a new intervention that might

1291 01:09:16.931 --> 01:09:20.370 improve chronic disease prevention,

1292 01:09:20.370 --> 01:09:22.920 screening and care in some of these states

 $1293\ 01:09:22.920 \longrightarrow 01:09:25.323$ for which these disparities exist.

 $1294\ 01:09:29.760 --> 01:09:32.875$ And then another example here of a paper

 $1295\ 01{:}09{:}32.875 \dashrightarrow 01{:}09{:}36.360$ that I along with others recently published that gives

 $1296\ 01:09:36.360 \dashrightarrow 01:09:40.350$ an example of a controlled interrupted time series

 $1297\ 01:09:40.350 --> 01:09:44.160$ is the looking at the causal impact

 $1298\ 01:09:44.160 \longrightarrow 01:09:46.680$ of the Affordable Care Act on colorectal cancer

 $1299\ 01:09:46.680 \longrightarrow 01:09:48.450$ incidence and mortality.

 $1300\ 01:09:48.450 --> 01:09:53.450$ So colorectal cancer incidence and mortality are

1301 01:09:53.637 --> 01:09:58.637 one of the biggest causes of cancer cases

 $1302\ 01:09:59.610 \longrightarrow 01:10:01.620$ and deaths in the United States.

 $1303\ 01:10:01.620 \longrightarrow 01:10:06.363$ And with the changing nutrition epidemiologic transition,

 $1304\ 01:10:07.650 \longrightarrow 01:10:09.900\ I$ think colorectal cancer is understudied

 $1305\ 01{:}10{:}09.900 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}12.630$ around the world, but it only stands to reason,

 $1306\ 01{:}10{:}12.630 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}16.380$ just as we've seen the increase in rates of other

 $1307\ 01:10:16.380 \longrightarrow 01:10:20.356$ chronic diseases such as diabetes and heart disease,

1308 01:10:20.356 --> 01:10:22.425 breast cancer and so forth,

- $1309\ 01:10:22.425 \longrightarrow 01:10:26.130$ we'll be seeing soon increases in the incidence
- $1310\ 01:10:26.130 \longrightarrow 01:10:28.800$ in mortality of colorectal cancer.
- 1311 01:10:28.800 --> 01:10:32.610 And it's known we have a efficacious
- $1312\ 01:10:32.610$ --> 01:10:35.730 evidence-based intervention for colorectal cancer.
- $1313\ 01{:}10{:}35.730 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}39.240$ It's called colonoscopy and it involves an examination
- $1314\ 01:10:39.240 --> 01:10:43.848$ of the colon for polyps and removal of polyps
- $1315\ 01:10:43.848 --> 01:10:46.540$ before they have an opportunity to develop
- $1316\ 01:10:46.540 \dashrightarrow 01:10:50.400$ into pre-cancerous and cancerous lesions.
- $1317~01:10:50.400 \dashrightarrow 01:10:55.080$ And it's been found to be at least 50% efficacious
- $1318\ 01:10:55.080 \longrightarrow 01:10:57.120$ in randomized trials.
- $1319\ 01{:}10{:}57.120 \dashrightarrow 01{:}10{:}59.880$ It's also expensive, in the United States it costs
- 1320 01:10:59.880 --> 01:11:03.510 at least \$3,000 per colonoscopy screening.
- $1321\ 01:11:03.510 \longrightarrow 01:11:06.296$ So many Americans were not able
- 1322 01:11:06.296 --> 01:11:09.090 to afford colonoscopy screening.
- 1323 01:11:09.090 --> 01:11:11.700 And when President Obama brought
- 1324 01:11:11.700 --> 01:11:13.650 in the Affordable Care Act, it's also called
- $1325\ 01{:}11{:}13.650 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}17.850$ Obamacare, one of the main tenets that it brought in,
- $1326\ 01{:}11{:}17.850 {\:\hbox{--}}{>}\ 01{:}11{:}20.340$ which people in the public health community really
- 1327 01:11:20.340 --> 01:11:24.210 liked is that it guaranteed funding
- $1328\ 01:11:24.210 \longrightarrow 01:11:28.404$ for evidence-based preventive interventions.
- $1329\ 01{:}11{:}28.404 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}31.710$ And colonoscopy was among those and maybe among
- $1330\ 01:11:31.710 \longrightarrow 01:11:33.270$ the most important.
- $1331\ 01:11:33.270 \longrightarrow 01:11:36.464$ So here's a perfect example where we can study
- $1332\ 01{:}11{:}36.464 \dashrightarrow 01{:}11{:}40.080$ the impact of the Affordable Care Act on colorectal
- $1333\ 01:11:40.080 \longrightarrow 01:11:41.670$ cancer incidence and mortality.

- $1334\ 01:11:41.670 \longrightarrow 01:11:45.480$ Well, we know from these trials that if people
- $1335\ 01:11:45.480 \longrightarrow 01:11:48.300$ manage to get colonoscopies, their rates, you know,
- $1336\ 01:11:48.300 \longrightarrow 01:11:52.800$ on the population level will go down by around 50% or more,
- 1337 01:11:52.800 --> 01:11:56.280 but can, by just simply changing the law,
- 1338 01:11:56.280 --> 01:11:57.510 if you think of the cascade,
- $1339\ 01:11:57.510 \longrightarrow 01:11:59.610$ there's so many steps that have to happen
- $1340\ 01:11:59.610 \dots > 01:12:03.120$ before people might actually get these colonoscopies
- $1341\ 01:12:03.120 \dashrightarrow 01:12:06.210$ and get them on the recommended schedule and then see
- $1342\ 01:12:06.210$ --> 01:12:10.680 the impact on reduction in colorectal cancer and incidence.
- $1343\ 01:12:10.680 \longrightarrow 01:12:15.680$ So what we did was we were able to, through,
- $1344\ 01:12:15.930 \longrightarrow 01:12:17.710$ we have a very big health system
- $1345\ 01{:}12{:}18.690 {\: -->\:} 01{:}12{:}21.150$ in the western part of the United States called
- 1346 01:12:21.150 --> 01:12:23.190 the Kaiser Permanente system,
- $1347\ 01:12:23.190 \longrightarrow 01:12:25.410$ and then they're divided into kind of subgroups.
- 1348 01:12:25.410 --> 01:12:27.090 So I had colleagues
- $1349\ 01:12:27.090 --> 01:12:30.390$ at Kaiser Permanente in Northern California.
- 1350 01:12:30.390 --> 01:12:32.550 It's an integrated healthcare delivery system.
- $1351\ 01:12:32.550 \longrightarrow 01:12:35.152$ It's a private system with over 4 million members
- $1352\ 01:12:35.152 --> 01:12:38.790$ who are representative of the regional population.
- 1353 01:12:38.790 --> 01:12:40.393 And so we used an open cohort
- $1354\ 01:12:40.393 --> 01:12:44.280$ of Kaiser Permanente of Northern California members
- $1355\ 01:12:44.280 --> 01:12:47.527$ who were 50 years or older between January 1st, 2000
- 1356 01:12:47.527 --> 01:12:50.400 and December 31st, 2017.

 $1357\ 01:12:50.400 \longrightarrow 01:12:53.551$ So there were over 1 million such individuals

 $1358\ 01:12:53.551 \longrightarrow 01:12:57.038$ who were part of the study population at some points

 $1359\ 01:12:57.038 \longrightarrow 01:12:59.760$ in time over this period.

 $1360\ 01:12:59.760 \longrightarrow 01:13:04.380$ And with around 220 million person months of follow up.

1361 01:13:04.380 --> 01:13:05.734 And during that time,

 $1362\ 01:13:05.734 --> 01:13:10.693$ there were almost 20,000 colorectal cancer cases occurred,

 $1363\ 01:13:10.693 \dashrightarrow 01:13:15.693$ and over 2,600 people died of colorectal cancer.

 $1364\ 01:13:16.572 --> 01:13:19.893$ So that's basically the study population here.

 $1365\ 01:13:22.683 \longrightarrow 01:13:26.670$ And then here is our interrupted time series design.

1366 01:13:26.670 --> 01:13:29.700 So it wasn't a controlled time series design,

 $1367\ 01:13:29.700 \longrightarrow 01:13:34.109$ but what we saw is, so this is colorectal cancer incidence

 $1368\ 01:13:34.109 \longrightarrow 01:13:37.710$ and, on the Y axis,

 $1369\ 01:13:37.710 --> 01:13:40.740$ so it's how many cases per hundred thousand were

1370 01:13:40.740 --> 01:13:43.080 occurring in the study population.

 $1371\ 01:13:43.080 \longrightarrow 01:13:44.820$ And then here's the red line.

 $1372\ 01:13:44.820$ --> 01:13:47.040 That's when the ACA, the Affordable Care Act was

1373 01:13:47.040 --> 01:13:48.657 rolled into public policy.

 $1374\ 01:13:48.657 \longrightarrow 01:13:50.515$ And then here's the after data.

 $1375\ 01:13:50.515 --> 01:13:54.600$ And what we're seeing, and then these, the very,

 $1376\ 01:13:54.600 \longrightarrow 01:13:57.600$ very jagged lines are the natural variation

 $1377\ 01:13:57.600 \longrightarrow 01:14:00.570$ in the monthly rates, which is the kind of thing we see,

 $1378\ 01:14:00.570 \longrightarrow 01:14:02.430$ statistical random variation.

 $1379\ 01{:}14{:}02.430 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}05.370$ We don't see smooth curves when we look at rates

- $1380\ 01:14:05.370 \longrightarrow 01:14:08.010$ on a very fine scale like this,
- $1381\ 01:14:08.010 \longrightarrow 01:14:10.260$ they're kind of going up and down.
- $1382\ 01:14:10.260 --> 01:14:13.972$ And then the red line kind of smooths these curves
- 1383 01:14:13.972 --> 01:14:16.980 without testing any particular hypothesis.
- 1384 01:14:16.980 --> 01:14:19.140 But we see that, you know,
- $1385\ 01:14:19.140 --> 01:14:22.045$ the rate before the Affordable Care Act came in,
- $1386\ 01:14:22.045 \to 01:14:26.940$ it was kind of fluctuating up and down a little bit.
- $1387\ 01:14:26.940 --> 01:14:29.327$ It's not that, when I showed you that earlier slide
- $1388\ 01{:}14{:}29.327 \dashrightarrow 01{:}14{:}32.730$ of the sort of schematic of an interrupted time
- 1389 01:14:32.730 --> 01:14:35.250 series design, there was just a straight line
- $1390\ 01:14:35.250 \longrightarrow 01:14:36.990$ going through here, it's not quite that,
- $1391\ 01:14:36.990 \longrightarrow 01:14:38.520$ this is real-life data,
- $1392\ 01:14:38.520 \longrightarrow 01:14:41.400$ but that we do see after the AC came in,
- $1393\ 01:14:41.400$ --> 01:14:44.850 even just, you know, not imposing any structure on the model
- 1394 01:14:44.850 --> 01:14:47.340 that we see that the colorectal cancer
- 1395 01:14:47.340 --> 01:14:49.523 incidence went down fairly quickly.
- 1396 01:14:49.523 --> 01:14:51.390 And you might wonder why.
- 1397 01:14:51.390 --> 01:14:54.462 Well, they take out these polyps that are
- 1398 01:14:54.462 --> 01:14:57.600 pre-cancerous and you don't get cancer.
- 1399 01:14:57.600 --> 01:14:59.553 So it can happen very quickly.
- $1400\ 01:15:00.750 \longrightarrow 01:15:03.060$ And then what we did was then we fit
- $1401\ 01:15:03.060 \dashrightarrow 01:15:07.044$ that classic interrupted time series model to the data.
- 1402 01:15:07.044 --> 01:15:08.340 And so what we saw,
- $1403\ 01:15:08.340 \longrightarrow 01:15:10.440$ that's this line here where you can see
- $1404\ 01:15:10.440 --> 01:15:13.410$ that what was happening was colorectal cancer actually

 $1405\ 01:15:13.410 --> 01:15:16.478$ in the background is slowly going up a little bit

 $1406\ 01:15:16.478 \longrightarrow 01:15:18.813$ in this part of the country and probably everywhere

 $1407\ 01:15:18.813 \longrightarrow 01:15:20.313$ in the United States.

1408 01:15:20.313 --> 01:15:22.519 But then ACA came in, we actually,

 $1409\ 01:15:22.519 \longrightarrow 01:15:24.813\ I$ mean we couldn't believe it, you know, there was this,

 $1410\ 01:15:24.813 \longrightarrow 01:15:29.280$ we saw this drop and then just like in the classic design,

1411 01:15:29.280 --> 01:15:30.586 and this was significant,

 $1412\ 01:15:30.586$ --> 01:15:35.586 and then we saw this continued slower decrease in trend.

1413 01:15:37.260 --> 01:15:39.450 So right, it was at this point that everyone

 $1414\ 01:15:39.450 \longrightarrow 01:15:42.443$ in Kaiser Permanente was able to get access

 $1415\ 01:15:42.443 \dashrightarrow 01:15:46.445$ to colonoscopies, and so it lowered the rates right

 $1416\ 01:15:46.445 --> 01:15:49.473$ away and then the rates continued to decline.

1417 01:15:50.850 --> 01:15:52.510 So that's an example of

1418 01:15:53.747 --> 01:15:57.070 an interrupted time series design to study

 $1419\ 01{:}15{:}57.917 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}00.870$ the implementation of an evidence-based intervention

 $1420\ 01:16:00.870 \longrightarrow 01:16:02.370$ at the policy level,

1421 01:16:02.370 --> 01:16:04.653 namely through the Affordable Care Act.

 $1422\ 01:16:07.350 \longrightarrow 01:16:10.320$ And here are the co-authors,

 $1423\ 01:16:10.320 \longrightarrow 01:16:12.153$ and then here's the publication.

 $1424\ 01:16:16.200 --> 01:16:18.630$ So now I'm gonna talk a little bit more about some

 $1425\ 01{:}16{:}18.630 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 01{:}16{:}21.870$ more innovative designs, because really everything

 $1426\ 01{:}16{:}21.870 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}24.840$ I've talked about so far, the stepped wedge design,

 $1427\ 01{:}16{:}24.840 {\: -->\:} 01{:}16{:}27.900$ cluster-randomized trial, interrupted time series

- $1428\ 01:16:27.900 \longrightarrow 01:16:31.590$ and so forth, those have been around for quite some time.
- $1429\ 01{:}16{:}31.590 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}34.790$ But now we can go into a little bit more of some model,
- $1430\ 01:16:34.790 \longrightarrow 01:16:37.950\ I$ mean some novel designs that are just starting
- $1431\ 01:16:37.950 \longrightarrow 01:16:41.430$ to be considered in implementation science.
- 1432 01:16:41.430 --> 01:16:44.073 In particular MOST, SMART and LAGO.
- $1433\ 01{:}16{:}47.100 \dashrightarrow 01{:}16{:}52.100$ So the MOST design is one design that's very well
- 1434 01:16:52.410 --> 01:16:55.080 suited for complex,
- $1435\ 01:16:55.080 \longrightarrow 01:16:57.933$ multi-level, multi-component interventions.
- $1436\ 01:16:59.160 \dashrightarrow 01:17:02.400$ That can be a very hard thing to set up at the start
- $1437\ 01:17:02.400 \longrightarrow 01:17:04.530$ of a study where when you've got all
- $1438\ 01:17:04.530 \longrightarrow 01:17:06.990$ these different features at different levels
- 1439 01:17:06.990 --> 01:17:09.720 to know exactly how to constitute
- 1440 01:17:09.720 --> 01:17:12.210 your intervention package, both
- 1441 01:17:12.210 --> 01:17:14.160 what's in it and what's not in it,
- 1442 01:17:14.160 --> 01:17:16.528 and at what kind of dose or strength
- $1443\ 01:17:16.528 \longrightarrow 01:17:21.528$ of implementation should each one of these components be.
- 1444 01:17:22.140 --> 01:17:23.430 So in the MOST design,
- $1445\ 01{:}17{:}23.430 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 01{:}17{:}27.060$ which was developed and promoted by a researcher
- 1446 01:17:27.060 --> 01:17:28.170 named Linda Collins,
- $1447\ 01:17:28.170 \longrightarrow 01:17:30.420$ and here's two of the key citations
- $1448\ 01:17:30.420 \longrightarrow 01:17:34.470$ to this design down here, there are three phases.
- 1449 01:17:34.470 --> 01:17:37.290 So what the first one is preparation,
- 1450 01:17:37.290 --> 01:17:41.670 and that's where things would be done,
- $1451\ 01:17:41.670 --> 01:17:44.406$ such as developing the conceptual model
- $1452\ 01:17:44.406 --> 01:17:48.478$ for what the implementation strategy might be,

 $1453\ 01:17:48.478 \ensuremath{\,\text{-->}}\ 01:17:53.478$ to identify sets of candidate components and to

 $1454\ 01:17:55.020 --> 01:17:59.310$ conduct pilot tests and identify optimization criteria.

 $1455\ 01:17:59.310 \longrightarrow 01:18:00.810$ And so what we mean by this is is

 $1456\ 01:18:00.810 \dashrightarrow 01:18:04.020$ this might be done largely through qualitative research.

 $1457\ 01:18:04.020 \dashrightarrow 01:18:06.540$ This is the first time I've mentioned qualitative

 $1458\ 01:18:06.540 \longrightarrow 01:18:07.803$ research in this talk.

 $1459\ 01:18:07.803 --> 01:18:10.980$ It's a very important part of implementation science.

 $1460\ 01:18:10.980 \longrightarrow 01:18:14.160$ Because what would happen in a MOST design, for example,

 $1461\ 01:18:14.160 \longrightarrow 01:18:17.160$ and even often informally in all of these other

1462 01:18:17.160 --> 01:18:19.072 designs we've talked about or many of them,

1463 01:18:19.072 --> 01:18:21.690 is that qualitative researchers,

1464 01:18:21.690 --> 01:18:25.499 social scientists will conduct focus groups

 $1465\ 01:18:25.499 \longrightarrow 01:18:30.499$ and individual interviews of stakeholders

 $1466\ 01:18:33.030 \longrightarrow 01:18:34.140$ at the different levels.

 $1467\ 01{:}18{:}34.140 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 01{:}18{:}39.140$ Clients, providers, health systems leaders, network,

 $1468\ 01{:}18{:}39.420 {\: -->\:} 01{:}18{:}43.192$ social network members to find out both what are

 $1469\ 01{:}18{:}43.192 \dashrightarrow 01{:}18{:}47.411$ the facilitators and barriers to them taking advantage

1470 01:18:47.411 --> 01:18:52.089 of or utilizing and promoting

 $1471\ 01:18:52.089 \longrightarrow 01:18:54.313$ this evidence-based intervention.

1472 01:18:54.313 --> 01:18:57.750 And then also what their views might be

 $1473\ 01:18:57.750 \longrightarrow 01:19:02.102$ about different components of an intervention strategy,

 $1474\ 01:19:02.102 \dashrightarrow 01:19:05.203$ or an implementation strategy that would make

1475 01:19:05.203 --> 01:19:09.972 this evidence-based intervention be adopted,

- 1476 01:19:09.972 --> 01:19:14.972 be more acceptable, be used with fidelity,
- $1477\ 01:19:15.387 \longrightarrow 01:19:17.632$ be sustainable and so forth.
- 1478 01:19:17.632 --> 01:19:20.130 And so with that kind of information
- 1479 01:19:20.130 --> 01:19:21.993 at the preparation phase,
- 1480 01:19:23.580 --> 01:19:25.770 you wouldn't really determine definitively
- 1481 01:19:25.770 --> 01:19:27.091 what the package would be,
- $1482\ 01:19:27.091 --> 01:19:30.120$ but you would get some ideas of what should
- 1483 01:19:30.120 --> 01:19:31.950 and shouldn't be in the package,
- $1484\ 01:19:31.950 \longrightarrow 01:19:33.900$ it could be a much larger set than
- 1485 01:19:33.900 --> 01:19:37.050 what you ultimately will study.
- 1486 01:19:37.050 --> 01:19:39.785 And then at the optimization phase,
- 1487 01:19:39.785 --> 01:19:42.842 you would conduct a factorial design
- $1488\ 01:19:42.842 \dashrightarrow 01:19:47.186$ that would take as many kind of combinations
- $1489\ 01:19:47.186 \dashrightarrow 01:19:51.480$ of these implementation strategies and components
- $1490\ 01{:}19{:}51.480 {\: -->\:} 01{:}19{:}56.480$ as possible and test them for response for some sort
- 1491 01:19:56.670 --> 01:20:00.630 of very short term implementation outcome,
- 1492 01:20:00.630 --> 01:20:03.120 which could be maybe even acceptability,
- $1493\ 01:20:03.120 \longrightarrow 01:20:05.593$ appropriateness and feasibility, and there are
- $1494\ 01:20:06.840 \longrightarrow 01:20:08.970$ five item scales that have been developed
- $1495\ 01{:}20{:}08.970 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}13.140$ by implementation scientists that can be used in that way.
- 1496 01:20:13.140 --> 01:20:15.186 And then based on, say, the responses,
- 1497 01:20:15.186 --> 01:20:17.320 you can then pare down
- 1498 01:20:18.240 --> 01:20:20.765 what the implementation strategy,
- $1499\ 01{:}20{:}20{:}765 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}25{:}320$ what the intervention package should be to then roll
- 1500 01:20:25.320 --> 01:20:29.844 out in a formal either stepped-wedge design
- $1501\ 01:20:29.844 \longrightarrow 01:20:32.250$ or cluster-randomized trial.
- $1502\ 01:20:32.250 \longrightarrow 01:20:34.042$ So what MOST does is it adds

- $1503\ 01{:}20{:}34.042 --> 01{:}20{:}36.826$ on to these randomized designs that we had talked
- $1504\ 01:20:36.826 \longrightarrow 01:20:41.670$ about earlier these two phases, the preparation phase,
- 1505 01:20:41.670 --> 01:20:45.450 which can often be largely qualitative,
- 1506 01:20:45.450 --> 01:20:47.610 and then the optimization phase,
- 1507 01:20:47.610 --> 01:20:51.370 which involves a very short term pilot
- $1508\ 01{:}20{:}52.815 \dashrightarrow 01{:}20{:}57.690$ high level factorial design to weed out the less
- $1509\ 01:20:57.690 \longrightarrow 01:21:01.593$ promising intervention package components.
- $1510\ 01{:}21{:}03.330 \dashrightarrow 01{:}21{:}08.151$ And there's some examples of using the MOST design
- $1511\ 01:21:08.151 \longrightarrow 01:21:11.610$ and it definitely could be used a lot more often.
- $1512\ 01:21:11.610 \longrightarrow 01:21:15.450$ And hopefully people can see that this is like, you know,
- $1513\ 01:21:15.450 \longrightarrow 01:21:20.370$ sort of a more scientific and rigorous way to use data,
- $1514\ 01:21:20.370 --> 01:21:24.213$ not just quantitative data, but also qualitative data to,
- 1515 01:21:25.290 --> 01:21:27.713 you know, sort of rigorously design a complex
- 1516 01:21:27.713 --> 01:21:31.143 intervention package before it's rolled out.
- $1517\ 01:21:46.050 --> 01:21:49.380$ And then there's the question of adaptation
- 1518 01:21:49.380 --> 01:21:52.800 versus fidelity, and then that's gonna come up
- $1519\ 01:21:52.800 \longrightarrow 01:21:54.900$ for these next two designs.
- 1520 01:21:54.900 --> 01:21:59.880 So even after, say, using a MOST structure,
- $1521\ 01:21:59.880 --> 01:22:02.970$ which would maximize the chances that you would kind
- 1522 01:22:02.970 --> 01:22:05.040 of get it right at baseline,
- $1523\ 01:22:05.040 --> 01:22:08.010$ I'm sure everybody here who's actually rolled out any
- $1524\ 01{:}22{:}08.010 \dashrightarrow 01{:}22{:}11.370$ kind of complex public health program of any sort

- $1525\ 01:22:11.370 --> 01:22:16.370$ knows that the realistic scenario is that this program
- $1526\ 01:22:17.610 \longrightarrow 01:22:20.119$ is gonna be adapted as we go along,
- $1527\ 01:22:20.119 \longrightarrow 01:22:24.060$ providers are gonna learn, the system is gonna learn,
- 1528 01:22:24.060 --> 01:22:25.200 clients are gonna learn,
- 1529 01:22:25.200 --> 01:22:28.413 we're gonna learn like what isn't working,
- $1530\ 01:22:28.413 \longrightarrow 01:22:30.660$ what we can improve and so forth...
- 1531 01:22:30.660 --> 01:22:34.064 And so it's just basically impossible usually
- $1532\ 01:22:34.064 \longrightarrow 01:22:36.120$ for researchers to say,
- $1533\ 01:22:36.120 \longrightarrow 01:22:39.874$ and maybe even unethical for researchers to say, no,
- $1534\ 01:22:39.874 \dashrightarrow 01:22:42.517$ you know, this is a randomized trial and you must
- $1535\ 01:22:42.517 --> 01:22:47.280$ stick with this intervention that we set at baseline
- $1536\ 01:22:47.280 \longrightarrow 01:22:48.420$ no matter what.
- 1537 01:22:48.420 --> 01:22:51.270 Obviously that's what we do in a phase III
- 1538 01:22:51.270 --> 01:22:53.310 individually randomized clinical trial.
- $1539\ 01:22:53.310 --> 01:22:56.820$ People either get the new drug or the placebo
- $1540\ 01:22:56.820 --> 01:22:59.430$ and we don't change the new drug after baseline,
- $1541\ 01:22:59.430 --> 01:23:02.188$ even if it's, people are getting the feeling somehow
- 1542 01:23:02.188 --> 01:23:05.040 that it's not doing what it's supposed to do,
- 1543 01:23:05.040 --> 01:23:07.140 all we can do is like early stopping
- $1544\ 01:23:07.140 \longrightarrow 01:23:11.298$ for overwhelming evidence of benefit or harm.
- $1545\ 01{:}23{:}11.298 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:} 01{:}23{:}16.298$ So this very busy slide is taken from this article
- 1546 01:23:16.320 --> 01:23:20.040 down here and it's a framework for reporting
- $1547\ 01:23:20.040 \longrightarrow 01:23:22.290$ adaptations and modifications
- $1548\ 01:23:22.290 \longrightarrow 01:23:24.480$ to evidence-based interventions.
- 1549 01:23:24.480 --> 01:23:26.880 So the reason, it's complicated,

- $1550\ 01:23:26.880 \longrightarrow 01:23:31.290$ but that's because what these researchers are trying
- $1551\ 01:23:31.290 \dashrightarrow 01:23:35.850$ to do is think of every possible kind of category
- 1552 01:23:35.850 --> 01:23:38.400 of adaptation that could take place
- $1553\ 01:23:38.400 \longrightarrow 01:23:42.202$ after an intervention is started to help people
- $1554\ 01:23:42.202 \longrightarrow 01:23:45.600$ record the adaptations.
- 1555 01:23:45.600 --> 01:23:48.930 Because those of us who kind of want
- 1556 01:23:48.930 --> 01:23:50.940 implementation science to be relevant,
- $1557\ 01:23:50.940 \dashrightarrow 01:23:55.030$ one of the three Rs, realize that we should not only
- 1558 01:23:56.550 --> 01:23:59.340 allow adaptations, we should embrace
- $1559\ 01:23:59.340 --> 01:24:03.220$ adaptations because they're only gonna likely improve
- $1560\ 01:24:04.080 --> 01:24:07.744$ the success of these evidence-based interventions.
- 1561 01:24:07.744 --> 01:24:11.639 But the only way to learn in a rigorous way,
- $1562\ 01:24:11.639 \dashrightarrow 01:24:16.500$ what aspects of adaptation are actually working,
- $1563\ 01:24:16.500 \longrightarrow 01:24:18.600$ is to be able to record them.
- 1564 01:24:18.600 --> 01:24:20.400 And then once they're recorded,
- $1565\ 01:24:20.400 \longrightarrow 01:24:22.470$ later on in secondary analysis,
- $1566\ 01{:}24{:}22.470 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}25.710$ we can go back and analyze the data because all
- $1567\ 01:24:25.710 \longrightarrow 01:24:29.910$ of these adaptations are just like exposure variables
- 1568 01:24:29.910 --> 01:24:32.550 in a complex epidemiologic study,
- $1569\ 01:24:32.550 \longrightarrow 01:24:34.830$ and using causal inference methods to control
- $1570\ 01{:}24{:}34.830 \dashrightarrow 01{:}24{:}38.007$ for confounding, we can look at which adaptations
- $1571\ 01:24:38.007 --> 01:24:41.700$ actually improved outcomes, which made outcomes worse,
- 1572 01:24:41.700 --> 01:24:43.920 which didn't do anything,

 $1573\ 01:24:43.920 \longrightarrow 01:24:46.950$ we can evaluate their cost-effectiveness and so forth,

1574 01:24:46.950 --> 01:24:49.380 but if they're not recorded, we're stuck.

 $1575\ 01:24:49.380 \longrightarrow 01:24:52.380$ So that's why I have this very busy slide here.

 $1576\ 01:24:52.380 \longrightarrow 01:24:56.550$ It's a very, very important one in terms of ensuring

 $1577\ 01:24:56.550 --> 01:25:00.723$ that implementation science produces relevant results.

 $1578\ 01:25:02.430 \longrightarrow 01:25:04.323$ In a rigorous manner.

 $1579\ 01:25:07.440 --> 01:25:10.252$ Now we can talk about the learn as you go design.

 $1580\ 01{:}25{:}10.252 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}12.930$ So that's a design that's very dear to my heart

 $1581\ 01:25:12.930 \longrightarrow 01:25:15.690$ because as you can see here to the left hand side,

 $1582\ 01:25:15.690 \longrightarrow 01:25:18.630$ I'm one of the people who's developed this design,

 $1583\ 01:25:18.630 --> 01:25:23.263$ and it's a very new design, we just published it last year.

 $1584\ 01:25:23.263 \longrightarrow 01:25:28.263$ We are in the process of using it in a study going on.

1585 01:25:28.369 --> 01:25:30.150 Some of you might be part

 $1586\ 01{:}25{:}30.150 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}35.150$ of the HLB-SIMPLe consortium that's supported

1587 01:25:35.250 --> 01:25:37.800 by the United States National Heart,

1588 01:25:37.800 --> 01:25:39.210 Lung, and Blood Institute.

1589 01:25:39.210 --> 01:25:40.560 It's a series of,

 $1590\ 01{:}25{:}40.560 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}44.623$ I think maybe six or more studies taking place

 $1591\ 01{:}25{:}45{.}589 \dashrightarrow 01{:}25{:}50{.}430$ in sub-Saharan Africa where what's being looked

1592 01:25:50.430 --> 01:25:53.100 at is different ways of integrating

 $1593\ 01:25:53.100 --> 01:25:56.100$ hypertension prevention, screening and treatment

- $1594\ 01:25:56.100 --> 01:26:00.570$ into HIV clinics with the idea that, as we all know,
- $1595\ 01:26:00.570 \longrightarrow 01:26:02.490$ the AIDS epidemic has,
- $1596\ 01:26:02.490 \longrightarrow 01:26:05.850$ AIDS has become a chronic disease everywhere in the world.
- 1597 01:26:05.850 --> 01:26:09.630 And we have aging HIV AIDS patients
- 1598 01:26:09.630 --> 01:26:11.910 and they're getting chronic diseases just like
- 1599 01:26:11.910 --> 01:26:14.880 those of us who are HIV negative.
- $1600\ 01{:}26{:}14.880 \dashrightarrow 01{:}26{:}19.184$ And the idea, the concept of integration of care, I think,
- $1601\ 01:26:19.184 --> 01:26:22.560$ is a very important one in global health
- 1602 01:26:22.560 --> 01:26:24.210 and US domestic health.
- 1603 01:26:24.210 --> 01:26:26.760 And this consortium is playing a role
- $1604\ 01:26:26.760 \longrightarrow 01:26:28.590$ in making this happen.
- 1605 01:26:28.590 --> 01:26:32.550 So I'm the statistician for one of the projects,
- 1606 01:26:32.550 --> 01:26:35.670 it's called Police and it's taking place in two
- 1607 01:26:35.670 --> 01:26:38.380 districts in Uganda where we're integrating
- 1608 01:26:39.270 --> 01:26:42.133 two types of intervention packages
- 1609 01:26:45.240 --> 01:26:47.207 into HIV clinics,
- $1610\ 01{:}26{:}47.207 --> 01{:}26{:}51.450$ hypertension basic and hypertension plus to try to
- $1611\ 01{:}26{:}51.450 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:} 01{:}26{:}53.850$ increase hypertension screening and treatment
- $1612\ 01:26:53.850 \longrightarrow 01:26:56.760$ and prevention in the clinics there.
- $1613\ 01:26:56.760 \longrightarrow 01:27:01.760$ And we're gonna be using this LAGO design. So what is LAGO?
- 1614 01:27:01.980 --> 01:27:03.000 Well first of all,
- $1615\ 01:27:03.000 \longrightarrow 01:27:04.612$ the intervention is a package consisting
- 1616 01:27:04.612 --> 01:27:06.390 of multiple components.
- $1617\ 01{:}27{:}06.390 {\: -->\:} 01{:}27{:}09.390$ We've both basically been talking about multiple
- $1618\ 01:27:09.390 \to 01:27:12.810$ component interventions throughout this talk.

 $1619\ 01:27:12.810 \longrightarrow 01:27:17.810$ And it can include combinations with treatments, a device,

1620 01:27:19.020 --> 01:27:22.110 care organization, multiple stakeholders,

 $1621\ 01:27:22.110 --> 01:27:25.620$ and similar stepped wedge design in a LAGO design

 $1622\ 01:27:25.620 \longrightarrow 01:27:28.210$ the data analyzed after each stage.

 $1623\ 01:27:28.210 --> 01:27:31.170$ And then what makes it like radically different

 $1624\ 01:27:31.170 --> 01:27:33.811$ in a way from other prior study designs

 $1625\ 01:27:33.811 \longrightarrow 01:27:37.050$ is it's actually possible in this design

 $1626\ 01{:}27{:}37.050 \dashrightarrow 01{:}27{:}41.730$ to reconfigure the intervention package and not just do

 $1627\ 01:27:41.730 \longrightarrow 01:27:43.500$ it sort of in a more ad hoc way,

 $1628\ 01:27:43.500 \longrightarrow 01:27:44.920$ as we were talking about

 $1629\ 01:27:50.043 \longrightarrow 01:27:51.120$ with the previous slide

 $1630\ 01:27:51.120 \longrightarrow 01:27:54.093$ on how to adapt interventions.

1631 01:27:55.500 --> 01:27:58.740 But you do it in a formal way where we have

 $1632\ 01{:}27{:}58.740 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}02.010$ a computer algorithm that will take all the data up

 $1633\ 01:28:02.010 \longrightarrow 01:28:04.770$ to the current stage, analyze it,

 $1634\ 01:28:04.770 \longrightarrow 01:28:07.587$ and then the data itself recommend

 $1635\ 01{:}28{:}07.587 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}10.770$ what's the optimal combination of the intervention

 $1636\ 01:28:10.770 \longrightarrow 01:28:12.480$ for the next stage.

 $1637\ 01:28:12.480 \longrightarrow 01:28:15.810$ And optimality would be determined by both trying

 $1638\ 01:28:15.810 \dashrightarrow 01:28:19.170$ to guarantee that we have adequate statistical power

 $1639\ 01{:}28{:}19.170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}21.840$ to test the overall intervention effect at the end

 $1640\ 01:28:21.840 \longrightarrow 01:28:23.040$ of the study.

 $1641\ 01:28:23.040 \longrightarrow 01:28:25.590$ And that it might be that we're trying to achieve also

 $1642\ 01:28:25.590 \longrightarrow 01:28:27.210$ a certain outcome goal.

- $1643\ 01{:}28{:}27.210 \dashrightarrow 01{:}28{:}30.300$ So like in the Police study I was just talking about,
- $1644\ 01:28:30.300 \longrightarrow 01:28:34.233$ we think that about 20% of people,
- 1645 01:28:35.489 --> 01:28:38.248 20\% of adults over,
- 1646 01:28:38.248 --> 01:28:42.430 HIV positive adults in the clinics might
- $1647\ 01:28:43.500 --> 01:28:47.610$ be hypertensive and be in hypertension control.
- $1648\ 01:28:47.610 \longrightarrow 01:28:51.300$ And then we're hoping to improve that to, say, 40%.
- $1649\ 01:28:51.300 \longrightarrow 01:28:54.317$ So the goal of the study is to get to 40%
- $1650\ 01:28:54.317 \longrightarrow 01:28:55.392$ through the intervention.
- 1651 01:28:55.392 --> 01:28:57.120 You might think that's modest,
- $1652\ 01:28:57.120 \longrightarrow 01:28:59.559$ but another thing that I've seen is sometimes
- $1653\ 01:28:59.559 \longrightarrow 01:29:01.403$ with these kinds of studies,
- $1654\ 01:29:01.403 \longrightarrow 01:29:04.470$ people are overly ambitious and they might say,
- 1655~01:29:04.470 --> 01:29:08.280 we wanna get like 80% or 90% of hypertension control
- $1656\ 01:29:08.280 \longrightarrow 01:29:09.270$ by the end of the study.
- 1657~01:29:09.270 --> $01:29:12.843~\mathrm{But}$ you know, if we're starting from 5%,~10% or 20%
- 1658 01:29:12.843 --> 01:29:14.850 to get all the way to like, say,
- $1659\ 01:29:14.850 --> 01:29:19.850\ 80\%$, we're starting to talk about relative risks of 160.
- $1660\ 01:29:20.220 \longrightarrow 01:29:21.090$ Those are like, you know,
- $1661\ 01:29:21.090 --> 01:29:24.240$ huge intervention effects that maybe we're being too
- $1662\ 01:29:24.240 --> 01:29:27.720$ hard on ourselves when we try to achieve goals like that,
- $1663\ 01:29:27.720 \longrightarrow 01:29:30.300$ even though that's what where we might ultimately
- $1664\ 01:29:30.300 \longrightarrow 01:29:31.533$ might wanna get to.
- $1665\ 01:29:32.970 \dashrightarrow 01:29:37.282$ So back to the LAGO design, we can, using the data.

- $1666\ 01:29:37.282 --> 01:29:39.845$ we can recommend the optimal intervention package
- $1667\ 01:29:39.845 \longrightarrow 01:29:42.120$ for the next stage.
- $1668\ 01:29:42.120$ --> 01:29:44.788 We can also use qualitative data and we don't have
- 1669 01:29:44.788 --> 01:29:46.950 to just use the quantitative data,
- 1670 01:29:46.950 --> 01:29:49.980 we can reconfigure the intervention package,
- $1671\ 01:29:49.980 \dashrightarrow 01:29:53.044$ then we roll it out again and then we repeat that up
- $1672\ 01:29:53.044 \longrightarrow 01:29:57.630$ to as many times as was preplanned.
- $1673\ 01:29:57.630 \longrightarrow 01:30:01.200$ And then we can, at the end of the study, ideally,
- 1674 01:30:01.200 --> 01:30:03.540 we would have a final outcome assessment,
- $1675\ 01:30:03.540 \dashrightarrow 01:30:05.970$ we test the null hypothesis that the intervention
- 1676 01:30:05.970 --> 01:30:07.380 had no effect.
- 1677 01:30:07.380 --> 01:30:09.390 We could assess the cost-effectiveness
- $1678\ 01:30:09.390 \longrightarrow 01:30:12.033$ of the different intervention components.
- $1679\ 01:30:13.296 \longrightarrow 01:30:17.552$ We have a model that we can use,
- 1680 01:30:17.552 --> 01:30:19.900 that could predict for different
- 1681 01:30:21.352 --> 01:30:22.737 intervention component combinations,
- $1682\ 01{:}30{:}29.809 \dashrightarrow 01{:}30{:}32.760$ what level of the outcome we might expect to have
- $1683\ 01:30:32.760 \longrightarrow 01:30:34.050$ and so forth.
- 1684 01:30:34.050 --> 01:30:35.550 So that's the LAGO design,
- 1685 01:30:35.550 --> 01:30:38.340 we'll see how it works in Police and hopefully
- $1686\ 01:30:38.340 \longrightarrow 01:30:39.300$ some other studies.
- $1687\ 01:30:39.300 \dashrightarrow 01:30:42.210$ There's some other projects under consideration
- $1688\ 01:30:42.210 \dashrightarrow 01:30:45.033$ for funding that have also proposed to use LAGO.
- $1689\ 01:30:46.260 --> 01:30:48.960$ And I'll give an example of LAGO here.
- $1690\ 01:30:48.960 \longrightarrow 01:30:50.850$ This is a post-hoc design.

1691 01:30:50.850 --> 01:30:53.460 So it's an illustrative example that we used

 $1692\ 01:30:53.460 \longrightarrow 01:30:57.000$ in our paper in this Annals of Statistics paper

 $1693\ 01:30:57.000 \longrightarrow 01:30:58.287$ that was published in 2021.

1694 01:30:58.287 --> 01:31:02.250 And by the way, not to kind of toot my horn,

1695 01:31:02.250 --> 01:31:05.372 but just to emphasize the rigor of this design

1696 01:31:05.372 --> 01:31:07.110 because it is, you know,

 $1697\ 01:31:07.110 \longrightarrow 01:31:09.300$ very different for people to accept that you can

 $1698\ 01{:}31{:}09.300 \dashrightarrow 01{:}31{:}12.330$ actually change your intervention after you start

1699 01:31:12.330 --> 01:31:14.910 the study and still have a valid P value.

1700 01:31:14.910 --> 01:31:15.743 You know,

 $1701\ 01:31:15.743 \longrightarrow 01:31:19.350$ the mathematics to prove this were quite high level.

 $1702\ 01{:}31{:}19.350 \dashrightarrow 01{:}31{:}21.660$ And the journal where this paper was published,

 $1703\ 01:31:21.660 --> 01:31:24.203$ the Annals of Statistics, is kind of considered one

 $1704\ 01:31:24.203 \longrightarrow 01:31:28.230$ of the top and most theoretical journals in statistics.

1705 01:31:28.230 --> 01:31:32.850 So this design is like really okay, it just,

 $1706\ 01{:}31{:}32.850 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>\:} 01{:}31{:}35.940$ it's okay theoretically, but it does need to kind

 $1707\ 01{:}31{:}35.940 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>} 01{:}31{:}39.240$ of be fleshed out in terms of being used and working

 $1708\ 01:31:39.240 \longrightarrow 01:31:41.040$ at the kinks on a practical level.

 $1709\ 01:31:41.040 \longrightarrow 01:31:42.065$ And as we start to use it,

 $1710\ 01{:}31{:}42.065 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 01{:}31{:}44.760$ I'm sure we'll start to learn a lot of things and be

 $1711\ 01:31:44.760 \longrightarrow 01:31:46.530$ able to further improve it.

1712 01:31:46.530 --> 01:31:50.580 But anyway, we took the BetterBirth study

 $1713\ 01:31:50.580 \longrightarrow 01:31:53.940$ as our example in this Annals of Statistics paper.

 $1714\ 01{:}31{:}53.940 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{>}\ 01{:}31{:}56.520$ It was a multicenter study that was conducted

 $1715\ 01:31:56.520 --> 01:31:59.790$ in Uttar Pradesh, India, which is a poor state

 $1716\ 01:31:59.790 \longrightarrow 01:32:01.320$ in Northern India.

 $1717\ 01:32:01.320$ --> 01:32:06.320 And its purpose was to test multiple component intervention

1718 01:32:06.749 --> 01:32:09.390 package to improve process

 $1719\ 01:32:09.390 \longrightarrow 01:32:12.180$ and health outcomes for mothers and newborns,

 $1720\ 01:32:12.180 --> 01:32:17.180$ that is to lower maternal mortality and neonatal mortality

 $1721\ 01:32:17.250 \longrightarrow 01:32:20.895$ in the state where the rates were unacceptably high.

 $1722\ 01:32:20.895 \longrightarrow 01:32:24.523$ The components involved: launching the intervention,

1723 01:32:24.523 --> 01:32:26.512 how many coaching visits,

 $1724\ 01{:}32{:}26.512 {\ \mbox{--}>}\ 01{:}32{:}31.500$ how many times health care providers received

 $1725\ 01:32:31.500 --> 01:32:35.280$ coaching visits, how often, the frequency, the duration,

1726 01:32:35.280 --> 01:32:37.050 there's audit and feedback loops,

 $1727\ 01:32:37.050 \dashrightarrow 01:32:40.110$ which is a very popular method in implementation

 $1728\ 01:32:40.110 --> 01:32:44.106$ science where it can be through direct observation

1729 01:32:44.106 --> 01:32:46.909 or through electronic health records,

1730 01:32:46.909 --> 01:32:50.760 providers are audited as to what extent

 $1731\ 01{:}32{:}50.760 {\: -->\:} 01{:}32{:}52.803$ they're actually implementing the intervention

 $1732\ 01:32:52.803 \longrightarrow 01:32:57.147$ and they're given feedback as to how well they're doing,

 $1733\ 01:32:57.147 \dashrightarrow 01:32:59.940$ and then often times there can be group discussions

1734 01:32:59.940 --> 01:33:02.070 where people talk about, you know,

 $1735\ 01:33:02.070 --> 01:33:04.560$ what were the barriers to why they didn't do it more

 $1736\ 01:33:04.560 \longrightarrow 01:33:07.050$ and how could they do it more often and so forth,

1737 01:33:07.050 --> 01:33:10.350 and that's been shown to be a proven way to improve

1738 01:33:10.350 --> 01:33:15.300 the uptake of a evidence-based intervention program

 $1739\ 01:33:15.300 \longrightarrow 01:33:17.811$ at the provider and system level.

1740 01:33:17.811 --> 01:33:18.781 And then of course,

1741 01:33:18.781 --> 01:33:22.920 stakeholder engagement is increasingly taken to be

1742 01:33:22.920 --> 01:33:26.183 an important part of successful sustainable

 $1743\ 01:33:26.183 \longrightarrow 01:33:29.820$ interventions conducted at high fidelity.

 $1744\ 01{:}33{:}29.820 {\:{\circ}{\circ}{\circ}} > 01{:}33{:}33.030$ And so engaging the district and facility leaders

 $1745\ 01:33:33.030 \longrightarrow 01:33:35.910$ was another important part of this package.

 $1746\ 01:33:35.910 --> 01:33:40.818$ And there were three stages of the study.

1747 01:33:40.818 --> 01:33:43.980 In stage one, they piloted this intervention

 $1748\ 01:33:43.980 --> 01:33:48.630$ in two centers, then through, you know, non-rigorously,

 $1749\ 01{:}33{:}48.630 {\: -->\:} 01{:}33{:}52.170$ not using LAGO, they then adapted the intervention

 $1750\ 01{:}33{:}52.170 \dashrightarrow 01{:}33{:}55.850$ package and they piloted it in four more centers.

 $1751\ 01:33:55.850 --> 01:34:00.104$ And then in stage three they rolled out a full trial

 $1752\ 01:34:00.104 \longrightarrow 01:34:03.270$ in 30 centers where the intervention was fixed

 $1753\ 01:34:03.270 \longrightarrow 01:34:05.024$ and they couldn't change it any more.

1754 01:34:05.024 --> 01:34:07.002 And in stages one and two,

 $1755\ 01:34:07.002 --> 01:34:09.840$ they used both quantitative and qualitative data

 $1756\ 01:34:09.840 \longrightarrow 01:34:11.561$ to guide the adaptation.

 $1757\ 01:34:11.561 \longrightarrow 01:34:16.011$ And so this is again, a very big ambitious trial.

 $1758\ 01:34:16.011 \longrightarrow 01:34:19.899$ There were 120 sites in 24 districts

1759 01:34:19.899 --> 01:34:24.899 and it involved almost 160,000 pregnancies.

 $1760\ 01{:}34{:}25.350 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}30.270$ And the intervention, the primary outcome was

 $1761\ 01{:}34{:}30{.}270 \dashrightarrow 01{:}34{:}34{.}731$ an implementation outcome and it was use of the WHO

 $1762\ 01:34:34.731 \longrightarrow 01:34:38.640$ safe child birth checklist with many of you might

 $1763\ 01:34:38.640 \longrightarrow 01:34:41.640$ be familiar with, there are 27 different things

 $1764\ 01:34:41.640 \longrightarrow 01:34:44.189$ that are supposed to be done at different stages

1765 01:34:44.189 --> 01:34:46.535 when a woman comes in to give birth

 $1766\ 01{:}34{:}46.535 {\: -->\:} 01{:}34{:}49.530$ with the different stages of pregnancy and right

 $1767\ 01:34:49.530 \longrightarrow 01:34:51.600$ after and so forth.

 $1768\ 01:34:51.600 \longrightarrow 01:34:56.280$ And the WHO recommends that this safe childbirth checklist,

1769 01:34:56.280 --> 01:34:58.676 which is a means of trying to ensure

 $1770\ 01:34:58.676 \ --> 01:35:03.676$ that these 27 evidence-based, you know, components be used,

 $1771\ 01:35:04.549 --> 01:35:08.940$ that it should be used at least 90% of the time.

 $1772\ 01:35:08.940 \longrightarrow 01:35:10.920$ So that was the goal of the study.

1773 01:35:10.920 --> 01:35:13.050 Again, they were, I think in this study it was

 $1774\ 01:35:13.050 --> 01:35:15.810$ at something like 5% where it was happening.

 $1775\ 01:35:15.810 --> 01:35:19.383$ So extremely ambitious and probably unrealistic.

 $1776\ 01:35:20.730 \longrightarrow 01:35:22.590$ And then we could look at different outcomes.

 $1777\ 01:35:22.590 \dashrightarrow 01:35:26.970$ So one outcome is, that we looked at, just, this is, again,

 $1778\ 01:35:26.970 --> 01:35:29.784$ an illustrative example of the LAGO design was

 $1779\ 01:35:29.784 \dashrightarrow 01:35:34.578$ adherence to oxytocin administration after birth

 $1780\ 01:35:34.578 \longrightarrow 01:35:36.247$ or after delivery.

1781 01:35:36.247 --> 01:35:38.100 And then we could also look at, say,

 $1782\ 01:35:38.100 --> 01:35:41.130$ seven day mortality of the mother and or the child.

 $1783\ 01:35:41.130 \longrightarrow 01:35:42.750$ And then there were also costs, say,

 $1784\ 01:35:42.750 \longrightarrow 01:35:45.333$ the costs per coaching session.

 $1785\ 01:35:52.410 --> 01:35:56.340$ Okay. So that's an example of the LAGO design.

 $1786\ 01:35:56.340 \longrightarrow 01:35:59.640$ And in fact, just to say that this study was published

 $1787\ 01:35:59.640 --> 01:36:01.978$ in the New England Journal of Medicine

 $1788\ 01:36:01.978 \longrightarrow 01:36:04.160$ and the design,

 $1789\ 01:36:05.682$ --> 01:36:09.120 it was published here in implementation science in 2015.

 $1790\ 01:36:09.120 \longrightarrow 01:36:10.640$ And then the outcome was the,

1791 01:36:10.640 --> 01:36:13.027 in the New England Journal of Medicine.

1792 01:36:13.027 --> 01:36:14.010 And in fact,

1793 01:36:14.010 --> 01:36:18.420 the trial was not successful in achieving its goals.

1794 01:36:18.420 --> 01:36:20.670 And probably what happened was,

1795 01:36:20.670 --> 01:36:22.590 you could say that's why we said, well,

1796 01:36:22.590 --> 01:36:25.320 if LAGO could have been used at stage three

 $1797\ 01:36:25.320 --> 01:36:27.150$ when there were all 30 centers,

 $1798\ 01:36:27.150 \longrightarrow 01:36:29.149$ there could have been more feedback figuring

1799 01:36:29.149 --> 01:36:33.210 out what aspects of this is working,

 $1800\ 01:36:33.210 \longrightarrow 01:36:36.060$ what aspects of these components are working

1801 01:36:36.060 --> 01:36:36.893 and not working.

 $1802\ 01{:}36{:}37.920 \dashrightarrow 01{:}36{:}40.670$ And then may be some other things need to be brought in.

1803 01:36:48.330 --> 01:36:51.423 Oh, somebody else who's maybe unmuted.

 $1804\ 01:36:53.345 \longrightarrow 01:36:57.998$ They failed to increase the use of the safe

 $1805~01{:}36{:}57.998$ --> $01{:}37{:}02.710$ child birth checklist to 90%, but they did improve it.

- 1806 01:37:02.710 --> 01:37:04.260 But they also, I don't think,
- 1807 01:37:04.260 --> 01:37:07.020 failed to see significant differences in, say,
- $1808\ 01:37:07.020 \longrightarrow 01:37:09.300$ health outcomes of mother and or child.
- $1809\ 01{:}37{:}09.300$ --> $01{:}37{:}14.300$ So it's an example of how unfortunate it could be
- $1810\ 01:37:14.340 \longrightarrow 01:37:17.880$ to have a very big study like this with a very
- 1811 01:37:17.880 --> 01:37:20.733 complex intervention following,
- $1812\ 01:37:22.465$ --> 01:37:26.580 attempting to implement WHO standards and then
- $1813\ 01:37:26.580 \longrightarrow 01:37:28.920$ being hard-coded in like this.
- $1814\ 01:37:28.920 \longrightarrow 01:37:31.230$ So there's no way to adapt and improve
- $1815\ 01:37:31.230 --> 01:37:33.810$ the intervention when it starts to look like
- $1816\ 01:37:33.810 \longrightarrow 01:37:36.633$ it's not achieving its goals.
- $1817\ 01:37:40.770 \longrightarrow 01:37:41.940$ So now I'm gonna talk
- 1818 01:37:41.940 --> 01:37:44.160 about effectiveness implementing-
- $1819\ 01:37:44.160 --> 01:37:46.230 < v -> Donna? < /v> < v -> Yes. < /v>$
- 1820 01:37:46.230 --> 01:37:49.200 <
v Speaker>Yeah, it's been a wonderful time.
</v>
- 1821 01:37:49.200 --> 01:37:52.210 I don't know, how many slides do you have left?
- $1822\ 01:37:52.210 --> 01:37:55.060 < v$ Presenter>Yeah, I'm not even sure myself. Let me see.
 /v>
- 1823 01:37:56.070 --> 01:37:57.780 <v Speaker>So, because, you know,</v>
- 1824 01:37:57.780 --> 01:38:00.540 this is Nigeria and it's about...
- 1825 01:38:00.540 --> 01:38:03.150 <
v Presenter>And it's late, right? Yeah, okay.
</v>
- $1826\ 01:38:03.150 \longrightarrow 01:38:05.599$ Oh, I was almost there actually.
- $1827\ 01:38:05.599 --> 01:38:07.170 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Almost there. Okay.} < /v>$
- 1828 01:38:07.170 --> 01:38:09.190 Oh good, good. Okay. <v ->Yes.</v>
- $1829\ 01:38:09.190 --> 01:38:13.530$ So, sorry everybody, you know, I'm very excited,
- $1830\ 01:38:13.530 \dashrightarrow 01:38:15.990$ there's a lot of material to cover and may be I should

- 1831 01:38:15.990 --> 01:38:17.610 have weeded it down a little bit more,
- $1832\ 01:38:17.610$ --> 01:38:20.370 but I really appreciate you all hanging in there with me.
- $1833\ 01:38:20.370 \longrightarrow 01:38:22.620\ I$ can see we've lost very few people there.
- 1835 01:38:24.417 --> 01:38:26.990 And the lecture is quite illuminating.
- 1836 01:38:26.990 --> 01:38:28.320 <v Presenter>So I'll just quickly say</v>
- 1837 01:38:28.320 --> 01:38:31.200 that because of an implementation science,
- $1838\ 01:38:31.200 \dashrightarrow 01:38:33.690$ I've been mostly talking about the interventions
- 1839 01:38:33.690 --> 01:38:34.890 in the design point of view,
- $1840\ 01:38:34.890 --> 01:38:39.068$ but there's also this hybrid design framework
- $1841\ 01:38:39.068 \longrightarrow 01:38:44.068$ where we can think of combined outcomes
- $1842\ 01:38:44.820 --> 01:38:48.630$ or differently emphasizing the health outcome versus
- $1843\ 01:38:48.630 \longrightarrow 01:38:50.820$ the implementation outcome.
- $1844\ 01:38:50.820 --> 01:38:54.750$ So there are three types, type 1, type 2, type 3.
- $1845\ 01{:}38{:}54.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}38{:}58.290$ And the goal here in using these hybrid designs
- $1846\ 01:38:58.290 --> 01:39:01.680$ is to accelerate transition from effectiveness trials
- $1847\ 01:39:01.680 \longrightarrow 01:39:03.780$ to implementation trials.
- $1848\ 01:39:03.780 \longrightarrow 01:39:06.300$ And this is a very unique design.
- $1849\ 01:39:06.300 \longrightarrow 01:39:10.064$ Here is the reference for it in implementation science.
- $1850\ 01:39:10.064 \longrightarrow 01:39:13.410$ And so the type 1, 2, and 3, I'll show
- 1851 01:39:13.410 --> 01:39:14.790 you on the next slide.
- $1852\ 01:39:14.790 \longrightarrow 01:39:19.320$ So the type 1, the focus is the clinical intervention.
- 1853 01:39:19.320 --> 01:39:22.830 So that would be, say, in, let's say,
- $1854\ 01:39:22.830 \longrightarrow 01:39:27.180$ in the examples I've given actually,
- $1855\ 01:39:27.180 \longrightarrow 01:39:31.740$ the clinical intervention, none of the examples

- 1856 01:39:31.740 --> 01:39:34.110 I've given actually were a type 1 design,
- 1857 01:39:34.110 --> 01:39:35.940 'cause the clinical, let's say
- $1858\ 01:39:35.940 \longrightarrow 01:39:38.718$ with BetterBirth, which we were just talking about,
- 1859 01:39:38.718 --> 01:39:41.040 the clinical intervention would be,
- $1860\ 01:39:41.040 \dashrightarrow 01:39:43.320$ I think actually they were powered for combined
- 1861 01:39:43.320 --> 01:39:47.400 endpoint of maternal and neonatal morbidity and mortality,
- $1862\ 01:39:47.400 \longrightarrow 01:39:49.353$ that would make it a type 1 design.
- 1863 01:39:49.353 --> 01:39:51.360 But then they were also measuring
- $1864\ 01:39:51.360 --> 01:39:54.030$ the implementation outcome of the extent
- $1865\ 01:39:54.030 --> 01:39:57.390$ to which the Safe Childbirth Checklist was used.
- $1866\ 01:39:57.390 \longrightarrow 01:39:58.500$ That's an implementation
- 1867 01:39:58.500 --> 01:40:01.110 outcome that wasn't their primary outcome.
- 1868 01:40:01.110 --> 01:40:03.720 So that makes it a hybrid type 1 design.
- 1869 01:40:03.720 --> 01:40:05.130 A hybrid type 2 design,
- 1870 01:40:05.130 --> 01:40:07.350 which a lot of people are very interested in,
- 1871 01:40:07.350 --> 01:40:09.750 would mean that we jointly think we power
- $1872\ 01{:}40{:}09.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}40{:}13.980$ the study both to ensure that we have the power to detect
- $1873\ 01:40:13.980 \longrightarrow 01:40:16.652$ a meaningful difference in the clinical outcome,
- 1874 01:40:16.652 --> 01:40:20.040 but also in the implementation strategy
- $1875\ 01:40:20.040 \longrightarrow 01:40:21.981$ and their co-primary endpoints.
- 1876 01:40:21.981 --> 01:40:25.360 And then the hybrid types 3 would be,
- $1877\ 01:40:25.360 --> 01:40:29.482$ focusing exclusively on the implementation endpoint.
- 1878 01:40:29.482 --> 01:40:32.190 But we're still measuring the health outcome
- $1879\ 01:40:32.190 --> 01:40:34.924$ just to get some idea that maybe in this new context,
- 1880 01:40:34.924 --> 01:40:36.979 we're at this greater scale,

 $1881\ 01:40:36.979 --> 01:40:40.133$ maybe we might see a difference, good or bad,

 $1882\ 01:40:40.133 \longrightarrow 01:40:42.180$ in the health endpoint.

 $1883\ 01{:}40{:}42.180 \dashrightarrow 01{:}40{:}44.700$ So those hybrid designs I think are very useful

 $1884\ 01:40:44.700 --> 01:40:47.030$ in implementation science and I'd encourage you all

 $1885\ 01:40:47.030 \longrightarrow 01:40:48.510$ to use them.

 $1886\ 01:40:48.510 \longrightarrow 01:40:50.943$ So this is my last slide.

 $1887\ 01:40:51.840 --> 01:40:54.930$ These are a few textbooks on implementation science

 $1888\ 01:40:54.930 \dashrightarrow 01:40:57.928$ that I encourage people to take a look at, if you can.

 $1889\ 01:40:57.928 --> 01:41:01.590$ Implementation studies require consideration of context,

 $1890\ 01:41:01.590 --> 01:41:05.910$ multiple levels, multiple components, timing matters.

1891 01:41:05.910 --> 01:41:07.560 When you're thinking about conducting

1892 01:41:07.560 --> 01:41:09.600 an implementation science study,

 $1893\ 01{:}41{:}09.600 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}12.450$ you can identify and rank potential study designs

1894 01:41:12.450 --> 01:41:14.790 then decide, and I've gone through a number

 $1895\ 01:41:14.790 --> 01:41:17.070$ of the most important ones and discuss some

 $1896\ 01:41:17.070 \longrightarrow 01:41:19.012$ of their pros and cons.

 $1897\ 01{:}41{:}19.012 --> 01{:}41{:}22.410$ We'll consider randomization and real world rollouts

 $1898\ 01:41:22.410 \longrightarrow 01:41:25.020$ when possible to increase rigor.

 $1899\ 01{:}41{:}25.020 --> 01{:}41{:}28.060$ But also I'm mentioning if randomization is not possible,

 $1900\ 01{:}41{:}28.060 {\:{\mbox{--}}\!>}\ 01{:}41{:}30.750$ there are quasi-experimental and observational

 $1901\ 01{:}41{:}30.750 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}33.481$ designs available for which causal inference methods

1902 01:41:33.481 --> 01:41:34.850 can be applied.

- $1903\ 01{:}41{:}34.850 \dashrightarrow 01{:}41{:}37.470$ And consider some of these innovative approaches
- 1904 01:41:37.470 --> 01:41:39.690 if they're relevant to your study.
- $1905\ 01:41:39.690 \longrightarrow 01:41:41.370$ So thank you all very much.
- 1906 01:41:41.370 --> 01:41:44.652 I'm sorry for keeping you up so late tonight.
- 1907 01:41:44.652 --> 01:41:47.340 It's been a pleasure to talking with you all
- 1908 01:41:47.340 --> 01:41:49.113 and sharing this information.
- 1909 01:41:52.095 --> 01:41:57.095 <
v Speaker>Wow, wow, wow, wow. Donna, you are fantastic.</v>
- $1910\ 01:41:58.170 \longrightarrow 01:41:59.866$ We're very, very greatful.
- 1911 01:41:59.866 --> 01:42:01.801 < v -> Thank you so much, Ike.< / v >
- 1912 01:42:01.801 --> 01:42:03.947 <v Speaker>Everyone...</v>
- 1913 01:42:03.947 --> 01:42:08.010 So I mean we're all still listening
- 1914 01:42:08.010 --> 01:42:11.400 to you since you started the lecture,
- $1915\ 01{:}42{:}11.400 {\: \hbox{--}}{>}\ 01{:}42{:}16.400$ that shows that we really appreciate you and actually
- $1916\ 01:42:16.410$ --> 01:42:19.503 no other person could have delivered this lecture but you,
- 1917 01:42:20.444 --> 01:42:24.420 the expertise cannot be underestimated.
- $1918\ 01:42:24.420 --> 01:42:28.590$ We are very, very grateful, and if you look at the chat,
- 1919 01:42:28.590 --> 01:42:32.490 oh, it's something that is quite encouraging,
- $1920~01{:}42{:}32.490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}37.490$ I wish, I've saved the chat, so I will send this to you.
- 1921 01:42:37.860 --> 01:42:39.600 Wonderful time,
- $1922\ 01{:}42{:}39.600 {\: \text{--}}{\:>}\ 01{:}42{:}44.510$ highly appreciated lecture, stimulating lecture...
- 1923 01:42:45.480 --> 01:42:48.390 It's still coming. Wow, great.
- 1924 01:42:48.390 --> 01:42:52.320 Thanks to the lecturer. So you can imagine.
- 1925 01:42:52.320 --> 01:42:53.730 So we're really very,
- $1926~01{:}42{:}53.730 \dashrightarrow 01{:}42{:}58.730$ very happy and really I'm sure I'm going to be
- 1927 01:42:58.740 --> 01:43:02.027 bombarded with requests for you to come.

```
1928 01:43:02.923 --> 01:43:04.020 <v Presenter>Well, Erica Saracho</v>
```

- $1929\ 01:43:04.020 \longrightarrow 01:43:06.210$ who's assisting me with this.
- 1930 01:43:06.210 --> 01:43:08.190 Erica, are you still on?
- 1931 01:43:08.190 --> 01:43:10.050 Because we should capture the chat,
- 1932 01:43:10.050 --> 01:43:12.270 a number of people are asking for the slides
- $1933\ 01:43:12.270 \longrightarrow 01:43:16.320$ and we can get back to everybody with these slides.
- $1934\ 01:43:16.320 --> 01:43:18.690 < v -> Good. < /v> < v -> Yes, Donna, < /v>$
- $1935\ 01:43:18.690 \longrightarrow 01:43:20.280\ I$ saved the chats.
- 1936 01:43:20.280 --> 01:43:23.790 <v ->Thank you so much, Erica.</v> <v ->Thank you very much, Erica.</v>
- $1937\ 01:43:23.790 \longrightarrow 01:43:28.790$ And so let us have some questions.
- 1938 01:43:29.040 --> 01:43:34.040 I'm sure some of us would want to clarify
- $1939\ 01:43:34.560 \longrightarrow 01:43:37.710$ whatever gray areas they have.
- $1940\ 01:43:37.710 \longrightarrow 01:43:41.700$ So I've asked them to send in their questions
- 1941 01:43:41.700 --> 01:43:44.340 but I've not seen one.
- 1942 01:43:44.340 --> 01:43:47.130 What we are just seeing is email addresses,
- 1943 01:43:47.130 --> 01:43:48.930 send me lectures.
- $1944\ 01:43:48.930 \longrightarrow 01:43:53.040$ So our colleagues there,
- $1945\ 01:43:53.040 --> 01:43:57.660$ could you please send in your questions
- 1946 01:43:57.660 --> 01:43:59.070 because she's here now,
- 1947 01:43:59.070 --> 01:44:02.860 she can clarify things and also give you some
- 1948 01:44:03.720 --> 01:44:06.060 better understanding of the slides
- $1949\ 01:44:06.060 \longrightarrow 01:44:08.010$ that you are requesting for.
- 1950 01:44:08.010 --> 01:44:08.843 Please... <v ->I know,</v>
- 1951 01:44:08.843 --> 01:44:11.730 but maybe it's so late, Ike, maybe people,
- 1952 01:44:11.730 --> 01:44:14.087 it's too late to actually take questions now.
- 1953 01:44:14.087 --> 01:44:16.912 I mean I'm fine but I understand it is quite
- $1954\ 01{:}44{:}16.912 \dashrightarrow 01{:}44{:}19.814$ late for people and I understand if people would like
- 1955 01:44:19.814 --> 01:44:23.583 to just say goodbye at this time.

1956 01:44:24.984 --> 01:44:29.984 <v Speaker>Let me just wait, maybe let's, can you unmute?</v>

1957 01:44:30.210 --> 01:44:33.300 Erica, can you unmute and let's see

 $1958\ 01:44:33.300 --> 01:44:38.300$ anyone raising up his hand, anyone raising up?

1959 01:44:39.840 --> 01:44:41.970 <
v Speaker>I think there are two questions earlier</br/>/v>

1960 01:44:41.970 --> 01:44:43.233 if you scroll up.

1961 01:44:45.618 --> 01:44:48.330 <v Speaker>Yeah, there is one I actually, okay,</v>

 $1962\ 01:44:48.330 \longrightarrow 01:44:53.280$ there is one here that says how do we balance

 $1963\ 01:44:53.280$ --> 01:44:58.280 between rigor and relevance in implementation size?

1964 01:45:01.350 --> 01:45:03.032 <v Presenter>Yeah, so that's a great question.</v>

 $1965\ 01:45:03.032 --> 01:45:04.890 < v -> Do you have -</v> < v -> Absolutely. </v>$

 $1966\ 01:45:04.890 \longrightarrow 01:45:06.990$ Yeah, that's a great question.

1967 01:45:06.990 --> 01:45:08.730 And you know,

 $1968\ 01:45:08.730 --> 01:45:12.960$ my view is there's no right answer to that.

 $1969~01{:}45{:}12.960 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}16.230$ That, you know, it's really, you have to say it depends,

1970 01:45:16.230 --> 01:45:20.040 but, you know, in my opinion I feel

 $1971\ 01:45:20.040 \longrightarrow 01:45:23.460$ that implementation science so far has

 $1972\ 01{:}45{:}23.460 --> 01{:}45{:}28.460$ over emphasized rigor over readiness and relevance

 $1973\ 01:45:28.650 \longrightarrow 01:45:33.060$ and therefore many of these big studies,

1974 01:45:33.060 --> 01:45:35.490 including these examples that I've given,

 $1975\ 01:45:35.490 --> 01:45:38.910$ have missed the boat in terms of policy.

 $1976~01{:}45{:}38.910 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}43.910$ So I might say, maybe we need to, if we have to choose,

 $1977\ 01{:}45{:}44.790 \dashrightarrow 01{:}45{:}47.910$ and I've also given examples of studies and designs

1978 01:45:47.910 --> 01:45:51.793 that can maybe be used that could still be rigorous

- 1979 01:45:51.793 --> 01:45:55.860 and rapid, that if we have to choose,
- $1980\ 01:45:55.860 \longrightarrow 01:45:57.989$ maybe we need to go over to the other,
- 1981 01:45:57.989 --> 01:46:00.960 that the rigorous needs to be, let's say,
- $1982\ 01{:}46{:}00.960 \dashrightarrow 01{:}46{:}04.500$ especially randomization needs to be softened up
- $1983\ 01:46:04.500 \longrightarrow 01:46:06.510$ a little bit so we can get,
- $1984\ 01:46:06.510 \longrightarrow 01:46:09.843$ we can contribute to policy decisions.
- 1985 01:46:13.110 --> 01:46:15.530 <
v Speaker>Okay, thank you very much.
</v>
- $1986\ 01:46:15.530 \longrightarrow 01:46:17.310$ There is another question.
- $1987\ 01:46:17.310 \longrightarrow 01:46:21.060$ What is the difference, if any,
- 1988 01:46:21.060 --> 01:46:24.011 between implementation science study
- 1989 01:46:24.011 --> 01:46:26.344 and implementation research?
- 1990 01:46:28.885 --> 01:46:31.050 <v Presenter>Yeah, I don't think there is a difference</v>
- $1991\ 01:46:31.050 \longrightarrow 01:46:32.763$ in my opinion.
- 1992 01:46:33.660 --> 01:46:36.000 You know, an implementation science study is a type
- $1993\ 01:46:36.000 \longrightarrow 01:46:39.240$ of implementation research, but there's a lot
- $1994\ 01:46:39.240 \longrightarrow 01:46:41.010$ of terminology floating around.
- $1995\ 01{:}46{:}41.010$ --> $01{:}46{:}43.558$ So sometimes people say implementation research,
- 1996 01:46:43.558 --> 01:46:45.828 sometimes they say implementation science,
- 1997 01:46:45.828 --> 01:46:50.490 in the United States, a lot of people say D& I research,
- $1998\ 01:46:50.490 \longrightarrow 01:46:52.680$ dissemination and implementation research
- $1999\ 01:46:52.680 --> 01:46:56.490$ because they wanna emphasize the dissemination piece more.
- 2000 01:46:56.490 --> 01:46:58.680 They feel like there's still inadequate uptake
- $2001\ 01:46:58.680 \longrightarrow 01:47:01.200$ and scale up and scale out of a lot
- $2002\ 01:47:01.200 --> 01:47:05.730$ of evidence-based interventions for whom, you know,
- $2003\ 01{:}47{:}05.730$ --> $01{:}47{:}09.960$ acceptable implementation packages have been developed.

- 2004 01:47:09.960 --> 01:47:12.360 So these words, these various words are,
- $2005\ 01{:}47{:}12.360 \dashrightarrow 01{:}47{:}15.573$ from my point of view, more or less synonymous.
- $2006\ 01:47:17.760 --> 01:47:19.315 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Oh, thank you very much.} </v>$
- $2007\ 01:47:19.315 \longrightarrow 01:47:23.340$ Another question is is there a difference
- $2008\ 01{:}47{:}23.340 {\: -->\:} 01{:}47{:}28.173$ between clinical and implementation outcomes?
- $2009\ 01:47:29.070 \longrightarrow 01:47:30.150 < v \text{ Presenter>Mm-hm. Yes.} < /v >$
- $2010\ 01:47:30.150 \longrightarrow 01:47:33.360$ So I probably should have actually had one
- 2011 01:47:33.360 --> 01:47:34.787 or two slides about that,
- 2012 01:47:34.787 --> 01:47:37.005 'cause that's actually an important concept
- $2013\ 01:47:37.005 --> 01:47:38.700$ in implementation science.
- $2014~01:47:38.700 \dashrightarrow 01:47:41.070$ So I'm sorry I didn't talk more about that,
- $2015\ 01:47:41.070 \longrightarrow 01:47:42.960$ but thank you for the question.
- 2016 01:47:42.960 --> 01:47:46.740 So in, and it's related even to the cascade
- $2017\ 01:47:46.740 \longrightarrow 01:47:51.740$ on my very first slide, where we go from efficacy research,
- $2018\ 01:47:52.579 \longrightarrow 01:47:56.160$ has clinical endpoints, that's it.
- 2019 01:47:56.160 --> 01:47:57.900 Effectiveness research
- 2020 01:47:57.900 --> 01:48:02.125 usually has clinical endpoints, that's it.
- 2021 01:48:02.125 --> 01:48:04.620 Then we get to implementation research,
- $2022\ 01:48:04.620 --> 01:48:06.570$ we start to have implementation outcomes
- $2023\ 01{:}48{:}06.570 \longrightarrow 01{:}48{:}09.270$ where we're not actually even looking at the impact
- $2024\ 01:48:09.270 \longrightarrow 01:48:11.820$ of the intervention on the health endpoints.
- $2025\ 01{:}48{:}11.820 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}14.340$ We're looking at the impact of the intervention
- 2026 01:48:14.340 --> 01:48:16.950 on how the evidence-based intervention
- $2027\ 01{:}48{:}16.950 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}20.910$ is being implemented with the idea that the actual
- $2028\ 01:48:20.910 \dashrightarrow 01:48:24.360$ public health barrier at this point in time is not
- 2029 01:48:24.360 --> 01:48:27.210 like discovering a new intervention,

 $2030\ 01:48:27.210 \longrightarrow 01:48:32.210$ it's rolling out an existing intervention that's useful,

 $2031\ 01{:}48{:}32.400 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}35.640$ and that's where the type 1, 2 and 3 hybrid designs

 $2032\ 01:48:35.640 --> 01:48:38.700$ come in, where in a type 3 hybrid design you would

2033 01:48:38.700 --> 01:48:40.980 just look at, is the safe childbirth,

2034 01:48:40.980 --> 01:48:44.726 is the uptake of the safe childbirth checklist,

 $2035\ 01:48:44.726 \longrightarrow 01:48:47.490$ has that increased?

 $2036~01{:}48{:}47.490 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}49.770$ We're not looking to see, did fewer mothers die?

2037 01:48:49.770 --> 01:48:50.880 Did fewer babies die?

2038 01:48:50.880 --> 01:48:54.300 We know, if these 27 things have been done,

 $2039\ 01{:}48{:}54.300 \dashrightarrow 01{:}48{:}57.000$ fewer mothers and fewer babies are gonna die.

 $2040\ 01{:}48{:}57.000 \dashrightarrow 01{:}49{:}02.000$ So we just wanna get more providers using these 27 things.

 $2041\ 01:49:03.000 \longrightarrow 01:49:05.103$ So that's pure implementation outcome.

2042 01:49:07.560 --> 01:49:10.671 <v Speaker>Well, thank you very much.</v>

2043~01:49:10.671 --> 01:49:14.100 I think the last one here or there's one about how do

 $2044\ 01:49:14.100 \longrightarrow 01:49:19.100$ we calculate the sample size for these designs.

2045 01:49:19.500 --> 01:49:24.090 I wonder how that will be addressed,

 $2046\ 01:49:24.090 \longrightarrow 01:49:26.649$ but that's the question. $\langle v - \rangle Okay. \langle /v \rangle$

 $2047\ 01:49:26.649 \dashrightarrow 01:49:30.450$ So that could be another like one or two hour talk

 $2048\ 01:49:30.450 \longrightarrow 01:49:33.630$ or even a whole class in itself.

2049 01:49:33.630 --> 01:49:37.680 But I can say a few basic principles is if you know

2050 01:49:37.680 --> 01:49:40.680 how to calculate, say, a study,

2051 01:49:40.680 --> 01:49:42.300 let's say, I'll just say

 $2052\ 01:49:42.300 \longrightarrow 01:49:46.999$ for a cluster-randomized trial compared

2053 01:49:46.999 --> 01:49:49.161 to an individually randomized trial,

- $2054\ 01:49:49.161 --> 01:49:51.630$ you can do the sample size calculation
- $2055\ 01:49:51.630 \dashrightarrow 01:49:53.700$ for the individually randomized trial.
- 2056 01:49:53.700 --> 01:49:55.020 And there's even like, you know,
- 2057 01:49:55.020 --> 01:49:57.240 in most statistics textbooks,
- $2058\ 01:49:57.240$ --> 01:50:00.720 you know even basic statistics 101 type courses,
- $2059\ 01:50:00.720 \dashrightarrow 01:50:04.978$ you'll see the formula for power or sample size
- $2060\ 01{:}50{:}04.978 {\: -->\:} 01{:}50{:}08.993$ for a test for the difference between two sample means
- 2061 01:50:08.993 --> 01:50:13.140 or two proportions in two groups.
- $2062\ 01:50:13.140 --> 01:50:16.470$ You can do that sample size or power calculation
- $2063\ 01:50:16.470 \longrightarrow 01:50:20.703$ and then adjust it by what's called the design factor,
- $2064\ 01:50:21.720 --> 01:50:24.120$ takes clustering into account.
- $2065\ 01:50:24.120 --> 01:50:28.080$ And the design factor also is a very simple, you know,
- $2066\ 01:50:28.080 --> 01:50:30.573$ it's like one plus the number of clusters minus one
- $2067\ 01:50:30.573 \longrightarrow 01:50:34.300$ times the intraclass correlation coefficient
- 2068 01:50:35.280 --> 01:50:38.153 and you multiply the sample size by that,
- $2069\ 01:50:38.153 --> 01:50:41.040$ or I don't remember the exact details actually, I'm sorry,
- 2070 01:50:41.040 --> 01:50:43.770 I don't wanna give a wrong formula and I don't remember
- $2071\ 01:50:43.770 \longrightarrow 01:50:45.240$ it off the top of my head.
- 2072 01:50:45.240 --> 01:50:47.765 But you can modify, without a computer,
- 2073 01:50:47.765 --> 01:50:49.665 just using a hand calculation,
- 2074 01:50:49.665 --> 01:50:53.190 you can modify a sample size calculation
- $2075\ 01:50:53.190 \longrightarrow 01:50:55.140$ for an individually randomized trial
- 2076 01:50:55.140 --> 01:50:57.827 with this design factor that only takes,
- 2077 01:50:57.827 --> 01:51:01.890 that all it needs to calculate it is the number

 $2078\ 01:51:01.890 --> 01:51:05.220$ of clusters and the intraclass correlation coefficient.

 $2079~01{:}51{:}05.220 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}08.550$ And then you get your new sample size or your new

2080 01:51:08.550 --> 01:51:11.703 power for your cluster-randomized trial.

2081 01:51:13.763 --> 01:51:15.690 There are also, in R,

 $2082\ 01{:}51{:}15.690 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}19.830$ there are R packages for doing these kinds of calculations

2083 01:51:19.830 --> 01:51:21.300 for stepped wedge designs

 $2084\ 01:51:21.300 \longrightarrow 01:51:23.190$ and for cluster-randomized trials.

 $2085~01{:}51{:}23.190 \dashrightarrow 01{:}51{:}27.630$ In fact we have an R package that calculates sample

2086 01:51:27.630 --> 01:51:31.050 size and power for a whole bunch of different

 $2087~01:51:31.050 \dashrightarrow 01:51:34.320$ variations of step wedge designs with continuous

 $2088\ 01:51:34.320 --> 01:51:38.806$ outcomes and binary outcomes and repeated measures

 $2089\ 01:51:38.806 \longrightarrow 01:51:40.140$ and all sorts of things.

2090 01:51:40.140 --> 01:51:45.140 It's called SWD_PWR, stepped wedge design power

 $2091\ 01:51:46.064 --> 01:51:50.374$ and it's an R package that's freely available to everybody.

 $2092\ 01:51:50.374 \longrightarrow 01:51:52.290$ So that's just a little bit

2093 01:51:52.290 --> 01:51:57.290 about how to do this and what's involved.

2094 01:51:59.640 --> 01:52:00.603 <v Speaker>Yeah, thank you.</v>

2095 01:52:00.603 --> 01:52:04.620 I think I'll just take two more questions.

2096~01:52:04.620 --> 01:52:09.620 There's one that is quite important and I think

2097 01:52:11.520 --> 01:52:16.520 would also help Donna to see how she can help us

2098 01:52:16.950 --> 01:52:19.440 for that, especially those who are interested

2099 01:52:19.440 --> 01:52:22.020 in implementation research.

 $2100\ 01:52:22.020 --> 01:52:25.800$ The comment says, there is generally poor knowledge

- 2101 01:52:25.800 --> 01:52:29.753 of implementation research among low to medium
- 2102 01:52:32.640 --> 01:52:36.450 middle income countries researchers
- $2103\ 01:52:36.450 \longrightarrow 01:52:38.880$ as evidenced especially by the number
- 2104 01:52:38.880 --> 01:52:40.620 of publications in Africa.
- $2105\ 01:52:40.620 --> 01:52:44.370$ Where can one get specific training opportunities
- 2106 01:52:44.370 --> 01:52:47.583 in implementation science research.
- 2107 01:52:49.260 --> 01:52:52.590 <
v Presenter>Yeah, so that is an extremely important point,</r>
- 2108 01:52:52.590 --> 01:52:56.347 and I can tell you a few things about this.
- 2109 01:52:56.347 --> 01:52:59.250 The first one is, I'm pretty sure
- $2110\ 01:52:59.250 --> 01:53:03.390$ that there's a West African Implementation Science Society.
- $2111\ 01:53:03.390 \longrightarrow 01:53:06.753$ Is there anybody on this call who's a part of this society?
- 2112 01:53:08.375 --> 01:53:11.416 <v Speaker>Yeah, CAWISA, there's CAWISA and there's NISA</v>
- $2113\ 01:53:11.416 \longrightarrow 01:53:12.749$ in Nigeria also.
- 2114 01:53:15.030 --> 01:53:15.863 <v -> Yeah, so I don't know, </v>
- $2115\ 01:53:15.863 --> 01:53:19.620$ would you like to say something about that and
- 2116 01:53:19.620 --> 01:53:21.090 what the society is doing,
- 2117 01:53:21.090 --> 01:53:23.413 at least in the West African context,
- $2118\ 01:53:23.413 \longrightarrow 01:53:27.180$ in terms of promoting implementation science,
- $2119\ 01{:}53{:}27.180 \dashrightarrow 01{:}53{:}29.787$ supporting new researchers at implementation science
- 2120 01:53:29.787 --> 01:53:30.933 and so forth?
- 2121 01:53:32.340 --> 01:53:33.720 <v Audience Member>I know that NISA</v>
- $2122\ 01:53:33.720 \dashrightarrow 01:53:37.110$ holds an annual conference on implementation science
- 2123 01:53:37.110 --> 01:53:41.340 in Abuja, I've been, I've attended that before.

- 2124~01:53:41.340 --> 01:53:44.940 I'm very aware that CAWISA is Central and West Africa
- 2125 01:53:44.940 --> 01:53:47.610 and they currently are expanding.
- 2126 01:53:47.610 --> 01:53:51.690 I think they have six countries
- $2127\ 01:53:51.690 \dashrightarrow 01:53:54.040$ in their court and they're currently expanding.
- 2128 01:53:55.866 --> 01:54:00.073 I could send to, the details of, you know,
- 2129 01:54:01.669 --> 01:54:04.440 the two organizations who do training,
- 2130 01:54:04.440 --> 01:54:07.740 therefore they have NIH grant I think to support...
- 2131 01:54:07.740 --> 01:54:10.650 Yes, they do have one or two NIH grants
- $2132\ 01:54:10.650 \longrightarrow 01:54:12.544$ to support implementation.
- 2133 01:54:12.544 --> 01:54:16.830 They just received a grant 443 to do it.
- 2134 01:54:16.830 --> 01:54:18.813 <v Presenter>Wow. Wonderful.</v>
- $2135\ 01:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01:54:20.587 --> 01:54:22.107 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Thank you very much.} < / v > 10:54:20.587 --> 01$
- $2136\ 01:54:22.107 \longrightarrow 01:54:25.637$ I believe that is Professor Bayanela.
- 2137 01:54:25.637 --> 01:54:28.372 <v ->My name is-</v> <v ->That is professor-</v>
- 2138 01:54:28.372 --> 01:54:31.960 < v ->Oh. Sorry-</v> < v ->She's my friend.</v>
- $2139\ 01:54:33.064 \longrightarrow 01:54:36.540 < v \longrightarrow Okay. (laughs) < / v >$
- $2140\ 01:54:36.540 \dashrightarrow 01:54:40.459$ Okay. Could you just type the names of the societies?
- $2141\ 01:54:40.459 --> 01:54:41.292 < v$ Presenter>Yeah, can I get the link?</v>
- 2142 01:54:41.292 --> 01:54:45.980 <v Speaker>Maybe give the others hint on this. Thank you.</v>
- 2143 01:54:47.377 --> 01:54:50.768 < v ->Okay. So that's one thing-</v> < v ->In the chat.</v>
- 2144 01:54:50.768 --> 01:54:52.101 Yeah, so, go on.
- 2145 01:54:53.013 --> 01:54:58.013 <v Presenter>And I know that the World Health Organization</v>
- $2146\ 01:54:59.040 \longrightarrow 01:55:04.040$ has an implementation science academy that's focused on,

 $2147\ 01:55:04.920 --> 01:55:08.280$ there's one that's more focused on infectious disease

 $2148\ 01:55:08.280 --> 01:55:11.471$ and then there's one that's focused on chronic disease.

 $2149\ 01:55:11.471 \longrightarrow 01:55:14.250$ But I don't have the links for either of those.

 $2150\ 01:55:14.250 \longrightarrow 01:55:16.740$ I'm not sure if there's anybody on this call

2151 01:55:16.740 --> 01:55:20.183 who's participated in either one and they're,

 $2152\ 01:55:20.183 \longrightarrow 01:55:22.883$ I know the chronic disease one, I'm pretty sure,

 $2153\ 01:55:22.883 --> 01:55:26.310$ is done in the summer and I don't remember

2154 01:55:26.310 --> 01:55:28.770 if before COVID it might have been

 $2155\ 01:55:28.770 \dashrightarrow 01:55:32.280$ that people had to apply and go to Geneva, but may be

 $2156\ 01:55:32.280 --> 01:55:35.370$ now it's done by Zoom and it can be more inclusive.

 $2157\ 01:55:35.370 \dashrightarrow 01:55:38.280$ I'm not really sure but I'm wondering if there's anyone

 $2158\ 01:55:38.280$ --> 01:55:43.280 on the call who is involved with either of those trainings

2159 01:55:43.350 --> 01:55:44.703 that are connected to WHO.

2160 01:55:51.711 --> 01:55:53.340 <v Speaker>I guess please,</v>

 $2161\ 01:55:53.340 --> 01:55:58.340$ let me advise our participants to actually use the Google.

2162 01:55:59.700 --> 01:56:02.558 You can type this in the Google and get some

 $2163\ 01:56:02.558 \longrightarrow 01:56:05.289$ of the resources.

 $2164\ 01:56:05.289$ --> 01:56:10.289 There are some training programs too.

 $2165\ 01:56:10.620 \longrightarrow 01:56:14.610\ I$ know the NIH also have the implementation

 $2166\ 01{:}56{:}14.610 {\: -->}\ 01{:}56{:}19.290$ science training program and we can,

 $2167\ 01:56:19.290$ --> 01:56:21.990 I mean you can actually apply for it. It is online.

2168 01:56:21.990 --> 01:56:24.972 And then in December- $<\! {\rm v}$ ->Didn't you do that, Ike?</r>

2169 01:56:24.972 --> 01:56:27.490 <v Speaker>You join the group. Yeah, that one.
</v>

- 2170 01:56:27.490 --> 01:56:31.800 <
v ->Didn't you do that one?</br/>/v> <v ->Yes, I did. I did that.</v>
- 2171 01:56:31.800 --> 01:56:33.420 <v Speaker>Maybe you could say a little bit more-</v>
- $2172\ 01:56:33.420 --> 01:56:35.490 < v$ Speaker>The conference.</v>
- 2173 01:56:35.490 --> 01:56:37.200 <-> Presenter>Yeah, maybe you could say a little bit more</r>
- $2174\ 01:56:37.200 \longrightarrow 01:56:39.330$ about what was involved because that was a pretty
- $2175\ 01:56:39.330 --> 01:56:43.390$ in-depth training I think that you were able to access.
- 2176 01:56:43.390 --> 01:56:46.980 <v Speaker>Yes, it was actually for about three months</v>
- 2177 01:56:46.980 --> 01:56:51.980 or so and we had the training online,
- 2178 01:56:52.140 --> 01:56:56.700 and we had exercises,
- $2179\ 01:56:56.700 \longrightarrow 01:57:01.700$ assignments and we had also facilitators
- 2180 01:57:04.560 --> 01:57:09.060 or resource courses for the different lectures,
- $2181\ 01:57:09.060 \longrightarrow 01:57:13.833$ and a lot was given on the theories.
- $2182\ 01:57:15.210 \dashrightarrow 01:57:19.560$ I mean they really went in depth so that they were
- $2183\ 01:57:19.560 \dashrightarrow 01:57:24.000$ well grounded in the theory of implementation science.
- $2184\ 01:57:24.000 \longrightarrow 01:57:27.510$ And then the various examples.
- 2185 01:57:27.510 --> 01:57:31.780 And this was capped by a meeting
- 2186 01:57:33.453 --> 01:57:37.950 in Washington and there, there was
- 2187 01:57:37.950 --> 01:57:42.780 a conference and we also had some sessions,
- 2188 01:57:42.780 --> 01:57:47.780 small group sessions and I mean
- $2189\ 01:57:47.820 \longrightarrow 01:57:49.980$ just to experience
- $2190\ 01{:}57{:}49.980 \dashrightarrow 01{:}57{:}54.980$ the different kinds of implementation research
- $2191\ 01:57:54.990 \dashrightarrow 01:57:58.890$ that has been carried out and it was quite helpful.
- $2192\ 01:57:58.890 --> 01:58:03.890$ So I guess with the emails we have, but like you said,

2193 01:58:04.170 --> 01:58:08.695 you can just Google and you can actually access all

2194 01:58:08.695 --> 01:58:11.739 of this, and like Donna said,

 $2195\ 01:58:11.739 \dashrightarrow 01:58:15.630$ there is also this WHO implementation science

2196 01:58:15.630 --> 01:58:18.660 training that's also free.

 $2197\ 01:58:18.660 \longrightarrow 01:58:19.543$ And so we can,

2198 01:58:19.543 --> 01:58:23.698 I mean you can access all of this at some point,

2199 01:58:23.698 --> 01:58:28.698 but you can get back to me if you need further

 $2200\ 01:58:29.040 \longrightarrow 01:58:30.570$ information on this.

2201 01:58:30.570 --> 01:58:35.400 And we have also heard about others who can help.

 $2202\ 01:58:35.400 \longrightarrow 01:58:40.352$ So if we get that, the names of the society organizations,

 $2203\ 01:58:40.352 \dashrightarrow 01:58:45.352$ it'll also help us to link a network amongst ourselves

 $2204\ 01:58{:}46.080 \dashrightarrow 01{:}58{:}50.560$ on this implementation science and implementation research

2205 01:58:51.720 --> 01:58:55.883 across the continent and even the group.

 $2206\ 01:58:55.883 \longrightarrow 01:58:59.957$ So the lot of network is there for us.

 $2207\ 01:59:00.840 --> 01:59:03.240$ I have to keep raising up their hands.

 $2208\ 01:59:03.240 \longrightarrow 01:59:07.200\ I$ have to allow them before we end this,

2209 01:59:07.200 --> 01:59:11.880 I have Dr. William and I have... (indistinct)

2210 01:59:11.880 --> 01:59:16.323 Dr. William, please let it be brief. Thank you.

2211 01:59:17.219 --> 01:59:18.501 Dr. William?

2212 01:59:18.501 --> 01:59:21.833 <v Presenter>I better tell Dr. Spigelman that too.</v>

 $2213\ 01:59:21.833 --> 01:59:23.375 < v \text{ Speaker} > \text{Pardon me. Donna?} < /v >$

2214 01:59:23.375 --> 01:59:25.350 <v Presenter>I said you better tell Dr. Spigelman</v>

2215 01:59:25.350 --> 01:59:29.070 let it be brief also. (laughs)

- 2216 01:59:29.070 --> 01:59:30.180 I'm just joking.
- $2217\ 01:59:30.180 \longrightarrow 01:59:31.284 < v \longrightarrow Hello? < /v > < v \longrightarrow Okay. < /v >$
- 2218 01:59:31.284 --> 01:59:33.180 <v Speaker>Hello. Good evening.</v>
- 2219 01:59:33.180 --> 01:59:35.999 <v Speaker>Hello Dr. Is that Dr. William? Yeah, thank you.</v>
- 2220 01:59:35.999 --> 01:59:37.936 <v Speaker>Yes. Good evening, ma'am.</v>
- 2221 01:59:37.936 --> 01:59:39.838 <v -> Yeah we are hearing you.</v> <v -> Good evening, ma'am.</v>
- 2222 01:59:39.838 --> 01:59:43.590 <
v ->Yes, we're hearing you.</v> <v ->Good evening. Hello.</v>
- 2223 01:59:43.590 --> 01:59:47.820 <v Speaker>Yeah, the lecture is a we-some.</v>
- 2224 01:59:47.820 --> 01:59:51.750 I had a lot of new things that were,
- $2225\ 01:59:51.750 \longrightarrow 01:59:56.750$ was being taught but my question majorly is concerning
- 2226 01:59:58.440 --> 02:00:03.440 the hybrid research that you mentioned
- $2227\ 02{:}00{:}03.810 \dashrightarrow 02{:}00{:}07.140$ that it is the same thing as mixed method research
- $2228\ 02:00:07.140 \longrightarrow 02:00:12.140$ and that since HIV is the chronic disease now,
- 2229 02:00:14.010 --> 02:00:19.010 would is it be better to do the research that you want
- $2230\ 02:00:20.190 \longrightarrow 02:00:23.010$ to do in East Africa, that's in Uganda, also
- $2231\ 02:00:23.010 \longrightarrow 02:00:27.773$ in West Africa also to see if there are changes in the.
- 2232 02:00:27.773 --> 02:00:29.757 though there are both flat,
- 2233 02:00:29.757 --> 02:00:34.450 but the different terrains and all that who also help
- $2234\ 02:00:36.956 \longrightarrow 02:00:37.860$ in managing the patient.
- $2235\ 02:00:37.860 --> 02:00:42.273$ So those are the issues I have. So, thank you.
- 2236 02:00:43.800 --> 02:00:44.633 <v Presenter>Great.</v>
- 2237 02:00:44.633 --> 02:00:47.333 So I'm glad you asked that question.

 $2238\ 02:00:47.333 \longrightarrow 02:00:52.290$ Hybrid designs and mixed methods are not the same thing.

2239 02:00:52.290 --> 02:00:56.520 So hybrid designs are, well, let me say,

 $2240\ 02:00:56.520 --> 02:00:58.950$ mixed methods, which I didn't really talk about.

 $2241\ 02{:}00{:}58.950 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}01.589$ That's another thing I could have actually included

 $2242\ 02:01:01.589 \longrightarrow 02:01:02.760$ in this talk.

2243 02:01:02.760 --> 02:01:06.376 But mixed methods involve the mixing of qualitative

 $2244\ 02:01:06.376 --> 02:01:11.273$ and quantitative research along the entire study process.

2245 02:01:11.273 --> 02:01:14.610 And there's different types of mixed methods

 $2246\ 02:01:14.610 --> 02:01:18.060$ designs depending on what's considered to be

 $2247\ 02:01:18.060 --> 02:01:21.180$ more important, the qualitative or the quantitative.

2248 02:01:21.180 --> 02:01:23.040 So like you could say, the MOST design,

 $2249\ 02:01:23.040 \longrightarrow 02:01:25.830$ which I did talk about is a mixed method design,

2250 02:01:25.830 --> 02:01:28.750 because phase one of the MOST design

 $2251\ 02:01:30.030 \longrightarrow 02:01:31.800$ at least has a qualitative component.

2252 02:01:31.800 --> 02:01:36.420 We use qualitative data to kind of narrow down

2253 02:01:36.420 --> 02:01:38.584 the intervention package components.

 $2254\ 02:01:38.584 \dashrightarrow 02:01:42.240$ But then we'd use quantitative data in phase two

 $2255\ 02:01:42.240 --> 02:01:45.810$ in MOST to further weed them down to what we're gonna

 $2256\ 02:01:45.810 \longrightarrow 02:01:47.904$ use for the intervention we're gonna roll

 $2257\ 02:01:47.904 \longrightarrow 02:01:49.500$ out in the full trial.

 $2258\ 02{:}01{:}49.500 \dashrightarrow 02{:}01{:}54.270$ But it's recommended, and even though I have really

2259 02:01:54.270 --> 02:01:56.670 almost no social science training,

 $2260\ 02:01:56.670 --> 02:02:00.210$ I've come to deeply appreciate and value the role

 $2261\ 02:02:00.210 \longrightarrow 02:02:02.918$ of social scientists in implementation science.

 $2262\ 02{:}02{:}02{:}02{:}02{:}06{.}058$ And I would say that we need qualitative research

 $2263\ 02:02:06.058 \longrightarrow 02:02:09.816$ along with quantitative along the entire like pathway

2264 02:02:09.816 --> 02:02:13.050 from qualitative and quantitative data

 $2265\ 02{:}02{:}13.050 --> 02{:}02{:}16.472$ about what is and isn't working about the intervention

2266 02:02:16.472 --> 02:02:20.010 if it's been in place or what people think

 $2267\ 02{:}02{:}20.010 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}23.940$ about a new kind of way of adapting the intervention

 $2268\ 02:02:23.940 \longrightarrow 02:02:25.650$ to a new situation.

2269 02:02:25.650 --> 02:02:27.540 And then you kind of roll out your trial,

 $2270\ 02:02:27.540 \longrightarrow 02:02:29.370$ whatever kind of trial you have.

2271 02:02:29.370 --> 02:02:31.350 And then while the trial's going on,

2272 02:02:31.350 --> 02:02:33.810 it's really important to collect qualitative data

 $2273\ 02:02:33.810 \longrightarrow 02:02:38.810$ because if it doesn't work, we wanna know why.

 $2274\ 02:02:39.330 \dashrightarrow 02:02:42.300$ So like in the Better Birth study that I mentioned.

2275 02:02:42.300 --> 02:02:44.188 because it wasn't a mixed method study,

 $2276\ 02{:}02{:}44.188 \dashrightarrow 02{:}02{:}48.810$ we have no idea why there was this failure to take up

2277 02:02:48.810 --> 02:02:50.610 the Safe Childbirth Checklist.

 $2278\ 02:02:50.610 \longrightarrow 02:02:54.500$ Was it that the turnover of staff was too high

 $2279\ 02:02:54.500 \longrightarrow 02:02:56.837$ or the supply is not in the facilities?

 $2280\ 02:02:56.837 \dashrightarrow 02:02:59.752$ I mean there's just so many reasons, we have no idea.

 $2281\ 02:02:59.752 \dashrightarrow 02:03:03.210$ So the qualitative piece while the study is going on

2282 02:03:03.210 --> 02:03:04.620 is really important.

- $2283\ 02:03:04.620 \longrightarrow 02:03:06.870$ And then you do your quantitative evaluation
- $2284\ 02:03:06.870 \longrightarrow 02:03:08.280$ of your endpoints.
- 2285 02:03:08.280 --> 02:03:11.490 And then a lot of people advocate, after that,
- $2286\ 02:03:11.490 \longrightarrow 02:03:14.550$ further qualitative data collection to find out
- 2287 02:03:14.550 --> 02:03:16.470 what people thought of the intervention,
- 2288 02:03:16.470 --> 02:03:19.410 what suggestions they have for improvement,
- $2289\ 02{:}03{:}19.410 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}21.477$ what they think the next step might be in terms
- $2290\ 02:03:21.477 \longrightarrow 02:03:23.940$ of scale up or scale out.
- 2291 02:03:23.940 --> 02:03:27.480 And so you'd have qualitative and quantitative trading
- $2292\ 02:03:27.480 \longrightarrow 02:03:30.090$ off along the whole continuum.
- $2293\ 02{:}03{:}30.090 \dashrightarrow 02{:}03{:}34.770$ And then also there's also formal ways of doing
- $2294\ 02:03:34.770 --> 02:03:38.836$ mixed methods analysis where, when you evaluate outcomes.
- 2295 02:03:38.836 --> 02:03:42.296 you actually integrate the qualitative
- 2296 02:03:42.296 --> 02:03:45.176 and quantitative data in some formal ways
- 2297 02:03:45.176 --> 02:03:47.400 that I know exist,
- $2298\ 02:03:47.400 \longrightarrow 02:03:50.490$ I haven't actually had the opportunity to do that yet.
- 2299 02:03:50.490 --> 02:03:52.170 And so I'm looking forward to learning more
- 2300 02:03:52.170 --> 02:03:54.180 about how to do that.
- 2301 02:03:54.180 --> 02:03:56.940 So that's very different now I hope you can see
- $2302\ 02{:}03{:}56.940 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}01.080$ from the hybrid design where we have a standard quantitative
- $2303\ 02{:}04{:}01.080 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}04.973$ study design like a CRT or a stepped wedge design
- 2304 02:04:04.973 --> 02:04:07.550 and the hybrid design is just more about,
- 2305 02:04:07.550 --> 02:04:10.843 is the primary outcome, health outcome,
- $2306\ 02{:}04{:}10.843 \longrightarrow 02{:}04{:}13.410$ a health outcome and an implementation outcome
- 2307 02:04:13.410 --> 02:04:15.933 or an implementation outcome only?

2308 02:04:20.370 --> 02:04:22.447 <v ->Okay, thank you, Donna.</v>

2309 02:04:22.447 --> 02:04:24.947 (indistinct)

2310 02:04:26.726 --> 02:04:28.960 <v Speaker>Yeah, thank you. Thank you very much.</v>

2311 02:04:28.960 --> 02:04:32.104 <v Speaker>One of the universities in Nigeria.</v>

2312 02:04:32.104 --> 02:04:33.547 <v -> It's all right.</v> <v -> You're welcome.</v>

2313 02:04:33.547 --> 02:04:36.910 <v Speaker>It's all right. Thank you very much.</v>

 $2314\ 02:04:36.910 --> 02:04:40.800$ Professor Donna, Professor Ajayi and everybody here.

 $2316~02:04:42.780 --> 02:04:45.393~\mathrm{I}$ was on the road so my network was off and on.

 $2317\ 02:04:46.463 --> 02:04:50.010$ I started hearing, listening to implementation science

 $2318~02{:}04{:}50.010 \dashrightarrow 02{:}04{:}55.010$ I think around 2016 at NIH and one the last speakers

 $2319\ 02:04:55.471 --> 02:04:58.857$ spoke about, showed up when they draw the map,

2320 02:04:58.857 --> 02:05:01.110 it was still new then,

 $2321\ 02:05:01.110 --> 02:05:05.160$ you would just see a lot of studies on East Africa,

2322 02:05:05.160 --> 02:05:08.407 hardly anything in West Africa.

2323 02:05:08.407 --> 02:05:11.820 You know, I'm just trying to look at the gaps

 $2324\ 02:05:11.820 \longrightarrow 02:05:14.048$ that we need to be filling.

 $2325\ 02:05:14.048 --> 02:05:18.480$ I'm challenging those of us present here and our speaker,

 $2326\ 02:05:18.480 \longrightarrow 02:05:21.027$ what really causes that?

2327 02:05:21.027 --> 02:05:24.600 There's not a balance.

2328 02:05:24.600 --> 02:05:29.340 You see a lot of studies on East African coast

 $2329\ 02:05:29.340 \longrightarrow 02:05:31.200$ and very minimal...

2330 02:05:31.200 --> 02:05:33.120 That's one thing I observed.

- 2331 02:05:33.120 --> 02:05:37.050 Secondly, each time I go for these meetings,
- $2332\ 02:05:37.050 --> 02:05:41.070$ with all due respect, you are talking about trials.
- 2333 02:05:41.070 --> 02:05:43.140 you're talking about these implementations,
- 2334 02:05:43.140 --> 02:05:44.910 hospitals, everything.
- $2335\ 02:05:44.910 \longrightarrow 02:05:48.630$ We hardly see those who handle these drugs.
- $2336\ 02:05:48.630 \dashrightarrow 02:05:52.920$ We hardly see, I mean I'd love multidisciplinary research,
- $2337\ 02:05:52.920 \longrightarrow 02:05:54.150$ that's why I'm here.
- 2338 02:05:54.150 --> 02:05:55.962 I believe in it.
- 2339 02:05:55.962 --> 02:05:59.250 But we hardly, it could be the fault of the,
- 2340 02:05:59.250 --> 02:06:02.460 those drug handlers, the pharmacies,
- $2341\ 02:06:02.460 \longrightarrow 02:06:04.200$ those that handle drugs.
- $2342\ 02:06:04.200 \dashrightarrow 02:06:07.290$ Because I was in another group with Harvard on malaria
- $2343\ 02:06:07.290 \longrightarrow 02:06:08.160$ and it's the same thing.
- $2344\ 02:06:08.160 \longrightarrow 02:06:09.030$ They were even shocked.
- $2345\ 02:06:09.030 --> 02:06:10.980$ They say you are the only pharmacist we've seen
- $2346\ 02:06:10.980 \longrightarrow 02:06:13.397$ in this thing and you're talking about medicines,
- $2347\ 02:06:13.397 \longrightarrow 02:06:16.140$ and they're not involved, in the hospitals,
- $2348\ 02:06:16.140 --> 02:06:20.640$ when I listen to them, they don't even want to mention them.
- $2349\ 02:06:20.640 \dashrightarrow 02:06:25.640$ So we should really be looking at involving every body
- $2350\ 02:06:26.228 --> 02:06:29.730$ in this health care sector for the implementation
- $2351\ 02:06:29.730 \longrightarrow 02:06:30.563$ to work in.
- $2352\ 02:06:30.563 --> 02:06:35.035$ In terms of community pharmacists, they do a lot in Africa.
- $2353\ 02:06:35.035 \longrightarrow 02:06:38.100$ They really need to be brought on board.
- $2354\ 02:06:38.100 \longrightarrow 02:06:39.180$ They do a whole lot.
- $2355\ 02:06:39.180 \longrightarrow 02:06:43.380$ They're the (indistinct) when they're ill.

 $2356\ 02:06:43.380 \dashrightarrow 02:06:47.700$ So we should look at those gaps and fill the skill sets

 $2357\ 02:06:47.700 \longrightarrow 02:06:49.110$ in that area.

 $2358\ 02:06:49.110 \longrightarrow 02:06:53.760$ And then finally is

 $2359\ 02:06:53.760 \longrightarrow 02:06:56.880$ that all these other websites

 $2360\ 02:06:56.880 \longrightarrow 02:07:00.150$ and all that, it would be good for those of us here,

 $2361\ 02:07:00.150 --> 02:07:04.980$ maybe or Professor Ajayi to really do certification,

 $2362\ 02:07:04.980 \longrightarrow 02:07:07.710$ social certification courses on these things

 $2363\ 02:07:07.710 \longrightarrow 02:07:11.070$ so that we will be well trained.

 $2364\ 02:07:11.070 --> 02:07:13.142\ \text{It's obvious that you need a lot of statistics}.$

2365 02:07:13.142 --> 02:07:15.090 Some of us may not be good

 $2366\ 02:07:15.090 --> 02:07:19.110$ as why multidisciplinary approach is very important.

2367 02:07:19.110 --> 02:07:21.603 Well, thank you very much for everything.

2368 02:07:24.180 --> 02:07:26.657 <-> Thank you.</v> <-> Oh thank you very much.</v>

2369 02:07:26.657 --> 02:07:29.806 <v ->I think it'll be more interesting just ahead.</v>

2370 02:07:29.806 --> 02:07:30.960 <v Speaker>Okay. Donna, I'm with you.</v>

2371 02:07:30.960 --> 02:07:32.010 <-> Oh, okay.</->

 $2372\ 02:07:32.010 \dashrightarrow 02:07:35.910$ Well, I think these comments are probably best

 $2373\ 02:07:35.910 \longrightarrow 02:07:40.410$ discussed by the many participants on this call more

 $2374\ 02:07:40.410 --> 02:07:44.760$ than me, 'cause they have to do with, you know,

2375 02:07:44.760 --> 02:07:46.571 the role of implementation science

2376 02:07:46.571 --> 02:07:50.077 in West Africa and what are the questions,

 $2377\ 02:07:50.077 \longrightarrow 02:07:51.540$ and some of them,

 $2378\ 02:07:51.540 --> 02:07:55.684$ the only thing I would just say one small observation that,

```
2379 02:07:55.684 --> 02:08:00.330 you know, it's an unintended consequence
```

- 2380 02:08:00.330 --> 02:08:02.010 of the fact that, you know,
- $2381\ 02:08:02.010 \dashrightarrow 02:08:04.521$ I think, to some extent the issue you're bringing up
- $2382\ 02:08:04.521 \longrightarrow 02:08:08.580$ is because HIV rates
- $2383\ 02:08:08.580 \dashrightarrow 02:08:13.350$ were so much lower in West Africa than East Africa.
- 2384 02:08:13.350 --> 02:08:16.080 So there was so much funding being poured
- 2385 02:08:16.080 --> 02:08:19.140 into East Africa in terms of mitigation
- $2386\ 02:08:19.140 \longrightarrow 02:08:21.660$ of the HIV AIDS epidemic.
- 2387 02:08:21.660 --> 02:08:24.540 And then now as the epidemic has lessened,
- $2388\ 02:08:24.540 --> 02:08:27.858$ it's starting to evolve into some of these other topics.
- 2389 02:08:27.858 --> 02:08:30.796 Whereas in West Africa there just wasn't as much
- 2390 02:08:30.796 --> 02:08:33.390 because luckily the AIDS epidemic was
- $2391\ 02:08:33.390 \longrightarrow 02:08:35.673$ just so much less severe.
- 2392 02:08:39.660 --> 02:08:42.090 <v ->Yeah, thank you very much for that response.
</v>
- $2393\ 02{:}08{:}42.090 \longrightarrow 02{:}08{:}45.878$ And I think it is a challenge also to researchers
- $2394\ 02:08:45.878 \longrightarrow 02:08:48.378$ in this part of the continent.
- 2395 02:08:49.344 --> 02:08:51.193 <v ->I know.</v> <v ->And with this lecture</v>
- 2396 02:08:51.193 --> 02:08:53.010 I think we should start
- 2397 02:08:53.010 --> 02:08:57.930 thinking of materials opportunities that are
- $2398\ 02:08:57.930 \longrightarrow 02:09:01.191$ there for us to tap into.
- 2399 02:09:01.191 --> 02:09:04.374 So thank you very much, (indistinct)
- 2400 02:09:04.374 --> 02:09:07.102 for that observation and I think
- $2401\ 02:09:07.102 \dashrightarrow 02:09:12.102$ we should try and bridge the gap and come up with...
- 2402 02:09:12.427 --> 02:09:14.844 (indistinct)
- $2403\ 02:09:18.840 \longrightarrow 02:09:20.227 < v \longrightarrow Please. < /v >$

2404 02:09:20.227 --> 02:09:24.300 So I think we need to really round up,

 $2405\ 02:09:24.300 \longrightarrow 02:09:29.300$ I want to mention that Donna actually moved

 $2406\ 02:09:29.520 \longrightarrow 02:09:31.530$ from one lecture to ours.

 $2407\ 02:09:31.530 \longrightarrow 02:09:33.210$ So we are really very,

 $2408\ 02:09:33.210 --> 02:09:37.440$ very grateful because we know by now you should be

 $2409\ 02:09:37.440 \dashrightarrow 02:09:42.440$ resting from the various assignments you had all morning.

2410 02:09:44.160 --> 02:09:48.401 So to Randolph, Donna, I've just observed

 $2411\ 02:09:48.401 \dots > 02:09:53.401$ we're wearing the, our clothes are of the same color.

2412 02:09:53.886 --> 02:09:58.750 <v ->I know, I noticed it also. It's kind of amazing.</v>

2413 02:09:58.750 --> 02:10:01.560 <v Speaker>Oh, what a coincidence. I'm so happy.</v>

2414 02:10:01.560 --> 02:10:02.393 <v ->I know.</v>

2415 02:10:02.393 --> 02:10:06.114 <v -> And that means I need to come back there soon.</v>

2416 02:10:06.114 --> 02:10:09.202 <v ->Yeah, that'd be great. That would be wonderful.</v>

2417 02:10:09.202 --> 02:10:10.690 <v -> Thank you very much.</v>

 $2418\ 02{:}10{:}10{:}10{.}690 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}15{.}593$ So we have Dr. Kiemi who is going to do the vote of thanks

 $2419\ 02:10:15.593 --> 02:10:19.920$ on behalf of the Institute for Advanced Medical Research

2420 02:10:19.920 --> 02:10:20.883 and Training.

2421 02:10:22.170 --> 02:10:26.313 So Dr. Kiemi, are you there?

2422 02:10:28.020 --> 02:10:30.510 <v ->Yes, I am.</v> <v ->Okay, please,</v>

 $2423\ 02:10:30.510 \longrightarrow 02:10:32.553$ the floor is yours now, thank you.

 $2424\ 02:10:33.450 \longrightarrow 02:10:36.540 < v \rightarrow Right, thank you very much, </v>$

 $2425\ 02{:}10{:}36.540 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}41.540$ Professor Donna Spiegelman, for a very exciting

 $2426\ 02{:}10{:}41.625 \dashrightarrow 02{:}10{:}44.703$ and illuminating lecture on implementation science.

- 2427 02:10:46.290 --> 02:10:47.880 In this vote of thanks,
- $2428\ 02:10:47.880 \longrightarrow 02:10:51.720$ I just like to say that this lecture is coming
- $2429\ 02:10:51.720 \longrightarrow 02:10:56.720$ just at the heels of an African summit
- $2430\ 02:10:56.730 \longrightarrow 02:10:58.473$ that we had just last week.
- $2431\ 02{:}10{:}59.730 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}03.270$ And one of the strong takes of that summit was
- $2432\ 02:11:03.270 \dashrightarrow 02:11:07.860$ that we need implementation science to reduce burden
- $2433\ 02:11:07.860 \longrightarrow 02:11:09.183$ of stroke in Africa.
- $2434\ 02:11:10.140 \longrightarrow 02:11:13.445$ We discovered that in Africa only 7%
- $2435\ 02:11:13.445 \longrightarrow 02:11:16.205$ of hypertensives are controlled.
- 2436 02:11:16.205 --> 02:11:19.020 And that begs the question of the need
- 243702:11:19.020 --> 02:11:21.900 of interpretation science to, you know,
- $2438\ 02:11:22.850 \longrightarrow 02:11:26.640$ to improve awareness about hypertension and, you know,
- $2439\ 02:11:26.640 --> 02:11:31.230$ and other risk factors and to improve optic
- $2440\ 02{:}11{:}31.230 --> 02{:}11{:}35.550$ of hypertensives to enhance control of hypertension,
- 2441 02:11:35.550 --> 02:11:38.010 and of course to our body.
- 2442 02:11:38.010 --> 02:11:40.830 So it's very germane to the field
- $2443\ 02{:}11{:}40.830 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}43.920$ of non-communicative diseases on the continent.
- $2444\ 02{:}11{:}43{.}920 \dashrightarrow 02{:}11{:}47{.}130$ And I'm sure you wouldn't mind partnering with us
- 2445 02:11:47.130 --> 02:11:48.533 in the years ahead, you know,
- $2446\ 02:11:48.533 --> 02:11:52.320$ to undertake implementation science research in reducing
- $2447\ 02:11:52.320 \longrightarrow 02:11:55.140$ the burden of stroke in Africa.
- 2448 02:11:55.140 --> 02:11:56.510 So on that note, I'd like to,
- 2449 02:11:56.510 --> 02:11:58.956 on behalf of the director
- $2450\ 02{:}11{:}58.956 {\:{\mbox{--}}}{\:{\mbox{0}}}\ 02{:}12{:}00.867$ of the Institute for Advanced Medical Research
- $2451\ 02{:}12{:}00.867 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}04.710$ and Training College of Medicine... (in distinct)

- $2452\ 02:12:04.710 --> 02:12:08.787$ I'd like to say very big thank you for the time
- $2453\ 02:12:08.787 \longrightarrow 02:12:13.140$ you have invested in sharing with us these deep
- $2454\ 02{:}12{:}13.140 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}17.250$ thoughts from your profound wealth of experience
- $2455\ 02:12:17.250 --> 02:12:20.867$ and knowledge in the field of implementation science.
- $2456\ 02{:}12{:}20.867 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}25.260$ Director, the entire staff and indeed the purpose
- $2457\ 02{:}12{:}25.260 --> 02{:}12{:}27.010$ of the College of Medicine, and a time not
- $2458\ 02{:}12{:}27.010 \dashrightarrow 02{:}12{:}29.603$ about the community and including colleagues
- $2459\ 02:12:29.603 \longrightarrow 02:12:32.213$ who have joined from other institutions in Nigeria,
- 2460 02:12:32.213 --> 02:12:35.658 across the continent, but they be grateful.
- $2461\ 02:12:35.658 --> 02:12:39.510$ We trust, we hope to build on this foundational
- $2462\ 02:12:39.510 \longrightarrow 02:12:43.200$ knowledge and share with us to advance the field
- $2463\ 02:12:43.200 \longrightarrow 02:12:44.790$ across the continent.
- 2464 02:12:44.790 --> 02:12:47.190 Thank you very much and God bless.
- 2465 02:12:48.305 --> 02:12:50.542 <v -> Thank you, everybody.</v>
- 2466 02:12:50.542 --> 02:12:51.874 Nice- <v ->And let us</v>
- 2467 02:12:51.874 --> 02:12:53.624 all give an applause.
- 2468 02:12:54.614 --> 02:12:56.852 <v ->Thank you.</v> <v ->Thank you so much.</v>
- 2469 02:12:56.852 --> 02:12:59.760 <
v Presenter>Thank you. It's been a pleasure.
</v>
- 2470 02:12:59.760 --> 02:13:01.519 Thank you so much. <v -> Thank you.</v>
- 2471 02:13:01.519 --> 02:13:03.049 <
v ->So much, Donna.</br/>/v> <v ->Thank you so much.</v>
- $2472\ 02:13:03.049 \longrightarrow 02:13:05.243 < v \longrightarrow Thank you.$ By by e. </v>
- 2473 02:13:05.243 --> 02:13:07.052 <v ->Bye.</v> <v ->Thank you.</v>
- $2474\ 02:13:07.052 \longrightarrow 02:13:08.552 < v \longrightarrow Bye. < /v > < v \longrightarrow Thank you. < /v >$

```
2475 02:13:09.981 --> 02:13:11.564 <-> Bye.</v> <-> Bye, Donna.</v>
```

2476 02:13:12.894 --> 02:13:15.826 <-v Student>Bye bye, thank you.</v>

2477 02:13:15.826 --> 02:13:18.743 <
v ->Thank you, thank you.</v> <
v ->Thank you.</v>

2478 02:13:21.231 --> 02:13:24.254 <v Speaker>Thank you, Donna. Thank you again.</v>

2479 02:13:24.254 --> 02:13:25.921 <v Speaker>So much.</v>

 $2480\ 02:13:28.356 \longrightarrow 02:13:30.773$ (indistinct)