ERIC Notebook

April 2000 Issue 12

UNC SCHOOL OF PUBLIC HEALTH
DEPARTMENT OF EPIDEMIOLOGY

Michel Ibrahim, MD, PhD
Director of Education Program

Lorraine Alexander, DrPH

Carl Shy, MD, DrPH

Sherry Farr, Graduate Research Assistant

VA ERIC
EPIDEMIOLOGIC RESEARCH & INFORMATION CENTER
Durham, North Carolina

Ron Horner, PhD
ERIC Director

http://hsrd.durham.med.va.gov/ERIC/

The ERIC Notebook is funded by the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA), Veterans Health Administration (VHA), Cooperative Studies Program (CSP), to promote the strategic growth of the epidemiologic capacity of the DVA.

Ecologic Studies

Ecologic studies are studies in which the unit of observation is a group, not separate individuals. Exposure and risk factors are known only at the group level, such as the average air pollution concentration in different cities. Disease occurrence is also only known at the group level, such as mortality from chronic lung disease in the same cities with measured levels of air pollution. Ecologic studies may be used to generate hypotheses of an association between exposure and disease, but these studies cannot confirm causation. This is because we do not know whether those individuals who died in a particular city under observation had a higher exposure than individuals who remained alive.

Ecologic Fallacy

When dealing with group level information, it is important to be aware of what is called the ecologic fallacy. This fallacy results from concluding that because an association exists between exposure and disease at the group level it therefore exists at the individual level. The cause of this fallacy is that we do not know the link between exposure and disease among individuals within each group. For example, we don't know the number of diseased persons who were exposed or not exposed in the high exposure group or in the low exposure group.

Description of the Ecologic Fallacy

In ecologic studies, only information on aggregate measures, such as the average exposure in City A and the death rate in City A can be known. At the individual level, however, we can determine the proportion of people who died within each of the categories of exposure (low or high).

Suppose air pollution is higher in Baltimore than in Tampa, but mortality from lung disease is lower in Baltimore than in Tampa. It would be fallacious to conclude that air pollution protects against lung disease deaths. It is possible that persons dying of lung disease in Tampa may have moved from cities with high air pollution. We do not know the cumulative exposures of cases and non-cases in either city. The heterogeneity of lifetime air pollution exposure among individuals in each city makes the average exposure unrepresentative of the distribution of exposure among individuals in the population.

The diagram presented below depicts how the ecologic fallacy can occur. Using the previous example, it is apparent that in-migrants to Tampa had previously experienced higher levels of exposure to air pollution, thus causing the aggregate level of lung disease deaths to appear higher in Tampa. The aggregate level of air pollution in Tampa does not allow us to see that there are the varying levels of exposure between lifelong residents and in-migrants.



Examples of questions investigated by ecologic studies include:

- Is the ranking of cities by air pollution levels associated with the ranking of cities by mortality from cardiovascular disease, adjusting for differences in average age, percent of the population below poverty level, and occupational structure?
- Have seat belt laws made a difference in motor vehicle fatality rates? This question could be addressed by comparing the motor vehicle fatality rates from years before and years after seat belt laws were passed.

- Are daily variations in mortality in Boston related to daily variations in particle air pollution, adjusting for season of year and temperature?
- What are the long-term time trends (1950-1995) for mortality from the major cancers in the U.S., Canada, and Mexico?

Advantages of Ecologic Studies
Aggregate data on exposure and disease are often publicly available in state and national databases, such as the US census. Agencies of the state and federal government collect considerable data, compiled at the aggregate level, on the economy, the environment, and the health and wellbeing of the population. Data are regularly obtained on air quality, water quality, weather conditions, the size of the population, the status of the economy, and the health of the population through surveys such as the National Health Interview Survey, National Health and Nutrition Examination, and Behavioral Risk Factor Survey. Data on the vital status of the population are obtained via birth and death registries and cancer and birth defects registries. These publicly available records provide databases for linking health outcomes with characteristics of the population, the environment, and the economy at the aggregate level.

Aggregate level data can conveniently be obtained by researchers at a low cost, and can be useful for evaluating the impact of community-level interventions. Examples of interventions that may be evaluated through ecologic study designs include fluoridation of water, seat belt laws, and mass media health campaigns. Aggregate level information can be compared before and after the intervention to determine the effect of the intervention at the community level.

Additional Advantages
In addition, minimal within-community differences between exposures may exist; however exposures may differ substantially between communities, cities, states, and countries. Examples of small within-community exposure differences but large between-community differences include:

- Quality of drinking water
- Concentration of certain air pollutants such as ozone and fine particles
- Average fat content of diet (larger differences between countries than between individuals within the same city)
- Cumulative exposure to sunlight (larger differences by latitude [north-south] of residence than among individuals at the same latitude)

Ecologic studies are also useful for studying the effect of short-term variations in exposure within the same community, such as the effect of temperature on mortality.

Types of Ecologic Study Designs
There are three main types of ecologic study designs: cross-sectional ecologic studies, time-trend ecologic studies, and solely descriptive ecologic studies.

Cross-sectional ecologic studies compare aggregate exposures and outcomes across comminutes over the same time period. An example of this study design is an investigation comparing bladder cancer mortality rates in cities with surface drinking water sources that contain chlorine by-products compared to rates in cities with ground drinking water sources that contain little or no chlorine by-products.

Time-trend ecologic studies compare variations in aggregate exposures and outcomes over time within the same community. A study investigating whether hospital admissions for cardiac disease in Los Angeles increase on days when carbon monoxide levels are higher would be an example of this type of study.

Solely descriptive ecologic studies investigate disease or risk factor differences between communities at the same time, or within the same community over time. This type of study design would be used to investigate the following questions: What are the differences in lung cancer mortality among cities in North Carolina? What is the secular trend of lung cancer mortality between 1960 and 1995 for the entire state of North Carolina?

Ecologic Study Designs at a Glance

Study type	Design	Time frame
Cross-sectional	Across communities	Same time period
Time-trend	Within the same community	Over time
Descriptive	Across communities or Within the same community	At a point in time or Over time

Limitations of Ecologic Studies
Ecologic studies are subject to numerous biases and limitations. Most notably, these study designs are subject to the ecologic fallacy, which occurs by inferring that associations at the aggregate level are true at the individual level. Ecologic studies are also more often subject to confounding bias than are individual risk studies. Confounding is a mixing of the effects of other risk factors with the exposure of interest. Confounding

bias may occur in an ecologic study if the confounding factor is correlated with the background rate of disease (the disease rate among unexposed persons in each study community). Cross-level bias occurs when the confounding factor is associated with the background rate of disease differentially across groups. The ecologic fallacy may occur as a result of cross-level bias.

- For example, suppose the association between average fat consumption and breast cancer incidence is examined across communities in the US. Certain communities may have a larger percentage of women with a genetic predisposition to breast cancer than other communities. Suppose these same communities containing large percentages of women with a genetic predisposition to breast cancer are also communities with a high per capita dietary fat consumption. The results of the study will show a strong correlation between average dietary fat consumption and breast cancer mortality. The association will be inflated due to the confounding factor, genetic predisposition to breast cancer. This bias occurred because the background rate of breast cancer incidence (the rate among women who consumed low fat diets) was differential across communities.

Time-trend ecologic studies are further limited in that an investigator cannot be confident that exposure preceded the outcome. Migration into and out of communities can also bias the interpretation of ecologic results.

Self-Evaluation

Use the graph below to answer the following questions.
From Medical Epidemiology. Greenberg, RS. 1993.



Scatter plot of incidence of gonorrhea and age-adjusted death rate from cervical cancer in selected communities in 1995.

1. What type of ecologic study is this?
   a. Cross-sectional
   b. Solely descriptive
   c. Time-trend

2. This analysis does not establish a cause-effect relationship between gonorrhea incidence and cervical cancer because:
   a. Only 8 communities were studied.
   b. Insufficient variation in cervical cancer mortality was observed.
   c. There is no comparison group.
   d. Another factor related to gonorrhea could be the true cause of cervical cancer.
   e. Not all cases of gonorrhea were reported.

Answers

1. a. Cross-sectional ecologic study. The study is concerned with data across communities at one point in time.
2. d. Confounding is a weakness in ecologic studies when it comes to inferring causality.

ERIC NOTEBOOK IS PRODUCED BY THE EDUCATIONAL ARM (MICHEL A. IBRAHIM, MD, PHD, DIRECTOR) OF THE EPIDEMIOLOGIC RESEARCH AND INFORMATION CENTER AT DURHAM, NC (RON HORNER, PHD, DIRECTOR)

If you would like to receive ERIC Notebook please fill out the form below:

Name: _____

Degree(s):_____

Address:_____

City, State, Zip:_____

Telephone Number:_____

Fax Number:_____

E-mail Address:_____

Please fax to: 919-416-5836 – Attn: Beth Armstrong **Or**

Mail to : Beth Armstrong, ERIC Program Manager, VA Medical Center (152), 508 Fulton Street, Durham, NC 27705

Upcoming Topics

ERIC evaluation

Please let Beth Armstrong know which topics are of special interest to you so that we can include them in a future issue.

ERIC Notebook

BETH ARMSTRONG, ERIC PROGRAM MANAGER
VA MEDICAL CENTER (152)
508 FULTON STREET
DURHAM, NC 27705