# How to get new answers from old trials with linked routine data?

(A case study from my PhD where I used infant nutrition trials linked to school records)

### Maximiliane Verfürden

UCL GOS Institute of Child Health March 2020



# Was the participant linked to the right pupil?

## Infant participant in 1993:



First Names Maximiliane Lara Surname Verfürden Date of birth 07/12/1993 Postcode at recruitment E8 1BX Lara Maximiliane Verfürden 07 / 12 / 1993 E4 0LZ



Pupil A





Pupil C etc...

### WHO IS IT??

What kind of trials am I following up using the administrative education data and why?

### Case study: 7 trial cohorts



 Table 1 Trial populations and interventions



## Why even bother?



### We have an incomplete picture

# To safeguard participant privacy linkage was done by another institution



## Infant participant in 1993:

Lara Maximiliane Verfürden 07 / 12 / 1993 E4 0LZ

Pupil A

First Names Maximiliane Lara Surname Verfürden Date of birth 07/12/1993 Postcode at recruitment E8 1BX

? →	Maxi Vaughan 12 / 07 / 1993 E8 1BX
	Pupil B
	Pupil C etc

But because the linked data we receive is de-identified, we requested information on how they matched for the best matching three pupils:

First Names: --Surname: --Date of birth: --

Pupil A123 links with participant 9 Participant ID: 9 **FN**: First name matches other name SN: Surname exact match **DOB:** DOB exact match Postcode: Local Authority match Pupil B123 links with participant 9 Postcode at recruitment: --**FN**: First name exact match Local authority at recruitment: --SN: No Link **DOB**: Transposed date **Postcode:** Postcode exact match Pupil C123 links with participant 9 etc...

#### Flags available for each participant-pupil pair after linkage

entifier	Description
	First name and other first name both exact match
First name	First name matches other name in both directions
	First name exact match
	First name matches other name
	Other name exact match
	First name truncated at any hyphen matches
	First name matches via common name alternatives lookup
	Pattern match function - % of 2 letter combinations from longer of two names that don't appear in shorter is 30% or less
	Pattern match function - % of 2 letter combinations from longer of two names that don't appear in shorter is 60% or less - AND first character of first name matches
	First name / surname match in both directions
	No Link
	Surname exact match (including alternative surnames)

Surname	Surname truncated at any hyphen matches
	Pattern match function - % of 2 letter combinations from longer of two names that don't appear in shorter is 30% or less
	Pattern match function - % of 2 letter combinations from longer of two names that don't appear in shorter is 60% or less - AND first character of surname matches
	First name / surname match in both directions
	No Link

#### DOB exact match

Day on source matches month on match, and vice versa; year matches (i.e. transposed date)

- Day and month match (i.e. wrong year)
- Date of Birth Day and year match (i.e. wrong month)
- Month and year match (i.e. wrong day)
- Either source or match DOB is 1st January; year matches
  - Either source or match DOB is 1st September; year matches
  - No Link



### This information is available for each participant-pupil pair:

Trial Participant ID	Pupil ID	Match level for			
		First name	Surname	DOB	Location
9	A123	First name matches other name	Surname exact match	DOB exact match	Local Authority match
9	B123	First name exact match	No Link	Transposed date	Postcode exact match
9	C123	No link	Surname truncated at any hyphen matches	Month and year match (i.e. wrong day)	Nearby Local Authority match
17	Q456				
etc					

### This information can be transformed into match weights:

Trial Participant ID	Pupil ID	Match weight	
9	A123	24.6	
9	B123	9	
9	C123	4	
17	Q456		
etc			

...higher match weights correspond to better fitting identifying information

Further reading: Ivan P. Fellegi & Alan B. Sunter (1969) A Theory for Record Linkage, Journal of the American Statistical Association, DOI: <u>10.1080/01621459.1969.10501049</u>

If multiple pupil candidates: deciding the best match using a mixture of review and weights

- age at first link was >21
- information on death and time of death available
- if highest match-weight for a participant was 10% > second best match automatically kept the best match. If difference lower, I manually reviewed

### Discussion

- Data linkage produces higher retention rates (with fewer • resources needed)
- Be aware its possible to link to wrong pupil records •
- 'Black box' can be addressed with descriptive linkage flags •
- Match weights can help to choose between participantulletpupil pairs



Further reading on cost comparisons: Llewellyn-Bennett et al. Post-trial follow-up methodology in large randomised controlled trials: a systematic review (2018) https://doi.org/10.1186/s13063-018-2653-0

### Thanks to my supervisory panel!



Prof Ruth Gilbert

 $E \cdot S \cdot R \cdot C$ 



Prof Mary Fewtrell



#### Prof John Jerrim

Dr Katie Harron

