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What are the challenges?
Ethical and Legal Issues

Informed consent

- Capacity to consent
  - Cognitive, other factors that impact capacity to consent
  - Proxy consent

- Full consent versus staged consent
  - 20 year duration
  - For biological samples, clinical assessment, questionnaire based information
  - Genetic and biochemical testing
  - For unspecified research projects in the future
    - issues related to re-consent

- Harmonization across provinces
  - Ethical approval from multiple REBs

- Privacy laws re use and disclosure of personal information across provinces
Implementation Issues

• Is it possible to collect fasting blood?

• Is it possible to do Oral Glucose Tolerance Test?

• What are the best ways to collect blood?
  – Home
  – Private labs
  – CLSA-specific labs
  – Hospital lab

• Sample preparation and shipment

• Timing of bio-sample collection
How are we dealing with the challenges?
Ethical, Legal and Social Issues (ELSI)

ELSI Committee
- Lawyers
- Ethicists
- Philosophers
- Geneticists
- Epidemiologists
- Social scientists
- Privacy commissioner

Provides “arms length” advice
- Workshops
- Commissioned papers
- Expert panels to advise PIs on practical issues
CLSA Development Phase

Phase I: April 1, 2004 to December 2005
  – Refine the study content
  – Conduct methodological feasibility studies

Phase II: January 2005 to December 2006
  – Content related feasibility studies
  – Validity, reliability testing and translation of selected measures

Phase III: January 2007 to March 2008
  – Pilot full protocol

CLSA Launch: Fall 2008
Participant Recruitment and Retention Studies

Study 1: Views of Canadians towards participation in a longitudinal, population-based study

Study 2: Test consent to release coordinates of participants in the CCHS

Study 3: Identification of the optimal consent process

Study 4: Identification of possible alternative sample frames

Study 5: Evaluation of tools to assess capacity to consent to observational research

Study 6: Development of optimal process for the baseline interview
Data Collection and Data Flow Studies

Study 7: Feasibility of proposed blood and urine sample collection/shipping/storage and analysis strategies

Study 8: Strategies to enhance data linkage with health care utilization data bases and disease registries

Study 9: Development and evaluation of disease identification algorithms

Study 10: Issues related to the return of clinical information to study participants and/or general practitioners

Study 11: Assessment of logistics of data collection methods data transfer and security
Preliminary Findings
**Views of Canadians**

**Objectives**

- To explore Canadians’ beliefs and attitudes toward a multi-faceted, long term study on aging
  - Provision of health, psychosocial, lifestyle and biological data
  - Willingness to participate, response burden
  - Privacy issues associated with data collection and storage, particularly biological samples, including DNA

**Methods**

- Focus groups conducted in six Canadian cities: Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, Hamilton, Montreal, Halifax
Views of Canadians
Themes

- Healthy aging
- Importance of research
- Benefits to participants
- Impact on participant behaviour
- Bio-samples
- DNA
- Unforeseen uses of data
- Data linkage
- Responsibility/commercialization
- Privacy & confidentiality
- Participant requirements, response burden
- Conduct of the study
Views of Canadians

Biosamples

- General willingness to provide blood and urine samples
- Some concern about providing a DNA sample
  - What will it be used for?
  - Adds credibility to the study
- Few concerns with respect to privacy and confidentiality
  - Assumption that confidentiality would be protected
  - Several participants indicated that only those with something to hide would be concerned about providing a DNA sample
  - Most concerns centered around the use of DNA
    - Information not be shared with insurance companies
    - Why do you need it
    - How would it be used
    - Who would have access to it
Views of Canadians

Preliminary Findings

- Healthy aging seen as a complex multi-dimensional process
- Participants willing to provide bio-samples but had some concerns about providing DNA
- Universities are trusted to carry out the study; government to fund
- Participants do not feel that private companies should profit from the study results
- Most participants trust that their privacy will be protected
- Altruism is a key motivator for most participants
Require sampling strategy for the recruitment of a representative sample of the Canadian population

Statistics Canada’s Canadian Community Health Survey (CCHS) identified as a survey vehicle that could provide a sample frame for the CLSA
Objectives

• Determine the willingness of CCHS participants to share **personal coordinates** (contact information) with CLSA

• Determine the willingness of CCHS participants to share **survey responses** with CLSA

• Explore respondents’ concerns in regards to their willingness to sharing either personal coordinates and/or survey responses
Methods

• Additional content related to CLSA was added to the activities of the CCHS 3.1 Pilot Test

• Qualitative testing of the questionnaire and respondent material in one-on-one interviews (25 E 10 F)

• CCHS 3.1 Pilot (summer 2004) Computer Assisted Personal Interview (n=318)

• Content focused on health issues, replicating the context in which CLSA plans to operate.
Results

Qualitative
• Majority of respondents did not express concern over giving their consent however many did not have a clear understanding of what they were actually agreeing to do
• Unsure of who/what CLHI is

Quantitative
• Interviews conducted in Vancouver, Montreal, Halifax
Consent to Release Coordinates: Results by sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share contact info</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share survey data</td>
<td>75.3%</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consent to Release Coordinates: Results by age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>40-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share contact info</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>76.8%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>55.3%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share CCHS data</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>86.6%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Consent to Release Coordinates: Results by Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vancouver</th>
<th>Montreal</th>
<th>Halifax</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share contact info</td>
<td>44.2%</td>
<td>78.1%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>63.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share CCHS info</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
<td>75.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Caveat….

n=429 100% of eligible sample
n=319 74.1% of those eligible agreed to participate in CCHS
n=298 94.9% of those who agreed to participate in CCHS agreed to share their data with the MOH
n=190 63.8% of those who agreed to share with MOH agreed to share contact info with CLSA

Therefore… 44.3% of those originally eligible agreed to share contact info
Consent to Release Coordinates

Key Findings

• Little variation between sexes
• Considerable variation between age groups, geographic region
• Based on original eligible sample, response low
• 42% of all respondents reported no concerns or did not ask any questions in regards to the CLSA initiative
• Three most often reported concerns were confidentiality, privacy issues (16.4%), lack of interest (7.1%), and commitment issues (6.7%).
Data Linkage with Health Care Utilization Data Bases

Objectives

- Examine barriers and facilitators to accessing and linking with health care utilization databases
- Explore the feasibility of using health insurance registries as CLSA’s sampling frame
- Develop best practice guidelines for use of and access to health care utilization data
Data Linkage with Health Care Utilization Data Bases

Methods

• Telephone interviews conducted with
  – Provincial and Territorial Data Stewards (N=20)
  – Provincial and Territorial Information Privacy Commissioners / Ombudsmen (N=13)

• Methodological & ethical issues of data linkage
Data Linkage with Health Care Utilization Data Bases

Preliminary Findings

- Participant informed consent is key to success: Clarity of understanding essential
- Data access agreement key: Provincial/territorial MOH—unique challenges
- Provincial privacy legislation AND health information legislation—new or emerging—need to operationalize
- Need to develop and maintain strong ongoing relationships with data stewards and managers
- Complex process, but possible
- Requires extensive “up front” work
Objective

• Document the infrastructure of existing clinical laboratory services in 6 cities across Canada

• Compare the feasibility, logistics and cost of collecting blood and urine specimens in private community-based and hospital-based clinical laboratories

• Assess the ability of select clinical laboratory sites to accommodate study participants, and to execute standardized “best practice” protocols for the collection, processing, on-site storage and shipment of specimens for the CLSA
Blood and Urine Sample Collection, Shipping, and Storage Strategies

Methods

40 participants per site, randomized to:

– Private (community based) lab (n=20)
– Public (hospital based) lab (n=20)

• Randomized to:
  • Collection of 93mL of (fasting) blood and a urine specimen (n=10) OR
  • Collection of 93mL of (fasting) blood and a urine specimen AND Oral Glucose Tolerance Test (OGTT) (n=10)

• Processing time approximately 1 hour, to be conducted within a 2 hour window
• Frozen, stored, shipped to central location in batches
Specimen Processing for the Canadian Longitudinal Study on Aging: Biological Specimen Collection Feasibility Study

First Centrifugation: 1500xg (3000 rpm) for 15 minutes

- Carefully transfer plasma to cryovial
- Carefully draw plasma off cells in each tube and transfer plasma to a corresponding cryovial
- For each tube, carefully draw plasma off cells and transfer evenly between two cryovials
- Transfer plasma evenly to two cryovials
- Transfer plasma to cryovial

Second Centrifugation: 1500xg (3000 rpm) for 15 minutes

- Transfer plasma
- Transfer serum from each tube evenly into 2 (5 mL) polystyrene tubes
- Transfer plasma evenly into 2 (5 mL) polystyrene tubes
- Transfer plasma to a corresponding cryovial
- Pipette 1.5 mL blood into each cryovial
- Pipette 1.5 mL urine into each cryovial
- Pipette 1.5 mL lav—ON ICE

- All cryovials and tubes on the pale blue fields must be placed in the freezer boxes provided and frozen within 2 hours of collection. Collection tubes and the 2nd Centrifuge Tube are to be discarded after completion of processing.

* For Grey tube labeled cryovial, processing is identical; plasma is transferred to
Analysis

• Participant questionnaire: Convenience, acceptability, discomfort, privacy etc.

• Laboratory Requisition: confirm fasting, time marks in specimen collection etc.

• Lab feedback Questionnaire: problems in execution, suggestions for improvement etc.

• Specimen evaluation: central lab evaluation of specimen quality (no analysis of blood samples)
Preliminary Findings

- Not all provinces have private labs
- Instability in private sector
- Considerable variation in capacity among hospital based labs
Objective

To explore the issues involved in returning individual clinical rest results to research participants and/or their family physicians

Methods

• Survey of other relevant longitudinal studies.

• Focus groups to explore potential participants’ views of the importance of the return of individual information, the type of information they would like to receive, and how they would like to receive it.

• Expert workshop of clinicians, epidemiologists, bioethicists and family physicians to guide decisions regarding returning clinically relevant test results to participants and/or family physicians.
Return of Clinical Information

Web-Based Survey

• Invitation to participate sent to 68 principal investigators or identified contact persons of longitudinal studies on aging

• Selected from CIHR and NIH publicly available database lists, supplemented by disease-specific longitudinal studies

• The web survey assessed:
  – characteristics of the study
  – types of health measures collected and whether individualized information was returned to participants
  – factors that impacted on the decision whether or not to return individualized information to participants
Return of Clinical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Type</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genetic</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional health</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lifestyle</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive abilities</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health services utilization</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Return of Clinical Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of measure</th>
<th>Collected</th>
<th>Returned if collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anthropomorphic measures</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional ability</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuropsych exam</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood pressure</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EKG</td>
<td>65%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced clinical tests</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hearing</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood biomarkers</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urine biomarkers</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biosample for genetics</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Preliminary Findings (n=20)

- Majority of studies returned some individualized information to study participants
- Results were most often returned through mail
- Ethical considerations identified as most important factor in deciding whether or not to return individualized test results
- 75% of respondents recommended return of individualized test results; 25% recommended no return
- Reasons in favour of returning individualized results: ethical considerations, participant retention, benefits to participants
- Reasons against returning individualized results: ethical considerations, tests not done in clinical settings, reliability too low, results not readily interpretable
In conclusion...

Common threads:

- Complexity
- Necessity (and appreciation) of “up front” work required for such a large scale study
- General sense of enthusiasm and support
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