ERRATUM TO

Epidemiology and Public Health Intelligence

Isabelle Bray and Krishna Regmi

© Springer International Publishing Switzerland 2016
K. Regmi, I. Gee (eds.), *Public Health Intelligence*,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-28326-5_2

DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-28326-5_13

In the original version of Chapter 2, figures 8 and 9 were incorrect. Both figures are replaced now with the correct versions.

The online version of the original chapter can be found at
http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28326-5_2

I. Bray (✉)

Department of Health and Social Sciences, Faculty of Health and Applied Sciences,
University of the West of England, Frenchay Campus, Coldharbour Lane,
Bristol BS16 1QY, UK
e-mail: issy.bray@uwe.ac.uk

K. Regmi

Faculty of Health and Social Sciences, University of Bedfordshire,
Putteridge Bury Campus, IHR-32, Luton LU2 8LE, UK

Fig. 8 Forest plot showing results of a systematic review

<u>Study Design</u>	<u>Advantages</u>	<u>Disadvantages</u>
Case series	Quick, based on existing case notes	No control group, hypothesis generating only
Ecological study	Uses existing data sources	Depends on quality of data, ecological fallacy
Cross-sectional study	Good for descriptive statistics e.g. prevalence. Can collect data on a range of exposures and outcomes	Exposure and outcome measured at the same point in time Bias associated with poor response rates
Case-control study	Good for rare outcomes Can investigate multiple exposures Can be quick (e.g outbreak investigation)	Not good for rare exposures Recall bias Appropriate selection of controls Cannot estimate incidence
Cohort study	Good for measuring incidence Exposure measured before outcome. Can collect data on a range of exposures and outcomes Can investigate rare exposures if sample selected accordingly	Takes longer to collect data Drop-out over time leads to bias Difficult to control for confounding
Randomised Controlled Trial	Controls for confounding through randomisation Can collect data on multiple outcomes	Takes longer to collect data Can only compare 2 (or sometimes 3) interventions
Systematic review	Provides a summary of all available evidence Systematically addresses quality of individual studies Meta-analysis increases sample size Highlights gaps in the evidence	Prone to publication bias There may be heterogeneity between studies (in terms of population, intervention and results)

Fig. 9 Advantages and disadvantages of different study designs