David W. Dowdy
Dale M. Needham
Pedro A. Mendez-Tellez
Margaret S. Herridge
Peter J. Pronovost

Studying outcomes of intensive care unit survivors: the role of the cohort study

Published online: 21 July 2005
© Springer-Verlag 2005

The online version of the original article can be found at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00134-005-2657-6>

D. W. Dowdy
School of Medicine,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

D. W. Dowdy
Department of Epidemiology,
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

D. M. Needham (✉)
Division of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA
e-mail: dale.needham@utoronto.ca

D. M. Needham · M. S. Herridge
Department of Medicine,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ont., Canada

P. A. Mendez-Tellez · P. J. Pronovost
Department of Anesthesiology/Critical Care Medicine,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

P. A. Mendez-Tellez · P. J. Pronovost
Department of Surgery,
Johns Hopkins University,
Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

M. S. Herridge
Interdepartmental Division of Critical Care Medicine,
University of Toronto,
Toronto, Ont., Canada

P. J. Pronovost
Department of Health Policy and Management,
Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health,
Baltimore, MD, 21205, USA

Intensive Care Med (2005) 31:914–921

Table 1 was rendered incorrectly. The correct table is given here.

Table 1 Advantages and limitations of the prospective cohort study in critical care medicine

Advantages

- Subject selection
 - Study of subjects from a general population or a selected population with a specific exposure
 - Measurement of outcomes and exposures
 - Examination of associations between multiple outcomes and exposures
 - Evaluation of potentially harmful exposures
 - Measurement of effectiveness, rather than efficacy, of ICU therapies
 - Handling of time
 - Establishment of temporal relationship between exposure and outcome
 - Allowance for prospective data collection
 - Measurement of exposures not routinely collected
 - Use of valid and reliable instruments not routinely used
 - Reduction in patient recall bias
-

Limitations

- Lack of randomization limiting ability to draw causal inference
 - Selection bias
 - Confounding by indication
 - Loss to follow-up in long-term studies
 - Resource intensity
 - Requirement for larger sample size
 - Increased demand for data collection and quality control
-