



**Differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a randomized clinical trial.**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002334
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Nov-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Bolland, Mark; University of Auckland, Department of Medicine Barber, Peter; Auckland Hospital, Neurology Doughty, Rob; University of Auckland, Department of Medicine Grey, Andrew; University of Auckland Gamble, Greg; University of Auckland, Department of Medicine Reid, Ian; University of Auckland, Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Diabetes and endocrinology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine
Keywords:	Calcium & bone < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, Adverse events < THERAPEUTICS, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Title:** Differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a randomized clinical trial.

**Running title:** Inaccurate self-reports of adverse events

**Authors:**

Mark J Bolland MBChB, PhD, Senior Research Fellow  
P Alan Barber MB ChB, PhD, Professor  
Robert N Doughty MD, Professor  
Andrew Grey MD, Associate Professor  
Greg Gamble, MSc, Biostatistician  
Ian R Reid MD, Professor

**Affiliation:** Department of Medicine, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

**Address for correspondence/reprints:**

Mark Bolland  
Bone and Joint Research Group,  
Department of Medicine, University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92 019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand  
Email: [m.bolland@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.bolland@auckland.ac.nz)  
Ph 64 9 373 7999  
Fax 64 9 373 7677

**Funding:**

This study was funded by the Health Research Council (HRC) of New Zealand.

**Word counts:**

Text only: 2225  
Abstract: 294  
Tables: 3

**Conflict of interest**

All authors have no conflict of interest.

**Trial registration:**

The trial is registered at the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry. (ACTRN12605000242628)

**Abstract:****Objectives:**

In clinical trials, adverse events are usually self-reported but may be adjudicated if serious or of particular interest. After adjudicating cardiovascular events for a 5-year calcium supplement trial, we observed discrepancies between self-reported and verified events. We systematically analysed those differences to assess their importance.

**Design:**

Secondary analysis of adverse cardiovascular events in a 5-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of calcium supplementation (1 g calcium daily) in 1471 postmenopausal women (mean age 74y).

**Setting:**

Clinical research centre.

**Methods:**

The participant's medical records were reviewed for all self-reported myocardial infarctions (MIs) or strokes, and the event independently adjudicated. Cause of death was obtained from hospital records or death certificates. To identify unreported events, the national hospital discharge database was searched and related hospital records reviewed.

**Results:**

1  
2  
3 45 women reported 64 MIs, of which 33 (52%) were verified after adjudication. An  
4  
5 additional 25 MIs were identified: 1 during adjudication of other events, 21 from the  
6  
7 hospital discharge database, 3 from death certificates. 68 women reported 86 strokes  
8  
9 of which 50 (58%) were verified. An additional 13 strokes were identified: 7 during  
10  
11 adjudication of reported transient ischaemic attacks, 5 from the hospital discharge  
12  
13 database, 1 from death certificates. Therefore, 43% of verified MIs and 21% of  
14  
15 verified strokes were not reported to investigators. For non-adjudicated discharge  
16  
17 codes, 10% of MIs and 22% of strokes were not verified after adjudication. 19% of  
18  
19 verified MIs and 27% of verified strokes were not identified in discharge coding or  
20  
21 death certificates. Neither the event source nor the level of adjudication altered the  
22  
23 relationship between treatment allocation and cardiovascular events.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

### 29 **Conclusions:**

30  
31  
32 When adverse event accuracy is critical, researchers should consider adjudicating self-  
33  
34 reported events and discharge codes, and attempt to identify unreported events.  
35  
36  
37

38  
39 **Trial registration:** Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials registry: ACTRN  
40  
41 012605000242628  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Key words:**

48  
49 Calcium supplement, myocardial infarction, stroke, clinical trial, adjudication, adverse  
50  
51 events  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Article focus:**

- The differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a clinical trial

**Key messages:**

- Substantial proportions of self-reported myocardial infarctions and strokes were not able to be verified, and substantial proportions of verified myocardial infarctions and strokes were not reported by participants or were not identified in discharge coding or death certificates
- When adverse event accuracy is critical to a clinical trial, unadjudicated self-reports or hospital discharge codes cannot be relied upon. Consideration should also be given to identifying unreported events.

**Strengths and limitations of this study:**

- A rigorous search for adverse events occurred and all events were independently adjudicated.
- Cardiovascular events were secondary endpoints, and participants may have placed less value on reporting these events than the primary endpoints.

## Introduction

In clinical research studies, participant self-report of adverse effects and outcome events are essential in determining the efficacy and tolerability of the intervention being studied. Participant self-reports may be accepted as accurate or may lead to independent adjudication, depending on the relevance to the study and the overall size and complexity of the study. In large clinical trials, adverse events are usually self-reported and not independently verified unless considered serious or of particular interest. However, the few studies that have specifically addressed the accuracy of self-reported medical events suggest relatively poor agreement between self-reports and medical records.<sup>1, 2</sup>

We recently completed a five-year trial of the effects of calcium supplementation in healthy postmenopausal women in which we observed an unexpected increase in the rate of vascular events in women allocated to calcium.<sup>3</sup> All vascular events were initially self-reported, and then adjudicated by blinded study investigators. We also conducted a systematic search for valid events that were not reported by participants. Here, we present the results of an analysis of the relationship between self-reported and adjudicated events, including unreported events.

## Methods

### Study design

The Auckland Calcium study was a five-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of calcium supplementation in 1471 normal postmenopausal women (mean age 74y), designed to assess the effects of 1g daily calcium on fracture incidence.

Cardiovascular outcomes were a pre-specified secondary endpoint. The methods have

1  
2  
3 been described in full previously.<sup>4</sup> In brief, women were recruited by advertisement  
4 and from mail-outs using electoral rolls, and were 5y or more postmenopausal and  
5 aged 55y or older. Women were ineligible if they were receiving therapy for  
6 osteoporosis, had other major ongoing disease, or had serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D  
7 <25 nmol/L. The study received approval from the regional Ethics Committee and the  
8 trial was registered with the Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials registry: ACTRN  
9 012605000242628  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 21 Cardiovascular Event Assessment

22  
23 Participants were reviewed every six months. Adverse events were recorded at each visit  
24 but questions about specific symptoms were not asked. A pre-planned secondary  
25 analysis was a comparison between the groups in the frequencies of myocardial  
26 infarction (MI), stroke, transient ischaemic attack (TIA) and other cardiovascular  
27 events.<sup>3</sup> The participant's medical records were reviewed when a MI, stroke, or TIA  
28 was self-reported (or by family members for fatal events). For participants who died  
29 during the study, the cause of death was obtained from hospital records or the death  
30 certificate. Data for each event were compiled by a physician and then adjudicated by  
31 a cardiologist (MI) or neurologist (stroke or TIA). All were blinded to the treatment  
32 group of each participant. MI was defined in accordance with the Joint European  
33 Society of Cardiology/ American College of Cardiology Committee criteria for acute,  
34 evolving or recent MI,<sup>5</sup> and stroke and TIA were defined in accordance with the  
35 World Health Organisation definition.<sup>6</sup>  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

### 54 Discharge codes:

55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 To identify events that were unreported, we searched the national database of hospital  
4 discharges for cardiovascular events (ICD9 discharge codes 410 for MI and 430, 431,  
5 433, 434 for stroke) that occurred during the study using each participant's unique  
6 National Health Index identifier. The hospital records related to these admissions  
7 were reviewed and adjudicated in the same manner as for self-reported events. We  
8 added all unreported, adjudicated hospital discharge events to the adjudicated self-  
9 reports to obtain a complete set of verified events. We compared this complete set of  
10 verified events with the events obtained solely from discharge ICD-9 codes or death  
11 certificates.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

### 25 Statistics

26 Agreement between reported and verified events was assessed using the kappa co-  
27 efficient. The number of women experiencing an incident event in each treatment  
28 group was compared using Fisher's exact test. All statistical analyses were performed  
29 using the SAS software package (SAS Institute, Cary, NC version 9.1).  $P < 0.05$  was  
30 considered statistically significant.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

### 40 **Results:**

#### 41 Myocardial infarction

42 Table 1 shows the number of self-reported, verified self-reported, verified unreported,  
43 and total verified events. 33 of 64 (52%) self-reported MIs were verified. Table 2  
44 shows the final diagnosis from the medical record for the 31 MIs that were not  
45 verified. In 10 instances, there was no report of the event in the medical record, but in  
46 each case a verified MI had previously occurred during the study. For 9 of the  
47 remaining 21 events (43%), MI was specifically excluded with final diagnoses made  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 of angina, unstable angina, or MI excluded. 25 unreported events were identified: 1  
4 during adjudication of other events, 21 from the national hospital discharge database  
5 search, and 3 from death certificates. Thus, of 58 verified MIs in 52 women, only 33  
6 (57%) were reported to study investigators and 25 (43%) were identified from other  
7 sources. The kappa value for agreement between reported and verified MI was 0.63  
8 (95% confidence interval 0.51-0.74).  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 When only non-adjudicated events identified from the discharge database search were  
20 considered, there were 48 MIs in 41 women. When death certificate data were added,  
21 there were 52 MIs in 45 women. 5 (10%) of the 48 MIs identified from the discharge  
22 database search were not verified. Another 11 verified MIs (19%) were identified  
23 from self-reports but not from hospital discharges or death certificates.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

### 32 Stroke:

33  
34 Table 1 shows that 50 of 86 (58%) self-reported strokes were verified. Table 2 shows  
35 the final diagnosis for the 36 strokes that were not verified. In 10 instances, there was  
36 no report of the event in the medical record, but in each case a verified stroke had  
37 previously occurred during the study. For 8 of the remaining 26 events (30%), stroke  
38 was specifically considered and excluded with final diagnoses made of TIA, or stroke  
39 excluded. 13 unreported events were identified: 7 during the adjudication of reported  
40 TIA, 5 from the discharge database search, and 1 from death certificates. Thus, of 63  
41 verified strokes in 59 women, 50 (79%) were reported to study investigators as stroke,  
42 7 (11%) as TIA, and 10% were identified from other sources. The kappa value for  
43 agreement between reported and verified stroke was 0.73 (95% confidence interval  
44 0.64-0.82).  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 When only non-adjudicated events identified from the discharge database search were  
6 considered, there were 50 strokes in 46 women. When death certificate data were  
7 added, there were 57 strokes in 48 women. 11 of the 50 strokes (22%) identified from  
8 the discharge database search were not verified. Another 17 verified strokes (27%)  
9 were identified from self-reports but not from hospital discharges or death certificates.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18

19 The relationship between treatment allocation and MI or stroke for the different event  
20 sources and levels of event adjudication is shown in Table 3. There were consistently  
21 increased relative risks for MI and stroke with calcium supplements and relatively  
22 minor changes in risk for the different event sources or levels of adjudication,  
23 although the differing numbers of events in each comparison led to more marked  
24 changes in P values.  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

### 34 Discussion

35 We observed differences between self-reported MI or stroke and the final verified  
36 diagnosis obtained from the medical record or death certificate. Almost half of self-  
37 reported MIs (48%) and strokes (42%) were not able to be verified, and 43% of self-  
38 reported MIs and 10% of verified strokes were unreported, with a further 11% of  
39 verified MIs and 10% of verified strokes were unreported, with a further 11% of  
40 verified strokes reported as TIA. Differences were also observed between events  
41 obtained solely from hospital discharge codes and final verified events. 10% of MIs  
42 and 22% of strokes obtained from discharge codes were not verified, and 19% of  
43 verified MIs and 27% of verified strokes were identified from self-reports but not  
44 from discharge codes or death certificates. Relying solely on self-reports of MI or  
45 stroke, or solely on discharge codes in our clinical trial, would have led to significant  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 numbers of participants being misclassified with regard to having experienced an  
4  
5 significant adverse event. Despite the differences between self-reports, hospital  
6  
7 discharge codes, and verified events, neither the source of the event nor the level of  
8  
9 adjudication substantially altered the relationship between treatment allocation and  
10  
11 occurrence of either MI or stroke.  
12  
13

14  
15  
16 In most cases, the final diagnosis for the non-verified, self-reported MIs were related  
17  
18 to a disorder of the heart, suggesting that miscommunication or misunderstanding  
19  
20 between the participant and their physician led to the error. It has been suggested that  
21  
22 the gastrointestinal side effects of calcium supplements might be misclassified as MI<sup>7</sup>  
23  
24 but we found no evidence that this was the case. In at least 43% of non-verified cases,  
25  
26 MI was specifically considered as a diagnosis and excluded. The most common final  
27  
28 diagnosis for non-verified, self-reported strokes was TIA, suggesting that participants  
29  
30 did not understand the distinction between these two conditions. This is not surprising  
31  
32 as TIA is often described as a “mini-stroke”. In approximately one third of non-  
33  
34 verified, self-reported events (both MI and stroke), there were no details of any  
35  
36 potentially related event in the medical record. These events all occurred in people  
37  
38 who had experienced a previous verified event, suggesting that they reported the same  
39  
40 event more than once, or they reported symptoms that were similar to their primary  
41  
42 event for which they did not seek medical attention.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48

49  
50 There are limited published data that specifically address differences between self-  
51  
52 reported events and the medical record. A systematic review identified 15 studies that  
53  
54 assessed the accuracy of questionnaires of medical history compared with the medical  
55  
56 record.<sup>1</sup> The proportion of illnesses reported in questionnaires ranged from 30-53% of  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 those listed in the medical record. Conversely, the medical record listed 36-70% of  
4  
5 illnesses reported in questionnaires. Reporting of surgical procedures or  
6  
7 hospitalisation in questionnaires appeared to be more accurate than reporting of non-  
8  
9 surgical illness. The findings of this systematic review have been replicated in more  
10  
11 recent studies.<sup>2, 8-10</sup> Further studies have addressed the accuracy of self-reported  
12  
13 cardiovascular events. For MI and stroke, approximately 70-80% of self-reported  
14  
15 events were confirmed by hospital record review,<sup>2, 8-13</sup> which the authors suggested is  
16  
17 sufficiently accurate for use in research studies.<sup>8, 9, 11</sup>  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22

23 A comprehensive analysis of reporting of cardiovascular events that occurred during  
24  
25 the Women's Health Initiative clinical and observational studies has been published.<sup>10</sup>  
26  
27 In these studies, local physician adjudicators reviewed self-reported data and patient  
28  
29 medical records for all self-reported cardiovascular events. The local adjudicators  
30  
31 were able to verify 68% of self-reported MIs and 72% of strokes. The local  
32  
33 adjudicators could only verify MI in 78% of events with a discharge code for MI, and  
34  
35 stroke in 81% of events with a discharge code for stroke, suggesting coding data from  
36  
37 hospital admissions may not be accurate, a finding consistent with the results of our  
38  
39 study. Finally, there was not complete agreement between local and central  
40  
41 adjudicators. 81% of locally adjudicated MIs were verified by central adjudicators,  
42  
43 and conversely 86% of centrally adjudicated MIs were classified as MI by local  
44  
45 adjudicators. The issue of unreported events was not addressed.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52 Our findings are broadly consistent with this previous research. The lower accuracy of  
53  
54 MI self-reports in our study compared with other studies might be because the  
55  
56 participants in our trial were older, had more co-morbidities, and had more cognitive  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 impairment than participants in previous studies. Another contributing factor might be  
4  
5 that although cardiovascular events were prespecified secondary endpoints, many of  
6  
7 the participants might not have been aware of this, and may have placed less value on  
8  
9 reporting these events than fractures, which were the primary endpoints of the study.  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 Inaccurate self-reports or underreporting of events would not be expected to affect the  
15  
16 results of a study unless the study treatment introduced a systematic bias that  
17  
18 produced differential rates of inaccurate self-reports or underreporting of events.  
19

20  
21 However, when the event numbers are small, as in many clinical trials, chance  
22  
23 differences can substantially impact upon the study results. In our study, the  
24  
25 adjudication process led to marked changes in the degree of statistical significance,  
26  
27 even though the relative risks of MI with calcium supplements remained elevated at  
28  
29 each stage. The relationship between calcium supplements and occurrence of MI or  
30  
31 stroke was similar regardless of whether the events were based solely on hospital  
32  
33 discharge coding or self-reports or final verified events, a finding that is supported by  
34  
35 the similar increase in vascular risk associated with calcium supplements across  
36  
37 randomised trials that used various means of event identification.<sup>14</sup>  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 A common approach in clinical trials is to adjudicate all significant adverse events  
44  
45 centrally, although the need to do this remains uncertain.<sup>15</sup> The advantages of central  
46  
47 adjudication include systematically applying the definition of an event, reducing the  
48  
49 possibility of differential misclassification of events, giving greater confidence in the  
50  
51 validity of the study results, and by including suitable triggers, potentially identifying  
52  
53 events that are missed by local investigators.<sup>15</sup> However, central adjudication is  
54  
55 unlikely to identify events that are not reported to the local investigators, adds  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 significant cost and complexity to trials, and has not been shown to improve the  
4 ability to determine treatment effects in cardiovascular trials.<sup>15</sup>  
5  
6  
7

8  
9  
10 In summary, our results suggest that when the accuracy of an event in clinical trials is  
11 critical, even for a relatively common and serious medical event such as MI or stroke,  
12 self-reports cannot be relied upon and should be independently verified from the  
13 medical record. However, even if independent verification occurs, our results also  
14 suggest that a substantial number of events will not have been reported. For adverse  
15 events of particular interest, additional steps, such as searches of hospital discharge  
16 databases, should be considered to attempt to identify unreported events. Relying  
17 solely on non-adjudicated hospital discharge coding will lead to similar inaccuracies  
18 as using self-reported data because some events will be missed and some events will  
19 be included that would not be verified by adjudication.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

#### 34 **Conflict of interest**

35  
36 All authors have no conflict of interest.  
37  
38  
39

#### 40 **Author contributions:**

41  
42 MJB, AG, IRR designed this secondary analysis of our clinical trial. PAB and RD  
43 adjudicated the events for the study. MJB and GG carried out the analyses. MJB  
44 drafted the paper. All authors critically reviewed the draft and improved it. MJB is the  
45 guarantor of the paper.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

#### 51 **Data sharing**

52  
53  
54  
55  
56 Data would be made available on request.  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Funding

Financial support by Health Research Council.

## References

1. Harlow SD and Linet MS. Agreement between questionnaire data and medical records. The evidence for accuracy of recall. *Am J Epidemiol.* 1989; 129: 233-48.
2. St Sauver JL, Hagen PT, Cha SS, et al. Agreement between patient reports of cardiovascular disease and patient medical records. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2005; 80: 203-10.
3. Bolland MJ, Barber PA, Doughty RN, et al. Vascular events in healthy older women receiving calcium supplementation: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ.* 2008; 336: 262-6.
4. Reid IR, Mason B, Horne A, et al. Randomized controlled trial of calcium in healthy older women. *Am J Med.* 2006; 119: 777-85.
5. Alpert JS, Thygesen K, Antman E and Bassand JP. Myocardial infarction redefined--a consensus document of The Joint European Society of Cardiology/American College of Cardiology Committee for the redefinition of myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2000; 36: 959-69.
6. Aho K, Harmsen P, Hatano S, Marquardsen J, Smirnov VE and Strasser T. Cerebrovascular disease in the community: results of a WHO collaborative study. *Bull World Health Organ.* 1980; 58: 113-30.
7. Lewis JR, Zhu K and Prince RL. Adverse events from calcium supplementation: relationship to errors in myocardial infarction self-reporting in randomized controlled trials of calcium supplementation. *J Bone Miner Res.* 2012; 27: 719-22.

- 1  
2  
3 8. Bergmann MM, Byers T, Freedman DS and Mokdad A. Validity of self-  
4 reported diagnoses leading to hospitalization: a comparison of self-reports with  
5 hospital records in a prospective study of American adults. *Am J Epidemiol*. 1998;  
6 147: 969-77.  
7
- 8  
9  
10  
11 9. Engstad T, Bonna KH and Viitanen M. Validity of self-reported stroke : The  
12 Tromso Study. *Stroke*. 2000; 31: 1602-7.  
13
- 14  
15  
16 10. Heckbert SR, Kooperberg C, Safford MM, et al. Comparison of self-report,  
17 hospital discharge codes, and adjudication of cardiovascular events in the Women's  
18 Health Initiative. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2004; 160: 1152-8.  
19
- 20  
21  
22  
23 11. Tretli S, Lund-Larsen PG and Foss OP. Reliability of questionnaire  
24 information on cardiovascular disease and diabetes: cardiovascular disease study in  
25 Finnmark county. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 1982; 36: 269-73.  
26
- 27  
28  
29  
30 12. Yamagishi K, Ikeda A, Iso H, Inoue M and Tsugane S. Self-reported stroke  
31 and myocardial infarction had adequate sensitivity in a population-based prospective  
32 study JPHC (Japan Public Health Center)-based Prospective Study. *J Clin Epidemiol*.  
33 2008.  
34
- 35  
36  
37  
38 13. Carter K, Barber PA and Shaw C. How does self-reported history of stroke  
39 compare to hospitalization data in a population-based survey in New Zealand? *Stroke*.  
40 2010; 41: 2678-80.  
41
- 42  
43  
44  
45 14. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Avenell A, Gamble GD and Reid IR. Calcium  
46 supplements with or without vitamin D and risk of cardiovascular events: reanalysis  
47 of the Women's Health Initiative limited access dataset and meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2011;  
48 342: d2040.  
49
- 50  
51  
52  
53 15. Granger CB, Vogel V, Cummings SR, et al. Do we need to adjudicate major  
54 clinical events? *Clin Trials*. 2008; 5: 56-60.  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For peer review only

Table 1: Numbers of events by source and adjudication status

Source/adjudication	Myocardial infarction	Stroke
Total self-reported events	64 (45)	86 (68)
Verified self-reported events	33 (30)	50 (47)
Verified unreported events	25 (24)	13 (12)
Total verified events	58 (52)	63 (59)

Data are number of events (number of women).

Table 2: Final diagnosis from medical records for self-reported, non-verified myocardial infarctions (n=31) and strokes (n=36)

Myocardial infarction		Stroke	
Final diagnosis	N	Final diagnosis	N
Unstable angina	5	Transient ischaemic attack	6
Congestive heart failure	5	Fall	3
Angina	2	Acute confusional state	3
Sudden unexplained death	2	Sudden unexplained death	2
Atrial fibrillation	1	Benign positional vertigo	2
Palpitations	1	Dementia	2
Postural hypotension	1	Postural hypotension	1
Renal failure	1	Unsteady on feet	1
Shortness of breath cause unknown	1	Seizure	1
Myocardial infarction excluded	2	Head injury	1
No details of event in medical record	10	Blackout	1
		Vasovagal event	1
		Ischaemic retinal vein occlusion	1
		Stroke excluded	1
		No details of event in medical record	10

Table 3: Relationship between treatment allocation to calcium supplementation and risk of event by source and adjudication status

<b>Event source and adjudication</b>	<b>Calcium<sup>a</sup> (N=732)</b>	<b>Placebo<sup>a</sup> (N=739)</b>	<b>Relative Risk (95% CI)</b>	<b>P</b>
<b>Myocardial infarction</b>				
Total self-reported events	31	14	2.24 (1.20-4.17)	0.0099
Verified self-reported events <sup>b</sup>	21	10	2.12 (1.01-4.47)	0.047
Total hospital discharge coding	24	17	1.43 (0.77-2.63)	0.27
Total hospital discharge coding and death certificates	27	18	1.51 (0.84-2.73)	0.18
Verified self-reports/hospital discharge coding and death certificates	31	21	1.49 (0.86-2.57)	0.16
<b>Stroke</b>				
Total self-reported events	40	28	1.44 (0.90-2.31)	0.14
Verified self-reported events <sup>c</sup>	31	22	1.42 (0.83-2.43)	0.21
Total hospital discharge coding	26	20	1.31 (0.74-2.32)	0.37
Total hospital discharge coding and death certificates	27	21	1.30 (0.74-2.27)	0.38
Verified self-reports/hospital discharge coding and death certificates	34	25	1.45 (0.88-2.49)	0.15

<sup>a</sup> data are number of women experiencing an incident event

<sup>b</sup> includes 1 incident myocardial infarction identified during the verification of other events

<sup>c</sup> includes 6 incident strokes identified during the verification of transient ischaemic attacks



**Differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a randomized clinical trial.**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002334.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	20-Feb-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Bolland, Mark; University of Auckland, Department of Medicine Barber, Peter; Auckland Hospital, Neurology Doughty, Rob; University of Auckland, Department of Medicine Grey, Andrew; University of Auckland Gamble, Greg; University of Auckland, Department of Medicine Reid, Ian; University of Auckland, Medicine
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b>:	Diabetes and endocrinology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Geriatric medicine, Cardiovascular medicine, Research methods
Keywords:	Calcium & bone < DIABETES & ENDOCRINOLOGY, GERIATRIC MEDICINE, Adverse events < THERAPEUTICS, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

**Title:** Differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a randomized clinical trial.

**Running title:** Inaccurate self-reports of adverse events

**Authors:**

Mark J Bolland MBChB, PhD, Senior Research Fellow  
P Alan Barber MB ChB, PhD, Professor  
Robert N Doughty MD, Professor  
Andrew Grey MD, Associate Professor  
Greg Gamble, MSc, Biostatistician  
Ian R Reid MD, Professor

**Affiliation:** Department of Medicine, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

**Address for correspondence/reprints:**

Mark Bolland  
Bone and Joint Research Group,  
Department of Medicine, University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92 019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand  
Email: [m.bolland@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.bolland@auckland.ac.nz)  
Ph 64 9 373 7999  
Fax 64 9 373 7677

**Funding:**

This study was funded by the Health Research Council (HRC) of New Zealand.

**Word counts:**

Text only: 2461  
Abstract: 295  
Tables: 3

**Conflict of interest**

All authors have no conflict of interest.

**Trial registration:**

The trial is registered at the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry. (ACTRN12605000242628)

**Abstract:****Objectives:**

In clinical trials, adverse events are usually self-reported but may be adjudicated if serious or of particular interest. After adjudicating cardiovascular events for a 5-year calcium supplement trial, we observed discrepancies between self-reported and verified events. We systematically analysed those differences to assess their importance.

**Design:**

Secondary analysis of adverse cardiovascular events in a 5-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of calcium supplementation (1 g calcium daily) in 1471 postmenopausal women (mean age 74y).

**Setting:**

Clinical research centre.

**Methods:**

The participant's medical records were reviewed for all self-reported myocardial infarctions (MIs) or strokes, and the event independently adjudicated. Cause of death was obtained from hospital records or death certificates. To identify unreported events, the national hospital discharge database was searched and related hospital records reviewed.

**Results:**

45 women reported 64 MIs, of which 33 (52%) were verified after adjudication. An

1  
2  
3 additional 25 MIs were identified: 1 during adjudication of other events, 21 from the  
4 hospital discharge database, 3 from death certificates. 68 women reported 86 strokes  
5 of which 50 (58%) were verified. An additional 13 strokes were identified: 7 during  
6 adjudication of reported transient ischaemic attacks, 5 from the hospital discharge  
7 database, 1 from death certificates. Therefore, 43% of verified MIs and 21% of  
8 verified strokes were not reported to investigators. For non-adjudicated discharge  
9 codes, 10% of MIs and 22% of strokes were not verified after adjudication. 19% of  
10 verified MIs and 27% of verified strokes were not identified in discharge coding or  
11 death certificates. Neither the event source nor the level of adjudication altered the  
12 relationship between treatment allocation and cardiovascular events.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Conclusions:**

28  
29 When adverse event accuracy is critical, researchers should consider adjudicating self-  
30 reported events and hospital discharge codes, and attempt to identify unreported  
31 events.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Trial registration:** Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials registry: ACTRN  
39 012605000242628  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Key words:**

48 Calcium supplement, myocardial infarction, stroke, clinical trial, adjudication, adverse  
49 events  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



**Article focus:**

- The differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a clinical trial

**Key messages:**

- Substantial proportions of self-reported myocardial infarctions and strokes were not able to be verified, and substantial proportions of verified myocardial infarctions and strokes were not reported by participants or were not identified in discharge coding or death certificates
- When adverse event accuracy is critical to a clinical trial, unadjudicated self-reports or hospital discharge codes cannot be relied upon. Consideration should also be given to identifying unreported events.

**Strengths and limitations of this study:**

- A rigorous search for adverse events occurred and all events were independently adjudicated.
- Cardiovascular events were secondary endpoints, and participants may have placed less value on reporting these events than the primary endpoints.

## Introduction

In clinical research studies, participant self-report of adverse effects and outcome events are essential in determining the efficacy and tolerability of the intervention being studied. Participant self-reports may be accepted as accurate or may lead to independent adjudication, depending on the relevance to the study and the overall size and complexity of the study. In large clinical trials, adverse events are usually self-reported and not independently verified unless considered serious or of particular interest. However, the few studies that have specifically addressed the accuracy of self-reported medical events suggest relatively poor agreement between self-reports and medical records.<sup>1 2</sup>

Previously, we completed a five-year trial of the effects of calcium supplementation in healthy postmenopausal women in which we observed an unexpected increase in the rate of vascular events in women allocated to calcium.<sup>3</sup> All vascular events were initially self-reported, and then adjudicated by blinded study investigators. We also conducted a systematic search for valid events that were not reported by participants. Here, we present the results of an analysis of the relationship between self-reported and adjudicated events, including unreported events. The current analyses were not planned in the original trial protocol or the subsequent protocol for the adjudication of vascular events. Ethical approval for the current analyses was not required.

## Methods

### Study design

The Auckland Calcium study was a five-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of calcium supplementation in 1471 normal postmenopausal women (mean age 74y),

1  
2  
3 designed to assess the effects of 1g daily calcium on fracture incidence.  
4  
5 Recruitment started in 1998 and was completed in 2006. Cardiovascular outcomes  
6  
7 were a pre-specified secondary endpoint. The methods have been described in full  
8  
9 previously.<sup>4</sup> In brief, women were recruited by advertisement and from mail-outs  
10  
11 using electoral rolls, and were 5y or more postmenopausal and aged 55y or older.  
12  
13 Women were ineligible if they were receiving therapy for osteoporosis, had other  
14  
15 major ongoing disease, or had serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D <25 nmol/L. The study  
16  
17 received approval from the regional Ethics Committee and the trial was registered with  
18  
19 the Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials registry: ACTRN 012605000242628  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

#### 25 Cardiovascular Event Assessment

26  
27 Participants were reviewed every six months. Adverse events were recorded at each visit  
28  
29 but questions about specific symptoms or illnesses were not asked. A pre-planned  
30  
31 secondary analysis was a comparison between the groups in the frequencies of  
32  
33 myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, transient ischaemic attack (TIA) and other  
34  
35 cardiovascular events.<sup>3</sup> In 2006-7, cardiovascular events were adjudicated. The  
36  
37 participant's medical records were reviewed when a MI, stroke, or TIA was self-  
38  
39 reported (or by family members for fatal events). For participants who died during the  
40  
41 study, the cause of death was obtained from hospital records or the death certificate.  
42  
43 Data for each event were compiled by a physician and then adjudicated by a  
44  
45 cardiologist (MI) or neurologist (stroke or TIA). All were blinded to the treatment  
46  
47 group of each participant. MI was defined in accordance with the Joint European  
48  
49 Society of Cardiology/ American College of Cardiology Committee criteria for acute,  
50  
51 evolving or recent MI,<sup>5</sup> and stroke and TIA were defined in accordance with the  
52  
53 World Health Organisation definition.<sup>6</sup>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Discharge codes:

To identify events that were unreported, we searched the national database of hospital discharges for cardiovascular events (ICD9 discharge codes 410 for MI and 430, 431, 433, 434 for stroke) that occurred during the study using each participant's unique National Health Index identifier. The hospital records related to these admissions were reviewed and adjudicated in the same manner as for self-reported events. We added all unreported, adjudicated hospital discharge events to the adjudicated self-reports to obtain a complete set of verified events. We compared this complete set of verified events with the events obtained solely from discharge ICD-9 codes or death certificates.

### Statistics

Agreement between reported and verified events was assessed using the kappa coefficient. The number of women experiencing an incident event in each treatment group was compared using Fisher's exact test. Differences between baseline characteristics were compared using t-tests for continuous variables, and Fisher's exact test for categorical data. All statistical analyses were performed using the SAS software package (SAS Institute, Cary, NC version 9.1).  $P < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

### **Results:**

#### Myocardial infarction

Table 1 shows the number of self-reported, verified self-reported, verified unreported, and total verified events. 33 of 64 (52%) self-reported MIs were verified. Table 2

1  
2  
3 shows the final diagnosis from the medical record for the 31 MIs that were not  
4  
5 verified. In 10 instances, there was no report of the event in the medical record, but in  
6  
7 each case a verified MI had previously occurred during the study. For 9 of the  
8  
9 remaining 21 events (43%), MI was specifically excluded with final diagnoses made  
10  
11 of angina, unstable angina, or MI excluded. 25 unreported events were identified: 1  
12  
13 during adjudication of other events, 21 from the national hospital discharge database  
14  
15 search, and 3 from death certificates. Thus, of 58 verified MIs in 52 women, only 33  
16  
17 (57%) were reported to study investigators and 25 (43%) were identified from other  
18  
19 sources. The kappa value for agreement between reported and verified MI was 0.63  
20  
21 (95% confidence interval 0.51-0.74).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28 When only non-adjudicated events identified from the discharge database search were  
29  
30 considered, there were 48 MIs in 41 women. When death certificate data were added,  
31  
32 there were 52 MIs in 45 women. 5 (10%) of the 48 MIs identified from the discharge  
33  
34 database search were not verified. Another 11 verified MIs (19%) were identified  
35  
36 from self-reports but not from hospital discharges or death certificates.  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 Stroke:

42  
43 Table 1 shows that 50 of 86 (58%) self-reported strokes were verified. Table 2 shows  
44  
45 the final diagnosis for the 36 strokes that were not verified. In 10 instances, there was  
46  
47 no report of the event in the medical record, but in each case a verified stroke had  
48  
49 previously occurred during the study. For 8 of the remaining 26 events (30%), stroke  
50  
51 was specifically considered and excluded with final diagnoses made of TIA, or stroke  
52  
53 excluded. 13 unreported events were identified: 7 during the adjudication of reported  
54  
55 TIA, 5 from the discharge database search, and 1 from death certificates. Thus, of 63  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 verified strokes in 59 women, 50 (79%) were reported to study investigators as stroke,  
4  
5 7 (11%) as TIA, and 10% were identified from other sources. The kappa value for  
6  
7 agreement between reported and verified stroke was 0.73 (95% confidence interval  
8  
9 0.64-0.82).  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 When only non-adjudicated events identified from the discharge database search were  
15  
16 considered, there were 50 strokes in 46 women. When death certificate data were  
17  
18 added, there were 57 strokes in 48 women. 11 of the 50 strokes (22%) identified from  
19  
20 the discharge database search were not verified. Another 17 verified strokes (27%)  
21  
22 were identified from self-reports but not from hospital discharges or death certificates.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 The relationship between treatment allocation and MI or stroke for the different event  
28  
29 sources and levels of event adjudication is shown in Table 3. There were consistently  
30  
31 increased relative risks for MI and stroke with calcium supplements, although the  
32  
33 relative risks changed in some cases depending upon event source or level of  
34  
35 adjudication, and the different numbers of events in each comparison led to more  
36  
37 marked changes in P values.  
38  
39  
40

41  
42  
43 Finally, we assessed possible relationships between baseline characteristics and  
44  
45 discrepancies between self-reported and final verified events. Women in whom there  
46  
47 were discrepancies were older ( $P<0.001$ ), and were more likely to have reported at the  
48  
49 baseline study visit having had a previous MI ( $P=0.013$ ) or previous TIA or stroke  
50  
51 ( $P=0.035$ ) than women without such discrepancies. However, there were no  
52  
53 differences in physical activity ( $P=0.7$ ) or other co-morbidities between the groups  
54  
55 ( $P>0.1$  for hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Discussion

We observed differences between self-reported MI or stroke and the final verified diagnosis obtained from the medical record or death certificate. Almost half of self-reported MIs (48%) and strokes (42%) were not able to be verified, and 43% of verified MIs and 10% of verified strokes were unreported, with a further 11% of verified strokes reported as TIA. Differences were also observed between events obtained solely from hospital discharge codes and final verified events. 10% of MIs and 22% of strokes obtained from discharge codes were not verified, and 19% of verified MIs and 27% of verified strokes were identified from self-reports but not from discharge codes or death certificates. Relying solely on self-reports of MI or stroke, or solely on discharge codes in our clinical trial, would have led to significant numbers of participants being misclassified with regard to having experienced an significant adverse event. Despite the differences between self-reports, hospital discharge codes, and verified events, neither the source of the event nor the level of adjudication substantially altered the relationship between treatment allocation and occurrence of either MI or stroke.

In most cases, the final diagnosis for the non-verified, self-reported MIs were related to a disorder of the heart, suggesting that miscommunication or misunderstanding between the participant and their physician led to the error. It has been suggested that the gastrointestinal side effects of calcium supplements might be misclassified as MI<sup>7</sup> but we found no evidence that this was the case. In at least 43% of non-verified cases, MI was specifically considered as a diagnosis and excluded. The most common final diagnosis for non-verified, self-reported strokes was TIA, suggesting that participants

1  
2  
3 did not understand the distinction between these two conditions. This is not surprising  
4  
5 as TIA is often described as a “mini-stroke”. In approximately one third of non-  
6  
7 verified, self-reported events (both MI and stroke), there were no details of any  
8  
9 potentially related event in the medical record. These events all occurred in people  
10  
11 who had experienced a previous verified event, suggesting that they reported the same  
12  
13 event more than once, or they reported symptoms that were similar to their primary  
14  
15 event for which they did not seek medical attention.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 There are limited published data that specifically address differences between self-  
22  
23 reported events and the medical record. A systematic review identified 15 studies that  
24  
25 assessed the accuracy of questionnaires of medical history compared with the medical  
26  
27 record.<sup>1</sup> The proportion of illnesses reported in questionnaires ranged from 30-53% of  
28  
29 those listed in the medical record. Conversely, the medical record listed 36-70% of  
30  
31 illnesses reported in questionnaires. Reporting of surgical procedures or  
32  
33 hospitalisation in questionnaires appeared to be more accurate than reporting of non-  
34  
35 surgical illness. The findings of this systematic review have been replicated in more  
36  
37 recent studies.<sup>2-8-10</sup> Further studies have addressed the accuracy of self-reported  
38  
39 cardiovascular events. For MI and stroke, approximately 70-80% of self-reported  
40  
41 events were confirmed by hospital record review,<sup>2-8-13</sup> which the authors suggested is  
42  
43 sufficiently accurate for use in research studies.<sup>8-9-11</sup> For sub-typing of stroke, review  
44  
45 of hospital records adds useful data to self-reports and discharge coding.<sup>14</sup>  
46  
47  
48  
49

50  
51 A comprehensive analysis of reporting of cardiovascular events that occurred during  
52  
53 the Women’s Health Initiative clinical and observational studies has been published.<sup>10</sup>  
54  
55 In these studies, local physician adjudicators reviewed self-reported data and patient  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 medical records for all self-reported cardiovascular events. The local adjudicators  
4  
5 were able to verify 68% of self-reported MIs and 72% of strokes. The local  
6  
7 adjudicators could only verify MI in 78% of events with a discharge code for MI, and  
8  
9 stroke in 81% of events with a discharge code for stroke, suggesting coding data from  
10  
11 hospital admissions may not be accurate, a finding consistent with the results of our  
12  
13 study. Finally, there was not complete agreement between local and central  
14  
15 adjudicators. 81% of locally adjudicated MIs were verified by central adjudicators,  
16  
17 and conversely 86% of centrally adjudicated MIs were classified as MI by local  
18  
19 adjudicators. The issue of unreported events was not addressed.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Our findings are broadly consistent with this previous research, although it is  
26  
27 uncertain whether self-reports in response to open-ended questions in a clinical trial  
28  
29 are comparable to responses to questionnaires or medical records based on a mixture  
30  
31 of open- and closed-ended questions. The lower accuracy of MI self-reports in our  
32  
33 study compared with other studies might be because the participants in our trial were  
34  
35 older, had more co-morbidities, and had more cognitive impairment than participants  
36  
37 in previous studies. Another contributing factor might be that although cardiovascular  
38  
39 events were prespecified secondary endpoints, many of the participants might not  
40  
41 have been aware of this, and may have placed less value on reporting these events  
42  
43 than fractures, which were the primary endpoints of the study. In the United  
44  
45 Kingdom, accuracy of diagnostic coding has improved substantially in recent years,<sup>15</sup>  
46  
47 although no similar data are available for New Zealand. It is possible that the  
48  
49 magnitude of differences between adjudicated events and hospital discharge coding  
50  
51 might have changed since our study was undertaken.  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Inaccurate self-reports or underreporting of events would not be expected to affect the  
4  
5 results of a study unless the study treatment introduced a systematic bias that  
6  
7 produced differential rates of inaccurate self-reports or underreporting of events.  
8

9  
10 However, when the event numbers are small, as in many clinical trials, chance  
11  
12 differences can substantially impact upon the study results. In our study, the  
13  
14 adjudication process led to marked changes in the degree of statistical significance,  
15  
16 even though the relative risks of MI with calcium supplements remained elevated at  
17  
18 each stage. The relationship between calcium supplements and occurrence of MI or  
19  
20 stroke was similar regardless of whether the events were based solely on hospital  
21  
22 discharge coding or self-reports or final verified events, a finding that is supported by  
23  
24 the similar increase in vascular risk associated with calcium supplements across  
25  
26 randomised trials that used various means of event identification.<sup>16 17</sup>  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 A common approach in clinical trials is to adjudicate all significant adverse events  
33  
34 centrally, although the need to do this remains uncertain.<sup>18</sup> The advantages of central  
35  
36 adjudication include systematically applying the definition of an event, reducing the  
37  
38 possibility of differential misclassification of events, giving greater confidence in the  
39  
40 validity of the study results, and by including suitable triggers, potentially identifying  
41  
42 events that are missed by local investigators.<sup>18</sup> However, central adjudication is  
43  
44 unlikely to identify events that are not reported to the local investigators, adds  
45  
46 significant cost and complexity to trials, and has not been shown to improve the  
47  
48 ability to determine treatment effects in cardiovascular trials.<sup>18</sup>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 In summary, our results suggest that when the accuracy of an event in clinical trials is  
55  
56 critical, even for a relatively common and serious medical event such as MI or stroke,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 self-reports cannot be relied upon and should be independently verified from the  
4  
5 medical record. However, even if independent verification occurs, our results also  
6  
7 suggest that a substantial number of events will not have been reported. For adverse  
8  
9 events of particular interest, additional steps, such as searches of hospital discharge  
10  
11 databases, should be considered to attempt to identify unreported events. Relying  
12  
13 solely on non-adjudicated hospital discharge coding will lead to similar inaccuracies  
14  
15 as using self-reported data because some events will be missed and some events will  
16  
17 be included that would not be verified by adjudication.  
18  
19

### 20 21 22 23 **Conflict of interest**

24 All authors have no conflict of interest.  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 **Author contributions:**

30 MJB, AG, IRR designed this secondary analysis of our clinical trial. PAB and RD  
31  
32 adjudicated the events for the study. MJB and GG carried out the analyses. MJB  
33  
34 drafted the paper. All authors critically reviewed the draft and improved it. MJB is the  
35  
36 guarantor of the paper.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 43 **Data sharing**

44 Data would be made available on request.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

1. Harlow SD, Linet MS. Agreement between questionnaire data and medical records. The evidence for accuracy of recall. *Am J Epidemiol* 1989;129:233-48.
2. St Sauver JL, Hagen PT, Cha SS, et al. Agreement between patient reports of cardiovascular disease and patient medical records. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2005;80:203-10.
3. Bolland MJ, Barber PA, Doughty RN, et al. Vascular events in healthy older women receiving calcium supplementation: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2008;336:262-6.
4. Reid IR, Mason B, Horne A, et al. Randomized controlled trial of calcium in healthy older women. *Am J Med* 2006;119:777-85.
5. Alpert JS, Thygesen K, Antman E, et al. Myocardial infarction redefined--a consensus document of The Joint European Society of Cardiology/American College of Cardiology Committee for the redefinition of myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;36:959-69.
6. Aho K, Harmsen P, Hatano S, et al. Cerebrovascular disease in the community: results of a WHO collaborative study. *Bull World Health Organ* 1980;58:113-30.
7. Lewis JR, Zhu K, Prince RL. Adverse events from calcium supplementation: relationship to errors in myocardial infarction self-reporting in randomized controlled trials of calcium supplementation. *J Bone Miner Res* 2012;27:719-22.

- 1  
2  
3 8. Bergmann MM, Byers T, Freedman DS, et al. Validity of self-reported  
4  
5 diagnoses leading to hospitalization: a comparison of self-reports with hospital  
6  
7 records in a prospective study of American adults. *Am J Epidemiol*  
8  
9 1998;147:969-77.
- 10  
11 9. Engstad T, Bonna KH, Viitanen M. Validity of self-reported stroke : The  
12  
13 Tromso Study. *Stroke* 2000;31:1602-7.
- 14  
15 10. Heckbert SR, Kooperberg C, Safford MM, et al. Comparison of self-report,  
16  
17 hospital discharge codes, and adjudication of cardiovascular events in the  
18  
19 Women's Health Initiative. *Am J Epidemiol* 2004;160:1152-8.
- 20  
21 11. Tretli S, Lund-Larsen PG, Foss OP. Reliability of questionnaire information  
22  
23 on cardiovascular disease and diabetes: cardiovascular disease study in  
24  
25 Finnmark county. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1982;36:269-73.
- 26  
27 12. Yamagishi K, Ikeda A, Iso H, et al. Self-reported stroke and myocardial  
28  
29 infarction had adequate sensitivity in a population-based prospective study  
30  
31 JPHC (Japan Public Health Center)-based Prospective Study. *J Clin Epidemiol*  
32  
33 2008.
- 34  
35 13. Carter K, Barber PA, Shaw C. How does self-reported history of stroke  
36  
37 compare to hospitalization data in a population-based survey in New Zealand?  
38  
39 *Stroke* 2010;41:2678-80.
- 40  
41 14. Britton A, Milne B, Butler T, et al. Validating self-reported strokes in a  
42  
43 longitudinal UK cohort study (Whitehall II): Extracting information from  
44  
45 hospital medical records versus the Hospital Episode Statistics database. *BMC*  
46  
47 *Med Res Methodol* 2012;12:83.
- 48  
49 15. Burns EM, Rigby E, Mamidanna R, et al. Systematic review of discharge  
50  
51 coding accuracy. *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2012;34:138-48.
- 52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 16. Bolland MJ, Avenell A, Baron JA, et al. Effect of calcium supplements on risk  
4 of myocardial infarction and cardiovascular events: meta-analysis. *BMJ*  
5 2010;341:c3691.  
6  
7
- 8  
9 17. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Avenell A, et al. Calcium supplements with or without  
10 vitamin D and risk of cardiovascular events: reanalysis of the Women's Health  
11 Initiative limited access dataset and meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2011;342:d2040.  
12  
13
- 14 18. Granger CB, Vogel V, Cummings SR, et al. Do we need to adjudicate major  
15 clinical events? *Clin Trials* 2008;5:56-60.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Numbers of events by source and adjudication status

Source/adjudication	Myocardial infarction	Stroke
Total self-reported events	64 (45)	86 (68)
Verified self-reported events	33 (30)	50 (47)
Verified unreported events	25 (24)	13 (12)
Total verified events	58 (52)	63 (59)

Data are number of events (number of women).

Table 2: Final diagnosis from medical records for self-reported, non-verified myocardial infarctions (n=31) and strokes (n=36)

Myocardial infarction		Stroke	
Final diagnosis	N	Final diagnosis	N
Unstable angina	5	Transient ischaemic attack	6
Congestive heart failure	5	Fall	3
Angina	2	Acute confusional state	3
Sudden unexplained death	2	Sudden unexplained death	2
Atrial fibrillation	1	Benign positional vertigo	2
Palpitations	1	Dementia	2
Postural hypotension	1	Postural hypotension	1
Renal failure	1	Unsteady on feet	1
Shortness of breath cause unknown	1	Seizure	1
Myocardial infarction excluded	2	Head injury	1
No details of event in medical record	10	Blackout	1
		Vasovagal event	1
		Ischaemic retinal vein occlusion	1
		Stroke excluded	1
		No details of event in medical record	10



Table 3: Relationship between treatment allocation to calcium supplementation and risk of event by source and adjudication status

Event source and adjudication	Calcium <sup>a</sup> (N=732)	Placebo <sup>a</sup> (N=739)	Relative Risk (95% CI)	P
<b>Myocardial infarction</b>				
Total self-reported events	31	14	2.24 (1.20-4.17)	0.0099
Verified self-reported events <sup>b</sup>	21	10	2.12 (1.01-4.47)	0.047
Total hospital discharge coding	24	17	1.43 (0.77-2.63)	0.27
Total hospital discharge coding and death certificates	27	18	1.51 (0.84-2.73)	0.18
Verified self-reports/hospital discharge coding and death certificates	31	21	1.49 (0.86-2.57)	0.16
<b>Stroke</b>				
Total self-reported events	40	28	1.44 (0.90-2.31)	0.14
Verified self-reported events <sup>c</sup>	31	22	1.42 (0.83-2.43)	0.21
Total hospital discharge coding	26	20	1.31 (0.74-2.32)	0.37
Total hospital discharge coding and death certificates	27	21	1.30 (0.74-2.27)	0.38
Verified self-reports/hospital discharge coding and death certificates	34	25	1.45 (0.88-2.49)	0.15

<sup>a</sup> data are number of women experiencing an incident event

<sup>b</sup> includes 1 incident myocardial infarction identified during the verification of other events

<sup>c</sup> includes 6 incident strokes identified during the verification of transient ischaemic attacks

**Title:** Differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a randomized clinical trial.

**Running title:** Inaccurate self-reports of adverse events

**Authors:**

Mark J Bolland MBChB, PhD, Senior Research Fellow  
P Alan Barber MB ChB, PhD, Professor  
Robert N Doughty MD, Professor  
Andrew Grey MD, Associate Professor  
Greg Gamble, MSc, Biostatistician  
Ian R Reid MD, Professor

**Affiliation:** Department of Medicine, University of Auckland, Auckland, New Zealand

**Address for correspondence/reprints:**

Mark Bolland  
Bone and Joint Research Group,  
Department of Medicine, University of Auckland  
Private Bag 92 019, Auckland 1142, New Zealand  
Email: [m.bolland@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:m.bolland@auckland.ac.nz)  
Ph 64 9 373 7999  
Fax 64 9 373 7677

**Funding:**

This study was funded by the Health Research Council (HRC) of New Zealand.

**Word counts:**

Text only: 2461  
Abstract: 295  
Tables: 3

**Conflict of interest**

All authors have no conflict of interest.

**Trial registration:**

The trial is registered at the Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry. (ACTRN12605000242628)

**Abstract:****Objectives:**

In clinical trials, adverse events are usually self-reported but may be adjudicated if serious or of particular interest. After adjudicating cardiovascular events for a 5-year calcium supplement trial, we observed discrepancies between self-reported and verified events. We systematically analysed those differences to assess their importance.

**Design:**

Secondary analysis of adverse cardiovascular events in a 5-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of calcium supplementation (1 g calcium daily) in 1471 postmenopausal women (mean age 74y).

**Setting:**

Clinical research centre.

**Methods:**

The participant's medical records were reviewed for all self-reported myocardial infarctions (MIs) or strokes, and the event independently adjudicated. Cause of death was obtained from hospital records or death certificates. To identify unreported events, the national hospital discharge database was searched and related hospital records reviewed.

**Results:**

45 women reported 64 MIs, of which 33 (52%) were verified after adjudication. An

1  
2  
3 additional 25 MIs were identified: 1 during adjudication of other events, 21 from the  
4 hospital discharge database, 3 from death certificates. 68 women reported 86 strokes  
5 of which 50 (58%) were verified. An additional 13 strokes were identified: 7 during  
6 adjudication of reported transient ischaemic attacks, 5 from the hospital discharge  
7 database, 1 from death certificates. Therefore, 43% of verified MIs and 21% of  
8 verified strokes were not reported to investigators. For non-adjudicated discharge  
9 codes, 10% of MIs and 22% of strokes were not verified after adjudication. 19% of  
10 verified MIs and 27% of verified strokes were not identified in discharge coding or  
11 death certificates. Neither the event source nor the level of adjudication altered the  
12 relationship between treatment allocation and cardiovascular events.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

### 27 **Conclusions:**

28  
29 When adverse event accuracy is critical, researchers should consider adjudicating self-  
30 reported events and [hospital](#) discharge codes, and attempt to identify unreported  
31 events.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 **Trial registration:** Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials registry: ACTRN  
39 012605000242628  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

### 47 **Key words:**

48 Calcium supplement, myocardial infarction, stroke, clinical trial, adjudication, adverse  
49 events  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

**Article focus:**

- The differences between self-reported and verified adverse cardiovascular events in a clinical trial

**Key messages:**

- Substantial proportions of self-reported myocardial infarctions and strokes were not able to be verified, and substantial proportions of verified myocardial infarctions and strokes were not reported by participants or were not identified in discharge coding or death certificates
- When adverse event accuracy is critical to a clinical trial, unadjudicated self-reports or hospital discharge codes cannot be relied upon. Consideration should also be given to identifying unreported events.

**Strengths and limitations of this study:**

- A rigorous search for adverse events occurred and all events were independently adjudicated.
- Cardiovascular events were secondary endpoints, and participants may have placed less value on reporting these events than the primary endpoints.

## Introduction

In clinical research studies, participant self-report of adverse effects and outcome events are essential in determining the efficacy and tolerability of the intervention being studied. Participant self-reports may be accepted as accurate or may lead to independent adjudication, depending on the relevance to the study and the overall size and complexity of the study. In large clinical trials, adverse events are usually self-reported and not independently verified unless considered serious or of particular interest. However, the few studies that have specifically addressed the accuracy of self-reported medical events suggest relatively poor agreement between self-reports and medical records.<sup>1 2</sup>

Previously, we completed a five-year trial of the effects of calcium supplementation in healthy postmenopausal women in which we observed an unexpected increase in the rate of vascular events in women allocated to calcium.<sup>3</sup> All vascular events were initially self-reported, and then adjudicated by blinded study investigators. We also conducted a systematic search for valid events that were not reported by participants. Here, we present the results of an analysis of the relationship between self-reported and adjudicated events, including unreported events. The current analyses were not planned in the original trial protocol or the subsequent protocol for the adjudication of vascular events. Ethical approval for the current analyses was not required.

## Methods

### Study design

The Auckland Calcium study was a five-year, randomized, placebo-controlled trial of calcium supplementation in 1471 normal postmenopausal women (mean age 74y),

1  
2  
3 designed to assess the effects of 1g daily calcium on fracture incidence.

4  
5 [Recruitment started in 1998 and was completed in 2006](#). Cardiovascular outcomes  
6  
7 were a pre-specified secondary endpoint. The methods have been described in full  
8  
9 previously.<sup>4</sup> In brief, women were recruited by advertisement and from mail-outs  
10  
11 using electoral rolls, and were 5y or more postmenopausal and aged 55y or older.  
12  
13 Women were ineligible if they were receiving therapy for osteoporosis, had other  
14  
15 major ongoing disease, or had serum 25-hydroxyvitamin D <25 nmol/L. The study  
16  
17 received approval from the regional Ethics Committee and the trial was registered with  
18  
19 the Australia New Zealand Clinical Trials registry: ACTRN 012605000242628  
20  
21

#### 22 23 24 25 Cardiovascular Event Assessment

26  
27 Participants were reviewed every six months. Adverse events were recorded at each visit  
28  
29 but questions about specific symptoms [or illnesses](#) were not asked. A pre-planned  
30  
31 secondary analysis was a comparison between the groups in the frequencies of  
32  
33 myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, transient ischaemic attack (TIA) and other  
34  
35 cardiovascular events.<sup>3</sup> [In 2006-7, cardiovascular events were adjudicated](#). The  
36  
37 participant's medical records were reviewed when a MI, stroke, or TIA was self-  
38  
39 reported (or by family members for fatal events). For participants who died during the  
40  
41 study, the cause of death was obtained from hospital records or the death certificate.  
42  
43 Data for each event were compiled by a physician and then adjudicated by a  
44  
45 cardiologist (MI) or neurologist (stroke or TIA). All were blinded to the treatment  
46  
47 group of each participant. MI was defined in accordance with the Joint European  
48  
49 Society of Cardiology/ American College of Cardiology Committee criteria for acute,  
50  
51 evolving or recent MI,<sup>5</sup> and stroke and TIA were defined in accordance with the  
52  
53 World Health Organisation definition.<sup>6</sup>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

### Discharge codes:

To identify events that were unreported, we searched the national database of hospital discharges for cardiovascular events (ICD9 discharge codes 410 for MI and 430, 431, 433, 434 for stroke) that occurred during the study using each participant's unique National Health Index identifier. The hospital records related to these admissions were reviewed and adjudicated in the same manner as for self-reported events. We added all unreported, adjudicated hospital discharge events to the adjudicated self-reports to obtain a complete set of verified events. We compared this complete set of verified events with the events obtained solely from discharge ICD-9 codes or death certificates.

### Statistics

Agreement between reported and verified events was assessed using the kappa coefficient. The number of women experiencing an incident event in each treatment group was compared using Fisher's exact test. [Differences between baseline characteristics were compared using t-tests for continuous variables, and Fisher's exact test for categorical data.](#) All statistical analyses were performed using the SAS software package (SAS Institute, Cary, NC version 9.1).  $P < 0.05$  was considered statistically significant.

### **Results:**

#### Myocardial infarction

Table 1 shows the number of self-reported, verified self-reported, verified unreported, and total verified events. 33 of 64 (52%) self-reported MIs were verified. Table 2



1  
2  
3 shows the final diagnosis from the medical record for the 31 MIs that were not  
4  
5 verified. In 10 instances, there was no report of the event in the medical record, but in  
6  
7 each case a verified MI had previously occurred during the study. For 9 of the  
8  
9 remaining 21 events (43%), MI was specifically excluded with final diagnoses made  
10  
11 of angina, unstable angina, or MI excluded. 25 unreported events were identified: 1  
12  
13 during adjudication of other events, 21 from the national hospital discharge database  
14  
15 search, and 3 from death certificates. Thus, of 58 verified MIs in 52 women, only 33  
16  
17 (57%) were reported to study investigators and 25 (43%) were identified from other  
18  
19 sources. The kappa value for agreement between reported and verified MI was 0.63  
20  
21 (95% confidence interval 0.51-0.74).  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 When only non-adjudicated events identified from the discharge database search were  
28  
29 considered, there were 48 MIs in 41 women. When death certificate data were added,  
30  
31 there were 52 MIs in 45 women. 5 (10%) of the 48 MIs identified from the discharge  
32  
33 database search were not verified. Another 11 verified MIs (19%) were identified  
34  
35 from self-reports but not from hospital discharges or death certificates.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

#### 41 Stroke:

42 Table 1 shows that 50 of 86 (58%) self-reported strokes were verified. Table 2 shows  
43  
44 the final diagnosis for the 36 strokes that were not verified. In 10 instances, there was  
45  
46 no report of the event in the medical record, but in each case a verified stroke had  
47  
48 previously occurred during the study. For 8 of the remaining 26 events (30%), stroke  
49  
50 was specifically considered and excluded with final diagnoses made of TIA, or stroke  
51  
52 excluded. 13 unreported events were identified: 7 during the adjudication of reported  
53  
54 TIA, 5 from the discharge database search, and 1 from death certificates. Thus, of 63  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 verified strokes in 59 women, 50 (79%) were reported to study investigators as stroke,  
4  
5 7 (11%) as TIA, and 10% were identified from other sources. The kappa value for  
6  
7 agreement between reported and verified stroke was 0.73 (95% confidence interval  
8  
9 0.64-0.82).  
10

11  
12  
13  
14 When only non-adjudicated events identified from the discharge database search were  
15  
16 considered, there were 50 strokes in 46 women. When death certificate data were  
17  
18 added, there were 57 strokes in 48 women. 11 of the 50 strokes (22%) identified from  
19  
20 the discharge database search were not verified. Another 17 verified strokes (27%)  
21  
22 were identified from self-reports but not from hospital discharges or death certificates.  
23  
24  
25

26  
27 The relationship between treatment allocation and MI or stroke for the different event  
28  
29 sources and levels of event adjudication is shown in Table 3. There were consistently  
30  
31 increased relative risks for MI and stroke with calcium supplements, *although the*  
32  
33 *relative risks changed in some cases depending upon event source or level of*  
34  
35 *adjudication, and the different numbers of events in each comparison led to more*  
36  
37 *marked changes in P values.*  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42

43 Finally, we assessed possible relationships between baseline characteristics and  
44  
45 discrepancies between self-reported and final verified events. Women in whom there  
46  
47 were discrepancies were older ( $P<0.001$ ), and were more likely to have reported at the  
48  
49 baseline study visit having had a previous MI ( $P=0.013$ ) or previous TIA or stroke  
50  
51 ( $P=0.035$ ) than women without such discrepancies. However, there were no  
52  
53 differences in physical activity ( $P=0.7$ ) or other co-morbidities between the groups  
54  
55 ( $P>0.1$  for hypertension, dyslipidemia, diabetes).  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Discussion

We observed differences between self-reported MI or stroke and the final verified diagnosis obtained from the medical record or death certificate. Almost half of self-reported MIs (48%) and strokes (42%) were not able to be verified, and 43% of verified MIs and 10% of verified strokes were unreported, with a further 11% of verified strokes reported as TIA. Differences were also observed between events obtained solely from hospital discharge codes and final verified events. 10% of MIs and 22% of strokes obtained from discharge codes were not verified, and 19% of verified MIs and 27% of verified strokes were identified from self-reports but not from discharge codes or death certificates. Relying solely on self-reports of MI or stroke, or solely on discharge codes in our clinical trial, would have led to significant numbers of participants being misclassified with regard to having experienced an significant adverse event. Despite the differences between self-reports, hospital discharge codes, and verified events, neither the source of the event nor the level of adjudication substantially altered the relationship between treatment allocation and occurrence of either MI or stroke.

In most cases, the final diagnosis for the non-verified, self-reported MIs were related to a disorder of the heart, suggesting that miscommunication or misunderstanding between the participant and their physician led to the error. It has been suggested that the gastrointestinal side effects of calcium supplements might be misclassified as MI<sup>7</sup> but we found no evidence that this was the case. In at least 43% of non-verified cases, MI was specifically considered as a diagnosis and excluded. The most common final diagnosis for non-verified, self-reported strokes was TIA, suggesting that participants

1  
2  
3 did not understand the distinction between these two conditions. This is not surprising  
4  
5 as TIA is often described as a “mini-stroke”. In approximately one third of non-  
6  
7 verified, self-reported events (both MI and stroke), there were no details of any  
8  
9 potentially related event in the medical record. These events all occurred in people  
10  
11 who had experienced a previous verified event, suggesting that they reported the same  
12  
13 event more than once, or they reported symptoms that were similar to their primary  
14  
15 event for which they did not seek medical attention.  
16  
17  
18  
19

20  
21 There are limited published data that specifically address differences between self-  
22  
23 reported events and the medical record. A systematic review identified 15 studies that  
24  
25 assessed the accuracy of questionnaires of medical history compared with the medical  
26  
27 record.<sup>1</sup> The proportion of illnesses reported in questionnaires ranged from 30-53% of  
28  
29 those listed in the medical record. Conversely, the medical record listed 36-70% of  
30  
31 illnesses reported in questionnaires. Reporting of surgical procedures or  
32  
33 hospitalisation in questionnaires appeared to be more accurate than reporting of non-  
34  
35 surgical illness. The findings of this systematic review have been replicated in more  
36  
37 recent studies.<sup>2-8-10</sup> Further studies have addressed the accuracy of self-reported  
38  
39 cardiovascular events. For MI and stroke, approximately 70-80% of self-reported  
40  
41 events were confirmed by hospital record review,<sup>2-8-13</sup> which the authors suggested is  
42  
43 sufficiently accurate for use in research studies.<sup>8-9-11</sup> [For sub-typing of stroke, review  
44  
45 of hospital records adds useful data to self-reports and discharge coding.<sup>14</sup>](#)  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

51  
52 A comprehensive analysis of reporting of cardiovascular events that occurred during  
53  
54 the Women’s Health Initiative clinical and observational studies has been published.<sup>10</sup>  
55  
56 In these studies, local physician adjudicators reviewed self-reported data and patient  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 medical records for all self-reported cardiovascular events. The local adjudicators  
4  
5 were able to verify 68% of self-reported MIs and 72% of strokes. The local  
6  
7 adjudicators could only verify MI in 78% of events with a discharge code for MI, and  
8  
9 stroke in 81% of events with a discharge code for stroke, suggesting coding data from  
10  
11 hospital admissions may not be accurate, a finding consistent with the results of our  
12  
13 study. Finally, there was not complete agreement between local and central  
14  
15 adjudicators. 81% of locally adjudicated MIs were verified by central adjudicators,  
16  
17 and conversely 86% of centrally adjudicated MIs were classified as MI by local  
18  
19 adjudicators. The issue of unreported events was not addressed.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25 Our findings are broadly consistent with this previous research, [although it is](#)  
26  
27 [uncertain whether self-reports in response to open-ended questions in a clinical trial](#)  
28  
29 [are comparable to responses to questionnaires or medical records based on a mixture](#)  
30  
31 [of open- and closed-ended questions](#). The lower accuracy of MI self-reports in our  
32  
33 study compared with other studies might be because the participants in our trial were  
34  
35 older, had more co-morbidities, and had more cognitive impairment than participants  
36  
37 in previous studies. Another contributing factor might be that although cardiovascular  
38  
39 events were prespecified secondary endpoints, many of the participants might not  
40  
41 have been aware of this, and may have placed less value on reporting these events  
42  
43 than fractures, which were the primary endpoints of the study. [In the United](#)  
44  
45 [Kingdom, accuracy of diagnostic coding has improved substantially in recent years,](#)<sup>15</sup>  
46  
47 [although no similar data are available for New Zealand. It is possible that the](#)  
48  
49 [magnitude of differences between adjudicated events and hospital discharge coding](#)  
50  
51 [might have changed since our study was undertaken.](#)  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Inaccurate self-reports or underreporting of events would not be expected to affect the  
4  
5 results of a study unless the study treatment introduced a systematic bias that  
6  
7 produced differential rates of inaccurate self-reports or underreporting of events.  
8

9  
10 However, when the event numbers are small, as in many clinical trials, chance  
11  
12 differences can substantially impact upon the study results. In our study, the  
13  
14 adjudication process led to marked changes in the degree of statistical significance,  
15  
16 even though the relative risks of MI with calcium supplements remained elevated at  
17  
18 each stage. The relationship between calcium supplements and occurrence of MI or  
19  
20 stroke was similar regardless of whether the events were based solely on hospital  
21  
22 discharge coding or self-reports or final verified events, a finding that is supported by  
23  
24 the similar increase in vascular risk associated with calcium supplements across  
25  
26 randomised trials that used various means of event identification.<sup>16 17</sup>  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

32 A common approach in clinical trials is to adjudicate all significant adverse events  
33  
34 centrally, although the need to do this remains uncertain.<sup>18</sup> The advantages of central  
35  
36 adjudication include systematically applying the definition of an event, reducing the  
37  
38 possibility of differential misclassification of events, giving greater confidence in the  
39  
40 validity of the study results, and by including suitable triggers, potentially identifying  
41  
42 events that are missed by local investigators.<sup>18</sup> However, central adjudication is  
43  
44 unlikely to identify events that are not reported to the local investigators, adds  
45  
46 significant cost and complexity to trials, and has not been shown to improve the  
47  
48 ability to determine treatment effects in cardiovascular trials.<sup>18</sup>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

54 In summary, our results suggest that when the accuracy of an event in clinical trials is  
55  
56 critical, even for a relatively common and serious medical event such as MI or stroke,  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 self-reports cannot be relied upon and should be independently verified from the  
4  
5 medical record. However, even if independent verification occurs, our results also  
6  
7 suggest that a substantial number of events will not have been reported. For adverse  
8  
9 events of particular interest, additional steps, such as searches of hospital discharge  
10  
11 databases, should be considered to attempt to identify unreported events. Relying  
12  
13 solely on non-adjudicated hospital discharge coding will lead to similar inaccuracies  
14  
15 as using self-reported data because some events will be missed and some events will  
16  
17 be included that would not be verified by adjudication.  
18  
19

### 20 21 22 23 **Conflict of interest**

24 All authors have no conflict of interest.  
25  
26  
27

### 28 29 **Author contributions:**

30 MJB, AG, IRR designed this secondary analysis of our clinical trial. PAB and RD  
31  
32 adjudicated the events for the study. MJB and GG carried out the analyses. MJB  
33  
34 drafted the paper. All authors critically reviewed the draft and improved it. MJB is the  
35  
36 guarantor of the paper.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

### 42 43 **Data sharing**

44 Data would be made available on request.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

1. Harlow SD, Linet MS. Agreement between questionnaire data and medical records. The evidence for accuracy of recall. *Am J Epidemiol* 1989;129:233-48.
2. St Sauver JL, Hagen PT, Cha SS, Bagniewski SM, Mandrekar JN, Curoe AM, et al. Agreement between patient reports of cardiovascular disease and patient medical records. *Mayo Clin Proc* 2005;80:203-10.
3. Bolland MJ, Barber PA, Doughty RN, Mason B, Horne A, Ames R, et al. Vascular events in healthy older women receiving calcium supplementation: randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2008;336:262-6.
4. Reid IR, Mason B, Horne A, Ames R, Reid HE, Bava U, et al. Randomized controlled trial of calcium in healthy older women. *Am J Med* 2006;119:777-85.
5. Alpert JS, Thygesen K, Antman E, Bassand JP. Myocardial infarction redefined--a consensus document of The Joint European Society of Cardiology/American College of Cardiology Committee for the redefinition of myocardial infarction. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2000;36:959-69.
6. Aho K, Harmsen P, Hatano S, Marquardsen J, Smirnov VE, Strasser T. Cerebrovascular disease in the community: results of a WHO collaborative study. *Bull World Health Organ* 1980;58:113-30.
7. Lewis JR, Zhu K, Prince RL. Adverse events from calcium supplementation: relationship to errors in myocardial infarction self-reporting in randomized controlled trials of calcium supplementation. *J Bone Miner Res* 2012;27:719-22.



- 1  
2  
3 8. Bergmann MM, Byers T, Freedman DS, Mokdad A. Validity of self-reported  
4  
5 diagnoses leading to hospitalization: a comparison of self-reports with hospital  
6  
7 records in a prospective study of American adults. *Am J Epidemiol*  
8  
9 1998;147:969-77.
- 10  
11 9. Engstad T, Bonna KH, Viitanen M. Validity of self-reported stroke : The  
12  
13 Tromso Study. *Stroke* 2000;31:1602-7.
- 14  
15 10. Heckbert SR, Kooperberg C, Safford MM, Psaty BM, Hsia J, McTiernan A, et  
16  
17 al. Comparison of self-report, hospital discharge codes, and adjudication of  
18  
19 cardiovascular events in the Women's Health Initiative. *Am J Epidemiol*  
20  
21 2004;160:1152-8.
- 22  
23 11. Tretli S, Lund-Larsen PG, Foss OP. Reliability of questionnaire information  
24  
25 on cardiovascular disease and diabetes: cardiovascular disease study in  
26  
27 Finnmark county. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 1982;36:269-73.
- 28  
29 12. Yamagishi K, Ikeda A, Iso H, Inoue M, Tsugane S. Self-reported stroke and  
30  
31 myocardial infarction had adequate sensitivity in a population-based  
32  
33 prospective study JPHC (Japan Public Health Center)-based Prospective  
34  
35 Study. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008.
- 36  
37 13. Carter K, Barber PA, Shaw C. How does self-reported history of stroke  
38  
39 compare to hospitalization data in a population-based survey in New Zealand?  
40  
41 *Stroke* 2010;41:2678-80.
- 42  
43 14. Britton A, Milne B, Butler T, Sanchez-Galvez A, Shipley M, Rudd A, et al.  
44  
45 Validating self-reported strokes in a longitudinal UK cohort study (Whitehall  
46  
47 II): Extracting information from hospital medical records versus the Hospital  
48  
49 Episode Statistics database. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2012;12:83.
- 50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 15. Burns EM, Rigby E, Mamidanna R, Bottle A, Aylin P, Ziprin P, et al.  
4  
5 Systematic review of discharge coding accuracy. *J Public Health (Oxf)*  
6  
7 2012;34:138-48.  
8  
9  
10 16. Bolland MJ, Avenell A, Baron JA, Grey A, Maclellan GS, Gamble GD, et al.  
11  
12 Effect of calcium supplements on risk of myocardial infarction and  
13  
14 cardiovascular events: meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2010;341:c3691.  
15  
16 17. Bolland MJ, Grey A, Avenell A, Gamble GD, Reid IR. Calcium supplements  
17  
18 with or without vitamin D and risk of cardiovascular events: reanalysis of the  
19  
20 Women's Health Initiative limited access dataset and meta-analysis. *BMJ*  
21  
22 2011;342:d2040.  
23  
24  
25 18. Granger CB, Vogel V, Cummings SR, Held P, Fiedorek F, Lawrence M, et al.  
26  
27 Do we need to adjudicate major clinical events? *Clin Trials* 2008;5:56-60.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Table 1: Numbers of events by source and adjudication status

Source/adjudication	Myocardial infarction	Stroke
Total self-reported events	64 (45)	86 (68)
Verified self-reported events	33 (30)	50 (47)
Verified unreported events	25 (24)	13 (12)
Total verified events	58 (52)	63 (59)

Data are number of events (number of women).

Table 2: Final diagnosis from medical records for self-reported, non-verified myocardial infarctions (n=31) and strokes (n=36)

Myocardial infarction		Stroke	
Final diagnosis	N	Final diagnosis	N
Unstable angina	5	Transient ischaemic attack	6
Congestive heart failure	5	Fall	3
Angina	2	Acute confusional state	3
Sudden unexplained death	2	Sudden unexplained death	2
Atrial fibrillation	1	Benign positional vertigo	2
Palpitations	1	Dementia	2
Postural hypotension	1	Postural hypotension	1
Renal failure	1	Unsteady on feet	1
Shortness of breath cause unknown	1	Seizure	1
Myocardial infarction excluded	2	Head injury	1
No details of event in medical record	10	Blackout	1
		Vasovagal event	1
		Ischaemic retinal vein occlusion	1
		Stroke excluded	1
		No details of event in medical record	10

Table 3: Relationship between treatment allocation to calcium supplementation and risk of event by source and adjudication status

Event source and adjudication	Calcium <sup>a</sup> (N=732)	Placebo <sup>a</sup> (N=739)	Relative Risk (95% CI)	P
<b>Myocardial infarction</b>				
Total self-reported events	31	14	2.24 (1.20-4.17)	0.0099
Verified self-reported events <sup>b</sup>	21	10	2.12 (1.01-4.47)	0.047
Total hospital discharge coding	24	17	1.43 (0.77-2.63)	0.27
Total hospital discharge coding and death certificates	27	18	1.51 (0.84-2.73)	0.18
Verified self-reports/hospital discharge coding and death certificates	31	21	1.49 (0.86-2.57)	0.16
<b>Stroke</b>				
Total self-reported events	40	28	1.44 (0.90-2.31)	0.14
Verified self-reported events <sup>c</sup>	31	22	1.42 (0.83-2.43)	0.21
Total hospital discharge coding	26	20	1.31 (0.74-2.32)	0.37
Total hospital discharge coding and death certificates	27	21	1.30 (0.74-2.27)	0.38
Verified self-reports/hospital discharge coding and death certificates	34	25	1.45 (0.88-2.49)	0.15

<sup>a</sup> data are number of women experiencing an incident event

<sup>b</sup> includes 1 incident myocardial infarction identified during the verification of other events

<sup>c</sup> includes 6 incident strokes identified during the verification of transient ischaemic attacks