NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES (NIJSES)

Volume 6 Issue 1 Page 88-97, 2025

©NIJSES PUBLICATIONS
Open Access

ONLINE ISSN:2992-5819
PRINT ISSN:2992-6149

https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJSES/2025/61.889700

Identification and Measurement of Risk Factors in Epidemiological Studies: A Review

Bilkisu Usman Farouk[1,2] David Francis Olebo[3,4,5] and Mathew Chibunna Igwe[3]

[1]Department of Radiology, Kampala International University, Uganda
[2]Department of Radiology, Kaduna State University, Nigeria
[3]Department of Public Health, School of Allied Health Sciences, Kampala International University, Western Campus, Ggaba Road, Kansanga, Uganda
[4]Department of Research, KOMASE Ebenezer Research Centre, Plot 155 Kibimba, Saaka Road Fort Portal Uganda.
[5]Department of Joint Mobile Emerging Disease Interventional Clinical Capability (JMEDICC), Makerere University Walter Reed Program, Plot 42 Nakasero Road, Kampala Uganda.
Corresponding Author: Dr. Bilkisu Usman Farouk. Email: bilkisu.usman@studwc.kiu.ac.ug, +2348094614358

ABSTRACT

Risk factors, encompassing personal behaviors, lifestyles, and environmental elements, are crucial predictors of disease, injury, and mortality. In the realms of survival analysis, demography, epidemiology, and public health, identifying and measuring these factors is essential for informing healthcare practitioners and policymakers. This comprehensive study focuses on chronic diseases, which pose a significant burden on global health policy and services. We aim to systematically investigate the multifaceted risk factors associated with chronic diseases, examining their impact at the individual, group, and population levels. Through a rigorous and evidence-based approach, we will elucidate the complex relationships between risk factors and disease outcomes, providing critical insights for targeted interventions and informed decision-making. By shedding light on the intricate dynamics of risk factors and chronic diseases, this study seeks to contribute meaningfully to the development of effective strategies for mitigating the burden of chronic diseases worldwide.

Keywords: Risk factors, identification, measurement

INTRODUCTION

A risk factor is an attribute, characteristic, or exposure that is associated with an increased chance of defining an outcome [1]. Risk factors are statements of association between exposure to a particular agent and the occurrence of disease [2]. Risk factors are defined as some aspects of personal behavior, lifestyles, or the environment that are associated with an increased chance of disease, injury, or mortality. These risk factors play an important role in prediction of future health in a variety of scientific disciplines, including survival analysis, demography, epidemiology, and public health [3]. Owing to their significance, most of the research in this area is conducted in order to identify and measure these factors, essential information used by practitioners and policymakers to select individuals at high potential risk. A wide variety of risk factors are involved, which can have a profound effect at the level of the individual, the group, or the population. This review will focus especially on chronic diseases and their corresponding risk factors, which significantly impact on health policy and services worldwide. Therefore, the primary objective within the realm of public health is to strategically reduce the prevalence of risk factors, ultimately leading to a lower prevalence of diseases or even a delay in their onset. By emphasizing this crucial aspect, the aim is to revolutionize the field of public health and improve the overall well-being of individuals across the globe.

Identifying and measuring the relevant risk factors plays a crucial role in the field of public health and healthcare [3]. However, it is important to recognize that our current knowledge about these factors is still limited, and

further research is needed. The identification process itself is multifaceted and requires a deeper understanding of which individuals and populations are at risk [4]. By gaining this knowledge, we can then establish explicit public health or health care goals that effectively address these concerns. We still need to know a great deal more about how to identify and measure the relevant risk factors, as well as for whom the identification is required, before explicit public health or health care goals are set [2].

An increased level of knowledge about risk factors does not necessarily result in a logical sequence to the improvement of health status or in a soundly based and effective health intervention strategy. The purpose of public health policy is to set public health targets and policies. In this respect, identification and measurement of risk factors indicate their necessary inclusion in public health policy. Both the identification and interventions are based on evidence, usually research evidence [5]. More specifically, this concept is used to help in developing a comprehensive understanding of the causes of a problem or a particular health-related event or outcome [6].

The primary purpose of public health policy is to establish clear targets and policies that address the well-being of the general population. To accomplish this, it is imperative to incorporate the identification and measurement of risk factors into the policy-making process [4]. These risk factors serve as indicators, highlighting areas that require particular attention and intervention within public health initiatives. By considering these factors, we can implement targeted strategies aimed at mitigating the associated risks and promoting overall health and well-being [7].

Both the identification and intervention processes primarily rely on evidence, particularly research evidence. This ensures that the decisions made and approaches taken are well-informed and backed by scientific rigor. Through comprehensive studies, we can identify various attributes, characteristics, or exposures that are associated with an increased likelihood of defining a specific health outcome. This concept of risk factors aids in our holistic understanding of the root causes behind problems or health-related events. By recognizing and studying these factors, we can formulate effective strategies that address the underlying issues and prevent future occurrences. This review will identify various attributes, characteristics, or exposures that are associated with an increased likelihood of health outcomes.

METHODOLOGY

Relevant journal articles were identified via online database search engines such as PubMed, Scopus, Springer and ScienceDirect. Articles published in English language from 2004 to 2024 (20 years) were reviewed. Key words used for the search were Identification of risk factors and measurement of risk factors. A total of 16 articles were reviewed.

Types of Risk Factors

Risk factor has been defined as 'an aspect of personal behavior, lifestyle, or environmental conditions that, alone or in synergy with other risk factors, increases the incidence of disease and injury.' [8]. There are several types of risk factors. They include:

Steerable (behavioral) risk factors, e.g., tobacco use, poor diet, sedentary behavior, and physical inactivity. That is, some risk factors are caused by people's behavior and may be modifiable. These risk factors, stemming from individuals' choices and actions, can significantly impact their overall health and well-being. By making conscious decisions to eliminate or modify unhealthy behaviors such as smoking, consuming nutritious meals, engaging in regular physical activity, and reducing sedentary habits, individuals can effectively decrease their risk of developing Various diseases and injuries.

Environmental risk factors, e.g., work environment, housing, transportation, and exposure to toxic substances. The environmental risk factors over which individuals have little control are described as 'public health' problems [9]. Environmental risk factors play a pivotal role in shaping an individual's health outcomes. Factors such as the working environment, quality of housing, accessibility of transportation, and exposure to toxic substances can significantly impact one's overall health. These factors, often beyond individual control, pose challenges to public health and require collective action to address and mitigate their detrimental effects. Agentic risk factors, e.g., risky behavior in sexual activity. These are behaviors that are related to personal agency and are also largely modifiable. Agentic risk factors pertain to behaviors that individuals engage in, particularly in the context of sexual activity, that may increase their vulnerability to certain health conditions. Engaging in risky sexual behaviors, such as unprotected sexual intercourse or having multiple sexual partners, can heighten the risk of contracting sexually transmitted infections or experiencing unintended pregnancies. Recognizing these agentic risk factors and actively working towards modifying them can significantly contribute to improving individuals' sexual health outcomes. Non-agentic (socio-demographic) risk factors, e.g., age, sex, occupational status, genetic predisposition, and ethnicity [10]. Some of these are also termed background variables, including sex, race/ethnicity, and socioeconomic status. Socio-demographic risk factors are not behaviors, but they are associated with and influence people's behaviors or are also causes of these behaviors. Non-agentic risk factors encompass various characteristics that individuals possess, such as their age, sex, occupational status, genetic predispositions, and ethnicity. While these factors may not be directly modifiable, they can influence and shape individuals' behaviors and lifestyles,

which ultimately impact their health outcomes. Understanding the role that socio-demographic risk factors play in shaping behaviors is crucial in tailoring effective interventions and strategies to promote overall well-being.

Risk factors may also be classified as modifiable (those that can be changed) or non-modifiable (those that cannot be changed). Environmental/contextual determinants develop over time and include social and economic inequalities, income, work environment, housing, access to services, and recreational opportunities [10]. Modifiable risk factors refer to those aspects of personal behavior, lifestyle, or environmental conditions that can be modified or altered through conscious efforts and interventions. On the other hand, non-modifiable risk factors are inherent characteristics or circumstances that individuals cannot change. These non-modifiable factors are often deeply rooted in social and economic inequalities, income disparities, work environments, access to services, and recreational opportunities. Identifying and addressing these environmental and contextual determinants are crucial in creating supportive environments that promote positive health outcomes for all individuals.

Risk factors are closely linked to one another via causative associations of factors with diseases. Cigarette smoking is one of the behavioral risk factors for heart disease. The risk for developing heart disease, such as smoking and hypertension, does not act as an additive effect. Such biomedical risk factors affect each other as multiple rather than dual risks. Risk factors rarely act in isolation. Instead, they often interact and synergistically contribute to the development of diseases and health conditions. For instance, smoking and hypertension, both recognized as major risk factors for heart disease, do not simply add up to increase the risk but rather interact and compound each other's effects. Acknowledging the complex interplay between multiple risk factors is crucial in developing comprehensive strategies for disease prevention and health promotion.

Risk factors are important because they affect the likelihood and severity of a disease or illness. Risk factors are interrelated, and their effects are cumulative. The process of behavior change can be more complex than the identification of risk factors. Recognizing the presence and significance of risk factors is essential in understanding the likelihood and severity of developing certain diseases or illnesses. Moreover, it is crucial to acknowledge that risk factors are interconnected and have cumulative effects on an individual's health. Addressing these risk factors requires a multifaceted approach that considers the complexity of behavior change and the broader determinants of health. By implementing comprehensive interventions that target multiple risk factors simultaneously, individuals can effectively reduce their overall disease burden and improve their overall well-being.

The purpose of identifying risk factors is to understand their relationship with disease and possible predictors of future trends in disease. In this way, it may be possible to promote risk reduction and health. Identifying and studying risk factors serves a critical purpose in unraveling the intricate relationships between these factors and various diseases. By gaining a deeper understanding of the associations between risk factors and diseases, it becomes possible to identify potential predictors of future disease trends and develop targeted interventions that promote risk reduction and enhance overall health. In the future, information about these risk factors for human beings could be used to help improve the environment in which they live, work, and play. These classifications can be useful for measurement because socio-demographic determinants are related to behaviors, knowledge, and physical resources where they can be more easily measured. Capitalizing on the knowledge and information gathered about these risk factors holds the potential to drive positive change in the environments where individuals live, work, and engage in recreational activities [4]. By leveraging these risk factor classifications, policymakers and public health professionals can measure the impact of socio-demographic determinants on behaviors, knowledge, and access to physical resources [10]. This measurement can further inform targeted interventions and policies aimed at improving overall health outcomes and fostering supportive environments.

Risk factors, therefore, encompass various aspects of personal behavior, lifestyle, and environmental conditions that significantly impact the incidence of disease and injury. These risk factors can be steerable (behavioral), environmental, agentic, or non-agentic (socio-demographic). While some risk factors can be modified through conscious choices and interventions, others may be deeply rooted in individual characteristics or circumstances. Understanding the interplay between these risk factors, their cumulative effects, and their association with diseases is crucial in developing effective strategies for promoting health and reducing the burden of diseases. By recognizing the significance of risk factors, studying their relationships with diseases, and implementing comprehensive interventions, individuals and communities can strive towards healthier lives and improved overall well-being.

Importance of Identifying and Measuring Risk Factors

Risk factors should be identified and measured early in the chain of events of diseases to allow preventive interventions to be timely and effective. It is important to ensure that risk factors are accurately and precisely measured to the required degree for effective prevention. This accurate measurement enables us to assess the impact of removing or reducing the risk on public health. Additionally, it is necessary to consider the combined effect of different combinations of risk factors, as they may have an additive effect on the chances of a particular outcome. With knowledge of relevant risk factors, it becomes possible to predict the overall chances of disease. Furthermore, the identification and measurement of important risk factors facilitate further investigation into less

well-understood causes of disease. By assessing causes and quantitatively measuring the extent of disease risk in specific sections of the population, we can effectively plan and implement strategies to prevent or control disease. These strategies are applicable to any health or social service, regardless of the geographical location or community context.

The opportunity to modify the risk of disease by modifying risk factors has important epidemiologic implications. For a preventive program to be formulated and resources distributed, the natural history of a disease, and particularly the etiologic characteristics involved, need to be understood. Risk factors, as determinants of diseases, therefore assume importance when it is acknowledged that preventive programs that prioritize are essential. Identification and quantification of risk also imply a way of affecting society, in so far as fair, equitable, and efficient use of health and social services depends on fair analysis of society's possibilities and needs. Clearly, diseases and their risk factors are determined by rules of human adaptation to the environment – both non-modifiable factors of time, age, sex, and place, and modifiable effector determinants like lifestyle and some aspects of work. As lifestyles and the environment change continually, so does the incidence and prevalence of various diseases. Efforts to understand the interaction between them are therefore continuous. The specialist nature of risk factor research increases, especially as more is learned about how society is related, via its organizational structures, to individual characteristics and their threats or benefits to health. In general, therefore, the belief that diseases and their determinants may be preventable increases interest in risk factors.

Methods of Identifying Risk Factors

A wide range of methodologies are applied in the field of risk factors in health research. Selecting the appropriate method depends on the goals and context of any given research question. Observational studies are the main tools for the identification of risk factors. Particularly, epidemiological studies are likely to help in delineating population trends with respect to risks for health in different parts of the world, identifying trends and allowing planning of interventions. They are also instrumental in understanding the natural history of etiology, detection, and outcome of disease; determining which risk factors are more important and in which groups; deciding which intragroup characteristics would be more crucial in relation to the prevention of that outcome, and evaluating how effective treatment is, once it does occur or is encouraged to occur. It is important to note that while observational studies can identify that there are differences in the incidence of a health outcome with exposure or non-exposure to a lifestyle factor, they cannot conclude or argue causality [11]. A clinical trial is a study primarily concerned with the effects of one factor or a group of factors taken together. It usually proceeds by giving two or more treatments to patients to understand the effect of manipulation on one variable while keeping all other variables as far as is humanly possible fixed between the two or more groups. If the groups are 'comparable' at the start, any differences in the outcome can be ascribed to the intervention of the study and no other factor [11]. In as far as all confounders are addressed in the trial, a causal association between the intervention and the outcome is warranted. It is from such studies that countries primarily gain approval to allow drugs on their markets as drugs are inadequate but have proven benefits.

Epidemiological Studies

One primary method for identifying risk factors is to conduct epidemiological research. There are several types of epidemiological research studies, including cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies [11]. Nuances in study design and methods can greatly enhance the weight one attributes to the study findings, thereby providing more comprehensive insights into potential risk factors. Although the magnitude of association can be estimated in an epidemiological study, causality is not directly demonstrated in this research methodology, as there may be confounding variables at play. Consequently, case series are qualitatively and quantitatively limited in their robustness, requiring careful interpretation of the results. Despite these acknowledged limitations and concerns, epidemiology stands as one of the two primary research methodologies used to uncover relationships between risk factors and health events in populations, playing a crucial role in public health. The distinction between the two primary research methodologies used in quality and patient safety research lies in the fact that RQI (Research Quality Improvement) focuses primarily on discovering associations rather than causation. Thus, special attention should be paid to sample selection, data collection, and statistical power, among other vital procedures, in order to minimize the risk of systematic error and ensure the validity of the research findings.

Researchers use at least two methods to evaluate potential associations between members of the general population who have developed an illness or condition and one or more specific values of the risk factor. The comparison is made between individuals affected by the condition and those unaffected, taking into account various factors such as the level of interest and significance. Systematic reviews, which provide comprehensive information, shed light on the association between one or more risk factors and the selected health outcome. Additionally, they can address questions relating to the direction and strength of causality or the probability of developing causality along with the strength of association. These robust findings enable the identification of subgroups within the population who are at a higher risk, which can then be targeted for early intervention. As a result, individuals in these high-risk subgroups may require more rigorous monitoring by their primary care

physicians. This approach aims to detect latent diseases at an earlier stage when they are more manageable and treatable, ultimately leading to improved outcomes and better overall health for these individuals.

Clinical Trials

The gold standard method to identify and evaluate risk factors is the randomized controlled trial, also known as a clinical trial. Clinical trials are conducted in a controlled setting with known conditions, clearly defined inclusion and exclusion criteria, and a well-defined comparator [12]. Clinical trials have two arms (with 'no treatment' as an exception) and can be conducted on, for example, participants, healthy volunteers, or communities. In general, clinical trials consist of a set of phases [12].

In a phase I trial, a new treatment is tested on a small group of 20–80 participants in an attempt to evaluate safety issues; this phase generally lasts several months. The purpose of this phase is to gather preliminary data and assess the treatment's dosage, side effects, and overall safety. By including a smaller number of participants, researchers can closely monitor and analyze the impact of the treatment on individuals.

In a phase II trial, the new treatment is evaluated in a larger group and is given to no more than 300 people. This phase can last several months to two years. Here, the treatment's effectiveness begins to be examined, while its safety is also further evaluated. The main objective of phase II trials is to determine the appropriate dosage and closely monitor any potential adverse reactions. Through a larger sample size, researchers can gather more comprehensive data on the treatment's efficacy and potential benefits.

The length of a phase III trial can vary from several years to up to 10 years. In this phase, the new treatment has been evaluated as at least as effective and safe as the standard of care. Phase III trials involve a significantly larger number of participants, often ranging from hundreds to thousands. These trials aim to establish the treatment's long-term effectiveness, compare it to existing standard treatments, and monitor any potential rare side effects that may occur over a longer duration. Since phase III trials require a larger time commitment and extensive data collection, they ensure robust and reliable conclusions about the treatment's benefits and risks. Apart from the main phases, clinical trials may also include additional exploratory phases such as phase IV. Phase IV trials are conducted after a treatment has been approved and is available to the general population, allowing researchers to monitor its performance and safety on a larger scale. Moreover, adaptive clinical trials, which incorporate flexibility in their design and methodology, are becoming increasingly popular due to their ability to adapt to new information and optimize results. Overall, clinical trials are an essential part of the research and development process in modern medicine. They provide a systematic approach to determine the safety, effectiveness, and potential risks of new treatments, ultimately improving healthcare outcomes for individuals and communities worldwide. While many observational studies are aimed at determining risk factors, a key advantage of clinical trials is that they provide a much sounder basis for causality determination and for evaluating the effectiveness of interventions targeting risk factors. They offer more opportunities to reduce biases as they are designed to prevent exposure misclassification through, for instance, randomization. All clinical trials should comply with the ethical principles in the Declaration of Helsinki, which states that the well-being of the trial subjects, preventive treatment for patients, and informed consent are the most important criteria of clinical trial ethics. Some of the large, landmark studies were developed decades ago, and their potential ethical problems are often innate to the period in which they took place. Officially, all clinical trials should be approved by an ethical committee, which evaluates the trial plan. Clinical trials and observational cohorts are inextricably related to each other in that the results of the former play a critical role in describing the associations between risk factors and diseases. Conversely, the results from cohort studies may be the impetus for specific interventions to be evaluated in clinical trials. It is crucial to recognize that clinical trials not only provide valuable insights into disease prevention and treatment, but they also contribute to the global understanding of healthcare practices. Through the rigorous monitoring and evaluation of drug efficacy and safety, international health organizations can make informed decisions regarding the approval, distribution, and regulation of medicines. The significance of post-marketing surveillance cannot be overstated, as it allows for the detection of rare or long-term adverse effects that may not have been identified during the initial phases of drug development. This ongoing assessment of a drug's real-world performance is paramount in ensuring the safety and well-being of patients worldwide. Furthermore, the role of clinical trials extends beyond the realm of pharmaceuticals. They serve as a crucial platform for assessing the effectiveness of various medical interventions, such as surgical procedures or behavioral therapies. By systematically collecting and analyzing data from diverse patient populations, clinical trials facilitate evidence-based medicine and contribute to the advancement of healthcare practices. However, it is essential to approach clinical trials with the utmost ethical considerations. The rights and welfare of trial subjects should always take precedence, and informed consent should be obtained in a transparent and comprehensive manner [12]. Additionally, ethical committees play a vital role in safeguarding the interests of trial participants and ensuring that research protocols adhere to established ethical guidelines. As medical knowledge continues to evolve, the importance of clinical trials and their integration with observational cohorts will remain indispensable in advancing our understanding of diseases and optimizing patient care. Through the interplay of rigorous scientific

methodologies and ethical principles, clinical trials continue to shape the future of medicine, paving the way for improved diagnoses, treatments, and ultimately, better health outcomes for individuals and communities worldwide.

Quantitative Measurement of Risk Factors

Risk factors for loss of health can be either quantitative or qualitative. With respect to quantitatively measured risk factors, these risk factors are associated with the development of the health outcome under investigation. In health research, many specific statistical concepts can be used to measure the risk factors; the most commonly used are relative risk and odds ratio for comparison, and the excess fraction and the slope index of inequality for public health research [13].

The main purpose of the analysis is to determine the significance of certain risks or a set of risks in relation to the outcome. It is through numbers that we can measure the strength of the association between these risks and the outcome. Once the numeric value surpasses the threshold for causation, we can classify the variable as a risk factor, which then presents opportunities for intervention. In the field of public health research, measuring the excess fraction has proven to be of great importance in shaping policies and political decisions. By studying and describing the impact of risk factors on the overall health of populations, we are able to understand the burden of disease that is both compulsory and unjust. This understanding enables us to direct interventions towards policy and practice that prioritize public health. Through assessing the effect sizes, we can develop evidence-based public health policies, strategies, and programs. It is essential to rely on reliable numbers and up-to-date information, which necessitates the use of statistically sound estimation methods and proper study designs. Statistical software plays a crucial role in ensuring the accuracy of our estimates.

When considering the precision of estimates, it is important to account for the inherent variability in both factual demographics and human nature. By calculating a sample size that far exceeds the minimum requirement, we can positively influence the accuracy of our results. This robustness in statistical methodology strengthens the credibility of our findings and their interpretation. As a result, we can confidently consider our conclusions to be valid and reliable, providing a certain level of security in the knowledge we contribute to the field of public health research.

Relative Risk and Odds Ratio

One of the most commonly used measures to explain the connection between exposure status and the occurrence of an outcome is the relative risk, also known as the risk ratio, successive ratio, or incidence ratio. This remarkable measure grants us valuable insights into the magnitude of the risk associated with developing a particular disorder or symptom of interest, such as lung cancer, stroke, or even mortality. By comparing two distinct groups or types of cases, often in the form of a ratio, we can gain a deeper understanding of the relationship at hand. When the numerator of this ratio pertains to the exposed group and the denominator refers to another group, we can discern the risk—typically incidence—associated with the likelihood of the outcome transpiring within a specified timeframe [13].

Using a hypothetical 2x2 contingency table of cases, controls and exposures as below [13]:

Table 1

	Cases	Controls	Total
Exposure	A	b	a+b
Non exposure	C	d	c+d
Total	a+c	b+d	a+b+c+d

Relative risk may be calculated as the ratio of a/a+b to c/c+d [13]

A relative risk of 1.0 suggests that the incidence of a condition under investigation in the exposed and comparison groups is equal, signifying no relationship between any of the factors. If the relative risk is higher than 1.0, the incidence in the exposed group is increased, probably owing to the presence of the risk factor; if the score is lower than 1.0, there is a reduction in the incidence of the condition in the exposed group relative to the unexposed group [14]. Thus, relative risk refers to the extent of the difference, and the development of health guidance and the public health significance of these differences and similarities are dependent on absolute and relative risks.

With the odds ratio and its confidence interval, clinicians and policy makers can compare the two treatments and concentrations on equal terms [14]. Use of the odds ratio will provide a single result, not sub-analysis, from which to draw conclusions in these instances. The public can readily understand the meaning of the increase in the reduction in risk.

Odds ratio is a measure of how strongly an event is associated with exposure [14]. It helps to show how likely an exposure will lead to an outcome. It's a ratio of two odds; the odds of the outcome occurring in the exposed group and the odds of the outcome occurring in the unexposed group.

It can be calculated using the formula (a/b:c/d= ad/bc) using the above hypothetical table [13]

Knowing whether and how much a treatment reduces risk is also of interest in situations in which the control's exposure has more to do with chance rather than a causal association. Misinterpretation of the absolute risk reduction from exposure not under control can lead to serious side effects.
Furthermore, understanding the extent to which a treatment diminishes the risk is crucial when the control's exposure is influenced more by chance rather than a causal association. It is imperative to beware of misinterpreting the absolute risk reduction arising from exposure that is not under control, as this can lead to severe side effects with grave consequences.

Attributable Risk

Ordinarily, when undertaking the process of estimating the etiology of a particular disease, it is essential to also encompass a comprehensive elucidation of the role played by all disease incidences that are directly associated with well-established risk factors. This crucial aspect of disease analysis holds immense practical significance, primarily due to the fact that the successful implementation of preventive and curative measures among the various variables within a given population necessitates the establishment of a prioritization hierarchy. This hierarchical framework aids in determining the diseases that exert the most substantial impact on overall health. There are multiple ways to measure the association between risk factors and health endpoints/diseases. Among these methods, three stand out: the relative risk, risk difference, and attributable risk. Each of these concepts provides valuable insights into the relationship between risk factors and the development of diseases. The risk difference calculates the absolute change in disease incidence associated with a particular risk factor. It focuses on the disparity in disease occurrence between those exposed to the risk factor and those not exposed to it. The attributable risk also assesses the proportion of disease incidence that can be attributed to a specific or a group of risk factors. By understanding this proportion, interventions can be effectively targeted to reduce the risk associated with these factors.
It is the difference in incidence rates between the exposed and the unexposed groups given as: AR= a/(a+b) - c/(c+d) [15]
When designing interventions to decrease the risk of these factors, the goal is to synthesize both the baseline risk and the basic level of the relative risk stemming from the combination of these upstream interventions. This integrated approach considers the probability of exposure among different groups and aims to change the risk landscape effectively. By implementing these interventions, policymakers can bridge the gap between health research on exposure and disease and translate it into meaningful health policies. This translation is crucial as it helps in guiding strategies that effectively mitigate the impact of risk factors on public health [5].
Understanding and estimating the attributable risk of a disease can have important practical implications in terms of resource allocation. Public health interventions, including research, surveillance, and educational and social policy components, include choices both about scope and about a division of priority and resources. Major issues and resources must ultimately be distributed according to potential to reduce illness. Most studies evaluating risk factors only describe the proportional effect that the risk factor has on the development of certain diseases. Several studies associated the impact of certain diseases on certain groups of individuals. Such distributions may suggest that the amount of disease reduction likely through intervention on such groups would be greater among those with problems as opposed to those without problems. Lastly, some studies have attempted to assess the extent to which the development of certain diseases are dependent events in individuals' lives. In this instance, the determination of the population attributable fraction for an explanatory setting becomes paramount. This demonstrates the calculation and interpretation of the population attributable risk (PAR). This is the percentage of an incidence rate in the overall population that can be attributed to the risk factor given by the formula below: [15]
PAR % = [((a+c) / N) – (c/(c+d))] / ((a+c) / N) x 100
N= general population
It also illustrates that the PAR is a qualitative measure which emphasizes population-level readiness and provides information that comparison measures cannot. By emphasizing dependent events, the PAR emphasizes that the prevalence of one event has some effect on the occurrence of a second event.

Challenges and Limitations in Risk Factor Identification

There are some limitations to identifying associations between causes and health outcomes, including that many factors can interact and there can be greater complexity in understanding them. In general, some key factors include accurately measuring the risk factor, ensuring all decisions are methodologically accurate and bias-free, and promoting scientific inquiry in public health.
The identification of risk factors has many limitations, especially scientific limitations. The main challenge in identifying risk factors is to measure exposure accurately. Furthermore, other factors could affect the identified relationship or produce bias.
Risk factors are measured separately from other variables, including moderators and moderating variables, or confounders [16]. It is important to remember that cholesterol levels, for example, height and age, are associated

with diet. Also, risky health behaviors, environmental factors, and genetics each contribute to many health conditions.

Risk factors' identification and measurement remain difficult to point out and do not shed light on effective solutions and alternative paradigms or models for causes.

It is difficult to identify risk factors because they are related to multiple factors and to the presence or absence of an event. Several alternative methods to the risk factor identification model have been proposed to explore alternative cause models. Bivariate analyses regarding theories of social, economic, and labor determinants, including the fundamental determinants of social, with the level of inequality in the social structures that have contributed to fundamental cause theory.

Challenges with identifying a risk factor have resulted in two strategies for identifying a cause of the exposure and the probability of a negative individual outcome. Note that these outcomes are not mutually exclusive. This means that risk factors are inadequate in terms that phenomena may result from a point-in-time accumulation or reservoir of physical, physiological, and psychological exposures.

Confounding Variables

The identification of risk factors may seem relatively straightforward: all we need are significant associations between the occurrence of events and the presence of suspected risk factors. In practice, however, the determination of whether or not risk factors or causal associations are present can be complicated by extraneous factors, such as confounding variables. Such variables can systematically distort the results of an otherwise valid study. For example, a study of students who were not granted a postsecondary degree because of poor health might reach the mistaken conclusion that poor health is a risk factor for dropping out of school; when, in fact, the confounding variable of being granted a postponement of postsecondary schooling because of being in poor health was the true factor of importance. Furthermore, it is essential to consider the broader context in which these risk factors operate. Factors such as socioeconomic status, access to healthcare, and cultural norms can significantly impact the occurrence of certain events and the presence of suspected risk factors. Ignoring these contextual factors in the analysis of risk could lead to incomplete or erroneous conclusions. There are several ways to deal with confounding variables. Some of these are: i) to perform matching of study and control subjects such that the confounding variable is effectively equivalent in the two groups with the exception of the independent variable [16]; ii) to use stratification accordingly; and iii) to use statistical control techniques such as analysis of covariance or multiple regression analysis, to partially account for the confounding variables present in the study [14]. By accounting for various factors simultaneously, researchers can enhance the validity and reliability of their findings. Failure to control for confounding variables may result in a conclusion that diseased and non-diseased individuals are equally likely to be exposed, when the reality might be quite different. The result of such poor control is that we become unsure about the existence and direction of possible causative agents in a given study, to the degree that our risk factor identification may amount to idle guessing in some cases.

Moreover, it is crucial to acknowledge that risk factors are not static and can evolve over time. With advances in medical knowledge, societal changes, and technological progress, the understanding of risk factors continuously evolves. As new evidence emerges, previously identified risk factors may be reassessed, new associations may be discovered, and existing knowledge may be revised. Therefore, it is important for researchers and policymakers to remain vigilant and up-to-date in their understanding of risk factors to inform effective preventive measures and interventions.

Bias in Study Design

There are several challenges to the identification of risk factors for a disease. An underlying problem in the search and identification is the risk of bias in the study design. Evidence with research designs that are quasi-experimental or experimental is solid only if the research process adheres to the study protocol with a low risk of other than random error. Many types of bias are shown. Some of the traditional types of bias are inherent in the study design phase, such as selection bias, information bias, and publication bias. This type of bias modifies the associations found due to individuals with certain characteristics being more likely to be selected in the study or to participate in follow-up activities. Another type of bias indicates that financial compensation has been rewarded for certain results. All of these biases result in reduced external or internal validity of the study. It may also dilute effects and make it difficult to prove associations or to show a lack of association for interventions. If environmental or occupational exposure and individuals are selected due to the suspicion built on a completed case, this type of bias is usually referred to as referral bias, lead-time bias, aura bias, or suspicion bias. It is essential to perform data analyses for bias estimation using these tools. For effectiveness, the data should run through the identical cluster of biases as the original studied cohort. The lack of acknowledgment of the multitude of biases may result in the implementation of ineffective interventions at best, and there may be harmful effects from implementing cost-ineffective and possibly harmful interventions if the biases are ignored and an association is found where none exists.

CONCLUSION

The identification and measurement of risk factors are crucial in understanding the likelihood and severity of diseases and health outcomes. Risk factors, encompassing personal behaviors, lifestyles, and environmental elements, play a significant role in predicting disease, injury, and mortality. By recognizing and studying these factors, healthcare professionals and policymakers can develop targeted interventions and informed decisions to mitigate the associated risks and promote overall well-being. The measurement of risk factors is complex and multifaceted, involving various methodologies, including observational studies, clinical trials, and quantitative measurements. Epidemiological studies, such as cohort, case-control, and cross-sectional studies, provide valuable insights into the associations between risk factors and health outcomes. Clinical trials, on the other hand, offer a more robust basis for causality determination and intervention evaluation. Quantitative measurements, including relative risk, odds ratio, and attributable risk, enable the assessment of the strength and significance of risk factor associations. However, challenges and limitations exist in risk factor identification, including confounding variables, bias in study design, and the complexity of interactions between multiple factors. To overcome these challenges, it is essential to consider the broader context in which risk factors operate, including socioeconomic status, access to healthcare, and cultural norms. Researchers and policymakers must remain vigilant and up-to-date in their understanding of risk factors to inform effective preventive measures and interventions. By acknowledging the complexities and limitations of risk factor identification, we can strive towards developing more effective strategies for promoting public health and reducing the burden of diseases worldwide.

Acknowledgments

We would like to express our gratitude to Kampala International University for providing a platform. Special appreciation goes to the researchers whose work contributed to the foundation of this review.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

The authors declare no conflict of interest related to the publication of this review and there is no funding from any agency.

REFERENCES

1. Dovjak, M., & Kukec, A. (2019). Identification of Health Risk Factors and Their Parameters. In *Creating Healthy and Sustainable Buildings* (pp. 83–120). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-19412-3_3
2. Ian McDowell. (2008). From risk factors to explanation in public health. *Journal of Public Health*, *30*(4), 517–517. https://doi.org/10.1093/pubmed/fdn096
3. Zhou, F., Yu, T., Du, R., Fan, G., Liu, Y., Liu, Z., Xiang, J., Wang, Y., Song, B., Gu, X., Guan, L., Wei, Y., Li, H., Wu, X., Xu, J., Tu, S., Zhang, Y., Chen, H., & Cao, B. (2020). Clinical course and risk factors for mortality of adult inpatients with COVID-19 in Wuhan, China: a retrospective cohort study. *The Lancet*, *395*(10229), 1054–1062. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30566-3
4. Murray, C. J. L., Aravkin, A. Y., Zheng, P., Abbafati, C., Abbas, K. M., Abbasi-Kangevari, M., Abd-Allah, F., Abdelalim, A., Abdollahi, M., Abdollahpour, I., Abegaz, K. H., Abolhassani, H., Aboyans, V., Abreu, L. G., Abrigo, M. R. M., Abualhasan, A., Abu-Raddad, L. J., Abushouk, A. I., Adabi, M., … Lim, S. S. (2020). Global burden of 87 risk factors in 204 countries and territories, 1990–2019: a systematic analysis for the Global Burden of Disease Study 2019. *The Lancet*, *396*(10258), 1223–1249. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(20)30752-2
5. Abu-Odah, H., Said, N. B., Nair, S. C., Allsop, M. J., Currow, D. C., Salah, M. S., Hamad, B. A., Elessi, K., Alkhatib, A., ElMokhallalati, Y., Bayuo, J., & AlKhaldi, M. (2022). Identifying barriers and facilitators of translating research evidence into clinical practice: A systematic review of reviews. *Health & Social Care in the Community*, *30*(6). https://doi.org/10.1111/hsc.13898
6. Sudlow, C., Gallacher, J., Allen, N., Beral, V., Burton, P., Danesh, J., Downey, P., Elliott, P., Green, J., Landray, M., Liu, B., Matthews, P., Ong, G., Pell, J., Silman, A., Young, A., Sprosen, T., Peakman, T., & Collins, R. (2015). UK Biobank: An Open Access Resource for Identifying the Causes of a Wide Range of Complex Diseases of Middle and Old Age. *PLOS Medicine*, *12*(3), e1001779. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001779
7. Alkhalifa, A. E., Al-Ghraiybah, N. F., Odum, J., Shunnarah, J. G., Austin, N., & Kaddoumi, A. (2023). Blood–Brain Barrier Breakdown in Alzheimer's Disease: Mechanisms and Targeted Strategies. In *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* (Vol. 24, Issue 22). Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms242216288
8. Wu, C., Chen, X., Cai, Y., Xia, J., Zhou, X., Xu, S., Huang, H., Zhang, L., Zhou, X., Du, C., Zhang, Y., Song, J., Wang, S., Chao, Y., Yang, Z., Xu, J., Zhou, X., Chen, D., Xiong, W., … Song, Y. (2020). Risk Factors Associated with Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome and Death in Patients with Coronavirus Disease

2019 Pneumonia in Wuhan, China. *JAMA Internal Medicine*, *180*(7), 934. https://doi.org/10.1001/jamainternmed.2020.0994
9. Huang, M., Bargues-Carot, A., Riaz, Z., Wickham, H., Zenitsky, G., Jin, H., Anantharam, V., Kanthasamy, A., & Kanthasamy, A. G. (2022). Impact of Environmental Risk Factors on Mitochondrial Dysfunction, Neuroinflammation, Protein Misfolding, and Oxidative Stress in the Etiopathogenesis of Parkinson's Disease. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*, *23*(18), 10808. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms231810808
10. Moses, B., & Igwe, M. C. (2024). Social Economic Determinants of Health and Health Disparities in Uganda. *Scholars Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, *11*(05), 155–164. https://doi.org/10.36347/sjebm.2024.v11i05.001
11. Kim, S. (2023). Overview of clinical study designs. *Clinical and Experimental Emergency Medicine*, *11*(1), 33–42. https://doi.org/10.15441/ceem.23.036
12. Chan, A.-W., Tetzlaff, J. M., Altman, D. G., Laupacis, A., Gøtzsche, P. C., Krleža-Jerić, K., Hróbjartsson, A., Mann, H., Dickersin, K., Berlin, J. A., Doré, C. J., Parulekar, W. R., Summerskill, W. S. M., Groves, T., Schulz, K. F., Sox, H. C., Rockhold, F. W., Rennie, D., & Moher, D. (2013). SPIRIT 2013 Statement: Defining Standard Protocol Items for Clinical Trials. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, *158*(3), 200. https://doi.org/10.7326/0003-4819-158-3-201302050-00583
13. Dey, T., Mukherjee, A., & Chakraborty, S. (2020). A Practical Overview of Case-Control Studies in Clinical Practice. *Chest*, *158*(1), S57–S64. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chest.2020.03.009
14. Suresh, K., Thomas, S., & Suresh, G. (2011). Design, data analysis and sampling techniques for clinical research. *Annals of Indian Academy of Neurology*, *14*(4), 287. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-2327.91951
15. Thomas, S., Suresh, K., & Suresh, G. (2013). Design and data analysis case-controlled study in clinical research. *Annals of Indian Academy of Neurology*, *16*(4), 483. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-2327.120429
16. Iwagami, M., & Shinozaki, T. (2022). Introduction to Matching in Case-Control and Cohort Studies. *Annals of Clinical Epidemiology*, *4*(2), 22005. https://doi.org/10.37737/ace.22005

CITE AS: Bilkisu Usman Farouk, David Francis Olebo and Mathew Chibunna Igwe (2025). Identification and Measurement of Risk Factors in Epidemiological Studies: A Review. NEWPORT INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SCIENTIFIC AND EXPERIMENTAL SCIENCES 6(1):88-97 https://doi.org/10.59298/NIJSES/2025/61.889700