COHORT STUDIES PRACTICE TEST (SAMPLE)

STUDY GUIDE

SAMPLE STUDY GUIDE WITH LIMITED QUESTIONS

VISIT US ONLINE FOR THE FULL VERSION STUDY GUIDE

https://cohortstudies.examzify.com

Table of Contents

Introduction

Preparing for a certification exam can feel overwhelming, but with the right tools, it becomes an opportunity to build confidence, sharpen your skills, and move one step closer to your goals. At Examzify, we believe that effective exam preparation isn't just about memorization, it's about understanding the material, identifying knowledge gaps, and building the test-taking strategies that lead to success.

This guide was designed to help you do exactly that.

Whether you're preparing for a licensing exam, professional certification, or entry-level qualification, this book offers structured practice to reinforce key concepts. You'll find a wide range of multiple-choice questions, each followed by clear explanations to help you understand not just the right answer, but why it's correct.

The content in this guide is based on real-world exam objectives and aligned with the types of questions and topics commonly found on official tests. It's ideal for learners who want to:

- Practice answering questions under realistic conditions,
- Improve accuracy and speed,
- Review explanations to strengthen weak areas, and
- Approach the exam with greater confidence.

We recommend using this book not as a stand-alone study tool, but alongside other resources like flashcards, textbooks, or hands-on training. For best results, we recommend working through each question, reflecting on the explanation provided, and revisiting the topics that challenge you most.

Remember: successful test preparation isn't about getting every question right the first time, it's about learning from your mistakes and improving over time. Stay focused, trust the process, and know that every page you turn brings you closer to success.

Let's begin.

How to Use This Guide

This guide is designed to help you study more effectively and approach your exam with confidence. Whether you're reviewing for the first time or doing a final refresh, here's how to get the most out of your Examzify study guide:

1. Start with a Diagnostic Review

Skim through the questions to get a sense of what you know and what you need to focus on. Your goal is to identify knowledge gaps early.

2. Study in Short, Focused Sessions

Break your study time into manageable blocks (e.g. 30 – 45 minutes). Review a handful of questions, reflect on the explanations.

3. Learn from the Explanations

After answering a question, always read the explanation, even if you got it right. It reinforces key points, corrects misunderstandings, and teaches subtle distinctions between similar answers.

4. Track Your Progress

Use bookmarks or notes (if reading digitally) to mark difficult questions. Revisit these regularly and track improvements over time.

5. Simulate the Real Exam

Once you're comfortable, try taking a full set of questions without pausing. Set a timer and simulate test-day conditions to build confidence and time management skills.

6. Repeat and Review

Don't just study once, repetition builds retention. Re-attempt questions after a few days and revisit explanations to reinforce learning. Pair this guide with other Examzify tools like flashcards, and digital practice tests to strengthen your preparation across formats.

There's no single right way to study, but consistent, thoughtful effort always wins. Use this guide flexibly, adapt the tips above to fit your pace and learning style. You've got this!

Questions

1. What is an advantage of cohort designs?

A. Establish temporality; calculate risk; versatile design; good with institutional records

B. Best for rare diseases

C. Quick and inexpensive

D. Immediate causal proof with no bias

2. Which statement correctly defines incidence rate?

A. Incidence rate is the probability of developing the outcome over a fixed period.

B. Incidence rate is the number of new cases per person-time at risk.

C. Incidence rate is the total number of existing cases in the population.

D. Incidence rate equals relative risk.

3. What does a significant log-rank test indicate when comparing survival curves?

A. It quantifies the exact difference in survival probabilities

B. It indicates a difference in survival over time but not the size of the difference

C. It proves causation

D. It indicates identical survival

4. In a two-by-two table, which cell corresponds to Exposed and Disease?

A. a

B. Exposed+Disease

C. c

D. d

5. Which method assesses unmeasured confounding that could explain away an observed association?

A. E-value

B. Kaplan-Meier curve

C. Hazard ratio

D. Mann-Whitney test

6. Define cumulative incidence.

A. Cumulative incidence is the probability of developing the outcome over a fixed period in a cohort.

B. Cumulative incidence is the rate at which new cases occur per unit time.

C. Cumulative incidence is the number of new cases per person-time.

D. Cumulative incidence is the difference in risk between exposed and unexposed.

7. What are competing risks and how do they affect cohort analyses?

A. They are rare events that can be ignored in most analyses

B. They increase the observed incidence of the primary outcome

C. They preclude the outcome and may bias standard analyses

D. They only affect exposure assessment

8. If the study population does not reflect the clinical population, which bias increases?

A. Selection bias

B. Information bias

C. Confounding bias

D. Observer bias

9. Which approach helps minimize loss to follow-up?

A. Rely On Self-Report Only

B. Use Cross-Sectional Design

C. Exclude Patients Unlikely To Remain In Database

D. Include All Regardless Of Follow-Up

10. What strategy helps reduce bias from prior drug use when studying new users?

A. Include All Users Regardless Of History

B. Exclude Long-Term Users When Studying New Users

C. Exclude All Ever-Users

D. Only Study Current Users

Answers

1. A
2. B
3. B
4. B
5. A
6. A
7. C
8. A
9. C
10. B

Explanations

1. What is an advantage of cohort designs?

A. Establish temporality; calculate risk; versatile design; good with institutional records

B. Best for rare diseases

C. Quick and inexpensive

D. Immediate causal proof with no bias

Cohort designs shine because you can establish temporality, calculate risk, enjoy versatility, and make good use of institutional records. Following exposures over time lets you see that the exposure happened before the outcome, which strengthens the inference that the exposure could be related to the outcome. This temporal sequence is much clearer in cohort studies than in designs where data are collected at a single point in time. You can also compute risk directly since you're tracking incident cases as they occur, allowing you to derive incidence rates and relative risks or risk differences. This quantitative view of how often outcomes arise in exposed versus unexposed groups is a core strength of cohort research. The design is versatile because it supports studying multiple outcomes from a single exposure, comparing different levels of exposure, and choosing prospective or retrospective approaches depending on data availability. This flexibility makes cohort studies applicable to a wide range of questions and settings. Using institutional records, such as electronic health records or registries, is another advantage. Cohorts can be built from existing data sources, reducing the burden of new data collection and often improving data completeness for exposure and outcome ascertainment when records are reliable. Other options don't fit as well: rare diseases are typically studied more efficiently with case-control designs; quick and inexpensive investigations are more characteristic of cross-sectional or case-control studies; and no observational design provides instant causal proof with no bias, since all such studies are subject to biases like confounding and misclassification.

2. Which statement correctly defines incidence rate?

A. Incidence rate is the probability of developing the outcome over a fixed period.

B. Incidence rate is the number of new cases per person-time at risk.

C. Incidence rate is the total number of existing cases in the population.

D. Incidence rate equals relative risk.

Incidence rate is about measuring how fast new cases appear in a population, taking into account both how many people are followed and for how long they are followed. It is calculated as the number of new cases divided by the total time that people were at risk, so the units are typically cases per person-time (for example, cases per 1,000 person-years). This differs from simply the probability of developing the outcome over a fixed period, which is called risk or cumulative incidence and does not account for varying follow-up times. It's also not the total number of existing cases in the population (prevalence), and it's not a measure of association like relative risk, which compares incidence between groups. So the statement that defines incidence rate as the number of new cases per person-time at risk is the correct one.

3. What does a significant log-rank test indicate when comparing survival curves?

A. It quantifies the exact difference in survival probabilities

B. It indicates a difference in survival over time but not the size of the difference

C. It proves causation

D. It indicates identical survival

The log-rank test is used to compare how survival experiences differ across groups over the entire follow-up period. When the result is statistically significant, it means there is evidence that the survival curves are not the same over time—the groups have different survival experiences at some points during follow-up. But the test does not quantify how large that difference is at any time point or overall; it only tells you that a difference exists. To gauge the size or direction of the difference, you'd look at effect measures from other analyses (like hazard ratios from a Cox model) or examine time-specific differences. It also doesn't imply causation, and a non-significant result doesn't prove identical survival—just that there isn't strong evidence of a difference given the data.

4. In a two-by-two table, which cell corresponds to Exposed and Disease?

A. a

B. Exposed+Disease

C. c

D. d

In a two-by-two table, one axis shows exposure status (exposed vs not exposed) and the other shows disease status (disease vs no disease). The cell that represents people who are both exposed and have the disease is the intersection where Exposed and Disease meet. That's why this cell is described as Exposed+Disease—the group that has both attributes. This cell is the key for understanding how exposure relates to disease and for calculating measures like incidence in the exposed group or the odds ratio. The other cells correspond to exposed without disease, not exposed with disease, and not exposed without disease.

5. Which method assesses unmeasured confounding that could explain away an observed association?

A. E-value

B. Kaplan-Meier curve

C. Hazard ratio

D. Mann-Whitney test

The method being tested is a sensitivity measure that tells you how strong an unmeasured confounder would have to be to explain away the observed association. The E-value does this by providing the minimum strength of association that an unknown confounder would need to have with both the exposure and the outcome to nullify the observed effect, under the usual study assumptions. It helps you gauge the robustness of findings in observational studies without having measured that confounder. This is not what a Kaplan-Meier curve does—that curve shows survival probabilities over time and doesn't quantify how much unmeasured confounding could bias results. It's also not the hazard ratio, which is a measure of effect size between groups but doesn't itself assess potential unmeasured confounding. And a Mann-Whitney test compares distributions between groups without addressing confounding at all. So the E-value is the tool that explicitly addresses how unmeasured confounding could influence the observed association. For intuition, if you observe a risk ratio of, say, 2.0, the E-value would be 2.0 + sqrt(2.0(2.0-1)) ≈ 3.41. That means an unmeasured confounder would need to have a fairly strong association (risk ratio around 3.4) with both the exposure and the outcome to fully explain away the observed association. The larger the E-value, the more robust the finding is to potential unmeasured confounding.*

6. Define cumulative incidence.

A. Cumulative incidence is the probability of developing the outcome over a fixed period in a cohort.

B. Cumulative incidence is the rate at which new cases occur per unit time.

C. Cumulative incidence is the number of new cases per person-time.

D. Cumulative incidence is the difference in risk between exposed and unexposed.

Cumulative incidence is the probability that someone who is free of the disease at the start will develop it during a defined period of follow-up in a cohort. It's a measure of risk expressed as a proportion: number of new cases during the period divided by the number at risk at the start. This makes it a fixed-time, cumulative measure of risk, not a rate. It's different from the incidence rate, which counts new cases per unit of person-time and can handle varying follow-up times. It's also not the same as a difference in risk between groups, which is about comparing risks (an effect measure) rather than defining what cumulative incidence itself is. For example, if 50 of 1,000 disease-free individuals develop the outcome over one year, the cumulative incidence is 50/1000 = 0.05 (5%).

7. What are competing risks and how do they affect cohort analyses?

A. They are rare events that can be ignored in most analyses

B. They increase the observed incidence of the primary outcome

C. They preclude the outcome and may bias standard analyses

D. They only affect exposure assessment

Competing risks are events that prevent the occurrence of the outcome you're studying. In a cohort, if someone experiences a competing event—like death from another cause, or another irreversible endpoint—they can no longer develop the primary outcome of interest. This matters because standard survival analyses treat competing events as if individuals could still experience the primary outcome later, effectively censoring them in a nonrandom way. That leads to biased estimates: the risk of the primary outcome can be misrepresented, often overestimated when using methods like Kaplan-Meier, and hazard ratios from traditional Cox models can mislead if the competing risk isn't properly accounted for. To handle this, analysts use methods designed for competing risks, such as the cumulative incidence function that directly incorporates competing events, or subdistribution hazard models (Fine-Gray) that provide interpretation of risk in the presence of competing risks. The key point is that competing risks preclude the outcome and can bias standard analyses if not properly addressed.

8. If the study population does not reflect the clinical population, which bias increases?

A. Selection bias

B. Information bias

C. Confounding bias

D. Observer bias

When the study population doesn't resemble the clinical population, the main issue is that the sample isn't representative of those who actually have or would receive the treatment. This creates selection bias, a systematic distortion of findings caused by how participants are chosen or retained. Because the enrolled group differs in important ways (such as severity of disease, age, or comorbidities), the observed association between exposure and outcome may not reflect what happens in the real-world clinical setting, reducing generalizability. For example, if a new therapy is studied mainly in younger, healthier patients, the results might overstate safety and effectiveness for the broader population that includes older individuals and those with multiple health issues. Information bias would involve errors in measuring or classifying exposure or outcome, not who is included in the study. Confounding bias arises when an external factor is linked to both exposure and outcome and isn't controlled. Observer bias occurs when investigators' expectations influence data assessment.

9. Which approach helps minimize loss to follow-up?

A. Rely On Self-Report Only

B. Use Cross-Sectional Design

C. Exclude Patients Unlikely To Remain In Database

D. Include All Regardless Of Follow-Up

Minimizing loss to follow-up is about keeping data complete for the period you're studying. Excluding patients who are unlikely to remain in the database directly reduces the chance of missing follow-up data, so the dataset you analyze stays more complete. This approach makes attrition less of a problem in the analysis. However, it does come with trade-offs: it can introduce selection bias and reduce generalizability because the study population is no longer fully representative of all patients initially eligible. The other options don't directly prevent missing follow-up data. Relying on self-report only can introduce reporting errors and may still miss information; a cross-sectional design isn't about follow-up at all, so it doesn't address longitudinal attrition; including everyone regardless of follow-up can leave you with substantial missing data and biased results when you try to analyze outcomes over time.

10. What strategy helps reduce bias from prior drug use when studying new users?

A. Include All Users Regardless Of History

B. Exclude Long-Term Users When Studying New Users

C. Exclude All Ever-Users

D. Only Study Current Users

Focus on starting exposure. When studying people who are just beginning a drug, including long-term or prevalent users introduces bias from prior exposure. Those long-term users differ in important ways—health status, reasons for continuing treatment, tolerance to the drug, adherence, and competing risks—that can distort the association you're trying to measure about new use. This is called prevalent-user bias: you're mixing people who already tolerated or benefited from the drug with true initiators, which can underestimate risks or misrepresent early effects. Excluding long-term users and starting the observation at initiation keeps the comparison more balanced. You follow new initiators from the moment they start and compare them to those not yet exposed, so baseline characteristics and risk factors related to prior use are not confounding the results. This approach helps isolate the effects that occur with the act of starting the drug, rather than effects shaped by a long history of prior use.

Next Steps

Congratulations on reaching the final section of this guide. You've taken a meaningful step toward passing your certification exam and advancing your career.

As you continue preparing, remember that consistent practice, review, and self-reflection are key to success. Make time to revisit difficult topics, simulate exam conditions, and track your progress along the way.

If you need help, have suggestions, or want to share feedback, we'd love to hear from you. Reach out to our team at hello@examzify.com.

Or visit your dedicated course page for more study tools and resources:

https://cohortstudies.examzify.com

We wish you the very best on your exam journey. You've got this!