SWAT 79: Effect of birthday cards with or without nudge on retention and data completion rates in trials involving children

Objective of this SWAT
To determine whether sending a birthday card with or without a nudge improves retention and completion rates in trials involving children

Study area: Retention, Follow-up
Sample type: Participants
Estimated funding level needed: Medium

Background
A low response rate to trial follow-up questionnaires adversely impacts on the validity and generalisability of findings. Participant retention in trials involving children has been identified as particularly challenging [1]. The Cochrane Methodology Review of retention interventions, albeit tested mainly in adults, identified a range of non-monetary incentives such as certificates of appreciation, pins, pens and offer of study results that have been tested [2]. Another Cochrane Methodology Review, by Edwards et. al., [3] also identified a range of non-monetary incentives intended to increase response to postal and electronic questionnaires. The odds of response were increased by more than one tenth when a non-monetary incentive was used (OR 1.15; 95% CI 1.08 to 1.22). Birthday cards are non-monetary incentives often used in longitudinal studies and paediatric trials to enhance participant retention [4-6], but to date their impact on retention rates has not been robustly evaluated.

This SWAT will be suitable for host trials with a minimum of a 12 month follow-up period. The SWAT can be used in trials using any method of follow-up, including face-to-face and postal. For logistical reasons and to avoid contamination between randomised groups, it would be easier to do a single randomisation for each participant and then that participant will either receive or not receive birthday cards for the whole trial.

Interventions and comparators
Intervention 1: Birthday card.
Our PPI (patient and public involvement) group felt that the birthday cards should be as personal as possible but not have anything on the front that could be offensive. The front will therefore have the participant’s age and a gender neutral image linked to the trial. The message on the inside should be from someone they know, such as the treating clinician, or research nurse at their local site and the trial team.
Intervention 2: Birthday card (as in intervention 1), but informed by nudge theory to encourage completion of questionnaires
Intervention 3: No birthday card

Index Type: Method of Follow-up, Birthday Cards

Method for allocating to intervention or comparator
Participants will be randomly allocated 1:1:1 to one of the three groups using block randomisation stratified by main trial allocation using randomly permuted block sizes. Allocation will take place at the time of allocation to the main trial so as not to miss any participants whose birthdays are shortly after their randomisation date. The allocation sequence will be generated by a statistician who is not involved in the recruitment of participants.

Outcome measures
Primary: Response rate to the participant follow-up questionnaire at the first time point following receipt of the birthday card.
Secondary: 1) Response rate to the participant follow-up questionnaire at the 12-month follow-up: 2) Time to response (number of days from date due to date returned) 3) Completeness of primary outcome measure (defined as providing sufficient data to produce a valid summary score) 4) Need for a postal reminder 5) Cost per participant retained
Analysis plans
The sample size for this embedded trial will be constrained to the number of participants recruited into the host trial. All participants recruited into the host trial and who are currently participating in the study, at the point at which their birthday card is due to be sent out, will be eligible to take part in this embedded trial. As an example, a host trial with a target sample size of approximately 1000 children, could assume a 20% attrition rate to achieve approximately 800 in the analysis. With 800 participants, the trial would have 90% power to detect a 10 percentage point difference in response rate between any two of the groups assuming a response rate of 80% in the control (no birthday card) group.

Analyses will follow the principles of intention to treat, including all participants in the groups to which they were originally allocated. Response rates, completeness of response and need for a postal reminder will be analysed using mixed-effect logistic regression adjusting for main trial allocation, and recruitment site as a random effect. Time to response will be compared between the groups using Cox proportional hazards regression.

Subgroup analyses for age and gender will be undertaken for the primary outcome to see if response rates differ in these groups. This will be undertaken by including an interaction between the factor (age/gender) and embedded trial allocation in the logistic regression model.

Possible problems in implementing this SWAT
The main challenge in implementing this SWAT relates to staff time to complete the mail out and the logistics of ensuring the correct age is on the card. Religious groups such as Jehovah's Witnesses might be averse to having their birthday acknowledged and care must be taken to source birthday cards which are inoffensive to diverse populations. The costs associated with the SWAT will relate to 1) design and printing, 2) postage and stationary, and 3) staff time for randomisation, writing and administering.
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