TREND Statement Checklist

Paper Section/ Topic	Item	Descriptor	Reported?	
	No		\checkmark	Pg #
Title and Absti	ract			
Title and Abstract	1	Information on how unit were allocated to interventions		2
		Structured abstract recommended		2 2
		Information on target population or study sample		2
Introduction				
Background	2	Scientific background and explanation of rationale		5-7
		Theories used in designing behavioral interventions		7
Methods	1			
Participants	3	• Eligibility criteria for participants, including criteria at different levels in		
·		recruitment/sampling plan (e.g., cities, clinics, subjects)		11,13
		 Method of recruitment (e.g., referral, self-selection), including the 		
		sampling method if a systematic sampling plan was implemented		11
		Recruitment setting		11
		Settings and locations where the data were collected		9-13
Interventions	4	• Details of the interventions intended for each study condition and how		1 0
		and when they were actually administered, specifically including:		13
		 Content: what was given? 		13
		 Delivery method: how was the content given? 		<u>13</u> 13 , 14
		 Unit of delivery: how were the subjects grouped during delivery? 		
		 Deliverer: who delivered the intervention? 		13,1
		 Setting: where was the intervention delivered? 		13 , 14
		 Exposure quantity and duration: how many sessions or episodes or events were intended to be delivered? How long were they intended to last? 		13-15
		 Time span: how long was it intended to take to deliver the intervention to each unit? 		13-1
		 Activities to increase compliance or adherence (e.g., incentives) 		13-1
Objectives	5	Specific objectives and hypotheses		7
Outcomes	6	Clearly defined primary and secondary outcome measures		15,1
		 Methods used to collect data and any methods used to enhance the quality of measurements 		9-15
		 Information on validated instruments such as psychometric and biometric properties 		12
Sample Size	7	How sample size was determined and, when applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping rules		13
Assignment Method	8	 Unit of assignment (the unit being assigned to study condition, e.g., individual, group, community) 		15
		 Method used to assign units to study conditions, including details of any restriction (e.g., blocking, stratification, minimization) 		13
		 Inclusion of aspects employed to help minimize potential bias induced due to non-randomization (e.g., matching) 	not a	ppli

TREND Statement Checklist

TREND States	mente	And Child	
Blinding (masking)	9	 Whether or not participants, those administering the interventions, and those assessing the outcomes were blinded to study condition assignment; if so, statement regarding how the blinding was accomplished and how it was assessed. 	15
Unit of Analysis	10	Description of the smallest unit that is being analyzed to assess	
	10	intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community)	13
	-	• If the unit of analysis differs from the unit of assignment, the analytical method used to account for this (e.g., adjusting the standard error estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)	not applica
Statistical Methods	11	• Statistical methods used to compare study groups for primary methods outcome(s), including complex methods of correlated data	15,16
		 Statistical methods used for additional analyses, such as a subgroup analyses and adjusted analysis 	not applica
	-	Methods for imputing missing data, if used	not applica
		Statistical software or programs used	16
Results			
Participant flow	12	• Flow of participants through each stage of the study: enrollment, assignment, allocation, and intervention exposure, follow-up, analysis (a diagram is strongly recommended)	Fig.1
		 Enrollment: the numbers of participants screened for eligibility, found to be eligible or not eligible, declined to be enrolled, and enrolled in the study 	Fig.1
	-	 Assignment: the numbers of participants assigned to a study condition 	Fig.1
		 Allocation and intervention exposure: the number of participants assigned to each study condition and the number of participants who received each intervention 	Fig.1
		 Follow-up: the number of participants who completed the follow- up or did not complete the follow-up (i.e., lost to follow-up), by study condition 	Fig.1
	-	 Analysis: the number of participants included in or excluded from the main analysis, by study condition 	Fig.1
		 Description of protocol deviations from study as planned, along with reasons 	
Recruitment	13	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	11,13
Baseline Data	14	Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of participants in each study condition	16,17
		Baseline characteristics for each study condition relevant to specific disease prevention research	16
		 Baseline comparisons of those lost to follow-up and those retained, overall and by study condition 	18
		 Comparison between study population at baseline and target population of interest 	Fig.2
Baseline	15	 Data on study group equivalence at baseline and statistical methods used to control for baseline differences 	not applida

TREND Statement Checklist

Numerale and					
Numbers analyzed	16	•	Number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis for each study condition, particularly when the denominators change for different		Fig.1,
			outcomes; statement of the results in absolute numbers when feasible		Table
		•	Indication of whether the analysis strategy was "intention to treat" or, if		15
			not, description of how non-compliers were treated in the analyses		± 5
Outcomes and	17	•	For each primary and secondary outcome, a summary of results for each		
estimation			estimation study condition, and the estimated effect size and a confidence		18,20
			interval to indicate the precision		
		•	Inclusion of null and negative findings		17-19
		•	Inclusion of results from testing pre-specified causal pathways through	 	
			which the intervention was intended to operate, if any		20
Ancillary	18	•	Summary of other analyses performed, including subgroup or restricted		
analyses			analyses, indicating which are pre-specified or exploratory	not a	applica
Adverse events	19	•	Summary of all important adverse events or unintended effects in each		
			study condition (including summary measures, effect size estimates, and		18-20
			confidence intervals)		
REGENERAL					
DISCUSSION					
	20	—		1	1
Interpretation	20	•	Interpretation of the results, taking into account study hypotheses,		22-25
Interpretation	20	•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses,		22-25
Interpretation	20		sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study		22-25
Interpretation	20	•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the		22-25
Interpretation	20		sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative		
Interpretation	20	•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations		
Interpretation	20		sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention,		
Interpretation	20	•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation		22-23 25-26
		•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications		22-23
Interpretation	20	•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account		22-23 25-26
		•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account the study population, the characteristics of the intervention, length of		22-23 25-26
		•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account the study population, the characteristics of the intervention, length of follow-up, incentives, compliance rates, specific sites/settings involved in		22-23 25-26 26-27
Generalizability	21	•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account the study population, the characteristics of the intervention, length of follow-up, incentives, compliance rates, specific sites/settings involved in the study, and other contextual issues		22-23 25-26 26-27
		•	sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account the study population, the characteristics of the intervention, length of follow-up, incentives, compliance rates, specific sites/settings involved in		22-23 25-26 26-27

From: Des Jarlais, D. C., Lyles, C., Crepaz, N., & the Trend Group (2004). Improving the reporting quality of nonrandomized evaluations of behavioral and public health interventions: The TREND statement. *American Journal of Public Health*, 94, 361-366. For more information, visit: <u>http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/</u>