

THE LANCET

Respiratory Medicine

Supplementary appendix

This appendix formed part of the original submission and has been peer reviewed. We post it as supplied by the authors.

Supplement to: Bruton A, Lee A, Yardley L, Raftery J, Arden-Close E, Kirby S, Zhu S, Thiruvothiyur M, Webley F, Taylor L, Gibson D, Yao G, Stafford-Watson M, Versnel J, Moore M, George S, Little P, Djukanovic R, Price D, Pavord ID, Holgate ST, Thomas M. T Physiotherapy breathing retraining for asthma: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet Respir Med* 2017; published online Dec 13, 2007. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600\(17\)30474-5](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2213-2600(17)30474-5).

Table 4. Between group comparisons of proportion of participants by marginal of change in Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire (AQLQ) score (12m-Baseline)

a. DVD vs Usual care

	DVD		
Usual care	Improved (0.725)	Stayed the same (0.212)	Deteriorated (0.063)
Improved (0.606)	0.44	0.13	0.04
Stayed the same (0.295)	0.21	0.06	0.02
Deteriorated (0.010)	0.07	0.02	0.01
NNT for DVD vs usual care	8.2		

b. Physiotherapy vs Usual care

	Physiotherapy		
Usual care	Improved (0.746)	Stayed the same (0.211)	Deteriorated (0.044)
Improved (0.606)	0.45	0.13	0.03
Stayed the same (0.295)	0.22	0.06	0.01
Deteriorated (0.010)	0.07	0.02	0.00
NNT for Physiotherapy vs usual care	6.8		

c. Physiotherapy vs DVD

	DVD		
Physiotherapy	Improved (0.725)	Stayed the same (0.212)	Deteriorated (0.063)
Improved (0.746)	0.54	0.16	0.05
Stayed the same (0.211)	0.15	0.04	0.01
Deteriorated (0.044)	0.03	0.01	0.00
NNT for physiotherapy vs DVD	41.0		

* The number needed to treat for one participant to benefit from breathing retraining is calculated by adding up cells of those who improved, subtracting the cells of those who deteriorated and dividing 1 by the result.

Table 5. Calculation of proportion of participants who benefited from receiving treatment in the BREATHE trial between treatment arms*

a. DVD vs Usual care

	DVD		
Usual care	Improved (0.725)	Stayed the same (0.212)	Deteriorated (0.063)
Improved (0.614)	0.45	0.12	0.04
Stayed the same (0.290)	0.21	0.06	0.02
Deteriorated (0.010)	0.07	0.02	0.01
NNT for DVD vs usual care	7.92		

b. Physiotherapy vs Usual care

	Physiotherapy		
Usual care	Improved (0.755)	Stayed the same (0.2)	Deteriorated (0.045)
Improved (0.614)	0.46	0.12	0.03
Stayed the same (0.290)	0.22	0.06	0.01
Deteriorated (0.010)	0.07	0.02	0.00
NNT for Physiotherapy vs usual care	6.86		

c. DVD vs Physiotherapy

	DVD		
Physiotherapy	Improved (0.725)	stayed the same (0.212)	Deteriorated (0.063)
Improved (0.755)	0.56	0.15	0.05
Stayed the same (0.2)	0.15	0.04	0.01
Deteriorated (0.045)	0.03	0.01	0.00
NNT for DVD vs physiotherapy	55.52		

*- The number needed to treat for one participant to benefit from breathing retraining is calculated by adding up cells of those who improved, subtracting the cells of those who deteriorated and dividing 1 by the result.

Table 6. Adjusted change in physiological parameters at 12 months in DVD, physiotherapy and usual care treatment arms on the intention to treat population and per protocol populations

Parameters	Intention to treat			Per protocol		
	Adjusted mean difference ¹ (95% CI)			Adjusted mean difference ¹ (95% CI)		
	Physiotherapy vs Usual care	DVD vs Usual care	DVD vs Physiotherapy	Physiotherapy vs Usual care	DVD vs Usual care	DVD vs Physiotherapy
FEV1	-0.04 (-0.11,0.04)	-0.001 (-0.07,0.07)	0.03 (-0.05,0.12)	0.02 (-0.06,0.11)	-0.01 (-0.08,0.07)	-0.03 (-0.12,0.06)
FVC	-0.04 (-0.16,0.08)	-0.03 (-0.14,0.07)	0.01 (-0.12,0.13)	0.03 (-0.09,0.16)	0.02 (-0.09,0.13)	-0.01 (-0.14,0.12)
FEV1/FVC ratio	-0.01 (-0.02,0.01)	0.004 (-0.01,0.02)	0.01 (-0.01,0.03)	0.01 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.003 (-0.02,0.01)	-0.004 (-0.03,0.02)
FEV1 % predicted	0.44 (-3.23,4.12)	0.53 (-2.75,3.81)	0.09 (-3.81,3.99)	-1.49 (-5.33,2.36)	-0.98 (-4.35,2.39)	0.51 (-3.55,4.57)
PEFR	-4.79 (-22.35,12.77)	-1.99 (-17.83,13.85)	2.80 (-15.94,21.54)	3.19 (-15.41,21.80)	2.91 (-13.66,19.48)	-0.29 (-20.10,19.53)
FENO ⁺	1.05 (0.95,1.23)	1.13 (0.98,1.29)	1.07 (0.91,1.25)	1.05 (0.89,1.23)	1.14 (0.98,1.31)	1.08 (0.92,1.28)

¹ Adjusted for pre-specified list of covariates * Geometric mean difference

Table 7. Unadjusted change in physiological parameters from baseline to 12 months post-intervention in DVD, physiotherapy and usual care treatment arms on the intention to treat and per protocol populations

a. ITT

Parameters	Baseline			12 months			Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)		
	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=132)	Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=143)	Physiotherapy (n=92)	Usual care (n=189)	Physiotherapy vs Usual care	DVD vs Usual care	DVD vs Physiotherapy
FEV1	2.6 (0.8)	2.5 (0.7)	2.6 (0.8)	2.6 (0.8)	2.4 (0.7)	2.5 (0.7)	0.01 (-0.06,0.09)	-0.02 (-0.08,0.04)	-0.03 (-0.09,0.03)
FVC	3.5 (0.9)	3.3 (0.9)	3.4 (0.9)	3.6 (1.0)	3.2 (0.8)	3.4 (0.9)	0.01 (-0.11,0.13)	-0.01 (-0.09,0.09)	-0.01 (-0.10,0.08)
FEV1/FVC ratio	0.8 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.7 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.003 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.02 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.005 (-0.01,0.00)
FEV1 % predicted	90.5(18.8)	88.8 (18.1)	91.9 (21.6)	90.5(19.2)	89.5 (19.5)	91.9 (17.4)	-2.05 (-5.78,1.68)	-2.02 (-4.9,0.89)	0.03 (-2.89,3.00)
PEFR	425.5(115.7)	414.9 (110.0)	423.4 (120.7)	422.7(122.3)	400.1 (114.7)	415.1 (117.2)	4.49 (-11.15,20.13)	2.32 (-11.36,15.99)	-2.17 (-15.54,11.11)
FENO Median (IQR)	21 (14,35)	23 (15,33)	23 (14,34)	20 (13,33)	21 (13,32)	20 (13,31)	Unadjusted Median difference p-value		
							Z=-1.09,r=-0.07 ¹ , p=0.28	Z=-2.412, r=-0.14 ¹ , p=0.02	Z=-0.941, r=-0.03 ¹ , p=0.34

¹-Cohen's effect size

b. PP

Parameters	Baseline			12 months			Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)		
	DVD (n=215)	Physiotherapy (n=110)	Usual care (n=231)	DVD (n=134)	Physiotherapy (n=83)	Usual care (n=180)	Physiotherapy vs Usual care	DVD vs Usual care	DVD vs Physiotherapy
FEV1	2.6 (0.8)	2.4 (0.7)	2.6 (0.8)	2.6 (0.8)	2.4 (0.7)	2.5 (0.7)	-0.003 (-0.08,0.08)	-0.03 (-0.001,0.07)	-0.02 (-0.05,0.01)
FVC	3.5 (0.9)	3.2 (0.8)	3.4 (0.9)	3.5 (1.0)	3.3 (0.8)	3.4 (0.9)	-0.004 (-0.13,0.13)	-0.02 (-0.13,0.09)	-0.01 (-0.04,0.02)
FEV1/FVC ratio	0.8 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	0.7 (0.1)	0.8 (0.1)	-0.0004 (-0.002,0.001)	-0.001 (-0.02,0.02)	-0.001 (-0.02,0.02)
FEV1 % predicted	90.3(19.3)	87.6 (17.9)	92.2(21.8)	90.5 (16.6)	89.8 (18.9)	91.6 (17.3)	-3.29 (-7.16,0.57)	-2.39 (-5.45,0.66)	0.90 (-1.9,3.9)
PEFR	422.5(118.8)	410.5 (108.1)	421.9(120.4)	419.6 (121.4)	401.3 (110.2)	413.3 (118.0)	3.0 (-13.56,19.57)	3.3 (-11.05,17.71)	0.33 (-13.67,13.01)
FENO Median(IQR)	21 (15,35)	22 (15,34)	22.5(14,34.5)	19 (13,33)	21 (13,32)	20 (13,31)	Unadjusted Median difference, p-value		
							Z=-0.85, r=-0.05 ¹ , p=0.40	Z=-2.12, r=-0.13 ¹ , p=0.03	Z=-0.91, r=-0.03 ¹ , p=0.36

¹-Cohen's effect size

Sensitivity analyses

A. Pre-specified sensitivity analysis on the primary outcome

As per the pre-specified statistical analysis plan (SAP), we carried out a sensitivity analysis on the primary outcome data, the change in AQLQ scores between baseline and 12 months. In this analysis, we included all randomised patients regardless of whether baseline or follow-up AQLQ data was present. Two different methods were employed during this sensitivity analysis, last observation carried forward (LOCF) and multiple imputation.

1. Using LOCF

For baseline AQLQ, scores for each domain were calculated provided at least two-thirds of the items were scored, otherwise the domain score was set to missing. If any domain score was missing, the overall AQLQ score was also set to missing (Juniper et al, Asthma Quality of life during 1 year of treatment with budesonide with or without formoterol. Eur R J 1999; 14: 1038-43). For missing baseline AQLQs, scores were replaced by their cohort mean (White & Thompson Adjusting for partially missing baseline measurements in randomized trials, Statistics in Medicine 2005; 24:993-1007).

For missing 12m AQLQ scores, the method of LOCF was applied. If 12m AQLQ score was missing, the 6m AQLQ score was taken. If both the 12m and 6m were missing, the 3m AQLQ score was used to replace. If all the 3m, 6m and 12m were missing (that is, no followup information available), then it was assumed that the subject returned to their baseline AQLQ and the baseline AQLQ score was used to replace.

Hence both baseline and 12m have equal 'n'.

Table 8: Baseline to 12 month unadjusted change in Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire (AQLQ) score in the DVD, physiotherapy and usual care arms on the intention to treat population using LOCF

AQLQ score	Baseline			12 months			Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)		
	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=132)	Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=132)	Usual care (n=262)	Physiotherapy (n=132) vs Usual care (n=262) (Total=394)	DVD (n=261) vs Usual care (n=262) (Total=523)	DVD (n=261) vs Physiotherapy (n=132) (Total=393)
Total	4.3 (0.9)	4.2 (0.9)	4.3 (0.9)	5.3 (1.2)	5.3 (1.1)	5.1 (1.2)	0.26 (0.05,0.48)*	0.17 (-0.01,0.35)	-0.09 (-0.31,0.12)
Symptoms	4.2 (1.0)	4.1 (1.1)	4.2 (1.0)	5.1 (1.3)	5.1 (1.2)	4.9 (1.2)	0.37 (0.10,0.63)**	0.17 (-0.04,0.38)	-0.19 (-0.45,0.06)
Activities	5.0 (1.3)	4.8 (1.4)	5.0 (1.3)	5.8 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	0.16 (-0.09,0.42)	0.11 (-0.09,0.32)	-0.05 (-0.30,0.20)
Emotion	4.0 (1.3)	4.1 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	5.2 (1.6)	5.4 (1.4)	5.0 (1.6)	0.31 (0.001,0.62)*	0.25 (-0.01,0.50)	-0.06 (-0.37,0.24)
Environment	4.0 (1.1)	3.8 (1.2)	3.9 (1.1)	5.0 (1.5)	5.0 (1.4)	4.8 (1.5)	0.21 (-0.05,0.48)	0.13 (-0.10,0.37)	-0.08 (-0.36,0.20)

* p<0.05 ** p<0.001

Table 9: Baseline to 12 month unadjusted change in Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire (AQLQ) score in the DVD, physiotherapy and usual care arms on an intention to treat and per protocol population using LOCF

AQLQ score	Baseline			12 months			Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)		
	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=123)	Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=123)	Usual care (n=262)	Physiotherapy (n=123) vs Usual care (n=262) (Total=385)	DVD (n=261) vs Usual care (n=262) (Total=523)	DVD (n=261) vs Physiotherapy (n=123) (Total=384)
Total	4.3 (0.9)	4.2 (0.9)	4.3 (0.9)	5.3 (1.2)	5.3 (1.1)	5.1 (1.2)	0.30 (0.08,0.52)*	0.17 (-0.01,0.35)	-0.13 (-0.35,0.09)
Symptoms	4.2 (1.0)	4.0 (1.1)	4.2 (1.0)	5.1 (1.3)	5.2 (1.1)	4.9 (1.2)	0.40 (0.12,0.67)*	0.17 (-0.04,0.38)	-0.22 (-0.49,0.04)
Activities	5.0 (1.3)	4.8 (1.4)	5.0 (1.3)	5.8 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	0.19 (-0.08,0.45)	0.11 (-0.09,0.32)	-0.08 (-0.33,0.18)
Emotion	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	5.2 (1.6)	5.5 (1.3)	5.0 (1.6)	0.36 (0.04,0.68)*	0.25 (-0.01,0.50)	-0.11 (-0.43,0.20)
Environment	4.0 (1.1)	3.8 (1.2)	3.9 (1.1)	5.0 (1.5)	5.0 (1.4)	4.8 (1.5)	0.27 (-0.005,0.53)	0.13 (-0.10,0.37)	-0.13 (-0.42,0.15)

* p<0.05

Table 10: Adjusted mean difference in 12 month Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire (AQLQ) score in the DVD, physiotherapy and usual care treatment arms on the intention to treat and per protocol populations using LOCF

AQLQ score	Intention to treat			Per protocol		
	Adjusted mean difference ¹ (95% CI)			Adjusted mean difference ¹ (95% CI)		
	Physiotherapy vs Usual care	DVD vs Usual care	DVD vs Physiotherapy	Physiotherapy vs Usual care	DVD vs Usual care	DVD vs Physiotherapy
Total	0.21 (0.02,0.40)*	0.17 (0.02, 0.33)*	-0.04 (-0.23,0.15)	0.25 (0.06, 0.44)*	0.17 (0.01, 0.33)*	-0.08 (-0.27,0.12)
Symptoms	0.26 (0.04,0.47)*	0.16 (-0.02, 0.34)	-0.09 (-0.31,0.12)	0.29 (0.07,0.51)*	0.16 (-0.02, 0.34)	-0.13 (-0.35,0.09)
Activities	0.06 (-0.14,0.27)	0.13 (-0.05, 0.30)	0.06 (-0.15,0.27)	0.10 (-0.11,0.31)	0.12 (-0.05,0.30)	0.02 (-0.19,0.24)
Emotion	0.32 (0.06,0.58)*	0.23 (0.02,0.45)*	-0.09 (-0.34,0.17)	0.36 (0.10,0.62)*	0.23 (0.02, 0.44)*	-0.13 (-0.39,0.14)
Environment	0.16 (-0.07,0.40)	0.18 (-0.02,0.38)	0.01 (-0.23,0.25)	-0.18 (-0.46,0.9)	0.22 (-0.03, 0.46)	-0.04 (-0.29,0.21)

¹ Adjusted for pre-specified list of covariates * p<0.05

B. Using multiple imputation

At the request of a Lancet statistical reviewer, further analyses were performed using multiple imputation. For baseline AQLQ, scores for each domain were calculated provided at least two-thirds of the items were scored, otherwise the domain score was set to missing. If any domain score was missing, the overall AQLQ score was also to missing (Juniper et al, Asthma Quality of life during 1 year of treatment with budesonide with or without formoterol. Eur R J 1999; 14: 1038-43). For missing baselir AQLQs, scores were replaced by their cohort mean (White & Thompson Adjusting for partially missing baseline measurements in randomized trials, Statistics in Medici 2005; 24:993-1007).

For missing 12m AQLQ scores, assuming missing at random (MAR), a fully conditional specification multiple imputation method was applied (<http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.468.9391&rep=rep1&type=pdf> Carpenter R and Kenward M; (2013) *Multiple imputation and its application*. Wiley, Chichester, p. 364. ISBN 978-0-470-74052-1.

Table 11: Baseline to 12 month unadjusted change in Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire (AQLQ) score in the DVD, physiotherapy and usual care arms on intention to treat population using multiple imputation

AQLQ score	Baseline			12 months			Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)		
	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=132)	Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=132)	Usual care (n=262)	Physiotherapy (n=132) vs Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=261) vs Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=261) vs Physiotherapy (n=132)
Total	4.3 (0.9)	4.2 (0.9)	4.3 (0.9)	5.4 (1.2)	5.3 (1.2)	5.1 (1.2)	0.29 (0.05,0.52)*	0.22 (0.03,0.41)*	-0.06 (-0.30,0.17)
Symptoms	4.2 (1.0)	4.1 (1.1)	4.2 (1.0)	5.2 (1.3)	5.2 (1.3)	4.9 (1.3)	0.39 (0.10,0.68)**	0.20 (-0.02,0.42)	-0.19 (-0.47,0.09)
Activities	5.0 (1.3)	4.8 (1.4)	5.0 (1.3)	5.8 (1.3)	5.7 (1.4)	5.7 (1.4)	0.17 (-0.09,0.44)	0.15 (-0.07,0.36)	-0.02 (-0.30,0.24)
Emotion	4.0 (1.3)	4.1 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	5.4 (1.6)	5.4 (1.4)	5.1 (1.6)	0.31 (-0.01,0.64)	0.29 (0.02,0.56)*	-0.02 (-0.35,0.30)
Environment	4.0 (1.1)	3.8 (1.2)	3.9 (1.1)	5.1 (1.6)	5.0 (1.5)	4.8 (1.6)	0.27 (-0.03,0.57)	0.20 (-0.04,0.45)	-0.07 (-0.36,0.23)

* p<0.05 ** p<0.001

Table 12: Baseline to 12 month unadjusted change in Asthma Quality of Life Questionnaire (AQLQ) score in the DVD, physiotherapy and usual care arms on per protocol population using multiple imputation

AQLQ score	Baseline			12 months			Unadjusted mean difference (95% CI)		
	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=123)	Usual care (n=262)	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=123)	Usual care (n=262)	Physiotherapy (n=123) vs Usual care (n=262) (Total=385)	DVD (n=261) vs Usual care (n=262) (Total=523)	DVD (n=261) vs Physiotherapy (n=123) (Total=384)
Total	4.3 (0.9)	4.2 (0.9)	4.3 (0.9)	5.3 (1.2)	5.3 (1.1)	5.1 (1.2)	0.31 (0.08,0.54)*	0.22 (0.04,0.41)*	-0.09 (-0.31,0.14)
Symptoms	4.2 (1.0)	4.0 (1.1)	4.2 (1.0)	5.1 (1.3)	5.2 (1.1)	4.9 (1.2)	0.42 (0.15,0.69)*	0.20 (-0.02,0.42)	-0.19 (-0.47,0.08)
Activities	5.0 (1.3)	4.8 (1.4)	5.0 (1.3)	5.8 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	5.6 (1.4)	0.20 (-0.07,0.48)	0.15 (-0.07,0.39)	-0.02 (-0.29,0.25)
Emotion	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	4.0 (1.3)	5.2 (1.6)	5.5 (1.3)	5.0 (1.6)	0.41 (0.07,0.74)*	0.29 (0.02,0.58)*	-0.09 (-0.41,0.23)
Environment	4.0 (1.1)	3.8 (1.2)	3.9 (1.1)	5.0 (1.5)	5.0 (1.4)	4.8 (1.5)	0.31 (0.02,0.61)*	0.20 (-0.02,0.45)	-0.08 (-0.38,0.22)

Appendix 3: Missing baseline primary and secondary outcomes by treatment arm.

	DVD (n=261)	Physiotherapy (n=132)	Usual care (n=262)	Overall (n=655)
Mini AQLQ	17 (6.5%)	12 (9.1%)	16 (6.1%)	45 (6.9%)
Nijmegen	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.3%)
HADS	4 (1.5%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.6%)	6 (0.9%)
EQ-5D				
Mobility	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.3%)
Self-care	3 (1.1%)	1 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	4 (0.6%)
Usual activities	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.3%)
Pain/Discomfort	2 (0.8%)	1 (0.8%)	1 (0.4%)	4 (0.6%)
Anxiety/Depression	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.3%)
EQ-5D VAS	5 (1.9%)	1 (0.8%)	4 (1.5%)	10 (1.5%)
ACQ	3 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (0.5%)
FEV1 (litres)	15 (5.7%)	2 (1.5%)	9 (3.4%)	26 (4.0%)
FENO (litres)	23 (8.8%)	6 (4.5%)	20 (7.6%)	49 (7.5%)
FVC (litres)	15 (5.1%)	2 (1.5%)	9 (3.4%)	26 (4.0%)
FEV1/FVC ratio	15 (5.1%)	2 (1.5%)	9 (3.4%)	26 (4.0%)
FEV1% predicted	15 (5.1%)	2 (1.5%)	9 (3.4%)	26 (4.0%)
PEFR	17 (6.5%)	3 (2.3%)	13 (5.0%)	33 (5.0%)
Smoking status	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.3%)
Weight in kg	3 (1.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	4 (0.6%)
Height in cm	2 (0.8%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.4%)	3 (0.5%)

Values are in n(%)

Appendix 4. Mean NHS total cost per patient by arm

The mean NHS service use and cost per patient by treatment arm was aggregated from the costs of asthma-related prescriptions, consultations and hospital admissions. The unadjusted mean cost was highest in the usual-care arm (£356; Table A1), with a similar cost in the physiotherapy arm (£335) and the lowest cost in the DVD arm (£296). The main cost items for each group were asthma-related medications and GP consultations, with lower costs reflecting low levels of use of other services; although there were few hospital admissions (usual-care arm, n = 8; physiotherapy arm, n = 0; DVD arm, n = 4), they were by far the most costly item.

Table 1. Mean NHS resource use and cost, unadjusted, in each treatment arm (2014/2015 prices)

Treatment arm		Categories	Means (SD) for those using service	Mean for All (SD)
Usual Care: N=262	Cost (£)	All costs	379(672) n= 246	356 (657)
		Medication	183(217) n= 242	169 (214)
		GP consultation	100(84) n= 201	77 (85)
		Outpatient attendance	347(321) n= 21	28 (130)
		Hospital admission	2581(0) n= 8	79 (445)
Face-to-Face: N=132	Cost (£)	All costs	335(254) n= 132	335 (254)
		Medication	173(199) n= 120	157 (196)
		GP consultation	92(93) n= 99	69 (90)
		Outpatient attendance	203(88) n= 14	21 (68)
		Hospital admission	n= 0	0 (0)
		Intervention	83(.) n= 132	83 (0)
DVD:	Cost (£)	All costs	296(715) n= 261	296 (715)

N=201	Medication	107(177) n= 222	142 (174)
	GP consultation	94(99) n= 186	67 (94)
	Outpatient attendance	221(122) n= 25	21 (75)
	Hospital admission	3872(2581) n= 4	59 (551)
	Intervention	3(0) n= 261	3 (0)

Notes: All costs comprise the total of costs incurred. The main components of all costs were the services shown, that is GP consultations, medications, hospital admission and intervention.

The mean costs in each arm changed only slightly when bootstrapped (Table 2): £377 in Usual Care, £333 in the face-to-face arm and £293 in the DVD arm (Table 31). These differences were not statistically significant at the 5% level.

Given that the intervention costs were higher in the face-to-face group (£83.5) and DVD group (£2.85) compared to Usual Care, the inclusion of NHS costs offset these higher costs, leading to lower overall mean costs in both intervention arms compared to usual care.

Table 2. Mean total costs per person (mean, 95% CI) using bootstrap methods

Treatment arms	Costs (£)	Incremental cost (£)
Usual Care	377 (310, 459)	
Face-to-Face	333 (299, 369)	-41 (-134, 33)
DVD	293 (228, 374)	-83 (-187, 12)