

BMJ Open

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (<http://bmjopen.bmj.com>).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email info.bmjopen@bmj.com

BMJ Open

Integrating quantitative and qualitative data and findings when undertaking randomised controlled trials

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-032081.R1
Article Type:	Communication
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Jul-2019
Complete List of Authors:	Hill, Jacqueline; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Richards, David; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Bazeley, Patricia; Research Support P/L Borglin, Gunilla; Malmö University, Department of Care Science Craig , Peter ; Glasgow University Emsley, Richard; King's College London, Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience Frost, Julia; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Horwood, Jeremy; University of Bristol, UK, Population Health Sciences Hutchings, Hayley; Swansea University, Medicine Jinks, Clare; Keele University, Arthritis Research UK Primary Care Centre Montgomery, Alan; University of Nottingham, Moore, Graham; Cardiff University, School of Social Sciences Plano Clark, Vicki; University of Cincinnati College of Education Criminal Justice and Human Services, School of Education Tonkin-Crine, Sarah ; University of Oxford, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, and NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance Wade, Julia; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Warren, Fiona; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Wyke, Sally; University of Glasgow, Intitute of Health and Wellbeing Young, Bridget; University of Liverpool, Institute of Population Health Sciences O'Cathain, Alicia; University of Sheffield, School of Health and Related Research
Primary Subject Heading:	Research methods
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Evidence based practice, Patient-centred medicine, Qualitative research
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Integrating quantitative and qualitative data and findings when undertaking randomised

controlled trials

Jacqueline J. Hill, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

*David A Richards, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. d.a.richards@exeter.ac.uk; 01392 724615

Patricia Bazeley, Research Support, Western Sydney University, Sydney, Australia.

Gunilla Borglin, Department of Care Science, Malmo University, Sweden.

Peter Craig, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, UK.

Richard Emsley, Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK.

Julia Frost, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Jeremy Horwood, Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

Hayley Hutchings, College of Medicine, Swansea University, Swansea, UK.

Clare Jinks, Arthritis Research UK Primary Care Centre, Keele University, Staffordshire, UK.

Alan Montgomery, Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

Graham Moore, School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK.

Vicki Plano Clark, School of Education, University of Cincinnati College of Education Criminal Justice and Human Services, Cincinnati, US.

Sarah Tonkin-Crine, Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, and NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Julia Wade, Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

Fiona Warren, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Sally Wyke, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.

Bridget Young, Institute of Population Health Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

Alicia O'Cathain, Medical Care Research Unit, SchARR, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

* Corresponding author

Keywords: research methods; integration; qualitative; trials; quantitative

Word count: 2605

For peer review only

ABSTRACT

It is common to undertake qualitative research alongside randomised controlled trials (RCTs) when evaluating complex interventions. Researchers tend to analyse these datasets separately and then informally integrate their findings within the discussion section of the final report, rarely integrating quantitative and qualitative data or findings, and missing opportunities to integrate data in order to generate further important insights about the intervention under evaluation.

This paper reports on a two day expert meeting funded by the United Kingdom Medical Research Council Hubs for Trials Methodology Research with the aim to reflect on the current level of integration occurring in the context of RCTs, the potential value of integration, and the need for guidance to help researchers plan and undertake integration specific to this context. We summarise integration techniques and highlight the potential value of integration using three examples. We suggest that applying mixed methods integration techniques to data or findings from studies involving both RCTs and qualitative research can yield insights that might be useful for understanding variation in outcomes, the mechanism by which interventions have an impact, and identifying ways of tailoring therapy to patient preference and type. Given a general lack of examples and knowledge of these techniques, researchers and funders will need future guidance on how to undertake and appraise them.

BACKGROUND

It is common to undertake qualitative research alongside randomised controlled trials (RCTs) when evaluating complex interventions.[1,2] Qualitative research can be used to explore the feasibility, acceptability and implementation of an intervention to help understand how it was effective or why it was not effective within the RCT, or to explore the conduct of the RCT to help improve recruitment or retention rates.[2] Qualitative research can be undertaken as part of a mixed methods process evaluation,[3] as a qualitative process evaluation, or as an embedded qualitative study alongside a fully powered or pilot RCT.[4] In studies like this, researchers have a number of datasets to analyse: outcome data from the RCT, quantitative process data, and qualitative process data. Researchers tend to analyse these datasets separately and then informally integrate their findings within the discussion section of the final report to funders. Researchers rarely integrate quantitative and qualitative data or findings,[1] or use formal analytical techniques recommended within wider mixed methods research. This may be because researchers are not aware of existing integration techniques or do not see the value of these techniques to the context of RCTs. They may be missing opportunities to use data that has taken years to collect at great cost in order to generate further important insights about the intervention under evaluation.

INTEGRATING DATA FROM MIXED METHODS DESIGNS

In 2017, researchers who generate evidence on the effectiveness of health interventions in health care and public health, and researchers who have written methodological guidance on integration in mixed methods research, came together in a two day meeting funded by the Medical Research Council Hubs for Trials Methodology Research. The aim was to reflect on the current level of integration occurring in the context of RCTs, the potential value of integration, and the need for guidance to help researchers plan and undertake integration specific to this context. In this paper, the attendees at that meeting summarise relevant integration techniques, describe the key conclusions drawn, and propose the potential value of integration using three examples of

1
2
3 integration in the context of both pilot and fully powered RCTs. The focus is on RCTs of health
4 interventions but the paper is likely to be relevant to RCTs in other fields such as education and
5 social care.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **Summary of integration techniques**

13
14 The term integration is used to describe an intentional process whereby researchers use quantitative
15 and qualitative data or findings interdependently to address a common goal. Mixed methods
16 researchers have described a range of integration techniques. [5-9] A key integration technique is
17 joint displays that involve the production of a figure, table or graph to bring together and compare
18 quantitative and qualitative data or findings.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 **Meeting conclusions: the need for examples and guidance**

29
30 Having listened to discussions about integration in mixed methods research, and considered its role
31 in the context of RCTs, attendees concluded that integration rarely occurs in practice, that there is
32 much to be learnt from integration techniques from wider mixed methods research, and that an
33 important step is to communicate the potential value of integration to the research community
34 through relevant examples. Once researchers see evidence of value, in terms of this practice
35 generating credible new and useful insights, formal guidance could be developed to ensure the
36 quality of this endeavour. This guidance could address how researchers could make decisions about
37 the most appropriate approach to adopt in different circumstances, how to ensure that the potential
38 for data integration is factored into trial design at the earliest possible stages, the meaning of
39 credibility for integrative practices, and how reviewers, funding boards, and readers can make
40 judgments about the credibility of integration.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Examples of the potential value of integration in the context of RCTs

Attendees struggled to identify many published examples of integration undertaken in the context of RCTs. Three examples are described below, integrating data or findings in the context of pilot or fully powered RCTs.

Example 1: Integrating findings from a pilot RCT and embedded qualitative interview study to develop insights about treatment responses

Thirty-one cancer patients took part in a cross-over pilot RCT of music medicine compared with music therapy.[10] Music medicine consisted of two sessions of listening to pre-recorded music; music therapy involved two sessions of interactive music-making with a music therapist. Before and after each session patients rated their mood, anxiety, relaxation and pain. Thirty RCT participants also completed a qualitative interview at the end of treatment. The quantitative rates of change in outcomes over time and qualitative interview data of experiences were analysed separately. Findings were then integrated to explore why some individual patients appeared to benefit more from one intervention than the other. The pilot RCT was not designed to detect clinically meaningful differences in the effectiveness of these treatments so did not provide robust evidence on the relative effects of these treatments. The findings from the pilot RCT were that patients' mood, anxiety, relaxation and pain appeared to improve following either music medicine or music therapy. The findings from the qualitative interviews were that patients experienced music medicine and music therapy as relaxing and fun. Participants escaped from stress in general and worries related to cancer in particular. Music also offered hope for the future. In addition, music therapy enabled patients to be creative and the presence of a therapist helped some patients to release emotion. Other patients felt more comfortable with music medicine because there was no therapist and because they could listen to familiar music.

1
2
3 Findings were integrated during the analysis phase of the study to explore reasons for variation in
4 outcomes. The researchers did this by creating a joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings
5 for four groups of the 30 patients with both qualitative and quantitative data: participants who
6 showed quantitative (a) improvement following music therapy (MT) but much less or no
7 improvement following music medicine (MM) (b) improvement following MM but much less or no
8 improvement following MT, (c) improvement following both interventions, and (d) deterioration
9 following both interventions. Improvement or deterioration was determined based on z-scores for
10 changes in mood, anxiety, relaxation and pain for each patient. Patient experiences, expressed in the
11 qualitative interviews, were summarised in the table for each of the four groups. These experiences
12 differed by each of the four groups. Patients who described valuing the therapeutic relationship and
13 creative elements of making music in the qualitative research benefited more from MT than MM.
14 Patients who were apprehensive about active music making and exploring feelings related to cancer
15 benefited more from MM than MT (see Figure 1).
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

---insert figure 1 somewhere near here---

39 Integration of findings from independent quantitative and qualitative analyses identified that
40 participant preferences and attitudes appeared to impact on treatment benefits. This generates the
41 hypothesis that an effective intervention could be one where cancer patients are offered a choice of
42 music therapy or music medicine based on their preferences. This hypothesis could then be tested
43 in a fully powered RCT. This approach to analysis is not without problems. For example, blinding of
44 qualitative researchers to the groups would be important during integration, and such analyses
45 always involve small numbers. Nonetheless it shows the potential for this technique to identify new
46 insights about variation in outcomes and how to develop interventions to address them.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Example 2: Integrating data from a pilot RCT and qualitative process data to develop insights**
4
5 **about treatment adherence and outcomes**
6

7
8 Sixty-eight adults with depression participated in a pilot RCT of Morita Therapy plus treatment as
9
10 usual (TAU) versus TAU alone.[11] Morita Therapy is a Japanese psychological therapy for common
11
12 mental health problems where patients are taught that unpleasant thoughts and emotions ebb and
13
14 flow as a matter of course, cannot be controlled by will, and can be accepted as part of the natural
15
16 ecology of the human experience. Twenty-eight intervention participants also attended a post-
17
18 treatment qualitative interview.[12] Following separate analysis of the RCT data and the qualitative
19
20 interviews, data from the pilot RCT and interviews were integrated at the level of the individual
21
22 participant to explore how participants' views of the intervention related to the number of sessions
23
24 they attended and whether they responded to treatment. Morita Therapy participants attended a
25
26 mean of 8 treatment sessions out of a maximum of 12; 24/34 (70.6%) adhered to a per-protocol
27
28 minimum dose (≥ 5 sessions). The pilot RCT was not powered to detect clinically meaningful
29
30 differences in treatment effectiveness; however, at follow-up 22/33 intervention participants
31
32 (66.7%) scored below the threshold for major depressive disorder on a depression symptom
33
34 checklist compared with 13.3% of controls. During the qualitative interviews, many but not all of
35
36 those receiving Morita Therapy found it acceptable. Acceptability was related to participants'
37
38 expectations and understandings of treatment (or 'orientation' towards treatment) being
39
40 compatible or not with the principles of Morita Therapy. Participants distinguished between
41
42 engaging with Morita Therapy on a conceptual level and engaging with it on a practical level such as
43
44 finding the required time to do it.
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 Quantitative and qualitative data were then integrated for individual intervention participants.
53
54 Qualitative data were organised into typologies of views on Morita Therapy, according to the extent
55
56 to which participants found (1) the principles and (2) the practical processes of the therapy
57
58 acceptable. Quantitative data from the RCT on the numbers of sessions attended and the clinical
59
60

1
2
3 outcomes were added into a joint display. Participants who identified with Morita Therapy
4 principles typically responded to treatment regardless of the number of sessions they attended;
5
6 conversely, those whose orientation towards treatment was incompatible with the intervention did
7
8 not respond to treatment, again regardless of treatment adherence. Participants whose personal
9
10 circumstances (such as a lack of time or support from others) impeded their opportunity to engage
11
12 in the intervention generally attended the fewest number of sessions but this did not drive clinical
13
14
15
16
17 outcome.

18
19
20
21 By integrating qualitative and quantitative data the possibility of new relationships between
22
23 orientation towards treatment, adherence and clinical outcomes were found. These suggested that
24
25 personalising depression treatment by choosing an approach (for example, “Western” or “Eastern”
26
27 treatment, directive or non-directive approaches) according to the extent to which the conceptual
28
29 underpinnings of that treatment were compatible with a person’s own worldview, could lead to
30
31 better individual outcomes. It also raised the possibility that, where this congruence is present,
32
33 patients with demanding personal circumstances which constrain their ability to engage in
34
35 treatment may still benefit from a lower intensity version of the same treatment offered in fewer
36
37 sessions. The analysis did not prove that these insights were true but raised interesting possibilities
38
39 for testing in future RCTs of personalised medicine.
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Example 3: Integrating findings from the quantitative and qualitative parts of a process evaluation**
47
48 **to interpret the findings of a fully powered cluster RCT**

49
50 A large, multi-country factorial cluster RCT was conducted to examine the effectiveness of
51
52 interventions aimed at decreasing antibiotic prescribing for acute cough by general practitioners
53
54 (GPs).[13] Interventions were: (1) GP communication skills training and use of a patient booklet; (2)
55
56 training in the provision and use of a C-reactive protein (CRP) test device; (3) both interventions; or
57
58 (4) neither interventions. Each of the separate interventions led to decreases in antibiotic
59
60

1
2
3 prescribing and the combination of both led to the largest decrease. The mixed methods process
4 evaluation, undertaken alongside the RCT, collected quantitative and qualitative data on patients'
5 and GPs' views on prescribing antibiotics for acute cough and their experiences of the interventions.
6
7 Quantitative self-report data were collected from 2886 patients and 346 GPs. Qualitative data were
8 collected from interviews with 62 patients and 66 GPs. Data from the four different sources in the
9 process evaluation were analysed separately. Findings from all four sources were then compared in
10 an integrative analysis.[14] Based on the surveys, there was a high level of satisfaction with both
11 interventions. GPs reported that the communication skills training, use of a patient booklet, and
12 training with use of the CRP test helped them to reduce prescribing. Patients who received the
13 booklet reported the highest levels of self-care enablement for their cough and awareness that
14 taking antibiotics could be risky and harmful. Based on the qualitative interviews, GPs felt that the
15 communication skills training gave them greater confidence in addressing patient expectations for
16 an antibiotic and that the CRP test was helpful to decrease diagnostic uncertainty and reassure
17 patients. The booklet and use of the CRP test were acceptable to patients and patients perceived
18 that both the interventions supported GPs' prescribing decision.

19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39 The key findings from each of the four datasets in the process evaluation were integrated by
40 summarising them in a form of joint display known as Triangulation Protocol.[15] Three analysts
41 independently compared findings across the datasets, considering where they agreed, partly agreed,
42 did not agree, or where there was an unexpected gap in findings from one of the datasets. Examples
43 of the joint displays are given within the article. There was disagreement between findings from
44 different datasets in terms of the utility of the CRP test. In the qualitative interviews with GPs, the
45 CRP test was viewed as helping to convince patients that a no-antibiotic decision was appropriate
46 when the patient expected an antibiotic to be prescribed. In contrast, patients reported in
47 interviews that they were confident in the GP's prescription decision regardless of whether or not
48 the CRP test had been undertaken, especially if they were given a detailed explanation by their GP
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and a booklet on self-care. Findings from the patient survey reinforced the importance of
4
5 communication to patients. This highlighted the importance to patients of improved communication
6
7 rather than diagnostics for antibiotic prescribing. This study also highlighted that attention needs to
8
9 be paid to the quality of the application of integration techniques, for example the use of three
10
11 independent analysts to create and interpret the joint display.
12
13
14
15

16 **CONCLUSIONS**

17
18 Applying mixed methods integration techniques to data or findings from studies involving both RCTs
19
20 and qualitative research can yield insights that might be useful for understanding variation in
21
22 outcomes, the mechanism by which interventions have an impact, and identifying ways of tailoring
23
24 therapy to patient preference and type. Further examples of integration might help to persuade
25
26 researchers and funders of the value of doing this. If future examples show value then guidance can
27
28 help to ensure the quality of this practice by recommending the use of independent analysts, and
29
30 blinding of analysts, for example. Guidance might also equip research funding boards, reviewers and
31
32 other readers to judge the credibility of any integration.
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 **Competing interests:** the authors declare that they have no competing interests

40
41 **Funding:** the United Kingdom Medical Research Council Hubs for Trials Methodology Research
42
43 (HTMR) Network funded the meeting. The funder had no role in the design of the meeting and in
44
45 writing the manuscript.
46
47

48 **Acknowledgements and authors' contributions:** JJH, AoC and DAR conceived, planned and
49
50 conducted the meeting. JJH, AoC and DAR drafted the original manuscript. PB, GB, PC, RE, JF, JH, HH,
51
52 CJ, AM, GM, VPC, ST-C, JW, FW, SW, BY attended the meeting and read, edited and approved the
53
54 final manuscript. Holly Sugg provided information for example 2.
55
56
57
58
59
60

REFERENCES

- 1 Lewin S, Glenton C, and Oxman AD, *Use of qualitative methods alongside randomised controlled trials of complex healthcare interventions: methodological study*. BMJ 2009;**339**:b3496.
- 2 O'Cathain A, Thomas KJ, Drabble SJ et al., *What can qualitative research do for randomised controlled trials? A systematic mapping review*. BMJ Open 2013;**3**(6):e002889.
- 3 Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M et al., *Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance*. BMJ 2015;**350**.
- 4 O'Cathain A, *A practical guide to using qualitative research with randomized controlled trials*; Oxford: OUP, 2018.
- 5 Bazeley P, *Integrating analyses in mixed methods research*; London: Sage, 2018.
- 6 Feters MD, Curry LA, and Creswell JW, *Achieving Integration in Mixed Methods Designs- Principles and Practices*. Health Services Research 2013;**48**(6):2134-2156.
- 7 Creswell JW and Plano Clark VL, *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA; London, UK; New Dehli, India; Singapore: SAGE, 2017.
- 8 O'Cathain A, Murphy E, and Nicholl J, *Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods studies*. BMJ 2010;**341**.

- 1
2
3 9 Guetterman TC, Fetters MD, and Creswell JW, *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative*
4 *Results in Health Science Mixed Methods Research Through Joint Displays*. Ann Fam Med
5
6
7 2015;**13**(6):554-561.
8
9
10
11
12 10 Bradt J, Potvin N, Kesslick A et al., *The impact of music therapy versus music medicine on*
13 *psychological outcomes and pain in cancer patients: a mixed methods study*. Support Care
14
15
16 Cancer 2015;**23**(5):1261-1271.
17
18
19
20
21 11. Sugg HVR, Richards DA and Frost J, *Morita Therapy for depression (Morita Trial): a pilot*
22 *randomised controlled trial*. BMJ Open 2018;8:e021605.doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021605
23
24
25
26
27
28 12. Sugg HVR, Richards DA, Frost J. (2018). Morita Therapy for depression (Morita Trial):
29 a pilot randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Open*; 8:e021605. doi:10.1136/bmjopen
30
31
32
33
34
35 13 Little P, Stuart B, Francis N, et al., *Effects of internet-based training on antibiotic prescribing*
36 *rates for acute respiratory-tract infections: a multinational, cluster, randomised, factorial,*
37 *controlled trial*. Lancet 2013;382(9899):1175–82.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44 14 Tonkin-Crine S, Anthierens S, Hood K et al., *Discrepancies between qualitative and*
45 *quantitative evaluation of randomised controlled trial results: achieving clarity through*
46 *mixed methods triangulation*. Implement Sci 2016;**11**.
47
48
49
50
51
52
53 15 Farmer T, Robinson K, Elliott SJ et al., *Developing and implementing a triangulation protocol*
54 *for qualitative health research*. Qualitative Health Research 2006;16:377-394.doi:
55
56
57 10.1177/1049732305285708
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Figure 1 Joint display table summarising findings from RCT and qualitative research** (Bradt J, Potvin
4
5 N, Kesslick A et al. Supportive Care in Cancer 2015,[10] reproduced with permission)
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Table 4 Joint display of patient experiences per treatment benefits

Treatment benefits	Change in music therapy ^a	Change in music medicine ^a	Patient experiences
↑MT, ↓ MM	0.65 to 1.88	-0.11 to 0.38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize the importance of therapeutic relationship and support by therapist • Enjoy the creative aspect of music making • Are hopeful for the future
↑MM, ↓ MT	-0.46 to 0.59	0.33 to 1.63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apprehensive about active music making • Prefer familiarity of pre-recorded music • Hesitant about exploring feelings related to cancer
↑MT, ↑ MM	0.61 to 1.07	0.73 to 1.37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong conviction about the power of music to support and give hope • Use music for mental escape • Use music for emotional exploration and value processing of emotions with therapist
↓ MT, ↓ MM	-0.67 to -1.03	-0.52 to -1.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold little hope for the future • Music evokes sad and traumatic memories • Feel inadequate regarding music making and singing • Prefer aesthetics of original recordings

↑ great improvement, ↓ less improvement or worsening

^aRange of overall z-scores (average of z-scores for mood, anxiety, relaxation, and pain)

206x96mm (96 x 96 DPI)

BMJ Open

Integrating quantitative and qualitative data and findings when undertaking randomised controlled trials

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2019-032081.R2
Article Type:	Communication
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Oct-2019
Complete List of Authors:	<p>Richards, David; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Bazeley, Patricia; Western Sydney University, Transitional Research and Social Innovation Group Borglin, Gunilla; Malmo University, Department of Care Science; Lovisenberg Diaconal University College, Department of Nursing Education Craig , Peter ; University of Glasgow, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit Emsley, Richard; King's College London, Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience Frost, Julia; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Hill, Jacqueline; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Horwood, Jeremy; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Hutchings, Hayley; Swansea University, Medical School Jinks, Clare; Keele University, School of Primary, Community and Social Care Montgomery, Alan; University of Nottingham, Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit Moore, Graham; Cardiff University, School of Social Sciences Plano Clark, Vicki; University of Cincinnati College of Education Criminal Justice and Human Services, School of Education Tonkin-Crine, Sarah ; University of Oxford, Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, and NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance Wade, Julia; University of Bristol, Population Health Sciences Warren, Fiona; University of Exeter, College of Medicine and Health Wyke, Sally; University of Glasgow, Institute of Health and Wellbeing Young, Bridget; University of Liverpool, Institute of Population Health Sciences O'Cathain, Alicia; University of Sheffield, School of Health and Related Research</p>
Primary Subject Heading:	Research methods
Secondary Subject Heading:	Health services research, Evidence based practice, Patient-centred medicine, Qualitative research
Keywords:	QUALITATIVE RESEARCH, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Integrating quantitative and qualitative data and findings when undertaking randomised

controlled trials

*David A Richards, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK. d.a.richards@exeter.ac.uk; 01392 724615

Patricia Bazeley, Transitional Research and Social Innovation Group, Western Sydney University, Sydney, Australia.

Gunilla Borglin, Department of Care Science, Malmo University, Sweden.

Department of Nursing Education, Lovisenberg Diaconal University College, Oslo, Norway

Peter Craig, MRC/CSO Social and Public Health Sciences Unit, University of Glasgow, UK.

Richard Emsley, Department of Biostatistics and Health Informatics, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology and Neuroscience, King's College London, London, UK.

Julia Frost, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Jacqueline J. Hill, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Jeremy Horwood, Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

Hayley Hutchings, Medical School, Swansea University, Swansea, UK.

Clare Jinks, School of Primary, Community and Social Care, Keele University, Staffordshire, UK.

Alan Montgomery, Nottingham Clinical Trials Unit, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, UK.

Graham Moore, School of Social Sciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK.

Vicki Plano Clark, School of Education, University of Cincinnati College of Education Criminal Justice and Human Services, Cincinnati, US.

Sarah Tonkin-Crine, Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, and NIHR Health Protection Research Unit in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial Resistance, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

Julia Wade, Population Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK.

Fiona Warren, Institute for Health Research, College of Medicine and Health, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

Sally Wyke, Institute of Health and Wellbeing, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK.

Bridget Young, Institute of Population Health Sciences, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK.

1
2
3 Alicia O'Cathain, Medical Care Research Unit, ScHARR, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.
4
5
6

7 * Corresponding author
8
9

10
11 Keywords: research methods; integration; qualitative; trials; quantitative
12
13

14 Word count: 2851
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

ABSTRACT

It is common to undertake qualitative research alongside randomised controlled trials (RCTs) when evaluating complex interventions. Researchers tend to analyse these datasets one by one and then consider their findings separately within the discussion section of the final report, rarely integrating quantitative and qualitative data or findings, and missing opportunities to combine data in order to add rigour, enabling thorough and more complete analysis, provide credibility to results, and generate further important insights about the intervention under evaluation.

This paper reports on a two day expert meeting funded by the United Kingdom Medical Research Council Hubs for Trials Methodology Research with the aims to identify current strengths and weaknesses in the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods in clinical trials, establish the next steps required to provide the trials community with guidance on the integration of mixed methods in RCTs and set-up a network of individuals, groups and organisations willing to collaborate on related methodological activity.

We summarise integration techniques and go beyond previous publications by highlighting the potential value of integration using three examples that are specific to RCTs. We suggest that applying mixed methods integration techniques to data or findings from studies involving both RCTs and qualitative research can yield insights that might be useful for understanding variation in outcomes, the mechanism by which interventions have an impact, and identifying ways of tailoring therapy to patient preference and type. Given a general lack of examples and knowledge of these techniques, researchers and funders will need future guidance on how to undertake and appraise them.

BACKGROUND

1
2
3 It is common to undertake qualitative research alongside randomised controlled trials (RCTs) when
4 evaluating complex interventions.[1,2] Qualitative research can be used to explore the feasibility,
5 acceptability and implementation of an intervention to help understand how it was effective or why
6 it was not effective within the RCT, or to explore the conduct of the RCT to help improve recruitment
7 or retention rates.[2] Qualitative research can be undertaken as part of a mixed methods process
8 evaluation,[3] as a qualitative process evaluation, or as an embedded qualitative study alongside a
9 fully powered or pilot RCT.[4] In studies like this, researchers have a number of datasets to analyse:
10 outcome data from the RCT, quantitative process data, and qualitative process data. Researchers
11 tend to analyse these datasets separately and then consider their findings separately within the
12 discussion section of the final report to funders. Researchers rarely integrate quantitative and
13 qualitative data or findings,[1] or use formal analytical techniques recommended within wider mixed
14 methods research. This may be because researchers are not aware of existing integration techniques
15 or do not see the value of these techniques to the context of RCTs. Unfortunately, they may be
16 missing opportunities to fully utilise data that has taken years to collect at great cost that could
17 generate further important insights about the intervention under evaluation.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38

39 AIMS

40
41 In 2017, 20 researchers who generate evidence on the effectiveness of health interventions in health
42 care and public health, and/or who have written methodological articles on integration in mixed
43 methods research, came together in a two day meeting funded by the United Kingdom Medical
44 Research Council Hubs for Trials Methodology Research. The aims of the meeting were to: i) identify
45 current strengths and weaknesses in the integration of quantitative and qualitative methods in
46 clinical trials; ii) establish the next steps required to provide the trials community with guidance on
47 the integration of mixed methods in RCTs; iii) set-up a network of individuals, groups and
48 organisations willing to collaborate on related methodological activity.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The meeting was structured in the form of a summit (day 1) and expert panel (day 2) with pre-
4
5 circulated agenda topics. The summit was focussed on current strengths and weaknesses in the
6
7 integration of quantitative and qualitative trial data including presentations from leading experts on
8
9 integration and clinical trials, mixed methods analyses, mixed methods study designs, and writing
10
11 mixed methods grant applications and study reports. Each topic was followed by facilitated small
12
13 group discussions with focussed questions for each group. These outputs were summarised and
14
15 presented to the whole group on day two where the expert panel considered the need for guidance
16
17 on the analytic integration of quantitative and qualitative trial data and the next steps required to
18
19 produce it. Delegates also discussed the writing of a position paper, publication plans and future
20
21 collaboration networks.
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 In this paper, the attendees at that meeting summarise relevant integration techniques, describe the
29
30 key conclusions drawn, and propose the potential value of integration using three examples of
31
32 integration suggested by the expert panel in the context of both pilot and fully powered RCTs. The
33
34 focus is on RCTs of health interventions but the paper is likely to be relevant to RCTs in other fields
35
36 such as education and social care.
37
38
39
40

41 **Summary of integration techniques**

42
43 The term integration is used to describe an intentional process whereby researchers use quantitative
44
45 and qualitative data or findings interdependently to address a common goal. Mixed methods
46
47 researchers have described a range of integration techniques. [5-9] One key integration technique is
48
49 joint displays that involve the production of a figure, table or graph to juxtapose and compare
50
51 quantitative and qualitative data or findings. Other techniques can compare the qualitative
52
53 responses of participants based on their measured response to the trial, or create a consolidated
54
55 database drawing on both quantitative and (transformed) qualitative data for further statistical
56
57 analysis.
58
59
60

Meeting conclusions: the need for examples and guidance

Having listened to discussions about integration in mixed methods research, and considered its role in the context of RCTs, attendees concluded that integration rarely occurs in practice, that there is much to be learnt from integration techniques from wider mixed methods research, and that an important step is to communicate the potential value of integration to the research community through relevant examples. Once researchers see evidence of value, in terms of this practice generating credible new and useful insights, formal guidance could be developed to ensure the quality of this endeavour. Such guidance could include systematic reviews of the utility of different methods used for mixed methods data integration with decision aids to help researchers make decisions about the most appropriate approach to adopt in different circumstances, how to ensure that the potential for data integration is factored into trial design at the earliest possible stages, the meaning of credibility for integrative practices, and how reviewers, funding boards, and readers can make judgments about the credibility of integration. Attendees agreed that in common with other clinical guidance documents, concrete examples of where these techniques have been used are required as part of the guideline. However, attendees struggled to identify many published examples of integration undertaken in the context of RCTs.

Examples of the potential value of integration in the context of RCTs

Three examples were nonetheless identified and suggested by participants, and are described below. These examples integrate data or findings in the context of pilot or fully powered RCTs, and use various approaches to data integration and synthesis, guided by quantitative and/or qualitative data.

Example 1: Integrating findings from a pilot RCT and embedded qualitative interview study to develop insights about treatment responses

1
2
3 Thirty-one cancer patients took part in a cross-over pilot RCT of music medicine compared with
4 music therapy.[10] Music medicine consisted of two sessions of listening to pre-recorded music;
5
6 music therapy involved two sessions of interactive music-making with a music therapist. Before and
7
8 after each session participants rated their mood, anxiety, relaxation and pain; 30 participants also
9
10 completed a qualitative interview at the end of treatment. The quantitative pre-post change in
11
12 outcomes and qualitative interview data of experiences were analysed separately. Findings were
13
14 then integrated to explore why some individual patients appeared to benefit more from one
15
16 intervention than the other. As a pilot RCT the study did not have sufficient statistical power to
17
18 detect clinically meaningful differences in the effectiveness of these treatments, should such
19
20 differences exist, but the study quantitative findings were that participants' mood, anxiety,
21
22 relaxation and pain appeared to improve following either music medicine or music therapy. The
23
24 findings from the qualitative interviews were that patients experienced music medicine and music
25
26 therapy as relaxing and fun. Participants escaped from stress in general and worries related to
27
28 cancer in particular. Music also offered hope for the future. In addition, music therapy enabled
29
30 patients to be creative and the presence of a therapist helped some patients to release emotion.
31
32 Other patients felt more comfortable with music medicine because there was no therapist and
33
34 because they could listen to familiar music.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Findings were integrated during the analysis phase of the study to explore reasons for variation in
44
45 outcomes. The researchers did this by creating a joint display of quantitative and qualitative findings
46
47 for four groups of the 30 patients with both qualitative and quantitative data: participants who
48
49 showed quantitative (a) improvement following music therapy (MT) but much less or no
50
51 improvement following music medicine (MM) (b) improvement following MM but much less or no
52
53 improvement following MT, (c) improvement following both interventions, and (d) deterioration
54
55 following both interventions. Improvement or deterioration was determined based on z-scores for
56
57 changes in mood, anxiety, relaxation and pain for each patient. Patient experiences, expressed in the
58
59
60

1
2
3 qualitative interviews, were summarised in the table for each of the four groups. These experiences
4
5 differed by each of the four groups. Patients who described valuing the therapeutic relationship and
6
7 creative elements of making music in the qualitative research benefited more from MT than MM.
8
9
10 Patients who were apprehensive about active music making and exploring feelings related to cancer
11
12 benefited more from MM than MT (see Figure 1).
13
14
15

16
17 ---insert figure 1 somewhere near here---
18
19
20

21 Integration of findings from independent quantitative and qualitative analyses identified that
22
23 participant preferences and attitudes appeared to impact on treatment benefits. This generates the
24
25 hypothesis that an effective intervention could be one where cancer patients are offered a choice of
26
27 music therapy or music medicine based on their preferences. This hypothesis could then be tested
28
29 in a fully powered RCT. This approach to analysis is not without challenges. Although blinding of
30
31 qualitative researchers is often thought to be highly difficult because of the nature of the
32
33 researcher/participant conversations, with careful organisation it is possible to do initial analyses blind
34
35 to knowledge of the other, for example by analysing qualitative findings not knowing the trial
36
37 outcomes, generating key finding statements from each dataset still blind. Blinding of mixed
38
39 methods analysts to the quantitatively determined group allocations may be difficult but would be
40
41 desirable during integration to further reduce the potential for analytical bias. Despite organisational
42
43 difficulties, however, there is the potential for this technique to identify new insights about variation
44
45 in outcomes and how to develop interventions to address them.
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 **Example 2: Integrating data from a pilot RCT and qualitative process data to develop insights**
53
54 **about treatment adherence and outcomes**

55
56 Sixty-eight adults with depression participated in a pilot RCT of Morita Therapy plus Treatment As
57
58 Usual (TAU) versus TAU alone.[11] Morita Therapy is a Japanese psychological therapy for common
59
60

1
2
3 mental health problems where patients are taught that unpleasant thoughts and emotions ebb and
4
5 flow as a matter of course, cannot be controlled by will, and can be accepted as part of the natural
6
7 ecology of the human experience. Twenty-eight intervention participants also attended a post-
8
9 treatment qualitative interview.[12] Following separate analysis of the RCT data and the qualitative
10
11 interviews, data from the interviews and pilot RCT were integrated at the level of individual
12
13 participants who had provided both types of data to explore how participants' views of the
14
15 intervention related to the number of sessions they attended and whether they responded to
16
17 treatment. Morita Therapy participants attended a mean of 8 treatment sessions out of a maximum
18
19 of 12; 24/34 (70.6%) adhered to a per-protocol minimum dose (≥ 5 sessions). The pilot RCT was not
20
21 powered to detect clinically meaningful differences in treatment effectiveness; however, at follow-
22
23 up 22/33 intervention participants (66.7%) scored below the threshold for major depressive disorder
24
25 on a depression symptom checklist compared with 13.3% of controls. During the qualitative
26
27 interviews, many but not all of those receiving Morita Therapy found it acceptable. Acceptability was
28
29 related to participants' expectations and understandings of treatment (or 'orientation' towards
30
31 treatment) being compatible or not with the principles of Morita Therapy. Participants distinguished
32
33 between engaging with Morita Therapy on a conceptual level and engaging with it on a practical
34
35 level such as finding the required time to do it.
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Quantitative and qualitative data were then integrated for individual intervention participants.
44
45 Qualitative data were organised into typologies of views on Morita Therapy, according to the extent
46
47 to which participants found (1) the principles and (2) the practical processes of the therapy
48
49 acceptable. Quantitative data from the RCT on the numbers of sessions attended and the clinical
50
51 outcomes were added into a joint display. Participants who identified with Morita Therapy
52
53 principles typically responded to treatment regardless of the number of sessions they attended;
54
55 conversely, those whose orientation towards treatment was incompatible with the intervention did
56
57 not respond to treatment, again regardless of treatment adherence. Participants whose personal
58
59
60

1
2
3 circumstances (such as a lack of time or support from others) impeded their opportunity to engage
4
5 in the intervention generally attended the fewest number of sessions but this did not drive clinical
6
7 outcome.
8
9

10
11 By integrating qualitative and quantitative data the possibility of new relationships between
12
13 orientation towards treatment, adherence and clinical outcomes were found. These suggested that
14
15 personalising depression treatment by choosing an approach (for example, “Western” or “Eastern”
16
17 treatment, directive or non-directive approaches) according to the extent to which the conceptual
18
19 underpinnings of that treatment were compatible with a person’s own worldview, could lead to
20
21 better individual outcomes. It also raised the possibility that, where this congruence is present,
22
23 patients with demanding personal circumstances which constrain their ability to engage in
24
25 treatment may still benefit from a lower intensity version of the same treatment offered in fewer
26
27 sessions. Clearly the small numbers in this study is a limitation and the analysis was not conclusive,
28
29 but rather they raised interesting possibilities for testing in future RCTs of personalised medicine.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 37 **Example 3: Integrating findings from the quantitative and qualitative parts of a process evaluation** 38 39 **to interpret the findings of a fully powered cluster RCT**

40
41 A large, multi-country factorial cluster RCT was conducted to examine the effectiveness of
42
43 interventions aimed at decreasing antibiotic prescribing for acute cough by general practitioners
44
45 (GPs).[13] Interventions were: (i) GP communication skills training and use of a patient booklet; (ii)
46
47 training in the provision and use of a C-reactive protein (CRP) test device; (iii) both interventions; or
48
49 (iv) neither intervention. Each of the separate interventions led to decreases in antibiotic prescribing
50
51 and the combination of both led to the largest decrease. The mixed methods process evaluation,
52
53 undertaken alongside the RCT, collected quantitative and qualitative data on patients’ and GPs’
54
55 views on prescribing antibiotics for acute cough and their experiences of the interventions.
56
57
58 Quantitative self-report data were collected from 2886 patients and 346 GPs. Qualitative data were
59
60

1
2
3 collected from interviews with 62 patients and 66 GPs. Data from the four different sources in the
4 process evaluation were analysed separately. Findings from all four sources were then compared in
5 an integrative analysis.[14] Based on the surveys, there was a high level of satisfaction with both
6 interventions. GPs reported that the communication skills training, use of a patient booklet, and
7 training with use of the CRP test helped them to reduce prescribing. Patients who received the
8 booklet reported the highest levels of self-care enablement for their cough and awareness that
9 taking antibiotics could be risky and harmful. Based on the qualitative interviews, GPs felt that the
10 communication skills training gave them greater confidence in addressing patient expectations for
11 an antibiotic and that the CRP test was helpful to decrease diagnostic uncertainty and reassure
12 patients. The booklet and use of the CRP test were acceptable to patients and patients perceived
13 that both the interventions supported GPs' prescribing decision.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 The key findings from each of the four datasets in the process evaluation were integrated by
31 summarising them in a form of joint display known as Triangulation Protocol.[15] Three analysts
32 independently compared findings across the datasets, considering where they agreed, partly agreed,
33 did not agree, or where there was an unexpected gap in findings from one of the datasets. Examples
34 of the joint displays are given within the article. There was disagreement between findings from
35 different datasets in terms of the utility of the CRP test. In the qualitative interviews with GPs, the
36 CRP test was viewed as helping to convince patients that a no-antibiotic decision was appropriate
37 when the patient expected an antibiotic to be prescribed. In contrast, patients reported in
38 interviews that they were confident in the GP's prescription decision regardless of whether or not
39 the CRP test had been undertaken, especially if they were given a detailed explanation by their GP
40 and a booklet on self-care. Findings from the patient survey reinforced the importance of
41 communication to patients. This highlighted the importance to patients of improved communication
42 rather than diagnostics for antibiotic prescribing. Limitations included the non-complementary
43 nature of the retrospectively designed interview guides and the lack of individual participant level
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 data linking. This study also highlighted that attention needs to be paid to the quality of the
4
5 application of integration techniques, for example the use of three independent analysts to create
6
7 and interpret the joint display.
8
9

10 11 12 **CONCLUSIONS**

13
14 Applying mixed methods integration techniques to data or findings from studies involving both RCTs
15
16 and qualitative research can yield insights that might be useful for understanding variation in
17
18 outcomes, the mechanism by which interventions have an impact, and identifying ways of tailoring
19
20 therapy to patient preference and type. The three examples given here are by no means definitive.
21
22 However, they do illustrate different approaches to data integration including synthesis of findings
23
24 driven by quantitative data (example 1), qualitative data (example 2), or by both equally (example
25
26 3). Further examples of integration using these and other analytical techniques might help to
27
28 persuade researchers and funders of the value of doing this. However, published examples remain
29
30 rare and the research community has no guidance on which of these and other techniques might
31
32 yield the best added value to RCTs. The development of guidance will help to ensure the quality of
33
34 this practice by, for example, recommending the use of independent data collection and analysis,
35
36 blinding of analysts undertaking integration analyses, and rationale for the choice of analysis
37
38 methods. Such guidance could include systematic reviews of the utility of different methods used for
39
40 mixed methods data integration with decision aids to help. Guidance might also equip research
41
42 funding boards, reviewers and other readers to judge the credibility of any integration.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Competing interests:** the authors declare that they have no competing interests.
51
52

53
54 **Funding:** the United Kingdom Medical Research Council Hubs for Trials Methodology Research
55
56 (HTMR) Network funded the meeting. The funder had no role in the design of the meeting and in
57
58 writing the manuscript.
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 **Authors' contributions:** DAR, JJH and AoC conceived, planned and conducted the meeting. AoC, JJH
6 and DAR drafted the original manuscript. PB, GB, PC, RE, JF, JH, HH, CJ, AM, GM, VPC, ST-C, JW, FW,
7
8 SW, BY attended the meeting and read, edited and approved the final manuscript.
9

10
11
12
13
14 **Acknowledgements:** Holly Sugg provided information for example 2. DR is supported by the National
15 Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration (ARC) South West Peninsula. CJ
16 is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied Research Collaboration
17 (ARC) West Midlands. JH is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Applied
18 Research Collaboration (ARC) West. STC is funded by the National Institute for Health Research
19 Health Protection Research Unit (NIHR HPRU) in Healthcare Associated Infections and Antimicrobial
20 Resistance at the University of Oxford in partnership with Public Health England (PHE) [HPRU-2012-
21 10041].
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the MRC, NHS, the NIHR,
the Department of Health and Social Care or Public Health England.

REFERENCES

- 1 Lewin S, Glenton C, and Oxman AD, *Use of qualitative methods alongside randomised
2 controlled trials of complex healthcare interventions: methodological study.* BMJ
3 2009;**339**:b3496.
- 4 O'Cathain A, Thomas KJ, Drabble SJ et al., *What can qualitative research do for randomised
5 controlled trials? A systematic mapping review.* BMJ Open 2013;**3**(6):e002889.

- 1
2
3 3 Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M et al., *Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical*
4
5 *Research Council guidance*. BMJ 2015;**350**.
6
7
8
9
10 4 O’Cathain A, *A practical guide to using qualitative research with randomized controlled trials*;
11
12 Oxford: OUP, 2018.
13
14
15
16 5 Bazeley P, *Integrating analyses in mixed methods research*; London: Sage, 2018.
17
18
19
20
21 6 Feters MD, Curry LA, and Creswell JW, *Achieving Integration in Mixed Methods Designs-*
22
23 *Principles and Practices*. Health Services Research 2013;**48**(6):2134-2156.
24
25
26
27
28 7 Creswell JW and Plano Clark VL, *Designing and conducting mixed methods research*. 3rd ed.
29
30 Thousand Oaks, CA; London, UK; New Dehli, India; Singapore: SAGE, 2017.
31
32
33
34 8 O’Cathain A, Murphy E, and Nicholl J, *Three techniques for integrating data in mixed*
35
36 *methods studies*. BMJ 2010;**341**.
37
38
39
40
41 9 Guetterman TC, Feters MD, and Creswell JW, *Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative*
42
43 *Results in Health Science Mixed Methods Research Through Joint Displays*. Ann Fam Med
44
45 2015;**13**(6):554-561.
46
47
48
49
50 10 Bradt J, Potvin N, Kesslick A et al., *The impact of music therapy versus music medicine on*
51
52 *psychological outcomes and pain in cancer patients: a mixed methods study*. Support Care
53
54 Cancer 2015;**23**(5):1261-1271.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 11. Sugg HVR, Richards DA and Frost J, *Morita Therapy for depression (Morita Trial): a pilot*
4 *randomised controlled trial*. *BMJ Open* 2018;8:e021605.doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-021605
5
6
7
8
9
10 12. Sugg HVR, Frost J, Richards DA. (2019). Morita Therapy for depression (Morita Trial): an
11 embedded qualitative study of acceptability. *BMJ Open*, 9, e023873.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19 13. Little P, Stuart B, Francis N, et al., *Effects of internet-based training on antibiotic prescribing*
20 *rates for acute respiratory-tract infections: a multinational, cluster, randomised, factorial,*
21 *controlled trial*. *Lancet* 2013;382(9899):1175–82.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28 14. Tonkin-Crine S, Anthierens S, Hood K et al., *Discrepancies between qualitative and*
29 *quantitative evaluation of randomised controlled trial results: achieving clarity through*
30 *mixed methods triangulation*. *Implement Sci* 2016;**11**.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 15. Farmer T, Robinson K, Elliott SJ et al., *Developing and implementing a triangulation protocol*
38 *for qualitative health research*. *Qualitative Health Research* 2006;16:377-394.doi:
39 10.1177/1049732305285708
40
41
42
43
44
45

46 **Figure 1 Joint display table summarising findings from RCT and qualitative research** (Bradt J, Potvin
47
48 N, Kesslick A et al. Supportive Care in Cancer 2015,[10] reproduced with permission)
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 4 Joint display of patient experiences per treatment benefits

Treatment benefits	Change in music therapy ^a	Change in music medicine ^a	Patient experiences
↑MT, ↓MM	0.65 to 1.88	-0.11 to 0.38	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize the importance of therapeutic relationship and support by therapist • Enjoy the creative aspect of music making • Are hopeful for the future
↑MM, ↓MT	-0.46 to 0.59	0.33 to 1.63	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Apprehensive about active music making • Prefer familiarity of pre-recorded music • Hesitant about exploring feelings related to cancer
↑MT, ↑MM	0.61 to 1.07	0.73 to 1.37	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strong conviction about the power of music to support and give hope • Use music for mental escape • Use music for emotional exploration and value processing of emotions with therapist
↓MT, ↓MM	-0.67 to -1.03	-0.52 to -1.06	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold little hope for the future • Music evokes sad and traumatic memories • Feel inadequate regarding music making and singing • Prefer aesthetics of original recordings

↑ great improvement, ↓ less improvement or worsening

^aRange of overall z-scores (average of z-scores for mood, anxiety, relaxation, and pain)

206x96mm (96 x 96 DPI)