

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 (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

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

BMJ Open

Feasibility study for supporting medication adherence for adults with cystic fibrosis: mixed-methods process evaluation

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039089
Article Type:	Original research
Date Submitted by the Author:	06-Apr-2020
Complete List of Authors:	Hind, Daniel; The University of Sheffield, ScHARR Drabble, Sarah; The University of Sheffield, Medical Care Research Unit, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR) Arden, Madelynne; Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Behavioural Science and Applied Psychology Mandefield, Laura; University of York, Health Sciences Waterhouse, Simon; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Maguire, Chin; University of Sheffield, Cantrill, Hannah; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Robinson, Louisa; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Scott, Alex; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Scott, Alex; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Scott, Alex; The University of Sheffield Hutchings, Marlene; Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Bradley, Judy; Queen's University Belfast, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences Nightingale, Julia ; University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust Allenby, Mark; University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust Dewar, Jane; Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust Whelan, Pauline; The University of Manchester, Health e-Research Centre Ainsworth, John; The University of Manchester, Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences Walters, Stephen; University of Sheffield, ScHARR O'Cathain, Alicia; University of Sheffield, School of Health and Related Research Wildman, Martin; Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Keywords:	Cystic fibrosis < THORACIC MEDICINE, Health informatics < BIOTECHNOLOGY & BIOINFORMATICS, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, SOCIAL MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT

1 2	
3 4 5	SCHOLARONE ™
5 6 7	Manuscripts
8	
10 11	
12	
14	
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	
57 58	
59 60	For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/auidelines.xhtm
50	



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

6

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
10
יא 20
∠∪ 21
∠ı วว
∠∠ วว
23
24
25
20
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

1	Feasibility study for supporting medication adherence
2	for adults with cystic fibrosis: mixed-methods process
3	evaluation
4	

Daniel Hind^{1§}, Sarah J Drabble², Madelynne A Arden³, Laura Mandefield⁴, Simon

Waterhouse¹, Chin Maguire¹, Hannah Cantrill¹, Louisa Robinson¹, Daniel Beever¹,

7	Alexander J Scott ¹ , Sam Keating ¹ , Marlene Hutchings ⁵ , Judy Bradley ⁶ , Julia
8	Nightingale ⁷ , Mark I Allenby ⁷ , Jane Dewar ⁸ , Pauline Whelan ⁹ , John Ainsworth ⁹ ,
9	Stephen J Walters ² , Martin J Wildman ^{2,5} , Alicia O'Cathain ² .
10	
11	¹ Clinical Trials Research Unit, University of Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent
12	Street, Sheffield, S1 4DA, UK
13	² School of Health and Related Research, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield,
14	SI 4DA, UK
15	³ Centre for Behavioural Science and Applied Psychology, Sheffield Hallam
16	University, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield, S10 2BQ
17	⁴ Department of Health Sciences, University of York, University of York, Seebohm
18	Rowntree Building, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD
19	⁵ Sheffield Adult Cystic Fibrosis Unit Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation
20	Trust, Northern General Hospital, Herries Road, Sheffield, S5 7AU
21	⁶ Wellcome-Wolfson Institute For Experimental Medicine, School of Medicine,
22	Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, UK
23	⁷ Wessex Adult Cystic Fibrosis Service, University Hospital Southampton NHS

- Foundation Trust, Tremona Road, Southampton, Hampshire, SO16 6YD.
- 25 ⁸ Wolfson Cystic Fibrosis Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, City
- 26 Hospital, Hucknall Road, Nottingham, NG5 1PB.

3 4	27	⁹ Health eResearch Centre - Division of Imaging, Informatics and Data Sciences,
5 6	28	School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, The University
7 8	29	of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, United
9 10 11	30	Kingdom
12 13	31	[§] Corresponding author
14 15	32	
16 17 18	33	Email addresses:
19 20	34	DH: d.hind@sheffield.ac.uk
21 22 22	35	SD: s.j.drabble@sheffield.ac.uk
23 24 25	36	Madelynne A: M.Arden@shu.ac.uk
26 27	37	LM: 1.mandefield@sheffield.ac.uk
28 29	38	SW: s.waterhouse@sheffield.ac.uk
30 31 22	39	CM: c.maguire@sheffield.ac.uk
32 33 34	40	HC: h.cantrill@sheffield.ac.uk
35 36	41	LR: louisa.robinson@sheffield.ac.uk
37 38	42	DB: d.a.beever@sheffield.ac.uk
39 40 41	43	AS: alex.scott@sheffield.ac.uk
42 43	44	SK: s.m.keating@sheffield.ac.uk
44 45	45	MH: marlene.hutchings@sth.nhs.uk
46 47 48	46	JB: judy.bradley@qub.ac.uk
48 49 50	47	JN: julia.nightingale@uhs.nhs.uk
51 52	48	Mark A: mark.allenby@uhs.nhs.uk
53 54	49	JD: jane.dewar@nuh.nhs.uk
55 56 57	50	PW: pauline.whelan@manchester.ac.uk
58 59 60	51	JA: John.Ainsworth@manchester.ac.uk

1 2		
- 3 4	52	SJW: s.j.walters@sheffield.ac.uk
5 6	53	AOC: a.ocathain@sheffield.ac.uk
7 8	54	MW: martin.wildman@sth.nhs.uk
9 10 11		
11 12 13		
14 15		
16 17		
18 19		
20 21		
22 23 24		
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		
		- 3 -

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

56 Abstract 57 Objectives 58 To undertake a process evaluation of an adherence support intervention for people 59 with cystic fibrosis (PWCF), to assess its feasibility and acceptability.

61 Setting

- 62 Two UK Cystic Fibrosis (CF) units
- 63

64 Participants

- 65 Fourteen adult PWCF; 3 professionals delivering adherence support
- 66 ('interventionists'); 5 multi-disciplinary CF team members.
- 67

68 Interventions

- 69 Nebuliser with data recording and transfer capability, linked to a software platform,
- 70 and strategies to support adherence to nebulised treatments facilitated by

71 interventionists over five months (+/- one month).

72

73 Primary and secondary measures

- 74 Feasibility and acceptability of the intervention, assessed through semi-structured
- 75 interviews, questionnaires, fidelity assessments, click analytics.

76

77 **Results**

- 78 Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention and training. Key barriers
- 79 to intervention feasibility and acceptability were identified. Interventionists had
- 80 difficulty finding clinic space and time in normal working hours to conduct review

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

81	visits. As a result, fewer than expected intervention visits were conducted and
82	interviews indicated this may explain low adherence in some intervention arm
83	participants. Adherence levels appeared to be >100% for some patients, due to
84	inaccurate prescription data, particularly in patients with complex treatment regimens.
85	Flatlines in adherence data at the start of the study were linked to device connectivity
86	problems. Fidelity assessments identified that interventionists needed to focus more
87	on the 'active ingredients' of the intervention during sessions.
88	
89	Conclusions
90	The process evaluation led to 14 key changes to intervention procedures to overcome
91	barriers to intervention success. With the identified changes, it is feasible and
92	acceptable to support medication adherence with this intervention.
93	
94	Registration: ISRCTN13076797; 7th June 2016.
95 96	
97	Strengths and limitations of this study
98	• This is a detailed evaluation of the feasibility of an adherence support system
99	for people with cystic fibrosis.
100	• The use of mixed methods provided indepth understanding of the processes
101	involved in delivering the service, its value, and factors that might influence
102	its use, implementation and success.
103	• This was a small, two-centre study.

104 Background

 Cystic Fibrosis (CF) is a long-term inherited condition affecting over 80,000 people
worldwide, primarily of Northern European ancestry [1]. Median survival for people
with CF (PWCF) is estimated at 31 years [2–6] with progressive lung function
decline, caused by regular infection and damage to airways, being one of the main
disease features [2].

Preventative medications preserve lung function and reduce exacerbations [7– 13].Low adherence to these medications is problematic as this predicts exacerbations requiring intravenous antibiotics (IVAB)[14,15]. Exacerbations of this nature carry a risk of systemic side effects of both increased mortality[16,17], and cost of care [18– 20]. In 2012, the total spend on CF in the UK was estimated to be £100 million, with £30 million spent on inhaled antibiotics and mucolytics[21]; the UK CF population received 171,907 days of IVAB with 93,455 days received in hospital, costing an estimated £27 million[22].

Self-reported adherence to inhaled therapies underestimates objectively-measured
adherence, with rates of 80% and 36% recorded, respectively[23] and systematic data
collection suggests objective adherence to be closer to 30%[24]. As a result, clinicians
are currently unable to identify PWCF with low adherence, in order to provide
additional support.

127 Consistent with identified research priorities[25,26], a complex intervention was

128 developed [Cite companion paper] to support inhaled medication adherence in PWCF.

129 This article presents the results of a process evaluation that was undertaken alongside

- 6 -

2 3	120	
4	130	a phot RC1, and describes the resultant changes made to intervention procedures
5 6 7	131	prior to a full-scale RCT[27,28]. The specific objectives of the process evaluation
8	132	were:
9 10 11	133	
12 13	134	1. To triangulate qualitative and quantitative data collected on intervention
14 15 16	135	inputs, engagement, activities, and contextual factors, alongside immediate and
17 18	136	intermediate outcomes recorded in the feasibility study, to understand and identify
19 20	137	potential barriers to intervention implementation and success.
21 22 22	138	2. To document and use these findings to guide changes to intervention
23 24 25	139	procedures, ahead of a future, full-scale RCT.
26		
27 28	140	Methods
29	141	The wider feasibility study
30 31	142	The process evaluation forms one part of a wider pilot study, which also assessed the
32 33 24	143	feasibility of RCT procedures (reported elsewhere[29]). The pilot RCT consisted of
34 35 36	144	33 intervention patients and 31 control patients. Three trained interventionists in two
37 38	145	UK CF centres delivered the intervention to PWCF in the intervention arm and
39 40	146	followed them up for 5 months, plus or minus one month.
41 42	147	Intervention description
43 44	148	The complex intervention to support adherence in CF was developed to enable PWCF
45 46	149	to manage adherence to nebulised medication, with a view to shifting CF treatment
47 48	150	from rescue in hospital settings to prevention, managed in the community. The full
49 50 51	151	intervention development process is described in a separate article[29].
52 53	152	
54 55	153	The complex intervention consists of four key elements: the eTrack, CFHealthHub
56 57	154	server, the CFHealthHub Apps and the manualised behavioural intervention. A logic
58 59 60	155	model (Figure 1) was produced to reflect, in detail, constructs and processes by which

3
4
5
6
7
0
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
20
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
20
3/
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
15
46
40
4/
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
)) 56
56
57
58
59
60

1 2

156	the intervention was expected to function; this is in terms of inputs, engagement,
157	activities, and outcomes. The logic model's hashed numbers (#1, #2, etc) provide a
158	reference for linking intervention materials and processes to logic model constructs in
159	Figure 1.
160	
161	The eTrack (#4) (PARI Pharma GmbH, Starnberg, Germany) is a microchipped
162	nebuliser, enabling real-time monitoring of adherence to nebulised medications.
163	Timestamped records of medications administered via the eTrack are sent to a 2net
164	Hub (Qualcomm, San Diego, USA; #5) which transmits data to PARI.
165	
166	Real-time inhalation data is received by the CFHealthHub (CFHH) server
167	infrastructure, stored securely and used for display in both a web-based interface and
168	a mobile app (#6, see Figure 2). Each of these displays adherence data alongside
169	tools to support behaviour change and educational content.
170	
171	Participants and their interventionists had access to adherence displays for monitoring
172	(#13, #19, #20) and other CFHH content (#21- #26), such as education about
173	treatments (#21) and problem solving in the face of adherence barriers (#26).
174	Interventionists would use CFHH to facilitate delivery of manualised behavioural
175	intervention sessions (#8, #17).
176	
177	Health professionals (n =3) included a clinical psychologist, a physiotherapist and a
178	social worker. They received specific training to deliver the manualised intervention
179	sessions (#9). Training was delivered over two days, in face-to-face workshops. This
180	was supplemented by online learning modules and a further four-week training

Page 11 of 197

1 2

BMJ Open

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

181	schedule. Interventionists were assessed with online theory tests and in a competency
182	assessment which examined intervention delivery within the first 5 sessions.

183

184	Sessions were delivered either face-to-face or remotely, on a one-to-one basis. All
185	intervention arm participants received an initial intervention visit and a minimum of
186	one additional review visit over the period of the study (#18). The content of sessions
187	varied by participant reported motivation; sessions for those with low motivation were
188	tailored to promote relationship / confidence building and to support the participant in
189	the exploration of relevant CFHealthHub educational and information material (#21,
190	#22). Relevant material could be added to the participant's personalised 'Toolkit'.
191	Sessions conducted with participants displaying higher motivation would also involve
192	supporting the participant to set personalised adherence goals (#23, #24), and to make
193	action plans (#25) and engage in problem-solving including making coping plans
194	where relevant (#26).
195	
196	Design
197	A mixed-methods approach was used for the process evaluation. Although this
198	pragmatic case study[30,31] primarily works at the level of the programme, we also
199	present a nested multiple-case design, with cases at the level of the PWCF, and two
200	embedded units of analysis – interviews with intervention participants and trial data.

60

201

202 Data Sources

Quantitative and qualitative data sources were triangulated to address process
evaluation objectives. These are described using hashed numbers to relate data
sources to aspects of the logic model (Figure1) for which they contributed data.

- 3 4	207	Qualitative data included: verbal reports from project staff (#1. #2, #10, #16); semi-
5 6	208	structured interviews with interventionists and participants in the intervention and
/ 8 9	209	control arms of the pilot RCT (#8, #9, #12, #13, #14, #15, #16, #17, #19, #20, #21);
10 11	210	minutes of meetings (#3); emails (#4), website development reports (#6); and fidelity
12 13	211	assessments (#17).
14 15	212	
10 17 18	213	Quantitative data included: implementation log entries and data management reports
19 20	214	(#3), questionnaire data derived from secondary clinical outcome measures described
21 22	215	in Table 1 (#7, #28, #29, #30, #31, #32, #33) an interventionist-completed structured
23 24 25	216	questionnaire on interventionist confidence post-training (#9), structured
26 27	217	interventionist fidelity assessments in which audio-recordings of intervention sessions
28 29	218	were coded using a fidelity scoring system which assessed whether each component
30 31 22	219	of the intervention was delivered and the quality of that delivery (#11, #17), CFHH
32 33 34	220	click analytics (#13, #14, #15, #18, #20, #21, #22, #23, #24, #25, #26), session
35 36	221	frequency and duration records (#15); and adherence data taken from CFHH (#35).
37 38	222	These 23 logic model constructs were collected as part of the trial protocol from
39 40 41	223	sources described in Table 1.
42 43	224	Semi-structured interviews, conducted face-to-face, were digitally audio-recorded and
44 45	225	transcribed verbatim. The median length of interviews was 30 minutes (range 11 to
46 47 48	226	87) for PWCF, 86 minutes (63 to 102) for interventionists and 62 minutes (51 to 66)
49 50	227	for CF team members.
51 52	228	
53 54 55 56	229 230	Sampling Participants were recruited for semi-structured interviews. Participants included
57 58	231	intervention arm participants (n=14), interventionists (n=3, 0.8 WTE at each centre)
59 60	232	and members of the wider, multi-disciplinary CF team (n=5). Participants were

1 2

> multi-disciplinary CF team (n=5). Participants were - 10 -

3 4	233	purposively sampled based on site, age, gender, deprivation index, objective and
5 6	234	subjective adherence levels (service-users), or site and professional category
7 8 9	235	(professionals). Interventionists were interviewed twice – at the beginning and end of
10 11	236	the study – patients once. PWCF who consented to be approached for interview were
12 13	237	contacted by letter or email and, subsequently, telephone or email depending on
14 15 16	238	preference. Professionals were contacted directly by the study team.
17 18	239	
19 20	240	
21	2.4.1	Dete Analysia
22	241	Data Analysis
23 24	242	We conducted a Framework analysis of interview transcripts[32], within NVivo (QSR
25 26	243	International) using multiple frameworks including the Theoretical Domains
27 28	244	Framework[33], a process evaluation framework[34], and the logic model (Figure 1).
29 30 31	245	
32 33	246	Using a modified triangulation protocol[35], we integrated qualitative and quantitative
34 35	247	datasets at the programme- and the case-level[36]. We used a joint display table[37]
36 37 29	248	to summarise data sets for 35 logic model constructs in the Inputs (n=12),
39 40	249	Engagement (n=6), Activities (n=7), Immediate outcomes (n=6) and Intermediate
41 42	250	outcomes (n=2) columns (Figure 1). The fit of data integration was categorised as:
43 44	251	'confirmation' (quantitative and qualitative data provided similar findings);
45 46 47	252	'expansion' (the datasets addressed different or complementary aspects of the
48 49	253	phenomenon); or, 'discordance' (the datasets were contradictory)[38]. We described
50 51	254	similar and unique contributions, made by the two data sets, to the research question
52 53	255	[35].
54 55 56	256	
57	0.55	та та та стала та стала та стала.
58 59	257	In the 14 intervention participants, for whom both qualitative and quantitative process
60	258	data was available, we produced case-profiles[39], triangulating qualitative data with

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
a	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20 21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
20	
50 21	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
30	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
21	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
72	
bU	

1 2

259	individual-participant adherence run charts[40] (Additional File 01) and other
260	quantitative process data (see Additional File 02 – Study protocol, pp29-31). We
261	worked abductively, moving between behaviour change theories[41,42] and
262	contextual observations, agreeing plausible hypotheses to explain patterns which
263	could be tested in future work [43–46].
264	
265	We produced a case-ordered descriptive matrix[47], with cases ranked by average
266	adherence during the last month of the study, to understand how processes and
267	outcomes were mediated by local and individual conditions. Adherence levels of
268	>80% were assessed as high; 50-80% moderate; <50% low [14,48]. We theorised that
269	high life chaos, as measured by the Confusion, Hubbub and Order Scale
270	(CHAOS)[49] and low motivation would be associated with low adherence. We used
271	four measures to understand motivation: (1) a single item, scored on a 1-7 Likert scale
272	- "I want to do all of my nebuliser treatment" (motivation); (2) a single item, scored
273	on a 1-7 Likert scale, which asked, "I am confident I can do all of my nebuliser
274	treatments" ('confidence'); (3) the necessities and, (4) concerns five-point subscales
275	of the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire nebuliser-specific (BMQ) instrument
276	[50]. Interventionists assessed the participant's motivation to increase adherence on a
277	one to seven scale after discussion with the patient; adequate motivation was
278	necessary before participants could make action plans and do problem solving
279	activities.
280	
281 282	Approach taken to modifying the intervention Modifications to the intervention fell into three categories: the software platform;
283	other IT infrastructure; and the manual and training. Identified problems and solutions

were tabulated following a modified approach of that taken by Bugge [28]. Digital

3 4	285	platform development was reviewed regularly using the "Must have, Should have,
5 6 7	286	<u>C</u> ould have, and <u>W</u> on't have but would like" (MoSCoW)[27], often used in agile
/ 8 9	287	software development [51,52].
10 11	288	
12 13 14	289 290	Patient and Public Involvement Recruitment for the Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) Group was achieved by
15 16 17	291	advertising within CF units and on the People in Research website, as well as via
18 19	292	group members themselves. Cross-infection between PWCF[53] was prevented by
20 21	293	arranging meetings via teleconference. The PPI group gave feedback on intervention
22 23 24	294	data-sharing policies, usability and presentation of the website/user-guide. In addition,
25 26	295	the PPI group piloted the participant information materials and one individual gave
27 28	296	feedback on the trial protocol and interview guides (Additional File 02).
29 30	297	
31 32	298	
33 34	299	The study received approval from London Brent Research Ethics Committee
35 36	300	(16/LO/0356). The funder was not involved in the trial design, patient recruitment,
37 38 39	301	data collection, analysis, interpretation, or presentation, writing or editing of the
40 41	302	report, or the decision to submit for publication. The corresponding author had full
42 43	303	access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to
44 45	304	submit for publication.
40 47 48 49	305	
50	306	Results
51 52 53	307	In what follows, we address contextual factors that affected implementation and
54 55	308	participant responses, then follow the columns (inputs, engagement, activities,
56 57	309	immediate and intermediate outcomes) of the logic model. Additional File 03
50 59	310	summarises quantitative process outcomes for 14 case study participants, ranked by

311	objective adherence at the end of the trial. Hashed numbers (#1, #2, etc) indicate cross
312	references to the logic model (Figure 1) and supporting evidence in Additional File
313	04, which summarises data triangulation at the level of individual logic model
314	constructs. Both qualitative and quantitative data were available for 13/34 logic model
315	constructs, providing confirmation of (n=2) or expansion on (n=11) inferences drawn
316	from quantitative data. A case-ordered descriptive matrix based on logic model
317	columns (Additional File 05) and run charts annotated with key events (Additional
318	File 01) provides an integrated analysis at the level of the participant for fourteen
319	'case studies', cross referenced by participant numbers (R02/52, R01/54, etc).
320	
321	Contextual factors affecting implementation and participant
322 323	The key factor affecting implementation was the mixed economy of CF drug delivery
324	systems: the e-Flow (PARI Pharma GmbH, Starnberg, Germany); the iNeb (Philips
325	Healthcare, Eindhoven, Netherlands); and a number of dry powder delivery systems.
326	The e-Flow is the only device able to deliver all the wet nebulised drugs that are used
327	in CF care. The e-Track we used in this trial was a version of the e-Flow developed to

328 transfer time- and date-stamped data. Most patients at site R01 used e-Flows;

329 switching consenting participants over to the e-Track was generally unproblematic.

330 The e-Flow's competitor, the iNeb, cannot deliver aztreonam and requires double

chamber filling to deliver tobramycin, so it is not suitable for all patients. The data

transfer version of the iNeb, the BiNeb, is a prototype for which limited numbers are

available. We were unable to secure approval to integrate the BiNeb into CFHH in

time to incorporate it into this study. At site R02 where iNebs were commonly used,

- those who were familiar with and liked the iNeb were less keen to swap to an
- alternative device; some who swapped to the e-Track, later wanted to move back to

Page 17 of 197

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
a	
10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
10	
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	

337	the iNeb. A minority of patients use dry powder delivery systems, none of which have
338	data transfer versions. We were unsuccessful in engaging any of the companies
339	producing dry powders in time to get dry powder systems integrated into CFHH,
340	meaning that dry powder users could not be recruited to this feasibility study. Making
341	nebulisers with data recording and transfer capability available within hospitals
342	following local delivery took prolonged engagement with medical engineering
343	departments to obtain local safety approvals. For more than one participant, the
344	strength of their mobile data signal affected 2net Hub connectivity with the central
345	server (Implementation log, 19 Oct 16).
346	
347	Through meetings with site staff, the team identified a range of human factors that
348	also affected implementation. The struggle for clinic space and patient convenience
349	resulted in more home visits than anticipated for consent and review meetings,
350	informed by local lone-working policies. Reorganisation of one CF Centre, involving
351	the transfer of patients from the care of one local hospital to another, had created
352	discontent among some patients involved in the trial.
353	
354	
255	
355 356	The study chief investigator reported introducing local site investigators, centre
357	directors and MDTs to CFHH (#1). Through case reports, he conveyed that relying on
358	FEV ₁ , symptoms and BMI for CF management alone is inadequate and that objective
359	adherence data could help overcome the 'lamppost syndrome' [54], also known as the
360	'streetlight effect'[55,56] or 'drunkard's search'(page 11[57]) – a type of availability
361	bias[58]. The chief investigator reported feeling that site investigators at both centres

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
0	
9 10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
21	
24	
25	
26	
2/	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
52	
55	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1

362	were fully bought in, but that one clinician (not an investigator) believed that the
363	disparities between subjective and objective adherence[23] were overstated (#2).
364	
365	Interventionists entered prescription data into CFHH based on patient records and
366	self-reported treatment regimen (#3). Occasionally, interventionists were slow to
367	make monthly prescription checks when prompted by system alerts, resulting in
368	apparent adherence levels of over 100%, traced to the use of alternating treatment
369	regimens[59] (Implementation Log, 01 Dec 16, TMG minutes 10 Jan 17). Nebulisers
370	with data recording and transfer capability (#4), 2net Hubs (#5), the CFHH website
371	and mobile application (#6), were made available (emails to project manager 20 May
372	16, 23 Jun 16). The Capability Opportunity Motivation -Beliefs about Medicines
373	Questionnaire (COM-BMQ – see Additional File 02)[50] questionnaire data (#7) was
374	collected in CFHH (Additional File 06 - Table 8).
375	
375 376	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly
375 376 377	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study
375376377378	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects
 375 376 377 378 379 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an
 375 376 377 378 379 380 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH,
 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH, HC) identified differences in the way site investigators interacted with
 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH, HC) identified differences in the way site investigators interacted with interventionists, with one giving more intensive practical support, through weekly
 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH, HC) identified differences in the way site investigators interacted with interventionists, with one giving more intensive practical support, through weekly meetings and problem-solving (not prescribed by the intervention), than the other.
 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH, HC) identified differences in the way site investigators interacted with interventionists, with one giving more intensive practical support, through weekly meetings and problem-solving (not prescribed by the intervention), than the other. Fidelity data was collected on all three interventionists and the fidelity assessment
 375 376 377 378 379 380 381 382 383 384 385 	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects (#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH, HC) identified differences in the way site investigators interacted with interventionists, with one giving more intensive practical support, through weekly meetings and problem-solving (not prescribed by the intervention), than the other. Fidelity data was collected on all three interventionists and the fidelity assessment instrument was modified before use in the full RCT (#11). During interviews,

Page 19 of 197

BMJ Open

struggled to find space or time for consent / intervention encounters in clinic, the
study team requested an increase in the number of home visits (Implementation log 19
Oct 2016). As a result of initial problems in contacting participants and the need for
flexibility in arranging meetings out of usual clinic hours, the study team requested
flexible working in which the team worked 12:00-20:00 two days a week (interviews
& TMG minutes 29 Nov 2016).

394 Engagement

Interviews and click analytics showed that MDT members did not access adherence data (#13), aside from in the form of bar charts brought to MDT meetings by interventionists. It is important to note that extending the use of CFHH to the MDT was not an objective of the trial and no training was given in this regard. Click analytics showed that interventionists tracked adherence (#14). Of 14 case study participants, three did not contribute complete adherence data: R02/42 and R02/02 withdrew, while R02/03 was lost to follow-up. In other participants, flatlines in adherence data caused concern (Additional File 01). Flatlines at the beginning of the study (e.g. R01/39, R01/48) indicated technical problems with pairing nebulisers and hubs. Flatlines at the end of the study period (e.g. R01/42, R01/44, R02/12) were confirmed as the genuine recording of non-adherence through the use of adherence data beyond the end of the study period, interview data, self-report subjective adherence and the MAD-3 (Additional File 03 – Table f). Click analytics showed the median number of participant CFHH sessions was three (#15) (Additional File 03 – Table c). Of those with low usage, initial technical

411 problems (R01/02, R01/48) and initial lack of availability of a mobile application (#6)

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 0	
ð	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
21	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
20	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
וד [.] גע	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
10	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	
60	

were potential contributing factors. Some case study participants showed moderate
(R02/52, R01/54 and R01/40: 9-13 sessions) or high use (R02/12 and R01/42: >40
sessions). Push notifications - user-defined messages from the server which give
participants congratulations or reminders about adherence behaviour – were not
available in the pilot trial (#16).

417

1

418 Based on fidelity assessment of intervention session recordings, the *content* fidelity of 419 face-to-face interactions, was excellent (100%) – with all aspects delivered as per the 420 manual (#17). Delivery *quality* fidelity was more variable (60-92%). The generation 421 of goals and action plans was sometimes too directive rather than negotiated and 422 supportive. Interviews demonstrated that assessing the true level of motivation to 423 adhere to treatment was challenging; sometimes those with insufficient intrinsic 424 motivation (e.g. R01/48, R01/54 and R02/03) were assessed as having sufficient 425 motivation and inappropriately tasked with setting and reviewing goals, making 426 action plans and problem solving (see below #23-26). These individuals were variably 427 motivated by wanting to prove themselves to MDT members, who had doubted their 428 adherence (R01/49 and R01/54, Additional File 05), or by helping the research: 429 430 "I made that special effort 'cause I was taking part in this trial... I didn't see 431 how it was going to make me better" (R01/48). 432

Interaction with these individuals should have been confined to relationship-building
and trust-building. Fidelity assessment of recordings identified that, in interactions
with the adequately motivated, the focus was not always on the most active
ingredients – goal-setting, action planning (habit formation) and problem-

437	solving/coping planning. Participant run charts (Additional File 01) revealed a
438	disparity in whether and when review visits happened (#18).
439	
440	Activities
441	In interviews, CF team clinicians (as distinct from the interventionists) confirmed they
442	were not monitoring adherence as part of usual care (#19). Participant R01/02
443	complained that the research focus on adherence was "parallel rather than
444	integrated" with mainstream clinical management. However the intervention was
445	designed to be interventionist delivered allowing individual randomisation in a system
446	without contamination of controls rather than an intervention aimed at achieving
447	system change which would have required a cluster trial design. Participants' clicks
448	(median 11) on the CFHH "How am I doing?" (run charts) page sometimes related to
449	a limited number of sessions. In interviews, one moderately frequent user (R01/54)
450	only accessed this page to check their data was uploading. Other moderate/frequent
451	users described this page as important for adherence self- monitoring (#20), even
452	when their grasp of their own adherence was poor (R01/49).
453	
454	In interviews with participants, for tailored education about treatment (#21),
455	participants accessed particular education pages for specific issues, such as nebuliser
456	malfunction, which was viewed as, "more down to earth" than technical manuals. In
457	particular a video about the treatment action of Dornase alfa, was often praised, as a
458	means of educating others about CF; 'Talking heads' videos (in these videos people
459	with CF described strategies for successful nebuliser use) (#22) divided opinion: for
460	some, the opportunity for social comparison[60] provided relief and reassurance;
461	those who were less appreciative were those who found comparisons with people

healthier than themselves could make them feel as though they were not doing well

and comparisons with those less healthy could make them fearful of the future.

Page 22 of 197

464	
465	Other activities (#23 to #26 on the logic model) required participants to have adequate
466	levels of motivation. Interventionists classified all but one case study participant
467	(R01/44) as having adequate motivation (Additional File 03, Table b) and therefore
468	eligible for further tailored intervention. But, as detailed above (see #17 in the
469	engagement section), this was sometimes based on inadequate discussion with the
470	participants. In interviews, participants generally reported setting goals (#23), but
471	fidelity assessment showed that goals were sometimes formulated by interventionists
472	rather than by participants (see #17). The mean number of review sessions (#24) over
473	five months was 1 (Additional File 03 – Table e); this was fewer than intended, likely
474	reflecting a failure of the study team to set appropriate expectations and a lack of time
475	created by the high pace of recruitment (problem log entries: 31-Jan-17; 13-Feb-17).
476	Two individuals (R01/39 and R01/40) received their first face-to-face session with an
477	interventionist over halfway through the study period (Additional File 01). CFHH
478	action plan (#25), problem solving and coping plan (#26) pages were accessed a
479	median of two, three and one times, respectively (Additional File 03 – Table e).
480	Interviews data suggests action / coping plans were completed during intervention
481	visits but not accessed by participants otherwise. In interviews, some participants said
482	they were reassured by the presence of, and sometimes reported insights from,
483	problem-solving modules, such as what to do when going on holiday. However, the
484	use of action plans was disliked by some participants who found writing down the
485	action plans like "going back to school". This dislike at least partly reflected the

- 20 -

 BMJ Open

2		
3 4	486	generation of action and coping plans by interventionists rather than by the
5	487	participants themselves (see $\#17$)
6 7	107	
8	488	
9		
10	180	Immediate outcomes
12	409	The milet are part designed to disconsingly the interpretion serves the contra and mith
13 14	490	The pilot was not designed to disseminate the intervention across the centre and with
15 16	491	minimal monitoring by professionals within the wider CF team (see #19) routine
17 18	492	medical care was not informed by adherence (#27). Unsurprisingly, given the lower
19 20 21	493	than expected face-to-face contact (#18, #24), intervention arm group averages for
21 22 23	494	immediate (process) outcomes (#28-33) changed little over five months, with the
24 25	495	exception that there was a mean reduction of 1.84 (SD 3.44) barriers to adherence per
26 27	496	person (#33), which could be the outcome of problem solving and education about
28 29 30	497	treatment processes (Additional file 03 – Table f). Frequent use of CFHH and self-
31 32	498	monitoring in particular (see above, #20) did not necessarily mean that self-reported
33 34	499	subjective adherence and electronically-captured objective adherence were well
35 36 27	500	aligned (#28) (Additional file 03 – Tables f and g). A post hoc paired comparison of
37 38 39	501	subjective and objective adherence at 5 (+/-1) months (Figure 3) suggests that higher
40 41	502	adherers were more uniformly accurate in their understanding of their own adherence,
42 43	503	whereas low adherers could be overly optimistic.
44 45 46 47	504	
48	505	Intermediate outcomes
49 50	506	Item #34 of the logic model treatment optimisation is defined by NICE as "a
50 51	000	
52 53	507	person-centred approach to safe and effective medicines use" to ensure best
54 55	508	outcomes[61]. Treatment optimisation is a service-level objective, which was beyond
56	500	

- the scope of our patient-focused intervention but is the subject of related ongoing
- research (see Discussion). During interviews, RCT participants in the intervention

- 21 -

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
a	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
10	
1/	
10	
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	

511	arm described behaviours that would affect treatment optimisation, for instance taking
512	holidays from their treatment. Levels of CF treatment adherence (#35) were 10%
513	(95% CI: -5.2 to 25.2) higher in the intervention arm (Additional File 06, Table 17).
514	We developed a number of theories about why some intervention patients did or did
515	not increase their adherence (#35) during the analysis. In some cases the run charts
516	illustrated, in line with Control Theory, the goal-directed nature of behaviour and how
517	it is regulated by feedback control processes[62]. For example, R01/39 and R01/49
518	seemed to show improvement shortly before planned face-to-face visits from
519	interventionists (Additional File 01). R01/39, who seemed intrinsically motivated
520	when interviewed, sustained improvement in adherence beyond the trial period
521	through what they described as positive interaction with the interventionist. Others,
522	who seemed more extrinsically motivated in interviews (R01/49, R01/54, R01/48: see
523	#17), did not sustain adherence, with charts suggesting an effortful, 'all-or-nothing'
524	pattern. At baseline, R02/07 had no well-established routine (CHAOS score of 10:
525	Additional File 01), implying substantial self-regulatory effort to achieve higher
526	adherence. In their interview, this participant reported finding habit formation parts,
527	such as goal-setting, helpful which may have enabled him to maintain high adherence
528	with reduced effort, as measured by increased habit and reduced life chaos and
529	barriers (change scores -5 and -3 respectively: Additional File 03 - Table f). Finally, it
530	is important to understand that individual-level adherence can be unstable over time
531	(Additional File 01, see especially, R01/54, R01/48) highlighting the problem of
532	assessing adherence as a 'snapshot' in a pre-/post-test analysis, rather than in a
533	continuous assessment over time.
534	

Page 25 of 197

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
5	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
26	
20	
2/	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

535	Several participants with low baseline adherence appeared to have responded well to
536	the intervention. R01/40 had high motivation (Additional File 03 – Table b;
537	Additional File 01), possibly due to the salience of a recent hospitalisation for IVAB
538	treatment of an exacerbation. Click analytic data showed high engagement, with
539	independent access of the website and use of problem-solving tools. However in other
540	patients, case study run charts (Additional File 01) showed that measuring change in
541	average objective adherence between baseline and five months sometimes masked
542	periods of success in between (e.g. R01/02, and R02/12). Without looking at
543	adherence graphs, and only measuring objective adherence at baseline and five
544	months, this would have been missed (see Discussion). Interview data offered some
545	reasons for improved adherence. While R01/49 had not made an action plan and their
546	subjective adherence was optimistic (Additional file 03 – Table f), their objective
547	adherence increased from low to moderate over the trial period (Additional File 01);
548	their motivation also increased and self-reported barriers decreased (Additional file 03
549	– Table f), potentially through their high use of problem-solving modules and self-
550	monitoring (Additional File 03, Table d). R01/02's run chart also showed a period of
551	improvement, ending after the last review visit (Additional File 01); nonetheless,
552	reduced life chaos (Additional file 03 – Table f) and interview data suggested an
553	established routine and reduced barriers associated with intensive face-to-face
554	therapist interaction and action/coping plans (Additional File 03, Table d). The tailing
555	off of adherence after the end of the trial in some case study participants may indicate
556	that adherence remained effortful or participation in the trial was motivated by
557	altruism not help-seeking (see quotation from R01/48, above).
558	

559 Modifications to the intervention

Additional file 07 documents 14 technical changes that will be made for the full-scale RCT, based on the process evaluation findings, to CFHH (n=5), IT infrastructure (n=1) and to the interventionist training, manual and procedures (n=8). To prevent adherence data flatlines, nebulisers (#4) and 2net Hubs (#5) will be paired at the factory. Three changes to CFHH (#6) will make it easier for interventionists to view/edit prescription data and to handle alternating treatment regimens (#3). Other changes to CFHH will include making graphs more easily interpretable and, based on interview data and PPI feedback, adding descriptions to videos. Changes to the interventionist manual (#8) will increase the emphasis on 'active ingredients', introduce intervention triggers for reduced adherence or exacerbations and introduce new habit formation sessions. The need for increased numbers of protocolised intervention review sessions arose because, in the feasibility study, a focus on RCT recruitment targets gave interventionists inadequate time to deliver review visits (#18, #24), critical for updating personalised action plans (#25) and updating coping plans (#26). Training (#9) in the full-scale trial will be delivered as an intensive one-week course, with more explicit focus on intervention fidelity, supported by new case study data and role plays to ensure baseline competency (#17).

Discussion

The process evaluation identified elements of the intervention which could be improved and 14 changes were documented. The complex intervention was developed using mixed methods research with an inter-disciplinary, person-centred and iterative approach[63–69]. The mere usage of a digital behaviour change intervention may not indicate engagement or lead to desired outcomes[63,68,70–73]; there is no simple

BMJ Open

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 8	
a	
10	
11	
12	
12	
1/	
14	
16	
17	
17 18	
10	
20	
20 21	
27	
22	
23	
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	
5/ 50	
20	
צנ	

60

584 dose-response relationship[74]. In fact, for those with low motivation and low 585 confidence, evidence of non-adherence can be threatening[75]. With different 586 baseline motivation and life chaos, a population-level definition of "effective 587 engagement"[65] may be infeasible, but contextual and motivational data may still 588 explain patterns observed in run charts[76]. What may matter more than defining 589 engagement is the correct assessment and tailoring of management to different 590 psychosocial barriers[64,77–85]. Our study suggests that digital systems cannot 591 replace, only complement, face-to-face interaction between health professionals and 592 patients[86–88], potentially creating a sense of 'accountability' consistent with 593 control theory [42,89]. However, it is important to recognise that in the absence of 594 objective adherence data clinicians and patients will find it difficult to even begin to 595 engage with behaviour change.

596

597 Our use of objective adherence measurement overcomes the limitations of previous
598 studies[90] and confirms that subjective and objective adherence are poorly
599 aligned[23]. This process evaluation has succeeded in demonstrating that delivery of
600 this intervention is possible in busy clinical settings; participant uptake was high and,
601 with further development on the basis of these findings, the process of gathering
602 objective adherence data and implementing it alongside a behavioural intervention is
603 both possible and effective.

604 Given the known difficulties with nebuliser use among PWCF, interventions that can
605 make it less effortful are important[91]. In particular, healthy behaviours are better
606 predicted by a patient's level of automatic behavioural repetition than their beliefs or
607 experiences, meaning a focus on increasing habit strength is critical for chronic
608 disease self-management[92]. Through delivery of intervention components designed

כ ⊿	
4	
5	
0	
/	
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	
32	
34	
35	
36	
27	
20	
20	
10	
40 41	
41	
42	
45	
44	
4) 14	
40 17	
4/	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1 2

609 to promote habit formation, we intend to reduce effort with the CFHH intervention. 610 We are limited in drawing conclusions as to the impact of habit formation 611 components of the intervention from this analysis; this is mostly due to the limited 612 time constraints of the feasibility study leaving insufficient opportunity for habit 613 formation[93]. However, there was some indication that habit components were 614 useful and we have elsewhere demonstrated the importance of habit in high adherence 615 [94,95]. It has also been indicated that adherence interventions focusing on habit 616 formation are the most effective[96]. 617 Successful habit formation will reduce burden by making sustained self-care 618 automatic. The CFHH intervention aims to deliver the fall in burden highlighted by 619 the Lind alliance prioritisation exercise as the most important goal of CF research. 620 621 To date, there is little previous research showing the effects of giving patients access 622 to their data, with respect to health outcomes and cost-effectiveness. Amidst the 623 evidence that does exist, the research is generally poor and lacks information about 624 context and implementation[97,98]. Following modifications made to our complex 625 intervention, the full scale RCT across 19 UK centres (ISRCTN55504164) will 626 provide high quality evidence, indicating the impact of adherence data on sustained 627 self-care. The full-scale RCT will include a further process evaluation and health-628 economic modelling. Furthermore, the CFHealthHub Data Observatory 629 (ISRCTN14464661) following on from the RCT will address the issue of how to 630 embed the use of adherence data in routine practice for healthcare professionals[99– 631 103]. The sites involved in the reported pilot study have now transitioned into the 632 Data Observatory, eventually to be joined by sites involved in the full-scale RCT. 633 Data collected in the data observatory quality improvement project will be used in the

Page 29 of 197

1

BMJ Open

development of generalisable theory and practical guidance about the collaborative

use of adherence data [104,105], with a focus on optimising the use of health care

efficient trials [106,107], providing an opportunity to share processes and

demands of future research [108].

Conclusions

Declarations

Ouestionnaire

List of abbreviations CF – Cystic Fibrosis

IVAB - Intravenous Antibiotics MAD-3 Medication Adherence Data MDT – Multi-Disciplinary Team PAM-13 - Patient Activation Measure

PWCF – People With Cystic Fibrosis RCT – Randomised Controlled Trial

CFHH – CFHealthHub complex intervention CFQ-R – Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised CHAOS - Confusion, Hubbub, and Order Scale

EQ-5D-5L – EuroQol generic health status measure FEV1 - Forced expiratory volume in 1 second GAD-7 – General Anxiety Disorder 7-item

PHQ-8 – Patient Health Questionnaire depression scale

SRBAI - Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index

resources and improving patient care [61]. The Observatory will act as a platform for

improvement activities to enable participating CF clinical research teams to meet the

We have developed a theory-based complex intervention to help PWCF adhere to

identified potential sources of intervention failure and modifications have been made

accordingly. With improved intervention processes, it is feasible and acceptable to

support sustained self-care via medication adherence through the application of

behaviour change theory delivered through digital and human components.

COM- BMQ – The Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs

their medication and form habits of sustained self-care. The process evaluation

3	621
4	034
5	
5	635
6	050
7	
8	636
9	
10	627
11	057
10	
12	638
13	
14	(20)
15	639
16	
17	
18	
10	640
20	641
20	041
21	
22	642
23	-
24	(10)
25	643
25	
20	644
27	077
28	
29	645
30	
31	616
31 32	646
31 32 33	646
31 32 33 34	646
31 32 33 34	646
31 32 33 34 35	646 647
31 32 33 34 35 36	646 647
31 32 33 34 35 36 37	646 647 648
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38	646 647 648
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39	646 647 648 649
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40	646 647 648 649 650
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	646 647 648 649 650 651
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	646 647 648 649 650 651
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42	646 647 648 649 650 651 652
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653
31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 40 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661
 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662
 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 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663
 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 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664
 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 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664
 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 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665
 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 	646 647 648 649 650 651 652 653 654 655 656 657 658 659 660 661 662 663 664 665 666

60

- 27 -

Ethics, consent and permissions

Written informed consent was obtained prior to participation.

Ethical approval

- The study received ethical approval from the London Brent Research Ethics
- Committee (16/LO/0356).

Consent for publication

In the consent form, participants signed a statement to confirm consent for publication of anonymised quotes, in reports, conference presentations and journal publications.

Availability of data and materials

Requests for further data not available in this publication can be directed at Sheffield Clinical Trials Research Unit. Email: ctru@sheffield.ac.uk Tel: 0114 222 0866

Competing interests

Martin Wildman received funding from Zambon and support from Philips Respironics for the early intervention development work. This has not had any direct influence on the feasibility study reported here. In addition, Martin Wildman has worked with Pari to carry out studies using the e-track. This has not had any direct influence on the feasibility study reported here. The University of Manchester software team received funding from Pari to create a medication reporting component within the CFHealthHub software. This has not had any direct influence on the feasibility study reported here.

The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This report presents independent research funded by the NIHR under its Grants for Applied Research Programme (Grant Reference Number RP-PG-1212-20015). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, Medical Research Council (MRC), Central Commissioning Facility (CCF), the Programme Grants for Applied Research Programme, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Authors' contributions

Daniel Hind (Assistant Director, CTRU), Sarah Drabble (Research Associate) and Laura Mandefield (Statistician), together produced the first draft of the report.

- The following conceived of or designed the work: Martin Wildman (Consultant Respiratory Physician), Alicia O'Cathain (Professor of Health Services Research), Stephen Walters (Professor of Medical Statistics and Clinical Trials), Madelynne Arden (Professor of Health
- Psychology), Marlene Hutchings (Physiotherapist), Judy Bradley (Professor of

1		
2		
3	707	Physiotherapy), John Ainsworth (Professor of Health Informatics), Daniel Beever (Patient
4	708	and Public Involvement Representative) and Daniel Hind.
5	709	1 /
6	710	The following were involved in the acquisition of data for the work. Julia Nightingale
7	711	(Consultant in Respiratory Medicine) Mark Allenby (Consultant in Respiratory Medicine)
8	712	Iane Dewar (Consultant in Respiratory Medicine) Sarah Drabhle Madelynne Arden Chin
9	712	Maguire Hannah Cantrill Alexander Scott (Besearch Associate) Sam Keating (Besearch
10	713	Associate) Marlane Hutchings and Pauline Whelen (mHealth Applications Manager)
11	714	Associate), Mariene Hutchings and Faunne whetan (infreatin Applications Manager).
12	715	The following more investigation the employing of Jeter Devial Hind Couch Devial 1.
13	/10	The following were involved in the analysis of data: Daniel Hind, Sarah Drabble, Alicia
14	/1/	O'Cathain, Daniel Beever, Alexander Scott, Sam Keating, Madelynne Arden, Laura
15	/18	Mandefield, Simon Waterhouse (Data Manager).
16	719	
17	720	Daniel Hind, Sarah Drabble, Madelynne Arden, Laura Mandefield, Simon Waterhouse, Chin
18	721	Maguire, Hannah Cantrill, Louisa Robinson, Marlene Hutchings, Judy Bradley, Julia
19	722	Nightingale, Mark Allenby, Jane Dewar, Daniel Beever, Stephen Walters, Alicia O'Cathain,
20	723	Martin J Wildman, were involved in the interpretation of data for the work.
21	724	
22	725	All authors were involved in the final approval of the version to be published.
23	726	
24	727	All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions
25	728	related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and
26	729	resolved.
2/	730	
28		
29	731	Acknowledgements
30	722	
22	732	
32	733	We would like to thank the trial participants who offered us their time. We gratefully
34	734	acknowledge the clerical and other input of Helen Wakefield, Heather Dakin, Katie
35	735	Shore and Louise Turner, trial support officers.
36	736	
37	737	We would also like to thank Claire Oliver. Fiona Haynes and Lisa Eyans for their
38	738	commitment and hard work in delivering the intervention and supporting the study
39	730	communent and hard work in derivering the intervention and supporting the study.
40	737	Drafaggar Walters is a National Institute for Health Descents (NIIID) Serier
41	740	Professor watters is a National Institute for Health Research (NITR) Semon
42	/41	Investigator. The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not
43	742	necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health and Social
44	743	Care.
45	744	
46		
47	715	
48	/45	
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
55 56		
55 56 57		
55 56 57 58		
55 56 57 58 59		

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

746

References

747	1	Mowat A. Why does cystic fibrosis display the prevalence and distribution
748		observed in human populations? Curr Pediatr Res 2017;21:164–71.
749	2	Jeffery A, Charman S, Cosgriff R, et al. UK Cystic Fibrosis Registry Annual
750		Data Report 2016. London: : Cystic Fibrosis Trust 2017.
751	3	Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. Annual Data Report 2016 Cystic Fibrosis
752		Foundation Patient Registry. Bethesda, Maryland: : Cystic Fibrosis Foundation
753		Patient 2017. https://www.cff.org/Research/Researcher-Resources/Patient-
754		Registry/2016-Patient-Registry-Annual-Data-Report.pdf
755	4	European Cystic Fibrosis Society. ECFS Patient Registry Annual Data Report.
756		Karup, Denmark: : European Cystic Fibrosis Society 2013.
757	5	Ahern S, Sims G, Tacey M, et al. The Australian Cystic Fibrosis Data Registry
758		Annual Report, 2015. Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and
759		Preventive Medicine, October 2017, Report No 18. Melbourne, Victoria: :
760		Australian Cystic Fibrosis Data Registry 2017.
761	6	Cystic Fibrosis Canada. The Canadian CF Registry 2016 Annual Data Report.
762		Toronto: : Cystic Fibrosis Canada 2017.
763		http://www.cysticfibrosis.ca/uploads/2016 Registry Annual Data Report.pdf
764	7	Southern KW, Barker PM, Solis-Moya A, et al. Macrolide antibiotics for cystic
765		fibrosis. In: Southern KW, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
766		Chichester, UK: : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2011.
767		doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002203.pub3
768	8	Ramsey BW, Davies J, McElvaney NG, et al. A CFTR Potentiator in Patients
769		with Cystic Fibrosis and the G551D Mutation. N Engl J Med 2011;365:1663-
770		72. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1105185
771	9	McCoy KS, Quittner AL, Oermann CM, et al. Inhaled aztreonam lysine for

- 30 -

1 ว			
2 3 4	772		chronic airway Pseudomonas aeruginosa in cystic fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit
5 6	773		<i>Care Med</i> 2008; 178 :921–8.
7 8 9	774	10	Ryan G, Mukhopadhyay S, Singh M. Nebulised anti-pseudomonal antibiotics
9 10 11	775		for cystic fibrosis. In: Ryan G, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
12 13	776		Chichester, UK: : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2003.
14 15	777		doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001021
16 17 18	778	11	Jones AP, Wallis C. Dornase alfa for cystic fibrosis. In: Jones AP, ed.
19 20	779		Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Chichester, UK: : John Wiley &
21 22	780		Sons, Ltd 2010. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001127.pub2
23 24 25 26 27 28 29	781	12	Wark P, McDonald VM. Nebulised hypertonic saline for cystic fibrosis. In:
	782		Wark P, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Chichester, UK: : John
	783		Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2009. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001506.pub3
30 31 32	784	13	Ryan G, Singh M, Dwan K. Inhaled antibiotics for long-term therapy in cystic
32 33 34	785		fibrosis. Cochrane database Syst Rev 2011;:CD001021.
35 36	786		doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001021.pub2
37 38	787	14	Eakin MN, Bilderback A, Boyle MP, et al. Longitudinal association between
 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 	788		medication adherence and lung health in people with cystic fibrosis. J Cyst
	789		Fibros 2011;10:258. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2011.03.005
	790	15	Briesacher BA, Quittner AL, Saiman L, et al. Adherence with tobramycin
	791		inhaled solution and health care utilization. BMC Pulm Med 2011;11:5.
	792		doi:10.1186/1471-2466-11-5
	793	16	Smyth A, Lewis S, Bertenshaw C, et al. Case-control study of acute renal
53 54	794		failure in patients with cystic fibrosis in the UK. Thorax 2008;63:532-5.
55 56 57	795		doi:10.1136/thx.2007.088757
58 59 60	796	17	Mayer-Hamblett N, Rosenfeld M, Emerson J, et al. Developing Cystic Fibrosis

1 2

3 4	797		Lung Transplant Referral Criteria Using Predictors of 2-Year Mortality. Am J
5 6	798		Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166:1550-5. doi:10.1164/rccm.200202-087OC
/ 8 9	799	18	Shiers D, Rafi I, Cooper S, et al. 2014 update (with acknowledgement to the
10 11	800		late Helen Lester for her contribution to the original 2012 version) Positive
12 13	801		Cardiometabolic Health Resource: an intervention framework for patients with
14 15	802		psychosis and schizophrenia. R Coll Psychiatr 2014;:London.
16 17 18	803	19	Quittner AL, Zhang J, Marynchenko M, et al. Pulmonary medication adherence
19 20	804		and health-care use in cystic fibrosis. Chest 2014;146:142-51.
21 22	805		doi:10.1378/chest.13-1926
23 24 25	806	20	Narayanan S, Mainz JG, Gala S, et al. Adherence to therapies in cystic fibrosis:
26 27	807		a targeted literature review. Expert Rev Respir Med 2017;11:129-45.
28 29	808		doi:10.1080/17476348.2017.1280399
30 31 32	809	21	McManus P. Lead Pharmacist - specialised services (South Yorkshire and
32 33 34	810		Bassetlaw) NHS England.
35 36	811	22	McNeil S. Personal communication from Stephanie McNeil, Chief Statistician
37 38	812		of UK CF Registry.
39 40 41	813	23	Daniels T, Goodacre L, Sutton C, et al. Accurate assessment of adherence: self-
42 43	814		report and clinician report vs electronic monitoring of nebulizers. Chest
44 45	815		2011; 140 :425–32. doi:10.1378/chest.09-3074
46 47 48	816	24	Hoo Z, Curley R, Walters S, et al. Exploring the implications of different
49 50	817		approaches to estimate centre-level adherence using objective adherence data
51 52	818		in an adult cystic fibrosis centre - a retrospective observational study. J Cyst
53 54	819		Fibros 2020;19:162-7. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2019.10.008
55 56 57	820	25	Horne RW, Barber N, Elliot R, et al. Concordance, adherance and compliance
58 59 60	821		in medicine taking: A conceptual map and research priorities. National Co-
Page 35 of 197

BMJ Open

1 2				
2 3 4	822		ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisational R&D	
5 6	823		(NCCSDO). 2005.	
/ 8 9	824	26	James Lind Alliance. Priority Setting Partnership: Cystic Fibrosis.	
10 11	825		2017.http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/cystic-fibrosis/	
12 13	826		(accessed 2 Jun 2017).	
14 15 16	827	27	Clegg D, Barker R. Case Method Fast-Track: A RAD Approach. Boston, MA: :	
17 18	828		Addison-Wesley 1994.	
19 20	829	28	Bugge C, Williams B, Hagen S, et al. A process for Decision-making after	
21 22 23	830		Pilot and feasibility Trials (ADePT): development following a feasibility study	
23 24 25	831		of a complex intervention for pelvic organ prolapse. <i>Trials</i> 2013;14:353.	
26 27	832		doi:10.1186/1745-6215-14-353	
28 29	833	29	Hind D, Drabble SJ, Arden MA, et al. Supporting medication adherence for	
30 31 32	834		adults with cystic fibrosis: a randomised feasibility study. BMC Pulm Med	
33 34	835		2019; 19 :77. doi:10.1186/s12890-019-0834-6	
35 36	836	30	Cherryholmes CH. Notes on Pragmatism and Scientific Realism. Educ Res	
37 38 30	837		1992; 21 :13–7. doi:10.3102/0013189X021006013	
40 41	838	31	Yin RK. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. London: : Sage 2014.	
42 43	839	32	Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In:	
44 45	840		Bryman A, Burgess RG, eds. Analysing qualitative data. Routledge 1994. 173-	
40 47 48	841		94.	
49 50	842	33	Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains	
51 52	843		framework for use in behaviour change and implementation research.	
53 54 55	844		Implement Sci 2012;7:37. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-37	
56 57	845	34	Linnan L, Steckler A. Process evaluation for public health interventions and	
58 59 60	846		research: an overview. In: Linnan L, Steckler A, eds. Process evaluation for	

BMJ Open

2 3	817		public health interportions and research Son Francisco: · Josson Pass 2002
4 5	047		public health interventions and research. Sail Flancisco Jossey-Bass 2002.
6	848		1–
/ 8 9	849		23.http://media.johnwiley.com.au/product_data/excerpt/66/07879597/0787959
10 11	850		766.pdf (accessed 6 May 2014).
12 13	851	35	Farmer T, Robinson K, Elliott SJ, et al. Developing and implementing a
14 15 16	852		triangulation protocol for qualitative health research. Qual Health Res
17 18	853		2006; 16 :377–94. doi:10.1177/1049732305285708
19 20	854	36	Yin RK. Analyzing Case Study Evidence: How to Start Your Analysis, Your
21 22	855		Analytic Choices, and How They Work. In: Case Study Research: Design and
23 24 25	856		Methods. London: : Sage 2014. 133-76. doi:10.1111/bjd.13028
26 27	857	37	Guetterman TC, Fetters MD, Creswell JW. Integrating quantitative and
28 29	858		qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint
30 31 32	859		displays. Ann Fam Med 2015;13:554-61. doi:10.1370/afm.1865
33 34	860	38	Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods
35 36	861		designs - Principles and practices. Health Serv Res 2013;48:2134-56.
37 38	862		doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12117
39 40 41	863	39	Simons H. Case Study Research: In-Depth Understanding in Context. In:
42 43	864		Leavy P, ed. The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research. Oxford: : Oxford
44 45	865		University Press 2014. 455–70.
46 47 48	866	40	Perla RJ, Provost LP, Murray SK. The run chart: a simple analytical tool for
49 50	867		learning from variation in healthcare processes. BMJ Qual Saf 2011;20:46–51.
51 52	868		doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2009.037895
53 54	869	41	Bandura A. Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. Annu Rev
55 56 57	870		Psychol 2001;52:1-26. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
58 59 60	871	42	Carver CS, Scheier MF. Control theory: a useful conceptual framework for

Page 37 of 197

BMJ Open

1 2				
- 3 4	872		personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. <i>Psychol Bull</i> 1982;92:111-	
5 6	873		35. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.92.1.111	
7 8	874	43	Ho YC. Abduction? Deduction? Induction? Is there a Logic of Exploratory	
9 10 11	875		Data Analysis? Proc Annu Meet Am Educ Res Assoc 1994;:28.	
12 13	876		doi:http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.135.3507&rep=	
14 15	877		ep1&type=pdf	
16 17 18	878	44	Peirce CS. How to make our ideas clear. Pop Sci Mon 1878;12:286-302.	
19 20	879	45	Swedberg R. Before theory comes theorizing or how to make social science	
21 22	880		more interesting. Br J Sociol 2016;67. doi:10.1111/1468-4446.12184	
23 24	881	46	Timmermans S, Tavory I. Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From	
25 26 27	882		Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis. Sociol Theory 2012;30:167-86.	
28 29	883		doi:10.1177/0735275112457914	
30 31	884	47	Miles MB, Huberman AM, Saldaña J. Methods of Ordering. In: Qualitative	
32 33 34	885		Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. London: 2014. 193–220.	
35 36	886	48	Hoo ZH, Boote J, Wildman MJ, et al. Determinants of objective adherence to	
37 38	887		nebulised medications among adults with cystic fibrosis: an exploratory mixed	
39 40	888		methods study comparing low and high adherers. Heal Psychol Behav Med	
41 42 43	889		2017; 5 :299–316. doi:10.1080/21642850.2017.1338958	
44 45	890	49	Wong MD, Sarkisian C a., Davis C, et al. The Association Between Life	
46 47	891		Chaos, Health Care Use, and Health Status Among HIV-Infected Persons. J	
48 49 50	892		Gen Intern Med 2007;22:1286-91. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0265-6	
50 51 52	893	50	Horne R, Weinman J, Hankins M. The beliefs about medicines questionnaire:	
53 54	894		The development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive	
55 56	895		representation of medication. <i>Psychol Health</i> 1999;14:1–24.	
57 58 59 60	896		doi:10.1080/08870449908407311	

BMJ Open

3 4	897	51	Bittner K, Spence I. Use Case Modeling. Boston, MA: : Addison-Wesley	
5 6 7	898		Professional 2002.	
7 8 9	899	52	Craig Larman. Agile and Iterative Development: A Manager's Guide. Boston,	
10 11	900		MA: : Addison-Wesley 2004.	
12 13	901	53	Govan JR. Infection control in cystic fibrosis: methicillin-resistant	
14 15	902		Staphylococcus aureus, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and the Burkholderia cepacia	
16 17 18	903		complex. <i>J R Soc Med</i> 2000; 93 Suppl 3 :40–	
19 20	904		5.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10911818	
21 22	905	54	Wildman MJ, Hoo ZH. Moving cystic fibrosis care from rescue to prevention	
23 24 25	906		by embedding adherence measurement in routine care. Paediatr Respir Rev	
25 26 27	907		2014; 15 :16–8. doi:10.1016/j.prrv.2014.04.007	
28 29	908	55	Schattner A. Predictors of Adherence to Inhaled Medications. J Gen Intern	
30 31	909		Med 2013;28:758-758. doi:10.1007/s11606-013-2384-6	
32 33 34	910	56	Battaglia M, Atkinson MA. The Streetlight Effect in Type 1 Diabetes. Diabetes	
35 36	911		2015; 64 :1081–90. doi:10.2337/db14-1208	
37 38	912	57	Kaplan A. The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. New	
39 40 41	913		Brunswick, N.J.: : Transaction Publishers 1964.	
42 43	914	58	Tversky A, Kahneman D. Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and	
44 45	915		probability. Cogn Psychol 1973;5:207-32. doi:10.1016/0010-0285(73)90033-9	
46 47	916	59	Flume PA, Clancy JP, Retsch-Bogart GZ, et al. Continuous alternating inhaled	
48 49 50	917		antibiotics for chronic pseudomonal infection in cystic fibrosis. J Cyst Fibros	
51 52	918		2016;15:809-15. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2016.05.001	
53 54	919	60	Michie S, Atkins L, West R. The Behaviour Change Wheel: A Guide To	
55 56 57	920		Designing Interventions. Sutton: : Silverback Publishing 2014.	
57 58 59 60	921	61	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Medicines optimisation: the	

Page 39 of 197

BMJ Open

1				
2 3 4	922		safe and effective use of medicines to enable best possible outcomes (NG5).	
5 6	923		London: : NICE 2015.	
7 8 0	924	62	Carver CS, Scheier MF. On the self-regulation of behavior. Cambridge: :	
9 10 11	925		Cambridge University Press 2001.	
12 13	926	63	Yardley L, Spring BJ, Riper H, et al. Understanding and Promoting Effective	
14 15	927		Engagement With Digital Behavior Change Interventions. Am J Prev Med	
16 17 18	928		2016; 51 :833-42. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.015	
19 20	929	64	Allemann SS, Nieuwlaat R, van den Bemt BJF, et al. Matching Adherence	
21 22	930		Interventions to Patient Determinants Using the Theoretical Domains	
23 24 25	931		Framework. Front Pharmacol 2016;7:429. doi:10.3389/fphar.2016.00429	
26 27	932	65	Michie S, Yardley L, West R, et al. Developing and evaluating digital	
28 29	933		interventions to promote behavior change in health and health care:	
30 31 22	934		Recommendations resulting from an international workshop. J Med Internet	
32 33 34	935		<i>Res</i> 2017; 19 . doi:10.2196/jmir.7126	
35 36	936	66	Murray E, Hekler EB, Andersson G, et al. Evaluating Digital Health	
37 38	937		Interventions: Key Questions and Approaches. Am J Prev Med 2016;51:843-	
39 40 41	938		51. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.008	
42 43	939	67	Car J, Tan WS, Huang Z, et al. eHealth in the future of medications	
44 45	940		management: personalisation, monitoring and adherence. BMC Med	
46 47 48	941		2017;15:73. doi:10.1186/s12916-017-0838-0	
49 50	942	68	Baumel A, Birnbaum ML, Sucala M. A Systematic Review and Taxonomy of	
51 52	943		Published Quality Criteria Related to the Evaluation of User-Facing eHealth	
53 54	944		Programs. J Med Syst 2017;41:128. doi:10.1007/s10916-017-0776-6	
55 56 57	945	69	Ryan C, Bergin M, Wells JS. Theoretical Perspectives of Adherence to Web-	
58 59 60	946		Based Interventions: a Scoping Review. Int J Behav Med Published Online	

BMJ Open

3 4	947		First: 20 July 2017. doi:10.1007/s12529-017-9678-8	
5 6	948	70	Van Gemert-Pijnen JE, Kelders SM, Bohlmeijer ET. Understanding the Usage	
7 8	949		of Content in a Mental Health Intervention for Depression: An Analysis of Log	
9 10 11	950		Data. J Med Internet Res 2014;16:e27. doi:10.2196/jmir.2991	
12 13	951	71	Strecher V, McClure J, Alexander G, et al. The Role of Engagement in a	
14 15	952		Tailored Web-Based Smoking Cessation Program: Randomized Controlled	
16 17 19	953		Trial. J Med Internet Res 2008;10:e36. doi:10.2196/jmir.1002	
19 20	954	72	Danaher BG, Seeley JR. Methodological Issues in Research on Web-Based	
21 22	955		Behavioral Interventions. Ann Behav Med 2009;38:28-39. doi:10.1007/s12160-	
23 24	956		009-9129-0	
25 26 27	957	73	Ainsworth B, Steele M, Stuart B, et al. Using an Analysis of Behavior Change	
28 29	958		to Inform Effective Digital Intervention Design: How Did the PRIMIT Website	
30 31	959		Change Hand Hygiene Behavior Across 8993 Users? Ann Behav Med	
32 33 34	960		2017; 51 :423–31. doi:10.1007/s12160-016-9866-9	
35 36	961	74	Hawe P. Lessons from complex interventions to improve health. Annu Rev	
37 38	962		Public Health 2015;36:307-23. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-	
39 40 41	963		114421	
41 42 43	964	75	Sherman DAK, Nelson LD, Steele CM. Do Messages about Health Risks	
44 45	965		Threaten the Self? Increasing the Acceptance of Threatening Health Messages	
46 47	966	Via Self-Affirmation. <i>Personal Soc Psychol Bull</i> 2000; 26 :1046–58.		
48 49 50	967		doi:10.1177/01461672002611003	
51 52	968	76	Perski O, Blandford A, West R, et al. Conceptualising engagement with digital	
53 54	969		behaviour change interventions: a systematic review using principles from	
55 56 57	970		critical interpretive synthesis. Transl Behav Med 2017;7:254-67.	
57 58 59	971		doi:10.1007/s13142-016-0453-1	

BMJ Open

2				
- 3 4	972	77	Frazee SG, Muzina DJ, Nease RF. Strategies to Overcome Medication	
5 6	973		Nonadherence. JAMA 2014;311:1693. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.1760	
7 8	974	78	Mohammed MA, Moles RJ, Chen TF. Medication-related burden and patients'	
9 10	975		lived experience with medicine: a systematic review and metasynthesis of	
11 12 13	976		qualitative studies. BMJ Open 2016;6:e010035. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-	
14 15	977		010035	
16 17	978	79	Huygens MWJ, Vermeulen J, Swinkels ICS, et al. Expectations and needs of	
18 19 20	979		patients with a chronic disease toward self-management and eHealth for self-	
20 21 22	980		management purposes. BMC Health Serv Res 2016;16:232.	
23 24	981		doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1484-5	
25 26	082	80	Kelders SM Oinas Kukkonen H. Oörni A. at al. Health Behavior Change	
27	982	80	Keiders Sivi, Olias-Kukkohen II, Oorin A, et al. Health Behavior Change	
28 29 20	983		Support Systems as a research discipline; a viewpoint. Int J Med Inform	
30 31 32	984		Published Online First: 2016. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.06.022	
33 34	985	81	Rathbone AP, Todd A, Jamie K, et al. A systematic review and thematic	
35 36	986		synthesis of patients' experience of medicines adherence. Res Soc Adm Pharm	
37 38	987		Published Online First: 2016. doi:10.1016/j.sapharm.2016.06.004	
39 40 41	988	82	O'Connor S, Hanlon P, O'Donnell CA, et al. Understanding factors affecting	
41 42 43	989		patient and public engagement and recruitment to digital health interventions: a	
44 45	990		systematic review of qualitative studies. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak	
46 47	991		2016; 16 :120. doi:10.1186/s12911-016-0359-3	
48 49 50	992	83	Bond CM. Adherence: the Holy Grail? BMJ Qual Saf 2016;25:736-8.	
50 51 52	993		doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004886	
53 54	994	84	Cammidge SL, Duff AJA, Latchford GJ, et al. When Women with Cystic	
55				
56 57	995		Fibrosis Become Mothers: Psychosocial Impact and Adjustments. Pulm Med	
эх 59 60	996		2016; 2016 :9458980. doi:10.1155/2016/9458980	

BMJ Open

2				
2 3 4	997	85	Powell KR. Patient-Perceived Facilitators of and Barriers to Electronic Portal	
5 6	998		Use. CIN Comput Informatics, Nurs 2017;35:565–73.	
7 8	999		doi:10.1097/CIN.00000000000377	
9 10 11	1000	86	Curtis LM, Mullen RJ, Russell A, et al. An efficacy trial of an electronic health	
12 13	1001		record-based strategy to inform patients on safe medication use: The role of	
14 15	1002		written and spoken communication. Patient Educ Couns 2016;99:1489-95.	
16 17	1003		doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.07.004	
18 19 20	1004	87	Morton K, Dennison L, May C, et al. Using digital interventions for self-	
21 22	1005		management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review	
23 24	1006		of published studies. Patient Educ Couns 2017;100:616-35.	
25 26 27	1007		doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.10.019	
28 29	1008	88	Hanlon P, Daines L, Campbell C, et al. Telehealth Interventions to Support	
30 31	1009		Self-Management of Long-Term Conditions: A Systematic Metareview of	
32 33 34	1010		Diabetes, Heart Failure, Asthma, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, and	
35 36	1011		Cancer. J Med Internet Res 2017;19:e172. doi:10.2196/jmir.6688	
37 38	1012	89	Oussedik, E., Foy, C.G, Masicampo, E.J., Kammrath, L.K, Anderson, R.E,	
39 40	1013		Feldman SR (in press). Accountabiliy: a missing construct in models of	
41 42 43	1014		adherence behavior and in clinical practice. Patient Prefer Adherence	
44 45	1015		2017;:1285–94. doi:10.2147/PPA.S135895	
46 47	1016	90	O'Donohoe R, Fullen BM. Adherence of subjects with cystic fibrosis to their	
48 49 50	1017		home program: a systematic review. Respir Care 2014;59:1731-46.	
50 51 52	1018		doi:10.4187/respcare.02990	
53 54	1019	91	Sawicki GS, Goldman DP, Chan W, et al. Patient preference for treatment	
55 56	1020		administration in cystic fibrosis. Am J Pharm Benefits 2015;7:174-81.	
57 58 59 60	1021	92	Phillips LA, Cohen J, Burns E, <i>et al.</i> Self-management of chronic illness: the	

BMJ Open

2 3	1022		role of 'habit' versus reflective factors in exercise and medication adherence I			
4 5	1022					
6 7	1023		<i>Behav Med</i> 2016; 39 :1076–91. doi:10.1007/s10865-016-9732-z			
, 8 9	1024	93	Lally P, van Jaarsveld CHM, Potts HWW, et al. How are habits formed:			
10 11	1025		Modelling habit formation in the real world. Eur J Soc Psychol 2010;40:998-			
12 13	1026		1009. doi:10.1002/ejsp.674			
14 15 16	1027	94	Arden MA, Drabble S, O'Cathain A, et al. Adherence to medication in adults			
16 17 18	1028		with Cystic Fibrosis: An investigation using objective adherence data and the			
19 20	1029		Theoretical Domains Framework. Br J Health Psychol Published Online First:			
21 22	1030		March 2019. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12357			
23 24 25	1031	95	Hoo ZH, Gardner B, Arden MA, et al. Role of habit in treatment adherence			
26 27	1032		among adults with cystic fibrosis. Thorax 2019;74:197-9.			
28 29	1033	doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-211453				
30 31 22	1034	96	Conn VS, Ruppar TM. Medication adherence outcomes of 771 intervention			
32 33 34	1035		trials: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Prev Med (Baltim) 2017;99:269-			
35 36	1036		76. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.03.008			
37 38	1037	97	Goldzweig CL, Orshansky G, Paige NM, et al. Electronic patient portals:			
39 40 41	1038		evidence on health outcomes, satisfaction, efficiency, and attitudes: a			
42 43	1039		systematic review. Ann Intern Med 2013;159:677-87. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-			
44 45	1040		159-10-201311190-00006			
46 47 48	1041	98	Lau AY, Arguel A, Dennis S, et al. "Why Didn't it Work?" Lessons From a			
48 49 50	1042		Randomized Controlled Trial of a Web-based Personally Controlled Health			
51 52	1043		Management System for Adults with Asthma. J Med Internet Res			
53 54	1044		2015; 17 :e283. doi:10.2196/jmir.4734			
55 56 57	1045	99	Kruse CS, Kothman K, Anerobi K, et al. Adoption Factors of the Electronic			
57 58 59 60	1046		Health Record: A Systematic Review. JMIR Med informatics 2016;4:e19.			

3 4	1047		doi:10.2196/medinform.5525	
5 6	1048	100	Greenhalgh T, Swinglehurst D, Stones R. Rethinking resistance to 'big IT': a	
7 8 0	1049		sociological study of why and when healthcare staff do not use nationally	
9 10 11	1050		mandated information and communication technologies. Heal Serv Deliv Res	
12 13	1051		2014; 2 :1-86. doi:10.3310/hsdr02390	
14 15	1052	101	Ross J, Stevenson F, Lau R, et al. Factors that influence the implementation of	
16 17 18	1053		e-health: a systematic review of systematic reviews (an update). Implement Sci	
19 20	1054		2016;11:146. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0510-7	
21 22	1055	102	Hennemann S, Beutel ME, Zwerenz R. Ready for eHealth? Health	
23 24 25	1056		Professionals' Acceptance and Adoption of eHealth Interventions in Inpatient	
26 27	1057		Routine Care. J Health Commun 2017;22:274–84.	
28 29	1058		doi:10.1080/10810730.2017.1284286	
30 31 22	1059	103	Harris M, Lawn SJ, Morello A, et al. Practice change in chronic conditions	
32 33 34	1060		care: an appraisal of theories. BMC Health Serv Res 2017;17:170.	
35 36	1061		doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2102-x	
37 38	1062	104	Ovretveit J, Leviton L, Parry G. Increasing the generalisability of improvement	
39 40 41	1063		research with an improvement replication programme. BMJ Qual Saf	
42 43	1064		2011; 20 :i87–91. doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2010.046342	
44 45	1065	105	Eikey E V, Reddy MC, Kuziemsky CE. Examining the role of collaboration in	
46 47 48	1066		studies of health information technologies in biomedical informatics: A	
49 50	1067		systematic review of 25 years of research. J Biomed Inform 2015;57:263-77.	
51 52	1068		doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2015.08.006	
53 54	1069	106	Relton C, Torgerson D, O'Cathain A, et al. Rethinking pragmatic randomised	
55 56 57	1070		controlled trials: introducing the 'cohort multiple randomised controlled trial'	
58 59 60	1071		design. BMJ 2010; 340 :c1066. doi:10.1136/bmj.c1066	

2 3	1072	107	Young-Afat DA Verkooijen HAM van Gils CH <i>et al</i> Staged-informed
4 5	1072	107	Toung-Mat DA, Verkoofjen main, van Ons em, et al. Staged-informed
6 7	1073		Consent in the Cohort Multiple Randomized Controlled Trial Design.
7 8 9	1074		Epidemiology 2016;27:389-92. doi:10.1097/EDE.000000000000435
10 11	1075	108	Retsch-Bogart GZ, Van Dalfsen JM, Marshall BC, et al. Highly effective cystic
12 13	1076		fibrosis clinical research teams: critical success factors. J Gen Intern Med
14 15	1077		2014; 29 Suppl 3 :S714-23. doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2896-8
16 17 18	1078	109	Hibbard JH, Mahoney ER, Stockard J, et al. Development and testing of a short
19 20	1079		form of the patient activation measure. <i>Health Serv Res</i> 2005;40:1918–30.
21 22	1080		doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00438.x
23 24 25	1081	110	Verplanken BAS, Ell OR, Orbell S. Reflections on past behavior: A self-report
26 27	1082		index of habit strength. J Appl Soc Psychol 2003;33:1313-30.
28 29	1083		doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x
30 31 22	1084		
32 33 34	1085		
35 36	1086		
37 38	1087		
39 40 41	1088		
41 42 43	1089		
44 45			
46			
47 48			
49			
50			
51 52			
52 53			
55			
55			
56			
57			
58			
59 60			
00			

1090 Tables

1091 Table 1 - Quantitative data contributing to the understanding of1092 logic model constructs

#	Logic model column / construct	Quantitative
	INPUTS	
3	Prescription data	CFHH; problems documented in implementation log.
7	COM-BMQ questionnaire responses	Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs Questionnaire (COM-BMQ), incorporating the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire (Nebuliser adherence)[50], one additional belief item, one intention item, one confidence item, and a list of barriers
9	Interventionist training programme	Structured questionnaire on interventionist confidence after training programme.
11	Competency/Fidelity assessment	Structured instrument for the assessment of interventionist competence.
	ENGAGEMENT	
13	Clinicians accessing adherence data*	CFHH click analytics.
14	Adherence data tracking	CFHH click analytics.
15	Participant accessing CFHealthHub	CFHH click analytics.

1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
27	
22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
47 10	
40 10	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
00	

17	CFHealthHub Intervention	Project-specific structured fidelity assessment
	sessions delivered according to	instrument.
	Manual (Fidelity)	
18	Initial session, and then review at	CFHH click analytics.
	each clinic visit	
	ACTIVITIES	
	Intervention components for all	
	participants	
20	Self-monitoring adherence	CFHH click analytics.
21	Tailored education about	CFHH click analytics.
	treatment	
22	Tailored patient stories (videos)	CFHH click analytics.
	Intervention components for	4.
	those with adequate motivation	
23	Personalised goal-setting	CFHH click analytics.
24	Goal review	CFHH click analytics.
25	Personalised action plan	CFHH click analytics.
26	Tailored problem-solving	CFHH click analytics.
	IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES	
	For all participants	
28	Acute awareness of adherence /	Subjective adherence single question (self-

2
2
5
4
5
6
7
8
0
9
10
11
12
13
1/
1-
15
16
17
18
19
20
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
27
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
25
22
36
37
38
39
40
/1
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
<u>10</u>
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
5/
58
59
60

increased Motivation report estimate of adherence as a percentage COM-BMQ. 29 Increased necessity and decreased COM-BMQ and Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13[109]) 30 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confidered to adhere; PAM-13. 30 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confidered to adhere; PAM-13. 31 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confidered to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confidered to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity in (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-lebehaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measure life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Belief's about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Intercased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)			
29 Increased necessity and decreased (COM-BMQ and Patient Activation Measu concern 20 Increased self-efficacy / (PAM-13[109]) 30 Increased self-efficacy / (COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13.) 31 For those with adequate motivation 32 Increased self-efficacy / (Motivation) 33 Increased self-efficacy / (Motivation) 34 Increased habit / reduced chaos 35 Increased habit / reduced chaos 36 Reduced barriers 37 Reduced barriers 38 Reduced barriers 39 Increased adherence 30 Increased adherence 31 Increased adherence 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos 33 Reduced barriers 34 Reduced barriers 35 Increased adherence		increased Motivation	report estimate of adherence as a percentage);
29 Increased necessity and decreased COM-BMQ and Patient Activation Measu concern (PAM-13[109]) 30 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 31 For those with adequate motivation COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 31 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-I behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Seale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) 34 INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Nebuliser data (CFHH)			COM-BMQ.
concern (PAM-13[109]) 30 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. For those with adequate motivation COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 31 Increased self-efficacy/ Motivation COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit- behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Nebuliser data (CFHH)	29	Increased necessity and decreased	COM-BMQ and Patient Activation Measure
30 Increased self-efficacy / COM-BMQ single question about confide Motivation to adhere; PAM-13. Increased self-efficacy/ COM-BMQ single question about confide Motivation to adhere; PAM-13. Increased self-efficacy/ COM-BMQ single question about confide Motivation to adhere; PAM-13. Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-1 behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hui and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu Iife chaos[49]. Iife chaos[49]. Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) INTERMEDIATE UTCOMES 33 Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)		concern	(PAM-13[109])
Motivation to adhere; PAM-13. For those with adequate motivation COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. Increased self-efficacy/ Motivation COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-I behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Nebuliser data (CFHH)	30	Increased self-efficacy /	COM-BMQ single question about confidence
For those with adequate motivation 31 Increased self-efficacy/ COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity 1 (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-1 behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Nebuliser data (CFHH)		Motivation	to adhere; PAM-13.
motivationCOM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13.31Increased self-efficacy/ MotivationCOM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13.32Increased habit / reduced chaosSelf-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-l behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49].33Reduced barriersNo change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50])34INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMESNebuliser data (CFHH)		For those with adequate	
31 Increased self-efficacy/ COM-BMQ single question about confide to adhere; PAM-13. 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-I behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) 34 INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Nebuliser data (CFHH)		motivation	
Motivationto adhere; PAM-13.32Increased habit / reduced chaosSelf-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit- behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49].33Reduced barriersNo change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50])34INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMESNebuliser data (CFHH)	31	Increased self-efficacy/	COM-BMQ single question about confidence
 32 Increased habit / reduced chaos 32 Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity I (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers 34 No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) 35 Increased adherence 36 Nebuliser data (CFHH) 		Motivation	to adhere; PAM-13.
(SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of Self Report Habit index to capture habit-I behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49].33Reduced barriersNo change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50])35INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMESNebuliser data (CFHH)	32	Increased habit / reduced chaos	Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index
Self Report Habit index to capture habit-l behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence		•	(SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of the
 behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hul and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measu life chaos[49]. Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH) 			Self Report Habit index to capture habit-based
and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measulife chaos[49]. 33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence			behaviour patterns[110]; Confusion, Hubbub,
33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)			and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measure of
33 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)			life chaos[49].
 Reduced barriers No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH) 			2/
 Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH) 	33	Reduced barriers	No change in the group averages for The
 specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21- item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH) 			Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire -
item[50]) INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence			specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-
INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)			item[50])
OUTCOMES 35 Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)		INTERMEDIATE	
35 Increased adherence Nebuliser data (CFHH)		OUTCOMES	
	35	Increased adherence	Nebuliser data (CFHH)

BMJ Open

1 2	
3	
5 6 1094	
7 8 1095	
9 10 11 1096	
12 13	
14 15	
16 17 18	
18 19 20	
21 22	
23 24	
25 26 27	
27 28 29	
30 31	
32 33	
34 35 26	
30 37 38	
39 40	
41 42	
43 44	
45 46 47	
48 49	
50 51	
52 53	
54 55 56	
50 57 58	
59 60	
	- 47 -

1		
2		
3		
4		
5	1097	rigures
6	1098	
7	1070	
8	1000	
9	1099	Figure 1 - Logic model
10		
11	1100	
12		
12	1101	Figure 2 - The digital platform
14		
15	1102	
16	1102	
17	1102	Figure 0. Objective contractive callegements of 5 (1) (1) months stratified
17	1103	Figure 3 – Objective versus subjective adherence at 5 (+/- 1) months stratified
10		
19	1104	by adherence
20		
21	1105	
22		
23		
24	1100	Additional files
25	1106	Additional mes
26	1107	
27		
28	1109	Additional file 01 - Participant adherence run charts for fourteen case studies
29	1108	Additional me of - Participant adherence fun charts for fourteen case studies
30	1109	
31	1110	
32	1110	Additional file 02 – Study protocol and interview guides
33	1111	
34	1112	
35	1113	Additional file 03 – Quantitative results from process evaluation
36	1114	
37		
38	1115	Additional file 04 – Joint display table
39	1116	
40	_	
41	1117	Additional file 05 - Case-ordered descriptive matrix for fourteen case studies
42	1117	Additional me vo – oase-ordered descriptive matrix for fourteen case studies
43	1110	
44	1110	Additional file 06 - Statistical methods, outcomes and estimation
45	1119	Auditional me vo – Statistical methous, outcomes and estimation
46	1120	
47		
48	1121	Additional file 07 – Changes to intervention procedures
49		
50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57		
58		
59		
60		



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml





The digital platform







Weeks after consent

ACtiF



Sheffield Teaching Hospitals



Sheffield Hallam University



Development and evaluation of an intervention to support <u>A</u>dherence to treatment in adults with <u>Cystic</u> <u>F</u>ibrosis

A feasibility study comprised of an external pilot randomised controlled trial and process evaluation

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

V3.1 16Nov16 Sheffield CTRU IRAS ISRCTN Authorised by:

J13-002 ISRCTN13076797 Martin Wildman

Alicia O'Cathain

This project was funded by the Programme Grants for Applied Research programme (RP-PG-1212-20015) and will be published in full in the NIHR Journals Library. This research presents independent research commissioned by the NIHR. The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, MRC, CCF, NETSCC, the Health Technology Assessment programme or the Department of Health.

Roles and responsibilities

Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors

The following all contributed to drafting elements throughout the protocol: Martin Wildman, Consultant Respiratory Medic; Marlene Hutchings, Physiotherapist (Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust); Madelynne Arden, Professor of Health Psychology (Sheffield Hallam University); Alicia O'Cathain, Professor of Health Services Research; Sarah Drabble, Research Associate, Stephen Walters (Professor of Medical Statistics and Clinical Trials); Paul Tappenden, Reader in Health Economics; Daniel Beever, Research Associate and Patient Representative; Pauline Wheelan mHealth Applications Manager (University of Manchester); Judy Bradley, Professor of Physiotherapy and Health Services Research; Hannah Cantrill (Research Associate); Chin Maguire (Study Manager); and, Daniel Hind, Assistant Director, Sheffield Clinical Trials Research Unit (University of Sheffield). MW and MA are guarantors of the intervention description; SW is the guarantor of the statistical design and analysis plan; DH is the guarantor of other elements of the pilot trial; AO'C is guarantor for the qualitative research components.

Sponsor

Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust D Floor Clinical Research Office Royal Hallamshire Hospital Glossop Road Sheffield S10 2JF Tel: (0114) 2256424 Fax: (0114)

Role of study sponsor and funders

Neither the funder nor the sponsor have had any role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of manuscripts.

Key Contacts

Study Manager

Chin Maguire Clinical Trials Research Unit The University of Sheffield School of Health and Related Research 30 Regent Street Sheffield S1 4DA Tel: (0114) 222 0717 Fax: (0114) 222 0870 e-mail: <u>c.maguire@sheffield.ac.uk</u>

Chief Investigator

Dr Martin Wildman Adult CF Centre Northern General Hospital Herries Road Sheffield S5 7AU

Tel: (0114) 2715212 Fax: (0114) 222 0870 e-mail: <u>Martin.Wildman@sth.nhs.uk</u>

Composition, roles, and responsibilities

Project Management Group

Name	Role	Institution
Dr Martin Wildman	Chief Investigator	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals
		NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Alicia O'Cathain	Chief Investigator	University of Sheffield
Dr Daniel Hind	CTRU Assistant Director	University of Sheffield
Chin Maguire	Study Manager	University of Sheffield
Hannah Cantrill	Research Assistant	University of Sheffield
Helen Wakefield	Trial Support Office	University of Sheffield
Dan Beever	PPI Lead	University of Sheffield
Dr Sarah Drabble	Qualitative Researcher	University of Sheffield
Professor Maddy Arden	Professor of Health Psychology	Sheffield Hallam University
Marlene Hutchings	Research Physiotherapist	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals
		NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Judy Bradley	Professor in Physiotherapy	Queens University Belfast

1
2
2
ر ۸
4
5
6
7
8
0
10
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
10
1/
18
19
20
21
22
22
23
24
25
26
27
20
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
25
35
36
37
38
39
40
40 41
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
40
40
49
50
51
52
53
51
54 55
55
56
57
58

Independent Project Steering Committee

Name	Role	Institution
Professor Kathy Rowan	Independent Chair	London School of Hygiene and
		Tropical Medicine
Professor Sarah Garner	Independent member	The National Institute for Health
		and Care Excellence
Professor David Torgerson	Independent Member	University of York
Dr Lisa Hampson	Independent Statistician	Lancaster University
Dominic Kavanagh	PPI Representative	
Dr Martin Wildman	Chief Investigator	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals
		NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Alicia O'Cathain	Chief Investigator	University of Sheffield
Dr Daniel Hind	CTRU Assistant Director	University of Sheffield
Chin Maguire	Study Manager	University of Sheffield
Professor Maddy Arden	Professor of Health	Sheffield Hallam University
	Psychology	

Contents

Funding	2
Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	2
Sponsor	2
Role of study sponsor and funders	2
Composition, roles, and responsibilities	3
Project Management Group	
Independent Project Steering Committee	4
Contents	5
Figures	7
Tables	7
1. Lay summary	8
2. Introduction	9
2.1 Background	9
2.2 Rationale	9
3. Aim and objectives	11
3.1 Aims	11
3.2 Objectives	11
4. Design	
5. Participants and study settings	
5.1 Settings and locations where the data will be collected	
5.2 Eligibility	
5.2.1 Inclusion criteria for participants	
5.2.2 Exclusion criteria for participants	
5.2.3 Eligibility criteria for study centres	
5.2.4 Eligibility criteria for interventionists	
5. Interventions	14
6.1 Summary	
6.2 Microchipped devices	15
6.2.1 The eTrack nebuliser system (Pari GmbH)	15
6.2.2 The Bi-neb AAD System from (Philips Healthcare)	15
6.3 Information technology infrastructure	15
6.3.1 The Qualcomm hub	15
6.3.2 CFHealthHub	15
6.3.3 The Bi-Neb data transfer system	16
6.4 The Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI)	
6.4.1 Rationale and theory	17
6.4.2 Intervention providers	
6.4.3 Materials	
6.4.4 Procedures	
6.5 Usual care	
6.6 Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions	
6.7 Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols	
6.7.1 For health professionals	28
6.7.2 For patients	28
6.8 Relevant permitted / prohibited concomitant care	28
7. Outcomes	29
7 1 Feasibility outcomes ('stop-go' or 'success' criteria for RCT)	29
, customer, currently burgers of success entering for really minimum	

7.3 Process data relating to the implementation of the intervention	
7.4 Clinical outcomes and covariates	
7.4.1 Primary clinical outcome	
7.4.2 Secondary clinical outcomes	
7.4.3 Adherence to prescribed medication	
8. Sampling	
8.1 Quantitative components	
8.1.1 Sites	
8.1.2 Sample size	
8.1.3 Approach, non-participation and recruitment	
8.2 Qualitative components	
9. Assignment of interventions	
9.1 Sequence generation	
9.2 Allocation concealment	
9.3 Implementation	
9.4 Blinding	
10. Data collection, management and analysis	
10.1 Quantitative data	
10.1.1 Data collection methods	
10.1.2 Data Management	40
10.1.3 Data quality assurance	40
10.2 Qualitative data	41
10.2.1 Audio recordings of consultations	41
10.2.2 Semi-structured interviews: participants	41
10.2.3 Semi-structured interviews: professionals	41
10.2.4 Undertaking the interviews	41
11. Data analysis	
11.1 Quantitative analysis	
11.2 Oualitative analysis	
11.3 Combining data and findings from the different components	
12. Monitoring	
12.1 Oversight	
12.2 Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines.	
12.2 Description of any internal analyses and stopping gardennes	45
12.3.1 Serious Adverse Events	45
12.3.2 Adverse events we require reporting.	46
12.3.3 Expected SAEs and adverse events	
12.3.6 Expected of the and adverse events internet in a second se	
12.3.4 Reporting	
12.5 Finance and indemnity	
12.5 Thatee and incoming	/ 4 / /۱۷
13.1 Approvals	40 10
13.1 Approvais	48 10
13.2 FIOLOCOL AIDENUIDENTS	
13.3 Consent	
13.4 Confidentiality	
13.5 Declaration of Interests	
13.0 Access to data	
13. / Ancillary and post-trial care	
13.8 Dissemination policy	
Keierences	
Appendix 1. W.H.O. Trial Registration Data Set	56

Figures

Figure 1. Interaction between complex intervention components	14
Figure 2. Interactions between capability, opportunity and motivation	17
Figure 3. Habit formation incorporating COM-B and necessities and concerns	18
Figure 4. Interplay between COM-B components during habit formation	18
Figure 5. Behaviour change intervention flow chart	26
Figure 6. Participant timeline for the external pilot RCT	36
Figure 7. Assumptions of the MRC Guidance on Process Evaluation	43

Tables

Table 1. Learning objectives of the CFHealthHub modules	16
Table 2: Intervention modules	20
Table 3. Individual-level data derived from PWCF and sites	34
Table 4 CFHealthHub data (research arm only)	35
Tuele ii el lieutuillue dum (researen min sing)	

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

1. Lay summary

Cystic Fibrosis (CF) is an inherited disease affecting 10000 people in the UK with an average age at death of 28 years in 2012. The lungs of people with CF (PWCF) are prone to infections. Daily physiotherapy and inhaled medications are needed to stay healthy. Around £30 million is spent annually on inhaled therapy but average adherence has been shown to be only 36%. Data suggest that adherence is better in younger children (71% in under 12s, falling to 50% in teenagers) but of the 10000 UK PWCF almost 6000 are now adults. PWCF who collect <50% of their medication cost the healthcare system significantly more than PWCF who collect more than 80% and most of the additional cost results from unscheduled emergency care and hospital admission. This unscheduled emergency care is distressing for PWCF and their families.

18 We have designed an intervention to help adult PWCF see how much treatment they use. We 19 use dose-counting nebulisers to collect data and send it to a website where it can be displayed. 20 We have worked with PWCF to make the information easy to understand. The website has 21 22 modules which teach PWCF how to build successful treatment habits. We have developed a 23 toolkit to help PWCF and a health professional (interventionist) work together to form habits 24 of adherence to treatment. 25

26 The NHS should not fund this intervention without its effectiveness and value for money 27 being evaluated in a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT). However, there is currently 28 29 insufficient information to effectively plan or justify funding a RCT on the scale required. 30 This feasibility study is an essential preliminary to the full scale RCT. The purpose of this 31 feasibility study is to see whether the proposed procedures for the full scale RCT are feasible 32 and acceptable to PWCF. It will also tell us whether the intervention can be delivered by 33 health professionals and is acceptable to PWCF, outside the NHS trust where it was 34 developed. 35

37 We will recruit PWCF for four months at two CF units. We hope we will recruit 64 PWCF 38 overall, but will deem the full scale RCT feasible if we recruit 48. A computer will decide 39 whether people who consent to be in the study will receive usual care alone or also receive the 40 intervention. Both groups have a short period of two to four weeks when data is collected 41 through their nebulisers and fed back to the website. It is only after that period that those 42 allocated to the intervention are allowed to use the website and receive enhanced care from 43 the interventionist. After that point, all participants are followed up for 5 (+/-) months. 44 45 Participants will complete a series of questionnaires at the outset and at 5 (+/-) months. 46

47 With appropriate consent, the interventionist or member of the multidisciplinary team (MDT) 48 will audio record consultations between themselves and PWCF who are receiving the 49 intervention or usual care. Qualitative researchers will conduct: 20-24 interviews with PWCF receiving the intervention; 20-24 interviews with PWCF receiving usual care; eight interviews with the four health professionals who are delivering the intervention; and eight semistructured interviews with members of the wider MDT. These interviews are intended to help the team understand and mitigate potential sources of failure in the intervention and the proposed full-scale trial.

60

2. Introduction

1 2 3

8

9

2.1 Background

Cystic Fibrosis (CF) is a long term condition (LTC) in which poor adherence to high cost drugs shortens lives and increases NHS costs. CF is a LTC affecting 10,000 people in the UK 10 with PWCF typically dying from lung damage at a median age of 28 years [1]. Randomised 11 12 controlled trials show that preventative medications reduce exacerbations and/or preserve 13 lung function, [2-8] however adherence is poor. A recent review of objective measures of 14 adherence using medicine possession ratios (MPR: prescriptions collected over prescriptions 15 issued) and instrumented medication monitors showed adherence ranging from 67% for oral 16 antibiotics, 31-53% for inhaled antibiotics, 53-79% for mucolytics agents and 41-72% for 17 hypertonic saline [9]. Accumulating evidence suggests poor adherence is associated with poor 18 outcomes. PWCF collecting four or more courses of alternate month nebulised tobramycin per 19 year were 60% less likely to be admitted to hospital than PWCF collecting one or less [10]. 20 21 Lower composite MPR predicted exacerbations requiring intravenous antibiotics (IVAB) [9] 22 and over a 12 month period PWCF with an MPR of 80% had significantly lower total 23 healthcare costs than PWCF with an MPR <50% with a cost difference \$14,211 per patient 24 and most excess costs related to hospital care [11]. Rescue therapy with IVAB can cause 25 renal failure [12]. The total 2012 UK spend for CF was estimated to be £100 million of which 26 £30 million was spent on inhaled antibiotics and mucolytics [13]. Although patient self-27 28 reported adherence to inhaled therapy was 80%, objective measurement showed median 29 adherence was only 36% and the clinicians were unable to predict which PWCF were able to 30 successfully adhere [14] making adherence support difficult. In 2012, the UK CF population 31 received 171,907 days of IVAB with the 93,455 of these that occurred in hospital costing an 32 estimated $\pounds 27$ million [15]. It is recommended that adherence interventions should be 33 targeted where adherence really matters [16] and targeting support towards the high cost 34 inhaled preventative drugs in CF (median adherence 36%) has the potential to impact on the 35 36 171,907 days of IVAB a proportion of which will represent rescue therapy necessitated by 37 failed prevention. 38

2.2 Rationale

39 40

41 42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49 50 51

52

53

54

55

56 57 58

59

60

The National Institute for Health Research have commissioned a Programme Grant for Applied Research to systematically develop and evaluate an adherence intervention for PWCF. The Programme Grant has three work packages

Work package 1: Build IT infrastructure to capture adherence data from nebulisers. Coproduce a web-portal, 'CFHealthHub', with PWCF and clinicians, in order to display routinely collected adherence data for the use of both groups.

Work package 2: Develop a toolkit based on psychological theory that can support PWCF to adhere to treatment. This will include feedback of measured adherence data and personalised interventions to increase adherence delivered through CFHealthHub. Manualise a Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI) for use by health professionals and PWCF.

All four work packages have received a favourable opinion from an NHS REC:

Work package 2.1A: A study of the views of people with cystic fibrosis about their condition and treatments (Hampshire A REC: 14/SC/1455; IRAS: 171049);

• Work package 2.1C: A study to produce videos for the CFHealthHub website (Camden & Kings Cross REC: 15/LO/0944; IRAS: 182367);

- Work package 2.2B: A study to develop a Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI) to help patients with CF manage treatment adherence ((South Yorkshire REC: 15/YH/0332; IRAS: 184477); and,
- Work package 2.2B(1): A study to understand how to use the eTrack and Bi-neb nebuliser to help people with CF to manage their inhalation treatments (West of Scotland REC 5: 15/WS/0089; IRAS: 177900).

Work package 3: Evaluate the toolkit developed in work package 2. The planned definitive evaluation will take place in a large-scale, multi-centre Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT). The definitive evaluation will compare usual care plus staff training in the importance of knowledge, skills and confidence building for adherence versus the same plus the structured behaviour change in intervention (CFHealthHub plus manual).

There is too little information available to effectively plan or justify funding a full scale RCT. We wish to conduct feasibility study comprising of:

- an 'external pilot RCT' to establish the feasibility of recruitment to a larger, definitive study; and,
- a 'process evaluation' which will help us understand the strengths and weaknesses of both the intervention and research protocols, and ways of addressing any weaknesses.

3. Aim and objectives

3.1 Aims

The principal aims of this feasibility study are to assess the feasibility and acceptability of:

- a complex intervention, when delivered outside the team which conceived and developed it; and,
- procedures for a full-scale RCT.

3.2 Objectives

1. An external pilot randomised controlled trial to determine feasibility of a randomised controlled trial based on objective stop-go criteria (Section 7.1) related to:

(a) participant recruitment;

(b) participant retention; and,

(c) quality of primary outcome data at 5(+/- 1) month.

2. A process evaluation, relating quantitative and qualitative data on procedures to outcomes, in order to understand and mitigate potential sources of failure in:

(a) the intervention; and,

(b) the full trial.

4. Design

Mixed-methods study comprising of:

• Quantitative component: parallel group, open labelled, external pilot RCT;

and,

• Qualitative component: analysis of audio-recorded consultations and interviews.

Quantitative and qualitative data will contribute to the process evaluation.

5. Participants and study settings

5.1 Settings and locations where the data will be collected

Nebuliser adherence data and information derived from CFHealthHub will be automatically uploaded by participants nebulisers in their own home. Data collection involving patient notes and patient reported outcome measures will take place in two specialist CF units which have not been involved in the development of the intervention. Exacerbation data will be collected by the ACtiF trial interventionist and clinicians at sites from participant notes.

5.2 Eligibility

5.2.1 Inclusion criteria for participants

- 1. Diagnosed with CF and with data within the CF registry
- 2. Aged 16 years and above
- 3. Taking inhaled mucolytics or antibiotics via a chipped nebuliser (e.g. eTrack or Bi-Neb) or able and willing to take via eTrack or Bi-Neb.

5.2.2 Exclusion criteria for participants

- 1. Post-lung transplant
- 2. People on the active lung transplant list
- 3. Patients receiving palliative care, Lacking in capacity to give informed consent
- 4. Using dry powder devices to take antibiotics or mucolytics

5.2.3 Eligibility criteria for study centres

- 1. Adult CF Centre;
- 2. Recognised by commissioners
- 3. Receiving year-of-care funding

5.2.4 Eligibility criteria for interventionists

1. Health care professional e.g. registered nurse, physiotherapist or other appropriately skilled individual such as a psychology graduate able to work at NHS Agenda for Change Band - 4 or above

6. Interventions

6.1 Summary

In the external pilot RCT, we will test procedures for a full trial. This involves allocation of PWCF to either a complex intervention or usual care. A 'complex intervention' is defined as one with several interacting components [17]. The complex intervention under evaluation has three broad categories of components (Figure 1):

(a) *a microchipped device* (nebuliser) for delivering inhaled medications, which are routinely prescribed for the control of cystic fibrosis (Section 6.2);

(b) *information technology infrastructure* to capture and store adherence data from the nebulisers and display it to PWCF and the CF team (Section 6.3); and,

(c) *the behaviour change intervention*, comprising a software platform ('CFHealthHub' mobile apps and website) offering adherence feedback and tailored modules of content and tools used by the health professional in interactions with PWCF (Section 6.4) and accessed independently by PWCF via CFHealthHub

Services received as usual care described in Section 6.5.

Figure 1. Interaction between complex intervention components



6.2 Microchipped devices

Depending on treatment strategies at different centres the participant may use an eTrack nebuliser system (Section 6.2.1), an Bi-neb AAD System from (Section 6.2.2).

6.2.1 The eTrack nebuliser system (Pari GmbH)

The eTrack controller is a modified version of the eBase controller and can be used to operate both the eFlow rapid nebulizer or Altera nebulizer. Compared to the eBase controller the eTrack is equipped with a Bluetooth chip and has a monitoring function to allow the capture of inhalation adherence data. The eFlow rapid nebuliser with eTrack controller is a CE marked medical device to be used for inhalation therapy. The device allows medications (approved for inhalation) to be transported deep into the lungs.

6.2.2 The Bi-neb AAD System from (Philips Healthcare)

The Bi-neb AAD system is a CE marked medical device which is intended for use to deliver aerosolised liquid medications for participants with cystic fibrosis. The drug delivery device is small and battery powered designed to deliver a precise dose of drug into patient's lungs. The Bi-neb AAD system is designed to deliver liquid medications that are specifically approved for use with the Bi-neb AAD System.

6.3 Information technology infrastructure

The information technology infrastructure for the complex intervention comprises:

- i. The Qualcomm hub (Section 6.3.1)
- ii. CFHealthHub (Section 6.3.2).
- iii. The Bi-Neb data transfer system (6.3.3)

6.3.1 The Qualcomm hub

The Qualcomm hub (Qualcomm; Cambridge, UK) is a wireless device which acquires data from the chipped device and transmits it to a cloud-based data centre. It is a Class I MDD and CE registered in Europe. It is designed, developed and manufactured in accordance with a quality system compliant with ISO13485 standards, meaning it aligns with the quality requirements of international regulatory agencies in the health care industry.

6.3.2 CFHealthHub

CFHealthHub is a web-portal which displays adherence data and provides resources and tools to people with cystic fibrosis and health professionals in order to support improved nebuliser adherence. It is available on-line via computers, tablets or mobile phones.

A qualitative study (WP 2.1A) to identify the barriers and facilitators of nebuliser use in PWCF informed the development of an intervention designed to increase nebuliser adherence. Analysis of the interview data was conducted using the COM-B framework, and these findings were used to inform the development of a complex intervention centred around the feedback of objective adherence data. The intervention was further developed and refined in consultation with PWCF and clinicians. An iterative study in which prototype versions of the intervention were delivered to and reviewed by PWCF was conducted. In that iterative study we interviewed PWCF and interventionists about the usability and tailoring of the
intervention, and made improvements to the process and materials based on this feedback. The system has been developed to ensure it meets the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It is intended that data on maintenance and relapse will be generated during the full scale trial.

CFHealthHub has a number of modules addressing barriers to adherence based on the COM-B system described in greater detail in Section 6.4.1. The objectives of the modules as mapped to the COM-B are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Learning objectives of the CFHealthHub modules

COM-B model component	Objectives						
Physical capability	- Have the skills to be able to use the nebuliser correctly						
Psychological capability	 Understand the importance of nebuliser use in CF treatment Be able to remember to use nebuliser Be able to self-monitor nebuliser use Be aware of a need to improve nebuliser use 						
Physical opportunity	 Have a realistic medication plan Have a working/functioning nebuliser Have a suitable place to use nebuliser Have the time to use nebuliser 						
Social opportunity	- Be/feel supported by others to use nebuliser						
Reflective motivation	 Perceive benefits of nebuliser use Perceive few/no concerns about nebuliser use Understand the health consequences of use/non-use Feel confident about nebuliser use Intend to use nebuliser 						
Automatic motivation	Have an established routine for nebuliser useHave a habit to use nebuliser						

6.3.3 The Bi-Neb data transfer system

The Bi-Neb Bluetooth data transfer system is intended to automatically extract breathing device use (adherence data) from the device (Bi-Neb) via a Smartphone hub and a secure data server onto CFHealthHub. Providing the Bi-Neb is within the Bluetooth range within the patient's house, the system can retrieve this data once a day.

6.4 The Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI)

6.4.1 Rationale and theory

The rationale of the BCI is to help CF patients to self-manage their condition and to form habits that will improve adherence to their medication, thereby extending life and improving quality of life. The MRC framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions recommends that intervention development should be informed by a suitable theoretical framework and evidence base [17]. The theoretical model adopted is the COM-B model [18] which describes a 'behaviour system' of the essential and interacting conditions of Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation [18]. The model posits that nonadherence is either non-intentional (a problem of capability or opportunity or intentional (a problem of motivation). The model has been adapted to nebuliser adherence on the basis of evidence about the factors influencing nebuliser adherence in PWCF [19–32], input from expert clinicians currently delivering services to PWCF, as well as from the PPI panel and exploratory research conducted in Sheffield. It is important that interventions are tailored to individual needs and use a multi-modal approach [33]. Each of the conditions of Capability, Opportunity and Motivation has been considered in turn in the development of our intervention. The primary component of the intervention is adherence feedback delivered via the CFHealthHub. Evidence suggests that while personalised feedback can have an effect size of up to 20% in increasing adherence [34, 35], feedback is most effective when combined with additional behaviour change techniques [34].

Figure 2. Interactions between capability, opportunity and motivation





The identification and choice of appropriate behaviour change techniques has been driven by the Behaviour Change Wheel framework for the development of interventions [Michie, S. F., Atkins, L., & West, R. (2015). The behaviour change wheel: a guide to designing interventions.] which outlines a process of intervention design using the COM-B model "through the systematic evaluation of theory and evidence" (p. 13). In brief, the process involved the following steps:

- 1. In depth identification and analysis of the factors influencing nebuliser adherence in PWCF through an examination of the existing literature, and a qualitative study in which participants viewed charts of their objective nebuliser adherence data within an interview about factors affecting their motivation, capability and opportunity to adhere to their nebuliser treatment (study 2.1). The Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF; [36]) which analyses Capability, Opportunity and Motivation in greater detail was used as a framework to guide the analysis.
- 2. Identification and evaluation of potential intervention functions (e.g. education, persuasion, enablement, environmental restructuring, modelling) to address the identified factors influencing nebuliser adherence in consultation with the research team, clinicians and PPI.
- 3. Development of intervention modules to include specific Behaviour Change Techniques to deliver intervention functions, selection of mode of delivery, and mechanism for tailoring of BCI delivery to meet individual needs with regard to Capability, Opportunity and Motivation. The module contents have been discussed and refined as a result of discussions with clinicians and PPI.
- 4. Identification of potential mediators of behaviour change, and identification of tools to measure each mediator.

The intervention arrived at through this process is described in Table 2.

Table 2: Intervention modules

Module	СОМ-В	Intervention functions	Behaviour Change Techniques	Mode of Delivery
<u>Universal parts o</u>	f the intervention			
Self-monitoring	Psychological capability Reflective Motivation	Education Environmental restructuring Enablement	 Self-monitoring of behaviour Adding objects to the environment (CFHealthHub) 	• Charts of objective adherence data presented within CFHealthHub
Goal setting & review	Psychological capability Automatic motivation	Enablement Incentivisation	 Goal setting (behaviour) Feedback on behaviour Discrepancy between current behaviour and goal Review behavioural goals Graded tasks Social reward 	 Discussion and agreement of goal with interventionist Review of goal Feedback on progress (through CFHealthHub and interventionist) Visual reward if goal met on CFHealthHub
Treatment plan	Psychological capability Physical Opportunity Social Opportunity Automatic motivation	Training Environmental restructuring Enablement	 Action planning Habit formation Prompts/cues (tailored) 	 Action planning tool within CFHealthHub Option to set reminders
Confidence building	Reflective Motivation	Persuasion	Focus on past success	• Interventionist encouraging focus on periods of higher adherence on charts

Module	COM-B	Intervention functions	Behaviour Change Techniques	Mode of Delivery						
Tailored parts of the intervention (based on baseline COM beliefs and barriers questionnaire (COM-BMQ) ¹ and consultation with interventionist)										
My treatment	Reflective Motivation Psychological capability	Education Persuasion Modelling	 Information about health consequences Credible source Salience of consequences Demonstration of the behaviour Vicarious consequences Self-talk 	 Q&A linked to information within CFHealthHub (tailored by baseline beliefs and prescription data) Presentation though text, patient stories, 'talking heads' and animation Credible sources including clinicians, PWCF and interventionist Interventionist eliciting self-talk through focus on why motivation is not lower than rating given on pre- screening questionnaire 						
Confidence building	Reflective Motivation	Modelling Persuasion	Demonstration of behaviour	• 'Talking heads' videos of coping stories within CFHealthHub						
Problem- solving (including skills training)	Physical capability Psychological capability Physical opportunity Social opportunity	Training Environmental restructuring Enablement	 Instruction on how to perform the behaviour Demonstration of the behaviour Behavioural practice/rehearsal Problem solving Restructure the physical environment self-talk social support (practical) 	 Tailored problem solving guided by interventionist Solution bank within CFHealthHub. Construction of if-then coping plans Videos demonstrating correct use of nebulisers within CFHealthHub 						

Incorporating the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire (BMQ-specific nebuliser treatment) Horne, 2010

5 6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17 18

19

21

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

6.4.2 Intervention providers

Interventionists may already be working at, or be new to participating organisations or be the ACtiF interventionist employed to deliver the trial locally at the site. Externally appointed staff will be recruited through a formal job interview. Suitable individuals will include registered nurses or other member of the multidisciplinary team or a ; graduate in a suitable psychology or, other relevant profession who holds relevant skills / subject such as experience. Candidates for the post will ideally have a minimum of two years postgraduate experience which might include delivering a research project to time and target. They will be employed on the Project to work to NHS Agenda for Change Band 4 or above. They must have access to a car for work purposes e.g. participant home visits.

Interventionists will be supported in the delivery of the intervention by members of the Multidisciplinary team (MDT) at the site in which they are based. MDTs will receive training 20 about the approach of the intervention, and the way in which they can support its delivery (see page 28). 22

Training for interventionists in how to deliver the intervention according to the specifications of the behaviour change manual will be provided by Marlene Hutchings with oversight provided by Madelynne Arden and/or Judy Bradley. A comprehensive training manual and training programme will be developed to facilitate this. A certificate of competence will be provided prior to the interventionist being able to use CFHealthHub with participants.

An additional trained regional interventionist will offer support to trial sites. This on occasion will involve input to patients (face to face or telephone contact), and assisting with problem solving via liaising with the nebuliser company. They will be named on the local site delegation log.

6.4.3 Materials

The BCI contains two broad categories of components:

- i. CFHealthHub behaviour change modules including adherence feedback used by PWCF and health professionals
- The behaviour change manual and toolkit used by the interventionist in interactions ii. with PWCF in order to understand the specific barriers to adherence for that individual, and to tailor and personalise delivery of the behaviour change modules accordingly.

6.4.4 Procedures

The BCI will be delivered over a 4 to 6 month period through a combination of face-to-face sessions and contact via telephone with an interventionist, and through participant interaction with different modules of content available on CFHealthHub. The interventionist will discuss participant data with members of the MDT to ensure that care is informed by objective adherence data. If any concerns become apparent as the interventionists collect data and work with participants, these concerns will be passed onto the clinical team. The clinical team will follow their standard procedures in relation to any concerns raised. The intervention content and delivery flow are outlined in Figure 5 and described below:

6.4.4.1 Consent Visit (all participants)

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

39

54 55

56

57

58

59 60

At the consent visit participants will be given a chipped nebuliser (eTrack) and Qualcom hub or the participants will receive a visit from a clinical trainer who will convert the participant's I-neb to a Bi-neb by adding a Bluetooth chip and providing a Smartphone hub. The clinical trainer may set up the Bi-neb in the patient's home or at hospital either during the main consent visit or at a separate visit after consent has been obtained. Both the eTrack and Bi-neb will connect to CFHealthHub which will enable adherence data be collected. The interventionist will input the participant's prescription details into CFHealthHub. Together these will allow the system to generate adherence charts for that participant. At this visit participants will complete a range of baseline measures (see Table 3) including the COM beliefs and barriers questionnaire (COM-BMQ) which will be entered into CFHealthHub. The responses to this questionnaire will be used to populate the 'My toolkit' section of CFHealthHub with specific tailored elements from the 'My treatment' modules prior to the Initial Intervention Visit. The participant's pseudomonas status will be clarified at baseline and confirmed by the PI with the opportunity to compare the participant's prescription with the pseudomonas status.

6.4.4.2 Initial Intervention Visit (intervention arm only)

Participants will be introduced to CFHealthHub. They will be asked to complete an online
consent form on behalf of their NHS trust in which they will specify what additional data they
would be willing for CFHealthHub to record and display (e.g. name, and uploaded
photographs) and what functional options they would like access to (e.g. push notifications).
Permissions may be changed at any time. The participant will have the option to upload their
own "patient story" into CFHealthHub after completion of the online consent form.

The interventionist will discuss their motivation to adhere to their nebuliser treatment, will address beliefs associated with poor adherence and will refer back to answers on the COM-BMQ to elicit the participants beliefs associated with adherence. Participants will be shown 'My toolkit' which will have been prepopulated with tailored motivational content (see consent visit).

The interventionist and participant will look at and discuss the adherence charts on
 CFHealthHub with a focus on period of higher adherence. The interventionist will note any
 barriers raised by participants during this discussion.

The interventionist will support the participant to identify where and when additional nebuliser treatments could be fitted into their schedule and support them to make an action plan using the online tool available on CFHealthHub. This action plan will be saved to the 'My toolkit' zone. The interventionist will then agree a % adherence goal for the next four to six weeks based on the number of additional treatments that have been planned. This will be recorded on CFHealthHub and will be represented by a target line on the adherence charts.

If motivation is so low that participants are reluctant to set an action plan/goal then the interventionist will spend further time discussing motivation and will skip to confidence building (see below).

The interventionist will encourage participants to focus on likely problems or issues that might disrupt the achievement of the adherence goal and will use the Problem-solving module on CFHealthHub to address each of these anticipated problems. The Problem-solving module includes solutions based on educational content, practical support (e.g. model letters to

29

30

31 32

33

58

59

60

1 2

employers) and interactive tools. Relevant solutions will be saved to the 'My Toolkit' zone of CFHealthHub.

The interventionist will discuss the participant's confidence to meet their goal and will identify 2-3 'talking heads' videos showing other people with CF addressing and overcoming similar barriers to nebuliser adherence.

9 The visit will conclude with a review of the goal and the tailored and personalised contents 10 saved to the 'My toolkit' zone of CFHealthHub. The interventionist will encourage a learning 11 mindset, emphasising that even if adherence doesn't increase starting to think about adherence 13 will produce learning that will make subsequent attempts to change easier.

6.4.4.3 Participant Independent access to CFHealthHub (intervention arm)

Participants will have independent access to CFHealthHub at all times following the Baseline visit. They can, at any time, access their adherence charts, 'My toolkit' contents, and can browse the other areas of content as they wish. Frequency of access to each area of CFHealthHub will be monitored and recorded.

Adherence charts will provide colour -coded feedback about participant achievement towards their adherence goal so that they are provided with immediate, easy to recognise information about their achievements. Subject to consent, participants will be sent encouraging messages via push notifications, or alternatively when they access CFHealthHub, to match the progress made e.g. congratulations on achieving their goal, congratulations on having made progress towards their goal, encouragement to remember their action plan.

6.4.4.4 Review visit (Visit 3 - intervention arm)

At the review visit, the interventionist and participant will look at and discuss the adherence charts on CFHealthHub and goal achievement with a focus on progress made and periods of higher adherence.

If the adherence goal was met then the participant will be encouraged to set a new higher adherence goal or to a goal to maintain their current level of adherence which will be recorded on CFHealthHub. Following this the participant and interventionist will review the contents of 'My toolkit' and revise action plans, problems/solutions as required. If issues of motivation are still a concern the interventionist may recommend additional/alternate elements of content from 'My treatment' or 'Talking heads' to go into 'My toolkit'.

If the adherence goal was not met then the interventionist and participants will discuss the
barriers to goal achievement (motivation, capability, opportunity). The interventionist will
address beliefs associated with poor adherence and will add/revise the elements of content
from 'My treatment' or 'Confidence building' to go into 'My toolkit'.

If no goal was previously set then the interventionist will review motivation and confidence and then will consider if the participant is ready to action plan and set a goal. If not they will spend more time reviewing motivation and confidence.

49 The participant will be encouraged to set a realistic % adherence goal for the next four to six 50 weeks and this will be recorded on CFHealthHub. The interventionist will support the 51 participant to revise their action plan as needed and save this to the 'My toolkit' zone. Based 52 on the earlier discussion about the barriers that prevented goal achievement the Problem-53 solving module on CFHealthHub will be used to address each of the problems encountered, 54 and any that are anticipated. Relevant solutions will be saved to the 'My Toolkit' zone of 55 56 CFHealthHub. 57

The visit will conclude with a review of the goal and the tailored and personalised contents saved to the 'My toolkit' zone of CFHealthHub. The interventionist will re-emphasise a

learning mindset, emphasising that the participant cannot fail, but can learn from the process so that they can work together on the adherence challenge.

Participating centres will provide participants with contact details, typically telephone numbers, but other methods may be volunteered by centres. Contact details will be provided so that participants can contact the centre if they have queries or problems regarding CFHealthHub between visits. The interventionist will be able to feedback any information from the intervention delivery **after** the baseline intervention visit to members of the wider CF team. This may include adherence data from sessions with the participant's clinician and MDT particularly if the participant raises any concerns or issues e.g. side effects of a drug to allow their usual clinician to discuss this with them at their next clinic visit.

6.4.4.5 Subsequent Review (intervention arm)

Following these two sessions the amount of interaction which each PWCF has with the interventionist will be tailored to their needs and requirements although it is anticipated that these will normally marry with routine clinic visits: They may have additional face-to-face sessions or contact via telephone or e-mail. No more than one monthly face-to-face session will be conducted because of the research protocol; if the participant requests additional support, the centre may accommodate this at their discretion. Review meetings will take 30 minutes and be conducted over the 5month (+/- 1 month) of the follow-up period. The structure of review sessions will follow the same pattern as for 6.4.4.4.

6.4.4.6 Final research visit (5 months +/- 1 month from consent)

All participants will complete a final research visit 4-6 months from the date of consent. At this visit the interventionist will collect the primary and secondary outcome data (see table 3) including demography data, health care resource use and the participant completed questionnaires. At this final research visit the interventionist will re-check that all adherence data has been transferred to CFHealthHub. The eTrack can store approximately 6 months of treatment data, ensuring all the data is transferred at this visit should help to prevent missing data.

Following the final 4-6 month post-consent research visit, we will continue to collect: adherence data from CFHealthHub; exacerbations; FEV1 and ask participants the subjective adherence question until, 30th April 2017. At this point the study closes and the involvement of all participants ceases. After the trial ends (30/4/17), the aspiration is to allow participants in the control to have access to the intervention for which negotiations are ongoing. Currently funding is in place for the trial interventionists at study sites to deliver the intervention only over a 12-month period i.e. up to 30/4/17. It is anticipated that CFHealthHub used outside the trial would be delivered within the existing resources of the MDT so using CFHealthHub outside the trial should not need the trust to employ any additional staff members. As this is a pilot feasibility study where we are testing the intervention in participants, there is an expectation that further iteration of CFHealthHub may occur.

Page 81 of 197

 BMJ Open



6.5 Usual care

Patients in both arms will receive usual care. Usual care is heterogeneous within and between centres, based on the needs of patients and the skills and interests of CF Unit staff. To better understand the configuration of usual care at participating centres a survey tool will be administered by the CTRU to the lead clinician at the centre. This will identify the spectrum of clinical and behaviour change interventions that are in use in the management and self-management of CF.

A minor component of the intervention is to train all members of the MDT in awareness of patient activation so that they are open to addressing issues raised for PWCF in the intervention arm. In addition, a staff member in the MDT will help to deliver the intervention. There is the possibility that the awareness of patient activation will have some effect on PWCF in both the intervention and control arms, and of leakage of the learning from the behaviour change component of the intervention to controls. We will investigate this possibility during the process evaluation.

Members of the MDT at each centre will receive one half-day, on-site, face-to-face training about the importance of objective nebuliser adherence data in the management of CF, and awareness of the importance of building patients' knowledge, skills and confidence to enable them to self-manage their treatment. This will include training in the interpretation of graphs and charts of objective adherence data produced by CFHealthHub, and the rationale for reducing target adherence in poor adherers in order to increase confidence. This will be delivered by designated members of the ACtiF research team.

Participants in the control arm will use a microchipped nebulizer but will not be able to access adherence data or other content and tools through CFHealthHub, neither will they receive the structured CFHealthHub intervention as described in the intervention manual. Control arm participants using Bi-neb nebulizers might have access to their data as part of routine care but this will not be in the user friendly format provided by the intervention.

One function of the qualitative research interviews with staff and control participants (see Section 8 below) is to understand the extent to which the patient activation awareness training has affected staff behaviour and whether control arm participants have received some aspects of the behaviour change intervention.

6.6 Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions

There are no criteria for discontinuing treatment. Participants will be made aware that their participation is voluntary and they may discontinue study interventions, should they wish, at any time.

If a participant wishes to withdraw from treatment they will be able to speak to a member of the site study team i.e. ACtiF interventionist. This will be documented on a participant withdrawal form, within the Case Report Form. Any data already collected during the course of the trial up to the point of withdrawal will be used in the final analysis. We will ask the participants for their permission to continue to collect the primary outcome data i.e. CF exacerbations. The participant or clinician can make the decision to discontinue the allocated study intervention for any reason.

Participants will have the following options if they wish to withdraw:

- 1. Withdraw from the intervention i.e. intervention delivery visits only but will remain in the study. Patients can continue to use CFHealthHub. All study data would continue to be collected at subsequent follow up time points as per protocol.
- 2. Withdrawal from the study. Unless the patient objects, any data collected up to this point would be retained and used in the study analysis. The local interventionist would ask the participant if they agree to the collection of primary outcome data as defined in the protocol and or adherence data If

they agree to collection of adherence data, CTRU and or interventionist will continue to follow up participants for adherence data.

3. Withdrawal from the trial entirely. Unless the patient objects, any data collected up to this point would be retained and used in the study analysis. If the patient does not wish to be contacted with regard to primary outcome data or adherence data, no further contact with regard to the study will be made. If the participant does specifically request for all their data to be removed information regarding the participant will be retained at site, as part of the patient notes, along with their withdrawal form and request to delete the data.

A participant would be classed as complete if they have continued in the study until the last protocol defined visit, however there may be missing visits and / or data.

Loss to Follow-Up

A participant would be classed as lost to follow up if the participant has 1) not completed the study or 2) been withdrawn despite attempts for further contact, as per protocol, having been made. Unless the participant withdraws from the study entirely we will continue to collect the primary outcome data when possible (i.e. from medical notes).

This withdrawal section has been developed in accordance with the CTRU Participant Discontinuation and Withdrawal of Consent Standard Operating Procedure (SSU003).

6.7 Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols

6.7.1 For health professionals

The intervention protocols will be described in detail in an intervention manual. Interventionists will be trained to deliver the intervention according to the manual protocols. Interventionist training (as a form of behaviour change) will focus on Capability, Opportunity and Motivation. It will utilise evidence about the importance and likely effectiveness of the intervention and will challenge common misconceptions about adherence. Skills training and an introduction to the tools available on CFHealthHub will increase staff capability, and we will work with clinics and clinicians to ensure that the practical requirements for intervention delivery are in place: space, time etc (opportunity).

CFHealthHub will record interventionist access to the site. It will also automatize some of the tailoring of the intervention according to the COM-BMQ which will be completed online. The contents of 'My Toolkit' will be recorded for each participant so that we will have records of what content they have been recommended. Interventionists will also be required to complete session records each time that they deliver the intervention to record the decisions made and the reasons for these,

6.7.2 For patients

Where participants provide consent we will send optional push notifications to encourage engagement with CFHealthHub. For example, we will send congratulatory messages when adherence improves, encouraging messages to remind participants to engage with the content. Face-to-face visits will, where possible be arranged to coincide with clinic visits as per usual care, therefore minimising the additional burden on participants.

6.8 Relevant permitted / prohibited concomitant care

No concomitant care will be denied based on the research protocol.

7. Outcomes

7.1 Feasibility outcomes ('stop-go' or 'success' criteria for RCT)

In line with proposed CONSORT extension for pilot studies [37], in this section, we state the criteria for success of the external pilot trial. The criteria are based on the primary feasibility objectives, which provide the basis for interpreting the results of the external pilot and for determining the feasibility of proceeding to the full-scale study scheduled for months 31 to 60 of the project. Depending on the funder's perspectives, the outcome of the external pilot might be:

- (i) "Stop main study not feasible";
- (ii) "Continue, but modify protocol feasible with modifications";
- (iii) "Continue without modifications, but monitor closely feasible with close monitoring"; or,
- (iv) "Continue without modifications feasible as is."[37]

We anticipate that modifications to the research protocol will be necessary as the feasibility study progresses. Some of the qualitative research will be undertaken early in the pilot trial and lessons learned about the trial procedures will be identified and acted on during the pilot trial. There are three objective stop-go criteria:

1. Feasibility of recruitment to RCT

Defined as recruitment of no fewer than 48 participants randomised at two centres over four months, 75% of the rate required in the main trial;

2. Feasibility of retaining participants in the RCT

Defined as attrition from the research protocol of no more than 15% of randomised participants at 5 (+/-1) months.

If these are met the full trial will go ahead. If these are not met overall, but are met in the last half of the pilot trial after trial procedures have been improved based on lessons learned from the early stage of the pilot trial, then the full trial will go ahead.

7.2 Process data relating to the implementation of the trial

1. Number and characteristics of eligible patients approached for the study

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database

2. Reasons for refused consent

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database.

3. Reach

How many participants are consented into the study, sub-grouped by socio-economic status (from CF Registry), as a proportion of:

- Those approached, expressed quantitatively, based on 'pre-screening' logs completed by ACtiF interventionist;
- Those known to be eligible, expressed quantitatively based on CF Registry.

4. Participant attrition rate

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database.

5. Reasons for attrition

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database.

6. Maintenance:

The processes by which participants are kept involved in the collection of key secondary outcome data research data:

- The extent to which adherence data is successfully uploaded from the chipped nebulisers, described quantitatively using CFHealthHub (Intervention arm only).

7. Number of missing values/incomplete cases

Assessed by data management team, based on data in Prospect database.

8. Participant,/interventionist and members of MDT views on research protocols

Assessed through qualitative interviews and to include:

- Barriers to recruitment, problems encountered in reaching participants [38];
- Perceived problems with trial procedures such as recruitment, informed consent etc.
- Acceptability
- Perceived utility and burden of outcome assessments.

9. A survey on the content of usual care at participating centres

A CTRU staff member will complete this survey with the principal investigator, a senior medic or delegate working at the participating centre.

7.3 Process data relating to the implementation of the intervention

1. Context

Definitions of 'context' tend to cluster around setting, roles, interactions and relationships [39]. It is important that context is understood as diachronic and emergent rather than synchronic and static [40, 41]. Frameworks for process evaluation have defined 'context' as:

- "aspects of the larger social, political, and economic environment that may influence intervention implementation" [42];
- "factors external to the intervention which may influence its implementation, or whether its mechanisms of impact act as intended" [43].

The context, and its interaction with implementation, mechanisms of impact, outcomes, the description of the intervention and its causal assumptions [43] will be described using qualitative data from research interviews, field notes, study management logs, minutes and e-mails. The focus will be how the context of individual CF Units affects implementation of the intervention and its potential outcomes.

2. Implementation

Definitions of 'implementation' tend to cluster around the processes or stages of adoption, the methods, means or social organisation of bringing innovative practices into use [39]. One way of describing the process of getting research into practice is to use a process model [44]. To structure our narrative of how the complex intervention was implemented we will use a process model called the Quality of Implementation Framework [45].

3. Recruitment:

Based on e-mails and minutes we will describe in narrative terms, the procedures used to approach and attract to the project NHS Trusts and interventionists [42].

4. Training:

The comprehensiveness of the training component of the intervention for the health professionals delivering the intervention will be assessed by a combination of audio recordings of consultations and by interview.

5. Fidelity

"The extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned. It represents the quality and integrity of the intervention as conceived by the developers. Fidelity is a function of the intervention providers."[42]

- Interaction with participant along lines recommended by manual, determined by audio recordings of consultations between the interventionist and PwCF in the intervention arm.
- Recommendation of appropriate CFHealthHub tasks by interventionist, determined by audio recordings and by data from CFHealthHub;

The fidelity assessment will be developed and based on a tool used by Borelli et al [46].

6. Use [38] / dose received [42] of intervention

Use of CFHealthHub by participant, as proposed by interventionist, determined by data capture by CFHealthHub, including the online activities started and completed, minutes spent on recommended pages and which parts the participant has picked out and put in a "my favourites" page. The number of times, frequency over time and duration with which users log on to CFHealthHub, as well as the activities they perform while logged in, described quantitatively using data from CFHealthHub.

A record of the discussion between the interventionist and the MDT will be kept. This will include who was there, brief notes of what was discussed and any agreement of treatment goals made.

7. Acceptability

The acceptability of the intervention to hospital staff and PWCF assessed through semi-structured interviews.

8. Perceived benefits and harms

Assessed through semi-structured interviews with health professionals and PWCF.

9. Leakage of intervention to controls

Assessed through audio recordings of consultations between the MDT, interventionist, and PwCF in the control arm, and semi-structured interviews with PwCF in the control arm.

7.4 Clinical outcomes and covariates

The time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants can be found in Table 3 and Table 4 below.

7.4.1 Primary clinical outcome

The primary clinical outcome is the number of pulmonary exacerbations in 5 (+/-1) month post-baseline follow-up period, defined according to the Fuchs criteria [47]. An exacerbation of respiratory symptoms will be said to have occurred when a patient was treated with parenteral antibiotics for **any one of the following 12 signs or symptoms** [48]:

- 1. change in sputum;
- 2. new or increased hemoptysis;
- 3. increased cough;
- 4. increased dyspnea;
- 5. malaise, fatigue, or lethargy;

- 6. temperature above 38 °C;
- 7. anorexia or weight loss;
- 8. sinus pain or tenderness;
- 9. change in sinus discharge.
- 10. change in physical examination of the chest, derived from notes by site staff.
- 11. decrease in pulmonary function by 10 percent or more from a previously recorded value, derived from notes by site staff; or,
- 12. radiographic changes indicative of pulmonary infection, derived from notes by site staff.

The trial interventionist or prescribing clinician/nurse will collect data on the "exacerbations" form at the point of a participant starting a course of IV antibiotics.

7.4.2 Secondary clinical outcomes

1. Body Mass Index (BMI).

- 2. Forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁): standardised spirometry as a measure of condition severity [49].
- 3. EuroQol EQ-5D-5L: generic health status measure for health economic analysis [50].
- 4. **The Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13) (Health Style Assessment**): assessment of patient knowledge, skill, and confidence for self-management [51]. *PAM-13 was labelled as "Health Style Assessment" following a request from the licence owners to ensure the purpose of the questionnaire is clear for participants.
- 5. Assessment of routine : measure of life chaos [52].
- 6. **Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index (SRBAI):** automaticity-specific subscale of the Self Report Habit index to capture habit-based behaviour patterns [53].
- 7. Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised (CFQ-R): disease specific health-related quality of life instrument [54].
- 8. The Patient Health Questionnaire depression scale (PHQ-8): severity measure for depressive disorders [55].
- 9. MAD (Medication Adherence Data-3 items) : medication adherence measure
- 10. The General Anxiety Disorder 7-item anxiety scale (GAD-7): severity measure for anxiety [56].
- 11. The Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs Questionnaire (COM-BMQ): This questionnaire incorporates:
 - a. The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21item): a validated self-report tool[57], customised by the author to identify perceived necessities and concerns for nebuliser treatment.
 - **b.** The following project-specific items: one additional belief item, one intention item, one confidence item, and a list of barriers. These will serve as a tailoring tool for the intervention and also as a secondary outcome measure.
- 12. **Subjective adherence single question:** self-report estimate of adherence as a percentage. Self-reported problems: identification of capability and opportunity barriers to nebuliser adherence

- 13. Concomitant medications: bespoke instrument, designed for this research project.
- 14. **Resource use form:** interventionist collects data from a combination of hospital notes and the NHS patient electronic system to determine 1) inpatient IV days 2) Routine clinic visits 3) Unscheduled outpatient contacts 3) unscheduled inpatient stays.
- 15. **Exploratory analysis of habit formation**: analyses with the objective nebuliser data will be performed to explore the process of habit formation with the delivery of the adherence intervention
- 16. **Prescription**: a monthly prescription check to both check for data transfer to CFHealthHub and review for an indication that the prescription has changed or indication of microorganism e.g. pseudomonas (please see table 2 and 3 and refer to section 10.1.1).
- 17. Adherence to prescribed medication (see 7.4.3)
- 18. Any treatment with IV antibiotics

7.4.3 Adherence to prescribed medication

Adherence to prescribed medication will be defined in several ways including:

- 1. Unadjusted adherence
- 2. Simple normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)
- 3. Sophisticated normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)
- 4. Simple normative adherence (with numerator adjustment)
- 5. Sophisticated normative adherence (with numerator adjustment)

Further detail about the outcomes will be reported in the trial statistical analysis plan.

Table 3. Individual-level data derived from PWCF and sites

	Where?	Completed by?	Consent visit	Baseline (intervention) visit	At clinic visits	Exacerbations episode	5 months (+/- 1 month) from consent visit	÷
Enrolment								
Pre-screening form (before 1 st visit)	Prospct	Site	-	-	-	-	-	
Confirmation of eligibility form	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	
Informed consent	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	
Intravenous days in last registry year	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	
Pseudomonas status +	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	
Primary outcome								T
Exacerbations form including: Parenteral antibiotics Change in sputum* New or increased hemoptysis* Increased cough* Increased dyspnea* Malaise, fatigue, or lethargy* Temperature above 38 °C* Anorexia or weight loss* Sinus pain or tenderness* Change: sinus discharge* Change: phys. exam. chest* Decrease: pulmonary function * Indicative radiographic changes*	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	•	•	
Secondary outcomes	Prospet							+
BMI (height and weight)	Prospet	Site	•	-	-	_	•	_
	Prospet	Site	•	-	•	•	•	+
EQ-5D-5L**	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	_
PAM-13(Health Style Assessment)	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	_	•	╉
Assessment of Routine	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	_	•	+
SKBAI	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	_	•	╉
	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	_	•	+
PHQ-8	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	_	•	╉
GAD-7	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	_	•	╉
MAD-3 (Medication Adherence Data-3 items)	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	<u> </u>	•	╀
	СЕНН	PWCF	•	-	-		•	+
Objective adherence	Prospet	CFHH	•	-	•	-	•	╀
Subjective adherence single question	Prospet	PWCF		-	•		•	╀
Concomitant medications	Drospet	Site		-	-	-	•	╀
Other SAEs	rrospet	Site	-	-	•			

+ Pseudomonas (or other microorganism) status will be checked together with the monthly prescription

* Only required where PWCF indicates they have received parenteral antibiotics

** EQ5D-5L collected at the start and end of every exacerbation episode

Table 4. CFHealthHub data (research arm only)

	Completed by?	Baseline (intervention) visit	At intervention visit s with interventionist	Between sessions	At clinic visits	5 months (+/- 1 month) from consent visit	Up till 30th April 2017
Clinician metrics							
Adherence data*	PWCF	•	•	•	•	•	•
Recommendation of modules by interventionist	Interventionist	•	٠	-	•	-	Х
Feed back to participant their adherence data screens (data click)	Interventionist	•	•	-	•	-	Х
Check prescription with participant	Interventionist	•	•	-	•	-	Х
Order of clicks	CFHH	•	•	-	•	-	х
Interventionist responds to patient changing prescription	Interventionist	-	٠	•	•	•	Х
Monthly check on prescription +	Interventionist / CTRU	•	•	•	•	•	х
Time in and out preparation	Interventionist /CFHH	•	•	-	-	•	х
Time in and out with patient	Interventionist /CFHH	•	•	-	-	•	х
Time in and out review	Interventionist /CFHH	•	•	-	-	•	х
Patient metrics							
Adherence (number of nebulized doses taken per day.) ¹	PWCF	•	٠	•	•	•	х
Duration of inhalation	Nebuliser	•	•	-	-	-	х
Accessing CFHealthHub - look at adherence data	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	х
Accessing CFHealthHub - look at 'My Toolkit'	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	х
Accessing CFHealthHub problem solving / education / talking heads pages outside of 'My Toolkit'	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	X
Accessing CF HealthHub – first to last click in a session	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	х

*Adherence data collected for both research and control arms

+ Monthly prescription checked by CTRU centrally to alert local interventionists to any potential changes in control arm and potentially also intervention arm

X data continued to be collected in CFHealthHub and interventionist responds for those participants who have "opted in" to receive intervention till 30/4/17

¹To be broken down in statistical analysis plan.



*When I-nebs are converted to Bi-nebs a representative from the company (Philips) will do this between the consent visit and first intervention visit.

The study recognises that flexibility in accommodating participant schedules may cause time windows to change but this will allow us to adapt the intervention for the main RCT.

8. Sampling

8.1 Quantitative components

8.1.1 Sites

Two large specialist CF centres have been screened for their ability to recruit participants based on the number of participants they have on their CF registry and their motivation to participate in the pilot trial.

8.1.2 Sample size

The sample size for a feasibility study should be adequate to estimate the uncertain critical parameters (standard deviations for continuous outcomes; consent rates, event rates, attrition rates for binary outcomes) needed to inform the design of the full RCT with sufficient precision [37, 58–60]. For the main RCT, the target sample size is 688 participants (344 per arm). We are proposing that 15 CF units recruit on average 46 patients in six months, a recruitment rate of approximately eight patients per centre per month.

To assess whether this recruitment rate is feasible the external pilot RCT will open in two CF units for 12 months, with four months recruitment, one months 'run-in' period (the period between the consent and baseline visit), and 5 (+/-1) months follow up. To match the proposed recruitment rate of the main RCT, the target sample over the four months for which the pilot RCT is open, will be 32 per centre (64 in total from the two pilot centres). We propose to recruit to time, that is for a fixed period of four months rather than to a fixed sample size. We would want to see a minimum of 75% of the recruitment target to be confident of the trial viability i.e. at least 48 patients in total consented and randomized in four months' of recruitment from two centres.

8.1.3 Approach, non-participation and recruitment

Approach: Health professionals involved in approaching and screening PWCF and collecting data will be trained in the study protocol and procedures. Additionally those taking consent will have up-to-date training in Good Clinical Practice (GCP). All study personnel will be named on the study delegation log. Health professionals working with the CF team will identify a sample of PWCF registered at the centre via the CF registry database locally. All inclusion and exclusion criteria will be assessable via patient records and they will exclude any patients who do not fit the eligibility criteria.

A member of the participant's direct clinical team will send the potential participant a PIS and introductory letter by post or give the written information during a routine clinic visit. A sticker with a website address and Quick Response code will be placed in the envelope both of which will link to a video of the researcher explaining the study. If information is provided in a routine clinic visit, the clinical care team will seek permission for the ACtiF Interventionist to follow up with a phone call in order to answer any further questions and discuss involvement. Written informed consent may be conducted at this visit where the participant is happy to take part as this is a low risk trial.

Telephone call: Up to a week after posting out the information, the ACtiF Interventionist will telephone the PWCF to discuss the study over the phone and answer any questions. If the potential participant is happy to take part, the ACtiF Interventionist will arrange an appointment to gather written informed consent.

Non-participation: Spontaneously offered reasons for non-participation in the trial will be recorded.

8.2 Qualitative components

<u>At each of the two pilot sites</u> we will undertake:

- Audio-recordings of all 16 initial assessments for PWCF in the intervention arm and 10-12 consultations between the senior interventionist from the MDT (or other MDT member) and PWCF in the control arm. Numbers will depend on numbers of PWCF giving written consent for this.
- 10-12 semi-structured face-to-face (or telephone or skype) interviews with PWCF receiving the intervention and 10-12 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with PWCF in the control arm (total n~40-48 PWCF; n~40-48 interviews);
- two semi-structured face-to-face (or telephone or skype) interviews with each of the two interventionists in each centre (total n=4 interventionists; n=8 interviews); and,
- two semi-structured (face to face, telephone or skype) interviews with two members of the MDT (total n=4 staff; n=8 interviews).

Written informed consent will be obtained from both the interventionist and the PWCF participating in the audio recording when they consent to be in the study. Separate consent will be sought from PWCF and interventionists or members of the wider CF team for semi-structured interviews.

9. Assignment of interventions

9.1 Sequence generation

Participants will be allocated in equal proportions to one of the two groups using a computer generated pseudo-random list, stratified by centre and the number of days participants have been on IV antibiotics in the previous 12 month period as collected at consent visit, with random permuted blocks of varying sizes. The two categories for stratification within the number of IV days will be (i) less than or equal to 14 days and (ii) greater than 14 days.

9.2 Allocation concealment

The allocation sequence will be hosted by the Sheffield CTRU in accordance with their standard operating procedures and will be held on a secure server. Access to the allocation sequence will be restricted to those with authorisation. The sequence will be concealed until recruitment, data collection, and analyses are complete.

9.3 Implementation

The allocation sequence will be created by a Sheffield CTRU statistician who is not otherwise associated with the trial. At the consent visit, a health professional who is named on the delegation log, will go over the patient information sheet again with the study candidate and answer any questions. If the PWCF is still willing to enter the trial, they obtain full written consent and complete the eligibility form. If the participant is eligible, then baseline assessments will be taken. The recruiting health professional will log into the remote, secure Internet-based randomisation system and enter basic demographic information, after which the allocation will be revealed.

9.4 Blinding

After revelation of the allocation, only the statisticians will be blinded to allocation as per CTRU SOPs (ST001 and ST005)

10. Data collection, management and analysis

10.1 Quantitative data

10.1.1 Data collection methods

Data handling and record keeping. The Sheffield CTRU will oversee data collection, management and analysis and ensure the trial is undertaken according to Good Clinical Practice Guidelines and CTRU standard operating procedures. Data will be collected and retained in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Patients will be reassured that all data which are collected during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential.

The study team will train those collecting data in the study procedures before the trial begins. Data will either be collected directly from the participants, carers, interventionist, CFHealthHub or from source documents (e.g. patient notes) and input onto the CRF or Sheffield CTRU's electronic web-based data capture system (Prospect). The Data Monitoring and Management Plan for the study will provide further guidance on the types and levels of data and how these will be monitored and verified. Some essential documents may be posted to the central team to facilitate this e.g. participant consent forms in which case this will be detailed in the appropriate participant PIS and consent forms.

The CTRU will perform checks with the participant via monthly phone calls to ensure data is being captured and alert the local interventionist if there is an indication of a prescription change and a need to check pseudomonas (or other microorganism) status. This is required for the correct denominator to assess "normative adherence". Data will be extracted from the CF registry to understand exacerbations in the preceding 12 months since prior exacerbations can have a bearing on the optimum target regimen.

Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up.

Participant retention will be ensured by the following procedure:

- 1. At each point of contact, the interventionist will check with the participant that the Qualcomm hub or Smartphone hub is plugged in and turned on. A member of CTRU who is performing data and prescription checks may alert the interventionist. They will remind the participant of the proximity required for data transfer (10 metres)
- 2. In the event of no data being displayed in CFHealthHub for a period of at least a week (and the participant is not known to be on holiday) the interventionist will make contact with the participant (Email/Text/Telephone call) to check that the following
 - That the Qualcomm or Smartphone hub is plugged in
 - That the Qualcomm hub is working (showing solid green and yellow lights on the display)
 - That they have been within range of the Qualcomm hub sufficient to facilitate data transfer (10 metres)
 - That the Smartphone hub is switched on (showing the locked 'password' screen when any button is pressed)
 - That the Bi-neb and Smartphone hub have been kept in the same room, or at least have been in close proximity at some point during the day.

Any participants using the Bi-neb who are still experiencing issues after following the steps above, may receive a face to face or telephone support (at home or hospital) from the clinical trainer to resolve any outstanding issues.

Troubleshooting:

Data capture will be monitored both by interventionist at the site and centrally by the CTRU. In the event of data not being uploaded patients will be contacted to trouble shoot problems. Patients will be offered support to suit their circumstances including home visits (conducted by the members of the site research team) where necessary.

10.1.2 Data Management

Anonymised trial data will be entered onto a validated database system designed to an agreed specification between the Chief Investigator and Sheffield CTRU. The research staff at sites (mainly the ACtiF interventionist) will be responsible for data entry locally. The Sheffield CTRU Trial Manager, research assistant and the Data Management Team will work with sites to ensure the quality of data provided. The study manager, research assistant, data manager, PI's, any research nurses and site interventionist will have access to the anonymised data on the database through the use of usernames and encrypted passwords. The system has a full electronic audit trail and will be regularly backed up. The secure data management system will incorporate quality control procedures to validate the study data. Error reports will be generated where data clarification is needed. Output for analysis will be generated in a format and at intervals to be agreed between Sheffield CTRU and the Chief Investigator.

Trial documents will be retained in a secure location during and after the trial has finished. The study will use the CTRU's in-house data management system (Prospect) for the capture and storage of participant data. Prospect stores all data in a PostgreSQL database on virtual servers hosted by Corporate Information and Computing Services (CiCS) at the University of Sheffield. Prospect uses industry standard techniques to provide security, including password authentication and encryption using SSL/TLS. Access to Prospect is controlled by usernames and encrypted passwords, and a comprehensive privilege management feature can be used to ensure that users have access to only the minimum amount of data required to complete their tasks. This can be used to restrict access to personal identifiable data.

Participants who give consent to the qualitative part of this study will also give consent to their name and address to be given to the University of Sheffield qualitative research staff in order to be contactable.

10.1.3 Data quality assurance

Prospect provides a full electronic audit trail, as well as validation and verification features which will be used to monitor study data quality, in line with CTRU SOPs and the Data Management Plan (DMP). Error reports will be generated where data clarification is required. Rates of missing data and data points which are out of the expected or allowed range will be presented to the team at monthly management group meetings.

10.2 Qualitative data

10.2.1 Audio recordings of consultations

All initial assessments will be audio recorded with permission (n=16 in each site). Findings from early assessments will be fed back to the interventionist so that changes can be made to the intervention delivery before subsequent assessments. Consultations between the senior interventionist and PWCF in the control arm will be audio recorded with permission (n=10-12 in each site). Encrypted digital recorders will be used and recordings sent securely to the research team for analysis.

10.2.2 Semi-structured interviews: participants

In each site we will interview 3-4 PWCF receiving the intervention who are recruited at the beginning of the pilot. We will interview them around one month into the intervention to seek views of the most intensive part of the intervention. This will identify any problems early and be fed back to the intervention development team, staff delivering the intervention, and trial staff. We will interview 5-6 PWCF around four to six months into the intervention. These PWCF will have experienced more independent use of the CFHealthHub and we can explore how to keep PWCF engaged with the intervention in the longer term. We will interview 2-3 PWCF who drop out of the intervention to explore why this occurred. We will interview 10-12 PWCF in the control arm around four to six months into the trial to explore whether they have experienced aspects of patient activation and leakage of the intervention.

10.2.3 Semi-structured interviews: professionals

The first interviews with the interventionist and senior interventionist in each site will take place after they have undertaken assessments with the first few PWCF to identify teething problems with the intervention or the trial and the comprehensiveness of the training sessions they received. The findings will be fed back to the team to consider whether changes are needed to the intervention or trial protocol. The second interviews will take place when the first few PWCF have completed the intervention to allow the interventionist to reflect back over the whole process. The interventionists may have different lengths of experience of working with CF, nebulisers or behaviour change and we will consider the influence of differences in backgrounds on their ability to implement the intervention.

We will also undertake interviews with two members of the MDT at each centre when the first few PWCF have received 2-3 months of the intervention and then again towards the end of the feasibility study when all PWCF have been recruited and received around 3 months of the intervention.

10.2.4 Undertaking the interviews

For the interviews we have developed topic guides based on our research questions and these are attached to the application. Topic guides develop throughout any qualitative interview study and our topic guides may change as the study progresses. We will audio record all interviews after receiving written permission to do so. We will use an encrypted digital recorder. Reflexive notes will be made during and after the interviews. We expect

interviews to last around one hour. We do not expect data saturation in pilot studies; the aim is to identify any learning that can be addressed in preparation for the full trial.

11. Data analysis

11.1 Quantitative analysis

The analysis will be performed after data lock by a CTRU statistician under the supervision of the senior study statistician. As the trial is a pragmatic parallel group RCT data will be reported and presented according to the CONSORT 2010 statement [61] with reference to proposed extension for pilot / feasibility studies [37]. As a pilot/feasibility study the main analysis will be mainly descriptive and focus on confidence interval estimation and not formal hypothesis testing [58]. We will report rates of consent, recruitment and follow-up by centre and by randomized group.

Clinical outcome measures will be summarised overall and by randomized group. Baseline demographic (age, gender), physical measurements (e.g. weight, height, BMI), and patient reported outcome measures (EQ-5D, PAM-13, Assessment of Routine, MAD-3, SRBAI, CFQ-R, GAD-7, COM-BMQ, PHQ-8), and clinical measurements (e.g. FEV1, IV days in last registry year) will be described and summarised overall and for both treatment groups.

The primary outcome is the number of pulmonary exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics over the 6 month post-randomisation follow-up period. We will also include, as part of the feasibility analysis, estimation of the effect size for the 6-month pulmonary exacerbations outcome with 95% confidence interval estimates to check that the likely effect is within a clinically relevant range (as confirmation that it is worth progressing with the full trial). For this we will use a Poisson generalised linear model (GLM). Secondary continuous outcomes such as six-month post randomisation FEV1, BMI EQ-5D, PAM-13, Assessment of Routine, MAD-3, SRBAI, CFQ-R, GAD-7, COM-BMQ, PHQ-8) will be analysed with a multiple linear regression model with the baseline value of the outcome and randomised group as covariates. The treatment group coefficient and its associated 95% confidence interval will be reported from the various multiple linear regression models. The mean level of adherence (to prescribed medication) between the intervention and control groups over the 6 month post-randomisation follow-up period will also be reported and compared between the groups and a 95% confidence interval (CI) for the mean difference in this parameter between the randomised groups will also be calculated.

Further analyses with the objective nebuliser data will be performed to explore the process of habit formation with the delivery of the adherence intervention. The analyses will include:

(a) generating objective habit scores by taking into account time of nebuliser use

(b) using statistical process control to identify when periods of stability is achieved

(c) other time-series methods, including cross-correlation between habit scores and adherence.

Adverse events will be based on serious adverse events (SAE) case report forms. A serious adverse event is defined as any adverse event or adverse reaction that results in death, is life-threatening, requires hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity, or is a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

The following summaries will be presented as overall rates and stratified by AE classification:

• the number and percentages of patients reported as having Serious Adverse Events (SAE) in each treatment arm; and,

• the number and percentages recorded as having all forms of Adverse Events (AE) in each arm.

This information along with the acceptability of the study design and protocol to patients/GPs; the safety of the intervention; patient recruitment and attrition/retention rates will enable us to determine whether or not the definitive RCT is feasible within a satisfactory timescale and cost envelope using UK centres alone.

11.2 Qualitative analysis

Transcripts will be coded using the latest version of NVivo (QSR International). The analysis will use the National Centre for Social Research 'Framework' approach [62]. AO'C and SD will undertake the following stages of the analysis of patient transcripts: familiarisation; identifying a thematic framework; indexing; charting; and, mapping and interpretation. The theoretical framework for understanding intervention adherence is the Necessities-Concerns framework [63] within the COM-B system [18]. This will be used within the thematic framework. We will use the process evaluation functions of context, mechanisms and implementation to frame the analysis [43]. Within mechanisms we will use the COM-B system as stated above and consider the use of the Theoretical Domains Framework [36]. We will compare and contrast findings from each site because the different backgrounds of the interventionists, and the different contexts in which care is provided in each CF unit, may affect implementation and acceptability of the intervention.

Figure 7. Assumptions of the MRC Guidance on Process Evaluation

[39, 64]

27

28 29 30

31

32

33

34

35 36

37

42 43 44

45

46

47

48

49

50 51

52

53 54

55 56 57

58

59

60



This qualitative research will:

Inform the refinement of the intervention (e.g. CFHealthHub, training of interventionists, initial assessments, manualised instructions) and its implementation (e.g. introduction within a CF Unit) for use in the full trial.

Inform refinement to trial procedures for the full trial.

Inform the selection of the final secondary measures used in the full trial to ensure they address the perceived benefits of the intervention.

Help to understand the extent of any leakage of the intervention to controls.

11.3 Combining data and findings from the different components

We will use Farmer's triangulation protocol to display the findings from each component of the study together and discuss as a team the extent to which findings converge, complement each other or contradict each other [65, 66]. For example, we will display all findings about recruitment together to consider the feasibility of recruitment for the full trial and the actions required to ensure feasibility. We will also display in a matrix the qualitative and quantitative data for individual PWCF who have received the intervention and been interviewed [66]. We will use this to consider the extent to which our secondary outcome measures identify issues raised by PWCF in the interviews.

12. Monitoring

12.1 Oversight

The CTRU SOP GOV003 Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee states "A DMEC does not need convening in studies that carry low risk to patients". This project involves delivering a behaviour change intervention through the website CFHealthHub and would therefore be classified as low risk.

The overall responsibility for the study will be with Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust who will act as sponsors for the study. The local Principal Investigator (PI) will be responsible for the study at each participating site and it will be registered and approved with each local R&D department. The study will be conducted in accordance with the protocol, GCP and Sheffield CTRU Standard Operating Procedures. The two committees which will govern the conduct of the study are:

- 1. Programme Steering Committee (PSC)
- 2. Project Management Group (PMG)

The PSC will be responsible for the overall conduct of the trial and consists of an independent chair and four other independent members including a statistician and PPI representative. The committee will meet every 6 months to monitor the study.

The PMG will comprise of the trial manager and the core research team . The PMG will meet on a monthly basis to monitor the day-to-day running of the trial. The Trial Manager will be jointly supervised by the CI and the Assistant Director of CTRU via the form of regular meetings (face to face and telephone calls). The Trial Manager will be responsible for liaising with the whole project team. Trial monitoring procedures will be assessed based on the level of risk of the study. The Site Monitoring Plan will outline the types and frequency of site monitoring activities for the study and this will be agreed with the Sponsor prior to the start of the study.

12.2 Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines

There are no planned interim analyses or stopping guidelines for this study.

12.3 Harms (safety assessments)

12.3.1 Serious Adverse Events

Trial sites are to report Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) in conjunction with the CTRU standard operating procedure PM004 (Adverse events and serious adverse events). The definition of an SAE is as follows:

- results in death;
- is life-threatening* (subject at immediate risk of death);
- requires in-patient hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation;**
- results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity;
- consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect; or,
- is another important medical event that may jeopardise the subject.***

* 'life-threatening' refers to an event in which the patient was at risk of death at the time of the event; it does not refer to an event which hypothetically might have caused death if it were more severe.

**Hospitalisation is defined as an inpatient admission, regardless of length of stay, even if the hospitalisation is a precautionary measure for continued observation. Hospitalisations

 for a pre-existing condition, including elective procedures that have not worsened, do not constitute an SAE.

***Other important medical events that may not result in death, be life-threatening, or require hospitalisation may be considered a serious adverse event/experience when, based upon appropriate medical judgment, they may jeopardise the subject and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed in this definition.

It is not anticipated that there will be many SAEs related to the behaviour change intervention. We will report any SAEs which are deemed related to the trial intervention and unexpected to the Sponsor within the specified timeframes below (12.3.4).

12.3.2 Adverse events we require reporting:

We do require that sites report any new diagnosis of depression which requires treatment with medication or psychological therapy e.g. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT).

12.3.3 Expected SAEs and adverse events

Certain adverse events are common to CF and associated medications. Expected SAEs must be reported in the annual safety report. Hospitalisation as a result of an exacerbation will be recorded in the study database and not be reported as an SAE.

Expected AEs in relation to medications or common in patients with CF

- 1. Acute FEV1 drop >15% after 1st dose of medication
- 2. Increased productive cough
- 3. Nasal congestion or stuffy nose
- 4. Chest congestion
- 5. Wheezing
- 6. Chest pain or chest discomfort
 - 7. Voice alteration/change
- 8. Dysponea (breathlessness)
- 9. Haemoptysis (coughing blood)
- 10. Rhinitis
- 11.
- 12. Headache
- 13. Crackles in lung
- 14. Throat irritation/ sore throat
- 15. URTI
- 16. Sinusitis
- 17. Deafness
- 18. Indigestion / reflux
- 19. Tonsillitis
- 20. Joint pain
- 21. Decreased appetite
- 22. Fatigue
- 23. Headache

- 24. Distal intestinal obstructive syndrome
- 25. Fever

- 26. Otitis media or ear infection
- 27. Conjunctivitis
- 28. Pneumothorax
- 29. Decreased exercise tolerance
- 30. Pyrexia
- 31. Abdominal pain
- 32. Influenza
- 33. Pseudomonas infection
- 34. Vomiting
- 35. Diabetes
- 36. Pneumonia

12.3.4 Reporting

Adverse events and SAEs can be reported for participants at any stage of their trial participation. A member of the site study team (interventionist, clinician or other) will enquire about any adverse events at routine clinic appointments. These will be record on the adverse event section of the paper CRF and database. The event will be assessed by the local Principal Investigator and the form will be kept in the site file. Serious adverse events will be reported in the periodic safety reports to the research ethics committee and Trial Steering committee.

All adverse events (serious or other based on the definitions above) will be recorded on the case report form and details will be **entered on the study database within 1 week of completing the paper form**. Any SAEs which are deemed related to the trial intervention, the site will complete the paper CRF and **fax details this form to the CTRU within 24 hours of becoming aware of the event** in order for the CTRU to report this event to the Sponsor and the main REC within the required timeframes (15 days).

In participants using the Bi-Neb, any Adverse or SAEs relating to the use of Promixin via this device will be reported to the Patient Support team (PSP) at Phillips as per their standard practice.

12.4 Auditing

The sponsor will permit monitoring and audits by the relevant authorities, including the Research Ethics Committee. The investigator will also allow monitoring and audits by these bodies and the sponsor, and they will provide direct access to source data and documents.

12.5 Finance and indemnity

The trial has been financed by the NIHR and details have been drawn up in a separate agreement. This is an NHS sponsored study. If there is negligent harm during the clinical

trial when the NHS body owes a duty of care to the person harmed, NHS Indemnity will cover NHS staff, medical academic staff with honorary contracts and those conducting the trial. NHS Indemnity does not offer no-fault compensation and is unable to agree in advance to pay compensation for non-negligent harm. Ex-gratia payments may be considered in the case of a claim.

13. Ethics and dissemination

13.1 Approvals

The trial will be conducted subject to Research Ethics Committee favourable opinion including any provisions for site specific assessment. The application will be submitted through the IRAS central allocation system. The approval letter from the ethics committee and copy of approved patient information leaflets, consent forms and any ethically approved questionnaires will be present in the site files before initiation of the study and patient recruitment. Local research governance approvals will be sought from all participating research sites. This clinical trial will be conducted in accordance with Good Clinical Practice Guidelines and CTRU standard operating procedures. MHRA approval is not required for this study.

13.2 Protocol amendments

The investigator will be updated following an amendment to the protocol or study documents. The new documents, REC approval, R&D approval, HRA assessment letter and any other appropriate documentation surrounding the amendment will be sent to the site via a "site file update". The sites will receive the documents with a site file update sheet, detailing where to file the amended documents and which documents to supersede. If there are any significant changes to the study procedures or eligibility criteria sites will be notified by a combination of email, telephone, newsletters or additional project training when required.

In relation to informing REC, if any study documents require amending, the changes will be discussed with the sponsor and either a substantial (via IRAS and HRA) or minor amendment (notification via email) will be submitted to REC and HRA. Following REC acknowledgment and approval (when applicable) other appropriate approvals will be obtained i.e. HRA and R&D approval.

If a protocol amendment requires participants to be re-consented they will be informed of the amendment by an updated participant information sheet and will be asked to re-consent to the study. Trial registries, journals and regulators will be updated regarding protocol amendments when appropriate.

13.3 Consent

Consent for the main trial:

The ACtiF trial interventionist or local PI at the site will be responsible for taking informed consent from potentially eligible trial participants face to face at home or in clinic. Any researcher or clinical member of the team taking informed consent will be trained in study procedures and GCP. Participants will have the option to specify whether they are

interested in being approached for the qualitative interviews and audio recordings. However, they do not have to consent to these to be involved in the main study.

Consent for the interviews:

Consent for interviews (participant, interventionist or MDT member) will separately be taken by the qualitative researcher. Participants can participate in the main trial but choose to not take part in the qualitative research.

13.4 Confidentiality

Participant confidentiality will be respected at all times. Participant names and contact details will be collected and entered on the prospect database. Access to these personal details will be restricted to users with appropriate privileges only. All users who do not require access to identifiable data will only identify data by participant ID number, and no patient identifiable data will be transferred from the database to the statistician.

Trial documents (paper and electronic) will be retained in a secure location during and after the trial has finished. All source documents will be retained for a period of 5 years following the end of the trial. Where trial related information is documented in the medical records – those records will be retained for 5 years after the last patient last visit. Each site is responsible for ensuring records are archived and the information supplied to the Chief Investigator.

Any participant data held within CFHealthHub will be stored on a secure server at the University of Manchester. CFHealthHub complies with the Data Protection Act and follows best practice guidelines on security and information governance. Encrypted channels are used to transfer any data to and from the web and mobile application platforms. All user interaction with the CFHealthHub server and each action performed by a user will be logged. An audit log contains the username of the user performing the action, the date & time of the action, short description of the action performed. All users are authenticated via a secure password a with access to the system restricted on a role basis.

13.5 Declaration of Interests

Martin Wildman has received funding from Zambon who market the Ineb to carry out research to understand the performance of the Ineb and in the past we received funding from Zambon to carry out work to understand barriers to adherence.

13.6 Access to data

The central ACtiF study team alone will have access to the final dataset details of which will be outlined in the study DMP.

13.7 Ancilliary and post-trial care

Centres will be able to continue to use CFHealthHub if they wish to do so after the end of the pilot and feasibility study. If so, participants in the control arm will be able to cross over to use the intervention at this stage.

13.8 Dissemination policy

As this is a feasibility study its main interest will be to potential researchers and funding bodies. Data will be reported according to the revised CONSORT statement (Schultz,

2010). The findings of this research will be available to NIHR, patient groups and other interested bodies. It will also be offered for presentation at medical meetings and will be offered for publication in peer reviewed medical journals.

References

1. Alexander BM, Petren EK, Grimes M, Fink A, Myers V, Sewall A: Mission of the cystic fibrosis foundation Annual Data Report 2013 Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Patient Registry. 2014.

2. Southern KW, Barker PM, Solis-Moya A, Patel L: **Macrolide antibiotics for cystic fibrosis**. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Southern KW. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2011.

3. Ramsey BW, Davies J, McElvaney NG, Tullis E, Bell SC, Dřevínek P, Griese M, McKone EF, Wainwright CE, Konstan MW, Moss R, Ratjen F, Sermet-Gaudelus I, Rowe SM, Dong Q, Rodriguez S, Yen K, Ordoñez C, Elborn JS: A CFTR Potentiator in Patients with Cystic Fibrosis and the *G551D* Mutation. *N Engl J Med* 2011, **365**:1663–1672.

4. McCoy KS, Quittner AL, Oermann CM, Gibson RL, Retsch-Bogart GZ, Montgomery AB: **Inhaled aztreonam lysine for chronic airway Pseudomonas aeruginosa in cystic fibrosis.** *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2008, **178**:921–8.

5. Ryan G, Mukhopadhyay S, Singh M: Nebulised anti-pseudomonal antibiotics for cystic
fibrosis. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Ryan G. Chichester, UK:
John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2003.

6. Jones AP, Wallis C: Dornase alfa for cystic fibrosis. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Jones AP. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2010.

7. Wark P, McDonald VM: **Nebulised hypertonic saline for cystic fibrosis**. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Wark P. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2009.

8. Ryan G, Singh M, Dwan K: Inhaled antibiotics for long-term therapy in cystic fibrosis.
In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Ryan G. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2011.

41
42
43
43
44
45
45
41
9. Eakin MN, Bilderback A, Boyle MP, Mogayzel PJ, Riekert KA: Longitudinal association
43
44
45
45

10. Briesacher BA, Quittner AL, Saiman L, Sacco P, Fouayzi H, Quittell LM, Accurso F,
Modi A, Lim C, Yu N, Geller D, Wagner M, Quittner A, DiMatteo M, Quittner A, Barker D,
Marciel K, Grimley M, Emerson J, Rosenfeld M, McNamara S, Ramsey B, Gibson R, Nixon
G, Armstrong D, Carzino R, Carlin J, Olinsky A, Robertson C, Grimwood K, et al.:
Adherence with tobramycin inhaled solution and health care utilization. *BMC Pulm Med*2011, 11:5.

11. AL Q, KA R, Zhang J: Relationship between adherence to pulmonary medications
 and health care costs: longitudinal analyses from 2005-2011. *Pediatr Pulmonol* 2012,
 47:198.

58
 12. Smyth A, Lewis S, Bertenshaw C, Choonara I, McGaw J, Watson A: Case-control study
 of acute renal failure in patients with cystic fibrosis in the UK. *Thorax* 2008, 63:532–5.
2 3	13. McManus P: Lead Pharmacist - Specialised Services (South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw)
4 5	NHS England
6 7 8 9	14. Daniels T, Goodacre L, Sutton C, Pollard K, Conway S, Peckham D: Accurate assessment of adherence: self-report and clinician report vs electronic monitoring of nebulizers. <i>Chest</i> 2011, 140 :425–32.
10 11 12 12	15. McNeil S: Personal Communication from Stephanie McNeil, Chief Statistician of UK CF Registry
13 14 15 16	16. Horne RW, Barber N, Elliot R, Morgan M: <i>Concordance, Adherance and Compliance in Medicine Taking: A Conceptual Map and Research Priorities. National Co-Ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisational R&D (NCCSDO).</i> 2005.
17 18 19 20 21	17. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M: Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance . <i>BMJ</i> 2008:a1655–a1655.
22 23 24	18. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R: The behaviour change wheel: a new method for characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. <i>Implement Sci</i> 2011, 6 :42.
25 26 27	19. Parham R, Thomas S, Mills R, Al. E: CF patient's beliefs about nebuliser treatment: implications for adherence to treatment . <i>J Cyst Fibros</i> 2012, 11 (Suppl 1):S9.
28 29 30 31	20. Bucks RS, Hawkins K, Skinner TC, Horn S, Seddon P, Horne R: Adherence to treatment in adolescents with cystic fibrosis: the role of illness perceptions and treatment beliefs. <i>J Pediatr Psychol</i> 2009, 34 :893–902.
32 33 34 35 36	21. George M, Rand-Giovannetti D, Eakin MN, Borrelli B, Zettler M, Riekert KA: Perceptions of barriers and facilitators: self-management decisions by older adolescents and adults with CF. <i>J Cyst Fibros</i> 2010, 9 :425–32.
37 38 39 40	22. Dziuban EJ, Saab-Abazeed L, Chaudhry SR, Streetman DS, Nasr SZ: Identifying barriers to treatment adherence and related attitudinal patterns in adolescents with cystic fibrosis. <i>Pediatr Pulmonol</i> 2010, 45 :450–8.
41 42 43 44	23. Bregnballe V, Schiøtz PO, Boisen KA, Pressler T, Thastum M: Barriers to adherence in adolescents and young adults with cystic fibrosis: a questionnaire study in young patients and their parents. <i>Patient Prefer Adherence</i> 2011, 5 :507–15.
45 46 47	24. Modi AC, Quittner AL: Barriers to treatment adherence for children with cystic fibrosis and asthma: What gets in the way? <i>J Pediatr Psychol</i> 2006, 31 :846–858.
48 49 50	25. Abbott J, Dodd M, Bilton D, Webb AK: Treatment compliance in adults with cystic fibrosis. <i>Thorax</i> 1994, 49 :115–20.
52 53 54	26. Abbott J, Dodd M, Webb AK: Health perceptions and treatment adherence in adults with cystic fibrosis. <i>Thorax</i> 1996, 51 :1233–8.
55 56 57	27. Abbott J, Dodd M, Gee L, Webb K: Ways of coping with cystic fibrosis: implications for treatment adherence. <i>Disabil Rehabil</i> 2001, 23 :315–24.
58 59 60	28. Conway SP, Pond MN, Hamnett T, Watson A: Compliance with treatment in adult patients with cystic fibrosis. <i>Thorax</i> 1996, 51 :29–33.
	A Crite Diret Protocol

2 3 29. Jones S, Curley R, Wildman M: 345 Systematic review of qualitative studies 4 investigating barriers to adherence in patients with cystic fibrosis using framework 5 analysis structured by a conceptual framework of behaviour change. J Cyst Fibros 2013, 6 12(Suppl 1):S136. 7 8 30. Kettler LJ, Sawyer SM, Winefield HR, Greville HW: Determinants of adherence in 9 adults with cystic fibrosis. Thorax 2002, 57:459-64. 10 11 31. Lask B: Non-Adherence to Treatment in Cystic Fibrosis. J R Soc Med 1994, 87(21 12 13 Suppl):25–27. 14 15 32. Latchford G, Duff A, Quinn J, Conway S, Conner M: Adherence to nebulised 16 antibiotics in cystic fibrosis. Patient Educ Couns 2009, 75:141-4. 17 18 33. Horne R, Weinman J, Barber N, Elliott R: Concordance, Adherence and Compliance in 19 Medicine Taking: Report for the National Co-Ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery 20 and Organisation R & D (NCCSDO). London: NCCSDO; 2005. 21 22 34. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, O'Brien MA, 23 Johansen M, Grimshaw J, Oxman AD: Audit and feedback: effects on professional 24 practice and healthcare outcomes. Cochrane database Syst Rev 2012, 6:CD000259. 25 26 35. Geraedts H, Zijlstra A, Bulstra SK, Stevens M, Zijlstra W: Effects of remote feedback in 27 home-based physical activity interventions for older adults: a systematic review. Patient 28 29 Educ Couns 2013, 91:14-24. 30 36. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S: Validation of the theoretical domains framework for 31 32 use in behaviour change and implementation research. Implement Sci 2012, 7:37. 33 34 37. Thabane L, Ma J, Chu R, Cheng J, Ismaila A, Rios LP, Robson R, Thabane M, 35 Giangregorio L, Goldsmith CH: A tutorial on pilot studies: the what, why and how. BMC 36 Med Res Methodol 2010, 10:1. 37 38 38. Baranowski T, Stables G: Process Evaluations of the 5-a-Day Projects. Heal Educ 39 Behav 2000, 27:157-166. 40 41 39. Pfadenhauer LM, Mozygemba K, Gerhardus A, Hofmann B, Booth A, Lysdahl KB, 42 Tummers M, Burns J, Rehfuess EA: Context and implementation: A concept analysis 43 towards conceptual maturity. Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundhwes 2015, 109:103-114. 44 45 40. Weber K, Glynn M a.: Making Sense with Institutions: Context, Thought and Action 46 in Karl Weick's Theory. Organ Stud 2006, 27:1639-1660. 47 48 41. Hyatt D: Time for a change: a critical discoursal analysis of synchronic context with 49 50 diachronic relevance. Discourse Soc 2005, 16:515-534. 51 52 42. Linnan L, Steckler A: Process evaluation for public health interventions and research: 53 an overview. In Process evaluation for public health interventions and research. 1st edition. 54 Edited by Linnan L, Steckler A. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2002:1–23. 55 56 43. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O'Cathain A, 57 Tinati T, Wight D, Baird J: Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical 58 Research Council guidance. BMJ 2015, 350:h1258. 59 60

2 3 44. Nilsen P: Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. 4 Implement Sci 2015, 10:1–13. 5 6 45. Meyers DC, Durlak J a., Wandersman A: The Quality Implementation Framework: A 7 Synthesis of Critical Steps in the Implementation Process. Am J Community Psychol 2012, 8 **50**:462–480. 9 10 46. Borrelli B: The Assessment, Monitoring, and Enhancement of Treatment Fidelity In 11 Public Health Clinical Trials. J Public Health Dent 2011, 71:S52–S63. 12 13 47. Fuchs HJ, Borowitz DS, Christiansen DH, Morris EM, Nash ML, Ramsey BW, 14 Rosenstein BJ, Smith AL, Wohl ME: Effect of aerosolized recombinant human DNase on 15 16 exacerbations of respiratory symptoms and on pulmonary function in patients with 17 cvstic fibrosis. The Pulmozyme Study Group. N Engl J Med 1994, 331:637–42. 18 19 48. Ratjen F, Durham T, Navratil T, Schaberg A, Accurso FJ, Wainwright C, Barnes M, Moss 20 RB: Long term effects of denufosol tetrasodium in patients with cystic fibrosis. J Cyst 21 Fibros 2012, 11:539–49. 22 23 49. Miller MR, Hankinson J, Brusasco V, Burgos F, Casaburi R, Coates A, Crapo R, Enright 24 P, van der Grinten CPM, Gustafsson P, Jensen R, Johnson DC, MacIntyre N, McKay R, 25 Navajas D, Pedersen OF, Pellegrino R, Viegi G, Wanger J: Standardisation of spirometry. 26 27 Eur Respir J 2005, 26:319–38. 28 50. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, Janssen M, Kind P, Parkin D, Bonsel G, Badia X: 29 30 Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EO-5D (EO-5D-31 5L). Qual Life Res 2011, 20:1727–36. 32 33 51. Hibbard JH, Mahoney ER, Stockard J, Tusler M: Development and testing of a short 34 form of the patient activation measure. Health Serv Res 2005, 40(6 Pt 1):1918–30. 35 36 52. Wong MD, Sarkisian C a., Davis C, Kinsler J, Cunningham WE: The Association 37 Between Life Chaos, Health Care Use, and Health Status Among HIV-Infected Persons. 38 J Gen Intern Med 2007, 22:1286-1291. 39 40 53. Verplanken B, Orbell S: Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit 41 Strength1. J Appl Soc Psychol 2003, 33:1313–1330. 42 43 54. Quittner a L, Sweeny S, Watrous M, Munzenberger P, Bearss K, Gibson Nitza a, Fisher 44 L a, Henry B: Translation and linguistic validation of a disease-specific quality of life 45 46 measure for cystic fibrosis. J Pediatr Psychol 2000, 25:403-14. 47 48 55. Kroenke K, Strine TW, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Berry JT, Mokdad AH: The PHO-8 49 as a measure of current depression in the general population. J Affect Disord 2009, 50 **114**:163–173. 51 52 56. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Löwe B: A brief measure for assessing 53 generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. Arch Intern Med 2006, 166:1092-7. 54 55 57. Horne R, Weinman J, Hankins M: The beliefs about medicines questionnaire: The 56 development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive representation 57 of medication. Psychol Health 1999, 14:1-24. 58 59 58. Lancaster GA, Dodd S, Williamson PR: Design and analysis of pilot studies: 60

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

59. Arain M, Campbell MJ, Cooper CL, Lancaster GA: What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of current practice and editorial policy. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2010, **10**:67.

60. Eldridge S, Bond C, Campbell M, Lancaster G, Thabane L, Hopwell S: **Definition and reporting of pilot and feasibility studies**. *Trials* 2013, **14**(Suppl 1):O18.

61. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D: **CONSORT 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomized trials**. *Annu Intern Med* 2010, **152**:726–732.

62. Ritchie J, Spencer L: **Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research**. In *Analysing qualitative data*. Edited by Bryman A, Burgess RG. Routledge; 1994:173–194.

63. Horne R: **Treatment perceptions and self-regulation**. In *The Self-regulation of Health and Illness Behaviour*. Edited by Cameron L, Leventhal H. London: Routledge; 2003:138–53.

64. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O'Cathain A, Tinati T, Wight D, Baird J: **Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance**. *BMJ* 2015, **350**(mar19 6):h1258–h1258.

65. Farmer T, Robinson K, Elliott SJ, Eyles J: **Developing and implementing a triangulation protocol for qualitative health research.** *Qual Health Res* 2006, **16**:377–94.

66. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J, Cathain AO: **Three techniques for integrating data in mixed methods studies**. *BMJ* 2010, **341**(sep17 1):c4587–c4587.

Appendix 1. W.H.O. Trial Registration Data Set

	INFORMATION
DATA CATEGORY	
Primary registry and trial identifying number	To be added
Date of registration in primary registry	10 be added
Secondary identifying numbers	NIHR: RP-PG-1212-20015
	Sponsor (STH): STH19213
Source(s) of monetary or material support	National Institute for Health Research
	(NIHR) Programme Grants for Applied
	Research programme.
Primary sponsor	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS
	Foundation Trust.
Secondary sponsor(s)	none
Contact for public queries	Chin Maguire
	Trial Manager
	Clinical Trials Research Unit
	University of Sheffield
	Regent Court
	30 Regent Street
	Sheffield
	S1 4DA
	Tel: (+44) (0)114 222 0717
	Fax: (+44) (0)114 222 0870
	email : c.maguire@sheffield.ac.uk
Contact for scientific queries	Dr Martin Wildman
1	Adult CF Centre
	Northern General Hospital
	Herries Road
	Sheffield
	S5 7AU
	Tel: (0114) 2715212
	Fax: (0114) 222 0870
	email : Martin Wildman@sth nhs uk
Public title	Adherence to treatment in adults with Cystic
	Fibrosis (ACtiF)
Scientific title	Development and evaluation of an
	intervention to support Adherence to
	treatment in adults with Cystic Fibrosis : a
	feasibility study comprised of an external
	nilot randomised controlled trial and process
	evaluation
Countries of recruitment	United Kingdom
Uselth condition(s) or problem(s) studied	Cystic Fibrosis
Internation(a)	Usual core plus a microchinged rehulter
intervention(s)	Usual care plus a inicrocnipped nebuliser
	with or without a complex intervention. The
	complex intervention consists of:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
, 8
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
21
27
2∠ 22
22 24
34 25
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
55
50
57
20
59

	 A software platform, CFHealthHub mobile apps and website, which allows access to medication adherence data and education modules intended to remove barriers to adherence A manual containing a 'behaviour change toolkit' to guide interactions between health
Key inclusion and exclusion criteria	Inclusion criteria for participants 1.Diagnosed with CF and with data within the CF registry 2.Aged 16 years and above 3.Taking inhaled mucolytics or antibiotics via a chipped nebuliser (e.g. eTrack or Bi- Neb) or able and willing to take via eTrack or Bi-Neb.
	Exclusion criteria for participants 1.Post-lung transplant 2.People on the active lung transplant list 3.Patients receiving palliative care, 4.Lacking in capacity to give informed consent 5.Using dry powder devices to take antibiotics or mucolytics
Study type	Feasibility study comprised of an external pilot randomised controlled trial and process evaluation
Date of first enrolment	Anticipated: 02/05/2016
Target sample size	We propose to recruit to time, that is for a fixed period of four months rather than to a fixed sample size. To match the proposed recruitment rate of the main RCT, the target sample over the four months for which the pilot RCT is open, will be n=64.
Recruitment status	Not yet open.
Primary outcome(s)	Exacerbations of cystic fibrosis as defined by the Fuchs criteria (<i>N Engl J Med</i> 1994, 331:637–42.)
Key secondary outcomes	None.







ACtiF Pilot Study

Control Patient Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

We're interested in your experiences of the service that you receive for helping you to use your nebuliser.

- 1. Why did you decide to take part in the research?
- 2. How did you find being asked to take part in the trial? [Prompts: paperwork volume, information provided, questionnaires]

Now I'd like to ask you about the care you received before the trial started to help you use your nebuliser.

- 3. What types of things did the unit/hospital recommend that you do to help you use your nebuliser? [Prompts: appointments / what do you talk about? / nebulisers / skills to use your nebuliser properly / knowledge and beliefs?]
- 4. What types of things did the unit/hospital recommend that you do to help you use your nebuliser as much as possible? [Prompts: setting goals, solving problems, making plans, giving you information, building skills, beliefs about nebuliser medication, giving you confidence]
- 5. How did the care you received to help you use your nebuliser fit with any other care you received for CF more generally?

Pilot – ACtiF Control Patient Topic guide: v1 2Feb16

- 6. How could the care you received for helping you to use your nebuliser as prescribed be improved?
 - 7. Overall how happy are you with the care you received for your nebuliser? [Prompts: what could be done better?]

Now I want to ask you about specific kinds of things that might have changed since the trial started:

- 8. Since you joined the trial has the care that you receive in the unit / hospital changed at all? [Prompts: Has anybody done anything different? What have they done?]
- 9. Since you joined the trial has anyone asked you to change how you use your nebuliser? If so, what have they suggested you do? [Prompt: capability skills / knowledge including beliefs / where has the change come from?]
- 10. Since you joined the trial has anyone suggested ways to help you use your nebuliser as much as possible? If so what? [Prompt: opportunity finding time to use nebuliser / making plans / setting goals / where has the change come from?]
- 11. Since you joined the trial has anyone helped you have more confidence to use your nebuliser as prescribed? [Prompt: where has the change come from? what have they done?]

Is there anything else that we haven't talked about that you'd like to comment on?

THANK YOU

The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for Applied Research.

Pilot – ACtiF Control Patient Topic guide: v1 2Feb16









ACtiF Pilot Study

Intervention Patient Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

We're interested in your experiences of the service that you have received from CFHealthHub including both the meetings to discuss your nebuliser medication and the website/app you have used.

1. Why did you decide to take part in the research?

2. How did you find being asked to take part in the trial? [Prompts: recruitment, paperwork volume, information provided, questionnaires]

Now I'd like to ask you about your meetings with the person who has been working with you on CFHealthHub.

3. What types of things did they recommend that you do? [prompts: setting goals, solving problems, making plans (myplan), giving you information]

4. Do you think you have had any benefit from these meetings?

If yes, what benefit and what about the service helped you to get this?

If no, what has stopped you gaining benefit?

5. What was good about how the meetings were delivered? [Prompt: what needs to be improved?]

Now	I'd like to talk to you about the CFHealthHub website / app.
6.	What was good about the website? [Prompts: my plan, how am I doing, tool kit, graphs, my treatment]
7.	What needs to be improved? [Prompts: my plan, how am I doing, tool kit, graphs, my treatment]
8.	Do you think you've had any benefit from using the website?
	If yes, what benefit and what about the website helped you to get this?
	If no, what has stopped you gaining benefit?
9.	Have the website and/or meetings helped you to improve how often you use your nebuliser?
	If yes, how has it helped you to do this?
	If not, why not?
10.	How do the CFHealthHub website and the meetings work together?
11.	Has using CFHealthHub helped you to be able to use your nebuliser any better? Why / Why not? [Prompt: capability skills / knowledge including beliefs]
12.	Has using CFHealthHub helped you to find the time to use your nebuliser more? Why / why not? [Prompt: opportunity / making plans]
13.	Has using CFHealthHub made you want to use your nebuliser more? Why / why not? [Prompt: motivation and confidence]
14.	How does the CFHealthHub service (website and meetings) fit with the care you were already receiving at the unit/hospital?

2		
3	15.	Do you think you would continue using CFHealthHub? [Prompt: during the study / after the
4		study]
5		Study]
6		
7		
8	10	$f_{\rm c}$ CFU as $f_{\rm c}$ by the second this statement is second for a single with CF2 (M/b) $2/M/b$, and 2
9	16.	is CFHealthHub a good thing to use in general for people with CF? why? / why hot?
10		
11		
12		
13	17.	How have you found being part of the study?
14		
15		
10		
17	Is there	e anything else that we haven't talked about that you'd like to comment on?
10		
19		
20		
21	THANK	
22		
23		
25		
26		
27		
28		
29		
30		
31		
32		
33		
34		
35		
36		
37		
38		
39		
40		
41		
42		
43		
44		
45		
40		
47		
40		
49 50		
51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56	The ΔC	tiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for
57		in respect is junded by the National institute for reduct research strogramme drants for
58	Applied	l Research.
59		
60		







Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Page 118 of 197

ACTIF Pilot Study

Interventionist Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today.

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

Introduction to the interview: Interested in how you've found using CFHealthhub (CFHH) with your participants and any learning from it

The trial

- 1. What works or could be improved about:
 - a) recruiting patients to the trial?
 - b) collecting data?
 - c) any other aspect?

The intervention:

Now I'd like to go through each of the steps for providing the intervention to get your views on each of these

1.ev

- 2. What works or could be improved about:
 - a) how you have assessed participants' adherence levels prior to using CFHH?
 - b) how you set up appointments with your participants?

c) session 1? [Prompts: gathering data, introducing the nebuliser, entering prescription data into CFHH, completion of screening tools, patient feedback, anything else]

d) session 2? [Prompts: reviewing adherence data, introducing CFHH, explaining modules, setting goals, action planning, identifying suitable tailored content, technical issues, anything else]

e) session 3? [Prompts: reviewing goals, reviewing adherence plans, motivation, problem solving, anything else]

- 3. What works or could be improved about the training manuals and training sessions?
- 4. What works or could be improved about the support available from the research team? [Prompts: timing, availability, problem solving].
 [Specific prompt for MDT senior interventionist: do you think the training has equipped you to deliver this intervention in your centre yourself after the trial ends? If no, what further training would be needed?]
- 5. How has the CFHH intervention been received by the rest of the team? [Prompt: how has your communication been with the rest of the team about CFHH?]
- 6. What sort of follow-up did participants request? How will you handle this?
- 7. How has the CFHH intervention helped your participants to know how to use their nebuliser? [Prompt: capability / skills, knowledge and beliefs]
- 8. How has the CFHH intervention helped your participants find ways to use their nebuliser more? [Prompt: opportunity]
- 9. How has the CFHH intervention helped to motivate your participants to use their nebuliser? [Prompt: motivation / confidence]

General questions:

- 10. How engaged did participants seem with CFHH? [Prompt: What feedback if any have you had from participants about CFHH?]
- 11. How useful do you think CFHH is for your participants?

- 12. How easy / difficult has it been to get your participants to use CFHH?
- 13. Have you seen any changes to the ways in which your participants use their nebulisers since starting CFHH?
- 14. What have you learnt from using CFHH with your participants?
- 15. What if any are the benefits to you and / or to your participants of using CFHH?

- 16. How do you think CFHH fits with the other care offered by the centre?
- 17. How have you found being part of the trial?

Is there anything else you'd like to say about CFHH?

THANK YOU

The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for Applied Research.

Page 121 of 197







ACTIF Pilot Study

MDT Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today.

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

We're interested in your views of the CFHealthHub service and how it fits into the care provided in your centre.

1. Can you describe the key things you did in your centre to help patients adhere to their nebulisers prior to the ACtiF study?

2. How does nebuliser adherence fit with the other things you do for CF patients?

3. What involvement have you had in the CFHealthHub intervention? [Prompts: website, interventionist, training of staff]

4. You had training to help you be more aware of patient activation. What did you think of the training? [Prompts: Do you think it has changed your practice in any way? If yes what changes, if no why not? Key aspects – patient knowledge including beliefs / skills / confidence]

5. Do you think CFHealthHub is a useful intervention? Why? / Why not? [Prompts: what do you think about the: website, feedback about adherence data, interventionist, training?]

6. How do you think the CFHealthHub intervention is operating in practice? [Prompt: what are the strengths / improvements needed?]

7. How does the CFHealthHub intervention fit with the care offered by your centre?

8. How does the CFHealthHub intervention help your patients to know how to use their nebuliser? [Prompts: Skills / knowledge / beliefs. How / Why doesn't it help?]

9. How does the CFHealthHub intervention help your patients to find ways to use their nebuliser more? [Prompts: How / Why doesn't it help?]

Pilot – ACtiF MDT Topic guide v1 2Feb16

BMJ Open

10. How does the CFHealthHub intervention help to motivate your patients to use their nebuliser? [Prompts: How / Why doesn't it help?]

11. Do you think CFHealthHub is helping your intervention patients to improve their adherence? If yes, what key things have helped this? If no, what if anything could be done to help this?

12. Has the CFHealthHub intervention changed anything about the way in which you and/or your team approach adherence in your centre?

i) for patients receiving the intervention?

ii) for patients not receiving the intervention?

[Prompts: MDT discussions / differences between control and intervention patients]

13. Which patient groups are most likely to benefit from CFHealthHub? Why?

14. Which patient groups are least likely to benefit from CFHealthHub? Why?

15. Would you consider continuing to use CFHealthHub in the future? Why? Why not?

16. How has it been for you / your centre taking part in the trial? [Prompt: recruitment to the study]

17. How able do you feel to go on delivering care related to improving adherence after the study ends? [Prompt: has the study changed the way you will go about this?]

18. Are there any aspects of the research that we haven't talked about that you'd like to comment on?

Is there anything else you'd like to say?

THANK YOU

The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for Applied Research.

Pilot – ACtiF MDT Topic guide v1 2Feb16

Additional File 03 - Quantitative results from process evaluation

Table a. Key dates in process evaluation by participant

Study ID	Interview Date	Baseline date	5 month follow up date	Date of first intervention meeting	Time in the trial at interview (days)	Time since first intervention session at interview (days)	Time in trial at follow up (days)
R02/02	13/09/2016	06/07/2016	10/11/2016	05/08/2016	69	39	127
R02/03	09/09/2016	08/07/2016	NA	05/08/2016	63	35	NA
R02/42	12/10/2016	15/07/2016	21/12/2016	NA	89	NA	159
R02/07	15/11/2016	12/07/2016	12/12/2016	09/09/2016	126	67	153
R02/12	02/11/2016	14/07/2016	03/01/2017	05/10/2016	111	28	173
R02/52	03/02/2017	04/07/2016	22/11/2016	05/10/2016	214	121	141
R01/44	01/12/2016	07/07/2016	16/11/2016	08/11/2016	147	23	132
				eliez o			

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

R01/48	17/01/2017	04/07/2016	15/11/2016	13/10/2016	197	96	134
R01/49	30/01/2017	22/07/2016	07/12/2016	10/10/2016	192	112	138
R01/54	21/03/2017	25/07/2016	13/12/2016	02/11/2016	239	139	141
R01/39	27/02/2017	02/08/2016	21/12/2016	03/11/2016	209	116	141
R01/02	06/12/2016	31/08/2016	25/01/2017	15/08/2016	97	113	147
R01/40	05/12/2016	05/09/2016	17/02/2017	05/10/2016	91	61	165
R01/42	03/10/2016	12/09/2016	15/02/2017	15/08/2016	21	49	156

to per terien ont

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table b. Interventionist-generated motivation data (intervention

arm) R02/42, R02/49, R02/15 and R01/48 were all missing

Participant ID	Date	Consent Visit	Was Participant motivation too low
		Motivation Rating	Answer Yes/No
R02/39	05.08.16	7	No
R02/40	23.08.16	4	No
R02/02	05.08.16	7	No
R02/03	03.08.16	1	No
R02/43	12.08.16	7	No
R02/05	22.08.16	5	No
R02/45	18.08.16	7	No
R02/07	09.08.16	7	No
R02/48	05.10.16	7	No
R02/10	14.09.16	7	No
R02/11	28.09.16	7	No
R02/50	26.09.16	7	No
R02/12	05.10.16	7	No
R02/52	03.10.16	7	No
R01/39	03.11.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/02	16.09.16	7	No
R01/03	03.10.16	5	No
R01/40	05.10.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/42	15.08.16	5	Page missing from report
R01/44	08.11.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/47	10.10.16	5	Yes
R01/06	10.10.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/49	17.10.16	7	No
R01/08	01.11.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/50	Missing report		
R01/53	29.11.16	7	Not ticked
R01/54	Missing report		
R01/10	10.11.16	2	Not ticked
R01/57	31.10.16	0	Yes
L	1		

Table c. Engagement

	Adherence data collected (did not withdraw from data collection before 6m) n(%)	Total CFHH sessions Median (IQR)	Baseline adherence Median (IQR)
Overall (n=33)	29(88%)	3(1,8)	20(2.1,47.8)
Qualitative case studies			
High adherence at end			
R01/39	Yes	1	0
R02/07	Yes	2	96.7
R01/40	Yes	9	43.1
R02/52	Yes	13	96.6
Moderate adherence at end			
R01/49	Yes	4	13.2
Low adherence at end			
R01/54	Yes	11	44.8
R01/02	Yes	1	30.2
R01/48	Yes	3	1.8
R02/12	Yes	44	10.2
R02/03	No	3	5.4
R01/44	Yes	1	19.5
Withdrawn			
R01/42	Yes	41	21.1
R02/02	No	3	92.5
R02/42	No	0	4.2

Note: R02/42, R02/02 withdrew from adherence data collection and from the intervention and R02/03 was lost to follow-up. R01/42 did not withdraw from data collection until the end of the study; they did not contribute sufficient data for the 150-180 day period.

 BMJ Open

	Self-	Tailored	Tailored	Personalised	Tailored	problem-	Goal review;
	monitoring	education	patient	action	sol	ving	Rewards
	adherence	about	stories	plan/Personalis			
		treatment	(videos)	ed goal-setting			
		C1 1			Clicks	Clicks	Review
	Clicks How	Clicks	Clicks	Clicks Action	Problem	Coping	sessions with
Maan (SD)#/Madian*	am I doing?	Toolkit	Videos	Plan	Solving	Plan	Interventionis
(IOR) overall (n=33)	11(5 20)*	3(0,7)*	$2(1 \ 2)*$	$2(1 \ 7)*$	3(0, 8)*	1(0 2)*	1(0,5)+
Qualitative case studies	11(5,50)	5(0,7)	2(1,5)	2(1,7)	5(0,0)	I(0, 5)	1(0.5)
High adherence at end							
R01/39	8	3		1	0	1	1
P02/07	5	1		1	2	1	1
R02/07	5	1	1		2	0	1
K01/40	32	0	1		3	0	1
R02/52	70	5	3		17	1	l
Medium adherence at end	d						
R01/49	30	2	1	0		0	1
Low adherence at end							
R01/54	24	4	5	3	4	2	1
R01/02	3	0	1	2	0	Uh	2
R01/48	38	6	2	7	7	1	1
R02/12	98	12	10	13	14	8	1
R02/03	15	12	1	25	1	14	1
R01/44	11	0	2	4	8	3	1
Withdrawn							
R01/42	69	18	9	16	20	3	2
R02/02	3	7	1	8	8	7	1
R02/42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table e. Activities: highly motivated participants

(Those who answered 'No' to question, 'Was the participant motivation too low) n=17. Some of these were missing or not answered n=14, only 2 answered 'Yes'.

	Self-	Tailored	Tailored	Personalised	Tailored	problem-	Goal review;
	monitoring	education	patient	action	sol	ving	Rewards
	adherence	about	stories	plan/Personalis			
		treatment	(videos)	ed goal-setting			
					Clicks	Clicks	Review
	Clicks How	Clicks	Clicks	Clicks Action	Problem	Coping	sessions with
	am I doing?	Toolkit	Videos	Plan	Solving	Plan	Interventionist
High motivation Mean	16 (5 33)*	5 (2,12)*	3 (1, 4)*	4 (2 , 12)*	4(2,11)*	1(1,7)*	1.12(0.33)†
(SD)†/Median* (IQR)							
overall (n=17)							
Oualitative case studies							
(high motivation)							
R02/07	5	1	1	1	2	0	1
R02/52	70	5	3	1	17		1
R01/49	30	2	1	0	1	0	1
R01/02	3	0	1	2	0	1	2
R02/12	98	12	10	13	14	8	1
R02/03	15	12	1	25	1	14	1
R02/02	3	7	1	8	8	7	1

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table f. Process Outcomes

	Accurate awareness of adherence	Increased Motivation	Increased 1 decrease beliefs N	necessity and d concern / Motivation	Increased self- efficacy /	Motivation	Increased habit /	Reduced CHAOS	Reduced barriers
	Subjective adherence (0-100): Medication Adherence Data Questionnaire	Change in BMQ question 'I want to do all my prescribed medications in the next 2 weeks (0-7)	Change in BMQ Necessities score (2-5)	Change in BMQ Concerns score (1-3)	Change in BMQ question 'I am confident I can do all my prescribed medications in the next 2 weeks (0-7)	Change in PAM activation score (0-100)	Change in SRBAI score (0-28)	Change in CHAOS score (0-24)	Change in no. of BMQ barriers ticked (0-6)
n Overall	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
Mean (SD) overall Qualitative	2.07(27.87) c case studies baseline(change)	-0.1(1.27)	0.26(0.58)	-0.19(0.31)	0.06(1.79)	2.38(14.01)	0.32(3.92)	0.1(2.75)	-1.84(3.44)
	%	baseline (change)			baseline (change)	5			
High adhe	erence at end								
R01/39	85(14)	7(0)	0.5	-0.4	7(0)	-5.9 🗖	-2	2	-4
R02/07	100(-2)	7(0)	0.2	-0.2	7(0)	0	1	-5	-3
R01/40	92(8)	7(0)	0.6	-0.2	5(1)	7.2	-9	0	1
R02/52	95(-25)	7(0)	0.3	-0.2	7(0)	4.9	3	-1	1

BMJ Open

Page	130	of	197
i uge	150	01	

R01/49	100(0)	7(0)	-0.8	-0.7	7(0)	9.9	-1	0	-4	
Low adhe	Low adherence at end									
R01/54	60(-10)	7(-1)	-0.3	0.4	6(0)	-7.9	1	-1	6	
R01/02	55(16)	7(0)	0.8	-0.2	2(3)	0	-1	-1	-2	
R01/48	0(100)	7(0)	0.9	-0.8	6(0)	0	0	0	-2	
R02/12	NA	7(0)	-0.1	-0.7	4(0)	14.6	-3	-2	-5	
R02/03	50(NA)	1(NA)	NA	NA	2(NA)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
R01/44	0(0)	7(0)	1.4	0.2	5(-4)	-16.6	0	-1	-5	
Withdrawn										
R01/42	0(0)	5(-1)	-0.3	-0.1	4(0)	-5	-1	5	-6	
R02/02	80(10)	7(0)	0.1	-0.5	7(0)	9.2	2	-1	1	
R02/42	100(0)	7(0)	0.9	0	7(0)	-12.1	1	7	-1	

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

 BMJ Open

Tuble g. Inter mean				
	End of trial adherence (day 150-180)✦	Change in Objective adherence✦ (%)	Change in FEV1	Number of exacerbations in 6 months
Mean (SD) ⁺ / Median (IQR)*	<u>34.7 (0.4,78)*</u>	<u>1.25(-5.8, 36.3)*</u>	$0.1(0.51)^{+}$	<u>1(0,2)*</u>
overall (n=33)				
Qualitative case studies	- Oh			
High adherence at end				
R01/39	95.2	95.16	-0.02	1
R02/07	93.5	-3.12	NA	0
R01/40	88.2	45.07	0.22	0
R02/52	83.9	-12.68	-0.13	0
Medium adherence at end				
R01/49	68.3	55.06	-0.12	3
Low adherence at end				
R01/54	29	-15.8	-0.03	2
R01/02	29	-1.14	0	0
R01/48	5.2	3.34	1.07	0
R02/12	0	-10.23	-0.21	0
R02/03	0	-5.42	NA	NA
R01/44	0	-19.54	0.9	1
Withdrawn				
R01/42	NA	NA	0	0
R02/02	NA	NA	-0.04	3
R07/47	NΔ	NA	0.35	1

♦Normative numerator adjusted adherence

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Additional File 04: Joint display table (data sources in **bold**)

#	Logic model column / construct	Quantitative	Qualitative	Convergence code
	INPUTS			
1	MDT introduction to CFHealthHub		Chief investigator reported: introducing MDT to concept behind and application of CFHH.	-
2	CF Clinicians aware of the importance of monitoring adherence		Chief investigator reported: briefing collaborating MDTs. Reported change agents at centres internalised idea; some residual scepticism among senior physicians.	-
3	Prescription data	Study team found adherence levels of over 100% (Implementation log, 01 Dec 16)	Late identification of prescription changes found to be responsible. (Minutes, Trial Management Group Meeting 10 Jan 17)	Expansion
4	Chipped nebuliser	-	Devices ordered centrally by CTRU were delivered to sites on 20th May 2016 and processed for distribution on 23rd June 2016. (Project manager emails)	-
5	Qualcom-Hub (docking & upload)	-	Devices ordered centrally by CTRU were delivered to sites on 20th May2016 and processed for distribution on 23rd June 2016 (Project manager emails)	-
6	CFHealthHub website/app	-	Available, but under development through trial (Additional File 01)	-
7	COM-BMQ questionnaire	COM-BMQ questionnaire data was collected at baseline for all consenting participants	-	-

Page 133 of 197

 BMJ Open

	responses	(Additional File 04 - Table 8)		
8	Intervention manual	-	High levels of interventionist satisfaction with manual. R01 Interventionist 1 remarked that, "all the stuff in the manuals was really good."	-
9	Interventionist training programme Interventionist support	Structured questionnaire on interventionist confidence after training programme: Interventionists (n=5) all averaged >8 for confidence across 11 questions. Isolated scores of <8 occurred three times: viewing charts/tables, completing report forms and understanding online training/assessment.	In interviews , interventionists reported high levels of satisfaction; one requested for more integration of research and intervention procedures. R01 Interventionist 1 remarked "You had the manual but I was missing bits". She wanted more case studies and mock patients in the training to compensate for this. An interventionist (R01 MDT member 1), who was a social worker by background, found the training very good, indicating that it the training had acceptability beyond physiotherapists. Research team member (MH) reported giving mentorship and that one site/trust received more support from the PI than the other. The main	Expansion
11	Competency/Fidelity assessment	Structured instrument for the assessment of interventionist competence: Digital recordings were made and assessed for fidelity by MA, MH and JB. Fidelity assessment instrument modified after discussion, in advance of use on full-scale RCT.	support from the PI than the other. The main interventionist at the other site received support from the part-time interventionist who was a member of the multi-disciplinary team.	-

2	
3	
4	
-	
2	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
19	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
J∠ 22	
55 24	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

-				
12	Motivated and effective	-	In interviews, interventionists reported that	-
	interventionists		they were enthusiastic about the intervention	
	ENGAGEMENT			
13	Clinicians accessing adherence data*	Clinicians did not access CFHH. (CFHH Click analytics)	In interviews , interventionists talked about run charts occasionally being viewed when brought to MDT meetings by interventionists.	Confirmation
14	Adherence data tracking	CFHH click analytics showed interventionists accessing data before meetings	This was confirmed in interviews .	Confirmation
15	Participant accessing CFHealthHub	Click analytics: The median number of sessions over 5 (+/- 1) months was 3 (interquartile range 1 to 8, range 1-44, Additional File 05 - Table c), with a mean duration of 36.1 (SD=23.9) minutes. The mean total duration of interaction time across the study was 49.3 (SD 44.8) minutes. The mean length of an interaction was 12.4 (SD=9.6) minutes. The median number of days in the trial with interactions was 2 (IQR=1,7).	Lack of usability was explained in interviews by initially difficult login procedures and the lack of a mobile app for most of the pilot trial, leading participants to access an unsatisfactory desktop version on their mobile.	Expansion
16	Push notifications/reminders each week*	-	Programmer reported that automated push notifications not available during pilot trial. In interviews , one participant and one interventionist, reported the spontaneous development of informal push notifications in which the interventionist was ringing up and praising the participant for accomplishments, thereby building the relationship.	-
17	CFHealthHub_Intervention sessions delivered according	Collected via project-specific structured fidelity assessment instrument (#11). After discussion	Fidelity observations indicated: limited discussion of motivations; communication style	Expansion

 BMJ Open

	to Manual (Fidelity)	between MA, MH and JB summary scores were agreed for delivery of content 100% and quality of delivery: 60-92%. Co-author Judy Bradley is intending to publish this work elsewhere.	sometimes paternalistic rather than autonomy- enabling; insufficient attention to most active ingredients.	
18	Initial session, and then review at each clinic visit	Collected via click analytics. Patient run charts reveal a disparity in when and whether these happened (Additional File 07).	-	-
	ACTIVITIES			
19	Clinicians monitor adherence	· Peerrei	Clinician access to adherence data was sporadic (see #13) and staff interviews confirmed that it was not monitored. In an interview , participant R01/02 described the research intervention as "parallel rather than integrated" with mainstream clinical management.	-
	Intervention components for all participants		eh.	
20	Self-monitoring adherence	Click analytics: 'How am I doing?' pages were the most frequently visited in terms of the total number of clicks during the trial. 30 (90.9%) participants clicked a median of 11 (range 5-30) times in 5 months, but sometimes in a single session (Additional File 05 – Table d). Access did not always result in good alignment between subjective and objective adherence (Additional File 05 – Tables f and g respectively).	In interviews , moderate and frequent users said they mostly valued this page for self-monitoring.	Expansion
21	Tailored education about treatment	Click analytics: Toolkit clicked a median 3 (range 0-7) times (Additional File 05 – Table d).	In participant interviews , the DNASE video was popular. Other pages were accessed	Expansion

			infrequently or when issues arose, when the information was viewed as "more down to earth" (R02/07) than technical manuals.	
22	Tailored patient stories (videos)	Click analytics: 'Talking heads' videos accessed a median 2 (range 1-3) times (Additional File 05 – Table d).	In participant interviews , these videos divided opinion. Some participants liked to know that they were not alone; others did not want to see videos of others with CF.	Expansion
	Intervention components for those with adequate motivation	0r Do		
23	Personalised goal-setting	Click analytics: Participants set target adherence levels in CFHH (Additional File 05 – Table 3).	In interviews, participants reported goal- setting, but it was not clear how much it came from patients and how much from interventionists.	Expansion
24	Goal review	Click analytics: Mean (SD) review sessions 1 (0.5) (Additional File 05 – Table e).	en on	-
25	Personalised action plan	Click analytics: Action plan pages clicked on median 2 (inter-quartile range 1-7) times (Additional File 05 – Table e).	Disliked by some participants who, the interventionist from centre R01 reported during an interview , found writing down action plans like "being at school"	Expansion
26	Tailored problem-solving	Click analytics: Problem solving and coping plan pages clicked on median 3 (inter-quartile range 0- 8) and 1 (0-3) times respectively (Additional File 05 – Table e).	In interviews , one participant realised that when she goes to her friend's house, rather than missing a treatment she could do it in the car or anywhere. One interventionist from centre R02 thought it important that the information was	Expansion

 BMJ Open

			"there if you need it" for patients.	
	IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES			
27	Medical care informed by adherence	-	Interviews with PIs found that the trial and intervention ran alongside usual care rather than being informed by it (see also #13, #19).	-
	For all participants			
28	Acute awareness of adherence / increased Motivation	Answers to the subjective adherence question (Additional File 05 – Table f) were well aligned with run charts (Additional File 07) in those with high adherence. Alignment was more variable in those with moderate and poor adherence.	In interviews , some with high adherence used the CFHH "How am I doing page" (run charts) as a check (R02/07, R01/40); other high adherers did not (R01/49). Some felt that it increased their adherence, acknowledging that monitoring meant that they had, "better make an effort here".	Expansion
29	Increased necessity and decreased concern	No change in the group averages for the COM-BMQ (incorporating Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) 21- item validated self-report tool[1]) or Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13) (Health Style Assessment) assessment of patient knowledge, skill, and confidence for self-management[2]. (Additional File 05 – Table f)	- Ch OJ	-
30	Increased self-efficacy / Motivation	No change in the group averages for a single question about confidence to adhere or the PAM-13. (Additional File 05 – Table f)	-	-
	For those with adequate			

2	
3	
4	
5	
ر ح	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
24	
24	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
⊿ <u></u> 2	
42 13	
43	
44	
45	
46	

	motivation			
31	Increased self-efficacy/ Motivation	No change in the group averages for a single question about confidence to adhere or the PAM-13 . (Additional File 05 – Table f)	-	-
32	Increased habit / Reduced CHAOS	No change in the group averages for Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of the Self Report Habit index to capture habit-based behaviour patterns[3] or in the assessment of routine measure of life chaos [4]. (Additional File 05 – Table f)	-	-
33	Reduced barriers	No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item) (Additional File 05 – Table f)	The tailored problem-solving modules (#26) were not widely used but, in interviews , party plans and nebuliser guides were cited as having removed barriers by those who did use this content. For instance, one participant was able to find the technical name for a part of a nebuliser for which he needed to order a replacement.	Expansion
	INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES			
34	Treatment optimisation	-	Interview data revealed patients to be behaving in unexpected ways, for instance taking holidays from their treatment or not taking medication as prescribed.	-
35	Increased adherence	Nebuliser data via CFHH: Mean adherence across all participants was 10 (95% CI: -5.2 to 25.2) percent higher in the intervention than in the	-	-

control arm. Within the case study participants (all				
intervention), an increase of 7.5% (95% CI: -8.2-				
23.1) in simple normative adherence with				
numerator adjustment can be observed in the				
intervention arm. Following month 1, adherence is				
consistently higher in the intervention arm with				
the greatest difference observed in month 5 (mean				
difference: 10.8, 95% CI: -11.44, 22.9). These				
differences would indicate a potentially clinically				
important difference between the intervention and				
usual care arms.				

- [1] R. Horne, J. Weinman, M. Hankins, The beliefs about medicines questionnaire: The development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive representation of medication, Psychol. Health. 14 (1999) 1–24. doi:10.1080/08870449908407311.
- [2] J.H. Hibbard, E.R. Mahoney, J. Stockard, M. Tusler, Development and testing of a short form of the patient activation measure., Health Serv. Res. 40 (2005) 1918–30. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00438.x.
- [3] B. Verplanken, S. Orbell, Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit Strength1, J. Appl. Soc. Psychol. 33 (2003) 1313–1330. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x.
- [4] M.D. Wong, C. a. Sarkisian, C. Davis, J. Kinsler, W.E. Cunningham, The Association Between Life Chaos, Health Care Use, and Health Status Among HIV-Infected Persons, J. Gen. Intern. Med. 22 (2007) 1286–1291. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0265-6.

Additional File 05 - Case-ordered descriptive matrix for fourteen case studies

 Qualitative findings in italics. Otherwise, motivation, confidence, necessities, concerns, life chaos and subjective adherence (baselines and process outcomes) from self-report instruments (see Methods and Additional File 04). Engagement, activities and data captured by CFHealthHub.

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
High adherence (average >80%) in last month of trial				
R01/39. High motivation, confidence and necessities, medium concerns, quite high chaos. <i>They got a lot of</i> <i>information about CF from other</i> <i>websites.</i>	Used CFHH once. Very engaged with interventionist and trial.	Didn't make plans – felt it was her responsibility to adapt her life; found others monitoring helpful. Didn't like videos or social aspects of website because of the	Knowledge that clinicians could access treatment adherence information provided extra motivation to adhere.	End of trial adherence 95% (95% improvement).
R02/07. High motivation, and confidence, medium-high necessity, medium concerns and chaos. Existing high adherer, <i>sees treatment as a "plan for longevity" rather than a "chore"</i> .	Used CFHH twice. Didn't find it useful or like the videos (doesn't want to see negative side of CF).	Made action plan, accessed some modules once. Found goal-setting with interventionist helpful.	Little change as already, motivated. Reduced CHAOS and barriers.	End of trial adherence 93% (3% decline).
R01/40. High motivation, medium confidence and necessities, low concerns, medium-to-low chaos. <i>Was</i> <i>recruited soon after exacerbation</i> .	Had nine CFHH sessions. "I've been logging on to track my progress every two weeks to a month". Finds others monitoring him helpful.	Frequent self-monitoring. Compensates for slippages by planning to do the rest of his doses.	Motivation already high, but habit lacking. Intervention has made him think about adherence more than he did before.	End of trial adherence 88% (45% improvement). Variance over trial, but trajectory.
R02/52. High motivation, confidence and necessity, low concerns, low-medium chaos. Existing good adherer; <i>wanted</i> <i>something like a fitness tracker</i> <i>with feedback - messages on</i> <i>performance.</i>	13 CFHH sessions. <i>Liked the</i> <i>more portable nebuliser,</i> <i>could take it away on work.</i> CFHH session that precedes interventionist visit explained by interventionist testing login details.	Frequent self-monitoring, regular use of tailored education and problem solving (fixing nebuliser problems) and some use of videos. Wanted it expanding to physical activity.	Motivation already high. Increased habit.	End of trial adherence 83% (12% decline).

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
Moderate adherence (average				
50-80%) in last month of trial R01/49. High motivation, confidence, medium-high necessity and concerns low chaos. Participated to 'prove' themselves to their physiotherapist; poor awareness of own adherence not improved	4 CFHH sessions	Used problem-solving modules and self- monitoring, but no action plan.	Increased motivation, reduced barriers.	End of trial adherence 68' (55% improvement). An important improvement from low adherence, but subjective adherence still poorly 'calibrated' with objective adherence.
over course of trial. Poor adherence (>50%) in last month of trial				
R01/54. Professed high motivation and confidence, medium necessity, low concerns, medium to low chaos. <i>Wants the doctor "to notice"</i> <i>that they are adherent to their</i> <i>treatment, demotivated by the</i> <i>fact they don't.</i>	44 CFHH sessions. Appreciative of extrinsic motivation from face-to- face contact with interventionist.	Frequent self-monitoring; initially high use of action plans and problem solving. <i>Dislikes 'talking heads'</i> <i>videos.</i>	More barriers by the end of the trial.	End of trial adherence 29 (16% decline), but run ch shows huge variance wee by week.
R01/02. High motivation, low confidence, medium necessity and concerns, high chaos. <i>Dissatisfaction at service</i> <i>reconfiguration: moved across</i> <i>from Poole to Southampton</i> <i>during trial. Upset that wider</i> <i>team isn't noticing their</i> <i>adherence.</i>	Used CFHH once but had technical problems. Appreciative of interventionist: "Having a personal contact and someone to guide you through it is really useful" Wider team not talking about adherence: "parallel rather than integrated".	Two review sessions with interventionist.	Reduced CHAOS and barriers; increased self- efficacy	Lack of pre-post change r contradicted by the run chart which shows improvement.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
10	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
27	
J∠ 22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
41 40	
4Z	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
R01/48. professed high motivation and confidence, medium-high necessities and concerns; medium chaos. <i>This</i> 69-year old doesn't like nebulising; "can't teach an old dog new tricks". No belief in benefit of nebulised medication. Poor awareness of own adherence. Altruistic trial participant.	Used CFHH three times. Access problems (passwords, etc) - gave up.	Some engagement with toolkit, action plans and problem-solving, <i>didn't like</i> <i>the videos</i> . Engagement drops off as soon as the last meeting over.	No change in process outcomes.	End of trial adherence 5% (3% improvement). Said was making an effort for the trial. In line with this, objective adherence was high (~80%) for weeks 6-21
R02/12. High motivation, medium to low confidence, medium to high necessity and concerns, medium chaos.	Started off engaged, lots of CFHH use and two intervention sessions in first 100 days, nothing thereafter.	Made plans, liked website, checked graphs. <i>Liked face-</i> <i>to-face interaction with</i> <i>interventionist.</i>	Decreased chaos and barriers but also decreased habit.	Initial improvement in adherence (up to 100% between weeks seven and nine after first intervention not sustained over time. Review stimulates brief improvement at week 15, again not sustained.
Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes	
--	--	---	---	
Minimal short-term engagement with CFHH. Interventionist notes that participant has always been difficult to get hold of.	Made action and coping plans, checked graphs.	No process data at follow- up.	Withdrew from treatme early.	
One CFHH session (at intervention visit 1). Interventionist appears not to have done correct preparation. Only participant rated by an interventionist as having inadequate motivation.	Participant confirms that he made action plan, coping plan and checked graphs with interventionist but chaotic lifestyle and low motivation prevented further use. Admits only has a routine in hospital.	No change in process variables.	Initial spikes of adherence not sustained over time.	
	One CFHH session (at interventionist appears not to have done correct preparation. Only participant rated by an interventionist as having inadequate motivation.	Winning short-termengagement with CFHH. Interventionist notes that participant has always been difficult to get hold of.One CFHH session (at intervention visit 1). Interventionist appears not to have done correct preparation. Only participant rated by an interventionist as having inadequate motivation.Participant confirms that he made action plan, coping plan and checked graphs with interventionist but chaotic lifestyle and low motivation prevented further use. Admits only has a routine in hospital.	Initial shorethinIndex action and coping plans, checked graphs.Not process data at follow- up.Interventionist notes that participant has always been difficult to get hold of.Participant confirms that he made action plan, coping plan and checked graphsNo change in process variables.One CFHH session (at intervention visit 1). Interventionist appears not to have done correct preparation. Only participant rated by an interventionist as having inadequate motivation.Participant confirms that he made action plan, coping plan and checked graphs with interventionist but chaotic lifestyle and low motivation prevented further use. Admits only has a routine in hospital.No change in process variables.	

Withdrawn				
Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
R01/42. Medium motivation, low confidence, medium-high necessity, medium concerns, low chaos. Originally an i-neb user. Does not think nebulising three times a day is achievable. Moved house during study. No broadband – so didn't do nebulisations.	Loved the website and shared it. 41 CFHH sessions. Intervention visit 1 reported to be chaotic.	Made action plan.	Little change in process variables.	Interview might have triggered brief increase in nebuliser use, when participant realised nebulisations were being logged even when he wasn't plugging it in.
R02/02. High motivation and confidence, medium-high necessity low concerns and chaos. <i>Interview shows them to</i> <i>be motivated by interventionist</i> <i>visit and qualitative interview</i> <i>(Hawthorne effect).</i> Subjective adherence poorly aligned to objective adherence.	Limited engagement. Three CFHH Sessions all on the same day.	Made an action plan but reported that she didn't set goals because she thought she her adherence was already good.	Little change in process variables.	Adherence run chart starts off high, but drops off quickly. Interview might have triggered brief increase in nebuliser use. Withdrew from collection of nebuliser data collection.
R02/42. High motivation and confidence, medium to high necessity, low concerns, medium chaos	Withdrew - didn't like the eTrac nebuliser - delivering the drug too quickly made them cough. Interventionist encouraged discontinuation.	Didn't look at the website.	No change in process outcomes	Assumed no change in adherence, but objective lacking.

ACtiF Pilot Statistical Report

L Mandefield

Methods

Outcomes

Feasibility outcomes

The primary objective of this study was to determine the feasibility of proceeding to a definitive trial. An external pilot randomised controlled trial to determine feasibility of a randomised controlled trial based on objective stop-go criteria related to:

- (a) participant recruitment;
- (b) participant retention; and,
- (c) quality of primary outcome data at 5 (+/-1) months post randomisation.

These were assessed by

- i. The number of screened, eligible and recruited participants per month, per centre and overall;
- ii. The number and percentage of participants who complete their 5(+/-1) month post randomisation follow up;
- iii. The number of Fuchs criteria by exacerbation.

Clinical outcomes

The primary clinical outcome measure was the number of pulmonary exacerbations in the 5 (+/-1) month post-baseline follow-up period, defined according to a modified version of the Fuchs criteria. The original Fuchs criteria was 4 out of 16 symptoms leading to IV antibiotic treatment. An exacerbation of respiratory symptoms will be said to have occurred when a participant was treated with parenteral antibiotics for any one of the following 12 signs or symptoms:

- 1. change in sputum;
- 2. new or increased hemoptysis;
- 3. increased cough;
- 4. increased dyspnea;
- 5. malaise, fatigue, or lethargy;
- 6. temperature above 38 °C;
- 7. anorexia or weight loss;

- 8. sinus pain or tenderness;
- 9. change in sinus discharge.
- 10. change in physical examination of the chest, derived from notes by site staff.
- 11. decrease in pulmonary function by 10 percent or more from a previously recorded value, derived from notes by site staff; or,
- 12. radiographic changes indicative of pulmonary infection, derived from notes by site staff.

The trial interventionist or prescribing clinician/nurse will collect data on the "exacerbations" form at the point of a participant starting a course of IV antibiotics.

The following secondary outcomes were also collected at baseline and 5 (+/-1) month follow up:

- 1. Body Mass Index (BMI).
- 2. Forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1): standardised spirometry as a measure of condition severity.
- 3. EuroQol EQ-5D-5L: generic health status measure for health economic analysis.
- 4. The Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13): assessment of patient knowledge, skill, and confidence for self-management.
- 5. Confusion, Hubbub, and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measure of life chaos.
- 6. Medication Adherence Data-3 items (MAD-3)
- 7. Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index (SRBAI)
- 8. Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised (CFQ-R): disease specific health-related quality of life instrument.
- 9. The Patient Health Questionnaire depression scale (PHQ-8): severity measure for depressive disorders.
- 10. The General Anxiety Disorder 7-item anxiety scale (GAD-7): severity measure for anxiety.
- 11. The Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs Questionnaire (COM- BMQ): This questionnaire incorporates:
- a. The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item): a validated self-report tool, customised by the author to identify perceived necessities and concerns for nebuliser treatment.
- b. The following project-specific items: one additional belief item, one intention item, one confidence item, and a list of barriers. These will serve as a tailoring tool for the intervention and also as a secondary outcome measure. 12.Subjective adherence single question: self-report estimate of adherence as a percentage. Self-reported problems: identification of capability and opportunity barriers to nebuliser adherence
- 13. Concomitant medications: bespoke instrument, designed for this research project.
- 14. Resource use form: interventionist collects data from a combination of hospital notes and the NHS patient electronic system to determine 1) inpatient IV days 2) Routine clinic visits 3) Unscheduled outpatient contacts 3) unscheduled inpatient stays.
- 15. Prescription: a monthly prescription check to both check for data transfer to CFHealthHub and review for an indication that the prescription has changed or indication of microorganism e.g.
- 16. Adherence to prescribed medication
- 17. Any treatment with IV antibiotics

Sample Size

Sample size calculation was based on estimating parameters within a certain amount of precision rather than hypothesis testing. The sample size for a feasibility study should be adequate to estimate the uncertain critical parameters (standard deviations for continuous outcomes; consent rates, event rates, attrition rates for binary outcomes) needed to inform the design of the full RCT with sufficient precision.

To assess recruitment rate, the external pilot RCT ran in two CF units for 12 months, with four months recruitment, one months 'run-in' period (the period between the consent and baseline visit), and 5 (+/-1) months follow up. To match the proposed recruitment rate of the main RCT, the target sample over the four months for which the pilot RCT was open, was 32 per centre (64 in total from the two pilot centres). We aimed to see a minimum of 75% of the recruitment target to be confident of the trial viability i.e. at least 48 patients in total consented and randomized in four months' of recruitment from two centres.

Randomisation

Randomisation was conducted using a computer generated pseudo-random list with random permuted blocks of varying sizes, created and hosted by the Sheffield CTRU in accordance with their Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and was held on a secure server. ACtiF participants will be randomised in a 1:1 ratio, intervention to control arms, stratified by:

- Site;
- Number of IV days in previous 12 months as collected at consent visit (two categories will be (i) less than or equal to 14 days and (ii) greater than 14 days).

Study researchers accessed the allocation for each participant by logging in to the remote, secure internet-based randomisation system. Once a participant had consented to the study, the researcher logged into the randomisation system and entered basic demographic information. After this information had been entered the allocation for that participant was then revealed to the researcher.

Block randomisation with randomly varying block size of 2, 4 and 6 was used so that the sequence of allocation could not be predicted. The block sizes were determined by the trial statistician and block size was not revealed to any other member of the study team.

Blinding

The trial statisticians remained blind until data freeze, at which point unblinded data was presented to them so checks could be carried out.

Statistical Methods

All statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.3.1.

Analysis Populations

The ITT population includes all participants for whom consent was obtained and who were randomised to treatment, regardless of whether they received the intervention or not. This is the primary analysis set and endpoints were summarised for the ITT population unless otherwise stated.

Participant Flow

A CONSORT flow diagram was used to display data completeness and patient flow from first contact to final follow up.

The number of participants recruited at each centre each month was presented. The number of participants who withdrew consent from the trial, withdrew from the intervention, withdrew from collection of the primary outcome, withdrew consent from adherence data collection and who were lost to follow up were presented overall, by treatment arm and site. The reasons for attrition, where given, were presented.

Patient reported outcome measures (PROMS)

The following PROMS were completed at baseline and 5 (+/-1) month follow up visit. For detailed methods of how these questionnaires were scored, please see the appendix.

Data completeness

A CONSORT flow diagram was used to display data completeness and patient throughput from first contact to final follow up.

Baseline characteristics

Participants' demographics (age, sex, ethnicity, IMD decile), physical measurements (weight, height, BMI), clinical measurements (FEV1, IV days in last registry year, Pseudomonas status, Adherence in first 2 weeks, Subjective adherence, Medication, Treatment burden) patient reported outcomes (EQ-5D-5L, PAM-13, CHAOS, MAD-3,SRBAI, CFQ-R, GAD-7, COMBMQ, PHQ-8). Imbalance between treatment arms was not tested statistically but were reported descriptively.

Primary effectiveness analysis of clinical outcomes

The primary endpoint of the study is the number of exacerbations in a 5 (+/- 1) month period. Exacerbations were defined as being treated with IV antibiotics and meeting at least 1 Fuchs criteria.

The number of exacerbations by participant were presented. The number and percentage of exacerbations with each Fuchs criteria were presented. The length of IV course was summarised by intervention arm for all exacerbations and for participants experiencing exacerbations.

The primary effectiveness analysis used a negative binomial model and included all exacerbations in a 6 month follow up period. Participants who were not followed for this length were excluded. An adjusted model included IV days in the previous 12 months as a covariate. Although not prespecified, a further sensitivity analysis was carried out. This model included the number of days followed up as an offset. This allowed all consenting participants to be included. An adjusted offset model included IV days in the previous 12 months as a covariate.

Secondary effectiveness analysis of clinical outcomes

Patient reported outcome measures

Secondary outcomes were measured at baseline and 5 (+/-1) months post randomisation. The mean difference between treatment arms was calculated for each of the secondary outcomes, along with 95% confidence intervals using a multiple linear regression model. Adjustment for baseline and site was carried out and both unadjusted and adjusted results were presented.

Adherence to medication

The time of inhalations of medication was recorded via chipped nebulisers. This data along with prescription data was used to calculate a number of different adherence measures. Adherence in people with CF is of key importance. For this reason, it was decided that 7 separate measures of adherence to prescribed medication were to be presented:

- 1. Total doses;
- 2. Unadjusted adherence;
- 3. Simple normative adherence (without numerator adjustment);
- 4. Sophisticated normative adherence (without numerator adjustment);
- 5. Simple normative adherence (with numerator adjustment);
- 6. Sophisticated normative adherence (with numerator adjustment);
- 7. Subjective single adherence.

Measures 1-6 are calculated daily based on the chipped nebuliser data and the dose prescribed that day. Means can be calculated for set periods, e.g. weekly.

The specific calculations of these adherence measured are described below.

Total doses taken

As a basic, unadjusted measure of adherence, the total number of doses taken for the time period will be calculated.

Unadjusted adherence

Adherence is typically calculated as the dose taken divided by the dose described per day.

Simple normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)

Quality of adherence reporting is dependent on the PWCF being prescribed the appropriate medications. Adjusting the denominator of the adherence calculation controls for treatment rationalisation to try reduce treatment burden, which is an approach often seen in people in CF. The simple normative adherence is calculated as follows:

- 1. If the participant does not have pseudomonas
- Minimum denominator is set at 1 treatment/day.

2. If the participant has chronic pseudomonas

- Minimum denominator is set at 3 treatments/day
- 3. The participant has chronic pseudomonas and intermittent inhaled antibiotic regimens
- Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day during 28 day 'on' period
- Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day during 28 day 'off' period
- 4. The participant has intermittent pseudomonas
- Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day for 1 or 3 months depending on the eradication regime
- Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day for the rest of the time

In calculating normative adherence an expected minimum prescription based on a patient's health state is needed. Most patients take a dose of a mucolytic, and patients meeting the criteria will take two doses of antibiotics. In adherence calculations, participants had their denominator amended to reflect their prescription. A complication arises in denominator adjustments when the antibiotic prescribed is one that is expected to be used in an alternating fashion (e.g. 28 days use, 28 days off). The antibiotic medications Aztreonam Lysine and Tobramycin are normally prescribed in this way; for patients with prescriptions for these medications with periods of more than 28 days without a prescription for an antibiotic, the denominator was adjusted to add in 2 doses / day. After 28 days of substituted antibiotic use, a 28 'day off' cycle was programmed. This cycle was continued until such time as another antibiotic prescription was present.

Sophisticated normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)

The sophisticated normative adherence is calculated as follows:

- 1. If someone has 'mild genotype', is pancreatic sufficient and has FEV1 > 90%, without Pseudomonas and used <= 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the past 1 year.
- There is no minimum target. Denominator is determined by the agreed prescription between clinicians and participants.
- 2. If someone is homozygous for class I-III CFTR mutation OR pancreatic insufficient OR FEV1 <= 90%, but without Pseudomonas and used <= 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the past 1 year. Minimum denominator is set at 1 treatment/day.
- 3. If the person has chronic pseudomonas AND/OR
- the person used > 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the previous year Minimum denominator is set at 3 treatments/day
- 4. If the person has chronic pseudomonas AND/OR used > 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the previous year but is on intermittent inhaled antibiotic regimens
- Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day during 28 day 'on' period
- Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day during 28 day 'off' period
- 5. If someone has intermittent pseudomonas but used <= 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the past 1 year

- Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day for 1 or 3 months depending on the eradication regime
- Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day (or 0, i.e. no minimum target) depending on their genotype, pancreatic status and FEV1 for the rest of the time.

Numerator adjustment in simple and sophisticated normative case

Numerator adjustment occurs only if a daily adherence measure is greater than 100%, thus the maximum daily adherence is set at 100%.

Subjective single adherence

All participants will be asked to estimate their adherence as a percentage at baseline, clinic visits, 5(+/-1) months and any further visits up to 30th April 2017. These subjective measures were presented separately. The question referred to the previous 2 weeks.

Adherence summaries

The mean and SD was calculated for each month of the trial by treatment arm. Weekly numerator adjusted normative adherence was calculated and a mean by treatment arm was calculated and presented as a line graph for the first 25 weeks from randomisation.

Intervention adherence

The intervention comprised of:

- (a) a chipped nebuliser to collect adherence data
- (b) access for participants and interventionist to the adherence data summaries
- (c) an online platform (CFHealthHub) offering summaries of adherence and tailored modules to be used by the health professional when interacting with the participant and independently by the participant.

A number of metrics were collected from CFHealthHub including the timing and date of clicks and the page/module that was clicked on. Interactions with CFHH were defined as a series of clicks with no greater that 15 minute gaps between clicks. Length of each session was calculated and days with interactions were calculated by participant.

The mean, standard deviation (SD), median and interquartile range (IQR) for the CFHH metrics were calculated and presented by participant. The same summary statistics were also presented for length of all sessions. The timing of CFHH interactions in days from randomisation was plotted by participant. The number of clicks per page category (Home, How am I doing?, Treatment etc) was plotted in a bar chart and also presented in a table by participant and by session.

Date and time of sessions with the interventionist were also recorded. The number of sessions with an interventionist and the length of sessions by participant were summarised in a table.

Clinic visits

The number of clinic visits completed by each participant excluding consent and 5 month follow up was recorded. Summary statistics were presented by treatment arm to assess whether ascertainment bias occurred in the intervention arm.

Safety analysis

The number of Adverse Events (AEs) and Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) was recorded and presented by treatment arm. These events were further categorised by the type of adverse event and whether they were related to the intervention.

Protocol non compliances

The number and type of protocol non compliances were presented descriptively.

Summary of missing data

The number of missing values or scores for each of the primary and secondary outcomes was presented by baseline and 5 (+/-1) months post randomisation and by treatment arm. Furthermore, the number and percentage of missing items was presented for each of these questionnaires.

Results

Participant Flow

Participants were recruited for 4 months across 2 sites. The CONSORT flow diagram (Fig.1) shows the flow of participants through the trial. 32 participants were randomised at each site. 33 participants were randomised to the intervention arm and 31 participants were randomised to usual care. A total of 59 participants completed the 5 (+/- 1) month follow up visit (Intervention = 31, Usual care = 28).

A total of 8 participants discontinued the trial before the follow up visit (Intervention = 4, Usual care = 4). Of these discontinuations, 5 no longer had their adherence data collected and the same 5 participants did not have their primary outcome collected. Of those who did not continue with primary outcome collection, 2 participants died, 1 withdrew consent and 2 were lost to follow up.

Following the 5 (+/-1) month visit, adherence data and primary outcome data was collected. 2 participants withdrew from adherence data collection during this time (Intervention =1, Usual care =1). 59 participants completed primary outcome data collection up to study completion on 30th April 2017 (Intervention = 31, Usual care =28).

to been terien only

Recruitment by centre and month

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml





Table 1: Participants consented by centre and by month

	June 16	July 16	Aug 16	Sept 15	Total
Site A	4	16	7	5	32
Site B	2	17	5	8	32

Attrition by Centre and Treatment arm

Table 2: Attrition presented by treatment arm and site.

		n	Withdrew Consent (%)	Died (%)	Lost to Follow up (%)	Overall (%)
Overall		64	1(17%)	2(33%)	2(40%)	5(7.8%)
Treatment arm	Intervention	33	0(0%)	0(0%)	2(40%)	2(6.1%)
	Usual Care	31	1(20%)	2(40%)	0(0%)	3(9.7%)
Site	Site A	32	0(0%)	1(20%)	1(20%)	2(6.2%)
	Site B	32	1(20%)	1(20%)	1(20%)	3(9.4%)

Baseline characteristics

Table 4 shows the baseline characteristics of participants randomised by treatment arm. 33 participants were randomised to the intervention and 31 were randomised to usual care. The average age of participants was 29.7 (SD=11.5). Participants in the intervention arm were slightly older (median=28, IQR=(21,37)) than those in the usual care arm (median=26, IQR=(20,34)). Table 5 shows the CF measures presented by treatment arm. Tables 6-7 show the baseline questionnaire scores presented by treatment arm.

Baseline demographics

Table 3: Baseline demographics by treatment arm

	Intervention	Control	Overall
Age	2		
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	31.6(13.3)	27.8(8.9)	29.7(11.5)
Median(IQR)	28(21,37)	26(20,34)	27(21,36)
Min,Max	(16,69)	(16,50)	(16,69)
Sex			
Male	18(54.5%)	18(58.1%)	36(56.2%)
Female	15(45.5%)	13(41.9%)	28(43.8%)
Socioeconomic Status			
Most deprived	6(18.2%)	1(3.2%)	7(10.9%)
High deprivation	4(12.1%)	7(22.6%)	11(17.2%)
Average	8(24.2%)	8(25.8%)	16(25%)
Low deprivation	6(18.2%)	9(29%)	15(23.4%)
Least deprived	9(27.3%)	6(19.4%)	15(23.4%)
Weight (KG)			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	65.5(18)	63.7(15.6)	64.6(16.8)
Median(IQR)	63(53,76)	62.9(49,74)	63(52.9,74.3)
Min,Max	(35,128)	(35.6,103.7)	(35,128)
Height (cm)			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	168.6(10.5)	167.7(9.6)	168.2(10)
Median(IQR)	170(162,177)	168(159,175)	168.5(160.5,175.5)
Min,Max	(147,193)	(149,186)	(147,193)
BMI			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	22.8(5)	22.4(4.3)	22.6(4.6)

Median(IQR)	22.2(19.7,25.3)	22.1(19.1,25.4)	22.1(19.55,25.35)
Min,Max	(15.8,42.8)	(16,33.9)	(15.8,42.8)

Table 4: Baseline CF measures by treatment arm

No. of IV days in previous 12 months 33 31 64 n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 26.3(25.7) 26(22.1) 26.2(23.8) Median(IQR) 17(7.44) 28(0.44) 17(7.44) Min,Max (0,117) (0,70) (0,117) No. of participants requiring IV days in previous 12 months 4 At least 1 IV day 26(78.8%) 23(74.2%) 49(76.6%) Days since last IV start date n 31 28 59 Mean(SD) 168.7(245.2) 202.3(325.2) 184.6(283.9) Median(IQR) 75(45,194) 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Min,Max (6,1085) (7,157) (6,1575) FEV1 r n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 2(0.8) 2.3(1) 2.1(0.9) 2.1(0.9) Median(IQR) 1.9(1.4,2.4) 2.1(1.6,2.8) 1.9(1.5,2.7) Min,Max Rean(SD) 2(0.8) 2.3(2,100.7) (23.2,103.7) 2.1(3.9) <		Intervention	Control	Overall
n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 26.3(25.7) 26(22.1) 26.2(23.8) Median(IQR) 17(7,44) 28(0,44) 17(7,44) Min,Max (0,117) (0,70) (0,117) No. of participants requiring IV days in previous 12 months Jate 100,000 Jate 100,000 At least 1 IV day 26(78.8%) 23(74.2%) 49(76.6%) Days since last IV start date Jate 100,000 168.7(245.2) 202.3(325.2) 184.6(283.9) Mean(SD) 168.7(245.2) 202.3(325.2) 184.6(283.9) Jate 6(80.8) Min,Max (6,1085) (7575) (6,1575) FEV1 n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 20.8) 2.3(1) 2.1(0.9) Median(IQR) 1.9(1.4,2.4) 2.1(1.6,2.8) 1.9(1.5,2.7) Mean(SD) 20.8) 2.3(1) 2.1(0.9) Median(IQR) 4.9(2.8),4.6(1.9) 5.3.4(1.9, 6.5) 4.9(6.4),9.76,7) Min,Max (0.8,4) (0.6,5) 4.9(6.4),9.76,7) Mea	No. of IV days in previous 12 months			
in previous 12 months 26(78.8%) 23(74.2%) 49(76.6%) Days since last IV start date 31 28 59 Mean(SD) 168.7(245.2) 202.3(325.2) 184.6(283.9) Median(IQR) 75(45,194) 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Min,Max (6,1085) (7,1575) (6,1575) FEV1 7 7 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Min,Max (6,1085) (7,1575) 6,1575) FEV1 7 7 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Median(IQR) 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) 6,1675) Median(IQR) 1.9(1.4,2.4) 2.1(1.6,2.8) 1.9(1.5,2.7) Min,Max (0.8,4) (0.6,5) (0.6,5) FEV1 7 7.3(21.3) 1.9(1.5,2.7) Min,Max (0.8,4) (0.6,5) 7.3(21.3) Median(IQR) 49.2(39.4,61.9) 53.4(43.80) 49.6(41.9,76.7) Min,Max (26,103) (23.2,100.7) (23.2,103) 1.9(1.5,7.7) Min,Max (26,103) (23.2,100.7) (23.2,103) 1.9(1.5,7.7) Min	n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max No. of participants requiring IV days	33 26.3(25.7) 17(7,44) (0,117)	31 26(22.1) 28(0,44) (0,70)	64 26.2(23.8) 17(7,44) (0,117)
At least 1 IV day 26(78.8%) 23(74.2%) 49(76.6%) Days since last IV start date 31 28 59 Mean(SD) 168.7(245.2) 202.3(325.2) 184.6(283.9) Median(IQR) 75(45,194) 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Min,Max (6,1085) (7,1575) (6,1575) FEV1 7 75(45,194) 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Min,Max (6,1085) (7,1575) (6,1575) FEV1 7 7 7 7 n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 2(0.8) 2.3(1) 2.1(0.9) Median(IQR) 1.9(1.4,2.4) 2.1(1.6,2.8) 1.9(1.5,2.7) Min,Max (0.8,4) (0.6,5) (0.6,5) FEV1 % 9redicted 7 53.4(19.4) 61.4(22.7) 57.3(21.3) Median(IQR) 49.2(39.4,61.9) 53.4(43,80) 49.6(41.9,76.7) Min,Max (26,103) (23.2,100.7) (23.2,103) Clinician pseudomonas status 15(45.5%) 8(26.7%) 23(36.5%) Intermittent 3(9.1%)	in previous 12 months			
n 31 28 59 Mean(SD) 168.7(245.2) 202.3(325.2) 184.6(283.9) Median(IQR) 75(45,194) 100(24.5,219.5) 91(39,213) Min,Max (6,1085) (7,1575) (6,1575) FEV1	At least 1 IV day Days since last IV start date	26(78.8%)	23(74.2%)	49(76.6%)
n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 2(0.8) 2.3(1) 2.1(0.9) Median(IQR) 1.9(1.4,2.4) 2.1(1.6,2.8) 1.9(1.5,2.7) Min,Max (0.8,4) (0.6,5) (0.6,5) FEV1 % Predicted 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 53.4(19.4) 61.4(22.7) 57.3(21.3) Median(IQR) 49.2(39.4,61.9) 53.4(43,80) 49.6(41.9,76.7) Min,Max (26,103) (23.2,100.7) (23.2,103) Clinician pseudomonas status 15(45.5%) 8(26.7%) 23(36.5%) Negative 15(45.5%) 19(63.3%) 34(54%) Leeds Criteria pseudomonas status 15(45.5%) 10(33.3%) 25(39.7%) Negative 15(42.1%) 4(13.3%) 8(12.7%) Intermittent 4(12.1%) 4(13.3%) 30(47.6%)	n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max FEV1	31 168.7(245.2) 75(45,194) (6,1085)	28 202.3(325.2) 100(24.5,219.5) (7,1575)	59 184.6(283.9) 91(39,213) (6,1575)
n333164Mean(SD)53.4(19.4)61.4(22.7)57.3(21.3)Median(IQR)49.2(39.4,61.9)53.4(43,80)49.6(41.9,76.7)Min,Max(26,103)(23.2,100.7)(23.2,103)Clinician pseudomonas status15(45.5%)8(26.7%)23(36.5%)Negative15(45.5%)3(10%)6(9.5%)Chronic15(45.5%)19(63.3%)34(54%)Leeds Criteria pseudomonas status15(45.5%)10(33.3%)25(39.7%)Negative15(42.1%)4(13.3%)8(12.7%)Chronic14(42.4%)16(53.3%)30(47.6%)	n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max FEV1 % Predicted	33 2(0.8) 1.9(1.4,2.4) (0.8,4)	31 2.3(1) 2.1(1.6,2.8) (0.6,5)	64 2.1(0.9) 1.9(1.5,2.7) (0.6,5)
Negative15(45.5%)8(26.7%)23(36.5%)Intermittent3(9.1%)3(10%)6(9.5%)Chronic15(45.5%)19(63.3%)34(54%)Leeds Criteria pseudomonas status15(45.5%)10(33.3%)25(39.7%)Negative15(45.5%)10(33.3%)25(39.7%)Intermittent4(12.1%)4(13.3%)8(12.7%)Chronic14(42.4%)16(53.3%)30(47.6%)	n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Clinician pseudomonas status	33 53.4(19.4) 49.2(39.4,61.9) (26,103)	31 61.4(22.7) 53.4(43,80) (23.2,100.7)	64 57.3(21.3) 49.6(41.9,76.7) (23.2,103)
Negative15(45.5%)10(33.3%)25(39.7%)Intermittent4(12.1%)4(13.3%)8(12.7%)Chronic14(42.4%)16(53.3%)30(47.6%)	Negative Intermittent Chronic Leeds Criteria pseudomonas status	15(45.5%) 3(9.1%) 15(45.5%)	8(26.7%) 3(10%) 19(63.3%)	23(36.5%) 6(9.5%) 34(54%)
	Negative Intermittent Chronic	15(45.5%) 4(12.1%) 14(42.4%)	10(33.3%) 4(13.3%) 16(53.3%)	25(39.7%) 8(12.7%) 30(47.6%)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1				
2				
3	Subjective adherence			
4				
5	n	23	20	43
6 7	Mean(SD)	65.6(40.1)	67.8(35.4)	66.6(37.6)
8	Median(IQR)	90(20,99)	80(45,99.5)	90(35,99)
9 10	Min,Max	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
10	Simple normative adherence (first 2			
12	weeks)			
13	n	33	31	64
14 15	Mean(SD)	0.5(0)	0.5(0)	0.5(0)
16	Median(IQR)	0.5(0.5,0.5)	0.5(0.5,0.5)	0.5(0.5,0.5)
17	Min,Max	(0.5,0.5)	(0.5,0.5)	(0.5,0.5)
18 19	Treatment Burden			
20	Low	10(30.3%)	11(35.5%)	21(32.8%)
21	Medium	16(48.5%)	12(38.7%)	28(43.8%)
23	High	2(6.1%)	5(16.1%)	7(10.9%)
24				
25	Baseline outcome measures			

Baseline outcome measures

Table 5: Baseline outcome measures by treatment arm

	Intervention	Control	Overall
EQ5D-5L			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	0.866(0.121)	0.822(0.151)	0.845(0.137)
Median(IQR)	0.901(0.767,0.951)	0.825(0.737,0.942)	0.872(0.752,0.946)
Min,Max	(0.53,1)	(0.486,1)	(0.486,1)
PAM-13			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	60.4(11.2)	60(13.2)	60.2(12.1)
Median(IQR)	60.6(53.2,67.8)	58.1(48.9,67.8)	60.6(51,67.8)
Min,Max	(36.8,84.8)	(38.1,90.7)	(36.8,90.7)
CHAOS			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	9.8(3.4)	10.1(4)	10(3.7)
Median(IQR)	10(8,11)	10(7,12)	10(8,11)
Min,Max	(4,18)	(4,20)	(4,20)
MAD-3			
n	32	30	62
Mean(SD)	9.8(3.3)	9(3.4)	9.4(3.4)
CHAOS n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max MAD-3 n Mean(SD)	33 9.8(3.4) 10(8,11) (4,18) 32 9.8(3.3)	31 10.1(4) 10(7,12) (4,20) 30 9(3.4)	64 10(3.7) 10(8,11) (4,20) 62 9.4(3.4)

			ылорст	ı	
Median(IQR) Min,Max SRBAI	9(8,12.5 (3,15))	9.5(6,11) (3,15)	9(8,12) (3,15)	
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max GAD-7	33 11.5(4.9 12(8,16) (4,20))	30 10.2(5.6) 9(4,14) (4,20)	63 10.9(5.2) 10(7,15) (4,20)	
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max PHQ-8	33 4.1(4.5) 3(0,5) (0,15)		31 3.8(3.6) 3(1,7) (0,11)	64 3.9(4) 3(0.5,5.5) (0,15)	
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Fable 6: Basel	33 7(4.9) 6(3,12) (0,16) ine CFQR	domains by	31 6.5(5.2) 6(3,8) (0,18) treatment arm	64 6.8(5) 6(3,10.5) (0,18)	
Physical Fund	tioning	Intervention	Control	Overall	
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Emotional Fu	nctioning	33 48.5(34.8) 38(25,88) (0,100)	31 49.2(30.8) 42(17,83) (0,100)	64 48.9(32.7) 42(21,85.5) (0,100)	
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Emotional Fui n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Eating	nctioning	33 48.5(34.8) 38(25,88) (0,100) 33 70.2(21.1) 67(53,93) (27,100)	31 49.2(30.8) 42(17,83) (0,100) 31 62.3(26.1) 67(40,80) (7,100)	64 48.9(32.7) 42(21,85.5) (0,100) 64 66.4(23.8) 67(53,87) (7,100)	
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Emotional Fui n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Eating n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Social Functio	nctioning	33 48.5(34.8) 38(25,88) (0,100) 33 70.2(21.1) 67(53,93) (27,100) 33 79.9(24.8) 89(67,100) (0,100)	31 49.2(30.8) 42(17,83) (0,100) 31 62.3(26.1) 67(40,80) (7,100) 31 74.6(27.7) 78(56,100) (0,100)	64 48.9(32.7) 42(21,85.5) (0,100) 64 64.66.4(23.8) 67(53,87) (7,100) 64 77.3(26.2) 89(61.5,100) (0,100)	

Mean(SD) 65(20.3) 59.6(26.2) 62.4(23.3) Median(IQR) 67(50,78) 61(44,83) 67(44,83) Min,Max (17,100) (11,100) (11,100) Body Image - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 68.5(27.3) 64.9(31.7) 66.7(29.3) Median(IQR) 78(56.89) 67(44,100) 78(44,89) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) Treatment Burden - - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) Median(IQR) 44(44,67) 56(33,76) 50(44.67) Min,Max (1,178) (0,100) (0,100) Paen(SD) 53.5(27.5) 56(33,78) 56(33,78) Median(IQR) 50(33,78) 56(33,78) 56(33,78) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) Digestion n 33 31 64 Mean(SD)	Page 161 of 197			BMJ Open	
Mean(SD) 65(20.3) 59.6(26.2) 62.4(23.3) Median(IQR) 67(50.78) 61(44.83) 67(44.83) Min,Max (17,100) (11,100) (11,100) Body Image - - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 68.5(27.3) 64.4(31.7) 66.7(29.3) Median(IQR) 78(56.89) 67(44.100) 78(44.89) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) Treatment Burden - - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) Median(IQR) 44(44.67) 56(33.76) 50(44.67) Min,Max (11.76) (0,100) (0,100) Respiratory - - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50.3(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) Median(IQR) 79(67.89) 80.4(26.4) 79.1(21.9) Median(IQR)	1				
Mean(SD) 65(20.3) 59.6(26.2) 62.4(23.3) Median(ICR) 67(50.78) 61(44,83) 67(44,83) Min,Max (17100) (11100) (11100) Body Image (11100) (11100) (11100) N 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 68.5(27.3) 64.9(31.7) 66.7(29.3) Median(IQR) 78(56.89) 67(44.100) 78(44.89) Min,Max (0.100) (0.100) (0.100) Treatment Burden (1178) 66(35.67) 51(21.4) Median(IQR) 44(44.67) 56(33.67) 50(44.67) Min,Max (11.78) (0.100) (0.100) Respiratory 7 N 33 31 64 Median(IQR) 53.5(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) Median(IQR) 50(33.78) Median(IQR) 50(33.78) 65(33.78) 65(33.78) 64 111111111111111111111111111111111111	2				
Machan (LOR) Gr (20.78) Gr (44.83) Gr (44.83) Min,Max (17,100) (11,100) (11,100) Body Image	3	Mean(SD)	65(20.3)	59 6(26 2)	62 4(23 3)
Metanif(CaR) Of (30, 7) Of (44, 33) Min,Max (17, 100) (11, 100) (11, 100) Body Image n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 68, 5(27, 3) 64, 9(31, 7) 66, 7(29, 3) Median(IQR) 78, (65, 89) 67(44, 100) 78, (44, 89) Min,Max (0, 100) (0, 100) (0, 100) Treatment Burden n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50, 5(16, 5) 51, 6(25, 9) 51(21, 4) Median(IQR) 44(44, 67) 56(33, 67) 50(44, 67) Median(IQR) 44(44, 67) 56(33, 78) 50(44, 67) Median(IQR) 44(44, 67) 56(33, 78) 50(44, 67) Median(IQR) 50, 5(1, 75) 54(27, 3) 53, 7(27, 2) Mean(SD) 53, 5(27, 5) 54(27, 3) 53, 7(27, 2) Mean(SD) 77, 9(16, 9) 80, 4(2, 64) 79, 1(21, 9) Mean(SD) 77, 9(16, 9) 80, 4(2, 64) 79, 1(21, 9) Mean(SD) 77, 9(16, 9) 80, 78, 100)	4	Modian(IOP)	67(50,78)	61(44.93)	67(11 82)
Min.Max (17,100) (11,100) (11,100) 8 Body Image n 33 31 64 9 n 33 31 64.9(31.7) 66.7(29.3) 12 Median(IQR) 78(56.89) 67(44.100) 78(44.89) 13 Min.Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) 14 Min.Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) 15 Treatment Burden n 33 31 64 16 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) 16 Mean(IQR) 44(44.67) 56(33.67) 50(44.67) 17 Min.Max (11,78) (0,100) (0,100) 16 Mean(IQR) 53.5(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) 17 Mean(IQR) 50(33.78) 56(33.78) 56(33.78) 18 n 33 31 64 19 Median(IQR) 78(67.89) 89(78.100) 80(67.100) 10 Median	5		07(30,78)	01(44,03)	07(44,63)
Body Imagen333164n333164.729.3Median(QR)78(56,89) $67(44,100)$ 78(44,89)Min.Max(0,100)(0,100)(0,100)Treatment Burdenn333164Mean(SD)60.5(16.5)51.6(25.9)51(21.4)Median(IQR)44(44,67)56(33,67)50(44,67)Min.Max(11,78)(0,100)(0,100)Respiratoryn333164Median(IQR)50(37,78)56(33,78)Median(IQR)53.5(27.5)54(27.3)Aman S33164Min.Max(0,100)(6,100)Digestion-n333164Min.Max(0,100)(6,100)Digestion-n333164Min.Max(0,100)(0,100)Min.Max(0,100)(0,100)Median(IQR)77.9(16.9)80.4(26.4)Min.Max(0,100)(0,100)Min.Max(0,100)(0,100)Median(IQR)75.8(33)67(42.83)Median(IQR)65.2(24.3)64(25.9)Aman SD3164Median(IQR)65.2(24.3)64(25.9)Median(IQR)65.2(24.3)67(50.83)Min.Max(0,100)(0,100)Median(IQR)65.2(24.3)64(25.9)Median(IQR)3331Aman SD3164 <t< td=""><td>7</td><td></td><td>(17,100)</td><td>(11,100)</td><td>(11,100)</td></t<>	7		(17,100)	(11,100)	(11,100)
9 n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 68.5(27.3) 64.9(31.7) 66.7(29.3) Median(IQR) 78(56.89) 67(44.10) 78(44.89) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) Treatment Burden - - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51/21.4) Median(IQR) 44(44.67) 56(3.37) 50(44.67) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) Meanis(IQR) 53.5(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) Meanis(IQR) 50(3.378) 56(33.78) 56(33.78) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) 10 Digestion - - - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 77.9(16.9) 80.4(26.4) 79.1(21.9) Meanis(IQR) 78(67.89) 89(67.100) - Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) - Min,Max </td <td>8</td> <td>Body Image</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	8	Body Image			
10 Mean(SD) 68.5(27.3) 64.9(31.7) 66.7(29.3) 12 Median(IQR) 78(56.89) 67(44,100) 78(44,89) 13 Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) 14 max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) 15 reatment Burden	9	n	33	31	64
Incent(CP) OBJ(56,89) OF(4,100) 78(44,89) III Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) 78(44,89) III Nim,Max (0,100) (0,100) 78(44,89) III n 33 31 64 III Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) Median(ICR) 44(44.67) 56(33,67) 50(44.67) III Min,Max (11,78) (0,100) (0,100) III Min,Max (11,78) (0,100) (0,100) III Nam,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) III Nam,Max (0,100) (6,100) (0,100) III n 33 31 64 III n 33 31 64 IIII n 33 31 64 IIII n 33 31 64 IIIII n 33 31 64 IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	10	Mean(SD)	68 5(27 3)	64 9(31 7)	66 7(29 3)
International (ICR) 76(35,35) 67(44,100) 76(44,53) Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) Treatment Burden n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) Median(IQR) 44(44,67) 56(33,67) 50(44,67) Min,Max (11,78) (0,100) (0,100) Respiratory - - - n 33 31 64 Main,Max (0,100) (0,100) - n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 53.5(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) Median(IQR) 50(33,78) 56(33,78) 56(33,78) Jigestion - - - - n 33 31 64 - Mean(SD) 77.9(16.9) 80.4(26.4) 79.1(21.9) - Median(IQR) 78(67.89) 89(78,100) 89(67,100) - Median(IQR) 67(50,83)	11	Median(UOP)	79/56 90)	67(44,100)	79(44.90)
Min, Max (0,100) (0,100) (0,100) Treatment Burden n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) Median(IQR) 44(44.67) 56(33.67) 50(44.67) Min, Max (11,78) (0,100) (0,100) Respiratory	12		70(00,09)	67 (44, 100)	70(44,69)
15 Treatment Burden 17 n 33 31 64 18 Mean(SD) 50.5(16.5) 51.6(25.9) 51(21.4) 19 Median(IQR) 44(44.67) 56(33.67) 50(44.67) 21 Min,Max (11,78) (0.100) (0.100) 22 Respiratory - - - 23 Mean(SD) 53.5(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) 24 n 33 31 64 25 Mean(SD) 50(33.78) 66(33.78) 56(33.78) 26 Min,Max (0,100) (0,100) 0.100) 27 Median(IQR) 78(67.89) 89(78.100) 89(67.100) 28 Min,Max (44,100) (0,100) 0.100) 29 n 33 31 64 31 n 33 31 64 32 Mean(SD) 65.2(24.3) 64(25.9) 67(42.83) 34 Median(IQR) 6	14	Min,Max	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	15	Treatment Burden			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	16	n	33	31	64
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	17	Mean(SD)	50 5(16 5)	51 6(25 9)	51(21 4)
Min,Max 44(44,07) 50(35,07) 50(44,07) Min,Max (11,78) (0,100) (0,100) Respiratory n 33 31 64 Mean(SD) 53,5(27.5) 54(27.3) 53.7(27.2) Median(IQR) 50(33,78) 56(33,78) 56(33,78) Digestion 0,100) (6,100) (0,100) Mean(SD) 77.9(16.9) 80.4(26.4) 79.1(21.9) Median(IQR) 78(67,89) 89(78,100) 89(67,100) Min,Max (44,100) (0,100) (0,100) Mean(SD) 65.2(24.3) 64(25.9) 64.6(24.9) Min,Max (0,100) (8,100) (0,100) Mean(SD) 65.2(24.3) 64(25.9) 64.6(24.9) Min,Max (0,100) (8,100) (0,100) Min,Max (0,100) (8,100) (0,100) Mean(SD) 65.2(24.3) 64(25.9) 64.6(24.9) Min,Max (0,100) (8,100) (0,100) Min,Max (0,100)	19	Median(IOP)	44(44,67)	56(22.67)	51(21.7)
21Min,Max(11,78)(0,100)(0,100) 22 Respiratory 24 n333164 25 Mean(SD)53.5(27.5)54(27.3)53.7(27.2) 26 Median(IQR)50(33.78)56(33.78)56(33.78) 27 Median(IQR)50(33.78)56(33.78)56(33.78) 28 Min,Max(0,100)(6,100)(0,100) 29 Digestion(0,100)(0,100) 20 Digestion77.9(16.9)80.4(26.4)79.1(21.9) 34 Median(IQR)78(67.89)89(78.100)89(67.100) 35 Min,Max(44,100)(0,100)(0,100) 36 Nin,Max(44,100)(0,100)(0,100) 37 Role Functioning $75.2(24.3)$ 64(25.9) 41 Median(IQR)65.2(24.3)64(25.9)64.6(24.9) 41 Median(IQR)67(50.83)67(42.83)67(50.83) 42 Mean(SD)65.2(28.4)40.6(22)39.2(22.3) 44 Mean(SD)37.8(22.8)40.6(22)39.2(22.3) 44 Mean(SD)37.8(22.8)40.6(22)39.2(22.3) 44 Mean(SD)33.0(7,50)42(25,58) 50 Min,Max(8,92)(0,75)(0,92) 44 Mean(SD)47.8(27.7)51.6(24.9)49.6(26.3) 56 Mean(IQR)47.8(27.7)51.6(24.9)49.6(26.3) 56 Mean(IQR)47.8(27.7)51.6(24.9)49.6(26.3)	20		44(44,07)	50(55,67)	50(44,87)
22 23Respiratory24n33316425 26Mean(SD) $53.5(27.5)$ $54(27.3)$ $53.7(27.2)$ 27 27 27Median(IQR) $50(33.78)$ $56(33.78)$ $56(33.78)$ 28 29 30Min,Max(0,100)(6,100)(0,100)29 30Digestion31 31n3331 64 33Mean(SD)77.9(16.9) $80.4(26.4)$ $79.1(21.9)$ 34 34 35Median(IQR) $78(67.89)$ $89(67,100)$ 35 36 37 37Min,Max(44,100)(0,100)36 37n3331 64 40 40 41Median(IQR) $67(50.83)$ $67(50.83)$ 41 42 43Median(IQR) $67(50.83)$ $67(50.83)$ 42 44 45n3331 64 44 45 46 47 46n33 31 64 47 46 47 48 49 49 40 40 $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(9,92)$ 48 49 49 40 40 40 41 $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(9,92)$ 49 40 40 41 $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(9,92)$ 41 45 46n33 31 64 47 46 47 48 49 40 40 41 $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(9,92)$ 48 49 40 40 41 $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(9,92)$ 49 40 40 40 41 $(0,100)$ $(0,92)$ 41 45 4610 40<	21	Min,Max	(11,78)	(0,100)	(0,100)
22 222	22	Respiratory			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	23	n	33	31	64
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	25	Mean(SD)	53 5(27 5)	54(27.3)	53 7(27 2)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	26	Median(IOP)	50(22.78)	56(22.79)	56(22.79)
25Min,Max $(0,100)$ $(0,100)$ $(0,100)$ $(0,100)$ 29Digestion31n33316432Mean(SD)77.9(16.9) $80.4(26.4)$ $79.1(21.9)$ 34Median(IQR)78(67.89) $89(78,100)$ $89(67,100)$ 35Min,Max $(44,100)$ $(0,100)$ $(0,100)$ 36Role Functioning $71.9(16.9)$ $89(67,100)$ 37Role Functioning $71.9(16.9)$ $61.2(24.3)$ $64.2(24.9)$ 39n3331 64 40Mean(SD) $65.2(24.3)$ $64(25.9)$ $64.6(24.9)$ 41Median(IQR) $67(50.83)$ $67(42.83)$ $67(50.83)$ 42Min,Max $(0,100)$ $(8,100)$ $(0,100)$ 43Min,Max $(0,100)$ $(8,100)$ $(0,100)$ 44Vitality $71.8(22.8)$ $40.6(22)$ $39.2(22.3)$ 46n $33(17.50)$ $42(25,58)$ $42(25,58)$ 50Min,Max $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(0,92)$ 49Median(IQR) $33(17.50)$ $42(25,58)$ 50Min,Max $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(0,92)$ 51Health Perceptions $71.6(24.9)$ $49.6(26.3)$ 52Mean(SD) $47.8(27.7)$ $51.6(24.9)$ $44(33.67)$	27		50(33,78)	50(33,78)	(0.4.00)
Digestion31n33316432Mean(SD)77.9(16.9) $80.4(26.4)$ $79.1(21.9)$ 33Median(IQR) $78(67.89)$ $89(78,100)$ $89(67,100)$ 34Median(IQR) $78(67.89)$ $89(78,100)$ $89(67,100)$ 35Min,Max(44,100) $(0,100)$ $(0,100)$ 36m33316437Role Functioning $77(50.83)$ $64(25.9)$ $64.6(24.9)$ 38n33 31 64 40Mean(SD) $67(50.83)$ $67(42.83)$ $67(50.83)$ 41Median(IQR) $67(50.83)$ $67(42.83)$ $67(50.83)$ 43Min,Max $(0,100)$ $(8,100)$ $(0,100)$ 44Vitality $78.6(22.8)$ $40.6(22)$ $39.2(22.3)$ 46n33 31 64 47Mean(SD) $37.8(22.8)$ $40.6(22)$ $39.2(22.3)$ 48Median(IQR) $33(17,50)$ $42(25,58)$ $42(25,58)$ 50Min,Max $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(0,92)$ 51Heatth Perceptions $51.6(24.9)$ $49.6(26.3)$ 52n 33 31 64 53n 33 31 64 54Mean(SD) $47.8(27.7)$ $51.6(24.9)$ $49.6(26.3)$ 55Median(IQR) $44(22.67)$ $56(33.67)$ $44(33.67)$	28 29		(0, 100)	(6,100)	(0,100)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	30	Digestion			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	31	n	33	31	64
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	32	Mean(SD)	77 9(16 9)	80 4(26 4)	79 1(21 9)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	33	Modian(IOP)	78(67.80)	80(78 100)	89(67,100)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	35		10(01,09)	(0, 4, 00)	(0.4.00)
37Role Functioning 38 39 n 33 31 64 40 Mean(SD) $65.2(24.3)$ $64(25.9)$ $64.6(24.9)$ 41 Median(IQR) $67(50,83)$ $67(42,83)$ $67(50,83)$ 42 42 Min,Max $(0,100)$ $(8,100)$ $(0,100)$ 44 Vitality 45 $7.8(22.8)$ $40.6(22)$ $39.2(22.3)$ 49 Median(IQR) $33(17,50)$ $42(25,58)$ 49 Median(IQR) $33(17,50)$ $42(25,58)$ 50 Min,Max $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(0,92)$ 51 Health Perceptions 51 64 55 Mean(SD) $47.8(27.7)$ $51.6(24.9)$ $49.6(26.3)$ 56 Median(IQR) $44(22.67)$ $56(33.67)$ $44(33.67)$	36		(44,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	37	Role Functioning			
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	38	n	33	31	64
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	40	Mean(SD)	65.2(24.3)	64(25.9)	64.6(24.9)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	41	Median(IOR)	67(50.83)	67(42.83)	67(50.83)
43 Min, Max (0, 100) (0, 100) (0, 100) 44 Vitality 5 5 1 46 n 33 31 64 47 Mean(SD) 37.8(22.8) 40.6(22) 39.2(22.3) 48 Median(IQR) 33(17,50) 42(25,58) 42(25,58) 50 Min, Max (8,92) (0,75) (0,92) 51 Health Perceptions 5 5 Mean(SD) 33 31 64 52 N 33 31 64 5 56 Median(IQR) 44(22,67) 51.6(24.9) 49.6(26.3) 56 Median(IQR) 44(22,67) 56(33,67) 44(33,67)	42	Min Mox	(0,100)	(9 100)	(0.100)
44Vitality45n33316446n37.8(22.8) $40.6(22)$ $39.2(22.3)$ 48Median(IQR) $33(17,50)$ $42(25,58)$ $42(25,58)$ 50Min,Max $(8,92)$ $(0,75)$ $(0,92)$ 51Health Perceptions5250N53n33316454Mean(SD) $47.8(27.7)$ $51.6(24.9)$ $49.6(26.3)$ 56Median(IQR) $44(22.67)$ $56(33.67)$ $44(33.67)$	43		(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
46n33316447Mean(SD)37.8(22.8)40.6(22)39.2(22.3)48Median(IQR)33(17,50)42(25,58)42(25,58)50Min,Max(8,92)(0,75)(0,92)51Health Perceptions	44 45	Vitality			
47 Mean(SD) 37.8(22.8) 40.6(22) 39.2(22.3) 48 Median(IQR) 33(17,50) 42(25,58) 42(25,58) 50 Min,Max (8,92) (0,75) (0,92) 51 Health Perceptions	46	n	33	31	64
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	47	Mean(SD)	37.8(22.8)	40.6(22)	39.2(22.3)
49 Modula (Ref.) 60(11,60) 12(20,60) 12(20,60) 50 Min,Max (8,92) (0,75) (0,92) 51 Health Perceptions	48	Median(IQR)	33(17 50)	42(25,58)	42(25 58)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	49	Min Max	(8.92)	(0.75)	(0.92)
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	51	Hoalth Daraantiana	(0,02)	(0,10)	
53 n 33 31 64 54 Mean(SD) 47.8(27.7) 51.6(24.9) 49.6(26.3) 56 Median(IQR) 44(22.67) 56(33.67) 44(33.67)	52	nealin Perceptions			
54 Mean(SD) 47.8(27.7) 51.6(24.9) 49.6(26.3) 56 Median(IQR) 44(22.67) 56(33.67) 44(33.67)	53	n	33	31	64
56 Median(IQR) 44(22.67) 56(33.67) 44(33.67)	54	Mean(SD)	47.8(27.7)	51.6(24.9)	49.6(26.3)
	55 56	Median(IQR)	44(22.67)	56(33.67)	44(33.67)
57	57				······································
58	58				
59 For peer review only - http://bmionen.bmi.com/site/about/quidelines.yhtml	59	For near re	view only - http:/	/hmionen.hmi	com/site/about/quidelines.yhtml

Min,Max Weight	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)			
n	33	31	64			
Mean(SD)	70.7(36.1)	63.4(39.8)	67.2(37.9)			
Median(IQR)	100(33,100)	67(33,100)	83.5(33,100)			
Min,Max	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)			
Table 7: Baseline COM-BMQ domains by treatment arm						

	Intervention	Control	Overall
COM BMQ Necessities			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	3.2(0.7)	3.4(0.8)	3.3(0.8)
Median(IQR)	3.1(2.7,3.7)	3.3(2.9,4.1)	3.1(2.7,4)
Min,Max	(2,4.9)	(2,4.7)	(2,4.9)
COM BMQ Concerns			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	2.1(0.6)	2.1(0.6) 2.2(0.6)	
Median(IQR)	2.1(1.5,2.6)	1(1.5,2.6) 2.1(1.7,2.6)	
Min,Max	(1.2,3.4)	(1.1,3.3)	(1.1,3.4)

Primary Analysis

- In total, there were 79 exacerbations in participants followed up for at least 6 months
- Of these, 60 exacerbations fitted our criteria to be included in the primary analysis
 - 18 were not treated with IV antibiotics
 - 1 did not meet any Fuchs criteria
- A total of 60 participants had at least 6 months of exacerbation data (Intervention=32, Control =28)
- 4 participants were excluded
 - 2 died (Control=2)
 - 1 withdrew consent (Control=1)
 - 1 lost to follow up before 6 months (Intervention=1)
- 35 exacerbations occurred in Intervention participants, 25 occurred in Control participants
- 33 participants experienced at least 1 exacerbation (Intervention= 19 (60%), Control= 14 (50%))

The most frequently reported Fuchs criteria (Table 9) were 'Increased cough' (n=52) and 'Change in sputum (n=48). The median number of Fuchs criteria reported per exacerbation included in the primary analysis was 4 (IQR=4,6).

The median IV course length of exacerbations included in the primary analysis was 14 days in both the intervention and usual care arm (Table 12).

BMJ Open

As ACtiF was a pilot study, it was not powered to detect an intervention effect. However, differences between treatment arms and their 95% confidence intervals have been calculated (Table 13). The median number of exacerbations was 1 in the intervention arm and 0.5 in the usual care arm. Following adjustment for site and the number of IV days in the previous year, adjusted IRR was 1.12 (95% CI: 0.658-1.94). This demonstrates a small increase in exacerbations in the intervention arm, however the confidence intervals are relatively wide. The IRR from the offset model shows an IRR of 0.958 (95% CI: 0.615,1.5). Here, a small decrease in exacerbations can be observed. As with the previous model, the confidence interval is relatively wide.

to occurrent only

BMJ Open







Figure 2: The number of exacerbations in participants by treatment arm in 6 months [n=60]

Fuchs Criteria

Table 8: The number of each Fuchs criterion in the exacerbations used as the primary outcome

5				primary cateorne
6 7 8 9 10 11		n (%) for exacerbations in 6 months after consent and meeting our criteria (primary outcome)	n (%) for exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics and met at least one Fuchs criteria	n (%) for any exacerbation during the study
12 13	Change in sputum	48 (80 %)	63 (77.8 %)	69 (69 %)
14 15	New or increased hemoptysis	12 (20 %)	15 (18.5 %)	16 (16 %)
16	Increased cough	52 (86.7 %)	70 (86.4 %)	77 (77 %)
17	Increased dyspnea	43 (71.7 %)	56 (69.1 %)	61 (61 %)
19 20	Malaise, fatigue, or lethargy	48 (80%)	66 (81.5 %)	69 (69 %)
21 22 23	Temperature above 38 °C	13 (21.7 %)	18 (22.2 %)	20 (20 %)
24	Anorexia or weight loss	20 (33.3 %)	30 (37 %)	31 (31 %)
25 26	Sinus pain or tenderness	13 (21.7 %)	19 (23.5 %)	21 (21 %)
27 28 29	Change in sinus discharge	13 (21.7 %)	21 (25.9 %)	22 (22 %)
30 31 32 33	Change in physical examination of the chest, derived from notes by site staff.	9 (15 %)	12 (14.8 %)	13 (13 %)
34 35 36 37 38 39 40	Decrease in pulmonary function by 10 percent or more from a previously recorded value, derived from notes by site staff	12 (20 %)	17 (21 %)	19 (19 %)
41 42 43 44 45	Radiographic changes indicative of pulmonary infection, derived from notes by site staff)	2 (3.3 %)	2 (2.5 %)	2 (2 %)

Table 9:Summary of Fuchs criteria for the exacerbations that were included in the primary outcome (IV days and at least 1 Fuchs criteria in 6 month follow up period

Description	
Exacerbations included in primary analysis	
n (%) with IV and at least 1 Fuchs	60 (60 %)
Mean (SD) number of Fuchs criteria	4.8(2.1)
Median (IQR) number of Fuchs criteria	4(4,6)
Min, max number of Fuchs criteria	(1,10)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 2 Fuchs criteria	58 (96.7 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 3 Fuchs criteria	48 (80 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 4 Fuchs criteria	46 (76.7 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 5 Fuchs criteria	29 (48.3 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 6 Fuchs criteria	20 (33.3 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 7 Fuchs criteria	12 (20 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 8 Fuchs criteria	8 (13.3 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 9 Fuchs criteria	3 (5 %)
n (%) of exacerbations with at least 10 Fuchs criteria	1 (1.7 %)

Table 10:Summary of the exacerbations in the 6 month follow up period that were not included in the primary outcome (IV days and at least 1 Fuchs criteria) and the reasons for exclusion

Exacerbations in 6 months not meeting criteria for primary outcome

Total exacerbations excluded	19 (24 %)
n (%) with IV days but no Fuchs criteria met	1(1%)
n (%) with no IV but at least 1 Fuchs	7 (8 %)
n (%) no IV days or Fuchs recorded (missing values)	11 (14 %)

Length of IV course



Figure 3: The length on IV courses by treatment arm

Analysis models

6 month model

Table 12:Analysis of the primary clinical outcome, the number of exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics with at least 1 Fuchs criteria in a 6 month period adjusted for site and the number of IV days in the previous year.

	Intervention n	Mean (SD)	Median (IQR)	Control n	Mean (SD)	Median (IQR)	IRR	95% CI
Unadjusted	32	1.1(1.1)	1(0,2)	28	0.9(1.1)	0.5 (0 , 2)	1.22	(0.686,2.21)
Adjusted							1.12	(0.658,1.94)

Offset model

Table 13:A sensitivity analysis using all exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics with at least 1 Fuchs criteria that occurred during the study with the number of days of data collection included as an offset in the model. Adjusted for site and number of IV days in the previous year

	Interventio n n	Total exacerbations (min,max)	Mean (SD) days followed up	Mean (SD) exacerbation s per month	Contro I n	Total exacerbation s (min,max)	Mean (SD) days followed up	Mean (SD) exacerbatio ns per month	IRR	95% CI
Adjusted, Offset model	33	46(0,5)	263.2(47.2	0.17(0.16)	31	40(0,5)	250.5(74.8	0.2(0.28)	0.958	(0.615,1.5
		For peer	review only - htt	p://bmjopen.bmj.c	com/site/ab	out/guidelines.xht	ml			

 BMJ Open

Secondary analysis

Tables 15-16 show the results of the secondary analyses. As this is a pilot study, we have not powered to detect any effect. Key results are described below.

- Adjusted mean difference of 5% (95% CI: -2-12%) in FEV % predicted. This is an encouraging difference in the intervention arm.
- No notable differences in any of the other secondary outcomes but this is not of great concern as it is a pilot study.
- Fewer participants had BMI recorded than other outcomes (Intervention=18, Control=15).
- Small reduction in BMQ Concerns score in intervention arm (Mean difference=-0.21, 95% CI: -0.38, -0.048).

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the secondary outcome measures at baseline and follow up by treatment arm.

Table 14:Results of secondary effectiveness analysis

	n Intervention	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	n Control	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	Mean Diff	95% CI
FEV1 Unadjusted	30	1.8(1.17,2.83)	2(0.9)	27	1.9(1.46,2.83)	2.2(1)	-0.21	(-0.73,0.3)
FEV1 Adjusted							0.22	(-0.062,0.51)
FEV1 % Unadjusted	30	51.8(33.46,71.26)	54.2(21.1)	27	50.9(42.49,77.97)	59(23.9)	-4.8	(-17,7.1)
FEV1 % Adjusted							5	(-2,12)
BMI Unadjusted BMI Adjusted	18	20.5(19.5,26)	22.1(4.2)	15	23.4(20.7,26.2) =	23.8(3.5)	-1.7 -0.08	(-4.5,1.1) (-1,0.89)
EQ5D-5L Unadjusted EQ5D-5L Adjusted	31	0.9(0.76,0.95)	0.9(0.2)	27	0.9(0.77,1)	0.9(0.2)	- 0.00062 -0.016	(- 0.084,0.083) (- 0.087,0.055)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

2									
3 4 5	PAM-13 Unadjusted	31	63.1(51,67.8)	58.5(14.3)	28	58.1(51,63.1)	57.9(9.9)	0.56	(-5.9,7)
6 7	PAM-13 Adjusted							0.046	(-5.8,5.9)
8 9	CHAOS Unadjusted	31	9(7,13)	9.9(3.9)	28	9(7.5,11.5)	9.4(3.3)	0.55	(-1.4,2.4)
10 11 12	CHAOS Adjusted							0.79	(-0.47,2.1)
13 14	MAD-3 Unadjusted	31	12(9,13)	10.8(3.9)	26	9.5(7,13)	9.4(3.6)	1.4	(-0.58,3.4)
15 16	MAD-3 Adjusted							0.82	(-0.51,2.1)
17 18 19	SRBAI Unadjusted	31	13(8,16)	12.1(5.3)	28	10.5(6,15.5)	10.6(5)	1.4	(-1.3,4.1)
20	SRBAI Adjusted							0.15	(-1.8,2.1)
22 23	GAD-7 Unadjusted	31	3(1,6)	4.1(4.1)	28	2.5(0,7)	4.2(4.4)	-0.05	(-2.3,2.2)
24 25 26	GAD-7 Adjusted							-0.31	(-1.9,1.3)
27 28	PHQ-8 Unadjusted	31	7(4,12)	7.3(5.2)	28	4(1.5,7)	5.3(5.1)	2	(-0.68,4.7)
29 30	PHQ-8 Adjusted							0.97	(-0.96,2.9)
32 33	COM-BMQ Concerns	31	2(1.5,2.3)	1.9(0.5)	27	2.1(1.9,2.4)	2.1(0.5)	-0.22	(-0.48,0.026)
35 36 37	COM-BMQ Concerns Adjusted							-0.21	(-0.38,- 0.048)
38 39 40 41	COM BMQ Necessities Unadjusted	31	3.4(3,4)	3.5(0.6)	27	3.4(2.9,4)	3.5(0.7)	0.011	(-0.35,0.37)
42 43 44	-			h.u., //l . *					
45 46			For peer review only -	http://bmjope	n.bmj.com/	site/about/guidelines.xl	ntml		

 BMJ Open

	rv affactivanass	sanalusis					_	(5.10,0.
	n Intervention	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	n Control	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	Mean Diff	95%
sical	31	54(25,88)	54.4(31.6)	28	62.5(33,92)	60.9(31.2)	-6.4	(-23,
sical Adjusted							-2.6	(-13,
tional State	31	67(53,93)	68.3(23.4)	28	73(56.5,90)	72.3(22.7)	-4	(-16,
tional State							-7.7	(- 16,0
ng Unadjusted ng Adjusted	31	89(67,100)	80.7(21.6)	28	83.5(67,100)	79.9(20.7)	0.85 1.1	(-10 (-6.5
al Unadjusted al Adjusted	31	67(56,78)	65.4(15.8)	28	64(50,83)	66.4(20.9)	-1 -3.7	(-11, (-10,
y Image	31	78(67,89)	73.3(23.8)	28	78(56,100)	73.1(25.5)	0.19	(-13
y Image							0.62	(-7.2
tment Burden	31	56(44,67)	56.5(16.6)	28	56(44,67)	57.3(19.9)	-0.83	(-10
itment Burden							1.2	(-6.4
piratory	31	67(44,78)	59.5(25.2)	27	67(50,83)	65.6(22.7)	-6.1	(-19
piratory							-4.4	(-14
	sical sical Adjusted otional State otional State ng Unadjusted ng Adjusted ial Unadjusted ial Adjusted y Image y Image atment Burden atment Burden piratory piratory	intervention sical Adjusted ational State 31 otional State 31 otional State 31 ial Unadjusted 31 ial Adjusted 31 ial Adjusted 31 y Image 31 y Image 31 atment Burden 31 atment Burden 31 piratory 31 piratory 31	Intervention(IQR)sical3154(25,88)sical Adjusted3167(53,93)otional State3189(67,100)ng Unadjusted3167(56,78)ial Unadjusted3167(56,78)ial Adjusted3178(67,89)y Image3156(44,67)atment Burden3167(44,78)piratory3167(44,78)piratory5050For peer review only - http://	Intervention (IQR) (SD) sical 31 54(25,88) 54.4(31.6) sical Adjusted 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) otional State 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) otional State 31 89(67,100) 80.7(21.6) ng Unadjusted 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) ial Unadjusted 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) ial Adjusted 31 78(67,89) 73.3(23.8) y Image 31 56(44,67) 56.5(16.6) atment Burden 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) piratory 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2)	Intervention (IQR) (SD) Control sical 31 54(25,88) 54.4(31.6) 28 sical Adjusted 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 otional State 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 ing Unadjusted 31 89(67,100) 80.7(21.6) 28 ing Adjusted 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 ial Adjusted 31 78(67,89) 73.3(23.8) 28 y Image 31 56(44,67) 56.5(16.6) 28 atment Burden 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 piratory 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27	Intervention (IQR) (SD) Control (IQR) sical 31 54(25,88) 54.4(31.6) 28 62.5(33,92) sical Adjusted 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 73(56.5,90) otional State 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 73(56.5,90) otional State 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 83.5(67,100) ng Unadjusted 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 64(50,83) ial Unadjusted 31 78(67,89) 73.3(23.8) 28 78(56,100) y Image 31 56(44,67) 56.5(16.6) 28 56(44,67) atment Burden 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 67(50,83) piratory 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 67(50,83)	Intervention (ICR) (SD) Control (ICR) (SD) sical 31 54(25,88) 54.4(31.6) 28 62.5(33,92) 60.9(31.2) sical Adjusted 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 73(56.5,90) 72.3(22.7) otional State 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 73(56.5,90) 72.3(22.7) otional State 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 83.5(67,100) 79.9(20.7) ng Adjusted 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 64(50,83) 66.4(20.9) ial Adjusted 31 78(67,89) 73.3(23.8) 28 78(56,100) 73.1(25.5) y Image 31 56(44,67) 56.5(16.6) 28 56(44,67) 57.3(19.9) atment Burden 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 67(50,83) 65.6(22.7) piratory 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 67(50,83) 65.6(22.7)	Intervention (IQK) (SD) Control (IQK) (SD) Diff sical 31 54(25,88) 54.4(31.6) 28 62.5(33,92) 60.9(31.2) -6.4 sical Adjusted 31 67(53,93) 68.3(23.4) 28 73(56.5,90) 72.3(22.7) -4 otional State 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 83.5(67,100) 79.9(20.7) 0.85 ng Adjusted 31 67(56,78) 65.4(15.8) 28 64(50,83) 66.4(20.9) -1 ial Adjusted 31 78(67,89) 73.3(23.8) 28 78(56,100) 73.1(25.5) 0.19 y Image 31 56(44,67) 56.5(16.6) 28 56(44,67) 57.3(19.9) -0.83 atment Burden 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 67(50,83) 65.6(22.7) -6.1 piratory 31 67(44,78) 59.5(25.2) 27 67(50,83) 65.6(22.7) -6.1

CFQ-R Digestion Unadjusted CFQ-R Digestion Adjusted	31	89(67,100)	81.1(18.4)	27	89(78,100)	84.4(23.5)	-3.3 -2.3	(-14,7.7) (-11,6.2)
CFQ-R Role Unadjusted CFQ-R Role Adjusted	31	75(33,83)	64.8(26.1)	27	75(56,92)	70.3(21.5)	-5.6 -8.2	(-18,7.1) (-17,0.4)
CFQ-R Vital Unadjusted CFQ-R Vital Adjusted	31	42(25,42)	38.5(19.5)	28	50(33,62.5)	48.7(23)	-10 -7	(- 21,0.81) (- 15 0 99)
CFQ-R Health Unadjusted CFQ-R Health Adjusted	31	44(22,67)	45.5(25.4)	28	61.5(33,72.5)	56.8(27.6)	-11 -6.5	(-25,2.6) (-16,2.8)
CFQ-R Weight Unadjusted CFQ-R Weight Adjusted	31	89(67,100)	81.1(18.4)	27	89(78,100)	84.4(23.5)	-3.3 -2.3	(-14,7.7) (-11,6.2)



BMJ Open

Figure 4:Box plots showing the distribution of secondary outcomes by treatment arm

BMJ Open

For peer review only

BMJ Open

Adherence to CF medication

During the trial, 8 participants withdrew from adherence data collection (Intervention=4, Control=4). An exact date of withdrawal was not recorded but could be seen from inhalation data (last non zero number of daily inhalations). This has been improved for the main trial and date of adherence data collection withdrawal will be recorded.

Participants who withdrew from adherence data collection were removed from summaries of adherence for 6 months as they did not have 6 months' worth of data. Where possible, inhalation data collected before withdrawal was included in the mean adherence by arm in the monthly table and the plot by week. The number included in each of these estimates can be seen in Table 18.

Table 17 shows the mean adherence by treatment arm for the 6 months post randomisation. Adherence is greater in the intervention arm for each of the different adherence measures. A difference of 10% (95% CI: -5.2 to 25.2) in simple normative adherence with numerator adjustment can be observed in the intervention arm. Table 18 shows the difference in simple normative adherence with numerator adjustment by treatment arm for each individual month in the study. Adherence is greater in the Intervention arm in month 1 (mean difference=2.6, 95% CI: -13.5, 18.6). Following month 1, adherence is consistently higher in the intervention arm with the greatest difference observed in month 5 (mean difference: 13%, 95% CI: -4.8, 30.8). These differences would indicate a potentially clinically important difference between the intervention and usual care arms.

The difference in adherence has been presented by weeks post randomisation in Figure 5. There is a difference in numerator adjusted normative adherence with greater adherence observed in the intervention arm. This difference becomes clear after week 4 which coincides with use of the intervention around week 2-3.

Table 16:Summary of average adherences in 6 months following consent by intervention arm and the difference in means with 95% confidence intervals

	n Intervention	Mean Intervention	n Control	Mean Control	Mean Difference (95% CI)
Baseline (first 2 weeks)	29	25.9(31.4)	26	23.2(29)	2.6(-13.9,19.2)
Total doses	29	222.4(233.1)	26	245.7(238.6)	-23.3(-151.2,104.6)
Unadjusted adherence	29	47.7(33.8)	26	37.7(27.1)	10(-6.5,26.4)
Simple normative	29	45.5(32.8)	26	34.7(27)	10.8(-5.4,27)

Sophisticated normative	29	41.6(33.4)	26	34.2(27.1)	7.5(-8.9,23.9)
Simple normative with numerator adjustment	29	43.6(30.4)	26	33.6(25.9)	10(-5.2,25.2)
Sophisticated normative with numerator adjustment	29	39.9(30.9)	26	33.2(25.9)	6.8(-8.6,22.2)

Table 17:Summary of average adherences in each month from following consent from 1 to 6 months by intervention arm

	n Intervention	Mean Intervention	n Control	Mean Control	Mean Difference (95% CI)
Month 1	32	29.7(34.5)	28	27.2(27.5)	2.6(-13.5,18.6)
Month 2	31	42.1(33.1)	28	33.7(31.5)	8.4(-8.5,25.2)
Month 3	30	42.3(33.7)	28	33.3(34.8)	9(-9,27.1)
Month 4	29	42.7(34.7)	27	34.5(30.5)	8.2(-9.3,25.7)
Month 5	29	42.8(36.2)	27	29.8(30.1)	13(-4.8,30.8)
Month 6	29	41.3(36.5)	27	32.9(28.5)	8.4(-9.1,25.9)
					J.

 BMJ Open



Figure 5:Mean weekly adherence by treatment arm

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

For peer review only
Intervention adherence (Participants)

Table 19 shows the median number of CFHH interactions was 3 (IQR: 1-8). 3 participants had no interactions with CFHH and the maximum number of interactions was 44. The mean total duration of interaction time across the study was 49.3 (SD= 44.8) minutes. The mean length of an interaction by participant was 12.4 (SD=9.6) minutes and the mean length of all interactions was 6.6 (SD=11) minutes. The median number of days in the trial with interactions was 2 (IQR=1,7) by participant. Figure 6 shows the wide range of values across participants, particularly for the total duration of interactions.

Figure 7 shows when interactions occurred in days for each participant. Some participants were interacting fairly regularly, however most participants were inconsistent with their interactions. Figure 8 shows that the 'How am I doing?' pages were the most frequently visited in terms of the total number of clicks during the trial. 30 (90.9%) of participants visited the 'How am I doing?', 'Treatment' and 'Videos' page at least once (Table 20). 224 (91.4%) sessions included a visit to the 'How am I doing?' page.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Table 18:Summary of clicks in CFHH. An interaction is defined as a series of clicks with no greater than a 15 minute lag between clicks

Interactions with CFHH by participant

n	33
Mean (SD)	7.4(11.6)
Median (IQR)	3(1,8)
Min, Max	(0,44)
Total duration of interactions by participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	49.3(44.8)
Median (IQR)	38(26,55)
Min, Max	(0,177)
Mean duration of interactions by participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	12.4(9.6)
Median (IQR)	10.7(4.3,19)
Min, Max	(0.37)
Days with interactions by participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	57(82)
Median (IQR)	2(1.7)
Min. Max	(0.32)
Duration of interactions	
n	245
Mean (SD)	6.6(11)
Median (IQR)	1(0.8)
Min, Max	(0,57)

Page 181 of 197

BMJ Open





For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml







Figure 8: Frequency of clicks by CFHH categories

•			
	Total (%) clicks	Participants (%) with at least one click	Sessions (%) with at least one click
About	24(0.8%)	13(39.4%)	20(8.2%)
Action Plan	177(6.1%)	28(84.8%)	53(21.6%)
Coping Plan	110(3.8%)	24(72.7%)	38(15.5%)
Home	605(20.8%)	30(90.9%)	244(99.6%)
How am I Doing	735(25.2%)	30(90.9%)	224(91.4%)
Planner	189(6.5%)	21(63.6%)	39(15.9%)
Prescription	46(1.6%)	22(66.7%)	42(17.1%)
Problem Solving	197(6.8%)	24(72.7%)	44(18%)
Reward	2(0.1%)	2(6.1%)	2(0.8%)
Terms and Conditions	2(0.1%)	2(6.1%)	2(0.8%)
Toolkit	194(6.7%)	24(72.7%)	66(26.9%)
Treatment	549(18.8%)	30(90.9%)	87(35.5%)
Videos	84(2.9%)	30(90.9%)	62(25.3%)

Table 19:Summary of clicks by page categories in CFHH

1 2		
3 4	Intervention fidelity (Clinicians)	
5 6 7	Table 21 shows the median number with a mean duration of 36.1 (SD=2	of intervention sessions per participant was 3 (IQR= $2,4$) 23.9) minutes.
8 9 10	Table 20:Summary of intervention s study	sessions received by intervention participants during the
11 12	Sessions per participant	
13	n	33
14	Moon (SD)	3(1.6)
15 16	Mean (SD)	3(1.6)
10	Median (IQR)	3(2,4)
18	Min, Max	(0,6)
19	Total time by participant	
20		
21	n	33
22	Mean (SD)	114.2(46.9)
23	Median (IQR)	100.5(90,125)
25	Min. Max	(40.249)
26	Time per session by participant	(10,210)
27	Time per session by participant	
28	n	33
29	Mean (SD)	37.3(14.2)
30 21	Median (IOR)	31 3(28 3 48)
32		(18 CE)
33		(18,05)
34	Time per session	
35	n	99
36	Maan (CD)	
3/		30.1(23.9)
20 20	Median (IQR)	30(15,55)
40	Min, Max	(4,119)
41	Intervention session per participar	nt
42		
43	n	33
44	Mean (SD)	0.9(0.3)
45 46	Median (IQR)	1(1,1)
47	Min, Max	(0,1)
48	Total Intervention session time pe	r participant
49		partopart
50	n	29
51 52	Mean (SD)	58.1(14.2)
52 53	Median (IQR)	60(48.60)
55	Min Max	(35.90)
55	ועוווז, ועומא	(00,00)
56		
57		

2	
3	
4	
5	
0 7	
/ 8	
o Q	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23 24	
27	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33 24	
34	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45 46	
40 47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59 60	
00	

Review session per participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	1(0.5)
Median (IQR)	1(1,1)
Min, Max	(0,2)
Total Review session time per participant	
n	29
Mean (SD)	43.2(30.6)
Median (IQR)	40(20,55)
Min, Max	(10,154)
Preparation session per participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	0.7(0.9)
Median (IQR)	0(0,1)
Min, Max	(0,3)
Total Preparation session time per participant	
n	14
Mean (SD)	18.4(9.7)
Median (IQR)	15(15,30)
Min, Max	(4,35)
Ad hoc sessions per participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	0.4(0.6)
Median (IQR)	0(0,1)
Min, Max	(0,2)
Total ad hoc session time per participant	
n	
	12
Mean (SD)	12 19.2(6.7)
Mean (SD) Median (IQR)	12 19.2(6.7) 15(15,25)
Mean (SD) Median (IQR) Min, Max	12 19.2(6.7) 15(15,25) (15,30)
Mean (SD) Median (IQR) Min, Max	12 19.2(6.7) 15(15,25) (15,30)

Clinic visits

Participants completed a median of 2 clinic visits. This was consistent across treatment arms. The number of clinic visits by participant is similar across treatment arms (Figure 9).



Figure 9:Barplot showing the number of participants for each number of clinic visits by treatment arm

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Safety analysis

A total of 8 adverse events (AEs) occurred during the trial and 7 participants (10.9%) had a least one AE (Table 22). 5 of these were deemed to be Serious Adverse Events (SAEs). None of the SAEs were related to the intervention.

Table 21:Summary of adverse events recorded during the study

	Intervention	n (%)	Control n (%	6) Overall	n (%)
All Adverse Events	5		3	8	
Participants with at least 1 AE	4(12.1%)		3(9.7%)	7(10.9%	6)
Type of Adverse Event					
Chest pain or chest discomfort	1(25%)		0(0%)	1(14.3%	6)
Voice change or Alteration	0(0%)		0(0%)	1(14.3%	6)
Other	4(100%)		2(66.7%)	6(85.7%	6)
Table 22:Summary of serious ac	lverse events	record	ed during the	e study	
	0	Interve (%)	ention n	Control n (%)	Overall n (%)
All Serious Adverse events		3(9.1%	6)	2(6.5%)	5(7.8%)
Level of Seriousness					
Death		0(0%)		2(100%)	2(40%)
Hospitalisation		2(66.7	%)	0(0%)	2(40%)
Persistent or significant		1(33.3	%)	0(0%)	1(20%)
disability/incapacity					
Frequency					
Isolated		2(66.7	%)	2(100%)	4(80%)
Continuous		1(33.3	%)	0(0%)	1(20%)
Intensity					
Moderate		3(1009	%)	0(0%)	3(60%)
Severe		0(0%)		2(100%)	2(40%)
Outcome					
Recovered		1(33.3	%)	0(0%)	1(20%)
Improved		2(66.7	%)	0(0%)	2(40%)
Death		0(0%)		2(100%)	2(40%)
Expected SAE					
No		3(1009	%)	2(100%)	5(100%)
Related to Intervention			-	. ,	
No		3(1009	%)	2(100%)	5(100%)
					. ,

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	
12	
14	
15	
17	
18	
19 20	
21	
22	
23	
25	
26 27	
28	
29 30	
31	
32	
34	
35	
36 37	
38	
39 40	
41	
42	
45 44	

Table 23:Description of serious adverse events recorded during the study (table has been redacted to maintain anonymity)

Participant	Description of event	Sorious
		Senous
xxx_15	Patient admitted on xx.xx.16 with acute exacerbation, developed type 2 respiratory failure. Despite maximal treatment of IV antibiotics, oxygen and NIV the patient continued to deteriorate and decision made to palliate. The patient died shortly afterwards.	Yes
xxx_14	Patient was having a kidney biopsy and had a bleed as a result, so had been kept in hospital on xxxxx ward at xxx city campus.	Yes
xxx_23	Patient admitted xx/xx/2016 with worsening disease and type 2 respiratory failure. Treated with non -invasive ventilation and intravenous antibiotics. deteriorated despite treatment and passed away xx/xx/2016	Yes
xxx_17	Rash reoccurred after re-trying oral antibiotic medication. Advised to stop again	No
xxx_17	Patient on holiday. Telephoned to report rash on both legs after starting new oral antibiotics. Advised to discontinue	No
xxx_20	Patient was admitted with influenza and CF. Exacerbation treated with iv antibiotics, discharged with home IV's. readmitted on the xx xxx with AKI (Acute Kidney Injury) Assumed secondary to dehydration. Dornase stopped	Yes

Protocol non-compliances

In total, there were 9 protocol non compliances during the trial. 6(67%) of these were follow up visits conducted outside of the calculated window (5 +/-1 month). 3(33%) of these were participants ticking statements on the consent form rather than initialling. All of these protocol non compliances were assessed as minor non-compliances.

Summary of missing data

Exacerbation data was collected for 6 months in 60/64 participants (94%). Adherence was collected for at least 6 months for 58/64 participants (90%).

The number of missing scores for questionnaires completed at baseline and 5 month follow up was very low (Table 25). Completion rate was 100% for the majority of baseline questionnaires and at least 89% for 5 month questionnaires. Missing scores were due to drop out(described in section 2.1). Such high completion rates are reassuring for the main trial.

Table 24:Summary of missing scores and items within questionnaires

	Time	Total	%	Intervention Median (min,max)	Control Median (min,max)	Overall Median (min,max)
EQ5D- 5L	Baseline	64	100 %	5(5,5)	5(5,5)	5(5,5)
5 items	5 (+/-1) months	58	90.6 %	5(0,5)	5(0,5)	5(0,5)
PAM-13	Baseline	64	100 %	13(13,13)	13 (13 , 13)	13(13,13)
13 item	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	13 (0 , 13)	13 (0 , 13)	13 (0 , 13)
CHAOS	Baseline	64	100 %	4 (4 , 4)	4 (4 , 4)	4 (4 , 4)
4 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	4(0,4)	4 (0 , 4)	4 (0 , 4)
MAD-3	Baseline	62	96.9 %	3(1,3)	3(0,3)	3(0,3)
3 items	5 (+/-1) months	57	89.1 %	3(0,3)	3(0,3)	3(0,3)
SRBAI	Baseline	63	98.4 %	4(0,4)	4(4,4)	4(0,4)
4 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	4(0,4)	4(0,4)	4(0,4)
GAD-7	Baseline	64	100 %	7(7,7)	7(7,7)	7(7,7)
7 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	7(0,7)	7(0,7)	7(0,7)
PHQ-8	Baseline	64	100 %	8(8,8)	8(8,8)	8(8,8)
8 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	8(0,8)	8(0,8)	8(0,8)

Recommendations for Main Trial/ Points for discussion

- For the primary analysis in the main trial, we would recommend the use of the offset adjusted model as this will allow the use of more data and allows the inclusion of potentially important participants over a greater amount of time. For example, our original model excluded participants who died, however doing so means we have lost key information.
- This is a pilot study, not powered to detect an effect
- The nature of the data means that small changes appear to influence the result greatly

to beet teries only

Appendix

Description of the patient reported outcomes

Name	Score		Interpretation of score
	range	Description	-
EQ-5D-5L	-0.224-1	Measure of health status	A score of zero means death, 1 is full health, negative score is a state worse than death
PAM-13	0-100	Measures patient activation e.g. ability and willingness to manage their health, 13 items with scoring	0= low patient activation 100= high patient
		spreadsheet	activation
CHAOS-6	0-24	Measures confusion, hubbub and order. 6 item questionnaire	0= low level of chaos 24= high level of chaos
SRBAI	0-28	Measure of habit and automaticity 4 item, 7 point likert scale	0= low level of automaticity 28= high level of automaticity
CFQ-R	0-100	8 domains each score 0-100. The domains are: Physical, Emotion, Social, Eating, Body, Treatment Burden, Respiratory, Digestion	0= low 100= high
PHQ-8	0-24	Measure of depression. 8 item questionnaire, 0-3 for each item	0= No or minimal depression 24= Severe depression
GAD-7	0-21	Measure of anxiety. 7 item questionnaire	0= No anxiety 21= Severe anxiety
COM-BBQ			-
Specific Necessities	2-5	Measure of perceived personal need for medication	Direction of effect would be an increase in score
Specific Concerns	1-3	Measure of perceived concerns about the negative effects of the medicine they are taking	Direction of effect would be a decrease in score
MAD-3	3-15	Specifically made 3 item questionnaire to measure perceived medication adherence	3= low 15= high

Additional File 07. Changes to intervention procedures

Change Number	Problem type	Problem Identified	Solutions implemented in full-scale trial (hashed numbers - # - refer to logic model constructs)	Timing of change implementation
CFHealthHub IT component				
1	Real World and Trial	Interventionists having difficulty identifying videos (#22) appropriate for a patient's needs or interests.	Descriptions were provided with each video. The PPI group agreed with this change and assisted with writing descriptions for each video.	During the feasibility study
2	Real World and Trial	Adherence charts (#14, #20) were showing >100% adherence. This appeared to be more common in patients with alternating regimes, or taking medications <i>pro re</i> <i>nata</i> (PRN, meaning 'as needed').	Prescription flow amended with the addition of PRN or alternating regime alerts, which will assist the data management team in highlighting any data discrepancies.	Post-feasibility study
3	Real World and Trial	Clinician functionality (amending prescriptions/ treatment targets (#3, #23) inaccessible through participant view (used in intervention sessions).	Participant view functionality implemented to facilitate intervention sessions. Clinicians are now able to run intervention sessions using CFHH through participant view but easily switch to clinician view to change prescriptions and to set goals.	Post-feasibility study

4	Real World and Trial	The lead psychologist	The option to export data about number of	Post-feasibility study
		identified the need to	push notifications sent to participants from	
		determine which participants	the app (#16).	
		were receiving push		
		notifications as this relates to		
		dose and rewards for		
		adherence.		
5	Real World and Trial	Originally the normative	To improve interpretability of adherence	Post-feasibility study
		adherence was used to come	data (#14), percentages are now calculated	
		up with the percentage	against the actual treatments prescribed and	
		adherence. It was identified	graphs are not capped at 100% to aid any	
		this did not always match	interpretation of graphs and trouble	
		what participants were	shooting.	
		actually prescribed and this		
		made the graphs difficult to	(<u>Q</u> ,	
		interpret. The capping of the		
		made interpretation difficult.	0	
Other IT infrastructure				
6	Real World and Trial	Flatlines at the beginning of	To achieve quality assurance of adherence	Post-feasibility study
		some participant adherence	data (#4, #5, #14, #35), hardware is now	5 5
		run charts were identified to	paired at the factory. The full-scale trial has	
		relate to the date registered	been monitoring for, and has not found,	
		at the time the nebuliser (#4)	such instances. Flatlines at the end of run	
		is paired with the Qualcomm	charts established as genuine through	
		Hub (#5). Flatlines at the end	triangulation with self-report quantitative	
		of the feasibility study were	and qualitative data.	
		also observed (#14, #35).		

Interventionist training and manual				
7	Real World and Trial	Training packages were initially developed for physiotherapists. This led to interventionist recruitment problems.	The job specification and training was redeveloped to suit non-physiotherapists (#9, #12), to enable any member of the MDT to be trained up to deliver the intervention. A suitably qualified individual such as a postgraduate psychologist could be supported by the MDT to deliver the intervention.	Post-feasibility study
8	Real World and Trial	The interventionist job specification did not reflect the flexibility needed to carry out the interventionist role- e.g. flexibility in working patterns, skills in motivational interviewing and extensive travel.	The research team, with input from the interventionists, revised the job specification for the interventionist role based on experience of delivering the intervention in the pilot in order to better manage expectations of the role (#12).	Post-feasibility study
9	Real World and Trial	Pilot study interventionists felt that training was good but could be helped by introducing case studies with real world data, in CFHealthHub.	Realistic case studies with data to support interventionist training / role plays for using website were developed to provide training more applicable to real CF patients (#9). This model is generally used in a healthcare training setting.	Post-feasibility study
10	Real World and Trial	Sporadic training over six weeks, whilst also conducting research procedures was	Training was condensed into an intensive course over ten days, focusing solely on intervention delivery (#9).	Post-feasibility study

		overwhelming for interventionists.		
11	Real World and Trial	Assessment of intervention fidelity identified that some of the active ingredients of the intervention were absent e.g. negotiating goals and letting participants take ownership of choices.	The recruitment and training process was modified to incorporate role play at the interview; explaining fidelity assessment criteria during training and also on-going assessment to ensure that any issues are identified quickly (#9).	Post-feasibility study
12	Real World and Trial	The focus of interventionists during intervention delivery was not always on the aspects that evidence would indicate are the most active ingredients for example goal setting, action planning and coping planning.	Emphasis was placed on the main 'active ingredients' in the manual and in training (#8, #9).	Post-feasibility study
13	Real World and Trial	During the course of the trial, it became apparent that participants were not being followed up and engaged in a manner to allow them to build a habit.	Focus on habit formation / revised logic model will be implemented by a 6-8 week period of habit formation sessions (#8).	Post-feasibility study
14	Real World and Trial	It was identified that after some participants last review visit, their adherence to treatment dropped.	For the full RCT, intervention visits are now triggered if the participant is having an exacerbation/IV, has a drop of 20% or more adherence in the last 4 weeks and if the participant requests additional support.	Post-feasibility study

	These will be termed 'intervention triggers' (#8).	
		5
For peer review only - http:	//bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	5

Good Reporting of A Mixed Methods Study (GRAMMS).

O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. The quality of mixed methods studies in health services research. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2008;13:92–8. doi:10.1258/jhsrp.2007.007074

Added to the EQUATOR Network database 26/09/2013.

(1) Describe the justification for using a mixed methods approach to the research question.

p5; lines 93-95.

(2) Describe the design in terms of the purpose, priority and sequence of methods

p11; line 240: we used a modified triangulation protocol; the study is described as nested, indicating, that the methods were used concurrently (p9; line 192).

(3) Describe each method in terms of sampling, data collection and analysis

Pages 9-12; 195-273.

(4) Describe where integration has occurred, how it has occurred and who has participated in it

Pages 11-12; Lines 240-273.

(5) Describe any limitation of one method associated with the present of the other method

Page 25; Lines 576-582.

(6) Describe any insights gained from mixing or integrating methods

p5; lines 93-95. p25; lines 573-611.

BMJ Open

Feasibility study for supporting medication adherence for adults with cystic fibrosis: mixed-methods process evaluation

Journal:	BMJ Open	
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2020-039089.R1	
Article Type:	Original research	
Date Submitted by the Author:	27-Jul-2020	
Complete List of Authors:	Hind, Daniel; The University of Sheffield, ScHARR Drabble, Sarah; The University of Sheffield, Medical Care Research Unit, School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR) Arden, Madelynne; Sheffield Hallam University, Centre for Behavioural Science and Applied Psychology Mandefield, Laura; University of York, Health Sciences Waterhouse, Simon; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Maguire, Chin; University of Sheffield, Cantrill, Hannah; The University of Sheffield, CTRU Robinson, Louisa; The University of Sheffield Beever, Daniel; The University of Sheffield Beever, Daniel; The University of Sheffield Beever, Daniel; The University of Sheffield Hutchings, Marlene; Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust Bradley, Judy; Queen's University Belfast, School of Medicine, Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences Nightingale, Julia ; University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust Allenby, Mark; University Hospital Southampton NHS Foundation Trust Dewar, Jane; Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust Whelan, Pauline; The University of Manchester, Health e-Research Centre Ainsworth, John; The University of Manchester, Division of Informatics, Imaging & Data Sciences Walters, Stephen; University of Sheffield, ScHARR Wildman, Martin; Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust O'Cathain, Alicia; University of Sheffield, SchOol of Health and Related Research	
Primary Subject Heading :	Respiratory medicine	
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice, Health informatics, Health services research, Patient-centred medicine, Qualitative research	
Keywords:	Cystic fibrosis < THORACIC MEDICINE, Health informatics < BIOTECHNOLOGY & BIOINFORMATICS, Clinical trials < THERAPEUTICS, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, SOCIAL MEDICINE, Quality in health care < HEALTH SERVICES ADMINISTRATION & MANAGEMENT	

1	
2	
4	
5	
6 7	SCHOLARONE™
8	Manuscripts
9	indituseripes
10 11	
12	
13	
14	
16	
17	
18 10	
20	
21	
22	
24	
25	
26 27	
28	
29	
30	
32	
33	
34	
36	
37	
38	
39 40	
41	
42	
44	
45	
46	
47	
49	
50 51	
52	
53	
54	
56	
57	
58	
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



I, the Submitting Author has the right to grant and does grant on behalf of all authors of the Work (as defined in the below author licence), an exclusive licence and/or a non-exclusive licence for contributions from authors who are: i) UK Crown employees; ii) where BMJ has agreed a CC-BY licence shall apply, and/or iii) in accordance with the terms applicable for US Federal Government officers or employees acting as part of their official duties; on a worldwide, perpetual, irrevocable, royalty-free basis to BMJ Publishing Group Ltd ("BMJ") its licensees and where the relevant Journal is co-owned by BMJ to the co-owners of the Journal, to publish the Work in this journal and any other BMJ products and to exploit all rights, as set out in our <u>licence</u>.

The Submitting Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJ to the Submitting Author unless you are acting as an employee on behalf of your employer or a postgraduate student of an affiliated institution which is paying any applicable article publishing charge ("APC") for Open Access articles. Where the Submitting Author wishes to make the Work available on an Open Access basis (and intends to pay the relevant APC), the terms of reuse of such Open Access shall be governed by a Creative Commons licence – details of these licences and which <u>Creative Commons</u> licence will apply to this Work are set out in our licence referred to above.

Other than as permitted in any relevant BMJ Author's Self Archiving Policies, I confirm this Work has not been accepted for publication elsewhere, is not being considered for publication elsewhere and does not duplicate material already published. I confirm all authors consent to publication of this Work and authorise the granting of this licence.

reziez onz

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
20 21
21 22
22 22
23
24
25
20
27 20
20
29
21
27
32
34
25
36
50 72
27 20
20
39 40
40
41
4∠ ∕\?
43 44
44 45
45
46
4/
48
49 50
50
51
5∠ 52
55 ⊑4
54
55
56
5/
58
59
60

1	Feasibility study for supporting medication adherence
2	for adults with cystic fibrosis: mixed-methods process
3	evaluation
4	

Daniel Hind^{1§}, Sarah J Drabble², Madelynne A Arden³, Laura Mandefield⁴, Simon

	6	Waterhouse ¹ , Chin Maguire ¹ , Hannah Cantrill ¹ , Louisa Robinson ¹ , Daniel Beever ¹ ,
	7	Alex Scott ¹ , Sam Keating ¹ , Marlene Hutchings ⁵ , Judy Bradley ⁶ , Julia Nightingale ⁷ ,
	8	Mark I Allenby ⁷ , Jane Dewar ⁸ , Pauline Whelan ⁹ , John Ainsworth ⁹ , Stephen J
	9	Walters ² , Martin J Wildman ^{2,5} , Alicia O'Cathain ² .
1	0	
1	1	¹ Clinical Trials Research Unit, University of Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent
1	2	Street, Sheffield, S1 4DA, UK
1	3	² School of Health and Related Research, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield,
1	4	S1 4DA, UK
1	5	³ Centre for Behavioural Science and Applied Psychology, Sheffield Hallam
1	6	University, Collegiate Crescent, Sheffield, S10 2BQ
1	7	⁴ Department of Health Sciences, University of York, University of York, Seebohm
1	8	Rowntree Building, Heslington, York, YO10 5DD
1	9	⁵ Sheffield Adult Cystic Fibrosis Unit Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation
2	0	Trust, Northern General Hospital, Herries Road, Sheffield, S5 7AU
2	1	⁶ Wellcome-Wolfson Institute For Experimental Medicine, School of Medicine,
2	2	Dentistry and Biomedical Sciences, Queen's University Belfast, UK
2	3	⁷ Wessex Adult Cystic Fibrosis Service, University Hospital Southampton NHS
2	4	Foundation Trust, Tremona Road, Southampton, Hampshire, SO16 6YD.

- 25 ⁸ Wolfson Cystic Fibrosis Centre, Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, City
- 26 Hospital, Hucknall Road, Nottingham, NG5 1PB.

3 4	27	⁹ Health eResearch Centre - Division of Imaging, Informatics and Data Sciences,
5 6	28	School of Health Sciences, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, The University
7 8	29	of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Manchester, United
9 10 11	30	Kingdom
12 13	31	§ Corresponding author: Daniel Hind, Clinical Trials Research Unit, University of
14 15	32	Sheffield, Regent Court, 30 Regent Street, Sheffield, S1 4DA, UK.
16 17 19	33	d.hind@sheffield.ac.uk
19 20	34	
21 22	35	Email addresses:
23 24 25	36	DH: d.hind@sheffield.ac.uk
25 26 27	37	SD: s.j.drabble@sheffield.ac.uk
28 29	38	Madelynne A: M.Arden@shu.ac.uk
30 31	39	LM: l.mandefield@sheffield.ac.uk
32 33 34	40	SW: s.waterhouse@sheffield.ac.uk
35 36	41	CM: c.maguire@sheffield.ac.uk
37 38	42	HC: h.cantrill@sheffield.ac.uk
39 40 41	43	LR: louisa.robinson@sheffield.ac.uk
42 43	44	DB: d.a.beever@sheffield.ac.uk
44 45	45	AS: alex.scott@sheffield.ac.uk
46 47 48	46	SK: s.m.keating@sheffield.ac.uk
49 50	47	MH: marlene.hutchings@sth.nhs.uk
51 52	48	JB: judy.bradley@qub.ac.uk
53 54 55	49	JN: julia.nightingale@uhs.nhs.uk
55 56 57	50	Mark A: mark.allenby@uhs.nhs.uk
58 59 60	51	JD: jane.dewar@nuh.nhs.uk

2		
3 4	52	PW: pauline.whelan@manchester.ac.uk
5	53	14 · John Ainsworth@manchester ac uk
6 7	55	JA: John Amsworth amanenester. ac. uk
8	54	SJW: s.j.walters@sheffield.ac.uk
9 10	55	$\Delta \Omega C$: a ocathain@sheffield.ac.uk
11	55	AOC. a.ocaliam@shefficid.ac.uk
12 13	56	MW: martin.wildman@sth.nhs.uk
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		
45 46		
47 49		
40 49		
50 51		
52		
53 54		
55		
56 57		
57 58		
59		
60		

58	Abstract
59	Objectives
60	To undertake a process evaluation of an adherence support intervention for people
61	with cystic fibrosis (PWCF), to assess its feasibility and acceptability.
62	
63	Setting
64	Two UK Cystic Fibrosis (CF) units
65	
66	Participants
67	Fourteen adult PWCF; 3 professionals delivering adherence support
68	('interventionists'); 5 multi-disciplinary CF team members.
69	
70	Interventions
71	Nebuliser with data recording and transfer capability, linked to a software platform,
72	and strategies to support adherence to nebulised treatments facilitated by
73	interventionists over five months (+/- one month).
74	
75	Primary and secondary measures
76	Feasibility and acceptability of the intervention, assessed through semi-structured
77	interviews, questionnaires, fidelity assessments, click analytics.
78	
79	Results
80	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention and training. Key barriers
81	to intervention feasibility and acceptability were identified. Interventionists had
82	difficulty finding clinic space and time in normal working hours to conduct review

BMJ Open

3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9 10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
22	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
17	
+/ 10	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
57	
20	
59	
60	

83	visits. As a result, fewer than expected intervention visits were conducted and
84	interviews indicated this may explain low adherence in some intervention arm
85	participants. Adherence levels appeared to be $>100\%$ for some patients, due to
86	inaccurate prescription data, particularly in patients with complex treatment regimens.
87	Flatlines in adherence data at the start of the study were linked to device connectivity
88	problems. Content and delivery quality fidelity were 100% and 60-92% respectively,
89	indicating that interventionists needed to focus more on intervention 'active
90	ingredients' during sessions.
91	
92 93	Conclusions The process evaluation led to 14 key changes to intervention procedures to overcome
94	barriers to intervention success. With the identified changes, it is feasible and
95	acceptable to support medication adherence with this intervention.
96	
97 98	Registration: ISRCTN13076797; 7 th June 2016.
99	
100	Strengths and limitations of this study
101	• This is a detailed evaluation of the feasibility of an adherence support system
102	for people with cystic fibrosis.
103	• The use of mixed methods provided indepth understanding of the processes
104	involved in delivering the service, its value, and factors that might influence
105	its use, implementation and success.
106	• This was a small, two-centre study.

107 Background

 109 Cystic Fibrosis (CF) is a life-threatening, inherited condition affecting over 90,000 110 people worldwide, primarily of Northern European ancestry[1]. Median survival for 111 people with CF (PWCF) is estimated at 31 years [2–6] with progressive lung function 112 decline, caused by regular infection and damage to airways, being one of the main 113 disease features [2].

Preventative medications preserve lung function and reduce exacerbations [7– 13].Low adherence to these medications is problematic as this predicts exacerbations requiring intravenous antibiotics (IVAB)[14,15]. Exacerbations of this nature carry a risk of systemic side effects of both increased mortality[16,17], and cost of care [18– 20]. In 2012, the total spend on CF in the UK was estimated to be £100 million, with £30 million spent on inhaled antibiotics and mucolytics[21]; the UK CF population received 171,907 days of IVAB with 93,455 days received in hospital, costing an estimated £27 million[22].

Self-reported adherence to inhaled therapies underestimates objectively-measured adherence, with rates of 80% and 36% recorded, respectively [23] and systematic data collection suggests objective adherence to be closer to 30%[24]. As a result, clinicians are currently unable to identify PWCF with low adherence, in order to provide additional support. Hitherto, the most objective surrogate measure of adherence has been the medicines possession ratio (MPR). However, based on the experience of a CF service in Leeds UK, MPR rates of 63%[25] considerably over-estimate adherence compared with nebuliser download data of 36%[26].

Page 9 of 202

BMJ Open

1		
2 3 4	133	Treatment burden has long been recognised as a key barrier to medication adherence
5 6 7	134	in CF[27], and reducing treatment burden is a key research priority for PWCF and
7 8 9	135	clinicians, identified by the Cystic Fibrosis Foundation and the James Lind
10 11	136	Alliance[28,29]. In response, a complex intervention was developed to support
12 13	137	inhaled medication adherence in PWCF[30]. This article presents the results of a
14 15 16	138	process evaluation that was undertaken alongside a pilot RCT, the objectives of which
17 18	139	were to determine the feasibility of a full-scale RCT[30]. Here, we describe the
19 20	140	resultant changes made to intervention procedures prior to that full-scale RCT[31].
21 22	141	The specific objectives of the process evaluation were:
23 24 25	142	
26 27	143	1. To triangulate qualitative and quantitative data collected on intervention
28 29	144	inputs, engagement, activities, and contextual factors, alongside immediate and
30 31	145	intermediate outcomes recorded in the feasibility study, to understand and identify
32 33 34	146	potential barriers to intervention implementation and success.
35 36	147	2. To document and use these findings to guide changes to intervention
37 38	148	procedures, ahead of a future, full-scale RCT.
39 40		
41	149	Methods
42 43	150	The wider feasibility study
44 45	151	The process evaluation forms one part of a wider pilot study, which also assessed the
46 47	152	feasibility of RCT procedures and mechanisms of action (reported elsewhere[30,32]).
48 49	153	The pilot RCT consisted of 33 intervention patients and 31 control patients. Three
50 51 52	154	trained interventionists in two UK CF centres delivered the intervention to PWCF in
53 54	155	the intervention arm and followed them up for 5 months, plus or minus one month.
55	156	Intervention description
56 57	150	The complex intervention to support adherence in CF was developed to enable PWCF
57 58	1.07	The complex intervention to support denotence in er was developed to enable i wei
59 60	158	to manage adherence to nebulised medication, with a view to shifting CF treatment

159 from rescue in hospital settings to prevention, managed in the community. The full160 intervention development process is described in a separate article[30].

The complex intervention consists of four key elements: the eTrack, CFHealthHub server, the CFHealthHub Apps and the manualised behavioural intervention. A logic model (Figure 1) was produced to reflect, in detail, constructs and processes by which the intervention was expected to function; this is in terms of inputs, engagement, activities, and outcomes. The logic model's hashed numbers (#1, #2, etc) provide a reference for linking intervention materials and processes to logic model constructs in Figure 1.

The eTrack (#4) (PARI Pharma GmbH, Starnberg, Germany) is a microchipped
nebuliser, enabling real-time monitoring of adherence to nebulised medications.
Timestamped records of medications administered via the eTrack are sent to a 2net
Hub (Qualcomm, San Diego, USA; #5) which transmits data to PARI.

Real-time inhalation data is received by the CFHealthHub (CFHH) server infrastructure, stored securely and used for display in both a web-based interface and a mobile app (#6, see Figure 2). Each of these displays adherence data alongside tools to support behaviour change and educational content[33]. Educational modules within CFHH include: 'What is Cystic Fibrosis?'; 'What does my IV treatment do?'; 'I'm not convinced that my nebuliser treatment works'; 'What does my nebuliser treatment do and why should I take it?'; 'Why is it important that I do my nebuliser treatment every day?'; and, 'I have concerns about my nebuliser treatments'. The

Page 11 of 202

BMJ Open

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

183	nebuliser medication information displayed to the user in these sections are tailored to
184	them based on a baseline assessment of motivation, so as not to overwhelm them.
185	
186	Participants and their interventionists had access to adherence displays for monitoring
187	(#13, #19, #20) and other CFHH content (#21- #26), such as education about
188	treatments (#21) and problem solving in the face of adherence barriers (#26).
189	Interventionists would use CFHH to facilitate delivery of manualised behavioural
190	intervention sessions (#8, #17).
191	
192	Interventionists ($n = 3$) included a clinical psychologist, a physiotherapist and a social
193	worker. They received specific training to deliver the manualised intervention
194	sessions (#9). Training was delivered over two days, in face-to-face workshops. This
195	was supplemented by online learning modules and a further four-week training
196	schedule. Interventionists were assessed with online theory tests and in a competency
197	assessment which examined intervention delivery within the first 5 sessions.
198	
199	Sessions were delivered either face-to-face or remotely, on a one-to-one basis. All
200	intervention arm participants received an initial intervention visit and a minimum of
201	one additional review visit over the period of the study (#18). The content of sessions
202	varied by participant reported motivation; sessions for those with low motivation were
203	tailored to promote relationship / confidence building and to support the participant in
204	the exploration of relevant CFHealthHub educational and information material (#21,
205	#22). Relevant material could be added to the participant's personalised 'Toolkit'.
206	Sessions conducted with participants displaying higher motivation would also involve
207	supporting the participant to set personalised adherence goals (#23, #24), and to make

2	
ך ע	
4	
5	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
30	
30	
27	
2∠ 22	
22 24	
34 25	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
57	
20	
59 60	
nu	

action plans (#25) and engage in problem-solving including making coping plans
where relevant (#26).

211 Design

210

216

A mixed-methods approach was used for the process evaluation. Although this pragmatic case study[34,35] primarily works at the level of the programme, we also present a nested multiple-case design, with cases at the level of the PWCF, and two embedded units of analysis – interviews with intervention participants and trial data.

217 Data Sources

Quantitative and qualitative data sources were triangulated to address process
evaluation objectives. These are described using hashed numbers to relate data
sources to aspects of the logic model (Figure 1) for which they contributed data.

221

222 Qualitative data included: verbal reports from project staff (#1. #2, #10, #16); semi-

structured interviews with interventionists and participants in the intervention and

224 control arms of the pilot RCT (#8, #9, #12, #13, #14, #15, #16, #17, #19, #20, #21);

225 minutes of meetings (#3); emails (#4), website development reports (#6); and fidelity

226 assessments (#17). Semi-structured interviews, conducted face-to-face, were digitally

227 audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. The median length of interviews was 30

228 minutes (range 11 to 87) for PWCF, 86 minutes (63 to 102) for interventionists and 62

229 minutes (51 to 66) for CF team members.

230

231

232 Quantitative data included: implementation log entries and data management reports

233 (#3), questionnaire data derived from secondary clinical outcome measures described

1		
2 3 4	234	in Table 1 (#7, #28, #29, #30, #31, #32, #33) an interventionist-completed structured
5 6	235	questionnaire on interventionist confidence post-training (#9), structured
7 8 9	236	interventionist fidelity assessments in which audio-recordings of intervention sessions
10 11	237	were coded using a fidelity scoring system which assessed whether each component
12 13	238	of the intervention was delivered and the quality of that delivery (#11, #17), CFHH
14 15 16	239	click analytics (#13, #14, #15, #18, #20, #21, #22, #23, #24, #25, #26), session
17 18	240	frequency and duration records (#15); and adherence data taken from CFHH (#35).
19 20	241	Quantitative or descriptive data was collected for the 23 logic model constructs listed
21 22 23	242	in this paragraph as part of the trial protocol, as described in Table 1.
23 24 25	243	
26	244	Sampling
27 28	245	Participants were recruited for semi-structured interviews. Participants included
29 30 31	246	intervention arm participants (n=14), interventionists (n=3, 0.8 WTE at each centre)
32 33	247	and members of the wider, multi-disciplinary CF team (n=5). Participants were
34 35	248	purposively sampled based on site, age, gender, deprivation index, objective and
36 37 28	249	subjective adherence levels (service-users), or site and professional category
39 40	250	(professionals). Interventionists were interviewed twice – at the beginning and end of
41 42	251	the study – patients once. PWCF who consented to be approached for interview were
43 44 45	252	contacted by letter or email and, subsequently, telephone or email depending on
46 47	253	preference. Professionals were contacted directly by the study team.
48 49	254	
50 51	255	
52	256	Data Analysis
53 54 55	250	We conducted a Framework analysis of interview transcripts[36], within NVivo (QSR
56 57	258	International) using multiple frameworks including the Theoretical Domains
58 59 60	259	Framework[37], a process evaluation framework[38], and the logic model (Figure 1).

260	
261	Using a modified triangulation protocol[39], we integrated qualitative and quantitative
262	datasets at the programme- and the case-level[40]. We used a joint display table[41]
263	to summarise data sets for 35 logic model constructs in the Inputs (n=12),
264	Engagement (n=6), Activities (n=7), Immediate outcomes (n=6) and Intermediate
265	outcomes (n=2) columns (Figure 1). The fit of data integration was categorised as:
266	'confirmation' (quantitative and qualitative data provided similar findings);
267	'expansion' (the datasets addressed different or complementary aspects of the
268	phenomenon); or, 'discordance' (the datasets were contradictory)[42]. We described
269	similar and unique contributions, made by the two data sets, to the research question
270	[39].
271	
272	In the 14 intervention participants, for whom both qualitative and quantitative process
273	data was available, we produced case-profiles[43], triangulating qualitative data with
274	individual-participant adherence run charts[44] (Additional File 01) and other
275	quantitative process data (see Additional File 02 – Study protocol, pp29-31). We
276	worked abductively, moving between behaviour change theories[45,46] and
277	contextual observations, agreeing plausible hypotheses to explain patterns which
278	could be tested in future work [47–50].
279	
280	We produced a case-ordered descriptive matrix[51], with cases ranked by average
281	adherence during the last month of the study, to understand how processes and
282	outcomes were mediated by local and individual conditions. Adherence levels of
283	>80% were assessed as high; 50-80% moderate; <50% low [14,52]. We theorised that
284	high life chaos, as measured by the Confusion, Hubbub and Order Scale

- 12 -
| 285 | (CHAOS)[53] and low motivation would be associated with low adherence. We used |
|------------|--|
| 286 | four measures to understand motivation: (1) a single item, scored on a 1-7 Likert scale |
| 287 | - "I want to do all of my nebuliser treatment" (motivation); (2) a single item, scored |
| 288 | on a 1-7 Likert scale, which asked, "I am confident I can do all of my nebuliser |
| 289 | treatments" ('confidence'); (3) the necessities and, (4) concerns five-point subscales |
| 290 | of the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire nebuliser-specific (BMQ) instrument |
| 291 | [54]. Interventionists assessed the participant's motivation to increase adherence on a |
| 292 | one to seven scale after discussion with the patient; adequate motivation was |
| 293 | necessary before participants could make action plans and do problem solving |
| 294 | activities. |
| 295 | |
| 206 | Approach taken to modifying the intervention |
| 290
297 | Modifications to the intervention fell into three categories: the software platform; |
| 298 | other Information Technology (IT) infrastructure; and the manual and training. |
| 299 | Identified problems and solutions were tabulated following a modified approach of |
| 300 | that taken by Bugge [31]. Digital platform development was reviewed regularly using |
| 301 | the " <u>M</u> ust have, <u>S</u> hould have, <u>C</u> ould have, and <u>W</u> on't have but would like" |
| 302 | (MoSCoW)[55], often used in agile software development [56,57]. |
| 303 | |
| 304 | Patient and Public Involvement |
| 305 | Recruitment for the Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) Group was achieved by |
| 306 | advertising within CF units and on the People in Research website, as well as via |
| 307 | group members themselves. Cross-infection between PWCF[58] was prevented by |
| 308 | arranging meetings via teleconference. The PPI group gave feedback on intervention |
| 309 | data-sharing policies, usability and presentation of the website/user-guide. In addition, |
| | 285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
294
295
296
297
298
299
300
301
302
300
301
302
303
304
305
306
307
308
309 |

the PPI group piloted the participant information materials and one individual gave

feedback on the trial protocol and interview guides (Additional File 02).

3 ⊿	
4	
5	
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	
3/	
20	
39 40	
40 //1	
47	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

1 2

310

311

312

313

Ethical approval

The study received approval from London Brent Research Ethics Committee (16/LO/0356). The funder was not involved in the trial design, patient recruitment, data collection, analysis, interpretation, or presentation, writing or editing of the report, or the decision to submit for publication. The corresponding author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

320

335

321 **Results**

322 In what follows, we address contextual factors that affected implementation and 323 participant responses, then follow the columns (inputs, engagement, activities, 324 immediate and intermediate outcomes) of the logic model. Additional File 03 (Tables 325 A-G) summarises quantitative process outcomes for 14 case study participants, ranked 326 by objective adherence at the end of the trial. Hashed numbers (#1, #2, etc) indicate 327 cross references to the logic model (Figure 1) and supporting evidence in Additional 328 File 04, which summarises data triangulation at the level of individual logic model 329 constructs. Both qualitative and quantitative data were available for 13/34 logic model 330 constructs, providing confirmation of (n=2) or expansion on (n=11) inferences drawn 331 from quantitative data. A case-ordered descriptive matrix based on logic model 332 columns (Additional File 05) and run charts annotated with key events (Additional 333 File 01) provides an integrated analysis at the level of the participant for fourteen 334 'case studies', cross referenced by participant numbers (R02/52, R01/54, etc).

Page 17 of 202

BMJ Open

336 337	Contextual factors affecting implementation and participant responses
338	The key factor affecting implementation was the mixed economy of CF drug delivery
339	systems: the e-Flow (PARI Pharma GmbH, Starnberg, Germany); the iNeb (Philips
340	Healthcare, Eindhoven, Netherlands); and a number of dry powder delivery systems.
341	The e-Flow is the only device able to deliver all the wet nebulised drugs that are used
342	in CF care. The e-Track we used in this trial was a version of the e-Flow developed to
343	transfer time- and date-stamped data. Most patients at site R01 used e-Flows;
344	switching consenting participants over to the e-Track was generally unproblematic.
345	The e-Flow's competitor, the iNeb, cannot deliver aztreonam and requires double
346	chamber filling to deliver tobramycin, so it is not suitable for all patients. The data
347	transfer version of the iNeb, the BiNeb, is a prototype for which limited numbers are
348	available. We were unable to secure approval to integrate the BiNeb into CFHH in
349	time to incorporate it into this study. At site R02 where iNebs were commonly used,
350	those who were familiar with and liked the iNeb were less keen to swap to an
351	alternative device; some who swapped to the e-Track, later wanted to move back to
352	the iNeb. A minority of patients use dry powder delivery systems, none of which have
353	data transfer versions. We were unsuccessful in engaging any of the companies
354	producing dry powders in time to get dry powder systems integrated into CFHH,
355	meaning that dry powder users could not be recruited to this feasibility study. Making
356	nebulisers with data recording and transfer capability available within hospitals
357	following local delivery took prolonged engagement with medical engineering
358	departments to obtain local safety approvals. For more than one participant, the
359	strength of their mobile data signal affected 2net Hub connectivity with the central
360	server (Implementation log, 19 Oct 16).
361	

- 15 -

362	Through meetings with site staff, the team identified a range of human factors that
363	also affected implementation, in particular: the availability of out-patient rooms; the
364	need to clean rooms after each consultation for cross-infection control purposes; and,
365	the expectation that, during hospital visits, outpatients will see the whole each
366	member of the multidisciplinary team separately. The struggle for clinic space and
367	patient convenience resulted in more home visits than anticipated for consent and
368	review meetings, informed by local lone-working policies. Reorganisation of one CF
369	Centre, involving the transfer of patients from the care of one local hospital to
370	another, had created discontent among some patients involved in the trial.
371	
372	
373 374	Inputs The study chief investigator reported introducing local site investigators, centre
375	directors and Multi-Disciplinary Teams (MDTs) to CFHH (#1). Through case reports,
376	he conveyed that relying on FEV_1 , symptoms and BMI for CF management alone is
377	inadequate and that objective adherence data could help overcome the 'lamppost
378	syndrome'[59], also known as the 'streetlight effect'[60,61] or 'drunkard's
379	search'(page 11[62]) – a type of availability bias[63]. The chief investigator reported
380	feeling that site investigators at both centres were fully bought in, but that one
381	clinician (not an investigator) believed that the disparities between subjective and
382	objective adherence[23] were overstated (#2).
383	
384	Interventionists entered prescription data into CFHH based on patient records and
385	self-reported treatment regimen (#3). Occasionally, interventionists were slow to
386	make monthly prescription checks when prompted by system alerts, resulting in

Page 19 of 202

BMJ Open

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

38	87	apparent adherence levels of over 100%, traced to the use of alternating treatment
38	88	regimens[64] (Implementation Log, 01 Dec 16, TMG minutes 10 Jan 17). Nebulisers
38	89	with data recording and transfer capability (#4), 2net Hubs (#5), the CFHH website
39	90	and mobile application (#6), were made available (emails to project manager 20 May
39	91	16, 23 Jun 16). The Capability Opportunity Motivation -Beliefs about Medicines
39	92	Questionnaire (COM-BMQ – see Additional File 02)[54] questionnaire data (#7) was
39	93	collected in CFHH (Additional File 06, Tables 1-22, Figures 1-9).
39	94	
39	95	Interventionists were complimentary about the intervention manual (#8) and highly
39	96	satisfied with training, but suggested that future courses involved a case study
39	97	approach, following a patient through the intervention to illustrate its different aspects
39	98	(#9) (Additional File 04). A member of the research team (MH) acted as an
39	99	intervention mentor to interventionists (#10). Interviews (SD) and observations (MH,
40	00	HC) identified differences in the way site investigators interacted with
40	01	interventionists, with one giving more intensive practical support, through weekly
40	02	meetings and problem-solving (not prescribed by the intervention), than the other.
40	03	Fidelity data was collected on all three interventionists and the fidelity assessment
40	04	instrument was modified before use in the full RCT (#11). During interviews,
40	05	interventionists were enthusiastic about intervention processes (#12). As sites
40	06	struggled to find space or time for consent / intervention encounters in clinic, the
40	07	study team requested an increase in the number of home visits (Implementation log 19
40	08	Oct 2016). As a result of initial problems in contacting participants and the need for
40)9	flexibility in arranging meetings out of usual clinic hours, the study team requested
4	10	flexible working in which the team worked 12:00-20:00 two days a week (interviews
4	11	& TMG minutes 29 Nov 2016).

412	
413 414	Engagement Interviews and click analytics showed that MDT members did not access adherence
415	data (#13), aside from in the form of bar charts brought to MDT meetings by
416	interventionists. It is important to note that extending the use of CFHH to the MDT
417	was not an objective of the trial and no training was given in this regard. Click
418	analytics showed that interventionists tracked adherence (#14). Of 14 case study
419	participants, three did not contribute complete adherence data: R02/42 and R02/02
420	withdrew, while R02/03 was lost to follow-up. In other participants, flatlines in
421	adherence data caused concern (Additional File 01). Flatlines at the beginning of the
422	study (e.g. R01/39, R01/48) indicated technical problems with pairing nebulisers and
423	hubs. Flatlines at the end of the study period (e.g. R01/42, R01/44, R02/12) were
424	confirmed as the genuine recording of non-adherence through the use of adherence
425	data beyond the end of the study period, interview data, self-report subjective
426	adherence and the MAD-3 (Additional File 03 – Table f).
427	
428	Click analytics showed the median number of participant CFHH sessions was three
429	(#15) (Additional File 03 – Table c). Of those with low usage, initial technical
430	problems (R01/02, R01/48) and initial lack of availability of a mobile application (#6)
431	were potential contributing factors. Some case study participants showed moderate
432	(R02/52, R01/54 and R01/40: 9-13 sessions) or high use (R02/12 and R01/42: >40
433	sessions). Push notifications - user-defined messages from the server which give
434	participants congratulations or reminders about adherence behaviour - were not
435	available in the pilot trial (#16).
436	

Page 21 of 202

1 ว	
2 3 4	437
5 6	438
7 8	439
9 10 11	440
11 12 13	441
14 15	442
16 17	443
18 19 20	444
20 21 22	445
23 24	446
25 26	447
27 28	448
29 30 31	449
32 33	450
34 35	450
36 37	451
38 39	452
40 41	453
42 43	454
44 45 46	455
40 47 48	456
49 50	457
51 52	458
53 54	450
55 56	459 460
57 58	461
60	.01

437	Based on fidelity assessment of intervention session recordings, the <i>content</i> fidelity of
438	face-to-face interactions, was excellent (100%) – with all aspects delivered as per the
439	manual (#17). Delivery quality fidelity was more variable (60-92%). The generation
440	of goals and action plans was sometimes too directive rather than negotiated and
441	supportive. Interviews demonstrated that assessing the true level of motivation to
442	adhere to treatment was challenging; sometimes those with insufficient intrinsic
443	motivation (e.g. R01/48, R01/54 and R02/03) were assessed as having sufficient
444	motivation and inappropriately tasked with setting and reviewing goals, making
445	action plans and problem solving (see below #23-26). These individuals were variably
446	motivated by wanting to prove themselves to MDT members, who had doubted their
447	adherence (R01/49 and R01/54, Additional File 05), or by helping the research:
448	
449	"I made that special effort 'cause I was taking part in this trial I didn't see
450	how it was going to make me better" ($R01/48$).
451	
452	Interaction with these individuals should have been confined to relationship-building
453	and trust-building. Fidelity assessment of recordings identified that, in interactions
454	with the adequately motivated, the focus was not always on the most active
455	ingredients - goal-setting, action planning (habit formation) and problem-
456	solving/coping planning. Participant run charts (Additional File 01) revealed a
457	disparity in whether and when review visits happened (#18).
458	
459	Activities
460	In interviews, CF team clinicians (as distinct from the interventionists) confirmed they
461	were not monitoring adherence as part of usual care (#19). Participant R01/02

2
3
4
5
6
7
/
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
ר ∠ בר
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
20
29
30
31
32
33
34
25
22
36
37
38
39
40
/1
40 1
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
10
77 50
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
50
57
58
59
60

462	complained that the research focus on adherence was "parallel rather than
463	integrated" with mainstream clinical management. However, the intervention was
464	designed to be interventionist delivered allowing individual randomisation in a system
465	without contamination of controls rather than an intervention aimed at achieving
466	system change which would have required a cluster trial design. Participants' clicks
467	(median 11) on the CFHH "How am I doing?" (run charts) page sometimes related to
468	a limited number of sessions. In interviews, one moderately frequent user (R01/54)
469	only accessed this page to check their data was uploading. Other moderate/frequent
470	users described this page as important for adherence self- monitoring (#20), even
471	when their grasp of their own adherence was poor (R01/49).
472	
473	In interviews with participants, for tailored education about treatment (#21),
474	participants accessed particular education pages for specific issues, such as nebuliser
475	malfunction, which was viewed as, "more down to earth" than technical manuals. In
476	particular a video about the treatment action of Dornase alfa, was often praised, as a
477	means of educating others about CF; 'Talking heads' videos (in these videos people
478	with CF described strategies for successful nebuliser use) (#22) divided opinion: for
479	some, the opportunity for social comparison[65] provided relief and reassurance;
480	those who were less appreciative were those who found comparisons with people
481	healthier than themselves could make them feel as though they were not doing well
482	and comparisons with those less healthy could make them fearful of the future.
483	
484	Other activities (#23 to #26 on the logic model) required participants to have adequate
485	levels of motivation. Interventionists classified all but one case study participant
486	(R01/44) as having adequate motivation (Additional File 03, Table b) and therefore

Page 23 of 202

1 2

BMJ Open

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 21
3 I 2 2
2∠ 22
27
25
36
30
38
30
40
40 41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59

60

487	eligible for further tailored intervention. But, as detailed above (see #17 in the
488	engagement section), this was sometimes based on inadequate discussion with the
489	participants. In interviews, participants generally reported setting goals (#23), but
490	fidelity assessment showed that goals were sometimes formulated by interventionists
491	rather than by participants (see #17). The mean number of review sessions (#24) over
492	five months was 1 (Additional File 03 – Table e); this was fewer than intended, likely
493	reflecting a failure of the study team to set appropriate expectations and a lack of time
494	created by the high pace of recruitment (problem log entries: 31-Jan-17; 13-Feb-17).
495	Two individuals (R01/39 and R01/40) received their first face-to-face session with an
496	interventionist over halfway through the study period (Additional File 01). CFHH
497	action plan (#25), problem solving and coping plan (#26) pages were accessed a
498	median of two, three and one times, respectively (Additional File 03 – Table e).
499	Interviews data suggests action / coping plans were completed during intervention
500	visits but not accessed by participants otherwise. In interviews, some participants said
501	they were reassured by the presence of, and sometimes reported insights from,
502	problem-solving modules, such as what to do when going on holiday. However, the
503	use of action plans was disliked by some participants who found writing down the
504	action plans like "going back to school". This dislike at least partly reflected the
505	generation of action and coping plans by interventionists rather than by the
506	participants themselves (see #17).
507	

508 Immediate outcomes

509 The pilot was not designed to disseminate the intervention across the centre and with 510 minimal monitoring by professionals within the wider CF team (see #19) routine 511 medical care was not informed by adherence (#27). Unsurprisingly, given the lower

1	
-	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
~~ 72	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
21	
22	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
10	
40	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	
00	

1 2 3

512	than expected face-to-face contact (#18, #24), intervention arm group averages for
513	immediate (process) outcomes (#28-33) changed little over five months, with the
514	exception that there was a mean reduction of 1.84 (SD 3.44) barriers to adherence per
515	person (#33), which could be the outcome of problem solving and education about
516	treatment processes (Additional file 03 – Table f). Frequent use of CFHH and self-
517	monitoring in particular (see above, #20) did not necessarily mean that self-reported
518	subjective adherence and electronically-captured objective adherence were well
519	aligned (#28) (Additional file 03 – Tables f and g). A post hoc paired comparison of
520	subjective and objective adherence at 5 (+/-1) months (Figure 3) suggests that higher
521	adherers were more uniformly accurate in their understanding of their own adherence,
522	whereas low adherers could be overly optimistic.
523	

524 Intermediate outcomes 525 Item #34 of the logic model, treatment optimisation, is defined by NICE as, "a person-centred approach to safe and effective medicines use" to ensure best 526 527 outcomes[66]. Treatment optimisation is a service-level objective, which was beyond 528 the scope of our patient-focused intervention but is the subject of related ongoing 529 research (see Discussion). During interviews, RCT participants in the intervention 530 arm described behaviours that would affect treatment optimisation, for instance taking 531 holidays from their treatment. Levels of CF treatment adherence (#35) were 10% 532 (95% CI: -5.2 to 25.2) higher in the intervention arm (Additional File 06). We 533 developed a number of theories about why some intervention patients did or did not 534 increase their adherence (#35) during the analysis. In some cases the run charts 535 illustrated, in line with Control Theory, the goal-directed nature of behaviour and how 536 it is regulated by feedback control processes[67]. For example, R01/39 and R01/49

Page 25 of 202

1

BMJ Open

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
0	
9 10	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
20	
20	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
27	
27	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
ΔΔ	
15	
40	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
57	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
50	
52	

60

537	seemed to show improvement shortly before planned face-to-face visits from
538	interventionists (Additional File 01). R01/39, who seemed intrinsically motivated
539	when interviewed, sustained improvement in adherence beyond the trial period
540	through what they described as positive interaction with the interventionist. Others,
541	who seemed more extrinsically motivated in interviews (R01/49, R01/54, R01/48: see
542	#17), did not sustain adherence, with charts suggesting an effortful, 'all-or-nothing'
543	pattern. At baseline, R02/07 had no well-established routine (CHAOS score of 10:
544	Additional File 01), implying substantial self-regulatory effort to achieve higher
545	adherence. In their interview, this participant reported finding habit formation parts,
546	such as goal-setting, helpful which may have enabled him to maintain high adherence
547	with reduced effort, as measured by increased habit and reduced life chaos and
548	barriers (change scores -5 and -3 respectively: Additional File 03 - Table f). Finally, it
549	is important to understand that individual-level adherence can be unstable over time
550	(Additional File 01, see especially, R01/54, R01/48) highlighting the problem of
551	assessing adherence as a 'snapshot' in a pre-/post-test analysis, rather than in a
552	continuous assessment over time.
553	
554	Several participants with low baseline adherence appeared to have responded well to

555 the intervention. R01/40 had high motivation (Additional File 03 - Table b;

556 Additional File 01), possibly due to the salience of a recent hospitalisation for IVAB

treatment of an exacerbation. Click analytic data showed high engagement, with

558 independent access of the website and use of problem-solving tools. However in other

559 patients, case study run charts (Additional File 01) showed that measuring change in

560 average objective adherence between baseline and five months sometimes masked

561 periods of success in between (e.g. R01/02, and R02/12). Without looking at

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

1

562	adherence graphs, and only measuring objective adherence at baseline and five
563	months, this would have been missed (see Discussion). Interview data offered some
564	reasons for improved adherence. While R01/49 had not made an action plan and their
565	subjective adherence was optimistic (Additional file 03 – Table f), their objective
566	adherence increased from low to moderate over the trial period (Additional File 01);
567	their motivation also increased and self-reported barriers decreased (Additional file 03
568	- Table f), potentially through their high use of problem-solving modules and self-
569	monitoring (Additional File 03, Table d). R01/02's run chart also showed a period of
570	improvement, ending after the last review visit (Additional File 01); nonetheless,
571	reduced life chaos (Additional file 03 – Table f) and interview data suggested an
572	established routine and reduced barriers associated with intensive face-to-face
573	therapist interaction and action/coping plans (Additional File 03, Table d). The tailing
574	off of adherence after the end of the trial in some case study participants may indicate
575	that adherence remained effortful or participation in the trial was motivated by
576	altruism not help-seeking (see quotation from R01/48, above).
577	
578	Modifications to the intervention

579 Additional file 07 documents 14 technical changes that will be made for the full-scale 580 RCT, based on the process evaluation findings, to CFHH (n=5), IT infrastructure (n=1) and to the interventionist training, manual and procedures (n=8). To prevent 581 582 adherence data flatlines, nebulisers (#4) and 2net Hubs (#5) will be paired at the 583 factory. Three changes to CFHH (#6) will make it easier for interventionists to 584 view/edit prescription data and to handle alternating treatment regimens (#3). Other changes to CFHH will include making graphs more easily interpretable and, based on 585 interview data and PPI feedback, adding descriptions to videos. Changes to the 586

- 24 -

BMJ Open

interventionist manual (#8) will increase the emphasis on 'active ingredients', introduce intervention triggers for reduced adherence or exacerbations and introduce new habit formation sessions. The need for increased numbers of protocolised intervention review sessions arose because, in the feasibility study, a focus on RCT recruitment targets gave interventionists inadequate time to deliver review visits (#18, #24), critical for updating personalised action plans (#25) and updating coping plans (#26). Training (#9) in the full-scale trial will be delivered as an intensive one-week course, with more explicit focus on intervention fidelity, supported by new case study data and role plays to ensure baseline competency (#17).

Discussion

The process evaluation identified elements of the intervention which could be improved and 14 changes were documented. The complex intervention was developed using mixed methods research with an inter-disciplinary, person-centred and iterative approach[68–74]. The mere usage of a digital behaviour change intervention may not indicate engagement or lead to desired outcomes [68, 73, 75–78]; there is no simple dose-response relationship[79]. In fact, for those with low motivation and low confidence, evidence of non-adherence can be threatening[80,81]. With different baseline motivation and life chaos, a population-level definition of "effective engagement" [70] may be infeasible, but contextual and motivational data may still explain patterns observed in run charts[82]. What may matter more than defining engagement is the correct assessment and tailoring of management to different psychosocial barriers[69,83–91]. Our study suggests that digital systems cannot replace, only complement, face-to-face interaction between health professionals and patients[92–95], potentially creating a sense of 'accountability' consistent with

Page 28 of 202

control theory[46,96]. However, it is important to recognise that in the absence of
objective adherence data clinicians and patients will find it difficult to even begin to
engage with behaviour change.

BMJ Open

Chronic disease self-management is a complex and multi-factorial problem and, we were unable to cover all of the analyses that many would consider relevant. For instance, although the intervention is meant to increase health literacy through education, we cannot rule out that baseline socio-economic status, known to affect health literacy, outcomes and self-management[97–99], was not a factor. Another limitation of this study is that we interviewed just over only one quarter of the pilot trial sample. Given a relatively homogeneous population, narrow, exploratory study aims and the use of established theory, fourteen interviews should be adequate to discern common perceptions and experiences [100,101]. In the full-scale evaluation of this intervention (see below), the process evaluation will involve a user acceptability survey of \sim 250 intervention users from 19 centres and face-to-face interviews with over 50 intervention users, interventionists and clinicians. As in many other process evaluations, we will use maximum variation sampling on sociodemographic characteristics and baseline adherence, alongside triangulation, to minimise the risk of bias[102]. Additionally, readers should be aware that small scale feasibility work does not generalise in every regard when scaled up in larger scale studies[103,104]. Finally, early health economic modelling of the cost-effectiveness[105], was not updated as part of this feasibility work, but will be revisited in 2021 as part of the full-scale evaluation.

Page 29 of 202

BMJ Open

Our use of objective adherence measurement overcomes the limitations of previous studies[106] and confirms that subjective and objective adherence are poorly aligned[23]. This process evaluation has succeeded in demonstrating that delivery of this intervention is possible in busy clinical settings; participant uptake was high and, with further development on the basis of these findings, the process of gathering objective adherence data and implementing it alongside a behavioural intervention is both possible and effective. Given the known difficulties with nebuliser use among PWCF, interventions that can

make it less effortful are important[107]. In particular, healthy behaviours are better predicted by a patient's level of automatic behavioural repetition than their beliefs or experiences, meaning a focus on increasing habit strength is critical for chronic disease self-management[108]. Through delivery of intervention components designed to promote habit formation, we intend to reduce effort with the CFHH intervention. We are limited in drawing conclusions as to the impact of habit formation components of the intervention from this analysis; this is mostly due to the limited time constraints of the feasibility study leaving insufficient opportunity for habit formation[109]. However, there was some indication that habit components were useful and we have elsewhere demonstrated the importance of habit in high adherence [110,111]. It has also been indicated that adherence interventions focusing on habit formation are the most effective[112].

656 Successful habit formation will reduce burden by making sustained self-care
657 automatic. The CFHH intervention aims to deliver the fall in burden highlighted by
658 the Lind alliance prioritisation exercise as the most important goal of CF research.

Page 30 of 202

BMJ Open

3
4
5
6
7
, 0
0
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
21 22
∠∠)2
23
24 25
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
27
20
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
52 52
22
54 55
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 2

660	To date, there is little previous research showing the effects of giving patients access
661	to their data, with respect to health outcomes and cost-effectiveness. Amidst the
662	evidence that does exist, the research is generally poor and lacks information about
663	context and implementation[113,114]. Following modifications made to our complex
664	intervention, the full scale RCT across 19 UK centres (ISRCTN55504164) will
665	provide high quality evidence, indicating the impact of adherence data on sustained
666	self-care. The full-scale RCT will include a further process evaluation and health-
667	economic modelling. Furthermore, the CFHealthHub Data Observatory
668	(ISRCTN14464661) following on from the RCT will address the issue of how to
669	embed the use of adherence data in routine practice for healthcare professionals[115-
670	119]. The sites involved in the reported pilot study have now transitioned into the
671	Data Observatory, eventually to be joined by sites involved in the full-scale RCT.
672	Data collected in the data observatory quality improvement project will be used in the
673	development of generalisable theory and practical guidance about the collaborative
674	use of adherence data [120–122], with a focus on optimising the use of health care
675	resources and improving patient care [66,123]. The Observatory will act as a platform
676	for efficient trials[124,125], providing an opportunity to share processes and
677	improvement activities to enable participating CF clinical research teams to meet the
678	demands of future research [126].

679 **Conclusions**

We have developed a theory-based complex intervention to help PWCF adhere to
their medication and form habits of sustained self-care. The process evaluation
identified potential sources of intervention failure and modifications have been made
accordingly. With improved intervention processes, it is feasible and acceptable to

1		
2 3 4	684	support sustained self-care via medication adherence through the application of
5 6 7	685	behaviour change theory delivered through digital and human components.
8 9 10	686	Declarations
11	687	List of abbreviations
12 13	688	CF – Cystic Fibrosis
14	689	CFHH – CFHealthHub complex intervention
15	690	CFQ-R – Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised
16	691	CHAOS - Confusion, Hubbub, and Order Scale
17 19	692	COM- BMQ – The Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs
10 19	693	Questionnaire
20	694	EQ-5D-5L – EuroQol generic health status measure
21	695	FEV1 - Forced expiratory volume in 1 second
22	696	GAD-7 – General Anxiety Disorder 7-item
23	697	IT – Information Technology
24 25	698	IVAB - Intravenous Antibiotics
26	699	MAD-3 Medication Adherence Data
27	700	MDT – Multi-Disciplinary Team
28	701	PAM-13 - Patient Activation Measure
29	702	PHQ-8 – Patient Health Questionnaire depression scale
30 31	703	PWCF – People With Cystic Fibrosis
32	704	RC1 – Randomised Controlled Irial
33	705	SRBAI – Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index
34	/06	
35	707	Ethics, consent and permissions
36	707	
37 38	/08	written informed consent was obtained prior to participation.
39	700	Ethical approval
40	707	
41	/10	The study received ethical approval from the London Brent Research Ethics
42	711	Committee (16/10/0256)
43 44	/11	Committee (16/L0/0356).
45		
46	712	Consent for publication
47	/12	
48	713	In the consent form, participants signed a statement to confirm consent for publication
49 50	714	of anonymised quotes, in reports, conference presentations and journal publications.
50 51		
52	715	Availability of data and materials
53	716	Requests for further data not available in this publication can be directed at Sheffield
54 55	717	Clinical Trials Research Unit. Email: ctru@sheffield.ac.uk Tel: 0114 222 0866
56	718	Competing interests
57	719	Martin I Wildman received funding from Zambon and support from Philips
58 59	720	Respirances for the early intervention development work. This has not had any direct
60	720	influence on the feasibility study reported here. In addition Martin Wildman has
	/ 41	intuence on the reasoning study reported here. In addition, Martin whaman has
		- 29 -

worked with Pari to carry out studies using the e-track. This has not had any direct

software team received funding from Pari to create a medication reporting component

influence on the feasibility study reported here. The University of Manchester

within the CFHealthHub software. This has not had any direct influence on the

This report presents independent research funded by the NIHR under its Grants for

Applied Research Programme (Grant Reference Number RP-PG-1212-20015). The

views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors

(MRC), Central Commissioning Facility (CCF), the Programme Grants for Applied

Daniel Hind (Assistant Director, CTRU), Sarah Drabble (Research Associate) and Laura

The following conceived of or designed the work: Martin Wildman (Consultant Respiratory

(Professor of Medical Statistics and Clinical Trials), Madelynne Arden (Professor of Health

Physiotherapy), John Ainsworth (Professor of Health Informatics), Daniel Beever (Patient

(Consultant in Respiratory Medicine), Mark Allenby (Consultant in Respiratory Medicine),

Jane Dewar (Consultant in Respiratory Medicine), Sarah Drabble, Madelynne Arden, Chin

Maguire, Hannah Cantrill, Alexander Scott (Research Associate), Sam Keating (Research

The following were involved in the acquisition of data for the work: Julia Nightingale

Associate), Marlene Hutchings and Pauline Whelan (mHealth Applications Manager).

The following were involved in the analysis of data: Daniel Hind, Sarah Drabble, Alicia

Daniel Hind, Sarah Drabble, Madelynne Arden, Laura Mandefield, Simon Waterhouse, Chin

Nightingale, Mark Allenby, Jane Dewar, Daniel Beever, Stephen Walters, Alicia O'Cathain,

All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions

related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and

O'Cathain, Daniel Beever, Alexander Scott, Sam Keating, Madelynne Arden, Laura

Maguire, Hannah Cantrill, Louisa Robinson, Marlene Hutchings, Judy Bradley, Julia

Martin J Wildman, were involved in the interpretation of data for the work.

All authors were involved in the final approval of the version to be published.

Physician), Alicia O'Cathain (Professor of Health Services Research), Stephen Walters

Psychology), Marlene Hutchings (Physiotherapist), Judy Bradley (Professor of

and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, Medical Research Council

The other authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Research Programme, or the Department of Health and Social Care.

Mandefield (Statistician), together produced the first draft of the report.

and Public Involvement Representative) and Daniel Hind.

Mandefield, Simon Waterhouse (Data Manager).

resolved.

Funding

feasibility study reported here.

Authors' contributions

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the trial participants who offered us their time. We gratefully acknowledge the clerical and other input of Helen Wakefield, Heather Dakin, Katie Shore and Louise Turner, trial support officers.

We would also like to thank Claire Oliver, Fiona Haynes and Lisa Evans for their commitment and hard work in delivering the intervention and supporting the study.

Professor Walters is a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Senior Investigator. The views expressed in this article are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NHS, the NIHR, or the Department of Health and Social Care. to peet teries only

- 31 -

2 3		Def	
4	786 787	Ret	erences
6	/8/	1	Ben SC, Man MA, Gutienez H, <i>et al.</i> The future of cystic horosis care. a
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	788		global perspective. Lancet Respir Med 2020;8:65-124. doi:10.1016/S2213-
	789		2600(19)30337-6
	790	2	Jeffery A, Charman S, Cosgriff R, et al. UK Cystic Fibrosis Registry Annual
	791		Data Report 2016. London: : Cystic Fibrosis Trust 2017.
	792	3	Cystic Fibrosis Foundation. Annual Data Report 2016 Cystic Fibrosis
	793		Foundation Patient Registry. Bethesda, Maryland: : Cystic Fibrosis Foundation
	794		Patient 2017. https://www.cff.org/Research/Researcher-Resources/Patient-
23 24	795		Registry/2016-Patient-Registry-Annual-Data-Report.pdf
25 26	796	4	European Cystic Fibrosis Society. ECFS Patient Registry Annual Data Report.
27 28 29	797		Karup, Denmark: : European Cystic Fibrosis Society 2013.
30 31	798	5	Ahern S, Sims G, Tacey M, et al. The Australian Cystic Fibrosis Data Registry
32 33	799		Annual Report, 2015. Monash University, Department of Epidemiology and
34 35 36	800		Preventive Medicine, October 2017, Report No 18. Melbourne, Victoria: :
37 38	801		Australian Cystic Fibrosis Data Registry 2017.
39 40	802	6	Cystic Fibrosis Canada. The Canadian CF Registry 2016 Annual Data Report.
41 42	803		Toronto: : Cystic Fibrosis Canada 2017.
43 44 45	804		http://www.cysticfibrosis.ca/uploads/2016 Registry Annual Data Report.pdf
46 47	805	7	Southern KW, Barker PM, Solis-Moya A, et al. Macrolide antibiotics for cystic
48 49 50 51	806		fibrosis. In: Southern KW, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
	807		Chichester, UK: : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2011.
53 54	808		doi:10.1002/14651858.CD002203.pub3
55 56 57 58	809	8	Ramsey BW, Davies J, McElvaney NG, et al. A CFTR Potentiator in Patients
	810		with Cystic Fibrosis and the G551D Mutation. N Engl J Med 2011;365:1663-
60	811		72. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1105185

2			
3 4	812	9	McCoy KS, Quittner AL, Oermann CM, et al. Inhaled aztreonam lysine for
5 6	813		chronic airway Pseudomonas aeruginosa in cystic fibrosis. Am J Respir Crit
7 8	814		<i>Care Med</i> 2008; 178 :921–8.
9 10 11	815	10	Ryan G, Mukhopadhyay S, Singh M. Nebulised anti-pseudomonal antibiotics
12 13	816		for cystic fibrosis. In: Ryan G, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.
14 15	817		Chichester, UK: : John Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2003.
16 17	818		doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001021
18 19	819	11	Jones AP Wallis C Dornase alfa for cystic fibrosis In Jones AP ed
20 21	019		Contentra, Walle C. Donado and for Optic Horobic. In: Content II, ed.
22 23	820		Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Chichester, UK: : John Wiley &
24	821		Sons, Ltd 2010. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001127.pub2
26 27	822	12	Wark P, McDonald VM. Nebulised hypertonic saline for cystic fibrosis. In:
28 29	823		Wark P, ed. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Chichester, UK: : John
30 31	824		Wiley & Sons, Ltd 2009. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001506.pub3
32 33 34	825	13	Ryan G, Singh M, Dwan K. Inhaled antibiotics for long-term therapy in cystic
35 36	826		fibrosis. Cochrane database Syst Rev 2011;:CD001021.
37 38	827		doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001021.pub2
39 40	828	14	Eakin MN, Bilderback A, Boyle MP, et al. Longitudinal association between
41 42	829		medication adherence and lung health in people with cystic fibrosis. J Cyst
43 44 45	830		<i>Fibros</i> 2011; 10 :258. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2011.03.005
46 47	831	15	Briesscher BA Quittner AI Saiman I <i>at al</i> Adherence with tobramycin
48	0.51	15	Diesacher DA, Quittier AL, Samian L, et al. Autorence with tobramyen
49 50	832		inhaled solution and health care utilization. BMC Pulm Med 2011;11:5.
51 52	833		doi:10.1186/1471-2466-11-5
53 54 55	834	16	Smyth A, Lewis S, Bertenshaw C, et al. Case-control study of acute renal
55 56 57	835		failure in patients with cystic fibrosis in the UK. Thorax 2008;63:532-5.
58 59 60	836		doi:10.1136/thx.2007.088757

1

2			
- 3 4	837	17	Mayer-Hamblett N, Rosenfeld M, Emerson J, et al. Developing Cystic Fibrosis
5 6	838		Lung Transplant Referral Criteria Using Predictors of 2-Year Mortality. Am J
7 8	839		Respir Crit Care Med 2002;166:1550-5. doi:10.1164/rccm.200202-087OC
9 10 11	840	18	Shiers D, Rafi I, Cooper S, et al. 2014 update (with acknowledgement to the
12 13	841		late Helen Lester for her contribution to the original 2012 version) Positive
14 15	842		Cardiometabolic Health Resource: an intervention framework for patients with
16 17	843		psychosis and schizophrenia. R Coll Psychiatr 2014;:London.
18 19 20	844	19	Quittner AL, Zhang J, Marynchenko M, et al. Pulmonary medication adherence
21 22	845		and health-care use in cystic fibrosis. Chest 2014;146:142-51.
23 24	846		doi:10.1378/chest.13-1926
25 26 27	847	20	Narayanan S, Mainz JG, Gala S, et al. Adherence to therapies in cystic fibrosis:
28 29	848		a targeted literature review. Expert Rev Respir Med 2017;11:129–45.
30 31	849		doi:10.1080/17476348.2017.1280399
32 33 24	850	21	McManus P. Lead Pharmacist - specialised services (South Yorkshire and
34 35 36	851		Bassetlaw) NHS England.
37 38	852	22	McNeil S. Personal communication from Stephanie McNeil, Chief Statistician
39 40	853		of UK CF Registry.
41 42 43	854	23	Daniels T, Goodacre L, Sutton C, et al. Accurate assessment of adherence: self-
44 45	855		report and clinician report vs electronic monitoring of nebulizers. Chest
46 47	856		2011; 140 :425-32. doi:10.1378/chest.09-3074
48 49	857	24	Hoo Z, Curley R, Walters S, et al. Exploring the implications of different
50 51 52	858		approaches to estimate centre-level adherence using objective adherence data
53 54	859		in an adult cystic fibrosis centre - a retrospective observational study. J Cyst
55 56	860		<i>Fibros</i> 2020; 19 :162–7. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2019.10.008
57 58	861	25	White H, Shaw N, Denman S, et al. Variation in lung function as a marker of
60			

1 2			
- 3 4	862		adherence to oral and inhaled medication in cystic fibrosis. Eur Respir J
5 6	863		2017; 49 :1600987. doi:10.1183/13993003.00987-2016
7 8	864	26	Daniels T, Goodacre L, Sutton C, et al. Accurate Assessment of Adherence.
9 10 11	865		Chest 2011;140:425-32. doi:10.1378/chest.09-3074
12 13	866	27	Sawicki GS, Sellers DE, Robinson WM. High treatment burden in adults with
14 15	867		cystic fibrosis: Challenges to disease self-management. J Cyst Fibros
16 17 19	868		2009; 8 :91–6. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2008.09.007
19 20	869	28	Horne RW, Barber N, Elliot R, et al. Concordance, adherance and compliance
21 22	870		in medicine taking: A conceptual map and research priorities. National Co-
23 24 25	871		ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisational R&D
23 26 27	872		(NCCSDO). 2005.
28 29	873	29	James Lind Alliance. Priority Setting Partnership: Cystic Fibrosis.
30 31	874		2017.http://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/priority-setting-partnerships/cystic-fibrosis/
32 33 34	875		(accessed 2 Jun 2017).
35 36	876	30	Hind D, Drabble SJ, Arden MA, et al. Supporting medication adherence for
37 38	877		adults with cystic fibrosis: a randomised feasibility study. BMC Pulm Med
39 40 41	878		2019; 19 :77. doi:10.1186/s12890-019-0834-6
41 42 43	879	31	Bugge C, Williams B, Hagen S, et al. A process for Decision-making after
44 45	880		Pilot and feasibility Trials (ADePT): development following a feasibility study
46 47	881		of a complex intervention for pelvic organ prolapse. Trials 2013;14:353.
48 49 50	882		doi:10.1186/1745-6215-14-353
51 52	883	32	Drabble S, O'Cathain A, Scott A, et al. Mechanisms of relationship, visibility
53 54	884		and fit within a complex intervention to improve nebuliser adherence in adults
55 56 57	885		with cystic fibrosis: a qualitative interview study (in press). J Internet Med Res
58 59 60	886		2020.

3 4	887	33	Arden M, Hind D, Drabble S. Applying the Theoretical Domains Framework:
5 6 7	888		adherence to nebuliser treatment in adults with cystic fibrosis. In: Complex
7 8 9	889		interventions in a complex world: applications of Behavioural Medicine: 12th
10 11	890		UKSBM Annual Scientific Meeting, Cardiff, 1st-2nd Dec 2016. 2016. 0021.
12 13	891	34	Cherryholmes CH. Notes on Pragmatism and Scientific Realism. Educ Res
14 15 16	892		1992; 21 :13–7. doi:10.3102/0013189X021006013
17 18	893	35	Yin RK. Case Study Research: Design and Methods. London: : Sage 2014.
19 20	894	36	Ritchie J, Spencer L. Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research. In:
21 22 23	895		Bryman A, Burgess RG, eds. Analysing qualitative data. Routledge 1994. 173–
24 25	896		94.
26 27	897	37	Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S. Validation of the theoretical domains
28 29 30	898		framework for use in behaviour change and implementation research.
31 32	899		Implement Sci 2012;7:37. doi:10.1186/1748-5908-7-37
33 34	900	38	Linnan L, Steckler A. Process evaluation for public health interventions and
35 36 27	901		research: an overview. In: Linnan L, Steckler A, eds. Process evaluation for
38 39	902		public health interventions and research. San Francisco: : Jossey-Bass 2002.
40 41	903		1–
42 43	904		23.http://media.johnwiley.com.au/product_data/excerpt/66/07879597/0787959
44 45 46	905		766.pdf (accessed 6 May 2014).
47 48	906	39	Farmer T, Robinson K, Elliott SJ, et al. Developing and implementing a
49 50	907		triangulation protocol for qualitative health research. Qual Health Res
51 52 53	908		2006; 16 :377–94. doi:10.1177/1049732305285708
55 54 55	909	40	Yin RK. Analyzing Case Study Evidence: How to Start Your Analysis, Your
56 57	910		Analytic Choices , and How They Work. In: Case Study Research: Design and
58 59 60	911		Methods. London: : Sage 2014. 133-76. doi:10.1111/bjd.13028

2			
3 4	912	41	Guetterman TC, Fetters MD, Creswell JW. Integrating quantitative and
5 6	913		qualitative results in health science mixed methods research through joint
7 8	914		displays. Ann Fam Med 2015;13:554-61. doi:10.1370/afm.1865
9 10 11	915	42	Fetters MD, Curry LA, Creswell JW. Achieving integration in mixed methods
12 13	916		designs - Principles and practices. Health Serv Res 2013;48:2134-56.
14 15	917		doi:10.1111/1475-6773.12117
16 17	918	43	Simons H. Case Study Research: In-Depth Understanding in Context. In:
18 19 20	919		Leavy P, ed. The Oxford Handbook of Qualitative Research. Oxford: : Oxford
20 21 22	920		University Press 2014. 455–70.
23 24	921	44	Perla RJ, Provost LP, Murray SK. The run chart: a simple analytical tool for
25 26	922		learning from variation in healthcare processes. <i>BMJ Qual Saf</i> 2011; 20 :46–51.
27 28 29	923		doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2009.037895
30 31	924	45	Bandura A. Social Cognitive Theory: An Agentic Perspective. Annu Rev
32 33	925		<i>Psychol</i> 2001; 52 :1–26. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.1
34 35 26	926	46	Carver CS, Scheier MF. Control theory: a useful conceptual framework for
37 38	927		personality-social, clinical, and health psychology. <i>Psychol Bull</i> 1982; 92 :111–
39 40	928		35. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.92.1.111
41 42	929	47	Ho YC. Abduction ? Deduction ? Induction ? Is there a Logic of Exploratory
43 44 45	930		Data Analysis? Proc Annu Meet Am Educ Res Assoc 1994::28.
46 47	931		doi:http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.135.3507&rep=r
48 49	932		ep1&type=pdf
50 51	000	40	
52 53	933	48	Peirce CS. How to make our ideas clear. <i>Pop Sci Mon</i> 18/8;12:286–302.
54 55	934	49	Swedberg R. Before theory comes theorizing or how to make social science
56 57	935		more interesting. Br J Sociol 2016;67. doi:10.1111/1468-4446.12184
58 59 60	936	50	Timmermans S, Tavory I. Theory Construction in Qualitative Research: From

1 2

3 4	937		Grounded Theory to Abductive Analysis. Sociol Theory 2012;30:167–86.
5 6	938		doi:10.1177/0735275112457914
7 8	939	51	Miles MB, Huberman AM, Saldaña J. Methods of Ordering. In: Qualitative
9 10 11	940		Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook. London: 2014. 193-220.
12 13	941	52	Hoo ZH, Boote J, Wildman MJ, et al. Determinants of objective adherence to
14 15	942		nebulised medications among adults with cystic fibrosis: an exploratory mixed
16 17 18	943		methods study comparing low and high adherers. Heal Psychol Behav Med
19 20	944		2017; 5 :299–316. doi:10.1080/21642850.2017.1338958
21 22	945	53	Wong MD, Sarkisian C a., Davis C, et al. The Association Between Life
23 24 25	946		Chaos, Health Care Use, and Health Status Among HIV-Infected Persons. J
26 27	947		Gen Intern Med 2007;22:1286-91. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0265-6
28 29	948	54	Horne R, Weinman J, Hankins M. The beliefs about medicines questionnaire:
30 31	949		The development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive
32 33 34	950		representation of medication. <i>Psychol Health</i> 1999;14:1–24.
35 36	951		doi:10.1080/08870449908407311
37 38	952	55	Clegg D, Barker R. Case Method Fast-Track: A RAD Approach. Boston, MA: :
39 40 41	953		Addison-Wesley 1994.
42 43	954	56	Bittner K, Spence I. Use Case Modeling. Boston, MA: : Addison-Wesley
44 45	955		Professional 2002.
46 47 48	956	57	Craig Larman. Agile and Iterative Development: A Manager's Guide. Boston,
49 50	957		MA: : Addison-Wesley 2004.
51 52	958	58	Govan JR. Infection control in cystic fibrosis: methicillin-resistant
53 54	959		Staphylococcus aureus, Pseudomonas aeruginosa and the Burkholderia cepacia
55 56 57	960		complex. <i>J R Soc Med</i> 2000; 93 Suppl 3 :40–
58 59 60	961		5.http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/10911818

2			
3 4	962	59	Wildman MJ, Hoo ZH. Moving cystic fibrosis care from rescue to prevention
5 6	963		by embedding adherence measurement in routine care. Paediatr Respir Rev
7 8	964		2014;15:16-8. doi:10.1016/j.prrv.2014.04.007
9 10 11	965	60	Schattner A. Predictors of Adherence to Inhaled Medications. J Gen Intern
12 13	966		Med 2013;28:758-758. doi:10.1007/s11606-013-2384-6
14 15	967	61	Battaglia M, Atkinson MA. The Streetlight Effect in Type 1 Diabetes. Diabetes
16 17 18	968		2015; 64 :1081–90. doi:10.2337/db14-1208
19 20	969	62	Kaplan A. The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. New
21 22	970		Brunswick, N.J.: : Transaction Publishers 1964.
23 24	971	63	Tversky A, Kahneman D. Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and
25 26 27	972		probability. Cogn Psychol 1973;5:207-32. doi:10.1016/0010-0285(73)90033-9
28 29	973	64	Flume PA, Clancy JP, Retsch-Bogart GZ, et al. Continuous alternating inhaled
30 31	974		antibiotics for chronic pseudomonal infection in cystic fibrosis. J Cyst Fibros
32 33 34	975		2016;15:809–15. doi:10.1016/j.jcf.2016.05.001
35 36	976	65	Michie S, Atkins L, West R. The Behaviour Change Wheel: A Guide To
37 38	977		Designing Interventions. Sutton: : Silverback Publishing 2014.
39 40 41	978	66	National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Medicines optimisation: the
42 43	979		safe and effective use of medicines to enable best possible outcomes (NG5).
44 45	980		London: : NICE 2015.
46 47 48	981	67	Carver CS, Scheier MF. On the self-regulation of behavior. Cambridge: :
48 49 50	982		Cambridge University Press 2001.
51 52	983	68	Yardley L, Spring BJ, Riper H, et al. Understanding and Promoting Effective
53 54	984		Engagement With Digital Behavior Change Interventions. Am J Prev Med
55 56 57	985		2016; 51 :833–42. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.015
58 59 60	986	69	Allemann SS, Nieuwlaat R, van den Bemt BJF, et al. Matching Adherence

3 4	987		Interventions to Patient Determinants Using the Theoretical Domains
5 6	988		Framework. Front Pharmacol 2016;7:429. doi:10.3389/fphar.2016.00429
/ 8 9	989	70	Michie S, Yardley L, West R, et al. Developing and evaluating digital
10 11	990		interventions to promote behavior change in health and health care:
12 13	991		Recommendations resulting from an international workshop. J Med Internet
14 15 16	992		Res 2017;19. doi:10.2196/jmir.7126
17 18	993	71	Murray E, Hekler EB, Andersson G, et al. Evaluating Digital Health
19 20	994		Interventions: Key Questions and Approaches. Am J Prev Med 2016;51:843-
21 22 23	995		51. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.008
24 25	996	72	Car J, Tan WS, Huang Z, et al. eHealth in the future of medications
26 27	997		management: personalisation, monitoring and adherence. BMC Med
28 29	998		2017; 15 :73. doi:10.1186/s12916-017-0838-0
30 31 32	999	73	Baumel A, Birnbaum ML, Sucala M. A Systematic Review and Taxonomy of
33 34	1000		Published Quality Criteria Related to the Evaluation of User-Facing eHealth
35 36	1001		Programs. J Med Syst 2017;41:128. doi:10.1007/s10916-017-0776-6
37 38 39	1002	74	Ryan C, Bergin M, Wells JS. Theoretical Perspectives of Adherence to Web-
40 41	1003		Based Interventions: a Scoping Review. Int J Behav Med Published Online
42 43	1004		First: 20 July 2017. doi:10.1007/s12529-017-9678-8
44 45 46	1005	75	Van Gemert-Pijnen JE, Kelders SM, Bohlmeijer ET. Understanding the Usage
46 47 48	1006		of Content in a Mental Health Intervention for Depression: An Analysis of Log
49 50	1007		Data. J Med Internet Res 2014;16:e27. doi:10.2196/jmir.2991
51 52	1008	76	Strecher V, McClure J, Alexander G, et al. The Role of Engagement in a
53 54 55	1009		Tailored Web-Based Smoking Cessation Program: Randomized Controlled
56 57	1010		Trial. J Med Internet Res 2008;10:e36. doi:10.2196/jmir.1002
58 59 60	1011	77	Danaher BG, Seeley JR. Methodological Issues in Research on Web-Based

1 2			
3 4	1012		Behavioral Interventions. Ann Behav Med 2009;38:28-39. doi:10.1007/s12160-
5 6 7 8 9	1013		009-9129-0
	1014	78	Ainsworth B, Steele M, Stuart B, et al. Using an Analysis of Behavior Change
10 11	1015		to Inform Effective Digital Intervention Design: How Did the PRIMIT Website
12 13	1016		Change Hand Hygiene Behavior Across 8993 Users? Ann Behav Med
14 15 16 17 18	1017		2017; 51 :423-31. doi:10.1007/s12160-016-9866-9
	1018	79	Hawe P. Lessons from complex interventions to improve health. Annu Rev
19 20	1019		Public Health 2015;36:307-23. doi:10.1146/annurev-publhealth-031912-
21 22	1020		114421
23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41	1021	80	Sherman DAK, Nelson LD, Steele CM. Do Messages about Health Risks
	1022		Threaten the Self? Increasing the Acceptance of Threatening Health Messages
	1023		Via Self-Affirmation. Personal Soc Psychol Bull 2000;26:1046–58.
	1024		doi:10.1177/01461672002611003
	1025	81	Drabble SJ, O'Cathain A, Arden MA, et al. When Is Forgetting Not
	1026		Forgetting? A Discursive Analysis of Differences in Forgetting Talk Between
	1027		Adults With Cystic Fibrosis With Different Levels of Adherence to Nebulizer
	1028		Treatments. Qual Health Res 2019;29:2119–31.
42 43	1029		doi:10.1177/1049732319856580
44 45	1030	82	Perski O, Blandford A, West R, et al. Conceptualising engagement with digital
46 47 48	1031		behaviour change interventions: a systematic review using principles from
49 50	1032		critical interpretive synthesis. Transl Behav Med 2017;7:254-67.
51 52	1033		doi:10.1007/s13142-016-0453-1
53 54	1034	83	Frazee SG, Muzina DJ, Nease RF. Strategies to Overcome Medication
55 56 57	1035		Nonadherence. JAMA 2014;311:1693. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.1760
58 59 60	1036	84	Mohammed MA, Moles RJ, Chen TF. Medication-related burden and patients'

3 4	1037		lived experience with medicine: a systematic review and metasynthesis of
5 6	1038		qualitative studies. BMJ Open 2016;6:e010035. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-
7 8 0	1039		010035
9 10 11	1040	85	Huygens MWJ, Vermeulen J, Swinkels ICS, et al. Expectations and needs of
12 13	1041		patients with a chronic disease toward self-management and eHealth for self-
14 15 16	1042		management purposes. BMC Health Serv Res 2016;16:232.
10 17 18	1043		doi:10.1186/s12913-016-1484-5
19 20	1044	86	Kelders SM, Oinas-Kukkonen H, Oörni A, et al. Health Behavior Change
21 22	1045		Support Systems as a research discipline; a viewpoint. Int J Med Inform
23 24 25	1046		Published Online First: 2016. doi:10.1016/j.ijmedinf.2016.06.022
26 27	1047	87	Rathbone AP, Todd A, Jamie K, et al. A systematic review and thematic
28 29	1048		synthesis of patients' experience of medicines adherence. Res Soc Adm Pharm
30 31 32	1049		Published Online First: 2016. doi:10.1016/j.sapharm.2016.06.004
33 34	1050	88	O'Connor S, Hanlon P, O'Donnell CA, et al. Understanding factors affecting
35 36	1051		patient and public engagement and recruitment to digital health interventions: a
37 38 30	1052		systematic review of qualitative studies. BMC Med Inform Decis Mak
40 41	1053		2016; 16 :120. doi:10.1186/s12911-016-0359-3
42 43	1054	89	Bond CM. Adherence: the Holy Grail? BMJ Qual Saf 2016;25:736-8.
44 45 46	1055		doi:10.1136/bmjqs-2015-004886
40 47 48	1056	90	Cammidge SL, Duff AJA, Latchford GJ, et al. When Women with Cystic
49 50	1057		Fibrosis Become Mothers: Psychosocial Impact and Adjustments. Pulm Med
51 52	1058		2016; 2016 :9458980. doi:10.1155/2016/9458980
53 54 55	1059	91	Powell KR. Patient-Perceived Facilitators of and Barriers to Electronic Portal
56 57	1060		Use. CIN Comput Informatics, Nurs 2017;35:565–73.
58 59 60	1061		doi:10.1097/CIN.00000000000377

Page 45 of 202

1 2			
2 3 4	1062	92	Curtis LM, Mullen RJ, Russell A, et al. An efficacy trial of an electronic health
5 6	1063		record-based strategy to inform patients on safe medication use: The role of
/ 8 9	1064		written and spoken communication. Patient Educ Couns 2016;99:1489-95.
10 11	1065		doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.07.004
12 13	1066	93	Morton K, Dennison L, May C, et al. Using digital interventions for self-
14 15 16	1067		management of chronic physical health conditions: A meta-ethnography review
17 18	1068		of published studies. Patient Educ Couns 2017;100:616-35.
19 20	1069		doi:10.1016/j.pec.2016.10.019
21 22 22	1070	94	Hanlon P, Daines L, Campbell C, et al. Telehealth Interventions to Support
23 24 25	1071		Self-Management of Long-Term Conditions: A Systematic Metareview of
26 27	1072		Diabetes, Heart Failure, Asthma, Chronic Obstructive Pulmonary Disease, and
28 29	1073		Cancer. J Med Internet Res 2017;19:e172. doi:10.2196/jmir.6688
30 31 32	1074	95	O'Cathain A, Drabble SJ, Foster A, et al. Being Human: A Qualitative
33 34	1075		Interview Study Exploring Why a Telehealth Intervention for Management of
35 36	1076		Chronic Conditions Had a Modest Effect. J Med Internet Res 2016;18:e163.
37 38 20	1077		doi:10.2196/jmir.5879
40 41	1078	96	Oussedik, E., Foy, C.G, Masicampo, E.J., Kammrath, L.K, Anderson, R.E,
42 43	1079		Feldman SR (in press). Accountabiliy: a missing construct in models of
44 45	1080		adherence behavior and in clinical practice. Patient Prefer Adherence
46 47 48	1081		2017;:1285-94. doi:10.2147/PPA.S135895
49 50	1082	97	Rudd RE. Health literacy skills of U.S. adults. Am J Health Behav 2007;31
51 52	1083		Suppl 1:S8-18. doi:10.5555/ajhb.2007.31.supp.S8
53 54 55	1084	98	DeWalt DA, Pignone M, Malone R, et al. Development and pilot testing of a
56 57	1085		disease management program for low literacy patients with heart failure.
58 59 60	1086		Patient Educ Couns 2004;55:78-86. doi:10.1016/j.pec.2003.06.002

3 4	1087	99	Sarkar U, Fisher L, Schillinger D. Is Self-Efficacy Associated With Diabetes
5 6	1088		Self-Management Across Race/Ethnicity and Health Literacy? Diabetes Care
7 8	1089		2006; 29 :823–9. doi:10.2337/diacare.29.04.06.dc05-1615
9 10 11	1090	100	Guest G, Bunce A, Johnson L. How Many Interviews Are Enough?: An
12 13	1091		Experiment with Data Saturation and Variability. Field methods 2006;18:59-
14 15 16	1092		82. doi:10.1177/1525822X05279903
16 17 18	1093	101	Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview
19 20	1094		Studies: Guided by Information Power. Qual Health Res 2015;:1–8.
21 22 22	1095		doi:10.1177/1049732315617444
23 24 25	1096	102	Liu H, Mohammed A, Shanthosh J, et al. Process evaluations of primary care
26 27	1097		interventions addressing chronic disease: a systematic review. BMJ Open
28 29	1098		2019;9:e025127. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2018-025127
30 31 32	1099	103	Beets MW, Weaver RG, Ioannidis JPA, et al. Identification and evaluation of
33 34	1100		risk of generalizability biases in pilot versus efficacy/effectiveness trials: a
35 36	1101		systematic review and meta-analysis. Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act 2020;17:19.
37 38 20	1102		doi:10.1186/s12966-020-0918-y
39 40 41	1103	104	Cooper CL, Whitehead A, Pottrill E, et al. Are pilot trials useful for predicting
42 43	1104		randomisation and attrition rates in definitive studies: A review of publicly
44 45	1105		funded trials. Clin Trials 2018;15:189-96. doi:10.1177/1740774517752113
46 47 48	1106	105	Tappenden P, Sadler S, Wildman M. An Early Health Economic Analysis of
49 50	1107		the Potential Cost Effectiveness of an Adherence Intervention to Improve
51 52	1108		Outcomes for Patients with Cystic Fibrosis. Pharmacoeconomics 2017;35:647-
53 54	1109		59. doi:10.1007/s40273-017-0500-x
56 57	1110	106	O'Donohoe R, Fullen BM. Adherence of subjects with cystic fibrosis to their
58 59 60	1111		home program: a systematic review. Respir Care 2014;59:1731-46.

1 2			
3 4	1112		doi:10.4187/respcare.02990
5 6	1113	107	Sawicki GS, Goldman DP, Chan W, et al. Patient preference for treatment
7 8	1114		administration in cystic fibrosis. Am J Pharm Benefits 2015;7:174-81.
9 10 11	1115	108	Phillips LA, Cohen J, Burns E, et al. Self-management of chronic illness: the
12 13	1116		role of 'habit' versus reflective factors in exercise and medication adherence. J
14 15	1117		Behav Med 2016; 39 :1076–91. doi:10.1007/s10865-016-9732-z
16 17 18	1118	109	Lally P, van Jaarsveld CHM, Potts HWW, et al. How are habits formed:
19 20	1119		Modelling habit formation in the real world. Eur J Soc Psychol 2010;40:998–
21 22	1120		1009. doi:10.1002/ejsp.674
23 24 25	1121	110	Arden MA, Drabble S, O'Cathain A, et al. Adherence to medication in adults
26 27	1122		with Cystic Fibrosis: An investigation using objective adherence data and the
28 29	1123		Theoretical Domains Framework. Br J Health Psychol Published Online First:
30 31	1124		March 2019. doi:10.1111/bjhp.12357
32 33 34	1125	111	Hoo ZH, Gardner B, Arden MA, et al. Role of habit in treatment adherence
35 36	1126		among adults with cystic fibrosis. <i>Thorax</i> 2019;74:197–9.
37 38	1127		doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-211453
39 40 41	1128	112	Conn VS, Ruppar TM. Medication adherence outcomes of 771 intervention
42 43	1129		trials: Systematic review and meta-analysis. Prev Med (Baltim) 2017;99:269-
44 45	1130		76. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2017.03.008
46 47 48	1131	113	Goldzweig CL, Orshansky G, Paige NM, et al. Electronic patient portals:
48 49 50	1132		evidence on health outcomes, satisfaction, efficiency, and attitudes: a
51 52	1133		systematic review. Ann Intern Med 2013;159:677-87. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-
53 54	1134		159-10-201311190-00006
55 56 57	1135	114	Lau AY, Arguel A, Dennis S, et al. "Why Didn't it Work?" Lessons From a
58 59 60	1136		Randomized Controlled Trial of a Web-based Personally Controlled Health

2			
3 4	1137		Management System for Adults with Asthma. J Med Internet Res
5 6	1138		2015;17:e283. doi:10.2196/jmir.4734
7 8	1139	115	Kruse CS, Kothman K, Anerobi K, et al. Adoption Factors of the Electronic
9 10 11	1140		Health Record: A Systematic Review. JMIR Med informatics 2016;4:e19.
12 13	1141		doi:10.2196/medinform.5525
14 15	1142	116	Greenhalgh T, Swinglehurst D, Stones R. Rethinking resistance to 'big IT': a
16 17	1143		sociological study of why and when healthcare staff do not use nationally
18 19 20	1144		mandated information and communication technologies. Heal Serv Deliv Res
20 21 22	1145		2014; 2 :1–86. doi:10.3310/hsdr02390
23	1146	117	
24 25	1146	117	Ross J, Stevenson F, Lau R, <i>et al.</i> Factors that influence the implementation of
26 27	1147		e-health: a systematic review of systematic reviews (an update). Implement Sci
28 29	1148		2016; 11 :146. doi:10.1186/s13012-016-0510-7
30 31 22	1149	118	Hennemann S, Beutel ME, Zwerenz R. Ready for eHealth? Health
32 33 34	1150		Professionals' Acceptance and Adoption of eHealth Interventions in Inpatient
35 36	1151		Routine Care. J Health Commun 2017;22:274-84.
37 38	1152		doi:10.1080/10810730.2017.1284286
39 40	1153	119	Harris M, Lawn SJ, Morello A, et al. Practice change in chronic conditions
41 42 43	1154		care: an appraisal of theories. BMC Health Serv Res 2017;17:170.
44 45	1155		doi:10.1186/s12913-017-2102-x
46 47	1156	120	Ovretveit J, Leviton L, Parry G. Increasing the generalisability of improvement
48 49	1157		research with an improvement replication programme. BMJ Qual Saf
50 51 52	1158		2011; 20 :i87–91. doi:10.1136/bmjqs.2010.046342
53			
54 55	1159	121	Eikey E V, Reddy MC, Kuziemsky CE. Examining the role of collaboration in
56 57	1160		studies of health information technologies in biomedical informatics: A
58 59 60	1161		systematic review of 25 years of research. J Biomed Inform 2015;57:263-77.

1 2			
2 3 4	1162		doi:10.1016/j.jbi.2015.08.006
5 6	1163	122	Girling C, Hind D, Arden MA, et al. Developing an implementation strategy
7 8 0	1164		for the use of objective adherence data in routine clinical practice: a case study
9 10 11	1165		in cystic fibrosis clinics. Implement Sci 2019;14:P9. doi:10.1186/s13012-019-
12 13	1166		0911-5
14 15	1167	123	Bevan A, Tahir M, Miller B, et al. P337 Easy Medicines for Burden Reduction
16 17 18	1168		and Care Enhancement: using real time adherence data to optimise inhaled
19 20	1169		therapies in adults with cystic fibrosis. The UK National EMBRACE
21 22	1170		programme. J Cyst Fibros 2020;19:S150. doi:10.1016/S1569-1993(20)30666-4
23 24 25	1171	124	Relton C, Torgerson D, O'Cathain A, et al. Rethinking pragmatic randomised
26 27	1172		controlled trials: introducing the 'cohort multiple randomised controlled trial'
28 29	1173		design. BMJ 2010; 340 :c1066. doi:10.1136/bmj.c1066
30 31 32	1174	125	Young-Afat DA, Verkooijen HAM, van Gils CH, et al. Staged-informed
32 33 34	1175		Consent in the Cohort Multiple Randomized Controlled Trial Design.
35 36	1176		Epidemiology 2016;27:389–92. doi:10.1097/EDE.000000000000435
37 38	1177	126	Retsch-Bogart GZ, Van Dalfsen JM, Marshall BC, et al. Highly effective cystic
39 40 41	1178		fibrosis clinical research teams: critical success factors. J Gen Intern Med
42 43	1179		2014; 29 Suppl 3 :S714-23. doi:10.1007/s11606-014-2896-8
44 45	1180	127	Hibbard JH, Mahoney ER, Stockard J, et al. Development and testing of a short
46 47	1181		form of the patient activation measure. Health Serv Res 2005;40:1918-30.
48 49 50	1182		doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00438.x
51 52	1183	128	Verplanken BAS, Ell OR, Orbell S. Reflections on past behavior: A self-report
53 54	1184		index of habit strength. J Appl Soc Psychol 2003;33:1313-30.
55 56 57	1185		doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x
58 59 60	1186		

1187		
1180 1189 1190		
1191		
Tables

1193Table 1 - Quantitative data contributing to the understanding of1194logic model constructs

#	Logic model column / construct	Quantitative
	INPUTS	
3	Prescription data	CFHH; problems documented in
		implementation log.
7	COM-BMQ questionnaire	Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour
	responses	Beliefs Questionnaire (COM-BMQ),
		incorporating the Beliefs about Medicines
		Questionnaire (Nebuliser adherence)[54], one
	<pre></pre>	additional belief item, one intention item, one
		confidence item, and a list of barriers
9	Interventionist training	Structured questionnaire on interventionist
	programme	confidence after training programme.
11	Competency/Fidelity assessment	Structured instrument for the assessment of
		interventionist competence.
	ENGAGEMENT	
13	Clinicians accessing adherence	CFHH click analytics.
	data*	
14	Adherence data tracking	CFHH click analytics.
15	Participant accessing	CFHH click analytics.
	CFHealthHub	

2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 0	
ð	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
15	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
١Ŏ	
19	
20	
21	
22	
~~ 72	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
20	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
22	
24	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20	
20	
39	
40	
41	
42	
12	
ر ب	
44	
45	
46	
47	
<u>4</u> 8	
40	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
55	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
~ ~ ~	

17	CFHealthHub Intervention	Project-specific structured fidelity assessment
	sessions delivered according to	instrument.
	Manual (Fidelity)	
18	Initial session, and then review at	CFHH click analytics.
	each clinic visit	
	ACTIVITIES	
	Intervention components for all	
	participants	
20	Self-monitoring adherence	CFHH click analytics.
21	Tailored education about	CFHH click analytics.
	treatment	
22	Tailored patient stories (videos)	CFHH click analytics.
	Intervention components for	4.
	those with adequate motivation	
23	Personalised goal-setting	CFHH click analytics.
24	Goal review	CFHH click analytics.
25	Personalised action plan	CFHH click analytics.
26	Tailored problem-solving	CFHH click analytics.
	IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES	
	For all participants	

28	Acute awareness of adherence /	Subjective adherence single question (self-
	increased Motivation	report estimate of adherence as a percentage);
		COM-BMQ.
29	Increased necessity and	COM-BMQ and Patient Activation Measure
	decreased concern	(PAM-13[127])
30	Increased self-efficacy /	COM-BMQ single question about confidence
	Motivation	to adhere; PAM-13.
	For those with adequate	
	motivation	
31	Increased self-efficacy/	COM-BMQ single question about confidence
	Motivation	to adhere; PAM-13.
32	Increased habit / reduced chaos	Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index
		(SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of the
		Self Report Habit index to capture habit-based
		behaviour patterns[128]; Confusion, Hubbub,
		and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measure of
		life chaos[53].
		1
33	Reduced barriers	No change in the group averages for The
		Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire -
		specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-
		item[54])
	INTERMEDIATE	
	OUTCOMES	

Increased adherence

Nebuliser data (CFHH)

1 2		
3		35
4 5		
6		
7 o	1107	
o 9	1196	
10	1197	
11 12	1177	
13	1198	
14		
15 16		
17		
18 10		
19 20		
21		
22		
23		
25		
26 27		
28		
29		
30 31		
32		
33		
34 35		
36		
37		
30 39		
40		
41 42		
43		
44		
45 46		
47		
48 40		
49 50		
51		
52 53		
54		
55		
56 57		
58		
59		
60		

For perturbative and the second

2 3		
4	1199	Figures
5 6 7	1200	
, 8 9	1201	Figure 1 - Logic model
10 11	1202	
12 13 14	1203	Figure 2 - The digital platform
14 15 16	1204	
17 18	1205	Figure 3 – Objective versus subjective adherence at 5 (+/- 1) months stratified
19 20	1206	by adherence
21 22 23	1207	
24 25	1200	Additional files
26	1208	Additional mes
27	1209	
28 29 30	1210 1211	Additional file 01 – Participant adherence run charts for fourteen case studies
31		
32 33	1212	Additional file 02 – Study protocol and interview guides
34	1213	
35	1215	Additional file 03 – Quantitative results from process evaluation
36 37	1216	
38	1217	Additional file 04 – Joint display table
39	1217	
40 41		
41	1219	Additional file 05 – Case-ordered descriptive matrix for fourteen case studies
43	1220	
44	1221	Additional file 06 – Statistical methods, outcomes and estimation
45 46	1222	
47 48	1223	Additional file 07 – Changes to intervention procedures
49 50		
50 51		
52		
53		
54 55		
56		
57		
58 59		
60		



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml









ACtiF



Sheffield Teaching Hospitals



Sheffield Hallam University



Development and evaluation of an intervention to support <u>A</u>dherence to treatment in adults with <u>Cystic</u> <u>Fibrosis</u>

A feasibility study comprised of an external pilot randomised controlled trial and process evaluation

RESEARCH PROTOCOL

V3.1 16Nov16 Sheffield CTRU IRAS ISRCTN Authorised by:

J13-002 ISRCTN13076797 Martin Wildman

Alicia O'Cathain

Funding

This project was funded by the Programme Grants for Applied Research programme (RP-PG-1212-20015) and will be published in full in the NIHR Journals Library. This research presents independent research commissioned by the NIHR. The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, MRC, CCF, NETSCC, the Health Technology Assessment programme or the Department of Health.

Roles and responsibilities

Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors

The following all contributed to drafting elements throughout the protocol: Martin Wildman, Consultant Respiratory Medic; Marlene Hutchings, Physiotherapist (Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust); Madelynne Arden, Professor of Health Psychology (Sheffield Hallam University); Alicia O'Cathain, Professor of Health Services Research; Sarah Drabble, Research Associate, Stephen Walters (Professor of Medical Statistics and Clinical Trials); Paul Tappenden, Reader in Health Economics; Daniel Beever, Research Associate and Patient Representative; Pauline Wheelan mHealth Applications Manager (University of Manchester); Judy Bradley, Professor of Physiotherapy and Health Services Research; Hannah Cantrill (Research Associate); Chin Maguire (Study Manager); and, Daniel Hind, Assistant Director, Sheffield Clinical Trials Research Unit (University of Sheffield). MW and MA are guarantors of the intervention description; SW is the guarantor of the statistical design and analysis plan; DH is the guarantor of other elements of the pilot trial; AO'C is guarantor for the qualitative research components.

Sponsor

Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust D Floor Clinical Research Office Royal Hallamshire Hospital Glossop Road Sheffield S10 2JF Tel: (0114) 2256424 Fax: (0114)

Role of study sponsor and funders

Neither the funder nor the sponsor have had any role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of manuscripts.

Key Contacts

Study Manager

Chin Maguire Clinical Trials Research Unit The University of Sheffield School of Health and Related Research 30 Regent Street Sheffield S1 4DA Tel: (0114) 222 0717 Fax: (0114) 222 0870 e-mail: <u>c.maguire@sheffield.ac.uk</u>

Chief Investigator

Dr Martin Wildman Adult CF Centre Northern General Hospital Herries Road Sheffield S5 7AU

Tel: (0114) 2715212 Fax: (0114) 222 0870 e-mail: <u>Martin.Wildman@sth.nhs.uk</u>

Composition, roles, and responsibilities

Project Management Group

Name	Role	Institution
Dr Martin Wildman	Chief Investigator	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals
		NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Alicia O'Cathain	Chief Investigator	University of Sheffield
Dr Daniel Hind	CTRU Assistant Director	University of Sheffield
Chin Maguire	Study Manager	University of Sheffield
Hannah Cantrill	Research Assistant	University of Sheffield
Helen Wakefield	Trial Support Office	University of Sheffield
Dan Beever	PPI Lead	University of Sheffield
Dr Sarah Drabble	Qualitative Researcher	University of Sheffield
Professor Maddy Arden	Professor of Health Psychology	Sheffield Hallam University
Marlene Hutchings	Research Physiotherapist	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Judy Bradley	Professor in Physiotherapy	Queens University Belfast

Independent Project Steering Committee

Name	Role	Institution
Professor Kathy Rowan	Independent Chair	London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine
Professor Sarah Garner	Independent member	The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence
Professor David Torgerson	Independent Member	University of York
Dr Lisa Hampson	Independent Statistician	Lancaster University
Dominic Kavanagh	PPI Representative	
Dr Martin Wildman	Chief Investigator	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Alicia O'Cathain	Chief Investigator	University of Sheffield
Dr Daniel Hind	CTRU Assistant Director	University of Sheffield
Chin Maguire	Study Manager	University of Sheffield
Professor Maddy Arden	Professor of Health Psychology	Sheffield Hallam University

Contents

Names, affiliations, and roles of protocol contributors	
Sponsor	
Role of study sponsor and funders	• • • • • • • • • •
Composition roles and responsibilities	•••••
Project Management Group	• • • • • • • • • •
Independent Project Steering Committee	• • • • • • • • • •
Contents	•••••
Figures	•••••
Tables	•••••
1 I av summary	•••••
 Introduction 	•••••
2.1 Background	•••••
2.1 Dackground	•••••
2.2 Katoliale	•••••
3.1 Aime	•••••
3.2 Objectives	•••••
J.2 Objectives	•••••
+. Design	•••••
5.1 Softings and locations where the date will be collected	
5.2 Elisibility	•••••
5.2 Eligibility	•••••
5.2.1 Inclusion criteria for participants	•••••
5.2.2 Exclusion criteria for participants	•••••
5.2.5 Englointy criteria for interventionists	•••••
5.2.4 Eligibility chiefia for interventionists	•••••
6. Interventions	
6.1 Summary	•••••
6.2 Microchipped devices	•••••
6.2.1 The elfrack nebuliser system (Parl GmbH)	•••••
6.2.2 The Bi-neb AAD System from (Philips Healthcare)	•••••
6.3 Information technology infrastructure	•••••
6.3.1 The Qualcomm hub	•••••
6.3.2 CFHealthHub	•••••
6.3.3 The B1-Neb data transfer system	•••••
6.4 The Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI)	•••••
6.4.1 Rationale and theory	
6.4.2 Intervention providers	•••••
6.4.5 Materials	•••••
6.4.4 Procedures	•••••
6.5 Usual care	•••••
6.6 Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions	••••••
6.7 Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols	•••••
6.7.1 For health professionals	•••••
6.7.2 For patients	•••••
6.8 Relevant permitted / prohibited concomitant care	•••••
7. Outcomes	•••••
7.1 Feasibility outcomes ('stop-go' or 'success' criteria for RCT)	•••••
7.2 Process data relating to the implementation of the trial	

10.2.1 Audio recordings of consultations41 12.2 Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines......45 12.3.1 Serious Adverse Events45

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

1

Figures

Figure 1. Interaction between complex intervention components	14
Figure 2. Interactions between capability, opportunity and motivation	17
Figure 3. Habit formation incorporating COM-B and necessities and concerns	
Figure 4. Interplay between COM-B components during habit formation	
Figure 5. Behaviour change intervention flow chart	
Figure 6. Participant timeline for the external pilot RCT	
Figure 7. Assumptions of the MRC Guidance on Process Evaluation	43

Tables

Table 1. Learning objectives of the CFHealthHub modules	16
Table 2: Intervention modules	20
Table 3. Individual-level data derived from PWCF and sites	34
Table 4. CFHealthHub data (research arm only)	35
rubleer freutinfub dut (researen unif onif)	

1. Lay summary

Cystic Fibrosis (CF) is an inherited disease affecting 10000 people in the UK with an average age at death of 28 years in 2012. The lungs of people with CF (PWCF) are prone to infections. Daily physiotherapy and inhaled medications are needed to stay healthy. Around £30 million is spent annually on inhaled therapy but average adherence has been shown to be only 36%. Data suggest that adherence is better in younger children (71% in under 12s, falling to 50% in teenagers) but of the 10000 UK PWCF almost 6000 are now adults. PWCF who collect <50% of their medication cost the healthcare system significantly more than PWCF who collect more than 80% and most of the additional cost results from unscheduled emergency care and hospital admission. This unscheduled emergency care is distressing for PWCF and their families.

We have designed an intervention to help adult PWCF see how much treatment they use. We use dose-counting nebulisers to collect data and send it to a website where it can be displayed. We have worked with PWCF to make the information easy to understand. The website has modules which teach PWCF how to build successful treatment habits. We have developed a toolkit to help PWCF and a health professional (interventionist) work together to form habits of adherence to treatment.

The NHS should not fund this intervention without its effectiveness and value for money being evaluated in a Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT). However, there is currently insufficient information to effectively plan or justify funding a RCT on the scale required. This feasibility study is an essential preliminary to the full scale RCT. The purpose of this feasibility study is to see whether the proposed procedures for the full scale RCT are feasible and acceptable to PWCF. It will also tell us whether the intervention can be delivered by health professionals and is acceptable to PWCF, outside the NHS trust where it was developed.

We will recruit PWCF for four months at two CF units. We hope we will recruit 64 PWCF overall, but will deem the full scale RCT feasible if we recruit 48. A computer will decide whether people who consent to be in the study will receive usual care alone or also receive the intervention. Both groups have a short period of two to four weeks when data is collected through their nebulisers and fed back to the website. It is only after that period that those allocated to the intervention are allowed to use the website and receive enhanced care from the interventionist. After that point, all participants are followed up for 5 (+/-) months. Participants will complete a series of questionnaires at the outset and at 5 (+/-) months.

With appropriate consent, the interventionist or member of the multidisciplinary team (MDT) will audio record consultations between themselves and PWCF who are receiving the intervention or usual care. Qualitative researchers will conduct: 20-24 interviews with PWCF receiving the intervention; 20-24 interviews with PWCF receiving usual care; eight interviews with the four health professionals who are delivering the intervention; and eight semi-structured interviews with members of the wider MDT. These interviews are intended to help the team understand and mitigate potential sources of failure in the intervention and the proposed full-scale trial.

8

9

2. Introduction

2.1 Background

Cystic Fibrosis (CF) is a long term condition (LTC) in which poor adherence to high cost drugs shortens lives and increases NHS costs. CF is a LTC affecting 10,000 people in the UK 10 with PWCF typically dying from lung damage at a median age of 28 years [1]. Randomised 11 12 controlled trials show that preventative medications reduce exacerbations and/or preserve 13 lung function, [2-8] however adherence is poor. A recent review of objective measures of 14 adherence using medicine possession ratios (MPR: prescriptions collected over prescriptions 15 issued) and instrumented medication monitors showed adherence ranging from 67% for oral 16 antibiotics, 31-53% for inhaled antibiotics, 53-79% for mucolytics agents and 41-72% for 17 hypertonic saline [9]. Accumulating evidence suggests poor adherence is associated with poor 18 outcomes. PWCF collecting four or more courses of alternate month nebulised tobramycin per 19 year were 60% less likely to be admitted to hospital than PWCF collecting one or less [10]. 20 21 Lower composite MPR predicted exacerbations requiring intravenous antibiotics (IVAB) [9] 22 and over a 12 month period PWCF with an MPR of 80% had significantly lower total 23 healthcare costs than PWCF with an MPR <50% with a cost difference \$14,211 per patient 24 and most excess costs related to hospital care [11]. Rescue therapy with IVAB can cause 25 renal failure [12]. The total 2012 UK spend for CF was estimated to be £100 million of which 26 £30 million was spent on inhaled antibiotics and mucolytics [13]. Although patient self-27 28 reported adherence to inhaled therapy was 80%, objective measurement showed median 29 adherence was only 36% and the clinicians were unable to predict which PWCF were able to 30 successfully adhere [14] making adherence support difficult. In 2012, the UK CF population 31 received 171,907 days of IVAB with the 93,455 of these that occurred in hospital costing an 32 estimated $\pounds 27$ million [15]. It is recommended that adherence interventions should be 33 targeted where adherence really matters [16] and targeting support towards the high cost 34 inhaled preventative drugs in CF (median adherence 36%) has the potential to impact on the 35 36 171,907 days of IVAB a proportion of which will represent rescue therapy necessitated by 37 failed prevention. 38

2.2 Rationale

39 40

41 42

43

44

45 46

47

48

49 50 51

52

53

54

55

56 57 58

59

60

The National Institute for Health Research have commissioned a Programme Grant for Applied Research to systematically develop and evaluate an adherence intervention for PWCF. The Programme Grant has three work packages

Work package 1: Build IT infrastructure to capture adherence data from nebulisers. Coproduce a web-portal, 'CFHealthHub', with PWCF and clinicians, in order to display routinely collected adherence data for the use of both groups.

Work package 2: Develop a toolkit based on psychological theory that can support PWCF to adhere to treatment. This will include feedback of measured adherence data and personalised interventions to increase adherence delivered through CFHealthHub. Manualise a Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI) for use by health professionals and PWCF.

All four work packages have received a favourable opinion from an NHS REC:

Work package 2.1A: A study of the views of people with cystic fibrosis about their condition and treatments (Hampshire A REC: 14/SC/1455; IRAS: 171049);

BMJ Open

- Work package 2.1C: A study to produce videos for the CFHealthHub website (Camden & Kings Cross REC: 15/LO/0944; IRAS: 182367);
- Work package 2.2B: A study to develop a Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI) to help patients with CF manage treatment adherence ((South Yorkshire REC: 15/YH/0332; IRAS: 184477); and,
- Work package 2.2B(1): A study to understand how to use the eTrack and Bi-neb nebuliser to help people with CF to manage their inhalation treatments (West of Scotland REC 5: 15/WS/0089; IRAS: 177900).

Work package 3: Evaluate the toolkit developed in work package 2. The planned definitive evaluation will take place in a large-scale, multi-centre Randomised Controlled Trial (RCT). The definitive evaluation will compare usual care plus staff training in the importance of knowledge, skills and confidence building for adherence versus the same plus the structured behaviour change in intervention (CFHealthHub plus manual).

There is too little information available to effectively plan or justify funding a full scale RCT. We wish to conduct feasibility study comprising of:

- an 'external pilot RCT' to establish the feasibility of recruitment to a larger, definitive study; and,
- a 'process evaluation' which will help us understand the strengths and weaknesses of both the intervention and research protocols, and ways of addressing any weaknesses.

3. Aim and objectives

3.1 Aims

The principal aims of this feasibility study are to assess the feasibility and acceptability of:

- a complex intervention, when delivered outside the team which conceived and developed it; and,
- procedures for a full-scale RCT.

3.2 Objectives

1. An external pilot randomised controlled trial to determine feasibility of a randomised controlled trial based on objective stop-go criteria (Section 7.1) related to:

(a) participant recruitment;

(b) participant retention; and,

(c) quality of primary outcome data at 5(+/-1) month.

2. A process evaluation, relating quantitative and qualitative data on procedures to outcomes, in order to understand and mitigate potential sources of failure in:

(a) the intervention; and,

(b) the full trial.

4. Design

Mixed-methods study comprising of:

• Quantitative component: parallel group, open labelled, external pilot RCT;

and,

• Qualitative component: analysis of audio-recorded consultations and interviews.

Quantitative and qualitative data will contribute to the process evaluation.

5. Participants and study settings

5.1 Settings and locations where the data will be collected

Nebuliser adherence data and information derived from CFHealthHub will be automatically uploaded by participants nebulisers in their own home. Data collection involving patient notes and patient reported outcome measures will take place in two specialist CF units which have not been involved in the development of the intervention. Exacerbation data will be collected by the ACtiF trial interventionist and clinicians at sites from participant notes.

5.2 Eligibility

5.2.1 Inclusion criteria for participants

- 1. Diagnosed with CF and with data within the CF registry
- 2. Aged 16 years and above
- 3. Taking inhaled mucolytics or antibiotics via a chipped nebuliser (e.g. eTrack or Bi-Neb) or able and willing to take via eTrack or Bi-Neb.

5.2.2 Exclusion criteria for participants

- 1. Post-lung transplant
- 2. People on the active lung transplant list
- 3. Patients receiving palliative care, Lacking in capacity to give informed consent
- 4. Using dry powder devices to take antibiotics or mucolytics

5.2.3 Eligibility criteria for study centres

- 1. Adult CF Centre;
- 2. Recognised by commissioners
- 3. Receiving year-of-care funding

5.2.4 Eligibility criteria for interventionists

1. Health care professional e.g. registered nurse, physiotherapist or other appropriately skilled individual such as a psychology graduate able to work at NHS Agenda for Change Band - 4 or above

6. Interventions

6.1 Summary

 In the external pilot RCT, we will test procedures for a full trial. This involves allocation of PWCF to either a complex intervention or usual care. A 'complex intervention' is defined as one with several interacting components [17]. The complex intervention under evaluation has three broad categories of components (Figure 1):

(a) *a microchipped device* (nebuliser) for delivering inhaled medications, which are routinely prescribed for the control of cystic fibrosis (Section 6.2);

(b) *information technology infrastructure* to capture and store adherence data from the nebulisers and display it to PWCF and the CF team (Section 6.3); and,

(c) *the behaviour change intervention*, comprising a software platform ('CFHealthHub' mobile apps and website) offering adherence feedback and tailored modules of content and tools used by the health professional in interactions with PWCF (Section 6.4) and accessed independently by PWCF via CFHealthHub

Services received as usual care described in Section 6.5.

Figure 1. Interaction between complex intervention components



6.2 Microchipped devices

Depending on treatment strategies at different centres the participant may use an eTrack nebuliser system (Section 6.2.1), an Bi-neb AAD System from (Section 6.2.2).

6.2.1 The eTrack nebuliser system (Pari GmbH)

The eTrack controller is a modified version of the eBase controller and can be used to operate both the eFlow rapid nebulizer or Altera nebulizer. Compared to the eBase controller the eTrack is equipped with a Bluetooth chip and has a monitoring function to allow the capture of inhalation adherence data. The eFlow rapid nebuliser with eTrack controller is a CE marked medical device to be used for inhalation therapy. The device allows medications (approved for inhalation) to be transported deep into the lungs.

6.2.2 The Bi-neb AAD System from (Philips Healthcare)

The Bi-neb AAD system is a CE marked medical device which is intended for use to deliver aerosolised liquid medications for participants with cystic fibrosis. The drug delivery device is small and battery powered designed to deliver a precise dose of drug into patient's lungs. The Bi-neb AAD system is designed to deliver liquid medications that are specifically approved for use with the Bi-neb AAD System.

6.3 Information technology infrastructure

The information technology infrastructure for the complex intervention comprises:

- i. The Qualcomm hub (Section 6.3.1)
- ii. CFHealthHub (Section 6.3.2).
- iii. The Bi-Neb data transfer system (6.3.3)

6.3.1 The Qualcomm hub

The Qualcomm hub (Qualcomm; Cambridge, UK) is a wireless device which acquires data from the chipped device and transmits it to a cloud-based data centre. It is a Class I MDD and CE registered in Europe. It is designed, developed and manufactured in accordance with a quality system compliant with ISO13485 standards, meaning it aligns with the quality requirements of international regulatory agencies in the health care industry.

6.3.2 CFHealthHub

CFHealthHub is a web-portal which displays adherence data and provides resources and tools to people with cystic fibrosis and health professionals in order to support improved nebuliser adherence. It is available on-line via computers, tablets or mobile phones.

A qualitative study (WP 2.1A) to identify the barriers and facilitators of nebuliser use in PWCF informed the development of an intervention designed to increase nebuliser adherence. Analysis of the interview data was conducted using the COM-B framework, and these findings were used to inform the development of a complex intervention centred around the feedback of objective adherence data. The intervention was further developed and refined in consultation with PWCF and clinicians. An iterative study in which prototype versions of the intervention were delivered to and reviewed by PWCF was conducted. In that iterative study we interviewed PWCF and interventionists about the usability and tailoring of the intervention, and made improvements to the process and materials based on this feedback. The system has been developed to ensure it meets the requirements of the Data Protection Act 1998. It is intended that data on maintenance and relapse will be generated during the full scale trial.

CFHealthHub has a number of modules addressing barriers to adherence based on the COM-B system described in greater detail in Section 6.4.1. The objectives of the modules as mapped to the COM-B are outlined in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Learning objectives of the CFHealthHub modules

COM-B model component	Objectives			
Physical capability	- Have the skills to be able to use the nebuliser correctly			
Psychological capability	 Understand the importance of nebuliser use in CF treatment Be able to remember to use nebuliser Be able to self-monitor nebuliser use Be aware of a need to improve nebuliser use 			
Physical opportunity	 Have a realistic medication plan Have a working/functioning nebuliser Have a suitable place to use nebuliser Have the time to use nebuliser 			
Social opportunity	- Be/feel supported by others to use nebuliser			
Reflective motivation	 Perceive benefits of nebuliser use Perceive few/no concerns about nebuliser use Understand the health consequences of use/non-use Feel confident about nebuliser use Intend to use nebuliser 			
Automatic motivation	 Have an established routine for nebuliser use Have a habit to use nebuliser 			

6.3.3 The Bi-Neb data transfer system

The Bi-Neb Bluetooth data transfer system is intended to automatically extract breathing device use (adherence data) from the device (Bi-Neb) via a Smartphone hub and a secure data server onto CFHealthHub. Providing the Bi-Neb is within the Bluetooth range within the patient's house, the system can retrieve this data once a day.

6.4 The Behaviour Change Intervention (BCI)

6.4.1 Rationale and theory

The rationale of the BCI is to help CF patients to self-manage their condition and to form habits that will improve adherence to their medication, thereby extending life and improving quality of life. The MRC framework for developing and evaluating complex interventions recommends that intervention development should be informed by a suitable theoretical framework and evidence base [17]. The theoretical model adopted is the COM-B model [18] which describes a 'behaviour system' of the essential and interacting conditions of Capability, Opportunity, and Motivation [18]. The model posits that nonadherence is either non-intentional (a problem of capability or opportunity or intentional (a problem of motivation). The model has been adapted to nebuliser adherence on the basis of evidence about the factors influencing nebuliser adherence in PWCF [19–32], input from expert clinicians currently delivering services to PWCF, as well as from the PPI panel and exploratory research conducted in Sheffield. It is important that interventions are tailored to individual needs and use a multi-modal approach [33]. Each of the conditions of Capability, Opportunity and Motivation has been considered in turn in the development of our intervention. The primary component of the intervention is adherence feedback delivered via the CFHealthHub. Evidence suggests that while personalised feedback can have an effect size of up to 20% in increasing adherence [34, 35], feedback is most effective when combined with additional behaviour change techniques [34].

Figure 2. Interactions between capability, opportunity and motivation





The identification and choice of appropriate behaviour change techniques has been driven by the Behaviour Change Wheel framework for the development of interventions [Michie, S. F., Atkins, L., & West, R. (2015). The behaviour change wheel: a guide to designing interventions.] which outlines a process of intervention design using the COM-B model "through the systematic evaluation of theory and evidence" (p. 13). In brief, the process involved the following steps:

- 1. In depth identification and analysis of the factors influencing nebuliser adherence in PWCF through an examination of the existing literature, and a qualitative study in which participants viewed charts of their objective nebuliser adherence data within an interview about factors affecting their motivation, capability and opportunity to adhere to their nebuliser treatment (study 2.1). The Theoretical Domains Framework (TDF; [36]) which analyses Capability, Opportunity and Motivation in greater detail was used as a framework to guide the analysis.
- 2. Identification and evaluation of potential intervention functions (e.g. education, persuasion, enablement, environmental restructuring, modelling) to address the identified factors influencing nebuliser adherence in consultation with the research team, clinicians and PPI.
- 3. Development of intervention modules to include specific Behaviour Change Techniques to deliver intervention functions, selection of mode of delivery, and mechanism for tailoring of BCI delivery to meet individual needs with regard to Capability, Opportunity and Motivation. The module contents have been discussed and refined as a result of discussions with clinicians and PPI.
- 4. Identification of potential mediators of behaviour change, and identification of tools to measure each mediator.

The intervention arrived at through this process is described in Table 2.

Table 2: Intervention modules

Module	СОМ-В	Intervention functions	Behaviour Change Techniques	Mode of Delivery
<u>Universal parts o</u>	f the intervention			
Self-monitoring	Psychological capability Reflective Motivation	Education Environmental restructuring Enablement	 Self-monitoring of behaviour Adding objects to the environment (CFHealthHub) 	• Charts of objective adherence data presented within CFHealthHub
Goal setting & review	Psychological capability Automatic motivation	Enablement Incentivisation	 Goal setting (behaviour) Feedback on behaviour Discrepancy between current behaviour and goal Review behavioural goals Graded tasks Social reward 	 Discussion and agreement of goal with interventionist Review of goal Feedback on progress (through CFHealthHub and interventionist) Visual reward if goal met on CFHealthHub
Treatment plan	Psychological capability Physical Opportunity Social Opportunity Automatic motivation	Training Environmental restructuring Enablement	 Action planning Habit formation Prompts/cues (tailored) 	 Action planning tool within CFHealthHub Option to set reminders
Confidence building	Reflective Motivation	Persuasion	Focus on past success	• Interventionist encouraging focus on periods of higher adherence on charts

Page 81 of 202

BMJ Open

Module	СОМ-В	Intervention functions	Behaviour Change Techniques	Mode of Delivery			
Tailored parts of	Tailored parts of the intervention (based on baseline COM beliefs and barriers questionnaire (COM-BMQ) ¹ and consultation with interventionist)						
My treatment	Reflective Motivation Psychological capability	Education Persuasion Modelling	 Information about health consequences Credible source Salience of consequences Demonstration of the behaviour Vicarious consequences Self-talk 	 Q&A linked to information within CFHealthHub (tailored by baseline beliefs and prescription data) Presentation though text, patient stories, 'talking heads' and animation Credible sources including clinicians, PWCF and interventionist Interventionist eliciting self-talk through focus on why motivation is not lower than rating given on pre- screening questionnaire 			
Confidence building	Reflective Motivation	Modelling Persuasion	Demonstration of behaviour	• 'Talking heads' videos of coping stories within CFHealthHub			
Problem- solving (including skills training)	Physical capability Psychological capability Physical opportunity Social opportunity	Training Environmental restructuring Enablement	 Instruction on how to perform the behaviour Demonstration of the behaviour Behavioural practice/rehearsal Problem solving Restructure the physical environment self-talk social support (practical) 	 Tailored problem solving guided by interventionist Solution bank within CFHealthHub. Construction of if-then coping plans Videos demonstrating correct use of nebulisers within CFHealthHub 			

Incorporating the Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire (BMQ-specific nebuliser treatment) Horne, 2010

6.4.2 Intervention providers

Interventionists may already be working at, or be new to participating organisations or be the ACtiF interventionist employed to deliver the trial locally at the site. Externally appointed staff will be recruited through a formal job interview. Suitable individuals will include registered nurses or other member of the multidisciplinary team or a ; graduate in a suitable subject such as psychology or, other relevant profession who holds relevant skills / experience. Candidates for the post will ideally have a minimum of two years postgraduate experience which might include delivering a research project to time and target. They will be employed on the Project to work to NHS Agenda for Change Band 4 or above. They must have access to a car for work purposes e.g. participant home visits.

Interventionists will be supported in the delivery of the intervention by members of the Multidisciplinary team (MDT) at the site in which they are based. MDTs will receive training about the approach of the intervention, and the way in which they can support its delivery (see page 28).

Training for interventionists in how to deliver the intervention according to the specifications of the behaviour change manual will be provided by Marlene Hutchings with oversight provided by Madelynne Arden and/or Judy Bradley. A comprehensive training manual and training programme will be developed to facilitate this. A certificate of competence will be provided prior to the interventionist being able to use CFHealthHub with participants.

An additional trained regional interventionist will offer support to trial sites. This on occasion will involve input to patients (face to face or telephone contact), and assisting with problem solving via liaising with the nebuliser company. They will be named on the local site delegation log.

6.4.3 Materials

The BCI contains two broad categories of components:

- i. CFHealthHub behaviour change modules including adherence feedback used by PWCF and health professionals
- ii. The behaviour change manual and toolkit used by the interventionist in interactions with PWCF in order to understand the specific barriers to adherence for that individual, and to tailor and personalise delivery of the behaviour change modules accordingly.

6.4.4 Procedures

The BCI will be delivered over a 4 to 6 month period through a combination of face-to-face sessions and contact via telephone with an interventionist, and through participant interaction with different modules of content available on CFHealthHub. The interventionist will discuss participant data with members of the MDT to ensure that care is informed by objective adherence data. If any concerns become apparent as the interventionists collect data and work with participants, these concerns will be passed onto the clinical team. The clinical team will

39

54 55

56

57

58

59 60

follow their standard procedures in relation to any concerns raised. The intervention content and delivery flow are outlined in Figure 5 and described below:

6.4.4.1 Consent Visit (all participants)

At the consent visit participants will be given a chipped nebuliser (eTrack) and Qualcom hub or the participants will receive a visit from a clinical trainer who will convert the participant's I-neb to a Bi-neb by adding a Bluetooth chip and providing a Smartphone hub. The clinical 10 trainer may set up the Bi-neb in the patient's home or at hospital either during the main 11 consent visit or at a separate visit after consent has been obtained. Both the eTrack and Bi-neb 12 will connect to CFHealthHub which will enable adherence data be collected. The 13 interventionist will input the participant's prescription details into CFHealthHub. Together 14 these will allow the system to generate adherence charts for that participant. At this visit 15 participants will complete a range of baseline measures (see Table 3) including the COM 16 17 beliefs and barriers questionnaire (COM-BMQ) which will be entered into CFHealthHub. 18 The responses to this questionnaire will be used to populate the 'My toolkit' section of 19 CFHealthHub with specific tailored elements from the 'My treatment' modules prior to the 20 Initial Intervention Visit. The participant's pseudomonas status will be clarified at baseline 21 and confirmed by the PI with the opportunity to compare the participant's prescription with 22 the pseudomonas status. 23

6.4.4.2 Initial Intervention Visit (intervention arm only)

Participants will be introduced to CFHealthHub. They will be asked to complete an online
consent form on behalf of their NHS trust in which they will specify what additional data they
would be willing for CFHealthHub to record and display (e.g. name, and uploaded
photographs) and what functional options they would like access to (e.g. push notifications).
Permissions may be changed at any time. The participant will have the option to upload their
own "patient story" into CFHealthHub after completion of the online consent form.

The interventionist will discuss their motivation to adhere to their nebuliser treatment, will address beliefs associated with poor adherence and will refer back to answers on the COM-BMQ to elicit the participants beliefs associated with adherence. Participants will be shown 'My toolkit' which will have been prepopulated with tailored motivational content (see consent visit).

The interventionist and participant will look at and discuss the adherence charts on
 CFHealthHub with a focus on period of higher adherence. The interventionist will note any
 barriers raised by participants during this discussion.

The interventionist will support the participant to identify where and when additional nebuliser treatments could be fitted into their schedule and support them to make an action plan using the online tool available on CFHealthHub. This action plan will be saved to the 'My toolkit' zone. The interventionist will then agree a % adherence goal for the next four to six weeks based on the number of additional treatments that have been planned. This will be recorded on CFHealthHub and will be represented by a target line on the adherence charts.

⁵⁰ If motivation is so low that participants are reluctant to set an action plan/goal then the ⁵¹ interventionist will spend further time discussing motivation and will skip to confidence ⁵³ building (see below).

The interventionist will encourage participants to focus on likely problems or issues that might disrupt the achievement of the adherence goal and will use the Problem-solving module on CFHealthHub to address each of these anticipated problems. The Problem-solving module includes solutions based on educational content, practical support (e.g. model letters to employers) and interactive tools. Relevant solutions will be saved to the 'My Toolkit' zone of CFHealthHub.

The interventionist will discuss the participant's confidence to meet their goal and will identify 2-3 'talking heads' videos showing other people with CF addressing and overcoming similar barriers to nebuliser adherence.

The visit will conclude with a review of the goal and the tailored and personalised contents saved to the 'My toolkit' zone of CFHealthHub. The interventionist will encourage a learning mindset, emphasising that even if adherence doesn't increase starting to think about adherence will produce learning that will make subsequent attempts to change easier.

6.4.4.3 Participant Independent access to CFHealthHub (intervention arm)

15 Participants will have independent access to CFHealthHub at all times following the Baseline 16 17 visit. They can, at any time, access their adherence charts, 'My toolkit' contents, and can 18 browse the other areas of content as they wish. Frequency of access to each area of CFHealthHub will be monitored and recorded. 20

Adherence charts will provide colour -coded feedback about participant achievement towards their adherence goal so that they are provided with immediate, easy to recognise information about their achievements. Subject to consent, participants will be sent encouraging messages via push notifications, or alternatively when they access CFHealthHub, to match the progress made e.g. congratulations on achieving their goal, congratulations on having made progress towards their goal, encouragement to remember their action plan.

6.4.4.4 Review visit (Visit 3 - intervention arm)

1 2 3

4

5

6

7

8 9

10

11

12

13 14

19

21

22

23

24 25

26

27 28

29

30

31 32

33

58

59

60

At the review visit, the interventionist and participant will look at and discuss the adherence charts on CFHealthHub and goal achievement with a focus on progress made and periods of higher adherence.

34 If the adherence goal was met then the participant will be encouraged to set a new higher 35 adherence goal or to a goal to maintain their current level of adherence which will be recorded 36 on CFHealthHub. Following this the participant and interventionist will review the contents of 37 'My toolkit' and revise action plans, problems/solutions as required. If issues of motivation are 38 still a concern the interventionist may recommend additional/alternate elements of content 39 from 'My treatment' or 'Talking heads' to go into 'My toolkit'. 40

41 If the adherence goal was not met then the interventionist and participants will discuss the 42 barriers to goal achievement (motivation, capability, opportunity). The interventionist will 43 address beliefs associated with poor adherence and will add/revise the elements of content 44 from 'My treatment' or 'Confidence building' to go into 'My toolkit'. 45

If no goal was previously set then the interventionist will review motivation and confidence 46 and then will consider if the participant is ready to action plan and set a goal. If not they will 47 48 spend more time reviewing motivation and confidence.

49 The participant will be encouraged to set a realistic % adherence goal for the next four to six 50 weeks and this will be recorded on CFHealthHub. The interventionist will support the 51 participant to revise their action plan as needed and save this to the 'My toolkit' zone. Based 52 on the earlier discussion about the barriers that prevented goal achievement the Problem-53 solving module on CFHealthHub will be used to address each of the problems encountered, 54 and any that are anticipated. Relevant solutions will be saved to the 'My Toolkit' zone of 55 56 CFHealthHub. 57

The visit will conclude with a review of the goal and the tailored and personalised contents saved to the 'My toolkit' zone of CFHealthHub. The interventionist will re-emphasise a learning mindset, emphasising that the participant cannot fail, but can learn from the process

Participating centres will provide participants with contact details, typically telephone

numbers, but other methods may be volunteered by centres. Contact details will be provided

so that participants can contact the centre if they have queries or problems regarding

CFHealthHub between visits. The interventionist will be able to feedback any information

from the intervention delivery after the baseline intervention visit to members of the wider

CF team. This may include adherence data from sessions with the participant's clinician and

MDT particularly if the participant raises any concerns or issues e.g. side effects of a drug to

- 8 9 10 11 12
- 13 14

31 32 33

34

35

36

37

38

allow their usual clinician to discuss this with them at their next clinic visit. 15

so that they can work together on the adherence challenge.

6.4.4.5 Subsequent Review (intervention arm) 16

17 Following these two sessions the amount of interaction which each PWCF has with the 18 interventionist will be tailored to their needs and requirements although it is anticipated that 19 these will normally marry with routine clinic visits: They may have additional face-to-face 20 sessions or contact via telephone or e-mail. No more than one monthly face-to-face session 21 will be conducted because of the research protocol; if the participant requests additional 22 support, the centre may accommodate this at their discretion. Review meetings will take 30 23 minutes and be conducted over the 5month (+/- 1 month) of the follow-up period. The 24 25 structure of review sessions will follow the same pattern as for 6.4.4.4. 26

6.4.4.6 Final research visit (5 months +/- 1 month from consent)

All participants will complete a final research visit 4-6 months from the date of consent. At this visit the interventionist will collect the primary and secondary outcome data (see table 3) including demography data, health care resource use and the participant completed questionnaires. At this final research visit the interventionist will re-check that all adherence data has been transferred to CFHealthHub. The eTrack can store approximately 6 months of treatment data, ensuring all the data is transferred at this visit should help to prevent missing data.

Following the final 4-6 month post-consent research visit, we will continue to collect: adherence data from CFHealthHub; exacerbations; FEV1 and ask participants the subjective adherence question until, 30th April 2017. At this point the study closes and the involvement of all participants ceases. After the trial ends (30/4/17), the aspiration is to allow participants in the control to have access to the intervention for which negotiations are ongoing. Currently funding is in place for the trial interventionists at study sites to deliver the intervention only over a 12-month period i.e. up to 30/4/17. It is anticipated that CFHealthHub used outside the trial would be delivered within the existing resources of the MDT so using CFHealthHub outside the trial should not need the trust to employ any additional staff members. As this is a pilot feasibility study where we are testing the intervention in participants, there is an expectation that further iteration of CFHealthHub may occur.




6.5 Usual care

Patients in both arms will receive usual care. Usual care is heterogeneous within and between centres, based on the needs of patients and the skills and interests of CF Unit staff. To better understand the configuration of usual care at participating centres a survey tool will be administered by the CTRU to the lead clinician at the centre. This will identify the spectrum of clinical and behaviour change interventions that are in use in the management and self-management of CF.

A minor component of the intervention is to train all members of the MDT in awareness of patient activation so that they are open to addressing issues raised for PWCF in the intervention arm. In addition, a staff member in the MDT will help to deliver the intervention. There is the possibility that the awareness of patient activation will have some effect on PWCF in both the intervention and control arms, and of leakage of the learning from the behaviour change component of the intervention to controls. We will investigate this possibility during the process evaluation.

Members of the MDT at each centre will receive one half-day, on-site, face-to-face training about the importance of objective nebuliser adherence data in the management of CF, and awareness of the importance of building patients' knowledge, skills and confidence to enable them to self-manage their treatment. This will include training in the interpretation of graphs and charts of objective adherence data produced by CFHealthHub, and the rationale for reducing target adherence in poor adherers in order to increase confidence. This will be delivered by designated members of the ACtiF research team.

Participants in the control arm will use a microchipped nebulizer but will not be able to access adherence data or other content and tools through CFHealthHub, neither will they receive the structured CFHealthHub intervention as described in the intervention manual. Control arm participants using Bi-neb nebulizers might have access to their data as part of routine care but this will not be in the user friendly format provided by the intervention.

One function of the qualitative research interviews with staff and control participants (see Section 8 below) is to understand the extent to which the patient activation awareness training has affected staff behaviour and whether control arm participants have received some aspects of the behaviour change intervention.

6.6 Criteria for discontinuing or modifying allocated interventions

There are no criteria for discontinuing treatment. Participants will be made aware that their participation is voluntary and they may discontinue study interventions, should they wish, at any time.

If a participant wishes to withdraw from treatment they will be able to speak to a member of the site study team i.e. ACtiF interventionist. This will be documented on a participant withdrawal form, within the Case Report Form. Any data already collected during the course of the trial up to the point of withdrawal will be used in the final analysis. We will ask the participants for their permission to continue to collect the primary outcome data i.e. CF exacerbations. The participant or clinician can make the decision to discontinue the allocated study intervention for any reason.

Participants will have the following options if they wish to withdraw:

- 1. Withdraw from the intervention i.e. intervention delivery visits only but will remain in the study. Patients can continue to use CFHealthHub. All study data would continue to be collected at subsequent follow up time points as per protocol.
- 2. Withdrawal from the study. Unless the patient objects, any data collected up to this point would be retained and used in the study analysis. The local interventionist would ask the participant if they agree to the collection of primary outcome data as defined in the protocol and or adherence data If

they agree to collection of adherence data, CTRU and or interventionist will continue to follow up participants for adherence data.

3. Withdrawal from the trial entirely. Unless the patient objects, any data collected up to this point would be retained and used in the study analysis. If the patient does not wish to be contacted with regard to primary outcome data or adherence data, no further contact with regard to the study will be made. If the participant does specifically request for all their data to be removed information regarding the participant will be retained at site, as part of the patient notes, along with their withdrawal form and request to delete the data.

A participant would be classed as complete if they have continued in the study until the last protocol defined visit, however there may be missing visits and / or data.

Loss to Follow-Up

A participant would be classed as lost to follow up if the participant has 1) not completed the study or 2) been withdrawn despite attempts for further contact, as per protocol, having been made. Unless the participant withdraws from the study entirely we will continue to collect the primary outcome data when possible (i.e. from medical notes).

This withdrawal section has been developed in accordance with the CTRU Participant Discontinuation and Withdrawal of Consent Standard Operating Procedure (SSU003).

6.7 Strategies to improve adherence to intervention protocols

6.7.1 For health professionals

The intervention protocols will be described in detail in an intervention manual. Interventionists will be trained to deliver the intervention according to the manual protocols. Interventionist training (as a form of behaviour change) will focus on Capability, Opportunity and Motivation. It will utilise evidence about the importance and likely effectiveness of the intervention and will challenge common misconceptions about adherence. Skills training and an introduction to the tools available on CFHealthHub will increase staff capability, and we will work with clinics and clinicians to ensure that the practical requirements for intervention delivery are in place: space, time etc (opportunity).

CFHealthHub will record interventionist access to the site. It will also automatize some of the tailoring of the intervention according to the COM-BMQ which will be completed online. The contents of 'My Toolkit' will be recorded for each participant so that we will have records of what content they have been recommended. Interventionists will also be required to complete session records each time that they deliver the intervention to record the decisions made and the reasons for these,

6.7.2 For patients

Where participants provide consent we will send optional push notifications to encourage engagement with CFHealthHub. For example, we will send congratulatory messages when adherence improves, encouraging messages to remind participants to engage with the content. Face-to-face visits will, where possible be arranged to coincide with clinic visits as per usual care, therefore minimising the additional burden on participants.

6.8 Relevant permitted / prohibited concomitant care

No concomitant care will be denied based on the research protocol.

7. Outcomes

7.1 Feasibility outcomes ('stop-go' or 'success' criteria for RCT)

In line with proposed CONSORT extension for pilot studies [37], in this section, we state the criteria for success of the external pilot trial. The criteria are based on the primary feasibility objectives, which provide the basis for interpreting the results of the external pilot and for determining the feasibility of proceeding to the full-scale study scheduled for months 31 to 60 of the project. Depending on the funder's perspectives, the outcome of the external pilot might be:

- (i) "Stop main study not feasible";
- (ii) "Continue, but modify protocol feasible with modifications";
- (iii) "Continue without modifications, but monitor closely feasible with close monitoring"; or,
- (iv) "Continue without modifications feasible as is."[37]

We anticipate that modifications to the research protocol will be necessary as the feasibility study progresses. Some of the qualitative research will be undertaken early in the pilot trial and lessons learned about the trial procedures will be identified and acted on during the pilot trial. There are three objective stop-go criteria:

1. Feasibility of recruitment to RCT

Defined as recruitment of no fewer than 48 participants randomised at two centres over four months, 75% of the rate required in the main trial;

2. Feasibility of retaining participants in the RCT

Defined as attrition from the research protocol of no more than 15% of randomised participants at 5 (+/-1) months.

If these are met the full trial will go ahead. If these are not met overall, but are met in the last half of the pilot trial after trial procedures have been improved based on lessons learned from the early stage of the pilot trial, then the full trial will go ahead.

7.2 Process data relating to the implementation of the trial

1. Number and characteristics of eligible patients approached for the study

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database

2. Reasons for refused consent

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database.

3. Reach

How many participants are consented into the study, sub-grouped by socio-economic status (from CF Registry), as a proportion of:

- Those approached, expressed quantitatively, based on 'pre-screening' logs completed by ACtiF interventionist;
- Those known to be eligible, expressed quantitatively based on CF Registry.

4. Participant attrition rate

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database.

5. Reasons for attrition

Collected by centres in screening logs and transferred to Prospect database.

6. Maintenance:

 The processes by which participants are kept involved in the collection of key secondary outcome data research data:

- The extent to which adherence data is successfully uploaded from the chipped nebulisers, described quantitatively using CFHealthHub (Intervention arm only).

7. Number of missing values/incomplete cases

Assessed by data management team, based on data in Prospect database.

8. Participant,/interventionist and members of MDT views on research protocols

Assessed through qualitative interviews and to include:

- Barriers to recruitment, problems encountered in reaching participants [38];
- Perceived problems with trial procedures such as recruitment, informed consent etc.
- Acceptability
- Perceived utility and burden of outcome assessments.

9. A survey on the content of usual care at participating centres

A CTRU staff member will complete this survey with the principal investigator, a senior medic or delegate working at the participating centre.

7.3 Process data relating to the implementation of the intervention

1. Context

Definitions of 'context' tend to cluster around setting, roles, interactions and relationships [39]. It is important that context is understood as diachronic and emergent rather than synchronic and static [40, 41]. Frameworks for process evaluation have defined 'context' as:

- "aspects of the larger social, political, and economic environment that may influence intervention implementation" [42];
- "factors external to the intervention which may influence its implementation, or whether its mechanisms of impact act as intended" [43].

The context, and its interaction with implementation, mechanisms of impact, outcomes, the description of the intervention and its causal assumptions [43] will be described using qualitative data from research interviews, field notes, study management logs, minutes and e-mails. The focus will be how the context of individual CF Units affects implementation of the intervention and its potential outcomes.

2. Implementation

Definitions of 'implementation' tend to cluster around the processes or stages of adoption, the methods, means or social organisation of bringing innovative practices into use [39]. One way of describing the process of getting research into practice is to use a process model [44]. To structure our narrative of how the complex intervention was implemented we will use a process model called the Quality of Implementation Framework [45].

3. Recruitment:

Based on e-mails and minutes we will describe in narrative terms, the procedures used to approach and attract to the project NHS Trusts and interventionists [42].

4. Training:

The comprehensiveness of the training component of the intervention for the health professionals delivering the intervention will be assessed by a combination of audio recordings of consultations and by interview.

5. Fidelity

"The extent to which the intervention was delivered as planned. It represents the quality and integrity of the intervention as conceived by the developers. Fidelity is a function of the intervention providers."[42]

- Interaction with participant along lines recommended by manual, determined by audio recordings of consultations between the interventionist and PwCF in the intervention arm.
- Recommendation of appropriate CFHealthHub tasks by interventionist, determined by audio recordings and by data from CFHealthHub;

The fidelity assessment will be developed and based on a tool used by Borelli et al [46].

6. Use [38] / dose received [42] of intervention

Use of CFHealthHub by participant, as proposed by interventionist, determined by data capture by CFHealthHub, including the online activities started and completed, minutes spent on recommended pages and which parts the participant has picked out and put in a "my favourites" page. The number of times, frequency over time and duration with which users log on to CFHealthHub, as well as the activities they perform while logged in, described quantitatively using data from CFHealthHub.

A record of the discussion between the interventionist and the MDT will be kept. This will include who was there, brief notes of what was discussed and any agreement of treatment goals made.

7. Acceptability

The acceptability of the intervention to hospital staff and PWCF assessed through semi-structured interviews.

8. Perceived benefits and harms

Assessed through semi-structured interviews with health professionals and PWCF.

9. Leakage of intervention to controls

Assessed through audio recordings of consultations between the MDT, interventionist, and PwCF in the control arm, and semi-structured interviews with PwCF in the control arm.

7.4 Clinical outcomes and covariates

The time schedule of enrolment, interventions (including any run-ins and washouts), assessments, and visits for participants can be found in Table 3 and Table 4 below.

7.4.1 Primary clinical outcome

The primary clinical outcome is the number of pulmonary exacerbations in 5 (+/-1) month post-baseline follow-up period, defined according to the Fuchs criteria [47]. An exacerbation of respiratory symptoms will be said to have occurred when a patient was treated with parenteral antibiotics for **any one of the following 12 signs or symptoms** [48]:

- 1. change in sputum;
- 2. new or increased hemoptysis;
- 3. increased cough;
- 4. increased dyspnea;
- 5. malaise, fatigue, or lethargy;

- 6. temperature above 38 °C;
- 7. anorexia or weight loss;
- 8. sinus pain or tenderness;
- 9. change in sinus discharge.
- 10. change in physical examination of the chest, derived from notes by site staff.
- 11. decrease in pulmonary function by 10 percent or more from a previously recorded value, derived from notes by site staff; or,
- 12. radiographic changes indicative of pulmonary infection, derived from notes by site staff.

The trial interventionist or prescribing clinician/nurse will collect data on the "exacerbations" form at the point of a participant starting a course of IV antibiotics.

7.4.2 Secondary clinical outcomes

1. Body Mass Index (BMI).

- 2. Forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV₁): standardised spirometry as a measure of condition severity [49].
- 3. EuroQol EQ-5D-5L: generic health status measure for health economic analysis [50].
- 4. **The Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13) (Health Style Assessment**): assessment of patient knowledge, skill, and confidence for self-management [51]. *PAM-13 was labelled as "Health Style Assessment" following a request from the licence owners to ensure the purpose of the questionnaire is clear for participants.
- 5. Assessment of routine : measure of life chaos [52].
- 6. **Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index (SRBAI):** automaticity-specific subscale of the Self Report Habit index to capture habit-based behaviour patterns [53].
- 7. Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised (CFQ-R): disease specific health-related quality of life instrument [54].
- 8. The Patient Health Questionnaire depression scale (PHQ-8): severity measure for depressive disorders [55].
- 9. MAD (Medication Adherence Data-3 items) : medication adherence measure
- 10. The General Anxiety Disorder 7-item anxiety scale (GAD-7): severity measure for anxiety [56].
- 11. The Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs Questionnaire (COM-BMQ): This questionnaire incorporates:
 - a. The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21item): a validated self-report tool[57], customised by the author to identify perceived necessities and concerns for nebuliser treatment.
 - **b.** The following project-specific items: one additional belief item, one intention item, one confidence item, and a list of barriers. These will serve as a tailoring tool for the intervention and also as a secondary outcome measure.
- 12. **Subjective adherence single question:** self-report estimate of adherence as a percentage. Self-reported problems: identification of capability and opportunity barriers to nebuliser adherence

- 13. Concomitant medications: bespoke instrument, designed for this research project.
- 14. **Resource use form:** interventionist collects data from a combination of hospital notes and the NHS patient electronic system to determine 1) inpatient IV days 2) Routine clinic visits 3) Unscheduled outpatient contacts 3) unscheduled inpatient stays.
- 15. **Exploratory analysis of habit formation**: analyses with the objective nebuliser data will be performed to explore the process of habit formation with the delivery of the adherence intervention
- 16. **Prescription**: a monthly prescription check to both check for data transfer to CFHealthHub and review for an indication that the prescription has changed or indication of microorganism e.g. pseudomonas (please see table 2 and 3 and refer to section 10.1.1).
- 17. Adherence to prescribed medication (see 7.4.3)
- **18.** Any treatment with IV antibiotics

7.4.3 Adherence to prescribed medication

Adherence to prescribed medication will be defined in several ways including:

- 1. Unadjusted adherence
- 2. Simple normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)
- 3. Sophisticated normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)
- 4. Simple normative adherence (with numerator adjustment)
- 5. Sophisticated normative adherence (with numerator adjustment)

Further detail about the outcomes will be reported in the trial statistical analysis plan.

Table 3. Individual-level data derived from PWCF and sites

	- 1	1		1		1	Γ	-
	Where?	Completed by?	Consent visit	Baseline (intervention) visit	At clinic visits	Exacerbations episode	5 months (+/- 1 month) from consent visit	Up to 30 th April 2017
Enrolment								
Pre-screening form (before 1 st visit)	Prospct	Site	-	-	-	-	-	-
Confirmation of eligibility form	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	-
Informed consent	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	-
Intravenous days in last registry year	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	-
Pseudomonas status +	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	-	-
Primary outcome			<u> </u>					
Exacerbations form including: Parenteral antibiotics Change in sputum* New or increased hemoptysis* Increased cough* Increased dyspnea* Malaise, fatigue, or lethargy* Temperature above 38 °C* Anorexia or weight loss* Sinus pain or tenderness* Change: sinus discharge* Change: phys. exam. chest* Decrease: pulmonary function * Indicative radiographic changes*	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	•	•	•
Secondary outcomes	Description	1	1					
BMI (height and weight)	Prospet	Site	•	-	-	-	•	-
FEV ₁	Prospet	Site	•	-	•	-	•	•
EQ-5D-5L**	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	•	•	-
PAM-13(Health Style Assessment)	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
Assessment of Routine	Prospet	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
SRBAI	Prospct	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
CFQ-R	Prospct	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
PHQ-8	Prospct	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
GAD-7	Prospct	PWCF	٠	-	-	-	•	-
MAD-3 (Medication Adherence Data-3 items)	Prospct	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
COM-BMQ	Prospct	PWCF	•	-	-	-	•	-
Objective adherence	CFHH	CFHH	•	-	•	-	•	-
Subjective adherence single question	Prospct	PWCF	•	-	•	-	•	•
Concomitant medications	Prospct	Site	•	-	-	-	•	-
Other SAEs	Prospct	Site	-	_	•	-	•	-
Resource use	Prospct	Site	-	-	-	-	•	-
	^	i	·			I	1	1

+ Pseudomonas (or other microorganism) status will be checked together with the monthly prescription

* Only required where PWCF indicates they have received parenteral antibiotics

** EQ5D-5L collected at the start and end of every exacerbation episode

Table 4. CFHealthHub data (research arm only)

	Completed by?	Baseline (intervention) visit	At intervention visit s with interventionist	Between sessions	At clinic visits	5 months (+/- 1 month) from consent visit	
Clinician metrics							
Adherence data*	PWCF	•	•	•	•	•	
Recommendation of modules by interventionist	Interventionist	•	٠	-	•	-	
Feed back to participant their adherence data screens (data click)	Interventionist	•	•	-	•	-	
Check prescription with participant	Interventionist	•	•	-	•	-	
Order of clicks	CFHH	•	•	-	•	-	
Interventionist responds to patient changing prescription	Interventionist	-	•	•	•	•	
Monthly check on prescription +	Interventionist / CTRU	•	•	•	•	•	
Time in and out preparation	Interventionist /CFHH	•	•	-	-	•	
Time in and out with patient	Interventionist /CFHH	•	•	-	-	•	
Time in and out review	Interventionist /CFHH	•	•	-	-	•	
Patient metrics							
Adherence (number of nebulized doses taken per day.) ¹	PWCF	•	•	•	•	•	
Duration of inhalation	Nebuliser	•	•	-	-	-	
Accessing CFHealthHub – look at adherence data	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	
Accessing CFHealthHub – look at 'My Toolkit'	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	
Accessing CFHealthHub problem solving / education / talking heads pages outside of 'My Toolkit'	PWCF	•	٠	-	-	-	
Accessing CF HealthHub – first to last click in a session	PWCF	•	•	-	-	-	

*Adherence data collected for both research and control arms

+ Monthly prescription checked by CTRU centrally to alert local interventionists to any potential changes in control arm and potentially also intervention arm

X data continued to be collected in CFHealthHub and interventionist responds for those participants who have "opted in" to receive intervention till 30/4/17

¹To be broken down in statistical analysis plan.



60

1





*When I-nebs are converted to Bi-nebs a representative from the company (Philips) will do this between the consent visit and first intervention visit.

 The study recognises that flexibility in accommodating participant schedules may cause time windows to change but this will allow us to adapt the intervention for the main RCT.

8. Sampling

8.1 Quantitative components

8.1.1 Sites

Two large specialist CF centres have been screened for their ability to recruit participants based on the number of participants they have on their CF registry and their motivation to participate in the pilot trial.

8.1.2 Sample size

The sample size for a feasibility study should be adequate to estimate the uncertain critical parameters (standard deviations for continuous outcomes; consent rates, event rates, attrition rates for binary outcomes) needed to inform the design of the full RCT with sufficient precision [37, 58–60]. For the main RCT, the target sample size is 688 participants (344 per arm). We are proposing that 15 CF units recruit on average 46 patients in six months, a recruitment rate of approximately eight patients per centre per month.

To assess whether this recruitment rate is feasible the external pilot RCT will open in two CF units for 12 months, with four months recruitment, one months 'run-in' period (the period between the consent and baseline visit), and 5 (+/-1) months follow up. To match the proposed recruitment rate of the main RCT, the target sample over the four months for which the pilot RCT is open, will be 32 per centre (64 in total from the two pilot centres). We propose to recruit to time, that is for a fixed period of four months rather than to a fixed sample size. We would want to see a minimum of 75% of the recruitment target to be confident of the trial viability i.e. at least 48 patients in total consented and randomized in four months' of recruitment from two centres.

8.1.3 Approach, non-participation and recruitment

Approach: Health professionals involved in approaching and screening PWCF and collecting data will be trained in the study protocol and procedures. Additionally those taking consent will have up-to-date training in Good Clinical Practice (GCP). All study personnel will be named on the study delegation log. Health professionals working with the CF team will identify a sample of PWCF registered at the centre via the CF registry database locally. All inclusion and exclusion criteria will be assessable via patient records and they will exclude any patients who do not fit the eligibility criteria.

A member of the participant's direct clinical team will send the potential participant a PIS and introductory letter by post or give the written information during a routine clinic visit. A sticker with a website address and Quick Response code will be placed in the envelope both of which will link to a video of the researcher explaining the study. If information is provided in a routine clinic visit, the clinical care team will seek permission for the ACtiF Interventionist to follow up with a phone call in order to answer any further questions and discuss involvement. Written informed consent may be conducted at this visit where the participant is happy to take part as this is a low risk trial.

Telephone call: Up to a week after posting out the information, the ACtiF Interventionist will telephone the PWCF to discuss the study over the phone and answer any questions. If the potential participant is happy to take part, the ACtiF Interventionist will arrange an appointment to gather written informed consent.

Non-participation: Spontaneously offered reasons for non-participation in the trial will be recorded.

8.2 Qualitative components

<u>At each of the two pilot sites</u> we will undertake:

- Audio-recordings of all 16 initial assessments for PWCF in the intervention arm and 10-12 consultations between the senior interventionist from the MDT (or other MDT member) and PWCF in the control arm. Numbers will depend on numbers of PWCF giving written consent for this.
- 10-12 semi-structured face-to-face (or telephone or skype) interviews with PWCF receiving the intervention and 10-12 semi-structured face-to-face interviews with PWCF in the control arm (total n~40-48 PWCF; n~40-48 interviews);
- two semi-structured face-to-face (or telephone or skype) interviews with each of the two interventionists in each centre (total n=4 interventionists; n=8 interviews); and,
- two semi-structured (face to face, telephone or skype) interviews with two members of the MDT (total n=4 staff; n=8 interviews).

Written informed consent will be obtained from both the interventionist and the PWCF participating in the audio recording when they consent to be in the study. Separate consent will be sought from PWCF and interventionists or members of the wider CF team for semi-structured interviews.

9. Assignment of interventions

9.1 Sequence generation

Participants will be allocated in equal proportions to one of the two groups using a computer generated pseudo-random list, stratified by centre and the number of days participants have been on IV antibiotics in the previous 12 month period as collected at consent visit, with random permuted blocks of varying sizes. The two categories for stratification within the number of IV days will be (i) less than or equal to 14 days and (ii) greater than 14 days.

9.2 Allocation concealment

The allocation sequence will be hosted by the Sheffield CTRU in accordance with their standard operating procedures and will be held on a secure server. Access to the allocation sequence will be restricted to those with authorisation. The sequence will be concealed until recruitment, data collection, and analyses are complete.

9.3 Implementation

The allocation sequence will be created by a Sheffield CTRU statistician who is not otherwise associated with the trial. At the consent visit, a health professional who is named on the delegation log, will go over the patient information sheet again with the study candidate and answer any questions. If the PWCF is still willing to enter the trial, they obtain full written consent and complete the eligibility form. If the participant is eligible, then baseline assessments will be taken. The recruiting health professional will log into the remote, secure Internet-based randomisation system and enter basic demographic information, after which the allocation will be revealed.

9.4 Blinding

After revelation of the allocation, only the statisticians will be blinded to allocation as per CTRU SOPs (ST001 and ST005)

10. Data collection, management and analysis

10.1 Quantitative data

10.1.1 Data collection methods

Data handling and record keeping. The Sheffield CTRU will oversee data collection, management and analysis and ensure the trial is undertaken according to Good Clinical Practice Guidelines and CTRU standard operating procedures. Data will be collected and retained in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998. Patients will be reassured that all data which are collected during the course of the research will be kept strictly confidential.

The study team will train those collecting data in the study procedures before the trial begins. Data will either be collected directly from the participants, carers, interventionist, CFHealthHub or from source documents (e.g. patient notes) and input onto the CRF or Sheffield CTRU's electronic web-based data capture system (Prospect). The Data Monitoring and Management Plan for the study will provide further guidance on the types and levels of data and how these will be monitored and verified. Some essential documents may be posted to the central team to facilitate this e.g. participant consent forms in which case this will be detailed in the appropriate participant PIS and consent forms.

The CTRU will perform checks with the participant via monthly phone calls to ensure data is being captured and alert the local interventionist if there is an indication of a prescription change and a need to check pseudomonas (or other microorganism) status. This is required for the correct denominator to assess "normative adherence". Data will be extracted from the CF registry to understand exacerbations in the preceding 12 months since prior exacerbations can have a bearing on the optimum target regimen.

Plans to promote participant retention and complete follow-up.

Participant retention will be ensured by the following procedure:

- 1. At each point of contact, the interventionist will check with the participant that the Qualcomm hub or Smartphone hub is plugged in and turned on. A member of CTRU who is performing data and prescription checks may alert the interventionist. They will remind the participant of the proximity required for data transfer (10 metres)
- 2. In the event of no data being displayed in CFHealthHub for a period of at least a week (and the participant is not known to be on holiday) the interventionist will make contact with the participant (Email/Text/Telephone call) to check that the following
 - That the Qualcomm or Smartphone hub is plugged in
 - That the Qualcomm hub is working (showing solid green and yellow lights on the display)
 - That they have been within range of the Qualcomm hub sufficient to facilitate data transfer (10 metres)
 - That the Smartphone hub is switched on (showing the locked 'password' screen when any button is pressed)
 - That the Bi-neb and Smartphone hub have been kept in the same room, or at least have been in close proximity at some point during the day.

Any participants using the Bi-neb who are still experiencing issues after following the steps above, may receive a face to face or telephone support (at home or hospital) from the clinical trainer to resolve any outstanding issues.

Troubleshooting:

Data capture will be monitored both by interventionist at the site and centrally by the CTRU. In the event of data not being uploaded patients will be contacted to trouble shoot problems. Patients will be offered support to suit their circumstances including home visits (conducted by the members of the site research team) where necessary.

10.1.2 Data Management

Anonymised trial data will be entered onto a validated database system designed to an agreed specification between the Chief Investigator and Sheffield CTRU. The research staff at sites (mainly the ACtiF interventionist) will be responsible for data entry locally. The Sheffield CTRU Trial Manager, research assistant and the Data Management Team will work with sites to ensure the quality of data provided. The study manager, research assistant, data manager, PI's, any research nurses and site interventionist will have access to the anonymised data on the database through the use of usernames and encrypted passwords. The system has a full electronic audit trail and will be regularly backed up. The secure data management system will incorporate quality control procedures to validate the study data. Error reports will be generated where data clarification is needed. Output for analysis will be generated in a format and at intervals to be agreed between Sheffield CTRU and the Chief Investigator.

Trial documents will be retained in a secure location during and after the trial has finished. The study will use the CTRU's in-house data management system (Prospect) for the capture and storage of participant data. Prospect stores all data in a PostgreSQL database on virtual servers hosted by Corporate Information and Computing Services (CiCS) at the University of Sheffield. Prospect uses industry standard techniques to provide security, including password authentication and encryption using SSL/TLS. Access to Prospect is controlled by usernames and encrypted passwords, and a comprehensive privilege management feature can be used to ensure that users have access to only the minimum amount of data required to complete their tasks. This can be used to restrict access to personal identifiable data.

Participants who give consent to the qualitative part of this study will also give consent to their name and address to be given to the University of Sheffield qualitative research staff in order to be contactable.

10.1.3 Data quality assurance

Prospect provides a full electronic audit trail, as well as validation and verification features which will be used to monitor study data quality, in line with CTRU SOPs and the Data Management Plan (DMP). Error reports will be generated where data clarification is required. Rates of missing data and data points which are out of the expected or allowed range will be presented to the team at monthly management group meetings.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

10.2 Qualitative data

10.2.1 Audio recordings of consultations

All initial assessments will be audio recorded with permission (n=16 in each site). Findings from early assessments will be fed back to the interventionist so that changes can be made to the intervention delivery before subsequent assessments. Consultations between the senior interventionist and PWCF in the control arm will be audio recorded with permission (n=10-12 in each site). Encrypted digital recorders will be used and recordings sent securely to the research team for analysis.

10.2.2 Semi-structured interviews: participants

In each site we will interview 3-4 PWCF receiving the intervention who are recruited at the beginning of the pilot. We will interview them around one month into the intervention to seek views of the most intensive part of the intervention. This will identify any problems early and be fed back to the intervention development team, staff delivering the intervention, and trial staff. We will interview 5-6 PWCF around four to six months into the intervention. These PWCF will have experienced more independent use of the CFHealthHub and we can explore how to keep PWCF engaged with the intervention in the longer term. We will interview 2-3 PWCF who drop out of the intervention to explore why this occurred. We will interview 10-12 PWCF in the control arm around four to six months into the trial to explore whether they have experienced aspects of patient activation and leakage of the intervention.

10.2.3 Semi-structured interviews: professionals

The first interviews with the interventionist and senior interventionist in each site will take place after they have undertaken assessments with the first few PWCF to identify teething problems with the intervention or the trial and the comprehensiveness of the training sessions they received. The findings will be fed back to the team to consider whether changes are needed to the intervention or trial protocol. The second interviews will take place when the first few PWCF have completed the intervention to allow the interventionist to reflect back over the whole process. The interventionists may have different lengths of experience of working with CF, nebulisers or behaviour change and we will consider the influence of differences in backgrounds on their ability to implement the intervention.

We will also undertake interviews with two members of the MDT at each centre when the first few PWCF have received 2-3 months of the intervention and then again towards the end of the feasibility study when all PWCF have been recruited and received around 3 months of the intervention.

10.2.4 Undertaking the interviews

For the interviews we have developed topic guides based on our research questions and these are attached to the application. Topic guides develop throughout any qualitative interview study and our topic guides may change as the study progresses. We will audio record all interviews after receiving written permission to do so. We will use an encrypted digital recorder. Reflexive notes will be made during and after the interviews. We expect

interviews to last around one hour. We do not expect data saturation in pilot studies; the aim is to identify any learning that can be addressed in preparation for the full trial.

11. Data analysis

11.1 Quantitative analysis

The analysis will be performed after data lock by a CTRU statistician under the supervision of the senior study statistician. As the trial is a pragmatic parallel group RCT data will be reported and presented according to the CONSORT 2010 statement [61] with reference to proposed extension for pilot / feasibility studies [37]. As a pilot/feasibility study the main analysis will be mainly descriptive and focus on confidence interval estimation and not formal hypothesis testing [58]. We will report rates of consent, recruitment and follow-up by centre and by randomized group.

Clinical outcome measures will be summarised overall and by randomized group. Baseline demographic (age, gender), physical measurements (e.g. weight, height, BMI), and patient reported outcome measures (EQ-5D, PAM-13, Assessment of Routine, MAD-3, SRBAI, CFQ-R, GAD-7, COM-BMQ, PHQ-8), and clinical measurements (e.g. FEV1, IV days in last registry year) will be described and summarised overall and for both treatment groups.

The primary outcome is the number of pulmonary exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics over the 6 month post-randomisation follow-up period. We will also include, as part of the feasibility analysis, estimation of the effect size for the 6-month pulmonary exacerbations outcome with 95% confidence interval estimates to check that the likely effect is within a clinically relevant range (as confirmation that it is worth progressing with the full trial). For this we will use a Poisson generalised linear model (GLM). Secondary continuous outcomes such as six-month post randomisation FEV1, BMI EQ-5D, PAM-13, Assessment of Routine, MAD-3, SRBAI, CFQ-R, GAD-7, COM-BMQ, PHQ-8) will be analysed with a multiple linear regression model with the baseline value of the outcome and randomised group as covariates. The treatment group coefficient and its associated 95% confidence interval will be reported from the various multiple linear regression models. The mean level of adherence (to prescribed medication) between the intervention and control groups over the 6 month post-randomisation follow-up period will also be reported and compared between the groups and a 95% confidence interval (CI) for the mean difference in this parameter between the randomised groups will also be calculated.

Further analyses with the objective nebuliser data will be performed to explore the process of habit formation with the delivery of the adherence intervention. The analyses will include:

(a) generating objective habit scores by taking into account time of nebuliser use

(b) using statistical process control to identify when periods of stability is achieved

(c) other time-series methods, including cross-correlation between habit scores and adherence.

Adverse events will be based on serious adverse events (SAE) case report forms. A serious adverse event is defined as any adverse event or adverse reaction that results in death, is life-threatening, requires hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation, results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity, or is a congenital anomaly or birth defect.

The following summaries will be presented as overall rates and stratified by AE classification:

• the number and percentages of patients reported as having Serious Adverse Events (SAE) in each treatment arm; and,

• the number and percentages recorded as having all forms of Adverse Events (AE) in each arm.

This information along with the acceptability of the study design and protocol to patients/GPs; the safety of the intervention; patient recruitment and attrition/retention rates will enable us to determine whether or not the definitive RCT is feasible within a satisfactory timescale and cost envelope using UK centres alone.

11.2 Qualitative analysis

Transcripts will be coded using the latest version of NVivo (QSR International). The analysis will use the National Centre for Social Research 'Framework' approach [62]. AO'C and SD will undertake the following stages of the analysis of patient transcripts: familiarisation; identifying a thematic framework; indexing; charting; and, mapping and interpretation. The theoretical framework for understanding intervention adherence is the Necessities-Concerns framework [63] within the COM-B system [18]. This will be used within the thematic framework. We will use the process evaluation functions of context, mechanisms and implementation to frame the analysis [43]. Within mechanisms we will use the COM-B system as stated above and consider the use of the Theoretical Domains Framework [36]. We will compare and contrast findings from each site because the different backgrounds of the interventionists, and the different contexts in which care is provided in each CF unit, may affect implementation and acceptability of the intervention.

Figure 7. Assumptions of the MRC Guidance on Process Evaluation

[39, 64]



This qualitative research will:

• Inform the refinement of the intervention (e.g. CFHealthHub, training of interventionists, initial assessments, manualised instructions) and its implementation (e.g. introduction within a CF Unit) for use in the full trial.

• Inform refinement to trial procedures for the full trial.

• Inform the selection of the final secondary measures used in the full trial to ensure they address the perceived benefits of the intervention.

Help to understand the extent of any leakage of the intervention to controls.

11.3 Combining data and findings from the different components

We will use Farmer's triangulation protocol to display the findings from each component of the study together and discuss as a team the extent to which findings converge, complement each other or contradict each other [65, 66]. For example, we will display all findings about recruitment together to consider the feasibility of recruitment for the full trial and the actions required to ensure feasibility. We will also display in a matrix the qualitative and quantitative data for individual PWCF who have received the intervention and been interviewed [66]. We will use this to consider the extent to which our secondary outcome measures identify issues raised by PWCF in the interviews.

12. Monitoring

12.1 Oversight

The CTRU SOP GOV003 Data Monitoring and Ethics Committee states "A DMEC does not need convening in studies that carry low risk to patients". This project involves

delivering a behaviour change intervention through the website CFHealthHub and would therefore be classified as low risk.

The overall responsibility for the study will be with Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust who will act as sponsors for the study. The local Principal Investigator (PI) will be responsible for the study at each participating site and it will be registered and approved with each local R&D department. The study will be conducted in accordance with the protocol, GCP and Sheffield CTRU Standard Operating Procedures. The two committees which will govern the conduct of the study are:

- 1. Programme Steering Committee (PSC)
- 2. Project Management Group (PMG)

The PSC will be responsible for the overall conduct of the trial and consists of an independent chair and four other independent members including a statistician and PPI representative. The committee will meet every 6 months to monitor the study.

The PMG will comprise of the trial manager and the core research team . The PMG will meet on a monthly basis to monitor the day-to-day running of the trial. The Trial Manager will be jointly supervised by the CI and the Assistant Director of CTRU via the form of regular meetings (face to face and telephone calls). The Trial Manager will be responsible for liaising with the whole project team. Trial monitoring procedures will be assessed based on the level of risk of the study. The Site Monitoring Plan will outline the types and frequency of site monitoring activities for the study and this will be agreed with the Sponsor prior to the start of the study.

12.2 Description of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines

There are no planned interim analyses or stopping guidelines for this study.

12.3 Harms (safety assessments)

12.3.1 Serious Adverse Events

Trial sites are to report Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) in conjunction with the CTRU standard operating procedure PM004 (Adverse events and serious adverse events). The definition of an SAE is as follows:

- results in death;
- is life-threatening* (subject at immediate risk of death);
- requires in-patient hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation;**
- results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity;
- consists of a congenital anomaly or birth defect; or,
- is another important medical event that may jeopardise the subject.***

* 'life-threatening' refers to an event in which the patient was at risk of death at the time of the event; it does not refer to an event which hypothetically might have caused death if it were more severe.

**Hospitalisation is defined as an inpatient admission, regardless of length of stay, even if the hospitalisation is a precautionary measure for continued observation. Hospitalisations for a pre-existing condition, including elective procedures that have not worsened, do not constitute an SAE.

***Other important medical events that may not result in death, be life-threatening, or require hospitalisation may be considered a serious adverse event/experience when, based upon appropriate medical judgment, they may jeopardise the subject and may require medical or surgical intervention to prevent one of the outcomes listed in this definition.

It is not anticipated that there will be many SAEs related to the behaviour change intervention. We will report any SAEs which are deemed related to the trial intervention and unexpected to the Sponsor within the specified timeframes below (12.3.4).

12.3.2 Adverse events we require reporting:

We do require that sites report any new diagnosis of depression which requires treatment with medication or psychological therapy e.g. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (CBT).

12.3.3 Expected SAEs and adverse events

Certain adverse events are common to CF and associated medications. Expected SAEs must be reported in the annual safety report. Hospitalisation as a result of an exacerbation will be recorded in the study database and not be reported as an SAE.

Expected AEs in relation to medications or common in patients with CF

- 1. Acute FEV1 drop >15% after 1^{st} dose of medication
- 2. Increased productive cough
- 3. Nasal congestion or stuffy nose
- 4. Chest congestion
- 5. Wheezing
- 6. Chest pain or chest discomfort
 - 7. Voice alteration/change
- 8. Dysponea (breathlessness)
- 9. Haemoptysis (coughing blood)
- 10. Rhinitis
- 11.

- 12. Headache
- 13. Crackles in lung
- 14. Throat irritation/ sore throat
- 15. URTI
- 16. Sinusitis
- 17. Deafness
- 18. Indigestion / reflux
- 19. Tonsillitis
- 20. Joint pain
- 21. Decreased appetite
- 22. Fatigue
- 23. Headache

- 24. Distal intestinal obstructive syndrome25. Fever26. Otitis media or ear infection
 - 27. Conjunctivitis
 - 28. Pneumothorax
- 29. Decreased exercise tolerance
- 30. Pyrexia
- 31. Abdominal pain
 - 32. Influenza
 - 33. Pseudomonas infection
 - 34. Vomiting
 - 35. Diabetes
 - 36. Pneumonia

12.3.4 Reporting

Adverse events and SAEs can be reported for participants at any stage of their trial participation. A member of the site study team (interventionist, clinician or other) will enquire about any adverse events at routine clinic appointments. These will be record on the adverse event section of the paper CRF and database. The event will be assessed by the local Principal Investigator and the form will be kept in the site file. Serious adverse events will be reported in the periodic safety reports to the research ethics committee and Trial Steering committee.

All adverse events (serious or other based on the definitions above) will be recorded on the case report form and details will be **entered on the study database within 1 week of completing the paper form**. Any SAEs which are deemed related to the trial intervention, the site will complete the paper CRF and **fax details this form to the CTRU within 24 hours of becoming aware of the event** in order for the CTRU to report this event to the Sponsor and the main REC within the required timeframes (15 days).

In participants using the Bi-Neb, any Adverse or SAEs relating to the use of Promixin via this device will be reported to the Patient Support team (PSP) at Phillips as per their standard practice.

12.4 Auditing

The sponsor will permit monitoring and audits by the relevant authorities, including the Research Ethics Committee. The investigator will also allow monitoring and audits by these bodies and the sponsor, and they will provide direct access to source data and documents.

12.5 Finance and indemnity

The trial has been financed by the NIHR and details have been drawn up in a separate agreement. This is an NHS sponsored study. If there is negligent harm during the clinical

trial when the NHS body owes a duty of care to the person harmed, NHS Indemnity will cover NHS staff, medical academic staff with honorary contracts and those conducting the trial. NHS Indemnity does not offer no-fault compensation and is unable to agree in advance to pay compensation for non-negligent harm. Ex-gratia payments may be considered in the case of a claim.

13. Ethics and dissemination

13.1 Approvals

The trial will be conducted subject to Research Ethics Committee favourable opinion including any provisions for site specific assessment. The application will be submitted through the IRAS central allocation system. The approval letter from the ethics committee and copy of approved patient information leaflets, consent forms and any ethically approved questionnaires will be present in the site files before initiation of the study and patient recruitment. Local research governance approvals will be sought from all participating research sites. This clinical trial will be conducted in accordance with Good Clinical Practice Guidelines and CTRU standard operating procedures. MHRA approval is not required for this study.

13.2 Protocol amendments

The investigator will be updated following an amendment to the protocol or study documents. The new documents, REC approval, R&D approval, HRA assessment letter and any other appropriate documentation surrounding the amendment will be sent to the site via a "site file update". The sites will receive the documents with a site file update sheet, detailing where to file the amended documents and which documents to supersede. If there are any significant changes to the study procedures or eligibility criteria sites will be notified by a combination of email, telephone, newsletters or additional project training when required.

In relation to informing REC, if any study documents require amending, the changes will be discussed with the sponsor and either a substantial (via IRAS and HRA) or minor amendment (notification via email) will be submitted to REC and HRA. Following REC acknowledgment and approval (when applicable) other appropriate approvals will be obtained i.e. HRA and R&D approval.

If a protocol amendment requires participants to be re-consented they will be informed of the amendment by an updated participant information sheet and will be asked to re-consent to the study. Trial registries, journals and regulators will be updated regarding protocol amendments when appropriate.

13.3 Consent

Consent for the main trial:

The ACtiF trial interventionist or local PI at the site will be responsible for taking informed consent from potentially eligible trial participants face to face at home or in clinic. Any researcher or clinical member of the team taking informed consent will be trained in study procedures and GCP. Participants will have the option to specify whether they are

interested in being approached for the qualitative interviews and audio recordings. However, they do not have to consent to these to be involved in the main study.

Consent for the interviews:

Consent for interviews (participant, interventionist or MDT member) will separately be taken by the qualitative researcher. Participants can participate in the main trial but choose to not take part in the qualitative research.

13.4 Confidentiality

Participant confidentiality will be respected at all times. Participant names and contact details will be collected and entered on the prospect database. Access to these personal details will be restricted to users with appropriate privileges only. All users who do not require access to identifiable data will only identify data by participant ID number, and no patient identifiable data will be transferred from the database to the statistician.

Trial documents (paper and electronic) will be retained in a secure location during and after the trial has finished. All source documents will be retained for a period of 5 years following the end of the trial. Where trial related information is documented in the medical records – those records will be retained for 5 years after the last patient last visit. Each site is responsible for ensuring records are archived and the information supplied to the Chief Investigator.

Any participant data held within CFHealthHub will be stored on a secure server at the University of Manchester. CFHealthHub complies with the Data Protection Act and follows best practice guidelines on security and information governance. Encrypted channels are used to transfer any data to and from the web and mobile application platforms. All user interaction with the CFHealthHub server and each action performed by a user will be logged. An audit log contains the username of the user performing the action, the date & time of the action, short description of the action performed. All users are authenticated via a secure password a with access to the system restricted on a role basis.

13.5 Declaration of Interests

Martin Wildman has received funding from Zambon who market the Ineb to carry out research to understand the performance of the Ineb and in the past we received funding from Zambon to carry out work to understand barriers to adherence.

13.6 Access to data

The central ACtiF study team alone will have access to the final dataset details of which will be outlined in the study DMP.

13.7 Ancilliary and post-trial care

Centres will be able to continue to use CFHealthHub if they wish to do so after the end of the pilot and feasibility study. If so, participants in the control arm will be able to cross over to use the intervention at this stage.

13.8 Dissemination policy

As this is a feasibility study its main interest will be to potential researchers and funding bodies. Data will be reported according to the revised CONSORT statement (Schultz,

2010). The findings of this research will be available to NIHR, patient groups and other interested bodies. It will also be offered for presentation at medical meetings and will be offered for publication in peer reviewed medical journals.

5 6 7

8

9

10 11

33

34

35

36

References

1. Alexander BM, Petren EK, Grimes M, Fink A, Myers V, Sewall A: Mission of the cystic fibrosis foundation Annual Data Report 2013 Cystic Fibrosis Foundation Patient Registry. 2014.

Southern KW, Barker PM, Solis-Moya A, Patel L: Macrolide antibiotics for cystic
 fibrosis. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Southern KW. Chichester,
 UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2011.

3. Ramsey BW, Davies J, McElvaney NG, Tullis E, Bell SC, Dřevínek P, Griese M, McKone
EF, Wainwright CE, Konstan MW, Moss R, Ratjen F, Sermet-Gaudelus I, Rowe SM, Dong
Q, Rodriguez S, Yen K, Ordoñez C, Elborn JS: A CFTR Potentiator in Patients with Cystic
Fibrosis and the *G551D* Mutation. N Engl J Med 2011, 365:1663–1672.

4. McCoy KS, Quittner AL, Oermann CM, Gibson RL, Retsch-Bogart GZ, Montgomery AB:
 Inhaled aztreonam lysine for chronic airway Pseudomonas aeruginosa in cystic fibrosis.
 Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2008, 178:921–8.

5. Ryan G, Mukhopadhyay S, Singh M: Nebulised anti-pseudomonal antibiotics for cystic
fibrosis. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Ryan G. Chichester, UK:
John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2003.

6. Jones AP, Wallis C: Dornase alfa for cystic fibrosis. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Jones AP. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2010.

7. Wark P, McDonald VM: **Nebulised hypertonic saline for cystic fibrosis**. In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Wark P. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2009.

8. Ryan G, Singh M, Dwan K: Inhaled antibiotics for long-term therapy in cystic fibrosis.
In *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. Edited by Ryan G. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2011.

41
42
43
43
44
45
45
41
9. Eakin MN, Bilderback A, Boyle MP, Mogayzel PJ, Riekert KA: Longitudinal association
43
44
45
45

10. Briesacher BA, Quittner AL, Saiman L, Sacco P, Fouayzi H, Quittell LM, Accurso F,
Modi A, Lim C, Yu N, Geller D, Wagner M, Quittner A, DiMatteo M, Quittner A, Barker D,
Marciel K, Grimley M, Emerson J, Rosenfeld M, McNamara S, Ramsey B, Gibson R, Nixon
G, Armstrong D, Carzino R, Carlin J, Olinsky A, Robertson C, Grimwood K, et al.:
Adherence with tobramycin inhaled solution and health care utilization. *BMC Pulm Med*2011, 11:5.

11. AL Q, KA R, Zhang J: Relationship between adherence to pulmonary medications
 and health care costs: longitudinal analyses from 2005-2011. *Pediatr Pulmonol* 2012,
 47:198.

58
 12. Smyth A, Lewis S, Bertenshaw C, Choonara I, McGaw J, Watson A: Case-control study
 of acute renal failure in patients with cystic fibrosis in the UK. *Thorax* 2008, 63:532–5.

13. McManus P: Lead Pharmacist - Specialised Services (South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw) NHS England. . 14. Daniels T, Goodacre L, Sutton C, Pollard K, Conway S, Peckham D: Accurate assessment of adherence: self-report and clinician report vs electronic monitoring of nebulizers. Chest 2011, 140:425-32. 10 15. McNeil S: Personal Communication from Stephanie McNeil, Chief Statistician of UK CF 11 Registry. . 12 13 16. Horne RW, Barber N, Elliot R, Morgan M: Concordance, Adherance and Compliance in 14 Medicine Taking: A Conceptual Map and Research Priorities. National Co-Ordinating 15 16 Centre for NHS Service Delivery and Organisational R&D (NCCSDO). 2005. 17 18 17. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M: Developing and 19 evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ 20 2008:a1655-a1655. 21 22 18. Michie S, van Stralen MM, West R: The behaviour change wheel: a new method for 23 characterising and designing behaviour change interventions. Implement Sci 2011, 6:42. 24 25 19. Parham R, Thomas S, Mills R, Al. E: CF patient's beliefs about nebuliser treatment: 26 implications for adherence to treatment. J Cyst Fibros 2012, 11(Suppl 1):S9. 27 28 20. Bucks RS, Hawkins K, Skinner TC, Horn S, Seddon P, Horne R: Adherence to 29 treatment in adolescents with cystic fibrosis: the role of illness perceptions and 30 treatment beliefs. J Pediatr Psychol 2009, 34:893–902. 31 32 33 21. George M, Rand-Giovannetti D, Eakin MN, Borrelli B, Zettler M, Riekert KA: 34 Perceptions of barriers and facilitators: self-management decisions by older adolescents 35 and adults with CF. J Cyst Fibros 2010, 9:425-32. 36 37 22. Dziuban EJ, Saab-Abazeed L, Chaudhry SR, Streetman DS, Nasr SZ: Identifying 38 barriers to treatment adherence and related attitudinal patterns in adolescents with 39 cystic fibrosis. Pediatr Pulmonol 2010, 45:450-8. 40 41 23. Bregnballe V, Schiøtz PO, Boisen KA, Pressler T, Thastum M: Barriers to adherence in 42 adolescents and young adults with cystic fibrosis: a questionnaire study in young 43 patients and their parents. Patient Prefer Adherence 2011, 5:507–15. 44 45 24. Modi AC, Quittner AL: Barriers to treatment adherence for children with cystic 46 fibrosis and asthma: What gets in the way? J Pediatr Psychol 2006, 31:846–858. 47 48 25. Abbott J, Dodd M, Bilton D, Webb AK: Treatment compliance in adults with cystic 49 50 fibrosis. Thorax 1994, 49:115-20. 51 52 26. Abbott J, Dodd M, Webb AK: Health perceptions and treatment adherence in adults 53 with cystic fibrosis. Thorax 1996, 51:1233-8. 54 55 27. Abbott J, Dodd M, Gee L, Webb K: Ways of coping with cystic fibrosis: implications 56 for treatment adherence. Disabil Rehabil 2001, 23:315-24. 57 58 28. Conway SP, Pond MN, Hamnett T, Watson A: Compliance with treatment in adult 59 patients with cystic fibrosis. Thorax 1996, 51:29-33. 60

1 2 3

4

5 6

7

8

1 2 3 29. Jones S, Curley R, Wildman M: 345 Systematic review of qualitative studies 4 investigating barriers to adherence in patients with cystic fibrosis using framework 5 analysis structured by a conceptual framework of behaviour change. J Cyst Fibros 2013, 6 12(Suppl 1):S136. 7 8 30. Kettler LJ, Sawyer SM, Winefield HR, Greville HW: Determinants of adherence in 9 adults with cystic fibrosis. Thorax 2002, 57:459-64. 10 11 31. Lask B: Non-Adherence to Treatment in Cystic Fibrosis. J R Soc Med 1994, 87(21 12 13 Suppl):25–27. 14 32. Latchford G, Duff A, Quinn J, Conway S, Conner M: Adherence to nebulised 15 16 antibiotics in cystic fibrosis. Patient Educ Couns 2009, 75:141-4. 17 18 33. Horne R, Weinman J, Barber N, Elliott R: Concordance, Adherence and Compliance in 19 Medicine Taking: Report for the National Co-Ordinating Centre for NHS Service Delivery 20 and Organisation R & D (NCCSDO). London: NCCSDO; 2005. 21 22 34. Ivers N, Jamtvedt G, Flottorp S, Young JM, Odgaard-Jensen J, French SD, O'Brien MA, 23 Johansen M, Grimshaw J, Oxman AD: Audit and feedback: effects on professional 24 practice and healthcare outcomes. Cochrane database Syst Rev 2012, 6:CD000259. 25 26 35. Geraedts H, Zijlstra A, Bulstra SK, Stevens M, Zijlstra W: Effects of remote feedback in 27 home-based physical activity interventions for older adults: a systematic review. Patient 28 29 Educ Couns 2013, 91:14-24. 30 36. Cane J, O'Connor D, Michie S: Validation of the theoretical domains framework for 31 32 use in behaviour change and implementation research. Implement Sci 2012, 7:37. 33 34 37. Thabane L, Ma J, Chu R, Cheng J, Ismaila A, Rios LP, Robson R, Thabane M, 35 Giangregorio L, Goldsmith CH: A tutorial on pilot studies: the what, why and how. BMC 36 Med Res Methodol 2010, 10:1. 37 38 38. Baranowski T, Stables G: Process Evaluations of the 5-a-Day Projects. Heal Educ 39 Behav 2000, 27:157-166. 40 41 39. Pfadenhauer LM, Mozygemba K, Gerhardus A, Hofmann B, Booth A, Lysdahl KB, 42 Tummers M, Burns J, Rehfuess EA: Context and implementation: A concept analysis 43 towards conceptual maturity. Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundhwes 2015, 109:103-114. 44 45 40. Weber K, Glynn M a.: Making Sense with Institutions: Context, Thought and Action 46 in Karl Weick's Theory. Organ Stud 2006, 27:1639-1660. 47 48 41. Hyatt D: Time for a change: a critical discoursal analysis of synchronic context with 49 50 diachronic relevance. Discourse Soc 2005, 16:515-534. 51 52 42. Linnan L, Steckler A: Process evaluation for public health interventions and research: 53 an overview. In Process evaluation for public health interventions and research. 1st edition. 54 Edited by Linnan L, Steckler A. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass; 2002:1–23. 55 56 43. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O'Cathain A, 57 Tinati T, Wight D, Baird J: Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical 58 Research Council guidance. BMJ 2015, 350:h1258. 59 60

44. Nilsen P: Making sense of implementation theories, models and frameworks. Implement Sci 2015, 10:1–13.

45. Meyers DC, Durlak J a., Wandersman A: The Quality Implementation Framework: A Synthesis of Critical Steps in the Implementation Process. Am J Community Psychol 2012, **50**:462–480.

46. Borrelli B: The Assessment, Monitoring, and Enhancement of Treatment Fidelity In Public Health Clinical Trials. J Public Health Dent 2011, 71:S52–S63.

13 47. Fuchs HJ, Borowitz DS, Christiansen DH, Morris EM, Nash ML, Ramsey BW, 14 Rosenstein BJ, Smith AL, Wohl ME: Effect of aerosolized recombinant human DNase on 15 16 exacerbations of respiratory symptoms and on pulmonary function in patients with cvstic fibrosis. The Pulmozyme Study Group. N Engl J Med 1994, 331:637–42. 18

48. Ratjen F, Durham T, Navratil T, Schaberg A, Accurso FJ, Wainwright C, Barnes M, Moss 20 RB: Long term effects of denufosol tetrasodium in patients with cystic fibrosis. J Cyst Fibros 2012, 11:539–49. 22

49. Miller MR, Hankinson J, Brusasco V, Burgos F, Casaburi R, Coates A, Crapo R, Enright P, van der Grinten CPM, Gustafsson P, Jensen R, Johnson DC, MacIntyre N, McKay R, Navajas D, Pedersen OF, Pellegrino R, Viegi G, Wanger J: Standardisation of spirometry. Eur Respir J 2005, 26:319–38.

28 50. Herdman M, Gudex C, Lloyd A, Janssen M, Kind P, Parkin D, Bonsel G, Badia X: 29 30 Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EO-5D (EO-5D-5L). Qual Life Res 2011, 20:1727–36. 32

33 51. Hibbard JH, Mahoney ER, Stockard J, Tusler M: Development and testing of a short 34 form of the patient activation measure. Health Serv Res 2005, 40(6 Pt 1):1918–30. 35

36 52. Wong MD, Sarkisian C a., Davis C, Kinsler J, Cunningham WE: The Association Between Life Chaos, Health Care Use, and Health Status Among HIV-Infected Persons. 38 J Gen Intern Med 2007, 22:1286-1291. 39

53. Verplanken B, Orbell S: Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit Strength1. J Appl Soc Psychol 2003, 33:1313–1330.

43 54. Quittner a L, Sweeny S, Watrous M, Munzenberger P, Bearss K, Gibson Nitza a, Fisher 44 L a, Henry B: Translation and linguistic validation of a disease-specific quality of life 45 46 measure for cystic fibrosis. J Pediatr Psychol 2000, 25:403-14. 47

48 55. Kroenke K, Strine TW, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Berry JT, Mokdad AH: The PHO-8 49 as a measure of current depression in the general population. J Affect Disord 2009, 50 114:163-173. 51

52 56. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JBW, Löwe B: A brief measure for assessing 53 generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. Arch Intern Med 2006, 166:1092-7. 54

55 57. Horne R, Weinman J, Hankins M: The beliefs about medicines questionnaire: The 56 development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive representation 57 of medication. Psychol Health 1999, 14:1-24. 58

59 58. Lancaster GA, Dodd S, Williamson PR: Design and analysis of pilot studies: 60

1 2 3

4

5 6

7

8

9 10

11

12

17

19

21

23

24

25

26 27

31

37

40

41

59. Arain M, Campbell MJ, Cooper CL, Lancaster GA: What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of current practice and editorial policy. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2010, **10**:67.

60. Eldridge S, Bond C, Campbell M, Lancaster G, Thabane L, Hopwell S: Definition and

61. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D: CONSORT 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for

63. Horne R: **Treatment perceptions and self-regulation**. In *The Self-regulation of Health and Illness Behaviour*. Edited by Cameron L, Leventhal H. London: Routledge; 2003:138–53.

64. Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O'Cathain A,

triangulation protocol for qualitative health research. *Qual Health Res* 2006, 16:377–94.

66. O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J, Cathain AO: Three techniques for integrating data

reporting parallel group randomized trials. Annu Intern Med 2010, 152:726–732.

62. Ritchie J, Spencer L: **Qualitative data analysis for applied policy research**. In *Analysing qualitative data*. Edited by Bryman A, Burgess RG. Routledge; 1994:173–194.

Tinati T, Wight D, Baird J: Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical

65. Farmer T, Robinson K, Elliott SJ, Eyles J: Developing and implementing a

Research Council guidance. BMJ 2015, 350(mar19 6):h1258-h1258.

in mixed methods studies. BMJ 2010, 341(sep17 1):c4587-c4587.

recommendations for good practice. J Eval Clin Pract 2004, 10:307–12.

reporting of pilot and feasibility studies. Trials 2013, 14(Suppl 1):O18.

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

Appendix 1. W.H.O. Trial Registration Data Set

DATA CATEGORY	INFORMATION
Primary registry and trial identifying number	To be added
Date of registration in primary registry	To be added
Secondary identifying numbers	NIHR: RP-PG-1212-20015
	Sponsor (STH): STH19213
Source(s) of monetary or material support	National Institute for Health Research
	(NIHR) Programme Grants for Applied
	Research programme.
Primary sponsor	Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS
	Foundation Trust.
Secondary sponsor(s)	none
Contact for public queries	Chin Maguire
	Trial Manager
	Clinical Trials Research Unit
	University of Sheffield
	Regent Court
	30 Regent Street
	Sheffield
	SI 4DA
	1e1: (+44) (0)114 222 0/17
	Fax: $(+44)(0)11422208/0$
Contact for acientific marine	Dr Mortin Wildman
Contact for scientific queries	Dr Marun wildman A dult CE Contro
	Northern Conoral Hospital
	Herries Road
	Sheffield
	STALL
	Tel: (0114) 2715212
	Fax: $(0114) 222 0870$
	email : Martin.Wildman@sth.nhs.uk
Public title	Adherence to treatment in adults with Cystic
	Fibrosis (ACtiF)
Scientific title	Development and evaluation of an
	intervention to support Adherence to
	treatment in adults with Cystic Fibrosis : a
	feasibility study comprised of an external
	pilot randomised controlled trial and process
	evaluation
Countries of recruitment	United Kingdom
Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied	Cystic Fibrosis
Intervention(s)	Usual care plus a microchipped nebuliser
	with or without a complex intervention. The
	complex intervention consists of:

	 A software platform, CFHealthHub mobile apps and website, which allows access to medication adherence data and education modules intended to remove barriers to adherence A manual containing a 'behaviour change toolkit' to guide interactions between health
Key inclusion and exclusion criteria	Inclusion criteria for participants 1.Diagnosed with CF and with data within the CF registry 2.Aged 16 years and above 3.Taking inhaled mucolytics or antibiotics via a chipped nebuliser (e.g. eTrack or Bi- Neb) or able and willing to take via eTrack or Bi-Neb.
	 Exclusion criteria for participants 1.Post-lung transplant 2.People on the active lung transplant list 3.Patients receiving palliative care, 4.Lacking in capacity to give informed consent 5.Using dry powder devices to take antibiotics or mucolytics
Study type	Feasibility study comprised of an external pilot randomised controlled trial and process evaluation
Date of first enrolment	Anticipated: 02/05/2016
Target sample size	We propose to recruit to time, that is for a fixed period of four months rather than to a fixed sample size. To match the proposed recruitment rate of the main RCT, the target sample over the four months for which the pilot RCT is open, will be n=64.
Recruitment status	Not yet open.
Primary outcome(s)	Exacerbations of cystic fibrosis as defined by the Fuchs criteria (<i>N Engl J Med</i> 1994, 331:637–42.)
Key secondary outcomes	None.
• •	







Sheffield Teaching Hospitals

Page 118 of 202

ACtiF Pilot Study

Control Patient Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

We're interested in your experiences of the service that you receive for helping you to use your nebuliser.

- 1. Why did you decide to take part in the research?
- 2. How did you find being asked to take part in the trial? [Prompts: paperwork volume, information provided, questionnaires]

Now I'd like to ask you about the care you received before the trial started to help you use your nebuliser.

- 3. What types of things did the unit/hospital recommend that you do to help you use your nebuliser? [Prompts: appointments / what do you talk about? / nebulisers / skills to use your nebuliser properly / knowledge and beliefs?]
- 4. What types of things did the unit/hospital recommend that you do to help you use your nebuliser as much as possible? [Prompts: setting goals, solving problems, making plans, giving you information, building skills, beliefs about nebuliser medication, giving you confidence]
- 5. How did the care you received to help you use your nebuliser fit with any other care you received for CF more generally?

Pilot – ACtiF Control Patient Topic guide: v1 2Feb16

- 6. How could the care you received for helping you to use your nebuliser as prescribed be improved?
 - 7. Overall how happy are you with the care you received for your nebuliser? [Prompts: what could be done better?]

Now I want to ask you about specific kinds of things that might have changed since the trial started:

- 8. Since you joined the trial has the care that you receive in the unit / hospital changed at all? [Prompts: Has anybody done anything different? What have they done?]
- 9. Since you joined the trial has anyone asked you to change how you use your nebuliser? If so, what have they suggested you do? [Prompt: capability skills / knowledge including beliefs / where has the change come from?]
- 10. Since you joined the trial has anyone suggested ways to help you use your nebuliser as much as possible? If so what? [Prompt: opportunity finding time to use nebuliser / making plans / setting goals / where has the change come from?]
- 11. Since you joined the trial has anyone helped you have more confidence to use your nebuliser as prescribed? [Prompt: where has the change come from? what have they done?]

Is there anything else that we haven't talked about that you'd like to comment on?

THANK YOU

The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for Applied Research.

Pilot – ACtiF Control Patient Topic guide: v1 2Feb16





Sheffield Teaching Hospitals

Page 120 of 202

ACtiF Pilot Study

Intervention Patient Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

We're interested in your experiences of the service that you have received from CFHealthHub including both the meetings to discuss your nebuliser medication and the website/app you have used.

1. Why did you decide to take part in the research?

2. How did you find being asked to take part in the trial? [Prompts: recruitment, paperwork volume, information provided, questionnaires]

Now I'd like to ask you about your meetings with the person who has been working with you on CFHealthHub.

3. What types of things did they recommend that you do? [prompts: setting goals, solving problems, making plans (myplan), giving you information]

4. Do you think you have had any benefit from these meetings?

If yes, what benefit and what about the service helped you to get this?

If no, what has stopped you gaining benefit?

5. What was good about how the meetings were delivered? [Prompt: what needs to be improved?]

6.	What was good about the website? [Prompts: my plan, how am I doing, tool kit, gra treatment]
7.	What needs to be improved? [Prompts: my plan, how am I doing, tool kit, graphs, m treatment]
8.	Do you think you've had any benefit from using the website?
	If yes, what benefit and what about the website helped you to get this?
	If no, what has stopped you gaining benefit?
9.	Have the website and/or meetings helped you to improve how often you use your nebuliser?
	If yes, how has it helped you to do this?
	If not, why not?
10.	How do the CFHealthHub website and the meetings work together?
11.	Has using CFHealthHub helped you to be able to use your nebuliser any better? Why not? [Prompt: capability skills / knowledge including beliefs]
12.	Has using CFHealthHub helped you to find the time to use your nebuliser more? When not? [Prompt: opportunity / making plans]
13.	Has using CFHealthHub made you want to use your nebuliser more? Why / why not? [Prompt: motivation and confidence]

- 15. Do you think you would continue using CFHealthHub? [Prompt: during the study / after the study]
- 16. Is CFHealthHub a good thing to use in general for people with CF? Why? / Why not?
- 17. How have you found being part of the study?

<text> Is there anything else that we haven't talked about that you'd like to comment on?

THANK YOU

 The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for Applied Research.








ACTIF Pilot Study

Interventionist Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today.

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

Introduction to the interview: Interested in how you've found using CFHealthhub (CFHH) with your participants and any learning from it

<u>The trial</u>

- 1. What works or could be improved about:
 - a) recruiting patients to the trial?
 - b) collecting data?
 - c) any other aspect?

The intervention:

Now I'd like to go through each of the steps for providing the intervention to get your views on each of these

JIC.

- 2. What works or could be improved about:
 - a) how you have assessed participants' adherence levels prior to using CFHH?
 - b) how you set up appointments with your participants?

c) session 1? [Prompts: gathering data, introducing the nebuliser, entering prescription data into CFHH, completion of screening tools, patient feedback, anything else]

d) session 2? [Prompts: reviewing adherence data, introducing CFHH, explaining modules, setting goals, action planning, identifying suitable tailored content, technical issues, anything else]

e) session 3? [Prompts: reviewing goals, reviewing adherence plans, motivation, problem solving, anything else]

- 3. What works or could be improved about the training manuals and training sessions?
- 4. What works or could be improved about the support available from the research team? [Prompts: timing, availability, problem solving].
 [Specific prompt for MDT senior interventionist: do you think the training has equipped you to deliver this intervention in your centre yourself after the trial ends? If no, what further training would be needed?]
- 5. How has the CFHH intervention been received by the rest of the team? [Prompt: how has your communication been with the rest of the team about CFHH?]
- 6. What sort of follow-up did participants request? How will you handle this?
- 7. How has the CFHH intervention helped your participants to know how to use their nebuliser? [Prompt: capability / skills, knowledge and beliefs]
- 8. How has the CFHH intervention helped your participants find ways to use their nebuliser more? [Prompt: opportunity]
- 9. How has the CFHH intervention helped to motivate your participants to use their nebuliser? [Prompt: motivation / confidence]

General questions:

- 10. How engaged did participants seem with CFHH? [Prompt: What feedback if any have you had from participants about CFHH?]
- 11. How useful do you think CFHH is for your participants?

- 12. How easy / difficult has it been to get your participants to use CFHH?
 - 13. Have you seen any changes to the ways in which your participants use their nebulisers since starting CFHH?
 - 14. What have you learnt from using CFHH with your participants?
 - 15. What if any are the benefits to you and / or to your participants of using CFHH?

- 16. How do you think CFHH fits with the other care offered by the centre?
- 17. How have you found being part of the trial?

Is there anything else you'd like to say about CFHH?

THANK YOU

The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for Applied Research.





Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

ACTIF Pilot Study

MDT Topic guide

Thank you for agreeing to take part in the interview today.

Check timing ok

Check consent form filled in / received

Are you happy for the interview to be recorded?

We're interested in your views of the CFHealthHub service and how it fits into the care provided in your centre.

1. Can you describe the key things you did in your centre to help patients adhere to their nebulisers prior to the ACtiF study?

2. How does nebuliser adherence fit with the other things you do for CF patients?

3. What involvement have you had in the CFHealthHub intervention? [Prompts: website, interventionist, training of staff]

4. You had training to help you be more aware of patient activation. What did you think of the training? [Prompts: Do you think it has changed your practice in any way? If yes what changes, if no why not? Key aspects – patient knowledge including beliefs / skills / confidence]

5. Do you think CFHealthHub is a useful intervention? Why? / Why not? [Prompts: what do you think about the: website, feedback about adherence data, interventionist, training?]

6. How do you think the CFHealthHub intervention is operating in practice? [Prompt: what are the strengths / improvements needed?]

7. How does the CFHealthHub intervention fit with the care offered by your centre?

8. How does the CFHealthHub intervention help your patients to know how to use their nebuliser? [Prompts: Skills / knowledge / beliefs. How / Why doesn't it help?]

9. How does the CFHealthHub intervention help your patients to find ways to use their nebuliser more? [Prompts: How / Why doesn't it help?]

Pilot – ACtiF MDT Topic guide v1 2Feb16

60

BMJ Open

2	
3	10 How does the CEHeelth Hub intervention help to meetingto your patients to you their nebulicar?
4	10. How does the CFHealthHub intervention help to motivate your patients to use their nebuliser?
5	[Prompts: How / Why doesn't it help?]
6	
7	
8	11. Do you think CFHealthHub is helping your intervention patients to improve their adherence? If
9	ves, what key things have helped this? If no, what if anything could be done to help this?
10	
11	
12	12 Has the CEHealthHub intervention changed anything about the way in which you and/or your
13	12. This the criteatin tub intervention changed anything about the way in which you and/or you
14	team approach adherence in your centre?
15	i) for natients receiving the intervention?
16	
17	ii) for patients not receiving the intervention?
18	
19	[Prompts: MDT discussions / differences between control and intervention patients]
20	
21	
22	13. Which natient groups are most likely to benefit from CEHealthHub? Why?
23	15. Which putient groups are most mery to benefit from er readinitable why.
24	
25	14. Which nations groups are least likely to henefit from CEHealthHub? Why?
26	14. Which patient groups are least likely to benefit nom er realtinub: why:
27	
28	15 Mould you consider continuing to use CEH calth Hub in the future? Why? Why not?
29	15. Would you consider continuing to use Crheattinub in the future? Why? Why hot?
31	
32	16. How has it have for you (your control to bing part in the trial) [Drement, requiring on the the study]
33	16. How has it been for you / your centre taking part in the than? [Prompt: recruitment to the study]
34	
35	
36	17. How able do you feel to go on delivering care related to improving adherence after the study
37	ends? [Prompt: has the study changed the way you will go about this?]
38	
39	
40	18. Are there any aspects of the research that we haven't talked about that you'd like to comment
41	on?
42	
43	
44	Is there anything else you'd like to say?
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
55 57	
55	
56	
57	The ACtiF Project is funded by the National Institute for Health Research's Programme Grants for
58	Applied Research
59	

Pilot – ACtiF MDT Topic guide v1 2Feb16

Additional File 03 - Quantitative results from process evaluation

Table a. Key dates in process evaluation by participant

Study ID	Interview Date	Baseline date	5 month follow up date	Date of first intervention meeting	Time in the trial at interview (days)	Time since first intervention session at interview (days)	Time in trial at follow up (days)
R02/02	13/09/2016	06/07/2016	10/11/2016	05/08/2016	69	39	127
R02/03	09/09/2016	08/07/2016	NA	05/08/2016	63	35	NA
R02/42	12/10/2016	15/07/2016	21/12/2016	NA	89	NA	159
R02/07	15/11/2016	12/07/2016	12/12/2016	09/09/2016	126	67	153
R02/12	02/11/2016	14/07/2016	03/01/2017	05/10/2016	111	28	173
R02/52	03/02/2017	04/07/2016	22/11/2016	05/10/2016	214	121	141
R01/44	01/12/2016	07/07/2016	16/11/2016	08/11/2016	147	23	132
				eliez o			

Page 129 of 202

BMJ Open

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

R01/48	17/01/2017	04/07/2016	15/11/2016	13/10/2016	197	96	134
R01/49	30/01/2017	22/07/2016	07/12/2016	10/10/2016	192	112	138
R01/54	21/03/2017	25/07/2016	13/12/2016	02/11/2016	239	139	141
R01/39	27/02/2017	02/08/2016	21/12/2016	03/11/2016	209	116	141
R01/02	06/12/2016	31/08/2016	25/01/2017	15/08/2016	97	113	147
R01/40	05/12/2016	05/09/2016	17/02/2017	05/10/2016	91	61	165
R01/42	03/10/2016	12/09/2016	15/02/2017	15/08/2016	21	49	156

tor peer teriew only

Table b. Interventionist-generated motivation data (intervention

arm) R02/42, R02/49, R02/15 and R01/48 were all missing

Participant ID	Date	Consent Visit	Was Participant motivation too low
		Motivation Rating	Answer Yes/No
R02/39	05.08.16	7	No
R02/40	23.08.16	4	No
R02/02	05.08.16	7	No
R02/03	03.08.16	1	No
R02/43	12.08.16	7	No
R02/05	22.08.16	5	No
R02/45	18.08.16	7	No
R02/07	09.08.16	7	No
R02/48	05.10.16	7	No
R02/10	14.09.16	7	No
R02/11	28.09.16	7	No
R02/50	26.09.16	7	No
R02/12	05.10.16	7	No
R02/52	03.10.16	7	No
R01/39	03.11.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/02	16.09.16	7	No
R01/03	03.10.16	5	No
R01/40	05.10.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/42	15.08.16	5	Page missing from report
R01/44	08.11.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/47	10.10.16	5	Yes
R01/06	10.10.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/49	17.10.16	7	No
R01/08	01.11.16	7	Page missing from report
R01/50	Missing report		
R01/53	29.11.16	7	Not ticked
R01/54	Missing report		
R01/10	10.11.16	2	Not ticked
R01/57	31.10.16	0	Yes
L			

Table c. Engagement

	Adherence data collected (did not withdraw from data collection before 6m) n(%)	Total CFHH sessions Median (IQR)	Baseline adherence Median (IQR)
Overall (n=33)	29(88%)	3(1,8)	20(2.1,47.8)
Qualitative case studies			
High adherence at end			
R01/39	Yes	1	0
R02/07	Yes	2	96.7
R01/40	Yes	9	43.1
R02/52	Yes	13	96.6
Moderate adherence at end	l		
R01/49	Yes	4	13.2
Low adherence at end			
R01/54	Yes	11	44.8
R01/02	Yes	1	30.2
R01/48	Yes	3	1.8
R02/12	Yes	44	10.2
R02/03	No	3	5.4
R01/44	Yes	1	19.5
Withdrawn			
R01/42	Yes	41	21.1
R02/02	No	3	92.5
R02/42	No	0	4.2

Note: R02/42, R02/02 withdrew from adherence data collection and from the intervention and R02/03 was lost to follow-up. R01/42 did not withdraw from data collection until the end of the study; they did not contribute sufficient data for the 150-180 day period.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
10	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
27	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
70 //1	
41	
4Z	
43	
44	
45	
46	

Table d. Activities: all participants

	Self- monitoring adherence	Tailored education about treatment	Tailored patient stories (videos)	Personalised action plan/Personalis ed goal-setting	Tailored solv	problem- ving	Goal review; Rewards
	Clicks How am I doing?	Clicks Toolkit	Clicks Videos	Clicks Action Plan	Problem Solving	Clicks Coping Plan	Review sessions with Interventionist
Mean (SD)†/Median* (IOR) overall (n=33)	11(5 30)*	3(0,7)*	2(13)*	2(1 7)*	3(0.8)*	1(0 3)*	1(0,5);
Qualitative case studies	11(5,50)	5(0,1)	2(1,5)	2(1,7)	5(0,0)	1(0,5)	1(0.5)
High adherence at end							
R01/39	8	3	1	1	0	1	1
R02/07	5	1	1	1	2	0	1
R01/40	52	0	1	1	3	0	1
R02/52	70	5	3		17	1	1
Medium adherence at end	l						
R01/49	30	2	1	0	1	0	1
Low adherence at end							
R01/54	24	4	5	3	4	2	1
R01/02	3	0	1	2	0		2
R01/48	38	6	2	7	7	1	1
R02/12	98	12	10	13	14	8	1
R02/03	15	12	1	25	1	14	1
R01/44	11	0	2	4	8	3	1
Withdrawn							
R01/42	69	18	9	16	20	3	2
R02/02	3	7	1	8	8	7	1
R02/42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Table e. Activities: highly motivated participants

(Those who answered 'No' to question, 'Was the participant motivation too low) n=17. Some of these were missing or not answered n=14, only 2 answered 'Yes'.

	Self-	Tailored	Tailored	Personalised	Tailored	problem-	Goal review;
	monitoring	education	patient	action	sol	ving	Rewards
	adherence	about	stories	plan/Personalis			
		treatment	(videos)	ed goal-setting			
					Clicks	Clicks	Review
	Clicks How	Clicks	Clicks	Clicks Action	Problem	Coping	sessions with
	am I doing?	Toolkit	Videos	Plan	Solving	Plan	Interventionist
High motivation Mean	16 (5 33)*	5 (2,12)*	3 (1, 4)*	4 (2 , 12)*	4(2,11)*	1(1,7)*	1.12(0.33)†
(SD)†/Median* (IQR)							
overall (n=17)							
Qualitative case studies							
(high motivation)							
R02/07	5	1	1	1	2	0	1
R02/52	70	5	3	1	17		1
R01/49	30	2	1	0	1	0	1
R01/02	3	0	1	2	0	1	2
R02/12	98	12	10	13	14	8	1
R02/03	15	12	1	25	1	14	1
R02/02	3	7	1	8	8	7	1

Table f. Process Outcomes

	Accurate awareness of adherence	Increased Motivation	Increased 1 decrease beliefs N	necessity and d concern / Motivation	Increased self- efficacy /	Motivation	Increased habit /	Reduced CHAOS	Reduced barriers
	Subjective adherence (0-100): Medication Adherence Data Questionnaire	Change in BMQ question 'I want to do all my prescribed medications in the next 2 weeks (0-7)	Change in BMQ Necessities score (2-5)	Change in BMQ Concerns score (1-3)	Change in BMQ question 'I am confident I can do all my prescribed medications in the next 2 weeks (0-7)	Change in PAM activation score (0-100)	Change in SRBAI score (0-28)	Change in CHAOS score (0-24)	Change in no. of BMQ barriers ticked (0-6)
n Overall	30	31	31	31	31	31	31	31	31
Mean (SD) overall Qualitative	2.07(27.87) case studies	-0.1(1.27)	0.26(0.58)	-0.19(0.31)	0.06(1.79)	- 2.38(14.01)	0.32(3.92)	0.1(2.75)	-1.84(3.44)
	baseline(change) %	baseline (change)			baseline (change)	06			
High adhe	erence at end								
R01/39	85(14)	7(0)	0.5	-0.4	7(0)	-5.9	-2	2	-4
R02/07	100(-2)	7(0)	0.2	-0.2	7(0)	0	1	-5	-3
R01/40	92(8)	7(0)	0.6	-0.2	5(1)	7.2	-9	0	1
R02/52	95(-25)	7(0)	0.3	-0.2	7(0)	4.9	3	-1	1

Page 135 of 202

 BMJ Open

R01/49	100(0)	7(0)	-0.8	-0.7	7(0)	9.9	-1	0	
Low adhe	rence at end	(())			,(0)				
R01/54	60(-10)	7(-1)	-0.3	0.4	6(0)	-7.9	1	-1	6
R01/02	55(16)	7(0)	0.8	-0.2	2(3)	0	-1	-1	-2
R01/48	0(100)	7(0)	0.9	-0.8	6(0)	0	0	0	-2
R02/12	NA	7(0)	-0.1	-0.7	4(0)	14.6	-3	-2	-5
R02/03	50(NA)	1(NA)	NA	NA	2(NA)	NA	NA	NA	N
R01/44	0(0)	7(0)	1.4	0.2	5(-4)	-16.6	0	-1	-5
Withdraw	'n				10.				
R01/42	0(0)	5(-1)	-0.3	-0.1	4(0)	-5	-1	5	-(
R02/02	80(10)	7(0)	0.1	-0.5	7(0)	9.2	2	-1	1
R02/42	100(0)	7(0)	0.9	0	7(0)	-12.1	1	7	-1

	End of trial adherence	Change in Objective	C1	
		0 5	Change in	exacerbations in 6
	(day 150-180) ♦	adherence ← (%)	FEV1	months
Mean (SD) ^{+/} Median (IQR) ³	<u>34.7 (0.4,78)*</u>	1.25(-5.8, 36.3)*	$0.1(0.51)^+$	<u>1(0,2)*</u>
overall (n=33)				
Qualitative case studies				
High adherence at end				
R01/39	95.2	95.16	-0.02	1
R02/07	93.5	-3.12	NA	0
R01/40	88.2	45.07	0.22	0
R02/52	83.9	-12.68	-0.13	0
Medium adherence at end				
R01/49	68.3	55.06	-0.12	3
Low adherence at end				
R01/54	29	-15.8	-0.03	2
R01/02	29	-1.14	0	0
R01/48	5.2	3.34	1.07	0
R02/12	0	-10.23	-0.21	0
R02/03	0	-5.42	NA	NA
R01/44	0	-19.54	0.9	1
Withdrawn				
R01/42	NA	NA	0	0
R02/02	NA	NA	-0.04	3
R02/42	NA	NA	0.35	1

◆Normative numerator adjusted adherence

 BMJ Open

#	Logic model column / construct	Quantitative	Qualitative	Convergence code
	INPUTS			
1	MDT introduction to CFHealthHub		Chief investigator reported: introducing MDT to concept behind and application of CFHH.	-
2	CF Clinicians aware of the importance of monitoring adherence		Chief investigator reported: briefing collaborating MDTs. Reported change agents at centres internalised idea; some residual scepticism among senior physicians.	-
3	Prescription data	Study team found adherence levels of over 100% (Implementation log, 01 Dec 16)	Late identification of prescription changes found to be responsible. (Minutes, Trial Management Group Meeting 10 Jan 17)	Expansion
4	Chipped nebuliser	-	Devices ordered centrally by CTRU were delivered to sites on 20th May 2016 and processed for distribution on 23rd June 2016. (Project manager emails)	-
5	Qualcom-Hub (docking & upload)	-	Devices ordered centrally by CTRU were delivered to sites on 20th May2016 and processed for distribution on 23rd June 2016 (Project manager emails)	-
6	CFHealthHub website/app	-	Available, but under development through trial (Additional File 01)	-
7	COM-BMQ questionnaire	COM-BMQ questionnaire data was collected at baseline for all consenting participants	-	-

BMJ Open

	responses	(Additional File 04 - Table 8)		
8	Intervention manual	-	High levels of interventionist satisfaction with manual. R01 Interventionist 1 remarked that, "all the stuff in the manuals was really good."	-
9	Interventionist training programme	Structured questionnaire on interventionist confidence after training programme: Interventionists (n=5) all averaged >8 for confidence across 11 questions. Isolated scores of <8 occurred three times: viewing charts/tables, completing report forms and understanding online training/assessment.	In interviews , interventionists reported high levels of satisfaction; one requested for more integration of research and intervention procedures. R01 Interventionist 1 remarked "You had the manual but I was missing bits". She wanted more case studies and mock patients in the training to compensate for this. An interventionist (R01 MDT member 1), who was a social worker by background, found the training very good, indicating that it the training had acceptability beyond physiotherapists.	Expansion
10	Interventionist support	-	Research team member (MH) reported giving mentorship and that one site/trust received more support from the PI than the other. The main interventionist at the other site received support from the part-time interventionist who was a member of the multi-disciplinary team.	-
11	Competency/Fidelity assessment	Structured instrument for the assessment of interventionist competence: Digital recordings were made and assessed for fidelity by MA, MH and JB. Fidelity assessment instrument modified after discussion, in advance of use on full-scale RCT.	-	-

Page 139 of 202

 BMJ Open

12	Motivated and effective interventionists	-	In interviews , interventionists reported that they were enthusiastic about the intervention	-
	ENGAGEMENT			
13	Clinicians accessing adherence data*	Clinicians did not access CFHH. (CFHH Click analytics)	In interviews , interventionists talked about run charts occasionally being viewed when brought to MDT meetings by interventionists.	Confirmation
14	Adherence data tracking	CFHH click analytics showed interventionists accessing data before meetings	This was confirmed in interviews .	Confirmation
15	Participant accessing CFHealthHub	Click analytics: The median number of sessions over 5 (+/- 1) months was 3 (interquartile range 1 to 8, range 1-44, Additional File 05 - Table c), with a mean duration of 36.1 (SD=23.9) minutes. The mean total duration of interaction time across the study was 49.3 (SD 44.8) minutes. The mean length of an interaction was 12.4 (SD=9.6) minutes. The median number of days in the trial with interactions was 2 (IQR=1,7).	Lack of usability was explained in interviews by initially difficult login procedures and the lack of a mobile app for most of the pilot trial, leading participants to access an unsatisfactory desktop version on their mobile.	Expansion
16	Push notifications/reminders each week*	-	Programmer reported that automated push notifications not available during pilot trial. In interviews , one participant and one interventionist, reported the spontaneous development of informal push notifications in which the interventionist was ringing up and praising the participant for accomplishments, thereby building the relationship.	-
17	CFHealthHub_Intervention sessions delivered according	Collected via project-specific structured fidelity assessment instrument (#11). After discussion	Fidelity observations indicated: limited discussion of motivations; communication style	Expansion

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
20	
50 21	
51	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
40	
41 42	
42 42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

	to Manual (Fidelity)	between MA, MH and JB summary scores were agreed for delivery of content 100% and quality of delivery: 60-92%. Co-author Judy Bradley is intending to publish this work elsewhere.	sometimes paternalistic rather than autonomy- enabling; insufficient attention to most active ingredients.	
18	Initial session, and then review at each clinic visit	Collected via click analytics. Patient run charts reveal a disparity in when and whether these happened (Additional File 07).	-	-
I	ACTIVITIES			
19	Clinicians monitor adherence	- Peerrei	Clinician access to adherence data was sporadic (see #13) and staff interviews confirmed that it was not monitored. In an interview , participant R01/02 described the research intervention as "parallel rather than integrated" with mainstream clinical management.	-
	Intervention components for all participants		Ch.	
20	Self-monitoring adherence	Click analytics: 'How am I doing?' pages were the most frequently visited in terms of the total number of clicks during the trial. 30 (90.9%) participants clicked a median of 11 (range 5-30) times in 5 months, but sometimes in a single session (Additional File 05 – Table d). Access did not always result in good alignment between subjective and objective adherence (Additional File 05 – Tables f and g respectively).	In interviews , moderate and frequent users said they mostly valued this page for self-monitoring.	Expansion
21	Tailored education about treatment	Click analytics: Toolkit clicked a median 3 (range 0-7) times (Additional File 05 – Table d).	In participant interviews , the DNASE video was popular. Other pages were accessed	Expansion

 BMJ Open

			infrequently or when issues arose, when the information was viewed as "more down to earth" (R02/07) than technical manuals.	
22	Tailored patient stories (videos)	Click analytics: 'Talking heads' videos accessed a median 2 (range 1-3) times (Additional File 05 – Table d).	In participant interviews , these videos divided opinion. Some participants liked to know that they were not alone; others did not want to see videos of others with CF.	Expansion
	Intervention components for those with adequate motivation	Or Do		
23	Personalised goal-setting	Click analytics: Participants set target adherence levels in CFHH (Additional File 05 – Table 3).	In interviews , participants reported goal- setting, but it was not clear how much it came from patients and how much from interventionists.	Expansion
24	Goal review	Click analytics: Mean (SD) review sessions 1 (0.5) (Additional File 05 – Table e).	en on	-
25	Personalised action plan	Click analytics: Action plan pages clicked on median 2 (inter-quartile range 1-7) times (Additional File 05 – Table e).	Disliked by some participants who, the interventionist from centre R01 reported during an interview, found writing down action plans like "being at school"	Expansion
26	Tailored problem-solving	Click analytics: Problem solving and coping plan pages clicked on median 3 (inter-quartile range 0- 8) and 1 (0-3) times respectively (Additional File 05 – Table e).	In interviews , one participant realised that when she goes to her friend's house, rather than missing a treatment she could do it in the car or anywhere. One interventionist from centre R02 thought it important that the information was	Expansion

			"there if you need it" for patients.	
	IMMEDIATE OUTCOMES			
27	Medical care informed by adherence	-	Interviews with PIs found that the trial and intervention ran alongside usual care rather than being informed by it (see also #13, #19).	-
	For all participants			
28	Acute awareness of adherence / increased Motivation	Answers to the subjective adherence question (Additional File 05 – Table f) were well aligned with run charts (Additional File 07) in those with high adherence. Alignment was more variable in those with moderate and poor adherence.	In interviews , some with high adherence used the CFHH "How am I doing page" (run charts) as a check (R02/07, R01/40); other high adherers did not (R01/49). Some felt that it increased their adherence, acknowledging that monitoring meant that they had, "better make an effort here".	Expansion
29	Increased necessity and decreased concern	No change in the group averages for the COM-BMQ (incorporating Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) 21- item validated self-report tool[1]) or Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13) (Health Style Assessment) assessment of patient knowledge, skill, and confidence for self-management[2]. (Additional File 05 – Table f)	- Ch M M	-
30	Increased self-efficacy / Motivation	No change in the group averages for a single question about confidence to adhere or the PAM-13. (Additional File 05 – Table f)	-	-
	For those with adequate			

	motivation			
31	Increased self-efficacy/ Motivation	No change in the group averages for a single question about confidence to adhere or the PAM-13 . (Additional File 05 – Table f)	-	-
32	Increased habit / Reduced CHAOS	No change in the group averages for Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index (SRBAI) automaticity-specific subscale of the Self Report Habit index to capture habit-based behaviour patterns[3] or in the assessment of routine measure of life chaos [4]. (Additional File 05 – Table f)	-	-
33	Reduced barriers	No change in the group averages for The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire - specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item) (Additional File 05 – Table f)	The tailored problem-solving modules (#26) were not widely used but, in interviews , party plans and nebuliser guides were cited as having removed barriers by those who did use this content. For instance, one participant was able to find the technical name for a part of a nebuliser for which he needed to order a replacement.	Expansion
	INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES			
34	Treatment optimisation	-	Interview data revealed patients to be behaving in unexpected ways, for instance taking holidays from their treatment or not taking medication as prescribed.	-
35	Increased adherence	Nebuliser data via CFHH: Mean adherence across all participants was 10 (95% CI: -5.2 to 25.2) percent higher in the intervention than in the	-	-

control arm. Within the case study participants (all
intervention), an increase of 7.5% (95% CI: -8.2-
23.1) in simple normative adherence with
numerator adjustment can be observed in the
intervention arm. Following month 1, adherence is
consistently higher in the intervention arm with
the greatest difference observed in month 5 (mean
difference: 10.8, 95% CI: -11.44, 22.9). These
differences would indicate a potentially clinically
important difference between the intervention and
usual care arms.

- [1] R. Horne, J. Weinman, M. Hankins, The beliefs about medicines questionnaire: The development and evaluation of a new method for assessing the cognitive representation of medication, Psychol. Health. 14 (1999) 1–24. doi:10.1080/08870449908407311.
- [2] J.H. Hibbard, E.R. Mahoney, J. Stockard, M. Tusler, Development and testing of a short form of the patient activation measure., Health Serv. Res. 40 (2005) 1918–30. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6773.2005.00438.x.
- B. Verplanken, S. Orbell, Reflections on Past Behavior: A Self-Report Index of Habit Strength1, J. Appl. Soc. Psychol. 33 (2003) 1313–1330. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2003.tb01951.x.
- [4] M.D. Wong, C. a. Sarkisian, C. Davis, J. Kinsler, W.E. Cunningham, The Association Between Life Chaos, Health Care Use, and Health Status Among HIV-Infected Persons, J. Gen. Intern. Med. 22 (2007) 1286–1291. doi:10.1007/s11606-007-0265-6.

Additional File 05 - Case-ordered descriptive matrix for fourteen case studies

Qualitative findings in italics. Otherwise, motivation, confidence, necessities, concerns, life chaos and subjective adherence (baselines and process outcomes) from self-report instruments (see Methods and Additional File 04). Engagement, activities and data captured by CFHealthHub.

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
High adherence (average				
>80%) in last month of trial				
R01/39. High motivation,	Used CFHH once. Very	Didn't make plans – felt it	Knowledge that	End of trial adherence 95%
confidence and necessities,	engaged with interventionist	was her responsibility to	clinicians could access	(95% improvement).
medium concerns, quite high	and trial.	adapt her life; found others	treatment adherence	
chaos. They got a lot of	6	monitoring helpful. Didn't	information provided	
information about CF from other		like videos or social aspects	extra motivation to	
websites.		of website because of the	adhere.	
		reminder of her mortality.		
R02/07. High motivation, and	Used CFHH twice. <i>Didn't</i>	Made action plan, accessed	Little change as already,	End of trial adherence 93%
confidence, medium-high	find it useful or like the	some modules once. Found	motivated. Reduced	(3% decline).
necessity, medium concerns and	videos (doesn't want to see	goal-setting with	CHAOS and barriers.	
chaos. Existing high adherer, sees	negative side of CF).	interventionist helpful.		
treatment as a "plan for				
longevity" rather than a "chore".				
R01/40. High motivation,	Had nine CFHH sessions.	Frequent self-monitoring.	Motivation already high,	End of trial adherence 88%
medium confidence and	"I've been logging on to track	Compensates for slippages	but habit lacking.	(45% improvement).
necessities, low concerns,	my progress every two	by planning to do the rest	Intervention has made	Variance over trial, but
medium-to-low chaos. Was	weeks to a month". Finds	of his doses.	him think about	trajectory.
recruited soon after exacerbation.	others monitoring him		adherence more than he	
	helpful.		did before.	
R02/52. High motivation,	13 CFHH sessions. Liked the	Frequent self-monitoring,	Motivation already high.	End of trial adherence 83%
confidence and necessity, low	more portable nebuliser,	regular use of tailored	Increased habit.	(12% decline).
concerns, low-medium chaos.	could take it away on work.	education and problem		
Existing good adherer; wanted	CFHH session that precedes	solving (fixing nebuliser		
something like a fitness tracker	interventionist visit explained	problems) and some use of		
with jeedback - messages on	by interventionist testing	videos. <i>Wantea It</i>		
perjormance.	login details.	expanding to physical		
		аснуну.		

2	
3	
4	
5	
ر د	
0	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
10	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
21	
21	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
42	
43 11	
44 45	
45	
46	

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
Moderate adherence (average 50-80%) in last month of trial				
R01/49. High motivation, confidence, medium-high necessity and concerns low chaos. <i>Participated to 'prove'</i> <i>themselves to their</i> <i>physiotherapist</i> ; poor awareness of own adherence not improved over course of trial.	4 CFHH sessions	Used problem-solving modules and self- monitoring, but no action plan.	Increased motivation, reduced barriers.	End of trial adherence 68% (55% improvement). An important improvement from low adherence, but subjective adherence still poorly 'calibrated' with objective adherence.
Poor adherence (>50%) in last month of trial				
R01/54. Professed high motivation and confidence, medium necessity, low concerns, medium to low chaos. <i>Wants the doctor "to notice"</i> <i>that they are adherent to their</i> <i>treatment, demotivated by the</i> <i>fact they don't.</i>	44 CFHH sessions. Appreciative of extrinsic motivation from face-to- face contact with interventionist.	Frequent self-monitoring; initially high use of action plans and problem solving. <i>Dislikes 'talking heads'</i> <i>videos.</i>	More barriers by the end of the trial.	End of trial adherence 29% (16% decline), but run chart shows huge variance week by week.
R01/02. High motivation, low confidence, medium necessity and concerns, high chaos. <i>Dissatisfaction at service</i> <i>reconfiguration: moved across</i> <i>from Poole to Southampton</i> <i>during trial. Upset that wider</i> <i>team isn't noticing their</i> <i>adherence.</i>	Used CFHH once but had technical problems. Appreciative of interventionist: "Having a personal contact and someone to guide you through it is really useful" Wider team not talking about adherence: "parallel rather than integrated".	Two review sessions with interventionist.	Reduced CHAOS and barriers; increased self- efficacy	Lack of pre-post change not contradicted by the run chart which shows improvement.

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
R01/48. professed high	Used CFHH three times.	Some engagement with	No change in process	End of trial adherence 5%
motivation and confidence,	Access problems	toolkit, action plans and	outcomes.	(3% improvement). Said
medium-high necessities and	(passwords, etc) - gave up.	problem-solving, didn't like		was making an effort for th
concerns; medium chaos. This		the videos. Engagement		trial. In line with this,
69-year old doesn't like		drops off as soon as the last		objective adherence was
nebulising; "can't teach an old		meeting over.		high (~80%) for weeks 6-2
dog new tricks". No belief in				
benefit of nebulised medication.				
Poor awareness of own				
adherence. Altruistic trial				
participant.				
R02/12. High motivation,	Started off engaged, lots of	Made plans, liked website,	Decreased chaos and	Initial improvement in
medium to low confidence,	CFHH use and two	checked graphs. Liked face-	barriers but also decreased	adherence (up to 100%
medium to high necessity and	intervention sessions in first	to-face interaction with	habit.	between weeks seven and
concerns, medium chaos.	100 days, nothing	interventionist.		nine after first intervention
	thereafter.			not sustained over time.
				Review stimulates brief
				improvement at week 15,
				again not sustained.

Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
R02/03. Low motivation and	Minimal short-term	Made action and coping	No process data at follow-	Withdrew from treatment
confidence, medium necessities,	engagement with CFHH.	plans, checked graphs.	up.	early.
concerns and chaos. Treatment	Interventionist notes that			
is something that he has to do	participant has always been			
but doesn't want to do it, or	difficult to get hold of.			
think about CF. Forgets about				
treatment because of busy				
lifestyle. Prioritises other things				
above health. Knows that this				
doesn't end well, but no				
readiness to change.				
R01/44. High motivation,	One CFHH session (at	Participant confirms that he	No change in process	Initial spikes of
medium confidence, necessities,	intervention visit 1).	made action plan, coping	variables.	adherence not sustained
low concerns, high chaos ("I	Interventionist appears not	plan and checked graphs		over time.
can't seem to get into a	to have done correct	with interventionist but		
routine"). Recruited during	preparation. Only	chaotic lifestyle and low		
exacerbation: baseline	participant rated by an	motivation prevented		
artificially high. Intervention 1	interventionist as having	further use. Admits only has		
visit didn't happen until Week	inadequate motivation.	a routine in hospital. 🤇 💧		
17. Participant describes self as			1	
"uncompliant" except around				
inpatient stays.				
			J.	

Withdrawn				
Case / baselines / context	Engagement	Activities	Process outcomes	Intermediate outcomes
R01/42. Medium motivation, low confidence, medium-high necessity, medium concerns, low chaos. Originally an i-neb user. Does not think nebulising three times a day is achievable. Moved house during study. No broadband – so didn't do nebulisations.	Loved the website and shared it. 41 CFHH sessions. Intervention visit 1 reported to be chaotic.	Made action plan.	Little change in process variables.	Interview might have triggered brief increase in nebuliser use, when participant realised nebulisations were being logged even when he wasn't plugging it in.
R02/02. High motivation and confidence, medium-high necessity low concerns and chaos. <i>Interview shows them to</i> <i>be motivated by interventionist</i> <i>visit and qualitative interview</i> <i>(Hawthorne effect).</i> Subjective adherence poorly aligned to objective adherence.	Limited engagement. Three CFHH Sessions all on the same day.	Made an action plan but reported that she didn't set goals because she thought she her adherence was already good.	Little change in process variables.	Adherence run chart starts off high, but drops off quickly. Interview might have triggered brief increase in nebuliser use. Withdrew from collection of nebuliser data collection.
R02/42. High motivation and confidence, medium to high necessity, low concerns, medium chaos	Withdrew - didn't like the eTrac nebuliser - delivering the drug too quickly made them cough. Interventionist encouraged discontinuation.	Didn't look at the website.	No change in process outcomes	Assumed no change in adherence, but objective lacking.

ACtiF Pilot Statistical Report

L Mandefield

Methods

Outcomes

Feasibility outcomes

The primary objective of this study was to determine the feasibility of proceeding to a definitive trial. An external pilot randomised controlled trial to determine feasibility of a randomised controlled trial based on objective stop-go criteria related to:

- (a) participant recruitment;
- (b) participant retention; and,
- (c) quality of primary outcome data at 5 (+/-1) months post randomisation.

These were assessed by

- i. The number of screened, eligible and recruited participants per month, per centre and overall;
- ii. The number and percentage of participants who complete their 5(+/-1) month post randomisation follow up;
- iii. The number of Fuchs criteria by exacerbation.

Clinical outcomes

The primary clinical outcome measure was the number of pulmonary exacerbations in the 5 (+/-1) month post-baseline follow-up period, defined according to a modified version of the Fuchs criteria. The original Fuchs criteria was 4 out of 16 symptoms leading to IV antibiotic treatment. An exacerbation of respiratory symptoms will be said to have occurred when a participant was treated with parenteral antibiotics for any one of the following 12 signs or symptoms:

- 1. change in sputum;
- 2. new or increased hemoptysis;
- 3. increased cough;
- 4. increased dyspnea;
- 5. malaise, fatigue, or lethargy;
- 6. temperature above 38 °C;
- 7. anorexia or weight loss;

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

- 8. sinus pain or tenderness;
- 9. change in sinus discharge.
- 10. change in physical examination of the chest, derived from notes by site staff.
- 11. decrease in pulmonary function by 10 percent or more from a previously recorded value, derived from notes by site staff; or,
- 12. radiographic changes indicative of pulmonary infection, derived from notes by site staff.

The trial interventionist or prescribing clinician/nurse will collect data on the "exacerbations" form at the point of a participant starting a course of IV antibiotics.

The following secondary outcomes were also collected at baseline and 5 (+/-1) month follow up:

- 1. Body Mass Index (BMI).
- 2. Forced expiratory volume in 1 second (FEV1): standardised spirometry as a measure of condition severity.
- 3. EuroQol EQ-5D-5L: generic health status measure for health economic analysis.
- 4. The Patient Activation Measure (PAM-13): assessment of patient knowledge, skill, and confidence for self-management.
- 5. Confusion, Hubbub, and Order Scale (CHAOS 6-item): measure of life chaos.
- 6. Medication Adherence Data-3 items (MAD-3)
- 7. Self-Report Behavioural Automaticity Index (SRBAI)
- 8. Cystic Fibrosis Questionnaire-Revised (CFQ-R): disease specific health-related quality of life instrument.
- 9. The Patient Health Questionnaire depression scale (PHQ-8): severity measure for depressive disorders.
- 10. The General Anxiety Disorder 7-item anxiety scale (GAD-7): severity measure for anxiety.
- 11. The Capability Opportunity Motivation Behaviour Beliefs Questionnaire (COM- BMQ): This questionnaire incorporates:
- a. The Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire specific (Nebuliser adherence) (BMQ 21-item): a validated self-report tool, customised by the author to identify perceived necessities and concerns for nebuliser treatment.
- b. The following project-specific items: one additional belief item, one intention item, one confidence item, and a list of barriers. These will serve as a tailoring tool for the intervention and also as a secondary outcome measure. 12.Subjective adherence single question: self-report estimate of adherence as a percentage. Self-reported problems: identification of capability and opportunity barriers to nebuliser adherence
- 13. Concomitant medications: bespoke instrument, designed for this research project.
- 14. Resource use form: interventionist collects data from a combination of hospital notes and the NHS patient electronic system to determine 1) inpatient IV days 2) Routine clinic visits 3) Unscheduled outpatient contacts 3) unscheduled inpatient stays.
- 15. Prescription: a monthly prescription check to both check for data transfer to CFHealthHub and review for an indication that the prescription has changed or indication of microorganism e.g.
- 16. Adherence to prescribed medication
- 17. Any treatment with IV antibiotics

Sample Size

Sample size calculation was based on estimating parameters within a certain amount of precision rather than hypothesis testing. The sample size for a feasibility study should be adequate to estimate the uncertain critical parameters (standard deviations for continuous outcomes; consent rates, event rates, attrition rates for binary outcomes) needed to inform the design of the full RCT with sufficient precision.

To assess recruitment rate, the external pilot RCT ran in two CF units for 12 months, with four months recruitment, one months 'run-in' period (the period between the consent and baseline visit), and 5 (+/-1) months follow up. To match the proposed recruitment rate of the main RCT, the target sample over the four months for which the pilot RCT was open, was 32 per centre (64 in total from the two pilot centres). We aimed to see a minimum of 75% of the recruitment target to be confident of the trial viability i.e. at least 48 patients in total consented and randomized in four months' of recruitment from two centres.

Randomisation

Randomisation was conducted using a computer generated pseudo-random list with random permuted blocks of varying sizes, created and hosted by the Sheffield CTRU in accordance with their Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) and was held on a secure server. ACtiF participants will be randomised in a 1:1 ratio, intervention to control arms, stratified by:

- Site;
- Number of IV days in previous 12 months as collected at consent visit (two categories will be (i) less than or equal to 14 days and (ii) greater than 14 days).

Study researchers accessed the allocation for each participant by logging in to the remote, secure internet-based randomisation system. Once a participant had consented to the study, the researcher logged into the randomisation system and entered basic demographic information. After this information had been entered the allocation for that participant was then revealed to the researcher.

Block randomisation with randomly varying block size of 2, 4 and 6 was used so that the sequence of allocation could not be predicted. The block sizes were determined by the trial statistician and block size was not revealed to any other member of the study team.

Blinding

The trial statisticians remained blind until data freeze, at which point unblinded data was presented to them so checks could be carried out.

Statistical Methods

All statistical analyses were performed in R version 3.3.1.

Analysis Populations

The ITT population includes all participants for whom consent was obtained and who were randomised to treatment, regardless of whether they received the intervention or not. This is the

primary analysis set and endpoints were summarised for the ITT population unless otherwise stated.

Participant Flow

A CONSORT flow diagram was used to display data completeness and patient flow from first contact to final follow up.

The number of participants recruited at each centre each month was presented. The number of participants who withdrew consent from the trial, withdrew from the intervention, withdrew from collection of the primary outcome, withdrew consent from adherence data collection and who were lost to follow up were presented overall, by treatment arm and site. The reasons for attrition, where given, were presented.

Patient reported outcome measures (PROMS)

The following PROMS were completed at baseline and 5 (+/-1) month follow up visit. For detailed methods of how these questionnaires were scored, please see the appendix.

Data completeness

A CONSORT flow diagram was used to display data completeness and patient throughput from first contact to final follow up.

Baseline characteristics

Participants' demographics (age, sex, ethnicity, IMD decile), physical measurements (weight, height, BMI), clinical measurements (FEV1, IV days in last registry year, Pseudomonas status, Adherence in first 2 weeks, Subjective adherence, Medication, Treatment burden) patient reported outcomes (EQ-5D-5L, PAM-13, CHAOS, MAD-3,SRBAI, CFQ-R, GAD-7, COMBMQ, PHQ-8). Imbalance between treatment arms was not tested statistically but were reported descriptively.

Primary effectiveness analysis of clinical outcomes

The primary endpoint of the study is the number of exacerbations in a 5 (+/- 1) month period. Exacerbations were defined as being treated with IV antibiotics and meeting at least 1 Fuchs criteria.

The number of exacerbations by participant were presented. The number and percentage of exacerbations with each Fuchs criteria were presented. The length of IV course was summarised by intervention arm for all exacerbations and for participants experiencing exacerbations.

The primary effectiveness analysis used a negative binomial model and included all exacerbations in a 6 month follow up period. Participants who were not followed for this length were excluded. An adjusted model included IV days in the previous 12 months as a covariate. Although not prespecified, a further sensitivity analysis was carried out. This model included the number of days followed up as an offset. This allowed all consenting participants to be included. An adjusted offset model included IV days in the previous 12 months as a covariate.

Secondary effectiveness analysis of clinical outcomes

Patient reported outcome measures

Secondary outcomes were measured at baseline and 5 (+/-1) months post randomisation. The mean difference between treatment arms was calculated for each of the secondary outcomes, along with 95% confidence intervals using a multiple linear regression model. Adjustment for baseline and site was carried out and both unadjusted and adjusted results were presented.

Adherence to medication

The time of inhalations of medication was recorded via chipped nebulisers. This data along with prescription data was used to calculate a number of different adherence measures. Adherence in people with CF is of key importance. For this reason, it was decided that 7 separate measures of adherence to prescribed medication were to be presented:

1. Total doses;

- 2. Unadjusted adherence;
- 3. Simple normative adherence (without numerator adjustment);
- 4. Sophisticated normative adherence (without numerator adjustment);
- 5. Simple normative adherence (with numerator adjustment);
- 6. Sophisticated normative adherence (with numerator adjustment);
- 7. Subjective single adherence.

Measures 1-6 are calculated daily based on the chipped nebuliser data and the dose prescribed that day. Means can be calculated for set periods, e.g. weekly.

The specific calculations of these adherence measured are described below.

Total doses taken

As a basic, unadjusted measure of adherence, the total number of doses taken for the time period will be calculated.

Unadjusted adherence

Adherence is typically calculated as the dose taken divided by the dose described per day.

Simple normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)

Quality of adherence reporting is dependent on the PWCF being prescribed the appropriate medications. Adjusting the denominator of the adherence calculation controls for treatment rationalisation to try reduce treatment burden, which is an approach often seen in people in CF. The simple normative adherence is calculated as follows:

- 1. If the participant does not have pseudomonas
- Minimum denominator is set at 1 treatment/day.

- 2. If the participant has chronic pseudomonas
 - Minimum denominator is set at 3 treatments/day
 - 3. The participant has chronic pseudomonas and intermittent inhaled antibiotic regimens
 - Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day during 28 day 'on' period
 - Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day during 28 day 'off' period
 - 4. The participant has intermittent pseudomonas
 - Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day for 1 or 3 months depending on the eradication regime
 - Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day for the rest of the time

In calculating normative adherence an expected minimum prescription based on a patient's health state is needed. Most patients take a dose of a mucolytic, and patients meeting the criteria will take two doses of antibiotics. In adherence calculations, participants had their denominator amended to reflect their prescription. A complication arises in denominator adjustments when the antibiotic prescribed is one that is expected to be used in an alternating fashion (e.g. 28 days use, 28 days off). The antibiotic medications Aztreonam Lysine and Tobramycin are normally prescribed in this way; for patients with prescriptions for these medications with periods of more than 28 days without a prescription for an antibiotic, the denominator was adjusted to add in 2 doses / day. After 28 days of substituted antibiotic use, a 28 'day off' cycle was programmed. This cycle was continued until such time as another antibiotic prescription was present.

Sophisticated normative adherence (without numerator adjustment)

The sophisticated normative adherence is calculated as follows:

- 1. If someone has 'mild genotype', is pancreatic sufficient and has FEV1 > 90%, without Pseudomonas and used <= 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the past 1 year.
- There is no minimum target. Denominator is determined by the agreed prescription between clinicians and participants.
- 2. If someone is homozygous for class I-III CFTR mutation OR pancreatic insufficient OR FEV1 <= 90%, but without Pseudomonas and used <= 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the past 1 year. Minimum denominator is set at 1 treatment/day.
- 3. If the person has chronic pseudomonas AND/OR
- the person used > 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the previous year Minimum denominator is set at 3 treatments/day
- 4. If the person has chronic pseudomonas AND/OR used > 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the previous year but is on intermittent inhaled antibiotic regimens
- Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day during 28 day 'on' period
- Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day during 28 day 'off' period
- 5. If someone has intermittent pseudomonas but used <= 14 days intravenous antibiotics in the past 1 year

- Minimum denominator is 3 treatments/day for 1 or 3 months depending on the eradication regime
- Minimum denominator is 1 treatment/day (or 0, i.e. no minimum target) depending on their genotype, pancreatic status and FEV1 for the rest of the time.

Numerator adjustment in simple and sophisticated normative case

Numerator adjustment occurs only if a daily adherence measure is greater than 100%, thus the maximum daily adherence is set at 100%.

Subjective single adherence

All participants will be asked to estimate their adherence as a percentage at baseline, clinic visits, 5(+/-1) months and any further visits up to 30th April 2017. These subjective measures were presented separately. The question referred to the previous 2 weeks.

Adherence summaries

The mean and SD was calculated for each month of the trial by treatment arm. Weekly numerator adjusted normative adherence was calculated and a mean by treatment arm was calculated and presented as a line graph for the first 25 weeks from randomisation.

Intervention adherence

The intervention comprised of:

- (a) a chipped nebuliser to collect adherence data
- (b) access for participants and interventionist to the adherence data summaries
- (c) an online platform (CFHealthHub) offering summaries of adherence and tailored modules to be used by the health professional when interacting with the participant and independently by the participant.

A number of metrics were collected from CFHealthHub including the timing and date of clicks and the page/module that was clicked on. Interactions with CFHH were defined as a series of clicks with no greater that 15 minute gaps between clicks. Length of each session was calculated and days with interactions were calculated by participant.

The mean, standard deviation (SD), median and interquartile range (IQR) for the CFHH metrics were calculated and presented by participant. The same summary statistics were also presented for length of all sessions. The timing of CFHH interactions in days from randomisation was plotted by participant. The number of clicks per page category (Home, How am I doing?, Treatment etc) was plotted in a bar chart and also presented in a table by participant and by session.

Date and time of sessions with the interventionist were also recorded. The number of sessions with an interventionist and the length of sessions by participant were summarised in a table.

Clinic visits

The number of clinic visits completed by each participant excluding consent and 5 month follow up was recorded. Summary statistics were presented by treatment arm to assess whether ascertainment bias occurred in the intervention arm.

Safety analysis

The number of Adverse Events (AEs) and Serious Adverse Events (SAEs) was recorded and presented by treatment arm. These events were further categorised by the type of adverse event and whether they were related to the intervention.

Protocol non compliances

The number and type of protocol non compliances were presented descriptively.

Summary of missing data

The number of missing values or scores for each of the primary and secondary outcomes was presented by baseline and 5 (+/-1) months post randomisation and by treatment arm. Furthermore, the number and percentage of missing items was presented for each of these questionnaires.

Results

Participant Flow

Participants were recruited for 4 months across 2 sites. The CONSORT flow diagram (Fig.1) shows the flow of participants through the trial. 32 participants were randomised at each site. 33 participants were randomised to the intervention arm and 31 participants were randomised to usual care. A total of 59 participants completed the 5 (+/- 1) month follow up visit (Intervention = 31, Usual care = 28).

A total of 8 participants discontinued the trial before the follow up visit (Intervention = 4, Usual care = 4). Of these discontinuations, 5 no longer had their adherence data collected and the same 5 participants did not have their primary outcome collected. Of those who did not continue with primary outcome collection, 2 participants died, 1 withdrew consent and 2 were lost to follow up.

Following the 5 (+/-1) month visit, adherence data and primary outcome data was collected. 2 participants withdrew from adherence data collection during this time (Intervention =1, Usual care =1). 59 participants completed primary outcome data collection up to study completion on 30th April 2017 (Intervention = 31, Usual care =28).
1	
2	
3	Recruitment by centre and month
4	
5	
0 7	
/ 2	
9	
10	
10	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
∠1 22	
22 23	
23	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35 26	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47 79	
40 70	
47 50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	Ear poor rouiou antu http://hmianan.hmi.com/sita/shaut/suidalisaauhtuu
60	For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml



59 60

Site A 4 16 7 5 32 Site B 2 17 5 8 32 Attrition by Centre and Treatment arm Table 2: Attrition presented by treatment arm and site. Died Lost to Follow up (%) Overall 64 1(17%) 2(33%) 2(40%) Treatment arm Intervention 33 0(0%) 0(0%) 2(40%) Usual Care 31 1(20%) 2(40%) 0(0%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)	June	16 July 16 A	Aug 1	6 Sept 15	Total		
Site B 2 17 5 8 32 Attrition by Centre and Treatment arm and site. Table 2: Attrition presented by treatment arm and site. Died Lost to Follow up (%) Overall 64 1(17%) 2(33%) 2(40%) Treatment arm Intervention 33 0(0%) 0(0%) 2(40%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)	Site A	4 16	U	7 5	32		
Attrition by Centre and Treatment arm and site. Table 2: Attrition presented by treatment arm and site. N Consent (%) (%) up (%) Overall 64 1(17%) 2(33%) 2(40%) Treatment arm Intervention 33 0(0%) 0(0%) 2(40%) Treatment arm Intervention 33 0(0%) 2(40%) 0(0%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)	Site B	2 17		5 8	32		
n Consent (%) (%) up (%) Overall 64 1(17%) 2(33%) 2(40%) Treatment arm Intervention 33 0(0%) 0(0%) 2(40%) Usual Care 31 1(20%) 2(40%) 0(0%) 3(40%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)	Attrition by Ce Table 2: Attritic	entre and Trea on presented by	tmer ⁄ trea	it arm tment arm and Withdrew	d site.	Died	Lost to Follow
Overall 64 1(17%) 2(33%) 2(40%) Treatment arm Intervention 33 0(0%) 0(0%) 2(40%) Usual Care 31 1(20%) 2(40%) 0(0%) 3(0%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)			n	Consent (%)		(%)	up (%)
Intervention 33 0(0%) 0(0%) 2(40%) Usual Care 31 1(20%) 2(40%) 0(0%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)	Overall		64	1(17%)		2(33%)	2(40%)
Usual Care 31 1(20%) 2(40%) 0(0%) Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%)	Treatment arm	Intervention	33	0(0%)		0(0%)	2(40%)
Site Site A 32 0(0%) 1(20%) 1(20%) Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)		Usual Care	31	1(20%)		2(40%)	0(0%)
Site B 32 1(20%) 1(20%) 1(20%)	Site	Site A	32	0(0%)		1(20%)	1(20%)
		Site B	32	1(20%)		1(20%)	1(20%)

Baseline characteristics

Table 4 shows the baseline characteristics of participants randomised by treatment arm. 33 participants were randomised to the intervention and 31 were randomised to usual care. The average age of participants was 29.7 (SD=11.5). Participants in the intervention arm were slightly older (median=28, IQR=(21,37)) than those in the usual care arm (median=26, IQR=(20,34)). Table 5 shows the CF measures presented by treatment arm. Tables 6-7 show the baseline questionnaire scores presented by treatment arm.

Baseline demographics

Table 3: Baseline demographics by treatment arm

	Intervention	Control	Overall
Age			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	31.6(13.3)	27.8(8.9)	29.7(11.5)
Median(IQR)	28(21,37)	26(20,34)	27(21,36)
Min,Max	(16,69)	(16,50)	(16,69)
Sex			
Male	18(54.5%)	18(58.1%)	36(56.2%)
Female	15(45.5%)	13(41.9%)	28(43.8%)
Socioeconomic Status			
Most deprived	6(18.2%)	1(3.2%)	7(10.9%)
High deprivation	4(12.1%)	7(22.6%)	11(17.2%)
Average	8(24.2%)	8(25.8%)	16(25%)
Low deprivation	6(18.2%)	9(29%)	15(23.4%)
Least deprived	9(27.3%)	6(19.4%)	15(23.4%)
Weight (KG)			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	65.5(18)	63.7(15.6)	64.6(16.8)
Median(IQR)	63(53,76)	62.9(49,74)	63(52.9,74.3)
Min,Max	(35,128)	(35.6,103.7)	(35,128)
Height (cm)			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	168.6(10.5)	167.7(9.6)	168.2(10)
Median(IQR)	170(162,177)	168(159,175)	168.5(160.5,175.5)
Min,Max	(147,193)	(149,186)	(147,193)
BMI			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	22.8(5)	22.4(4.3)	22.6(4.6)

BMJ Open

Median(IQR)	22.2(19.7,25.3)	22.1(19.1,25.4)	22.1(19.55,25.35)
Min,Max	(15.8,42.8)	(16,33.9)	(15.8,42.8)

Table 4: Baseline CF measures by treatment arm

	Intervention	Control	Overall
No. of IV days in previous 12 months			
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max No. of participants requiring IV days in previous 12 months At least 1 IV day	33 26.3(25.7) 17(7,44) (0,117) 26(78.8%)	31 26(22.1) 28(0,44) (0,70) 23(74.2%)	64 26.2(23.8) 17(7,44) (0,117) 49(76.6%)
Days since last IV start date	.31	28	59
Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max FEV1	168.7(245.2) 75(45,194) (6,1085)	202.3(325.2) 100(24.5,219.5) (7,1575)	184.6(283.9) 91(39,213) (6,1575)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max FEV1 % Predicted	33 2(0.8) 1.9(1.4,2.4) (0.8,4)	31 2.3(1) 2.1(1.6,2.8) (0.6,5)	64 2.1(0.9) 1.9(1.5,2.7) (0.6,5)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Clinician pseudomonas status	33 53.4(19.4) 49.2(39.4,61.9) (26,103)	31 61.4(22.7) 53.4(43,80) (23.2,100.7)	64 57.3(21.3) 49.6(41.9,76.7) (23.2,103)
Negative Intermittent Chronic Leeds Criteria pseudomonas status	15(45.5%) 3(9.1%) 15(45.5%)	8(26.7%) 3(10%) 19(63.3%)	23(36.5%) 6(9.5%) 34(54%)
Negative Intermittent Chronic	15(45.5%) 4(12.1%) 14(42.4%)	10(33.3%) 4(13.3%) 16(53.3%)	25(39.7%) 8(12.7%) 30(47.6%)

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
/	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
3/	
24	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
/1	
+1 1	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
<u>⊿</u> Ω	
+0	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
54 Er	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

Subjective adherence			
n	23	20	43
Mean(SD)	65.6(40.1)	67.8(35.4)	66.6(37.6)
Median(IQR)	90(20,99)	80(45,99.5)	90(35,99)
Min,Max	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
Simple normative adherence (first 2 weeks)			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	0.5(0)	0.5(0)	0.5(0)
Median(IQR)	0.5(0.5,0.5)	0.5(0.5,0.5)	0.5(0.5,0.5)
Min,Max	(0.5,0.5)	(0.5,0.5)	(0.5,0.5)
Treatment Burden			
Low	10(30.3%)	11(35.5%)	21(32.8%)
Medium	16(48.5%)	12(38.7%)	28(43.8%)
High	2(6.1%)	5(16.1%)	7(10.9%)

Baseline outcome measures

Table 5: Baseline outcome measures by treatment arm

	Intervention	Control	Overall
EQ5D-5L			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	0.866(0.121)	0.822(0.151)	0.845(0.137)
Median(IQR)	0.901(0.767,0.951)	0.825(0.737,0.942)	0.872(0.752,0.946)
Min,Max	(0.53,1)	(0.486,1)	(0.486,1)
PAM-13			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	60.4(11.2)	60(13.2)	60.2(12.1)
Median(IQR)	60.6(53.2,67.8)	58.1(48.9,67.8)	60.6(51,67.8)
Min,Max	(36.8,84.8)	(38.1,90.7)	(36.8,90.7)
CHAOS			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	9.8(3.4)	10.1(4)	10(3.7)
Median(IQR)	10(8,11)	10(7,12)	10(8,11)
Min,Max	(4,18)	(4,20)	(4,20)
MAD-3			
n	32	30	62
Mean(SD)	9.8(3.3)	9(3.4)	9.4(3.4)

of 202			BMJ Oper	1
Median(Min,Max SRBAI	IQR) 9(8,12 c (3,15)	5) s	9.5(6,11) (3,15)	9(8,12) (3,15)
n Mean(S Median(Min,Max GAD-7	33 D) 11.5(4 IQR) 12(8,1 c (4,20)	.9) 6) <u>(</u>	30 10.2(5.6) 9(4,14) (4,20)	63 10.9(5.2) 10(7,15) (4,20)
n Mean(S Median(Min,Max PHQ-8	33 D) 4.1(4.9 IQR) 3(0,5) c (0,15)	5)	31 3.8(3.6) 3(1,7) (0,11)	64 3.9(4) 3(0.5,5.5) (0,15)
n Mean(S Median(Min,Max Table 6: I	33 D) 7(4.9) IQR) 6(3,12 (0,16) Baseline CFG) () R domains by t	31 6.5(5.2) 6(3,8) (0,18) rreatment arm	64 6.8(5) 6(3,10.5) (0,18)
Physical	Functioning	Intervention	Control	Overall
n Mean(S Median(Min,Max Emotion	D) IQR) al Functioning	33 48.5(34.8) 38(25,88) (0,100) g	31 49.2(30.8) 42(17,83) (0,100)	64 48.9(32.7) 42(21,85.5) (0,100)
n Mean(S Median(Min,Max Eating	D) IQR)	33 70.2(21.1) 67(53,93) (27,100)	31 62.3(26.1) 67(40,80) (7,100)	64 66.4(23.8) 67(53,87) (7,100)
n Mean(S Median(Min,Max Social F	D) IQR) (unctioning	33 79.9(24.8) 89(67,100) (0,100)	31 74.6(27.7) 78(56,100) (0,100)	64 77.3(26.2) 89(61.5,100) (0,100)
n	5	33	31	64

Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Body Image	65(20.3) 67(50,78) (17,100)	59.6(26.2) 61(44,83) (11,100)	62.4(23.3) 67(44,83) (11,100)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Treatment Burden	33 68.5(27.3) 78(56,89) (0,100)	31 64.9(31.7) 67(44,100) (0,100)	64 66.7(29.3) 78(44,89) (0,100)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Respiratory	33 50.5(16.5) 44(44,67) (11,78)	31 51.6(25.9) 56(33,67) (0,100)	64 51(21.4) 50(44,67) (0,100)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Digestion	33 53.5(27.5) 50(33,78) (0,100)	31 54(27.3) 56(33,78) (6,100)	64 53.7(27.2) 56(33,78) (0,100)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Role Functioning	33 77.9(16.9) 78(67,89) (44,100)	31 80.4(26.4) 89(78,100) (0,100)	64 79.1(21.9) 89(67,100) (0,100)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Vitality	33 65.2(24.3) 67(50,83) (0,100)	31 64(25.9) 67(42,83) (8,100)	64 64.6(24.9) 67(50,83) (0,100)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR) Min,Max Health Perceptions	33 37.8(22.8) 33(17,50) (8,92)	31 40.6(22) 42(25,58) (0,75)	64 39.2(22.3) 42(25,58) (0,92)
n Mean(SD) Median(IQR)	33 47.8(27.7) 44(22,67)	31 51.6(24.9) 56(33,67)	64 49.6(26.3) 44(33,67)

Min,Max	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
Weight			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	70.7(36.1)	63.4(39.8)	67.2(37.9)
Median(IQR)	100(33,100)	67(33,100)	83.5(33,100)
Min,Max	(0,100)	(0,100)	(0,100)
Table 7: Baseline COM-	BMQ domains	by treatment	arm
	Intervention	Control	Overall
COM BMQ Necessities		Control	ovorali
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	3.2(0.7)	3.4(0.8)	3.3(0.8)
Median(IQR)	3.1(2.7,3.7)	3.3(2.9,4.1)	3.1(2.7,4)

Min,Max	(2,4.9)	(2,4.7)	(2,4.9)
COM BMQ Concerns			
n	33	31	64
Mean(SD)	2.1(0.6)	2.2(0.6)	2.1(0.6)
Median(IQR)	2.1(1.5,2.6)	2.1(1.7,2.6)	2.1(1.6,2.6)
Min,Max	(1.2,3.4)	(1.1,3.3)	(1.1,3.4)

Primary Analysis

- In total, there were 79 exacerbations in participants followed up for at least 6 months
- Of these, 60 exacerbations fitted our criteria to be included in the primary analysis
 - 18 were not treated with IV antibiotics
 - 1 did not meet any Fuchs criteria
- A total of 60 participants had at least 6 months of exacerbation data (Intervention=32, Control =28)
- 4 participants were excluded
 - 2 died (Control=2)
 - 1 withdrew consent (Control=1)
 - 1 lost to follow up before 6 months (Intervention=1)
- 35 exacerbations occurred in Intervention participants, 25 occurred in Control participants
- 33 participants experienced at least 1 exacerbation (Intervention= 19 (60%), Control= 14 (50%))

The most frequently reported Fuchs criteria (Table 9) were 'Increased cough' (n=52) and 'Change in sputum (n=48). The median number of Fuchs criteria reported per exacerbation included in the primary analysis was 4 (IQR=4,6).

The median IV course length of exacerbations included in the primary analysis was 14 days in both the intervention and usual care arm (Table 12).

As ACtiF was a pilot study, it was not powered to detect an intervention effect. However, differences between treatment arms and their 95% confidence intervals have been calculated (Table 13). The median number of exacerbations was 1 in the intervention arm and 0.5 in the usual care arm. Following adjustment for site and the number of IV days in the previous year, adjusted IRR was 1.12 (95% CI: 0.658-1.94). This demonstrates a small increase in exacerbations in the intervention arm, however the confidence intervals are relatively wide. The IRR from the offset model shows an IRR of 0.958 (95% CI: 0.615,1.5). Here, a small decrease in exacerbations can be observed. As with the previous model, the confidence interval is relatively wide.

to occurrent only



Figure 2: The number of exacerbations in participants by treatment arm in 6 months [n=60]

Table 8: The number of each Fuchs criterion in the exacerbations used as the primary outcome

	n (%) for exacerbations in 6 months after consent and meeting our criteria (primary outcome)	n (%) for exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics and met at least one Fuchs criteria	n (%) for any exacerbation during the study
Change in sputum	48 (80 %)	63 (77.8 %)	69 (69 %)
New or increased hemoptysis	12 (20 %)	15 (18.5 %)	16 (16 %)
Increased cough	52 (86.7 %)	70 (86.4 %)	77 (77 %)
Increased dyspnea	43 (71.7 %)	56 (69.1 %)	61 (61 %)
Malaise, fatigue, or lethargy	48 (80 %)	66 (81.5 %)	69 (69 %)
Temperature above 38 °C	13 (21.7 %)	18 (22.2 %)	20 (20 %)
Anorexia or weight loss	20 (33.3 %)	30 (37 %)	31 (31 %)
Sinus pain or tenderness	13 (21.7 %)	19 (23.5 %)	21 (21 %)
Change in sinus discharge	13 (21.7 %)	21 (25.9 %)	22 (22 %)
Change in physical examination of the chest, derived from notes by site staff.	9 (15 %)	12 (14.8 %)	13 (13 %)
Decrease in pulmonary function by 10 percent or more from a previously recorded value, derived from notes by site staff	12 (20 %)	17 (21 %)	19 (19 %)
Radiographic changes indicative of pulmonary infection, derived from notes by site staff)	2 (3.3 %)	2 (2.5 %)	2 (2 %)

Table 9:Summary of Fuchs criteria for the exacerbations that were included in the primary outcome (IV days and at least 1 Fuchs criteria in 6 month follow up period

60 (60 %)
4.8(2.1)
4(4,6)
(1,10)
58 (96.7 %)
48 (80 %)
46 (76.7 %)
29 (48.3 %)
20 (33.3 %)
12 (20 %)
8 (13.3 %)
3 (5 %)
1 (1.7 %)

Table 10:Summary of the exacerbations in the 6 month follow up period that were not included in the primary outcome (IV days and at least 1 Fuchs criteria) and the reasons for exclusion

Exacerbations in 6 months not meeting criteria for primary outcome

······································	
Total exacerbations excluded	19 (24 %)
n (%) with IV days but no Fuchs criteria met	1(1%)
n (%) with no IV but at least 1 Fuchs	7 (8 %)
n (%) no IV days or Fuchs recorded (missing values)	11 (14 %)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Length of IV course

Table 11:Summary of IV length by exacerbation and participant

		Intervention	Usual Care
IV days per exacer	bation in 6 months		
n Mean (SD) Median (IQR) Min, Max IV days per particip	ant with exacerbations in 6 mor	35 13.6(4.2) 14(13,14) (2,30) nths	25 13.7(3.3) 14(13,15) (7,21)
n Mean (SD) Median (IQR) Min, Max IV days per exacerl	bation in whole study	19 13.4(2.7) 14(11,14) (9,21.7)	14 13.6(3.2) 14(13,15) (8,20)
n Mean (SD) Median (IQR) Min, Max		45 13.7(4.1) 14(13,14) (2,30)	36 13.9(3.1) 14(13,15) (7,21)
	6 months		
Usual care -	•••••		
Intervention arm -	· · · · · ·		
int Arm	A Constraint of the second sec		Intervention areUsual care
Treatme	Total study period		Intervention areUsual care
Usual care -			

Figure 3: The length on IV courses by treatment arm

Analysis models

6 month model

Table 12: Analysis of the primary clinical outcome, the number of exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics with at least 1 Fuchs criteria in a 6 month period adjusted for site and the number of IV days in the previous year.

ivenuonin ivean (SL) Median (IQR)	Control n	Mean (SD)	Median (IQR)	IRR	95% CI
1.1(1.1)	1(0,2)	28	0.9(1.1)	0.5 (0 , 2)	1.22	(0.686,2.21)
					1.12	(0.658,1.94)
	1.1 (1.1)	1.1 (1.1) 1 (0,2)	1.1 (1.1) 1 (0 , 2) 28	1.1(1.1) 1(0,2) 28 0.9(1.1)	1.1(1.1) 1(0,2) 28 0.9(1.1) 0.5(0,2)	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$

Offset model

Table 13:A sensitivity analysis using all exacerbations treated with IV antibiotics with at least 1 Fuchs criteria that occurred during the study with the number of days of data collection included as an offset in the model. Adjusted for site and number of IV days in the previous year

	Interventio n n	Total exacerbations (min,max)	Mean (SD) days followed up	Mean (SD) exacerbation s per month	Contro I n	Total exacerbation s (min,max)	Mean (SD) days followed up	Mean (SD) exacerbatio ns per month	IRR	95% CI
Adjusted, Offset model	33	46(0,5)	263.2(47.2)	0.17(0.16)	31	40(0,5)	250.5(74.8	0.2(0.28)	0.958	(0.615,1.5
		For peer	review only - htt	tp://bmjopen.bmj.o	com/site/ab	oout/guidelines.xht	ml			

Secondary analysis

Tables 15-16 show the results of the secondary analyses. As this is a pilot study, we have not powered to detect any effect. Key results are described below.

- Adjusted mean difference of 5% (95% CI: -2-12%) in FEV % predicted. This is an encouraging difference in the intervention arm.
- No notable differences in any of the other secondary outcomes but this is not of great concern as it is a pilot study.
- Fewer participants had BMI recorded than other outcomes (Intervention=18, Control=15).
- Small reduction in BMQ Concerns score in intervention arm (Mean difference=-0.21, 95% CI: -0.38,-0.048).

Figure 4 shows the distribution of the secondary outcome measures at baseline and follow up by treatment arm.

Table 14:Results of secondary effectiveness analysis

	n Intervention	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	n Control	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	Mean Diff	95% CI
FEV1 Unadjusted	30	1.8(1.17,2.83)	2(0.9)	27	1.9(1.46,2.83)	2.2(1)	-0.21	(-0.73,0.3)
FEV1 Adjusted	Ł						0.22	(-0.062,0.51)
FEV1 % Unadjusted	30	51.8(33.46,71.26)	54.2(21.1)	27	50.9(42.49,77.97)	59(23.9)	-4.8	(-17,7.1)
FEV1 % Adjusted							5	(-2,12)
BMI Unadjusted	ed 18	20.5(19.5,26)	22.1(4.2)	15	23.4(20.7,26.2)	23.8(3.5)	-1.7 -0.08	(-4.5,1.1) (-1.0.89)
EQ5D-5I	31	0 9(0 76 0 95)	0 9(0 2)	27	0 9(0 77 1)	0 9(0 2)	-0.00	(-1,0.09)
Unadjusted		0.0(0.70,0.00)	0.0(0.2)	21	0.0(0.17,1)	0.0(0.2)	0.00062	0.084,0.083)
EQ5D-5L Adjusted							-0.016	(- 0.087,0.055)

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1 2									
3 4	PAM-13 Unadjusted	31	63.1(51,67.8)	58.5(14.3)	28	58.1(51,63.1)	57.9(9.9)	0.56	(-5.9,7)
5 6 7	PAM-13 Adjusted							0.046	(-5.8,5.9)
8 9	CHAOS Unadjusted	31	9(7,13)	9.9(3.9)	28	9(7.5,11.5)	9.4(3.3)	0.55	(-1.4,2.4)
10 11 12	CHAOS Adjusted							0.79	(-0.47,2.1)
13 14	MAD-3 Unadjusted	31	12(9,13)	10.8(3.9)	26	9.5(7,13)	9.4(3.6)	1.4	(-0.58,3.4)
15 16	MAD-3 Adjusted							0.82	(-0.51,2.1)
17 18 19	SRBAI Unadjusted	31	13(8,16)	12.1(5.3)	28	10.5(6,15.5)	10.6(5)	1.4	(-1.3,4.1)
20 21	SRBAI Adjusted							0.15	(-1.8,2.1)
22 23	GAD-7 Unadjusted	31	3(1,6)	4.1(4.1)	28	2.5(0,7)	4.2(4.4)	-0.05	(-2.3,2.2)
24 25 26	GAD-7 Adjusted							-0.31	(-1.9,1.3)
27 28	PHQ-8 Unadjusted	31	7(4,12)	7.3(5.2)	28	4(1.5,7)	5.3(5.1)	2	(-0.68,4.7)
29 30	PHQ-8 Adjusted							0.97	(-0.96,2.9)
31 32 33	COM-BMQ Concerns	31	2(1.5,2.3)	1.9(0.5)	27	2.1(1.9,2.4)	2.1(0.5)	-0.22	(-0.48,0.026)
34 35 36 37	Unadjusted COM-BMQ Concerns Adjusted							-0.21	(-0.38,- 0.048)
38 39 40 41	COM BMQ Necessities Unadjusted	31	3.4(3,4)	3.5(0.6)	27	3.4(2.9,4)	3.5(0.7)	0.011	(-0.35,0.37)
42 43 44 45 46 47			For peer review only -	http://bmjoper	n.bmj.com/s	ite/about/guidelines.xh	ıtml		

	ry chectivenese	s analysis						
	n Intervention	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	n Control	Median (IQR)	Mean (SD)	Mean Diff	95% C
CFQ-R Physical Unadjusted	31	54(25,88)	54.4(31.6)	28	62.5(33,92)	60.9(31.2)	-6.4	(-23,10
CFQ-R Physical Adjusted							-2.6	(-13,7.4
CFQ-R Emotional State Unadjusted	31	67(53,93)	68.3(23.4)	28	73(56.5,90)	72.3(22.7)	-4	(-16,8)
CFQ-R Emotional State Adjusted							-7.7	(- 16,0.55
CFQ-R Eating Unadjusted	31	89(67,100)	80.7(21.6)	28	83.5(67,100)	79.9(20.7)	0.85	(-10,12
CFQ-R Eating Adjusted							1.1	(-6.5,8.
CFQ-R Social Unadjusted	31	67(56,78)	65.4(15.8)	28	64(50,83)	66.4(20.9)	-1	(-11,8.6
CFQ-R Social Adjusted							-3.7	(-10,2.8
CFQ-R Body Image Unadjusted	31	78(67,89)	73.3(23.8)	28	78(56,100)	73.1(25.5)	0.19	(-13,13
CFQ-R Body Image Adjusted							0.62	(-7.2,8.
CFQ-R Treatment Burden Unadjusted	31	56(44,67)	56.5(16.6)	28	56(44,67)	57.3(19.9)	-0.83	(-10,8.7
CFQ-R Treatment Burden Adjusted							1.2	(-6.4,8.
CFQ-R Respiratory Unadjusted	31	67(44,78)	59.5(25.2)	27	67(50,83)	65.6(22.7)	-6.1	(-19,6.6
CFQ-R Respiratory Adjusted							-4.4	(-14,4.8

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

 BMJ Open

2									
3 4	CFQ-R Digestion Unadjusted	31	89(67,100)	81.1(18.4)	27	89(78,100)	84.4(23.5)	-3.3	(-14,7.7)
6	CFQ-R Digestion Adjusted							-2.3	(-11,6.2)
7 8 9	CFQ-R Role Unadjusted CFQ-R Role Adjusted	31	75(33,83)	64.8(26.1)	27	75(56,92)	70.3(21.5)	-5.6 -8.2	(-18,7.1) (-17,0.4)
10 11 12	CFQ-R Vital Unadjusted	31	42(25,42)	38.5(19.5)	28	50(33,62.5)	48.7(23)	-10	(- 21.0.81)
13 14	CFQ-R Vital Adjusted							-7	(- 15,0.99)
15 16 17	CFQ-R Health Unadjusted CFQ-R Health Adjusted	31	44(22,67)	45.5(25.4)	28	61.5(33,72.5)	56.8(27.6)	-11 -6.5	(-25,2.6) (-16,2.8)
19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31	CFQ-R Weight Unadjusted CFQ-R Weight Adjusted	31	89(67,100)	81.1(18.4)	27	89(78,100)	84.4(23.5)	-3.3 -2.3	(-14,7.7) (-11,6.2)
32 33 34									
JT									



Figure 4:Box plots showing the distribution of secondary outcomes by treatment arm

 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

For beer review only For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Adherence to CF medication

During the trial, 8 participants withdrew from adherence data collection (Intervention=4, Control=4). An exact date of withdrawal was not recorded but could be seen from inhalation data (last non zero number of daily inhalations). This has been improved for the main trial and date of adherence data collection withdrawal will be recorded.

Participants who withdrew from adherence data collection were removed from summaries of adherence for 6 months as they did not have 6 months' worth of data. Where possible, inhalation data collected before withdrawal was included in the mean adherence by arm in the monthly table and the plot by week. The number included in each of these estimates can be seen in Table 18.

Table 17 shows the mean adherence by treatment arm for the 6 months post randomisation. Adherence is greater in the intervention arm for each of the different adherence measures. A difference of 10% (95% CI: -5.2 to 25.2) in simple normative adherence with numerator adjustment can be observed in the intervention arm. Table 18 shows the difference in simple normative adherence with numerator adjustment by treatment arm for each individual month in the study. Adherence is greater in the Intervention arm in month 1 (mean difference=2.6, 95% CI: -13.5, 18.6). Following month 1, adherence is consistently higher in the intervention arm with the greatest difference observed in month 5 (mean difference: 13%, 95% CI: -4.8, 30.8). These differences would indicate a potentially clinically important difference between the intervention and usual care arms.

The difference in adherence has been presented by weeks post randomisation in Figure 5. There is a difference in numerator adjusted normative adherence with greater adherence observed in the intervention arm. This difference becomes clear after week 4 which coincides with use of the intervention around week 2-3.

Table 16:Summary of average adherences in 6 months following consent by intervention arm and the difference in means with 95% confidence intervals

	n Intervention	Mean Intervention	n Control	Mean Control	Mean Difference (95% CI)
Baseline (first 2 weeks)	29	25.9(31.4)	26	23.2(29)	2.6(-13.9,19.2)
Total doses	29	222.4(233.1)	26	245.7(238.6)	-23.3(-151.2,104.6)
Unadjusted adherence	29	47.7(33.8)	26	37.7(27.1)	10(-6.5,26.4)
Simple normative	29	45.5(32.8)	26	34.7(27)	10.8(-5.4,27)

Page	181	of 202
------	-----	--------

 BMJ Open

Sophisticated normative	29 41.6(33.4)	26 34.2(27.1)	7.5(-8.9,23.9)
Simple normative with numerator adjustment	29 43.6(30.4)	26 33.6(25.9)	10(-5.2,25.2)
Sophisticated normative with numerator adjustment	29 39.9(30.9)	26 33.2(25.9)	6.8(-8.6,22.2)

Table 17:Summary of average adherences in each month from following consent from 1 to 6 months by intervention arm

	n Intervention	Mean Intervention	n Control	Mean Control	Mean Difference (95% Cl)
Month 1	32	29.7(34.5)	28	27.2(27.5)	2.6(-13.5,18.6)
Month 2	31	42.1(33.1)	28	33.7(31.5)	8.4(-8.5,25.2)
Month 3	30	42.3(33.7)	28	33.3(34.8)	9(-9,27.1)
Month 4	29	42.7(34.7)	27	34.5(30.5)	8.2(-9.3,25.7)
Month 5	29	42.8(36.2)	27	29.8(30.1)	13(-4.8,30.8)
Month 6	29	41.3(36.5)	27	32.9(28.5)	8.4(-9.1,25.9)
					J.



Figure 5:Mean weekly adherence by treatment arm

 For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

BMJ Open

For beer review only For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Intervention adherence (Participants)

Table 19 shows the median number of CFHH interactions was 3 (IQR: 1-8). 3 participants had no interactions with CFHH and the maximum number of interactions was 44. The mean total duration of interaction time across the study was 49.3 (SD= 44.8) minutes. The mean length of an interaction by participant was 12.4 (SD=9.6) minutes and the mean length of all interactions was 6.6 (SD=11) minutes. The median number of days in the trial with interactions was 2 (IQR=1,7) by participant. Figure 6 shows the wide range of values across participants, particularly for the total duration of interactions.

Figure 7 shows when interactions occurred in days for each participant. Some participants were interacting fairly regularly, however most participants were inconsistent with their interactions. Figure 8 shows that the 'How am I doing?' pages were the most frequently visited in terms of the total number of clicks during the trial. 30 (90.9%) of participants visited the 'How am I doing?', 'Treatment' and 'Videos' page at least once (Table 20). 224 (91.4%) sessions included a visit to the 'How am I doing?' page.

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

1		
2		
3	Table 18:Summary of clicks in CFHH. An	interaction is defined as a series of clicks with no
4	greater than a 15 minute lag between click	KS
6	Interactions with CFHH by participant	
7		
8	n	33
9	Mean (SD)	7.4(11.6)
10	Median (IQR)	3(1.8)
 10	Min Max	(0, 44)
12		(0,44)
14	I otal duration of interactions by participal	nt
15	n	33
16	Mean (SD)	49 3(44 8)
17		29(26.55)
18 10		30(20,33)
20	Min, Max	(0,177)
21	Mean duration of interactions by participa	ant
22		33
23		
24	Mean (SD)	12.4(9.6)
25 26	Median (IQR)	10.7(4.3,19)
20 27	Min, Max	(0,37)
28	Days with interactions by participant	
29		
30	n	33
31	Mean (SD)	5.7(8.2)
32	Median (IQR)	2(1,7)
33 34	Min Max	(0.32)
35	Duration of interactions	
36	Duration of interactions	
37	n	245
38	Mean (SD)	6.6(11)
39	Median (IOR)	1(0.8)
40 41		(0,53)
41	Min, Max	(0,57)
43		
44		
45		
46		



For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Page 187 of 202

45 46 47 BMJ Open





Figure 8: Frequency of clicks by CFHH categories

Coping Plan

How am I Doing

Home

Planner

Action Plan

About

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Prescription Problem Solving

Page Category with CFHH

Reward Terms and Conditions Toolkit

Treatment

Videos

BMJ Open

	10tal (70) CIICKS	Participants (%) with at least one click	Sessions (%) with at least one clic
About	24(0.8%)	13(39.4%)	20(8.2%)
Action Plan	177(6.1%)	28(84.8%)	53(21.6%)
Coping Plan	110(3.8%)	24(72.7%)	38(15.5%)
Home	605(20.8%)	30(90.9%)	244(99.6%)
How am I Doing	735(25.2%)	30(90.9%)	224(91.4%)
Planner	189(6.5%)	21(63.6%)	39(15.9%)
Prescription	46(1.6%)	22(66.7%)	42(17.1%)
Problem Solving	197(6.8%)	24(72.7%)	44(18%)
Reward	2(0.1%)	2(6.1%)	2(0.8%)
Terms and Conditions	2(0.1%)	2(6.1%)	2(0.8%)
Toolkit	194(6.7%)	24(72.7%)	66(26.9%)
Treatment	549(18.8%)	30(90.9%)	87(35.5%)
Videos	84(2.9%)	30(90.9%)	62(25.3%)

Intervention fidelity (Clinicians)

Table 21 shows the median number of intervention sessions per participant was 3 (IQR= 2,4) with a mean duration of 36.1 (SD=23.9) minutes.

Table 20:Summary of intervention sessions received by intervention participants during the study

Sessions per participant

n	33
Mean (SD)	3(1.6)
Median (IOR)	3(2.4)
	(0, 6)
Total time by participant	(0,0)
rotar time by participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	114.2(46.9)
Median (IQR)	100.5(90,125)
Min, Max	(40,249)
Time per session by participant	
2	22
Moon (SD)	27 2(14 2)
Median (IOP)	31.3(14.2)
	31.3(20.3,40)
Time per acceion	(10,03)
Time per session	
n	99
Mean (SD)	36.1(23.9)
Median (IQR)	30(15,55)
Min, Max	(4,119)
Intervention session per participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	0.9(0.3)
Median (IQR)	1(1.1)
Min. Max	(0.1)
Total Intervention session time per partie	cipant
n	20
Mean (SD)	58 1(14 2)
Median (IOR)	60(48 60)
IVIIII, IVIAA	(33,30)

ge 191 of 202	BMJ Open
Poviow sossion por participant	
Review session per participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	1(0.5)
Median (IQR)	1(1,1)
Min, Max	(0,2)
Total Review session time per partici	pant
n	29
Mean (SD)	43.2(30.6)
Median (IQR)	40(20,55)
Min, Max	(10,154)
Preparation session per participant	
n	33
Mean (SD)	0.7(0.9)
Median (IQR)	0(0.1)
Min. Max	(0,3)
Total Preparation session time per pa	articipant
n	14
Mean (SD)	18.4(9.7)
Median (IQR)	15(15.30)
Min. Max	(4.35)
Ad hoc sessions per participant	
<u>n</u>	33
Moon (SD)	0.4(0.6)
Median (IOR)	0(0,1)
	(0, 2)
Total ad hoc session time per particir	ant (0,2)
n Maran (OD)	12
Mean (SD)	19.2(6.7)
Median (IQR)	15(15,25)
Min, Max	(15,30)
For peer review only - http:	;//bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Clinic visits

Participants completed a median of 2 clinic visits. This was consistent across treatment arms. The number of clinic visits by participant is similar across treatment arms (Figure 9).



Figure 9:Barplot showing the number of participants for each number of clinic visits by treatment arm

Safety analysis

A total of 8 adverse events (AEs) occurred during the trial and 7 participants (10.9%) had a least one AE (Table 22). 5 of these were deemed to be Serious Adverse Events (SAEs). None of the SAEs were related to the intervention.

Table 21:Summary of adverse events recorded during the study

	Interventior	n (%)	Control n (%	6) Overall n (%)
All Adverse Events	5		3	8	
Participants with at least 1 AE	4(12.1%)		3(9.7%)	7(10.9%)	
Type of Adverse Event					
Chest pain or chest discomfort	1(25%)		0(0%)	1(14.3%)	
Voice change or Alteration	0(0%)		0(0%)	1(14.3%)	
Other	4(100%)		2(66.7%)	6(85.7%)	
Table 22:Summary of serious ac	lverse events	record	ed during the	study	
	0	Interve (%)	ention n	Control n (%)	Overall n (%)
All Serious Adverse events		3(9.1%	6)	2(6.5%)	5(7.8%)
Level of Seriousness					
Death		0(0%)		2(100%)	2(40%)
Hospitalisation		2(66.7	%)	0(0%)	2(40%)
Persistent or significant disability/incapacity		1(33.3	%)	0(0%)	1(20%)
Frequency					
Isolated		2(66.7	%)	2(100%)	4(80%)
Continuous		1(33.3	%)	0(0%)	1(20%)
Intensity					
Moderate		3(1009	%)	0(0%)	3(60%)
Severe		0(0%)		2(100%)	2(40%)
Outcome					
Recovered		1(33.3	%)	0(0%)	1(20%)
Improved		2(66.7	%)	0(0%)	2(40%)
Death		0(0%)		2(100%)	2(40%)
Expected SAE					
No		3(1009	%)	2(100%)	5(100%)
Related to Intervention					
No		3(100%	%)	2(100%)	5(100%)

~	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
g	
1	ი
1	1
1	י ר
1	2 2
1	3 ⊿
1	4
1	5
1	6
1	7
1	8
1	9
2	0
2 2	0 1
2 2 2	0 1 2
2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3
2 2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3 4
2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3 4 5
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3 4 5 6
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	012345670
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0123456780
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	01234567890
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3	01234567890
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3	012345678901
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3	0123456789012
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3	01234567890123
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	012345678901234
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3	0123456789012345
2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 3 3 3 3 3 3	01234567890123456

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

to been terien ont
Table 23:Description of serious adverse events recorded during the study (table has been redacted to maintain anonymity)

Participant	Description of event	Serious
 	Patient admitted on xx.xx.16 with acute exacerbation, developed type 2 respiratory failure. Despite maximal treatment of IV antibiotics, oxygen and NIV the patient continued to deteriorate and decision made to palliate. The patient died shortly afterwards.	Yes
xxx_14	Patient was having a kidney biopsy and had a bleed as a result, so had been kept in hospital on xxxxx ward at xxx city campus.	Yes
xxx_23	Patient admitted xx/xx/2016 with worsening disease and type 2 respiratory failure. Treated with non -invasive ventilation and intravenous antibiotics. deteriorated despite treatment and passed away xx/xx/2016	Yes
xxx_17	Rash reoccurred after re-trying oral antibiotic medication. Advised to stop again	No
xxx_17	Patient on holiday. Telephoned to report rash on both legs after starting new oral antibiotics. Advised to discontinue	No
xxx_20	Patient was admitted with influenza and CF. Exacerbation treated with iv antibiotics, discharged with home IV's. readmitted on the xx xxx with AKI (Acute Kidney Injury) Assumed secondary to dehydration. Dornase stopped	Yes

Protocol non-compliances

In total, there were 9 protocol non compliances during the trial. 6(67%) of these were follow up visits conducted outside of the calculated window (5 +/-1 month). 3(33%) of these were participants ticking statements on the consent form rather than initialling. All of these protocol non compliances were assessed as minor non-compliances.

Summary of missing data

Exacerbation data was collected for 6 months in 60/64 participants (94%). Adherence was collected for at least 6 months for 58/64 participants (90%).

The number of missing scores for questionnaires completed at baseline and 5 month follow up was very low (Table 25). Completion rate was 100% for the majority of baseline questionnaires and at least 89% for 5 month questionnaires. Missing scores were due to drop out(described in section 2.1). Such high completion rates are reassuring for the main trial.

Table 24:Summary of missing scores and items within questionnaires

	Time	Total	%	Intervention Median (min,max)	Control Median (min,max)	Overall Median (min,max)
EQ5D- 5L	Baseline	64	100 %	5(5,5)	5 (5 , 5)	5(5,5)
5 items	5 (+/-1) months	58	90.6 %	5(0,5)	5(0,5)	5(0,5)
PAM-13	Baseline	64	100 %	13(13,13)	13(13,13)	13(13,13)
13 item	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	13 (0 , 13)	13 (0 , 13)	13 (0 , 13)
CHAOS	Baseline	64	100 %	4 (4 , 4)	4 (4 , 4)	4 (4 , 4)
4 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	4(0,4)	4(0,4)	4(0,4)
MAD-3	Baseline	62	96.9 %	3(1,3)	3(0,3)	3(0,3)
3 items	5 (+/-1) months	57	89.1 %	3(0,3)	3(0,3)	3(0,3)
SRBAI	Baseline	63	98.4 %	4(0,4)	4(4,4)	4(0,4)
4 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	4(0,4)	4(0,4)	4(0,4)
GAD-7	Baseline	64	100 %	7(7,7)	7(7,7)	7(7,7)
7 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	7(0,7)	7(0,7)	7(0,7)
PHQ-8	Baseline	64	100 %	8(8,8)	8(8,8)	8(8,8)
8 items	5 (+/-1) months	59	92.2 %	8(0,8)	8(0,8)	8(0,8)

Recommendations for Main Trial/ Points for discussion

- For the primary analysis in the main trial, we would recommend the use of the offset adjusted model as this will allow the use of more data and allows the inclusion of potentially important participants over a greater amount of time. For example, our original model excluded participants who died, however doing so means we have lost key information.
- This is a pilot study, not powered to detect an effect
- The nature of the data means that small changes appear to influence the result greatly

to beer terien only

Appendix

Description of the patient reported outcomes

Name	Score		Interpretation of score
	range	Description	-
EQ-5D-5L	-0.224-1	Measure of health status	A score of zero means death, 1 is full health, negative score is a state worse than death
PAM-13	0-100	Measures patient activation e.g. ability and willingness to manage their health. 13 items with scoring spreadsheet	0= low patient activation 100= high patient activation
CHAOS-6	0-24	Measures confusion, hubbub and order. 6 item questionnaire	0= low level of chaos 24= high level of chaos
SRBAI	0-28	Measure of habit and automaticity 4 item, 7 point likert scale	0= low level of automaticity 28= high level of automaticity
CFQ-R	0-100	8 domains each score 0-100. The domains are: Physical, Emotion, Social, Eating, Body, Treatment Burden, Respiratory, Digestion	0= low 100= high
PHQ-8	0-24	Measure of depression. 8 item questionnaire, 0-3 for each item	0= No or minimal depression 24= Severe depression
GAD-7	0-21	Measure of anxiety. 7 item questionnaire	0= No anxiety 21= Severe anxiety
COM-BBQ			
Specific Necessities	2-5	Measure of perceived personal need for medication	Direction of effect would be an increase in score
Specific Concerns	1-3	Measure of perceived concerns about the negative effects of the medicine they are taking	Direction of effect would be a decrease in score
MAD-3	3-15	Specifically made 3 item questionnaire to measure perceived medication adherence	3= low 15= high

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Additional File 07. Changes to intervention procedures

Change Number	Problem type	Problem Identified	Solutions implemented in full-scale trial (hashed numbers - # - refer to logic model constructs)	Timing of change implementation
CFHealthHub IT component				
1	Real World and Trial	Interventionists having difficulty identifying videos (#22) appropriate for a patient's needs or interests.	Descriptions were provided with each video. The PPI group agreed with this change and assisted with writing descriptions for each video.	During the feasibility study
2	Real World and Trial	Adherence charts (#14, #20) were showing >100% adherence. This appeared to be more common in patients with alternating regimes, or taking medications <i>pro re</i> <i>nata</i> (PRN, meaning 'as needed').	Prescription flow amended with the addition of PRN or alternating regime alerts, which will assist the data management team in highlighting any data discrepancies.	Post-feasibility study
3	Real World and Trial	Clinician functionality (amending prescriptions/ treatment targets (#3, #23) inaccessible through participant view (used in intervention sessions).	Participant view functionality implemented to facilitate intervention sessions. Clinicians are now able to run intervention sessions using CFHH through participant view but easily switch to clinician view to change prescriptions and to set goals.	Post-feasibility study

4	Real World and Trial	The lead psychologist identified the need to determine which participants were receiving push notifications as this relates to dose and rewards for adherence.	The option to export data about number of push notifications sent to participants from the app (#16).	Post-feasibility study
5	Real World and Trial	Originally the normative adherence was used to come up with the percentage adherence. It was identified this did not always match what participants were actually prescribed and this made the graphs difficult to interpret. The capping of the weekly graph at 100% also made interpretation difficult.	To improve interpretability of adherence data (#14), percentages are now calculated against the actual treatments prescribed and graphs are not capped at 100% to aid any interpretation of graphs and trouble shooting.	Post-feasibility study
Other IT infrastructure				
6	Real World and Trial	Flatlines at the beginning of some participant adherence run charts were identified to relate to the date registered at the time the nebuliser (#4) is paired with the Qualcomm Hub (#5). Flatlines at the end of the feasibility study were also observed (#14, #35).	To achieve quality assurance of adherence data (#4, #5, #14, #35), hardware is now paired at the factory. The full-scale trial has been monitoring for, and has not found, such instances. Flatlines at the end of run charts established as genuine through triangulation with self-report quantitative and qualitative data.	Post-feasibility study

Interventionist training and manual				
7	Real World and Trial	Training packages were initially developed for physiotherapists. This led to interventionist recruitment problems.	The job specification and training was redeveloped to suit non-physiotherapists (#9, #12), to enable any member of the MDT to be trained up to deliver the intervention. A suitably qualified individual such as a postgraduate psychologist could be supported by the MDT to deliver the intervention.	Post-feasibility study
8	Real World and Trial	The interventionist job specification did not reflect the flexibility needed to carry out the interventionist role- e.g. flexibility in working patterns, skills in motivational interviewing and extensive travel.	The research team, with input from the interventionists, revised the job specification for the interventionist role based on experience of delivering the intervention in the pilot in order to better manage expectations of the role (#12).	Post-feasibility study
9	Real World and Trial	Pilot study interventionists felt that training was good but could be helped by introducing case studies with real world data, in CFHealthHub.	Realistic case studies with data to support interventionist training / role plays for using website were developed to provide training more applicable to real CF patients (#9). This model is generally used in a healthcare training setting.	Post-feasibility study
10	Real World and Trial	Sporadic training over six weeks, whilst also conducting research procedures was	Training was condensed into an intensive course over ten days, focusing solely on intervention delivery (#9).	Post-feasibility study

1	
2	
2	
1	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
1/	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
25	
20	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
20 20	
20	
29	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	

		overwhelming for interventionists.		
11	Real World and Trial	Assessment of intervention fidelity identified that some of the active ingredients of the intervention were absent e.g. negotiating goals and letting participants take ownership of choices.	The recruitment and training process was modified to incorporate role play at the interview; explaining fidelity assessment criteria during training and also on-going assessment to ensure that any issues are identified quickly (#9).	Post-feasibility study
12	Real World and Trial	The focus of interventionists during intervention delivery was not always on the aspects that evidence would indicate are the most active ingredients for example goal setting, action planning and coping planning.	Emphasis was placed on the main 'active ingredients' in the manual and in training (#8, #9).	Post-feasibility study
13	Real World and Trial	During the course of the trial, it became apparent that participants were not being followed up and engaged in a manner to allow them to build a habit.	Focus on habit formation / revised logic model will be implemented by a 6-8 week period of habit formation sessions (#8).	Post-feasibility study
14	Real World and Trial	It was identified that after some participants last review visit, their adherence to treatment dropped.	For the full RCT, intervention visits are now triggered if the participant is having an exacerbation/IV, has a drop of 20% or more adherence in the last 4 weeks and if the participant requests additional support.	Post-feasibility study

Page	203	of	202
------	-----	----	-----

BMJ Open

	(#8).	

Good Reporting of A Mixed Methods Study (GRAMMS).

O'Cathain A, Murphy E, Nicholl J. The quality of mixed methods studies in health services research. *J Health Serv Res Policy* 2008;13:92–8. doi:10.1258/jhsrp.2007.007074

Added to the EQUATOR Network database 26/09/2013.

(1) Describe the justification for using a mixed methods approach to the research question.

p5; lines 93-95.

(2) Describe the design in terms of the purpose, priority and sequence of methods

p11; line 240: we used a modified triangulation protocol; the study is described as nested, indicating, that the methods were used concurrently (p9; line 192).

(3) Describe each method in terms of sampling, data collection and analysis

Pages 9-12; 195-273.

(4) Describe where integration has occurred, how it has occurred and who has participated in it

Pages 11-12; Lines 240-273.

(5) Describe any limitation of one method associated with the present of the other method

Page 25; Lines 576-582.

(6) Describe any insights gained from mixing or integrating methods

p5; lines 93-95. p25; lines 573-611.