Bah humbug! Association between sending Christmas cards to trial participants and trial retention: randomised study within a trial conducted simultaneously across eight host trials

Supplementary Material

Table A: Details on the proximity of the completion of the follow-up to when it was due, and results of the Cox Proportional Hazard model for all trials, and combined meta-analysis results

	Sent a card: Days between due and completion Mean (SD) (Min, Max)	Not sent a card: Days between due and completion Mean (SD) (Min, Max)	Overall: Days between due and completion Mean (SD) (Min, Max)	Hazards Ratio (95% CI)*	p-value
C-Gall	53.2 (40.9)	57.3 (46.0)	55.2 (43.4)	1.08	0.62
	(4, 156)	(3, 158)	(3, 158)	(0.81 to 1.43)	
CPIT-3	10.1 (14.3)	10.5 (16.2)	10.3 (15.3)	1.02	0.85
	(0, 76)	(0, 83)	(0, 83)	(0.81 to 1.29)	
DISC	12.5 (46.5)	8.7 (22.2)	10.7 (36.6)	0.94	0.65
	(-71, 335)	(-42, 156)	(-71, 335)	(0.71 to 1.23)	0.03
FUTURE	38.3 (44.3)	41.5 (39.9)	39.8 (42.2)	1.05	0.71
	(1, 188)	(1, 172)	(1, 188)	(0.83 to 1.33)	0.71
ProFHER-2	1.6 (13.9)	7.3 (14.1)	4.2 (14.0)	1.25	0.57
	(-29, 26)	(-16, 28)	(-29, 28)	(0.57 to 2.73)	0.57
PurE	14.7 (28.2)	5.9 (9.7)	9.5 (19.6)	0.87	0.71
	(-1, 103)	(-1, 38)	(-1, 103)	(0.43 to 1.79)	0.71
REFLECT	25.7 (25.5)	23.5 (23.7)	24.6 (24.6)	0.95	0.72
	(0, 132)	(-8, 121)	(-8, 132)	(0.73 to 1.25)	0.72
SWHSI-2	16.5 (18.7)	30.5 (56.9)	23.2 (41.5)	1.30	0.50
	(-3, 72)	(4, 218)	(-3, 218)	(0.61 to 2.77)	0.50
Overall	26.1 (38.5)	26.4 (35.9)	26.3 (37.2)	1.01	0.80
	(-71, 335)	(-42, 218)	(-71, 335)	(0.91 to 1.13)	0.80

^{*}Reference arm is the intervention arm

Sensitivity analyses

Primary outcome further adjusted for gender

Due to an imbalance of gender in some of the host trials, a sensitivity analysis was undertaken. The results for each trial can be found in Table B. The results were robust and when combined in a meta-analysis produced an OR of 0.96, 95% CI 0.71 to 1.30, p = 0.78. The results suggest a negative impact on retention when sending a Christmas card, although these are non-significant.

Table B: Results of sensitivity analysis which further adjusted the primary analysis model for gender

	Sent a card: % Complete (n complete /n due)	Not sent a card: % Complete (n complete /n due)	Overall: % Complete (n complete /n due)	Adjusted Odds Ratio (95% CI)*	p-value
C-Gall	87.3%	86.1%	86.7%	1.09	0.84
	(96/110)	(93/108)	(189/218)	(0.49 to 2.38)	
CPIT-3	90.4%	89.7%	90.0%	1.09	0.81
	(142/157)	(139/155)	(281/312)	(0.52 to 2.30)	
DICC	84.0%	87.2%	85.5%	0.78	0.50
DISC	(105/125)	(102/117)	(207/242)	(0.38 to 1.61)	
FUTURE	94.8%	96.4%	95.6%	0.66	0.48
	(147/155)	(133/138)	(280/293)	(0.21 to 2.08)	
ProFHER-2	82.4%	80.0%	81.3%	1.04	0.96
	(14/17)	(12/15)	(26/32)	(0.16 to 6.75)	
PurE	65.0%	70.4%	68.1%	0.84	0.79
	(13/20)	(19/27)	(32/47)	(0.23 to 3.02)	
REFLECT	75.0%	75.4%	75.2%	0.98	0.95
	(108/14)	(104/138)	(212/282)	(0.57 to 1.69)	
SWHSI-2	66.7%	59.1%	62.8%	1.36	0.64
	(14/21)	(13/22)	(27/43)	(0.38 to 4.84)	
Overall	85.3%	85.4 %	85.4 %	0.96	0.78
	(639/749)	(615/720)	(1,254/1,469)	(0.71 to 1.30)	

^{*}Reference arm is the intervention arm

Time to completion: postal only

When repeating the time to completion analysis, with only those follow-ups that were done via postal questionnaire, the results were found to be similar to that when including all participants. This analysis affected three trials: CPIT-3, DISC and ProFHER-2. All participants from CPIT-3 were excluded. The full details can be found in Table C. A combined HR of 1.03 (95% CI 0.89 to 1.18, p=0.72) suggests a slight benefit from receiving the card, but the results are not statistically significant.

Table C: Results of sensitivity analysis where the time to completion analysis was repeated including only postal follow-ups.

	Sent a card: Days between due and completion Mean (SD) (Min, Max)	Not sent a card: Days between due and completion Mean (SD) (Min, Max)	Overall: Days between due and completion Mean (SD) (Min, Max)	Hazards Ratio (95% CI)*	p-value
C-Gall	N=96 53.2 (40.9) (4, 156)	N=93 57.3 (46.0) (3, 158)	N=189 55.2 (43.4) (3, 158)	1.08 (0.81 to 1.43)	0.62
СРІТ-3†	N=0 -	N=0 -	N=0 -	-	-
DISC†	N=25 2.2 (4.9) (-1, 17)	N=22 1.6 (6.0 (-1, 28)	N=47 2.0 (5.4) (-1, 28)	0.91 (0.51 to 1.62)	0.76
FUTURE	N=147 38.3 (44.3) (1, 188)	N=133 41.5 (39.9) (1, 172)	N=280 39.8 (42.2) (1, 188)	1.05 (0.83 to 1.33)	0.71
ProFHER-2†	N=8 4.3 (10.1) (-7, 24)	N=5 11.4 (13.6) (-1, 28)	N=13 7.0 (11.6) (-7, 28)	1.73 (0.52 to 5.73)	0.37
PurE	N=13 14.7 (28.2) (-1, 103)	N=19 5.9 (9.7) (-1, 38)	N=32 9.5 (19.6) (-1, 103)	0.87 (0.43 to 1.79)	0.71
REFLECT	N=108 25.7 (25.5) (0, 132)	N=104 23.5 (23.7) (-8, 121)	N=212 24.6 (24.6) (-8, 132)	0.95 (0.73 to 1.25)	0.72
SWHSI-2	N=14 16.5 (18.7) (-3, 72)	N=13 30.5 (56.9) (4, 218)	N=27 23.2 (41.5) (-3, 218)	1.30 (0.61 to 2.77)	0.50
Overall	N=411 34.1 (38.8) (-7, 188)	N=389 35.7 (39.8) (-8, 218)	N=800 34.9 (39.3) (-8, 218)	1.03 (0.89 to 1.18)	0.72

^{*}Reference arm is the intervention arm † some participants have been excluded from these trials as part of the sensitivity analysis