TREND Statement Checklist

| Paper Section/ Topic | Item | Descriptor | Reported? | |
|----------------------------|------|---|--------------|--------------|
| | No | | | Pg# |
| Title and Abst | ract | | | |
| Title and | 1 | Information on how unit were allocated to interventions | X | 4 |
| Abstract | | Structured abstract recommended | X | 4 |
| | | Information on target population or study sample | X | 4 |
| Introduction | | | | |
| Background | 2 | Scientific background and explanation of rationale | X | 6 |
| | | Theories used in designing behavioral interventions | | |
| M - 41 4 - | | | | |
| Methods Participants | 3 | Eligibility criteria for participants, including criteria at different levels in | | |
| Participants | | recruitment/sampling plan (e.g., cities, clinics, subjects) | X | 20 |
| | | Method of recruitment (e.g., referral, self-selection), including the | 1 | 120 |
| | | sampling method if a systematic sampling plan was implemented | | |
| | | Recruitment setting | | |
| | | Settings and locations where the data were collected | X | 24 |
| Interventions | 4 | Details of the interventions intended for each study condition and how | | |
| | | and when they were actually administered, specifically including: | | |
| | | O Content: what was given? | X | 20 |
| | | Delivery method: how was the content given? | X | 20 |
| | | Unit of delivery: how were the subjects grouped during delivery? | | 1 |
| | | Deliverer: who delivered the intervention? | | 1 |
| | | Setting: where was the intervention delivered? | X | 24 |
| | | Exposure quantity and duration: how many sessions or episodes or | | - |
| | | events were intended to be delivered? How long were they | | |
| | | intended to last? | X | 20 |
| | | Time span: how long was it intended to take to deliver the | | - |
| | | intervention to each unit? | X | 20 |
| | | Activities to increase compliance or adherence (e.g., incentives) | | |
| Objectives | 5 | Specific objectives and hypotheses | X | 4, 7 |
| Outcomes | 6 | Clearly defined primary and secondary outcome measures | X | 4,7 |
| | | Methods used to collect data and any methods used to enhance the | | |
| | | quality of measurements | X | 20, 21 |
| | | Information on validated instruments such as psychometric and biometric | | † <u>^</u> |
| | | properties | | |
| Sample Size | 7 | How sample size was determined and, when applicable, explanation of any | | |
| -3p.c 0.20 | | interim analyses and stopping rules | | |
| Assignment | 8 | Unit of assignment (the unit being assigned to study condition, e.g., | | |
| Method | | individual, group, community) | | |
| | | Method used to assign units to study conditions, including details of any | † | - |
| | | restriction (e.g., blocking, stratification, minimization) | | |
| | | Inclusion of aspects employed to help minimize potential bias induced due | | † |
| | | to non-randomization (e.g., matching) | | |

TREND Statement Checklist

| Blinding | 9 | Whether or not participants, those administering the interventions, and | | |
|------------------------|----|---|----------|--------|
| (masking) | | those assessing the outcomes were blinded to study condition assignment; if so, statement regarding how the blinding was accomplished and how it | | |
| | | was assessed. | | |
| Unit of Analysis | 10 | Description of the smallest unit that is being analyzed to assess intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) | X | 23 |
| | | If the unit of analysis differs from the unit of assignment, the analytical method used to account for this (e.g., adjusting the standard error | | |
| Ctatictical | 11 | estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis) | | |
| Statistical Methods | 11 | Statistical methods used to compare study groups for primary methods outcome(s), including complex methods of correlated data | X | 23 |
| Wicthous | | Statistical methods used for additional analyses, such as a subgroup | 7 | |
| | | analyses and adjusted analysis | | |
| | | Methods for imputing missing data, if used | <u> </u> | |
| | | Statistical software or programs used | X | 23, 24 |
| Results | l | | | |
| Participant flow | 12 | Flow of participants through each stage of the study: enrollment, | | |
| | | assignment, allocation, and intervention exposure, follow-up, analysis (a | | |
| | | diagram is strongly recommended) | X | 9, Fig |
| | | Enrollment: the numbers of participants screened for eligibility, | | |
| | | found to be eligible or not eligible, declined to be enrolled, and | | |
| | | enrolled in the study | X | 9 |
| | | Assignment: the numbers of participants assigned to a study condition | X | 9 |
| | | Allocation and intervention exposure: the number of participants | | |
| | | assigned to each study condition and the number of participants who received each intervention | X | 9 |
| | | Follow-up: the number of participants who completed the follow- | | |
| | | up or did not complete the follow-up (i.e., lost to follow-up), by | 37 | |
| | | study condition | X | 9 |
| | | Analysis: the number of participants included in or excluded from | X | 9 |
| | | the main analysis, by study condition Description of protocol deviations from study as planned, along with | Λ | |
| | | reasons | X | 9 |
| Recruitment | 13 | Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up | X | 9 |
| Baseline Data | 14 | Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of participants in each | 7.1 | |
| baseline bata | | study condition | X | Table |
| | | Baseline characteristics for each study condition relevant to specific | | |
| | | disease prevention research | | |
| | | Baseline comparisons of those lost to follow-up and those retained, overall and by study condition | | |
| | | Comparison between study population at baseline and target population of interest | | |
| | 15 | Data on study group equivalence at baseline and statistical methods used | 1 | |
| Baseline | | | | i |

TREND Statement Checklist

| Numbers analyzed | 16 | Number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis for each study condition, particularly when the denominators change for different outcomes; statement of the results in absolute numbers when feasible | X | 9,10 |
|-------------------------|----|--|---|-------|
| | | Indication of whether the analysis strategy was "intention to treat" or, if not, description of how non-compliers were treated in the analyses | | |
| Outcomes and estimation | 17 | For each primary and secondary outcome, a summary of results for each estimation study condition, and the estimated effect size and a confidence interval to indicate the precision Section Section | X | 9 |
| | | Inclusion of null and negative findings Inclusion of results from testing pre-specified causal pathways through which the intervention was intended to operate, if any | | |
| Ancillary analyses | 18 | Summary of other analyses performed, including subgroup or restricted analyses, indicating which are pre-specified or exploratory | X | 10-14 |
| Adverse events | 19 | Summary of all important adverse events or unintended effects in each study condition (including summary measures, effect size estimates, and confidence intervals) | X | 10 |
| DISCUSSION | | | | |
| Interpretation | 20 | Interpretation of the results, taking into account study hypotheses, sources of potential bias, imprecision of measures, multiplicative analyses, and other limitations or weaknesses of the study | X | 15-19 |
| | | Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations | X | 15-18 |
| | | Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation | | |
| | | Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications | X | 15,18 |
| Generalizability | 21 | Generalizability (external validity) of the trial findings, taking into account the study population, the characteristics of the intervention, length of follow-up, incentives, compliance rates, specific sites/settings involved in the study, and other contextual issues | X | 15,16 |
| Overall Evidence | 22 | General interpretation of the results in the context of current evidence and current theory | X | 15 |

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