TREND Statement Checklist

Paper Section/ Topic	Item	Descriptor	Reported?	
	No		\checkmark	Pg #
Title and Abst	ract			
Title and	1	Information on how unit were allocated to interventions	\checkmark	2
Abstract		Structured abstract recommended	\checkmark	2
		Information on target population or study sample	\checkmark	2
Introduction				
Background	2	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	✓	3,4
		Theories used in designing behavioral interventions	\checkmark	3,4
Mathada				•, :
Methods Participants	3	Eligibility criteria for participants, including criteria at different levels in		
	Ū	recruitment/sampling plan (e.g., cities, clinics, subjects)	\checkmark	15
		 Method of recruitment (e.g., referral, self-selection), including the 	,	
		sampling method if a systematic sampling plan was implemented		15
		Recruitment setting	\checkmark	15
		Settings and locations where the data were collected	\checkmark	15
Interventions	4	Details of the interventions intended for each study condition and how		
		and when they were actually administered, specifically including:		
		 Content: what was given? 	\checkmark	15
		 Delivery method: how was the content given? 	\checkmark	15
		 Unit of delivery: how were the subjects grouped during delivery? 		15
		 Deliverer: who delivered the intervention? 		15
		 Setting: where was the intervention delivered? 		15
		 Exposure quantity and duration: how many sessions or episodes or events were intended to be delivered? How long were they intended to last? 	\checkmark	15
		 Time span: how long was it intended to take to deliver the intervention to each unit? 	\checkmark	15
		 Activities to increase compliance or adherence (e.g., incentives) 		
Objectives	5	Specific objectives and hypotheses	\checkmark	16
Outcomes	6	Clearly defined primary and secondary outcome measures	\checkmark	16
		 Methods used to collect data and any methods used to enhance the quality of measurements 	\checkmark	16
		 Information on validated instruments such as psychometric and biometric properties 	\checkmark	16
Sample Size	7	How sample size was determined and, when applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping rules	~	15
Assignment Method	8	 Unit of assignment (the unit being assigned to study condition, e.g., individual, group, community) 	\checkmark	15
		 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

9 • 10 • 11 •	Whether or not participants, those administering the interventions, and those assessing the outcomes were blinded to study condition assignment; if so, statement regarding how the blinding was accomplished and how it was assessed. Description of the smallest unit that is being analyzed to assess intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) 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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)	~	15
•	 if so, statement regarding how the blinding was accomplished and how it was assessed. Description of the smallest unit that is being analyzed to assess intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) 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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis) 	~	15
•	Description of the smallest unit that is being analyzed to assess intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) 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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)	 Image: A start of the start of	15
•	intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) 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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)	 Image: A start of the start of	15
•	intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) 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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)	\checkmark	15
•	intervention effects (e.g., individual, group, or community) 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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)	\checkmark	15
11 •	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 estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)		+
	method used to account for this (e.g., adjusting the standard error estimates by the design effect or using multilevel analysis)		1
	Statistical methods used to compare study groups for primary methods		18,19
	outcome(s), including complex methods of correlated data	•	10,19
•	Statistical methods used for additional analyses, such as a subgroup		
	analyses and adjusted analysis		
•	Methods for imputing missing data, if used	,	
•	Statistical software or programs used	\checkmark	18,19
12 •	Flow of participants through each stage of the study: enrollment,		
	assignment, allocation, and intervention exposure, follow-up, analysis (a		
	diagram is strongly recommended)		
	 Enrollment: the numbers of participants screened for eligibility, 		
			5
		\checkmark	5
		\checkmark	5
	who received each intervention		5
	• 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		5
	,		
			5
		v	
•			
12		./	5
			5
		\checkmark	5
•			
•			
	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		
	to control for baseline differences		
11	2 • 	 Statistical software or programs used Flow of participants through each stage of the study: enrollment, assignment, allocation, and intervention exposure, follow-up, analysis (a diagram is strongly recommended) Enrollment: the numbers of participants screened for eligibility, found to be eligible or not eligible, declined to be enrolled, and enrolled in the study Assignment: the numbers of participants assigned to a study condition Allocation and intervention exposure: the number of participants assigned to each study condition and the number of participants who received each intervention 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 study condition Analysis: the number of participants included in or excluded from the main analysis, by study condition Description of protocol deviations from study as planned, along with reasons Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up 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	 Statistical software or programs used Statistical software or programs used Flow of participants through each stage of the study: enrollment, assignment, allocation, and intervention exposure, follow-up, analysis (a diagram is strongly recommended) Enrollment: the numbers of participants screened for eligibility, found to be eligible or not eligible, declined to be enrolled, and enrolled in the study Assignment: the numbers of participants assigned to a study condition Allocation and intervention exposure: the number of participants assigned to each study condition and the number of participants who received each intervention 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 study condition Analysis: the number of participants included in or excluded from the main analysis, by study condition Description of protocol deviations from study as planned, along with reasons Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up Baseline demographic and clinical characteristics of participants in each study condition 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 Data on study group equivalence at baseline and statistical methods used

TREND Statement Checklist

Numbers	16	Number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis for each		_
analyzed		study condition, particularly when the denominators change for different		5
		outcomes; statement of the results in absolute numbers when feasible		
		 Indication of whether the analysis strategy was "intention to treat" or, if 		
Outcomes and	17	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	\checkmark	6,7
		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	18	Summary of other analyses performed, including subgroup or restricted		
analyses		analyses, indicating which are pre-specified or exploratory		
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) 	\checkmark	5,6
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	\checkmark	10-14
		 Discussion of results taking into account the mechanism by which the intervention was intended to work (causal pathways) or alternative mechanisms or explanations 	\checkmark	10-14
		 Discussion of the success of and barriers to implementing the intervention, fidelity of implementation 	\checkmark	10-14
		 Discussion of research, programmatic, or policy implications 	\checkmark	10-14
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		
Overall Evidence	22	General interpretation of the results in the context of current evidence and current theory	\checkmark	10-14
LVIGENCE				

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: <u>http://www.cdc.gov/trendstatement/</u>