

# Evaluating alternative approaches to packaging evidence and exploring the influence of context in guideline development in Kenya

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| <b>Submission date</b><br>01/03/2011   | <b>Recruitment status</b><br>No longer recruiting | <input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered<br><input type="checkbox"/> Protocol            |
| <b>Registration date</b><br>16/03/2011 | <b>Overall study status</b><br>Completed          | <input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results |
| <b>Last Edited</b><br>22/03/2013       | <b>Condition category</b><br>Other                | <input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data  |

## Plain English summary of protocol

Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

### Type(s)

Scientific

### Contact name

Mr Opiyo Newton

### Contact details

KEMRI/Wellcome Trust Research Programme

P.O. Box 43640-00100, GPO

Nairobi

Kenya

00100

+254 (0)20 271 0672 / 272 0163

nopiyo@nairobi.kemri-wellcome.org

## Additional identifiers

EudraCT/CTIS number

IRAS number

ClinicalTrials.gov number

### Secondary identifying numbers

SSC Protocol No. 1770 (Revised)

# Study information

## Scientific Title

Evaluating approaches to packaging evidence and exploring the influence of context in the process of developing evidence-informed guidelines for newborn care in rural hospitals in Kenya

## Study objectives

Study 1 (randomised controlled trial) tests the null hypothesis that presenting research evidence using graded-entry summaries is not useful to those involved in national guideline development.

Study 2 (descriptive case study) involves description of deliberative processes involved in guideline development statement of a null hypothesis is consequently inappropriate.

## Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

## Ethics approval(s)

Ethics approval received from the Kenya Medical Research Institute National Ethical Review Committee on the 2nd March 2010 [ref. SSC Protocol No 1770 (Revised)].

## Study design

Randomised controlled trial and a descriptive case study

## Primary study design

Interventional

## Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

## Study setting(s)

Other

## Study type(s)

Quality of life

## Participant information sheet

Not available in web format, please use the contact details below to request a patient information sheet

## Health condition(s) or problem(s) studied

Child health: evidence-informed guidelines

## Interventions

Study 1. Randomised controlled trial

Participants will be randomly allocated to receive the following graded-entry evidence summary formats.

A = Technical reviews + Systematic reviews (TR+SR)

B = Technical reviews + Systematic reviews + GRADE Summary of Findings table (TR+SR+SoF)

C = Technical reviews + Systematic reviews + Locally prepared mini-reviews with user- friendly front-ends (e.g. GRADE Summary of Findings table or SUPPORT-type summaries) placed under the abstract (TR+SR+MR+SoF)

The different evidence summary formats will be provided to participants as pre-reading materials one month before the national guideline development workshop.

## Study 2. Descriptive case study

The usefulness of the linkage-exchange forum will be explored by conducting follow-up interviews with a sub-sample of the experts representing the spectrum of interest groups to, among other reasons, generate information on the opinions that shape stakeholder views on research evidence among different audiences for the guidelines.

### Intervention Type

Other

### Phase

Not Applicable

### Primary outcome measure

Study 1. Randomised controlled trial

We will measure the impact of graded-entry evidence packs on participants understanding of key messages resulting from the evidence (tracer topic) summaries e.g. issues around persistent dilemmas on the timing (early or delayed) and rate of advancement (rapid or slow) of feeding volumes in prematurely born sick infants.

## Study 2. Descriptive case study

Data collection will focus on documenting processes involved in knowledge exchange and in the application of GRADE grid in guideline development. Emerging themes following the application of GRADE grid will be presented to all the participants for further discussions to promote consensus on draft essential newborn care (ENC) recommendations.

### Secondary outcome measures

We will measure the impact of graded-entry evidence packs on participants rating of their experience / satisfaction with the use of provided evidence packs.

Rating will be done using a 5-point Likert scale tool (used successfully in previous studies measuring 3 domains of their experience: usability (ease of use as indicated by average time spent looking for information), practical value (e.g. in tailoring research evidence) and barriers to use of evidence pack (accessibility)).

### Overall study start date

01/05/2010

### Completion date

30/09/2010

## Eligibility

**Key inclusion criteria**

Participants will consist of a purposive sample of technical experts, practitioners and policy makers gathered to develop consensus guidelines during a planned 1 week neonatal stakeholder workshop.

**Participant type(s)**

Patient

**Age group**

Adult

**Sex**

Both

**Target number of participants**

36-40 technical experts, practitioners and policy makers

**Key exclusion criteria**

Does not meet inclusion criteria

**Date of first enrolment**

01/05/2010

**Date of final enrolment**

30/09/2010

**Locations****Countries of recruitment**

Kenya

**Study participating centre**

KEMRI/Wellcome Trust Research Programme

Nairobi

Kenya

00100

**Sponsor information****Organisation**

The Wellcome Trust (UK)

**Sponsor details**

Wellcome Trust, Gibbs Building, 215 Euston Road  
London  
United Kingdom  
NW1 2BE  
+44 (0)20 7611 8888  
contact@wellcome.ac.uk

**Sponsor type**

Charity

**Website**

<http://www.wellcome.ac.uk/>

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/029chgv08>

## Funder(s)

**Funder type**

Charity

**Funder Name**

The Wellcome Trust (UK) (grant ref: 084538)

## Results and Publications

**Publication and dissemination plan**

Not provided at time of registration

**Intention to publish date****Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan****IPD sharing plan summary**

Not provided at time of registration

**Study outputs**

| Output type                     | Details | Date created | Date added | Peer reviewed? | Patient-facing? |
|---------------------------------|---------|--------------|------------|----------------|-----------------|
| <a href="#">Results article</a> | results | 01/02/2013   |            | Yes            | No              |