

# Is a multi-component intervention to reduce workplace sedentary behaviour acceptable and feasible to professional males?

<b>Submission date</b> 07/10/2019	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 27/02/2020	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 28/03/2023	<b>Condition category</b> Other	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

## Plain English summary of protocol

**Methods:** Male staff will be invited to take part. Primary outcomes are acceptability and feasibility and secondary outcomes include levels of sedentary behaviour, physical activity and work engagement.

**Discussion:** The findings are expected to inform the design of a future trial assessing the impact of an intervention using pedal machines and mHealth on short and longer-term occupational sedentary behaviour, work-related outcomes such as productivity and cost effectiveness.

## Background and study aims

Prolonged sitting, an independent risk factor for increased death and disease, occurs mostly in the workplace. A recent study found that professional males have the longest workplace sitting times. Current evidence supports the use of multi-level interventions developed using participative approaches. This study aims to explore the acceptability and feasibility of a multi-level intervention to reduce workplace sitting.

## Who can participate?

Males over 18 working in full-time sedentary and professional occupations

## What does the study involve?

Two companies in Dublin, Ireland will take part in a cluster-randomised crossover pilot study, and office-based employees will be recruited. The components of the intervention target multiple levels of influence including organisational structures (via management consultation and recruitment), the physical work environment (via provision of an under-desk pedal machine), and individual determinants (via mHealth technology to support behaviour change techniques).

## What are the possible benefits and risks of participating?

The benefits of the study are that the participants involved are contributing to the understanding of the acceptability and feasibility of an intervention to reduce sedentary behaviour in a workplace setting. People taking part will potentially reduce their daily sedentary behaviour and may thereby benefit from taking part in the study. There are minimal risks to taking part in this study.

Where is the study run from?  
Public Health and Primary Care, Trinity College, Dublin

When is the study starting and how long is it expected to run for?  
September 2019 to December 2019

Who is funding the study?  
Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin, Ireland

Who is the main contact?  
Gail Nicolson  
nicolsg@tcd.ie

## Contact information

**Type(s)**  
Scientific

**Contact name**  
Ms Gail Nicolson

**ORCID ID**  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5580-8635>

**Contact details**  
Institute of Population Health  
Tallaght Cross  
Belgard Square West  
Dublin  
Ireland  
D24 DH74  
+353 1 8963739  
nicolsg@tcd.ie

## Additional identifiers

**Clinical Trials Information System (CTIS)**  
Nil known

**ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT)**  
Nil known

**Protocol serial number**  
Study3

## Study information

**Scientific Title**

Pilot study to test the acceptability and feasibility of a theory-led multicomponent intervention to reduce sedentary behaviour in the workplace

### **Study objectives**

A multicomponent theory-led intervention to reduce workplace sedentary behaviour will be acceptable and feasible to professional males

### **Ethics approval required**

Old ethics approval format

### **Ethics approval(s)**

Approved 18/09/2019, School of Medicine, Trinity College Dublin (Trinity College, 152-160 Pearse St, Dublin 2, Ireland; +353 1 896 1476; SOMREC@tcd.ie), ref: 20190702

### **Study design**

Randomised wait-list crossover design

### **Primary study design**

Interventional

### **Study type(s)**

Prevention

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

Reduction of risk factor sedentary behaviour

### **Interventions**

Two companies in Dublin, Ireland will take part in a cluster-randomised crossover pilot study, and office-based employees will be recruited and randomised to the control or the intervention arms.

The components of the intervention target multiple levels of influence including organisational structures (via management consultation and recruitment), the physical work environment (via provision of an under-desk pedal machine), and individual determinants (via mHealth technology to support behaviour change techniques).

The intervention comprises the provision of three components:

1. An under-desk pedal machine (DeskCycle2; 3D Innovations LLC., Greeley, CO, USA)
2. Garmin Forerunner 35 activity tracker
3. Access to a Garmin Connect application (app) and website (Garmin.com)

The intervention will communicate the key message: "Cycle at work". As highlighted from prior qualitative work determinants of goal-setting, self-monitoring, and social-comparison will be targeted using behaviour change techniques provided within the Garmin Connect app/website. Social-comparison, focusing on the masculine ideal and gender influences, such as individual or team-based competition will be used as a strategy in this study. This BCT will be targeted by the lead researcher creating a graph displaying each team's participants' weekly progress to enable social comparison. Participants will also be prompted to move every 60 minutes of accumulated sedentary behaviour using the move prompt on the Garmin Forerunner 35 wrist-worn device. Based on randomisation, either the first or fourth week will involve an active intervention to use

an under-desk pedal machine to interrupt sedentary behaviour every hour and accumulate  $\geq 30$  minutes of light physical activity during the working day. There will be a washout period of one week between the intervention and control arms. In circumstances where a participant suffers any adverse outcome such as pain or discomfort while taking part in the study, they will be advised to immediately discontinue participation in the study.

#### Randomisation

Following baseline assessments, worksites will be randomised to either the intervention or control arms of the trial. Simple cluster randomisation will be determined by a statistician not associated with the project, who will use randomisation software to allocate each worksite to begin with either the intervention or control period.

#### Allocation concealment

Participants will not be advised of their group allocation until after baseline assessments have been made. The allocation concealment mechanism is important to reduce selection bias as it prevents foreknowledge of the period (control/intervention) in which participants are enrolling, which negatively affect recruitment.

#### Blinding

Due to the nature of the study, neither the participants nor research team will be blinded to group assignments. This lack of blinding introduces biases such as performance bias and outcome assessment bias. However, the use of objective and reliable measures of the secondary outcomes have been included in terms of measurement of the secondary outcomes which reduces the risks associated with a lack of blinding.

#### Control arm

Participants in the control arm will be informed that they have been randomised to a delayed intervention that will begin after three weeks, and will be asked to continue their normal workplace habits. All measures collected in the intervention group will be collected in the control arm.

### **Intervention Type**

Behavioural

### **Primary outcome(s)**

The following outcomes will be assessed using a pen and paper questionnaire:

1. Appropriateness of the intervention
2. Acceptability of the intervention
3. Feasibility of the intervention

The outcomes will also be assessed via focus groups and/or semi-structured interviews:

4. Experience of using the under-desk pedal machines, including factors perceived as affecting the pedal machine, issues (contextual, practical, individual or others), and adverse consequences (work, health or otherwise related)
5. Experiences of the other intervention components
6. Organisational-level and management perspectives of using the pedal machine
7. Acceptability of the intervention
8. Acceptability of the assessments and burden
9. Acceptability of the study procedures

Feasibility outcomes:

10. Recruitment process - number of people recruited to the study recorded by the researcher at

the beginning of the study.

11. Feasibility of measurement tools - missing data from questionnaires. This information will be recorded by the researcher in a separate report at the end of the study

### **Key secondary outcome(s)**

Trial-related outcomes, assessed at baseline (before randomisation) and throughout the control and intervention periods:

1. Sedentary behaviour and physical activity measured using ActivPal3 accelerometers

1.1 Sedentary behaviour during working hours (workplace sedentary behaviour) and all waking hours (total sedentary behaviour)

1.2 Physical activity during working hours (workplace activity) and all waking hours (total physical activity)

2. Context-specific sedentary behaviour measured using EMA with notifications of survey, completion sent six times a day at random times throughout the baseline, control and intervention arms.

3. Work Engagement will be measured at baseline, post control arm, and post-intervention arm using the UWES-9 using pen and paper.

4. Perception of the benefits of reducing workplace sedentary behaviour will be assessed using a 3-point questionnaire

### **Completion date**

20/12/2019

## **Eligibility**

### **Key inclusion criteria**

For participants

1. Male

2. Adult (i.e. 18 years and older) currently in full-time sedentary and professional occupation

3. Must be present for the duration of the study period

4. rPARQ will be used as a screening tool to ensure physical capability in the study. Individuals who answer no to all of the questions can be included in the study

For worksites:

1. Professional company in the Dublin region with >5 male employees

### **Participant type(s)**

Healthy volunteer

### **Healthy volunteers allowed**

No

### **Age group**

Adult

### **Lower age limit**

18 years

### **Sex**

Male

**Total final enrolment**

22

**Key exclusion criteria**

Does not meet inclusion criteria

**Date of first enrolment**

18/09/2019

**Date of final enrolment**

11/10/2019

## **Locations**

**Countries of recruitment**

Ireland

**Study participating centre**

**Trinity College Dublin**

Public Health and Primary Care

Dublin

Ireland

D24 DH74

## **Sponsor information**

**Organisation**

Trinity College Dublin

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/02tyrky19>

## **Funder(s)**

**Funder type**

University/education

**Funder Name**

Dean of the Faculty of Health Sciences, Trinity College Dublin

# Results and Publications

## Individual participant data (IPD) sharing plan

The current data sharing plans for this study are unknown and will be available at a later date

## IPD sharing plan summary

Data sharing statement to be made available at a later date

## Study outputs

Output type	Details	Date created	Date added	Peer reviewed?	Patient-facing?
<a href="#">Results article</a>		02/09/2021	09/09/2021	Yes	No
<a href="#">Protocol article</a>		10/11/2020	28/03/2023	Yes	No
<a href="#">Participant information sheet</a>		07/10/2019	27/02/2020	No	Yes
<a href="#">Protocol file</a>		10/10/2019	27/02/2020	No	No