

# A randomised controlled trial of nurse facilitated self-help treatment for patients in primary care with chronic fatigue syndrome

<b>Submission date</b> 18/05/2001	<b>Recruitment status</b> No longer recruiting	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Prospectively registered
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Protocol
<b>Registration date</b> 18/05/2001	<b>Overall study status</b> Completed	<input type="checkbox"/> Statistical analysis plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Results
<b>Last Edited</b> 29/06/2016	<b>Condition category</b> Mental and Behavioural Disorders	<input type="checkbox"/> Individual participant data

## Plain English summary of protocol

Not provided at time of registration

## Contact information

### Type(s)

Scientific

### Contact name

Dr Alison Wearden

### Contact details

School of Psychological Sciences  
Coupland 1 Building  
Oxford Road  
Manchester  
United Kingdom  
M13 9PL

## Additional identifiers

EudraCT/CTIS number

IRAS number

ClinicalTrials.gov number

Secondary identifying numbers

G0200212

# Study information

## Scientific Title

A randomised controlled trial of nurse facilitated self-help treatment for patients in primary care with chronic fatigue syndrome: the FINE trial (Fatigue Intervention by Nurses Evaluation)

## Acronym

FINE

## Study objectives

1. Is pragmatic rehabilitation, delivered at home by nurses to CFS patients recruited from primary care, a clinically effective intervention in terms of reduced disability and fatigue when compared with treatment as usual delivered through the primary care team?
2. Is pragmatic rehabilitation, delivered at home by nurses to CFS patients recruited from primary care, a cost effective intervention when compared with treatment as usual delivered through the primary care team?
3. Is supportive listening, delivered at home by nurses to CFS patients recruited from primary care, a clinically effective intervention in terms of reduced disability and fatigue when compared with treatment as usual delivered through the primary care team?
4. Is supportive listening, delivered at home by nurses to CFS patients recruited from primary care, a cost effective intervention when compared with treatment as usual delivered through the primary care team?

Can we demonstrate that the active component of pragmatic rehabilitation operates in addition to a non-specific treatment effect due to contact with a supportive therapist?

## Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

## Ethics approval(s)

Not provided at time of registration

## Study design

Randomised controlled trial

## Primary study design

Interventional

## Secondary study design

Randomised controlled trial

## Study setting(s)

Home

## Study type(s)

Treatment

## Participant information sheet

Not available in web format, please use contact details to request a participant information sheet

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

Chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS)

**Interventions**

1. Pragmatic rehabilitation
2. Supportive listening
3. Treatment as usual by GP

**Intervention Type**

Other

**Phase**

Not Specified

**Primary outcome measure**

The primary outcome measures will be patient-rated to avoid observer bias, and will be supplemented with an objective measure of the patients exercise tolerance. These will be:

1. Score on the physical functioning scale of the SF-36
2. Cost-effectiveness using the Euroquol
3. The score on the 11-item Fatigue Scale

**Secondary outcome measures**

1. A timed step-test to provide an objective measure of the patients exercise tolerance and cardiovascular fitness
2. Scores on the HAD to provide measures of depression and anxiety
3. A brief four-item sleep scale

**Overall study start date**

21/06/2004

**Completion date**

25/07/2008

**Eligibility****Key inclusion criteria**

Patients 18 and over, who fulfil the Oxford criteria for CFS (Sharpe et al. 1991) [Prior to Feb'2005 the criteria was the Fukuda criteria], and who have a principal complaint of fatigue. Patients must score 4 or more on the 11-item Chalder fatigue scale, and 70% or less on the SF-36 physical functioning scale.

**Participant type(s)**

Patient

**Age group**

Adult

**Lower age limit**

18 Years

**Sex**

Both

**Target number of participants**

360

**Key exclusion criteria**

1. Patients whose fatigue is explained by any active medical condition
2. Patients with schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, dementia, eating disorder, substance abuse, morbid obesity
3. Patients with current suicidal ideation
4. Patients with anti-social, borderline or paranoid personality disorder
5. Patients who cannot read or write English sufficiently well to participate
6. Patients who are incapable of giving informed consent

**Date of first enrolment**

21/06/2004

**Date of final enrolment**

25/07/2008

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

England

United Kingdom

**Study participating centre**

**University of Manchester**

Manchester

United Kingdom

M13 9PL

**Sponsor information****Organisation**

University of Manchester (UK)

**Sponsor details**

Research Office

Oxford Road

Manchester

England

United Kingdom

M13 9PL  
+44 (0)161 275 2227  
john.rogers@manchester.ac.uk

**Sponsor type**

University/education

**ROR**

<https://ror.org/027m9bs27>

## **Funder(s)**

**Funder type**

Research council

**Funder Name**

Medical Research Council (MRC) (UK) (G0200212)

**Alternative Name(s)**

Medical Research Council (United Kingdom), UK Medical Research Council, MRC

**Funding Body Type**

Government organisation

**Funding Body Subtype**

National government

**Location**

United Kingdom

## **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="#">Protocol article</a>	protocol	07/04/2006	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results of qualitative study	23/02/2010	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results of randomised controlled trial	23/04/2010	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results of patient engagement	01/04/2011	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	22/12/2011	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	01/09/2012	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	18/01/2013	Yes	No
<a href="#">Results article</a>	results	14/12/2015	Yes	No