# Paying-for-performance and cost effectiveness of strategies to combat anaemia in China

Submission date Recruitment status Prospectively registered 11/01/2011 No longer recruiting [ ] Protocol [ ] Statistical analysis plan Registration date Overall study status 31/01/2011 Completed [X] Results [ ] Individual participant data **Last Edited** Condition category 18/12/2020 Haematological Disorders

# Plain English summary of protocol

Not provided at time of registration

# **Contact information**

# Type(s)

Scientific

#### Contact name

Dr Scott Rozelle

#### Contact details

616 Serra Street, Encina Hall East Wing, Room 402 Stanford United States of America 94305

# Additional identifiers

#### Protocol serial number

N/A

# Study information

#### Scientific Title

Paying-for-performance and cost effectiveness of strategies to combat anaemia in China: an interventional, multicentre cluster-randomised trial

#### Study objectives

To study the impact of financial incentives to primary school principals on anaemia reductions among students in rural China.

As of 15/03/2011 the target number of participants for this study has been increased from 2,957 to 3944

# Ethics approval required

Old ethics approval format

# Ethics approval(s)

Stanford University Human Subjects Research Institutional Review Board approved on the 21st July 2009 (ref: 17071)

## Study design

Interventional multicentre cluster-randomised trial

#### Primary study design

Interventional

#### Study type(s)

Quality of life

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

Iron deficiency anaemia

#### **Interventions**

Information only:

To some randomly-assigned schools we provided three types of information to school principals:

- 1. The share of enrolled students who are anaemic
- 2. Descriptions of efficacious methods for reducing anaemia (including vitamin supplementation, lunch fortification, and other dietary changes as well as the possible role of educating parents about anaemia)
- 3. Details about anaemia's relationship to school attendance, educational performance, and cognitive development as reported in peer-reviewed academic studies

Information and earmarked operating budget subsidy (hereafter termed "Subsidy" for simplicity):

Because purchasing inputs to reduce anaemia may be difficult given current operating budgets (which have little discretionary funds available), we randomly assigned some schools to receive earmarked operating budget subsidies. The subsidy schools were given 1.5 RMB per student per day, an amount that was enough to buy two to three ounces of red meat if the entire amount was spent on red meat. These subsidies are only allowed to be used for nutrition-related expenses.

However, it is always possible that other components of a school budget could be re-allocated, effectively resulting in subsidies being used for other more highly prioritised purposes (if a school's own nutrition spending fell in response to the subsidy); we investigate this possibility directly. In addition, we provide exactly the same information to principals as in Information only schools.

Information and earmarked operating budget subsidy and anaemia reduction incentive (hereafter termed "Incentive"):

To test the effectiveness of direct rewards for health improvement, we randomly assigned a third group of school principals to receive performance payments for reductions in anaemia among their student populations. Given the governance structure of Chinese primary schools, school principals make executive decisions about school operations (National People's Congress 1995).

Incremental incentive payments were linear in the absolute reduction in students with anaemia (150 RMB per student) between baseline and follow-up. The amount 150 RMB was chosen to equal roughly two months of salary (3000 RMB) if the principal was successful in reducing the number of students with anaemia by 20 students a feasible reduction according to our early pilot experience. These schools also received the same information and subsidies as in the Information only and Subsidy schools.

Control Group (Added 15/03/2011): No intervention in these schools.

The treatment lasted 6 months. The evaluation survey was done over the course of a week.

As of 15/03/2011 the trial record has been updated to include an additional control group.

# **Intervention Type**

Other

#### Phase

Not Applicable

# Primary outcome(s)

Haemoglobin concentrations, obtained by finger prick testing using HemoCue AB point-of-care diagnostics, measured during the evaluation survey, six months after the start of the treatment

# Key secondary outcome(s))

Measured during the evaluation survey, six months after the start of the treatment:

- 1. Differential approaches of principals to reduce anaemia
- 2. Changes over time in the composition of meals at home (meat, tofu, and fruit)
- 3. Changes in school budgetary allocations in both the Subsidy, Incentive and Information only groups relative to the Control group

# Completion date

06/04/2010

# **Eligibility**

# Kev inclusion criteria

All fourth and fifth grade students (both male and female students ages 8 - 11 years) in 57 randomly selected rural primary schools in ten nationally designated poor counties in China's Ningxia and Qinghai provinces.

# Participant type(s)

Patient

# Healthy volunteers allowed

No

## Age group

Child

# Lower age limit

8 years

# Upper age limit

11 years

#### Sex

All

#### Total final enrolment

3553

#### Key exclusion criteria

- 1. Students found to be extremely anaemic were excluded and sent to a clinician for treatment
- 2. Students identified as having thalassaemia

#### Date of first enrolment

10/01/2009

#### Date of final enrolment

06/04/2010

# Locations

# Countries of recruitment

China

United States of America

# Study participating centre 616 Serra Street, Encina Hall

Stanford United States of America 94305

# Sponsor information

# Organisation

Stanford University (USA)

#### **ROR**

https://ror.org/00f54p054

# Funder(s)

# Funder type

Research organisation

#### **Funder Name**

International Initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie), Inc. (USA)

#### **Funder Name**

Stanford University (USA)

#### Alternative Name(s)

Stanford, Leland Stanford Junior University, SU

# **Funding Body Type**

Government organisation

# **Funding Body Subtype**

Universities (academic only)

#### Location

United States of America

# **Results and Publications**

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?
Results article	results	27/07/2012	18/12/2020	Yes	No