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Guiding Good Choices (GGC)

- 5- Session program for all parents of adolescents ages 11-14
- Evaluated in two RCTs
  - Affects Parenting Behavior regardless of family risk (Spoth et al., 1998)
  - Reduced Growth in Substance Use, Delinquency; Depressive Symptoms (Mason et al., 2003, 2007)
  - Cost-beneficial: Benefit-Cost Ratio: $2.77 (WSIPP, 2018)

- Sessions emphasize
  - Build family bonding
  - Establish and reinforce clear and consistent guidelines; monitor children’s behavior
  - Teach children skills to resist peer influence
  - Improve family management practices
  - Reduce family conflict

GGC is organized around substance use prevention delivered universally, but skills generalize to other parenting concerns.
GGC Helps Fill a Service Gap in Pediatric Primary Care

- AAP recommends pediatricians provide anticipatory guidance to parents – but there are barriers to doing this.

- Instead: Have pediatricians refer parents to GGC for delivery by behavioral health specialists within each HCS.
  - Pediatricians have high credibility and parents’ trust. They are good agents for validating positive parenting practices.
  - Care provided in a pediatric primary care setting is non-stigmatizing.

 ➔ Advantages may create higher recruitment and retention rates in primary care compared to community settings.

 ➔ This pragmatic trial, set in the context of real-world health systems, will allow us to examine recruitment and retention outcomes as well as adolescent behavioral health impacts.
GGC4H: 4-Year Pragmatic Trial

- Longitudinal cluster-randomized trial in 3 HCS:
  - Kaiser Permanente Northern California, Kaiser Permanente Colorado, Henry Ford Health System
  - Randomize pediatricians within clinic and HCS (24 per HCS), approximately 3,636 families recruited to experimental or control arm

- Implement GGC universally during two years (Y2, Y3 of study)
  - Intervention arm pediatricians refer all parents of adolescents ages 12 during well-child visit
  - 2 GGC delivery modalities: Group and self-guided

- RE-AIM* framework used to evaluate implementation and effectiveness outcomes through Y5
  - Implementation: Reach, adoption, fidelity, participant engagement and skills
  - Effectiveness: Evaluate GGC’s impact on adolescent substance use initiation at Year 5 endpoint

*Reach, Effectiveness, Adoption, Implementation, Maintenance
### Project Status: A Very Busy UG3 Year!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INTERVENTION</th>
<th>DATA COLLECTION/EHR</th>
<th>SITE IMPLEMENTATION</th>
<th>OVERSIGHT</th>
<th>ADMINISTRATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Develop, finalize self-guided intervention</td>
<td>• Design finalized</td>
<td>• Develop, finalize recruitment methods</td>
<td>• Develop Governance Plan</td>
<td>• Protocol to NIH for initial review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Intervention available – all sites</td>
<td>• Develop, finalize data collection methods</td>
<td>• Engage HCS practitioners</td>
<td>• Establish study-related committees</td>
<td>• Protocol to PRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Implementation and recruitment tools</td>
<td>• Finalize plans for ascertaining primary endpoint</td>
<td>• Train all personnel</td>
<td>• Finalize design, analysis plan</td>
<td>• Transition Request to NIH</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Completed an ambitious set of milestones
- Pilot Study conducted at all sites (5 clinics)
- Transition Request made, 3 NCCIH reviews, 2 PRC meetings
- Awaiting UH3 funding decision
Challenge 1: Study Design

Goal: Answer 2 critical study questions

1) Assess GGC effectiveness
2) Understand GGC uptake in naturalistic setting

Original study design

Pragmatic but problematic: Selection bias, no pre-intervention baseline data.

Final study design

1) Design challenges solved with input from Biostats core, PRC, and our own creative thinking
2) Allows us to address GGC effectiveness and uptake questions
GGC4H Effectiveness Design

**Intervention Arm**
- Yes to Study: Adolescent Baseline Survey
  - Adolescent Recruitment to Study
  - Pediatrician letter/email recommending GGC to parents
    - No to Study
  - Well Visit: Pediatrician makes in-person referral to GGC (in addition to letter/email).
    - No Well Visit: No pediatrician in-person referral.
  - Study team reaches out to parents to enroll in GGC
  - GGC Group Intervention
  - GGC Self-Guided Intervention
  - Annual Follow-up Assessments (post intervention)

**Control Arm**
- Yes to Study: Adolescent Baseline Survey
  - Adolescent Recruitment to Study
  - Pediatrician letter/email recommending GGC to parents
    - No to Study
  - Well Visit: Pediatrician makes in-person referral to GGC (in addition to letter/email).
    - No Well Visit: No pediatrician in-person referral.
  - Study team reaches out to parents to enroll in GGC
  - GGC Group Intervention
  - GGC Self-Guided Intervention
  - Annual Follow-up Assessments

**Randomize Pediatricians**
- GGC INTERVENTION
GGC4H Implementation Design
Challenge 2: Valid Statistical Inference

- **2 GGC delivery modalities:** Group and Self-guided
- **Pragmatic enrollment approach:** Parents from the same pediatrician (P) enroll in different groups, parents from different pediatricians (P) enroll in the same group → cross-classification
- **Result:** Cluster-randomized trial with partial cross-classification in the intervention arm
- **If not modelled appropriately:** Threats to inference (bias), increased Type I error
Solution: Include Strong Study Biostatisticians on the Team

- **Lead Biostatistician Quesenberry → Innovative statistical approach**
  - **Extended Luo et al. (2015)** for a generalized linear model with binary outcomes
  - **Key:** Appropriately modelling of random effects in control (pediatrician), self-guided GGC (pediatrician), and group GGC (pediatrician, GGC group)
  - **Analysis focus:** Point and interval estimation of trial arm indicator regression coefficient

- **Biostatistician Oleg Sofrygin conducted simulation study**
  - **Goal:** Evaluate power for assessing primary outcomes, alpha levels, coverage
  - **Varied:** Sample size, ICC for GGC groups and pediatricians, effect sizes for binary outcomes (based on prior GGC trials), group size
  - **Result – 2000 virtual cohorts:** Strong power, nominal alpha levels, adequate coverage at 100%, 90% of expected adolescent recruitment levels
GGC4H Data Sharing Plan

- **Internal Data Sharing Plan**
  - Remove all 18 Protected Health Identifiers.
  - Therefore do not need to execute data sharing agreements among 4 site partners.

- **External Data Sharing Plan: Supervised Data Archive with Monitored data sharing**
  - Protect against deductive disclosure.
  - De-identified individual data.
  - Requests must be of high scientific merit.
  - Co-authorship of at least one study PI or MPI.
## GGC4H Barriers Scorecard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Level of Difficulty*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment and engagement of patients/subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement of clinicians and health systems</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data collection and merging datasets</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory issues (IRBs and consent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stability of control intervention</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing/delivering intervention across healthcare organizations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Your best guess!
1 = little difficulty
5 = extreme difficulty
Many “Barriers” weren’t because of Team Skills, Experience

- **Challenge was accomplishing so much so quickly!**
- **Great breadth and depth in skills, experience of team members**
  - IRB: **Boggs**
  - HCS-embedded research and relationships, data sharing: **Sterling, Beck, Braciszewski, Hartman, Daley, Perrin**
  - GGC intervention: **Catalano, Haggerty, Kuklinski, Casey-Goldstein**
  - GGC intervention delivery: **Negusse, Jones, Williams, Barela, Kazan, Elsiss**
  - Cluster-randomized trials in real-world settings: **Catalano, Sterling, Kuklinski, Beck, Braciszewski, Brown**
  - Biostatistics/methodology: **Quesenberry, Sofrygin, Oesterle, Brown**
Summary and Conclusions

- GGC4H: A pragmatic test of anticipatory guidance for parents of adolescents in primary care
- High levels of support and partnership from all three healthcare systems
- Excellent progress in UG3 phase—aided by Collaboratory input. Experience will benefit UH3 trial
- Simulation study showed statistical innovations provide more than adequate power to evaluate primary outcome at study endpoint
- We have a strong study team. We are enthusiastic and well-prepared for the larger trial.
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