

A mixed methods study to evaluate the feasibility of using the Adolescent Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool App in paediatric diabetes care in preparation for a longitudinal cohort study

Helen Cooper^{1,4}, University of Chester, Department of Public Health and Wellbeing, Riverside Campus, Castle Drive, Chester CH1 1SL. Email: h.cooper@chester.ac.uk.

Gillian Lancaster², University of Lancaster, Dept. Mathematics and Statistics, LA1 4YF
Email: g.lancaster@lancaster.ac.uk.

Gichuru Phillip³, University of Lancaster, Dept. Mathematics and Statistics, LA1 4YF
p.gichuru@lancaster.ac.uk. E mail: p.gichuru@lancaster.ac.uk.

Matthew Peak⁴, NIHR [Alder Hey Clinical Research Facility](#), Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Eaton Road, West Derby, Liverpool L12 2AP.
Email: matthew.peak@alderhey.nhs.uk

Abstract

Background

An evaluation study to determine the feasibility of integrating the Adolescent Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool (ADNAT) App into UK paediatric diabetes care, to ascertain best practice standards, and to determine methodological recommendations for a future cohort study.

Methods

A non-randomised, cohort, mixed methods study design was used to ensure equality of access to ADNAT for all participants at three sites in the North West of England. Patients who completed ADNAT (completers) were compared with those who failed to complete (non-completers). Following UK Medical Research Council guidance, a logic model and the RE-AIM (reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, maintenance) framework were used to define study objectives. Patients' glycaemic control (HbA_{1c}) was accessed from their clinical data at baseline and at 6 months, alongside their ADNAT scores which were correlated with changes in HbA_{1c} levels. The diabetes teams (respondents) completed a web-based survey and attended focus group interviews.

Results

89 patients were recruited. Withdrawal rates were low at 4.5% (n=4). Forty-four patients (49.4%) completed ADNAT, leaving 45 (50.6%) non-completers. There were large baseline differences in HbA_{1c} and variable rates of change at 6 months. After adjusting for baseline HbA_{1c} and site in an Analysis of Covariance, completers had a lower post-ADNAT mean HbA_{1c} level than non-completers at 6 months, suggesting improvement for those using ADNAT (95% CI -11.48, 0.64). Patients' glycaemic control (HbA_{1c}) at 6 months correlated reasonably well with their ADNAT scores (Spearman's rho=0.46). Survey and focus group data showed that ADNAT was judged to be an effective clinical tool by the diabetes teams. Value to patients was perceived to be linked to parental support, age and previous diabetes

education. The combined data triangulated suggesting validity of the study. It served to capture different dimensions which were used to define best practice standards and methodological recommendations including the need for a team based approach to implementation, broader patient-based outcomes, and non-participant clinic observations.

Conclusions

The combined data showed that ADNAT was a clinically viable tool and that a future mixed methods, non-randomised, longitudinal cohort study would be feasible following MRC guidance for process evaluation of complex interventions, including use of the piloted logic model and the RE-AIM framework.

Trial registration

NIHR Children's Clinical Research Network– UKCRN ID 6633

Keywords

Evaluation, Type 1 diabetes, needs assessment, questionnaire, patient education, glycaemic control, App.

Introduction

This paper reports on a study which evaluated the use of the Adolescent Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool (ADNAT) App in three paediatric diabetes units (PDUs) in the North West of England. The study used a realist evaluation approach¹ to address two issues: firstly, whether the ADNAT App could be integrated into paediatric diabetes care; and secondly to determine best practice standards and methodological recommendations for a future cohort study. A core assumption of a realist perspective is that phenomena such as ADNAT are complex interventions introduced into constantly changing systems, which has particular relevance to paediatric diabetes care in the UK. Comparisons within and between clinical sites were therefore required to determine what did and didn't work and why, in order to establish local modifications necessary to ensure efficacy in practice. This relationship is expressed in MRC guidance² for process evaluation of complex interventions which defines evaluation of context, implementation and mechanisms of implementation as the primary aims of such studies.

Background

Type 1 diabetes (T1D) is one of the most common endocrine and metabolic conditions in childhood within Europe. The UK, which has 27,600 children and young people living with the condition, alongside the Russian Federation and Germany, make the largest contribution to the overall numbers in T1D in young people cases is 31.1 per 100,000 aged 10-14 years versus 12.1 per 100,000 aged 0-4 years^{3,4}. Alongside this, young people in the UK also have one of the worst rates of glycaemic control in Europe, which is associated with later micro and macrovascular risk⁵. This has been demonstrated in successive National Paediatric Diabetes Audits (NPDA) for England and Wales for those aged 0-25 years, with the latest for 2014-15⁴ reporting improving but still disturbing figures alongside the need to reduce variability in outcomes:

- Only 23.5% achieved recommended glycaemic targets of less than 58 mmol/mol, with 21.3% having levels above 80 putting them at high risk of complications.
- Glycaemic variability is due to service related factors, including standards and delivery of diabetes self-care education which showed wide regional variability with only 50% overall receiving education.
- Socio-economic factors strongly influenced outcomes - those in the most deprived areas have poorer blood glucose control, a higher risk of obesity and more microvascular changes in the kidney compared with those in the least deprived areas; and white ethnic groups achieved better control than other ethnicities.

- For those aged 12 years and over: 27.1% had high blood pressure, 21.8% had high cholesterol, over 11.6% had albuminuria (sign of kidney disease), over 12.8% had early signs of eye disease, and 20.7% i.e. 1 in 4 were obese.
- Overall, just 25.4% of children and young people received all 7 of the recommended key care processes including blood glucose (HbA1c), body mass index, blood pressure, urinary albumin, cholesterol, eye screening, and foot examination.

These findings have been supported by the UK's National Peer Review Programme⁶ which highlighted inequity of service provision to young people. They also fit with the UK's Kennedy Review⁷ which described teenagers as a 'forgotten group', reporting that their health care needs are given low priority by commissioners, policy makers and clinicians alike, and recommended investment in youth friendly services. This is particularly important for adolescents who can engage in behaviours which carry health risks, and many lack the skills and strategies to avoid them. This has particular relevance to those with diabetes given their added risk of future debilitating complications.

In 2012 the UK Government responded to the problem by introducing a paediatric diabetes 'Best Practice Tariff' (BPT) which specifies tailored education based on personal need as a mandatory care standard⁸. For adults, over a 10-year period, such education has been shown to save the National Health Service (NHS) £2,200 per patient, breaking even at four years^{9,10}. No such data are available for young people, although Swift¹¹ reported that education for young people has greater effects than for adults with small to medium effects on glycaemic control and larger effects on psychosocial outcomes.

In the UK, six paediatric educational trial interventions have recently reported their results¹²⁻¹⁶. They all followed traditional didactic face-to-face approaches, reported considerable variations in outcomes, and no significant long-term changes in glycaemic control.

Recommendations included the need to review research methodology and to modernise paediatric care through the use of technology enhanced learning (TEL) to support long-term patient training. This latter recommendation is supported by a review of technology enabled approaches to diabetes management which endorsed self-assessment tools and tailored education based on patients' unique histories and their immediate needs¹⁷. In support of this, a meta-analysis of 46 studies found that a blend of TEL and face-to-face instruction had stronger learning outcomes than did face-to-face instruction alone in primary/secondary/tertiary education¹⁸. However, there are few validated diabetes websites for young people, the majority being directed toward adults; there is wide variation in the quality of evidence provided, and they offer didactic information at high reading levels with little problem-solving assistance^{19,20}. Social networking, as a patient-led tool, is growing in

popularity and starting to be used by patients and practitioners but research in children with T1D in all these areas is lacking, both in terms of quantity and quality, reflecting the complex issues of using social media as a clinical tool²¹. Systematic reviews^{22,23}, including our own²⁴, have consistently highlighted an absence of rigorous UK based research, minimal use of theory, and no reporting of process, health inequalities, dose response and cost-effectiveness data. In addition, findings highlighted the need to personalise learning in alignment with developmental stages i.e. age-related reasoning and cognitive abilities making regular needs assessment a core requirement. No instrument to assess such needs was located in the UK. We therefore developed, validated and psychometrically tested the ADNAT App. The App provides secure username and password protected access to ADNAT through mobile devices eg. smart phones and tablets, it delivers immediate feedback to users, and emails confidential patient data to practitioners.

The ADNAT App

Development, validation and psychometric testing of ADNAT have been reported elsewhere²⁵⁻²⁷. The research programme followed Medical Research Council (MRC) guidance for complex interventions²⁸. It has included studies of adolescent diabetes self-care²⁹⁻³¹ and technological methods of learning²⁴, and theory³². ADNAT consists of 117 questions divided between 6 domains including: all about me, physical activity, eating, monitoring blood glucose, medication taking and living with diabetes. Whilst the total number of questions is large, the actual number answered by users is filtered according to, for example, insulin regimen and lifestyle factors. Thirty-six of the questions, hidden amongst the total number, provide two scored 'Needs Assessment Ratings' (NARs) relating to self-care and psychosocial health. From our previous research²⁶, ADNAT was theoretically determined to have the following mechanisms of action:

1. Mediator for facilitating tailored education and support by: raising patients' self-awareness about their diabetes self-care and coping mechanisms, identifying patient-led foci for conversation in the clinical consultation, and providing practitioners and patients with data to guide individual health care planning.
2. Augmenting resource efficiency through: flexibility of access for patients and practitioners using mobile phones and tablets, auto-saving function for ease of use by patients, large data storage capacity, and provision of 'connected information' for all members of the multidisciplinary team including patients.

3. Strengthening professional accountability through: standardisation of needs assessment, promotion of team working, and provision of educational audit data.

Based on these premises, ADNAT was included in the UK National Paediatric Diabetes Improvement Plan for 2013-2018³³. This inclusion stipulated the need to evaluate ADNAT's use in clinical practice prior to long term implementation which proposed to follow a clinical efficacy and process evaluation route to support its on-going development.

Aims and objectives

Paediatric diabetes clinical practice was (and still is) undergoing extensive changes. These changes have been instigated by the 13 BPT care standards⁸, alongside the annual National Paediatric Diabetes Audit⁴, and a Peer Review Quality Assurance Programme⁶. These emerging changes meant that 'routine care' was neither standardised nor constant so that the outcomes of using ADNAT depended upon clinical context and health professionals' responses to its implementation. This meant that the setting was a mediator of outcomes so that comparisons between PDUs was an important part of the evaluation study.

The MRC's guidance for process evaluation of complex interventions² identifies 3 areas for evaluation which are informed by the causal assumptions of the intervention, and interpretation of context, implementation, and mechanisms of implementation. This process evaluation model and the theories underpinning the intervention (experiential learning theories and the transtheoretical change cycle) guided the aims of the evaluation study which were to assess: (i) resources and processes that influenced implementation of ADNAT, and (ii) methodological issues in preparation for a large scale cohort study. A logic model was developed for the study based on this process model and is summarised in Table 1.

Table 1: ADNAT Logic Model

INPUTS	OUTPUTS		OUTCOMES/IMPACT		
	Activity	Participants/ Respondents	Pre-implementation	Implementation	Post-implementation
			At 6 months	At 12 months	At 18 months
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff training Technical support Research Nurses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> On-line assessment of patients' needs using ADNAT Staff responses to patients' identified needs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Patients (participants) Diabetes teams (respondents) 	<p>Patients:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recruitment to study ≥30% of PDUs' populations aged 12-16 years Baseline data collected No deterioration in mean HbA1c levels <p>Diabetes teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mapping of NPDA historical data for each recruited site staff training completed 	<p>Patients:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response rates to ADNAT ≥50% Entry into behaviour change cycle reported Non-significant improvements in mean HbA1c levels. <p>Diabetes teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> zero data protection issues reported collaborating on use of ADNAT tailoring ADNAT to meet sites' needs positive feedback on ADNAT's efficacy including: system and information quality and accessibility intention to continue using ADNAT 	<p>Patients:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Response rates >60% Changes in behaviour reported Mean HbA1c levels significantly improving <p>Diabetes teams:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> zero data protection issues reported ADNAT normalised into team working positive feedback on ADNAT's efficacy intention to continue using ADNAT using ADNAT as an Audit tool
Internal Factors			External Factors		
Clinic and team structures/absorptive capacity for new knowledge/receptive context for change			Socio-political climate/incentives and mandates/environmental stability/norm setting/peer opinion		
<p>Evaluation</p> <p>Implement ADNAT → Collect data → Analyse and interpret data → Report</p>					

The objectives were defined using the RE-AIM framework, as recommended in MRC guidance³⁴. RE-AIM stands for: reach, effectiveness, adoption, implementation, and maintenance and included the following:

1. Reach: we assessed the number of participants recruited and retained, and response rates to ADNAT i.e. number completed divided by total number of recruits. Data were obtained from research nurses' and patients' ADNAT (monthly) data returns.
2. Effectiveness: we used NPDA data to assess (pre-study) the functional status of each site, a survey to measure site and practitioners' views on ADNAT's efficacy; and collected pre/post glycosylated haemoglobin (HbA_{1c}) data, taken from patients' notes by the research nurses, to determine any changes in patients' glycaemic control.
3. Adoption: we carried out a survey to assess system and information quality, accessibility, social norms, data protection, and intention of PDUs to use ADNAT in the future. Focus group interviews explored resources needed to set up and sustain use of ADNAT, staff perceptions of factors affecting adoption, and their training needs.
4. Implementation/Maintenance: the survey and focus groups also explored staff responses to working with ADNAT including perceived value and health improvement outcomes; and the focus group interviews looked at facilitators and barriers to use.

Methods

The study was conducted between January 2013 and February 2015. Set up and delivery was supported by the Cheshire and Merseyside Children's Clinical Research Network (CRN). This support included access to the NIHR CRN-funded research nurses in post at the three NHS Trust sites which were selected based on geography and positive responses to invitation letters. Ethics approval for the study was sought from the UK National Research Ethics Service (NRES) where it was defined as a service evaluation not requiring ethical review³⁵ (see Additional file 1 for copy of letter). Approvals were received from all three sites based on the requirement that we used site files, information sheets, and consent/assent forms. The research team had no access to identifiable information for any patient consenting to use ADNAT.

Participants

Young people with type 1 diabetes aged 12–18 years.

Respondents, sites and support

Respondents were health professional members of the diabetes teams including paediatric diabetes specialist: nurses, doctors, dieticians, and psychologists at three paediatric

diabetes centres in the North West of England. These 3 sites allowed the study to capture diversity of feedback data and ensured adequate representation based on information provided in the 2013-14 NPDA data (see Table 4). The approach to the implementation of ADNAT was tailored according to team dynamics but each site had a named research nurse for the study, and all members of the team were trained informally by HC to use ADNAT. On-going support was provided by the on-site research nurses, and by the ADNAT technologist via email. Each site commenced at a different time point with Site 1 starting in March 2013, Site 2 in June 2013, and Site 3 in February 2014.

Recruitment

Recruitment was undertaken by the research nurses working in liaison with the diabetes teams to identify young people who met the inclusion/exclusion criteria, as shown in Table 2. A letter of explanation and the study information sheet were posted to eligible young people who were later targeted at their clinic appointments. If they agreed to participate, those under 16 gave signed assent, whilst those over 16 years provided informed consent. Proxy consent of parents/guardians of young people under 16 was also obtained. All information sheets and consent forms were produced in age-and-stage-of-development appropriate formats, and were checked before use by an audit team at one of the participating sites. Copies of the signed assent/consent documentation were given to the young people and, where appropriate, their parent/guardian for their records; the original copy was filed in participants' medical notes, and copies were kept in the site study files held by the research nurses.

Table 2: Inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
Type 1 Diabetes (T1D) ≥3 months post diagnosis	Co-existing pathology e.g. cystic fibrosis
Aged 12–18 years inclusive	In receipt of prescribed medication likely to affect glycaemic control e.g. systemic steroids
Able to give assent <16 years of age and informed consent >16 years	Have a diagnosed psychological or psychiatric disorder(s) that requires specialist treatment.
Have parental/guardian consent for young people <16 years	
Able to complete ADNAT	
Have internet access at home, school, hospital, public library, or via mobile technology	

Delivery of ADNAT

Participants were provided by the research nurses with username and password access to the ADNAT App, alongside standard care based on the BPT⁸ criteria (3 monthly follow-up including HbA_{1c}, and tailored self-care education; annual review of body mass index, blood pressure check and screening for eye and kidney problems from age 12, plus psychological assessment). The ADNAT App was accessed through the internet using a PC, laptop, or mobile technological devices including participants' mobile phones or tablets. They could choose where to complete it: at home and/or in clinic on their own smart phones or using iPads loaned to them by the research nurses. All participants were followed up at their diabetes outpatient clinics or at a home visit. In both cases, the ADNAT outcome data was used to guide their health care plans. Those who successfully completed and submitted their ADNAT questionnaires were called the 'completers', whilst those who chose not to submit were called the 'non-completers' and were used as the comparative group.

Quantitative outcome data

A range of feasibility outcomes were measured including:

- o ADNAT data to measure response rates across the PDUs. All data, which was automatically downloaded onto a secure central database, were encrypted to ensure anonymity. Data included: response rates and ADNAT NARs for self-care and psycho-social health.
- National Paediatric Diabetes Audit data⁴ to assess the functional status of each site.
- Glycaemic control to compare pre/post intervention levels of glycaemic control using baseline HbA_{1c} levels (means/standard deviations over previous 12 months), and 6 month post ADNAT levels obtained from patients' clinical notes by the research nurses.
- A 67-item survey to collect information on adoption, implementation and maintenance. Adapted from a validated survey developed by Okazaki et al³⁶, it has 7 domains including: system and information quality, accessibility, perceived value, data protection, health improvement, subjective norms, and intention to use in the future. We also included an open-ended question at the end asking if there was anything they would change. The survey was facilitated by the Audit Department at one of the participating sites using SNAP software (<http://www.snapsurveys.com/>), and was pilot tested by two researchers. It was sent out by the Audit Department via an email link to all respondents.

Responses were returned directly to the Audit Department where analysis of the data was completed using SNAP software.

Qualitative process evaluation data

Three focus groups were run at the end of the study period, one at each of the 3 sites. All respondents were invited to participate and they were sent information sheets and an interview schedule prior to the meetings. The schedule was informed by the RE-AIM domains. Consent forms were signed prior to participation and to tape-recording the interviews.

Data analysis

The encrypted quantitative ADNAT data were collated, coded and analysed using R or SPSS. All quantitative data taken from the ADNAT questionnaires were checked for missing or unusual values and for internal consistency of the scoring items. Participant glycaemic control (HbA_{1c}) was monitored pre and post use of ADNAT at each site and across all sites using summary statistics for completers and non-completers. Analysis of covariance was performed with post HbA_{1c} as the dependent variable; and baseline HbA_{1c}, completer status and site as independent variables to assess whether any preliminary change in HbA_{1c} levels was apparent. Correlations between high/moderate self-care needs (based on the self-care NAR) and poor/moderate levels of (pre-baseline and at 6 months) HbA_{1c} were analysed using Spearman's rho statistic³⁷.

Qualitative data were analysed using an inductive thematic content analysis, assisted by QSR NVivo software. First, an evolving set of themes was created and linked to respondents' 'quotes'. These themes were then categorised within the RE-AIM domains. To assure trustworthiness of the analysis, respondent validation was used by cross-checking findings with respondents and triangulating it with the quantitative outcomes.

Results

Data from recruitment of patients, the NPDA, the survey and focus groups comprise the results of the study. The RE-AIM domains are used to present both the quantitative and the qualitative data.

1. Quantitative outcome data

Reach

Figure 1 and Table 3 show recruitment rates and participant characteristic data. We planned to recruit a minimum of 80 patients and we recruited 89 in total, with an uptake of 65-70% of those who were screened as eligible to participate. The graph shows that actual recruitment rates were above our monthly anticipated target rates. Of those recruited, there were twice as many females to males and the withdrawal rate was low at 4.5% (n=4). Reasons for withdrawal included patient transfer to other areas (n=1), and not wanting to continue with the study (n=3). Forty-four young people (49.4%) submitted their completed ADNAT questionnaires. There were more female than male completers and non-completers (ratio ~1 male to 2 females), and their average age was 14.3 years compared to 14.5 years for the non-completers.




Figure 1: Recruitment rates: actual set against target rate (March 2013 - September 2014)

Table 3: Participant (patient) characteristics

Site	1	2	3	Combined
No. recruited	28	26	35	89
Male:Female ratio	8:20	10:16	12:23	30:59
Withdrawals (%)	0	3 (11.5%)	1 (2.9%)	4 (4.5%)
ADNAT Completers				
N ([†] %)	13 (46.4%)	18 (73.1%)	13 (37.1%)	44 (49.4%)
Male:Female ratio	4:9	8:10	3:10	15:29
Mean age yrs. (range)	14.3 (12-16)	14.3 (12-17)	14.3 (12-16)	14.3
ADNAT non-Completers				
N ([†] %)	15 (53.6%)	8 (30.8%)	22 (62.9%)	45 (50.6%)
Male:Female	4:11	1:3	9:13	1:2
Mean age yrs. (range)	14.6 (12-17)	15.3 (12-18)	14.1 (12-17)	14.5

[†] Percentage of the number recruited

Effectiveness: Glycaemic Control

Data in Table 4 are taken from the 2013/14 NPDA⁴. It shows disparity between the sites for the percentage of young people who have a mean HbA_{1c} of the recommended level of less than 58 mmol/mol (range 8.1% - 26.5%), with the mean (range: 65.5 – 78.7 mmol/mol) and median values (range: 64 – 78.7 mmol/mol) for all sites above the recommended level. The NPDA ascribes such variability (despite statistical adjustments for known confounding influences, such as ethnicity, social deprivation, gender, age and diabetes duration) to differences in service provision and delivery which has particular relevance for this study. In relation to this, care process records, which are used to monitor diabetes management and detect long-term complications at the earliest treatable stage, were also significantly different in terms of incomplete records (range: 25.4 – 69.1%), again highlighting disparity between the three sites. Of note is the fact that the two with poorer HbA_{1c} audit results (Sites 1 and 3) had interruptions in team functioning during the study period due to staff changes and/or long term staff absences owing to sickness.

Table 4: Summary outcome data for the three study sites taken from the 2013-14 National Paediatric Diabetes Audit

Site	1	2	3
Total number of patients (aged 10-18 years)	248 (211)	110 (98)	121 (99)
HbA _{1c} <58mmol/mol (normal HbA _{1c} range = 20-41mmol/mol)	16.6%	26.5%	8.1%
Mean HbA _{1c}	72.4	65.5	78.7
Median HbA _{1c}	69.0	64	74.0
% incomplete records of care processes (except HbA _{1c})	25.4%	40.7%	69.1%

Table 5 shows the glycaemic control data pre and 6 months post ADNAT for the completers versus the non-completers. For both groups subject-specific profile plots (not shown) and the range of pre- and post-HbA_{1c} levels, indicated that the young people had very different pre-glucose levels and variable rates of change leading to their post-HbA_{1c} levels. Overall, summarising across all 3 sites, there was a non-significant reduction in the post ADNAT mean and median HbA_{1c} levels for the completers, versus a non-significant increase in the mean and median levels for the non-completers. The mean HbA_{1c} levels are illustrated in Figure 2 and suggest a potential decreasing trend in HbA_{1c} for ADNAT completers. This trend is encouraging given that our Logic Model defined '*no deterioration in HbA_{1c}*' as the outcome at 6 months.

Table 5: Participant (patient) glycaemic control data pre/post-ADNAT

Summary measure	Site 1	Site 2	Site 3	All sites
COMPLETERS				
Pre-mean HbA _{1c} mmol/mol (range)	73.1(22.4)	64.1(15.9)	74.6(14.7)	69.7(18.0)
Post-mean HbA _{1c} (mmol/mol) (range)	63.1(12.6)	67.7(9.8)	75.9(21.7)	67.7(16.0)
Pre-median	65(43-119)	62(44-101)	71(56-104)	65(43-119)
Post-median	64(42-82)	61(55-90)	67(49-117)	65(42-117)
number pre ADNAT	13	19	13	45
number post ADNAT	13	15	13	41
NON-COMPLETERS				
Pre-mean HbA _{1c} mmol/mol (range)	78.9(21.0)	63.6(13.3)	68.8(18.8)	71.4(19.4)
Post-mean HbA _{1c} (mmol/mol) (range)	81.4(23.6)	63.7(13.2)	71.0(20.5)	73.4(21.3)
Pre-median	83(45-108)	69(42-83)	68(37-112)	69.5(37-112)
Post-median	80(40-122)	65(48-83)	71(40-130)	71(40-130)
number pre ADNAT	15	7	22	44
number post ADNAT	14	7	22	43




Figure 2: Plot of pre and post mean HbA_{1c} levels for completers and non-com

The results of the Analysis of Covariance (ANCOVA), presented in Table 6, show how post ADNAT mean HbA_{1c} levels change after adjustment for pre-HbA_{1c}, completer status and site. In general the model explained a reasonable amount of the overall variability in post HbA_{1c} levels with a R^2 value of 0.52. Only pre-HbA_{1c} mean level was a strong predictor of post HbA_{1c} mean level ($p < 0.001$), which is to be expected since the two measures are correlated. On average post HbA_{1c} levels increased by 0.71 mmol/mol for each unit increase in baseline HbA_{1c}. The completer status variable reached borderline significance (95% Confidence Interval -11.48, 0.64), indicating that on average completers had a post-ADNAT mean HbA_{1c} level of 5.42 mmol/mol lower than non-completers. Mean differences between Site 2 and Site 3 compared to Site 1 indicated a lower average post HbA_{1c} mean difference by 1.75

mmol/mol at Site 2, and a higher average mean difference by 1.50 mmol/mol at Site 3, compared to Site 1, after adjusting for baseline HbA_{1c} and completer status, but these differences were non-significant. Please note that the results from the above model should be interpreted with caution due to the small numbers at each site.

Table 6: ANCOVA regression analysis on Post-HbA_{1c} levels

*Variable	Estimate	Std.Error	95% Confidence Interval
Intercept	22.79	6.31	10.42, 35.16
Pre-HbA1c	0.71	0.08	0.55, 0.87
Completers	-5.42	3.09	-11.48, 0.64
Site 2	-1.75	4.11	-9.80, 6.30
Site 3	1.50	3.92	-6.18, 9.18

*Reference categories are non-Completers and Site 1

Figure 3 shows a scatter plot of the correlation between HbA_{1c} level and self-care score. The Spearman rho coefficient is 0.46 suggesting a good moderate correlation with higher (worse) self-care scores indicating higher HbA_{1c} levels overall. Only at one site was very little correlation observed due to several outlying young people with high HbA_{1c} levels but generally lower self-care scores.




Figure 3: Scatterplot of HbA_{1c} level and self-care total score at 6 months

All questions comprising the self-care score are listed in Table 7 together with the number of children and percentage scoring green, amber and red at each site using the ADNAT scoring algorithm. The tables indicate that a large proportion of young people were scoring green for each item, indicating reasonable management, but box plots by item and site (not shown) suggested that there was variability across items and sites and that it was not necessarily the same group of young people scoring green across all items. It was noted that for Questions 66/71 that whilst there were amber and red counts listed, there were no green counts but instead blanks in the dataset. This identified a likely anomaly in the algorithm programming and these were recoded to green for the analysis as the most likely value. The anomaly is being investigated.

Table 7: Summary of item scoring classifications of 20 ADNAT self-care questions

			Scoring algorithm summaries Count (%)		
Domain	Item No.	Question	Green	Amber	Red
Physical Activity	16	How many hours of pulse-raising exercise or physical activity did you do last week	8 (18 %)	19 (42 %)	18 (40 %)
	18	What stops or prevents you from starting to do exercise or physical activity	26 (58 %)	2 (4 %)	17 (38 %)
	21	What makes it difficult to manage your blood glucose levels when exercising or doing physical activity	19 (42 %)	9 (20 %)	17 (38 %)
	22	What usually happens to your blood glucose levels when you do exercise or physical activity?	23 (51 %)	15 (33 %)	7 (16 %)
Eating	34	Do you eat fruit and/or vegetables?	28 (62 %)	16 (36 %)	1 (2 %)
	35	How many times a week do you eat treats, such as sweets, chocolate, fast food, takeaways?	20 (44 %)	15 (33 %)	10 (22 %)
	38	Which statement best describes you? (diet control)	34 (76 %)	11 (24 %)	0 (0 %)
	41	Which statement most applies to you? (carbohydrate calculation)	42 (93 %)	0 (0 %)	3 (7 %)
	45	Are you happy with your weight?	19 (42 %)	12 (27 %)	14 (31 %)
Monitoring Blood Glucose	50	How often do you normally test your blood glucose in a day?	35 (78 %)	10 (22 %)	0 (0 %)
	51	What motivates you to test your blood glucose?	40 (89 %)	5 (11 %)	0 (0 %)
	53	How would you describe your blood glucose results?	20 (44 %)	21 (47 %)	4 (9 %)
	57/62	How often do you have hypos/low blood glucose (less than 4 mmols/l) Have you been unconscious from hypoglycaemia in the last 12 months?	6 (13 %)	33 (73 %)	6 (13 %)
	66/71	How often do you have high blood glucose (more than 10 mmols/l) Have you had diabetic ketoacidosis in the last 12 months (not including at diagnosis)?	24 (53 %)	5 (11 %)	16 (36 %)
	76	What would you like your HbA1c to be?	39 (87 %)	0 (0 %)	6 (13%)
Medication Taking	80	What motivates you to do your injections or to give insulin through your pump?	30 (67 %)	14 (31 %)	1 (2 %)
Living with Diabetes	92	What would you do if you were ill with an infection (e.g. sickness/flu) and it made your blood glucose high?	38 (84 %)	1 (2 %)	6 (13 %)
	94	You are staying over at your friend's house. Which of the following would you do?	42 (93 %)	1 (2 %)	2 (4 %)
	111	You are going to a party one Friday night with your friends and you know that they will be drinking alcohol. Which statement best describes what you would do?	37 (84 %)	4 (9 %)	3 (7 %)
	112	Which statement best describes you? (diabetes and life)	13 (30 %)	24 (54)	7 (16 %)

1.3 Survey

Eleven people (2 males, 9 females) completed and submitted the survey. They included 7 nurses, 1 doctor, 2 dietitians, and 1 research nurse. When asked about years worked in paediatrics, two had worked for 5 or less years, two for 6-10 years, five for 11-20 years and two for 21-25 years. Two people had a recognised adult teaching certificate (English National Board 998 Adult Teaching and Assessing course) but no one had a paediatric teaching qualification.

Adoption

Table 8 shows responses to statements relating to adoption of ADNAT which covered the following areas:

- **Information and System quality:** In relation to information quality, respondents gave a strong (74.5%) positive response to 5 statements suggesting confidence in ADNAT including its coverage of diabetes, although 12 responses (21%) indicated uncertainty. Overall, 79 out of 117 responses (68%) agreed or strongly agreed with the 13 statements relating to system quality, 6 (5%) disagreed and 32 (27%) neither agreed nor disagreed.
- **Intention to use ADNAT in the future, accessibility and capability with technology:** 10 respondents (91%) said they intended to use ADNAT when it is available at their work place. However, the majority (n=9) indicated that accessing Wi-Fi is a problem in their work place, and 4 people felt that their workplace is not good in the way it uses technology. Nine reported that patients had completed ADNAT at home, and five in clinic. All respondents (100%) felt that ADNAT was secure with regard to data protection. When asked about using technology in clinical practice, 9 respondents reported capability with computers, tablets and mobile devices, the remaining 2 were ambivalent (neither agreeing nor disagreeing). Out of 110 total responses, there were 51 positive replies (46%) relating to capability, with 9 people regarding technology to be an important element of their patients' education. However, there was also ambivalence on 32 occasions (29%).
- **Social norms** (not shown in Table 7): when asked to give an opinion on whether their National Children and Young Peoples' Diabetes Network, their managers, their colleagues, and their patients and their families would think they should be using ADNAT, 100% positively responded (n=11) to the Network and patients and families, and 63% (n=7) positively responded to the managers and colleagues options.

Table 8: Responses to statements concerning system and information quality and intention to use ADNAT in the future

INFORMATION QUALITY: The information I obtained from ADNAT:	Yes	No	Not sure			
was easy to understand	9		2			
was easy to interpret	8	1	2			
included all necessary assessments	9		2			
was sufficiently complete to meet my patients' needs	7		4			
had sufficient breadth and depth for my patients	8	1	2			
Total	41	2	12			
SYSTEM QUALITY	Strongly disagree	Disagree	Neither agree nor disagree	Agree	Strongly agree	Not applicable
ADNAT is easy to use			1	6	3	1
ADNAT is equipped with useful features and functions			1	7	2	1
ADNAT is easy to complete				6	3	2
ADNAT is always available to use		1	3	5	1	1
ADNAT launches and runs right away		2	5	2	1	1
ADNAT does not crash		1	5	3	1	1

ADNAT does not freeze after entering or retrieving information		1	4	4	1	1
The commands of ADNAT are well depicted by symbols and buttons			3	5	2	1
The layout of ADNAT is clear and consistent			1	6	3	1
The design of ADNAT is easy to use or operate		1	1	5	3	1
The Technologist showed a sincere interest in solving my problems			2	3	1	5
The Technologist gave me personal attention			3	2	1	5
The Technologist was dependable			3	2	1	5
Total		6	32	56	23	26
INTENTION TO USE IN THE FUTURE						
Technology is an important element of my patients' education			2	3	6	
Without Technology I would be unable to do my work			3	2	6	
Technology makes my work more enjoyable		1	7	1	2	
My workplace is not good in the way it uses Technology	1	2	4	2	2	
With Technology I interact more with my patients		3	2	4	2	
I find using computers difficult	6	3	2			
I find using technological devices difficult e.g. mobile phones, iPads	6	3	2			

Getting access to Wifi is a problem in my work place	1	1	2	7		
Technology makes my work easier			4	5	2	
It would be good if Technology was used more			4	4	3	
Total	14	13	32	28	23	0

Implementation/Maintenance

Table 9 summarises survey responses to questions relating to implementation and maintenance of ADNAT which covered the following:

- **Perceived value:** overall, respondents judged ADNAT to be effective, practical, useful and efficient, with 68% (n=30 total responses) regarding it to be good or excellent, and nobody judging it to be poor. In relation to factors that influenced its value to patients, respondents were unsure about gender, insulin regimen, and hospital admissions, but confident with regard to parental support, age, and previous diabetes education.
- **Health improvement outcomes:** statements here were based on the Transtheoretical Change cycle³⁸. 96% (n=79 total responses) indicated that ADNAT had an effect at each of the eight different stages of the cycle with the majority (85%) indicating that effects happened sometimes, often or regularly. The 'not applicable' responses came from the research nurse who was not involved at the clinical level and were therefore not included in the calculations.

When asked to add any comments about what they would change about ADNAT, 5 responses were received including the need for iPads and improved Wi-Fi access in clinics, access to on-line reports, and inclusion of a section for patients to ask for immediate feedback/help from the diabetes team.

Table 9: Responses to statements concerning perceived value of ADNAT and health improvement outcomes

Statements	Poor	Fair	Average	Good	Excellent	
Perceived value of ADNAT in relation to:						
Effectiveness		1	2	8		
Practicality		2	4	5		
Usefulness			1	8	2	
Efficiency			4	6	1	
Total		3	11	27	3	
The value placed on ADNAT by my patients depended upon:						
	Yes	No	Not sure			
Age	6	1	4			
Gender		4	7			
Reading and numeracy skills	6		5			
Previous diabetes education	6	1	4			
Parental support	8		3			
Insulin regimen		4	7			
Hospital admissions		4	7			
No. of contacts with diabetes team	3	2	6			
How frequently did ADNAT help your patients in relation to:						
	Never	Seldom	Sometimes	Often	Regularly	Not applicable
Enlisting help		3	6	1	1	
Increasing knowledge about managing diabetes		1	6	2	1	1
Being aware of personal risks		1	8	0	1	1
Understanding benefits of changing behaviour(s)	1		8		1	1
Committing to changing behaviour(s)		1	8		1	1
Developing a plan for changing behaviour(s)	1	1	8		1	
Changing behaviour(s)		1	8		1	1
Being aware of relapse	1	1	6	1	1	1
Total	3	9	58	4	8	6

1. Qualitative process evaluation data

Focus Groups

Each site and participant was coded (based on roles and numbers) for reference purposes as follows: Paediatric Diabetes Specialist Nurses (PDSN 1- 6), Doctors (Dr 1,2), Researcher (R 1,2), Psychologist (P), and Dietician (Di). 12 people in total attended the three groups providing a total of 124 minutes of recorded conversation. One individual interview of 36 minutes was also completed (person was unable to attend the focus group), giving a total of 160 minutes of recorded conversation. Analysis of the focus group data produced 7 sub-themes which were aligned to the RE-AIM framework (themes). Findings are presented

using anonymised quotes to capture the essence of the phenomena, and are summarised in the discussion.

Adoption themes

- **Tension for change**

Respondents found ADNAT to be a viable option for clinical practice and wanted to change the way they engaged with their patients by using technology, recognising that web-based applications play a crucial role in adolescent life. They perceived technology as a way of overcoming communication barriers, as this nurse commented,

“I remember being quite impressed at what they were saying they didn’t know. So it seems to get past that barrier when it is face to face. They are more likely to be honest even though they know we’re going to see it” (PDSN4).

- **System fit**

The 3 sites all felt that ADNAT fit within their team’s values and goals, with participants suggesting that it could standardise educational assessment allowing for comparisons between PDUs. As a policy driver, the BPT enhanced motivation to use ADNAT, linking it to the education criteria. Other respondents agreed with this thinking suggesting that it also met with the peer review process but questioned its practical potential as an audit tool given that it assesses those aged 12-18 years only making it *“difficult to draw any conclusions”* (Dr1).

- **Organisational working**

Operationally, decision making regarding how to implement ADNAT was devolved to the teams to see what emerged. Two different methods were used: individual nurses reviewing their own patient returns versus using a generic email for all returned questionnaires which was reviewed by one PDSN only. For the former, choice of treatment was determined by the individual nurses but they also discussed their approaches within their teams. For the latter, the PDSN identified urgent cases i.e. red traffic light returns for discussion at team meetings. Both approaches therefore embraced working as a team, as the following quote highlights,

“We did bring the red ones to the team meeting and there were actions..generated from it, and we did implement those actions. I think the ones that came through green reinforced what we felt but it was good to get the teenagers’ perspectives married up with ours” (PDSN2).

- **Team working**

Team capacity varied owing to sickness absence and/or new staff starting. Site 2 was not affected by these problems and had an established team. It was notable that this site had the best 2013/14 audit returns in relation to glycaemic control (as highlighted in Table 4) and also the best ADNAT return rates (73.1%), compared with the other two sites (46.4% and 37.1%). With regard to team working, participants commented on how ADNAT encouraged a standardised approach which supported consistency in the messages given to patients. They argued that integrating ADNAT into their team work would normalise its use, although lack of time, given the current politically driven changes, had impacted upon feelings of being in control. Respondents talked about “*time constraints*”, “*feeling too busy*”, and “*a continual focus on problems*”. Receptivity for change therefore varied across the sites although respondents felt that ADNAT had the potential to drive change.

Implementation/Maintenance themes

- **Time**

The time taken for patients to complete ADNAT was discussed given the large number of questions to be answered but two respondents had asked patients for their perspectives and both reported positive responses,

“I asked quite a few of them, was it a waste of 30 minutes of their life and they all said ‘no’ they felt it was useful that they’d done it, and many of them said it made them think...” (Dr2)

“..a lot of them came back and said it was a good use of their time and gave them that refreshment of the advice that we gave them previously” (PDSN6).

For the practitioners, the time taken to review patients’ outcome results was helped by ADNAT’s scoring and traffic light feedback systems, alongside the drop-down menus and navigation commands to allow selection of scoring questions only, and/or questions relating to the different domains. However, when asked whether they felt the traffic light system was good for the children, there was a mixed response. It was viewed as both a facilitator and a barrier, with the barrier relating to its potential to raise young peoples’ anxiety.

- **Embedding ADNAT into practice**

There were mixed responses with regard to where ADNAT should be completed. Location was seen as important affecting both uptake and practitioner feedback to patients. Home completions brought problems in relation to patients being willing to complete it once they left clinic, and time between completion and feedback was deemed important, as the following quote highlights,

“Because they did it at home and sometimes then a week after their previous clinic appointment, then it would be reviewing it again much later. ...and actually they couldn't remember the results” (PDSN4)

Theoretically, completions in clinic prior to their consultation were thought beneficial but practically this was not an option given time limitations. Home visits were appropriate for two of the sites but at the third site, home visits were being discouraged by management. These comments highlighted a barrier to embedding ADNAT into practice. When questioned about how this could be overcome, integrating ADNAT into patients' health care plans was seen as a viable option, with patients completing ADNAT prior to their next clinic appointment at home. Suggestions included gaining consents in clinic, sending instructions on how to complete ADNAT with their clinic appointment letters, followed by text reminders. The role of the lead clinician was seen as crucial for embedding ADNAT into routine practice, alongside mandating its use through, for example, including it in the BPT criteria. Tailoring ADNAT to fit each site was seen as important, paying attention to the whole team being involved. To meet this goal, training (up to a maximum of 4 hours) was considered essential. Web based instruction was not popular given the need for self-motivation and personal time, but face-to-face training was deemed superior in that it would,

“ ..help to promote the team aspect of it because discussion could be had about how to make it cohesive as a team” (PDSN4).

Another suggestion was to include previous users of ADNAT i.e. expert patients in the training programme.

- **Linkages**

Respondents felt that ADNAT mapped on to what they are aiming to achieve in clinic including getting patients to “*create (their own) agendas and identify things*” (P). Other respondents felt that it provided the link between all the different components of diabetes

self-management commenting that ADNAT got patients *“thinking about aspects of the condition which they might normally not really think about”* (PDSN 3). There were comments that in clinic the focus tends to be on blood glucose and insulin doses whilst ADNAT promoted reflection on all aspects of their diabetes, including their feelings. One person summarised ADNAT’s perceived value in the following way,

“the opportunity for self-evaluation of learning, reflection, and for young people to actually get feedback on what they know, and also for the teams to have feedback on what they know as young people” (Di).

This process of self-evaluation was a strong theme throughout the focus groups with one nurse commenting that ADNAT, *“...reminded them (patients) about the right ways to manage their diabetes”* (PDSN6). There was agreement that ADNAT promotes behaviour change and in terms of why it is effective, one person summarised her opinion by saying that,

“It gives them (patients) a chance to identify. They’re doing the identifying, possibly prioritising things for themselves ...and if it has come from them, then they are much more likely to engage in conversations about what could be done differently....” (P)

Respondents questioned the primary (misplaced) focus on glycaemic control with one person stating that education is more about quality of life at this age, and being able to, *“... get a balance between their diabetes and being a teenager..”* (PDSN4). This point was agreed by others who felt that a single educational intervention is not going to impact upon glycaemic control because there are *“an awful lot of things that affect someone’s HbA_{1c}’* (Dr.2). Education was seen as beneficial in other ways including improving quality of life and self-care processes and the example of carrying glucose to treat hypoglycaemia was used to highlight this point.

Having open-ended text responses at the end of each question was seen as important, because it allowed patients to express their feelings of knowing more and being in control. This concept of ‘control’ was an important theme, with ADNAT being viewed as a way of accessing patients’ needs without removing their sense of control, as the following quote highlights,

“..it might be a question that they (patients) might not have thought about, but felt a bit embarrassed, or thought well, I shouldn’t think like that, or maybe other people don’t feel or think like that, I should know that.” (PDSN3)

Accessing patients' needs meant that the teams could tailor conversations with their patients, focusing in on their raised self-awareness with regard to what they did and didn't know, providing a base on which to progress joint health care planning

Discussion

This evaluation study aimed to assess resources and processes that influence implementation of ADNAT taking into account context and impact. It also aimed to determine methodological recommendations for a future large-scale cohort study. A logic model was developed and research objectives were defined using the RE-AIM framework. Based on the quantitative outcome results and the qualitative process evaluation findings, a number of practice and methodological implications can be determined as follows:

Practice implications

Table 10 provides a summary of the quantitative results and the qualitative findings and shows that from a quantitative (reach and effectiveness) outcomes perspective, ADNAT met the proposed mechanisms of action and the short-term objectives, as defined in the Logic Model. The survey and qualitative findings indicate that ADNAT was acceptable for adoption by the diabetes teams and by their patients. Findings from the qualitative data supported the following recommendations for the successful use of ADNAT:

- **Reach:** to ensure uptake, a lead clinician's support is essential alongside a team approach to foster integration, normalisation and consistency in the messages given to patients and their carers.
- **Adoption:** to support adoption, access to technical support and iPads with SIM cards to overcome Wi-Fi problems in clinics is required, alongside training using an activity style of learning and limited to a maximum of 4 hours, to support team working and the tailoring of ADNAT to fit each team. Including patients in the training will provide insight into their experiences of using ADNAT supporting the connection between theory and practice.
- **Implementation/Maintenance:** to promote implementation, a short time span is needed between patients' completions of ADNAT and follow-up reviews. To support this, consents can be taken in clinic, followed by instructions at a later date in patients'

appointment letters. ADNAT can then be completed at home prior to their clinic consultation, supported by automatic text reminders.

- ADNAT requires a section for patients to ask for immediate feedback/help from diabetes teams, and also to short on-line reports i.e. ADNAT profiles for each patient for practitioners. Patients' potential negative responses to the traffic light feedback system also need to be addressed by using a less threatening feedback response.
- NPDA data for the three sites in Table 4 show that 85% of their total population is aged 10-18 years which suggests that use of ADNAT as an audit tool is a viable option.

Methodological implications: Strengths and limitations

- A strength of this study lies in its mixed methods design and the fact that there was overlap between the data sets. This means that there is less probability of drawing erroneous conclusions and serves to validate the findings from each method. It also helps to explain outcomes to provide a frame for application of the results. Findings therefore provided an insight into ADNAT's potential in relation to glycaemic control (HbA1c), particularly for those poorly controlled. It also raised issues regarding the wording of 2 questions. We therefore trialled changing the wording and re-calculating the correlations which showed small improvements suggesting that the changes were viable.
- A limitation of this study is the small number of sites, participants and respondents involved raising statistical issues concerning the accuracy of the outcome data. We are therefore seeking funding for a large scale study across many PDUs in Northern England.
- Another limitation relates to the number of young people who completed the ADNAT questionnaires. Whilst the percentage of completers (49.4%) is good in terms of figures quoted for the response rate of the general population to web based surveys (24.8%)³⁹, it remains questionable as to how typical the completers were relative to the non-completers and to those who declined to participate. Reasons why young people choose to engage or not in using ADNAT therefore need to be researched to improve response rates.
- The research setting is a mediator of outcomes so that a limiting factor is the problem of treatment heterogeneity. Whilst ADNAT is a standardised intervention, the responses of

the teams to the outcomes of using ADNAT are heterogeneous. In addition, no member of the diabetes teams involved in the study had training in paediatric education. This demonstrates a need to include non-participant clinic observations to evaluate educational capability amongst the diabetes teams. It also validates the need to research comparative effectiveness to provide evidence on the benefits and harms of different response options. This will have wider benefits in terms of recommendations for educational and practice related training.

- The recruitment and non-allocation procedures maintained comparable groups to ensure internal validity. It allowed access to ADNAT by all participants, overcoming ethical issues of withholding treatment. Also the problems of cross-contamination within and between sites, particularly relevant where ADNAT is concerned given its novelty potentially creating motivations to access ADNAT by sharing usernames/passwords via social networking etc., which is relevant to this age group, and the fact that information is publicly available via the web and in publications.
- For those who did choose to take part, it could be presumed that they wanted a different kind of management for their diabetes, one that fits more effectively with their digital culture and their learning styles. This has implications for the results of the evaluation because it suggests that some of the participants were ready to make changes. Using a non-randomised design (completers versus non-completers) will overcome the ethical issues noted above. Such a study needs to cover longer term outcomes and processes i.e. beyond 12 months, as defined in the Logic Model. The fact that ADNAT offers a tailored, reinforcing, long term approach to education, which is different to education programmes that have been trialled previously, reinforces this fact.
- Previous research has highlighted the need for adult diabetes education to have broad patient-based outcomes, and not to be expected to have lasting benefits on glycaemic control unless it is repeated³⁹. The focus group data reinforced these points highlighting the need to include other outcomes such as quality of life and patients' greater self-involvement in their care. Findings from previous trials of paediatric diabetes education have also affirmed this point¹⁵. Measures of effectiveness therefore need to include but not be limited to glycaemic control.

Table 10: Summary of data sets

RE-AIM THEMES	OUTCOMES (Patients)	SURVEY (Diabetes Team)	FOCUS GROUPS (Diabetes Team)
Reach	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Uptake better than expected (n=89) • Twice as many females to males recruited • Low accrual rates (n=4) • Response rates 49.4% • Average age of completers & non-completers 14.3/14.5 years respectively • More female than male completers: ratio ~1:2 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All reported technological capability in clinical practice • Some ambivalence re: using technology in patients' education • No paediatric teaching qualifications 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ideal time to integrate ADNAT into clinical practice • Offers a technological approach to care in line with policy and young peoples' needs • Fits within BPT's education criterion/peer review process. • Potential as an audit tool questioned given its focus on 12-18 yrs only. • Training to use activity learning to support a team approach and include expert users of ADNAT
Effectiveness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Completers - post-ADNAT mean HbA_{1c} level 5.42 mmol/mol's lower than non-completers at 6 months, suggesting change was apparent. • ADNAT judged to be effective at each of the 8 different stages of the transtheoretical change cycle. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ADNAT's system and information quality judged as good • ADNAT judged to be effective, practical, useful and efficient • Value to patients perceived to be linked to parental support, age and previous diabetes education. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Time between patients' completions and reviews with practitioners in clinic/home critical to effectiveness. • ADNAT perceived to promote behaviour change • Primary outcomes to include glycaemic control and quality of life, with qualitative data to illuminate wider effects of education
Adoption		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Majority of patients completed ADNAT in clinic • All felt that patients, their families and the Diabetes Network would want ADNAT to be used • Majority intend to use ADNAT in the future 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead clinician's support essential • Requires a team approach to implementation • Needs to be tailored to fit each team • Scoring, traffic light feedback, drop-down menus and navigation commands support tailored health care planning but some concern re: patients' responses to traffic light system
Implementation/ Maintenance		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to Wi-Fi in clinics poor/negligible • No data protection issues reported • Need for: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o improved Wi-Fi access and iPads o Section for patients to ask for immediate feedback/help from diabetes teams o Access to short on-line patient reports 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access to on-line technical support needed • Use of Ipads with SIM cards to overcome Wi-Fi problems in clinics • To secure clinical feasibility: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o home completions prior to clinic visits o consents taken in clinic o instructions sent in appointment letters o automatic text reminders.

CONCLUSIONS

This evaluation study addresses the question of whether the diabetes teams and patients would accept ADNAT as part of the diabetes health care process. It also provided methodological information for future research. Having the non-completers as a comparative control group minimised type 1 errors given that patient groups (and practitioners) had access to the same processes of care including training in how to use ADNAT. The evaluation demonstrated a number of limitations which have provided practice and methodological guidance. It has shown that a future mixed methods non-randomised interventional longitudinal cohort study would be feasible following MRC guidance for process evaluation of complex interventions, including use of the logic model and the RE-AIM framework.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

To meet the requirements of the Research Governance Framework, approval for the study was sought from the UK National Research Ethics Service (NRES). The protocol was submitted to the North West – Cheshire NRES Committee where it was agreed that the study was not considered to be research according to their guidance³⁹ and was defined as a service evaluation not requiring ethical review (see Additional file 1 for copy of letter). Their decision was based on the fact that the study involved an intervention only with no allocation or randomisation procedures, that the choice of treatment (education/support) was determined by the clinician(s) and patients, that it measured current service without reference to a standard, and data collection involved analysis of existing data together with administration of interviews and questionnaires. Following this, the proposal was submitted to the NHS Research and Development Departments at each of the three sites for their approvals and agreement that the study was a service evaluation rather than a research study. Approvals were received from all three sites based on the requirement that appropriate ethical standards were followed. We therefore used site files, information sheets, and consent/assent forms. Confidentiality and anonymity were maintained by using a coding system for all participants (allocated by the Research Nurses), and data were stored in a locked cabinet. The research team had no access to identifiable information for any patient taking part in the study.

Competing interests

The authors declare they have no competing interests.

Funding

The study was supported by Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust which funded the purchase of 10 iPads and the employment of three NIHR Children's Research Nurses.

Authors' contributions

HC wrote the protocol, carried out the training, analysis of the qualitative data and interpretation of the survey data, and drafted the initial manuscript. GL and PG were responsible for the analysis and interpretation of the statistical data and revisions of the questionnaire. GL was also involved in the design of the study, and reviewed and revised the manuscript. MP was involved in the design of the study, approved funding for the study, and reviewed the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank HealthImo for their work on developing the website and the App under the direction of Eric Link. We thank all the patients who completed ADNAT and the health professionals and research nurses who contributed at the three study sites. Also, the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) [Alder Hey Clinical Research Facility](#) which supported the study under the direction of Professor Matthew Peak and Chris Walsh, portfolio manager at the NIHR Clinical Research Network (CRN) for Children. We also thank the Audit Department at one of the sites which supervised the writing, distribution and analysis of the survey under the direction of Steven Riley.

Authors' details

Helen Cooper^{1,3} was seconded to the NIHR [Alder Hey Clinical Research Facility](#), Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust whilst this study was conducted.

¹University of Chester, Department of Public Health and Wellbeing, University of Chester Riverside Campus, Castle Drive, Chester, CH1 1SL. ²University of Lancaster, Department of Mathematics and Statistics, LA1 4YF. ³NIHR [Alder Hey Clinical Research Facility](#), Alder Hey Children's NHS Foundation Trust, Eaton Road, West Derby, Liverpool L12 2AP.

References

1. Pawson, R. *The Science of Evaluation: A Realist Manifesto*, Sage: Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore, 2013.
2. Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O’Cathain A, Tinati T, Wight D, Baird J. *Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance*. MRC Population Health Science Research Network, London, 2014.
3. International Diabetes Federation. *IDF Diabetes, 7 ed*. Brussels, Belgium: International Diabetes Federation, 2015. <http://www.diabetesatlas.org>. Accessed 7 Feb 2016.
4. NHS Information Centre for Health and Social Care. *National Diabetes Paediatric Audit Reports*. London: Department of Health. In: <http://www.rcpch.ac.uk/improving-child-health/quality-improvement-and-clinical-audit/national-paediatric-diabetes-audit-n-0>. Accessed 7 Feb 2016.
5. Diabetes Control and Complications Trial Research Group (1994) Effect of intensive diabetes treatment on the development and progression of long term complications in adolescents with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus. *Journal of Pediatr.* 1994; 125: 177–188.
6. National Peer Review Programme. *National Peer Review Report: Paediatric Diabetes Services 13/14*. 30th March 2015.
7. Department of Health. Kennedy I. *Getting it right for children and young people. Overcoming cultural barriers in the NHS so as to meet their needs*. September 2010.
8. DH. *Payment by Results team. Payment by Results Guidance for 2011-12*. London: Department of Health, 2011.
9. Diabetes UK (2014). *The cost of diabetes report*. In: <http://www.diabetes.org.uk/Documents/Diabetes%20UK%20Cost%20of%20Diabetes%20Report.pdf>. Accessed 7 Feb. 2016.
10. Li et al. *Cost-effectiveness of interventions to prevent and control diabetes mellitus: a systematic review*. (2010) *Diabetes Care*. In: <http://stacks.cdc.gov/view/cdc/7107/>. Accessed 7 Feb 2016.
11. Swift, P. (2009) *Diabetes education in children and adolescents*. *Pediatr Diabetes*; 10 (Suppl s12): 51–57.
12. Waldron S. (2012) *Education and other interventions for diabetes management in children and young people: Detailed overview of randomised controlled trials*. *Diabetes Care for Children and Young People*. 2012; 1(2): 73-74.
13. Price KJ, Wales J, Eiser C, Knowles J, Heller S, Freeman, J, Brennan A, McPherson A, Wellington J. *Does an intensive self-management structured education course improve*

- outcomes for children and young people with type 1 diabetes? The Kids In Control OF Food (KICK-OFF) cluster randomised controlled trial protocol. *BMJ (Online)*. 2013; 3: e002429.
14. Murphy H.R., Wadham C., Rayman G. and Skinner, T.C. Approaches to integrating paediatric diabetes care and structured education. *Diabetic Med*. 2007; 24: 1261-1268.
 15. Chaney D., Coates V.E. and Shevlin M. Running a complex intervention – lessons learned. *J Diabetes Nurs*. 2010; 14: 370–9.
 16. Hawthorne K., Bennert K., Lowes L., Channon S., Robling M., and Gregory J.W. on behalf of the DEPICTED Study team. The experiences of children and their parents in paediatric diabetes services should inform the development of communication skills for healthcare staff (the DEPICTED Study). *Diabetic Med*. 2011; 28: 1103–08.
 17. Kaufman N. (2010) Internet and information technology use in treatment of diabetes. *Int J Clin Pract*. 2011; 64 (Suppl 166): 41–46.
 18. Means B., Toyama Y., Murphy R., Bakia M., Jones K. (2010) Evaluation of Evidence-Based Practices in Online Learning. A Meta-Analysis and Review of Online Learning Studies. In: http://repository.alt.ac.uk/629/1/US_DepEdu_Final_report_2009.pdf. Accessed 8 Feb 2016.
 19. Seidman JJ, Steinwachs D, Rubin H. (2003) Design and testing of a tool for evaluating the quality of diabetes consumer-information Web sites. *J Med Internet Res*. 2003; 5: e30.
 20. Bull SS, Gaglio B, McKay HG, et al. Harnessing the potential of the internet to promote chronic illness self-management diabetes as an example of how well we are doing. *Chronic Illn*. 2005; 1:143-55.
 21. Pal BR. Social media for diabetes health education - inclusive or exclusive? *Curr Diabetes Rev*. 2014; 10(5): 284-90.
 22. [Boren SA](#), [Gunlock TL](#), [Peeples MM.](#), [Krishna S](#). Computerized Learning Technologies for Diabetes: A Systematic Review. *J Diabetes Sci Technol*. 2008; 2(1): 139–146.
 23. Bass AM, Farhangian ME, Feldman SR. Internet-based adherence interventions for treatment of chronic disorders in adolescents. *Adolesc Health Med Ther*. 2015; 6: 91-99.
 24. Cooper H., Cooper J., Milton B. Technology-based approaches to patient education for young people living with diabetes: a systematic literature review. *Ped Diabetes*. 2009; 10: 474-483.
 25. Cooper H, Spencer J, Lancaster J, Titman A, Johnson M, Lwin R, Wheeler S. Development and psychometric testing of the online Adolescent Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool (ADNAT). *J Adv Nurs*. 2014; 70(2): 454–468.

26. Cooper H, Spencer J, Lancaster J, Johnson M, Lwin R. (2013) Perceptions of the Clinical Usefulness of the Adolescent Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool (ADNAT). *Diabetes Care for Children and Young People*. 2013; 1(2): 55-61.
27. Cooper H, Spencer J, Lancaster J, Titman A, Johnson M, Lwin R, Wheeler S. (2015) Development and psychometric testing of the online Adolescent Diabetes Needs Assessment Tool (ADNAT). *World Biomed frontiers Obesity and Diabetes*. In: <http://biomedfrontiers.org/diabetes-obesity-2015-1-21/>. Accessed 1/3/2016.
28. Craig P., Dieppe P., Macintyre S., Michie S., Nazareth I. and Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ*. 2008; 337: 979–983.
29. Spencer J, Cooper H, Milton B. (2013) A qualitative phenomenological study to explore the lived experiences of young people (13-16 years) with type 1 diabetes and their parents. *Diabetic Med*. 2013; 30: e17–e24.
30. Spencer J, Cooper H. A multidisciplinary paediatric diabetes health care team: perspectives on adolescent care. *Pract Diabetes Int*. 2011; 28(5): 210-14.
31. Spencer J, Cooper H, Milton B. Qualitative studies of Type 1 diabetes in adolescence: a systematic literature review. *Ped Diabetes*. 2010; 11(5): 364-375.
32. Cooper H. and Geyer R. Using 'Complexity' for improving educational research in health care. *Soc Sci Med*. 2008; 67, 177-182.
33. NHS Diabetes. (2013) National Paediatric Diabetes Service Improvement Plan 2013-2018. Department of Health: London.
34. Moore G, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O’Cathain A, Tinati T, Wight D, Baird J. (2014) Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. MRC Population Health Science Research Network, London.
35. Okazaki S, Castañeda JA, Sanz S, Henseler J. Factors affecting mobile diabetes monitoring adoption among physicians: questionnaire study and path model. *J Medical Internet Research*, 2012; 14(6): e183.
36. Altman DG, *Practical Statistics for Medical Research*, Chapman and Hall/CRC 1990
37. Ruggiero L. & Prochaska J.O. Readiness for change: application of the transtheoretical model to diabetes. *Diabetes Spectrum*. 1993; 6: 21–60.
38. Penwarden R. (2014) Response rates for online surveys – what numbers should we be aiming for? In: <http://fluidsurveys.com/university/response-rate-statistics-online-surveys-aiming/>. Accessed 7 Feb 2016.

39. NRES: Determine whether your study is research. In: <http://www.hra.nhs.uk/research-community/before-you-apply/determine-whether-your-study-is-research/>. Accessed 7 Feb 2016.