

Title: Financial Cost Analysis Associated with a Locomotor Exercise Randomized Controlled Trial in Chronic Stroke

Authors: Emily M. Hazen, BS¹, Bria L. Bartsch, MS, OTR/L^{1,2}, Sandra A. Billinger, PT, PhD, FAHA^{1,3,4,5}

¹Department of Neurology, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS

²Department of Physical Therapy, Rehabilitation Science, and Athletic Training, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS

³University of Kansas Alzheimer's Disease Research Center, Fairway, KS

⁴Department of Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS

⁵Department of Cell Biology and Physiology, University of Kansas Medical Center, Kansas City, KS

Short Title: Exercise Trial Cost in Stroke

Corresponding Author: Sandra A. Billinger, PhD, (913) 945-6685

3901 Rainbow Blvd., Mail Stop 3051, Kansas City, KS 66160, sbillinger@kumc.edu

Twitter (X) handle: @Sandy_REACHLab

Key Words: Rehabilitation, Cerebrovascular Accident, Aerobic Exercise, Walking,

Recruitment, Retention

Total Word Count: 5,151

1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** Post-stroke recovery trials pose distinct recruitment and retention challenges, and
3 understanding the financial requirements of conducting randomized controlled trials is crucial to
4 ensure sufficient resources for successful study execution. The purpose of this analysis was to
5 quantify the costs at a single site with a large catchment area of the Moderate-Intensity Exercise
6 Versus High-Intensity Interval Training to Recover Walking Post-Stroke, HIT Stroke Trial.

7 **Methods:** To determine cost, study expense reports were gathered and divided into four
8 categories: oversight, recruitment, retention, and outcome assessments. Categories were then
9 further divided into chronological order for initial contact and prescreening, consenting, initial
10 screening, and baseline testing. The 12-week intervention was divided into 4-week blocks:
11 intervention block 1, post 4-week outcome testing, intervention block 2, post 8-week outcome
12 testing, intervention block 3, and post 12-week outcome testing.

13 **Results:** Total direct cost for site execution was \$539,768 with cost per participant approximated
14 as \$35,984. Oversight costs accounted for 65.8% of the budget at \$355,661. To achieve goals
15 related to inclusive participant recruitment (\$21,923) and retention (\$28,009), our site costs
16 totaled \$49,932. Direct study-related costs included screening assessments (\$5,905), baseline
17 assessments (\$15,028), intervention (\$76,952), and outcome assessments (\$36,288).

18 **Conclusion:** Clinical trials on walking rehabilitation and exercise, especially those involving
19 multiple assessment visits, require intensive oversight. This cost analysis provides important and
20 critical insight into the expenses required to successfully execute an exercise-based walking
21 rehabilitation trial in the United States.

22

23

24 **Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms**

25 HIT: High-Intensity Interval Training

26 MAT: Moderate Aerobic Training

27 PHQ-9: Patient Health Questionnaire 9

28 EQ-5D: EuroQol-5D

29 ABC: Activities-specific Balance Confidence Scale

30 PROMIS: Patient Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System Fatigue Scale,²⁴

31 GXT: Graded Exercise Test

32 CTSU: Clinical and Translational Science Unit

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47 INTRODUCTION

48 A key issue surrounding stroke recovery trials is recruitment and retention of participants.
49 Our previous work¹ and others²⁻⁵ have highlighted the trial barriers, demands on the study team,
50 and proposed strategies for successful recruitment and retention. However, to our knowledge,
51 exploring the cost associated with stroke recovery trials is non-existent. Recognizing the
52 financial requirements of clinical trials is essential for ensuring success and facilitates effective
53 planning and trial execution.⁶⁻⁸ Further, insight into cost demand allows for adequate funds to be
54 devoted to resource procurement, study recruitment, outcome assessments, salaries, and other
55 indirect study-related costs. The underestimation of required funds can hinder study execution
56 and data quality, lead to wasted resources, and negatively impact the clinical decision-making
57 which ultimately impacts patient care.^{9,10}

58 Pharmaceutical trial costs have been well-documented, with a recent study reporting the
59 average cost of a clinical drug trial was \$48 million.¹¹ Given the potential for robust impact on
60 health and aging, exercise emerges as a powerful non-pharmacological alternative. Recognizing
61 its status as “one of the most promising interventions to directly delay physiological decline and
62 increase the health span,”¹² understanding optimal exercise prescription parameters and their
63 associated clinical trial costs becomes critical. A few studies have explored the cost demands for
64 exercise trials in older adults.¹³⁻¹⁵ In particular, a phase III, multisite randomized controlled trial
65 enrolling a targeted sample of 639 older adult participants reported the total cost to randomize
66 one participant through study completion cost approximately \$16,494 for an estimated total cost
67 of \$10.5 million dollars.¹³ By allocating sufficient resources to stroke rehabilitation and
68 recovery interventions, particularly in the context of support from initiatives like the NIH
69 StrokeNet² and other funding mechanisms, we enhance scientific rigor and reproducibility in

70 clinical trials with the aim of influencing clinical practice and public health outcomes including
71 overall mortality.¹⁶⁻¹⁹ Documenting the cost demand of a walking rehabilitation exercise trial in
72 chronic stroke will: 1) Provide increased insight into the financial resources required to
73 successfully execute an exercise study, and 2) Allow future investigators to devote adequate
74 finances to budget applications, study start-up, and study execution.

75 HIT-Stroke was a 12-week, National Institute of Health funded, multi-site exercise trial
76 to determine the optimal training intensity for improving walking capacity in individuals 6-
77 months to 5-years post-stroke. The detailed study protocol and main trial results have been
78 published elsewhere.^{16,20} The purpose of this cost analysis was to report the cost demands
79 associated with the University of Kansas Medical Center site. As we've published previously,
80 our site serves a large catchment area that spans our suburban and rural areas of Kansas.¹ Kansas
81 City is automobile-centric with poor availability of public transportation,²¹ which limits
82 opportunities for research participation at an academic medical center. Our study team strives for
83 inclusive science practices in our clinical trials and a cost analysis would provide insight into the
84 reality of successful trial execution, including transportation costs. Here, we provide a detailed
85 summary of costs associated with: 1) Resource procurement, 2) Recruitment, 3) Intervention
86 delivery, 4) Outcome assessments, 5) Salaries, and 6) Indirect study-related costs, such as
87 participant transportation. Further, we provide insight into budgeting to overcome common
88 stroke recovery and rehabilitation research barriers, such as affordable transportation, parking
89 considerations, navigating from parking to laboratory, and treatment compliance.²

90

91 **METHODS**

92 Licensed physical therapists completed intervention and assessment training and
93 completed the required competencies for their respective roles (intervention or blinded assessor).
94 Outcome assessments occurred across the 12-week intervention at baseline, 4, 8, and 12 weeks.
95 Prior to randomization, participants successfully completed: (1) written informed consent, a
96 medical history and medical record review, (2) the Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9), (3) a
97 2-step command, (4) lower extremity Fugl-Meyer Motor Assessment, (5) lower limb spasticity
98 assessment (Ashworth Scale), and (6) NIH Stroke Scale ataxia and neglect items.

99 At baseline, participants completed blinded assessments including: (1) a pre-visit form
100 with repeated blood pressure measurements, (2) 10 meter walk tests at both comfortable and
101 fastest possible speeds,²² (3) a 6-minute walk test,²³ (4) functional ambulation category, (5) the
102 EuroQol-5D (EQ-5D), (6) Activities-specific Balance Confidence (ABC) Scale, (7) Patient
103 Reported Outcomes Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Fatigue Scale,²⁴ (8) and a
104 graded exercise test (GXT).²⁵ These outcome assessments were repeated at 4, 8, and 12 weeks in
105 addition to the Participant Ratings of Change survey. During the 12-week intervention,
106 participants completed three 45-minute treatment sessions a week consisting of a 3-minute
107 warm-up of overground walking, 10 minutes of overground training of either high-intensity
108 interval training (HIT) or moderate aerobic training (MAT), 20 minutes of harness-assisted
109 treadmill training (HIT or MAT), a second bout of 10-minute overground training (HIT or
110 MAT), and a 2-minute cool down of overground walking. Lactate was collected once a week.

111 To estimate the financial costs of the HIT Stroke study at the University of Kansas
112 Medical Center site, expenses were assigned to seven different categories: Recruitment,
113 Screening Assessments, Baseline Assessments, Intervention, Outcome Assessments, Retention,
114 and Oversight. Each of these categories includes costs related to study team effort, equipment

115 and materials, and facilities and services used. Recruitment costs include factors such as staff
116 time spent making recruitment calls and scheduling, newspaper advertisements, social media,
117 and time spent introducing the study in clinic and stroke support groups. Screening Assessments
118 include costs for training physical therapist time and assistance from students. Baseline
119 Assessments include testing physical therapist time and space usage for graded exercise testing
120 in addition to walking tests. Intervention consists of cost of equipment including initial purchases
121 and maintenance, physical therapist time for intervention delivery, and student workers.
122 Outcome assessments include costs of administration of graded exercise tests, testing physical
123 therapist time, and required equipment for each assessment. Retention costs include participant
124 compensation for successful completion of each outcome testing visit, transportation costs to and
125 from study visits, and medical translator fees. Oversight includes principal investigator, study
126 coordinator, and physical therapist efforts for the intervention delivery and the assessor (physical
127 therapist) who was blinded to group assignment across trial duration. Oversight activities include
128 initial study start up activities such as initial training, training site study staff, Data Safety and
129 Monitoring Board meetings, adverse event reporting, data queries, maintaining supplies, overall
130 study coordination, and regulatory document submissions to the Institutional Review Board
131 (IRB).

132 To understand the distribution of these costs across the timeline of the trial, expense
133 categories were further subdivided into chronological groups: Initial Contact and Prescreening,
134 Consenting and Screening, Baseline Outcome Testing, Intervention Block 1 (weeks 1-4), Post-4
135 Week Blinded Outcome Testing, Intervention Block 2 (weeks 5-8), Post-8 Week Blinded
136 Outcome Testing, Intervention Block 3 (weeks 9-12), and Post-12 Week Blinded Outcome

137 Testing (Figure 2). To represent the cost per completed participant (n=15), the total cost for each
138 chronological group was divided by 15.

139

140 **RESULTS**

141 A total of 18 participants were enrolled at our site, with 15 completing the study. During
142 the study, three participants withdrew due to adverse events.¹⁶ These participants withdrew after
143 completing Post-4 Week Blinded Outcome Testing and were included in cost analysis for all
144 visits completed. As shown in Figure 1, most participants lived within a 50km radius to the
145 laboratory site. Two participants resided in rural, or frontier counties, which are indicated by
146 light gray shading.

147

148 **TOTAL COST**

149 The estimated total direct cost of the HIT Stroke Trial at the University of Kansas
150 Medical Center was \$539,768, resulting in a trial cost of \$19,600 over the grant budget. This
151 amount was offset using internal funds to support transportation costs that exceeded our site
152 budget and to support a medical translator at each study visit and outcome testing. Figure 2
153 shows the percentages associated with the distribution of costs across oversight, recruitment,
154 retention, and outcome assessment categories.

155

156 **COST PER PARTICIPANT**

157 The overall cost for one enrolled participant to complete the study was estimated to be
158 \$35,984.54. This cost includes screening, consenting, baseline and outcome testing, and
159 intervention sessions. Oversight and retention costs have been integrated into the following

160 categories, capturing the commitment of both the principal investigator and study coordinator.
161 Additionally, these categories encompass costs specifically allocated to enhance research
162 accessibility. Figure 3 outlines the distribution of cost per participant.

163

164 RECRUITMENT

165 Recruitment costs totaled \$21,923, including the cost of newspaper advertisements,
166 media interviews, time spent introducing the trial in clinic and support groups, and staff time
167 spent conducting phone screenings. As highlighted in Figure 3, cost is frontloaded per
168 participant. This initial increased cost for one participant to complete the HIT Stroke trial occurs
169 at Initial Contact and Prescreening and reflects the number of potential participants that must be
170 contacted to enroll and randomize one participant. To determine the increased cost factor,
171 defined as financial effort required to randomize one participant, we divided the number of
172 participants randomized by total number of individuals phone screened to provide a
173 randomization ratio.¹³ We then took the inverse of this ratio and established an increased cost
174 factor of 5.88, which indicates that to randomize one participant, approximately six potentials
175 had to be screened.¹³

176

177 SCREENING and BASELINE ASSESSMENTS

178 Initial in-person screening assessments had an estimated cost of \$5,905 which included
179 physical therapist time and student assistants in the doctor of physical therapy program. Baseline
180 assessment costs totaled \$15,028. These assessments were completed at the University of Kansas
181 Clinical and Translational Science Unit (CTSU) with a designated physical therapist, costing
182 approximately \$11,352. The cost for student assistants was approximately \$3,675.

183

184 INTERVENTION

185 The cost to conduct the HIT Stroke Trial intervention at the University of Kansas
186 Medical Center was approximately \$76,952. Training visits were completed by designated
187 physical therapists, whose effort totaled at \$49,756 and the student assistants resulted in a cost of
188 approximately \$3,675. Equipment needed for the intervention, including a treadmill, harness
189 system, heart rate monitors, and iPods, had an approximate total cost of \$23,521.

190

191 OUTCOME ASSESSMENTS

192 Outcome assessments had an estimated cost of \$36,288 and were completed at our
193 University of Kansas CTSU by assessors blinded to group assignment. Outcome assessment
194 costs included: 1) the bundled cost for the graded exercise tests with gas analysis and personnel.
195 A certified exercise physiologist performed the graded exercise test and medical monitor read the
196 electrocardiogram, 2) the physical therapist ensured participant safety with the treadmill and
197 harness system throughout the graded exercise test, 3) the therapist performed all walking
198 assessments; and 4) the study coordinator performed questionnaires.

199

200 RETENTION

201 Figure 4 details the cost distribution related to participant retention. Retention costs
202 totaled \$28,009. Our site spent 76.1% (\$21,334) on ride-share transportation to minimize the
203 barriers of study participation. At study completion, all participants required transportation to a
204 single study visit, highlighting the importance of providing transportation to minimize missed
205 study visits or outcome testing. The primary reasons for transportation were: 1) family member

206 unavailable, 2) car broke down, or 3) family member ill and unable to drive participant.
207 Approximately, 25% of participants required transportation for all visits due to no transportation
208 access including public transportation. We calculated ~\$1,725 was spent on medical translation
209 and interpreter services for one non-English speaking individual. For compensation, participants
210 were provided \$75 after each outcome testing visit, totaling \$4,950. For study completion,
211 participants were provided a completion certificate, for a total of \$0.20.

212

213 OVERSIGHT

214 Oversight costs for the trial duration totaled \$355,661 and reflects principal investigator
215 and study coordinator total compensation. Principal investigator effort was dedicated to all trial
216 related activities including but not limited to budget, training study team members, personnel
217 oversight, data monitoring, study meetings, creating annual reports for our site, and data safety
218 and monitoring board preparation and meetings, totaling \$215,273. Study coordinator salary was
219 dedicated to managing regulatory documents including institutional review board, protocol
220 adherence, assisting with consenting, adverse event documentation, screening and outcome
221 assessments, and participant scheduling for a total of \$140,388.

222

223 DISCUSSION

224 This cost analysis aimed to elucidate the financial intricacies involved in recruitment,
225 enrollment, outcome testing, and intervention for a clinical exercise trial focusing on stroke
226 recovery. Understanding these costs is crucial for effective resource planning, budgeting, and
227 fund procurement as stroke rehabilitation and recovery trials “are not simply acute stroke studies
228 that are initiated at late time points”.² Rather, the challenges associated with recruitment,

229 retention, and intervention delivery are unique to stroke recovery and the information provided
230 here should address potential costs and provide valuable information related to stroke recovery
231 trials.

232

233 INCREASED COST FACTOR AND RECRUITMENT

234 The data showed an average cost of enrollment and trial completion per participant was
235 \$35,984 with approximately 1/5 of cost dedicated to recruitment and screening for initial
236 enrollment. The cost per participant is lower than an acute endovascular intervention where the
237 cost of the intervention group was reported at \$126,494 versus the control at \$143,331.²⁶
238 However, the costs reported in the acute endovascular study included resources used such as
239 therapy during the 2-year follow up. For the present study, the increased cost factor indicated our
240 site would conduct phone screens on at least 6 potential participants for one to be randomized.
241 The increased cost factor reported here is similar to that observed in a recent 12-month exercise
242 intervention trial in older adults, which reported an increased cost factor of 5.95 for phone
243 screening and randomization for 494 participants.¹³ It is important to note, however, that factors
244 such as study inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as individual interest in a given study
245 topic,²⁷ may influence the increased cost factor. For example, a study with more strict inclusion
246 and exclusion criteria may require increased participant screening for randomization, and these
247 factors should be considered in study design. Further, successful recruitment methods may be
248 implemented to minimize increased cost factor. We have previously published our approach for
249 optimizing recruitment in stroke recovery trials, using a “service first” approach.¹ Establishing
250 supportive relationships with physicians and providing training to the recruitment team on
251 effective participant communication before study start-up may optimize recruitment.¹ Further,

252 sites may consider using participant databases for a streamlined recruitment approach. Since
253 completion of the HIT Stroke trial, our site has created a Stroke Recovery Registry in which we
254 enroll participants interested in stroke recovery research. In our registry, we record
255 demographics, medical history, and study interests to pair individuals who have experienced a
256 stroke with potential research opportunities that meet their interests and needs based on inclusion
257 and exclusion criteria to identify more quickly those who may be eligible during the phone
258 screening phase.

259

260 BASELINE AND OUTCOME ASSESSMENTS

261 Another driving factor for our site related costs in the HIT Stroke trial was baseline and
262 outcome testing, including the personnel time dedicated to these measures. Testing included
263 graded exercise tests, conducted by trained personnel with physical therapist oversight, physical
264 function testing conducted by a physical therapist, and questionnaires conducted by the study
265 coordinator. Graded exercise tests with gas analysis and a bodyweight support harness were
266 conducted every 4 weeks for 12 weeks. The HIT Stroke study design focused on identifying both
267 the intensity needed to change walking outcomes and the duration (4, 8, 12 weeks). Therefore,
268 these additional outcome assessments added increased but necessary costs to the trial to answer
269 the research questions. An additional consideration for baseline and outcome testing is assessor
270 qualifications. The HIT Stroke trial employed licensed physical therapists for physical function
271 assessments and added safety for the graded exercise testing. While utilizing physical therapists
272 to conduct the study increases trial applicability for translation to clinical practice, necessitating
273 an advanced degree and licensure in an assessor may increase assessment costs. Further, this

274 requirement may decrease the generalizability of study results to settings without physical
275 therapy availability.

276

277 INTERVENTION

278 For exercise sessions, a treadmill and bodyweight support harness, heart rate and lactate
279 monitors, iPods for real time monitoring of heart rate, and step watches for session step count
280 were required. Personnel costs included licensed physical therapist to deliver the intervention
281 and we employed doctor of physical therapy students to assist with the intervention. We
282 acknowledge that our cost factor is likely influenced by the salaries associated with the need for
283 licensed physical therapists. However, to ensure safe delivery of the intervention, we believe
284 these costs are justified. The cost factor may not be identical to all locations across the United
285 States and is likely dependent on regional cost of living and may differ between sites. For
286 example, the cost of living index in the Kansas-Missouri region is 87.4-88.3, whereas it is 92.2 in
287 Ohio, and 100.8 in Delaware.²⁸ Further, the annual mean wage of physical therapists is higher in
288 Ohio and Delaware than the Kansas-Missouri region.²⁹ As such, staff salaries may differ between
289 sites and needs to be considered when planning multi-site trials.

290

291 PARTICIPANT RETENTION

292 *Transportation*

293 Our retention costs include expenses required to decrease barriers to research
294 engagement. Approximately \$21,334 were dedicated ride share services. Research suggests that
295 transportation is a key barrier to research participation and results from decreased access to
296 vehicles or public transportation, inadequate infrastructure, and travel distance and costs.^{2,27,30,31}

297 Our site experiences challenges for participant transportation due to the poor availability of
298 public transportation in the Kansas City Metro area. According to the 2021 American
299 Community Survey²¹, 0.8% of individuals in the Kansas City Metro area use public
300 transportation, and 86.3% use a car, truck, or van to commute to work. Conversely, at our partner
301 sites in Newark, DE, and Cincinnati, OH, 3% to 6.2% of individuals use public transportation,
302 and 69% to 77.5% use a car, truck, or van to commute to work, respectively. Additionally, due to
303 geographics of the Kansas City Metro area, only 1.1% of individuals walk to work, whereas
304 11.6% and 5.5% in Newark and Cincinnati walk to work, respectively. Figure 1 shows the
305 distribution of participants for the HIT Stroke trial in our catchment area and the willingness of
306 people living with stroke to engage and participate in an exercise trial designed to improve
307 walking. In advance of the clinical trial, we budgeted for participant transportation. However,
308 our expenses related to transportation costs exceeded the budgeted amount in the grant. Internal
309 funds and other sources of funding were used to support participants and reduce barriers to
310 promote inclusive science.

311 In addition to transportation support, our team placed special emphasis on parking and
312 navigating from parking locations to clinic, which have been cited as commonly neglected
313 barriers to research engagement in stroke.² Our site offered free parking to all participants in the
314 parking site nearest our laboratory, which is less than 500 feet from the building entrance. We
315 provided a detailed parking map and instructions prior to study visits. Additionally, if needed our
316 staff would meet participants at their vehicles and provide wheelchair assistance to reduce
317 fatigue prior to the study visit or assessment visits.

318

319 *Translation services*

320 To further decrease barriers to engagement at our site, we used other funding sources to
321 cover costs of \$1,725 to a medical translator and language interpreter to decrease barriers to
322 clinical trial participation. Currently, over 7,000 languages exist worldwide, and the English
323 predominance in research not only decreases research accessibility, but also the generalizability
324 of research findings for individuals who do not speak English.³² Research suggests that these
325 language barriers perpetuate healthcare inequities and may negatively impact healthcare policies
326 and delivery.³² By providing transportation through ride-share programs and translator services,
327 we minimize recruitment and retention barriers for all, create a trust-worthy environment within
328 our academic medical center setting, and assist with place-based disparities for those in rural or
329 urban settings without access to transportation.

330

331 *Compensation*

332 Participants were compensated for their time in the HIT Stroke trial. Although concerns
333 have been raised regarding the potential for participant bias in studies which offer
334 compensation,³³ research suggests that compensation helps to promote participant retention³⁴ and
335 offset the financial burden placed on participants for study engagement.³⁵ Participants often incur
336 expenses as a result of study travel and time away from work for participation and providing
337 study compensation can reduce socioeconomic disparities in research, where the burden of
338 engagement is greater on those with lower income.³⁵

339

340 *Non-Financial Incentives for Participation*

341 Lastly, we provided participants with a certificate of study completion. Research suggests
342 that non-financial incentives which express appreciation for participation are commonly used in

343 studies and help promote retention.³⁴ Due to financial limitations in clinical trials, consideration
344 of non-financial incentives may be optimal for helping to reduce participant drop out and loss to
345 follow-up bias.³⁴

346 These data provide novel findings related the cost associated with conducting a stroke
347 recovery trial. While we tracked study related costs, we acknowledge that the cost per participant
348 and increased cost factor are estimates, as it is impossible to determine how many individuals
349 were reached through study advertisements or actual effort was spent on each category such as
350 phone screens, emailing or calling participants and coordinating with the ride-share programs.
351 Further, we report costs for a single site of the HIT Stroke trial. Costs may differ between sites
352 due to factors such as staff salaries based on regional cost of living, costs for space usage,
353 transportation needs, and translation services. We did not account for costs that may have been
354 associated with operations during the COVID-19 pandemic including personal protective
355 equipment, additional staffing, screening participants for COVID-19, time lost due to staff or
356 participants who reported COVID-19 exposure and institution approved cleaning solutions to
357 protect against COVID-19. Additional costs that were not accounted for at our site additional
358 staff for data checking and time spent on coordinating delivery of equipment and supplies and
359 the set-up of equipment. Finally, we acknowledge these costs are associated with trial execution
360 in the United States. Therefore, some costs may not be relevant to all locations across the world.

361

362 **Conclusion**

363 This analysis outlines the costs associated required to conduct a single blind randomized
364 exercise trial focused on stroke recovery. Here, we provide a model for increasing participation
365 and retention to enroll participants effectively and inclusively for stroke recovery trials aligned

366 with our “service first” approach. We believe that this cost analysis will provide investigators
367 and funding agencies with a valuable information regarding the costs required to conduct a
368 successful and accessible exercise-based clinical trial in stroke.

369

370 **Acknowledgments**

371 The authors would like to thank Sasha Moores and Saniya Waghmare for their assistance with
372 gathering cost information. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not
373 necessarily represent the official views of the NIH.

374 **Sources of Funding**

375 B.L.B. was supported in part by 5T32HD057850. S.A.B. and E.M.H. were supported in part by
376 P30 AG072973 and S.A.B. in part by R01HD093694.

377 **Disclosures**

378 None.

379

380

381

382

383

384

385

386

387

388

389

390 **References**

- 391 1. Morton A, Myers M, Whitaker AA, et al. Optimizing Recruitment Strategies and
392 Physician Engagement for Stroke Recovery Research. *J Neurol Phys Ther*. Jan 2021;45(1):41-
393 45. doi:10.1097/NPT.0000000000000334
- 394 2. Cramer SC, Wolf SL, Adams HP, et al. Stroke Recovery and Rehabilitation Research.
395 *Stroke*. 2017;48(3):813-819. doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.116.015501
- 396 3. Blanton S, Morris DM, Prettyman MG, et al. Lessons Learned in Participant Recruitment
397 and Retention: The EXCITE Trial. *Physical Therapy*. 2006;86(11):1520-1533.
398 doi:10.2522/ptj.20060091
- 399 4. Boden-Albala B, Carman H, Southwick L, et al. Examining Barriers and Practices to
400 Recruitment and Retention in Stroke Clinical Trials. *Stroke*. 2015;46(8):2232-2237.
401 doi:doi:10.1161/STROKEAHA.114.008564
- 402 5. Boxall L, Hemsley A, White N. Exploring recruitment issues in stroke research: a
403 qualitative study of nurse researchers' experiences. *Nurse Researcher*. 2016;23(5):8-14.
404 doi:10.7748/nr.23.5.8.s3
- 405 6. Anderson C, Mhurchu CN, Rubenach S, Clark M, Spencer C, Winsor A. Home or
406 hospital for stroke Rehabilitation? Results of a randomized controlled trial : II: cost minimization
407 analysis at 6 months. *Stroke*. 2000;31(5):1032-1037. doi:10.1161/01.str.31.5
- 408 7. Skolarus LE, Burke JF, Freedman VA. The role of accommodations in poststroke
409 disability management. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. Nov 2014;69 Suppl 1(Suppl 1):S26-
410 34. doi:10.1093/geronb/gbu117

- 411 8. Medford-Davis LN, Fonarow GC, Bhatt DL, et al. Impact of Insurance Status on
412 Outcomes and Use of Rehabilitation Services in Acute Ischemic Stroke: Findings From Get With
413 The Guidelines-Stroke. *J Am Heart Assoc*. Nov 14 2016;5(11)doi:10.1161/JAHA.116.004282
- 414 9. Arenz D, Hero B, Eichhorst BF, et al. Estimating site costs prior to conducting clinical
415 trials. *Clinical investigation*. 2014;4:227-234.
- 416 10. Bentley C, Cressman S, van der Hoek K, Arts K, Dancey J, Peacock S. Conducting
417 clinical trials—costs, impacts, and the value of clinical trials networks: A scoping review.
418 *Clinical Trials*. 2019;16(2):183-193. doi:10.1177/1740774518820060
- 419 11. Moore TJ, Heyward J, Anderson G, Alexander GC. Variation in the estimated costs of
420 pivotal clinical benefit trials supporting the US approval of new therapeutic agents, 2015-2017: a
421 cross-sectional study. *BMJ Open*. Jun 11 2020;10(6):e038863. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2020-
422 038863
- 423 12. Erickson ML, Allen JM, Beavers DP, et al. Understanding heterogeneity of responses to,
424 and optimizing clinical efficacy of, exercise training in older adults: NIH NIA Workshop
425 summary. *Geroscience*. Feb 2023;45(1):569-589. doi:10.1007/s11357-022-00668-3
- 426 13. Donahue PT, Grove G, Stillman C, et al. Estimating the financial costs associated with a
427 phase III, multi-site exercise intervention trial: Investigating Gains in Neurocognition in an
428 Intervention Trial of Exercise (IGNITE). *Contemp Clin Trials*. Jun 2021;105:106401.
429 doi:10.1016/j.cct.2021.106401
- 430 14. Groessl EJ, Kaplan RM, Blair SN, et al. A Cost Analysis of a Physical Activity
431 Intervention for Older Adults. *Journal of Physical Activity and Health*. 01 Nov. 2009
432 2009;6(6):767-774. doi:10.1123/jpah.6.6.767

- 433 15. Groessl EJ, Kaplan RM, Castro Sweet CM, et al. Cost-effectiveness of the LIFE Physical
434 Activity Intervention for Older Adults at Increased Risk for Mobility Disability. *J Gerontol A*
435 *Biol Sci Med Sci*. May 2016;71(5):656-62. doi:10.1093/gerona/glw001
- 436 16. Boyne P, Billinger SA, Reisman DS, et al. Optimal Intensity and Duration of Walking
437 Rehabilitation in Patients With Chronic Stroke: A Randomized Clinical Trial. *JAMA Neurol*. Apr
438 1 2023;80(4):342-351. doi:10.1001/jamaneurol.2023.0033
- 439 17. Joundi RA, Patten SB, Lukmanji A, Williams JV, Smith EE. Association Between
440 Physical Activity and Mortality Among Community-Dwelling Stroke Survivors. *Neurology*. Aug
441 11 2021;97(12):e1182-91. doi:10.1212/WNL.00000000000012535
- 442 18. Billinger SA, Arena R, Bernhardt J, et al. Physical activity and exercise recommendations
443 for stroke survivors: a statement for healthcare professionals from the American Heart
444 Association/American Stroke Association. *Stroke*. Aug 2014;45(8):2532-53.
445 doi:10.1161/STR.0000000000000022
- 446 19. Billinger SA, Matlage AE, Ashenden AL, Lentz AA, Harter G, Rippee MA. Aerobic
447 exercise in subacute stroke improves cardiovascular health and physical performance. *J Neurol*
448 *Phys Ther*. Dec 2012;36(4):159-65. doi:10.1097/NPT.0b013e318274d082
- 449 20. Miller A, Reisman DS, Billinger SA, et al. Moderate-intensity exercise versus high-
450 intensity interval training to recover walking post-stroke: protocol for a randomized controlled
451 trial. *Trials*. Jul 16 2021;22(1):457. doi:10.1186/s13063-021-05419-x
- 452 21. Sex of Workers by Means of Transportation to Work American Community Survey 5-
453 year estimates. U.S. Census Bureau. Updated 2021.
454 https://censusreporter.org/data/table/?table=B08006&geo_ids=16000US2938000,31000US2814

- 455 [0,16000US3915000,16000US1050670,01000US,16000US2036000&primary_geo_id=16000US](https://doi.org/10.16000US3915000,16000US1050670,01000US,16000US2036000&primary_geo_id=16000US)
- 456 [2938000](https://doi.org/10.2938000)
- 457 22. Bohannon RW, Williams Andrews A. Normal walking speed: a descriptive meta-
- 458 analysis. *Physiotherapy*. Sep 2011;97(3):182-9. doi:10.1016/j.physio.2010.12.004
- 459 23. ATS Committee on Proficiency Standards for Clinical Pulmonary Function Laboratories.
- 460 ATS Statement: guidelines for the six-minute walk test. *American Journal of Respiratory and*
- 461 *Critical Care Medicine*. 2002;166(1):111-117. doi:10.1164/ajrccm.166.1.at1102
- 462 24. Cella D, Lai JS, Jensen SE, et al. PROMIS Fatigue Item Bank had Clinical Validity
- 463 across Diverse Chronic Conditions. *J Clin Epidemiol*. May 2016;73:128-34.
- 464 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.08.037
- 465 25. Boyne P, Reisman D, Brian M, et al. Ventilatory threshold may be a more specific
- 466 measure of aerobic capacity than peak oxygen consumption rate in persons with stroke. *Topics in*
- 467 *Stroke Rehabilitation*. 2017/02/17 2017;24(2):149-157. doi:10.1080/10749357.2016.1209831
- 468 26. van den Berg LA, Berkhemer OA, Fransen PSS, et al. Economic Evaluation of
- 469 Endovascular Treatment for Acute Ischemic Stroke. *Stroke*. Mar 2022;53(3):968-975.
- 470 doi:10.1161/strokeaha.121.034599
- 471 27. Weerasekara I, Baye J, Burke M, et al. What do stroke survivors' value about
- 472 participating in research and what are the most important research problems related to stroke or
- 473 transient ischemic attack (TIA)? A survey. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. Oct 10 2021;21(1):209.
- 474 doi:10.1186/s12874-021-01390-y
- 475 28. Cost of Living Data Series. Missouri Economic Research and Information Center.
- 476 <https://meric.mo.gov/data/cost-living-data-series>.

- 477 29. Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2022. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics.
478 Updated April 25, 2023. <https://www.bls.gov/oes/current/oes291123.htm>.
- 479 30. Rigatti M, DeGurian AA, Albert SM. "Getting There": Transportation as a Barrier to
480 Research Participation Among Older Adults. *J Appl Gerontol*. May 2022;41(5):1321-1328.
481 doi:10.1177/07334648211072537
- 482 31. Health Research & Educational Trust. Social determinants of health series:
483 Transportation and the role of hospitals. Accessed October 13th, 2023.
484 <https://www.aha.org/transportation>.
- 485 32. Ransing R, Vadivel R, Halabi SE, et al. Language as Multi-Level Barrier in Health
486 Research and the Way Forward. *Indian J Psychol Med*. Jan 2023;45(1):65-68.
487 doi:10.1177/02537176211052071
- 488 33. Pandya M, Desai C. Compensation in clinical research: The debate continues. *Perspect*
489 *Clin Res*. Jan 2013;4(1):70-4. doi:10.4103/2229-3485.106394
- 490 34. Robinson KA, Dennison CR, Wayman DM, Pronovost PJ, Needham DM. Systematic
491 review identifies number of strategies important for retaining study participants. *J Clin*
492 *Epidemiol*. Aug 2007;60(8):757-65. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2006.11.023
- 493 35. Bierer BE, White SA, Gelinis L, Strauss DH. Fair payment and just benefits to enhance
494 diversity in clinical research. *J Clin Transl Sci*. 2021;5(1):e159. doi:10.1017/cts.2021.816

495

496

497

498

499 Table 1. Increased Cost Factor Associated with Recruitment and Screening

Assessment	Participants	Participants	Randomization	Increased Cost
	Assessed	Randomized	Ratio	Factor
Phone Screening	106	18	0.17	5.88

500

501

502

503

504

505

506

507

508

509

510

511

512

513

514

515

516

517

518

519
520
521
522
523
524
525
526
527
528
529
530
531
532
533
534
535
536
537
538
539
540
541





Figure 1. Distribution of participants enrolled in the HIT Stroke trial. The circle depicts a 50km radius to the laboratory with predominantly urban and suburban areas. Points are in arbitrary locations, equidistant to the laboratory to protect participant confidentiality. Point size indicates the number of participants recruited from the given area.

542 Figure 2. Percentages Associated with Trial Cost Distribution Across Categories



543

544

545

546

547

548

549

550

551


552

553

554

555

556 Figure 3. Cost for One Enrolled Participant to Complete Each Trial Phase



557

558

559

560

561

562

563

564

565

566


567

568

569

570

571 Figure 4. Cost of Participant Retention



572

573

574

575

576

577