

1 Feasibility trial of a new digital training package to enhance 2 primary care practitioners' communication of clinical empathy 3 and realistic optimism 4

5 Short Title: Enhancing communication of clinical empathy and realistic optimism in primary care

6
7 Felicity L Bishop,^{*1} Jeremy Howick,^{2#a} Jane Vennik,³ Jennifer Bostock,³ Paul Little,³ Christian Mallen,⁴

8 Leanne Morrison,^{1,3} Mary Steele,³ Beth Stuart,^{3,#b} Stephanie Hughes,³ Kirsten Smith,^{3,#c} Mohana

9 Ratnapalan,³ Emily Lyness,³ Hajira Dambha-Miller,³ Riya Tiwari,¹ Clare Lockyer-Stevens,³ Hazel

10 Everitt.³

11 12 Affiliations

13 1. School of Psychology, University of Southampton, Southampton, Hampshire, UK.

14 2. Faculty of Philosophy, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK.

15 3. Primary Care Research Centre, University of Southampton, Southampton, Hampshire, UK.

16 4. School of Medicine, Keele University, Keele, Staffordshire, UK.

17 ^{#a} Current address: Stoneygate Centre for Empathic Healthcare, Leicester Medical School, University
18 of Leicester, Leicester, Leicestershire, UK.

19 ^{#b} Current address: Centre for Evaluation and Methods Wolfson Institute of Population Health,
20 Queen Mary University of London, London, UK.

21 ^{#c} Current address: School of Computing, University of Portsmouth, Portsmouth, Hampshire, UK.

22
23 *Corresponding author

24 Email: F.L.Bishop@soton.ac.uk. (FLB)

27 Abstract

28 Background: Patients can benefit when primary care practitioners communicate clinical empathy
29 and optimism during consultations, but previous training interventions for practitioners are overly
30 time-consuming and evidence on patient outcomes is limited. This study assessed the feasibility of a
31 cluster-randomized controlled trial in UK general practice to evaluate effects of a new brief digital
32 learning package in empathy and optimism (EMPathicO) for primary care practitioners.

33 Methods: The study ran January to October 2020, with COVID-19 related modifications (mostly,
34 practitioner and patient data had to be collected separately) from March 2020. 9 practices and 12
35 primary care practitioners recruited from UK (Southern England, Midlands). 12 practitioners
36 completed EMPathicO training and 11 completed qualitative telephone interviews. Patients
37 recruited through social media completed web-based questionnaires at baseline (<2 weeks post-
38 consultation) and 2-week follow-up (n=437). Purposively sampled patients completed qualitative
39 telephone interviews (n=30). Data analysed descriptively and thematically.

40 Results: Practitioners were keen to reflect on and enhance communication skills and were willing to
41 undertake digital training, even during COVID-19 pandemic. However, some practices and
42 practitioners would have declined if video-recording consultations was a mandatory aid to reflection
43 during training. Practitioners found EMPathicO brief, relevant and engaging and could implement
44 techniques taught in the training. Patients found the online questionnaires acceptable, though
45 retention was suboptimal at 57%; minor easily remedied feasibility and process issues were
46 identified (including incentivizing participation); and patients were enthusiastic about research to
47 improve communication.

48 Conclusions: An agile research strategy enabled useful feasibility data to be collected despite the
49 challenges of the COVID pandemic. It is feasible to proceed to a full trial of the effects of EMPathicO
50 on patient outcomes in primary care, if video-recording consultations is optional not mandatory.

51 Feasibility work to develop and test sophisticated questionnaire structures is valuable when planning
52 primary care patient surveys.

53 Registration: ISRCTN21215037. Registered: 06/02/2020. <https://doi.org/10.1186/ISRCTN21215037>.

54

55 Introduction

56 Patient-practitioner communication is often sub-optimal,[1, 2] and improving practitioner
57 communication skills can improve patients' symptoms, quality of life, adherence to and satisfaction
58 with care, producing modest benefits that are comparable to many pharmaceutical interventions.[3-
59 5] Improved communication may also reduce the risk of worsening quality of life and symptom
60 management, unwanted prescriptions and non-adherence;[6, 7] unnecessary economic costs;[7]
61 deviation from guideline-recommended treatment;[8] and complaints and litigation.[9, 10] In
62 particular, there is scope to better harness the benefits of communicating clinical empathy and
63 positive expectations[11] using verbal and non-verbal communication in primary care.[12-14] While
64 practitioners are willing to engage in brief training,[14, 15] few interventions have been tested
65 clinically for effects on patients' health,[16] or are sufficiently well-described and brief to be
66 implementable in over-burdened, pressurised, primary care settings.[17-19]

67 We recently developed a new brief digital training package for primary care practitioners (PCPs),
68 called EMPathicO (see Fig 1). This training package is designed for PCPs (including GPs, nurses,
69 physiotherapists, and others) to enhance their communication of clinical empathy and realistic
70 optimism through verbal and non-verbal behaviours. To develop EMPathicO we used the systematic
71 multi-component person-based approach (PBA) to put intervention users and beneficiaries at the
72 heart of the design and development process[20] and integrated evidence- and theory-based
73 approaches[21] to ground our training package. A full account of how we developed EMPathicO
74 using the LifeGuide open-source software for creating digital health interventions[22] and its basis in
75 evidence, theory, and users' experiences, is presented elsewhere.[23] Fig 2 presents the
76 underpinning logic model summarising our theory of how EMPathicO could change PCP
77 communication behaviours which in turn could change patient expectancies, affect and cognitions
78 and subsequent patient outcomes (adapted from [23, 24]).

79

80 **Fig 1. Summary of EMPathicO Digital Training Intervention**

81

82 **Fig 2. Logic Model for EMPathicO**

83

84 This study was designed to test the feasibility of evaluating EMPathicO in a cluster-randomized
85 controlled trial in UK general practices, with two groups of patients – those consulting for OA and
86 those consulting for other reasons. Cluster-randomization at the level of general practices was
87 chosen because randomizing individual PCPs risks cross-contamination within practices if
88 practitioners discussed the training with each other. A randomized feasibility trial was chosen
89 because this would best enable us to test the feasibility of recruitment and randomization methods
90 and recruitment and retention rates for the planned full trial. Two groups of patients were included
91 because: interventions targeted to specific audiences and conditions are likely to be more relevant
92 to recipients[25] (i.e., our PCPs) and changes in communication skills are likely to ‘spill over’ into
93 PCPs’ wider practice and thus benefit more patients, even if examples in the intervention are
94 focused on a specific condition. OA was chosen as it is common - approximately ten percent of UK
95 adults had OA in 2017² - it is primarily managed through general practice, NICE Guidelines
96 recommend a patient-centred approach, and evidence suggests that OA is likely to be responsive to
97 empathic, optimistic communication.[2, 11, 26]

98 The aims were: to establish methods to maximise recruitment and minimise attrition of practices
99 and patients in practices with a range of socio-demographic areas; to identify feasible randomisation
100 and consent procedures and finalise inclusion/exclusion criteria; and to finalise outcome and process
101 measures.

102 Methods

103 Ethical Approval

104 Ethical approval for our original study design was granted by the South Central – Hampshire B
105 Research Ethics Committee on 6th December 2019 (19/SC/0553). The sponsor reviewed and
106 approved the modified study design on 31st March 2020 (ERGO number 52146). An amendment to
107 restart study activity in practices was approved by the Research Ethics Committee on 13th July 2020.

108 Design

109 A mixed methods feasibility study was designed to evaluate methods for a cluster-randomised trial
110 of EMPathicO in patients with hip /or knee OA and a wider sample of all-consulters. The study is
111 reported in accordance with applicable reporting guidelines and checklists are available in
112 supplementary materials: TIDieR (S1),[27] Consort pilot and feasibility trials extension (S2),[28]
113 Consort conserve extension (S3).[29]

114 **Original Study Design**

115 This original study design was a cluster-randomized trial allocating practices to EMPathicO or no-
116 intervention control using a 1:1 ratio; data were to be collected from practitioners and their patients
117 via video-recordings of consultations, qualitative focus groups and interviews, and self-report
118 questionnaires. This original study design is summarised in Fig 3 with planned methods in S4
119 Appendix. The original study design was implemented from January to February 2020, during which
120 5 practices, 8 practitioners, and no patients were recruited, two practices (three practitioners)
121 completed baseline activities and were randomised, and one practitioner completed the
122 intervention.

123

124 Fig 3: Original Study Design

125

126 **Extenuating Circumstances**

127 On 19th March 2020, the NIHR paused all non-essential clinical research in response to the COVID-19
128 pandemic.[30] Therefore, we ceased activity with enrolled practices/practitioners and modified our
129 research design to meet as many aims and objectives as possible within our funding window without
130 involving practices in patient recruitment. Modifications were planned by the research team and
131 reviewed by the sponsor. Previously enrolled practices and practitioners were transferred to the
132 modified study design on regaining capacity for research. It was not possible to return to the
133 original study design because capacity for research in primary care remained extremely limited.

134 **Modified Study Design**

135 The modified study design entailed two separate studies. One mixed methods study with
136 practitioners comprised a qualitative study with embedded quantitative data. Practitioners worked
137 through the intervention and were interviewed about their experiences of the intervention and
138 views on the planned trial; quantitative intervention usage data was captured and described.

139 One mixed methods study with patients comprised an online survey with an embedded qualitative
140 component. In the online survey patients completed process and outcome measures at two time-
141 points via a web-based questionnaire. In the qualitative study a purposive sub-sample of survey
142 respondents took part in a single qualitative interview about their experiences of the questionnaires
143 and their recent primary care consultations.

144 The modified study design is summarised in Fig 4, study components are mapped to objectives in
145 Table 1 and the methods are described below. Important modifications were: all practitioners
146 allocated to the intervention; patients recruited via social media within two weeks following a self-
147 reported primary care consultation with any PCP; no pre-consultation patient reported measures; no
148 filming of consultations; no practice staff interviews; one-to-one interviews with practitioners
149 instead of focus groups. Additional items were added to the patient survey asking about the impact

150 of COVID on participants' survey responses and work situation. Furthermore, part-way through the
151 patient survey we ceased collecting data on two outcome measures (the HADS and the SF-12) as we
152 recruited more patients to the survey than planned for the original study design and exhausted our
153 licensed administrations. The modified study design was implemented from May to October 2020.
154 The protocol is available in S5.

155

156 Fig 4: Modified Study Design

157

158 Table 1. Summary of Objectives, Associated Data, and Analytic Techniques

| Objective | Data | Analysis |
|--|--|--|
| To establish methods to maximise recruitment and minimise attrition of practices and patients, in practices with a range of socio-demographic areas | | |
| 1. to assess recruitment rates associated with different methods of recruitment. | Patient survey | Percentage of patients recruited through each method |
| 2. to assess retention rates. | Patient survey | Percentage of patients completing follow-up survey |
| 3. to identify barriers to recruitment and retention of practices, PCPs, and patients, and ways to overcome them. | PCP and patient qualitative interviews | Qualitative content analysis |
| | Researcher field notes | |
| 4. to identify enablers of recruitment and retention | PCP and patient | Qualitative content |

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| of practices, PCPs, and patients, and ways to harness them. | qualitative interviews | analysis |
| | Researcher field notes | |
| To identify feasible randomisation and consent procedures and finalise inclusion/exclusion criteria | | |
| 5. to test the feasibility of cluster randomisation. | Researcher field notes | Descriptive |
| 6. to test the feasibility of different ways of taking practitioner and patient consent (modified design – only online consent tested). | Ethics review PCP and patient qualitative interviews | Descriptive |
| To finalise outcome and process measures | | |
| 7. to test the practical and ethical feasibility of video-recording consultations (as part of the intervention to aide practitioner learning, and as a potential process measure). | Ethics review Researcher field notes PCP qualitative interviews | Descriptive |
| 8. to explore the relevance, feasibility and acceptability of potential outcome and process measures for OA consultations and others. | Patient and PCP qualitative interviews Patient survey Patient survey PCP process measures | Qualitative content analysis Missing data analysis; properties of bespoke measures |

| | | |
|---|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
| 9. to explore feasible methods of analysing filmed consultations. | N/A | N/A |
| 10. to establish likely effect sizes. | N/A | N/A |
| 11. to explore data for indicative changes in outcome and process measures. | PCP-reported process measures | Descriptive |
| 12. to explore effective engagement with EMPathicO. | PCP intervention usage data | Descriptive |
| | PCP qualitative interviews | Qualitative content analysis |

159 Note. N/A indicates data not available due to revised study design. ^a 3 practitioners recorded
 160 baseline consultations during the implementation of the original study design.

161

162 Patient Public Involvement (PPI)

163 Co-author Jennifer Bostock contributed a patient perspective to the design, conduct, and write-up of
 164 this study as a member of our trial management group. We received additional PPI input from
 165 others (see Acknowledgements) on specific aspects of this study. Our PPI partners were people with
 166 OA and/or carers for people with OA.

167 Recruitment, Eligibility, and Consent: Practitioners

168 Practitioners were recruited from practices who had already enrolled or expressed interest in the
 169 original study design and practices known to the research team. Practitioners were offered
 170 feedback on the study, certificates, and CPD guidance; NHS support costs and research costs to
 171 cover their time for participation were paid to practices in line with recommendations from the
 172 NIHR-CRN.

173 Eligible practitioners reported regularly seeing people with OA in primary care in England.

174 All practitioners received a participant information sheet and the opportunity to ask any questions
175 before giving informed consent via the trial website. Consent was reconfirmed verbally before
176 commencing qualitative interviews.

177 Recruitment, Eligibility, and Consent: Patients

178 Patients were recruited via targeted advertising on Facebook; social media posts (twitter, Instagram,
179 Facebook); and printed posters and flyers distributed to pharmacies, retail and community settings
180 in the Wessex region and other areas chosen to increase potential to reach people from diverse
181 ethnic backgrounds (e.g., parts of London and the Midlands). When practices regained capacity for
182 some research activity from July 2020, study adverts were also placed on general practice
183 websites/social media and practices sent SMS messages to their recent consulters. There were no
184 (financial or non-financial) incentives for survey respondents.

185 Eligible patients self-reported being at least 18 years old and having consulted a PCP within the
186 previous two weeks. Using targeted advertising, we sought to include some patients who had
187 consulted about OA symptoms and some who had consulted about other symptoms.

188 Study advertisements directed patients to the study website, on which they were presented with an
189 information sheet, screening questions, and consent questions before accessing the study
190 questionnaire on Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT). The information sheet provided contact details of
191 the research team for patients to ask any questions before giving informed consent online. Consent
192 was reconfirmed verbally before commencing qualitative interviews.

193 Sample Size

194 As per the original study design, we aimed to recruit up to 20 PCPs from 10 practices, 60 patients
195 with OA and 120 patients with other reasons for consulting. We considered this would be sufficient
196 to examine our objectives related to practice, practitioner and patient recruitment, patient
197 retention, and patient reported outcome and process measures; this size is also typical of UK
198 feasibility trials.[31] However, as the pandemic continued into summer 2020 it became clear that

199 we would likely under-recruit PCPs and over-recruit patients, and so we sought and obtained
 200 approval from the sponsor and ethics committee accordingly.

201

202 Outcome and Process Measures

203 Table 2 lists all patient-reported outcome and process measures by time-point. Patient-reported
 204 outcomes were guided by the OMERACT-OARSI core outcome domains for trials in hip and/or knee
 205 OA: pain, physical function, quality of life, patient global assessment of the target joint, and adverse
 206 events including mortality.[32] Process variables and measures were selected to assess key variables
 207 hypothesised to mediate the relationship between doing EMPathicO training and improved patient
 208 outcomes (as shown in logic model, Fig 2). Patients completed questionnaires via Qualtrics.
 209 Practitioners completed questionnaires within the EMPathicO intervention on LifeGuide.

210

211 **Table 2. Patient Reported Outcome and Process Measures**

| Construct | Measure | N items | Post- consultation | Follow -up |
|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|------------|-----------------------|---------------|
| Patient Reported Outcome | | | | |
| Pain intensity | Numerical Rating Scale | 1 | ✓ | ✓ |
| Symptoms | Symptom change | 1 | - | ✓ |
| Symptoms | Symptom bothersomeness | 1 | ✓ | ✓ |
| OA symptoms ^a | HOOS and KOOS[33-35] | 24 | ✓ | ✓ |
| Satisfaction with consultation | MISS for UK general practice[36] | 21 | ✓ | - |
| Enablement | Modified PEI[37] | 6 | ✓ | ✓ |
| Health-related quality of life | SF-12 v1 ^b [38] [39] | 12 | ✓ | ✓ |

| | | | | |
|--|--|----|---|---|
| Wellbeing | Short Warwick Edinburgh Wellbeing Scale[40] | 7 | ✓ | ✓ |
| Pain Medication Change | Bespoke Osteoarthritis Pain Medication Questionnaire | 5 | - | ✓ |
| Adverse events | Bespoke adverse events form | 2 | - | ✓ |
| Patient Reported Process | | | | |
| Perceptions of PCP empathy | CARE[41] | 10 | ✓ | - |
| Anxiety | Anxiety subscale of the HADS[42, 43] | 7 | ✓ | - |
| Perceptions of PCP response expectancies | Bespoke item | 1 | ✓ | - |
| Response expectancies | Expectancy subscale of the CEQ[44] | 3 | ✓ | - |
| Response expectancies | Treatment Expectation Questionnaire (TEX-Q) | 11 | ✓ | - |
| Treatment credibility | Credibility subscale of the CEQ[44] | 3 | ✓ | - |

212 Notes. ^a completed by OA group only. ^b the protocol stated SF12 v2 but due to an administrative
 213 error v1 was administered.

214

215 **Patient-Reported Outcomes**

216 *Patients Consulting for Hip-Knee OA Symptoms*

217 The short form of the Hip and Disability Osteoarthritis Score (HOOS-12) and the Knee Injury and
 218 Osteoarthritis Score (KOOS-12) each assess pain, function, and quality of life, and produce an overall
 219 summary hip/knee impact score respectively and are scored by summing items on each scale and
 220 transforming to a 0 (extreme symptoms) to 100 (no symptoms).[33] The 12-item versions reduce
 221 patient burden and demonstrated promising psychometric properties compared to the 40-item

222 versions in patients undergoing joint replacement surgery.[33-35] To assess patient global
223 assessment of target joint,[32] the OA group rated their knee or hip symptoms now compared to
224 two weeks ago. A single item 11-point numerical rating scale (pain in last week, 0=no pain; 10 =
225 worst possible pain) was also used in the OA group, to explore whether this would be more feasible
226 for patients to complete before a consultation, compared to the 12-item HOOS or KOOS.

227 A bespoke Osteoarthritis Pain Medication Questionnaire was used to assess medication change in
228 the OA group. This instrument, adapted from the validated Medication Change Questionnaire[45] to
229 reduce complexity for patients, asks patients to list all the osteoarthritis pain medications they are
230 using (to include all tablets, medicines, gels, and creams) and to rate any changes in use since
231 starting the study. The main adaptations were: removing the questions “Is there any of this
232 medication that you would like to cut down, to take less of?” and “Is there any of this medication
233 that you would like to take more of?” and the associated details; replacing daily dosage of all
234 medications with a qualitative judgment on any changes in medication use (“For each of these
235 medications, please tell us whether the amount you use has changed since you saw the
236 doctor/nurse/physiotherapist and joined this study approximately two weeks ago. Think about how
237 much you used this before you joined the study. Now think about how much you have use this since
238 you joined the study, about 2 weeks ago. Have you used this medication more, less, or about the
239 same as you did before?” Response options: Much more/A bit more/About the same/A little bit
240 less/Much less).

241 *All Patients*

242 To explore the feasibility of two candidate primary outcomes that could apply to both OA consulters
243 and others, we measured symptom change and symptom bothersomeness over the past two weeks.
244 The symptom change item asks patients to rate their overall symptom change (Much better/A little
245 better/About the same/A little worse/Much worse), and was adapted from the COOP-WONCA
246 charts.[46, 47] The symptom bothersomeness item asks patients to rate how bothersome their

247 symptoms are (Not at all/Slightly/Moderately/Very much/Extremely), and was adapted from the
248 item developed to assess severity of back pain in primary care.[48] Both are single item generic
249 symptom measures, feasible to collect from a large number of patients with diverse health
250 conditions.

251 The Patient Enablement Index (PEI) captures the extent to which patients feel confident and
252 empowered by a consultation to cope with their illness, to keep healthy and to help themselves.[37]

253 The original publication described six items with 4 response options (much better/never/same or
254 less/not applicable). We used a modified 7-point response scale using agree-disagree anchors to
255 increase sensitivity to change.

256 Overall satisfaction with the consultation was measured using the validated, reliable, 21-item UK
257 primary care version of the Medical Interview Satisfaction Scale (MISS-21).[36] The MISS-21 uses 7-
258 point agree-disagree Likert scales to assess patients' experiences of four aspects of the consultation
259 – satisfaction with communication (4 items, e.g., “The doctor did not really understand my main
260 reason for coming”), satisfaction with rapport (8 items, e.g., “the doctor seemed warm and friendly
261 to me”), feeling relief from distress (6 items, e.g., “after talking with the doctor, I know just how
262 serious my illness is”), and intending to follow advice (3 items, e.g., “It may be difficult for me to do
263 exactly what the doctor told me to do”).

264 Wellbeing was assessed using the Short Warwick Edinburgh Wellbeing Scale.[40] The Warwick
265 Edinburgh Wellbeing Scale underwent extensive development, focuses exclusively on positive
266 aspects of wellbeing, and captures both hedonic (pleasure) and eudaimonic (self-actualisation)
267 aspects of mental health.[49] The short version reduces participant burden and retains robust
268 psychometric properties as a unidimensional interval level scale. [40]

269 Quality of life was assessed using the SF-12 v1.[39] The SF-12 has acceptable psychometric
270 properties[38] and comprises 12 items evaluating patient-perceived impact of health concerns

271 (physical, emotional, pain) on activities of daily living including work and social activities, calculated
272 as physical health and mental health component scores.

273 An adverse events form was included at the follow-up measurement point. This form was adapted
274 from the ACTIB trial[50] and asks whether, since starting the study, participants had any of the
275 following events: a life threatening event, admission to hospital where you had to stay overnight,
276 other medical events requiring medical attention. They are asked to provide details of any such
277 events. They are then asked “Has your health been adversely affected since the start of the study?”
278 with Yes/No response options, and space for details if ‘Yes’.

279 **Process Measures**

280 *Directly Assessed Process Measures*

281 Intervention usage data collected in a feasibility study can suggest essential and non-essential parts
282 of an intervention and provide insight into how it is used, potentially informing further tweaks to the
283 intervention before final full trial. Usage data was collected via LifeGuide and included: when and
284 for how long practitioners logged on to EMPathicO; which content was accessed (and for interactive
285 components, engaged with) and for how long; the order in which content was accessed.

286 *Practitioner-Reported Process Measures*

287 Our logic model includes three main precursors to practitioners adopting the behaviours taught in
288 EMPathicO: self-efficacy, outcome expectancy, and intentions for conveying empathy and optimism
289 in consultations. We wrote items to assess these constructs by following recommendations from
290 Bandura’s work on outcome expectancies and self-efficacy,[51] the Theory of Planned Behaviour on
291 intentions,[52, 53] and the Health Action Process Approach on coping efficacy,[54] and combining
292 standard item stems and response options with bespoke wording informed by qualitative interviews
293 conducted with PCPs during EMPathicO’s development.[23] This process resulted in 12 items
294 measuring self-efficacy for conveying empathy (7 items) and optimism (5 items) on 11-point
295 response scales; 8 pairs of items measuring outcome expectancy and outcome value for

296 implementing the changes selected as part of EMPathicO (scores on each pair were multiplied to
297 give a measure of expectancy in the likelihood and value of the outcome); and 3 items measuring
298 intentions to implement the changes selected as part of EMPathicO, on 7-point response scales (see
299 S6 Appendix).

300 *Patient-Reported Process Measures*

301 EMPathicO aims to improve PCPs' communication of clinical empathy and realistic optimism, and we
302 expect that any such changes, to be clinically meaningful, should be noticed by patients. Patient
303 perceptions of PCP clinical empathy were assessed using the 10-item CARE;^[41] patients rate how
304 well their practitioner demonstrated 10 aspects of clinical empathy in their consultation, using 5-
305 point response scales. This is validated, reliable, questionnaire has been used extensively in UK
306 primary care settings to assess patient perceptions of GP clinical empathy.

307 In the absence of an existing measure, patient perceptions of practitioner response expectancies
308 were assessed using a bespoke single item with 7 response options drafted for this study (see S6
309 Appendix).

310 Increases in practitioners' communication of clinical empathy and realistic optimism should lead to
311 increases in patients' response expectancies and perceptions of treatment credibility. The
312 Credibility Expectancy Questionnaire (CEQ)^[44] was used to assess patient response expectancies
313 and perceptions of treatment credibility. The 3-item expectancy subscale assesses the extent to
314 which patients believe their symptoms will improve. The 3-item credibility subscale assesses the
315 extent to which patients believe their treatment to be credible in general for their condition. The
316 CEQ is reliable and valid and has been used across many diverse settings and patient populations,
317 including OA and primary care.^[55, 56] We also assessed patient response expectancies using a
318 recently developed questionnaire specifically designed to assess patient expectations with respect to
319 the outcome of medical treatments, the Treatment Expectation Questionnaire (TEX-Q).^[57] This data
320 will be reported separately.

321 **Qualitative Data**

322 We invited all participating practitioners to take part in an audio-recorded semi-structured
323 telephone interview, conducted by KS and JV and anonymised on transcription by trained supervised
324 students. Interviews lasted between 14 and 32 minutes. The topic guide comprised open-ended
325 questions used flexibly to explore practitioners' experiences and perceptions of barriers and
326 facilitators to implementing the trial and to accessing and implementing EMPathicO (see S7
327 Appendix).

328 We invited by email a purposefully varied sample of 66 patient survey respondents to take part in a
329 telephone interview, aiming to include people with a range of age, gender, ethnicity, education
330 level, pain condition and OA, consultation modality (telephone, face-to-face or multiple) and
331 practitioner profession. Thirty-three people responded to invitations, 3 declined (without giving
332 reasons) and 30 were interviewed. The topic guide, developed and piloted by the study team,
333 comprised open-ended questions about experiences of the consultation, perceptions of practitioner
334 empathy and optimism, and experiences of the survey (see S8 Appendix). Participants were
335 encouraged to elaborate on their views and experiences of recent primary care consultations.
336 Interviews were conducted by three experienced female qualitative researchers (KS, JV, MS) and
337 lasted on average 28 minutes (range 15 to 43 minutes). Interviews were audio-recorded,
338 transcribed verbatim by a professional service, and anonymised using pseudonyms. Interviewees
339 were given £20 shopping e-vouchers.

340 Interviewers made field notes after each interview, capturing initial impressions and reflections on
341 the interview. Researchers also made field notes throughout the project, capturing reflections on
342 methods and processes including for example notes from conversations with research networks,
343 practice staff and PCPs. These were discussed at regular trial management meetings and key points
344 captured in meeting minutes.

345 Data Analysis Methods

346 Quantitative data were downloaded from LifeGuide and Qualtrics, cleaned, and imported into IBM
347 SPSS version 28 (IBM Corp, Armonk, NY) for analysis. Participant characteristics, recruitment and
348 retention rates, and patterns of intervention usage were examined using descriptive statistics. Scale
349 scores on all outcome and process measures were computed following published guidelines,
350 patterns of missing data were examined, and internal consistencies for new, bespoke, measures
351 were analysed using Cronbach’s alpha. Free text responses to survey questions were categorised by
352 meaning and described.

353 Qualitative interviews were transcribed verbatim, identifying details were removed and names
354 replaced with pseudonyms. Thematic analysis was applied to the practitioner and patient
355 interviews, to identify barriers and facilitators to recruitment and retention and to explore the
356 relevance, feasibility and acceptability of the outcome and process measures.[58] Multiple
357 researchers (JV, KS, CL-S, FB) were involved in the qualitative analysis to guard against idiosyncratic
358 or overly selective coding. NVivo version 14 (Lumivero, Denver, CO) was used to facilitate coding,
359 organise qualitative data, and maintain an audit trail of the analysis.

360 Table 1 maps the data and analyses to the objectives.

361 Results

362 Participants

363 Twelve practitioners from 9 primary care practices took part by working through the intervention
364 (Table 3). Four hundred and thirty seven patients consented to the online survey and 387 (89%)
365 answered at least one post-consent question, of whom 30 also took part in a qualitative interview
366 (see Table 4). The majority of patients (67%, n=294) were recruited via Facebook, others were
367 recruited via personal networks (11%, n=50), GP surgeries (9%, n=40), twitter (6%, n=25), and

368 adverts placed with charities, community settings, pharmacies, social prescribers, Universities, and
 369 press release (<5% each).

370

371 **Table 3. Characteristics of Practitioner Participants (n=12)**

| Characteristic | Category | n | % |
|--|-----------------------------------|---|-----|
| Gender | Female | 9 | 75% |
| | Male | 3 | 25% |
| Job role | GP partner | 4 | 33% |
| | GP trainee | 2 | 17% |
| | Physiotherapist | 4 | 33% |
| | Salaried GP | 2 | 17% |
| Practice index of multiple deprivation | 1-5 | 2 | 17% |
| | 6-10 | 6 | 50% |
| | Not available (military practice) | 4 | 33% |
| Practice list size | Small (<7900) ^a | 5 | 42% |
| | Large (>7900) | 7 | 58% |

372 ^a 7900 is median practice list size in England.

373

374 **Table 4. Characteristics of Patient Participants**

| Characteristic | Category | Survey respondents (n=437) | | Interviewees (n=30) | |
|----------------|----------|-------------------------------|------|------------------------|-----|
| | | n | % | n | % |
| Gender | Male | 80 | 12.6 | 7 | 23% |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|--|-----|------|----|-----|
| | Female | 302 | 69.1 | 23 | 77% |
| | Missing | 55 | 12.6 | | |
| Age | 18-29 | 21 | 4.8 | 2 | 7% |
| | 30-39 | 46 | 10.5 | 5 | 17% |
| | 40-49 | 32 | 7.3 | 0 | |
| | 50-59 | 43 | 9.8 | 2 | 7% |
| | 60-69 | 108 | 24.7 | 8 | 27% |
| | 70-79 | 115 | 26.3 | 11 | 37% |
| | 80+ | 12 | 2.7 | 2 | 7% |
| | Missing | 60 | 13.7 | 0 | |
| Ethnicity | White | 296 | 67.7 | 26 | 87% |
| | Mixed/ Multiple ethnic groups | 1 | .2 | 0 | |
| | Asian/ Asian British | 2 | .5 | 1 | 3% |
| | Black/ African/ Caribbean/ Black British | 1 | .2 | 0 | |
| | Other | 2 | .5 | 1 | 3% |
| | Missing | 135 | 30.9 | 2 | 7% |
| Employment | Employed full time | 59 | 13.5 | 4 | 13% |
| | Employed part-time | 42 | 9.6 | 5 | 17% |
| | Retired | 144 | 33.0 | 15 | 50% |
| | Unable to work | 11 | 2.5 | 2 | 7% |
| | Unemployed | 3 | .7 | 1 | 3% |
| | Doing unpaid work (E.g volunteering) | 8 | 1.8 | 0 | |
| | Other | 36 | 8.2 | 1 | 3% |
| | Missing | 134 | 30.7 | 2 | 7% |
| Education | No formal educational qualifications | 15 | 3.4 | 1 | 3% |

| | | | | | |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|
| | GCSEs/O levels/similar | 54 | 12.4 | 3 | 10% |
| | A levels or similar or ONC/OND | 48 | 11.0 | 6 | 20% |
| | HNC/HND degree | 19 | 4.3 | 3 | 10% |
| | Degree | 80 | 18.3 | 13 | 43% |
| | Postgraduate degree | 66 | 15.1 | 0 | |
| | Other | 21 | 4.8 | 2 | 7% |
| | Missing | 134 | 30.7 | 2 | 7% |
| IMD Decile | 1 (most deprived) – 5 | 90 | 21% | N/A | |
| | 6 - 10 (least deprived) | 173 | 40% | N/A | |
| | Missing | 174 | 40% | N/A | |

375 Note. N/A indicates data not available. IMD – Index of Multiple Deprivation (computed from
376 postcode).

377

378 **Objective 1: Recruitment and Retention**

379 **Recruitment and Retention Rates**

380 The flow of practices and practitioners through the study is shown in Fig 5. Twenty practices
381 expressed interest in the study, of whom 9 (45%) went on to participate. Twelve practitioners were
382 recruited over 6 months (January to June 2020) and 11 (92%) completed the study (one, 8% did not
383 respond to attempts to organise the qualitative interview).

384

385 **Fig 5. Flow of Practices and Practitioners through Study**

386

387 The flow of patients through the study is shown in Fig 6. It is not possible to identify how many
388 unique individuals visited the website, but after 1029 recorded visits, 437 eligible patients (42%)
389 went on to complete (at least some of) the baseline survey over 5 months (May to October 2020).
390 Most patients (91%) were consulting for reasons other than hip or knee OA. More patients
391 completed the follow-up questionnaire in the OA group (66%) compared to the all-comers group
392 (48%). After removing the 50 participants who consented but did not answer any of the baseline
393 survey, the overall retention rate from baseline to follow-up was 57% (219/387). Recruitment
394 ceased on reaching sufficient sample size for feasibility objectives, given the modified design and the
395 ongoing pandemic context precluding further recruitment within our funding window.

396

397 [Fig 6. Flow of Patients through Study](#)

398

399 **Barriers and Enablers of Practice and Practitioner Recruitment and** 400 **Retention**

401 The team worked with four clinical research networks (each supporting research in a different
402 geographical area) but only two successfully recruited practices. The lower service support costs
403 (funding for practices to cover their research activity) agreed by one network may have contributed
404 to lack of practice recruitment in their area. In the 11 practices expressing interest and subsequently
405 declining, the main reasons were lack of research capacity and/or COVID. During the five completed
406 site initiation visits, practices were generally enthusiastic about the study. They planned to involve
407 mainly GPs but also nurses and physiotherapists. The three practices who withdrew after study set-
408 up did so because of COVID.

409 The one practitioner who was interviewed after having experienced the original design study set up
410 found the study appealing and feasible to conduct in practice. However, they found the multiple

411 consent forms and paperwork complicated and recommended flow charts and “keeping it nice and
412 streamlined and straightforward” (PCP02, GP) and avoiding the confusing discrepancy between the
413 study name (“TIP”) and the intervention name (“EMPathicO”).

414 Retention of practitioner participants was very high, with 11 out of 12 completing the process
415 measures embedded in the intervention and taking part in a qualitative interview. This may be
416 because practitioner interviewees self-identified as having an interest in training and/or
417 communication. They perceived that others might not prioritise this type of learning (over
418 biomedical topics) and uptake could be lower in a larger study and/or future dissemination.
419 However, practitioners thought EMPathicO would be relevant to anyone who consults with patients,
420 for example “I think it would cross lots of different clinical specialisms, from doctors to nurses, to
421 physios, to rehabilitators like myself because ultimately it's ensuring that within that consultation,
422 you take as much from it as you can, but you also give the patient as much as they need from that
423 that time” (PCP07, Physiotherapist). Nurse practitioners, advanced nurse practitioners, pharmacists
424 and physician associates (PAs) were also mentioned as suitable training recipients. Many
425 practitioners felt that EMPathicO would be particularly helpful for trainees or clinicians new-to-
426 practice, but also found it useful themselves as experienced practitioners.

427 **Barriers and Enablers of Patient Recruitment and Retention**

428 Patients were recruited into the survey from targeted Facebook advertisements (n=294, 67%),
429 personal contacts (n=50, 11%), GP websites and SMS messages (n=40, 9%), and twitter (n=25, 6%);
430 less than 5% were recruited from the remaining sources (patient charities, community, pharmacies,
431 social prescribers, press release, University community).

432 Patient interviewees described taking part because they wanted to help the researchers, to improve
433 NHS services, to help doctors better appreciate patients’ perspectives, or to contribute to research
434 that they perceived as being interesting or worthwhile. People who had recently had a primary care
435 consultation when they saw the study advert perceived it to be relevant to them and were

436 motivated to share their experiences of that consultation. This was true for people who described
437 that consultation in broadly positive, negative, or mixed terms.

438 Patient interviewees expressed having had some concerns about taking part, related to data
439 protection, governance, sharing details about a mental health consultation, the time commitment
440 required, and not being able remember their consultation in sufficient detail. These concerns were
441 either not strong enough to deter participation or were allayed by reassuring factors such as: feeling
442 they understood what was involved in participating, the study being conducted by a reputable host
443 institution (University of Southampton), having independently verified the study (by searching for
444 and finding its webpage), understanding that research is conducted within ethical and governance
445 standards, being able to complete study questionnaires at a time that would fit around existing
446 commitments, and being able to withdraw from the study at any time.

447 Retention from baseline to follow-up was low at 57% overall. Retention was higher among patients
448 with hip or knee OA (66%) than among all-comers (48%). Interviewees – who may have been more
449 committed to the study than other survey respondents - reported that completing the follow-up
450 questionnaire was “fine” or “not a problem”. Several participants reported missing the first reminder
451 email and some suggested, for example “Another email reminder would have been helpful”
452 (Patient01).

453 **Objective 2: Randomisation and Consent**

454 **Feasibility of Randomisation**

455 The modified study design was implemented after only two practices had been randomised. No
456 problems or concerns were encountered from this limited experience with cluster randomisation.

457 **Feasibility of Consent**

458 The sponsor and the Research Ethics Committee approved our original study design with a range of
459 approaches to obtaining informed consent from patients, including: pre-consultation by a

460 researcher in person in the surgery, pre-consultation during computerised check-in followed by post-
461 consultation by a researcher in person in the surgery, post-consultation by a researcher in person in
462 the surgery, by the practitioner at the start of the consultation, provisionally by the practitioner at
463 the start of the consultation followed by a researcher in person in the surgery. Two practices
464 expressed concern during site initiation visits about patients being consented and completing pre-
465 consultation measures in the waiting room and planned to set aside a private space for this. In the
466 modified study design patient and practitioner participants all completed consent online and no
467 concerns were raised.

468 **Objective 3: Outcome and Process Measures**

469 **Filming and Analysing Consultations**

470 One practice who expressed interest and then declined to participate reported being deterred by
471 the requirement to video consultations as an aid to reflecting on one's consultations during the
472 training (see Figure 1). Three of the five practices who had a site set-up visit had their own video-
473 recording equipment, the other two required loans from the research team.

474 Only one practitioner interviewee filmed their baseline consultations (before the COVID
475 modification). They reported that patients agreed to be recorded and both parties soon forgot the
476 camera was on, so considered there was little effect on the consultation itself. However, they also
477 acknowledged selecting patients they knew would be open to being recorded.

478 GP interviewees described video-recording consultations as a powerful, educational tool that is
479 valuable for self-reflection and self-improvement, but they associated it with their own – for some
480 “difficult” and “painful” - experiences of recording their consultations as trainees. They considered it
481 difficult for regular GPs to record consultations for training purposes in routine clinics due to the
482 advanced planning and extra time required. And some would have been put off taking part had
483 videos been mandatory in the modified study design, for example: “I may not have participated if

484 that [videoing consultations] had been something I had to do for this [study].” (PCP01, GP), and “I
485 think for me, it just probably wouldn't happen. I can't think that I would be able to easily just set that
486 up on a day and think about how- it would just be another thing to try and do, rather than
487 something that just fitted in easily into some learning.” (PCP05, GP) Physiotherapist interviewees did
488 not have previous experience of recording their consultations. Overall, practitioner interviewees
489 suggested that recording consultations should be an optional part of EMPathicO, recognising that
490 many clinicians would not do it unless it was mandatory.

491 Because so few consultations were video-recorded before switching to the modified study design,
492 there was insufficient data to develop an analytic approach based on these data alone. This aspect
493 of the study was deprioritised and is being addressed separately.

494 **Relevance, Feasibility and Acceptability of Outcome and Process Measures**

495 *Patient Reported Measures*

496 Fig 7 shows the flow of participants through the baseline survey. Overall, 304 out of 437 participants
497 (70%) attempted every section of the survey that applied to them. Fifty respondents stopped
498 completing the survey immediately after the consent pages and are excluded from further analyses.
499 Fourteen people stopped after the MISS-21 and before the section asking about any treatments
500 recommended during their consultation. Thirteen people stopped after the section on treatment
501 expectations, which contained two similar measures for validation purposes (the CEQ and the TEX-
502 Q) but may have been perceived as repetitive by participants. Very few participants dropped out in
503 the final sections of the survey, although 12 stopped immediately before the final demographic
504 section asking for what could be perceived as more personal, potentially identifying, characteristics
505 including ethnicity and postcode.

506

507 **Fig 7. Flow of Patients through Baseline Survey Showing Numbers**

508 **Withdrawing per Section**

509

510 Table 5 shows the proportion of missing data points within each section of the baseline survey,
 511 among participants who were retained in the survey up to that point. Two questionnaires had
 512 notably higher rates of missing data – the MISS-21 (16%) and the CEQ (10%). On the MISS-21, four
 513 items towards the end of the questionnaire were skipped by more than 100 participants: The
 514 clinician has relieved my worries about my illness; I expect it will be easy for me to follow the
 515 clinician's advice; It may be difficult for me to do exactly what the clinician told me to do; I'm not
 516 sure the clinician's treatment will be worth the trouble it will take (MISS-21 items 17, 19, 20, 21). On
 517 the CEQ, the missing data was driven by 20 participants who skipped this whole questionnaire
 518 before going on to complete the next section.

519

520 **Table 5. Missing Data by Baseline Survey Section**

| Section | Retained Participants | Items | Missing Data Points | |
|---|-----------------------|-------|---------------------|-----|
| | n | n | n | % |
| Consultation characteristics | 387 | 3 | 0 | 0 |
| Gender, Age | 382 | 2 | 5 | 1% |
| Reasons for appointment, pain, bothersomeness | 372 | 4 | 2 | <1% |
| Hip OA (HOOS) | 21 | 12 | 5 | 2% |
| Knee OA (KOOS) | 29 | 12 | 17 | 5% |
| Perceived empathy (CARE) | 365 | 10 | 261 | 7% |
| Satisfaction (MISS-21) | 355 | 21 | 1169 | 16% |

| | | | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|-----|-----|
| Recommended treatment | 341 | 3 | 5 | 1% |
| Treatment Expectations (CEQ) | 206 | 6 | 124 | 10% |
| Wellbeing (SWEWBS) | 319 | 7 | 24 | 1% |
| Quality of Life (SF-12) | 190 | 12 | 8 | <1% |
| Anxiety and Depression (HADS) | 187 | 14 | 15 | 1% |
| Enablement (PEI) | 316 | 6 | 18 | 1% |
| COVID impact | 315 | 2 | 12 | 2% |
| Demographics | 303 | 5 | 6 | <1% |

521

522 Scores on the two bespoke 7-point items used to evaluate participants' perceptions of clinician
 523 optimism are summarised in Table 6; the full range was used, mean scores were slightly above the
 524 scale mid-point, and missing data was minimal. Supporting the convergent validity of the perceived
 525 clinician optimism about treatment item, scores were positively correlated with scores on the
 526 established CEQ measure of patient expectancy, $r(203)=.40$, $p<.001$, and credibility of treatment
 527 $r(203)=.45$, $p<.001$.

528

529 **Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Bespoke Items Assessing Patient**
 530 **Perception of Clinician Optimism**

| Item | N | Min | Max | M | SD | Missing (n) |
|--|-----|-----|-----|------|------|----------------|
| Thinking about your appointment, how optimistic was the clinician that your treatment will help you? | 230 | 1 | 7 | 5.40 | 1.12 | 1 |
| Thinking about your appointment, how | 103 | 1 | 7 | 4.48 | 1.21 | 2 |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| optimistic was the clinician? | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|

531

532 One open-ended survey question asked if participants had any problems filling in the questionnaire.
533 Of 67 responses to this question, 26 indicated no problems; 25 suggested 'not applicable' options
534 are needed and/or that some questions were difficult to answer, particularly for people who had
535 consulted about test results or were given a referral for further investigations; 8 described problems
536 viewing some items on a phone; and 7 provided other comments and/or clarifications (e.g., "it was a
537 bit long", "I was treated by a nurse not a clinician as such").

538 Across all baseline survey participants, the median survey duration was 17 minutes (IQ range: 10.8 –
539 25.9). Most patient interviewees reported that they had found the questionnaire acceptable in
540 terms of number of questions, time taken to answer them, clarity and ease of completion. For
541 example, "It seemed to be a reasonable use of my time! If it had been three-quarters-of-an-hour or
542 something I might have thought twice, but it wasn't." (Patient29). A few interviewees reported
543 finding the questionnaire "a bit long" with some items that seemed repetitive, but none said the
544 length was unacceptable with some noting that due to being in lockdown they had more spare time
545 than usual. Interviewees reported that they had found the question content "relevant", "clear",
546 "straight forward", "simple", and were, on the whole, willing to answer even the questions about
547 more sensitive topics such as mental health (e.g., the HADS). For example, "I thought it was good
548 though, it looked at it quite holistically. I know some of the questions were mental health ones, I
549 thought that was quite interesting to not just talk about your appointment, but also how it fits in
550 with the overall context" (Patient27).

551 Similar to the feedback on the survey, some interviewees whose consultation concluded with a
552 referral, follow-up appointment, advice, or new clarity that no treatment was needed, found it
553 difficult to answer questions that appeared to them to be about a prescribed treatment (despite
554 some explanatory text having been provided on the questionnaire). For example, "I didn't really

555 have treatment and I wasn't given medication and things so. It's just the blood tests told us it wasn't
556 DVT. So then it's just up to me to rest and not over work it and it will eventually get better. So in that
557 way I felt a lot of it [the survey] didn't apply to my case" (Patient9). Possible solutions suggested by
558 interviewees including providing more 'not applicable' response options and more free text boxes to
559 enable them to explain the nuance and context of their consultation. A few interviewees noted the
560 difficulty of expressing their experiences of pain and comorbid physical and mental health
561 conditions; one chose to answer the questionnaires in relation to her recent physical health
562 consultation, feeling that her recent mental health consultation was "too personal".

563 *Practitioner-Reported Measures*

564 All twelve practitioner participants completed demographic and clinical characteristics questions. All
565 but one participant completed the new bespoke scales (practitioner self-efficacy to communicate
566 clinical empathy and realistic optimism, practitioner intentions to achieve their individual behaviour
567 change goals and practitioner outcome expectancies for their behaviour change goals), descriptive
568 statistics for which are shown in Table 7. All four scales demonstrated acceptable internal
569 consistency (Cronbach's alphas ranged 0.69-0.98; Table 7). Practitioner interviewees reported no
570 difficulties or concerns about the practitioner-completed measures.

571

572 **Table 7. Descriptive Statistics for Practitioner-Completed Process Measures**

573 **(n=11)**

| Scale | Possible range | Actual range | M | SD | Cronbach's α |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------|-----------|---------------------------------------|
| Self-Efficacy for Empathy | 1-10 | 5.0-8.5 | 6.98 | 1.12 | 0.94 |
| Self-Efficacy for Optimism | 1-10 | 5.4-9.4 | 7.05 | 1.01 | 0.88 |
| Intention to Achieve Goals | 1-7 | 2.0-7.0 | 5.94 | 1.47 | 0.98 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------|---------|------|------|------|
| Outcome of Achieving Goals (Expected Outcome x Value of Outcome) | -21-+21 | 0.0-6.9 | 3.55 | 2.08 | 0.69 |
|--|---------|---------|------|------|------|

574

575 **Effect Sizes and Indicative Changes**

576 The modified design meant we were unable to evaluate effect sizes or indicative changes on patient
577 reported outcome measures. Descriptive statistics for baseline patient reported outcome and
578 process measures are presented in Table 8; mean scores should be interpreted with caution as over
579 half of patients said that COVID had influenced their responses to the survey (51.7%, 163 of 315
580 respondents to that question).

Table 8. Descriptive Statistics at Baseline for Patient-Reported Outcome and Process Measures

| Construct | Scale | N | N Items | M | SD | se | Min-Max | Cronbach' s α |
|---|-------------------------------------|-----|------------|-------|-------|------|---------|-------------------------|
| <i>Patient-Reported Outcomes</i> | | | | | | | | |
| Pain Intensity | Average pain intensity in past week | 189 | 1 | 6.03 | 2.22 | 0.16 | 1-10 | N/A |
| Symptoms | Symptom bothersomeness in past week | 372 | 1 | 3.84 | 1.23 | 0.06 | 1-6 | N/A |
| OA Symptoms | Hip Symptoms (HOOS-12) | 17 | 12 | 27.82 | 14.47 | 3.51 | 2.1-50 | 0.89 |
| | Hip Pain (HOOS-12) | 21 | 4 | 29.46 | 16.07 | 3.51 | 0-68.8 | 0.71 |
| | Hip Function (HOOS-12) | 17 | 4 | 30.51 | 18.47 | 4.48 | 0-62.5 | 0.89 |
| | Hip Quality of Life (HOOS-12) | 21 | 4 | 28.3 | 16.49 | 3.60 | 0-50.0 | 0.66 |
| | Knee Symptoms (KOOS-12) | 22 | 12 | 27.37 | 16.24 | 3.46 | 0-56.3 | 0.92 |
| | Knee Pain (KOOS-12) | 28 | 4 | 28.57 | 17.30 | 3.27 | 0-62.5 | 0.83 |
| | Knee Function (KOOS-12) | 22 | 4 | 28.98 | 17.73 | 3.78 | 0-68.8 | 0.87 |
| | Knee Quality of Life (KOOS-12) | 28 | 4 | 23.44 | 17.15 | 3.24 | 0-56.3 | 0.71 |
| Satisfaction with consultation | Overall Satisfaction (MISS-21) | 164 | 21 | 4.24 | 0.71 | 0.06 | 1.9-6.1 | 0.83 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----|----|-------|-------|------|------------|------|
| | Distress Relief (MISS-21) | 196 | 6 | 4.37 | 1.31 | 0.09 | 1-7 | 0.94 |
| | Communication Comfort (MISS-21) | 302 | 4 | 2.48 | 1.20 | 0.07 | 1-5.8 | 0.78 |
| | Rapport (MISS-21) | 217 | 8 | 5.28 | 1.32 | 0.09 | 1.5-7 | 0.96 |
| | Compliance Intent (MISS-21) | 226 | 3 | 3.57 | 0.66 | 0.04 | 1.7-5.3 | 0.61 |
| Enablement | Enablement (PEI) | 313 | 6 | 3.46 | 1.24 | 0.07 | 1-7 | 0.93 |
| Health-related quality of life | Quality of Life - Physical (SF-12) | 188 | 12 | 41.17 | 13.13 | 0.96 | 12.1-64.6 | N/A |
| | Quality of Life - Mental (SF-12) | 188 | 12 | 44.74 | 11.80 | 0.86 | 8.2-44.7 | N/A |
| | Wellbeing (Short Warwick Edinburgh Wellbeing Scale) | 313 | 7 | 23.77 | 5.38 | 0.30 | 7-35 | 0.90 |
| Process Measures | | | | | | | | |
| Perceived empathy and optimism | Perceived clinician empathy (CARE) | 254 | 10 | 38.2 | 12.60 | 0.79 | 10-50 | 0.99 |
| | Perceived clinician optimism | 333 | 1 | 5.12 | 1.23 | 0.07 | 1-7 | N/A |
| | Treatment Expectancy (CEQ) | 204 | 3 | .05 | 7.89 | 0.55 | -17.9-10.2 | 0.94 |
| | Treatment Credibility (CEQ) | 205 | 3 | -.01 | 6.27 | 0.44 | -16.9-7.1 | 0.86 |
| Mental health | Anxiety (HADS-A) | 186 | 7 | 13.44 | 4.49 | 0.33 | 0-21 | 0.87 |
| | Depression (HADS-D) | 185 | 7 | 6.91 | 4.25 | 0.31 | 0-21 | 0.84 |

582 As shown in Table 7, practitioners who had worked through the intervention, scored on average
583 above the mid-point on all four measures of practitioner self-efficacy, intentions, and outcome
584 expectancies. This indicates that they had high levels of self-efficacy for communicating empathy
585 and optimism, strong intentions to achieve their personal goals, and belief that achieving personal
586 goals would have valued consequences. Qualitative data from the practitioner interviews further
587 suggested that the practitioners were able to change some of their consultation behaviours to
588 implement techniques from EMPathicO into their consultations. For example, “It has definitely
589 impacted my consult. I think I’m consciously structured them differently so I am letting the patient
590 talk. Uh, get to know what I want to know. Try to reflect back on some of those goals, and then again
591 I make sure I finish on something positive” (PCP03, Physiotherapist). Practitioners described the
592 training content to be easy to implement in practice and perceived that just small changes could
593 make a difference to the consultation. Whilst participants generally found it easy to immediately
594 implement the training techniques, there was perceived value in slightly longer term engagement to
595 support behaviour change: “Sometimes a short period of times not long enough to ingrain the
596 change in your style or in your behaviour, but after say three months you might have actually made
597 the shift that you hadn’t realised” (PCP01, GP). Follow-up email prompts, a quiz, a short revision
598 module, and the opportunity to revisit specific previously bookmarked content were suggested as
599 ways to help practitioners embed new behaviours in practice.

600 **Effective Engagement with EMPathicO**

601 Effective engagement refers to sufficient and appropriate engagement with an intervention to
602 facilitate the intended outcomes.[59] Because the modified design separated the practitioner and
603 patient elements of the study, we were unable to measure patients’ ratings of clinician empathy and
604 optimism and to relate those to training utilisation. Instead, we explored clinicians’ patterns of
605 utilisation and experiences of the training to gain qualitative insights into engagement and potential
606 updates or tweaks that could be made before a full trial.

607 Practitioners accessed EMPathicO between one and ten times (median = 3.5, total 59) and typically
608 did so for less than an hour in total, spending longer on the content modules than on the reflection
609 and goal setting modules (Table 9). Participants accessed the intervention mostly during working
610 hours 09:00-18:00 (49 sessions), and all sessions took place between 05:00 and 22:00. Interviewees
611 described the time to complete the training as appropriate and not too burdensome.

612

613 **Table 9. Mean and standard deviation time spent by practitioners on**
614 **EMPathicO (n=12)**

| | Time spent (minutes) | |
|----------------|----------------------|-------|
| Module | M | SD |
| Empathy | 12.08 | 14.30 |
| Optimism | 14.95 | 11.77 |
| Osteoarthritis | 17.93 | 7.61 |
| Reflection | 7.93 | 5.94 |
| Goal Setting | 3.94 | 3.09 |
| Total | 56.84 | 24.82 |

615

616 Practitioners described EMPathicO as clear, user-friendly, and relevant. For example:

617 “it was easy to access, it was user friendly, it seemed quite straightforward and following the
618 instructions through the course, it seems very targeted, it was brief enough not to become
619 too onerous. I think some of these online learning tools can become quite burdensome in
620 the time that they take, and they don't allow you to read through at the speed that you
621 want to. So it was brief and to the point, but had enough information to allow you to grasp

622 what the aims of it were and for you to sort of personalise it to your own experience.”

623 (PCP09, GP).

624 The content was described as straight forward and not heavy going, but well-referenced enough

625 with good links to further evidence if desired. Practitioners liked the modular structure of

626 EMPathicO that could be completed all at one session, or separately over different days, and found

627 it easy to navigate with a good mixture of learning resources including text, video, and reflection.

628 Some found it helpful to leave time between modules to reflect on and try to implement the ideas

629 suggested.

630 The empathy module was generally described as a helpful refresher of fundamental points that

631 clinicians felt that they already knew, and this was the case for very experienced and more recently

632 trained practitioners, for GPs and physiotherapists. For example, “some of that, well I suppose I felt

633 was maybe a bit basic, but it's- it's a recap isn't it? So, it's not wasted learning” (PCP10, GP). Most

634 thought it was helpful to bring together multiple aspects of empathy in one place in a way that

635 facilitated explicit, focused, reflection on their current practice. One physiotherapist had not

636 thought about the use of empathy as a treatment and found the ideas more novel. Practitioners

637 found it helpful to be reminded of the importance of non-verbal communication for communicating

638 empathy and some reflected on times when their non-verbal communication may have diverged

639 from their verbal communication.

640 The optimism module was generally seen as relevant, novel, implementable and thought-provoking:

641 “Novel and it was made to be very achievable, and probably is something we don't do normally”

642 (PCP02, GP). It felt relevant to practitioners who, even if they saw themselves as generally optimistic

643 people, described how this may not be consistently communicated to patients in practice especially

644 towards the end of a long day or week: “So by Friday we kind of had that drain on your mood all

645 week and sometimes you can find when you're with a patient that is particularly negative, you know

646 it hits you at the right time and you can see that spiralling yourself, with the way you're kind of

647 going, well, maybe you're right, there is no hope to your knee pain or whatever it might be." (PCP04,
648 Physiotherapist). Aspects that were highlighted by practitioners as being particularly novel and
649 implementable were conceptualising optimism as a form of treatment, using optimism in "difficult
650 consultations," using optimism later in the consultation but not at the start, specific phrases
651 suggested in EMPathicO to convey optimism, and reframing safety netting in a more positive way.
652 Practitioners reflected on the complexities of optimistic communication in the context of a weak
653 evidence base, in situations that seemed to require supporting patients to accept the status quo,
654 and when patients hold what the practitioner considers to be unrealistic expectations. Content
655 about the need to tailor optimism to individuals was well-received: "So particularly the parts that
656 spoke about being specific and being realistic, I thought were kind of helpful, rather than just a
657 broad statement about trying to be optimistic. So yeah, sort of tailoring it through the consultation
658 was useful" (PCP05, GP).

659 The OA module was described as straightforward; practitioners were positive about the benefits of
660 empathy and optimism in OA and felt the module would help them to enhance consultations
661 accordingly. Participants suggested adding content on how to deal with patients who struggle to be
662 optimistic, and those who consider that they have already adhered to recommended exercises or
663 medication without the desired outcome. GPs found the video of an OA GP consultation somewhat
664 idealistic in that the patient consulted primarily for knee pain, accepted the given treatment options,
665 and had no competing health needs. Physiotherapists found the video overly simplistic: "If I look at
666 it with my biases of physio having 45 - 60 minutes for the new patient, it does take a reductionist
667 approach in terms of like here's a couple of exercises, you'll be fine. Things can be more complicated
668 than that I would suggest. But in a 15-minute consult I thought it was a really good way to show the
669 elements of empathy, positive language and then the kind of the warming up" (PCP04,
670 Physiotherapist).

671 When engaging with the reflection module, most participants described using the EMPathicO
672 checklist to guide them. Participants often reflected on a consultation that they had conducted in
673 the previous couple of days to ensure they could recall things clearly. Some also took a broader
674 approach, considering what they do in more general terms, but found this to be less specific or
675 useful. Most found the reflection and goal-setting modules to be useful and were able to set
676 themselves some goals to change practice, for example: “I did find that reflection helpful, it’s jarred
677 me into thinking about it, which I hadn’t ever done before” (PCP01, GP).

678 Fig 8 shows the goals set by practitioner interviewees. Goals about optimism were more commonly
679 set than goals about empathy, consistent with practitioners finding the optimism module novel and
680 implementable within routine consultations. The two most commonly set goals associated with the
681 optimism module were positive safety-netting and positive language.

682

683 Fig 8. Goals set by practitioner interviewees.

684 *Note. Goals in red are associated with the optimism module; goals in blue are associated with the*
685 *empathy module; goals in purple are associated with both modules. The size of each goal represents*
686 *the number of practitioners who chose it.*

687

688 Positive safety netting was considered easy to tweak and simple to implement, and potentially
689 beneficial for patients. Many participants reflected that their language in consultations was not
690 positive enough and found it helpful to see the examples of how to avoid negative terms, to frame
691 treatments more positively and to close consultations with a positive summary. For example:

692 “I think the thing about negative phrases, that’s probably the biggest thing I’ve taken from
693 this, is trying to think about how I phrase things and rather than saying ‘well, it works for
694 50% of people but not the others.’ Thinking about actually ‘this works for over half of

695 people, lots of patients find it very successful, lots of patients get some benefit from it'. And
696 trying to think of it in a much more positive way. So, I'm not trying to mislead people but,
697 thinking about it in and trying to just- just remove that negativity I suppose. Which I suppose
698 sometimes just creeps in without us really maybe realizing it" (PCP10, GP).

699 The most commonly set goal associated with the empathy module was to ask about and refer back
700 to patients' own goals. Participants reported that they might establish how the condition affect the
701 patient but not how it affects what patients want to achieve. Most reported that they didn't
702 commonly make treatment and management plans linked to the patient's own goals and thought
703 this could be done quite easily. Physiotherapists reported being familiar with goal-setting in general
704 but less familiar with a collaborative approach to goal-setting or a more open approach to patients'
705 own goals. For example, "I've done quite a bit around goal-setting before. But again, I think it's just
706 useful just to make sure that when we set goals with our patients, they are collaborative, and we're
707 not necessarily leading the patient on a goal that we think is best for them, and making sure that
708 they are part of that, that process as well" (PCP07, Physiotherapist).

709 Discussion

710 During 2020, we completed a feasibility study of methods for evaluating EMPathicO in a cluster-
711 randomized controlled trial in primary care. Despite the first COVID-19 lockdown in England
712 occurring a few weeks after commencing the trial, agile modifications meant it was still possible to
713 collect and analyse relevant data. Before modifications, we had secured sponsorship and ethics
714 approval, established a recruitment pipeline for practices including first contact physiotherapists and
715 successfully set-up 5 practices; we also identified barriers to practice recruitment. After the first
716 lockdown, when practices had no capacity to recruit patients, we modified the study design to
717 looked separately at practitioner activities (intervention, practitioner reported measures) and
718 patient activities (patient reported measures). While moving patient recruitment outside of practices
719 meant it was not possible to test planned practice-based recruitment methods, to explore

720 recruitment in practices serving a diverse range of communities, to collect data on harms for
721 patients, or to collect data to inform estimated effect sizes, these issues can be informed by prior
722 literature and other study objectives were addressed to varying degrees.

723 Working with the clinical research networks was an effective and efficient way to recruit practices
724 and practitioners, although variability in service support costs offered across different networks may
725 result in geographical variation in practice recruitment. Barriers for practice participation included
726 seeing insufficient patients with OA, not wanting to film consultations, using telephone consultations
727 for pain management, and being too busy during the winter months with seasonal increases in
728 consultation rates (primary care has higher winter increases in consultation rates than secondary
729 care [60]). Strategies that might overcome these include recruiting and working closely with
730 practices who have first contact practitioners to whom OA patients are triaged; removing the
731 requirement to film consultations, thus removing a barrier to practitioner participation and the
732 inclusion of telephone consultations; not starting the trial in January/February and planning for
733 seasonable fluctuations in patient recruitment. Practitioners who enrolled in the trial were
734 enthusiastic and committed to the study and suggested it would be relevant to newly qualified and
735 experienced PCPs from diverse professional backgrounds. They also warned that some PCPs would
736 likely prioritise training in more biomedical topics than in communication skills. Simplifying
737 practitioner-facing study documents and strengthening the description of the training to appeal to a
738 broad audience could help.

739 Targeted Facebook advertisements was the most effective way of recruiting patients via social
740 media, but retention into the follow-up survey was suboptimal particularly among those who had
741 consulted for reasons other than OA. Patients were enthusiastic about research on practitioner-
742 patient communication and keen to help. Retention could be improved by emphasising study
743 benefits; timely reminders; offering postal and/or telephone formats in addition to web-based;
744 giving incentives not conditional on completion; and working flexibly e.g., with PPI input, to engage

745 participants in the study. [61-64] [65] Because most patients in this feasibility study were recruited
746 via social media they may differ from patients in the main trial who will be recruited via primary care
747 practices. Being invited to take part by one's own GP practice may enhance recruitment and
748 retention rates compared to social media recruitment, by making the study more personally relevant
749 and credible, although patient recruitment remains challenging across trials.[66] There was
750 extensive missing data on patient ethnicity and the sample was likely lacking in diversity; this needs
751 to be addressed in the full trial.

752 The modified design left limited scope to address our second aim and associated objectives, about
753 randomisation procedures, consent procedures and eligibility criteria. Practice randomisation was
754 approved by the research ethics committee, worked for those practices who reached that stage, and
755 was not mentioned as deterring participation by practices or practitioners. Multiple approaches to
756 informed consent in the original study design were approved by the research ethics committee;
757 taking consent online (and reconfirming verbally before any qualitative interview) was acceptable
758 and effective in the modified study design. Practitioner interviewees supported including a range of
759 PCPs from diverse professional groups in our work.

760 Findings from qualitative and quantitative analysis of practitioner and patient data can inform the
761 selection of outcome and process measures in a future full trial. While our plan was approved by the
762 research ethics committee to have PCPs video-record consultations (both as part of the trial and as
763 part of the EMPathicO training), practices and practitioners were not enthusiastic about doing this
764 and some said they would not participate if videoing consultations was compulsory. This is
765 concerning because studies that require videoing consultations may recruit biased samples of
766 practitioners and patients.[67] Because of this, and the challenges experienced running this trial
767 during 2020 (while members of the team also, among other things, worked clinically, cared for
768 children when schools were closed, and delivered teaching online), we deprioritised exploring
769 methods of analysing filmed consultations.

770 Bespoke questionnaire items designed for this study to measure practitioners' self-efficacy,
771 intentions, and outcome expectancies related to empathy and optimism, and patients' perceptions
772 of practitioner optimism, were internally consistent, were acceptable to participants, and the
773 patient-reported measures correlated with measures of conceptually related constructs. Patient
774 interviewees and survey respondents who provided qualitative feedback were generally positive
775 about the content, length, and relevance of the survey (for the individual and/or the researchers)
776 but did not like multiple very similar questions, although this did not put them off answering them.
777 The main difficulty participants described was being unsure how to answer questions when their
778 own consultation experience did not appear to fit. Consistent with this, individual survey items with
779 higher rates of missing data tended to be those that assumed a consultation had been about a
780 specific symptom, condition, or illness and/or were more readily applicable if a consultation had
781 resulted in a prescription or referral for treatment. Whereas some participants had consulted about
782 multiple issues or to discuss test results or similar, and some did not expect and/or did not receive a
783 clear recommendation or prescription at the end of their consultation (e.g., they were sent for tests
784 or investigations). More careful testing and work with PPI is needed to ensure the survey makes
785 sense for patients who have consulted for multiple or non-symptomatic reasons (e.g., test results)
786 and/or who have not received a prescription or other treatment recommendation as an outcome of
787 the consultation. Survey flow and choice of questionnaire tools seem to be particularly challenging
788 when trying to conduct pragmatic applied research in primary care with representative samples of
789 all patients who consult PCPs, rather than restricting eligibility to sub-groups defined by diagnosis
790 and/or consultation outcome.

791 It was not possible to establish likely effect sizes or to explore data for indicative changes in outcome
792 and process measures. However, there were clear indications in the PCP data that engaging with
793 EMPathicO led to increased communication of optimism and/or empathy during consultations,
794 either through increased use of familiar techniques or uptake of novel techniques. EMPathicO was
795 generally well-received and seen as relevant, brief, and engaging; the empathy module was typically

796 seen as a valuable reminder while the optimism module was seen as comparatively novel; the OA
797 module was helpful in providing examples of techniques in one specific context; and PCPs engaged
798 well with the reflection and goal-setting modules and reported already implementing some changes
799 to their consultations. These findings have contributed to the process of finalising EMPathicO ready
800 for full trial.

801 Conclusion

802 PCPs were keen to reflect on and further improve their communication skills and were prepared to
803 undertake brief online training (even during the pressures of COVID). They found EMPathicO
804 accessible, sufficiently brief, relevant and engaging and felt they were able to learn and implement
805 the techniques for communicating clinical empathy and realistic optimism. They began
806 implementing techniques immediately after completing training and found the techniques relevant
807 to patients consulting for painful and non-painful conditions. Patients found the planned outcome
808 and process measures acceptable and were willing to complete them online; minor problems with
809 funnelling were identified and remedied; and patients were keen to take part in research that could
810 improve primary care consultations. With some relatively minor changes (e.g., tweaks to
811 EMPathicO, removing the requirement for videoing consultations, and incentivising patient
812 questionnaires) it is feasible to proceed to a full trial of the effects of EMPathicO on patient
813 outcomes in primary care. This is important because it would be the largest trial of an empathy and
814 optimism intervention to be undertaken in primary care, capturing patient health outcomes. If
815 proven effective in such a trial, EMPathicO could be rolled out at scale to enhance PCP
816 communication skills and improve patient outcomes. Broader learning for other trials include the
817 value of extensive testing to design questionnaire wording and structures to ensure primary care
818 patients attending for diverse reasons and with diverse consultation outcomes are shown questions
819 that are relevant to their situation, and the distinct lack of enthusiasm for video-taping consultations
820 even among PCPs who are keen to enhance their communication skills.

821

822 Acknowledgements

823 We thank the patients and primary care practitioners who took part in this project and all those who
824 facilitated patient recruitment. We thank Jessima Hunter for sharing thoughts from a patient's
825 perspective. University of Southampton students assisted with transcribing qualitative data and/or
826 testing questionnaires, including Alice Holden and Niamh Wood. The quantitative data for this
827 paper was collected using Qualtrics software. Copyright © Qualtrics. Qualtrics and all other Qualtrics
828 product or service names are registered trademarks or trademarks of Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA.
829 <https://www.qualtrics.com>.

830 Data Availability

831 Data cannot be shared publicly because consent was obtained to share data for secondary research
832 with suitably qualified individuals. Data are available from the University of Southampton
833 Institutional Data Repository (<https://doi.org/10.5258/SOTON/D3263>) for researchers who meet the
834 criteria for access to confidential data.

835 Funding

836 The EMPATHICA/TIP project is supported by a National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) School
837 for Primary Care Research grant (project number 389). The Primary Care Research Centre,
838 University of Southampton is a member of the NIHR School for Primary Care Research and
839 supported by NIHR Research funds. CDM is funded by the National Institute for Health Research
840 (NIHR) Collaborations for Leadership in Applied Health Research and Care West Midlands, the NIHR
841 School for Primary Care Research and an NIHR Research Professorship in General Practice (NIHR-RP-
842 2014-04-026).

843 The views expressed are those of the author(s) and not necessarily those of the NIHR or the
844 Department of Health and social care. For the purpose of open access, the author has applied a CC
845 BY public copyright licence to any Author Accepted Manuscript version arising from this submission.

846

847 References

- 848 1. Howick J, Steinkopf L, Ulyte A, Roberts N, Meissner K. How empathic is your healthcare
849 practitioner? A systematic review and meta-analysis of patient surveys. *BMC Med Educ.*
850 2017;17(1):136. Epub 2017/08/22. doi: 10.1186/s12909-017-0967-3. PubMed PMID: 28823250;
851 PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5563892.
- 852 2. Vennik J, Hughes S, Smith KA, Misurya P, Bostock J, Howick J, et al. Patient and practitioner
853 priorities and concerns about primary healthcare interactions for osteoarthritis: A meta-
854 ethnography. *Patient Educ Couns.* 2022. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pec.2022.01.009>.
- 855 3. Suarez-Almazor ME, Looney C, Liu Y, Cox V, Pietz K, Marcus DM, et al. A randomized
856 controlled trial of acupuncture for osteoarthritis of the knee: Effects of patient-provider
857 communication. *Arthritis Care Res.* 2010;62(9):1229-36.
- 858 4. Haskard Zolnieriek KB, DiMatteo MR. Physician communication and patient adherence to
859 treatment: A meta-analysis. *Med Care.* 2009;47(8).
- 860 5. Dambha-Miller H, Cooper AJM, Kinmonth AL, Griffin SJ. Effect on cardiovascular disease risk
861 factors of interventions to alter consultations between practitioners and patients with type 2
862 diabetes: A systematic review and meta-analysis of trials in primary care. *Health Expect.*
863 2017;20(6):1218-27. Epub 2017/02/28. doi: 10.1111/hex.12546. PubMed PMID: 28245085; PubMed
864 Central PMCID: PMC5689230.
- 865 6. Barry CA, Bradley CP, Britten N, Stevenson FA, Barber N. Patients' unvoiced agendas in
866 general practice consultations: qualitative study. *Br Med J.* 2000;320:1246-50.
- 867 7. Thorne SE, Bultz BD, Baile WF. Is there a cost to poor communication in cancer care?: a
868 critical review of the literature. *Psychooncology.* 2005;14(10):875-84. doi: 10.1002/pon.947.
- 869 8. Moffat M, Cleland J, van der Molen T, Price D. Poor communication may impair optimal
870 asthma care: a qualitative study. *Fam Pract.* 2007;24(1):65-70. doi: 10.1093/fampra/cml062.
- 871 9. Stelfox HT, Gandhi TK, Orav EJ, Gustafson ML. The relation of patient satisfaction with
872 complaints against physicians and malpractice lawsuits. *The American Journal of Medicine.*
873 2005;118(10):1126-33. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amjmed.2005.01.060>.
- 874 10. Pincock S. Poor communication lies at heart of NHS complaints, says ombudsman. *BMJ.*
875 2004;328(7430):10. PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5689230.
- 876 11. Howick J, Moscrop A, Mebius A, Fanshawe TR, Lewith G, Bishop FL, et al. Effects of empathic
877 and positive communication in healthcare consultations: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J R*
878 *Soc Med.* 2018;111(7):240-52. Epub 2018/04/20. doi: 10.1177/0141076818769477. PubMed PMID:
879 29672201; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC6047264.
- 880 12. Little P, Everitt H, Williamson I, Warner G, Moore M, Gould C, et al. Observational study of
881 effect of patient centredness and positive approach on outcomes of general practice consultations.
882 *Br Med J.* 2001;323 908-11.
- 883 13. Little P, White P, Kelly J, Everitt H, Gashi S, Bikker A, et al. Verbal and non-verbal behaviour
884 and patient perception of communication in primary care: an observational study. *Br J Gen Pract.*
885 2015;65(635):e357-e65. doi: 10.3399/bjgp15X685249.
- 886 14. Little P, White P, Kelly J, Everitt H, Mercer S. Randomised controlled trial of a brief
887 intervention targeting predominantly non-verbal communication in general practice consultations.
888 *Br J Gen Pract.* 2015;65(635):e351-e6. doi: 10.3399/bjgp15X685237.
- 889 15. Griffin SJ, Kinmonth AL, Veltman MWM, Gillard S, Grant J, Stewart M. Effect on Health-
890 Related Outcomes of Interventions to Alter the Interaction Between Patients and Practitioners: A
891 Systematic Review of Trials. *Annals of family medicine.* 2004;2(6):595-608.
- 892 16. Dwamena F, Holmes-Rovner M, Gauden CM, Jorgenson S, Sadigh G, Sikorskii A, et al.
893 Interventions for providers to promote a patient-centred approach in clinical consultations.
894 *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.* 2012;12:Art. No.: CD003267. DOI:
895 10.1002/14651858.CD003267.pub2.

- 896 17. Woolford SJ, Watson J, Reeve J, Harris T. The real work of general practice: understanding
897 our hidden workload. *Br J Gen Pract.* 2024;74(742):196. doi: 10.3399/bjgp24X737061.
- 898 18. Smith KA, Bishop FL, Dambha-Miller H, Ratnapalan M, Lyness E, Vennik J, et al. Improving
899 empathy in healthcare consultations—a secondary analysis of interventions. *J Gen Intern Med.*
900 2020;35(10):3007-14. Epub 2020/07/16. doi: 10.1007/s11606-020-05994-w. PubMed PMID:
901 32666488; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7572919.
- 902 19. Howick J, Lyness E, Albury C, Smith KA, Dambha-Miller H, Ratnapalan M, et al. Anatomy of
903 positive messages in healthcare consultations: component analysis of messages within 22
904 randomised trials. *Eur J Pers Cent Healthc.* 2019;17:656-64.
- 905 20. Yardley L, Morrison L, Bradbury K, Muller I. The person-based approach to intervention
906 development: Application to digital health-related behavior change interventions. *Journal of Medical*
907 *Internet Research.* 2015;17(1). PubMed Central PMCID: PMC7572919.
- 908 21. Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating
909 complex interventions: the new Medical Research Council guidance. *Br Med J.* 2008;337:a1655.
- 910 22. Yardley L, Osmond A, Hare J, Wills G, Weal M, De Roure D, et al. Introduction to the
911 LifeGuide: software facilitating the development of interactive behaviour change internet
912 interventions. . In *Adaptive and Emergent Behaviour and Complex Systems-Proceedings of the 23rd*
913 *Convention of the Society for the Study of Artificial Intelligence and Simulation of Behaviour*
914 *AISB2009.*
- 915 23. Smith KA, Vennik J, Morrison L, Hughes S, Steele M, Tiwari R, et al. Harnessing placebo
916 effects in primary care: Using the person-based approach to develop an online intervention to
917 enhance practitioners' communication of clinical empathy and realistic optimism during
918 consultations. *Frontiers in Pain Research.* 2021;2. doi: 10.3389/fpain.2021.721222.
- 919 24. Bishop FL, Cross N, Dewar-Haggart R, Teasdale E, Herbert A, Robinson ME, et al. Talking in
920 primary care (TIP): protocol for a cluster-randomised controlled trial in UK primary care to assess
921 clinical and cost-effectiveness of communication skills e-learning for practitioners'
922 musculoskeletal pain and enablement. *BMJ Open.* 2024;14(3):e081932. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2023-
923 081932.
- 924 25. Kreuter MW, Wray RJ. Tailored and targeted health communication: strategies for enhancing
925 information relevance. *American Journal of Health Behavior.* 2003;27(1):S227-S32.
- 926 26. Chassany O, Boureau Fo, Liard Fo, Bertin P, Serrie A, Ferran P, et al. Effects of training on
927 general practitioners' management of pain in osteoarthritis: a randomized multicenter study. *J*
928 *Rheumatol.* 2006;33(9):1827-34.
- 929 27. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of
930 interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide.
931 *BMJ.* 2014;348. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g1687.
- 932 28. Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT 2010
933 statement: extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *BMJ.* 2016;355:i5239. Epub
934 2016/10/26. doi: 10.1136/bmj.i5239. PubMed PMID: 27777223; PubMed Central PMCID:
935 PMC7572919 http://www.icmje.org/doi_disclosure.pdf and declare support from the following
936 organisations for the submitted work—Queen Mary University of London, University of Sheffield
937 (SchARR Research Committee Pump priming grant), NIHR Research Design Services London and
938 South East, NIHR Statisticians Group, Chief Scientist Office Scotland. GAL is editor in chief of the new
939 BioMed central journal *Pilot and Feasibility Studies* proposed by Daniel R Shanahan, which was
940 created out of this work. Daniel R Shanahan is employed by BioMed Central, and Trish Groves is an
941 editor of the *BMJ*. SME, CMB, MJC, and LT are on the editorial board of *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*
942 and CLC is an associate editor. Frank Bretz works for Novartis. The authors declare no other
943 competing interests. None of the listed people involved in either journal played any part in the peer
944 review process or editorial decision making.
- 945 29. Orkin AM, Gill PJ, Ghersi D, Campbell L, Sugarman J, Emsley R, et al. Guidelines for Reporting
946 Trial Protocols and Completed Trials Modified Due to the COVID-19 Pandemic and Other Extenuating

- 947 Circumstances: The CONSERVE 2021 Statement. *JAMA*. 2021;326(3):257-65. Epub 2021/06/22. doi:
948 10.1001/jama.2021.9941. PubMed PMID: 34152382.
- 949 30. NIHR National Institute for Health and Care Research. DHSC issues guidance on the impact of
950 COVID-19 on research funded or supported by NIHR 2020 [updated 19 March 2020 18 July 2024].
951 Available from: [https://www.nihr.ac.uk/news/dhsc-issues-guidance-on-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/news/dhsc-issues-guidance-on-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-research-funded-or-supported-by-nihr/35563)
952 [research-funded-or-supported-by-nihr/35563](https://www.nihr.ac.uk/news/dhsc-issues-guidance-on-the-impact-of-covid-19-on-research-funded-or-supported-by-nihr/35563).
- 953 31. Totton N, Lin J, Julious S, Chowdhury M, Brand A. A review of sample sizes for UK pilot and
954 feasibility studies on the ISRCTN registry from 2013 to 2020. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies*.
955 2023;9(1):188. doi: 10.1186/s40814-023-01416-w.
- 956 32. Smith TO, Hawker GA, Hunter DJ, March LM, Boers M, Shea BJ, et al. The OMERACT-OARSI
957 Core Domain Set for Measurement in Clinical Trials of Hip and/or Knee Osteoarthritis. *The Journal of*
958 *Rheumatology*. 2019;jrheum.181194. doi: 10.3899/jrheum.181194.
- 959 33. Gandek B, Roos EM, Franklin PD, Ware JE, Jr. A 12-item short form of the Hip disability and
960 Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (HOOS-12): tests of reliability, validity and responsiveness.
961 *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2019;27(5):754-61. Epub 2018/11/13. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2018.09.017.
962 PubMed PMID: 30419279.
- 963 34. Gandek B, Roos EM, Franklin PD, Ware JE, Jr. A 12-item short form of the Knee injury and
964 Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS-12): tests of reliability, validity and responsiveness.
965 *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2019;27(5):762-70. Epub 2019/02/05. doi: 10.1016/j.joca.2019.01.011.
966 PubMed PMID: 30716536.
- 967 35. Gandek B, Roos EM, Franklin PD, Ware JE, Jr. Item selection for 12-item short forms of the
968 Knee injury and Osteoarthritis Outcome Score (KOOS-12) and Hip disability and Osteoarthritis
969 Outcome Score (HOOS-12). *Osteoarthritis Cartilage*. 2019;27(5):746-53. Epub 2018/12/30. doi:
970 10.1016/j.joca.2018.11.011. PubMed PMID: 30593867.
- 971 36. Meakin R, Weinman J. The 'Medical Interview Satisfaction Scale' (MISS-21) adapted for
972 British general practice. *Fam Pract*. 2002;19(3):257-63. doi: 10.1093/fampra/19.3.257. PubMed
973 PMID: 11978716.
- 974 37. Howie JG, Heaney DJ, Maxwell M, Walker JJ. A comparison of a Patient Enablement
975 Instrument (PEI) against two established satisfaction scales as an outcome measure of primary care
976 consultations. *Fam Pract*. 1998;15(2):165-71.
- 977 38. Gandek B, Ware JE, Aaronson NK, Apolone G, Bjorner JB, Brazier JE, et al. Cross-Validation of
978 Item Selection and Scoring for the SF-12 Health Survey in Nine Countries; Results from the IQOLA
979 Project. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1998;51(11):1171-8.
- 980 39. Ware JE, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item short -form health survey. *Med Care*.
981 1996;34(3):220-33.
- 982 40. Stewart-Brown S, Tennant A, Tennant R, Platt S, Parkinson J, Weich S. Internal construct
983 validity of the Warwick-Edinburgh Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): a Rasch analysis using data
984 from the Scottish Health Education Population Survey. *Health and quality of life outcomes*.
985 2009;7:15. Epub 2009/02/21. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-7-15. PubMed PMID: 19228398; PubMed
986 Central PMCID: PMC2669062.
- 987 41. Mercer SW, Maxwell M, Heaney D, Watt GCM. The development and preliminary validation
988 of the Consultation and Relational Empathy (CARE) measure: an empathy-based consultation
989 process measure. *Fam Pract*. 2004;21 699-705.
- 990 42. Bjelland I, Dahl AA, Haug TT, Neckelmann D. The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and
991 Depression Scale: An updated literature review. *J Psychosom Res*. 2002;52(2):69-77.
- 992 43. Zigmond AS, Snaith RP. The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatr Scand*.
993 1983;67(6):361-70.
- 994 44. Devilly GJ, Borkovec TD. Psychometric properties of the credibility/expectancy
995 questionnaire. *J Behav Ther Exp Psychiatry*. 2000;31:73-86.
- 996 45. Paterson C, Symons L, Britten N, Bargh J. Developing the Medication Change Questionnaire.
997 *J Clin Pharm Ther*. 2004;29 (4):339-49.

- 998 46. Kinnersley P, Peters T, Stott N. Measuring functional health status in primary care using the
999 COOP-WONCA charts: acceptability, range of scores, construct validity, reliability and sensitivity to
1000 change. *Br J Gen Pract.* 1994;44(389):545-9. PubMed PMID: 7748664; PubMed Central PMCID:
1001 PMCPMC1239076.
- 1002 47. Van Weel C. Functional status in primary care: COOP/WONCA charts. *Disabil Rehabil.*
1003 1993;15(2):96-101. PubMed PMID: 8513163.
- 1004 48. Dunn KM, Croft PR. Classification of Low Back Pain in Primary Care: Using "Bothersomeness"
1005 to Identify the Most Severe Cases. *Spine.* 2005;30(16):1887-92.
- 1006 49. Tennant R, Hiller L, Fishwick R, Platt S, Joseph S, Weich S, et al. The Warwick-Edinburgh
1007 Mental Well-being Scale (WEMWBS): development and UK validation. *Health and quality of life*
1008 *outcomes.* 2007;5:63. Epub 2007/11/29. doi: 10.1186/1477-7525-5-63. PubMed PMID: 18042300;
1009 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2222612.
- 1010 50. Everitt HA, Landau S, O'Reilly G, Sibelli A, Hughes S, Windgassen S, et al. Assessing
1011 telephone-delivered cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) and web-delivered CBT versus treatment as
1012 usual in irritable bowel syndrome (ACTIB): a multicentre randomised trial. *Gut.* 2019. Epub
1013 2019/04/12. doi: 10.1136/gutjnl-2018-317805. PubMed PMID: 30971419.
- 1014 51. Bandura A. Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In: Urdan T, Pajares F, editors. *Self-*
1015 *Efficacy Beliefs of Adolescents: Information Age Publishing; 2006.* p. 307-37.
- 1016 52. Francis JJ, Eccles MP, Johnston M, Walker A, Grimshaw J, Foy R, et al. Constructing
1017 questionnaires based on the theory of planned behaviour. *A manual for health services researchers.*
1018 University of Newcastle: Centre for Health Services Research, 2004.
- 1019 53. Ajzen I. Constructing a theory of planned behavior questionnaire.
- 1020 54. Renner B, Schwarzer R. Risk and Health Behaviors. Documentation of the Scales of the
1021 Research Project: "Risk Appraisal Consequences in Korea" (RACK).
1022 <http://www.gesundheitsrisiko.de/docs/RACKEnglish.pdf>: International
1023 University Bremen & Freie Universität Berlin, 2007.
- 1024 55. Haanstra TM, Kamper SJ, Williams CM, Spriensma AS, Lin C-WC, Maher CG, et al. Does
1025 adherence to treatment mediate the relationship between patients' treatment outcome
1026 expectancies and the outcomes of pain intensity and recovery from acute low back pain? *Pain.*
1027 2015;156(8):1530-6. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.000000000000198. PubMed PMID:
1028 WOS:000358815500020.
- 1029 56. Dima A, Lewith GT, Little P, Moss-Morris R, Foster NE, Hankins M, et al. Patients' treatment
1030 beliefs in low back pain: development and validation of a questionnaire in primary care. *Pain.*
1031 2015;156(8):1489-500. Epub 2015/04/24. doi: 10.1097/j.pain.000000000000193. PubMed PMID:
1032 25906346.
- 1033 57. Shedden-Mora MC, Alberts J, Petrie KJ, Laferton JAC, von Blanckenburg P, Kohlmann S, et al.
1034 The Treatment Expectation Questionnaire (TEX-Q): Validation of a generic multidimensional scale
1035 measuring patients' treatment expectations. *PLoS One.* 2023;18(1):e0280472. Epub 2023/01/24. doi:
1036 10.1371/journal.pone.0280472. PubMed PMID: 36689398; PubMed Central PMCID:
1037 PMCPMC9870103.
- 1038 58. Joffe H, Yardley L. Content and thematic analysis. In: Marks DF, editor. *Research methods for*
1039 *clinical and health psychology.* London: Sage; 2004. p. 56-68.
- 1040 59. Yardley L, Spring BJ, Riper H, Morrison LG, Crane DH, Curtis K, et al. Understanding and
1041 Promoting Effective Engagement With Digital Behavior Change Interventions. *Am J Prev Med.*
1042 2016;51(5):833-42. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2016.06.015>.
- 1043 60. Millwood S, Tomlinson P, Hopwood J. Evaluation of winter pressures on general practice in
1044 Manchester: a cross-sectional analysis of nine GP practices. *BJGP Open.* 2021;5(1). Epub 2020/11/18.
1045 doi: 10.3399/bjgpopen20X101138. PubMed PMID: 33199311; PubMed Central PMCID:
1046 PMCPMC7960527.
- 1047 61. Edwards P. Questionnaires in clinical trials: guidelines for optimal design and administration.
1048 *Trials.* 2010;11(1):2.

- 1049 62. Edwards P, Cooper R, Roberts I, Frost C. Meta-analysis of randomised trials of monetary
1050 incentives and response to mailed questionnaires. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2005;59:987-99.
1051 63. Edwards PJ, Roberts I, Clarke MJ, DiGiuseppi C, Wentz R, Kwan I, et al. Methods to increase
1052 response to postal and electronic questionnaires. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.
1053 2009;(3). doi: 10.1002/14651858.MR000008.pub4. PubMed PMID: MR000008.
1054 64. Abshire M, Dinglas VD, Cajita MI, Eakin MN, Needham DM, Himmelfarb CD. Participant
1055 retention practices in longitudinal clinical research studies with high retention rates. *BMC Med Res*
1056 *Methodol*. 2017;17(1):30. Epub 2017/02/22. doi: 10.1186/s12874-017-0310-z. PubMed PMID:
1057 28219336; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC5319074.
1058 65. Brueton VC, Tierney JF, Stenning S, Meredith S, Harding S, Nazareth I, et al. Strategies to
1059 improve retention in randomised trials: a Cochrane systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open*.
1060 2014;4(2):e003821. Epub 2014/02/06. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2013-003821. PubMed PMID:
1061 24496696; PubMed Central PMCID: PMC3918995.
1062 66. Walters SJ, Bonacho dos Anjos Henriques-Cadby I, Bortolami O, Flight L, Hind D, Jacques RM,
1063 et al. Recruitment and retention of participants in randomised controlled trials: a review of trials
1064 funded and published by the United Kingdom Health Technology Assessment Programme. *BMJ*
1065 *Open*. 2017;7(3):e015276. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-015276.
1066 67. Coleman T. Using video-recorded consultations for research in primary care: advantages and
1067 limitations. *Fam Pract*. 2000;17(5):422-7. doi: 10.1093/fampra/17.5.422.

1068

1069 [Supplementary Material Captions](#)

1070 S1 TIDieR checklist

1071 S2 Consort checklist – extension for pilot and feasibility trials

1072 S3 Consort checklist - conserve extension

1073 S4 Appendix: Planned Methods for Original Study Design

1074 S5. Trial Protocol

1075 S6. Appendix: Bespoke Questionnaire Items

1076 S7. Appendix: Topic Guide for Practitioner Interviews

1077 S8. Appendix: Topic Guide for Patient Interviews

Introduction
Aims: To address barriers, engage and enthuse.
Content: Overview of content and duration. Short quiz about empathy and optimism.

User Chooses Order

Empathy

Aims: PCPs to express empathy effectively using verbal and non-verbal behaviours.

Content: Latest research on personalisation, validation and "warming up". Multimedia activities

Optimism

Aims: PCPs to express realistic optimism about recommended interventions.

Content: Latest research in outcome expectancies. Multimedia activities.

Osteoarthritis (OA)

Aims: PCPs to tailor their expression of empathy and optimism to account for issues specific to OA.

Content: Specific examples of using empathy and optimism in OA. NICE OA guidelines.

Activity: Reflections

Aims: PCPs identify own opportunities to improve.
Content: Guidance to reflect on recent (video-recorded) consultations Interactive exercises to identify opportunities for improvement.

Activity: Goal-Setting


Aim: PCPs select up to 3 behaviours to change and formulate an action plan.
Content: Interactive exercises to set goals and make plans based on previous sections.

Menu


Direct Access to All Prior Content

Activity: Goal Review


Aim: PCPs to review achievement of personal goals, revise/extend as appropriate.
Content: Personal goals shown, prompts to reflect on progress and revise/extend goals.




Panel a: Practice and Practitioner Activities




Panel b: Patient activities (post-randomisation)





Panel a: Practice and Practitioner Activities




Panel b: Patient activities









Patient Goals

Checking Understanding

Closing Positively

Introducing Computer Use

Explaining Treatment

Specifying Treatment Outcomes

Positive Safety Netting

Affirmation

Warming Up

Knowing The Patient

Emphasising Practitioner's Experience

Positive Language