

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository:<https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/130424/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Bailey, Sarah, Boivin, Jacky , Ting, Cheong, Bailey, Christopher, Kitson-Reynolds, Ellen and Macklon, Nick  
2020. Effective support following recurrent pregnancy loss: A randomized controlled feasibility and acceptability study. *Reproductive BioMedicine Online* 40 (5) , pp. 729-742. 10.1016/j.rbmo.2020.01.022

Publishers page: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.rbmo.2020.01.022>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1 A feasibility and acceptability study of the Positive Reappraisal Coping  
2 Intervention: a supportive intervention for women with recurrent pregnancy  
3 loss

4 Author names, emails and affiliations

5 **Sarah** (given name) **Bailey** (family name) <sup>a,b</sup> – [sarahl.bailey@soton.ac.uk](mailto:sarahl.bailey@soton.ac.uk)

6 **Jacky** (given name) **Boivin** (family name) <sup>c</sup> – [boivin@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:boivin@cardiff.ac.uk)

7 **Ying** (given name) **Cheong** (family name) <sup>d,e</sup> – [y.cheong@soton.ac.uk](mailto:y.cheong@soton.ac.uk)

8 **Christopher** (given name) **Bailey** (family name) <sup>b,1</sup> – [drcbailey@btinternet.com](mailto:drcbailey@btinternet.com)

9 **Ellen** (given name) **Kitson-Reynolds** (family name) <sup>b</sup> – [e.l.kitson-reynolds@soton.ac.uk](mailto:e.l.kitson-reynolds@soton.ac.uk)

10 **Nick** (given name) **Macklon** (family name) <sup>d,e,2</sup> – [nick.macklon@londonwomensclinic.com](mailto:nick.macklon@londonwomensclinic.com)

11

12 <sup>a</sup> University Hospitals Southampton NHS Foundation Trust, Princess Anne Hospital, Coxford Road,  
13 Southampton, SO16 5YA, UK

14 <sup>b</sup> Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Southampton, University Road, Southampton, SO17 1BJ,  
15 UK,

16 <sup>c</sup> School of Psychology, Cardiff University, 70 Park Place, Cardiff, CF10 3AT, Wales, UK

17 <sup>d</sup> Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, University Road, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, UK

18 <sup>e</sup> Complete Fertility Centre, Princess Anne Hospital, Coxford Road, Southampton, SO16 5YA, UK

19 Corresponding author

20 Sarah Bailey – [sarahl.bailey@soton.ac.uk](mailto:sarahl.bailey@soton.ac.uk)

21

22 Contributors

23 SB contributed to the design of the study, was responsible for obtaining ethical approval, liaised  
24 with the PPI group and collected study data. NM, JB, YC and CB contributed to the design of the  
25 study. SB and EK-R coded and analysed interview transcripts. All authors were involved in the  
26 interpretation of data. SB wrote first draft of manuscript, all authors were involved in subsequent  
27 revision and all approved final manuscript.

28 Declarations of interest: None

29

30 Abstract

31 Research Question

32 Is it feasible to perform a future definitive trial to determine the effectiveness of the Positive  
33 Reappraisal Coping Intervention (PRCI) in improving the psychological well-being of women with  
34 recurrent pregnancy loss (RPL) during the early stages of a new pregnancy?  
35

---

1 Present address - Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, Nottingham, NG7 2UH, UK

2 Present addresses - London Women's Clinic, 113-115 Harley St, Marylebone, London W1G 6AP, UK / Zealand University Hospital Copenhagen,  
Lykkebækvej 1, 4600 Køge, Denmark

## 1 Design

2 This mixed method study aimed to establish the feasibility of conducting a multicentre  
3 randomised controlled trial (RCT) to definitively test the effects of the PRCI on the psychological  
4 well-being of women with RPL. **Participants (n=75)** were recruited to the study and at the point of  
5 a positive pregnancy test, 47 were randomised into two study groups. The intervention group  
6 received the PRCI and weekly questionnaire assessment (Hospital Anxiety Depression Scale and  
7 Weekly Record Keeping Form) to monitor psychological well-being, the control group received the  
8 same questionnaires. Nested within the RCT was a qualitative process evaluation (QPE) exploring  
9 participants' subjective experience of study methods and the intervention. The study was  
10 conducted over a two-year period between 2014 and 2016

11

## 12 Results

13 This study successfully gathered knowledge about the feasibility aspects of conducting a future  
14 multi-centre definitive study to determine the effects of the PRCI on the psychological well-being  
15 of women with RPL. Participants were receptive to its use and the intervention appeared to  
16 convey benefits with no apparent downside.

## 17 Conclusions

18 The study concluded that a definitive RCT of the PRCI is possible and that the model of care  
19 already has the potential to be made more widely available as a safe, low cost, convenient and  
20 easily deliverable intervention to provide much needed support to a vulnerable patient  
21 population.

## 22 Keywords

23 Recurrent pregnancy loss, Anxiety, Randomised controlled trial, Feasibility

## 24 Funding sources

25 This work was supported by the National Institute for Health Research UK (award reference  
26 number CDRF-2012-03-004)

## 27 Trial Registration number

28 ISRCTN43571276

29

30

31

32

## 33 Introduction

34

35 Recurrent pregnancy loss (RPL) is currently defined as the loss of three or more pregnancies  
36 within the UK (RCOG 2011). However, other countries have adopted different definitions and the  
37 recently published European Society for Human Reproduction and Embryology (ESHRE) guideline  
38 suggests that RPL should be considered after the loss of two or more pregnancies (ESHRE 2017).

39 The early stages of a new pregnancy, when confirmation by ultrasound scan of an ongoing and  
40 viable pregnancy is awaited, represent a particularly challenging period for women affected by  
41 this condition. Previous studies have indicated that this waiting period is associated with high

1 levels of distress due to the anxiety of possibly experiencing a further miscarriage (Ockhuijsen et  
2 al. 2013a; Ockhuijsen et al. 2014c; Ockhuijsen et al. 2015). However, limited support and  
3 counselling is available during this difficult period and many are left to manage these distressing  
4 emotions without coping support. While some women seek frequent confirmation of viability by  
5 ultrasound scans, this approach is not feasible in most clinical settings, and appears to be of  
6 limited efficacy in reducing anxiety (Bailey et al. 2019). An alternative approach may be to provide  
7 the woman with tools that can help her cope with this period.

8 The Positive Reappraisal Coping Intervention (PRCI) is a novel self-administered supportive  
9 technique, based on the principles of positive reappraisal. It has been shown to be effective at  
10 promoting positive feelings and sustaining the ability to cope in a group of patients who  
11 experience a similar waiting period, namely fertility patients, awaiting the outcome of in vitro  
12 fertilisation (IVF) treatment (Lancastle and Boivin 2008; Ockhuijsen et al. 2014a, b). It comprises of  
13 an explanatory leaflet describing positive reappraisal coping and its potential benefits and 10  
14 positive reappraisal statements that users read at least twice a day to stimulate this form of  
15 coping (Figure 1). For women who have experienced RPL the waiting period in the early stages of  
16 a new pregnancy shares many characteristics (unpredictable, uncontrollable, immense personal  
17 significance) with the waiting period fertility patients experience after IVF, suggesting that the  
18 PRCI may also provide a potentially valuable supportive intervention for this patient group.

19 The essence of positive reappraisal coping is that it 'sustains the coping process through  
20 increasing positive mood, via cognitive processing' (Lancastle and Boivin 2008). In view of the  
21 overwhelming anxiety and despair women with RPL can experience during the early stages of a  
22 new pregnancy, they might find this concept difficult to understand and be sceptical about  
23 whether the PRCI, a self-managed intervention, is able to make them feel more positive.  
24 Therefore, to assess the potential value of the PRCI as a means of improving psychological well-  
25 being, a study was designed to assess the acceptability of the intervention and the feasibility of  
26 conducting a future large scale randomised controlled trial (RCT).

27 Effective feasibility or piloting work can anticipate difficulties with acceptability, compliance,  
28 delivery of the intervention and recruitment and retention (Craig et al. 2013). Correspondingly, a  
29 recent review concluded that the feasibility phase prior to an RCT helps to maximise the  
30 likelihood of researchers evaluating the optimum intervention utilising the most appropriate and  
31 proficient recruitment processes and trial design (O'Cathain et al. 2015). Much of the literature  
32 that examines the theory around such studies, use the terms feasibility and pilot studies  
33 interchangeably and the language used to describe the preliminary stages of a large-scale  
34 definitive study remains inconsistent. However, the significant factor that connects the  
35 synonymous use of the terms 'feasibility' and 'pilot' study appears to be that both types of study  
36 address the uncertainties of study design and lay the foundation for a future definitive RCT. A

1 fundamental aim of a feasibility study is to determine whether it is possible to successfully deliver  
2 a study in the proposed context (Bowen et al. 2009). Feasibility studies, therefore, play an  
3 important role in establishing appropriate study design to support successful study completion  
4 and may provide an indication of likely efficacy of the intervention.

5 The primary objective of this study was to establish the feasibility and acceptability of performing  
6 future exploratory and definitive trials to determine the effectiveness of the PRCI in improving the  
7 psychological well-being of women who have experienced RPL during the initial waiting period (1-  
8 12 weeks) of a subsequent pregnancy.

## 9 **Materials and Methods**

### 10 Study Design

11 **Between February 2014 and March 2016, women with a history of RPL were recruited to**  
12 **participate in this two-centred mixed method study incorporating an RCT and qualitative analysis**  
13 **in a triangulation design.** This approach was selected as it was considered to provide a broader  
14 understanding (Cresswell 2015) of both the acceptability and the possible effect of the PRCI in this  
15 clinical context.

16 In order to support the study design and increase the validity of findings (Lancaster et al. 2004),  
17 the research questions to be addressed were articulated as follows:

- 18 • How feasible and acceptable were the proposed methods of recruitment, randomisation,  
19 intervention and follow up?
- 20 • Was it possible to achieve acceptable recruitment and retention rates within each centre,  
21 taking into account defined inclusion/exclusion criteria?
- 22 • Were the proposed study questionnaires and data collection methods appropriate?
- 23 • Were the study time points for questionnaires and use of PRCI appropriate?
- 24 • Was there any preliminary indication of an effect of the PRCI?

25 A second component of the study was a qualitative process evaluation (QPE) that aimed to  
26 explore in depth women's subjective experience of the study intervention and research methods  
27 to provide information to refine any aspects of the research design (if appropriate). The study  
28 protocol and methodology employed in this qualitative element has been previously published  
29 elsewhere (Bailey et al. 2015)

### 30 The Intervention

31

32 The PRCI (Figure 1) is a theoretically derived and short coping intervention with proven reliability  
33 and validity, based on the concept of positive reappraisal (Lancastle and Boivin 2008; Ockhuijsen  
34 et al. 2013b; Ockhuijsen 2014; Domar et al. 2015). It aims to promote positive re-evaluation of a  
35 challenging situation and consists of a small card containing 10 positive reappraisal statements

1 that encourage users to redefine the waiting period more positively. An accompanying leaflet  
2 provides concise guidance on the use of the PRCI. Specifically, participants are encouraged to read  
3 the card at least twice a day, in the morning and the evening and any other time they feel the  
4 need. The guidance also advises that thinking about the positive aspects of a difficult situation  
5 does not mean pretending that 'everything is wonderful' when this is not the case, or ignoring the  
6 negative aspects of the situation, but taking account of positive aspects alongside the negative.

## 7 Study Population

8

9 The study population consisted of patients attending the Recurrent Miscarriage Clinic (RMC) and  
10 the Early Pregnancy Unit (EPU) at two tertiary referral hospitals in the United Kingdom. Site A  
11 operated a weekly RMC through which potential participants were identified and In Site B, access  
12 to potential participants was achieved through the site's EPU. Review of referral rates prior to  
13 recruitment suggested that approximately five eligible women would be seen in each centre per  
14 month.

## 15 Inclusion / Exclusion Criteria

16

17 All women who attended the RMC in Site A and the EPU in Site B who had experienced three or  
18 more miscarriages were eligible to participate. Exclusion criteria included if the woman was  
19 unable to speak English well enough to understand the study materials, required fertility  
20 treatment to achieve a pregnancy, was less than 18 years of age or unable to provide written  
21 consent to take part in the study.

## 22 Study Sample

23

24 The PRCI has only been previously applied in the context of recurrent miscarriage in one study  
25 (Ockhuijsen et al. 2015). This did not yield effect size, therefore, no clinical data was available on  
26 which to base a power calculation for the current study. Indeed one of the aims of the present  
27 feasibility study was to generate data that could inform a power calculation. Therefore, more  
28 pragmatic considerations were used to determine a sample capable, for example, of showing  
29 likely rate of referral of participants and feasibility of recruiting adequate numbers in a future  
30 definitive trial. It was estimated that the two study sites would yield a total of six patients a  
31 month (three from each centre) over a recruitment period of one year. The aim was to randomise  
32 50 participants within this time.

33 For entry in to the QPE, participants were selected purposively from those who had previously  
34 taken part in the RCT component of the study. Characteristics considered in the purposive  
35 sampling method were intended to produce a heterogeneous sample, and therefore included  
36 previous study group (intervention or control), ongoing pregnancy or miscarriage, ethnicity of  
Page 5 of 19

1 participant, age and number of previous live births. Fourteen participants were recruited to the  
2 QPE at which point data saturation was achieved.

### 3 Recruitment and Randomisation

4

5 Eligible participants were given a Patient Information Sheet (PIS) containing study information, by  
6 their clinical care team, when they attended the RMC or the EPU. The information was given once  
7 they had completed their consultation. If patients were interested in finding out more about the  
8 study, a meeting was arranged for detailed discussion with the researcher. Although potential  
9 participants were free to take as much time as they wished to consider their participation in the  
10 study, they were asked to consent to participation prior to becoming pregnant.

11 After providing consent the research participants were asked to notify the researcher of a positive  
12 pregnancy test in order to enable randomisation, the aim being to achieve randomisation on the  
13 same day as the positive pregnancy test or as soon as possible after this.

14 Randomisation into the two study groups (intervention and control) was carried out using an  
15 independent computerised randomisation system with a randomly sized block design with block  
16 sizes of 2, 4 and 6. The study population was stratified for those women receiving concurrent  
17 medical treatment for RPL, those with underlying medical conditions that were causative of RPL  
18 and number of previous miscarriages. The PRCI group were asked to use the intervention and  
19 received a weekly questionnaire assessment from the date of a positive pregnancy test until  
20 twelve weeks of pregnancy. The control group received the same weekly questionnaire  
21 assessment from the date of a positive pregnancy test until 12 weeks of pregnancy, but not the  
22 PRCI. All study materials including the study questionnaires and the PRCI were posted to the  
23 participant at randomisation. If a participant experienced a further miscarriage during the study  
24 period, they were asked to notify the researcher and were advised to discontinue completing  
25 study questionnaires after their miscarriage. Prior questionnaire data from women who  
26 experienced miscarriage before twelve weeks of pregnancy was included in the data analysis as  
27 for those whose pregnancies continued.

28 Participants became eligible to take part in the QPE if they reached twelve weeks of pregnancy,  
29 had used the PRCI and completed the weekly questionnaire assessment, or in the case of the  
30 control group, if they had completed weekly questionnaire assessments. If a participant  
31 experienced a further miscarriage, they were still approached and invited to take part in an  
32 interview. In all cases, the participant contacted the researcher directly to inform them of their  
33 miscarriage and it was at this point they were invited to participate in the QPE.

34 Participants indicated on the consent form of the RCT feasibility component of this study whether  
35 they would be willing to be invited to take part in the qualitative interviews. Potential participants  
36 for the qualitative interview were then selected purposively from the cohort of patients who  
Page 6 of 19

1 indicated a willingness to participate. The aim of the purposive sampling was to ensure that  
2 perspectives were collected from as diverse a group as possible.

### 3 Data Collection

4

#### 5 Pre intervention demographic questionnaire

6

7 This questionnaire was specifically designed for use in this study to capture relevant baseline  
8 demographic information including age, level of education, medical and psychological history (to  
9 identify any co-morbidities associated with RPL), gynaecological and reproductive history (fertility  
10 history, dates and number of live births and miscarriages) and the time period the woman had  
11 been trying to achieve a successful pregnancy.

#### 12 Outcome Measures

13

14 To assess psychological well-being in women in each study group, two validated outcome  
15 measure questionnaires, the Hospital Anxiety Depression Scale (HADS) (Zigmond and Snaith 1983)  
16 and the Daily Record Keeping Form (Boivin and Takefman 1995) were used at specific time points.  
17 Time points commenced on the day of a positive pregnancy test (or as soon as possible  
18 thereafter) and then at weekly intervals until the woman either reported a further miscarriage or  
19 reached 12 weeks gestation when ongoing viability is associated with a greater than 95% chance  
20 (Tong et al. 2008) of reaching live birth.

#### 21 Hospital Anxiety Depression Scale

22

23 The HADS and associated questionnaire has been shown to be a valid measure of the severity of  
24 anxiety and depression and of changes in a patient's emotional state (Zigmond and Snaith 1983).  
25 The questionnaire consists of 14 items (seven questions for anxiety and seven for depression)  
26 which are rated on a four-point Likert scale. The anxiety and depression scores are interspersed  
27 within the questionnaire, but are scored separately and are interpreted in ranges 0-7 (normal), 8-  
28 10 (mild), 11-14 (moderate) and 15-21 (severe).

#### 29 Daily Record Keeping Form

30

31 The Daily Record Keeping Form (DRK) was used to assess the emotions, appraisals, coping and  
32 physical symptoms experienced during the waiting period. The original measure was developed to  
33 assess these elements during the waiting period prior to a pregnancy test after fertility treatment  
34 (Boivin and Takefman 1995; Boivin and Lancaster 2010).

35 To adapt the DRK for use in this study, a number of relevant words and phrases were changed to  
36 better reflect the waiting period experienced by RPL patients. However, the overall format of the



1 questionnaire was not amended. Furthermore, to reduce the burden of daily monitoring and  
2 potential reactivity identified in previous studies (Ockhuijsen 2014), the DRK was completed only  
3 at weekly intervals. To avoid confusion for research participants, it was called the 'Weekly Record  
4 Keeping Form' for the duration of the study.

5 Process evaluations play a vital role in determining the feasibility of an intervention and  
6 optimising its design and evaluation (Moore et al. 2015). In the QPE, data were collected using  
7 face-to-face, semi-structured interviews that took place at a convenient place and time for the  
8 participant. The interviews followed a guide to steer the general direction of data collection and  
9 this was developed and based upon the feasibility aims of the study, a review of current literature  
10 and discussion with Patient Public Involvement (PPI) representatives and the study supervisory  
11 team. The interviews were scheduled to last for between thirty and sixty minutes.

## 12 Data Analysis

13

14 Descriptive statistics were used to explore the feasibility of the study processes (numbers of  
15 eligible women, recruitment and retention rates, missing data) for each centre. Scores from  
16 psychological well-being measures and data from the DRK were summarised and changes over  
17 the course of the study examined informally by study statistics and via graphical displays. The  
18 relationships between physical symptoms, psychological well-being and coping were explored,  
19 again through informal methods, such as graphical displays. An informal assessment of any  
20 indication of intervention effect was considered, however the purpose of this study was not  
21 hypothesis testing but feasibility and acceptability.

22 QPE interviews were audio recorded and then transcribed verbatim, aiming to achieve  
23 transparency by maintaining memos, field notes and a reflective diary during the process. Two  
24 members of the research team completed the initial coding of the raw data and developed the  
25 initial themes and this was discussed with other members of the research team who examined  
26 the transcripts and were asked to compare their perceptions of the interview data. The data was  
27 analysed utilising the general inductive approach (Thomas 2006). The main analytic strategy of  
28 this approach was to establish the core meanings evident in the text, which were relevant to the  
29 evaluation (or research) objectives.

30 Although findings from the quantitative and qualitative analyses are presented concurrently in  
31 this paper, fuller details of the qualitative methodology and findings are reported elsewhere  
32 (Bailey et al. 2015; Bailey et al. 2019)

1 Patient and Public Involvement

2

3 A Patient and Public Involvement (PPI) advisory group supported this research and met on a  
4 regular basis for the duration of this study. The group were involved with the design of the study  
5 and commented on any potential burden of participation in the study from a patient's  
6 perspective. The group were involved with data interpretation, and, at the end of the study,  
7 commented on the findings and contributed to the dissemination plan.

## 8 Results

9

10 The specific structure previously proposed for reporting findings of feasibility studies (Lancaster et  
11 al. 2004; Eldridge et al. 2016) was applied.

### 12 Recruitment-Related Feasibility Outcomes

13

14 In total, 126 women were assessed for eligibility to participate in the study across the two study  
15 sites, of whom 19 did not meet eligibility criteria. Of the 107 women approached to participate in  
16 the study, 6 (5.6%) declined to participate; there was lost contact with 26 (24.2%) women who  
17 either failed to notify the researcher whether they had decided to take part in the study or the  
18 researcher was unable to contact them. A total of 75 participants were recruited to the study, 67  
19 (89.3%) of these were from Site A where recruitment targets were exceeded. In contrast, in Site B,  
20 the number of women identified as potential participants fell well below the expected number,  
21 with a marked discrepancy between the estimated and actual recruitment rate. Despite an  
22 extended recruitment period and the provision of research infrastructure support systems,  
23 recruitment remained difficult at this site.

24 Baseline demographic characteristics of the recruited and randomised participants are shown in  
25 Table 1.

26 Participant recruitment and flow through the study and reasons for exclusions are outlined in the  
27 CONSORT diagram in Figure 2. No data relating to the proportion of patients who were  
28 approached and declined to participate or were not eligible were available from Site B.

29 All 14 women who participated in the QPE (for sample characteristics see Table 2) reported a  
30 positive attitude to taking part in the research and felt comfortable with the way they were  
31 approached and invited to participate in the research study. The participants commented that  
32 they considered this an important area of research and findings suggest that this group of women  
33 were altruistic, keen and willing to participate in research that would help women in a similar  
34 situation to themselves, even if it did not help them personally (see Box 1).

35

1 Randomisation- Related Feasibility Outcomes

2 Between February 2014 and March 2016 a combined site total of 47 participants (62.6% of  
3 participants who had consented to join the study) informed the researcher of a positive  
4 pregnancy test and were randomised to one of the two study groups. Participants were asked to  
5 inform the researcher of a positive pregnancy test as soon as possible to facilitate randomisation.  
6 All participants randomised to one of the study groups notified the researcher within 48 hours.  
7 One participant was excluded from randomisation, as she did not notify the researcher of her  
8 pregnancy until she had completed 12 weeks of pregnancy. The process of initiating  
9 randomisation and allocation to study group appeared to work smoothly and the study statistician  
10 confirmed that the computerised randomisation system worked efficiently. After randomisation,  
11 study materials (study questionnaires and PRCI if allocated) for the control and intervention  
12 groups were posted to the woman within 48 hours of her notifying the researcher of a positive  
13 pregnancy test. Study participants found both the concept and process of randomisation  
14 acceptable.

15 In the QPE all respondents noted that they had understood the notion of randomisation as  
16 described in the PIS. Two interview participants who were randomised to the control group  
17 voiced some disappointment that they had not received the study intervention. However, the fact  
18 that this study included an element of randomisation did not affect participants' willingness to  
19 participate in the study (see Box 2).

20 Study Questionnaires – Related Feasibility Outcomes

21

22 *Pre-Intervention Demographic Questionnaire*

23

24 Study participants completed this form at the time of recruitment. Questions were answered in  
25 an appropriate way and completed correctly, suggesting that the questionnaire was easy to use  
26 for the participant and that there were no general comprehension difficulties.

27

28 *The Hospital Anxiety Depression Scale*

29

30 Study participants were asked to complete the questionnaire on eight occasions at weekly  
31 intervals from a positive pregnancy test (normally around 4 weeks of pregnancy) until 12 weeks of  
32 pregnancy (but to discontinue its use if they experienced a further miscarriage). Study findings  
33 suggest that there were no identified difficulties with comprehension of the questionnaire  
34 wording or scoring. Questionnaires were provided in a paper format and participants were asked  
35 to return them in a prepaid envelope. Returned questionnaires were all completed correctly,  
36 there were no missing data and the forms were completed according to guidance.

1 *Weekly Record Keeping Form*

2

3 Participants were requested to complete this questionnaire weekly, alongside the HADS, until 12  
4 weeks of pregnancy (but to discontinue if they experienced a further miscarriage).

5 Overall, participants found the WRK a helpful and supportive questionnaire and interviewees  
6 shared numerous positive reflections on the impact of the WRK that suggested an effect  
7 additional to any effect of the PRCI. Participants appeared to view the questionnaires as a form of  
8 intervention, suggesting that completion of the questionnaires may have promoted psychological  
9 well-being. The self-adaptation of the questionnaires into an intervention and source of support  
10 appeared to focus on two main areas. Study participants used the questionnaires as a tool to help  
11 reflect on the difficult emotions they were experiencing during the waiting period, encouraging an  
12 awareness of their emotions, anxieties and feelings, and utilised the weekly completion of them  
13 as a method of monitoring the pregnancy's progression (see Box 3).

14 Intervention – related Feasibility Outcomes

15

16 It was important in this study to determine the acceptability of the intervention for use by women  
17 with RPL as there was a potential that participants would find the use of this self-administered  
18 intervention unacceptable. The study PIS introduced the concept of positive reappraisal and  
19 participants were given the opportunity to ask questions regarding this at the time of consent. No  
20 potential participants expressed concerns or declined taking part in the study as a result of a  
21 coping intervention being tested and all seemed amenable to the idea of using the PRCI.

22 Participants who received the PRCI were asked to read and reflect upon it at least twice a day and  
23 to record how often they actually used it during the previous week when they completed the  
24 WRK. An important aspect of assessing the feasibility and acceptability of the intervention was to  
25 determine frequency of use of the intervention and descriptive statistics were used to show this.  
26 Answers on the WRK indicated that all women used the PRCI but there was some variation in the  
27 frequency of its use as illustrated in Figure 3.

28 Qualitative feedback from the QPE contributed significantly to understanding the participants'  
29 perceptions of the PRCI. During the interview, women were asked to comment on the  
30 practicalities of using the intervention and to share their personal reflections of using it.

31 First impressions and initial reactions to the PRCI suggested a degree of scepticism as to how such  
32 a simple intervention could help in the management of their anxiety. But, overall there was a  
33 positive attitude and willingness to engage and participants appeared agreeable to continue with  
34 the intervention (see Box 4).

1 Respondents were asked to comment on the frequency with which they had used the PRCI. This  
2 varied considerably with some interviewees stating that they used the card more at the beginning  
3 of the waiting period and others suggesting they used it more as the pregnancy continued as they  
4 became more familiar with the intervention and concept of positive reappraisal. However,  
5 participants individualised how often they used the PRCI frequently utilising the intervention at  
6 time points when their anxiety levels were most elevated (see Box 5).

7 Despite initial reservations regarding the use of the PRCI, without exception, all of the  
8 interviewees offered varied and candid positive perspectives on the use of the intervention. There  
9 was a consensus that the PRCI promoted a positive re-evaluation of the waiting period and that it  
10 encouraged an appreciation of the positive aspects of their lives and a renewed appreciation of  
11 the everyday things in life. These positive aspects had often been forgotten and lost within the  
12 overwhelming feelings of anxiety experienced about the new pregnancy.

13 There were mixed accounts of whether the PRCI actually helped or reduced the anxiety the  
14 participants were experiencing. Some women expressed the belief that it had really helped to  
15 alleviate their worry and others suggested that the intervention sustained their ability to cope  
16 with the continued anxiety during the waiting period (see Box 6).

17 This study was not statistically powered to formally calculate the effectiveness of the PRCI in  
18 improving psychological well-being of women during the waiting stages of a new pregnancy  
19 following RPL. However, the quantitative and qualitative data did make it possible to assess some  
20 of the impact of the intervention on measures to be used in a future RCT. Descriptive statistics  
21 and graphical displays compared and contrasted anxiety scores within the control and  
22 intervention groups to generate data to help inform the power calculation for a definitive clinical  
23 study of the PRCI.

24 There were differences in HADS anxiety scores between the intervention and control group as  
25 shown in Figure 4. The PRCI group shows a smooth, overall downward trend (reducing anxiety  
26 levels) as pregnancies progress, indicating the expectation that anxiety scores would decrease on  
27 a weekly basis throughout the waiting period. However, the anxiety scores for the control group  
28 were more variable with peaks and troughs over the eight weeks of questionnaires. There was a  
29 notable increase in anxiety levels at week five of the questionnaire (week eight of pregnancy).

30 Recent publications concerned with ensuring appropriate reporting of feasibility and pilot studies  
31 (Shanyinde et al. 2011; Bugge et al. 2013) offer a useful analytic framework for applying  
32 methodological issues and summarising findings when assessing feasibility research. Table 3,  
33 based on the work of Bugge et al. (2013) summarises the key feasibility findings of this study  
34 against the methodological issues for feasibility research.

## 1 Discussion

2

3 This study aimed to establish the feasibility and acceptability of conducting a multicentre RCT to  
4 test the effects of the PRCI on the psychological well-being of women with RPL. The results  
5 provide a number of insights pertinent to the successful design of such a study, and of the likely  
6 value of the PRCI in this clinical context.

### 7 The Recruitment Process

8

9 Successful recruitment to a future definitive study investigating the use of the PRCI with women  
10 with RPL is shown to be possible. There is an appropriate and sizeable population willing to  
11 participate. However, as with many trials, recruitment at an external site proved more difficult  
12 than anticipated at the outset of the study, despite both using the same study protocol. A number  
13 of facilitators and barriers to recruitment were identified.

14 Lack of an on-site researcher to act as a champion to promote the research study and no named  
15 clinical lead for RPL patients were likely to have contributed to the relative under recruitment at  
16 Site B. In addition, because recruitment was taking place on the EPU and not in a specialist RPL  
17 outpatient clinic, patients were informed about the study at the time of their miscarriage. This  
18 may have discouraged the staff from inviting participation. These findings highlight the need to  
19 consider the broader processes of recruiting participants when planning recruitment sites in a  
20 future definitive multi-centre study of the PRCI.

### 21 Data Collection Questionnaires

22

23 The validation of data collection forms / questionnaires is fundamental to a feasibility study  
24 (Lancaster et al. 2004) and this is particularly important when the questionnaires are completed  
25 by the participants themselves. This includes ensuring that the selected questionnaires are the  
26 most appropriate data collection methods and provide researchers with the information they  
27 require.

28 The QPE highlighted a significant feasibility and internal validity issue, focusing particularly on the  
29 WRK. This questionnaire was intended as an instrument to measure emotional and physical  
30 reactions during the study time-period. However, many participants reported using the  
31 questionnaire as a self-monitoring intervention and may have perceived or experienced a positive  
32 effect as a result of weekly rating of the emotional and physical reactions listed on the WRK.

33 Self-monitoring refers to assessment procedures that involve data collection by the client  
34 (Korotitsch and Nelson-Gray 1999), and provides the user with continuous and immediate  
35 feedback on their situation (Bornstein et al. 1986). It has been shown to have therapeutic effects

1 due in part to the reactive effects of the self-monitoring activity (Korotitsch and Nelson-Gray  
2 1999).

3 In this feasibility study, the WRK provided study participants with an opportunity to spend time  
4 reflecting on the physical and emotional reactions they were experiencing during the waiting  
5 period of their new pregnancy. Participants reported this encouraged an awareness of the  
6 emotions, anxieties and feelings they were experiencing, helping them to rationalise them and  
7 giving back a some control in a situation where the women felt they had little control over the  
8 outcome.

9 The self-monitoring and reactivity effect of the WRK was not altogether surprising. A previous  
10 study which first investigated the use of the PRCI as a self-help coping intervention in women with  
11 miscarriage(s) also highlighted the potential reactivity effects of the WRK questionnaire.  
12 Specifically, it concluded that women could experience a positive or negative effect as a result of  
13 rating their emotions, physical symptoms, appraisal and coping (Ockhuijsen 2014) .

14 The fundamental issue here appears to be the repeated use of the WRK (daily or weekly),  
15 enabling it to act as a self-monitoring technique. From an internal validity point of view, any PRCI  
16 benefits may be due to an interaction between the monitoring and the PRCI, rather than the PRCI  
17 itself. Indeed, a study by Korotitsch and Nelson-Gray (1999) exploring the concept of self-  
18 monitoring research in assessment and treatment proposed that the reactive effects of self-  
19 monitoring may make an adjunctive contribution to the beneficial treatment effects when used  
20 alongside other interventions.

21 The PRCI was designed to help women re-interpret the demands of the waiting period in a more  
22 positive way (Ockhuijsen et al. 2014b) and the aim of the WRK in this feasibility study was to  
23 measure treatment specific reactions to using this by capturing the intervention's weekly effects.  
24 However, it seems evident that the weekly monitoring and associated reactivity to the WRK in  
25 itself have had an impact on the reporting of emotional and physical reactions. A future definitive  
26 study of the PRCI would need to pay careful consideration to how to disentangle this  
27 'methodological artefact' (Ockhuijsen 2014) and the effects of the PRCI to ensure the internal  
28 validity of any future study. Ockhuijsen et al. (2014a) showed that when the PRCI is used alone it  
29 demonstrates greater benefits than when combined with monitoring (on quantitative measures).

30 The Intervention

31

32 Although previous studies had shown no detrimental side effects of the PRCI (Lancastle and Boivin  
33 2008; Ockhuijsen et al. 2013b; Ockhuijsen et al. 2014b), establishing the acceptability of the  
34 intervention to women with RPL was an important consideration of this study. Indeed, Sekhon et  
35 al. (2017) proposes that determining acceptability has become an important consideration in the

1 design, evaluation and implementation of health care interventions. Successful implementation of  
2 an intervention, such as the PRCI, depends on the acceptability of the intervention to the  
3 recipients. Certainly, there was a concern at the outset of this study that women with RPL may  
4 find the concept of positive reappraisal difficult to understand and be sceptical of the value of  
5 using a self-managed intervention, given the extreme levels of anxiety and emotional turmoil they  
6 experience during the waiting period of a new pregnancy. As such, one of the main objectives of  
7 this feasibility study was to assess to what extent the PRCI was judged by women as suitable and  
8 functional to address their psychological needs and be practical and serviceable to use. In  
9 general, the quantitative findings from this feasibility study suggest that participants' willingness  
10 to take part in the study and general compliance in using the PRCI is an encouraging sign that  
11 women with RM might be receptive to this intervention.

12 Graphical presentation of the HADS scores (Figure 4) demonstrated a notable increase in anxiety  
13 levels at week five of the questionnaire (week eight of pregnancy). This may reflect the frequency  
14 of miscarriages occurring around this gestation, after which the likelihood of an ongoing  
15 pregnancy increases. As pregnancies progress to this stage, participants may have begun to  
16 emotionally invest in the pregnancy, and to anticipate anxiety of the grief that would accompany  
17 a further miscarriage at this stage.

18 The HADS showed reduced anxiety levels in the PRCI study group. While a previous study has  
19 demonstrated a lower anxiety level in women who used the PRCI during the IVF waiting period  
20 (Ockhuijsen et al. 2014a), the effects of the PRCI on anxiety levels, were attenuated when  
21 combined with daily monitoring of the emotions, which itself was found to have an impact.  
22 Consistent with this, the qualitative process evaluation suggested that anxiety levels were  
23 reduced as a result of completing the study questionnaires. These observed quantitative effects of  
24 the PRCI could be used to make a power calculation for a future study in which impact on anxiety  
25 is the primary endpoint.

26 Although a previous study of the PRCI during miscarriage waiting periods did not reveal any effect  
27 on anxiety (Ockhuijsen et al. 2014b) these participants had no history of recurrent pregnancy loss.  
28 In a qualitative study of the perceived usefulness of the PRCI, women with only one past  
29 miscarriage did not see the need for such a coping tool, whereas those women with recurrent  
30 miscarriage did (Ockhuijsen et al. 2013a). The PRCI might therefore be most useful in those  
31 needing to deploy coping effort because their available current coping resources are not sufficient  
32 to match the perceived threat (i.e. another miscarriage), resulting in greater levels of anxiety.

33

34 Another key study finding was that participants modified the frequency of use of the PRCI,  
35 reducing the overall time spent using the PRCI and decreasing or increasing the number of times



1 per day they read the card, adapting guidance to suit their needs or preference. Participants  
2 appeared to base this adaptation on their judgement and perception of the intensity of the  
3 emotions (e.g. anxiety, fear and uncertainty) they were experiencing and their assessment of the  
4 effect of the intervention on these challenging emotions. For example, some participants elected  
5 to utilise the card at times when their anxiety levels were most elevated, using the card more  
6 frequently at the beginning of the waiting period and decreasing when they came to feel more  
7 confident that the pregnancy would continue. Others increased the use of the PRCI throughout  
8 the waiting period as they became familiar with both the card and the process of positive  
9 reappraisal. Some participants chose to use the PRCI simply as a method of aiming to manage  
10 acute anxiety episodes. Interestingly, there was a general view among the participants that rather  
11 than adapting the PRCI guidance, they were personalising the use of the PRCI to suit their  
12 individual needs.

13 This observation, which has previously been described (Ockhuijsen 2014; Ockhuijsen et al. 2014b;  
14 Ockhuijsen et al. 2015) points to the need to consider how and whether fidelity should be  
15 accurately monitored to ensure consistent implementation of the PRCI in a future definitive multi-  
16 centre study. It could be that allowing women to individualise their use of the PRCI is likely to  
17 increase its effectiveness.

18 A further finding of this study is the large number of variables influencing both the use,  
19 interpretation and effects of the PRCI. For example, one person might read the card only once,  
20 but it may resonate with her and she keeps the PRCI statements firmly lodged in her memory. The  
21 next person may read the card twice a day as requested and start to think differently as a result,  
22 but it is a slow process to learn the skill of positive reappraisal. Another person may read it twice a  
23 day as requested, like a 'tick box' exercise, but avoid thinking about the concept of positive  
24 reappraisal at all, perhaps because it is too far out of her comfort zone and something she has no  
25 intention of thinking about. There are many different variants of how women might use and  
26 interpret the PRCI, but in terms of broad metrics, simply reading the card does not mean that the  
27 person is engaging with positive reappraisal. Indeed, the person who just reads the card once, but  
28 its statements resonate with her immediately, may be engaging with positive reappraisal coping  
29 most of all.

30 It appears that in this feasibility study 'engagement' and 'intervention fidelity' refer to far more  
31 than twice daily reading the PRCI and compliance with the guidelines for use. Given that it is a  
32 self-help intervention involving thinking and personal interpretation, it is difficult to measure,  
33 control or have insight into how participants precisely used it and this may be a limitation of the  
34 intervention and of this feasibility study.

1 The only quantitative measures of use of the PRCI in the current feasibility study were in the WRK  
2 questionnaire. Although the QPE added to the understanding of acceptability of the PRCI, it could  
3 have extended assessment of the intervention by asking participants in more detail about how  
4 and in what ways they tried to positively reappraise the situation (if at all) and about whether  
5 they felt that their coping strategies had improved as a result of the PRCI. Previous quantitative  
6 research does show that using the guidance as provided to participants in the present study does  
7 increase ability to use positive reappraisal coping as measured by another unrelated measure  
8 (Domar et al. 2015). However, more in-depth understanding of how the PRCI sustains coping  
9 could be a target for future research.

10

11 A key strength of this study is that its development and protocol was guided by an active PPI  
12 advisory group and this ensured the patient's perspective was central to the study. Study  
13 limitations included the fact that the majority of participants who took part in this study were of  
14 White British ethnicity, mainly due to the location of the study sites in the South of England. A  
15 more varied ethnicity sample may have provided a more diverse and richer insight into the  
16 cultural effects of RM.

17 In conclusion, this study successfully met its original objective determining that an effectiveness  
18 RCT of the PRCI is possible; it also highlighted specific feasibility issues (for example around  
19 recruitment and study outcome measures) that require further consideration in the planning of a  
20 definitive study. However, study participants engaged with the PRCI, were receptive to it and  
21 appeared to convey benefits from its use with no apparent downside. Furthermore, the cost of  
22 the PRCI is negligible in terms of both resources and finances. The study raises the important  
23 question of whether a future definitive multicentre RCT of the PRCI is justified given the  
24 substantial investment of finances and time this would require. The demand for healthcare  
25 continues to grow and public health systems are challenged to provide high quality, effective care  
26 within limited resources. With that in mind, evidence generated in this study suggests that this  
27 model of care might already have the potential to be made more widely available as a safe, low  
28 cost, convenient and easily deliverable intervention to provide much needed support to a  
29 vulnerable patient population. Future research will focus on technically innovative strategies to  
30 develop and deliver a supportive package of care, of which the PRCI will be an important  
31 component, to support the psychological well-being of women with RPL.

## 32 Acknowledgements

33

34 The authors would like to thank the women who kindly agreed to participate in this study and the  
35 members of the Patient and Public Involvement group for their valuable input into this  
36 programme of research.

## References

- Bailey S, Bailey C, Boivin J, Cheong Y, Reading I and Macklon N (2015) A feasibility study for a randomised controlled trial of the Positive Reappraisal Coping Intervention, a novel supportive technique for recurrent miscarriage. *BMJ open* 5:e007322. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2014-007322
- Bailey S, Boivin J, Cheong Y, Kitson-Reynolds E, Bailey C and Macklon N (2019) Hope for the best ... but expect the worst: a qualitative study to explore how women with recurrent miscarriage experience the early waiting period of a new pregnancy. *BMJ Open* 9:e029354(doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029354)
- Boivin J and Lancaster D (2010) Medical waiting periods: imminence, emotions and coping. *Women's health (London, England)* 6(1): 59-69
- Boivin J and Takefman JE (1995) Stress level across stages of in vitro fertilization in subsequently pregnant and nonpregnant women. *Fertility and Sterility* 64(4): 802-810
- Bornstein P, Hamilton S and Bornstein M (1986) Self-monitoring procedures IN: Ciminero K, Calhoun H and Adams H (eds) *Handbook of Behavioural Assessment* (Second edition Edition). New York: Wiley
- Bowen DJ, Kreuter M, Spring B, Cofta-Woerpel L, Linnan L, Weiner D, Bakken S, Kaplan CP, Squiers L, Fabrizio C and Fernandez M (2009) How We Design Feasibility Studies. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 36(5): 452-457
- Bugge C, Williams B, Hagen S, Logan J, Glazener C, Pringle S and Sinclair L (2013) A process for Decision-making after Pilot and feasibility Trials (ADePT): development following a feasibility study of a complex intervention for pelvic organ prolapse. *Trials* 14: 353-353
- Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Michie S, Nazareth I and Petticrew M (2013) Developing and evaluating complex interventions: The new Medical Research Council guidance. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 50(5): 587-592
- Cresswell J (2015) *A Concise Introduction to Mixed Methods Research* Los Angeles: Sage Publishing
- Domar A, Gross J, K R and Boivin J (2015) Exploratory randomized trial on the effect of a brief psychological intervention on emotions, quality of life, discontinuation, and pregnancy rates in invitro fertilization patients. *Fertility and Sterility* 104(2): 440-451
- Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, O'Cathain A, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, Lancaster GA, Altman D, Bretz F, Campbell M, Cobo E, Craig P, Davidson P, Groves T, Gumedze F, Hewison J, Hirst A, Hoddinott P, Lamb SE, Lang T, McColl E, Shanahan DR, Sutton C and Tugwell P (2016) CONSORT 2010 statement: Extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *BMJ (Online)* 355
- ESHRE (2017) *Recurrent Pregnancy Loss. Guideline of the European Society of Human Reproduction and Embryology.*
- Korotitsch WJ and Nelson-Gray RO (1999) An Overview of Self-Monitored Research in Assessment and Treatment. *Psychological Assessment* 11(4): 415
- Lancaster GA, Dodd S and Williamson PR (2004) Design and analysis of pilot studies: recommendations for good practice. *Journal of Evaluation in Clinical Practice* 10(2): 307-312
- Lancaster D and Boivin J (2008) A feasibility study of a brief coping intervention (PRCI) for the waiting period before a pregnancy test during fertility treatment. *Human Reproduction* 23(10): 2299-2307
- Moore GF, Audrey S, Barker M, Bond L, Bonell C, Hardeman W, Moore L, O'Cathain A, Tinati T, Wight D and Baird J (2015) Process evaluation of complex interventions: Medical Research Council guidance. *BMJ: British Medical Journal* 350(h1258): 1-7
- O'Cathain A, Hoddinott P, Lewin S, Thomas K, Young B, Adamson J, Jansen Y, Mills N, Moore G and Donovan J (2015) Maximising the impact of qualitative research in feasibility studies for randomised controlled trials: guidance for researchers. *Pilot and Feasibility Studies* 1(32)
- Ockhuijsen H (2014) *A Novel Intervention for Medical Waiting Periods in IVF and Early Pregnancy* Unpublished PhD thesis Utrecht, The Netherlands University

- Ockhuijsen H, van den Hoogen A, Eijkemans M, Macklon N and Boivin J (2014a) Clarifying the benefits of the positive reappraisal coping intervention for women waiting for the outcome of IVF. *Human Reproduction* 29(12): 2712-2718
- Ockhuijsen H, van den Hoogen A, Eijkemans M, Macklon N and Boivin J (2014b) The impact of a self-administered coping intervention on emotional well-being in women awaiting the outcome of IVF treatment: a randomized controlled trial. *Human Reproduction* 29(7): 1459-1470
- Ockhuijsen HDL, Boivin J, van den Hoogen A and Macklon NS (2013a) Coping after recurrent miscarriage: uncertainty and bracing for the worst. *Journal of Family Planning & Reproductive Health Care* 39(4): 250-256
- Ockhuijsen HDL, van den Hoogen A, Boivin J, Macklon NS and de Boer F (2014c) Pregnancy After Miscarriage: Balancing Between Loss of Control and Searching for Control. *Research in Nursing and Health* 37(4): 267-275
- Ockhuijsen HDL, van den Hoogen A, Boivin J, Macklon NS and de Boer F (2015) Original Article: Exploring a self-help coping intervention for pregnant women with a miscarriage history. *Applied Nursing Research* 28: 285-292
- Ockhuijsen HDL, van den Hoogen A, Macklon NS and Boivin J (2013b) The PRCI study: design of a randomized clinical trial to evaluate a coping intervention for medical waiting periods used by women undergoing a fertility treatment. *BMC Womens' Health*
- RCOG (2011) The investigation and treatment of couples with recurrent first-trimester and second-trimester miscarriage.
- Sekhon M, Cartwright M and Francis J (2017) Acceptability of health care interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. *BMC Health Services Research* 17(88)
- Shanyinde M, Pickering RM and Weatherall M (2011) Questions asked and answered in pilot and feasibility randomized controlled trials. *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 11(117): 1471-2288
- Thomas DR (2006) A General Inductive Approach for Analyzing Qualitative Evaluation Data. *American Journal of Evaluation* 27(2): 237-246
- Tong S, Kaur A, Walker S, Bryant V, Onwude J and Permezel M (2008) Miscarriage risk for asymptomatic women after a normal first-trimester prenatal visit. *Obstetrics and Gynaecology* 111(3): 710-714
- Zigmond AS and Snaith RP (1983) The Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica* 67(6): 361