

1 **Personalised adherence support for maintenance treatment of inflammatory bowel**
2 **disease: A tailored digital intervention to change adherence-related beliefs and barriers**

3 Authors: Dr Sarah Chapman^{1,2}, Dr Alice Sibelli^{1,3}, Ms Anja St-Clair Jones⁴, Prof Alastair
4 Forbes^{5,6}, Dr Angel Chater^{1,7} & Prof Rob Horne¹

5 ¹UCL School of Pharmacy, Centre for Behavioural Medicine, BMA House, Tavistock
6 Square, London, WC1H 9JP

7 ²Department of Pharmacy & Pharmacology, University of Bath, Claverton Down Road, Bath,
8 BA2 7AY

9 ³Health Psychology Section, Department of Psychology, Institute of Psychiatry, Psychology
10 and Neuroscience, King's College London, 5th Floor, Bermondsey Wing, Guy's Hospital
11 Campus, London Bridge, London SE1 9RT, UK

12 ⁴Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust, Royal Sussex County Hospital,
13 Pharmacy Department, Easter Road, Brighton, BN2 5BE

14 ⁵Institute for Digestive Diseases, University College London Hospitals Trust, London NW1
15 2BU, UK

16 ⁶Norwich Medical School, Bob Champion Building, James Watson Road, Norwich, NR4
17 7UQ

18 ⁷ Centre for Health, Wellbeing and Behaviour Change, Faculty of Education and Sport,
19 University of Bedfordshire, Polhill Avenue, Bedford, MK41 9EA

20 Short title: Personalised digital IBD adherence intervention

21 Corresponding Author: Prof Rob Horne, UCL School of Pharmacy, Centre for Behavioural
22 Medicine, BMA House, Tavistock Square, London, WC1H 9JP; r.horne@ucl.ac.uk; tel: 020
23 7874 1281.

24 Abbreviations:

25 IBD: Inflammatory Bowel Disease

- 1 PPA: Perceptions and Practicalities Approach
- 2 BMQ: Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire

1 Abstract

2 Background and aims: Interventions to improve adherence to medication may be more
3 effective if tailored to the individual, addressing adherence-related beliefs about treatment
4 and overcoming practical barriers to daily use. We evaluated whether an algorithm tailoring
5 support to address perceptual and practical barriers to adherence reduced barriers and was
6 acceptable to patients with IBD.

7 Methods: Participants with IBD, prescribed azathioprine and/or mesalazine were recruited via
8 patient groups, social media and hospital clinics and allocated to Intervention or Control
9 Groups. The online intervention comprised messages tailored to address beliefs about IBD
10 and maintenance treatment and provide advice on overcoming practical difficulties with
11 taking regular medication. The content was personalised to address specific perceptual and
12 practical barriers identified by a pre-screening tool. Validated questionnaires assessed
13 barriers to adherence and related secondary outcomes at baseline, one and three months of
14 follow-up.

15 Results: 329 participants were allocated to the Intervention (n=153) and Control (n=176)
16 Groups; just under half (46.2%) completed follow-up. At one and three months the
17 Intervention Group had significantly fewer concerns about IBD medication ($p \leq .01$); and, at
18 three months only, fewer doubts about treatment need, fewer reported practical barriers and
19 lower nonadherence ($p < .05$). Relative to controls at follow-up, the Intervention Group were
20 more satisfied with information about IBD medicines, and viewed pharmaceuticals in general
21 more positively. Questionnaires, interviews and intervention usage indicated the intervention
22 was acceptable.

23 Conclusions: Personalised adherence support using a digital algorithm can help patients
24 overcome perceptual (doubts about treatment necessity and medication concerns) and
25 practical barriers to adherence.

26 Keywords: Medication nonadherence; inflammatory bowel disease; digital intervention,
27 Necessity Concerns Framework.

28

29

1 **Personalised adherence support for maintenance treatment of inflammatory bowel**
2 **disease: A tailored digital intervention to change adherence-related beliefs and barriers**

3 Inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), comprising ulcerative colitis and Crohn's disease, is
4 treated with maintenance drugs including mesalazine, thiopurines (e.g. azathioprine), anti-
5 TNF therapies, and anti-integrins (e.g. vedolizumab). [1] These drugs control flare-ups [2-4],
6 avoid surgery, reduce colorectal cancer risk [1], and improve quality of life. However, an
7 estimated 53-72% of people with IBD do not take their medication as prescribed, resulting in
8 increased morbidity, healthcare costs, and decreased quality of life. [2, 5-10]

9 Nonadherence to medication may be intentional and unintentional, arising from *motivation*
10 and *ability*. [11] Motivation is influenced by factors including patients' perceptions and
11 experience of IBD and maintenance treatment, and trust in the prescriber and prescription.
12 Ability is influenced by internal (e.g. physical capability to administer maintenance
13 treatment) [11] and external (e.g. access to maintenance treatment) factors. [12] These
14 principles are recognised in the Perceptions and Practicalities Approach (PAPA) [13] to
15 supporting adherence, applied in NICE Medicines Adherence Guidelines. [14] This approach
16 suggests adherence support will be more effective if it addresses both perceptions (e.g. beliefs
17 about illness and treatment) and practicalities (e.g. capability and resources) affecting ability
18 and motivation to adhere. The importance of addressing IBD patients' beliefs has been
19 highlighted in a systematic review which found judgements of personal need for maintenance
20 medication (Necessity beliefs) and concerns about adverse consequences of treatment were
21 key determinants of nonadherence. [15-17] The Necessity-Concerns Framework [18] states
22 patients will be particularly motivated to take treatment when perceived personal need
23 (Necessity beliefs) is high relative to concerns about potential side effects (Concerns beliefs).
24 [19].

25 Beliefs are influenced by perceptions of IBD and symptoms. Patients who see a fit between
26 their IBD (illness representations) and their maintenance treatment are more likely to think
27 maintenance treatment is necessary. For many patients, taking medication does not 'make
28 common-sense' when they feel well. Likewise, Concerns may arise from perceiving
29 symptoms as side effects. But, even patients who have not experienced side effects can
30 harbour concerns e.g. about long-term effects, or dependence [20]. Such concerns have been
31 related to suspicions of pharmaceutical treatments and general background beliefs about

1 medicines (e.g. that they are intrinsically harmful [20]) and to patients' perceived personal
2 sensitivity to medication effects.

3 These findings suggest a three stage PAPA-based intervention may support adherence: 1)
4 Provide a rationale for medication necessity so that patients perceive a 'common-sense' fit
5 between IBD and treatment 2) elicit and address concerns about IBD medication and 3)
6 address practical barriers to adherence. Studies in other long-term conditions have
7 demonstrated the efficacy of this approach in improving adherence (e.g. [21, 22]), but no
8 interventions have incorporated this approach for IBD.

9 We report a 'proof of principle' study in which we examined a PAPA-based intervention in
10 which support was tailored to address treatment necessity beliefs and concerns and help
11 overcome practical barriers to adherence. We used an online platform to deliver the
12 intervention because many patients with IBD access information online and because this
13 support could be integrated with usual clinical care but accessed at patients' convenience.

14 Our aims were to: 1) Develop the PAPA-based intervention and 2) Evaluate the intervention
15 based on a) capacity to change perceptual and practical barriers to adherence; b) feasibility of
16 delivering online; and c) acceptability to patients.

17

1 **Methods**

2 In line with the objectives, this study had two phases 1) intervention development and 2)
3 intervention pilot.

4 **Ethics and trial registration**

5 The study received ethical approval from the NRES Committee London-Central. The trial
6 protocol was registered with a clinical trial database <http://clinicaltrials.gov/> (Identifier
7 NCT01852097).

8 **Phase 1: Intervention Development**

9 We followed the recommendations of the MRC for complex intervention development, and
10 considered research on the determinants of a behaviour and involving patients in the
11 intervention design [20]. As recommended by Horne and Clatworthy [23] the adherence
12 intervention was developed considering *content*, *context* and *channel (delivery vehicle)*.

13 Content: Our PAPA-based intervention applied National and European guidelines for IBD
14 management [24-31], UK adherence guidelines, [14], and research about barriers to
15 adherence in IBD. [15] We involved advisory panels of UK IBD patients and expert
16 clinicians to ensure that the intervention was appropriate to the local healthcare context. To
17 enable us to provide information about the medication participants were taking, we focused
18 on two of the most common IBD maintenance medications available in practice at the time of
19 the study design, azathioprine and mesalamine. The intervention addressed the 3-component
20 PAPA model:

- 21 1) *Necessity*- Addressing doubts about need for medication
- 22 2) *Concerns*- Addressing concerns about potential adverse effects of medication
- 23 3) *Practical Barriers*- Addressing practical issues with taking medication in daily life

24 We also added an *IBD Library*- comprising general resources about living with IBD not
25 tailored to address medication adherence directly.

26 Each of the three PAPA components was addressed using a number of Behaviour Change
27 Techniques (BCTs) [32] designed to modify behaviour regulatory processes. For example, to

1 increase perceived need for treatment ‘*Necessity*’ we used the BCTs ‘Information on health
2 consequences’ and ‘Credible Source’, providing quotes from IBD experts to explain why
3 patients need to take medication during both flare-ups and remission. Full details of the BCTs
4 used in each part of the intervention and example content are presented in Supplement 1. We
5 followed a communication strategy based on cognitive behavioural therapy and motivational
6 interviewing, to ensure that the BCTs were delivered using language that would enhance
7 awareness and intrinsic motivation.

8 Channel (delivery vehicle): The content of the messages was personalised using the
9 Persignia¹ algorithm which tailors content to address specific perceptual and practical
10 barriers identified by a pre-screening tool.

11 Context: To assess whether the intervention content and channel would fit well with existing
12 care pathways, we conducted three focus groups with 8 IBD patients. The Intervention
13 Development Group (specialists in gastroenterology, clinical psychology, pharmacy, and
14 health psychology) and three IBD patients undertook further usability testing. Further details
15 and a sample page are presented in the Supplementary Material.

16 **Phase 2: Intervention Pilot**

17 **Design**

18 The pilot was a single-blinded, quasi-randomized trial of the online intervention comparing
19 intervention and passive control (receiving standard care) groups. Patients completed the
20 study measures three times: baseline (immediately prior to receiving the intervention link), at
21 1 month (30 days after starting the baseline measures, and at 3 months (90 days after starting
22 the baseline measures). Our primary outcomes were self-reported perceptual and practical
23 barriers (BMQ Specific Concerns, BMQ Specific Necessity, and Practical Barriers). We also
24 tested whether the intervention had effects on a range of secondary outcomes: adherence,
25 beliefs about medicines in general, perceived sensitivity to the effects of medicines, beliefs
26 about IBD, satisfaction with information received about IBD medications, anxiety,
27 depression, quality of life, reported disease activity, reported treatment seeking and reported
28 burden of adverse effects to IBD maintenance treatment. We measured intervention usage

¹ Working title

1 statistics to assess feasibility. We used post-intervention questionnaires and interviews to
2 gauge acceptability of the intervention.

3 **Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria**

4 We recruited people aged 18 years or older, who reported a diagnosis of IBD and a current
5 prescription of azathioprine and/or mesalamine. We planned to exclude participants who did
6 not report at least one perceptual or practical barrier (i.e. no concerns about their medication,
7 no doubts about their need for medication and no practical barriers in the baseline
8 questionnaire). But all participants who entered the study reported at least one barrier.

9 **Recruitment**

10 Participants were recruited through Crohn's and Colitis UK's website, Facebook and Twitter
11 accounts. We also placed leaflets and posters in IBD clinics at University College London
12 Hospital and Brighton and Sussex University Hospitals NHS Trust. Potential participants
13 followed a link to information about the study and an eligibility questionnaire. Eligible
14 participants were then asked to provide informed consent. After the study commenced, we
15 became concerned that the dropout rate was higher than expected. We introduced a prize
16 draw for a £150 online gift voucher into which participants who completed all follow-ups
17 would be entered.

18 **Allocation**

19 Participants were allocated to Intervention or Control Groups by a computer algorithm blind
20 to their baseline characteristics. Due to an unanticipated technical issue this algorithm
21 allocated slightly more participants to the Control Group than the Intervention Group as the
22 study progressed², and so although blind, was not fully randomized. As a result of this
23 technical issue, 7 participants who resubmitted their baseline questionnaires (we suspect by

We planned to stratify participants by medication (azathioprine/mesalamine/both) and randomize using a computer generated random number sequence. To ensure equal group numbers, this was operationalized using a minimization algorithm; with the first participant in each strata randomized and subsequent participants assigned to the group with fewest participants for their medication. Due to an unanticipated feature of the platform, participants had new random allocation values encoded when completing follow-up questionnaires. These new allocation values, rather than original allocations, were used to randomize new participants. More Intervention Group participants dropped-out, so, as the study progressed these participants had an allocation value frozen at Intervention, meaning subsequent allocations were more likely to be to the Control Group. Thus we did not randomize. However, the algorithm had no effect on the intervention content presented to participants.

1 hitting refresh mid-submission) were allocated twice at baseline and recorded on our system
2 as allocated to both the Control and Intervention Groups. To avoid potentially cross-
3 contaminated participants, we excluded these from the analyses below.

4 **Measures**

5 Participants received the same questionnaire package at baseline, 1 and 3 months, which took
6 approximately 25 minutes to complete. It included:

7 **Beliefs about Medicine Questionnaire (BMQ).** The BMQ is a validated scale [29] with two
8 parts, the BMQ Specific, assessing patients' evaluations of a particular medicine for a
9 particular condition, in this case maintenance treatment for IBD, and General, assessing
10 patients' evaluations of pharmaceuticals as a class of treatments.

11 There are two BMQ Specific scales, BMQ Necessity (5-items), which assesses perceptions of
12 need for IBD medication (e.g. 'My life would be impossible without
13 mesalazine/azathioprine) and BMQ Concerns (6-items), which assesses beliefs about
14 potential adverse effects of IBD medication (e.g. 'Having to take mesalazine/azathioprine
15 worries me'). Participants either completed a BMQ Specific for azathioprine (AZA), or
16 mesalamine/ (MES) or one both medication, depending on whether they were taking AZA,
17 MES or both. Where participants completed both scales, we took their highest BMQ
18 Concerns score and their lowest BMQ Necessity score on the basis that these scores would be
19 indicative of barriers to adherence. A Necessity-Concerns Differential score (BMQ NCD),
20 indexing patients' overall evaluation of the benefits/risks of their IBD treatment was
21 calculated by subtracting BMQ Concerns scores from BMQ Necessity scores.

22 The BMQ General has three scales evaluating whether pharmaceutical medications are
23 generally harmful (Harm; 5 items; e.g. 'medicines do more harm than good'), overused and
24 overprescribed by medical practitioners (Overuse; 3 items), or beneficial to patients and
25 society (Benefit; 4 items). All items are assessed on Likert type scales anchored from
26 1=strongly agree to 5=strongly disagree. The measure has been found to be valid and reliable
27 [33]. In the current sample, all scales had good internal reliability at baseline (Cronbach's
28 α s=0.74-0.91).

29 **Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale (PSM).** The PSM assesses perceptions of their
30 personal sensitivity to the positive and negative effects of medicines. Participants indicate
31 their agreement with 5 items on the same Likert-type scale as used in the BMQ. It has

1 previously been shown to be reliable and valid [34] and had good internal reliability at
2 baseline in the current study (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.90$).

3 **Perceptual Barriers Profiler.** In addition to the full BMQ, an IBD BMQ Specific Profiler
4 was used to identify specific doubts and concerns about each IBD treatment. Participants
5 were asked indicate whether they had doubts about treatment need or concerns about adverse
6 effects by responding simply 'yes' or 'no' to doubts or concerns based on the BMQ Specific
7 items (17 items for AZA and 17 items for MES).

8 **Practical Barriers Profiler.** A scale to profile participants' experience of practical barriers
9 to taking medication was created by asking participants to respond 'yes' or 'no' to 10
10 practical issues that they might experience when taking their IBD medication. For example 'I
11 find it difficult to remember to take my medicines when my daily routine changes'. We
12 calculated the total number of practical barriers endorsed (possible range 0-10) as a 'Practical
13 Barriers' score.

14 The Perceptual and Practical Barriers Profilers were used to tailor the intervention content
15 presented to participants. Participants who reported any Necessity Barriers received all the
16 Necessity pages. Participants who reported Concerns or Practical Barriers received specific
17 pages tailored to their individual barriers to reduce burden and ensure that barriers were not
18 suggested to patients. For example, only participants who reported a Concern about long-term
19 effects of treatment received information about cancer risks. All participants received access
20 to the IBD Library.

21 **Medication Adherence Report Scale (MARS).** The MARS is a validated measure of self-
22 reported adherence to IBD medication. The MARS scale [33] has been extensively used to
23 measure self-report of the frequency of nonadherent behaviours (e.g. 'I forget to take
24 azathioprine') in a variety of illness populations [31-35]. The MARS attempts to diminish the
25 social pressure on patients to under-report non-adherence by phrasing adherence questions in
26 a non-threatening manner. In the current study we used a 6-item version scored from 1=very
27 often to 5=never resulting in a possible range of total scores of 6-30, 30 indicating the highest
28 self-reported adherence. Participants completed separate scales for AZA, MES or both. For
29 the combined analysis, we used the lowest reported score. The scale has been previously
30 validated (e.g. [33]) and had good baseline internal reliability in for both MES (Cronbach's
31 $\alpha=0.80$) and AZA (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.81$).

1 **Adherence Visual Analogue Scale (VAS).** Patients reported an estimate of the percentage of
2 their AZA and/or MES medication taken over the last week on a scale from 0-100%.

3 **Brief Illness Perception Questionnaire (IPQ).** The Brief IPQ [36] is an assessment of
4 cognitive and emotional representations of illness, on eight dimensions. Patients rated their
5 perceptions of the following aspects of their IBD: its impact on their lives (consequences),
6 chronicity (timeline), whether they could it (personal control), whether their treatment could
7 control it (treatment control), severity of symptoms (identity), concern about their symptoms
8 (concern), understanding of their IBD (understanding), and distressed about their IBD
9 (emotional response). Patients responded to each item on a scale of 0-10.

10 **Satisfaction with Information about Medicines Scale (SIMS).** The SIMS [37] assesses
11 how satisfied patients are with the information they have received about their medication. It
12 has two subscales: SIMS Action and Usage (SIMS-AU), measuring satisfaction with
13 information about the action and usage of IBD medication and SIMS Potential Problems
14 (SIMS-PP) measuring satisfaction with information about the potential problems that might
15 arise while taking IBD medication. Both scales have previously been found to be reliable and
16 valid [37], and, in the current sample, the subscales had good internal reliability at baseline
17 (Cronbach's α SIMS AU=0.81, SIMS PP=0.88).

18 **Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale (HADS).** The HADS measures current symptoms
19 of anxiety and depression [38] on two 7-item scales. It has good reliability and validity
20 including in IBD [35]. In the current sample both scales had good internal reliability at
21 baseline (both Cronbach's α =0.83). We categorised patients as being at risk for clinically
22 significant anxiety and depression if their total score (possible range 0-21) on either subscale
23 was above 10 [39].

24 **Short Inflammatory Bowel Disease Questionnaire (SIBDQ).** The SIBDQ measures quality
25 of life in IBD. It has been found to be valid, reliable and sensitive to clinical changes
26 (Cronbach's α =0.87 in current study). [36] The scale has 10 items that are summed to form a
27 total score (range 10-70) with higher scores indicative of better health.

28 **Demographic and clinical information.** Participants reported demographic factors: their
29 date of birth, gender, marital status, level of education, and ethnicity. They also reported
30 clinical information: age when diagnosed with IBD, whether they were currently in remission
31 or having a flare-up, number of flare-ups experienced in the last 3 months, medications

1 prescribed for IBD, and number of consultations for IBD (planned and unplanned) with
2 healthcare professionals in the last 3 months.

3 **Acceptability and Usage Assessments**

4 We conducted quantitative and qualitative assessments of the acceptability of the
5 intervention. We also assessed intervention usage by evaluating which participants had
6 logged in, for how long, and to which sections of the website.

7 **Quantitative Assessment- Acceptability Questionnaire.** After completing, the final 3-
8 month follow-up participants in the Intervention Group were automatically emailed a link to
9 a brief, final questionnaire evaluating the intervention. This included 17 statements about the
10 functionality, usefulness and trustworthiness of the website e.g. 'I think the information on
11 this website was not convincing', which participants rated their agreement with on a 5-point
12 Likert-type scale (1=strongly agree, 5=strongly disagree).

13 **Qualitative Assessment-Acceptability Interviews.** When giving informed consent,
14 participants were asked if they would be willing to be contacted for a follow-up telephone
15 interview. After recruitment and follow-up was complete, we contacted participants who had
16 expressed interest in this who were in the Intervention Group. We purposively sampled 6
17 male and female participants who had and hadn't used the intervention. Two research
18 assistants trained in qualitative methods conducted telephone interviews using a semi-
19 structured interview schedule to explore experiences of the intervention. The interviews were
20 transcribed and themes and quotes from the interviews are used below to provide context to
21 the quantitative data collected [41].

22 **Intervention Usage Statistics.** The platform automatically recorded the time each page of
23 the Intervention site was accessed. Using this information, we were able to calculate the total
24 time spent accessing the website by each participant and check when the intervention content
25 was accessed over the follow-up period (i.e. total number of visits to the intervention, total
26 time spent across intervention, date of first access).

27 **Statistical Analysis and Sample Size Calculation**

28 We determined the sample size needed to obtain 80% power to detect a statistically
29 significant ($p \leq 0.05$) medium-sized difference (Cohen's $d=0.5$) in beliefs between Control and
30 Intervention Groups at follow-up using the statistical package G*Power 3.1.3 (® Dusseldorf),

1 based on effect sizes for other online interventions [37]. We estimated 128 participants (64
2 per group) were necessary, rising to 214 assuming a 40% drop-out rate.

3 Statistical analysis was undertaken using SPSS 21 (®, IBM). We used intention-to-treat
4 analysis (i.e. without excluding participants who did not access the intervention) to assess the
5 unbiased effect of the intervention. We tested for normality of our variables and used means
6 and standard deviations to describe normally distributed variables, and medians and
7 interquartile ranges to describe skewed variables. At baseline, 1 month and 3 months follow-
8 up we tested for between-group differences in each variable using t-tests with Levene's
9 adjustment for unequal distributions or Mann-Whitney U-tests as appropriate.

10

1 **Results**

2 **Recruitment and Retention**

3 The screening questionnaire was completed by 1267 potential participants, 1115 of whom
4 met the eligibility criteria, 381 participants consented to take part in the study and started the
5 baseline questionnaire. See Figure 1 for recruitment and retention. Over 300 patients (329)
6 were allocated to intervention or control. At 3 months follow-up, just 46.2% of participants
7 were retained in the study.

8 **Sample demographics**

9 The sample was 72.8% female (n=238). Participants were aged between 18.5 years and 73.0
10 years, the median age was 36.3 years. The sample was 89.3% White British (n=293). One
11 hundred and fifty six participants had obtained a degree or higher degree (47.7%).

12 **Baseline clinical status**

13 At baseline, 54.3% of participants reported that they were currently experiencing a mild to
14 moderate flare-up (n=117) and 35.7% were in remission (n=117) and the remainder reported
15 a current severe flare-up (n=33, 10.1%). The median number of flare-ups reported by
16 participants in the previous 3 months was 1 (range 0-31), with 75.2% of participants reporting
17 at least one recent flare-up. Healthcare seeking for IBD was not high; most participants
18 reported 1 or fewer GP, consultant, nurse, telephone helpline, or pharmacist contacts. 72.9%
19 of participants were taking mesalamine and 54.7% were taking azathioprine. See Table 2 for
20 statistics.

21 The mean HADS anxiety score was 9.9 (SD=4.3). The mean HADS depression score was 7.5
22 (SD=2.2). Overall, 133 participants (41.8%) scored above 10 for HADS anxiety, and 70
23 (21.5%) scored above 10 for HADS depression, indicating risk of clinical significance.

24 **Primary outcome: Perceptual and practical barriers to adherence**

25 Participants reported both perceptual and practical barriers to taking their IBD medication at
26 baseline. On the profiling scale 90.8% (n=267) of participants reported at least one concern
27 about their medication, 95.4% (n=312) had at least one doubt about whether their IBD
28 medication was needed, and 89.9% (n=295) had at least one practical barrier to taking their
29 IBD medication.

1 Pre-intervention, participants in the Intervention and Control Groups reported similar levels
2 of concerns about their medication (BMQ Specific Concerns), and doubts about necessity
3 (BMQ Specific Necessity). We split participants into those who reported high and low
4 concerns and necessity beliefs using the midpoint of the scales (as per [16]). At baseline,
5 30.5% (n=99) of participants reported significant doubts about their need for their IBD
6 medication (low BMQ Specific Necessity), and 43.3% (n=141) reported high concerns about
7 the potential adverse effects of their IBD medication (high BMQ Specific Concerns).
8 Descriptive statistics for BMQ Necessity, BMQ Concerns, and the difference between these
9 two scores are presented in Table 3.

10 **Specific beliefs at follow-up**

11 At both 1 and 3 months follow-up, the Intervention Group had a higher BMQ NCD score,
12 indicating that their belief in their personal need for medication tended to outweigh their
13 concerns to a greater extent than it did for the Control Group, and this was statistically
14 significant at 3 months. They also expressed statistically significantly fewer doubts about
15 their personal need for IBD medication at 3 months, and fewer concerns about the potential
16 adverse effects of IBD medication at 1 and 3 months (see Table 3 and Figure 2).

17 **Practical barriers to taking medication at follow-up**

18 Intervention Group participants reported fewer practical barriers to taking medication at both
19 follow-up time points, but this was only statistically significant at 3 months (see Table 3).

20 **Secondary Outcomes**

21 See Tables 4 & 5 for descriptive statistics and between-group comparisons.

22 **Adherence**

23 Reported adherence to medication was high; at baseline the median MARS score was 28
24 (range 10-30) and the median VAS adherence was 100% (range 0-100). Likewise at both
25 follow-ups, the median VAS score was 100% in both groups for both medications. Due to
26 highly skewed data, we used non-parametric tests, to assess whether mean ranks of adherence
27 scores were different between the Intervention and Control groups over follow-up. At 1- and
28 3-months post-intervention the Intervention Group had higher VAS adherence than Controls,
29 higher adherence to mesalamine alone at 1 month on the VAS, and higher adherence to

1 azathioprine on both VAS and MARS at 3 months. There were no statistically significant
2 differences between groups for MARS adherence to mesalamine.

3 **Satisfaction with information about IBD medication**

4 At baseline participants reported that they were satisfied with a mean of 7.01 SIMS items
5 about Action and Usage (of a total of 9) and 4.82 SIMS items about the Potential Problems
6 associated with their medication (of a total of 8). There were no differences between the
7 Intervention and Control Groups in terms of satisfaction with information at baseline.

8 Intervention Group participants were more satisfied with the information they had received
9 about the potential problems associated with IBD medication (SIMS PP) than Controls at
10 both follow-up points ($p < .05$). Intervention participants were also more satisfied with the
11 information they had received about the action and usage of medication (SIMS AU) at both
12 follow-up points, but this was only statistically significant at 1 month ($p < .05$).

13 **General beliefs about pharmaceuticals as a class of treatment**

14 The groups were not statistically significantly different on general beliefs about
15 pharmaceutical medication: BMQ Harm, BMQ Overuse, BMQ General Benefit and
16 Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines at baseline. The Intervention Group were less likely than
17 Controls to believe that pharmaceutical medication is generally overused (BMQ Overuse)
18 and harmful (BMQ Harm) at both 1 month and 3 months follow-up ($p < .05$). There were no
19 statistically significant effects at either time on the belief that medications are generally
20 beneficial (BMQ Benefit) or on patients' perceptions of their own sensitivity to the effects of
21 medications (PSM).

22 **Illness beliefs**

23 Participants' scores on the Brief IPQ at baseline indicated that participants felt their IBD was
24 fairly severe, chronic, distressing and concerning but relatively well understood (see
25 Supplementary material for individual item scores. There was no overall difference in
26 baseline brief IPQ scores but a small statistically significant difference between groups at
27 baseline in treatment control beliefs; patients in the Intervention Group reported slightly more
28 agreement that their treatment can control their IBD than participants in the Control Group.
29 Participants in the Intervention Group had viewed their IBD more positively than Controls at
30 1 and 3 months although this was only statistically significant at 1 month (see Table 3).

1 **Quality of life, Anxiety and Depression**

2 Participants in the Intervention Group reported less anxiety and depression than controls
3 (HADS Anxiety and HADS Depression scales) and higher IBD-related quality of life
4 (SIBDQ) at both follow-up points. However, the differences between groups were only
5 statistically significant for anxiety and depression at the 3-month follow-up. See Table 3 for
6 means, medians and t-tests.

7 **Acceptability Questionnaire and Interviews**

8 Analysis of the acceptability interviews is presented in the Appendix. Thirty-two participants
9 in the Intervention Group filled in the acceptability questionnaire. The website was rated as
10 'easy to understand' by 100% (n=32) of participants and 'easy to navigate' by 93.3% (n=28)
11 of participants. A small number of participants indicated they found the website slow to load
12 (n=4, 13.3%) and unattractive (n=6, 20.0%). Most participants disagreed or strongly
13 disagreed that the website 'took too long' 84.4% (n=27), was 'not relevant to me' 75.0%
14 (n=24), 'not believable' 87.5% (n=28), and 'not convincing' 84.4% (n=27), indicating
15 positive views of the website. Likewise, 56.3% (n=18) agreed or strongly agreed that the
16 cartoons were helpful, 62.5% (n=20) were happy with the number of questions on the
17 website, and 59.4% (n=19) thought the website had made them think. Perceptions of the
18 intervention team were positive; the majority of the respondents rated the team as 'credible'
19 (86.7% n=26), 'trustworthy' (83.3%, n=25), 'dependable' (76.7%, n=23), 'reliable' (73.3%,
20 n=22), and 'reputable' (83.3%, n=25).

21 **Intervention Usage**

22 The intervention was used by 73.2% (n=112) of the Intervention Group. Of participants who
23 logged on to the intervention, the maximum number of sessions was 5 and slightly over half
24 of participants (54.9%, n=84) logged on once with the remaining participants using the
25 intervention on multiple occasions. The total time spent on the website varied between <0.01
26 seconds and 73 minutes, (median = 9.36 minutes). Participants accessed a median of 22 pages
27 (range 1-124).

28 Forty-one participants (26.8%) in the Intervention Group never logged on to the intervention.
29 There were no differences between participants who logged on to the intervention and those
30 who did not in terms of demographic variables (age, gender, ethnicity or education level),
31 baseline specific beliefs about medication for IBD (Specific Necessity and Concerns),

1 baseline general beliefs about medications (Harm, Overuse, Benefits), perceived personal
2 sensitivity to medicines, illness beliefs (IPQ), anxiety, depression or self-reported adherence
3 (all $p > .05$).

4 The most frequently visited area of the website was the Practical Barriers section, which
5 75.9% (n=85) of participants used. The Concerns section was accessed by 56.3% (n=63), the
6 Necessity sections by 45.5% (n=51) and the IBD library section by 34.8% (n=39).

1 **Discussion**

2 This is the first study to evaluate an intervention to change adherence-related beliefs about
3 maintenance treatment for IBD. We found a clear need for the intervention; all potential
4 participants reported a some doubt about the personal necessity of medication, concern about
5 medicines, or practical barrier to adherence. There was evidence the intervention effectively
6 addressed these barriers.

7 Perceptual and practical barriers have been associated with adherence in IBD [14-16]. From
8 equivalence at baseline, intervention participants had statistically significantly stronger
9 beliefs in the Necessity of their medication at 3-months follow up relative to the Control
10 group. This was achieved by providing patients with a common-sense rationale for treatment
11 and using the Persignia³ algorithm . The intervention reduced concerns about medication
12 over time relative to the Control Group.

13 There were other indicators of efficacy on secondary outcomes. Intervention Group
14 participants reported more satisfaction with information about IBD medication, more positive
15 beliefs about medications in general, and more positive views of IBD than the Control Group
16 at follow-up. This suggests addressing barriers to adherence may affect multiple variables
17 relevant to IBD self-management. The acceptability questionnaire recorded largely positive
18 views of the intervention. Participant interviews indicated the content was useful and
19 trustworthy, and suggested areas for further development including technical issues relating
20 to the web-based delivery channel. Intervention usage statistics indicated most participants
21 spent less than 15 minutes using the intervention. The online PAPA-based intervention has
22 the capacity to modify adherence barriers, is likely to be acceptable to patients and feasible to
23 deliver.

24 The effect of the intervention was less robust on other variables. Relative to Controls,
25 Intervention Group participants reported fewer practical barriers at 1 and 3 months follow-up,
26 this difference was only statistically significant at 3 months. The lack of change in practical
27 barriers could indicate a need for face-to-face or other support to address practical factors
28 such as difficulty in obtaining prescriptions or regimen complexity. Self-reported adherence
29 was higher in the Intervention Group at 1 month and 3 months follow-up but this was only

³ Working title

1 statistically significant for the VAS measure at 3 months. These differences are small and
2 unlikely to affect clinical outcomes in the short term, however, over time, not addressing
3 barriers to adherence may increase vulnerability to nonadherence and subsequently flare-ups
4 and hospitalisations. We found higher levels of reported adherence than previously reported
5 in IBD [2, 5-10], perhaps indicating our participants were more highly engaged with their
6 care than is typical, or that they under-reported nonadherence which may have placed a
7 ceiling effect on improvements in adherence.

8 Usage statistics indicated that patients varied in their use of the intervention, with some using
9 the intervention for a single short visit and others returning several times to the resources.
10 Overall, the median intervention usage time was under 10 minutes, indicating that it can be
11 considered to be low intensity relative to traditional face-to-face interventions that require a
12 series of appointments. Post-intervention questionnaires indicated that the intervention
13 content, website function and perceptions of the intervention source were largely positive.
14 Most participants who completed the feedback scale rated the website content as useful, the
15 research team as reliable and expert, and the loading of the website was not too slow. It
16 appears therefore that the intervention was largely acceptable to participants.

17 **Limitations**

18 Although our findings are promising and provide ‘proof of principle’ that tailored messages
19 can change adherence-related beliefs, the efficacy of the approach needs to be further tested
20 in a full scale RCT. Several limitations of trial design and conduct mean that the current
21 results do not represent a full test: allocation was blind but not fully randomised, high dropout
22 rates, and the monetary stimulus may also have biased the results of this pilot [38-40]. Our
23 attrition rate is typical of internet-based trials [41]. Perhaps the initial decision to participate
24 online requires less engagement, meaning participants are more prone to drop-out. Internet-
25 based trials are more ‘pragmatic’ and typical of practice than clinical trials e.g. our high drop-
26 out rate may parallel poorer attendance at follow-up appointments when patients are
27 recovered, however we cannot evaluate this using our data. We only have self-reported
28 prescriptions, clinical and adherence data, up to 3 months follow-up, limiting
29 recommendations regarding use of the intervention in practice. [42] The study was not
30 powered to determine effects on flare-ups or healthcare seeking. Finally, our participants may
31 represent a subset of relatively highly engaged IBD patients and therefore these findings may
32 not generalise.

1 **Implications for clinicians and policymakers**

2 Despite these limitations, these findings suggest that management of IBD may be improved
3 by providing online support to patients to address their personal barriers to adherence. Our
4 results indicate that directly addressing patients' doubts about treatment need and concerns
5 about adverse effects is possible, that it need not be highly time-consuming and that this
6 could impact positively on self-management as an addition to current clinical practice. Online
7 resources providing such personalised information may therefore be a useful addition to
8 existing models of care. This could be explored further in different healthcare settings (e.g.
9 resource limited settings,) and for different treatment regimens (e.g. steroids and biologics).
10 While we focused on mesalazine and azathioprine, patients also have concerns about new
11 biologic therapies, suggesting a similar intervention may support adherence to these drugs
12 [43].

13 **Conclusion**

14 A PAPA-based intervention changed adherence-related medication necessity beliefs and
15 concerns. Online interventions providing tailored information addressing barriers to
16 medication taking may be an acceptable and feasible tool for supporting IBD patients to
17 adhere to treatment. Potentially, this intervention may reduce flare-ups, hospital admissions
18 and other clinical indicators, however full trials are needed to evaluate this. These findings
19 suggest that a brief, online PAPA-based intervention has the capacity to support adherence, is
20 acceptable and feasible.

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 We are grateful to Crohn’s and Colitis UK for their support of this project. We would also
3 like to thank Elizabeth Poliquin, Kathryn King, Paulina Bondaronek, Federica Picarello,
4 Sarah-Jane Besser, and Helen Barker for their assistance with recruitment of participants and
5 follow-up, and with conducting and transcribing interviews. We are grateful to Spoonful of
6 Sugar Ltd (a UCL Business spin-out Company) for allowing us to use the Persignia System
7 (content management and algorithm). We also thank Chris Dickinson (Spoonful of Sugar),
8 and White October and the staff at LifeGuide for their support with the screening
9 questionnaire. Last, and by no means least, we would like to thank the members of CCUK
10 who supported recruitment for this project, provided input to the development of the
11 intervention and participated in the study.

12

1 References

- 2 1. Mowat, C., et al., *Guidelines for the management of inflammatory bowel disease in adults*.
3 Gut, 2011. **60**(5): p. 571-607.
- 4 2. Khan, N., et al., *Long-term mesalamine maintenance in ulcerative colitis: which is more*
5 *important? Adherence or daily dose*. Inflamm Bowel Dis, 2013. **19**(6): p. 1123-9.
- 6 3. Kane, S., et al., *Medication nonadherence and the outcomes of patients with quiescent*
7 *ulcerative colitis*. Am J Med, 2003. **114**(1): p. 39-43.
- 8 4. Long, M.D., et al., *Development of an internet-based cohort of patients with inflammatory*
9 *bowel diseases (CCFA Partners): methodology and initial results*. Inflamm Bowel Dis, 2012.
10 **18**(11): p. 2099-106.
- 11 5. Robinson, A., et al., *Maintaining stable symptom control in inflammatory bowel disease: a*
12 *retrospective analysis of adherence, medication switches and the risk of relapse*. Aliment
13 Pharmacol Ther, 2013. **38**(5): p. 531-8.
- 14 6. Shale, M.J. and S.A. Riley, *Studies of compliance with delayed-release mesalazine therapy in*
15 *patients with inflammatory bowel disease*. Aliment Pharmacol Ther, 2003. **18**(2): p. 191-8.
- 16 7. Mitra, D., et al., *Association between oral 5-ASA adherence and health care utilization and*
17 *costs among patients with active ulcerative colitis*. BMC Gastroenterol, 2012. **12**: p. 132.
- 18 8. Lachaine, J., et al., *Medication adherence and persistence in the treatment of Canadian*
19 *ulcerative colitis patients: analyses with the RAMQ database*. BMC Gastroenterol, 2013. **13**:
20 p. 23.
- 21 9. Yen, L., et al., *Medication use patterns and predictors of nonpersistence and nonadherence*
22 *with oral 5-aminosalicylic acid therapy in patients with ulcerative colitis*. J Manag Care
23 Pharm, 2012. **18**(9): p. 701-12.
- 24 10. Wan, G.J., et al., *Inflammatory bowel disease: healthcare costs for patients who are adherent*
25 *or non-adherent with infliximab therapy*. Journal of Medical Economics, 2014. **17**(6): p. 384-
26 393.
- 27 11. Horne, R., *Compliance, adherence, and concordance: implications for asthma treatment*.
28 Chest, 2006. **130**(1 Suppl): p. 65S-72S.
- 29 12. Piette, J.D., et al., *A conceptually based approach to understanding chronically ill patients'*
30 *responses to medication cost pressures*. Social science & medicine, 2006. **62**(4): p. 846-857.
- 31 13. Horne, R., et al., *Concordance, Adherence and Compliance in Medicine Taking: A conceptual*
32 *map and research priorities*. 2005, London: National Institute for Health Research (NIHR)
33 Service Delivery and Organisation (SDO) Programme.
34 <http://www.sdo.nihr.ac.uk/sdo762004.html>.
- 35 14. Nunes, V., et al., *Medicines Adherence: involving patients in decisions about prescribed*
36 *medicines and supporting adherence*. , N.C.C.f.P.C.a.R.C.o.G. Practitioners, Editor. 2009,
37 National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence: London.
- 38 15. Jackson, C.A., et al., *Factors Associated With Non-Adherence to Oral Medication for*
39 *Inflammatory Bowel Disease: A Systematic Review*. American Journal of Gastroenterology,
40 2010. **105**(3): p. 525-539.
- 41 16. Horne, R., et al., *Patients' Attitudes to Medicines and Adherence to Maintenance Treatment*
42 *in Inflammatory Bowel Disease*. Inflammatory bowel diseases, 2009. **15**(6): p. 837-844.
- 43 17. Selinger, C.P., et al., *Modifiable factors associated with nonadherence to maintenance*
44 *medication for inflammatory bowel disease*. Inflamm Bowel Dis, 2013. **19**(10): p. 2199-206.
- 45 18. Horne, R., et al., *Concordance, Adherence and Compliance in Medicine Taking: A conceptual*
46 *map and research priorities*, N.C.-o.C.f.N.S.D.a.O. NCCSDO, Editor. 2006: London.
- 47 19. Horne, R., *Your treatment will not work if the patient does not take it*, in *Clinical Dilemmas in*
48 *Inflammatory Bowel Disease. New challenges*. , P. Irving, et al., Editors. 2011, Wiley-
49 Blackwell: Oxford. p. 247-250.

- 1 20. Horne, R., et al., *Patients' attitudes to medicines and adherence to maintenance treatment in*
2 *inflammatory bowel disease* *Inflammatory Bowel Diseases*, 2008. **Online pre-**
3 **publication**(December).
- 4 21. O'Carroll, R.E., et al., *Improving adherence to medication in stroke survivors: a pilot*
5 *randomised controlled trial*. *Ann Behav Med*, 2013. **46**(3): p. 358-68.
- 6 22. Petrie, K.J., et al., *A text message programme designed to modify patients' illness and*
7 *treatment beliefs improves self-reported adherence to asthma preventer medication*. *British*
8 *journal of health psychology*, 2012. **17**(1): p. 74-84.
- 9 23. Horne, R. and J. Clatworthy, *Adherence to advice and treatment*. *Health Psychology*, 2010: p.
10 175-188.
- 11 24. Travis, S.P., et al., *European evidence-based Consensus on the management of ulcerative*
12 *colitis: Current management*. *J Crohns Colitis*, 2008. **2**(1): p. 24-62.
- 13 25. Stange, E.F., et al., *European evidence-based Consensus on the diagnosis and management*
14 *of ulcerative colitis: Definitions and diagnosis*. *J Crohns Colitis*, 2008. **2**(1): p. 1-23.
- 15 26. Biancone, L., et al., *European evidence-based Consensus on the management of ulcerative*
16 *colitis: Special situations*. *J Crohns Colitis*, 2008. **2**(1): p. 63-92.
- 17 27. Dignass, A., et al., *Second European evidence-based consensus on the diagnosis and*
18 *management of ulcerative colitis part 1: definitions and diagnosis*. *J Crohns Colitis*, 2012.
19 **6**(10): p. 965-90.
- 20 28. Dignass, A., et al., *Second European evidence-based consensus on the diagnosis and*
21 *management of ulcerative colitis part 2: current management*. *J Crohns Colitis*, 2012. **6**(10):
22 p. 991-1030.
- 23 29. Van Assche, G., et al., *Second European evidence-based consensus on the diagnosis and*
24 *management of ulcerative colitis part 3: special situations*. *J Crohns Colitis*, 2013. **7**(1): p. 1-
25 33.
- 26 30. Carter, M.J., et al., *Guidelines for the management of inflammatory bowel disease in adults*.
27 *Gut*, 2004. **53** **Suppl 5**: p. V1-16.
- 28 31. Mowat, C., et al., *Guidelines for the management of inflammatory bowel disease in adults*.
29 *Gut*, 2011. **60**(5): p. 571-607.
- 30 32. Michie, S., et al., *The behavior change technique taxonomy (v1) of 93 hierarchically clustered*
31 *techniques: building an international consensus for the reporting of behavior change*
32 *interventions*. *Annals of behavioral medicine*, 2013. **46**(1): p. 81-95.
- 33 33. Horne, R. and J. Weinman, *Patients' beliefs about prescribed medicines and their role in*
34 *adherence to treatment in chronic physical illness*. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 1999.
35 **47**(6): p. 555-67.
- 36 34. Horne, R., et al., *The perceived sensitivity to medicines (PSM) scale: an evaluation of validity*
37 *and reliability*. *Br J Health Psychol*, 2013. **18**(1): p. 18-30.
- 38 35. Bjelland, I., et al., *The validity of the Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale: an updated*
39 *literature review*. *Journal of psychosomatic research*, 2002. **52**(2): p. 69-77.
- 40 36. Jowett, S.L., et al., *The short inflammatory bowel disease questionnaire is reliable and*
41 *responsive to clinically important change in ulcerative colitis*. *Am J Gastroenterol*, 2001.
42 **96**(10): p. 2921-8.
- 43 37. Kaltenthaler, E., et al., *The acceptability to patients of computerised cognitive behaviour*
44 *therpay for depression: a systematic review*. *Psychological Medicine*, 2008. **184**(448-449).
- 45 38. Salim, A., et al., *Comparison of data analysis strategies for intent-to-treat analysis in pre-*
46 *test-post-test designs with substantial dropout rates*. *Psychiatry Res*, 2008. **160**(3): p. 335-45.
- 47 39. Higgins, J.P., et al., *The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised*
48 *trials*. *Bmj*, 2011. **343**: p. d5928.
- 49 40. Little , R.J., et al., *The Prevention and Treatment of Missing Data in Clinical Trials*. *New*
50 *England Journal of Medicine*, 2012. **367**(14): p. 1355-1360.

- 1 41. Mathieu, E., et al., *Internet-based randomized controlled trials: a systematic review*. Journal
2 of the American Medical Informatics Association, 2013. **20**(3): p. 568-576.
- 3 42. Nieuwlaat, R., et al., *Interventions for enhancing medication adherence*. The Cochrane
4 Library, 2014.
- 5 43. Michetti, P., et al., *Impact of treatment-related beliefs on medication adherence in immune-
6 mediated inflammatory diseases: results of the global ALIGN study*. Advances in therapy,
7 2017. **34**(1): p. 91-108.
- 8

1 **Guarantor of this article:** Prof Robert Horne

2 **Author contributions**

3 **SC:** Assisted with recruitment and follow-up, collecting qualitative data and website usage
4 data, conducted the analysis, and drafted the manuscript.

5 **AS:** Contributed to all aspects of study including intervention design, recruitment, data
6 analysis and the draft manuscript.

7 **AS-CJ:** Clinical Pharmacist involved in the study design, development of the medicines
8 information and review of protocol and manuscript

9 **AF:** Clinical gastroenterologist closely involved in the design of the study, review of all
10 versions of the protocol and the permissions' process, with surveillance of data collection and
11 analysis, and direct involvement in the writing and editing of the subsequent manuscript.

12 **AC:** Assisted with the development of the online material, website pages and linkage to
13 behaviour change techniques and cognitive behavioural therapy/motivational interviewing.
14 She assisted with the initial intervention protocol and provided feedback on the draft
15 manuscript.

16 **RH:** Contributed to all aspects of study including intervention design, recruitment, data
17 analysis and the draft manuscript.

18 All authors approve this final draft for submission.

19 **Financial support:** This study was funded by a 'Living with IBD' grant from Crohn's and
20 Colitis UK (CCUK). The work was conducted independently of CCUK.

21 **Potential competing interests:**

22 AF has undertaken speaker engagements for Dr Falk Pharma and in the more distant past for
23 other pharmaceutical companies who produce mesalazine and azathioprine, but has no other
24 competing interests to declare.

25 ASCJ has undertaken speaker engagements for Ferring Pharmaceutical Ltd and Actavis in the
26 past but not for the last two years. No other competing interest to declare.

27 All other authors have no competing interests to declare.

1 **Figure Legends**

2 **Figure 1: Participant flow chart**

3 *Note:* AZA = participants taking azathioprine, MES = participants taking mesalamine,
4 AZA+MES = participants taking both azathioprine and mesalamine.

5 *371 started baseline measures but of these, 42 participants dropped out before completing
6 baseline.

7 **Figure 2: Mean BMQ Necessity and Concern beliefs at baseline and follow-up**

8 *Note:* BMQ = Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire Necessity and Concerns scores, NCD =
9 Necessity Concerns Differential

10

1 **Tables**

2 **Table 1: Sample Demographics**

3 *Note:* IG=Intervention Group, CG=Control Group

	IG n=153	CG n=176
Gender: n(%) female	111 (72.5%)	127 (72.2%)
Ethnicity: n(%) White British	137 (89.5%)	156 (88.6%)
Age in years: Median [IQR]	36.0 [27.9-47.1]	36.8 [28.7-45.1]
Education: n(%) with degree/higher degree	76 (49.7%)	80 (46.0%)
Marital status: n(%) married/civil partnership/cohabiting	94 (61.4%)	100 (56.8%)

4

1 **Table 2: Clinical descriptive statistics**

2 *Note:* IG=Intervention Group, CG=Control Group.

	IG n=153	CG n=176
Current reported IBD status n(%)		
... in remission	57 (37.3%)	60 (34.3%)
...mild to moderate flare-up	82 (53.6%)	96 (54.9%)
...severe flare-up	14 (9.2%)	19 (10.8%)
Last 3 months, number of... median[IQR]		
flare-ups	1 [0-2]	1 [1-2]
flare-ups leading to change in treatment	0 [0-1]	0 [0-1]
face-to-face GP consultations	1 [0-2]	1 [0-3]
planned face-to-face GP consultations	0 [0-1]	0 [0-1]
face-to-face IBD consultant consultations	1 [0-2]	1 [0-2]
planned face-to-face IBD consultant consultations	1 [0-1]	1 [0-1]
face-to-face IBD nurse consultations	0 [0-1]	0 [0-0]
telephone/email contacts with IBD nurse	0 [0-3]	0 [0-3]
IBD nurse helpline contacts	0 [0-1]	0 [0-1]
face-to-face consultations with hospital/retail pharmacist	0 [0-1]	0 [0-1]
Current prescription n(%)		
Mesalamine	112 (73.2%)	128 (72.7%)
Azathioprine	82 (53.6%)	98 (55.7%)
Mercaptopurine	3 (2.0%)	10 (5.7%)
Prednisolone	40 (26.1%)	44 (25.0%)
Budesonide	8 (5.2%)	10 (5.7%)
Hydrocortisone	3 (2.0%)	10 (5.7%)
Infliximab	10 (6.5%)	13 (7.4%)
Adalimumab	14 (9.2%)	11 (6.3%)
Methotrexate	4 (2.6%)	1 (0.6%)

3

Table 3: Means, standard deviations and group comparisons (t-tests) for primary outcomes

Note: IG=Intervention Group, CG=Control Group, BMQ = Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire, NCD = Necessity Concerns Differential.

	Baseline			1 month			3 months		
	IG n=153 m (SD)	CG n=176 m (SD)	p	IG n=115 m (SD)	CG n=154 m (SD)	p	IG n=44 m (SD)	CG n=108 m (SD)	p
BMQ Concerns	2.86 (0.77)	2.94 (0.80)	.39	2.61 (0.86)	2.90 (0.84)	.01	2.52 (0.77)	2.98 (0.79)	<.01
BMQ Necessity	3.26 (0.92)	3.21 (0.91)	.57	3.20 (1.05)	3.20 (0.93)	.96	3.39 (1.01)	2.94 (1.03)	.02
BMQ NCD	0.40 (1.11)	0.26 (1.12)	.27	0.59 (1.21)	0.30 (1.20)	.07	0.87 (1.24)	-0.03 (1.18)	<.001
Practical Barriers	3.58 (2.67)	3.50 (2.49)	.78	3.19 (3.15)	3.50 (2.80)	.43	2.18 (2.29)	3.25 (2.77)	.03

Table 4: Descriptive statistics m(SD) or median [interquartile range] and group comparisons for secondary outcomes

Notes: All comparisons t tests except for MARS and VASA where Mann-Whitney U results reported; IG=Intervention Group, CG=Control Group, MARS = Medication Adherence Report Scale, VASA = Adherence VAS, BMQ = Beliefs about Medicines Questionnaire, PSM = Perceived Sensitivity to Medicines Scale, HADS = Hospital Anxiety and Depression Scale, SIBDQ = Short Inflammatory Bowel Disease Questionnaire, SIMS AU = Satisfaction with Information about Medicines Action and Usage Subscale, SIMS PP = Satisfaction with Information about Medicines Potential Problems Subscale. Brief Illness Perception Questionnaire results in Supplementary Content.

	Baseline			1 month			3 months		
	IG n=153	CG n=176	p	IG n=115	CG n=154	p	IG n=44	CG n=108	p
MARS	28 [24-30]	28 [25-30]	.97	29 [25-30]	28 [25-30]	.55	29 [27.3-30]	28.5 [25-30]	.10
VASA	100 [90-100]	100 [90-100]	.57	100 [90-100]	100 [90-100]	.23	100 [90-100]	100 [90-100]	.03
BMQ Harm	2.22 (0.68)	2.23 (0.66)	.92	2.11 (0.79)	2.30 (0.66)	.05	1.99 (0.57)	2.26 (0.61)	.02
BMQ Overuse	2.74 (0.88)	2.87 (0.86)	.19	2.67 (0.95)	3.03 (0.88)	<.01	2.62 (0.69)	3.07 (0.90)	<.01
BMQ Benefit	3.97 (0.54)	3.89 (0.64)	.25	3.97 (0.53)	3.91 (0.53)	.34	3.93 (0.48)	3.88 (0.46)	.63
PSM	2.80 (0.94)	2.83 (0.92)	.73	2.74 (1.03)	2.84 (0.91)	.40	2.86 (1.06)	2.82 (0.91)	.85
HADS Anxiety	9.79 (4.41)	9.97 (4.18)	.71	8.61 (4.91)	9.63 (4.52)	.11	7.26 (4.87)	9.53 (3.99)	<.01
HADS Depression	7.47 (4.23)	7.57 (4.21)	.84	6.70 (4.71)	7.69 (4.52)	.11	5.74 (4.10)	7.08 (4.09)	<.01
SIBDQ	38.01 (11.22)	36.91 (12.46)	.41	41.77 (13.19)	39.60 (13.47)	.23	44.15 (12.59)	41.11 (11.87)	.18
SIMS AU	7.08 (2.28)	6.94 (2.11)	.58	7.90 (2.19)	7.27 (2.27)	.03	7.52 (2.35)	8.27 (2.32)	.09
SIMS PP	4.97 (2.54)	4.69 (2.49)	.32	5.79 (2.51)	5.02 (2.61)	.03	7.04 (2.23)	5.27 (2.67)	<.001
Brief IPQ	55.19 (7.38)	55.27 (8.15)	.92	53.16 (7.51)	55.17 (7.68)	.04	52.65 (8.78)	54.76 (8.58)	.20

