

# Collecting genetic samples and linked mental health data from adolescents in schools: Protocol co-production and a mixed-methods pilot of feasibility and acceptability

Naomi Warne<sup>1,2</sup>, Sarah Rook<sup>1</sup>, Rhys Bevan-Jones<sup>1</sup>, Rachel Brown<sup>3</sup>, Lesley Bates<sup>1</sup>, Lucinda Hopkins-Jones<sup>1</sup>, Alexandra Evans<sup>1</sup>, Jeremy Hall<sup>1</sup>, Kate Langley<sup>1,4</sup>, Anita Thapar<sup>1</sup>, James Walters<sup>1</sup>, Simon Murphy<sup>3</sup>, Graham Moore<sup>3</sup>, Frances Rice<sup>1</sup>, \*Stephan Collishaw<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetics and Genomics, Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

<sup>2</sup> Centre for Academic Mental Health, Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

<sup>3</sup> Centre for Development, Evaluation, Complexity and Implementation in Public Health Improvement, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

<sup>4</sup> School of Psychology, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

\*Corresponding author. Email: [collishaws@cardiff.ac.uk](mailto:collishaws@cardiff.ac.uk)

Word count: 7470

## Abstract

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

Objectives: To co-produce a school-based protocol and examine acceptability and feasibility of collecting saliva samples for genetic studies from secondary/high school students for the purpose of mental health research.

Design: Protocol co-production and mixed-methods feasibility pilot.

Setting: Secondary schools in Wales, UK.

Participants: Students aged 11-13 years.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Co-produced research protocol including an interactive science workshop delivered in schools; school, parental and student recruitment rates; adherence to protocol and adverse events; ability to extract and genotype saliva samples; student enjoyment of the science workshop; and qualitative analysis of teacher focus groups on acceptability and feasibility.

Results: Five secondary schools participated in the co-production phase, and three of these took part in the research study (eligible sample n=868 students). Four further schools were subsequently approached, but none participated. Parental opt-in consent was received from 98 parents (11.3% eligible sample), three parents (0.3%) actively refused and responses were not received for 767 (88.4%) parents. We obtained saliva samples plus consent for data linkage for 79 students. Only one sample was of insufficient quality to be genotyped. The science workshop received positive feedback from students. Feedback from teachers showed that undertaking research like this in schools is viewed as acceptable in principle, potentially feasible, but that there are important procedural barriers to be overcome. Key recommendations include establishing close working relationships between the research team and school classroom staff, together with improved methods for communicating with and engaging parents.

Conclusions: There are major challenges to undertaking large scale genetic mental health research in secondary schools. Such research may be acceptable in principle, and in practice DNA collected from saliva in classrooms is of sufficient quality. However, key challenges that must be overcome include ensuring representative recruitment of schools and sufficient parental engagement where opt-in parental consent is required.

Key words: school; adolescent mental health; genetics; data linkage; feasibility and acceptability

30

## Article Summary

### 31 Strengths and limitations of this study

- 32 • This is the first study to test the feasibility and acceptability of collecting genetic samples in  
33 secondary schools and obtaining consent for linkage to questionnaire and record-based mental  
34 health data.
- 35 • A key strength is co-production of the research protocol with stakeholders (young people,  
36 parents/guardians, schools).
- 37 • We used a mixed-methods approach to assess the feasibility and acceptability of carrying out  
38 genetic research studies of mental health in schools.
- 39 • This pilot study was conducted in three mainstream secondary schools in Wales, UK so it is  
40 unclear whether findings are transferrable to a wider section of schools in Wales and other  
41 countries, education systems and age groups.
- 42 • It was not possible to collect data on the reasons for return or non-return of parental consent.

43

## 44 Introduction

45 In the UK, approximately 1 in 8 (12.8%) young people aged 5-19 years old have a diagnosable mental  
46 health disorder with rates increasing in recent years.(1,2) The causes of youth mental health  
47 difficulties involve genetic and environmental risk factors acting together in complex ways. The  
48 majority of adult mental health conditions originate before the age of 24,(3,4) and early identification  
49 and prevention are important priorities. However, only a minority of young people with mental health  
50 problems seek or receive help from health-care professionals.(1,5) To better understand risk and  
51 protective factors for psychiatric conditions, data from population-based samples of young people,  
52 including relevant genetic, biological, psychological and social factors is important. Established UK  
53 birth cohorts are a valuable resource for studying the development of mental ill health, including the  
54 interplay of genetic factors and family environment. However, the costs involved in setting up and  
55 maintaining such cohorts are considerable, and information about other social contexts such as  
56 schools is often limited.(6)

57 An alternative approach involves collecting data on mental health and associated risk and protective  
58 factors from young people within the school setting, offering the opportunity to study the roles of  
59 classroom, peer group and school-level effects. In addition, school-based designs offer the potential to  
60 recruit and obtain data from larger population-based samples than is possible using traditional birth  
61 cohort designs. Typically, student participation rates are high when health questionnaire data are  
62 collected during the school day.(7,8) What is unclear is whether it would be acceptable to schools,  
63 students and their parents to collect saliva samples for the purpose of genetic studies involving mental  
64 health, and what the main barriers are that need to be overcome to make this feasible in practice.  
65 Challenges include ensuring schools, parents/guardians and young people themselves will be  
66 accepting of research on genetics and mental health; providing information to young people, their  
67 parents and teachers; collecting appropriate informed consent; integrating research into the every-day  
68 life of schools in a way that fits with the needs of schools and learners; and implementing robust and  
69 ethical protocols for the collection of saliva samples in a classroom setting.

70 Previous studies have had some success with collecting salivary cortisol samples in school settings  
71 (for reviews see (9,10)). In contrast, little is known about the acceptability and feasibility of  
72 classroom-based collection of saliva samples for genetic research. Despite increasing understanding  
73 and acceptance of genetic research, public concerns remain - particularly in relation to children,(11–  
74 15) and mental health is often stigmatised,(16,17) so it is unclear whether this type of research would  
75 be acceptable to young people, parents/guardians and school staff. Similarly, the concept of data  
76 linkage (e.g. to mental health questionnaires or health records) might elicit concerns about  
77 privacy.(18) Parent/guardian recruitment and consent is typically challenging in school-based  
78 research,(19–22) particularly in secondary school settings. Having a research study and protocol that  
79 is acceptable to key stakeholders is critical to a research study's success.(8,23,24) It will not only help

80 with recruitment, but will also help develop a process that key stakeholders engage with or “buy into”,  
81 and that fits with the context and daily life of students, teachers and parents. Indeed, co-production of  
82 research with stakeholders is critical to support the development of school-based research.(8)

83 To our knowledge, no other study has examined the acceptability and feasibility of collecting saliva  
84 samples from young people in schools for the purpose of genetic research on mental health.

### 85 The current study

86 The Mental Wellbeing in Adolescence: Genes and Environment Study (MAGES) aimed to assess the  
87 acceptability and feasibility of collecting DNA saliva samples from young people in schools with  
88 consent for linkage to other routinely collected mental health questionnaire and record-based data.  
89 The over-arching aims were to work with stakeholders (school staff, parents, young people) to co-  
90 produce an acceptable research protocol, and then test this protocol in order to inform future studies  
91 on the best ways to carry out this kind of research.

92 The study was conducted in Wales which provides a globally unique research infrastructure, with  
93 student health, mental health and wellbeing data collected every two years in all mainstream  
94 secondary schools via SHRN (School Health Research Network, <http://www.shrn.org.uk/>) and  
95 potential linkage to routine health, education and social care data via SAIL (Secure Anonymised  
96 Information Linkage) databank ([www.saildatabank.com](http://www.saildatabank.com)). The SHRN 2017 health and well-being  
97 survey was completed by all state-funded schools in Wales, UK (n=193) and had 97% of students take  
98 part (n=112,045).(7,8)

99 In the development phase we worked with stakeholders (young people, parents/guardians, schools) to  
100 develop a study protocol that had the greatest chance of being both acceptable and feasible in practice.  
101 To evaluate the MAGES protocol, we used a mixed-method design with quantitative and qualitative  
102 data. Specifically, we examined school, parent/guardian and student consent/participation rates,  
103 considered adherence to the study protocol and the occurrence of any adverse events (e.g.  
104 complaints), and the ability to genotype samples. We collected feedback from young people and  
105 undertook focus groups with teachers to gain further insights on the feasibility and acceptability of the  
106 study, and how the protocol might be adapted in future.

## 107 Methods

### 108 Study design

109 The study was conducted in three stages: firstly a development phase, followed by implementation of  
110 the protocol, and then an evaluation phase (Figure 1). The development phase included co-production  
111 of the study protocol with key stakeholders. The MAGES protocol included recruitment of schools,  
112 obtaining consent from parents/guardians and students, and collection of saliva samples for genetic  
113 analysis. Saliva collection occurred during specially developed MAGES science workshops that took

114 the place of a normal science lesson (see below). No phenotypic information was collected on  
115 participants. Quantitative evaluation included numbers and percentages for each stage of recruitment,  
116 percent of usable genotyped samples, and student feedback scores on the science workshop aspect of  
117 the protocol. Qualitative evaluation included teacher focus group discussion of MAGES protocol  
118 following completion of classroom data collection.

#### 119 Development phase

120 Stakeholders involved during development of the research protocol included young people, school  
121 staff, and parents/guardians.

122 Researchers discussed the study protocol and the practicalities of using saliva collection kits in a  
123 classroom setting with a group of young people aged 14-17 years old (n=11, 5 males, 6 females).  
124 Young people were part of the public patient involvement group ALPHA  
125 (<http://decipher.uk.net/public-involvement/young-people/>). Based on feedback from this session we  
126 made changes to the study protocol (including a school assembly presentation) to simplify the content  
127 and to explain technical terms (e.g. data linkage) more fully.

128 School staff shared their perspectives on the acceptability of taking saliva samples from students in  
129 schools and provided advice on practical issues. Teachers from 9 schools that were engaged in SHRN  
130 research were invited to take part. A total of 5 teachers (3 females, 2 males) from 5 schools and 1  
131 Healthy Schools Practitioner (female) participated. Particular consideration was given to how research  
132 participation would impact teacher workload, how researchers could give back to schools, and  
133 potential practical challenges. School staff highlighted that getting the parent/guardian consent  
134 required for participants aged under 16 years old (as is required in Wales, UK) was likely to be the  
135 most challenging aspect of the project. As a result of this session, we adapted our protocol to target  
136 younger year groups (Years 7 and 8, age 11-13 years) as it was thought that parents/guardians would  
137 be more engaged and older cohorts could not afford to take time out of core lessons. Suggested ways  
138 to engage parents/guardians were to meet in person via events at each school, and by presenting  
139 MAGES information in different formats. We therefore included a parent/guardian event in our  
140 protocol and also created a website with videos explaining why the research is important and what  
141 taking part involves ([www.cardiff.ac.uk/MAGES](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/MAGES)). Giving back to schools was also highlighted as  
142 important and providing a science workshop to students was considered a good way to do this.

143 Mothers (n=10) recruited from a local parent research network took part in a discussion on the  
144 proposed research and provided feedback on the clarity and content of parent/guardian information  
145 sheets. Data linkage emerged as a key concern and we adapted information sheets to provide more  
146 information on this.

147 Finally, to ensure that the science workshop content was suitable and enjoyable for the proposed age  
148 range, we trialled the science workshop (see below) with a local Scout group of 12 boys aged 10-13  
149 years old and 2 adult scout leaders (1 male, 1 female).

150 Implementation phase

151 *Evaluation sample*

152 Participants were students in Years 7 and 8 (aged 11-13 years) at mainstream secondary schools in  
153 South Wales, UK that were part of the School Health Research Network (SHRN).(7,8)

154 *Recruitment and protocol*

155 Figure 1 depicts the recruitment and protocol used. Firstly, schools that were consulted in the  
156 development of the protocol (n=5) were invited to take part in MAGES via direct correspondence  
157 from the SHRN Manager to each of the SHRN school contacts. This was followed up by MAGES  
158 staff. A further four local SHRN schools were invited to participate at a second recruitment wave.  
159 Participating schools were offered £500 (£250 per year group) as a thank you for facilitating the  
160 research and to cover costs in staff time resulting from participation.

161 *School staff meetings:* Following initial contact, MAGES researchers met with members of each  
162 school's senior leadership teams. All schools were given the option of holding events for  
163 parents/guardians and teachers where MAGES staff would introduce the project and answer  
164 questions.

165 *Information packs:* Schools were asked to disseminate parent/guardian information packs (using  
166 typical communication methods). These included an overview of the study, frequently asked  
167 questions and a link to the study webpage ([www.cardiff.ac.uk/MAGES](http://www.cardiff.ac.uk/MAGES)). Parents/guardians were also  
168 given email and phone contact details for the MAGES team if they had queries or concerns.

169 At a later date, MAGES researchers delivered 15-20 minute assemblies to students to explain the  
170 project, following which, the schools were asked to distribute information packs to students.

171 *Workshops:* Feedback from stakeholders during the development phase indicated the value of science  
172 workshops on the theme of genetics for engaging schools and learners. Student science workshops  
173 were scheduled to start two weeks from the student assembly. During this period, schools distributed  
174 reminder letters to parents/guardians and collated consent forms. MAGES staff also provided  
175 reminders via social media (twitter).

176 MAGES researchers delivered the workshop to all classes in each participating year group in the place  
177 of a normal science lesson (lasting 50-60 minutes). Science workshops began with an introduction to  
178 MAGES and the team followed by an interactive lesson (see Figure 2) consisting of 1) a presentation  
179 teaching the basics of DNA, 2) a practical experiment extracting DNA from bananas, 3) an additional  
180 presentation on DNA structure, heredity, traits influenced by genes and impact of

181 environment/experience, and 4) an activity creating origami DNA models. During the origami  
182 activity, those students who had completed parent/guardian consent forms were invited to take part in  
183 the DNA collection. Students were given their own assent form to sign and then provided a saliva  
184 sample. This was conducted in a screened off area of the classroom or in a side room to provide  
185 privacy. At the end of the science workshop all students were asked to provide feedback about  
186 whether they had enjoyed the science session on a sticker chart (Supplementary Figure 1). Science  
187 workshops and data collection occurred between April and July 2019.

#### 188 *Ethical approval and consent*

189 Ethical approval was obtained from Cardiff University School of Medicine Research Ethics  
190 Committee. As students were under 16 years, participation in MAGES required informed parental  
191 opt-in consent and student assent. Both parents/guardians and students had the option to provide or  
192 not provide additional consent/assent for linking genetic information to other routinely collected data.  
193 Consent for routinely collected data was split into two broad categories: (i) health and educational  
194 records, and (ii) student-completed health and wellbeing questionnaires.

#### 195 Evaluation phase

##### 196 *Feasibility*

##### 197 *Recruitment and participants*

198 The numbers of schools recruited, parent/guardian consent forms returned, student participation and  
199 consent for data linkage were recorded and percentages of the eligible sample were calculated. Where  
200 possible, reasons for not taking part were recorded. To assess school-level response bias, participating  
201 and non-participating schools were compared on a number of routinely assessed school-level  
202 characteristics (<https://mylocalschool.gov.wales/>), including Free School Meals entitlement (%),  
203 minority ethnic pupils (%), student attendance (%), and academic achievement (% achieving 5  
204 General Certificate of Secondary Education at A\*-C grades).

##### 205 *Saliva samples*

206 Participants provided saliva samples (approximately 5ml) using Genotek Oragene saliva kits under  
207 the supervision of MAGES researchers (full instructions in Supplementary Figure 2). Participants  
208 were asked if they had eaten or drunk anything in the last 30 minutes and if not, were instructed to fill  
209 the saliva collection tube to the fill line. If participants had eaten or drunk in the last 30 minutes, they  
210 were asked to wait 30 minutes before providing a sample. Sample collection took around 5-10  
211 minutes per participant, and multiple students provided samples at the same time under researcher  
212 supervision. The collection tubes were labelled using barcodes and a unique participant study number.  
213 The samples were taken to the research laboratory - MRC Centre for Neuropsychiatric Genetics and  
214 Genomics at Cardiff University. All samples were processed in accordance with the standard  
215 operating procedures for sample management, storage, and tracking of biological materials. DNA was



216 extracted from the saliva samples in-house, following standard Genotek Oragene DNA Prep-IT  
217 protocols. DNA sample quantification was determined using Quant-iT PicoGreen dsDNA assay kits,  
218 and samples were genotyped using Illumina Infinium Global Screening arrays. Data were recorded on  
219 the number and percentage of successfully extracted and genotyped samples.

#### 220 [Adherence to study protocol and adverse events](#)

221 The research team undertook a review of the protocol following completion of the study within each  
222 school and recorded data on adherence to protocol. This included instances where the protocol (Figure  
223 1) was changed and any adverse events (e.g. complaints).

#### 224 [Acceptability](#)

##### 225 [Science workshop](#)

226 Student feedback was collected at the end of each workshop to assess the value of including the  
227 science workshops in the protocol. Students rated their enjoyment of the workshop using a sticker  
228 chart (Supplementary Figure 1) with a scale of: 1) “Yes – I had great fun”; 2) “Most of it was quite  
229 good”; 3) “Some of the time it was ok”; or 4) “No – I didn’t like it”.

##### 230 [Teacher focus groups post-MAGES](#)

231 Three focus groups were held with teachers in participating schools to get feedback on MAGES.  
232 Teachers were recruited to the focus groups by each school’s key contact teacher. A £20 voucher was  
233 offered as remuneration for each teacher’s time, and schools were given £125 for holding the focus  
234 group (to cover replacement teaching time). Five teachers participated in each focus group (School 1:  
235 3 females, 2 males; School 2: 5 females; School 3: 2 females, 3 males). This sample included science  
236 teachers, members of the senior leadership team and form tutors responsible for pastoral care. Data  
237 were collected at participant’s schools at a time and date convenient to them.

238 Focus groups lasted approximately 45 minutes and were conducted by two female MAGES  
239 researchers (SR, Med, 3 years’ experience of conducting and analysing focus groups; and NW, PhD,  
240 with training in semi-structured clinical interviews). Researchers were responsible for workshop  
241 delivery and saliva collection, and therefore had working relationships with the teachers prior to the  
242 focus group. Teachers were asked about their views on mental health research in young people, how  
243 MAGES was conducted in their school, how they and others (parents/guardians, students) found the  
244 MAGES process and what improvements they would make to the study (see Supplementary Table 1  
245 for focus group schedule). Digital audio recordings of the three focus groups were transcribed  
246 verbatim by a professional transcription company and supplementary handwritten notes were made.  
247 The transcribed interviews were then exported to NVivo 12, a qualitative data analysis computer  
248 software package.

249 Two researchers (SR and NW) conducted an inductive thematic analysis of the data following Braun  
250 and Clarke’s (2006) framework (25). The steps in this process included: 1) data familiarisation, 2)

251 initial code generation, 3) theme identification and framework development, 4) theme review, and 5)  
252 final theme definition. A wide range of views were collected and researchers were confident that there  
253 was no further information that could have been gained from recruiting more participants/ holding  
254 more focus groups.

255 Both researchers coded all the transcripts independently and then met to jointly develop a coding  
256 framework. This framework was derived inductively from the focus group data but was also  
257 influenced deductively by the research questions. They subsequently recoded the transcripts using the  
258 agreed framework using NVivo 12.

### 259 Patient and Public Involvement

260 The design of the protocol was informed by extensive PPI work with key stakeholders – young  
261 people, parents/guardians and school staff (see ‘Development phase’ above). Schools participating in  
262 the development phase of the project were offered the opportunity to take part in the main study and  
263 help recruit parents and students at their school. Results were disseminated to participating schools  
264 through electronic and paper feedback reports.

## 265 Results

### 266 Feasibility

#### 267 *Recruitment and participants*

268 Three of five schools involved in the advisory stage agreed to take part in MAGES, with the two non-  
269 participating schools stating they were too busy. No schools (0/4) in the second recruitment wave  
270 agreed to meet to discuss taking part in MAGES. Researchers were unable to reach the SHRN contact  
271 prior to the end of the study in two schools and two schools declined taking part due to being too busy  
272 (n=1), and having concerns over taking DNA from children and being perceived as having young  
273 people with mental health problems (n=1). The total school participation rate was 33.3% (3 out of 9  
274 invited schools). On average, the three participating schools had lower Free School Meal (FSM)  
275 entitlement (14.0% versus 23.1%), lower proportion of minority ethnic students (15.4% versus 21.9%)  
276 than the six non-participating schools, and similar student attendance (94.3% versus 93.7%), and  
277 academic achievement (58.4% versus 60.2% students 5 GCSE A\*-C grades). In comparison to the  
278 national average, participating schools had lower FSM entitlement (Wales average 17.5%), higher  
279 proportion of minority ethnic students (Wales average 9.8%), higher student attendance (Wales  
280 average 93.9%), and higher academic achievement (Wales average 55.1%).

281 Table 1 details the number of parent/guardian consent forms received, saliva samples collected and  
282 consent for data linkage for each participating school. Three parents from the eligible sample of 868  
283 (0.3%) refused permission for their child to participate, either via email (n=1) or on the consent forms

284 (n=2). 98 parents (11.3%) provided signed consent for students to participate in the study. No  
285 responses were received from the remaining eligible sample (88.4%).

286 Of the 98 students with parent/guardian consent, saliva samples were obtained from 90 students  
287 (89.6%; 31 males, 59 females). Five students decided they did not want to take part, two were absent  
288 on days of saliva collection, and there was not enough time to collect a sample from one student.  
289 Consent for complete data linkage was obtained for 79 (80.6%) students.

290 Sample collection rates varied by school, ranging from 7.5% to 15.3% of eligible students. This  
291 primarily reflected variation in parent/guardian consent (8.0%-17.2%). There was also considerable  
292 within-school variation in sample collection between different classes (School 1: 0-38.2%; School 2:  
293 11.1-28.0%; School 3: 0-21.4%).

#### 294 *DNA extraction and genotyping*

295 We were able to extract DNA and genotype 89 of the 90 (98.9%) samples collected. One sample was  
296 not genotyped due to insufficient concentration of DNA.

#### 297 *Adherence to study protocol*

298 The study protocol was followed for School 1. However, the time-limited nature of science  
299 workshops during a normal lesson restricted the number of saliva samples that could be collected. In  
300 subsequent schools we adjusted the protocol so that the saliva collection occurred approximately one  
301 week following the science workshop to allow adequate time.

302 After School 1 layout and formatting changes were made to the parent/guardian consent forms to  
303 increase clarity.

304 Only one school (School 3) opted to provide an event to explain MAGES to parents and guardians.  
305 This event was organised specifically to discuss MAGES (Thursday evening, 5.30pm start) but was  
306 poorly attended (n=5, 1.1% of school eligible sample). This session was primarily comprised of  
307 parents and guardians with concerns and queries about the research. No school chose to have the  
308 additional event for MAGES researchers to explain the project to teachers.

309 We did not receive any complaints about the research from students, parents/guardians or school staff.

#### 310 *Acceptability*

##### 311 *Science workshop*

312 Of the students who gave feedback on the science workshops, the majority (88.4%) said “Yes – I had  
313 great fun” or “Most of it was quite good” (Table 2).

314 *Teacher focus groups post-MAGES*

315 A number of themes were identified from thematic analysis of qualitative interviews with teachers  
316 (Table 3). Here we focus on key themes that informed our understanding of acceptability and  
317 feasibility.

318 *Acceptability*

319 Teachers were asked about their views on the appropriateness of conducting a study like MAGES in a  
320 school environment. Generally, teachers who were interviewed were in favour of such research.

321 *“You asked whether or not it’s a good idea to use the schools. I think we’re in an ideal position. A  
322 captive audience, if you want. It’s the easiest way of getting hold of those pupils and that information  
323 and of youngsters so I don’t necessarily have a problem with schools being involved.”*

324 The consensus was largely that the MAGES protocol was acceptable, however there was some  
325 concern that this view may not be shared by other people within the community. Some teachers  
326 suggested that people outside of the school may feel it was inappropriate for teachers to facilitate this  
327 kind of research.

328 *“I wonder how that might be seen by different people as in, why are they taking DNA? What are they  
329 going to do with it? Why should teachers allow them to come in and do that?”*

330 Teachers discussed the acceptability of MAGES from the point of view of parents/guardians and  
331 students. Although some participants suggested that they expected parents/guardians to react  
332 negatively to MAGES, all participants agreed that no parent or student approached them with any  
333 complaints or concerns.

334 *“When I first got sent the email about the project, as a scientist I thought some parents are not going  
335 to like that...but we took the risk and, in fact, we got more people coming back than I thought we  
336 would.”*

337 *Benefits*

338 The benefits of taking part in MAGES were widely discussed, with members of all groups indicating  
339 that they would be willing to participate in MAGES again in the future. The potential contribution to  
340 mental health research was noted in all three focus groups as a major benefit of being involved with  
341 MAGES.

342 *“I think there’s a lot of mental wellbeing issues in amongst children now. If we’ve got research and  
343 there’s data on it, if that data can be used in a positive way, then it’s a good thing but it’s just the  
344 feasibility of collecting that large amount of data for it to be viable.”*

345 Teachers also said they would have agreed to take part without the incentive of the science workshop,  
346 however there was a preference for the workshop to remain as part of MAGES.

347 *“I would have still agreed to do it, absolutely, but I wonder if the kids could actually link to what’s*  
348 *going on. I think that’s where the disconnect would be. We still would’ve signed up to it absolutely*  
349 *because we recognise we’ve got mental health issues in the school and the importance of these types*  
350 *of research studies.”*

351 Similarly, teachers acknowledged the value of linking genetic information with data on mental health.

352 *“I would’ve thought, to make your research valuable, you’ve got to do it otherwise all you’ve got it is*  
353 *a DNA sample.”*

354 The possibility that genetic research may become more acceptable to people in the future was brought  
355 up by multiple teachers.

356 *“I think that attitude will change in the future. This is quite early on. Everybody was initially*  
357 *technology – the beast. Now, everybody’s embracing it. I think exactly the same thing will happen*  
358 *with DNA and testing. I think it will probably become quite routine.”*

359 The prestige of working in partnership and forming a relationship with Cardiff University was also  
360 seen as a benefit.

361 *“Our incentive has been the formation of this partnership and feeling like we’re helping you with*  
362 *your samples and we’ve had something for our students back.”*

363 Science workshop

364 The biggest benefit identified was the science workshop that was delivered to all Year 7 and 8  
365 students. Teachers frequently commented on the value of having external visitors who could be  
366 viewed as role models. Science workshops were seen as helpful to clarify how students’ saliva  
367 samples would be used if they chose to take part. Teachers noted how much students enjoyed the  
368 session and suggested it gave them an opportunity to practice real, advanced science relevant to the  
369 teaching curriculum.

370 *“It creates a buzz that you’ve got the profile of Cardiff University coming in, it gets the children*  
371 *excited about it. When we have outside speakers, they love that and that’s why I think it’s needed*  
372 *because otherwise, it’s just spit into this thing and signing a form whereas if they did the banana*  
373 *DNA, they went home and talked about it, they were talking about it in their next lessons.”*

374 *“I think it’s really important for students to see researchers because students have this idea that*  
375 *scientists are lab coats and you don’t all look like Albert Einstein. For you guys to come in, you’re*  
376 *normal people and to say ‘we are scientists, we are doing this’ and for them to think, ‘you’re ordinary*  
377 *people, we could do that.’”*

378 [Concerns and potential challenges](#)

379 Although focus group participants agreed on the whole that it was acceptable to conduct MAGES  
380 within a school environment, they did acknowledge some concerns. These focused on the potential  
381 negative impact of genetic research on participants as well as privacy issues surrounding the process  
382 of data linkage.

383 All potential MAGES participants were told that they would not receive any results from their saliva  
384 sample during the initial assembly, in the science workshop and in all MAGES information packs.  
385 However, not all teachers were present in the assembly and many had not read the information  
386 leaflets. This led to some unaddressed concern among teachers about the potential harm that could be  
387 caused to students if they were to be informed that they had an increased genetic risk for particular  
388 mental health conditions. Focus group participants felt strongly that students should not receive  
389 feedback regarding the results of their DNA sample as feedback might lead students to believe they  
390 were predisposed to mental illness.

391 *“If we’ve got a young person who has mental health issues, they get a DNA test, they find they’ve got  
392 that gene, I fear they’d think there’s nothing they could do. They’d say, ‘I’ve got the gene, I’m  
393 genetically going to have mental health issues, there’s no point having therapy, there’s no point  
394 talking about it because that’s just who I am.’”*

395 Concerns about how participants’ data could be used in the future and the potential negative impact  
396 this might have were discussed.

397 *“If you discover a DNA precursor to mental health, what if an insurance company in the future said  
398 to you is this person likely to get mental health illnesses? Or a mortgage company?”*

399 Teachers acknowledged the value of data linkage and were aware of the measures in place to protect  
400 participant’s privacy, however some did still express concern.

401 *“I know its numbers and barcodes but at some stage in the process, somebody will have access to the  
402 names and be able to link it.”*

403 Participant understanding of MAGES and communication were noted as challenges. Some teachers  
404 felt that the information given to students by researchers about genetic research and data linkage was  
405 too complex for young people to properly understand.

406 *“It’s the lost in translation thing – they didn’t quite understand ... and when the kids are very, very  
407 weak [academically], it was more lost in translation.”*

408 The initial MAGES assembly was felt to be too complex and that this had led to misunderstanding the  
409 purpose of the study by some students. Teachers said that some students came away from the  
410 assembly believing that the purpose of MAGES was to screen them for mental health conditions.

411 *“I had one student ...who thought you were going to test her for mental health problems and was*  
412 *concerned that you were going to tell her there was something wrong with her.”*

413 Similarly, teachers suggested that parents/guardians may have found the information sheets to be too  
414 complex which may have impacted their decision about allowing their child to participate.

415 *“It’s education for the parents as well – they need to fully and truly understand what it’s for, what’s*  
416 *happening to their child’s DNA what are they going to do with it, what’s going to happen in the end?*  
417 *Obviously, we do have a lot of parents who ... don’t truly understand what it means to take DNA and*  
418 *they just understand DNA from the television... If they don’t truly understand why you’re taking it*  
419 *then no, it’s too scary...”*

420 Communication, in particular, was seen as a challenging element of MAGES, and that this required  
421 teachers to provide additional information and answer follow-up questions from students. Teachers  
422 reported that some staff members were approached by students with questions about MAGES  
423 following the initial assembly and the distribution of the student information sheets, suggesting that  
424 the information provided by researchers was inadequate on its own.

425 *“When I gave out the packs, I asked if there were any questions and I spent 10-15 minutes with people*  
426 *asking if it will tell them if they’ve got this disease and will they have this on file forever.”*

427 Teachers felt that not enough school staff were given information about MAGES and that this limited  
428 the school’s ability to facilitate the recruitment of potential participants.

429 *“They [students] would come and ask me, some of them who are in my class, but I think because the*  
430 *other science teachers weren’t massively, well they didn’t really know what this was about and what*  
431 *was going on, perhaps they weren’t as enthusiastic as I was.”*

432 The majority of teachers felt that the school’s contact with parents/guardians regarding MAGES was  
433 ineffective which may have had negative implications for recruitment.

434 *“Parents – we didn’t get them in ... the only way we managed to get it out was on our “Schoop Line”*  
435 *and via the letters. So, it was woeful in that respect in terms of engaging the parents.”*

#### 436 [Recommendations for the future](#)

##### 437 [Working with school staff](#)

438 Focus group members suggested various ways for researchers to more effectively engage staff in the  
439 participating schools. This included involving more staff throughout the school including science  
440 teachers, school nurses and teachers responsible for pastoral care. Participants suggested that the most  
441 effective way to engage with school staff would be for MAGES researchers to organise a face-to-face  
442 meeting to present information verbally.

443 *“I wonder as well... if because I spoke to Year 7 and 8 tutors only. I’ve mentioned it to other staff but*  
444 *in passing. I wonder if every member of staff in the school community could be aware of what is going*  
445 *on.”*

446 Engaging students and parents/guardians

447 There was significant discussion of the importance of MAGES researchers engaging with students  
448 and suggestions of several ways in which this could be improved. Proposed improvements included:  
449 simplifying the initial student assembly, making MAGES more exciting and appealing to students,  
450 and alternative DNA-related activities that may be more relevant to the research.

451 *“I feel that maybe it could have been sold as a bit more fun and special as in you’re helping people*  
452 *out, you’re doing this, not everyone’s getting to do it. Because you had to say all the important bits*  
453 *and everything ethically, that then it didn’t seem as fun for them... You’ve got to give the information*  
454 *but I’m wondering if it could be sparkled up.”*

455 As parental consent was a necessary prerequisite for student participation in MAGES, this was  
456 discussed extensively in focus groups as a key area in which to boost recruitment. A parent event in  
457 which MAGES researchers meet face-to-face with parents/guardians to answer questions and provide  
458 detailed information was considered to be the most effective way to achieve this.

459 *“I think that if we were to do this again, then we would look to hold an evening for parents, as*  
460 *everybody has said, to get the elephant out of the room and have those discussions.”*

461 Discussion

462 This study aimed to develop and test a protocol to obtain genetic samples in schools for mental health  
463 research. Whilst genetic and mental health research was viewed as important and acceptable by  
464 stakeholders in the development phase, and the protocol itself proved largely acceptable, we also  
465 found that the protocol was not feasible in its current form due to a number of challenges, notably  
466 non-response from parents and securing school participation. This protocol was highly resource-  
467 intensive, and further consideration of resources is required to make the protocol more effective if  
468 data collection is to be scaled up. The quality of saliva samples was good with only one sample unable  
469 to be genotyped, which suggests researcher-supervised saliva collection using spit kits is a viable  
470 method of collecting genetic data from young people in schools. We received no complaints from  
471 students, parents or school staff concerning the study, and only three active refusals from parents at  
472 the consent stage. The MAGES science workshops were viewed as an important (but perhaps not  
473 essential) component by teachers, and received positive feedback from the majority of students.  
474 Teachers saw mental health as important, and were, in principle, accepting of collecting genetic data  
475 for the purpose of mental health research in schools; however, this information is limited to teachers  
476 from schools that took part, therefore were already interested and invested in such research. Teachers



477 also highlighted concerns and challenges, such as improving communication and engagement, that  
478 should be addressed going forward.

479 A major strength of this study is the inclusion of stakeholders throughout the research process – from  
480 development through to evaluation. This allowed us to co-produce a study protocol with schools,  
481 young people and parents. Notably, the majority of schools who had participated in the co-production  
482 phase participated in MAGES, compared with none of the schools contacted subsequently. We took a  
483 mixed-methods approach, giving more depth of information than just quantitative or qualitative  
484 research alone. We were also able to increase awareness of mental health and genetics amongst  
485 stakeholders especially young people which, although not our primary aim, has been a positive  
486 outcome of the study.

487 Nevertheless, this study has limitations. Whilst parents and guardians were involved in the  
488 development phase, further information is needed to understand barriers to parent/guardian  
489 recruitment. At the individual level, the biggest driver of non-participation was parents not returning  
490 consent for their children's participation (rather than active refusal by parents or withdrawal by  
491 children). We were unable to contact parents directly so we were unable to collect information from  
492 parents regarding whether they had received information about the study and their reasons for not  
493 giving consent. We also did not collect phenotypic data on our participants so were unable to test  
494 predictors of non-participation directly. Engagement of parents/guardians can often be an important  
495 barrier to recruitment.(19–22) The current study required opt-in parental consent but this requirement  
496 varies across countries. In future, it will be important to develop research protocols that allow direct  
497 communication with parents. The study is also limited by the small number of schools that took part,  
498 and the limited uptake of teacher and parent MAGES meetings in these schools. This study took place  
499 in mainstream schools in Wales (UK) so results may not generalise to different education systems,  
500 countries and age groups.

501 Another limitation is the lack of diversity in our sample. As this was a small study assessing  
502 feasibility, we recruited an opportunity sample which may not have fully covered the diverse set of  
503 contexts needed to inform decisions going forward. This is important because there is much research,  
504 across multiple study designs, demonstrating that there are important differences between participants  
505 and non-participants in mental health research, with notable predictors of response that include  
506 affluence, family adversity, gender, educational attainment, behavioural problems, mental health and  
507 elevated genetic risk for mental health and neurodevelopmental problems.(26–28) In our study, at a  
508 school level, factors related to non-response included eligibility for free school meals which was  
509 higher in non-participating schools and the national average, indicating a wealthy volunteer bias. In  
510 addition, although our participating schools had a greater proportion of ethnic minority students than  
511 the national average, they had a lower proportion compared with schools who we approached but

512 which chose not to participate. In future, it will be important to understand more about recruitment  
513 and retention in ethnically diverse populations and develop research protocols that ensure that  
514 traditionally underrepresented groups are closely involved in the co-production of the research. This is  
515 particularly important for health-related research to ensure that research findings are relevant to  
516 marginalised groups who often have a high burden of mental health difficulties. It is also important so  
517 that policy and practice recommendations that follow from research are developed appropriately and  
518 fairly. We would argue that a co-production approach to genetic mental health research is essential,  
519 and that a priority is to find ways to develop new research of this kind that deals explicitly with  
520 potential barriers to participation with input from marginalised groups from the outset.

521 A further important point is that, as this study was focused on feasibility to inform future decisions,  
522 the overall sample size was small. Whilst the findings provide helpful insights on the acceptability  
523 and feasibility of the methods used, it is critical to remember that data from much large numbers of  
524 individuals are essential for standard genomic analyses. The current approach was both labour and  
525 cost-intensive and it may be that broader scale awareness raising and social media campaigns may be  
526 more effective, such as those currently used to recruit participants to genetic mental health studies in  
527 adults.(29)

528 Whilst the current study focused on evaluating a protocol to engage children in genetic mental health  
529 research in schools, it is also important to consider the role of the broader social and cultural context  
530 with acceptability of different approaches to genetic research also dependent on building public  
531 understanding and trust at a societal level. There is some evidence for a decline in trust over  
532 time(30)(with survey response rates showing a general decline)(31–33), as well as variation between  
533 countries in levels of public trust in science.(34)

534 To our knowledge, this is the first study that has assessed in detail the feasibility and acceptability of  
535 collecting saliva samples in schools for the purpose of genetic studies together with obtaining consent  
536 for data linkage. However, parent consent in the current study was lower than other school-based  
537 research in other contexts and countries. For instance, in a school-based study collecting smoking  
538 survey information and genetic samples in 14-15-year-olds there was a parental consent rate of  
539 54%,(19) and a school-based survey study trialling recruitment methods in 6-7-year-olds obtained  
540 56% parental consent in cohort 1 and 71% in cohort 2.(20) These studies were able to undertake more  
541 intensive recruitment strategies (e.g. multiple waves of letters sent directly to parents, follow-up  
542 phone calls, incentives) over a longer period of time. The added complexity of linking genetic data to  
543 health records in the current study may have also affected response rates given concerns of  
544 confidentiality rank highly in reasons for parent consent refusal,(19) and teachers in post-MAGES  
545 focus groups highlighted genetic privacy as a concern. Teacher concerns were similar to those

546 identified in previous research such as concerns about general privacy and the negative impact of  
547 potential future data disclosure (e.g. insurance and mortgage company discrimination).(11,12)

548 Our study suggests that it is very difficult to reach a full cross-section of parents or for such work to  
549 be undertaken at scale or to be representative of the whole population. Family-based study designs  
550 such as population-based birth cohorts, or clinic-based recruitment of children with mental health  
551 conditions and their families appear better placed for engaging parents directly with biological sample  
552 collection, including genetics. This is particularly the case in circumstances where an effective link  
553 between the research team and the family has helped establish trust and mutual understanding, e.g. as  
554 part of ongoing longitudinal population, patient or high-risk cohorts.

555 Our research points to a number of recommendations for future school-based mental health genetic  
556 research based on feedback from teachers and our own experience. First, engaging all stakeholders  
557 through the entire research process, from development to evaluation, is crucial. This not only  
558 facilitates recruitment and improves research protocols, but helps promote understanding of genetics  
559 and mental health amongst stakeholders, and the needs and perspectives of stakeholders amongst  
560 researchers. Face-to-face meetings are potentially best and should be included in school-based  
561 research protocols where possible, but this does have implications for researcher time and costs.  
562 Second, clear communication is essential for getting key messages to all stakeholders at all stages of  
563 the research. Factors that can aid clear communication are: simplified and concise information letters,  
564 multiple formats of information (e.g. video messages, paper letters, website, face-to-face meetings),  
565 direct channels of communication by the study team to all stakeholders (one limitation of our study  
566 was that it was not possible to contact parents directly), and working with stakeholders to develop  
567 information packs and to introduce the research in schools. Third, it is important to give back to  
568 schools to reflect the time and hard work required to effectively facilitate such research. The science  
569 workshops in particular were highlighted as a major benefit for students and teachers and we also  
570 provided schools remuneration for their time. Again, scaling up would have significant cost  
571 implications. Fourth, adequate time and resources need to be dedicated to the collection of saliva  
572 samples. For instance, we altered the MAGES protocol to provide additional time for this. Finally,  
573 clear strategies for parent recruitment are needed for each school based on consultation with school  
574 staff. This is likely to include multiple waves of information packs sent direct to parent addresses,  
575 telephone follow ups, and providing multiple ways to make it as easy as possible for parents to  
576 consent (e.g. paper form, electronic form by email, online forms).

577 Future research would benefit from investigation of how to enhance parental recruitment rates.  
578 Parental consent is a challenge in school-based research,(19–22) and may be particularly challenging  
579 in secondary schools compared to primary schools where parental links to schools are not as strong.  
580 Parental consent may also be particularly challenging with research that covers mental health,

581 genetics and data linkage. Typically, large scale DNA collection has worked when parents have been  
582 present, for instance Spit for Science (<https://lab.research.sickkids.ca/schachar/spit-for-science/>), but  
583 this is not always possible in school settings. We chose to recruit younger students from UK  
584 secondary schools (aged 11-13 years) as consultation with key stakeholders suggested parents of this  
585 age group would be more engaged; however, our low parent recruitment numbers suggest this may  
586 not be the case. Research focusing specifically on factors that affect parental rates of opt-in consent  
587 for school-based studies of this kind is needed. It would also be beneficial to assess whether parents  
588 would be easier to reach and be more engaged at other stages in their children's school careers, for  
589 instance, parents of primary school aged children (aged 4-11 years), though this would raise new  
590 questions about children's understanding and stakeholder views on the acceptability of genetic mental  
591 health research in this age group. Alternatively, research could focus on older students (e.g. in the UK  
592 aged 16+ years) where participants are able to provide their own active consent; however, in practice  
593 this would not obviate the need to keep all stakeholders in the school community, including parents,  
594 appropriately informed about the purposes and practicalities of the research. The current research took  
595 place in 2019. In view of the ongoing challenges faced by schools in returning to face-to-face  
596 learning, COVID-related risk management, and the additional pressures on delivering the core  
597 curriculum, it is likely that researchers will face additional challenges with recruitment of schools and  
598 in the engagement of parents/guardians if research of this kind were to be conducted now.

## 599 Conclusions

600 Our study suggests that it is challenging to collect genetic data for the purpose of mental health  
601 research in a school setting. Low participation rates amongst parents, indicate that the scope and scale  
602 of such research would likely be restricted to sample designs where it is less important that samples  
603 are representative at a whole population level. Ultimately, large-scale representative samples covering  
604 a broad spectrum of genetic, biological, psychological and social factors are required for  
605 advancements of our understanding of mental health risk and resilience in young people. The current  
606 study highlights that there would be major challenges in scaling up school-based mental health  
607 genetics research. The most important barrier is the difficulty in obtaining parent/guardian opt-in  
608 consent for their child's participation.

**Author Contribution:** All authors contributed to the conception and design of the study. NW and SR collected and analysed the data. RBJ and RB contributed to qualitative data analysis. LB, LHJ and AE managed the storage and analysis of genetic samples. NW wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors were involved in critically revising the manuscript for important intellectual content and approval of the final version.

**Acknowledgements:** We are extremely grateful to the school staff, parents and young people involved in the protocol development, and the students who took part in the study. We would also like to thank Joan Roberts for her assistance liaising with schools, Pete Gee for help with liaising with PPI groups, and the fieldworkers who assisted with science workshops in schools (Silvia Colonna, Catherine Ollerhead, Eleanor Horton, Bethany Butler, Victoria Powell, Henry Breary, and Morgan Moriarty).

**Funding:** This work was supported by a UK Medical Research Council Mental Health Data Pathfinder grant (MC\_PC\_17212).

The work was undertaken with the support of The Centre for the Development and Evaluation of Complex Interventions for Public Health Improvement (DECIPHer), a UKCRC Public Health Research Centre of Excellence. Joint funding (MR/KO232331/1) from the British Heart Foundation, Cancer Research UK, Economic and Social Research Council, Medical Research Council, the Welsh Government and the Wellcome Trust, under the auspices of the UK Clinical Research Collaboration, is gratefully acknowledged.

The work was undertaken with support from the Public Health Improvement Research Network (PHIRN). PHIRN is part of the National Centre for Population Health and Wellbeing Research funded by Health and Care Research Wales, Welsh Government

<http://www.healthandcareresearch.gov.wales/>

**Competing interests:** None declared.

**Patient consent for publication:** Not required.

**Ethics approval:** Parents/guardians of children gave written informed consent and children gave written informed assent to take part in the study. The study was approved by Cardiff University School of Medicine Research Ethics Committee (ref 18/57).

**Data availability statement:** Data are available upon reasonable request from the corresponding author.

## References

1. Sadler K, Vizard T, Ford T, Marchesell F, Pearce N, Mandalia D, et al. Mental health of children and young people in England, 2017. NHS Digital; 2018.
2. Collishaw S, Sellers R. Trends in child and adolescent mental health prevalence, outcomes, and inequalities. In: Taylor E et al, editor. *Mental Health and Illness of Children and Adolescents, Mental Health and Illness Worldwide*. 2020.
3. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Merikangas KR, Walters EE. Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2005;62(6):593–602.
4. Kim-Cohen J, Caspi A, Moffitt TE, Harrington H, Milne BJ, Poulton R. Prior juvenile diagnoses in adults with mental disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*. 2003;60(7):709.
5. Neufeld SAS, Dunn VJ, Jones PB, Croudace TJ, Goodyer IM. Reduction in adolescent depression after contact with mental health services: A longitudinal cohort study in the UK. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2017 Feb;4(2):120–7.
6. MRC Population Health Sciences Group. Maximising the value of UK population cohorts: MRC strategic review of the largest UK population studies. 2014.
7. Hewitt G, Roberts J, Fletcher A, Moore G, Murphy S. Improving young people’s health and well-being through a school health research network: Reflections on school–researcher engagement at the national level. *Research for All*. 2018 Jan 25;2(1):16–33.
8. Murphy S, Littlecott H, Hewitt G, MacDonald S, Roberts J, Bishop J, et al. A Transdisciplinary Complex Adaptive Systems (T-CAS) Approach to Developing a National School-Based Culture of Prevention for Health Improvement: the School Health Research Network (SHRN) in Wales. *Prevention Science*. 2021;22(1):50–61.
9. Condon EM. Psychosocial Influences on Acceptability and Feasibility of Salivary Cortisol Collection From Community Samples of Children. *Research in Nursing & Health*. 2016 Dec;39(6):449–62.
10. Dimolareva M, Gee NR, Pfeffer K, Maréchal L, Pennington K, Meints K. Measuring cortisol in the classroom with school-aged children—a systematic review and recommendations. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2018;15(5):1–23.
11. Bates BR, Lynch JA, Bevan JL, Condit CM. Warranted concerns, warranted outlooks: A focus group study of public understandings of genetic research. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2005;60(2):331–44.
12. Clayton EW, Halverson CM, Sathe NA, Malin BA. A systematic literature review of individuals’ perspectives on privacy and genetic information in the United States. Vol. 13, *PLoS ONE*. 2018. p. e0204417.
13. Etchegary H, Green J, Parfrey P, Street C, Pullman D. Community engagement with genetics: Public perceptions and expectations about genetics research. *Health Expectations*. 2015;18(5):1413–25.
14. Haga SB, Barry WT, Mills R, Ginsburg GS, Svetkey L, Sullivan J, et al. Public knowledge of and attitudes toward genetics and genetic testing. *Genetic Testing and Molecular Biomarkers*. 2013 Apr 1;17(4):327–35.

15. Tambor ES, Bernhardt BA, Rodgers J, Holtzman NA, Geller G. Mapping the human genome: An assessment of media coverage and public reaction. *Genetics in Medicine*. 2002;4(1):31–6.
16. Corrigan P. How stigma interferes with mental health care. Vol. 59, *American Psychologist*. 2004. p. 614–25.
17. Time to Change. Time to Change Children and Young People’s programme development: Summary of research and insights. 2012.
18. Russ TC, Woelbert E, Davis KAS, Hafferty JD, Ibrahim Z, Inkster B, et al. How data science can advance mental health research. *Nature Human Behaviour*. 2019 Jan 1;3(1):24–32.
19. Audrain J, Tercyak KP, Goldman P, Bush A. Recruiting adolescents into genetic studies of smoking behavior. *Cancer Epidemiology Biomarkers and Prevention*. 2002;11(3):249–52.
20. Schilpzand EJ, Sciberras E, Efron D, Anderson V, Nicholson JM. Improving survey response rates from parents in school-based research using a multi-level approach. *PLoS ONE*. 2015;10(5):e0126950.
21. Shaw T, Cross D, Thomas LT, Zubrick SR. Bias in student survey findings from active parental consent procedures. *British Educational Research Journal*. 2015;41(2):229–43.
22. Totura CMW, Kutash K, Labouliere CD, Karver MS. Evaluating Active Parental Consent Procedures for School Programming: Addressing the Sensitive Topic of Suicide Prevention. *Journal of School Health*. 2017 Feb 1;87(2):114–20.
23. Bevan Jones R, Stallard P, Agha SS, Rice S, Werner-Seidler A, Stasiak K, et al. Practitioner review: Co-design of digital mental health technologies with children and young people. Vol. 61, *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*. NLM (Medline); 2020. p. 928–40.
24. Bevan Jones R, Thapar A, Rice F, Mars B, Agha S, Smith D, et al. A Digital Intervention for Adolescent Depression (MoodHwb): Mixed Methods Feasibility Evaluation. *JMIR Ment Health*. 2020;7(7):e14536.
25. Braun V, Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* [Internet]. 2006 Jan 1;3(2):77–101. Available from: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
26. Martin J, Tilling K, Hubbard L, Stergiakouli E, Thapar A, Davey Smith G, et al. Association of genetic risk for schizophrenia with nonparticipation over time in a population-based cohort study. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2016 Jun 15;183(12):1149–58.
27. Wadsworth MEJ, Butterworth SL, Hardy RJ, Kuh DJ, Richards M, Langenberg C, et al. The life course prospective design: An example of benefits and problems associated with study longevity. *Social Science and Medicine*. 2003 Dec;57(11):2193–205.
28. Taylor AE, Jones HJ, Sallis H, Euesden J, Stergiakouli E, Davies NM, et al. Exploring the association of genetic factors with participation in the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2018 May 23;47(4):1207–16.
29. Davies MR, Kalsi G, Armour C, Jones IR, McIntosh AM, Smith DJ, et al. The Genetic Links to Anxiety and Depression (GLAD) Study: Online recruitment into the largest recontactable study of depression and anxiety. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*. 2019 Dec 1;123:103503.
30. Hamilton LC, Safford TG. Elite Cues and the Rapid Decline in Trust in Science Agencies on COVID-19: <https://doi.org/10.1177/07311214211022391> [Internet]. 2021 Jun 17 [cited 2021

Nov 10];64(5):988–1011. Available from:  
<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/full/10.1177/07311214211022391>

31. Boyd A, Golding J, Macleod J, Lawlor DA, Fraser A, Henderson J, et al. Cohort profile: The 'Children of the 90s'-The index offspring of the Avon Longitudinal Study of Parents and Children. *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2013;42(1):111–27.
32. Hawkes D, Plewis I. Modelling non-response in the National Child Development Study. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series A: Statistics in Society*. 2006;169(3):479–91.
33. Harrison S, Alderdice F, Henderson J, Redshaw M, Quigley MA. Trends in response rates and respondent characteristics in five National Maternity Surveys in England during 1995-2018. *Archives of Public Health [Internet]*. 2020 May 25 [cited 2021 Nov 10];78(1):1–11. Available from: <https://archpublichealth.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13690-020-00427-w>
34. Gallup. Wellcome Global Monitor – First Wave Findings [Internet]. 2019. Available from: <https://wellcome.org/reports/wellcome-global-monitor/2018>



Table 1. Participation and consent rates

<b>School (eligible sample)</b>	<b>Parent/guardian consent forms returned n (%)</b>	<b>Student saliva samples n (%)</b>	<b>Routine datasets linkage n (%)</b>	<b>School questionnaire data linkage n (%)</b>	<b>Routine datasets and school questionnaire linkage n (%)</b>
School 1 (n=246)	34 (13.82%)	31 (12.60%)	29 (11.79%)	30 (12.20%)	29 (11.79%)
School 2 (n=157)	27 (17.20%)	24 (15.29%)	24 (15.29%)	21 (13.38%)	21 (13.38%)
School 3 (n=465)	37 (7.96%)	35 (7.53%)	35 (7.53%)	29 (6.24%)	29 (6.24%)
Total (n=868)	98 (11.29%)	90 (10.37%)	88 (10.14%)	80 (9.22%)	79 (9.10%)

Note: % of eligible sample

Table 2. Student feedback on science workshops

	<b>Have you enjoyed the MAGES science workshop?</b>			
	<b>Yes - I had great fun n (%)</b>	<b>Most of it was quite good n (%)</b>	<b>Some of the time it was ok n (%)</b>	<b>No - I didn't like it n (%)</b>
School 1 (n=191)	148 (77.49%)	27 (14.14%)	12 (6.28%)	4 (2.09%)
School 2 (n=119)	79 (66.39%)	30 (25.21%)	5 (4.20%)	5 (4.20%)
School 3 (n=343)	185 (53.94%)	108 (31.49%)	34 (9.91%)	16 (4.66%)
<b>Total (n=653)</b>	<b>412 (63.09%)</b>	<b>165 (25.27%)</b>	<b>51 (7.81%)</b>	<b>25 (3.83%)</b>

Note: ns reflect the number of students present in class who chose to give feedback on the MAGES science workshop.

Table 3. Themes identified from qualitative analysis of teacher focus groups

<b>Main theme</b>	<b>Sub-theme</b>	<b>Second Sub-theme</b>
<b>Acceptability</b>	Value of data-linkage	
	More acceptability in the future	
	No expressed concerns	
	Perception of parent/guardian and child acceptability	
	School would take part again	<i>Would take part without workshop</i>
	Using schools for genetic research	
<b>Benefits</b>	Partnership with CU	
	Mental health research	
	Science workshops	<i>Advanced science</i> <i>Benefits research</i> <i>Student enjoyment</i> <i>External visitors</i> <i>Real science</i> <i>Role models</i> <i>Useful for teaching</i>
<b>Concerns</b>	Children don't understand	
	Future use and impact	
	Linkage - data privacy and access	
	Parent/guardian concern of genetics	
	Perceptions of mental health testing	
	Potential harm to participants	<i>Determinism</i> <i>Finding out</i>
<b>Challenges</b>	Communication with parents/guardians	<i>School contact with parents/guardians</i> <i>Lack of parent/guardian understanding</i>
	Communication with students	
	Communication with teachers	
	Recruitment	
<b>Suggestions for the future</b>	Engaging parents/guardians	<i>More information</i>  <i>Parent event</i>

	Engaging students	<i>Assembly</i> <i>Enthusiasm</i> <i>Science workshops</i>
	Working with teachers	<i>Engagement</i> <i>Involving form tutors</i> <i>Involving all staff</i> <i>Science department</i>
<b>Large scale MAGES</b>	Logistics	
	School variability	
	Views on expanding study	
	Workshop going forward	
<b>Mental health</b>	Awareness	
	In schools	
<b>Practicalities</b>	Disseminating MAGES information	
	Teacher workload	
	Timing and organisation	

Figure 1. MAGES recruitment and procedure





Figure 2. Science workshop structure and activities

## 1. Interactive presentation




- All living things are made up of cells
- Cells are the building blocks of life
- Cell structure
- DNA is in the nucleus
- DNA is like a recipe book for your cells

## 2. Practical experiment extracting DNA from bananas



## 3. Interactive presentation



- Discovery of DNA structure
- DNA backbone and base pairs
- Genes and heredity
- External and internal traits influenced by genes
- Impact of environment and experience

## 4. Origami DNA model making



[www.yourgenome.org/activities/origami-dna](http://www.yourgenome.org/activities/origami-dna)