

42 1. INTRODUCTION

43 During the closure of an HIV clinical trial, existing ethical guidelines stipulate a range
44 of obligations for researchers. These include a need to ensure continued access to required
45 HIV treatments and other services,(1, 2) hence measures are required to link trial participants
46 back to adequate services ('usual care') once the trial has concluded. Good practice also
47 includes the provision of trial feedback to participants.(3, 4) There is very little evidence
48 available however to guide current practice in this area or to determine the adequacy and
49 appropriateness of existing guidance, particularly in low income settings.(5, 6)

50 Several authors have criticised existing trial guidance for its emphasis on generic and
51 universalist principles that provide little detail on how to adapt and apply such principles into
52 highly diverse local contexts.(6-8) There is a call to develop post-trial care guidelines that
53 are flexible and sensitive to local contexts and to the specific needs of different groups of
54 participants. In line with good research practice and with the principles of patient and public
55 involvement,(9) such guidance should be developed collaboratively by a range of different
56 stakeholders such as the government, researchers, communities, and research sponsors,(10,
57 11) and implemented in research practice.(12)

58 In low income settings such as Uganda, there is often a disparity between healthcare
59 provided in facilities associated with clinical research trials and that provided within general
60 healthcare facilities.(8) Health care provided to participants during the research period varies
61 among individual trials and is guided by regulations set out by regulatory authorities such as
62 the Research Ethics Committees, the sponsors, and the communities involved. The specific
63 nature of care also depends on the characteristics of particular trials (i.e. the likely risks
64 involved, the type of intervention, and the bargaining power of the local authorities). At the
65 minimum, the standard of care in a research facility should not be lower than that provided in
66 public facilities.(13)

67 In low income settings such as Uganda, it is a reality that most aspects of healthcare
68 provided in clinical trial contexts (in research clinics) is usually significantly better than
69 public sector provision.(7) It usually includes prompt, adequate and free medical treatment
70 for various illnesses for research participants (and sometimes their families), comprehensive
71 medical check-ups, and a range of financial and material incentives such as assistance with
72 transport and meals.(5) Indeed, studies have shown that the superior nature of research-
73 facility based health services can act as a key motivation for individuals to participate in
74 clinical trials,(14, 15) and their withdrawal at trial closure can result in feelings of loss and
75 other negative effects.(16, 17) Hence it is paramount to consider trial closure as an important
76 part of the trial and for this to be managed appropriately. To date, there is no research on the
77 post-trial experience in relation to HIV care in low income settings.(14)

78 This article presents a model that can guide the post-trial care process, based on
79 findings from a research study that explored how care is perceived and enacted in HIV drug
80 trial closure in Uganda.(18) The model, entitled ‘Facilitated Transition’ generates new
81 insights for researchers and other stakeholders on how to plan and provide holistic and person
82 centred care during closure of clinical trials involving HIV positive participants in a low
83 income setting.

84

85 2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

86 The research aimed to establish an in-depth understanding of the post-trial care
87 phenomenon amongst participants in HIV drug trials in Uganda. It adopted an interpretive-
88 constructivist grounded theory approach.(19) The study included participants from three
89 trials. Trials 1 and 3 were conducted by the same research institution but at different sites.
90 Trial 1 was conducted at an urban site, situated in Kampala the capital city of Uganda, while
91 Trial 3 was conducted at a peri-urban site, in the Eastern part of Uganda. Trial 2 was

92 conducted at a peri-urban site in the Western part of Uganda. Table 1 below provides a
 93 summary of the included trials' characteristics.

94

Characteristic	Trial 1	Trial 2	Trial 3
Research aim (main objective)	Tested various second line treatments in patients who had failed on a first line regimen in Africa	Evaluated the safety of discontinuing Cotrimoxazole prophylaxis among adult HIV infected clients on ART in Uganda	Investigated the ability of three methods to reduce early mortality among patients initiating antiretroviral therapy (ART) while severely immuno-suppressed
The immune/health status of trial participants at recruitment	All participants were HIV-positive with immune suppression following first line treatment failure	All participants were HIV-infected with a sustained immune system following ART	All participants were HIV-infected, with severe immuno-deficiency
Prior experience of specialised HIV care/treatment before trial participation	Had previous experience	Had previous experience	No prior experience of specialised HIV care/treatment experiences before trial participation
Contact with pre-trial HIV treatment facilities during research	No contact retained	Participants continued to contact their former facilities on a three monthly basis for routine check-ups	Participants had no pre-trial HIV care providers
Access to HIV care and treatment during research	All HIV related care and treatment was received from the research facility	The trial regimen and treatments for opportunistic infections were provided by the research facility, while other routine medications and associated HIV routine services were obtained from their	All HIV related care and treatment were provided by the research facility

		former facilities	
Presence of a public HIV care facility attached to the research institution	Present	Not present	Present
Number of trial participants included in the current study	7	8	6

95 **Table 1: Characteristics of included trials**

96

97 **2.1 Recruitment and data collection methods**

98 The sample strategy aimed to achieve a balance between geographical sites and
99 genders and was guided by the principle of theoretical saturation. Purposive, convenience,
100 and theoretical sampling approaches were employed in selecting participants. The study
101 included 21 post-trial participants and 22 research staff. Confidentiality was ensured by
102 having all eligible trial participants contacted by their former research institutions, to seek
103 their permission to be contacted by the researcher. Those who consented were then
104 approached using phone calls or home visits by the first author. Research staff were
105 approached directly within their institutions, through their supervisors. All but three
106 participants who were contacted agreed to participate in the research. The eligibility criteria
107 for the study is presented in Table 2 below.

Considered aspects	Eligibility criteria
Trials	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Involved HIV positive participants• Involved an HIV treatment or prevention drug• Lasted for at least two years• Was within four to 12 months of trial closure
Post-trial participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• HIV positive• Participated in a prevention or treatment drug trial• Participated in the trial for at least six months• Within three to twelve months of trial exit
Research staff	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Worked directly with trial participants• Was involved in trial closure processes within the past one year

108 **Table 2: Eligibility criteria**

109

110 Data from post-trial participants was collected using in-depth interviews, while a
111 mixture of Focus Group Discussions (FGDs) and Key Informant Interviews (KIIs) were used
112 to collect data from research staff. Participants were asked open ended questions about their
113 experiences of trial closure. All interviews were audio recorded and field notes were taken by
114 the lead researcher to capture additional information of relevance. Data collection followed
115 the constructivist Grounded Theory approach by Charmaz, where initial data analysis
116 informed later data collection.(20, 21) The first author, who was a PhD student at the time of
117 the research, administered all interviews. This author was fluent in the two languages
118 (Luganda and English) in which the interviews were collected, hence there was no
119 requirement to have translators. All interviews were undertaken in the research clinics which
120 the respective trial participants had attended. Participants were compensated with
121 refreshments and a sum of Ugx10,000 (approx. £2.5) mainly to contribute to their transport
122 refund. Data was collected during October 2014 to August 2015.

123

124 **2.2 Data analysis**

125 Interviews were recorded, transcribed, and, where necessary, translated before
126 analysis by the first author. NVivo 10 software was used to organize and manage the data.
127 Data analysis followed a standard grounded theory approach.(19, 21) An initial line by line
128 coding process enabled an openness for any possible theoretical interpretations from the data.
129 Some initial codes were conceptual in nature and were later upgraded to theoretical
130 categories. We then undertook focused coding to elicit more conceptual codes that were
131 representative of the data. This process eventually led to the identification of concepts that
132 were further transformed into tentative categories. Further analytical techniques involved

133 memo writing, theoretical sampling, constant comparison, and diagramming. These
134 analytical techniques led the team to identify a core category ‘Facilitated Transition’,(19, 22)
135 that was developed, through further analysis, into the Facilitated Transition Model.

136

137 **2.3 Maintaining rigor**

138 Attention to rigor was achieved through on-going discussions within the research
139 team regarding each step of the research process and the resultant interpretations from the
140 data.(23) In addition, we strove to enhance credibility by using verbatim quotes to support
141 our interpretations of the data and paying attention to disconfirming cases and opposing or
142 divergent views of the participants. Credibility of the main findings was also enhanced as a
143 result of extensive triangulation of the data (from different sites, different trials and different
144 participant groups).

145

146 **2.4 Reflexivity**

147 We took note of possible influences that the researchers’ theoretical and practice
148 perspectives could have on the research. The first author had previously worked as a research
149 nurse in Uganda. This had exposed her to some of the concerns that HIV post-trial
150 participants face during trial closure. Hence, this background had potential to influence her
151 approach to the research, and her interpretations of the data. We tried to minimize this
152 possible influence through constant discussions with other team members and careful
153 memoing, a process that constantly challenged her pre-suppositions.

154

155

156

157 **2.5 Ethical approval**

158 Ethical approval was received from the University of Nottingham, UK and The AIDS
159 Support Organization (TASO) Uganda, Research Ethics Committee (REC). The study was
160 registered with the Uganda National Council for Science and Technology (UNCST), as
161 SS3608. Permission to conduct the research was granted by the respective research
162 institutions, and written informed consent was received from all respondents.

163

164 3. FINDINGS

165 This study included a total of 43 respondents from three HIV clinical trials. Twenty-
166 one of these were post-trial participants while 22 were research staff. Of the included trial
167 participants, seven were from Trial 1, eight were from Trial 2, while six were from Trial 3.
168 The majority of trial participants (62%) were female. Trial participants were in the age range
169 of 26-59 years, with the majority (67%) being 40 years and above. Only one participant had
170 attained a university degree, and the majority (67%) were below college level, having either
171 stopped at ordinary or primary levels, or had no education at all. Very few trial participants
172 (14%) were in official employment, while the rest depended on small scale jobs, subsistence
173 farming, or other sources of income such as support from families or friends. Ninety percent
174 (90%) of the trial participants resided in rural or peri-urban settings.

175 Of the research staff, three were trial coordinators, four were clinicians, five
176 undertook counselling and home visiting, and 10 were nurses (one of the trial coordinators
177 was also a nurse). Trial 1 included 15 research staff, Trial 2 included four research staff, and
178 Trial 3 included three research staff. One quarter of the research staff were male. We also
179 reviewed ethical documents from two trials (Trials 1 and 2), which included: the general trial
180 protocols, participant information documents, informed consent documents, and the trial
181 closure 'Standard Operating Procedure' (SOP) documents, also sometimes referred to as the
182 Close out 'Manual of Operations' (MOP).

183

184 **3.1 The facilitated transition model: understanding trial closure as a process**

185 Below, we describe the main category that was interpreted from the research – the
186 ‘Facilitated Transition Model’. The model is presented as a whole, followed by a more
187 detailed description of its distinct phases and how they inter-relate, supported by participant
188 quotes and contextual narrative.

189 Our findings revealed that the transition of HIV positive participants from trial
190 healthcare to non-trial (‘usual’) care facilities was a complex and multi-faceted process that
191 occurred over time and with specific phases. This ‘transition process’ encompassed the
192 events which occurred when an HIV positive trial participant, following planned completion
193 of trial participation, was exited from research and linked back to the public healthcare
194 system, to continue accessing HIV services. One trial participant referred to this transition as
195 “*moving between two worlds*”.

196 The main events which occurred along the transition process related to trial
197 participants’ care expectations, needs, experiences, and decisions, and to the actions of
198 researchers intended to facilitate and support them. Our research showed that trial
199 participants moved through 3 phases of the trial closure experience during the transition
200 process, which include: (i) the pre-closure phase (which represents events or experiences that
201 occurred before the actual trial closure but that influenced the post-trial care experiences), (ii)
202 the trial closure phase (which is the active phase of the closure in which trial participants
203 were prepared and exited from the trials), and, (iii) the post-trial phase (which represents
204 events that occurred after trial participants had been exited from trials until 12 months later).
205 These phases are demarcated by time points that reflect how the transition process evolved,
206 proceeded and concluded. Our findings also identified facilitative actions and strategies that
207 were or could be implemented at each stage to support the transition process. These include:

208 (i) planning for post-trial care (in phase 1), (ii) providing emotional and practical support (in
209 phase 2) and (iii) providing psycho-social support (in phase 3). The process and its phases are
210 depicted in Figure 1, in a model of ‘Facilitated Transition’, followed by a description of each
211 phase of the model in turn.

212

213 **Figure 1: Model of Facilitated Transition**

214

215 **3.2 Pre-closure phase**

216 According to the study participants, the pre-closure phase involved activities
217 undertaken or required during the preparation of participants for trial closure. This phase was
218 guided by policies on post-trial care that clarify the minimum post-trial care expectations
219 from researchers and is underpinned by trial participants’ care needs, expectations and
220 experiences. The pre-closure phase starts before or during planning of the trials up to three
221 months before the actual exit of the participant from the trial (**T₀-T₃**).

222 *Trial closure starts at the beginning of the study apparently. Because as we start the*
223 *treatment of patients, we go through the screening, we go through the enrolment, we*
224 *see them settle in, we prepare them or we tell them that there is time when the study*
225 *will end so that as we start, as they settle in, they know that there is time and the trial*
226 *will end. So, by the time we get to the closure, they are already into closure. (Joy,*
227 *counsellor/health visitor/community mobiliser)*

228 Several contextual factors that existed prior to trial participation were found to
229 influence how participants reacted to the closure and how they made decisions about post-
230 trial care. These factors include those related to (i) individual participants and (ii) those
231 related to the Ugandan health care structures.

232 Personal factors such as ongoing ill health and poverty, and participants' experiences
233 at the end of previous trials in which they may have participated influenced their care needs,
234 expectations and experiences during the closure of the current trial. For example, participants
235 with ongoing health issues (such as opportunistic infections) during trial closure were worried
236 about how they would receive care after they left research, and these worries were
237 exacerbated for those living in poverty. In addition, some participants had previous
238 experience of being involved in research, and their previous experiences influenced their
239 expectations of post-trial care in the current trial (for example if they had previously been
240 given money or other benefits):

241 *... because I will refer so much to the other one (trial) while exiting us, they also*
242 *gave us some money. Yes and now this one, they just exited us, and only gave us*
243 *transport. So now that is why I have told you that I will insist on that, to show you that*
244 *we didn't receive any money as such, yet in the other one people were many in the FX*
245 *study because there was good money. But this one had no money as such. (Baker,*
246 *Trial 2)*

247 Participants' perceptions and experiences related to previous healthcare delivery were
248 also found to influence how participants reacted to trial closure. In the current study, a
249 strongly held perception of 'poor' quality of care in the Ugandan public healthcare facilities
250 caused fear and tension amongst trial participants as they reflected on where they would seek
251 care after the trials ended. Hence, inequalities in care provision between research facilities
252 and the public health care facilities in Uganda was a contributing factor to negative emotions
253 among trial participants during trial closure.

254 *When we were brought from there (the former care sites), my understanding was that*
255 *they have removed me from that place because it was no longer capable. So when you*
256 *get me from there and you bring me here and you send me back after giving me some*
257 *treatment, and you send me back there, I think I cannot be contented. Why, because*

258 *you got me from there and brought me, now again you have completed the research*
259 *and you are taking me back, it means that I may go back to the same situation as I*
260 *was. (Joel, Trial 1)*

261

262 During this pre-closure phase a key factor thought to facilitate post-trial care was
263 early discussion about post-trial care plans (where trial participants were informed about the
264 trial closure processes from the start of the trial). Discussions of when the closure will occur,
265 how participants will be exited from the research, where they will be linked for post-trial
266 care, how trial drugs will be accessed after the trial, and when/how trial results will be
267 disseminated, were made. This activity helped to psychologically prepare the participants for
268 trial closure.

269 *As research teams, one of the obligations we have is to ensure that before research*
270 *participants or trial volunteers are exited, they are prepared. One, when you start,*
271 *your recruitment must be actually, it is in the consent form that they know the period*
272 *they are going to be in the study. So once they know that may be three years, they*
273 *should be working towards three years. (Bernard, community liaisons officer)*

274

275 *In the beginning when they were informing us about the research, they told us that it*
276 *(the research) would last for three years, after we have started, and when you have*
277 *spent three years, for you..., so when they ended, they exited us. (Abdu, Trial 2)*

278

279 Policy guidelines were a useful tool for guiding researchers on post-trial care
280 preparation. Ethical documents such as study protocols, informed consent forms, and trial
281 closure/exit documents were among the documents that contained information that guided
282 trial closure processes.

283 *Transferring patients back into standard clinical care: A list of participants with*
284 *dates of exit will be sent to individual referral/mother centres prior to exit. Sites will*
285 *be informed that participants will be supplied with drugs enough for 3 months at exit*
286 *and that their next appointments will be on individual appointment's card at exit.*
287 *Each participant will be given an exit report to the referral centre but this will be*
288 *followed by a telephone call to confirm that the patient delivered the report and that*
289 *the appointment date was noted and recorded in their appointments management*
290 *system for follow-up. (MOP, Trial 1)*

291
292 *A clinical summary report will also be the referral form. (This) will be produced in*
293 *triplicate by the data manager at each site. One copy ---kept by the participant, one -*
294 *--taken to the ART provider (referral letter) by the participant, one kept in the*
295 *participant's file. (MOP, Trial 2)*

296

297 **3.3 Trial closure phase**

298 The trial-closure phase describes events that occurred around the point of trial closure.
299 It included active trial closure activities such as psychological preparation, exiting, and
300 linking trial participants to post-trial care facilities. This phase began three months prior to
301 the planned exit of a participant from the clinical trial until three months after the exit (**T₋₃-**
302 **T₊₃**). Research participants reported that the intensive preparation for trial closure started on
303 average three months to the planned closure, a period which marked off the trial closure
304 phase as reflected on the Facilitated Transition model.

305 *The period (of preparing for trial closure) is inbuilt in our community engagement*
306 *process, so I don't want to say three months before the trial ends or six months. It is*
307 *inbuilt. [...] So our post-trial engagement does not start say, when we have seen the*

308 *last volunteer, its inbuilt we share it, but the bridging activities that take us between*
309 *when people are seen last for their trial participation and when the results are out,*
310 *and what happens beyond the results are out is what I actually I would say begins*
311 *three months before the end of the trial. (Bernard, community liaisons officer)*

312 In the trial-closure phase, trial participants were found to have a range of emotional
313 and practical support needs. Participants experienced multiple emotions resulting from the
314 trial closure and concerns about how to access care afterwards. The main factors that
315 influenced participants' emotional reactions included: the loss of quality care and valued
316 relationships in research settings, the need for recognition (compensation) for their
317 contributions in research, worry about future care after leaving research, fear of side effects
318 from trial interventions, and the need to receive feedback on trial outcomes.

319 *What I felt as for me was that we were going to miss the treatment we were receiving*
320 *from here. Because at health facility Y, sometimes there is no medications for treating*
321 *other illnesses you may suffer from and so you have to buy that medication, yet here*
322 *we would get it. (Abdu, Trial 2)*

323 The worries about access to post-trial care were generally associated with the
324 perceived poor healthcare in the Ugandan public healthcare facilities. Hence, participants
325 reported concerns about how best to find alternative care facilities and how to link to them.
326 Many participants had left their previous 'usual' care facilities when they joined the clinical
327 trials while others had no HIV care experience prior to taking part in the trials. These
328 participants were now required to identify suitable healthcare facilities for continuation of
329 HIV care and treatment. The good care experiences in the research centres coupled with
330 perceptions about, and experiences of, poor care in the public healthcare facilities influenced
331 how trial participants made choices of where to seek post-trial care.

332 *The thing which made me to select this place (site C), they handled me 99, let me say*
333 *100%. The way they handled me is not like other hospitals, that is why I selected to*
334 *stay here. (Nandi, Trial 3)*

335

336 *The care I got there (in research), it was just enough. I thought I am not going back to*
337 *that place (pre-trial care facility), I have to go back to site A. Yes, the care and ok the*
338 *distance also, but the care most. (Janet, Trial 1)*

339 Where new facilities were identified, participants also cited challenges in reporting to
340 them, in terms of the complex procedures required for registering into a new facility. They
341 reported this process as inconvenient and difficult and expressed a desire to be supported by
342 the research team, to be assisted to register.

343 *So in order to make it easy for us, they would do the same thing. They would get a*
344 *person with their referrals and take him/her back to facility D and they open for you*
345 *another file. So you are not disturbed... (Sumin, Trial 1)*

346

347 To facilitate the trial closure phase, researchers engaged in offering a range of
348 emotional and practical support strategies to address the care needs of the participants.

349 *Then of course, all the time we have to talk to the patients because some we know*
350 *become a bit anxious, they have been with you for four years, may be for how many*
351 *years, now somehow the end is coming, so you have to keep preparing them. (Jane,*
352 *trial coordinator)*

353

354 *So the linkage is providing them with a referral form with the details of their clinical*
355 *picture which they deliver to the service provider and then it gets filed in their records*
356 *the other side. (Ivan, trial coordinator)*

357

358

359 **3.4 Post-trial phase**

360 The post-trial phase describes events which occurred after a trial participant has been
361 exited from the trial and linked to a new facility where they would continue to access HIV
362 care. This phase starts approximately three months following trial closure and continues up to
363 12 months later (T_{+3} - T_{12}).

364 *.... there is that extra follow-up that may be done probably at 90 days, but continually*
365 *it poses a challenge especially when finances have to be incurred. (Elhana, nurse)*

366

367 *Actually, if it were possible, it is post-trial, it would be better that may be you know*
368 *what is happening after a year. You know for a year at least you know... (Jane, trial*
369 *coordinator)*

370 The post-trial phase illuminates how HIV positive trial participants adapted to the
371 post-trial situation, whilst receiving HIV care and treatment within the Ugandan public
372 healthcare system. Although trial documents were generally silent on most aspects of this
373 phase, researchers and trial participants recognised the need for supporting HIV positive post-
374 trial participants during this phase. A number of psychosocial and socio-economic factors
375 influenced trial participants' care needs, expectations and experiences during the post-trial
376 phase.

377 The psychosocial concerns that arose following participants' exit from HIV trials
378 included fear of HIV stigma (since non-trial care facilities did not provide as much privacy as
379 research institutions) and fear of poor healthcare (including overcrowding in the facilities,
380 lack of privacy, and poor time management), and specific concerns about how their
381 individual healthcare needs would be met (such as accessing routine HIV medications and
382 treatments for opportunistic infections). Trial participants also reported negative staff
383 attitudes (e.g. rudeness) which affected clinic attendances.

384 *And I went and informed them 'I am having headache,' but it was not a clinic day,*
385 *and I informed them I was having headache but they never gave me any medications,*
386 *not even Panadol, in fact I went away crying. (Brenda, Trial 2)*

387

388 In addition, some participants were concerned about the possibility of side effects
389 resulting from trial interventions, and wished to be informed of any plans of follow up and
390 monitoring them after leaving the trials.

391 *Because the other side (post-trial care facility), it is just a matter of presenting*
392 *your..., may be your book and they write down and they send you to the pharmacy*
393 *and they pick up your medication, but they cannot know the changes which is taking*
394 *place within you. So the first people (researchers) they are the ones who are good*
395 *whereby if you have any problem you can call them and you can go and they try to*
396 *examine you again and see what is going on. (Wilberforce, Trial 3)*

397

398 In terms of socio-economic issues, participants reported experiencing significant
399 challenges in meeting the financial burden of accessing care (for example transport and
400 treatment costs), after leaving the trials. Those with ongoing ill health problems were affected
401 more significantly by the transition as these were unlikely to be working yet suddenly
402 required additional finances (e.g. to buy medications or had specific food requirements).

403 *...we have to look for money for transport to fetch medication. And when I fail to get*
404 *it, I call them (research staff) and I request them to help me with money to go and I*
405 *collect the medication. (Ruth, Trial 1)*

406 Participants in the current study reported a number of measures that are required to
407 support trial participants during the post-trial phase, to enable them to cope with both their
408 psychosocial and economic needs. The supportive measures included; establishing

409 mechanisms to ensure and check that post-trial participants had successfully linked to
410 alternative care facilities and are receiving appropriate treatments, providing continued
411 psychological support, material and financial support, and monitoring for possible side
412 effects. Providing such support required continued engagement of research staff and other
413 stakeholders with the participants during the post-trial phase.

414 *... what they would have done is to continue moving, to continue inquiring to know*
415 *after they have gone back to where they were (before joining research), how have*
416 *they experienced life where they are; [...] I would say that this is the real summing up*
417 *(concluding) of the research. (Baker, Trial 2)*

418 *I believe we are supposed to be following them up, to see how they are coping up, to*
419 *see the challenges they are facing, and like these Trial 3 patients that we recruited*
420 *with low CD4s, to find out may be if they have increased, they are rising up, to see*
421 *generally how they are improving. (Favour, Counsellor/home visitor)*

422

423 However, findings indicated that in current practice, there was very little engagement
424 of researchers in the post-trial phase, despite this being recognised as a very important part of
425 trial care.

426 *It is really very important though we don't actively do it, post follow-up. Because*
427 *when they go back to their mother clinics, a lot of things change, it is like*
428 *transitioning. So if you are transitioning, you need to be followed up until you settle in*
429 *properly. (Charlotte, counsellor/home visitor)*

430 In general, the lack of post-trial care was blamed on inadequate policy guidance for
431 researchers in terms of how to support this phase of the trial. It was felt that the existing
432 guidelines lacked detail on important aspects of post-trial care which became a challenge for
433 researchers to plan for and implement them.

434 *And then, the other thing we have to put into mind is when you are budgeting, you*
435 *have budgeted for the study up to the exit, up to the closure. So you don't have more*
436 *funds to cater for people after this time, may be even the staff have been employed up*
437 *to that time. All these things keep, really tie us. [...] So even if you wanted, really you*
438 *can't. (Destiny, nurse)*

439 The participants recommended that policy makers include post-trial care into their
440 guidelines to make it mandatory for the researchers to provide post-trial support.

441 *So I would recommend that it is put into policy that every trial conducted, especially*
442 *clinical trials conducted, they should do a post-trial assessment to know how their*
443 *patients are doing. (Alloy, trial coordinator/nurse)*

444

445 *If it is an obligation or if it is a policy of an institution, then they can add it (post-trial*
446 *follow-up) on the budget; it can be added onto the budget and say 'for us we do this,*
447 *if it is a policy of an institution. (Jane, trial coordinator)*

448

449 4. **DISCUSSION**

450 The model presented in this paper shows that clinical trial closure is a complex
451 process for HIV positive participants in Uganda, and can be conceptualised as having 3
452 different phases, each with a range of emotional, socio-economic and practical needs
453 requiring different support strategies from trial staff. The model is supported by a recent
454 study (albeit in a different context) that similarly reported emotional and psychosocial
455 concerns as negative trial-closure outcomes. (7) In line with Cho and others,(1) our findings
456 emphasise the importance of providing care and support to trial participants to ensure a
457 smooth transition from research to non-research ('usual') care.

458 In this study, both research staff and participants expressed a strong need for a more
459 facilitated approach to the trial closure process, in terms of supporting participants to make
460 the transition back to usual care facilities at the end of a trial and maintaining contact to
461 ensure queries around side effects and information around trial outcomes could continue to be
462 shared. The ‘Facilitated Transition’ model describes key facilitation/care strategies that could
463 be applied to support participants during each of the three phases. The care needs of post-trial
464 participants varied depending on individual circumstances such as health status, economic
465 status, and available supportive structures, thereby requiring a case by case approach to post-
466 trial care, while trying to observe the general guidelines. Hence, the Facilitated Transition
467 Model depicts a person centred approach, and considers the need for ethical practice within a
468 flexible context-based framework.(24)

469 The pre-trial phase sets the pace for post-trial care by identifying trial participants’
470 expectations of post-trial care and is the beginning of preparation for trial closure. It is
471 recommended that post-trial care activities and outcomes (such as potential harms) be
472 disclosed to the participants before consent to participate, to facilitate the informed consent
473 process.(7) Relevant policies play a role at the pre-trial phase, to guide researchers on what is
474 expected of them in regards to post-trial care.(25, 26) The guidelines are expected to be
475 comprehensive enough to include activities that will be done to meet the post-trial needs of
476 the participants.(6)

477 The trial-closure phase highlights the main fears and concerns of trial participants
478 associated with leaving trial-related healthcare and finding suitable alternatives. The
479 psychological concerns that arise within the trial-closure phase mainly relate to the loss of the
480 quality care(8) in research related facilities which cannot be matched with that in the public
481 sector.(7) A recent systematic review similarly identified the loss of research-related care as
482 a cause of stress among post-trial participants and that affects their integration into the public

483 services.(16) Post-trial participants also go through a financial burden associated with
484 continued access to treatments especially for opportunistic infections (and especially among
485 those with low immunity). Various interventions are required to support the trial participants
486 during this phase, including psychological, financial and material support.(27, 28) In
487 addition, participants found a challenge of locating and reporting to new service providers,
488 and suggested that the process of linking to care needed to a more active approach from the
489 trial researchers.(29)

490 The post-trial phase is the period where trial participants adjust and get integrated into
491 the public healthcare system following trial exit. Participants report unique needs during this
492 phase that may affect their health and wellbeing, including access to HIV treatment and
493 prevention drugs, having to deal with the routines of the public healthcare system which are
494 largely unfavourable,(30) and looking for financial wellbeing. Since linkage to HIV care is
495 not a one off event,(30) our study recommends the need for supporting trial participants during
496 the post-trial phase, through a follow up mechanism and continuous engagement by research
497 staff (and other stakeholders), to enable them to get well established into the ‘new’ healthcare
498 system.(1)

499 A crosscutting concern across the whole transition journey is the lack of guidelines in
500 support of post-trial care. It was reported that limited support was provided in the post-trial
501 phase, as most activities were not actively planned for by the researchers. The trial documents
502 that were reviewed as part of the study found that they lacked guidance on some of the
503 important post-trial care aspects, as observed by other researchers.(6, 12) Our study
504 recommends the need for policies on post-trial care to be strengthened, by highlighting the
505 important post-trial care requirements and enforcing them in research practice.

506

507 **4.1 Transferability of the conceptual model**

508 The model of Facilitated Transition is primarily intended to guide the practice of
509 closure of HIV drug trials involving HIV positive individuals in Uganda, by providing flexible
510 guidelines which can be applied to different HIV drug trial contexts and geographical settings
511 in Uganda. These guidelines can however be applicable in other situations such as HIV drug
512 trial closure in other low income settings, transitioning of post-trial participants with other
513 chronic illnesses such as cancer, transitioning of individuals hospitalised for long periods and
514 re-establishing into the community/other healthcare settings, and settling of other groups of
515 individuals in the community e.g. from prisons.

516

517 **4.2 Limitations**

518 This was a single qualitative study that included a relatively small sample of
519 participants, which limits generalizability of the research findings beyond the studied sample
520 and context. Additionally, this study presented a potential for recall bias given that it was
521 undertaken retrospectively with some participants being interviewed close to 12 months
522 following trial exit. A larger prospective study on a similar population would improve
523 understanding of the studied phenomenon.

524

525 **4.3 Conclusions**

526 This article expands on the understanding of trial closure and post-trial care in HIV
527 drug trials involving HIV positive individuals in low income settings, by describing trial
528 closure as a process rather than a one-off event. The Facilitated Transition model explains the
529 process of transitioning from HIV research to ‘usual care’ facilities and offers guidelines on a
530 person-centred approach to post-trial care. By illustrating the concerns and needs of the
531 participants, and suggesting possible support approaches to address these, the model can thus

532 be useful in the planning and provision of post-trial care for HIV positive trial participants in
533 Uganda and related settings. This approach is likely to result into favourable health outcomes
534 for the participants.

535

536 5. **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

537 We acknowledge the participants who participated in this study for their time and
538 valuable views, the participating institutions and their staff for their effort and support during
539 study conduct, and the funders for SN's PhD study (Vice-Chancellor's Scholarship for
540 Research Excellence (International) and the University of Nottingham, United Kingdom)
541 under which the current study was undertaken.

542

543 6. **REFERENCES**

- 544 1. Cho HL, Danis M, Grady C. Post-trial responsibilities beyond post-trial access. The
545 Lancet. 2018;391(10129):1478-9.
- 546 2. Vallely A, Shagi C, Lees S, Shapiro K, Masanja J, Nikolau L, et al. Microbicides
547 Development Programme: Engaging the community in the standard of care debate in a
548 vaginal microbicide trial in Mwanza, Tanzania. BMC Medical Ethics. 2009;10.
- 549 3. Schroter S, Price A, Malički M, Richards T, Clarke M. Frequency and format of
550 clinical trial results dissemination to patients: a survey of authors of trials indexed in
551 PubMed. BMJ Open. 2019;9(10):e032701.
- 552 4. Chen R, Desai NR, Ross JS, Zhang W, Chau KH, Wayda B, et al. Publication and
553 reporting of clinical trial results: cross sectional analysis across academic medical centers.
554 BMJ. 2016;352:i637.

- 555 5. Nalubega S, Evans C. The views and experiences of HIV research participants in sub-
556 Saharan Africa: a worked example of a qualitative systematic review. *HIV Nursing*.
557 2014;14(3):15-20.
- 558 6. Slack CM. Ancillary care in South African HIV vaccine trials: addressing needs,
559 drafting protocols, and engaging community. *J Empir Res Hum Res Ethics*. 2014;9(1):83-95.
- 560 7. Lawton J, Blackburn M, Rankin D, Werner C, Farrington C, Hovorka R, et al.
561 Broadening the Debate About Post-trial Access to Medical Interventions: A Qualitative Study
562 of Participant Experiences at the End of a Trial Investigating a Medical Device to Support
563 Type 1 Diabetes Self-Management. *AJOB Empirical Bioethics*. 2019;10(2):100-12.
- 564 8. Odero I, Ondeng'e K, Mudhune V, Okola P, Oruko J, Otieno G, et al. Participant
565 satisfaction with clinical trial experience and post-trial transitioning to HIV care in Kenya. *Int*
566 *J STD AIDS*. 2018;956462418791946.
- 567 9. Gray-Burrows KA, Willis TA, Foy R, Rathfelder M, Bland P, Chin A, et al. Role of
568 patient and public involvement in implementation research: a consensus study. *BMJ Quality*
569 *& Safety*. 2018;27(10):858-64.
- 570 10. Dainesi SM, Goldbaum M. Post-trial access to study medication: a Brazilian e-survey
571 with major stakeholders in clinical research. *Journal of Medical Ethics*. 2012;38(12):757-62.
- 572 11. Haire B, Jordens C. Mind the gap: An empirical study of post-trial access in HIV
573 biomedical prevention trials. *Developing World Bioethics*. 2015;15(2):85-97.
- 574 12. Lewis K. Post-trial access to treatment: How managed access programs could be a
575 solution. *Medicine Access @ Point of Care*. 2018;2:2399202618795431.
- 576 13. UNCST. National Guidelines for Research involving Humans as Research
577 Participants. Kampala, Uganda: Uganda National Council for Science and Technology; 2014.

- 578 14. Nalubega S, Evans C. Participant views and experiences of participating in HIV
579 research in sub-Saharan Africa: a qualitative systematic review. *JBIC Database System Rev*
580 *Implement Rep.* 2015;13(5):330-420.
- 581 15. MacPhail C, Delany-Moretlwe S, Mayaud P. 'It's not about money, it's about my
582 health': determinants of participation and adherence among women in an HIV-HSV2
583 prevention trial in Johannesburg, South Africa. *Patient Prefer Adherence.* 2012;6:579-88.
- 584 16. Naidoo N, Nguyen VT, Ravaud P, Young B, Amiel P, Schanté D, et al. The research
585 burden of randomized controlled trial participation: a systematic thematic synthesis of
586 qualitative evidence. *BMC Med.* 2020;18(1):6.
- 587 17. Nalubega S, Cox K, Mugerwa H, Evans C. Moving to Another World: Understanding
588 the Impact of Clinical Trial Closure on Research Participants Living With HIV in Uganda. *J*
589 *Assoc Nurses AIDS Care.* 2019;30(5):e96-e108.
- 590 18. Nalubega S. Care in HIV drug trial closure: perspectives of research participants and
591 staff in Uganda. UK University of Nottingham 2017.
- 592 19. Charmaz K. *Constructing grounded theory* 2ed. London: Sage Publications; 2014.
- 593 20. Levy D. Qualitative methodology and grounded theory in property research. *Pacific*
594 *Rim Property Research Journal.*, 2006;12(4).
- 595 21. Charmaz K. *Constructing grounded theory : a practical guide through qualitative*
596 *analysis* London: Sage Publications,; 2006.
- 597 22. Mills J, Bonner A, Francis K. The development of grounded theory. *International*
598 *Journal of Qualitative Methods.* 2006;5(1).
- 599 23. Korstjens I, Mosery A. Series: Practical guidance to qualitative research. Part 4:
600 Trustworthiness and publishing. *Eur J Gen Pract.* 2018;24(1):120-4.
- 601 24. Haegert S. An African ethic for nursing? *Nursing Ethics.* 2000;7(6):492-502.

- 602 25. UNAIDS. Ethical considerations in biomedical HIV prevention trials. In: (UNAIDS)
603 JUNPoHA, editor.: UNAIDS/WHO; 2012.
- 604 26. Kwagala B, Wassenaar D, Ecuru J. Payments and Direct Benefits in HIV/AIDS
605 Related Research Projects in Uganda. *Ethics & Behavior*. 2010;20(2):95-109.
- 606 27. Lowther K, Harding R, Ahmed A, Gikaara N, Ali Z, Kariuki H, et al. Conducting
607 experimental research in marginalised populations: clinical and methodological implications
608 from a mixed-methods randomised controlled trial in Kenya. *AIDS Care*. 2016;28 Suppl
609 1:60-3.
- 610 28. Tweya H, Gugsu S, Hosseinipour M, Speight C, Ng'ambi W, Bokosi M, et al.
611 Understanding factors, outcomes and reasons for loss to follow-up among women in Option
612 B+ PMTCT programme in Lilongwe, Malawi. *Tropical Medicine & International Health*.
613 2014;19(11):1360-6.
- 614 29. Mugavero MJ. Predictors of Late Linkage to Medical Care After a New HIV
615 Diagnosis. 2011.
- 616 30. MacKellar DA, Williams D, Storer N, Okello V, Azih C, Drummond J, et al.
617 Enrollment in HIV Care Two Years after HIV Diagnosis in the Kingdom of Swaziland: An
618 Evaluation of a National Program of New Linkage Procedures. *PLoS ONE*.
619 2016;11(2):e0150086.
- 620 31. Held V. *The Ethics of Care, Personal, Political, and Global*. *The Ethics of Care as*
621 *Moral Theory*: Published to Oxford Scholarship Online.; 2005.
- 622 32. Beauchamp TL, Childress JF, editors. *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. 5 ed. Oxford:
623 University Press; 2001.
- 624 33. Bloch S, Green SA. An ethical framework for psychiatry. *Br J Psychiatry*.
625 2006;188:7-12.
- 626 34. Fry ST. The Role of Caring in a Theory of Nursing Ethics *Hypatia* 1989;4(2).

It is made available under a [CC-BY-NC 4.0 International license](#) .

627 35. Gonzales P. The Medical Model vs. The Nursing Model 2014.

628 36. Gilligan C. Ethics of care: Sharing views on good care. 2011.

629

Figure 1: Model of Facilitated Transition

