

# Online randomised trials with children: A scoping review

Simone Lepage<sup>1, 2\*</sup>¶ Aislinn Conway<sup>3</sup> Noah Goodson<sup>4</sup> Paul Wicks<sup>5</sup> Laura Flight<sup>6</sup> Declan Devane<sup>1, 2, 7, 8¶</sup>

1. Health Research Board – Trials Methodology Research Network (HRB-TMRN), University of Galway, Galway, H91E3YV, Ireland

2. School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Galway, Galway, H91E3YV, Ireland

3. Evidence Synthesis Ireland, University of Galway, Galway, H91E3YV, Ireland

4. Data & Analytics, Thread Research, Tustin, California, 92780, USA

5. Wicks Digital Health, Lichfield, Staffordshire, WS13 6AQ, United Kingdom

6. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester M1 4BT, United Kingdom

7. Evidence Synthesis Ireland, University of Galway, Galway, H91E3YV, Ireland

8. Cochrane Ireland, University of Galway, Galway, H91E3YV, Ireland

\*Corresponding author: E-mail: [s.lepage1@universityofgalway.ie](mailto:s.lepage1@universityofgalway.ie) (SL)

¶These authors contributed equally to this work.

## Abstract

**Background:** Paediatric trials must contend with many challenges that adult trials face but often bring additional obstacles. Decentralised trials, where some or all trial methods occur away from a

23 centralised location, are a promising strategy to help meet these challenges. This scoping review  
24 aims to (a) identify what methods and tools have been used to create and conduct entirely online-  
25 decentralised trials with children and (b) determine the gaps in the knowledge in this field. This  
26 review will describe the methods used in these trials to identify their facilitators and the gaps in the  
27 knowledge.

28 **Methods:** The methods were informed by guidance from the Joanna Briggs Institute and the  
29 PRISMA extension for scoping reviews. We systematically searched MEDLINE, CENTRAL, CINAHL, and  
30 Embase databases, trial registries, pre-print servers, and the internet. We included randomised and  
31 quasi-randomised trials conducted entirely online with participants under 18 published in English. A  
32 risk of bias assessment was completed for all included studies.

33 **Results:** Twenty-one trials met our inclusion criteria. The average age of participants was 14.6 years.  
34 Social media was the most common method of online recruitment. Most trials employed an external  
35 host website to store and protect their data. Duration of trials ranged from single-session  
36 interventions up to ten weeks. Fourteen trials compensated participants. Eight trials involved  
37 children in their trial design process; none reported compensation for this. Most trials had a low risk  
38 of bias in “random sequence generation”, “selective reporting”, and “other”. Most trials had a high  
39 risk of bias in “blinding participants and personnel”, “blinding of outcome assessment”, and  
40 “incomplete outcome data”. “Allocation concealment” was unclear in most studies.

41 **Conclusions:** There was a lack of transparent reporting of the recruitment, randomisation, and  
42 retention methods used in many of the trials included in this review. Patient and public involvement  
43 (PPI) was not common, and the compensation of PPI partners was not reported in any study.  
44 Consent methods and protection against fraudulent entries to trials were creative and thoroughly  
45 discussed by some trials and not addressed by others. More work and thorough reporting of how  
46 these trials are conducted is needed to increase their reproducibility and quality.

47 **Ethics and Dissemination:** Ethical approval was not necessary since all data sources used are publicly  
48 available.

49

## 50 Introduction

51 Randomised controlled trials (RCTs) are designed to minimise bias in evaluating healthcare  
52 interventions. When well executed, RCTs can provide credible evidence to help researchers  
53 determine the effectiveness of an intervention [1]. While the number of trials is growing [2],  
54 concerns are consistently raised about the quality of trials [3]. RCTs are often expensive and  
55 complex, and paediatric trials bring additional obstacles [4], including added ethical challenges [5],  
56 scarcity of funding [5-6], and recruitment barriers [2]. In 2015, a retrospective study of 559  
57 paediatric RCTs found that 19% (n = 104) were discontinued early [6]. A 2022 review of 13,259 trials  
58 in people under 18 found that 11% (n = 903) were discontinued before completion due primarily to  
59 recruitment barriers [4]. Not only are paediatric trials more challenging to navigate and complete,  
60 but fewer are also conducted [2]. In an analysis of 4,146 RCTs, Groff et al. identified 14.2% (n = 591)  
61 of trials enrolled paediatric participants, 67.3% (n = 2794) enrolled adults, and 18.3% (n = 761)  
62 enrolled both [2]. The U.S. government and European Parliament have issued policies in the last two  
63 decades calling for more high-quality paediatric clinical trials to increase medicinal safety and  
64 efficacy for children [5, 7-8]. Despite these initiatives, paediatric trials are still underfunded [6],  
65 conducted less frequently [2], and published less often [4, 6].

66

67 One strategy increasingly used to address the challenges of conducting randomised trials is  
68 decentralising the trial [9-11]. A *decentralised trial* is an umbrella term that captures trial methods  
69 that occur away from a central point of trial conduct, i.e., collecting data via multiple mobile clinics  
70 instead of one large hospital, leveraging digital technologies (e.g., wearable devices), or moving a  
71 trial entirely online [12]. Decentralised trials offer wider-reaching recruitment opportunities [11],  
72 diversify a population sample [10], decrease the burden of involvement on participants [12], and  
73 research waste and trial costs [11-12]. These trials have existed for many years [9-12]; however, the

74 COVID-19 pandemic has emphasised their potential. Many clinical trials were halted in early 2020,  
75 but Price et al. [12] found that by May 2020, participant recruitment in decentralised trials not only  
76 recovered from this forced pause but exceeded pre-pandemic recruitment. In a survey of 1,002  
77 rheumatology patients in 2020, Mirza et al. [13] reported that over 75% of patients responded  
78 positively to decentralised interventions such as remote trial visits.

79

80 Despite their advantages, researchers and reviewers have expressed apprehension about the ability  
81 of decentralised, particularly entirely online, trial methods to produce reliable results [14]. Online  
82 trials require careful and critical planning to sample appropriate populations, avoid fraudulent data,  
83 and ethically incentivise participants [14]. While decentralised strategies promise to improve trial  
84 processes, not all trials lend themselves to complete decentralisation. Partially decentralised or  
85 ‘hybrid’ trials have grown in numbers in the last two decades [9]. Hybrid trials include an aspect of  
86 decentralisation combined with traditional methods [10, 12].

87

88 In this paper, we are interested in fully online RCTs with children to inform the design and conduct of  
89 our own online trial with children. Given the absence of guidance for decentralised paediatric trials,  
90 this scoping review aims to (a) identify what methods and tools were used to conduct online trials  
91 with children and (b) determine the gaps in the knowledge. We describe recruitment methods,  
92 consent, data collection, compensation, loss to follow-up, and public and patient involvement (PPI)  
93 in online trials within paediatric populations. We also assess the risk of bias (RoB) for each trial and  
94 identify facilitators in the conduct of these trials.

95

## 96 **Methods**

97 The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses extension for Scoping  
98 Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) [15], the Joanna Briggs Institute’s Manual for Evidence Synthesis [16] and

99 Peters et al. [17] guided the review process. The completed PRISMA-ScR checklist is available in S1  
100 Checklist.

101

## 102 **Protocol, registration, and ethics**

103 The published protocol for this scoping review details our methodology [18]. The study is registered  
104 with Open Science Framework (OSF) at (<https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/WHJXY>) [19]. Ethical  
105 approval was not required as all included data sources are publicly available.

106

## 107 **Information sources, search strategies, and eligibility**

### 108 **criteria**

#### 109 **Information sources**

110 We searched the following sources:

- 111 1. Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL),
- 112 2. Cumulated Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) (EBSCO),
- 113 3. Embase (Elsevier),
- 114 4. MEDLINE (Ovid).
- 115 5. World Health Organization's (WHO) International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP)
- 116 6. EU Clinical Trials Register
- 117 7. NIH Clinical Trials Register
- 118 8. medRxiv, JMIR Preprints, HRB Open Research, and Advance from SAGE for pre-prints
- 119 9. Google and Google Scholar.

120

## 121 **Search strategies**

122 A detailed description of how the search strategy was devised is outlined in the protocol [18]. The  
123 strategy was constructed by SL and modified and finalised by an information and knowledge  
124 translation specialist (AC). The search strategies for all databases used are available in S2 Appendix.  
125 To search trial registries and preprint servers, we used the strategy developed in MEDLINE to guide  
126 us iteratively. We used different search terms and string combinations because preprint servers and  
127 trial registries do not allow for the same search complexity level as database libraries. The search  
128 strategies used for all grey literature searches are in S3 Appendix. We manually searched the  
129 reference lists of all studies that met the inclusion criteria. Searches were limited to English-language  
130 publications. We did not limit our search by date as detailed in S2 and S3 Appendices.

131

## 132 **Eligibility criteria**

133 Inclusion criteria were as follows:

- 134 1. randomised or quasi-randomised trials
- 135 2. participants under 18 years
- 136 3. children had to be active participants who contributed data
- 137 4. digital technologies connected to the internet had to be the primary method used in each  
138 trial phase.

139 Posters and conference abstracts were excluded due to the likely paucity of methods reporting.

140 All inclusion and exclusion criteria were pre-determined and detailed in the protocol [18]. One  
141 additional criterion was added after the protocol was published to clarify the required age of study  
142 participants. Trials where participants were an age-range cohort (e.g., 16- to 25- year-olds) and  $\geq$   
143 60% were under 18 years (e.g., 100 participants aged 16 to 25, and 65 of them were 18 years or  
144 under) were included. If a trial did not specify the exact number of participants under or above 18,  
145 the mean age of all participants had to be under 18-years-old.

146

## 147 **Screening and selecting evidence sources**

148 Following the search, all identified citations were imported into EndNote20 [20], the libraries were  
149 collated, and duplicates were removed. These titles and abstracts were uploaded into Covidence, a  
150 web-based software developed by the Cochrane group to streamline evidence synthesis reviews  
151 [21]. We originally planned to use SysRev [22] to screen titles, abstracts, and full texts, but this  
152 changed from the protocol during the piloting process. Covidence allowed us to expedite screening,  
153 as the two authors were more familiar with this software.

154

155 An initial pilot test (performed by SL and DD) screening 50 abstracts resulted in inter-rater reliability  
156 (IRR) of 72% using Cohen's kappa [23]. As outlined in the protocol, the target IRR was 75%, so the  
157 same two authors completed an additional pilot with 100 abstracts. This second pilot resulted in an  
158 IRR of 90%. In the interest of resource conservation and the designated screening author's  
159 familiarity with the review's objectives, a single author (SL) screened the remaining titles and  
160 abstracts. Two authors (SL and DD) completed a full-text pilot of 50 trials independently with an IRR  
161 of 77% calculated using Cohen's kappa [23]. The goal IRR was 75%, and per the protocol, one author  
162 (SL) screened the remaining full texts.

163

## 164 **Data charting**

165 Two authors (SL and DD) piloted the original data charting form published in the protocol and  
166 modified it to capture all pertinent data appropriately. Because the data charting process for this  
167 review was mainly narrative, an IRR was not calculated. To ensure a satisfactory level of agreement  
168 between reviewers, they independently charted five reports with the new data charting form,  
169 discussed any discrepancies, and came to a consensus. A single author (SL) charted all additional full  
170 texts. Data were charted using the primary articles and, where applicable, the protocols of the trials.

171 Study authors were not contacted for further information. The data charting form can be accessed in  
172 S4 Form.

173

174 We used the Cochrane Group’s RoB1 tool [24] as all included trials were either randomised or quasi-  
175 randomised and lent themselves to this assessment. Two authors (SL and DD) completed the RoB  
176 assessments independently and in duplicate. We consulted a third author (LF) for one trial with a  
177 persistent discrepancy in one domain. As published in the protocol [18], we planned to use  
178 RobotReviewer [25], an automated risk of bias assessment tool. We deviated from the protocol  
179 here, as using the automation tool and two independent reviewers was redundant.

180

## 181 **Data synthesis**

182 We described the general characteristics, recruitment methods, consent, data collection,  
183 compensation, loss to follow-up, public and patient involvement (PPI), RoB, and any findings  
184 pertinent to this review in online trials within paediatric populations.

185

## 186 **Results**

### 187 **Search results**

188 We screened 6,957 titles and abstracts and excluded 6,550 records. We screened 407 full texts.  
189 Twenty full texts met the inclusion criteria. These records’ references were manually searched, and  
190 one additional full text was added, resulting in 21 studies identified that met the inclusion criteria.  
191 Fig. 1 captures the information sources, search results, justifications for excluding full texts, and  
192 identification strategy for relevant studies in the PRISMA flow diagram [26].

193

194 **Figure 1. PRISMA 2020 flow diagram.**

195



## 196 Characteristics of included studies

197 Table 1 displays the basic characteristics of all included trials [27-47]. The years of publication of the  
 198 studies ranged from 2014 to 2022, where the majority (n = 14) were published in the last two years.  
 199 There were four pilot trials. The number of participants ranged from 45 to 2,452. The pilot trials had,  
 200 on average, fewer participants ( $\bar{x}$  = 86) than the full trials ( $\bar{x}$  = 560.7). The mean age of children who  
 201 participated was 14.6 years. Of the 21 included trials, seven were single-session interventions, and  
 202 one was unclear (Table 1). The remaining 13 trials ranged in duration from three- to ten- weeks.  
 203  
 204 Because of the breadth of our scoping review, the included studies are heterogeneous in design,  
 205 aims, and topic of study. We categorised the trials into four groups: mental health (n = 13),  
 206 substance use issues (n = 2), sexual health (n = 1), and public health and education (n = 5). Four trials  
 207 collected data contributed by both caregivers and children. Four of the 21 trials reported on gender  
 208 or sexual minority identification. Two trials intentionally enrolled only female participants, and one  
 209 intentionally enrolled only males. Sixteen trials reported race or ethnicity (S5 Table). All 16 reported  
 210 that most participants were White, the largest racial group in their respective countries of conduct  
 211 [48-54].

212  
 213 **Table 1. Overview of characteristics of included studies.**

Study (country)	Study type	Number of participants randomised <sup>s</sup>	Age of participants (mean age) in years	Intervention duration	Topic of study	Contribution of data by caregivers	Participants by reported gender %
Amsalem and Martin, 2022 (U.S.A.)	RT	1,183	14-18 (16.8)	SSI	Mental health	No	47.0 female 53.0 male
Arnaud et al., 2016 (Belgium, Czech Republic, Germany, Sweden)	RT	1,449	16-18 (16.8)	SSI	Substance use	No	48.2 female 51.8 male
Bragg et al., 2021 (U.S.A.)	RT	832	13-17 (14.7)	SSI	Public health	No	48.8 female 51.2 male
Craig et al., 2016 (U.S.A.)	RT	59 (child/caregiver dyads)	7-11 (9.7)	10 weeks	Mental health	Yes	41.0 female 59.0 male
Dobias et al., 2021 (U.S.A.)	RT	565	13-16 (14.9)	SSI	Mental health	No	A

Egan et al., 2021 (U.S.A.)	RT	240	14-18 (15.8)	4 weeks	Mental health	No	B
Ghaderi et al., 2020 (Sweden)	RT	443	15-20 (17.3)	4 weeks	Mental health	No	100.0 female 0.0 male
Green e et al., 2020 (U.S.A.)	RT	713	12-17 (14.7)	3 weeks	Substance use	No	66.0 female 34.0 male
Hillhouse et al., 2017 (U.S.A.)	RT	443 (child/caregiver dyads)	12-18 (15.2)	Unclear, likely an SSI	Public health	No	100.0 female 0.0 male
Kelleher, Moreno, & Wilt, 2018 (U.S.A.)	Pilot RT	45	15-23 (17.5)	SSI	Mental health	No	65.0 female 35.0 male
Lester et al., 2019 (Canada, Columbia, U.S.A.)	Pilot RT	51	12-17 (14.4)	8 weeks	Mental health	No	41.0 female 59.0 female
Mani cavasagar et al., 2014 (Australia)	RT	235	12-18 (15.4)	6 weeks	Mental health	No	67.5 female 32.5 male
Mogil et al., 2021 (U.S.A.)	RT	200 (families)	3-6 (4.5)	4-10 weeks	Public health	Yes	51.2 female 48.8 male
Moreno et al., 2021 (U.S.A.)	RT	1,520 (child/caregiver dyads)	12-17 (14.5)	8 weeks	Public health	Yes	51.9 female 48.1 male
Nelson et al., 2022 (U.S.A.)	Pilot RT	154	14-17 (16)	3 weeks	Sexual health	No	0.0 female 100.0 male
O'Connor et al., 2020 (Canada)	Pilot RT	94	13-17 (15.3)	8 weeks	Mental health	No	90.0 female 10.0 male
O'Dea et al., 2020 (Australia)	RT	193	12-16 (14.8)	SSI	Mental health	No	86.5 female 13.5 male
Parker, Scull, & Morrison, 2022 (U.S.A.)	RT	132	8-14 (10.9)	3 weeks	Public health	Yes	49.5 female 50.5 male
Radomski et al., 2020 (Canada)	RT	536	13-19 (16.6)	6 weeks	Mental health	No	71.3 female 28.7 male
Schleider et al., 2022 (U.S.A.)	RT	2,452	13-16 (14.8)	SSI	Mental health	No	88.1 <sup>c</sup>
Schwinn et al., 2015 (U.S.A.)	RT	236	15-16 (16.1)	4 weeks	Mental health	No	49.6 <sup>d</sup>

214 <sup>s</sup>=number of participants refers to either the number of children OR the number of child-caregiver groups randomised

215 RT\* = Randomised trial

216 SSI \*\* = Single-session intervention

217 A = 37.35% of participants in Dobias et al. identified as a gender minority

218 B = Egan et al. collected the following data: 16.3% identified as a cisgender girl, 36.7% as a cisgender boy, and 47.1% as a  
219 gender minority

220 <sup>c</sup> = Schleider et al. reported on 16 gender categories, and 80% of participants identified as a sexual minority

221 <sup>d</sup> =Schwinn et al. reported that 18.3% of participants identified as a gender minority

222

## 223 Recruitment methods

224 Social media was the most used platform for recruiting participants (n=15), and nine trials relied on

225 it exclusively. Seven trials leveraged multiple methods for their recruitment. Four trials only used

226 external, professional recruitment panels for their online recruitment, and one used email alone.

227 Detailed recruitment methods for all trials are available in S6 Table.

228

229 Of the social media platforms, Facebook, or a combination of Facebook and one or more additional

230 social media platforms, was used in 53.3% (n = 8/15) of trials. Seven of the 15 trials (46.7%) using

231 social media used Instagram, exclusively or in combination with others. Four trials did not identify

232 which social media platforms they used.

233

234 All seven trials using multiple recruitment methods employed an alternative form of online

235 advertising to social media, i.e., banner ads on different web pages, search engine advertising, live-

236 streaming events, and email listservs. Of these seven trials, six combined other online advertising

237 with social media. Three trials used a dedicated website for recruitment, combined with at least one

238 other method [28, 33-34] (S6 Table). Table 2 illustrates the online platforms leveraged by the

239 included trials and the social media platforms used.

240

241 Eight trials combined their online recruitment with offline advertising of the trial [28-29, 33-34, 38-

242 39, 42, 45]. Offline recruitment included advertisements in communities, through healthcare

243 professionals, and schools. Offline recruitment details are available in S6 Table.

244

245 **Table 2. Online platforms and specific social media platforms used for recruitment to trials.**

Study	Online platforms used for recruitment	Social media platform(s) used for recruitment
Amsalem and Martin, 2022	External Recruitment Panel	No
Arnaud et al., 2016	Multiple	Yes, platform not reported
Bragg et al., 2021	External Recruitment Panel	No
Craig et al., 2016	Multiple	Yes, platform not reported
Dobias et al., 2021	Social media	IG
Egan et al., 2021	Multiple	FB, IG
Ghaderi et al., 2020	Multiple	FB, IG
Greene et al., 2020	Multiple	FB
Hillhouse et al., 2017	External Recruitment Panel	No
Kelleher, Moreno, & Wilt, 2018	Social media	TR
Lester et al., 2019	Email	No
Manicavasagar et al., 2014	Multiple	No
Mogil et al., 2021	Social media	Yes, platform not reported
Moreno et al., 2021	External Recruitment Panel	No

Nelson et al., 2022	Social media	FB, IG
O'Connor et al., 2020	Multiple	FB, IG, TW
O'Dea et al., 2020	Social media	FB
Parker, Scull, & Morrison, 2022	Social media	Yes, platform not reported
Radomski et al., 2020	Social media	FB, IG, TR, TW
Schleider et al., 2022	Social media	IG
Schwinn et al., 2015	Social media	FB

246 FB= Facebook, IG= Instagram, TR= Tumblr, TW= Twitter

247

## 248 **Consent**

249 All included trials reported acquiring consent from participants. Parental/caregiver consent was  
250 required in twelve of the trials [29-30, 34-35, 37-40, 42-45], waived in five of them [31, 33, 41, 46-  
251 47] and not reported in four [27-28, 32, 36]. Ten trials validated participants' consent via attention-  
252 check questions, quality-check questions, ongoing consent, and orientation videos [29-31, 34, 37, 39,  
253 41-42, 45, 47].

254

255 Seven trials [27, 29, 31-33, 36, 38] sent links to their participants via email or a direct social media  
256 message to direct them to an e-consent form. Five trials [40-42, 45-46] used an external website  
257 (e.g., Qualtrics, REDCap, IRIS) that hosted their e-consent. Participants were automatically redirected  
258 through a click-link to an external website for the consent process. Two trials [37, 39] acquired  
259 consent verbally through videoconferencing, one used a dedicated study website [43], and one used  
260 a dedicated study app [47]. One trial accepted consent through email, text messages, their  
261 dedicated website, and fax and mail [34]. Four trials [28, 30, 35, 44] did not report the methods used  
262 to gain consent, stating only that it was acquired, although Craig et al. [30] described the procedures  
263 leading up to consent.

264

## 265 **Data collection**

266 Over half of the trials (52.4%, n=11) used externally hosted websites specialised in data collection.

267 Five trials reported using an externally hosted website and their own internally hosted, dedicated

268 websites. Four trials reported collecting data with their own dedicated study website with no  
269 additional external-host platform.

270

271 Not all trials employed websites for data collection. Mogil et al. [39] reported capturing their data via  
272 videoconferencing without specifying the platform. Four trials [34-36, 44] used surveys sent to  
273 participants for completion and return, and one study [47] did not specify how they collected their  
274 data, only that it was done online. Three trials used validation to protect against duplicate or  
275 fraudulent entries to the trial [27, 36, 41]. Validation methods included open-ended questions,  
276 CAPTCHA questions, timers (to ensure participants were not simply clicking through the questions),  
277 flagging suspicious IP addresses or geographical coordinates, and short completion times.

278

## 279 **Compensation**

280 Table 3 summarises the compensation offered to participants in the 14 trials that reported on  
281 compensation. The type of compensation differed among trials, but half reported using an e-gift  
282 card or e-voucher (n=7). Five trials did not report the form of compensation, only the amount, and  
283 two offered a chance to win an e-voucher or other prize. Compensation ranged from a US \$3.50 one-  
284 time payment to US \$120 to complete all study requirements. None of the trials that required  
285 caregiver consent or included data submitted by both caregivers and children specified who received  
286 the compensation.

287

288 **Table 3. Compensation type and amounts reported.**

Study	Form of compensation offered	Amount/ gift/ benefit offered
Amsalem and Martin, 2022	NR	US \$3.50
Arnaud et al., 2016	Prize draw competition	Tablet computer
Dobias et al., 2021	Cash prize draw competition	1-in-10 chance of winning US \$25 at baseline, US \$5 guaranteed at follow-up
Egan et al., 2021	NR	US \$10 at baseline, US \$25 at post-test, US \$50 at follow-up
Ghaderi et al., 2020	Multiple	FB, IG
Greene et al., 2020	NR	US \$10 at baseline, US \$10 at post-test, US \$10 at follow-up
Hillhouse et al., 2017	NR	up to US \$120 for completing all study requirements

Kelleher, Moreno, & Wilt, 2018	E-gift card/voucher	US \$10 at survey completion
Nelson et al., 2022	E-gift card/voucher	US \$15 at baseline, US \$25 at post-test, US \$35 at follow-up, US \$20 bonus for all three assessments
O'Dea et al., 2020	E-gift card/voucher	AU \$15 at baseline, AU \$15 at post-test, AU \$15 at follow-up
Parker, Scull, & Morrison, 2022	NR	US \$20 at baseline, US \$30 at follow-up
Radomski et al., 2020	E-gift card/voucher	CA \$25
Schleider et al., 2022	E-gift card/voucher	Up to US \$20
Schwinn et al., 2015	E-gift card/voucher	US \$25 at baseline, US \$30 at post-test, US \$45 at follow-up

289 NR= Not reported

290

## 291 **Loss to follow-up**

292 The trials included in this scoping review reported attrition differently and often with differing  
 293 terminology. The attrition rates can be found in the complete RoB tables in S7 Appendix.  
 294  
 295 Single-session interventions accounted for seven of the 21 trials (most likely eight, however,  
 296 Hillhouse et al. [35] did not report the duration of their intervention), and six of those (including  
 297 Hillhouse et al.) collected follow-up data. The remaining 13 trials varied in duration, and nine  
 298 collected follow-up data. Arnaud et al. [28] had the highest loss to follow-up rate (intervention,  
 299 84.9% & comparison, 86%) of all included trials. This trial had the third largest number of  
 300 participants (n = 1,449), was a single-session intervention, and had a 3-month follow-up assessment.  
 301 The authors hypothesised that this high dropout rate might be due to either invalid email addresses  
 302 provided by participants or the use of only one reminder email sent to each participant [28]. Bragg  
 303 et al. [29] was a single-session intervention with no follow-up data requirements conducted with 832  
 304 participants, offered no compensation, but reported the lowest loss to follow-up (reported as 6.5%  
 305 across combined intervention and comparator arms). Thirteen trials sent reminders to participants  
 306 [28, 32-33, 37-38, 40-43, 45-46] for enrolment, retention, or follow-up data collection.

307

## 308 **Children’s input in the design or conduct of trials**

309 Thirty-eight percent of the 21 trials (n = 8) collected input from children to inform their trial design  
310 or conduct [28, 32, 34-35, 37, 41-42, 44]. Half of these trials reported conducting pilot tests of their  
311 interventions for participants’ feedback. Only one trial [34] reported how they recruited their PPI  
312 group and provided their ages. Two trials [42, 44] collected input from clinicians and participants,  
313 and Parker, Scull & Morrison [44] further collected feedback from parents. Egan et al. [32]  
314 interviewed 20 youths from their target population to inform their trial design. Nelson et al. [41]  
315 assembled a youth advisory group and conducted a cross-sectional survey with their target  
316 demographic to inform the design and content of their intervention website. None of the trials  
317 discussed PPI compensation.

318

## 319 **Risk of bias (RoB) assessment**

320 The complete RoB tables for each trial are available in S7 Appendix. Fig. 2 displays the RoB summary  
321 data. The three domains where most assessments were ‘low’ risk were “random sequence  
322 generation” (n = 12), “selective reporting” (n = 14), and “other” bias (n = 17). ‘Unclear’ risk  
323 assessments were most common in “allocation concealment” (n = 11). The three domains with the  
324 most ‘high’ risk assessments were “blinding of participants and personnel” (n = 13), “blinding of  
325 outcome assessment” (n = 11), and “incomplete outcome data” (n = 11). The trial with the least risk  
326 of bias assessments was Schleider et al. [46] with six ‘low’ risk assessments. Four trials had five ‘low’  
327 risk assessments across domains (Arnaud et al. [28], Ghaderi et al. [33], Nelson et al. [41], and O’Dea  
328 et al. [43]). The trial with the most (n = 5) uncertainty in risk of bias across domains was Schwinn et  
329 al. [47]. The trials with the highest risk of bias across domains (n = 5) were Manicavasagar et al. [38]  
330 and O’Connor et al. [42].

331

332 **Figure 2. Risk of bias (RoB) assessment summary for all included trials.**

333

334

## 335 **Discussion**

336 We identified 21 trials with children conducted entirely online that met our inclusion criteria from  
337 6,957 screened, highlighting the scarcity of published research in this area. We found that the  
338 reporting of recruitment, retention and public involvement methods in the included studies were  
339 not always sufficient to assess or replicate. Consent acquisition, data collection, and compensation  
340 methods were reported more thoroughly.

341

342 Social media was used most often for recruitment purposes, and where studies discussed  
343 recruitment efforts, social media expedited this process for them [32-33, 42-43, 46]. Ten trials  
344 created dedicated study websites, but only three [28, 33-34] reported using them in their  
345 recruitment efforts. Newly created websites only receive traffic from word-of-mouth, seed  
346 recruitment (where one participant is responsible for recruiting other participants), advertising via  
347 other websites or search engines, and offline media. Relying on dedicated study websites or emailing  
348 listservs exclusively generated the least amount of enrolment. Four trials used commercial  
349 recruitment platforms, which advertise that they can recruit rapidly and cost-effectively, but there  
350 are concerns they lack transparency on cost, bias, and potential over-use of a narrow participant  
351 pool [9, 14].

352

353 A recent scoping review of 33 studies (1/33 was with children) examining recruitment to clinical  
354 trials via social media, traditional methods, and other online media reported that seven out of 20  
355 trials had the highest recruitment rates with social media compared to other methods [55]. Since  
356 most social media platforms have a lower age limit of 13 [56], and the digital age of consent varies  
357 across countries [57], researchers need to consider both the legal and ethical implications of



358 targeting social media recruitment toward children. Five trials in our review included children under  
359 13 and reported using social media for recruitment [30, 34, 39, 43-44]. Three of these trials [30, 34,  
360 39] reported targeting parents on social media, and two [34, 43] did not. Considering that all studies  
361 in our review received ethical approval, it is possible that social media advertising was targeted  
362 toward caregivers, but we are unable to make that assessment. Social media is an effective  
363 recruitment tool to reach adolescents who have higher social media usage than older adults [58],  
364 but not always appropriate for all paediatric populations.

365

366 Very little was reported on retention methods, and no analyses were done on the participant  
367 retention rates and engagement efforts. Online trials are often less burdensome for participants as  
368 they do not impose in-person interactions that may require travel, increased time commitments,  
369 and scheduling problems. This could result in higher participant retention; however, based on this  
370 review's findings, we cannot tease out which methods used to engage and retain child  
371 participants might have most potential. Delineating recruitment and retention in trials can be  
372 challenging. When a website or app is part of a trial, their ease of use, and visual impression affects  
373 how participants view the trial. Because of this, the technology and methods used for recruitment  
374 and delivering the trial intervention are linked intricately with a trial's retention rates. There were  
375 trials in our study that had high-quality data and high retention of participants showing that  
376 choosing suitable strategies to undertake online trials with children is possible and appropriate.

377

378 Our review found a lack of PPI input, and that input was not always sufficiently reported. Of the  
379 eight trials that sought feedback or input from children in the design of their trials, only one  
380 reported on how they recruited for their PPI group. Online advisory groups may be difficult to  
381 navigate logistically and therefore present a challenge to trial design; however, the involvement of  
382 PPI is key to increasing inclusivity and relevance of trial outcomes [59]. Further research is needed

383 on how online children’s PPI groups are best compensated so that it can be integrated into trial  
384 design.

385

386 The trials in our review did not report on cost analyses or comparisons, so we cannot make any  
387 assessments regarding the cost of different recruitment methods in online trials with children. Cost  
388 comparisons would be useful for trialists, although it may be difficult to determine if the cost of  
389 different online recruitment and retention methods affect those outcomes. However, beyond  
390 relying on the public, professional and advocacy groups to ‘share’ the trial details, all social media  
391 advertising incurs a cost, as do advertisements on search engines, websites, and the use of external  
392 recruitment panels. In two recent reviews that examined cost-effectiveness of online recruitment  
393 methods [55, 60], social media had a lower cost per enrollee than traditional enrolment methods.

394

395 Consent invitation processes varied, with e-consent links emailed or sent direct messages via social  
396 media to interested or potentially interested participants as the most common tool. Automated re-  
397 direction links to external websites were the second most common method. Ten trials [29-31, 34, 37,  
398 39, 41-42, 45, 47] in our review created consent validation checks demonstrating creative and varied  
399 methods to increase their participants’ comprehension of the trial.

400

401 A 2020 scoping review of 69 papers describing electronic informed consent in medical centres  
402 (three paediatric trials, one trial with both children and adults, 65 with adults) found no universal  
403 approach to gaining consent online, and the legal requirements for consent by country or region  
404 varied [61]. Nine of the 69 trials found that participants understood online consent more easily than  
405 traditional, paper consent forms and that online or e-consent forms may present a more streamlined  
406 approach in paediatric trials because in-person parental consent appointments often challenge  
407 parents and researchers [61].

408

409 Data collection methods were reported thoroughly in most of the trials included in our review. No  
410 challenges were reported in achieving adequate data protection measures, and external host  
411 websites appeared to fit this need for several studies. Where studies addressed fraudulent or  
412 duplicate entries (when a participant submits data or enters the trial more than once for incentive  
413 purposes or purely by mistake) this was addressed comprehensively and creatively, demonstrating  
414 several ways to decrease the likelihood of their occurrence [27, 36, 41].

415

416 No barriers were reported regarding the online compensation of participants. E-gift cards or  
417 vouchers were the most common and acceptable compensation in the trials included here.

418

419 Based on the findings of this review, we have collated the following considerations when designing  
420 and conducting online trials with children:

- 421 • social media and ‘other’ online advertising may expedite recruitment efforts in these  
422 populations
- 423 • consider the age demographics of the targeted participant pool
- 424 • combine methods of online recruitment to widen the participant pool
- 425 • consider conducting a SWAT (Study Within A Trial [62]) to help determine which  
426 recruitment methods best fit the needs of the trial
- 427 • consider transparency of sampling, randomisation and recruitment methods if employing  
428 commercial recruitment platforms
- 429 • involve PPI input as early as possible
- 430 • PPI group recruitment and involvement for online trials should occur online
- 431 • implement appropriate compensation for PPI partners
- 432 • embed consent validation methods to ensure informed consent/assent (e.g., questions to  
433 participants to check for understanding, using timers on screens to encourage all

434 information has been read or heard, double-checking IP addresses to decrease duplicate  
435 entries)

- 436 • check country and regional laws for online consent guidance
- 437 • fit-for-purpose external host websites store data securely and may assist in efficient data  
438 collection.

439

## 440 **Strengths and limitations**

441 We used a robust search strategy across a broad scope of literature sources. We did not limit our  
442 searches by date and applied a quality assessment of included studies completed independently by  
443 two reviewers in duplicate. We conducted our screenings and data charting in a reproducible and  
444 transferable manner. We assessed the included studies using a practical approach to understand and  
445 inform key stakeholders of the gaps in the knowledge, as well as which methods used in designing  
446 and conducting online trials with children were effective.

447

448 We limited our search to the English language publications because translation services would  
449 require additional resources. After the pilot screenings of the pre-determined number of abstracts  
450 and full texts, one author completed the remainder of those processes. While this provides  
451 consistency, independent duplicate screening may be preferable.

452

453 Two authors piloted the data charting of five included studies to determine the levels of agreement,  
454 and one author charted the remaining studies' data. Because the trials were so heterogeneous,  
455 some comparisons between trials were not possible. This was an anticipated and acceptable  
456 limitation since the methodologies were of greater interest than the trial outcomes. This scoping  
457 review's sole focus is online, randomised trials with children to identify and describe the methods  
458 and tools used to design and conduct these trials. We acknowledge there remains a large digital

459 divide through either economic disadvantage, infrastructure availability or personal choice. Nearly  
460 half of the world’s population remains offline [63], creating an entirely different ethical dilemma  
461 when conducting these trials.

462

## 463 **Conclusions**

464 The methods, facilitators, and gaps in the knowledge of how online, randomised trials with children  
465 are conducted were identified and described; most trials used social media for multiple phases of  
466 their trials, although this may not always be the most suitable platform for these methods. More in-  
467 depth consideration of target age groups, population, and PPI input should inform the design and  
468 conduct of these trials, and more thorough reporting of the methods is needed in future studies.

## 469 **Acknowledgements**

470 This work contributes to one of the authors’ (SL) doctoral projects. SL’s PhD is funded by the College  
471 of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences at the University of Galway and by the Health Research  
472 Board (HRB, Ireland) through a grant to the Health Research Board-Trials Methodology Research  
473 Network (HRB-TMRN). The findings and conclusions in the document are those of the authors and  
474 not necessarily those of the authors employing organisations.

475

476

477

478

479

## 480 **References**

481 1. Sibbald B, Roland M. Understanding controlled trials: Why are randomised controlled trials  
482 important?. *BMJ*. *BMJ*; 1998;316(7126):201–.

- 483 2. Groff ML, Offringa M, Emdin A, Mahood Q, Parkin PC, Cohen E. Publication Trends of  
484 Pediatric and Adult Randomized Controlled Trials in General Medical Journals, 2005–2018: A  
485 Citation Analysis. *Children*. 2020;7(12):293. doi: 10.3390/children7120293.
- 486 3. Piroasca S, Shiely F, Clarke M, Treweek S. Tolerating bad health research: the continuing  
487 scandal. *Trials*. 2022;23(1):458. doi: 10.1186/s13063-022-06415-5.
- 488 4. Brewster R, Wong M, Magnani CJ, Gunningham H, Hoffer M, Showalter S, et al. Early  
489 Discontinuation, Results Reporting, and Publication of Pediatric Clinical Trials. *Pediatrics*.  
490 2022;149(4). doi: 10.1542/peds.2021-052557. PubMed PMID: 35314864.
- 491 5. Kern SE. Challenges in conducting clinical trials in children: approaches for improving  
492 performance. *Expert Review of Clinical Pharmacology*. 2009;2(6):609-17. doi:  
493 10.1586/ecp.09.40.
- 494 6. Pica N, Bourgeois F. Discontinuation and Nonpublication of Randomized Clinical Trials  
495 Conducted in Children. *Pediatrics*. 2016;138(3):e20160223-e2016. doi: 10.1542/peds.2016-  
496 0223.
- 497 7. Medicine Io. Safe and Effective Medicines for Children: Pediatric Studies Conducted Under  
498 the Best Pharmaceuticals for Children Act and the Pediatric Research Equity Act. Field MJ,  
499 Boat TF, editors. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press; 2012. 432 p.  
500 <https://doi.org/10.17226/13311>.
- 501 8. Regulation (EC) No 1901/2006 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 12  
502 December 2006 on medicinal products for paediatric use, OJ L 378, 27.12.2006, p. 1.  
503 Available from: [https://eur-lex.europa.eu/EN/legal-content/summary/medicinal-products-  
504 for-paediatric-use.html](https://eur-lex.europa.eu/EN/legal-content/summary/medicinal-products-for-paediatric-use.html)
- 505 9. Rogers A, De Paoli G, Subbarayan S, Copland R, Harwood K, Coyle J, et al. A systematic  
506 review of methods used to conduct decentralised clinical trials. *British Journal of Clinical  
507 Pharmacology*. 2022;88(6):2843-62. doi: 10.1111/bcp.15205.

- 508 10. Frampton GK, Shepherd J, Pickett K, Griffiths G, Wyatt JC. Digital tools for the recruitment  
509 and retention of participants in randomised controlled trials: a systematic map. *Trials*.  
510 2020;21(1). doi: 10.1186/s13063-020-04358-3.
- 511 11. Mathieu E, McGeechan K, Barratt A, Herbert R. Internet-based randomized controlled trials:  
512 a systematic review. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*.  
513 2013;20(3):568-76. doi: 10.1136/amiajnl-2012-001175.
- 514 12. Fogel DB. Factors associated with clinical trials that fail and opportunities for improving the  
515 likelihood of success: A review. *Contemp Clin Trials Commun*. 2018 Aug 7;11:156-164. doi:  
516 10.1016/j.conctc.2018.08.001.
- 517 13. Price J, Goodson N, Warren EJ, Wicks P, Reites J. Resilient design: decentralized trials  
518 recovered faster from the impact of COVID-19 than traditional site-based designs. *Expert*  
519 *Review of Medical Devices*. 2021;18(sup1):1-4. doi: 10.1080/17434440.2021.2014818.
- 520 14. Mirza M, Siebert S, Pratt A, Insch E, McIntosh F, Paton J, et al. Impact of the COVID-19  
521 pandemic on recruitment to clinical research studies in rheumatology. *Musculoskeletal Care*.  
522 2022;20(1):209-13. doi: 10.1002/msc.1561.
- 523 15. Newman A, Bavik YL, Mount M, Shao B. Data Collection via Online Platforms: Challenges and  
524 Recommendations for Future Research. *Applied Psychology*. 2021;70(3):1380-402. doi:  
525 10.1111/apps.12302.
- 526 16. Tricco AC, Lillie E, Zarin W, O'Brien KK, Colquhoun H, Levac D, et al.: PRISMA Extension for  
527 Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Ann Intern Med*. 2018; 169(7):  
528 467–73. doi:[10.7326/M18-0850](https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850)
- 529 17. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, Mclnerney P, Munn Z, Tricco AC, Khalil H. Chapter 11: Scoping  
530 Reviews (2020 version). In: Aromataris E, Munn Z (Editors). *JBIM Manual for Evidence*  
531 *Synthesis*. JBI, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.46658/JBIMES-20-12>

- 532 18. Peters MDJ, Godfrey C, McInerney P, Khalil H, Larsen P, Marnie C, et al.: Best practice  
533 guidance and reporting items for the development of scoping review protocols. *JB* Evidence  
534 Synthesis. 2022; 20(4): 953–968. doi: 10.11124/JBIES-21-00242
- 535 19. Lepage S, Conway A, Goodson N, Wick P, Devane D. Online randomised trials with children:  
536 A scoping review protocol [version 1; peer review:1 approved]. *HRB Open Res.* 2022, 5:46.  
537 <https://doi.org/10.12688/hrbopenres.13566.1>
- 538 20. Lepage S, Conway A, Goodson N, Wicks P, Devane D. Online randomised trials with children:  
539 A scoping review protocol. Open Science Framework Project Data. 2022. [accessed 19  
540 September 2022] <http://www.doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/WHJXY>
- 541 21. EndNote: EndNote. Philadelphia, PA: Clarivate; 2013.
- 542 22. Covidence systematic review software, Veritas Health Innovation, Melbourne, Australia.  
543 Available from: [www.covidence.org](http://www.covidence.org).
- 544 23. Luechtefeld T. *SysRev. insilica*; 2017.
- 545 24. McHugh ML. Interrater reliability: the kappa statistic. *Biochem Med (Zagreb)*.  
546 2012;22(3):276-82. PubMed PMID: 23092060; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC3900052.
- 547 25. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Sterne JAC (editors). Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included  
548 studies. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of*  
549 *Interventions* Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.  
550 Available from: [www.handbook.cochrane.org](http://www.handbook.cochrane.org).
- 551 26. RobotReviewer [Internet] [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
552 <https://www.robotreviewer.net/>.
- 553 27. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The PRISMA  
554 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 2021;n71. doi:  
555 10.1136/bmj.n71.



- 556 28. Amsalem D, Martin A. Reducing depression-related stigma and increasing treatment seeking  
557 among adolescents: randomized controlled trial of a brief video intervention. *Journal of*  
558 *Child Psychology & Psychiatry*. 2022;63(2):210-7. doi: 10.1111/jcpp.13427.
- 559 29. Arnaud N, Baldus C, Elgán TH, De Paepe N, Tønnesen H, Csémy L, et al. Effectiveness of a  
560 Web-Based Screening and Fully Automated Brief Motivational Intervention for Adolescent  
561 Substance Use: a Randomized Controlled Trial. *Journal of medical Internet research*.  
562 2016;18(5):e103. doi: 10.2196/jmir.4643. PubMed PMID: CN-01260475.
- 563 30. Bragg M, Lutfeali S, Greene T, Osterman J, Dalton M. How Food Marketing on Instagram  
564 Shapes Adolescents' Food Preferences: online Randomized Trial. *Journal of medical Internet*  
565 *research*. 2021;23(10):e28689. doi: 10.2196/28689. PubMed PMID: CN-02339943.
- 566 31. Craig A, Brown E, Upright J, DeRosier M. Enhancing Children's Social Emotional Functioning  
567 Through Virtual Game-Based Delivery of Social Skills Training. *Journal of child and family*  
568 *studies*. 2016;25(3):959-68. doi: 10.1007/s10826-015-0274-8. PubMed PMID: CN-02110005.
- 569 32. Dobias ML, Schleider JL, Jans L, Fox KR. An online, single-session intervention for adolescent  
570 self-injurious thoughts and behaviors: results from a randomized trial. *Behaviour research*  
571 *and therapy*. 2021;147. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2021.103983. PubMed PMID: CN-02342148.
- 572 33. Egan JE, Corey SL, Henderson ER, Abebe KZ, Louth-Marquez W, Espelage D, et al. Feasibility  
573 of a Web-Accessible Game-Based Intervention Aimed at Improving Help Seeking and Coping  
574 Among Sexual and Gender Minority Youth: results From a Randomized Controlled Trial.  
575 *Journal of adolescent health*. 2021;69(4):604-14. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2021.03.027.  
576 PubMed PMID: CN-02287880.
- 577 34. Ghaderi A, Stice E, Andersson G, Enö Persson J, Allzén E. A randomized controlled trial of the  
578 effectiveness of virtually delivered Body Project (vBP) groups to prevent eating disorders.  
579 *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*. 2020;88(7):643-56. doi: 10.1037/ccp0000506.  
580 PubMed PMID: CN-02140414.

- 581 35. Greene K, Ray AE, Choi HJ, Glenn SD, Lyons RE, Hecht ML. Short term effects of the REAL  
582 media e-learning media literacy substance prevention curriculum: an RCT of adolescents  
583 disseminated through a community organization. Drug and alcohol dependence.  
584 2020;214:108170. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2020.108170. PubMed PMID: CN-02140538.
- 585 36. Hillhouse J, Turrisi R, Scaglione N, Cleveland M, Baker K, Florence L, et al. A Web-Based  
586 Intervention to Reduce Indoor Tanning Motivations in Adolescents: a Randomized  
587 Controlled Trial. Prevention Science. 2017;18(2):131-40. doi: 10.1007/s11121-016-0698-4.  
588 PubMed PMID: 120784944.
- 589 37. Kelleher E, Moreno M, Wilt MP. Recruitment of Participants and Delivery of Online Mental  
590 Health Resources for Depressed Individuals Using Tumblr: Pilot Randomized Control Trial.  
591 JMIR Res Protoc. 2018;7(4):e95. doi: 10.2196/resprot.9421. PubMed PMID: 29650507.
- 592 38. Lester E, Vranceanu A-M. Resilient youth with neurofibromatosis: Less perceived stress and  
593 greater life satisfaction after an 8-week virtual mind–body intervention. Philadelphia,  
594 Pennsylvania: Taylor & Francis Ltd, 2021.
- 595 39. Manicavasagar V, Horswood D, Burckhardt R, Lum A, Hadzi-Pavlovic D, Parker G. Feasibility  
596 and effectiveness of a web-based positive psychology program for youth mental health:  
597 randomized controlled trial. Journal of medical Internet research. 2014;16(6):e140. doi:  
598 10.2196/jmir.3176. PubMed PMID: CN-01116094.
- 599 40. Mogil C, Hajal N, Aralis H, Paley B, Milburn NG, Barrera W, et al. A Trauma-Informed, Family-  
600 Centered, Virtual Home Visiting Program for Young Children: one-Year Outcomes. Child  
601 psychiatry and human development. 2021. doi: 10.1007/s10578-021-01181-y. PubMed  
602 PMID: CN-02273506.
- 603 41. Moreno MA, Binger KS, Zhao Q, Eickhoff JC. Effect of a Family Media Use Plan on Media Rule  
604 Engagement Among Adolescents: A Randomized Clinical Trial. JAMA Pediatrics.  
605 2021;175(4):351-8. doi: 10.1001/jamapediatrics.2020.5629.

- 606 42. Nelson KM, Perry NS, Stout CD, Dunsiger SI, Carey MP. The Young Men and Media Study: A  
607 Pilot Randomized Controlled Trial of a Community-Informed, Online HIV Prevention  
608 Intervention for 14–17-Year-Old Sexual Minority Males. *AIDS & Behavior*. 2022;26(2):569-83.  
609 doi: 10.1007/s10461-021-03412-8
- 610 43. O'Connor K, Bagnell A, McGrath P, Wozney L, Radomski A, Rosychuk RJ, et al. An internet-  
611 based cognitive behavioral program for adolescents with anxiety: pilot randomized  
612 controlled trial. *JMIR mental health*. 2020;7(7). doi: 10.2196/13356. PubMed PMID: CN-  
613 02213033.
- 614 44. O'Dea B, Han J, Batterham PJ, Achilles MR, Calear AL, Werner-Seidler A, et al. A randomised  
615 controlled trial of a relationship-focussed mobile phone application for improving  
616 adolescents' mental health. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, and allied disciplines*.  
617 2020;61(8):899-913. doi: 10.1111/jcpp.13294. PubMed PMID: CN-02142528.
- 618 45. Parker AE, Scull TM, Morrison AM. DigiKnowIt News: Educating youth about pediatric clinical  
619 trials using an interactive, multimedia educational website. *Journal of Child Health Care*.  
620 *Journal of Child Health Care*; 2022;26(1):139–53.
- 621 46. Radomski AD, Bagnell A, Curtis S, Hartling L, Newton AS. Examining the usage, user  
622 experience, and perceived impact of an internet-based cognitive behavioral therapy  
623 program for adolescents with anxiety: randomized controlled trial. *JMIR mental health*.  
624 2020;7(2). doi: 10.2196/15795. PubMed PMID: CN-02213396.
- 625 47. Schleider JL, Mullarkey MC, Fox KR, Dobias ML, Shroff A, Hart EA, et al. A randomized trial of  
626 online single-session interventions for adolescent depression during COVID-19. *Nature*  
627 *human behaviour*. 2021. doi: 10.1038/s41562-021-01235-0.
- 628 48. Schwinn TM, Thom B, Schinke SP, Hopkins J. Preventing drug use among sexual-minority  
629 youths: findings from a tailored, web-based intervention. *Journal of adolescent health*. 2015;  
630 56(5):571-3. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.12.015. PubMed PMID: CN-01078656.

- 631 49. Government US. Census 2021 [Internet]. 2021 [accessed September 19 2022]. Available  
632 from: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045221>
- 633 50. Catalyst, Quick Take: People of Colour in Canada. [Internet]. October 20, 2020 [accessed  
634 2022 Sept 19]. Available from: [https://www.catalyst.org/research/people-of-colour-in-](https://www.catalyst.org/research/people-of-colour-in-canada/)  
635 [canada/](https://www.catalyst.org/research/people-of-colour-in-canada/)
- 636 51. World Atlas. [Internet] [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
637 <https://www.worldatlas.com/articles/ethnic-background-of-australians.html>
- 638 52. World Population Review. [Internet]. 2022 [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
639 <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/czech-republic-population>
- 640 53. Index Mundi. [Internet] [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
641 [https://www.indexmundi.com/sweden/demographics\\_profile.html](https://www.indexmundi.com/sweden/demographics_profile.html)
- 642 54. Index Mundi. [Internet] [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
643 [https://www.indexmundi.com/belgium/demographics\\_profile.html](https://www.indexmundi.com/belgium/demographics_profile.html)
- 644 55. World Population Review. [Internet]. 2022 [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
645 <https://worldpopulationreview.com/countries/colombia-population>
- 646 56. Pew Research Center [Internet]. Social Media Use in 2021. Washington, D.C.: Pew Research  
647 Center; April 7, 2021. [accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
648 <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2021/04/07/social-media-use-in-2021/>
- 649 57. Darmawan I, Bakker C, Brockman TA, Patten CA, Eder M. The Role of Social Media in  
650 Enhancing Clinical Trial Recruitment: Scoping Review. Journal of Medical Internet Research.  
651 Journal of Medical Internet Research; 2020;22(10):e22810.
- 652 58. Internet Matters. [Internet]. United Kingdom; 2014 [updated 2022; accessed 2022 Sept 19].  
653 Available from: [https://www.internetmatters.org/resources/what-age-can-my-child-start-](https://www.internetmatters.org/resources/what-age-can-my-child-start-social-networking/)  
654 [social-networking/](https://www.internetmatters.org/resources/what-age-can-my-child-start-social-networking/)

- 655 59. Global Data Hub. [Internet]. London (UK): Global Data Hub (Taylor Wessing); [updated 2022;  
656 accessed 2022 Sept 19]. Available from:  
657 <https://globaldatahub.taylorwessing.com/article/digital-consent-around-the-world>
- 658 60. Brøgger-Mikkelsen M, Ali Z, Zibert JR, Andersen AD, Thomsen SF. Online Patient Recruitment  
659 in Clinical Trials: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Journal of Medical Internet Research.  
660 Journal of Medical Internet Research; 2020;22(11):e22179.
- 661 61. Abrehart N, Frost K, Harris R, Wragg A, Stewart D, Sharif H, et al.. “A little (PPI) MAGIC can  
662 take you a long way”: involving children and young people in research from inception of a  
663 novel medical device to multi-centre clinical trial Roald Dahl, James and the Giant Peach  
664 (1961). Research Involvement and Engagement. Research Involvement and Engagement;  
665 2021;7(1).
- 666 62. Chen C, Lee PI, Pain KJ, Delgado D, Cole CL, Campion TR Jr. Replacing Paper Informed  
667 Consent with Electronic Informed Consent for Research in Academic Medical Centers: A  
668 Scoping Review. AMIA Jt Summits Transl Sci Proc. 2020 May 30;2020:80-88. PMID:  
669 32477626; PMCID: PMC7233043.
- 670 63. The United Nations [Internet] 2021. Press release DSG/SM/1579, With Almost Half of  
671 World’s Population Still Offline, Digital Divide Risks Becoming ‘New Face of Inequality’,  
672 Deputy Secretary-General Warns General Assembly. [accessed 2022 Sept 19]; Available  
673 from: <https://www.un.org/press/en/2021/dsgsm1579.doc.html>

674

675

## 676 **Supporting Information**

677 **S1 Checklist. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Extension for**

678 **Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) Checklist.**

679 **S2 Appendix. Database search strategies developed for MEDLINE (Ovid), CENTRAL, CINAHL**  
680 **(EBSCO), & Embase (Elsevier) for “Online randomised trials with children: A scoping**  
681 **review”**

682 **S3 Appendix. Grey literature summary of search terms and strings used in grey literature searches**  
683 **conducted for “Online randomised trials with children: A scoping review”**

684 **S4 Form. Data charting tool for “Online randomised trials with children: A scoping review.”**

685 **S5 Table. Racial and ethnic minority distribution of participants by author and country in “Online**  
686 **randomised trials with children: A scoping review.”**

687 Legend: NR= Not reported; NA= Not applicable


688 \*= Data taken from parents, maternal data is listed first, paternal data is listed second.

689 \$= Aboriginal or Torres Straight Islander




690 Where percentages do not equal 100, it was generally a case that Hispanic or Latino were not  
691 mutually exclusive from White/Caucasian as they can be considered an ethnicity and/or heritage,  
692 and the individual’s race may be listed differently. An individual may be Hispanic/ Latino and Black or  
693 Hispanic/Latino and White, etc., they also may list their ethnicity only as Hispanic/Latino.

694 **S6 Table. Recruitment methods of participants reported for “Online randomised trials with**  
695 **children: A scoping review”.**

696 **S7 Appendix. Completed data charting and risk of bias assessments for all included studies.**  
697  
698  
699



	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias
Amsalem and Martin, 2022	?	?	?	-	+	+	+
Arnaud et al., 2016	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Bragg et al., 2021	?	?	+	-	+	?	+
Craig et al., 2016	?	?	-	-	-	?	+
Dobias et al., 2021	?	+	?	-	-	+	+
Egan et al., 2021	+	?	-	-	-	+	?
Ghaderi et al., 2020	+	+	-	+	-	+	+
Greene et al., 2020	?	?	-	?	-	+	+
Hillhouse et al., 2017	?	?	-	?	+	+	+
Kelleher, Moreno, & Wilt, 2018	+	+	-	?	-	?	-
Lester et al., 2019	+	?	-	-	+	?	+
Manicavasagar et al., 2014	+	+	-	-	-	-	-
Mogil et al., 2021	?	?	-	+	+	+	+
Moreno et al., 2021	+	+	?	-	-	+	-
Nelson et al., 2022	+	?	+	?	+	+	+
O'Connor et al., 2020	-	-	-	-	-	+	+
O'Dea et al., 2020	+	+	-	-	+	+	+
Parker, Scull, & Morrison, 2022	+	?	+	?	-	-	+
Radomski et al., 2020	+	+	-	?	-	+	+
Schleider et al., 2022	+	+	+	?	+	+	+
Schwinn et al., 2015	?	?	?	?	+	?	+

 = 'Low' risk of bias, 
  = 'Unclear' risk of bias, 
  = 'High' risk of bias