UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Optimising primary care research participation: a comparison of three recruitment methods in data-sharing studies*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/94719/

Version: Accepted Version

Article:
Lord, P, Willis, T, Carder, P et al. (2 more authors) (2016) Optimising primary care research participation: a comparison of three recruitment methods in data-sharing studies. Family Practice, 33 (2). pp. 200-204. ISSN 0263-2136

https://doi.org/10.1093/fampra/cmw003

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

White Rose university consortium
Universities of Leeds, Sheffield & York

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

Table 2. Comparison of characteristics and quality measures between recruited and non-recruited practices for each recruitment method

	Opt-in			Mixed opt-in and opt-out			Opt-out		
	Not-recruited	Recruited	p	Not-recruited	Recruited	p	Not-recruited	Recruited	p
Practices, n	47 (42%)	64* (58%)		47 (30%)	110* (70%)		22 (20%)	89 (80%)	
List Size (Patients)	**4722**	**7153**	**0.03**	**5857**	**7091**	**0.043**	5534	6455	0.121
Number of GPs in the practice (mean)	**4.2**	**5.3**	**0.033**	**4**	**5**	**0.04**	3.6	5	0.055
Male GPs	2.3	2.6	0.301	**2**	**2.6**	**0.018**	2.2	2.6	0.17
IMD (proportionally applied across practice population)	22.5	25.8	0.997	33.1	33.7	0.769	30.6	33.1	0.25
Clinical Quality Measure									
Diabetic patients with HbA1c<=59mmol/mol (%)	57.2	56.6	0.562	**53.9**	**58.4**	**<0.01**	57.7	57.1	0.921
Patient Experience Measure									
Rating of GP treating you with care and concern (good/very good) (%)	84.8	84.7	0.673	80.5	81.4	0.76	84.4	83.3	0.595
Local Service Impact Measure									
Emergency Admissions / 1000	111.9	101.1	0.19	112.3	105.3	0.673	102.7	104.9	0.947

Averages are median unless otherwise stated. Comparison with Wilcoxon rank sum test with Monte Carlo permutation sampling (10,000 permutations).

*One practice closed between the end of the original studies and this analysis therefore full data were not available for comparison here.