

Don't Throw Your Heart Away: Medical Student Study 2  
NCT04176796  
Last IRB Approval Check-in: January 10 2024

# Study Information

## Title

Heart Transplant Tradeoff Study: 2-Condition Medical Student Study

## Authors

## Description

Publicly available outcome assessments for transplant programs do not make salient that some programs tend to reject many of the hearts they are offered, whereas other programs accept a broader range of donor offers. We use empirical studies to test whether transplant center performance data (i.e. transplant and waitlist outcome statistics) that reflect center donor acceptance rates influence laypersons to evaluate centers with high organ decline rates less favorably than centers with low organ decline rates. 125 medical student participants will be recruited from University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine and randomized to one of two different information presentation conditions. Participants will be given an introduction to the donor organ match process, then asked to view the table of transplant outcomes corresponding to the condition they were randomized to. Each participant is asked to choose which hospital is higher performing upon being given a choice between two hospitals: one hospital with an non-selective, "accepting" strategy (takes all donor heart offers), and one hospital with a more selective, "cherrypicking" strategy (tends to reject donor offers that are less than "excellent" quality). In order to identify the decision process that underlies this choice pattern, we will examine a putative mediator. Specifically, participants will be asked to rate the extent to which they considered patients' chances of getting an excellent heart, avoiding a less-than-optimal heart, and getting any type of heart when making their choice between the two hospitals.

## Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 When centers must present information on their transplant success rate only, lay evaluators will respond by selecting hospitals with higher transplant success. However, if information presented on transplant outcomes is stratified by the number and quality of donors used, or displayed in addition to total survival rates, then participants will respond by selecting hospitals with higher organ acceptance rates rather than the hospital with higher transplant outcomes. Hypothesis 1a: Preference for the non-selective transplant center will be lower (than for the selective center) in condition 1 (baseline: combined transplant survival only), compared to condition 2. That is, a higher proportion of participants will prefer the non-selective center over the selective center in condition 2, relative to condition 1. Hypothesis 1b: There will be a main effect of viewing stratified transplant survival, such that in condition 2 (when transplant survival is stratified by number and quality of donor hearts accepted at each center) participants will prefer the non-selective center over the selective center, relative to the baseline condition 1. Hypothesis 2 There will be an indirect (mediated) effect of providing participants with information about stratified transplant survival; this information will lead to higher preference for the non-selective hospital by leading participants to think that the chances a patient at either hospital will "get a heart at all" is a more important factor in their decision (about which hospital is a better choice for patients). Specifically ratings of importance

(0-100 continuous scale) for the item "likelihood of getting any heart" will differ across conditions 1-2 such that "getting any heart" will be rated lower in condition 1 than in condition 2. Furthermore, ratings on this item will be associated with choice, such that higher ratings will be associated with choice of the non-selective center.

## Design Plan

Study type

Experiment - A researcher randomly assigns treatments to study subjects, this includes field or lab experiments. This is also known as an intervention experiment and includes randomized controlled trials.

Blinding

- For studies that involve human subjects, they will not know the treatment group to which they have been assigned.

Is there any additional blinding in this study?

n/a

Study design

We have a between-subjects design in which participants are randomized to one of two information conditions (independent variable). In each condition, they make a choice (dependent variable) between two hospitals (one with a non-selective donor acceptance strategy, and another with a more selective donor acceptance strategy). Independent variables: (1) Condition 1 ("baseline" condition): view only combined transplant survival (e.g. transplant survival rate not stratified by number and quality of donor hearts accepted at each center) (2) Condition 2: view only stratified transplant survival (e.g. transplant survival rate stratified into patients who received excellent donor organs and patients who received less than optimal donor organs) These two conditions will be analyzed for our primary analysis: a 1x2 design with 2 arms (control arm or combined transplant survival, and experimental arm or stratified transplant survival).

Randomization

We will use simple randomization, where each participant will be randomly assigned to one of the two predetermined conditions. The Qualtrics randomizer function will be used for randomization into a condition.

## Sampling Plan

Existing Data

Registration prior to creation of data  
Explanation of existing data

n/a

Data collection procedures

125 medical student participants will be recruited from University of Pittsburgh Medical School. Participants will be recruited via (1) an email to the Class of 2020, Class of 2021, and Class of 2022 listserv pages, and (2) a Facebook post on the class Facebook pages for the classes

corresponding to the listservs described. Inclusion criteria: Participants who are 2nd, 3rd, or 4th year medical students at University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine will be asked to participate if they confirm the following inclusion criteria in the consent form. (1) 18 years of age or older (2) must read and understand the information in the consent form (3) must want to participate in the research and continue with the survey (4) must live in United States Payment: Participants will be entered into a lottery for completing the survey and providing an email (the latter is optional). The lottery gives a 1 in 60 chance of winning a \$50 Amazon gift card and a 1 in 10 chance of winning a \$5 Starbucks gift card.

#### Sample size

Our target sample size is 125 participants. We expect that this will amount to approximately 60 participants per condition, although due to the nature of the randomization technique used (Qualtrics randomizer function), we may end up with slightly more or slightly less than 60 per condition.

#### Sample size rationale

A sample size of 61 per group was calculated to yield at least 90% power to detect a 30 percentage point difference between conditions (e.g., 35% vs. 65%) with  $\alpha=0.05$  (GPower 3.1.9.4).

#### Stopping rule

We will stop data collection after the first of the following three scenarios is achieved: (1) 125 responses collected (2) January 20, 2020 and at least 100 responses collected (3) March 31, 2020

## Variables

#### Manipulated variables

We will manipulate how transplant center outcomes are presented. Different components of the same outcome statistics for two transplant centers will be varied over two different conditions. (1) Condition 1 ("baseline" condition): view only combined transplant survival (e.g. transplant survival rate not stratified by number and quality of donor hearts accepted at each center) (2) Condition 2: view only stratified transplant survival (e.g. transplant survival rate stratified into patients who received excellent donor organs and patients who received less than optimal donor organs) The two conditions will be included in our main analysis, which is a 2x1 design with 1 factors (transplant survival) and 2 levels per factor: "combined": reference level, in which transplant survival rate is not stratified by number and quality of donor hearts accepted at each center "stratified": transplant survival rate stratified into patients who received excellent donor organs and patients who received less than optimal donor organs

#### Measured variables

The outcome variable will be a binary choice between two hospitals: one with a selective donor-heart acceptance strategy and one with a non-selective donor heart acceptance strategy. Participants will respond to the question "Which Hospital do you consider to be higher performing? Please click on one of the two tables below to indicate which hospital is the better

choice." Participants will choose between two outcome tables featuring the selective and non-selective hospital (counterbalanced, such that each of the two choices is equally likely to be presented at top of the choice scenario in each condition). The number of participants that choose each hospital will be the measured outcome variable used in analyses. On the next page of the survey, participants will respond to three mediator questions: "There are many reasons why one transplant hospital might outperform another. Which reasons were most important in your decision? Please move the slider to indicate how much you considered each of the reasons below (0=reason was not important, 100=reason was extremely important)." Participants will then move a slider bar (0-100) to indicate the importance of the following three items: (1) Patients were more likely to receive an excellent donor heart at the hospital I picked. (2) Patients were less likely to receive a marginal donor heart at the hospital I picked. (3) Patients were more likely to receive any kind of heart at the hospital I picked. The third item (more likely to receive any kind of heart) will be the only variable that is included in the planned mediation analysis.

Indices

*No response*

*No files selected*

## Analysis Plan

Statistical models

To test Hypotheses 1a /1b, we will use a binomial logistic regression analysis. The categorical independent variable will be 'stratified transplant survival'; the dependent variable is binary choice of hospital. -We will test whether the main effect of "stratified transplant survival" is statistically significant and in the predicted positive direction. To test Hypothesis 2, we will conduct a causal mediation analysis to determine whether information display had a mechanistic effect on hospital choice through our proposed mediator. We will estimate the average causal mediation effect (ACME), average direct effect (ADE), and the total effect. The ACME is the effect of the experimental information display condition (stratified) on the outcome of hospital choice (selective vs. non-selective), mediated through the hypothesized mediator (the importance of "getting any heart" at each hospital when considering the choice). The remaining effect of information display on hospital choice that is not mediated through the hypothesized mediator represents the ADE. The entire effect of the information display on hospital choice via the hypothesized mediator and the direct effect is the total effect. The proportion of the total effect that is accounted for by the ACME is called the proportion mediated.{Imai, 2010}. Analyses will be performed using the "mediation" package in R (The R Foundation for Statistical Computing).{Tingley, 2014}. We will generate 95% confidence intervals by using 1000 bootstrap simulations. The unstandardized point estimate of the ACME and its 95% confidence intervals will be interpreted. -A significant ACME for "stratified transplant survival" would suggest that stratifying transplant survival by number and quality of accepted donors works via increasing the perceived importance of "getting any heart" to increase preference for the non-selective hospital. If the ACME is non-significant, we will identify where the causal path breaks down.

*No files selected*

Transformations

Logistic regression analysis: The categorical predictor "transplant survival stratified" will be dummy coded (0=not stratified, 1=stratified), with 'stratified' as the reference category. The outcome variable "choice of hospital" will be dummy-coded (0=selective hospital, 1=non-selective hospital). The reference category is 'selective hospital'. Mediation analysis: The categorical predictor "transplant survival stratified" will be dummy coded (0=not stratified, 1=stratified), with 'stratified' as the reference category. The continuous mediator variable "get any heart" will be mean-centered for each analysis. The outcome variable "choice of hospital" will be dummy-coded (0=selective hospital, 1=non-selective hospital). The reference category is 'selective hospital'.

Inference criteria

We will use the standard  $p=0.05$  criteria for determining if the results are significantly different from those expected if the null hypothesis were correct.

Data exclusion

Two attention checks will be used. The data will be analyzed with all participants, and with only the participants who pass both of these attention checks.

Missing data

If a participant does not complete the entire survey, they will not be included in the analysis.

Exploratory analysis

*No response*

## Other

Other

*No response*