

CORRESPONDENCE

Open Access



Only one cluster per condition is an invalid design for a cluster randomized trial and should be re-labeled a quasi-experimental study. Response to: “Effect of behavioral activation on time and frequency domain heart rate variability in older adults with subthreshold depression: a cluster randomized controlled trial in Thailand”

Yasaman Jamshidi-Naeini, Lilian Golzarri-Arroyo, Abu Bakkar Siddique, Colby J. Vorland and David B. Allison 

Abstract

Ayudhaya et al. examined the effect of Behavioral Activation on daily step count and heart rate variability among older adults with depression in a study labeled a cluster randomized controlled trial (cRCT). However, only one cluster was assigned to either of the study conditions. Such a design would have zero degrees of freedom for inferential testing, because the variation due to cluster membership cannot be estimated apart from the variation due to treatment assignment. Thus, the intervention effect is completely confounded with the cluster effect. The study should be labeled a quasi-experimental study, not a cRCT. Accordingly, the numerical results should be interpreted as associations but not evidence for causal relationships.

Keywords Cluster randomized trial, Degrees of freedom, Inferential testing, Nesting

Ayudhaya et al. [1] conducted a study to examine the effect of Behavioral Activation (BA) on daily step count (as a physical activity indicator) and heart rate variability (as a depression-related autonomic function indicator) among community-dwelling older adults with mild to moderate depression. The article is labeled as a cluster

randomized controlled trial (cRCT). However, there is only one cluster (i.e., hospitals) assigned to either of the study conditions (BA plus usual care or usual care only), which makes the study design invalid for estimating the causal effect of treatment assignment. Forty-one participants were recruited in each hospital after they were assigned to study conditions.

In cRCTs, there can be and typically are correlated data within each cluster (i.e., unit of randomization) so “errors” (loosely speaking, model residuals) cannot be assumed to be independent across study participants within clusters. Moreover, when clusters (rather than individuals) are assigned to study conditions, the study has a hierarchical structure (individuals nested in

*Correspondence:

David B. Allison
allison@iu.edu

Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Indiana University School of Public Health- Bloomington, 1025 E 7th St, PH 111, Bloomington, IN 47405, USA



© The Author(s) 2023. **Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (<http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/>) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated in a credit line to the data.

clusters) [2]. Thus, the degrees of freedom for testing the intervention effect depends both on the number of individual participants and on the number of clusters per condition [3]. A purported cRCT with two conditions and only one cluster assigned to each condition, such as Ayudhaya et al.'s study [1], would have zero degrees of freedom ($n_1 + n_2 - 2$) for inferential testing. That is, the variation due to cluster membership cannot be estimated apart from the variation due to treatment assignment, and a valid analysis of the intervention effect could not exist [4].

We commend Ayudhaya et al. for addressing an important question about depression among the older population, and for their collegiality in providing clarification about their study design. The authors' clarification confirmed our understanding from reading the published methods.

Because in Ayudhaya et al.'s study [1] the intervention effect is completely confounded with the cluster effect, it should be labeled a quasi-experimental study, not a cRCT. Accordingly, the numerical results should be interpreted as associations between BA and the outcomes but not evidence for causal relationships [5].

Abbreviations

BA Behavioral Activation
cRCT Cluster Randomized Controlled Trial

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: DBA, YJ-N, LG-A, ABS, CJV; Investigation: YJ-N; Writing original draft: YJ-N; Review and editing: DBA, LG-A, ABS, CJV. All authors approved the final draft.

Funding

Authors supported in part by NIH grants R25DK099080, R25HL124208, U24AG056053, P30AG050886, and the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation. The opinions expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of the NIH or any other organization.

Availability of data and materials

Not applicable.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

Not applicable.

Consent for publication

Not applicable.

Competing interests

Dr. Allison and his institution (Indiana University) have received payments for consultation, grants, contracts, in-kind donations, and contributions from multiple for-profit and not-for-profit entities interested in statistical design and analysis of experiments, but not directly related to the research questions addressed in the paper question.

Received: 7 October 2022 Accepted: 22 December 2022

Published online: 13 January 2023

References

1. Ayudhaya WSN, Pityaratstian N, Eungpinichpong W, et al. Effect of behavioral activation on time and frequency domain heart rate variability in older adults with subthreshold depression: a cluster randomized controlled trial in Thailand. *BMC Psychiatry*. 2022;22:319.
2. Murray DM, Varnell SP, Blitstein JL. Design and analysis of group-randomized trials: a review of recent methodological developments. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94:423–32.
3. Jamshidi-Naeini Y, Brown AW, Mehta T, et al. A practical decision tree to support editorial adjudication of submitted parallel cluster randomized controlled trials. *Obesity*. 2022;30:565–70.
4. Varnell SP, Murray DM, Baker WL. An evaluation of analysis options for the one-group-per-condition design: can any of the alternatives overcome the problems inherent in this design? *Eval Rev*. 2001;25:440–53.
5. Shadish WR, Cook TD, Campbell DT. *Experimental and quasi-experimental designs for generalized causal inference*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin. 2002.

Publisher's Note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Ready to submit your research? Choose BMC and benefit from:

- fast, convenient online submission
- thorough peer review by experienced researchers in your field
- rapid publication on acceptance
- support for research data, including large and complex data types
- gold Open Access which fosters wider collaboration and increased citations
- maximum visibility for your research: over 100M website views per year

At BMC, research is always in progress.

Learn more biomedcentral.com/submissions

