Study Within A Trial (SWAT) is to identify the most suitable multiple stakeholders in a meaningful way. The aim of this little guidance for researchers on the best ways to involve acceptable, engaging, feasible and effective. However, there is a lack of research in this area as to public acceptability of regulation of online advertising of HFSS products as a viable policy solution. This study examines the perceptions of parents and stakeholders in regulating this online environment to answer how the regulation of online advertising of HFSS products to children is viewed in the UK?

Methods Three qualitative methods were triangulated: 1) eight focus groups with parents who have children aged between five and 15 years old; 2) scoping review of 85 responses to a 2016 Committees of Advertising Practice consultation on non-broadcast advertising to children; and 3) 11 stakeholder interviews (industry, civil society, academics and government body). Data were analysed inductively and thematically using NVivo.

Results Parents reported finding it increasingly difficult to attain a healthy diet for their children, competing with a multitude of pressures, including online advertising of HFSS products. Non-industry stakeholders agreed with this perspective, whereas industry stakeholders were sceptical as to the influence online advertising had in contributing to an obesogenic environment. In terms of attitudes to regulation, two views emerged from the three data sets: 1) support for increased regulation of online advertising of HFSS products, or 2) the continuation of the current self-regulatory model. Underpinning their views were concerns as to the distribution of power within the obesogenic environment, with the majority of parents and all non-industry stakeholders describing the food and beverage industry as possessing too much power, and government and parents possessing too little. In contrast, the remaining parents and industry stakeholders argued that government possessed too much power and as such infringed on individual autonomy.

Conclusion Parents’ and stakeholders’ views in this study largely aligned with Beauchamp’s (1976) theory on social justice versus market justice. Although not generalisable, this study offers insights into how their perspectives on the distribution of power within the obesogenic environment may have informed their views on implementing increased regulation of the online advertising environment as a viable policy solution to tackle childhood obesity.
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Abstracts

Background Intervention development is a critical first step when conducting trials or observational studies. Research suggests that involving multiple stakeholders in this process increases the likelihood of developing interventions that are acceptable, engaging, feasible and effective. However, there is little guidance for researchers on the best ways to involve multiple stakeholders in a meaningful way. The aim of this Study Within A Trial (SWAT) is to identify the most suitable approach to involve patients and healthcare professionals in a consensus process to inform the development of the Improve Diabetes Eye-screening Attendance (IDEA)s intervention.

Methods This is a qualitative study. Three meetings were held to establish consensus on the content and delivery of the intervention. Meeting included 1 patients only, meeting 2 included a combination of patients and healthcare professionals and meeting 3 included healthcare professionals only. Stakeholders were asked to agree on intervention components which target patients and general practices. Each meeting was audio recorded and field notes were taken. After the meeting, semi-structured telephone interviews were carried out to explore stakeholders’ experiences of taking part. Data were transcribed verbatim and managed using NVivo V12 software. Thematic analysis was performed to identify themes relating to members’ experiences of taking part.

Results All three meetings put forward feasible ideas which were incorporated into the final intervention. Each meeting put forward ideas which were not put forward by the other groups but were incorporated into the final intervention (Meeting 1=6 ideas, Meeting 2=2 ideas and Meeting 3=5 ideas). Theoretical analysis suggests that stakeholders in meetings 1 and 3 felt comfortable expressing their opinions and grateful that they were given the opportunity to be heard. Stakeholders in meeting 2 felt they had to hold back on their opinions as they were aware that the other stakeholder group was in the room. They also felt that their contributions were undervalued by the other stakeholder group.

Conclusion Involving patients and healthcare professionals together in a consensus process is not a suitable approach to involve. This study will guide researchers on the most suitable approach to involve patients and healthcare professionals in a consensus process and will contribute to the evolving literature on the potential impact of involving multiple stakeholders in the intervention development process.