## Supplementary file 1 – measurement of fidelity in the ENRICH trial

#### **Procedures**

The finalised fidelity index was completed by researchers at each of the seven sites in the WP4 trial on three occasions at three monthly intervals during the main trial, with fidelity of set-up of peer support measured at the first time point only. As well as collecting and rating documentation relevant to peer support at each site – as specified in the index¹ – we sought to interview two peer workers, to trial participants in the intervention group and the peer worker coordinator at each site, recruiting different peer workers (where possible) and trial participants on each occasion. Fidelity study interviewees (with the exception of the Peer Worker Coordinator) were selected at random from those meeting the criteria above each time the fidelity measure is completed. Participant information was sent to interviewees as necessary prior to interviews in order for interviewees to be able to source any data that may be required (i.e. Peer Workers may need to consult their contact log) and informed consent re-checked verbally prior to interview (note that the original informed consent given by all participants included consent to be contacted to undertake interviews for different work packages in the programme).

### **Analysis**

Scores for each domain were calculated as a mean score for all the items that applied to that domain, separately for set-up and delivery at each time point. Table 1 indicates the number of items that applied to each domain for both set-up and delivery of peer support.

Table 1	· Number of	items ner	domain and	respondent group	,
Tuble 1	. Nullibel of	iteriis ber	uomunn ama	respondent arout	,

	Setup			Delivery		
	D	PWC	PW	PWC	PW	SP
Relationships based on shared lived experience	3	3	4	2	2	4
Mutuality and reciprocity	3	4	4	2	2	4
Leadership, choice and control	1	3	1	3	0	1
Discovering strengths and making connections	3	3	5	1	1	3

Key: D=Documentation; PWC=Peer Worker Coordinator; PW=Peer Worker; SP=Supported Peer

Fidelity scores for set-up and delivery were calculated as a sum of the mean score for each domain, at each site, and total fidelity score as a sum of the set-up and delivery score at the final time point to allow as much time as possible for practice to bed in at each site. Variation in fidelity scores across study period and site were explored graphically.

Set-up, delivery and total fidelity scores were also plotted graphically against effect on primary outcome at site level. Site specific effect sizes were calculated as difference in readmission rates, PW-CAU, a negative effect size indicates PW superior to CAU.

### Results

The fidelity index was completed at three points during the study, August 2018 (T1), November 2018 (T2) and February 2019 (T3). Table 2 reports the number of each type of respondent who were interviewed at each site, at each time point.

Table 2: Number of each type of respondent at each time point

	T1			T2			T3			
	PWC	PW	SP	PWC	PW	SP	PWC	PW	SP	
SWL*	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	
ELN*	1	2	2	1	2	0	1	2	1	
SSX	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	0	
CNW	1	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	1	
BDF	1	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	
BMS	1	2	0	1	2	1	1	2	1	
SAB	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	1	1	

Key: SWL=South West London; \*=pilot trial site; ELN=East London; SSX=Sussex; CNW=Central and North West London; BDF=Bradford; BMS=Birmingham and Solihull; SAB=Surrey and Borders

# References

Gillard S, Banach N, Barlow E, Byrne J, Foster R, Goldsmith L, Marks J, McWilliam C, Morshead R, Stepanian K, Turner R. Developing and testing a principle-based fidelity index for peer support in mental health services. Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology. 2021;19:1-9.