

The delivery of practitioner led online telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health: a systematic review protocol

David Nelson, Mark Gussy, Agnes Nanyonjo, Stephen Wyatt, Jaz Phull, Amanda Kenny, Nicholas Dodough

Citation

David Nelson, Mark Gussy, Agnes Nanyonjo, Stephen Wyatt, Jaz Phull, Amanda Kenny, Nicholas Dodough. The delivery of practitioner led online telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health: a systematic review protocol. PROSPERO 2021 CRD42021226490 Available from: https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021226490

Review question

The review question is: What type of practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies are being delivered to support mental health and how effective are they?

The review objectives are:

1. To identify and describe practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health.
2. To assess the utility and effectiveness of practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health.
3. What are the barriers and facilitators of implementing and engagement with practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health.

Searches

The search strategy will include a combination of keywords and subject headings in relation to: (1) Psychological Therapies (2) Mental Health and (3) Telehealth.

We will search the following bibliographic databases: MEDLINE, CINAHL, PsycINFO, Academic Search Complete, Web of Science, Scopus. Reference lists of included articles and existing systematic reviews will also be searched. In addition, supplementary searches on Google Scholar will be conducted.

Publication date: 2015-Present.

The bibliographic management software EndNote X9 will be used to store and manage the results.

Types of study to be included

Inclusion: Peer reviewed academic research. Quantitative, Qualitative and Mixed Methods designs that report primary data on the use of practitioner led psychological therapies that are delivered online to

adults (18+) via video conferencing software.

Exclusion: Non-peer reviewed academic research. Studies that do not report any primary data on the use of practitioner led psychological therapies that are delivered online to adults via video conferencing software. Systematic reviews, commentaries, opinion pieces, as well as unpublished data and studies will be excluded from the review.

Condition or domain being studied

We are examining high prevalence and low severity mental health conditions (e.g. anxiety, panic attacks, depression, stress, phobias, OCD, PTSD and eating disorders) and psychological therapies (e.g. Cognitive Behavioural Therapy, Talking Therapies, Counselling, Couples Therapy and Interpersonal Psychotherapy) that are delivered to adults by a practitioner utilising online video calling software.

Participants/population

We will include adults who have been referred for mental health treatment that utilises psychological therapies and are receiving this via online video calling software that is delivered by a practitioner. Furthermore, we will include mental health practitioners who deliver the online therapies using online video calling software.

We will exclude non-adult populations, psychological therapies that are non-digital, or not practitioner led and do not use video calling software (e.g. user led digital apps, online courses, telephone).

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

Practitioner led psychological therapies that are delivered online using video calling software to treat adults who report high prevalence/low severity mental health conditions.

We will exclude non-digital therapies and those which are not practitioner led or do not make use of video calling software.

Comparator(s)/control

We will include studies when there is no control comparison but we will extract this data should it be available. This could include participants not exposed to online psychological therapies using video calling software for mental health.

Context

There will be no restrictions on the study setting.

Main outcome(s)

The primary outcome of the review will be to identify and describe practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health.

An understanding of the utility and effectiveness of practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health. A description of routinely collected clinical measures of success for psychological therapies that use Telehealth including pre-post treatment effect sizes with quantitative outcomes such as the PHQ-9 (Depression) and GAD-7 (Anxiety).

A synthesis of the qualitative findings in relation to the barriers and facilitators of implementing practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health

practitioner led online telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies to support mental health.

Measures of effect

If possible, the effectiveness of online Telehealth interventions will be pooled via a statistical meta-analysis. The odds ratios (for categorical data) and weighted mean differences (for continuous data), as well as, their 95% confidence intervals will be calculated.

Additional outcome(s)

None.

Measures of effect

Data extraction (selection and coding)

Bibliographic management software EndNote X9 will be used to store and manage the results. Duplicate articles will be removed. Following this, the data files will then be exported into Covidence software and screened by title, abstract and full text according to the study eligibility criteria. At least two members of the review team will carry out the screening with any discrepancies being resolved with the support of another team member. Data extraction will be carried out on all full text articles that meet the eligibility criteria using a predetermined data extraction tool that will collect the following:

- Authors
- Title
- Year of Publication
- Journal of Publication
- Geographical Location
- Study Design
- Sample Size
- Participant Characteristics (Demographics; Patients; Practitioners)
- Recruitment
- Overview of Telehealth Intervention
- Overview of Psychological Therapy
- Outcome Measures
- Assessment of Harm
- Reported Barriers/Facilitators
- Risk of bias

Risk of bias (quality) assessment

The CASP Appraisal Checklists and/or similar quality assessment tools will be utilised to assess risk of bias dependent on the study design.

Two reviewers will independently perform the quality assessment with the support of a third in the event of any disagreements. All studies that have met the eligibility criteria after full text screening will be included irrespective of quality.

Strategy for data synthesis

Identification and description of practitioner led online Telehealth interventions that use psychological therapies will be presented in tabular form alongside a narrative summary.

Where possible, data assessing the effectiveness of the practitioner led online Telehealth interventions

will be pooled in statistical meta-analysis using RevMan software. The odds ratios (for categorical data) and weighted mean differences (for continuous data), as well as, their 95% confidence intervals will be calculated. Heterogeneity will be assessed using the χ^2 test. If statistical pooling is not possible the findings will be presented in narrative form.

Barriers and facilitators to implementation will be extracted as reported on in the primary studies and written up as a narrative summary.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets

Where possible, subgroup analysis will be conducted on the basis of outcome measures or by study/population characteristics. For example, by mental health condition, practitioner type, demographics or location.

Contact details for further information

David Nelson
dnelson@lincoln.ac.uk

Organisational affiliation of the review

Lincoln International Institute for Rural Health (LIIRH), University of Lincoln
<https://liirh.lincoln.ac.uk>

Review team members and their organisational affiliations

Dr David Nelson. Lincoln International Institute for Rural Health (LIIRH), University of Lincoln
Professor Mark Gussy. Lincoln International Institute for Rural Health (LIIRH), University of Lincoln
Dr Agnes Nanyonjo. Lincoln International Institute for Rural Health (LIIRH), University of Lincoln
Mr Stephen Wyatt. Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Dr Jaz Phull. Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Professor Amanda Kenny. La Trobe University
Dr Nicholas Dodough. Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

Collaborators

Tracy McCranor. Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Nick Harwood. Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust
Stephen Skinner. Lincolnshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust

Type and method of review

Intervention, Meta-analysis, Narrative synthesis, Systematic review

Anticipated or actual start date

01 February 2021

Anticipated completion date

31 December 2021

Funding sources/sponsors

None.

Conflicts of interest**Language**

English

Country

Australia, England

Stage of review

Review Ongoing

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Humans; Mental Health; Telemedicine

Date of registration in PROSPERO

22 April 2021

Date of first submission

09 March 2021

Details of any existing review of the same topic by the same authors**Stage of review at time of this submission**

Stage	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	No
Piloting of the study selection process	No	No
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	No	No
Data extraction	No	No
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	No	No
Data analysis	No	No

The record owner confirms that the information they have supplied for this submission is accurate and complete and they understand that deliberate provision of inaccurate information or omission of data may be construed as scientific misconduct.

The record owner confirms that they will update the status of the review when it is completed and will add

publication details in due course.

Versions

22 April 2021

PROSPERO

This information has been provided by the named contact for this review. CRD has accepted this information in good faith and registered the review in PROSPERO. The registrant confirms that the information supplied for this submission is accurate and complete. CRD bears no responsibility or liability for the content of this registration record, any associated files or external websites.