The acceptability of a guided internet-based trauma-focused self-help programme (Spring) for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD)

Natalie Simon[a b], Catrin E. Lewis[a], Kim Smallman[c], Lucy Brookes-Howell[a], Neil P. Roberts[a b], Neil J. Kitchiner[a b], Cono Ariti[c], Claire Nollett[c], Rachel McNamara[c], Jonathan I. Bisson[a]

[a] Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, Cardiff University School of Medicine, UK
[b] Directorate of Psychology and Psychological Therapies, Cardiff & Vale University Health Board, UK
[c] Centre for Trials Research (CTR), Cardiff University School of Medicine, UK

Corresponding Author:
Dr Natalie Simon
Division of Psychological Medicine and Clinical Neurosciences, School of Medicine, Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK
Hadyn Ellis Building, Maindy Road, Cardiff, CF24 4HQ, UK
Tel: 029 2068 8481
E-mail: SimonN2@cardiff.ac.uk
ORCID ID - 0000-0001-5712-9460

Other authors email addresses:
Catrin E. Lewis - LewisCE7@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0002-3818-9377
Kim Smallman – smallmank@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0002-9283-8120
Lucy Brookes-Howell - brookes-howelllc@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0002-8263-7130
Neil P. Roberts - robertsnp1@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0002-6277-0102
Neil J. Kitchiner - neil.kitchiner@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0003-0499-9520
Cono Ariti - aritic@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0001-7615-0935
Claire Nollett - nollettcl@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0001-6676-4933
Rachel McNamara - mcnamarar@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID - 0000-0002-7280-1611
Jonathan I. Bisson - bissonji@cardiff.ac.uk – ORCID ID 0000-0001-5170-1243

Abstract (200 words)

Background
Guided internet-based, cognitive behavioural therapy with a trauma-focus (i-CBT-TF) is recommended in guidelines for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). There is limited evidence regarding its acceptability, with significant dropout from individual face-to-face CBT-TF, suggesting non-acceptability at least in some cases.

Objective
To determine the acceptability of a guided internet-based CBT-TF intervention, 'Spring', in comparison with face-to-face CBT-TF for mild to moderate PTSD.

Method
Treatment adherence, satisfaction, and therapeutic alliance were measured quantitatively for participants receiving 'Spring' or face-to-face CBT-TF as part of a Randomised Controlled Trial. Qualitative interviews were conducted with a purposive sample of therapists and participants.

Results

'Spring' guided internet-based CBT-TF was found to be acceptable, with over 89% participants fully or partially completing the programme. Therapy adherence and alliance for 'Spring' and face-to-face CBT-TF did not differ significantly, apart from post-treatment participant-reported alliance, which was in favour of face-to-face CBT-TF. Treatment satisfaction was high for both treatments, in favour of face-to-face CBT-TF. Interviews with participants receiving, and therapists delivering 'Spring' corroborated its acceptability.

Conclusions

Guided internet-based CBT-TF is acceptable for many people with mild to moderate PTSD. Findings provide insights into future implementation, highlighting the importance of personalising guided self-help, depending on an individual's presentation, and preferences.

Keywords: post-traumatic stress disorder, internet-based cbt, guided self-help, acceptability, dropout.

Data availability: The dataset is available from the corresponding author.

Statement of ethics: The trial was granted a favourable ethical opinion by the South East Wales Research Ethics Committee (17/WA/0008).

Disclosure statement: The 'Spring' programme was developed by and is owned by X University and, if commercialised, Cardiff University would benefit, as would authors JIB, NK, CL, and NPR.

Highlights

- Guided internet-based trauma-focused CBT is an acceptable treatment for PTSD.
- A model of acceptability explained 45% of variance in treatment outcome.
- Importance of adapting guided self-help to suit presentation and preferences.

1. Introduction

Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) is a global mental health disorder, commonly co-occurring with other conditions (1). Lifetime prevalence has been estimated at 4% (2), and can double in populations affected by conflict (3). High-risk professional groups such as military service members and first responders are at greater risk (4), with healthcare workers at increased risk during pandemics (5). PTSD typically impacts a person's social and occupational functioning and some individuals may go on to develop maladaptive coping mechanisms, including substance use disorder (6). The economic burden of PTSD is significant, for example, high rates of unemployment have been found due to symptomatology impacting ability to function in the work setting (7).

Cognitive Behavioural Therapy with a trauma focus, delivered face-to-face (CBT-TF) (8), is a first choice treatment for PTSD (9, 10). CBT-TF typically includes psychoeducation, cognitive restructuring and behavioural exposure focusing on the traumatic event, with a view to updating the traumatic memory and addressing unhelpful beliefs and coping behaviours (11). There is a growing evidence base for internet-based CBT-TF that is therapist-guided, also known as guided self-help (12), recommended in recent treatment guidelines (9, 10), and recently demonstrated as non-inferior to face-to-face CBT-TF in a large pragmatic RCT, RAPID (13, 14).

Guided self-help may be advantageous for people less able to access outpatient services due to work, mobility, financial, and geographical restraints (15, 16), and offers increased flexibility about when to undertake treatment related activity (17), offering people greater choice and control regarding their health needs (18). Furthermore, guided internet-based CBT-TF typically requires fewer face-to-face sessions and less clinical support time than traditional CBT-TF (8).

International research, policy, and commissioning has prioritised digital therapies to widen access to evidence-based psychological care (19), with a number of such services developing across the UK (20). Its uptake and implementation was initially slow, however (21, 22), demonstrated in findings from eight European countries (23, 24). One explanation for this slow uptake may relate to therapeutic alliance, important in enabling individuals to feel safe for trauma treatment engagement (25, 26), and perceived by some therapists to be a weakness in guided self-help (27), despite limited evidence for this (28, 29). Slow uptake may relate to perceptions of dropout from trauma-focused treatment (30). Dropout may indicate non-acceptability in some cases, for example some may not wish to tolerate therapy that requires focusing on the traumatic memory they are trying to avoid (15, 16). There are however many reasons for dropout, with research indicating that some individuals drop out of treatment with significant gains in symptomatology, and might be better defined as early treatment responders (31).

More recently, since the COVID-19 pandemic, findings demonstrate a shift in practice and increasingly positive views around internet-based and remotely-delivered therapies, with an increased willingness by both patients and therapists to engage with this approach (12, 32). These findings add to a growing, albeit limited evidence base, for the acceptability of guided internet-based CBT-TF (33), and highlight that further research is needed.

Acceptability is a facet of healthcare quality (34), and explicit definitions are lacking, though include *"judgements about the treatment procedures by nonprofessionals, lay persons, clients and other potential consumers of treatment"* (35) (p.259). More recently, acceptability has been proposed as *"a multi-faceted construct that reflects the extent to which people delivering or receiving a healthcare intervention consider it to be appropriate, based on anticipated or experienced cognitive and emotional responses to the intervention."* (36) (p.14). Studies of treatment acceptability are

limited across the literature and are given less weight than efficacy by guideline developers when determining the evidence and putting forward recommendations (37). Yet treatment acceptability has been associated with treatment outcome (38), and is likely to affect treatment implementation (39, 40). Acceptability is a consideration within personalised care and shared decision making, acknowledged by NICE (41), shared decision making is evidenced as leading to improved patient experiences and treatment outcome (38).

There is wide variability in operationalising and reporting acceptability, across the healthcare literature (36), not limited to internet-based therapies (42, 43). Dropout is a frequently reported acceptability indicator, however, as noted, its interpretation is hampered without reported reasons for dropout (30). Furthermore, treatment acceptability may be considered multifaceted and complex. To illustrate, an individual might preconceive a treatment to be unacceptable, yet they may adhere and may see an improvement in symptoms, thereby rating that treatment as satisfactory overall.

A systematic review of ten included studies has demonstrated that internet-based CBT for PTSD is acceptable, as indicated by i-CBT programme usage, study-specific acceptability measures (k=3), satisfaction measures (k=2), and a measure of therapeutic alliance (k=1) (33). There was however evidence of greater dropout from internet-based CBT compared to waitlist in a meta-analysis of eight studies, though no difference was found between internet-based CBT and waitlist in a Cochrane systematic review update (12). The certainty of the evidence was very low and none of the included studies considered guided internet-based CBT compared with face-to-face CBT.

This study aimed to determine if a guided internet-based CBT-TF intervention, 'Spring', was as acceptable to participants and therapists as its comparator, face-to-face CBT-TF, in a pragmatic RCT. A multicomponent evaluation was conducted to provide a broad and deep understanding of acceptability. Measures of treatment adherence, satisfaction, and participant and therapist therapeutic alliance were administered, and qualitative interviews were conducted to collect information from the perspective of individuals receiving and delivering 'Spring' through the RAPID trial, to aid our interpretation of findings. An assessment of the influence of treatment acceptability on treatment outcome was also conducted. Additional trial information can be accessed via the main results and protocol papers (13, 14).

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Participants

Trial participants were consenting adults aged 18 or over with regular access to the internet and with mild to moderate severity PTSD to a single traumatic event as their only, or primary diagnosis, assessed via the Life Events Checklist-5 (LEC-5) (44) and Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5) (45). Individuals were excluded on the basis of: inability to read and write fluently in English, previous completion of trauma-focused psychological therapy, current engagement in a psychological therapy, a change in psychotropic medication in the last four weeks, psychosis, substance dependence and active suicide risk. A purposive sample of participants and therapists were invited to take part in qualitative interviews.

2.2 Procedure

The RAPID trial was conducted between August 2017 and January 2021, following favourable ethical opinion by the South East Wales Research Ethics Committee (17/WA/0008). Participants were identified from National Health Service (NHS) Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT)

services in England, and NHS psychological treatment settings in primary and secondary care services in Scotland and Wales. Potential participants were approached by clinicians involved in their care and were screened and assessed by researchers after providing informed consent. The trial aimed to recruit 192 participants, according to a power calculation that considered a non-inferiority margin (14). Full methodology details are described in the main trial paper (13).

All therapists had previous experience of delivering CBT-TF for PTSD and were trained to deliver both manualised treatments. Fidelity checks ensured treatment in both trial arms were delivered consistently. All outcome assessors were blinded to treatment allocation as far as possible, and participants were asked not to reveal their allocation at data collection follow-ups.

Participants and therapists were purposively sampled for qualitative interviews between February 2018 and November 2019; participant interviewees were identified according to gender, age, ethnicity, education level, nature of trauma, research site and outcome, and therapists according to their gender and research site. Over-sampling of participants receiving 'Spring', as opposed to those receiving CBT-TF allowed for an increased understanding to support the implementation of 'Spring', if indicated. The sample was guided by preliminary analysis and constant comparison at each data collection phase of themes from interviews, to ensure saturation.

2.3 Interventions

2.3.1. 'Spring'
'Spring' (46) was developed in line with Medical Research Council (MRC) guidance (47), co-produced with people with PTSD, and found to be effective compared to waitlist in a Phase II RCT (48). 'Spring' utilises an eight-step internet and App-based programme based on CBT-TF. Programme steps include: psychoeducation; grounding techniques; relaxation techniques; behavioural re-activation; an exposure-based trauma written narrative exercise; cognitive restructuring; graded exposure to overcome avoidance; and reinforcement of learning to keep well. Steps are completed sequentially, with resource tools becoming activated as the participant progresses through the programme. Key content entered by the participant into the programme is visible to the therapist, with the participant's knowledge. The intervention commences with an hour-long face-to-face orientation session to introduce the programme, with further guidance and progress checks scheduled fortnightly in four 30-minute sessions, face-to-face or on the telephone, to offer support, monitoring, motivation, and problem solving.

2.3.2 CBT-TF comparator
The version of face-to-face CBT-TF used as a comparator in the trial was Cognitive Therapy for PTSD (CT-PTSD) (49), which is an evidence-based approach adopted by IAPT services in England, and psychological therapy services in England, Scotland and Wales. CBT-TF seeks to identify and modify problematic appraisals, memory characteristics and triggers, behavioural and cognitive strategies that maintain PTSD symptoms. Individuals assigned to face-to-face CBT-TF met with a therapist for up to twelve sessions, each lasting 60-90 minutes, augmented by between session homework assignments.

2.4 Measures

The full set of trial measures and their psychometric properties are described in the main paper (13). The current study utilised the Life Events Checklist-5 (LEC-5) at baseline (44); the past-month CAPS-5 (45) at baseline, and the past-week version at 16-week follow-up; the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) (50) at baseline; and the Client Satisfaction Questionnaire (CSQ-8) (51) at 16-week follow-up. The CSQ-8 is a widely used 8-item, Likert Scale self-report statement of satisfaction with a high

degree of internal consistency, good concurrent validity and reliability (52), with higher scores indicating higher satisfaction. In addition, this study utilised the Agnew Relationship Measure-5 (ARM-5), a validated shortened version of the 28-item ARM therapeutic alliance measure (53). Patient and therapist versions of the ARM-5 were administered at three weeks and 16 weeks post-randomisation.

2.4.1 Adherence
Therapy session adherence was recorded by therapists and described categorically, defined *a priori* as: non-uptake (being offered, but not starting therapy sessions); partial adherence (completion of less than three 'Spring' therapy sessions, or less than eight CBT-TF therapy sessions); and full adherence (completion of three or more 'Spring' therapy sessions, or eight or more CBT-TF therapy sessions, or where earlier cessation had been agreed as no further treatment was deemed necessary). Total mean therapy session adherence was calculated (number of therapy sessions attended, as a percentage of the available number of sessions; five for 'Spring' and twelve for CBT-TF, or fewer where earlier cessation agreed). 'Spring' programme usage was described categorically: not-started (no steps started); partial completers (starting any number of, and/or completing up to, but not all of the eight steps); or full completers (all steps complete).

2.4.2 Qualitative Interviews
Interviews followed topic guides, co-produced with individuals with lived experience of PTSD from a Public Advisory Group (PAG), who contributed their lived experience to assist with RAPID design, management, conduct, analyses, and dissemination. Semi-structured interviews were conducted by KS, a researcher with experience across several qualitative methodologies. This approach ensured consistency in questioning, whilst also allowing for exploration of topics that were important to the interviewee, to gather in-depth experiences and views. Interviews were audio-recorded and transcripts were anonymised during preparation for analysis.

2.5 Analyses
2.5.1 Quantitative
Descriptive and statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS version 23.0 (54). The clinical importance of any potential baseline characteristics imbalance was considered, and ANCOVAs were conducted for therapy session adherence, satisfaction, and therapeutic alliance, each controlling for gender, site, baseline CAPS-5, and time since trauma. Baseline PHQ-9 was also controlled for, given that greater treatment dropout and smaller reduction in PTSD symptom severity post-treatment has been demonstrated for individuals with PTSD comorbid with depression (55, 56). Multiple regression was performed to assess whether CAPS-5 PTSD symptoms at 16-week follow-up was correlated with a multi-faceted model of acceptability, with the covariate of PTSD symptoms at baseline, to understand the contribution of these variables to the total variance explained.

2.5.2 Qualitative
Cleaned interview transcripts were imported into QSR NVivo 12 (57), and data analyses occurred concurrently with data collection, using a constant comparison approach to explore themes and data saturation (58). Thematic Framework Analysis was employed, allowing for an inductive approach and a systematic model for managing and mapping data (59), adhering to the principles of the Critical Appraisal Skills Programme qualitative checklist (60). Saturation was monitored through a double-coding process, with at least 20% of transcripts double coded. Interviewers made field notes including notes on self-reflection practice immediately following interviews (61). Several authors discussed interpretations, with input and support from the PAG, initially developing analytic frameworks from the interview questions and the coding of the first few interview transcripts. The

analytic frameworks were applied when coding the remainder of the transcripts and to populate the codes into framework matrices.

3. Results

3.1 Participants

The RAPID participant consort diagram is provided in the main trial paper (13).

Seven hundred and twenty-six referrals were received, and 196 were recruited and randomised; 97 to 'Spring', and 99 to face-to-face CBT-TF. The 16-week follow-up was completed by 160 individuals; 77 'Spring' participants, and 83 CBT-TF participants.

3.1.1 Participant Characteristics

Participant demographic and clinical characteristics across treatment groups are shown in Table 1. Around two-thirds of participants were female, 180 (91.8%) identified their ethnicity as white, the total mean age was 36.5 (SD=13.4), and mean time since trauma was 37.4 months (SD=77.2). Mean PHQ-9 baseline score was 15.1 (SD=6.2), and CAPS-5 baseline score was 35.1 (SD=6.7). One hundred and twenty-four (63.3%) participants had a level of education of '2+ A levels or equivalent', roughly equivalent to the German Abitur, and the French di Esame di Stato, for example.

[Insert Table 1 here]

3.1.2 Interviewee Characteristics

As detailed in Table 2, five female, and three male 'Spring' participants were interviewed post-treatment, all identifying their ethnicity as white, with a mean age of 39.3 years. Three participants had PTSD to a transportation accident, two to an uncomfortable or unwanted sexual experience, one to a serious accident, one to a life threatening illness or injury, and one to sudden or violent death. The mean interview length was 40.3 minutes, ranging from 20 to 60 minutes. Six interviews were conducted prior to the COVID-19 national lockdown commencing 23rd March 2020, and two were conducted after, having received 'Spring' just prior to national lockdown.

[Insert Table 2 here]

As detailed in Table 3, seven of the 23 RAPID therapists delivering treatment participated in post-delivery qualitative interviews, three male, and four female. Most were working in South Wales, the majority with low familiarity with 'Spring' prior to their involvement in the RCT. Interviews ranged from 28 to 78 minutes, with a mean of 59.3 (SD=17.9). All interviews were conducted during COVID-19 UK national lockdown.

[Insert Table 3 here]

3.2 Adherence

3.2.1 Fidelity

As described in the main trial paper (13), there was good fidelity, with all but one of the 74 audios of therapy sessions being rated as at least satisfactory.

3.2.2 Non-uptake, dropout, and adverse events

Acceptability was demonstrated, indicated by high uptake across treatments and low dropout, though the latter was in favour of CBT-TF. Five (5.2%) 'Spring' participants, and three (3%) CBT-TF participants were offered but did not attend any therapy sessions. Ten individuals withdrew from 'Spring', reporting reasons including physical health, not being ready to engage in therapy, or to commit to therapy, or feeling better due to a medication change. Four individuals withdrew from CBT-TF, reporting reasons including serious illness in the family, difficulty getting time off work, or feeling that solutions were not offered. There were six serious adverse events, though none were found to be related to involvement in the trial.

3.2.3 Therapy session adherence

Therapy session adherence was described categorically and on a continuous scale. Seventy-eight (80.4%) 'Spring' participants, and 55 (55.6%) CBT-TF participants fully adhered. Twelve (12.4%) 'Spring' participants and 34 (34.3%) CBT-TF participants partially adhered to therapy sessions. The percentage of planned sessions was recorded by therapists and was available for 94 'Spring' and 96 CBT-TF participants. Mean percentage therapy adherence was 79.6 (SD=36.5), for 'Spring', and 72.4 (SD=28.9), for CBT-TF. There was a 4.8% higher therapy adherence for 'Spring' compared to CBT-TF, 95% CI: -3.5 to 13.1%, p=0.259.

3.2.4 'Spring' usage

'Spring' acceptability was indicated by usage. Ten participants (10.3%) did not start, and as log-in details were provided at the first therapy session, at least five of these participants did not have the means to log in, due to not attending sessions. Forty-eight (49.5%) participants, partially completed 'Spring', starting any number of steps, and/or completing up to seven steps, and 39 (40.2%) fully completed 'Spring'.

3.3 Therapeutic Alliance

As shown in Table 4, acceptability may be indicated by mean scores found for participant and therapist-reported alliance, at both treatment timepoints, across treatment groups.

[Insert Table 4 here]

ARM-5 scores were available mid-treatment for 44 'Spring' and 52 CBT-TF participants, and for 52 therapists delivering 'Spring' and 51 therapists delivering CBT-TF; and post-treatment for 58 'Spring' and 65 CBT-TF participants and 52 therapists delivering 'Spring' and 51 therapists delivering CBT-TF. No statistically significant differences between groups was found for: *Participant-reported therapeutic alliance* at mid-treatment which was 0.2% higher for CBT-TF than 'Spring', 95% CI: -1.0% to 1.4%, p=.715; *therapist-reported therapeutic alliance at mid-treatment* which was 0.6% higher for CBT-TF than 'Spring', 95% CI: -3.2% to 1.5%, p=.51; and *therapist-reported therapeutic alliance score at post-treatment* which was 0.6% higher for CBT-TF than 'Spring', 95% CI: -.4% to 1.6%, p=.218. A statistically significant difference between groups was however found for *participant-reported post-treatment therapeutic alliance,* which was 1.1% higher and in favour of CBT-TF compared with 'Spring', 95% CI: .1% to 2.1%p=.030.

3.4 Treatment satisfaction

CSQ-8 scores were available for 70 of the 97 'Spring' participants and for 75 of the 99 participants randomised to CBT-TF. The mean scores were 26.9 (SD=6.3) for 'Spring' participants, and 29.8 (SD=3.3) for CBT-TF participants, indicative of acceptability for both interventions. Treatment satisfaction was 3.3% higher for CBT-TF compared with 'Spring', 95% CI: 1.6% to 5.0%, p<.001.

3.5 Treatment acceptability and treatment outcome

Multiple regression was conducted to explore associations between PTSD symptoms at 16-weeks follow-up and the following variables, pooled across groups; therapy adherence, treatment satisfaction, participant- and therapist-reported therapeutic alliance, mid- and post-treatment. Missing data were excluded pairwise, resulting in 65 cases included due to a number of missing therapist record sheets and ARM-5 measures. The overall regression model was a good fit for the data; the model of acceptability explained 45% of the variance in treatment outcome across treatment groups (R^2=.450, $F(7, 57)$=6.675, p<.001). As shown in Table 5 treatment satisfaction and baseline PTSD symptoms were significant correlates of PTSD symptoms at 16-week follow-up (Beta=-.482, p=.002 and Beta=.355, p=.001 respectively) within the model. Post-hoc analyses revealed that the regression model remained a good fit for the data even with the removal of baseline PTSD symptoms (R^2=.337, $F(6, 58)$=4.912, p<.001).

[Insert Table 5 here]

3.6 Qualitative interviews

'Spring' was described as calming, containing, empowering, essential, progressive, and structured, with good outcomes from treatment including a better understanding of PTSD. Interviewees shared a mixture of views about its pace, length and flexibility and also about therapeutic alliance, with most, but not all interviewees viewing the treatment approach as motivating towards treatment engagement and recovery. Treatment components such as the grounding tools and the trauma narrative exercise were viewed as beneficial, though some therapists expressed concern about exposure work through the guided self-help approach, highlighting resistance and avoidance from some participants. Some raised concern about 'Spring' use for individuals with PTSD symptoms to particular traumas, for example traumas involving grief and loss. Some therapists told us that their preconceptions of 'Spring' had changed through experience and spoke of internet-based therapies widening and diversify treatment access. Themes generated from interviews are described in Table 6.

[Insert Table 6 here]

4. Discussion

The RCT demonstrated good acceptability for 'Spring' guided internet-based CBT-TF and its comparator, face-to-face CBT-TF. Over 89% of participants partially or fully completed 'Spring'. Therapy session adherence and therapeutic alliance did not differ across treatment groups, apart from post-treatment participant-reported alliance, which was slightly in favour of CBT-TF. Treatment satisfaction was high in both groups, and slightly in favour of CBT-TF. An evaluation of

acceptability as multi-faceted, valuing several measures alongside each other explained 45.0% of the variance in treatment outcome across groups.

Non-uptake of 'Spring' therapy sessions was 5.2%, and non-uptake of 'Spring' programme steps was 10.3%, which contrasts with higher non-uptake rates in some other studies as reported in a systematic review of i-CBT for PTSD (33). Most 'Spring' participants fully adhered to therapy sessions (79.4%), and partial adherence (12.4%) was lower than for CBT-TF participants (34.3%), lower than guided self-help dropout rates found in a review of eMental health for PTSD (62), and at the lower end of rates found in another review of i-CBT for PTSD (33).

In-depth interviews with purposively selected participants receiving, and therapists delivering 'Spring', provided a mixture of views and overall corroborated acceptability ratings. Interviews revealed 'Spring' opportunities and barriers and provided insights into future implementation, including an appreciation for the importance of adapting 'Spring' to suit an individual's needs and preferences. In line with the literature, interviews revealed that flexibility facilitated engagement (63).

Digital therapeutic alliance was voted a top ten research priority in a UK study involving 600 mental health stakeholders (64). The findings of this study contribute to this research priority, aligning with the literature in demonstrating the equality of online and face-to-face therapies (15, 65). It should however be noted that equality of alliance was not demonstrated post-treatment by participants, which was in favour of CBT-TF, though this did not appear to impact on symptom outcomes, with 'Spring' showing non-inferiority to CBT-TF at follow-up (13). This equality of alliance difference might therefore reflect perceptions of a relationship that had strengthened over several sessions, or an improvement in symptoms at the end of treatment. Participant alliance ratings were however stable across timepoints, suggesting acceptability of alliance throughout treatment.

The mean 'Spring' satisfaction rating was 26.4 (SD=6.5), of a possible total of 32, comparable with findings elsewhere, including a mean CSQ-8 rating of 28 (SD=4.8) found in a pilot study of a group guided self-help intervention for low mood and depression (66). This is encouraging since satisfaction is an essential determinant of service effectiveness (67) and is a key nationally recommended intervention outcome metric for mental health services in Wales (68). Interviewees generally described 'Spring' positively and as a valuable alternative to face-to-face therapy.

Therapist interviewees who had experience of delivering both treatments perceived 'Spring' to be an acceptable alternative to weekly face-to-face therapy, aligning with findings of blended internet-based CBT for depression, where 94% of therapists were overall very or mostly satisfied with it (69). Some therapists did note preconceptions that individuals would prefer face-to-face CBT-TF, aligning with therapist views elsewhere in the literature, that internet-based approaches will not be as effective as face-to-face approaches, and that they will fail to meet patient expectations (27). Some therapists reported that their preconceptions had been challenged through experience. This casts doubt on treatment allocation equipoise, at least initially for some therapists. Clinical equipoise is a methodological challenge of the RCT design, a potential bias that is perhaps more likely in cases where a therapist is more experienced in the delivery of one intervention, over the comparator and therefore one that exists across the literature, though arguably largely unavoidable in trials of manualised interventions (70).

4.1 Strengths and limitations

The strengths and limitations of the full trial are described in the main paper. Fidelity to treatment delivery was high. Roughly two-thirds of participants identified as female, consistent with the literature reporting a higher female PTSD prevalence (71-73), and mean age at assessment was in line with the age of onset of PTSD reported elsewhere (74). Roughly two thirds of participants were educated to '2+ A levels or equivalent', in line with reports that around 64% of people in the UK aged 19 to 64 years have an education level of National Qualifications Framework (NQF) level 3, or above, equivalent to '2+ A levels or equivalent' (75). This does however limit the generalisability of the findings to people with a lower education level and the literature suggests education level may be a predictor of engagement with internet-based interventions (76). Furthermore, it is also important to note the study excluded individuals who did not have regular access to the internet and those unable to read and write fluently in English.

The pragmatic nature of the trial allowed for exploration of acceptability in a broad clinical context, albeit with the exception that participants are randomly allocated to treatment (77). Qualitative interviews were interpreted with support from public members with lived experience of PTSD (the PAG). Researchers practiced reflexivity around qualitative interviewing and analyses, though we must still acknowledge the potential impact of researcher bias. We cannot generalise the findings of the qualitative interviews. All interviewees had started 'Spring' therefore the findings cannot reflect views from the 10.3% of participants who did not take up the programme. To focus on factors impacting acceptability and implementation, we purposively sampled individuals with different outcomes resulting in over-representation of individuals with poorer outcomes compared to the trial overall. We did not evaluate qualitative interviews from CBT-TF participants, limiting our ability to understand acceptability for the comparison intervention. Furthermore, the therapist interviewees had experience delivering both treatments, whereas the participant interviewees knew only of the 'Spring' treatment. All therapist interviews, and two 'Spring' participant interviews were conducted after the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic, which we know has accelerated the perceived need, provision and use of remote therapies (78), an unintended limitation or arguably a strength of the study. Acceptability was not measured beyond 16-week follow-up, limiting our understanding of acceptability to immediately post-treatment. We must acknowledge challenges measuring adherence. Therapy session adherence was determined using a continuous scale, defined *a priori* as the number of sessions attended, as a percentage of the expected number of sessions. The continuum was capped at 100% so that all individuals who attended the expected number of sessions, or more, which was five or more in the case of 'Spring', or twelve or more for CBT-TF, were interpreted as adhering at 100%. Our findings do not therefore account for the individuals who received more than the total number of sessions.

Measuring and interpreting internet-based intervention adherence is particularly challenging (42, 79). There was a surprising discrepancy between findings of 'Spring' therapy session adherence and programme usage. Seventy-eight participants adhered fully to therapy sessions, whilst only 39 fully completed all eight of the programme steps. It is possible that participants more readily engaged with 'Spring' therapy sessions than with completion of the online programme. Alternatively, the *a priori* definitions for 'Spring' therapy adherence and online programme usage may not be as useful as we might have expected. For example, the 'Spring' programme indicated that steps were not complete if the individual had chosen not to take the non-mandatory quiz at the end of the step, even where the individual had exposed themselves to all the content of the step and entered information into this step. Similarly, the range of 'Spring' usage in the category of partial completers was very large, ranging from an individual starting just step one, to an individual completing steps one to seven but only starting step eight. Furthermore, some individuals shown to have completed

some steps, may not have meaningfully engaged with those steps. Interpreting online engagement is therefore challenging.

The multi-faceted construct of acceptability was demonstrated as sound and explained 45.0% of the variance in treatment outcome across groups. This builds on previous work proposing acceptability as multi-faceted, and reflecting the views of patients and providers (36). We did not however have data from participants who had officially withdrawn or had become lost to follow-up, and several therapist record sheets and ARM-5 measures were missing, resulting in the exclusion of almost two-thirds of participants in the multi-component analysis, which may therefore be under powered. We also acknowledge the potential for false positives from other ad-hoc quantitative analyses due to the multiplicity of statistical testing.

4.2 Research Implications

Several patient-specific factors appear to be important for engagement and acceptability, including baseline PTSD symptoms and depression. Future research is needed to examine the interaction of facets of acceptability and moderators and mediators, to understand for whom guided internet-based therapies will be most appropriate (80). Research must address common methodological challenges that have been highlighted, including measuring internet-based intervention adherence. Standardised methodology is required to draw meaningful comparisons across studies. Online intervention reporting guidelines are available (42). Measures specific to digital health interventions are available including a version of the ARM (43).

These findings contribute to evidence that guided internet-based therapies are suitable for mild to moderate disorders (23, 81). The mixture of views collected through qualitative interviews, sometimes opposing, suggests the importance of personalising guided self-help, depending on an individual's presentation, treatment formulation, and preferences. Further research is now required to understand the impact of adapting guided self-help. For example, adapting programmes to be available in a service user's mother tongue, or changing the gender of the voice over (82), or delivering the intervention entirely remotely (25, 83). Adaptations might include changes to the pace or time allocated to treatment components, which may be evaluated in routine clinical practice, for example 'Plan-Do-Study-Act' quality improvement (QI) initiatives (84). A QI project is currently examining 'Spring' delivered entirely remotely, in the context of routine NHS Wales practice.

The therapists of the RAPID trial were all experienced trauma psychological therapists, with prior experience delivering CBT-TF, casting some doubt on the level of equipoise. We need to understand the competencies required by guiding clinicians to facilitate guided self-help engagement and to enable individuals to feel safe to disclose trauma information and engage in remote trauma based processing (85, 86), as well as understanding the optimal model of training and supervision required, in line with findings elsewhere (26). Research should explore the extent to which guided internet-based therapies may be able to play a part in the treatment of people with severe PTSD, people with PTSD to multiple and prolonged traumas, and people with more complex needs (83, 87).

4.3 Clinical Implications

Guided self-help may increase availability and equitable resources for mental health care globally, potentially addressing unmet needs in many settings where evidence based psychological interventions are currently inaccessible (88). Guided self-help may however exclude some people if easy read versions or modifiable programmes are not available, and if equipment and mobile

network data cannot be provided. Shared decision making would consider an individual's readiness to engage with trauma-focused psychological therapies, holding in mind that some may choose not to engage with internet-based approaches (89). Clinicians may draw on literature identifying opportunities and barriers to working with and rolling out guided internet-based treatments for PTSD (26). For example, a lack of supervision and training have been identified as barriers (90), therefore protection of time and resources may be beneficial (91).

5. Acknowledgements

6. References

1. Bisson JI, Cosgrove S, Lewis C, Roberts NP. Post-traumatic stress disorder. 2015.

2. Karatzias T, Cloitre M, Maercker A, Kazlauskas E, Shevlin M, Hyland P, et al. PTSD and Complex PTSD: ICD-11 updates on concept and measurement in the UK, USA, Germany and Lithuania. European journal of psychotraumatology. 2018;8(sup7):1418103-6.

3. Steel Z, Chey T, Silove D, Marnane C, Bryant R, van Ommeren M. Association of Torture and Other Potentially Traumatic Events With Mental Health Outcomes Among Populations Exposed to Mass Conflict and Displacement A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. JAMA-J Am Med Assoc2009. p. 537-49.

4. Wilson LC. A systematic review of probable posttraumatic stress disorder in first responders following man-made mass violence. Psychiatry Research. 2015;229(1-2):21-6.

5. Carmassi C, Foghi C, Dell'Oste V, Cordone A, Bertelloni CA, Bui E, et al. PTSD symptoms in healthcare workers facing the three coronavirus outbreaks: What can we expect after the COVID-19 pandemic. Psychiatry Res. 2020;292:113312.

6. Roberts NP, Lotzin A, Schäfer I. A systematic review and meta-analysis of psychological interventions for comorbid post-traumatic stress disorder and substance use disorder. European Journal of Psychotraumatology. 2022;13(1):2041831.

7. Ferry FR, Brady SE, Bunting BP, Murphy SD, Bolton D, O' Neill SM. The Economic Burden of PTSD in Northern Ireland. Journal of Traumatic Stress. 2015;28(3):191-7.

8. Lewis C, Roberts NP, Andrew M, Starling E, Bisson JI. Psychological therapies for post-traumatic stress disorder in adults: systematic review and meta-analysis. European Journal of Psychotraumatology. 2020;11(1):1729633.

9. NICE. Post-traumatic stress disorder (NICE guideline NG116) 2018 [Available from: https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng116.

10. ISTSS. Posttraumatic Stress Disorder Prevention and Treatment Guidelines: Methodology and Recommendations 2018 [Available from: http://www.istss.org/getattachment/Treating-Trauma/New-ISTSS-Prevention-and-Treatment-Guidelines/ISTSS_PreventionTreatmentGuidelines_FNL.pdf.aspx.

11. Ehlers A, Clark DM. A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. Behaviour Research and Therapy. 2000;38(4):319-45.

12. Simon N, Robertson L, Lewis C, Roberts NP, Bethell A, Dawson S, et al. Internet-based cognitive and behavioural therapies for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in adults. Cochrane library. 2021.

13. Bisson JI, Ariti C, Cullen K, Kitchiner N, Lewis C, Roberts NP, et al. Guided, internet based, cognitive behavioural therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder: pragmatic, multicentre, randomised controlled non-inferiority trial (RAPID). BMJ. 2022;377:e069405.

14. Nollett C, Lewis C, Kitchiner N, Roberts N, Addison K, Brookes-Howell L, et al. Pragmatic randomised controlled trial of a trauma-focused guided self-help programme versus individual trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder (RAPID): trial protocol. BMC Psychiatry. 2018;18(1):Article 77-Article

15. Schumacher S, Weiss D, Knaevelsrud C. Dissemination of exposure in the treatment of anxiety disorders and post-traumatic stress disorder among German cognitive behavioural therapists. Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy. 2018;25(6):856-64.

16. Becker CB, Zayfert C, Anderson E. A survey of psychologists' attitudes towards and utilization of exposure therapy for PTSD. Behaviour research and therapy. 2004;42(3):277-92.

17. NHS. The NHS long term plan. 2019 [Available from: https://www.longtermplan.nhs.uk/.

18. Hollis C, Morriss R, Martin J, Amani S, Cotton R, Denis M, et al. Technological innovations in mental healthcare: harnessing the digital revolution. British journal of psychiatry. 2018;206(4):263-5.

19. Torous J, Andersson G, Bertagnoli A, Christensen H, Cuijpers P, Firth J, et al. Towards a consensus around standards for smartphone apps and digital mental health. World psychiatry. 2019;18(1):97-8.

20. Wakefield S, Kellett S, Simmonds-Buckley M, Stockton D, Bradbury A, Delgadillo J. Improving Access to Psychological Therapies (IAPT) in the United Kingdom: A systematic review and meta-analysis of 10-years of practice-based evidence. British Journal of Clinical Psychology. 2021;n/a(n/a):e12259.

21. Bennion MR, Hardy G, Moore RK, Millings A. E-therapies in England for stress, anxiety or depression: what is being used in the NHS? A survey of mental health services. BMJ Open. 2017;7(1):e014844.

22. Andersson G, Carlbring P, Titov N, Lindefors N. Internet Interventions for Adults with Anxiety and Mood Disorders: A Narrative Umbrella Review of Recent Meta-Analyses. Can J Psychiatry. 2019;64(7):465-70.

23. Topooco N, Riper H, Araya R, Berking M, Brunn M, Chevreul K, et al. Attitudes towards digital treatment for depression: A European stakeholder survey. Internet interventions : the application of information technology in mental and behavioural health. 2017;8(C):1-9.

24. Hadjistavropoulos HD, Pugh NE, Hesser H, Andersson G. Therapeutic Alliance in Internet-Delivered Cognitive Behaviour Therapy for Depression or Generalized Anxiety: Therapeutic Alliance in Internet-Delivered Therapy. Clinical psychology and psychotherapy. 2017;24(2):451-61.

25. Wild J, Warnock-Parkes E, Murray H, Kerr A, Thew G, Grey N, et al. Treating posttraumatic stress disorder remotely with cognitive therapy for PTSD. European Journal of Psychotraumatology. 2020;11(1):1785818.

26. Simon N, Ploszajski M, Lewis C, Smallman K, Roberts NP, Kitchiner NJ, et al. Internet-based psychological therapies: A qualitative study of National Health Service commissioners and managers views. Psychology and Psychotherapy: Theory, Research and Practice 2021.

27. Thew GR. IAPT and the internet: the current and future role of therapist-guided internet interventions within routine care settings. Cognitive behaviour therapist. 2020;13.

28. Andersson G, Titov N, Dear BF, Rozental A, Carlbring P. Internet-delivered psychological treatments: from innovation to implementation. World psychiatry. 2019;18(1):20-8.

29. Berger T. The therapeutic alliance in internet interventions: A narrative review and suggestions for future research. Psychotherapy Research. 2017;27(5):511-24.

30. Lewis C, Roberts NP, Gibson S, Bisson JI. Dropout from psychological therapies for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) in adults: systematic review and meta-analysis. Eur J Psychotraumatol. 2020;11(1):1709709.

31. Szafranski DD, Smith BN, Gros DF, Resick PA. High rates of PTSD treatment dropout: A possible red herring? Journal of Anxiety Disorders. 2017;47(C):91-8.

32.   Békés V, Aafjes-van Doorn K. Psychotherapists' attitudes toward online therapy during the COVID-19 pandemic. Journal of psychotherapy integration. 2020;30(2):238-47.

33.   Simon N, McGillivray L, Roberts NP, Barawi K, Lewis CE, Bisson JI. Acceptability of internet-based cognitive behavioural therapy (i-CBT) for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD): a systematic review. European Journal of Psychotraumatology. 2019;10(1):1646092.

34.   Maxwell. dimensions in quality revisited. Quality in Health Care. 1992.

35.   Kazdin AE. ACCEPTABILITY OF ALTERNATIVE TREATMENTS FOR DEVIANT CHILD BEHAVIOR. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis. 1980;13(2):259-73.

36.   Sekhon M, Cartwright M, Francis J. Acceptability of healthcare interventions: an overview of reviews and development of a theoretical framework. BMC Health Services Research. 2017;17.

37.   Hamblen JL, Norman SB, Sonis JH, Phelps AJ, Bisson JI, Nunes VD, et al. A guide to guidelines for the treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder in adults: An update. Psychotherapy (Chic). 2019;56(3):359-73.

38.   Swift JK, Callahan JL. The impact of client treatment preferences on outcome: a meta-analysis. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 2009;4(4):368-81.

39.   Wallin EEK, Mattsson S, Olsson EMG. The Preference for Internet-Based Psychological Interventions by Individuals Without Past or Current Use of Mental Health Treatment Delivered Online: A Survey Study With Mixed-Methods Analysis. JMIR mental health. 2016;3(2):e25-e.

40.   Craig P, Dieppe P, Macintyre S, Mitchie S, Nazareth I, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: The new Medical Research Council guidance. BMJ. 2008;337(7676):979-83.

41.   NICE. NICE decision aids: process guide. NICE; 2018.

42.   Eysenbach G. CONSORT-EHEALTH: Improving and Standardizing Evaluation Reports of Web-based and Mobile Health Interventions. J Med Internet Res. 2011;13(4):e126.

43.   Berry N, Lobban F, Emsley R, Bucci S. Acceptability of Interventions Delivered Online and Through Mobile Phones for People Who Experience Severe Mental Health Problems: A Systematic Review. J Med Internet Res. 2016;18(5):e121.

44.   Weathers FWB DDS, P.P.; Kaloupek, D.G.; Marx, B.P.; Keane, T.M. the Life Events Checklist for DSM-5 (LEC-5) 2013 [Available from: www.ptsd.va.gov2013.

45.   Weathers FW, Blake, D.D., Schnurr, P.P., Kaloupek, D.G., Marx, B.P., & Keane, T.M. The Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5)2013. Available from: http://www.ptsd.va.gov/.

46.   Santiago PN, Ursano RJ, Gray CL, Pynoos RS, Spiegel D, Lewis-Fernandez R, et al. A Systematic Review of PTSD Prevalence and Trajectories in DSM-5 Defined Trauma Exposed Populations: Intentional and Non-Intentional Traumatic Events. PloS one. 2013;8(4):e59236.

47.   Craig P, Petticrew M. Developing and evaluating complex interventions: Reflections on the 2008 MRC guidance. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2012.

48.   Lewis CE, Farewell D, Groves V, Kitchiner NJ, Roberts NP, Vick T, et al. Internet-based guided self-help for posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD): Randomized controlled trial. Depress Anxiety. 2017;34(6):555-65.

49.   Clarke Ea. A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. Behav Res Ther. 2000;38(4):319-45.

50.   Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW. The PHQ-9. Journal of general internal medicine : JGIM. 2001;16(9):606-13.

51.   Larsen DL, Attkisson, C.C., Hargreaves, W.A., and Nguyen, T.D. Assessment of client/patient satisfaction: Development of a general scale. Evaluation and Program Planning. 1979;2:197-207.

52.   Nguyen TD, Attkisson CC, Stegner BL. Assessment of patient satisfaction: Development and refinement of a Service Evaluation Questionnaire. Evaluation and Program Planning. 1983;6(3):299-313.

53.   Cahill J, Stiles WB, Barkham M, Hardy GE, Stone G, Agnew-Davies R, et al. Two short forms of the Agnew Relationship Measure: The ARM-5 and ARM-12. Psychotherapy Research. 2012;22(3):241-55.

54.   Corp I. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 23.0 Armonk, NY: IBM Corp; Released 2015.

55.   Flory JD, Yehuda R. Comorbidity between post-traumatic stress disorder and major depressive disorder: alternative explanations and treatment considerations. Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience. 2015;17(2):141-50.

56.   Barawi KS, Lewis C, Simon N, Bisson JI. A systematic review of factors associated with outcome of psychological treatments for post-traumatic stress disorder. Eur J Psychotraumatol. 2020;11(1):1774240.

57.   Ltd. QIP. NVivo (released in March 2020)2020.

58.   Saunders B, Sim J, Kingstone T, Baker S, Waterfield J, Bartlam B, et al. Saturation in qualitative research: exploring its conceptualization and operationalization. Quality & Quantity. 2018;52(4):1893-907.

59.   Gale NK, Heath G, Cameron E, Rashid S, Redwood S. Using the framework method for the analysis of qualitative data in multi-disciplinary health research. BMC medical research methodology. 2013;13(1):117-.

60.   Programme CCAS. CASP Qualitative Checklist 2019 [Available from: https://casp-uk.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/CASP-Qualitative-Checklist-2018.pdf.

61.   Stahl NA, King JR. Expanding Approaches for Research: Understanding and Using Trustworthiness in Qualitative Research. Journal of developmental education. 2020;44(1):26-8.

62.   Gaebel W, Großimlinghaus I, Mucic D, Maercker A, Zielasek J, Kerst A. EPA guidance on eMental health interventions in the treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD). European Psychiatry. 2017;41:140-52.

63.   Davies F, Shepherd HL, Beatty L, Clark B, Butow P, Shaw J. Implementing Web-Based Therapy in Routine Mental Health Care: Systematic Review of Health Professionals' Perspectives. Journal of medical Internet research. 2020;22(7):e17362.

64.   Hollis C, Sampson S, Simons L, Davies EB, Churchill R, Betton V, et al. Identifying research priorities for digital technology in mental health care: results of the James Lind Alliance Priority Setting Partnership. The Lancet Psychiatry. 2018;5(10):845-54.

65.   Pihlaja S, Stenberg J-H, Joutsenniemi K, Mehik H, Ritola V, Joffe G. Therapeutic alliance in guided internet therapy programs for depression and anxiety disorders – A systematic review. Internet Interventions. 2018;11:1-10.

66.   McClay C-A, Collins K, Matthews L, Haig C, McConnachie A, Morrison J, et al. A community-based pilot randomised controlled study of life skills classes for individuals with low mood and depression. BMC Psychiatry. 2015;15(1):17.

67.   DoH. IAPT Outcome Framework and Data Collection. In: England. NIfMHi, editor.

68.   Withers KLP, Sarah; O'Connell, Susan; Palmer, Robert I.; and Carolan-Rees, Grace. Standardising the collection of patient-reported

experience measures to facilitate benchmarking and

drive service improvement. Patient Experience Journal. 2018;5(3).

69.   Mol M, van Genugten C, Dozeman E, van Schaik DJF, Draisma S, Riper H, et al. Why Uptake of Blended Internet-Based Interventions for Depression Is Challenging: A Qualitative Study on Therapists' Perspectives. Journal of Clinical Medicine. 2020;9(1).

70.   Cook C, Sheets C. Clinical equipoise and personal equipoise: two necessary ingredients for reducing bias in manual therapy trials. The Journal of manual & manipulative therapy. 2011;19(1):55-7.

71.   Olff M. Sex and gender differences in post-traumatic stress disorder: an update. European Journal of Psychotraumatology. 2017;8(sup4).

72.   Pietrzak RH, Goldstein RB, Southwick SM, Grant BF. Prevalence and Axis I comorbidity of full and partial posttraumatic stress disorder in the United States: Results from Wave 2 of the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. Journal of Anxiety Disorders. 2011;25(3):456-65.

73.   Ditlevsen DN, Elklit A. Gender, trauma type, and PTSD prevalence: a re-analysis of 18 nordic convenience samples. Annals of general psychiatry. 2012;11(1):26.

74.   Lijster JMd, Dierckx B, Utens EMWJ, Verhulst FC, Zieldorff C, Dieleman GC, et al. The Age of Onset of Anxiety Disorders: A Meta-analysis. The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry. 2016;62(4):237-46.

75.   Statistics N. Education and training statistics for the UK. 2020.

76.   Karyotaki E, Efthimiou O, Miguel C, Bermpohl FMg, Furukawa TA, Cuijpers P, et al. Internet-Based Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Depression: A Systematic Review and Individual Patient Data Network Meta-analysis. JAMA Psychiatry. 2021.

77.   Schwartz D, Lellouch J. Explanatory and Pragmatic Attitudes in Therapeutical Trials. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2009;62(5):499-505.

78.   Wind TR, Rijkeboer M, Andersson G, Riper H. The COVID-19 pandemic: The 'black swan' for mental health care and a turning point for e-health. Internet interventions. 2020;20:100317-.

79.   Beintner I, Vollert B, Zarski A-C, Bolinski F, Musiat P, Görlich D, et al. Adherence Reporting in Randomized Controlled Trials Examining Manualized Multisession Online Interventions: Systematic Review of Practices and Proposal for Reporting Standards. J Med Internet Res. 2019;21(8):e14181.

80.   Rozental A, Andersson G, Carlbring P. In the Absence of Effects: An Individual Patient Data Meta-Analysis of Non-response and Its Predictors in Internet-Based Cognitive Behavior Therapy. Frontiers in Psychology. 2019;10(589).

81.   Stephen P, Craig W, Clare T, Tony K. GUIDELINES: Identification and care pathways for common mental health disorders: summary of NICE guidance. BMJ: British Medical Journal. 2011;342(7808):1203-6.

82.   Peck D. Hands-on-Help: Computer-Aided Psychotherapy Isaac M. Marks, Kate Cavanagh and Lina Gega Hove: Psychology Press (Maudsley Monograph 49), (2007). pp. 296. ISBN: 1-84169-679-9. Behavioural and cognitive psychotherapy. 2008;36(1):121-3.

83.   Ashwick R, Turgoose D, Murphy D. Exploring the acceptability of delivering Cognitive Processing Therapy (CPT) to UK veterans with PTSD over Skype: a qualitative study. European journal of psychotraumatology. 2019;10(1):1573128.

84.   Knudsen SV, Laursen HVB, Johnsen SP, Bartels PD, Ehlers LH, Mainz J. Can quality improvement improve the quality of care? A systematic review of reported effects and methodological rigor in plan-do-study-act projects. BMC health services research. 2019;19(1):1-10.

85.   Kehle-Forbes S, Kimerling R. Patient Engagement in PTSD Treatment. PTSD Research Quarterly. 2017:1-10.

86.   Capaldi S, Asnaani A, Zandberg LJ, Carpenter JK, Foa EB. Therapeutic Alliance during Prolonged Exposure Versus Client-Centered Therapy for Adolescent Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. Journal of Clinical Psychology. 2016;72(10):1026-36.

87.   Olff M, Amstadter A, Armour C, Birkeland MS, Bui E, Cloitre M, et al. A decennial review of psychotraumatology: what did we learn and where are we going? European journal of psychotraumatology. 2019;10(1):1672948.

88.   Olff M. Mobile mental health: a challenging research agenda. European Journal of Psychotraumatology. 2015;6(1).

89.   Ennis L, Rose D, Denis M, Pandit N, Wykes T. Can't surf, won't surf: The digital divide in mental health. Journal of Mental Health. 2012;21(4):395-403.

90.   Finch J, Ford C, Grainger L, Meiser-Stedman R. A systematic review of the clinician related barriers and facilitators to the use of evidence-informed interventions for post traumatic stress. Journal of Affective Disorders. 2020;263:175-86.

91.   Sarre S, Maben J, Aldus C, Schneider J, Wharrad H, Nicholson C, et al. The challenges of training, support and assessment of healthcare support workers: A qualitative study of experiences in three English acute hospitals. International Journal of Nursing Studies. 2018;79:145-53.

Tables

	Total (n=196)	GSH (n=97)	TF-CBT (n=99)
Female Gender (%)			
	125 (63.8%)	62 (63.9%)	63 (63.6%)
Age at assessment			
	36.5 (13.4)	35.4 (13.5)	37.6 (13.4)
Time since trauma (in months)			
	37.4 (77.2)	36.3 (80.9)	38.5 (73.6)
Mean Total Baseline PTSD Symptoms Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Version 5 (CAPS-5) (SD)			
	35.1 (6.7)	34.6 (6.8)	35.6 (6.7)
Mean Total Baseline Depression Patient Health Questionnaire Version 9 (PHQ-9) (SD)			
	15.1 (6.2)	15.1 (6.7)	15.1 (5.7)
Ethnicity			
White: Welsh/English/Scottish/Northern Irish/British	172 (87.8%)	86 (88.7%)	86 (86.9%)
White: Irish	2 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)
White: Any other White background	6 (3.1%)	3 (3.1%)	3 (3.0%)
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups: White and Black Caribbean	1 (.5%)	_	1 (1.0%)
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups: White and Black African	1 (.5%)	1 (1.0%)	_
Mixed/Multiple ethnic groups: Any other Mixed / Multiple ethnic background	1 (.5%)	1 (1.0%)	_
Asian/Asian British: Indian	3 (1.5%)	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.0%)
Asian/Asian British: Pakistani	1 (.5%)	1 (1.0%)	_
Asian/Asian British: Bangladeshi	1 (.5%)	_	1 (1.0%)
Asian/Asian British: Chinese	2 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British: African	3 (1.5%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.0%)

	Total (n=196)	GSH (n=97)	TF-CBT (n=99)
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British: Caribbean	1 (.5%)	_	1 (1.0%)
Black / African / Caribbean / Black British: Any other Black / African / Caribbean background	1 (.5%)	_	1 (1.0%)
Any other ethnic group	1 (.5%)	_	1 (1.0%)
Highest level of qualification			
'No qualifications'	8 (4.1%)	7 (7.2%)	1 (1.0%)
'1-4 UK General Certificate of Secondary Education (GCSE) or equivalent' (the UK GCSE is equivalent to the International General Certificate of Secondary Education (IGCSE))	24 (12.3%)	12 (12.4%)	12 (12.1%)
'5+ GCSEs or equivalent'	36 (18.4%)	17 (17.5%)	19 (19.2%)
'Apprenticeship'	4 (2.0%)	1 (1.0%)	3 (3.0%)
'2+ A Levels or equivalent' (the UK A level is roughly equivalent to the German Abitur, and the French di Esame di Stato, for example)	46 (23.5%)	24 (24.7%)	22 (22.2%)
'Degree level or above'	64 (32.7%)	27 (27.8%)	37 (37.4%)
'Other qualifications' (level unknown)	14 (7.1%	9 (9.3%)	5 (5.0%)
Recruitment Site			
Aneurin Bevan University Health Board (UHB)	9 (4.6%)	5 (5.2%)	4 (4.0%)
Cardiff & Vale UHB	77 (39.3%)	40 (41.2%)	37 (37.4%)
Coventry and Warwickshire Partnership National Health Service (NHS) Trust	20 (10.2%)	9 (9.3%)	11 (11.1%)
Cwm Taf Morgannwg UHB	19 (9.7%)	8 (8.3%)	11 (11.1%)
East London NHS Foundation Trust	7 (3.6%)	3 (3.1%)	4 (4.0%)
NHS Lothian	34 (17.4%)	17 (17.5%)	17 (17.2%)
Pennine Care NHS Foundation Trust	27 (13.8%)	13 (13.4%)	14 (14.1%)
South West Yorkshire Partnership NHS Foundation Trust	3 (1.5%)	2 (2.1%)	1 (1.0%)

	Total (n=196)	GSH (n=97)	TF-CBT (n=99)

Table 1: Demographic and clinical characteristics of RAPID participants at baseline

Pseudonym	Gender	Age band	Ethnicity	Education level	Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Version 5 (CAPS-5) Baseline Total score	Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Version 5 (CAPS-5) 16week Total score	'Spring' completion	Pre/Post COVID-19 UK national lockdown	Interview length (minutes)
Mike	Male	50-60	White Irish	Other vocational/work-related qualifications (level unknown)	39	36	Full completion	No	46
Kay	Female	60-70	White British	Other vocational/work-related qualifications (level unknown)	33	3	Full completion	No	46
Ellen	Female	20-30	White	5+GCSEs	32	9	Partial completion	No	38
Stewart	Male	50-60	White	Other vocational/work-related qualifications (level unknown)	39	24	Full completion	No	43
Becky	Female	20-30	White	2+ A levels	40	16	Full completion	No	28
Clare	Female	20-3-0	White	Degree level or above	49	40	Full completion	No	20
Emma	Female	30-40	White	Degree level or above	27	11	Partial completion	Yes	60

Luke	Male	30-40	White	5+ GCSEs		39	7	Full completion	Yes	41

Table 2: Participant (pseudonym) characteristics, 'Spring' GSH i-CBT-TF steps completed, and interview length.

Pseudonym	Research Region	Gender	Familiarity with 'Spring' (prior to RAPID RCT)	Interview Length (minutes)
Christian	South Wales	Male	Very high	46
Laura	South Wales	Female	Low	62
Jenny	South Wales	Female	Low	78
William	South Wales	Male	Low	28
Annabel	Central England	Female	Low	78
Meg	Central Scotland	Female	Low	57
Gavin	Central Scotland	Male	Low	66

Table 3: Therapist (pseudonym) characteristics, familiarity with 'Spring' (prior to RAPID RCT), and interview length

	Mean Total Therapeutic Alliance (Agnew Relationship Measure Version 5) (SD)			
	Participant Mid-Treatment	**Therapist Mid-Treatment**	**Participant Post-Treatment**	**Therapist Post-Treatment**
'Spring' guided internet-based Cognitive Behavioural Therapy with a trauma-focus	26.9 (3.0) (n=44)	25.5 (2.5) (n=52)	26.9 (3.6) (n=58)	23.3 (14.1) (n=56)
Face-to-face Cognitive Behavioural Therapy with a trauma-focus	27.4 (3.1) (n=52)	26.1 (1.95) (n=51)	28.1 (1.8) (n=65)	25.7 (6.2) (n=55)
Total	27.2 (3.0) (n=96)	25.8 (2.3) (n=103)	27.5 (2.8) (n=123)	24.5 (11.0) (n=111)

Table 4: Therapeutic alliance scores reported by participants and therapists at mid- and post-treatment, across groups

Variable (n=65)	Beta, 95% CI [lower, upper]	p-value
Therapy adherence	.021 [-.07, .08]	.850
Satisfaction	-.482 [-1.59, -.39]	.002
Therapeutic Alliance Participant Mid-treatment	.235 [-.03, 1.76]	.058
Therapeutic Alliance Participant Post-treatment	-.140 [-1.85, .75]	.399
Therapeutic Alliance Therapist Mid-treatment	.051 [-.90, 1.40]	.667
Therapeutic Alliance Therapist Post-treatment	-.168 [-.41, .07]	.156
Baseline Clinician Administered PTSD Scale for the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders Version 5 (CAPS-5)	.355 [.24, .92]	.001

Table 5: Summary of multiple linear regression analyses for therapy adherence, treatment satisfaction, therapeutic alliance, and baseline CAPS5 as correlates of CAPS5 at 16 weeks follow up

'Spring' theme 1   **Calming, containing, empowering, essential, progressive and structured.**
"I think it was… a very great and, and progressive method of doing this and ironically as the year's gone on with COVID I think you know, something like that is more and more essential…"   *(participant, Emma).*
"that variation for the therapist helps… guiding them along their journey... there were parts that kind of felt more, erm, therapeutic… but… yeah, it's a lot less intensive for the therapists."   (therapist, Annabel).
"it was so structured, it also helped me to try and also maintain a structure, and the other people as well. Especially if… they're prone to going off at a tangent… it helped them as well."   *(therapist, Gavin).*
'Spring' theme 2   **A mixture of views about its pace, length, and flexibility.**
"it was nice to just do half an hour every day… just perfect for me."   (participant, Luke).
"I honestly don't think that eight weeks, in my situation… it's not long enough."   *(participant, Mike).*
"luckily it fit in around work..."   *(participant, Stewart)*
"people can do it in their own homes if they felt a bit nervous about talking to somebody."   (participant, Becky)
"factoring in something that was self-driven myself, at home when I had a new born and… suffering from trauma was very difficult to do..."

*(*participant, Emma)
'Spring' theme 3   **A mixture of views about 'Spring' therapeutic alliance**
"I had a little bit of a dip where… it sort of gets worse before it gets better when you're confronting it… So she [therapist]… made me do it [trauma narrative exercise] there with her… Someone's sort of picking you up as you're going along."   *(participant, Ellen)*
Participant *Becky described the sessions as, "very administrative"*
"I noticed… a much stronger therapeutic alliance with the patients I was doing the face-to-face sessions with."   (therapist, William)
"the thoughts work and the updates to the memory… felt a lot more therapeutic… I think rapport was built quite well and I think that first face to face appointment makes a big difference…"   (therapist, Annabel).
'Spring' theme 4   **Benefits and drawbacks of 'Spring' treatment components**
"breathing exercises and stuff like that, so if I ever felt anxious… I would log on… it was a comfort for me… I felt grounded."   *(participant, Luke)*
Ellen described the trauma narrative exercise as a turning point, "where I went over the hill and it got it a lot easier… I think it's acceptance of what has happened… essentially getting it out."
"thinking about them having to go through that [exposure/reliving] on their own… I was… happy to do that in the session, together if we needed to, you're kind of there to really sort of help that process."   *(*therapist, Jenny)
'Spring' theme 5   ***Potential limitations of 'Spring' for individuals with PTSD symptoms to a specific trauma, or with complexity***
"delivering the programme when somebody had… lost a loved one I found that a little bit challenging… the grieving is going on as well… people probably benefit more from one to one…"   *(therapist, Jenny)*
In relation to themes of shame and guilt, Laura shared, "they could be addressed through guided self-help but I just felt that it needed more of a personal component to it from the therapist."
'Spring' theme 6   **Preconceptions of 'Spring' had been challenged through experience**
"… the bias I entered into was that the… cognitive therapy for PTSD [face-to-face therapy] … was going to be superior over the online version… But very quickly that's challenged."   *(therapist, Meg)*
"I think it's slightly surprising because people weren't as shocked as you think about only offering them… the guided self-help."   *(therapist, Laura)*
"I've become more… relaxed about using online…"   *(therapist, Gavin)*
'Spring' theme 7   **Widening and diversifying treatment access**
"you need the influencers… people with the power to commission… people that can see the value in it… in psychotherapies and mental health and… policy makers and Government."   (therapist, Christian)
'Spring' theme 8   **Good outcomes from 'Spring'**

"I just didn't wanna be around anyone cos I just felt angry all the time for no reason… but it kinda helped me realise that it's normal and I can stop being angry… I did then start making more of an effort to see my friends again."
(participant, Becky)

Table 6: Qualitative interview themes about 'Spring'