

Multimedia Appendix 1. Summary of efficacy studies of synchronous text-based psychological interventions.

Study	Population or sample	Design (eg, RCT ^a)	Eligibility criteria (specific diagnosis)	Intervention and duration (eg, single session, 6 week program)	Control condition (eg, TAU ^b)	Attrition	Main findings
S1. Blankers et al (2011), Netherlands [18]	<p>N=205 adults with drinking problems</p> <p>Therapy alcohol online n=68, Age: mean=41.9; 49% male</p> <p>Internet-based self-help n=68, Age: mean=41.1, 49% male</p> <p>Waitlist n=69, Age mean=43.7, 51% male</p>	RCT	18 years or older; AUDIT ^c score>8 to report drinking an average of more than 14 standard drinks a week	<p>Synchronous Web-based therapy based on CBT^d and motivation interviewing conducted in up to 7 text-based chat-therapy sessions (TAO^f)</p> <p>Assessments at baseline, 3 and 6 months</p>	<p>Self-help Alcohol Online, a fully automated treatment intervention based on CBT and motivational interviewing (SAO^g)</p> <p>Untreated waiting-list control group (WL^h)</p>	<p>TAO=36% at 3 months did not complete assessments, 40% at 6 months did not complete assessments</p> <p>SAO=30% at 3 months did not complete assessments; 43% at 6 months did not complete assessments</p> <p>WL= 26% at 3 months did not complete assessments, and 38% at 6 months did not complete assessments</p>	<p>Alcohol consumption: significant effects for TAO versus WL ($P=.002$) and for SAO versus WL ($P=.03$) on alcohol consumption at 3 months</p> <p>Differences between TAO and SAO were not significant at 3 months ($P=.11$) but were significant at 6 months ($P=.03$), with larger effects obtained for TAO</p> <p>QOLS^h score: differences between TAO and WL were significant at 3 months ($P=.11$) with</p>

							larger effects obtained for TAO Differences between TAO and SAO were not significant at 3 months ($P=.37$) but were at 6 months ($P=.02$) with larger effects obtained for TAO
S2. Cohen and Kerr (1999), United States [19]	N=24 Adolescents and adults (self-identified as wanting help for dealing with anxiety)	RCT	Help-seeking for anxiety	Single session Sessions conducted by psychology graduate students	TAU (face-to-face)		Anxiety: STAI ^l scores reduced significantly for both groups (chat and face-to-face) No significant differences between intervention groups
S3. Crutzen et al (2014), Netherlands [20]	N=12 Adolescents with psychosocial problems Web-based chat (n=5) Face-to-face (n=7)	RCT	SDQ ^l total score of 12 or higher on the SDQ	Three Web-based chat consultations with a YHC ^k worker (over a 3 month period)	Three face-to-face consultations with a YHC worker (over a 3 month period)	N=360 were invited to join the study; N=70 met secondary exclusion criteria n=165 declined to participate; n=74 not invited to participate; n=12 wrongly excluded;	Trial abandoned due to low recruitment rates

						n=10 no information; n=17 drop out before participation	
S4. Dowling and Rickwood (2015), Australia [21]	N=152 adolescents and adults who accessed a mental health website Age range: 16-25 years, Mean=17 (SD ¹ 2.45); 12.2% male	Naturalistic study with pre or post measures	The age range of 16-25 years	Web-based support provided by fully qualified and supervised mental health clinicians, for example, psychologists, mental health nurses, occupational therapists, and social workers		N=506 completed baseline survey n=354 (70%, 354/506) did not complete a therapy session n=152 accessed Web-based chat website and responded to follow-up Of these, n=38 (25%, 38/152) did not progress to have a Web-based session; n=62 (40.8%, 62/152) had one session; n= 52 (34.2%, 52/152) had 2-5 sessions	No differences between participants at baseline Psychological distress: all participants improved significantly with moderate to large ES ^m for time ($P<.001$, partial $\eta^2=.118$) regardless of amount of counseling received Life satisfaction: a significant though small ES for time, with an increase in life satisfaction for all groups. ($P=.009$, partial $\eta^2=.046$). No differences were found according to the amount of

							<p>Web-based counseling received</p> <p>Hope: no main effects but participants with 1 ($P=.019$, $d=.25$) or more ($P=.008$, $d=.36$) session increased significantly with a small to medium ES</p>
<p>S5. Fukkink and Hermanns (2009), Netherlands [22]</p>	<p>N=12,873 children who contacted helpline and answered 2 questions before intervention</p> <p>n=902 children and adolescents with first-post intervention questionnaire completed</p> <p>Age range 8-18 years</p> <p>Web-based chat: n=339</p> <p>Age: mean=13.8; 11.5% male</p>	<p>Naturalistic comparison</p>	<p>Aged less than 18 years</p>	<p>Single session</p> <p>Web-based chat</p> <p>Problem-solving based counseling session</p>	<p>TAU (telephone conversation)</p>	<p>11,971 did not complete postintervention questions</p> <p>At 1 month, 24.7% (223/902) available for follow-up: n=119 Web-based chat; n=94 telephone</p>	<p>Well-being increased for participants in both groups following intervention ($P<.001$): Web-based chat (ES=0.62, medium) and telephone (ES=0.34, small)</p> <p>Perceived burden of problem decreased in both groups following intervention ($P<.001$): Web-based chat (ES=0.44,</p>

	<p>Telephone n=563 Age: mean=12; 21.3% male</p>					<p>medium) and telephone (ES=0.12, small)</p> <p>Follow-up analysis at 1 month, showed that changes in well-being and perceived burden of the problem were stable for both intervention conditions</p> <p>Intervention comparison showed that Web-based chat was slightly more effective in both improving children's sense of well-being and decreasing the perceived burden of the problem</p> <p>Overall, children were satisfied with the support they received from both chat and telephone interventions</p>
--	---	--	--	--	--	--

<p>S6. Fukkink and Hermanns (2009), Netherlands [23]</p>	<p>N=110 Children and adolescents who contacted the helpline</p> <p>Age range 9-17 years</p> <p>Web-based chat n=53; 16% male</p> <p>Telephone n=42; 23% male</p>	<p>Selection of conversations from database either phone or chat based</p>	<p>Aged less than 18 years</p>	<p>Single session Web-based chat</p> <p>Problem-solving based counseling session</p>	<p>TAU (telephone conversation)</p>	<p>n=15 excluded conversations due to poor quality, or abrupt end to session</p>	<p>From selected conversations, children's well-being increased for both Web-based chat (ES=0.45, medium) and telephone interventions (ES=0.40, medium)</p> <p>Perceived burden of the problem decreased for online chat (ES=0.36, small) and telephone (ES=0.20, small)</p> <p>There were no significant differences between chat and telephone interventions</p>
<p>S7. Kessler et al (2009), United Kingdom [24]</p>	<p>N=297 adults with depression</p> <p>Age range 18-75 years</p> <p>Intervention n=149</p>	<p>RCT</p>	<p>New episode of depression (diagnosed within preceding 4 weeks) and BDI score >14</p> <p>No treatment for depression within</p>	<p>16 weeks duration</p> <p>CBT-based treatment with online therapist</p> <p>5-10 sessions</p>	<p>WL</p>	<p>Online CBT : At 4 months' follow-up, 92 (62%, 92/149) had completed the therapy as intended</p>	<p>At 4 months: intervention BDI mean 14.5 (SD 11.2), (ES=0.81, large)</p> <p>Study recovery criteria: n=43,</p>

	<p>Age: mean=35.6; 30% males</p> <p>WL control n=148</p> <p>Age mean=34.3; 33% males</p> <p>Web-based chat; BDI^a mean=32.8, SD=8.3</p> <p>Waitlist control; BDI mean=33.5, SD=9.3</p>		<p>the preceding 3 months</p> <p>No history of bipolar disorder, psychotic disorder, alcohol, or substance misuse</p>	55 min per session		<p>Data was collected for n=113 (76%, 113/149) of the intervention group</p> <p>At 8 months' follow-up, n=99 (66%, 99/149) had completed the therapy as intended</p> <p>Only 19 (13%, 19/149) received no sessions of therapy, nearly half n=70/149 had had at least eight sessions</p> <p>Data was collected for 109 (73%, 109/149) of the intervention group</p>	<p>(38%) reported a BDI of <10;</p> <p>WL BDI mean 22.0 (SD 13.5), and n=23 (24%) met BDI recovery criteria</p> <p>At 8 months: intervention BDI mean 14.7 (SD 11.6), (ES=0.70, large), Study recovery criteria met by: n=46 (42%)</p> <p>WL BDI mean 22.2 (SD 15.2); n=26 (26%) met BDI recovery criteria</p>
S8. King et al (2006), Australia [25]	<p>N=186 children seeking counseling</p> <p>Web-based chat n=86;</p> <p>Age: mean=15.4; 5% male</p>	Naturalistic comparison		<p>Single session; Counseling focused on information gathering and problem solving. Duration: 50-80 min.</p>	TAU—telephone duration: 45-60 min		<p>Distress: GHQ-12^o significantly reduced in both conditions (partial eta squared=0.50, large)</p> <p>Session impact: Higher</p>

	Telephone n=100 Age: mean=13.1; 33% male						SIS ^p for TAU (telephone) compared with Web-based chat (partial eta squared=0.15)
S9. Kordy et al (2016), Germany [26]	N=232 SUMMIT n=77 SUMMIT- PERSON n=79 TAU n=80	RCT	DSM-IV ^q criteria for MDD ^r with 3 or more major depressive episodes	Over 12 months, participants in both intervention arms received, in addition to TAU, the SUMMIT intervention which comprised intense monitoring via email or a mobile phone, including signaling of upcoming crises, assistance with personal crisis management, and facilitation of early intervention SUMMIT- PERSON additionally offered access to regular expert chats	TAU	n=8 (3.4%) participants discontinued participation: (TAU: n=5; SUMMIT: n=3) n=17 no interview data n=1 (TAU) was interviewed only once because his index treatment lasted 5.5 months Lost to follow- up: 6 months: n=20; 12 months: n=10; 18 months: n=12; 24 months: n=0	SUMMIT compared with TAU reduced the time with an unwell status (OR ^s 0.48; 95% CI 0.23-0.98) through faster transitions from unwell to well (OR 1.44; 95% CI 0.83-2.50) and slower transitions from well to unwell (OR 0.69; 95% CI 0.44-1.09) SUMMIT- PERSON was not superior to either SUMMIT (OR 0.77; 95% CI 0.38-1.56) or TAU (OR 0.62; 95% CI 0.31-1.24) The efficacy of

							<p>SUMMIT was strongest 8 months after the intervention</p> <p>The accumulated gains are illustrated by the median proportions of well weeks: 52% in SUMMIT and 48% in SUMMIT-PERSON versus 31% in TAU alone</p>
S10. Kramer et al (2014), Netherlands [27]	<p>N=263 adolescents with depressive symptoms</p> <p>Intervention (n=131)</p> <p>WL (n=132)</p>	RCT	12-22 years of age; a CES-D' score of 22 or higher (the cut-off to detect possible cases of depression among adolescents)	Generally limited to 5 chat sessions of Solution-Focused Brief Therapy called PratenOnline	WL	<p>N=592</p> <p>Excluded: n=329: CES-D<22; no consent signed n=265; baseline not completed n=39</p> <p>9 weeks: n=111 (42%); n=56 (praten); n=55 (WL)</p> <p>4.5months: n=131 (50%); n=58 (praten); n=76 (WL)</p>	PratenOnline showed significantly greater improvement in CES-D scores than the WL at both 9 weeks and 4.5 months with a small ES at 9 weeks (d=0.18, 95% CI -0.10 to 0.47) and a large ES at 4.5 months (d=0.79, 95% CI 0.45-1.08)
S11. Lelutiu-Weinberger et	N=41 males who have had	Naturalistic study	Male, aged between 18-29	Weekly sessions up to		N=146 eligibility	No significant change in

<p>al (2015), United States [28]</p>	<p>sex with men Age range: 18-29 years</p> <p>MiCHAT: n=31 Age: mean 25 (SD 3.2)</p> <p>Non attendance: n=10</p>		<p>years, negative or unknown HIV^u status, had used drugs ≥ 5 occasions in the last 90 days, at least one incidence of condomless anal sex in last 90 days</p>	<p>8 1-h motivational interviewing and cognitive behavioral skills-based Web-based live chat sessions</p>		<p>screenings</p> <p>Eligible: n=41 Intervention: Attended ≥ 1 session n=31</p> <p>Completed follow-up n=22</p> <p>No session attended n=10; Completed follow-up n=5</p>	<p>depression or anxiety symptom ratings:</p> <p>Brief Symptom Inventory Scale: Depressive symptoms Baseline mean 14.48 (SD 6.37) Follow-up: mean 13.37 (SD 6.00) ($P=.19$) D=0.10</p> <p>Anxious symptoms Baseline mean 13.29 (SD 6.59) Follow-up: mean 13.1 (SD 6.83) ($P=.88$) D=0.03</p>
<p>S12. Murphy et al (2009), Canada [29]</p>	<p>N=127 adults who contacted an employee and family assistance program provider via phone</p> <p>Web-based chat n=26 Age: mean=42; 27% male</p>	<p>Naturalistic comparison</p>		<p>Therapy Online counselors gave online counseling</p> <p>Intervention unclear</p> <p>Counseling provided by Interlock Masters level counselors or</p>	<p>TAU (face-to-face) Interlock counselors as well</p>	<p>n=44 Web-based participants completed satisfaction survey, n= 26 completed pre or post GAF^v ratings</p>	<p>GAF increased from pre to post intervention significantly in both conditions. Effect size not specified</p> <p>No group by time interaction</p>

	Face-to-face n=101 Age: mean=44; 24% male			social workers			
S13. Schaub et al (2015), Germany [30]	<p>N=308 adults with problematic cannabis use</p> <p>Self help + chat: n=114 Age: mean 28.4 (SD 9.6); 69.3% male</p> <p>Self help – chat: n=101 Age: mean 30.2 (SD 9.2); 76.2% male</p> <p>WL: n=93 Age: mean 29.8 (SD 10.0); 75.3% male</p>	RCT	<p>Age 18 years or older</p> <p>Cannabis use at least weekly in the last 30 days</p> <p>No history of serious psychiatric disorder</p> <p>Not pregnant</p> <p>Not currently undertaking other treatment for cannabis use disorder</p>	<p>6 weeks of self-help covering 8 modules based on principles of motivational interviewing and self-control practices with or without chat with trained counselor</p>	WL	<p>N=436 recruited</p> <p>Self help + chat: n=87 (76%, 87/114) did not complete chat component of intervention: No response: n=49; Other reason: n=3; No reason indicated by therapist: n=35</p> <p>Follow-up: n=76 (66.6%, 76/114) no response</p> <p>Self help – chat: Follow-up: n=61 (60%) no response</p> <p>WL: Follow-up: n=55 (59%) no response</p>	<p>Compared with cannabis use from Swiss treatment monitoring statistics (act-info) in 2013, participants reported similar gender distribution though they tended to be older and reported higher cannabis use rates for the previous 7 days</p> <p>Groups did not differ on demographic and drug use measures with the exception of number of years of cannabis use</p> <p>At 3 month follow-up: mean cannabis use days/week</p>

							<p>differed between self-help – chat versus self-help + chat (beta= -0.75, SE^v=0.32, $t=-2.39$, $P=.02$, $d=0.34$, 95% CI 0.07-0.61), and between self-help + chat versus WL (beta=.70, SE=0.32, $t=2.16$, $P=.03$, $d=0.20$, 95% CI -0.07 to 0.47), but not between self-help - chat versus WL (beta=-0.05, SE=0.33, $t=-0.16$, $P=.87$, $d=-0.14$, 95% CI -0.43 to 0.14)</p> <p>No significant differences in the group comparisons in the mental health outcomes. Slight improvements in mental health (MHI-</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	---

							5 ^g), Cannabis Use Disorder Identification Test, and severity of dependence scale in all 3 groups were reported (pre or post comparisons not reported)
S14. Wentz and Krevers (2012), Sweden [31]	N=12 adolescents and adults with ADHD ^y and/or an autism spectrum disorder Age range: 15-26 years mean: 20.1 years	Naturalistic study	Aged 15-26 years Diagnosis of ASD ^z and/or ADHD, autistic disorder, Asperger disorder Not currently diagnosed with substance abuse or dependence, depression or psychosis, low intelligence quotient	Maximum 14 session over 8-weeks Web-based support and coaching was offered at fixed times twice a week, 30 min to 1h per session		n=2 withdrew	Difference between baseline with 6-month follow-up showed significant increases on self-esteem ($P=.02$), sense of coherence ($P=.04$), and subjective global quality of life ($P=.03$)

^aRTC: randomized controlled trial.

^bTAU: treatment as usual.

^cAUDIT: Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test.

^dCBT: cognitive behavioral therapy.

^eWL: waitlist.

^fTAO: Therapy Alcohol Online;

^gSAO: Self-help Alcohol Online

^hQOLS: Quality of Life Scale.

ⁱSTAI: State-Trait Anxiety Inventory.

^jSDQ: The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.

^kYHC: youth health care.

^lSD: standard deviation.

^mES: effect size.

ⁿBDI: Beck Depression Inventory.

^oGHQ-12: 12-item General Health Questionnaire.

^pSIS: Session Impact Scale

^qDSM-IV: Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th edition.

^rMDD: major depressive disorder.

^sOR: odds ratio.

^tCES-D: Center for Epidemiologic Studies Depression Scale

^uHIV: human immunodeficiency virus.

^vGAF: Global Assessment of Functioning.

^wSE: standard error.

^xMHI-5: 5-item Mental Health Inventory.

^yADHD: Attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder.

^zASD: Autism spectrum disorder.

References

18. Blankers M, Koeter MW, Schippers GM. Internet therapy versus internet self-help versus no treatment for problematic alcohol use: a randomized controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 2011 Jun; 79(3):330-341
19. Cohen GE, Kerr BA. Computer-Mediated Counseling. *Computers in Human Services* 1999; 15(4):13-26
20. Crutzen R, Bosma H, Havas J, Feron F. What can we learn from a failed trial: insight into non-participation in a chat-based intervention trial for adolescents with psychosocial problems. *BMC Res Notes* 2014 Nov 20; 7:824
21. Dowling M, Rickwood D. A naturalistic study of the effects of synchronous online chat counselling on young people's psychological distress, life satisfaction and hope. *Counsell Psychother Res J* 2015; 15(4):274-283
22. Fukkink RG, Hermanns JM. Children's experiences with chat support and telephone support. *J Child Psychol Psychiatry* 2009 Jun; 50(6):759-66
23. Fukkink R, Hermanns J. Counseling children at a helpline: chatting or calling?. *J Community Psychol* 2009; 37(8):939-948
24. Kessler D, Lewis G, Kaur S, Wiles N, King M, Weich S, Sharp DJ, Araya R, Hollinghurst S, Peters TJ. Therapist-delivered internet psychotherapy for depression in primary care: a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2009 Aug 22; 374(9690):628-634
25. King R, Bambling M, Reid W, Thomas I. Telephone and online counselling for young people: a naturalistic comparison of session outcome, session impact and therapeutic alliance. *Counsell Psychother Res J* 2006 Sept; 6(3):175-181
26. Kordy H, Wolf M, Aulich K, Bürgy M, Hegerl U, Hüsing J, Puschner B, Rummel-Kluge C, Vedder H, Backenstrass M. Internet-delivered disease management for recurrent depression: a multicenter randomized controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosom* 2016; 85(2):91-8
27. Kramer J, Conijn B, Oijeveaar P, Riper H. Effectiveness of a web-based solution-focused brief chat treatment for depressed adolescents and young adults: randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2014 May 29; 16(5):e141
28. Lelutiu-Weinberger C, Pachankis JE, Gamarel KE, Surace A, Golub SA, Parsons JT. Feasibility, acceptability, and preliminary efficacy of a live-chat social media intervention to reduce HIV risk among young men who have sex with men. *AIDS Behav* 2015 Jul; 19(7):1214-27
29. Murphy L, Parnass P, Mitchell DL, Hallett RH, Cayley P, Seagram S. Client satisfaction and outcome comparisons of online and face-to-face counselling methods. *Br J Soc Work* 2009 Apr 15; 39(4):627-640
30. Schaub MP, Wenger A, Berg O, Beck T, Stark L, Buehler E, Haug S. A web-based self-help intervention with and without chat counseling to reduce cannabis use in problematic cannabis users: three-arm randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2015 Oct 13; 17(10):e232
31. Wentz E, Nydén A, Krevers B. Development of an internet-based support and coaching model for adolescents and young adults with ADHD and autism spectrum disorders: a pilot study. *Eur Child Adolesc Psychiatry* 2012 Nov; 21(11):611-22