

BMJ Open

Effective across different settings: impact of recruitment source in the EVIDENT-study, a randomized controlled trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms.

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015391
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Dec-2016
Complete List of Authors:	Klein, Jan; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Gamon, Carla; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Späth, Christina; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Berger, Thomas; University of Bern, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Meyer, Björn; GAIA AG; City University London Hohagen, Fritz; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Hautzinger, Martin; Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Lutz, Wolfgang; University of Trier, Psychology Vettorazzi, Eik; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Medical Biometry and Epidemiology Moritz, Steffen; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Schröder, Johanna; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy
Primary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	internet intervention, cognitive behavior therapy, depression, randomized controlled trial, recruitment source

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4 1 **Cover Pages**

5
6
7 2 Title

8
9 3 Effective across different settings: impact of recruitment source in the EVIDENT-study, a randomized
10 4 controlled trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms.
11
12

13 5

14 6

15
16
17 7 Authors

18 8 (1) Jan Philipp Klein

19 9 (2) Carla Gamon

20 10 (3) Christina Späth

21 11 (4) Thomas Berger

22 12 (5) Björn Meyer

23 13 (6) Fritz Hohagen

24 14 (7) Martin Hautzinger

25 15 (8) Wolfgang Lutz

26 16 (9) Eik Vettorazzi

27 17 (10)Steffen Moritz*

28 18 (11)Johanna Schröder*

29 19 *JS and SM contributed equally to the manuscript

30 20
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

2
3 1 Affiliations

4
5 2 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Lübeck University, Lübeck, Germany (FH, CG, JPK, CS)

6
7 3 Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland (TB)

8
9 4 GAIA AG, Hamburg, Germany; Department of Psychology, City University London, London, United
10 Kingdom (BM)

11
12 6 Eberhard Karls University Tübingen, Department of Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy,
13 Tübingen, Germany (MH)

14
15 8 Department of Psychology, University of Trier, Germany (WL)

16
17 9 Department of Medical Biometry and Epidemiology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf,
18 Hamburg, Germany (EV)

19
20 11 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg,
21 Germany (SM, JS)

22
23 12
24
25 13 Corresponding author

26
27 14 Dr. Jan Philipp Klein

28
29 15 Lübeck University, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy

30
31 16 Ratzeburger Allee 160, 23538 Lübeck, Germany

32
33 17 Phone: + 49 451 500 98871 Fax: + 49 451 500 98808

34
35 18 philipp.klein@uksh.de

36
37 19

38
39 20 Word count

40
41 21 Text: 3572

42
43 22 Abstract: 207

44
45 23 References: 31

46
47 24 Tables/Figures: 4

48
49 25

50
51 26 Running title: Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

52
53 27

54
55 28 Key words: internet intervention; cognitive behavior therapy; depression; randomized controlled trial;

56
57 29 recruitment source.

58
59 30

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4 1 Abstract

5
6 2
7 3 Objective: Examine whether the effects of internet interventions for depression generalize beyond
8
9 4 participants recruited through the internet or the media.

10
11 5 Design: subgroup analysis of the results of a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial.

12
13 6 Setting: six diagnostic centers in Germany.

14
15 7 Participants: 1,013 people with mild to moderate depressive symptoms were recruited from clinical
16
17 8 sources as well as internet forums, statutory insurance companies, and other sources.

18
19 9 Interventions: either care-as-usual alone (control) or a 12-week internet intervention (Deprexis) plus
20
21 10 usual care (intervention).

22
23 11 Main outcome measures: The primary outcome measure was self-rated depression severity (Patient
24
25 12 Health Questionnaire: PHQ-9). Further measures ranged from demographic and clinical parameters to a
26
27 13 measure of attitudes towards internet interventions (APOI).

28
29 14 Results: The recruitment source was only associated with very few of the examined demographic and
30
31 15 clinical characteristics. Compared to participants recruited from clinical sources, participants recruited
32
33 16 through insurance companies were more likely to be employed. Clinically recruited participants were as
34
35 17 severely affected as those from other recruitment sources but more skeptical of internet interventions.
36
37 18 The effectiveness of the intervention was not differentially associated with recruitment source (group by
38
39 19 recruitment source interaction $F_{3,817}=0.29, p = .83$).

40
41 20 Conclusion: Our results support the hypothesis that the intervention we studied is effective across
42
43 21 different recruitment sources.

44
45 22 Trial registration number: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT01636752.

46
47
48
49 23

50
51
52 24
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.
2
3

4 1 Strengths and limitations of this study

- 5 2 ▪ Ours is the first trial to examine the effect of recruitment source on outcome.
6 3 ▪ The large sample size makes detection of subgroup effects more likely.
7 4 ▪ The absence of a subgroup effect does not prove that the effect applies to all subgroups.
8 5 ▪ More randomized trials of internet interventions in clinical settings are needed.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 Disclosures

2 Competing interests

3 JPK received funding for clinical trials (German Federal Ministry of Health, Servier), payments for
4 presentations on internet interventions (Servier), payments for workshops and books (Beltz, Elsevier and
5 Hogrefe) on psychotherapy for chronic depression and on psychiatric emergencies. BM is employed as
6 research director at GAIA AG, the company that developed, owns, and operates the internet intervention
7 “deprexis”. MH is a consultant of Servier (distributor of the internet intervention “deprexis”). He was an
8 invited speaker at several workshops and continuous education workshops over the last two years. All
9 the other authors report no relationships with commercial interests.

10 Contributors

11 The principal investigators (TB, FH, JPK, BM and SM) designed the study and obtained funding. The
12 EVIDENT study steering committee (TB, JPK, BM, SM, CS, JS) further developed the study design in
13 collaboration with the EVIDENT study group (steering committee and Wolfgang Greiner, Bielefeld; MH;
14 WL; Matthias Rose, Berlin) and CG. Patient recruitment was coordinated by the EVIDENT study group.
15 JPK conducted the statistical analyses with substantial input from EV. The results were interpreted by the
16 steering committee with substantial input from the study group and CG. JPK wrote the manuscript with
17 substantial input from the steering committee and CG. All authors commented on the manuscript and
18 approved the final version.

19 Role of the Funding source

20 Funding source: German Federal Ministry of Health, II A 5 - 2512 FSB 052. The funding body had no role
21 in the design of the study, data collection, analysis or interpretation of the data. The corresponding
22 author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
23 for publication.

24 Acknowledgements

25 The authors wish to thank GAIA AG (Hamburg, Germany), which provided technical support and made
26 the internet intervention (Deprexis) available at no cost for participants in the trial. The full EVIDENT
27 study team consists of: Leonie Gmöhling, Sandra Nolte, Anna Paulitschek, Matthias Rose (local principal
28 investigator), Leonie Schickedanz; Berlin. Thomas Berger; Bern. Viola Gräfe, Wolfgang Greiner (local

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

2
3 1 principal investigator); Bielefeld. Mirja Behrens, Cecile Hoermann, Anna J. Katharina Jahns, Thies Lüdtké,
4 Björn Meyer, Steffen Moritz (local principal investigator), Johanna Schröder and Eik Vettorazzi; Hamburg.
5 2
6 3 Carla Gamon, Fritz Hohagen (principal investigator), Martin Kolbe, Philipp Klein (local principal
7 investigator), Antje Roniger, Christina Späth; Lübeck. Alice Arndt, Liv Glindemann, Wolfgang Lutz (local
8 principal investigator), David Rosenbaum, Kathinka Wolter; Trier. Flora Bach, Elisabeth Beck, Kristina
9 Fuhr, Martin Hautzinger (local principal investigator), Katharina Krisch, Melanie Wahl; Tübingen.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Background**

2 Numerous studies (Klein et al., 2016; Meyer et al., 2015; Moritz et al., 2015; Moritz et al., 2016) and
3 meta-analyses (Andrews et al., 2010; Arnberg et al., 2014; Cuijpers et al., 2011; Johansson et al., 2012;
4 Kuester et al., 2016; Olthuis et al., 2015) have shown that internet interventions are effective in the
5 treatment of a broad array of psychiatric disorders, ranging from depression (Andrews et al., 2010;
6 Cuijpers et al., 2011; Johansson et al., 2012) and anxiety (Andrews et al., 2010; Arnberg et al., 2014;
7 Olthuis et al., 2015) to posttraumatic stress disorder (Kuester et al., 2016) and schizophrenia (Moritz et
8 al., 2015; Moritz et al., 2016). However, most participants in these studies have been recruited through
9 media advertisements (Andrews et al., 2010; Arnberg et al., 2014), so it remains unclear whether they
10 are similar to those seeking face-to-face treatment in regular clinical settings (Andrews et al., 2010) and
11 whether the effects for internet interventions generalize across different recruitment settings (Cuijpers
12 et al., 2011).

13 Although some studies suggest that the promising results from efficacy studies can be transferred to
14 routine clinical practice (Andersson et al., 2013; Hedman et al., 2014), one recent study (Gilbody et al.,
15 2015) of two internet interventions in primary care reported null findings. This is not necessarily due to
16 the fact that these interventions are not effective in primary care but might be explained by insufficient
17 use of the interventions. No previous studies have directly examined whether differences in recruitment
18 source are associated with the effectiveness of depression-focused internet interventions.

19 A better understanding of whether participants recruited from different sources differ in other
20 important characteristics could help investigators avoid sampling bias or target specific clinical or
21 demographic subgroups. Previous studies have addressed associations of recruitment source with
22 patient characteristics in an internet clinic (Titov et al., 2010), in a trial of an internet intervention
23 (Lindner et al., 2015) and in a trial of face-to-face psychotherapy for depression (Krusche et al., 2014). It
24 might also be important to know if participants from certain recruitment sources are particularly open-
25 minded towards internet interventions. But none of the previous studies have compared attitudes
26 towards internet interventions across different recruitment sources.

27 Subgroup analyses examining associations between recruitment source and intervention effectiveness
28 require large sample sizes (Wang et al., 2007). We have recently published one of the largest randomized
29 trials of an internet intervention, the EVIDENT trial (Klein et al., 2016). Over one thousand participants
30 were randomized for this trial that demonstrated the effectiveness of the intervention (Deprexis) for

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 mild to moderate depressive symptoms. In the EVIDENT trial, we also developed a novel questionnaire
2 measuring positive and negative attitudes towards internet interventions (Schröder et al., 2015).

3 Using the EVIDENT trial data set, the current paper has two main objectives: firstly, we sought to
4 examine whether recruitment source is systematically associated with various baseline parameters,
5 including demographic and clinical characteristics as well as attitudes towards internet interventions.
6 Secondly, we aimed to examine whether recruitment source is differentially associated with the
7 effectiveness of the intervention. We also report on our general experiences with regard to recruiting
8 participants from clinical settings in the EVIDENT trial.

9 **Methods**

10 The EVIDENT study is a multicenter (diagnostic interviews were conducted in five sites in Germany),
11 randomized controlled trial (RCT). The trial was approved by the Ethics Committee of the German
12 Psychological Association (DGPs SM 04_2012) and is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01636752).
13 The full study protocol has been published (Klein et al., 2013).

14 **Participants**

15 Participants were recruited via multiple settings and online informed consent was obtained prior to the
16 baseline assessment. The main recruitment sources were internet forums for depression, magazines for
17 members of statutory German health insurance companies and various inpatient and outpatient clinics,
18 ranging from general practitioners' practices to psychiatrists' and psychotherapists' clinics, practices, and
19 hospital settings.

20 Recruitment source was assessed by self-report; specifically, a combination of a multiple-choice question
21 (clinical setting, internet forums, insurance company, other) and a free-text answer was used to identify
22 the exact source via which each patient was recruited. One of the authors (CG) cross-checked the free-
23 text answers against the multiple-choice answer and resolved any discrepancies through discussion with
24 her local study team (CS and JPK).

25 The main inclusion criterion for the RCT was the presence of self-reported mild to moderate depressive
26 symptoms, operationalized as a score between 5 and 14 on the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9)
27 (Kroenke et al., 2001). Eligible participants were between 18 and 65 years of age, had internet access and

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 were able to communicate in German. Participants with acute suicidality or a lifetime diagnosis of
4 2 bipolar disorder or schizophrenia were excluded.

3 Interventions

4 Following a naturalistic and pragmatic design approach, care-as-usual was not influenced by the
5 6 investigators. All participants were permitted to use any form of treatment, including antidepressant
7 8 medication and psychotherapy. Participants were randomized equally (1:1) to the two groups
9 10 (intervention or control). Participants in the control condition received only care-as-usual. They were
11 12 offered access to the internet intervention after the last follow-up assessment. Participants in the
13 14 intervention group received immediate access to the internet intervention (Deprexis) in addition to care-
15 16 as-usual. Briefly, this program consists of modules covering content that is broadly consistent with CBT
17 18 (e.g., cognitive restructuring, behavioral activation, acceptance and mindfulness, problem-solving)
19 20 (Meyer et al., 2009). The intervention can be used with or without guidance by a clinician (Berger et al.,
21 22 2011). In our trial, participants randomized to the intervention group with an initial PHQ-9 score
23 24 between 10 and 14 received the guided version (e-mail support), those scoring between 5 and 9 on the
25 26 PHQ-9 received the unguided version.
27 28
29

30 Outcome measures

31 32 The primary outcome for the RCT was change on the *Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)* (Kroenke et
33 34 al., 2001). The internal consistency of the PHQ-9 based on the trial data was good (Cronbach's alpha =
35 36 0.83). The *Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI)* (Sheehan et al., 1998) was used to assess
37 38 the presence of a depressive disorder as well as to rule out a lifetime diagnosis of bipolar disorder or
39 40 schizophrenia. Clinician-rated severity of depression was assessed with the 24-item version of the
41 42 *Hamilton Depression Rating Scale* (Hamilton, 1960) (Cronbach's alpha = 0.79). The MINI and the HDRS-24
43 44 were administered via telephone by trained raters.
45

46 47 Attitudes towards internet interventions were assessed using a questionnaire that was developed during
48 49 this trial, the *Attitudes towards Psychological Online Interventions Questionnaire (APOI)* (Schröder et al.,
50 51 2015). The APOI is the first questionnaire that measures both positive and negative attitudes towards
52 53 internet interventions in general. It comprises four subscales with scores ranging from 4 to 16, and these
54 55 are labelled "skepticism and perception of risks", "confidence in effectiveness", "technologization
56 57 threat" and "anonymity benefits". The total score ranges from 16 to 80 with higher scores reflecting a
58 59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 more favorable attitude towards internet interventions. When calculating the total score, the polarity of
2 the subscale scores for “skepticism and perception of risks” and “technologization threat” is reversed so
3 that all subscales contribute equally to the total score. The internal consistency of the APOI in this
4 sample is acceptable to good (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.77).

5 Demographic details and treatment history were assessed with non-standardized questionnaires. We
6 also employed a measure of health-related quality of life (*Short-Form Health Survey: SF-12*) (Ware, Jr. et
7 al., 1996), the *Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Psychotherapeutic Processes (FEP-2)* (Lutz et al., 2009)
8 and the *Web Screening Questionnaire (WSQ)*, a self-report instrument screening for frequent mental
9 disorders (Donker et al., 2009).

10 Assessments

11 The PHQ-9 was administered via online questionnaires along with all the other self-ratings at baseline,
12 after three months (post assessment) and after six months (follow-up assessment). Raters contacted
13 participants for the MINI and the HDRS-24 at baseline and after three months.

14 Recruiter survey

15 We also invited the clinicians recruiting for our study to participate in an online survey. They were asked
16 to provide demographic data and to complete two questionnaires: an unstandardized questionnaire that
17 assessed their recruitment experience and the *Attitudes towards Psychological Online Interventions*
18 *Questionnaire*, adapted for healthcare professionals (*APOI-HP*) (Schröder et al., 2016).

19 Statistical analysis

20 Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS 22 (IBM Corporation). We calculated univariate ANOVAs
21 for continuous variables. Post-hoc tests were Bonferroni-corrected for multiple comparisons. For
22 categorical variables, we calculated univariate multinomial logistic regression analyses. For the analysis
23 of the effect of the recruitment source on treatment efficacy, we used linear mixed models (LMM), as
24 they have the advantage of using all available data of each subject. Adjustment for baseline measure was
25 chosen as this increases statistical power and accounts for regression to the mean. The analysis followed
26 the intention-to-treat principle, which included all randomized participants. The outcome was analyzed
27 as change from baseline with a random intercept for the participant. Time, study group, recruitment
28 source and the interaction term group by recruitment source were entered as fixed effects and the

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 analysis was adjusted for the baseline depression severity. The hypothesis that the recruitment source
2 influences the effect of the intervention on depressive symptoms was tested on the group by
3 recruitment source interaction effect.

4 **Results**

5 Recruitment and participant flow

6 For the participant flow chart please refer to the report of the main results of this study (Klein et al.,
7 2013). Briefly, 2020 participants were assessed for eligibility, and 1007 (49.9%) were excluded. The most
8 common exclusion criterion was exceeding a score of 14 on the PHQ-9 (748, 37.0%). Non-completion
9 rates for the main outcome measure were 21.6% at post assessment ($n = 219$) and 24.6% at follow-up (n
10 = 259). The non-completion rate did not differ between the different recruitment sources ($\chi^2_3 = 4.34$, p
11 = .227 for the post assessment and $\chi^2_3 = 2.06$, $p = .559$ for the follow-up assessment).

12 Most participants (46%) self-identified as coming from the “other” recruitment source (see Table 1). The
13 remaining participants came from statutory health insurance companies (27%), internet forums (17%)
14 and clinical sources (10%). Inspection of the free-text answers revealed that most of the participants in
15 the “other” category learned about the study through articles in the news media.

16 Participant characteristics

17 For descriptive and inferential statistics on the differences between the four recruitment sources, refer
18 to Table 1 (demographic data) and Table 2 (clinical characteristics). Briefly, we did not find any
19 statistically significant differences for a broad range of clinical characteristics including self- and clinician
20 rated depression severity, psychosocial functioning and self-reported comorbid symptoms. Participants
21 recruited through online forums were slightly more likely to suffer from dysthymia and participants from
22 clinical settings and other sources were slightly more likely to report symptoms of panic disorder, but
23 these differences were not statistically significant. We did find statistically significant differences
24 between the recruitment sources for measures of resource use. Compared to participants recruited
25 through insurance companies and other sources, participants recruited in clinical settings were more
26 likely to be in psychiatric treatment ($p < .05$; OR vs. insurance 2.71, OR vs. other sources 1.70),
27 psychotherapy ($p < .01$; OR vs. insurance 2.66, OR vs. other sources 1.99) and inpatient psychiatric
28 treatment ($p < .001$; OR vs. insurance 4.06, OR vs. other sources 3.33, OR vs. internet forums 2.30). They
29 also reported having had significantly more sick leave days ($p < .001$). We also observed differences for

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 demographic variables. Compared to participants recruited in a clinical setting, participants recruited
2 through statutory health insurance companies were more likely to be employed full-time ($p < .01$) or
3 part-time ($p < .01$). Participants from the different recruitment sources also differed in their attitudes to
4 internet interventions (Table 3). Compared to participants recruited through insurance companies and
5 other sources, those recruited in clinical settings had less favorable attitudes towards internet
6 interventions ($p < .01$). In particular, they scored higher on skepticism and risk perception ($p < .01$) as
7 well as technology disadvantages ($p < .01$). Participants recruited in clinical settings also differed from all
8 the other groups in that they scored lower on perception of anonymity benefits ($p < .01$).

9 Intervention usage

10 A total of 509 participants were randomised to the intervention group. The mean number of sessions of
11 at least 10 minutes duration was 8.32 ($SD = 4.71$), the mean total usage time was 429.70 ($SD = 294.0$)
12 minutes (about seven hours). Participants from the different recruitment sources did not differ with
13 respect to the number of sessions ($F_{3,481} = 0.47$, $p = .70$) or the total usage time ($F_{3,481} = 0.51$, $p = .70$).

14 Symptom change

15 As reported previously (Klein et al., 2016), the intervention had a significant effect on the main outcome,
16 change in PHQ-9 scores from baseline to post and follow-up. Whereas depressive symptoms decreased
17 in both groups, changes in PHQ-9 differed significantly (main effect of group: $F_{1,823} = 21.84$, $p < .001$)
18 between groups. In the intervention group, PHQ-9 scores decreased by 1.40 (95% CI 0.81—1.99) points
19 more than in the CAU group, on average. We also observed a main effect of recruitment source on PHQ
20 change, which was marginally significant ($F_{3,817} = 2.58$, $p = .053$). Average symptom change was greater in
21 those recruited from clinical sources than those recruited via internet forums (1.33; 95%, CI -0.30—2.70;
22 Bonferroni corrected $p = .059$). The interaction term (group assignment by recruitment source) was not
23 statistically significant ($F_{3,817} = 0.29$, $p = .83$), indicating that treatment response was unrelated to
24 recruitment source (Table 4).

25 As a sensitivity analysis, we reran the analysis of the interaction effect with a binary subgroup definition.
26 Here we summarized the following recruitment sources as non-clinical: statutory health insurance
27 companies, internet forums and “other” recruitment sources. Again, we found a significant main effect
28 of recruitment source on PHQ-change ($F_{1,834} = 5.45$, $p = .02$). Symptom change was greater in those
29 recruited from clinical sources compared to those not recruited from clinical sources (1.50; 95%, CI

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

0.33—2.68). The interaction term (group assignment by binary recruitment source) was not statistically significant ($F_{1,834} = 1.66, p = .20$) confirming the result of the main subgroup analysis above.

We also conducted a sensitivity analysis with the binary outcome “minimally clinically important PHQ-change” as the dependent variable (binary logistic regression: $\chi^2_3 = 19.749, p < .001$, Nagelkerkes $r^2 = .031$). A minimally clinically important individual PHQ-9 improvement was defined as five point reduction (Lowe et al., 2004). In keeping with the results of the previously reported analyses we found a main effect of group ($B = 1.18$ (SE .51) $p = .021$) but the group by recruitment source interaction term was not statistically significant ($B = -0.16$ (SE .16) $p = .31$).

Recruiter characteristics

A total of 89 persons who supported our recruitment efforts in clinical settings (the recruiters) were contacted via e-mail for an online survey. Of these, 48 completed the survey (54%). They were mostly female (69%) and their mean age was 44.06 (SD 12.17). Almost half of them reported working in an inpatient setting (42%), mostly as psychotherapists (50%), specialists in psychosomatic medicine (33%) and psychiatry (22.9%). Recruiters could name multiple fields of work and, therefore, the total sum exceeds 100%. Recruiters also completed a questionnaire inquiring about their experiences with regard to the recruitment process. Here, 40% reported that they often forgot to talk with their patients about the study. 25% wrote they did not have the time to talk with their patients about the study or that their patients' symptoms were too severe to participate in the study. Only 12.5% of respondents reported inadequate computer literacy as a barrier to participating in the study. On the APOI, the recruiters had a total mean score of 51.23 (SD 12.17) and the following subscale mean scores (SD): skepticism and risk perception 11.14 (2.55), confidence in effectiveness 16.08 (1.92) perceived technology disadvantages 14.50 (SD 2.34) and perception of anonymity benefits 12.64 (2.47).

Discussion

Principal findings

This study examined associations of recruitment source with participant characteristics and effectiveness in a trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms. We found few demographic or clinical differences among participants recruited from different sources and no association of recruitment source with treatment effect. To our knowledge, this is the first study that examines the association of the recruitment source with the effectiveness of an internet intervention. While we have found that the

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

2
3 1 between-group effect is the same across recruitment sources, we did find that the within-group effect is
4 2 smaller in those recruited via internet forums than in those recruited via other settings. This differential
5 3 within-group effect was only marginally statistically significant though and should thus be replicated in
6 4 other studies before conclusion can be drawn from this finding. If confirmed in other studies, these
7 5 findings might imply that the recruitment source is a predictor of symptom change but does not have a
8 6 moderating effect on the effectiveness of the intervention.

14 7 Comparison with other studies

15 8 Some of the findings regarding clinical characteristics contrast with results from a previous study
16 9 (Lindner et al., 2015), which found somewhat more severe symptoms in patients recruited through
17 10 clinical settings. Participants recruited in clinical settings in our study were more likely to be on sick-
18 11 leave, suggesting that despite similar current symptom severity, their symptom-related psychosocial
19 12 impairment in the six months preceding randomization might have been greater. Even though
20 13 participants recruited in clinical settings did not differ from others in depression severity or quality of
21 14 life, they were about twice as likely to be in psychiatric treatment, compared to participants recruited via
22 15 health insurance companies (OR 2.71) or other sources, such as news media (OR 1.70). This might
23 16 indicate that internet interventions reach people who chose not to seek treatment through more
24 17 conventional means in spite of substantial symptom severity (Moritz et al., 2012).

25 18 We have found that participants recruited through insurance companies were more likely to be
26 19 employed. Also we observed a significant between groups difference regarding level of education. These
27 20 findings might orient researchers wishing to recruit participants with certain demographics as it has been
28 21 noted that participants in internet studies as well as outpatient treatment centers are more highly
29 22 educated than the general population (Titov et al., 2010).

30 23 Participants recruited through clinical settings had a less favorable view of internet interventions
31 24 compared to the other groups. The recruiters working in these clinical settings viewed internet
32 25 interventions less favorably than the participants. Understandably, patients engaging with psychiatric or
33 26 psychotherapeutic treatment and clinical treatment providers may regard internet based treatments
34 27 with somewhat greater skepticism. Interestingly, recruiters for our study had a more positive view of
35 28 internet interventions than psychotherapists recruited through professional associations for
36 29 psychotherapists who were surveyed in a separate study (Schröder et al., 2016). This might be due to

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 sampling bias: clinicians who are skeptical of internet interventions are less likely to recruit for a study of
4
5 2 such an intervention.
6

7
8 3 Limitations of the study

9
10 4 In spite of this relatively positive attitude, the 89 recruiters only recruited 105 participants for this trial
11
12 5 that were eligible to participate and could thus be randomized. This figure must be interpreted with
13
14 6 caution though as we could not link study participants to individual recruiters. Therefore, we do not
15
16 7 know whether the recruiters surveyed here actually recruited the participants in this study that self-
17
18 8 identified as clinically recruited. Still, these figures do suggest that it is more difficult to recruit for an
19
20 9 internet intervention through clinical settings compared to recruitment through the media and the
21
22 10 internet. These recruitment difficulties were not related to characteristics of the internet intervention
23
24 11 but rather to more general problems with recruiting for studies in a busy clinical routine.

25
26 12 There are some further limitations to consider when interpreting our results. The most common
27
28 13 recruitment source was "other", and most of these participants learned about our study through news
29
30 14 media. The clinical recruitment sources were heterogeneous. Most of the clinical recruiters self-
31
32 15 identified as psychotherapists. Our results may therefore have been different if we had recruited in
33
34 16 general practice. Also, our sample reported mild to moderate depressive symptoms and it is therefore
35
36 17 unclear if our results also extend to people with more severe depressive symptoms or other primary
37
38 18 mental health complaints. The inclusion of only mild and moderately depressed subjects might also have
39
40 19 limited our ability to detect baseline differences in clinical characteristics.

41
42 20 Furthermore, the absence of an interaction effect in our subgroup analysis does not necessarily mean
43
44 21 that the treatment effect applies to all subgroups (Wang et al., 2007). Statistical power is considerably
45
46 22 lower for interaction analyses compared to the main effect analysis, particularly if the subgroups are not
47
48 23 identical in size as in our study (Brookes et al., 2004). Inspection of Table 4 suggests that a differential
49
50 24 treatment effect might have attained statistical significance in an even larger sample. We have
51
52 25 previously reported that the internet intervention was less efficacious in mild to moderate depressives
53
54 26 who also received psychiatric or psychotherapeutic treatment (Klein et al., 2016). Internet interventions
55
56 27 may therefore confer the greatest benefit for individuals who are not in specialized psychiatric or
57
58 28 psychotherapeutic care.
59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 Conclusion
4

5 2 We conclude participants recruited through the internet or the media have been found to be as severely
6
7 3 affected as patients seen in regular care. Also we found that the internet intervention studied here
8
9 4 (Deprexis) appears to be equally effective for mildly to moderately depressed participants regardless of
10
11 5 their recruitment source. This adds to the growing literature that the impressive evidence of internet
12
13 6 interventions for psychiatric disorders might also extend to clinical settings. Still, more studies are
14
15 7 needed that only recruit in clinical settings before this can be said with more certainty.
16
17 8

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Tables and Figures**

2 **Table 1:** Differences in demographic data between different recruitment sources.

	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forums			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
Demographic characteristics	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	df	F	p
Age	105	41.58	11.930	171	41.89	11.239	271	43.32	9.777	466	43.23	11.327	3,1009	1.250	.290
Marital Status	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	df	chi ²	p
Married		36	34.3%		57	33.3%		131	48.3%		201	43.1%			
Committed relation	105	24	22.9%	171	32	18.7%	271	44	16.2%	466	89	19.1%	15	30.289	.011
Single		29	27.6%		51	29.8%		51	18.8%		116	24.9%			
Education status	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	df	chi ²	p
Highest secondary	105	52	49.5%	171	87	50.9%	271	118	43.5%	466	263	56.4%			
Higher secondary	105	15	14.3%	171	38	22.2%	271	54	19.9%	466	65	13.9%	18	37.205	.005
Middle secondary	105	27	25.7%	171	35	20.5%	271	84	31.0%	466	97	20.8%			
Employment status	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	df	chi ²	p
Full-time		44	41.9%		65	38.0%		136	50.2%		189	40.6%			
Part time	105	17	16.2%	171	32	18.7%	271	75	27.7%	466	103	22.1%	9	30.239	< .001
Other		18	17.1%		27	15.8%		24	8.9%		62	13.3%			

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 2:** Differences in clinical characteristics between different recruitment sources.

	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forum			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
Clinical characteristics	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	df	F	p
PHQ	105	10.06	2.60	171	10.21	2.44	271	10.40	2.39	466	10.30	2.38	3,1009	0.570	.635
PHQ suicidality item		1.30	0.483		1.23	0.451		1.21	0.406		1.27	0.461		1.905	.127
SF-12 PH	102	46.42	9.52	169	46.83	9.91	262	47.64	9.06	456	48.05	9.44	3,985	1.248	.291
SF-12 MH		30.11	6.96		31.39	8.45		31.49	7.34		31.51	7.69		0.987	.398
FEP-2	105	2.93	0.47	171	2.99	0.47	271	2.92	0.46	466	2.918	0.45	3,1009	1.079	.357
HRSQ		17.47	7.49		17.49	7.58		16.14	7.47		16.73	7.41		1.477	.219
Diagnosis	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	df	chi ²	p
Dysthymia		33	31.4%		77	45.0%		100	36.9%		166	35.6%		6.494	.090
Depressive Episode		36	34.3%		47	27.5%		75	27.7%		132	28.3%		1.895	.594
More than 5 episodes	105	36	34.3%	171	66	38.6%	271	99	36.5%	466	192	41.2%	3	2.624	.453
Panic d/o (WSQ)		40	38.1%		47	27.5%		75	27.7%		159	34.1%		6.676	.083
Social phobia (WSQ)		46	43.8%		80	46.8%		127	46.9%		221	47.4%		0.451	.930
Alcohol use d/o (WSQ)		4	3.8%		6	3.5%		11	4.1%		31	6.7%		4.155	.245
Resource use	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	N	N	%	df	chi ²	p
General practitioner		92	87.6%		141	82.5%		240	88.6%		397	85.2%		3.703	.295
Psychiatrist		44	41.9%		72	42.1%		57	21.0%		139	29.8%		28.665	< .001
Psychotherapist		52	49.5%		73	42.7%		73	26.9%		155	33.3%	3	22.579	< .001
Neurologist	105	20	19.0%	171	38	22.2%	271	39	14.4%	466	62	13.3%		8.758	.033
Inpatient psychiatry		19	18.1%		15	8.8%		14	5.2%		29	6.2%		20.345	< .001
Sick leave days		M	SD		M	SD		M	SD		M	SD	df	F	p
		40.13	66.675		29.99	53.542		15.72	36.411		20.15	43.402	3,1009	8.814	< .001

2

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 3:** Differences in attitude to psychological internet intervention.

APOI score	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forum			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD	df	F	p
Skepticism and Risk Perception		9.86	2.380		9.88	2.254		9.36	2.278		9.30	2.313		3.861	0.009
Confidence in Effectiveness		16.43	2.148		16.44	2.140		16.66	2.027		16.74	2.150		1.186	0.314
Technologization Threat	105	12.47	2.122	169	12.04	2.502	270	11.52	2.406	460	11.63	2.533	3,1009	4.908	0.002
Anonymity Benefits		11.48	2.879		12.62	2.605		12.70	3.067		12.47	3.191		4.373	0.005
Total		53.58	6.365		55.14	6.719		56.47	6.832		56.28	6.955		5.850	0.001

2

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 4:** Group effect and group by recruitment source interaction effect on estimated mean change in depressive symptoms (PHQ-9) from
2 baseline to post and follow-up and minimally clinically relevant PHQ-change at post assessment.

Recruitment source	Group	Estimated change			Effect Size		Minimally clinically important PHQ change		Effect size		
		Mean	SE	95% CI	d	95% CI	N	%	NNT	95% CI	
Main effect of group		$F_{1,823} = 21.84, p < .001$					B = 1.18 (SE .51) p = .021				
All (n = 1013)	Intervention (n = 509)	2.53	.221	2.09	2.96	0.37	0.06 – 0.67	143	28.1	9	6 – 15
	Control (n = 504)	1.13	.222	0.69	1.56			83	16.5		
Group by recruitment source interaction		$F_{3,817} = 0.29, p = .83$					B = -0.16 (SE .16) p = .31				
Clinical (n = 105)	Intervention (n = 42)	2.900	.547	1.826	3.973	0.26	-0.52 – 1.03	17	29.8	5	-3 – 107
	CAU (n = 38)	1.994	.585	0.845	3.142			8	16.7		
Internet forums (n = 171)	Intervention (n = 63)	1.794	.468	.874	2.714	0.38	-0.26 – 1.01	23	28.0	5	3 – 15
	CAU (n = 62)	0.428	.458	-0.471	1.328			9	10.1		
Insurance (n = 271)	Intervention (n = 106)	2.827	.359	2.122	3.532	0.46	-0.04 – 0.95	40	29.9	7	4 – 39
	CAU (n = 113)	1.135	.353	0.442	1.828			26	19.0		
Other (n = 466)	Intervention (n = 184)	2.584	.278	2.039	3.129	0.44	0.05 – 0.82	63	26.7	8	5 – 28
	CAU (n = 186)	0.942	.279	0.394	1.490			40	17.4		

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 References

1. Andersson, G. and Hedman, E., 2013. Effectiveness of guided Internet-delivered cognitive behaviour therapy in regular clinical settings. *Verhaltenstherapie* 140-148.
2. Andrews, G., Cuijpers, P., Craske, M.G., McEvoy, P., Titov, N., 2010. Computer therapy for the anxiety and depressive disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: a meta-analysis. *PLoS. One.* 10, e13196-
3. Arnberg, F.K., Linton, S.J., Hultcrantz, M., Heintz, E., Jonsson, U., 2014. Internet-delivered psychological treatments for mood and anxiety disorders: a systematic review of their efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness. *PloS One* 5, e98118-
4. Berger, T., Hammerli, K., Gubser, N., Andersson, G., Caspar, F., 2011. Internet-based treatment of depression: a randomized controlled trial comparing guided with unguided self-help. *Cogn. Behav. Ther.* 4, 251-266.
5. Brookes, S.T., Whitely, E., Egger, M., Smith, G.D., Mulheran, P.A., Peters, T.J., 2004. Subgroup analyses in randomized trials: risks of subgroup-specific analyses; power and sample size for the interaction test. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 3, 229-236.
6. Cuijpers, P., Donker, T., Johansson, R., Mohr, D.C., van, S.A., Andersson, G., 2011. Self-guided psychological treatment for depressive symptoms: a meta-analysis. *PLoS. One.* 6, e21274-
7. Donker, T., van Straten, A., Marks, I., Cuijpers, P., 2009. A Brief Web-Based Screening Questionnaire for Common Mental Disorders: Development and Validation. *J. Med. Internet. Res.* 3, e19-
8. Gilbody, S., Littlewood, E., Hewitt, C., Brierley, G., Tharmanathan, P., Araya, R., Barkham, M., Bower, P., Cooper, C., Gask, L., Kessler, D., Lester, H., Lovell, K., Parry, G., Richards, D.A., Andersen, P., Brabyn, S., Knowles, S., Shepherd, C., Tallon, D., White, D., 2015. Computerised cognitive behaviour therapy (cCBT) as treatment for depression in primary care (REEACT trial): large scale pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* h5627-
9. Hamilton, M., 1960. A rating scale for depression. *J. Neurol. Neurosurg. Psychiat.* 56-62.
10. Hedman, E., Ljotsson, B., Kaldø, V., Hesser, H., El Alaoui, S., Kraepelien, M., Andersson, E., Ruck, C., Svanborg, C., Andersson, G., Lindefors, N., 2014. Effectiveness of Internet-based cognitive behaviour therapy for depression in routine psychiatric care. *J. Affect. Disord.* 49-58.
11. Johansson, R. and Andersson, G., 2012. Internet-based psychological treatments for depression. *Expert. Rev. Neurother.* 7, 861-869.
12. Klein, J.P., Berger, T., Schröder, J., Späth, C., Meyer, B., Lutz, W., Hautzinger, M., Rose, M., Gräfe, V., Hohagen, F., Andersson, G., Vettorazzi, E., Moritz, S., 2013. The EVIDENT-trial: protocol and rationale of a multicenter randomized controlled trial testing the effectiveness of an online-based psychological intervention. *BMC Psychiatry* 239-

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

13. Klein, J.P., Berger, T., Schröder, J., Späth, C., Meyer, B., Caspar, F., Lutz, W., Arndt, A., Greiner, W., Gräfe, V., Hautzinger, M., Fuhr, K., Rose, M., Nolte, S., Löwe, B., Andersson, G., Vettorazzi, E., Moritz, S., Hohagen, F., 2016. Effects of a psychological internet intervention in the treatment of mild to moderate depressive symptoms: results of the EVIDENT study, a randomised controlled trial. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* 4, 218-228.
14. Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R.L., Williams, J.B., 2001. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J. Gen. Intern. Med.* 9, 606-613.
15. Krusche, A., Rudolf, v.R., I, Muse, K., Duggan, D., Crane, C., Williams, J.M., 2014. An evaluation of the effectiveness of recruitment methods: the staying well after depression randomized controlled trial. *Clin Trials.* 2, 141-149.
16. Kuester, A., Niemeyer, H., Knaevelsrud, C., 2016. Internet-based interventions for posttraumatic stress: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Psychol. Rev.* 1-16.
17. Lindner, P., Nyström, M.B., Hassmén, P., Andersson, G., Carlbring, P., 2015. Who seeks ICBT for depression and how do they get there? Effects of recruitment source on patient demographics and clinical characteristics. *Internet Interventions* 2, 221-225.
18. Lowe, B., Unutzer, J., Callahan, C.M., Perkins, A.J., Kroenke, K., 2004. Monitoring depression treatment outcomes with the patient health questionnaire-9. *Med. Care* 12, 1194-1201.
19. Lutz, W., Schürch, E., Stulz, N., Böhnke, J.R., Schöttke, H., Rogner, J., Wiedl, K.H., 2009. Entwicklung und psychometrische Kennwerte des Fragebogens zur Evaluation von Psychotherapieverläufen (FEP). *Diagnostica* 2, 106-116.
20. Meyer, B., Berger, T., Caspar, F., Beevers, C.G., Andersson, G., Weiss, M., 2009. Effectiveness of a novel integrative online treatment for depression (Deprexis): randomized controlled trial. *J. Med. Internet. Res.* 2, e15-e15.
21. Meyer, B., Bierbrodt, J., Schröder, J., Berger, T., Beevers, C.G., Weiss, M., Jacob, G., Späth, C., Andersson, G., Lutz, W., Hautzinger, M., Löwe, B., Rose, M., Hohagen, F., Caspar, F., Greiner, W., Moritz, S., Klein, J.P., 2015. Effects of an internet intervention (Deprexis) on severe depression symptoms: randomized controlled trial. *Internet Interventions* 48-59.
22. Moritz, S., Cludius, B., Hottenrott, B., Schneider, B.C., Saathoff, K., Kuelz, A.K., Gallinat, J., 2015. Mindfulness and relaxation treatment reduce depressive symptoms in individuals with psychosis. *Eur. Psychiatry* 6, 709-714.
23. Moritz, S., Schroder, J., Klein, J.P., Lincoln, T.M., Andreou, C., Fischer, A., Arlt, S., 2016. Effects of online intervention for depression on mood and positive symptoms in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2016.04.033-
24. Moritz, S., Schröder, J., Meyer, B., Hauschildt, M., 2012. The more it is needed, the less it is wanted: attitudes toward face-to-face intervention among depressed patients undergoing online treatment. *Depress. Anxiety.* 2, 157-167.

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1
2
3 1 25. Olthuis, J.V., Watt, M.C., Bailey, K., Hayden, J.A., Stewart, S.H., 2015. Therapist-supported Internet
4 2 cognitive behavioural therapy for anxiety disorders in adults. Cochrane. Database. Syst.
5 3 Rev. CD011565-
6
7
8 4 26. Schröder, J., Berger, T., Meyer, B., Späth, C., Michel, P., Eichenberg, C., Klein, J.P., Moritz, S., 2016.
9 5 Attitudes towards Internet interventions among psychotherapists and individuals with mild
10 6 to moderate depression symptoms. [unpublished manuscript]
11
12 7 27. Schröder, J., Sautier, L., Kriston, L., Berger, T., Meyer, B., Späth, C., Köther, U., Nestoriuc, Y., Klein,
13 8 J.P., Moritz, S., 2015. Development of a questionnaire measuring Attitudes towards
14 9 Psychological Online Interventions-the APOI. *J. Affect. Disord.* 136-141.
15
16
17 10 28. Sheehan, D.V., Lecrubier, Y., Sheehan, K.H., Amorim, P., Janavs, J., Weiller, E., Hergueta, T., Baker,
18 11 R., Dunbar, G.C., 1998. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N.I.): the
19 12 development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV
20 13 and ICD-10. *J. Clin. Psychiatry* 22-33.
21
22 14 29. Titov, N., Andrews, G., Kemp, A., Robinson, E., 2010. Characteristics of adults with anxiety or
23 15 depression treated at an internet clinic: comparison with a national survey and an
24 16 outpatient clinic. *PLoS. One.* 5, e10885-
25
26
27 17 30. Wang, R., Lagakos, S.W., Ware, J.H., Hunter, D.J., Drazen, J.M., 2007. Statistics in medicine--
28 18 reporting of subgroup analyses in clinical trials. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 21, 2189-2194.
29
30 19 31. Ware, J., Jr., Kosinski, M., Keller, S.D., 1996. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of
31 20 scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med. Care* 3, 220-233.
32 21
33 22
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	3
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	7
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	8
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	8
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	n.a.
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	8
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	8
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	9
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	9
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	n.a.
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	10 / 15
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	n.a.
Randomisation:			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	9
	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	9
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	Available in main publication
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	Available in main publication
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	9
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	n.a.
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	10
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup	10

		analyses and adjusted analyses	
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	11
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	11
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	Available in main publication
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	n.a.
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	17
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	20
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	20
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	20
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	12
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	Available in main publication
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	15
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	15
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	16
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	3
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	8
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	5

BMJ Open

**Does recruitment source moderate treatment effectiveness?
A subgroup analysis from the EVIDENT study, a randomised
controlled trial of an internet intervention for depressive
symptoms.**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015391.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Apr-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Klein, Jan; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Gamon, Carla; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Späth, Christina; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Berger, Thomas; University of Bern, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Meyer, Björn; GAIA AG; City University London Hohagen, Fritz; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Hautzinger, Martin; Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Lutz, Wolfgang; University of Trier, Psychology Vettorazzi, Eik; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Medical Biometry and Epidemiology Moritz, Steffen; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Schröder, Johanna; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy
Primary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	internet intervention, cognitive behavior therapy, depression, randomized controlled trial, recruitment source

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4 1 **Cover Pages**

5
6
7 2 Title

8
9 3 Does recruitment source moderate treatment effectiveness? A subgroup analysis from the EVIDENT
10 4 study, a randomised controlled trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms.
11
12

13 5

14 6

15
16
17 7 Authors

18 8 (1) Jan Philipp Klein

19 9 (2) Carla Gamon

20 10 (3) Christina Späth

21 11 (4) Thomas Berger

22 12 (5) Björn Meyer

23 13 (6) Fritz Hohagen

24 14 (7) Martin Hautzinger

25 15 (8) Wolfgang Lutz

26 16 (9) Eik Vettorazzi

27 17 (10)Steffen Moritz*

28 18 (11)Johanna Schröder*

29 19 *JS and SM contributed equally to the manuscript
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

2
3 1 Affiliations

4
5 2 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Lübeck University, Lübeck, Germany (FH, CG, JPK, CS)

6
7 3 Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland (TB)

8
9 4 GAIA AG, Hamburg, Germany; Department of Psychology, City University London, London, United
10 Kingdom (BM)

11
12 6 Eberhard Karls University Tübingen, Department of Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy,
13 Tübingen, Germany (MH)

14
15 8 Department of Psychology, University of Trier, Germany (WL)

16
17 9 Department of Medical Biometry and Epidemiology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf,
18 Hamburg, Germany (EV)

19
20 11 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg,
21 Germany (SM, JS)

22
23 12
24
25 13 Corresponding author

26
27 14 Dr. Jan Philipp Klein

28
29 15 Lübeck University, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy

30
31 16 Ratzeburger Allee 160, 23538 Lübeck, Germany

32
33 17 Phone: + 49 451 500 98871 Fax: + 49 451 500 98808

34
35 18 philipp.klein@uksh.de

36
37 19

38
39 20 Word count

40
41 21 Text: 3766

42
43 22 Abstract: 207

44
45 23 References: 31

46
47 24 Tables/Figures: 4

48
49 25

50
51 26 Running title: Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

52
53 27

54
55 28 Key words: internet intervention; cognitive behaviour therapy; depression; randomized controlled trial;

56
57 29 recruitment source.

58
59 30

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4 1 Abstract

5
6 2
7 3 Objective: Examine whether the effects of internet interventions for depression generalize beyond
8
9 4 participants recruited through the internet or the media.

10
11 5 Design: subgroup analysis of the results of a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial.

12
13 6 Setting: five diagnostic centers in Germany.

14
15 7 Participants: 1,013 people with mild to moderate depressive symptoms were recruited from clinical
16
17 8 sources as well as internet forums, statutory insurance companies, and other sources.

18
19 9 Interventions: either care-as-usual alone (control) or a 12-week internet intervention (Deprexis) plus
20
21 10 usual care (intervention).

22
23 11 Main outcome measures: The primary outcome measure was self-rated depression severity (Patient
24
25 12 Health Questionnaire: PHQ-9). Further measures ranged from demographic and clinical parameters to a
26
27 13 measure of attitudes towards internet interventions (APOI).

28
29 14 Results: The recruitment source was only associated with very few of the examined demographic and
30
31 15 clinical characteristics. Compared to participants recruited from clinical sources, participants recruited
32
33 16 through insurance companies were more likely to be employed. Clinically recruited participants were as
34
35 17 severely affected as those from other recruitment sources but more skeptical of internet interventions.
36
37 18 The effectiveness of the intervention was not differentially associated with recruitment source
38
39 19 (treatment by recruitment source interaction $F_{3,824} = 0.28, p = .84$).

40
41 20 Conclusion: Our results support the hypothesis that the intervention we studied is effective across
42
43 21 different recruitment sources.

44
45 22 Trial registration number: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT01636752.

46
47
48
49 23

50
51
52 24
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.
2
3

4 1 Strengths and limitations of this study

- 5 2 ▪ Ours is the first trial to examine the effect of recruitment source on outcome.
6 3 ▪ The large sample size makes detection of subgroup effects more likely.
7 4 ▪ The absence of a subgroup effect does not prove that the effect applies to all subgroups.
8 5 ▪ More randomized trials of internet interventions in clinical settings are needed.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 Background

2 Numerous studies [1-4] and meta-analyses [5-10] have shown that internet interventions are effective in
3 the treatment of a broad array of psychiatric disorders, ranging from depression [5-7] and anxiety [7-9]
4 to posttraumatic stress disorder [10] and schizophrenia [1,2]. However, most participants in these
5 studies have been recruited through media advertisements [7,9], so it remains unclear whether they are
6 similar to those seeking face-to-face treatment in regular clinical settings [7] and whether the effects for
7 internet interventions generalize across different recruitment settings [5].

8 Although some studies suggest that the promising results from efficacy studies can be transferred to
9 routine clinical practice [11,12], one recent study [13] of two internet interventions in primary care
10 reported null findings. This is not necessarily due to the fact that these interventions are not effective in
11 primary care but might be explained by insufficient use of the interventions. No previous studies have
12 directly examined whether differences in recruitment source are associated with the effectiveness of
13 depression-focused internet interventions.

14 A better understanding of whether participants recruited from different sources differ in other
15 important characteristics could help investigators avoid sampling bias or target specific clinical or
16 demographic subgroups. Previous studies have addressed associations of recruitment source with
17 patient characteristics in an internet clinic [14], in a trial of an internet intervention [15] and in a trial of
18 face-to-face psychotherapy for depression [16]. It might also be important to know if participants from
19 certain recruitment sources are particularly open-minded towards internet interventions. But none of
20 the previous studies have compared attitudes towards internet interventions across different
21 recruitment sources.

22 Subgroup analyses examining associations between recruitment source and intervention effectiveness
23 require large sample sizes [17]. We have recently published one of the largest randomized trials of an
24 internet intervention, the EVIDENT trial [3]. Over one thousand participants were randomized for this
25 trial that demonstrated the effectiveness of the intervention (Deprexis) for mild to moderate depressive
26 symptoms. In the EVIDENT trial, we also developed a novel questionnaire measuring positive and
27 negative attitudes towards internet interventions [18].

28 Using the EVIDENT trial data set, the current paper has two main objectives: firstly, we sought to
29 examine whether recruitment source is systematically associated with various baseline parameters,

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

2
3 1 including demographic and clinical characteristics as well as attitudes towards internet interventions.
4
5 2 Secondly, we aimed to examine whether recruitment source is differentially associated with the
6
7 3 effectiveness of the intervention. We also report on our general experiences with regard to recruiting
8
9 4 participants from clinical settings in the EVIDENT trial.

10 11 **Methods**

12
13 6 The EVIDENT study is a multicentre (diagnostic interviews were conducted in five sites in Germany),
14
15 7 randomized controlled trial (RCT). The trial was approved by the Ethics Committee of the German
16
17 8 Psychological Association (DGPs SM 04_2012) and is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01636752).
18
19 9 The full study protocol has been published [19].

20 21 **Participants**

22
23 11 Participants were recruited via multiple settings and online informed consent was obtained prior to the
24
25 12 baseline assessment. The main recruitment sources were internet forums for depression, magazines for
26
27 13 members of statutory German health insurance companies and various inpatient and outpatient clinics,
28
29 14 ranging from general practitioners' practices to psychiatrists' and psychotherapists' clinics, practices, and
30
31 15 hospital settings.

32
33 16 Recruitment source was assessed by self-report; specifically, a combination of a multiple-choice question
34
35 17 (clinical setting, internet forums, insurance company, other) and a free-text answer was used to identify
36
37 18 the exact source via which each patient was recruited. One of the authors (CG) cross-checked the free-
38
39 19 text answers against the multiple-choice answer and resolved any discrepancies through discussion with
40
41 20 her local study team (CS and JPK).

42
43 21 The main inclusion criterion for the RCT was the presence of self-reported mild to moderate depressive
44
45 22 symptoms, operationalized as a score from 5 to 14 on the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) [20].
46
47 23 Eligible participants were from 18 to 65 years of age, had internet access and were able to communicate
48
49 24 in German. Participants with acute suicidality or a lifetime diagnosis of bipolar disorder or schizophrenia
50
51 25 were excluded.

52 53 **Interventions**

54
55 27 Following a naturalistic and pragmatic design approach, care-as-usual was not influenced by the
56
57 28 investigators. All participants were permitted to use any form of treatment, including antidepressant

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 medication and psychotherapy. Participants were randomized equally (1:1) to the two groups
2 (intervention or control). Participants in the control condition received only care-as-usual (hereafter
3 referred to as the CAU group). They were offered access to the internet intervention after the last
4 follow-up assessment. Participants in the intervention group received immediate access to the internet
5 intervention (Deprexis) in addition to care-as-usual. Briefly, this program consists of modules covering
6 content that is broadly consistent with CBT (e.g., cognitive restructuring, behavioural activation,
7 acceptance and mindfulness, problem-solving) [21]. The intervention can be used with or without
8 guidance by a clinician [22]. In our trial, participants randomized to the intervention group with an initial
9 PHQ-9 score from 10 to 14 received the guided version (e-mail support); those scoring from 5 to 9 on the
10 PHQ-9 received the unguided version.

11 Outcome measures

12 The primary outcome for the RCT was change on the *Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)* [20]. The
13 internal consistency of the PHQ-9 based on the trial data was good (Cronbach's alpha = 0.83). The *Mini*
14 *International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI)* [23] was used to assess the presence of a depressive
15 disorder as well as to rule out a lifetime diagnosis of bipolar disorder or schizophrenia. Clinician-rated
16 severity of depression was assessed with the 24-item version of the *Hamilton Depression Rating Scale*
17 [24] (Cronbach's alpha = 0.79). The MINI and the HDRS-24 were administered via telephone by trained
18 raters.

19 Attitudes towards internet interventions were assessed using a questionnaire that was developed during
20 this trial, the *Attitudes towards Psychological Online Interventions Questionnaire (APOI)* [18]. The APOI is
21 the first questionnaire that measures both positive and negative attitudes towards internet interventions
22 in general. It comprises four subscales with scores ranging from 4 to 20, and these are labelled
23 "scepticism and perception of risks", "confidence in effectiveness", "technologization threat" and
24 "anonymity benefits". The total score ranges from 16 to 80 with higher scores reflecting a more
25 favourable attitude towards internet interventions. When calculating the total score, the polarity of the
26 subscale scores for "scepticism and perception of risks" and "technologization threat" is reversed so that
27 all subscales contribute equally to the total score. The internal consistency of the APOI in this sample is
28 acceptable to good (Cronbach's alpha = 0.77).

29 Demographic details and treatment history were assessed with non-standardized questionnaires. We
30 also employed the following self-rating scales: a measure of health-related quality of life (*Short-Form*

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 *Health Survey: SF-12*) [25] that covers physical health related quality of life (SF-12 PH) and mental health
4 related quality of life (SF-12 MH); a broad symptom measure covering dimensions ranging from general
5 2
6 3 well-being to interpersonal relationships (*Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Psychotherapeutic*
7 4
8 *Processes - FEP-2*) [26] and the *Web Screening Questionnaire (WSQ)*, an instrument screening for
9 5
10 frequent mental disorders [27].

11 6 Assessments

12 7 The PHQ-9 was administered via online questionnaires along with all the other self-ratings at baseline,
13 8
14 9 after three months (post assessment) and after six months (follow-up assessment). Raters contacted
15 10
16 11 participants for the MINI and the HDRS-24 at baseline and after three months.

17 10 Recruiter survey

18 11 We also invited the clinicians recruiting for our study to participate in an online survey. They were asked
19 12
20 13 to provide demographic data and to complete two questionnaires: an unstandardized questionnaire that
21 14
22 15 assessed their recruitment experience and the *Attitudes towards Psychological Online Interventions*
23 16
24 17 *Questionnaire*, adapted for healthcare professionals (*APOI-HP*) [28].

25 15 Statistical analysis

26 16 Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS 22 (IBM Corporation). We calculated univariate ANOVAs
27 17
28 18 for continuous variables. Post-hoc tests were Bonferroni-corrected for multiple comparisons. For
29 19
30 20 categorical variables, we calculated univariate multinomial logistic regression analyses. Effect sizes are
31 21
32 22 presented as Cohen's d for continuous data and numbers needed to treat (NNT) for dichotomous data.

33 20 For the analysis of the effect of the recruitment source on treatment effectiveness, we used linear mixed
34 21
35 22 models (LMM), as they have the advantage of using all available data of each subject. They also offer the
36 23
37 24 opportunity to choose an appropriate covariance structure reflecting the potential dependence due to
38 25
39 26 repeated measurements [29]. Adjustment for baseline measure was chosen as this accounts for
40 27
41 28 regression to the mean [30]. The analysis followed the intention-to-treat principle, which included all
42 29
43 30 randomized participants. No missing values were substituted as LMMs based on all observed data are
44 31
45 32 valid and unbiased methods for missing at random (MAR) data [31].

46 27 The outcome was analysed as change from baseline with a random intercept for the participant. Time,
47 28
48 29 treatment group, recruitment source and the interaction term treatment by recruitment source were
49 30
50 31

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 entered as fixed effects. We chose an autoregressive covariance structure and allowed variances to vary
2 between assessment points. The choice was based on Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) from a fixed
3 set of candidate structures, namely a first order autoregressive (AR1), or scaled identity structure or
4 heterogeneous versions thereof. The hypothesis that the recruitment source influences the effect of the
5 intervention on depressive symptoms was tested on the treatment by recruitment source interaction.
6 Here, the effect of the intervention is defined as the mean difference between average change in
7 outcome for the intervention group minus average change in outcome for the CAU group (the difference
8 in differences). The subgroup analysis had been pre-specified in the study protocol [19].

9 Results

10 Recruitment and participant flow

11 For the participant flow chart please refer to the report of the main results of this study [19]. Briefly,
12 2020 participants were assessed for eligibility, and 1007 (49.9%) were excluded. The most common
13 exclusion criterion was exceeding a score of 14 on the PHQ-9 (748, 37.0%). Non-completion rates for the
14 main outcome measure were 21.6% at post assessment ($n = 219$) and 24.6% at follow-up ($n = 259$). The
15 non-completion rate did not differ between the different recruitment sources ($\chi^2_3 = 4.34$, $p = .227$ for
16 the post assessment and $\chi^2_3 = 2.06$, $p = .559$ for the follow-up assessment).

17 Most participants (46%) self-identified as coming from the "other" recruitment source (see Table 1). The
18 remaining participants came from statutory health insurance companies (27%), internet forums (17%)
19 and clinical sources (10%). Inspection of the free-text answers revealed that most of the participants in
20 the "other" category learned about the study through articles in the news media.

21 Participant characteristics

22 For descriptive and inferential statistics on the differences between the four recruitment sources, refer
23 to Table 1 (demographic data) and Table 2 (clinical characteristics). Briefly, we did not find any
24 statistically significant differences for a broad range of clinical characteristics including self- and clinician
25 rated depression severity, psychosocial functioning and self-reported comorbid symptoms. Participants
26 recruited through online forums were slightly more likely to suffer from dysthymia and participants from
27 clinical settings and other sources were slightly more likely to report symptoms of panic disorder, but
28 these differences were not statistically significant. We did find statistically significant differences
29 between the recruitment sources for measures of resource use. Compared to participants recruited

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 through insurance companies and other sources, participants recruited in clinical settings were more
2 likely to be in psychiatric treatment ($p < .05$; odds ratio [OR] vs. insurance 2.71, OR vs. other sources
3 1.70), psychotherapy ($p < .01$; OR vs. insurance 2.66, OR vs. other sources 1.99) and inpatient psychiatric
4 treatment ($p < .001$; OR vs. insurance 4.06, OR vs. other sources 3.33, OR vs. internet forums 2.30). They
5 also reported having had significantly more sick leave days ($p < .001$; d vs. insurance 0.52, d vs. other
6 sources 0.41).

7 We also observed differences for demographic variables. Compared to participants recruited in a clinical
8 setting, participants recruited through statutory health insurance companies were more likely to be
9 employed full-time ($p < .01$; OR 2.23) or part-time ($p < .01$; OR 3.19). Participants from the different
10 recruitment sources also differed in their attitudes to internet interventions (Table 3). Compared to
11 participants recruited through insurance companies and other sources, those recruited in clinical settings
12 had less favourable attitudes towards internet interventions ($p < .01$; d vs. insurance 0.43, d vs. other
13 sources 0.40). In particular, they scored higher on technologization threat ($p < .01$; d vs. insurance
14 companies 0.41, d vs. other sources 0.34) and lower on anonymity benefits ($p < .01$; d vs. internet forums
15 0.42, d vs. insurance companies 0.41, d vs. other sources 0.32).

16 Intervention usage

17 A total of 509 participants were randomised to the intervention group. The mean number of sessions of
18 at least 10 minutes duration was 8.32 ($SD = 4.71$), the mean total usage time was 429.70 ($SD = 294.0$)
19 minutes (about seven hours). Periods of inactivity of 5 min or longer were subtracted in the computation
20 of the total usage time. Participants from the different recruitment sources did not differ with respect to
21 the number of sessions ($F_{3,481} = 0.47, p = .70$) or the total usage time ($F_{3,481} = 0.51, p = .70$).

22 Primary and secondary outcomes

23 As reported previously [3], the intervention had a significant effect on the main outcome, change in
24 PHQ-9 scores from baseline to post and follow-up. Whereas depressive symptoms decreased in both
25 groups, changes in PHQ-9 differed significantly (main effect of treatment: $F_{1,829} = 23.05, p < .001$)
26 between groups. In the intervention group, PHQ-9 scores decreased by 1.43 (95% CI 0.85 — 2.02) points
27 more than in the CAU group, on average. Both the main effect of recruitment source ($F_{3,825} = 2.61, p =$
28 $.051$) and the interaction term (treatment assignment by recruitment source) were not statistically
29 significant ($F_{3,824} = 0.28, p = .84$)(Table 4).

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 The analysis of the secondary outcomes (HRSD, SF-12 and FEP-2) mostly yielded the same pattern of
4 results (Table 5). The main effect of group was statistically significant for all secondary outcomes except
5 2
6 3 for physical health-related quality of life (SF-12 PH). The main effect of recruitment source was
7 4
8 5 significant for mental health related quality of life ($p = .011$) with patients recruited via internet forums
9 6
10 7 reporting smaller improvements compared to participants recruited from clinical settings (-3.82 ; 95% CI
11 8
12 9 -7.18 — -0.47 ; Bonferroni corrected $p = .016$) and participants recruited from other sources (-2.57 ; 95%
13 10
14 11 CI -4.99 — -0.15 ; Bonferroni corrected $p = .030$). The interaction term (treatment assignment by
15 12
16 13 recruitment source) was not statistically significant for any of the secondary outcomes.
17 14
18 15

18 9 Sensitivity analyses

19
20 10 As a sensitivity analysis for the primary outcome, we reran the analysis of the interaction with a binary
21 11
22 12 subgroup definition. Here we summarized the following recruitment sources as non-clinical: statutory
23 13
24 14 health insurance companies, internet forums and “other” recruitment sources. Here, we replicated the
25 15
26 16 significant main effect of treatment ($F_{1,834} = 7.94$, $p < .01$) and found a significant main effect of
27 17
28 18 recruitment source on change of PHQ-9 ($F_{1,834} = 5.45$, $p = .02$). Symptom change was greater in those
29 19
30 20 recruited from clinical sources compared to those not recruited from clinical sources (1.50 ; 95% CI 0.33 —
31 21
32 22 2.68). The interaction term (treatment by binary recruitment source) was not statistically significant
33 23
34 24 ($F_{1,834} = 1.66$, $p = .20$) confirming the result of the main subgroup analysis above.

35 18 We also conducted a sensitivity analysis with the binary outcome “minimally clinically important change
36 19
37 20 of PHQ-9” as the dependent variable (binary logistic regression: $\chi^2_3 = 19.749$, $p < .001$, Nagelkerke's $r^2 =$
38 21
39 22 $.031$). A minimally clinically important individual PHQ-9 improvement was defined as five point reduction
40 23
41 24 [32]. In keeping with the results of the previously reported analyses we found a main effect of treatment
42 25
43 26 ($B = 1.18$ (SE $.51$), $p = .021$), no main effect of recruitment source ($B = 0.08$ (SE $.13$), $p = 0.53$) and the
44 27
45 28 treatment by recruitment source interaction term was not statistically significant ($B = -0.16$ (SE $.16$), $p =$
46 29
47 30 $.31$).

48 25 In a final sensitivity analysis we used multiple imputation (50 imputations) to estimate missing scores by
49 26
50 27 evaluating the relationships between observed and missing scores as well as baseline scores. The results
51 28
52 29 were essentially the same as for the main analysis (main effect of treatment: $F_{1,1004} = 111.52$, $p < .001$;
53 30
54 31 main effect of recruitment source on change of PHQ-9: $F_{3,1004} = 2.547$, $p = .055$; treatment assignment by
55 32
56 33 recruitment source interaction: $F_{3,1004} = 0.45$, $p = .72$).

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 Recruiter characteristics

2 A total of 89 persons who supported our recruitment efforts in clinical settings (the recruiters) were
3 contacted via e-mail for an online survey. Of these, 48 completed the survey (54%). They were mostly
4 female (69%) and their mean age was 44.06 (SD 12.17). Almost half of them reported working in an
5 inpatient setting (42%), mostly as psychotherapists (50%), specialists in psychosomatic medicine (33%)
6 and psychiatry (22.9%). Recruiters could name multiple fields of work and, therefore, the total sum
7 exceeds 100%. Recruiters also completed a questionnaire inquiring about their experiences with regard
8 to the recruitment process. Here, 40% reported that they often forgot to talk with their patients about
9 the study. 25% wrote they did not have the time to talk with their patients about the study or that their
10 patients' symptoms were too severe to participate in the study. Only 12.5% of respondents reported
11 inadequate computer literacy as a barrier to participating in the study. On the APOI, the recruiters had a
12 total mean score of 51.23 (SD 12.17) and the following subscale mean scores (SD): scepticism and risk
13 perception 11.14 (2.55), confidence in effectiveness 16.08 (1.92) perceived technology disadvantages
14 14.50 (SD 2.34) and perception of anonymity benefits 12.64 (2.47).

15 Discussion

16 Principal findings

17 This study examined associations of recruitment source with participant characteristics and effectiveness
18 in a trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms. We found few demographic or clinical
19 differences among participants recruited from different sources. To our knowledge, this is the first study
20 that examines the association of the recruitment source with the effectiveness of an internet
21 intervention. Here, we found no moderating influence of the recruitment source on the treatment
22 effect. We did find an indication however that the recruitment source might predict course of depressive
23 symptoms independent of treatment group assignment. Decrease of symptoms was greater in those
24 recruited from clinical sources than in those recruited via other settings. This finding was only statistically
25 significant in one of the sensitivity analysis though and should thus be replicated in other studies before
26 firm conclusions can be drawn from this finding.

27 Comparison with other studies

28 Some of the findings regarding clinical characteristics contrast with results from a previous study [15],
29 which found somewhat more severe symptoms in patients recruited through clinical settings.

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 Participants recruited in clinical settings in our study were more likely to be on sick-leave, suggesting that
4
5 2 despite similar current symptom severity, their symptom-related psychosocial impairment in the six
6
7 3 months preceding randomization might have been greater. Even though participants recruited in clinical
8
9 4 settings did not differ from others in depression severity or quality of life, they were about twice as likely
10
11 5 to be in psychiatric treatment, compared to participants recruited via health insurance companies (OR
12
13 6 2.71) or other sources, such as news media (OR 1.70). This might indicate that internet interventions
14
15 7 reach people who chose not to seek treatment through more conventional means in spite of substantial
16
17 8 symptom severity [33].

18 9 We have found that participants recruited through insurance companies were more likely to be
19
20 10 employed. Also we observed a significant between groups difference regarding level of education. These
21
22 11 findings might provide some orientation for researchers wishing to recruit participants with certain
23
24 12 demographics as it has been noted that participants in internet studies as well as outpatient treatment
25
26 13 centres are more highly educated than the general population [14].

27 14 Participants recruited through clinical settings had a less favourable view of internet interventions
28
29 15 compared to the other groups. The recruiters working in these clinical settings viewed internet
30
31 16 interventions less favourably than the participants. Understandably, patients engaging with psychiatric
32
33 17 or psychotherapeutic treatment and clinical treatment providers may regard internet based treatments
34
35 18 with somewhat greater scepticism. Interestingly, recruiters for our study had a more positive view of
36
37 19 internet interventions than psychotherapists recruited through professional associations for
38
39 20 psychotherapists who were surveyed in a separate study [28]. This might be due to sampling bias:
40
41 21 clinicians who are sceptical of internet interventions are less likely to recruit for a study of such an
42
43 22 intervention.

44 23 Limitations of the study

45
46 24 In spite of this relatively positive attitude, the 89 recruiters only recruited 105 participants for this trial
47
48 25 that were eligible to participate and could thus be randomized. This figure must be interpreted with
49
50 26 caution though as we could not link study participants to individual recruiters. Therefore, we do not
51
52 27 know whether the recruiters surveyed here actually recruited the participants in this study that self-
53
54 28 identified as clinically recruited. Still, these figures do suggest that it is more difficult to recruit for an
55
56 29 internet intervention through clinical settings compared to recruitment through the media and the

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 internet. These recruitment difficulties were not related to characteristics of the internet intervention
2 but rather to more general problems with recruiting for studies in a busy clinical routine.

3 There are some further limitations to consider when interpreting our results. The most common
4 recruitment source was “other”, and most of these participants learned about our study through news
5 media. The clinical recruitment sources were heterogeneous. Most of the clinical recruiters self-
6 identified as psychotherapists. Our results may therefore have been different if we had recruited in
7 general practice. Also, our sample reported mild to moderate depressive symptoms and it is therefore
8 unclear if our results also extend to people with more severe depressive symptoms or other primary
9 mental health complaints. The inclusion of only mild and moderately depressed subjects might also have
10 limited our ability to detect baseline differences in clinical characteristics.

11 Furthermore, the absence of a statistically significant interaction in our subgroup analysis does not
12 necessarily mean that the treatment effect applies to all subgroups [17]. Statistical power is considerably
13 lower for interaction analyses compared to the main effect analysis, particularly if the subgroups are not
14 identical in size as in our study [34]. Inspection of Table 4 suggests that a differential treatment effect
15 might have attained statistical significance in an even larger sample. We have previously reported that
16 the internet intervention was less effective for patients with mild to moderate depressive symptoms
17 who received concurrent psychiatric or psychotherapeutic treatment [3]. Internet interventions may
18 therefore confer the greatest benefit for individuals who are not in specialized psychiatric or
19 psychotherapeutic care. However, this difference may also depend on symptom severity, as we have
20 previously observed stronger effects among severely depressed individuals who used an internet
21 intervention and received concurrent antidepressant medication [4].

22 Conclusion

23 We conclude that the internet intervention studied here (Deprexis) can be regarded as an effective
24 intervention, also when offered in a clinical setting. However, additional replications with patients
25 recruited from clinical settings would be desirable to establish the robustness of this conclusion. In terms
26 of their clinical and demographic characteristics, participants recruited from treatment settings are very
27 similar to participants recruited via insurance companies, internet forums and the media. From a public
28 health perspective, it appears justified to make this intervention available in clinical treatment settings
29 and beyond. When deployed in clinical settings, evidence-based internet interventions could be added to

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1 the repertoire of existing treatments; when deployed outside of treatment settings, they might offer
- 2 effective help for underserved people who, for various reasons, do not receive other forms of treatment.

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Tables and Figures**

2 **Table 1:** Differences in demographic data between different recruitment sources.

	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forums			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
Demographic characteristics	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	105	41.58	11.930	171	41.89	11.239	271	43.32	9.777	466	43.23	11.327	3,1009	1.250	.290
Marital Status	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Married and cohabiting		36	34.3%		57	33.3%		131	48.3%		201	43.1%			
Married and not cohabiting		4	3.8%		5	2.9%		9	3.3%		10	2.1%			
Committed relation	105	24	22.9%	171	32	18.7%	271	44	16.2%	466	89	19.1%	15	30.29	.011
Single		29	27.6%		51	29.8%		51	18.8%		116	24.9%			
Divorced		10	9.5%		21	12.3%		35	12.9%		49	10.5%			
Widowed		2	1.9%		5	2.9%		1	0.4%		1	0.2%			
Education status	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Highest secondary		52	49.5%		87	50.9%		118	43.5%		263	56.4%			
Higher secondary		15	14.3%		38	22.2%		54	19.9%		65	13.9%			
Middle secondary		27	25.7%		35	20.5%		84	31.0%		97	20.8%			
Lower secondary	105	6	5.7%	171	8	4.7%	271	12	4.4%	466	27	5.8%	18	37.21	.005
Still in school		1	1.0%		0	0%		0	0%		1	0.2%			
No degree		1	1.0%		0	0%		0	0%		0	0%			
Other		3	2.9%		3	1.8%		3	1.1%		13	2.8%			
Employment status	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Full-time		44	41.9%		65	38.0%		136	50.2%		189	40.6%			
Part time	105	17	16.2%	171	32	18.7%	271	75	27.7%	466	103	22.1%	9	30.24	< .001
Other		18	17.1%		27	15.8%		24	8.9%		62	13.3%			
None		26	24.8%		47	27.5%		36	13.3%		112	24.0%			

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 2:** Differences in clinical characteristics between different recruitment sources.

2 FEP-2: broad self-rated symptom measure covering dimensions ranging from general well-being to interpersonal relationships, HRSD: clinician-rated
3 depression severity, PHQ-9: self-rated depression severity, SF-12 PH: physical health related quality of life, SF-12 MH: mental health related quality of
4 life, WSQ: web screening questionnaire for mental disorders.

	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forum			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
Clinical characteristics	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
PHQ-9	105	10.06	2.60	171	10.21	2.44	271	10.40	2.39	466	10.30	2.38	3,1009	0.57	.635
PHQ-9 suicidality item		1.30	0.48		1.23	0.45		1.21	0.41		1.27	0.46		1.91	.127
SF-12 PH	102	46.42	9.52	169	46.83	9.91	262	47.64	9.06	456	48.05	9.44	3,985	1.25	.291
SF-12 MH		30.11	6.96		31.39	8.45		31.49	7.34		31.51	7.69		0.99	.398
FEP-2	105	2.93	0.47	171	2.99	0.47	271	2.92	0.46	466	2.918	0.45	3,1009	1.08	.357
HRSD		17.47	7.49		17.49	7.58		16.14	7.47		16.73	7.41		1.48	.219
Diagnosis	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Dysthymia		33	31.4%		77	45.0%		100	36.9%		166	35.6%		6.49	.090
Depressive Episode		36	34.3%		47	27.5%		75	27.7%		132	28.3%		1.90	.594
More than 5 episodes	105	36	34.3%	171	66	38.6%	271	99	36.5%	466	192	41.2%	3	2.62	.453
Panic d/o (WSQ)		40	38.1%		47	27.5%		75	27.7%		159	34.1%		6.68	.083
Social phobia (WSQ)		46	43.8%		80	46.8%		127	46.9%		221	47.4%		0.45	.930
Alcohol use d/o (WSQ)		4	3.8%		6	3.5%		11	4.1%		31	6.7%		4.16	.245
Resource use	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
General practitioner		92	87.6%		141	82.5%		240	88.6%		397	85.2%		3.70	.295
Psychiatrist		44	41.9%		72	42.1%		57	21.0%		139	29.8%		28.67	< .001
Psychotherapist		52	49.5%		73	42.7%		73	26.9%		155	33.3%	3	22.58	< .001
Neurologist	105	20	19.0%	171	38	22.2%	271	39	14.4%	466	62	13.3%		8.76	.033
Inpatient psychiatry		19	18.1%		15	8.8%		14	5.2%		29	6.2%		20.35	< .001
Sick leave days		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
		40.13	66.68		29.99	53.54		15.72	36.41		20.15	43.40	3,1009	8.81	< .001

5

6

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 3:** Differences in attitude to psychological internet intervention.

APOI score	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forum			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Scepticism and Risk Perception		9.86	2.38		9.88	2.25		9.36	2.28		9.30	2.31		3.86	0.009
Confidence in Effectiveness		16.43	2.15		16.44	2.14		16.66	2.03		16.74	2.15		1.19	0.314
Technologization Threat	105	12.47	2.12	169	12.04	2.50	270	11.52	2.41	460	11.63	2.53	3,1009	4.91	0.002
Anonymity Benefits		11.48	2.88		12.62	2.61		12.70	3.07		12.47	3.19		4.37	0.005
Total		53.58	6.37		55.14	6.72		56.47	6.83		56.28	6.96		5.85	0.001

2

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 4:** Main effect of treatment and treatment by recruitment source interaction on estimated mean change in self-rated depressive symptoms (PHQ-9) from baseline to
2 post and follow-up and minimally clinically relevant change of PHQ-9 at post assessment.

3 The sum of participants in the treatment groups (intervention plus CAU) is smaller than the number of participants in each subgroup because some participants did not
4 complete the post or the follow-up assessment and could therefore not be included in the main analysis. A sensitivity analysis using multiple imputation to replace missing
5 values yielded essentially the same results as the main analysis.

Recruitment source	Treatment	Estimated change				Effect Size		Minimally clinically important change of PHQ-9		Effect size	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>NNT</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	
Main effect of treatment		$F_{1,823} = 21.84, p < .001$						$B = 1.18 (SE .51), p = .021$			
All (n = 1013)	Intervention (n = 509)	2.94	.21	2.53	3.35	0.30	0.01 – 0.59	143	28.1	9	6 – 15
	CAU (n = 504)	1.51	.21	1.09	1.92			83	16.5		
Treatment by recruitment source interaction		$F_{3,817} = 0.29, p = .83$						$B = -0.16 (SE .16), p = .31$			
Clinical (n = 105)	Intervention (n = 42)	3.30	.54	2.24	4.37	0.27	-0.49 – 1.04	17	29.8	5	-3 – 107
	CAU (n = 38)	2.35	.58	1.21	2.49			8	16.7		
Internet forums (n = 171)	Intervention (n = 63)	2.20	.46	1.30	3.10	0.39	-0.23 – 1.01	23	28.0	5	3 – 15
	CAU (n = 62)	0.81	.45	-0.07	1.69			9	10.1		
Insurance (n = 271)	Intervention (n = 106)	3.24	.35	2.56	3.93	0.48	0.00 – 0.96	40	29.9	7	4 – 39
	CAU (n = 113)	1.52	.34	0.85	2.19			26	19.0		
Other (n = 466)	Intervention (n = 184)	3.00	.27	2.48	3.52	0.46	0.09 – 0.83	63	26.7	8	5 – 28
	CAU (n = 186)	1.34	.27	0.81	1.87			40	17.4		

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1 **Table 5:** Main effect of treatment, main effect of recruitment source and treatment by recruitment source interaction on estimated mean change in secondary outcomes.
 2 FEP-2: broad self-rated symptom measure covering dimensions ranging from general well-being to interpersonal relationships, HRSD: clinician-rated depression severity, SF-12 PH:
 3 physical health related quality of life, SF-12 MH: mental health related quality of life.

	Main effect of treatment			Main effect of recruitment source			Treatment by recruitment source interaction		
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
HRSD	1,696	11.82	.001	3,688	1.26	.300	3,687	32.99	.551
FEP-2	1,819	76.17	< .001	3,815	2.40	.067	3,814	0.141	.935
SF-12 PH	1,789	2.23	.135	3,785	0.312	.816	3,784	0.319	.811
SF-12 MH	1,789	136.06	< .001	3,785	3.736	.011	3,784	0.972	.405

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 Disclosures

2 Competing interests

3 JPK received funding for clinical trials (German Federal Ministry of Health, Servier - distributor of the
4 internet intervention "Deprexis"), payments for presentations on internet interventions (Servier),
5 payments for workshops and books (Beltz, Elsevier and Hogrefe) on psychotherapy for chronic
6 depression and on psychiatric emergencies. BM is employed as research director at GAIA AG, the
7 company that developed, owns, and operates the internet intervention "Deprexis". MH is a consultant of
8 Servier. He was an invited speaker at several workshops and continuous education workshops over the
9 last two years. All the other authors report no relationships with commercial interests.

10 Contributors

11 The principal investigators (TB, FH, JPK, BM and SM) designed the study and obtained funding. The
12 EVIDENT study steering committee (TB, JPK, BM, SM, CS, and JS) further developed the study design in
13 collaboration with the EVIDENT study group (steering committee and Wolfgang Greiner, Bielefeld; MH;
14 WL; Matthias Rose, Berlin) and CG. Patient recruitment was coordinated by the EVIDENT study group.
15 JPK conducted the statistical analyses with substantial input from EV. The results were interpreted by the
16 steering committee with substantial input from the study group and CG. JPK wrote the manuscript with
17 substantial input from the steering committee and CG. All authors commented on the manuscript and
18 approved the final version.

19 Role of the Funding source

20 Funding source: German Federal Ministry of Health, II A 5 - 2512 FSB 052. The funding body had no role
21 in the design of the study, data collection, analysis or interpretation of the data. The corresponding
22 author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
23 for publication.

24 Acknowledgements

25 The authors wish to thank GAIA AG (Hamburg, Germany), which provided technical support and made
26 the internet intervention (Deprexis) available at no cost for participants in the trial. The full EVIDENT
27 study team consists of: Leonie Gmöhling, Sandra Nolte, Anna Paulitschek, Matthias Rose (local principal
28 investigator), Leonie Schickedanz; Berlin. Thomas Berger; Bern. Viola Gräfe, Wolfgang Greiner (local

1 Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

2
3 1 principal investigator); Bielefeld. Mirja Behrens, Cecile Hoermann, Anna J. Katharina Jahns, Thies Lüdtké,
4 Björn Meyer, Steffen Moritz (local principal investigator), Johanna Schröder and Eik Vettorazzi; Hamburg.
5 2
6 3 Carla Gamon, Fritz Hohagen (principal investigator), Martin Kolbe, Philipp Klein (local principal
7 investigator), Antje Roniger, Christina Späth; Lübeck. Alice Arndt, Liv Glindemann, Wolfgang Lutz (local
8 principal investigator), David Rosenbaum, Kathinka Wolter; Trier. Flora Bach, Elisabeth Beck, Kristina
9 Fuhr, Martin Hautzinger (local principal investigator), Katharina Krisch, Melanie Wahl; Tübingen.
10
11
12
13

14 7 Data sharing statement

15 8 No additional data are available.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

References

- (1) Moritz S, Cludius B, Hottenrott B, et al. Mindfulness and relaxation treatment reduce depressive symptoms in individuals with psychosis. *Eur Psychiatry* 2015;30:709-14.
- (2) Moritz S, Schroder J, Klein JP, et al. Effects of online intervention for depression on mood and positive symptoms in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 2016;doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2016.04.033.
- (3) Klein JP, Berger T, Schröder J, et al. Effects of a psychological internet intervention in the treatment of mild to moderate depressive symptoms: results of the EVIDENT study, a randomised controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosomatics* 2016;85:218-28.
- (4) Meyer B, Bierbrodt J, Schröder J, et al. Effects of an internet intervention (Deprexis) on severe depression symptoms: randomized controlled trial. *Internet Interventions* 2015;2:48-59.
- (5) Cuijpers P, Donker T, Johansson R, et al. Self-guided psychological treatment for depressive symptoms: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e21274.
- (6) Johansson R, Andersson G. Internet-based psychological treatments for depression. *Expert Rev Neurother* 2012;12:861-9.
- (7) Andrews G, Cuijpers P, Craske MG, et al. Computer therapy for the anxiety and depressive disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2010;5:e13196.
- (8) Olthuis JV, Watt MC, Bailey K, et al. Therapist-supported Internet cognitive behavioural therapy for anxiety disorders in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;3:CD011565.
- (9) Arnberg FK, Linton SJ, Hultcrantz M, et al. Internet-delivered psychological treatments for mood and anxiety disorders: a systematic review of their efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness. *PLoS One* 2014;9:e98118.
- (10) Kuester A, Niemeyer H, Knaevelsrud C. Internet-based interventions for posttraumatic stress: A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Psychol Rev* 2016;43:1-16.
- (11) Hedman E, Ljotsson B, Kaldø V, et al. Effectiveness of Internet-based cognitive behaviour therapy for depression in routine psychiatric care. *J Affect Disord* 2014;155:49-58.
- (12) Andersson G, Hedman E. Effectiveness of guided Internet-delivered cognitive behaviour therapy in regular clinical settings. *Verhaltenstherapie* 2013;23:140-8.
- (13) Gilbody S, Littlewood E, Hewitt C, et al. Computerised cognitive behaviour therapy (cCBT) as treatment for depression in primary care (REEACT trial): large scale pragmatic randomised controlled trial. *BMJ* 2015;351:h5627.
- (14) Titov N, Andrews G, Kemp A, et al. Characteristics of adults with anxiety or depression treated at an internet clinic: comparison with a national survey and an outpatient clinic. *PLoS One* 2010;5:e10885.

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1 (15) Lindner P, Nyström MB, Hassmén P, et al. Who seeks ICBT for depression and how do they get
2 there? Effects of recruitment source on patient demographics and clinical characteristics.
3 *Internet Interventions* 2015;2:221-5.
- 4 (16) Krusche A, Rudolf vR, I, Muse K, et al. An evaluation of the effectiveness of recruitment methods:
5 the staying well after depression randomized controlled trial. *Clin Trials* 2014;11:141-9.
- 6 (17) Wang R, Lagakos SW, Ware JH, et al. Statistics in medicine--reporting of subgroup analyses in
7 clinical trials. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:2189-94.
- 8 (18) Schröder J, Sautier L, Kriston L, et al. Development of a questionnaire measuring Attitudes
9 towards Psychological Online Interventions-the APOI. *J Affect Disord* 2015;187:136-41.
- 10 (19) Klein JP, Berger T, Schröder J, et al. The EVIDENT-trial: protocol and rationale of a multicenter
11 randomized controlled trial testing the effectiveness of an online-based psychological
12 intervention. *BMC Psychiatry* 2013;13:239.
- 13 (20) Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J*
14 *Gen Intern Med* 2001;16:606-13.
- 15 (21) Meyer B, Berger T, Caspar F, et al. Effectiveness of a novel integrative online treatment for
16 depression (Deprexis): randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2009;11:e15.
- 17 (22) Berger T, Hammerli K, Gubser N, et al. Internet-based treatment of depression: a randomized
18 controlled trial comparing guided with unguided self-help. *Cogn Behav Ther* 2011;40:251-66.
- 19 (23) Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview
20 (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for
21 DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33.
- 22 (24) Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiat* 1960;23:56-62.
- 23 (25) Ware J, Jr., Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and
24 preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care* 1996;34:220-33.
- 25 (26) Lutz W, Schürch E, Stulz N, et al. Entwicklung und psychometrische Kennwerte des Fragebogens
26 zur Evaluation von Psychotherapieverläufen (FEP). *Diagnostica* 2009;55:106-16.
- 27 (27) Donker T, van Straten A, Marks I, et al. A Brief Web-Based Screening Questionnaire for Common
28 Mental Disorders: Development and Validation. *J Med Internet Res* 2009;11:e19.
- 29 (28) Schröder J, Berger T, Meyer B, et al. Attitudes towards Internet interventions among
30 psychotherapists and individuals with mild to moderate depression symptoms. [unpublished
31 manuscript] 2016.
- 32 (29) Gueorguieva R, Krystal JH. Move over ANOVA: progress in analyzing repeated-measures data and
33 its reflection in papers published in the Archives of General Psychiatry. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*
34 2004;61:310-7.

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1
2
3 1 (30) Vickers AJ, Altman DG. Statistics notes: Analysing controlled trials with baseline and follow up
4 2 measurements. *BMJ* 2001;323:1123-4.
5
6 3 (31) Bell ML, Fiero M, Horton NJ, et al. Handling missing data in RCTs; a review of the top medical
7 4 journals. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2014;14:118.
8
9 5 (32) Lowe B, Unutzer J, Callahan CM, et al. Monitoring depression treatment outcomes with the
10 6 patient health questionnaire-9. *Med Care* 2004;42:1194-201.
11
12 7 (33) Moritz S, Schröder J, Meyer B, et al. The more it is needed, the less it is wanted: attitudes toward
13 8 face-to-face intervention among depressed patients undergoing online treatment. *Depress*
14 9 *Anxiety* 2012;30:157-67.
15
16 10 (34) Brookes ST, Whitely E, Egger M, et al. Subgroup analyses in randomized trials: risks of subgroup-
17 11 specific analyses; power and sample size for the interaction test. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57:229-
18 12 36.
19
20
21
22 13
23 14
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	3
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	7
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	8
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	8
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	n.a.
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	8
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	8
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	9
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	9
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	n.a.
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	10 / 15
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	n.a.
Randomisation:			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	9
	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	9
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	Available in main publication
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	Available in main publication
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	9
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	n.a.
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	10
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup	10

		analyses and adjusted analyses	
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	11
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	11
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	Available in main publication
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	n.a.
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	17
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	20
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	20
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	20
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	12
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	Available in main publication
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	15
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	15
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	16
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	3
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	8
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	5

BMJ Open

**Does recruitment source moderate treatment effectiveness?
A subgroup analysis from the EVIDENT study, a randomised
controlled trial of an internet intervention for depressive
symptoms.**

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2016-015391.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	12-Apr-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Klein, Jan; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Gamon, Carla; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Späth, Christina; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Berger, Thomas; University of Bern, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Meyer, Björn; GAIA AG; City University London Hohagen, Fritz; Lübeck University, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Hautzinger, Martin; Eberhard Karls Universität Tübingen, Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy Lutz, Wolfgang; University of Trier, Psychology Vettorazzi, Eik; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Medical Biometry and Epidemiology Moritz, Steffen; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy Schröder, Johanna; University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Psychiatry and Psychotherapy
Primary Subject Heading:	Mental health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Evidence based practice
Keywords:	internet intervention, cognitive behavior therapy, depression, randomized controlled trial, recruitment source

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4 **1 Cover Pages**

5
6
7 **2 Title**

8
9 **3 Does recruitment source moderate treatment effectiveness? A subgroup analysis from the EVIDENT**
10 **4 study, a randomised controlled trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms.**

11
12
13 **5**

14
15 **6**

16
17 **7 Authors**

18
19 **8 (1) Jan Philipp Klein**

20
21 **9 (2) Carla Gamon**

22
23 **10 (3) Christina Späth**

24
25 **11 (4) Thomas Berger**

26
27 **12 (5) Björn Meyer**

28
29 **13 (6) Fritz Hohagen**

30
31 **14 (7) Martin Hautzinger**

32
33 **15 (8) Wolfgang Lutz**

34
35 **16 (9) Eik Vettorazzi**

36
37 **17 (10)Steffen Moritz***

38
39 **18 (11)Johanna Schröder***

40
41 **19 *JS and SM contributed equally to the manuscript**

42
43
44
45 **20**

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 Affiliations
4

5 2 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, Lübeck University, Lübeck, Germany (FH, CG, JPK, CS)

6
7 3 Department of Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland (TB)

8
9 4 GAIA AG, Hamburg, Germany; Department of Psychology, City University London, London, United

10
11 5 Kingdom (BM)

12 6 Eberhard Karls University Tübingen, Department of Psychology, Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy,

13
14 7 Tübingen, Germany (MH)

15 8 Department of Psychology, University of Trier, Germany (WL)

16
17 9 Department of Medical Biometry and Epidemiology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf,

18
19 10 Hamburg, Germany (EV)

20
21 11 Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg,

22
23 12 Germany (SM, JS)

24
25 13 Corresponding author

26
27 14 Dr. Jan Philipp Klein

28
29 15 Lübeck University, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy

30
31 16 Ratzeburger Allee 160, 23538 Lübeck, Germany

32
33 17 Phone: + 49 451 500 98871 Fax: + 49 451 500 98808

34
35 18 philipp.klein@uksh.de

36
37 19

38 20 Word count

39
40 21 Text: 3908

41
42 22 Abstract: 209

43
44 23 References: 31

45
46 24 Tables/Figures: 5

47
48 25 Supplemental Table: 1

49
50 26

51
52 27 Running title: Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

53
54 28

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Key words: internet intervention; cognitive behaviour therapy; depression; randomized controlled trial;
2 recruitment source.

3

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4 1 Abstract

5
6 2
7 3 Objective: Examine whether the effects of internet interventions for depression generalize to
8 4 participants recruited in clinical settings.

10
11 5 Design: subgroup analysis of the results of a randomized, controlled, single-blind trial.

13
14 6 Setting: five diagnostic centers in Germany.

15
16 7 Participants: 1,013 people with mild to moderate depressive symptoms were recruited from clinical
17 8 sources as well as internet forums, statutory insurance companies, and other sources.

19
20 9 Interventions: either care-as-usual alone (control) or a 12-week internet intervention (Deprexis) plus
21 10 usual care (intervention).

22
23
24 11 Main outcome measures: The primary outcome measure was self-rated depression severity (Patient
25 12 Health Questionnaire: PHQ-9). Further measures ranged from demographic and clinical parameters to a
26 13 measure of attitudes towards internet interventions (APOI).

27
28
29
30 14 Results: The recruitment source was only associated with very few of the examined demographic and
31 15 clinical characteristics. Compared to participants recruited from clinical sources, participants recruited
32 16 through insurance companies were more likely to be employed. Clinically recruited participants were as
33 17 severely affected as those from other recruitment sources but more skeptical of internet interventions.
34 18 The effectiveness of the intervention was not differentially associated with recruitment source
35 19 (treatment by recruitment source interaction $F_{3,824} = 0.28, p = .84$).

36
37
38 20 Conclusion: Our results support the hypothesis that the intervention we studied is effective across
39 21 different recruitment sources including clinical settings.

40
41
42 22 Trial registration number: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT01636752.

43
44
45
46
47
48 23

49
50
51 24

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1 Strengths and limitations of this study

- 2 2 ▪ Ours is the first trial to examine the effect of recruitment source on outcome.
- 3 3 ▪ The large sample size makes detection of subgroup effects more likely.
- 4 4 ▪ The absence of a subgroup effect does not prove that the effect applies to all subgroups.
- 5 5 ▪ More randomized trials of internet interventions in clinical settings are needed.

6

For peer review only

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Background**

2 Numerous studies [1-4] and meta-analyses [5-10] have shown that internet interventions are effective in
3 the treatment of a broad array of psychiatric disorders, ranging from depression [5-7] and anxiety [7-9]
4 to posttraumatic stress disorder [10] and schizophrenia [1,2]. However, most participants in these
5 studies have been recruited through media advertisements [7,9], so it remains unclear whether they are
6 similar to those seeking face-to-face treatment in regular clinical settings [7] and whether the effects for
7 internet interventions generalize across different recruitment settings [5].

8 Although some studies suggest that the promising results from efficacy studies can be transferred to
9 routine clinical practice [11,12], one recent study [13] of two internet interventions in primary care
10 reported null findings. This is not necessarily due to the fact that these interventions are not effective in
11 primary care but might be explained by insufficient use of the interventions. No previous studies have
12 directly examined whether differences in recruitment source are associated with the effectiveness of
13 depression-focused internet interventions.

14 A better understanding of whether participants recruited from different sources differ in other
15 important characteristics could help investigators avoid sampling bias or target specific clinical or
16 demographic subgroups. Previous studies have addressed associations of recruitment source with
17 patient characteristics in an internet clinic [14], in a trial of an internet intervention [15] and in a trial of
18 face-to-face psychotherapy for depression [16]. It might also be important to know if participants from
19 certain recruitment sources are particularly open-minded towards internet interventions. But none of
20 the previous studies have compared attitudes towards internet interventions across different
21 recruitment sources.

22 Subgroup analyses examining associations between recruitment source and intervention effectiveness
23 require large sample sizes [17]. We have recently published one of the largest randomized trials of an
24 internet intervention, the EVIDENT trial [3]. Over one thousand participants were randomized for this
25 trial that demonstrated the effectiveness of the intervention (Deprexis) for mild to moderate depressive
26 symptoms. In the EVIDENT trial, we also developed a novel questionnaire measuring positive and
27 negative attitudes towards internet interventions [18].

28 Using the EVIDENT trial data set, the current paper has two main objectives: firstly, we sought to
29 examine whether recruitment source is systematically associated with various baseline parameters,

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 including demographic and clinical characteristics as well as attitudes towards internet interventions.
2
3
4
5 1 Secondly, we aimed to examine whether recruitment source is differentially associated with the
6
7 2 effectiveness of the intervention. We also report on our general experiences with regard to recruiting
8
9 3 participants from clinical settings in the EVIDENT trial.
4

5 **Methods**

6 The EVIDENT study is a multicentre (diagnostic interviews were conducted in five sites in Germany),
7
8 randomized controlled trial (RCT). The trial was approved by the Ethics Committee of the German
9
10 Psychological Association (DGPs SM 04_2012) and is registered with ClinicalTrials.gov (NCT01636752).
11
12 The full study protocol has been published [19].
13

14 **Participants**

15 Participants were recruited via multiple settings and online informed consent was obtained prior to the
16
17 baseline assessment. The main recruitment sources were internet forums for depression, magazines for
18
19 members of statutory German health insurance companies and various inpatient and outpatient clinics,
20
21 ranging from general practitioners' practices to psychiatrists' and psychotherapists' clinics, practices, and
22
23 hospital settings.
24

25 Recruitment source was assessed by self-report; specifically, a combination of a multiple-choice question
26
27 (clinical setting, internet forums, insurance company, other) and a free-text answer was used to identify
28
29 the exact source via which each patient was recruited. One of the authors (CG) cross-checked the free-
30
31 text answers against the multiple-choice answer and resolved any discrepancies through discussion with
32
33 her local study team (CS and JPK).
34

35 The main inclusion criterion for the RCT was the presence of self-reported mild to moderate depressive
36
37 symptoms, operationalized as a score from 5 to 14 on the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) [20].
38
39 Eligible participants were from 18 to 65 years of age, had internet access and were able to communicate
40
41 in German. Participants with acute suicidality or a lifetime diagnosis of bipolar disorder or schizophrenia
42
43 were excluded.
44

45 **Interventions**

46 Following a naturalistic and pragmatic design approach, care-as-usual was not influenced by the
47
48 investigators. All participants were permitted to use any form of treatment, including antidepressant
49
50

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 medication and psychotherapy. Participants were randomized equally (1:1) to the two groups
2 (intervention or control). Participants in the control condition received only care-as-usual (hereafter
3 referred to as the CAU group). They were offered access to the internet intervention after the last
4 follow-up assessment. Participants in the intervention group received immediate access to the internet
5 intervention (Deprexis) in addition to care-as-usual. Briefly, this program consists of modules covering
6 content that is broadly consistent with CBT (e.g., cognitive restructuring, behavioural activation,
7 acceptance and mindfulness, problem-solving) [21]. The intervention can be used with or without
8 guidance by a clinician [22]. In our trial, participants randomized to the intervention group with an initial
9 PHQ-9 score from 10 to 14 received the guided version (e-mail support); those scoring from 5 to 9 on the
10 PHQ-9 received the unguided version.

11 Outcome measures

12 The primary outcome for the RCT was change on the *Patient Health Questionnaire (PHQ-9)* [20]. The
13 internal consistency of the PHQ-9 based on the trial data was good (Cronbach's alpha = 0.83). The *Mini*
14 *International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI)* [23] was used to assess the presence of a depressive
15 disorder as well as to rule out a lifetime diagnosis of bipolar disorder or schizophrenia. Clinician-rated
16 severity of depression was assessed with the 24-item version of the *Hamilton Depression Rating Scale*
17 [24] (Cronbach's alpha = 0.79). The MINI and the HDRS-24 were administered via telephone by trained
18 raters.

19 Attitudes towards internet interventions were assessed using a questionnaire that was developed during
20 this trial, the *Attitudes towards Psychological Online Interventions Questionnaire (APOI)* [18]. The APOI is
21 the first questionnaire that measures both positive and negative attitudes towards internet interventions
22 in general. It comprises four subscales with scores ranging from 4 to 20, and these are labelled
23 "scepticism and perception of risks", "confidence in effectiveness", "technologization threat" and
24 "anonymity benefits". The total score ranges from 16 to 80 with higher scores reflecting a more
25 favourable attitude towards internet interventions. When calculating the total score, the polarity of the
26 subscale scores for "scepticism and perception of risks" and "technologization threat" is reversed so that
27 all subscales contribute equally to the total score. The internal consistency of the APOI in this sample is
28 acceptable to good (Cronbach's alpha = 0.77).

29 Demographic details and treatment history were assessed with non-standardized questionnaires. We
30 also employed the following self-rating scales: a measure of health-related quality of life (*Short-Form*

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 *Health Survey: SF-12*) [25] that covers physical health related quality of life (SF-12 PH) and mental health
4 related quality of life (SF-12 MH); a broad symptom measure covering dimensions ranging from general
5 2 well-being to interpersonal relationships (*Questionnaire for the Evaluation of Psychotherapeutic*
6 3 *Processes - FEP-2*) [26] and the *Web Screening Questionnaire (WSQ)*, an instrument screening for
7 4 frequent mental disorders [27].
8 5
9

10 6 Assessments

11 7 The PHQ-9 was administered via online questionnaires along with all the other self-ratings at baseline,
12 8 after three months (post assessment) and after six months (follow-up assessment). Raters contacted
13 9 participants for the MINI and the HDRS-24 at baseline and after three months.

14 10 Recruiter survey

15 11 We also invited the clinicians recruiting for our study to participate in an online survey. They were asked
16 12 to provide demographic data and to complete two questionnaires: an unstandardized questionnaire that
17 13 assessed their recruitment experience and the *Attitudes towards Psychological Online Interventions*
18 14 *Questionnaire*, adapted for healthcare professionals (*APOI-HP*) [28].
19

20 15 Statistical analysis

21 16 Statistical analyses were performed with SPSS 22 (IBM Corporation). We calculated univariate ANOVAs
22 17 for continuous variables. Post-hoc tests were Bonferroni-corrected for multiple comparisons. For
23 18 categorical variables, we calculated univariate multinomial logistic regression analyses. Effect sizes are
24 19 presented as Cohen's d for continuous data and numbers needed to treat (NNT) for dichotomous data.

25 20 For the analysis of the effect of the recruitment source on treatment effectiveness, we used linear mixed
26 21 models (LMM), as they have the advantage of using all available data of each subject. They also offer the
27 22 opportunity to choose an appropriate covariance structure reflecting the potential dependence due to
28 23 repeated measurements [29]. Adjustment for baseline measure was chosen as this accounts for
29 24 regression to the mean [30]. The analysis followed the intention-to-treat principle, which included all
30 25 randomized participants. No missing values were substituted as LMMs based on all observed data are
31 26 valid and unbiased methods for missing at random (MAR) data [31].
32

33 27 The outcome was analysed as change from baseline with a random intercept for the participant. Time,
34 28 treatment group, recruitment source and the interaction term treatment by recruitment source were
35

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 entered as fixed effects. We chose an autoregressive covariance structure and allowed variances to vary
2 between assessment points. The choice was based on Akaike's Information Criterion (AIC) from a fixed
3 set of candidate structures, namely a first order autoregressive (AR1), or scaled identity structure or
4 heterogeneous versions thereof. The hypothesis that the recruitment source influences the effect of the
5 intervention on depressive symptoms was tested on the treatment by recruitment source interaction.
6 Here, the effect of the intervention is defined as the mean difference between average change in
7 outcome for the intervention group minus average change in outcome for the CAU group (the difference
8 in differences). The subgroup analysis had been pre-specified in the study protocol [19].

9 **Results**

10 Recruitment and participant flow

11 For the participant flow chart please refer to the report of the main results of this study [19]. Briefly,
12 2020 participants were assessed for eligibility, and 1007 (49.9%) were excluded. The most common
13 exclusion criterion was exceeding a score of 14 on the PHQ-9 (748, 37.0%). Non-completion rates for the
14 main outcome measure were 21.6% at post assessment ($n = 219$) and 24.6% at follow-up ($n = 259$). The
15 non-completion rate did not differ between the different recruitment sources ($\chi^2_3 = 4.34$, $p = .227$ for
16 the post assessment and $\chi^2_3 = 2.06$, $p = .559$ for the follow-up assessment).

17 Most participants (46%) self-identified as coming from the "other" recruitment source (see Table 1). The
18 remaining participants came from statutory health insurance companies (27%), internet forums (17%)
19 and clinical sources (10%). Inspection of the free-text answers revealed that most of the participants in
20 the "other" category learned about the study through articles in the news media.

21 Participant characteristics

22 For descriptive and inferential statistics on the differences between the four recruitment sources, refer
23 to Table 1 (demographic data) and Table 2 (clinical characteristics). Briefly, we did not find any
24 statistically significant differences for a broad range of clinical characteristics including self- and clinician
25 rated depression severity, psychosocial functioning and self-reported comorbid symptoms. Participants
26 recruited through online forums were slightly more likely to suffer from dysthymia and participants from
27 clinical settings and other sources were slightly more likely to report symptoms of panic disorder, but
28 these differences were not statistically significant. We did find statistically significant differences
29 between the recruitment sources for measures of resource use. Compared to participants recruited

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 through insurance companies and other sources, participants recruited in clinical settings were more
2 likely to be in psychiatric treatment ($p < .05$; odds ratio [OR] vs. insurance 2.71, OR vs. other sources
3 1.70), psychotherapy ($p < .01$; OR vs. insurance 2.66, OR vs. other sources 1.99) and inpatient psychiatric
4 treatment ($p < .001$; OR vs. insurance 4.06, OR vs. other sources 3.33, OR vs. internet forums 2.30). They
5 also reported having had significantly more sick leave days ($p < .001$; d vs. insurance 0.52, d vs. other
6 sources 0.41).

7 We also observed differences for demographic variables. Compared to participants recruited in a clinical
8 setting, participants recruited through statutory health insurance companies were more likely to be
9 employed full-time ($p < .01$; OR 2.23) or part-time ($p < .01$; OR 3.19). Participants from the different
10 recruitment sources also differed in their attitudes to internet interventions (Table 3). Compared to
11 participants recruited through insurance companies and other sources, those recruited in clinical settings
12 had less favourable attitudes towards internet interventions ($p < .01$; d vs. insurance 0.43, d vs. other
13 sources 0.40). In particular, they scored higher on technologization threat ($p < .01$; d vs. insurance
14 companies 0.41, d vs. other sources 0.34) and lower on anonymity benefits ($p < .01$; d vs. internet forums
15 0.42, d vs. insurance companies 0.41, d vs. other sources 0.32).

16 Intervention usage and utilization of other treatments

17 A total of 509 participants were randomised to the intervention group. The mean number of sessions of
18 at least 10 minutes duration was 8.32 ($SD = 4.71$), the mean total usage time was 429.70 ($SD = 294.0$)
19 minutes (about seven hours). Periods of inactivity of 5 min or longer were subtracted in the computation
20 of the total usage time. Participants from the different recruitment sources did not differ with respect to
21 the number of sessions ($F_{3,481} = 0.47$, $p = .70$) or the total usage time ($F_{3,481} = 0.51$, $p = .70$). The
22 intervention and the CAU group did not differ with respect to the use of concomitant treatments (e.g.
23 psychotherapy, psychotropic medication) during the study period (Supplemental Table 1).

24 Primary and secondary outcomes

25 As reported previously [3], the intervention had a significant effect on the main outcome, change in
26 PHQ-9 scores from baseline to post and follow-up. Whereas depressive symptoms decreased in both
27 groups, changes in PHQ-9 differed significantly (main effect of treatment: $F_{1,829} = 23.05$, $p < .001$)
28 between groups. In the intervention group, PHQ-9 scores decreased by 1.43 (95% CI 0.85 — 2.02) points
29 more than in the CAU group, on average. Both the main effect of recruitment source ($F_{3,825} = 2.61$, $p =$

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 .051) and the interaction term (treatment assignment by recruitment source) were not statistically
4
5 2 significant ($F_{3,824} = 0.28, p = .84$)(Table 4).

6
7 3 The analysis of the secondary outcomes (HRSD, SF-12 and FEP-2) mostly yielded the same pattern of
8
9 4 results (Table 5). The main effect of group was statistically significant for all secondary outcomes except
10
11 5 for physical health-related quality of life (SF-12 PH). The main effect of recruitment source was
12
13 6 significant for mental health related quality of life ($p = .011$) with patients recruited via internet forums
14
15 7 reporting smaller improvements compared to participants recruited from clinical settings (-3.82 ; 95%, CI
16
17 8 $-7.18 - -0.47$; Bonferroni corrected $p = .016$) and participants recruited from other sources (-2.57 ; 95%,
18
19 9 CI $-4.99 - -0.15$; Bonferroni corrected $p = .030$). The interaction term (treatment assignment by
20
21 10 recruitment source) was not statistically significant for any of the secondary outcomes.

22 11 Sensitivity analyses

23
24 12 As a sensitivity analysis for the primary outcome, we reran the analysis of the interaction with a binary
25
26 13 subgroup definition. Here we summarized the following recruitment sources as non-clinical: statutory
27
28 14 health insurance companies, internet forums and “other” recruitment sources. Here, we replicated the
29
30 15 significant main effect of treatment ($F_{1,834} = 7.94, p < .01$) and found a significant main effect of
31
32 16 recruitment source on change of PHQ-9 ($F_{1,834} = 5.45, p = .02$). Symptom change was greater in those
33
34 17 recruited from clinical sources compared to those not recruited from clinical sources (1.50 ; 95%, $0.33 -$
35
36 18 2.68). The interaction term (treatment by binary recruitment source) was not statistically significant
37
38 19 ($F_{1,834} = 1.66, p = .20$) confirming the result of the main subgroup analysis above.

39
40 20 We also conducted a sensitivity analysis with the binary outcome “minimally clinically important change
41
42 21 of PHQ-9” as the dependent variable (binary logistic regression: $\chi^2_3 = 19.749, p < .001$, Nagelkerkes $r^2 =$
43
44 22 $.031$). A minimally clinically important individual PHQ-9 improvement was defined as five point reduction
45
46 23 [32]. In keeping with the results of the previously reported analyses we found a main effect of treatment
47
48 24 ($B = 1.18$ (SE $.51$), $p = .021$), no main effect of recruitment source ($B = 0.08$ (SE $.13$), $p = 0.53$) and the
49
50 25 treatment by recruitment source interaction term was not statistically significant ($B = -0.16$ (SE $.16$), $p =$
51
52 26 $.31$).

53
54 27 Rerunning the primary analysis without baseline correction did not alter our results substantially (main
55
56 28 effect of group: $F_{1,827} = 20.47, p < .001$; main effect of recruitment source on PHQ change: $F_{3,827} = 2.28, p =$
57
58 29 $.078$; treatment assignment by recruitment source interaction: $F_{3,827} = 0.18, p = .91$). In a final sensitivity

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 analysis we used multiple imputation (50 imputations) to estimate missing scores by evaluating the
4 2 relationships between observed and missing scores as well as baseline scores. The results were
5 3 essentially the same as for the main analysis (main effect of treatment: $F_{1,1004} = 111.52$, $p < .001$; main
6 4 effect of recruitment source on change of PHQ-9: $F_{3,1004} = 2.547$, $p = .055$; treatment assignment by
7 5 recruitment source interaction: $F_{3,1004} = 0.45$, $p = .72$).

6 Recruiter characteristics

7 A total of 89 persons who supported our recruitment efforts in clinical settings (the recruiters) were
8 8 contacted via e-mail for an online survey. Of these, 48 completed the survey (54%). They were mostly
9 9 female (69%) and their mean age was 44.06 (SD 12.17). Almost half of them reported working in an
10 10 inpatient setting (42%), mostly as psychotherapists (50%), specialists in psychosomatic medicine (33%)
11 11 and psychiatry (22.9%). Recruiters could name multiple fields of work and, therefore, the total sum
12 12 exceeds 100%. Recruiters also completed a questionnaire inquiring about their experiences with regard
13 13 to the recruitment process. Here, 40% reported that they often forgot to talk with their patients about
14 14 the study. 25% wrote they did not have the time to talk with their patients about the study or that their
15 15 patients' symptoms were too severe to participate in the study. Only 12.5% of respondents reported
16 16 inadequate computer literacy as a barrier to participating in the study. On the APOI, the recruiters had a
17 17 total mean score of 51.23 (SD 12.17) and the following subscale mean scores (SD): scepticism and risk
18 18 perception 11.14 (2.55), confidence in effectiveness 16.08 (1.92) perceived technology disadvantages
19 19 14.50 (SD 2.34) and perception of anonymity benefits 12.64 (2.47).

20 Discussion

21 Principal findings

22 This study examined associations of recruitment source with participant characteristics and effectiveness
23 23 in a trial of an internet intervention for depressive symptoms. We found few demographic or clinical
24 24 differences among participants recruited from different sources. To our knowledge, this is the first study
25 25 that examines the association of the recruitment source with the effectiveness of an internet
26 26 intervention. Here, we found no moderating influence of the recruitment source on the treatment
27 27 effect. We did find an indication however that the recruitment source might predict course of depressive
28 28 symptoms independent of treatment group assignment. Decrease of symptoms was greater in those
29 29 recruited from clinical sources than in those recruited via other settings. This finding was only statistically

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 significant in one of the sensitivity analysis though and should thus be replicated in other studies before
4
5 2 firm conclusions can be drawn from this finding.

6
7 3 Comparison with other studies

8
9 4 Some of the findings regarding clinical characteristics contrast with results from a previous study [15],
10
11 5 which found somewhat more severe symptoms in patients recruited through clinical settings.
12
13 6 Participants recruited in clinical settings in our study were more likely to be on sick-leave, suggesting that
14
15 7 despite similar current symptom severity, their symptom-related psychosocial impairment in the six
16
17 8 months preceding randomization might have been greater. Even though participants recruited in clinical
18
19 9 settings did not differ from others in depression severity or quality of life, they were about twice as likely
20
21 10 to be in psychiatric treatment, compared to participants recruited via health insurance companies (OR
22
23 11 2.71) or other sources, such as news media (OR 1.70). This might indicate that internet interventions
24
25 12 reach people who chose not to seek treatment through more conventional means in spite of substantial
26
27 13 symptom severity [33].

28
29 14 We have found that participants recruited through insurance companies were more likely to be
30
31 15 employed. Also we observed a significant between groups difference regarding level of education. These
32
33 16 findings might provide some orientation for researchers wishing to recruit participants with certain
34
35 17 demographics as it has been noted that participants in internet studies as well as outpatient treatment
36
37 18 centres are more highly educated than the general population [14].

38
39 19 Participants recruited through clinical settings had a less favourable view of internet interventions
40
41 20 compared to the other groups. The recruiters working in these clinical settings viewed internet
42
43 21 interventions less favourably than the participants. Understandably, patients engaging with psychiatric
44
45 22 or psychotherapeutic treatment and clinical treatment providers may regard internet based treatments
46
47 23 with somewhat greater scepticism. Interestingly, recruiters for our study had a more positive view of
48
49 24 internet interventions than psychotherapists recruited through professional associations for
50
51 25 psychotherapists who were surveyed in a separate study [28]. This might be due to sampling bias:
52
53 26 clinicians who are sceptical of internet interventions are less likely to recruit for a study of such an
54
55 27 intervention.

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 Limitations of the study
4

5 2 In spite of this relatively positive attitude, the 89 recruiters only recruited 105 participants for this trial
6
7 3 that were eligible to participate and could thus be randomized. This figure must be interpreted with
8
9 4 caution though as we could not link study participants to individual recruiters. Therefore, we do not
10
11 5 know whether the recruiters surveyed here actually recruited the participants in this study that self-
12
13 6 identified as clinically recruited. Still, these figures do suggest that it is more difficult to recruit for an
14
15 7 internet intervention through clinical settings compared to recruitment through the media and the
16
17 8 internet. These recruitment difficulties were not related to characteristics of the internet intervention
18
19 9 but rather to more general problems with recruiting for studies in a busy clinical routine.

20
21 10 There are some further limitations to consider when interpreting our results. The most common
22
23 11 recruitment source was “other”, and most of these participants learned about our study through news
24
25 12 media. The clinical recruitment sources were heterogeneous. Most of the clinical recruiters self-
26
27 13 identified as psychotherapists. Our results may therefore have been different if we had recruited in
28
29 14 general practice. Also, our sample reported mild to moderate depressive symptoms and it is therefore
30
31 15 unclear if our results also extend to people with more severe depressive symptoms or other primary
32
33 16 mental health complaints. The inclusion of only mild and moderately depressed subjects might also have
34
35 17 limited our ability to detect baseline differences in clinical characteristics.

36
37 18 Furthermore, the absence of a statistically significant interaction in our subgroup analysis does not
38
39 19 necessarily mean that the treatment effect applies to all subgroups [17]. Statistical power is considerably
40
41 20 lower for interaction analyses compared to the main effect analysis, particularly if the subgroups are not
42
43 21 identical in size as in our study [34]. Inspection of Table 4 suggests that a differential treatment effect
44
45 22 might have attained statistical significance in an even larger sample. We have previously reported that
46
47 23 the internet intervention was less effective for patients with mild to moderate depressive symptoms
48
49 24 who received concurrent psychiatric or psychotherapeutic treatment [3]. Internet interventions may
50
51 25 therefore confer the greatest benefit for individuals who are not in specialized psychiatric or
52
53 26 psychotherapeutic care. However, this difference may also depend on symptom severity, as we have
54
55 27 previously observed stronger effects among severely depressed individuals who used an internet
56
57 28 intervention and received concurrent antidepressant medication [4].
58
59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 Conclusion
4

5 2 We conclude that the internet intervention studied here can be regarded as an effective intervention,
6
7 3 also when offered in a clinical setting. However, additional replications with patients recruited from
8
9 4 clinical settings would be desirable to establish the robustness of this conclusion. In terms of their clinical
10
11 5 and demographic characteristics, participants recruited from treatment settings are very similar to
12
13 6 participants recruited via insurance companies, internet forums and the media. From a public health
14
15 7 perspective, it appears justified to make this intervention available in clinical treatment settings and
16
17 8 beyond. When deployed in clinical settings, evidence-based internet interventions could be added to the
18
19 9 repertoire of existing treatments; when deployed outside of treatment settings, they might offer
20
21 10 effective help for underserved people who, for various reasons, do not receive other forms of treatment.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Tables and Figures**

2 **Table 1:** Differences in demographic data between different recruitment sources.

	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forums			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
Demographic characteristics	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Age	105	41.58	11.930	171	41.89	11.239	271	43.32	9.777	466	43.23	11.327	3,1009	1.250	.290
Marital Status	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Married and cohabiting		36	34.3%		57	33.3%		131	48.3%		201	43.1%			
Married and not cohabiting		4	3.8%		5	2.9%		9	3.3%		10	2.1%			
Committed relation	105	24	22.9%	171	32	18.7%	271	44	16.2%	466	89	19.1%	15	30.29	.011
Single		29	27.6%		51	29.8%		51	18.8%		116	24.9%			
Divorced		10	9.5%		21	12.3%		35	12.9%		49	10.5%			
Widowed		2	1.9%		5	2.9%		1	0.4%		1	0.2%			
Education status	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Highest secondary		52	49.5%		87	50.9%		118	43.5%		263	56.4%			
Higher secondary		15	14.3%		38	22.2%		54	19.9%		65	13.9%			
Middle secondary		27	25.7%		35	20.5%		84	31.0%		97	20.8%			
Lower secondary	105	6	5.7%	171	8	4.7%	271	12	4.4%	466	27	5.8%	18	37.21	.005
Still in school		1	1.0%		0	0%		0	0%		1	0.2%			
No degree		1	1.0%		0	0%		0	0%		0	0%			
Other		3	2.9%		3	1.8%		3	1.1%		13	2.8%			
Employment status	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Full-time		44	41.9%		65	38.0%		136	50.2%		189	40.6%			
Part time	105	17	16.2%	171	32	18.7%	271	75	27.7%	466	103	22.1%	9	30.24	< .001
Other		18	17.1%		27	15.8%		24	8.9%		62	13.3%			
None		26	24.8%		47	27.5%		36	13.3%		112	24.0%			

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

Table 2: Differences in clinical characteristics between different recruitment sources.

FEP-2: broad self-rated symptom measure covering dimensions ranging from general well-being to interpersonal relationships, HRSD: clinician-rated depression severity, PHQ-9: self-rated depression severity, SF-12 PH: physical health related quality of life, SF-12 MH: mental health related quality of life, WSQ: web screening questionnaire for mental disorders.

	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forum			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
Clinical characteristics	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
PHQ-9	105	10.06	2.60	171	10.21	2.44	271	10.40	2.39	466	10.30	2.38	3,1009	0.57	.635
PHQ-9 suicidality item		1.30	0.48		1.23	0.45		1.21	0.41		1.27	0.46		1.91	.127
SF-12 PH	102	46.42	9.52	169	46.83	9.91	262	47.64	9.06	456	48.05	9.44	3,985	1.25	.291
SF-12 MH		30.11	6.96		31.39	8.45		31.49	7.34		31.51	7.69		0.99	.398
FEP-2	105	2.93	0.47	171	2.99	0.47	271	2.92	0.46	466	2.918	0.45	3,1009	1.08	.357
HRSD		17.47	7.49		17.49	7.58		16.14	7.47		16.73	7.41		1.48	.219
Diagnosis	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
Dysthymia		33	31.4%		77	45.0%		100	36.9%		166	35.6%		6.49	.090
Depressive Episode		36	34.3%		47	27.5%		75	27.7%		132	28.3%		1.90	.594
More than 5 episodes	105	36	34.3%	171	66	38.6%	271	99	36.5%	466	192	41.2%	3	2.62	.453
Panic d/o (WSQ)		40	38.1%		47	27.5%		75	27.7%		159	34.1%		6.68	.083
Social phobia (WSQ)		46	43.8%		80	46.8%		127	46.9%		221	47.4%		0.45	.930
Alcohol use d/o (WSQ)		4	3.8%		6	3.5%		11	4.1%		31	6.7%		4.16	.245
Resource use	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>df</i>	<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
General practitioner		92	87.6%		141	82.5%		240	88.6%		397	85.2%		3.70	.295
Psychiatrist		44	41.9%		72	42.1%		57	21.0%		139	29.8%		28.67	< .001
Psychotherapist		52	49.5%		73	42.7%		73	26.9%		155	33.3%	3	22.58	< .001
Neurologist	105	20	19.0%	171	38	22.2%	271	39	14.4%	466	62	13.3%		8.76	.033
Inpatient psychiatry		19	18.1%		15	8.8%		14	5.2%		29	6.2%		20.35	< .001
Sick leave days		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
		40.13	66.68		29.99	53.54		15.72	36.41		20.15	43.40	3,1009	8.81	< .001

5

6

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 3:** Differences in attitude to psychological internet intervention.

APOI score	Recruitment Source												Statistics		
	(1) Clinical			(2) Internet Forum			(3) Insurance			(4) Other			Between groups		
	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Scepticism and Risk Perception		9.86	2.38		9.88	2.25		9.36	2.28		9.30	2.31		3.86	0.009
Confidence in Effectiveness		16.43	2.15		16.44	2.14		16.66	2.03		16.74	2.15		1.19	0.314
Technologization Threat	105	12.47	2.12	169	12.04	2.50	270	11.52	2.41	460	11.63	2.53	3,1009	4.91	0.002
Anonymity Benefits		11.48	2.88		12.62	2.61		12.70	3.07		12.47	3.19		4.37	0.005
Total		53.58	6.37		55.14	6.72		56.47	6.83		56.28	6.96		5.85	0.001

2

3

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Table 4:** Main effect of treatment and treatment by recruitment source interaction on estimated mean change in self-rated depressive symptoms (PHQ-9) from baseline to
2 post and follow-up and minimally clinically relevant change of PHQ-9 at post assessment.

3 The sum of participants in the treatment groups (intervention plus CAU) is smaller than the number of participants in each subgroup because some participants did not
4 complete the post or the follow-up assessment and could therefore not be included in the main analysis. A sensitivity analysis using multiple imputation to replace missing
5 values yielded essentially the same results as the main analysis.

Recruitment source	Treatment	Estimated change				Effect Size		Minimally clinically important change of PHQ-9		Effect size	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>d</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	<i>n</i>	%	<i>NNT</i>	<i>95% CI</i>	
Main effect of treatment		$F_{1,823} = 21.84, p < .001$						$B = 1.18 (SE .51), p = .021$			
All (n = 1013)	Intervention (n = 509)	2.94	.21	2.53	3.35	0.30	0.01 – 0.59	143	28.1	9	6 – 15
	CAU (n = 504)	1.51	.21	1.09	1.92			83	16.5		
Treatment by recruitment source interaction		$F_{3,817} = 0.29, p = .83$						$B = -0.16 (SE .16), p = .31$			
Clinical (n = 105)	Intervention (n = 42)	3.30	.54	2.24	4.37	0.27	-0.49 – 1.04	17	29.8	5	-3 – 107
	CAU (n = 38)	2.35	.58	1.21	2.49			8	16.7		
Internet forums (n = 171)	Intervention (n = 63)	2.20	.46	1.30	3.10	0.39	-0.23 – 1.01	23	28.0	5	3 – 15
	CAU (n = 62)	0.81	.45	-0.07	1.69			9	10.1		
Insurance (n = 271)	Intervention (n = 106)	3.24	.35	2.56	3.93	0.48	0.00 – 0.96	40	29.9	7	4 – 39
	CAU (n = 113)	1.52	.34	0.85	2.19			26	19.0		
Other (n = 466)	Intervention (n = 184)	3.00	.27	2.48	3.52	0.46	0.09 – 0.83	63	26.7	8	5 – 28
	CAU (n = 186)	1.34	.27	0.81	1.87			40	17.4		

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1 **Table 5:** Main effect of treatment, main effect of recruitment source and treatment by recruitment source interaction on estimated mean change in secondary outcomes.
 2 FEP-2: broad self-rated symptom measure covering dimensions ranging from general well-being to interpersonal relationships, HRSD: clinician-rated depression severity, SF-12 PH:
 3 physical health related quality of life, SF-12 MH: mental health related quality of life.

	Main effect of treatment			Main effect of recruitment source			Treatment by recruitment source interaction		
	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
HRSD	1,696	11.82	.001	3,688	1.26	.300	3,687	32.99	.551
FEP-2	1,819	76.17	< .001	3,815	2.40	.067	3,814	0.141	.935
SF-12 PH	1,789	2.23	.135	3,785	0.312	.816	3,784	0.319	.811
SF-12 MH	1,789	136.06	< .001	3,785	3.736	.011	3,784	0.972	.405

4

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 **Disclosures**

2 **Competing interests**

3 JPK received funding for clinical trials (German Federal Ministry of Health, Servier - distributor of the
4 internet intervention "Deprexis"), payments for presentations on internet interventions (Servier),
5 payments for workshops and books (Beltz, Elsevier and Hogrefe) on psychotherapy for chronic
6 depression and on psychiatric emergencies. BM is employed as research director at GAIA AG, the
7 company that developed, owns, and operates the internet intervention "Deprexis". MH is a consultant of
8 Servier. He was an invited speaker at several workshops and continuous education workshops over the
9 last two years. All the other authors report no relationships with commercial interests.

10 **Contributors**

11 The principal investigators (TB, FH, JPK, BM and SM) designed the study and obtained funding. The
12 EVIDENT study steering committee (TB, JPK, BM, SM, CS, and JS) further developed the study design in
13 collaboration with the EVIDENT study group (steering committee and Wolfgang Greiner, Bielefeld; MH;
14 WL; Matthias Rose, Berlin) and CG. Patient recruitment was coordinated by the EVIDENT study group.
15 JPK conducted the statistical analyses with substantial input from EV. The results were interpreted by the
16 steering committee with substantial input from the study group and CG. JPK wrote the manuscript with
17 substantial input from the steering committee and CG. All authors commented on the manuscript and
18 approved the final version.

19 **Role of the Funding source**

20 Funding source: German Federal Ministry of Health, II A 5 - 2512 FSB 052. The funding body had no role
21 in the design of the study, data collection, analysis or interpretation of the data. The corresponding
22 author had full access to all the data in the study and had final responsibility for the decision to submit
23 for publication.

24 **Acknowledgements**

25 The authors wish to thank GAIA AG (Hamburg, Germany), which provided technical support and made
26 the internet intervention (Deprexis) available at no cost for participants in the trial. The full EVIDENT
27 study team consists of: Leonie Gmöhling, Sandra Nolte, Anna Paulitschek, Matthias Rose (local principal
28 investigator), Leonie Schickedanz; Berlin. Thomas Berger; Bern. Viola Gräfe, Wolfgang Greiner (local

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1
2
3 1 principal investigator); Bielefeld. Mirja Behrens, Cecile Hoermann, Anna J. Katharina Jahns, Thies Lüdtké,
4 Björn Meyer, Steffen Moritz (local principal investigator), Johanna Schröder and Eik Vettorazzi; Hamburg.
5 2
6 3 Carla Gamon, Fritz Hohagen (principal investigator), Martin Kolbe, Philipp Klein (local principal
7 investigator), Antje Roniger, Christina Späth; Lübeck. Alice Arndt, Liv Glindemann, Wolfgang Lutz (local
8 4
9 principal investigator), David Rosenbaum, Kathinka Wolter; Trier. Flora Bach, Elisabeth Beck, Kristina
10 5
11 6 Fuhr, Martin Hautzinger (local principal investigator), Katharina Krisch, Melanie Wahl; Tübingen.

13
14 7 Data sharing statement

15
16 8 No additional data are available.

17
18
19 9
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

1 References

- 2 (1) Moritz S, Cludius B, Hottenrott B, et al. Mindfulness and relaxation treatment reduce depressive
3 symptoms in individuals with psychosis. *Eur Psychiatry* 2015;30:709-14.
- 4 (2) Moritz S, Schroder J, Klein JP, et al. Effects of online intervention for depression on mood and
5 positive symptoms in schizophrenia. *Schizophr Res* 2016;doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2016.04.033.
- 6 (3) Klein JP, Berger T, Schröder J, et al. Effects of a psychological internet intervention in the
7 treatment of mild to moderate depressive symptoms: results of the EVIDENT study, a
8 randomised controlled trial. *Psychother Psychosomatics* 2016;85:218-28.
- 9 (4) Meyer B, Bierbrodt J, Schröder J, et al. Effects of an internet intervention (Deprexis) on severe
10 depression symptoms: randomized controlled trial. *Internet Interventions* 2015;2:48-59.
- 11 (5) Cuijpers P, Donker T, Johansson R, et al. Self-guided psychological treatment for depressive
12 symptoms: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One* 2011;6:e21274.
- 13 (6) Johansson R, Andersson G. Internet-based psychological treatments for depression. *Expert Rev*
14 *Neurother* 2012;12:861-9.
- 15 (7) Andrews G, Cuijpers P, Craske MG, et al. Computer therapy for the anxiety and depressive
16 disorders is effective, acceptable and practical health care: a meta-analysis. *PLoS One*
17 2010;5:e13196.
- 18 (8) Olthuis JV, Watt MC, Bailey K, et al. Therapist-supported Internet cognitive behavioural therapy
19 for anxiety disorders in adults. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2015;3:CD011565.
- 20 (9) Arnberg FK, Linton SJ, Hultcrantz M, et al. Internet-delivered psychological treatments for mood
21 and anxiety disorders: a systematic review of their efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness. *PLoS*
22 *One* 2014;9:e98118.
- 23 (10) Kuester A, Niemeyer H, Knaevelsrud C. Internet-based interventions for posttraumatic stress: A
24 meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin Psychol Rev* 2016;43:1-16.
- 25 (11) Hedman E, Ljotsson B, Kaldö V, et al. Effectiveness of Internet-based cognitive behaviour therapy
26 for depression in routine psychiatric care. *J Affect Disord* 2014;155:49-58.
- 27 (12) Andersson G, Hedman E. Effectiveness of guided Internet-delivered cognitive behaviour therapy
28 in regular clinical settings. *Verhaltenstherapie* 2013;23:140-8.
- 29 (13) Gilbody S, Littlewood E, Hewitt C, et al. Computerised cognitive behaviour therapy (cCBT) as
30 treatment for depression in primary care (REEACT trial): large scale pragmatic randomised
31 controlled trial. *BMJ* 2015;351:h5627.
- 32 (14) Titov N, Andrews G, Kemp A, et al. Characteristics of adults with anxiety or depression treated at
33 an internet clinic: comparison with a national survey and an outpatient clinic. *PLoS One*
34 2010;5:e10885.

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1
2
3 1 (15) Lindner P, Nyström MB, Hassmén P, et al. Who seeks ICBT for depression and how do they get
4 2 there? Effects of recruitment source on patient demographics and clinical characteristics.
5 3 *Internet Interventions* 2015;2:221-5.
6
7 4 (16) Krusche A, Rudolf vR, I, Muse K, et al. An evaluation of the effectiveness of recruitment methods:
8 5 the staying well after depression randomized controlled trial. *Clin Trials* 2014;11:141-9.
9
10 6 (17) Wang R, Lagakos SW, Ware JH, et al. Statistics in medicine--reporting of subgroup analyses in
11 7 clinical trials. *N Engl J Med* 2007;357:2189-94.
12
13
14 8 (18) Schröder J, Sautier L, Kriston L, et al. Development of a questionnaire measuring Attitudes
15 9 towards Psychological Online Interventions-the APOI. *J Affect Disord* 2015;187:136-41.
16
17 10 (19) Klein JP, Berger T, Schröder J, et al. The EVIDENT-trial: protocol and rationale of a multicenter
18 11 randomized controlled trial testing the effectiveness of an online-based psychological
19 12 intervention. *BMC Psychiatry* 2013;13:239.
20
21 13 (20) Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J*
22 14 *Gen Intern Med* 2001;16:606-13.
23
24 15 (21) Meyer B, Berger T, Caspar F, et al. Effectiveness of a novel integrative online treatment for
25 16 depression (Deprexis): randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2009;11:e15.
26
27
28 17 (22) Berger T, Hammerli K, Gubser N, et al. Internet-based treatment of depression: a randomized
29 18 controlled trial comparing guided with unguided self-help. *Cogn Behav Ther* 2011;40:251-66.
30
31 19 (23) Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The Mini-International Neuropsychiatric Interview
32 20 (M.I.N.I.): the development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for
33 21 DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry* 1998;59 Suppl 20:22-33.
34
35 22 (24) Hamilton M. A rating scale for depression. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiat* 1960;23:56-62.
36
37 23 (25) Ware J, Jr., Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-Item Short-Form Health Survey: construction of scales and
38 24 preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care* 1996;34:220-33.
39
40
41 25 (26) Lutz W, Schürch E, Stulz N, et al. Entwicklung und psychometrische Kennwerte des Fragebogens
42 26 zur Evaluation von Psychotherapieverläufen (FEP). *Diagnostica* 2009;55:106-16.
43
44 27 (27) Donker T, van Straten A, Marks I, et al. A Brief Web-Based Screening Questionnaire for Common
45 28 Mental Disorders: Development and Validation. *J Med Internet Res* 2009;11:e19.
46
47 29 (28) Schröder J, Berger T, Meyer B, et al. Attitudes Towards Internet Interventions Among
48 30 Psychotherapists and Study Participants with Mild to Moderate Depression Symptoms. *Cognit*
49 31 *Ther Res* 2017;DOI 10.1007/s10608-017-9850-0.
50
51 32 (29) Gueorguieva R, Krystal JH. Move over ANOVA: progress in analyzing repeated-measures data and
52 33 its reflection in papers published in the Archives of General Psychiatry. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*
53 34 2004;61:310-7.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Impact of recruitment source in an RCT of an internet intervention for depression.

- 1
2
3 1 (30) Vickers AJ, Altman DG. Statistics notes: Analysing controlled trials with baseline and follow up
4 2 measurements. *BMJ* 2001;323:1123-4.
5
6 3 (31) Bell ML, Fiero M, Horton NJ, et al. Handling missing data in RCTs; a review of the top medical
7 4 journals. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2014;14:118.
8
9 5 (32) Lowe B, Unutzer J, Callahan CM, et al. Monitoring depression treatment outcomes with the
10 6 patient health questionnaire-9. *Med Care* 2004;42:1194-201.
11
12 7 (33) Moritz S, Schröder J, Meyer B, et al. The more it is needed, the less it is wanted: attitudes toward
13 8 face-to-face intervention among depressed patients undergoing online treatment. *Depress*
14 9 *Anxiety* 2012;30:157-67.
15
16 10 (34) Brookes ST, Whitely E, Egger M, et al. Subgroup analyses in randomized trials: risks of subgroup-
17 11 specific analyses; power and sample size for the interaction test. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2004;57:229-
18 12 36.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Supplemental Table 1: Treatment utilization during the study period. Patients could use more than one treatment modality.

	Intervention		Care as usual		<i>chi</i> ²	<i>p</i>
	<i>n</i> = 509 (50.1%)		<i>n</i> = 504 (49.9%)			
Treatment between baseline and three months assessment						
Psychotherapy	127	32.3	140	35.1	0.767	.381
Outpatient psychiatric treatment	106	27.0	108	27.1	0.005	.941
Inpatient psychiatric treatment	5	1.3	9	2.3	1.123	.289
Antidepressant medication	193	48.9	204	51.3	0.455	.500
Treatment between three months and six months assessment						
Psychotherapy	118	31.3	119	31.7	0.016	.898
Outpatient psychiatric treatment	94	24.9	96	25.6	0.044	.833
Inpatient psychiatric treatment	6	1.6	9	2.4	0.629	.428
Antidepressant medication	192	50.8	192	51.2	0.012	.911

Section/Topic	Item No	Checklist item	Reported on page No
Title and abstract			
	1a	Identification as a randomised trial in the title	1
	1b	Structured summary of trial design, methods, results, and conclusions (for specific guidance see CONSORT for abstracts)	3
Introduction			
Background and objectives	2a	Scientific background and explanation of rationale	7
	2b	Specific objectives or hypotheses	8
Methods			
Trial design	3a	Description of trial design (such as parallel, factorial) including allocation ratio	8
	3b	Important changes to methods after trial commencement (such as eligibility criteria), with reasons	n.a.
Participants	4a	Eligibility criteria for participants	8
	4b	Settings and locations where the data were collected	8
Interventions	5	The interventions for each group with sufficient details to allow replication, including how and when they were actually administered	9
Outcomes	6a	Completely defined pre-specified primary and secondary outcome measures, including how and when they were assessed	9
	6b	Any changes to trial outcomes after the trial commenced, with reasons	n.a.
Sample size	7a	How sample size was determined	10 / 15
	7b	When applicable, explanation of any interim analyses and stopping guidelines	n.a.
Randomisation:			
Sequence generation	8a	Method used to generate the random allocation sequence	9
	8b	Type of randomisation; details of any restriction (such as blocking and block size)	9
Allocation concealment mechanism	9	Mechanism used to implement the random allocation sequence (such as sequentially numbered containers), describing any steps taken to conceal the sequence until interventions were assigned	Available in main publication
Implementation	10	Who generated the random allocation sequence, who enrolled participants, and who assigned participants to interventions	Available in main publication
Blinding	11a	If done, who was blinded after assignment to interventions (for example, participants, care providers, those assessing outcomes) and how	9
	11b	If relevant, description of the similarity of interventions	n.a.
Statistical methods	12a	Statistical methods used to compare groups for primary and secondary outcomes	10
	12b	Methods for additional analyses, such as subgroup	10

		analyses and adjusted analyses	
Results			
Participant flow (a diagram is strongly recommended)	13a	For each group, the numbers of participants who were randomly assigned, received intended treatment, and were analysed for the primary outcome	11
	13b	For each group, losses and exclusions after randomisation, together with reasons	11
Recruitment	14a	Dates defining the periods of recruitment and follow-up	Available in main publication
	14b	Why the trial ended or was stopped	n.a.
Baseline data	15	A table showing baseline demographic and clinical characteristics for each group	17
Numbers analysed	16	For each group, number of participants (denominator) included in each analysis and whether the analysis was by original assigned groups	20
Outcomes and estimation	17a	For each primary and secondary outcome, results for each group, and the estimated effect size and its precision (such as 95% confidence interval)	20
	17b	For binary outcomes, presentation of both absolute and relative effect sizes is recommended	20
Ancillary analyses	18	Results of any other analyses performed, including subgroup analyses and adjusted analyses, distinguishing pre-specified from exploratory	12
Harms	19	All important harms or unintended effects in each group (for specific guidance see CONSORT for harms)	Available in main publication
Discussion			
Limitations	20	Trial limitations, addressing sources of potential bias, imprecision, and, if relevant, multiplicity of analyses	15
Generalisability	21	Generalisability (external validity, applicability) of the trial findings	15
Interpretation	22	Interpretation consistent with results, balancing benefits and harms, and considering other relevant evidence	16
Other information			
Registration	23	Registration number and name of trial registry	3
Protocol	24	Where the full trial protocol can be accessed, if available	8
Funding	25	Sources of funding and other support (such as supply of drugs), role of funders	5