A randomised controlled trial of computerised cognitive behaviour therapy for the treatment of depression in primary care: the Randomised Evaluation of the Effectiveness and Acceptability of Computerised Therapy (REEACT) trial

Elizabeth Littlewood,¹ Ana Duarte,² Catherine Hewitt,³ Sarah Knowles,^{4,5} Stephen Palmer,² Simon Walker,² Phil Andersen,¹ Ricardo Araya,^{6,7} Michael Barkham,⁸ Peter Bower,⁵ Sally Brabyn,¹ Gwen Brierley,^{1,9} Cindy Cooper,¹⁰ Linda Gask,⁵ David Kessler,¹¹ Helen Lester,^{5,12†} Karina Lovell,¹³ Usman Muhammad,³ Glenys Parry,¹⁰ David A Richards,^{1,14} Rachel Richardson,¹ Debbie Tallon,¹⁵ Puvan Tharmanathan,³ David White¹⁰ and Simon Gilbody^{1*} on behalf of the REEACT Team

¹Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK

- ³York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, UK
- ⁴Centre for Primary Care, Institute of Population Health, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- ⁵National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) School for Primary Care Research, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK (previously National Primary Care Research and Development Centre, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK) ⁶Academic Unit of Psychiatry, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- ⁷Department of Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK ⁸Centre for Psychological Services Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- ⁹Medical Research Council (MRC) Epidemiology Unit, University of Cambridge School of Clinical Medicine, Cambridge, UK
- ¹⁰Clinical Trials Research Unit, School of Health and Related Research, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK
- ¹¹Academic Unit of Primary Health Care, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK
- ¹²Primary Care Clinical Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK
- ¹³School of Nursing, Midwifery and Social Work, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK
- ¹⁴University of Exeter Medical School, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK
- ¹⁵School of Social & Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

*Corresponding author †In memoriam

²Centre for Health Economics, University of York, York, UK

Declared competing interests of authors: Simon Gilbody is a Health Technology Assessment Clinical Evaluation and Trials Board Member. Michael Barkham is a developer of the Clinical Outcomes in Routine Evaluation – Outcome Measure, which was used as a secondary outcome measure in the trial. Peter Bower reports personal fees from paid consultancy for the British Association of Counselling and Psychotherapy, outside the submitted work. Karina Lovell is a Non-Executive Director for Manchester Mental Health and Social Care Trust and is paid a salary.

Published December 2015 DOI: 10.3310/hta191010

Plain English summary

A RCT of cCBT for the treatment of depression in primary care Health Technology Assessment 2015; Vol. 19: No. 101 DOI: 10.3310/hta191010

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

Depression is a common mental health problem. An effective talking treatment for depression is cognitive behaviour therapy (CBT). Computerised CBT (cCBT) is a recently developed form of CBT which is delivered by computer rather than by a face-to-face therapist. We conducted a fair test of two cCBT programs compared with the usual care people receive from their general practitioner (GP) to find out whether or not cCBT is effective in treating people with depression.

A total of 691 people with depression were allocated to one of three interventions: (1) a pay-to-use cCBT program (called Beating the Blues[®]; Ultrasis, London, UK) added to usual GP care; (2) a free-to-use cCBT program (called MoodGYM; National Institute for Mental Health Research, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia) added to usual GP care; or (3) usual GP care alone. People received support and encouragement to complete cCBT sessions via weekly telephone calls. People completed questionnaires about general and mental well-being and symptoms of depression at 4, 12 and 24 months after the study started. Some people were also interviewed to find out about their experiences of cCBT.

The cCBT programs were no more effective at reducing symptoms of depression than usual GP care alone at 4 and 24 months, although there was a small benefit for MoodGYM compared with usual GP care alone at 12 months. The free-to-use program was not inferior to the more costly program. The cCBT programs were liked by some people and rejected by others, but the majority were ambivalent. We found that usual GP care was better value for money than cCBT in addition to usual GP care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2015. This work was produced by Littlewood *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Health Technology Assessment

HTA/HTA TAR

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 5.116

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the ISI Science Citation Index and is assessed for inclusion in the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 06/43/05. The contractual start date was in May 2009. The draft report began editorial review in January 2014 and was accepted for publication in September 2014. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2015. This work was produced by Littlewood *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Editor-in-Chief of *Health Technology Assessment* and NIHR Journals Library

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the HTA Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Professor Aileen Clarke Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Director of NETSCC, HTA, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Elaine McColl Director, Newcastle Clinical Trials Unit, Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research and Development Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Health Services Research Unit, University of Aberdeen, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk