

Behavioural modification interventions for medically unexplained symptoms in primary care: systematic reviews and economic evaluation

Joanna Leaviss,^{1*} Sarah Davis,¹ Shijie Ren,¹
Jean Hamilton,¹ Alison Scope,¹ Andrew Booth,¹
Anthea Sutton,¹ Glenys Parry,¹ Marta Buszewicz,²
Rona Moss-Morris³ and Peter White⁴

¹School of Health and Related Research (SchARR), University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK

²Department of Primary Care and Population Health, University College London Medical School, London, UK

³Department of Psychology, King's College London, London, UK

⁴Barts and The London School of Medicine and Dentistry, London, UK

*Corresponding author j.leaviss@sheffield.ac.uk

Declared competing interests of authors: Rona Moss-Morris has published papers that met the criteria for inclusion in the review, and she was previously an advisor to the NHS Improving Access to Psychological Therapies programme. Peter White does consultancy work for a re-insurance company. He also is a member of the Independent Medical Experts Group, a non-departmental body, which advises the UK Ministry of Defence regarding the Armed Forces Compensation Fund. Peter White was also an unpaid chairperson of One Health between 2002 and 2010. One Health is a not-for-profit company that was set up to promote the British Psychological Society model within medicine. Andrew Booth is a member of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Complex Reviews Advisory Board, the NIHR Health Services and Delivery Research Funding Board and the NIHR Systematic Review Advisory Group.

Published September 2020

DOI: 10.3310/hta24460

Plain English summary

Behavioural interventions for medically unexplained symptoms

Health Technology Assessment 2020; Vol. 24: No. 46

DOI: 10.3310/hta24460

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

Plain English summary

The term 'medically unexplained symptoms' is used in relation to individuals who present to their general practitioner with persistent symptoms that cannot easily be explained, even after adequate physical examination and appropriate investigations. Common interventions delivered in primary care tend to be psychological interventions, behaviour therapies or physical exercise therapies. These therapies often aim to change the behaviours of the individual that may make symptoms worse. We conducted systematic reviews of existing evidence to evaluate the effectiveness and acceptability of behavioural interventions delivered in primary care, and a cost-effectiveness analysis to see whether or not they offer good value. Studies measured improvement in outcomes, such as physical or psychological symptoms, or health-related quality of life. There were large differences in the nature of the behavioural interventions delivered and so we grouped them into 'types'. These included intervention types involving exercise (e.g. aerobic or strengthening, or graded activity); different types of psychotherapy, for example cognitive-behavioural therapy; interventions focused on relaxation or social/emotional support; interventions offering education and information; and interventions by general practitioners, for example receiving training on how to implement a behavioural approach to treating medically unexplained symptoms. Statistical analyses were conducted to investigate which, if any, of the intervention types were effective when compared with usual care. Results indicated that some of the behavioural intervention types showed beneficial effects at the end of treatment and at short-term follow-up. In particular, cognitive-behavioural therapy at a higher intensity, and therapies consisting of components of more than one intervention type (i.e. multimodal therapies), showed beneficial effects for specific physical symptoms such as pain, fatigue or bowel symptoms. High-intensity cognitive-behavioural therapy, other types of psychotherapies and interventions focusing on relaxation and social/emotional support showed some beneficial effects on mood outcomes such as depression and anxiety. By long-term follow-up, effects had diminished. More complex measures of symptom load or 'somatisation' showed fewer beneficial effects. We found that no one intervention improved outcomes across all medically unexplained symptoms.

However, the results of the statistical analyses should be interpreted with caution. Not only were there differences in the types of behavioural interventions trialled in the included studies, but there were also differences in the characteristics of interventions within the same type. Participants of the studies had a range of symptoms and syndromes, of varying severity and duration. Interventions of the same type varied in how they were delivered, for example the qualifications of the therapist and the contact time spent between therapist and patient. Owing to the limited number of studies in each intervention type, it has not been possible to identify how these differences influenced the results.

Interventions delivered by general practitioners themselves did not generally show beneficial effects. However, the relationship between general practitioner and patient was perceived to be important. Patients valued receiving explanations for their symptoms and learning self-management techniques. This was facilitated by good relationships with their health-care practitioner. Health-care practitioners reported a need for training and supervision, but patients reported that the primary care setting was both appropriate and helpful. A successful behavioural intervention should allow a patient and their care provider to maintain a relationship where the patient feels supported.

Analyses of the cost-effectiveness of the interventions showed a wide variation in costs. Costs varied between different intervention types, but also between interventions of the same type. Differences in the nature of interventions within the same intervention type, for example whether delivery is to groups or to individuals, make comparisons difficult.

Future research should focus on identifying how the relationship between the general practitioner and their patient can influence the effectiveness of a behavioural intervention when it is conducted in the primary care setting. In addition, more research is needed to explore which aspects of the more promising interventions are influencing their effectiveness.

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 3.370

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library and Clarivate Analytics Science Citation Index.

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

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.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

Health Technology Assessment (HTA) research is undertaken where some evidence already exists to show that a technology can be effective and this needs to be compared to the current standard intervention to see which works best. Research can evaluate any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease, provided the study outcomes lead to findings that have the potential to be of direct benefit to NHS patients. Technologies in this context mean any method used to promote health; prevent and treat disease; and improve rehabilitation or long-term care. They are not confined to new drugs and include any intervention used in the treatment, prevention or diagnosis of disease.

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.

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 14/26/08. The contractual start date was in September 2015. The draft report began editorial review in August 2017 and was accepted for publication in June 2019. 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 and Social Care. 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 and Social Care.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2020. This work was produced by Leaviss *et al.* under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health and Social Care. 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 Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor John Powell Chair of HTA and EME Editorial Board and Editor-in-Chief of HTA and EME journals. Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK, and Senior Clinical Researcher, Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, University of Oxford, UK

Professor Andrée Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals) and Editor-in-Chief of HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals

Professor Matthias Beck Professor of Management, Cork University Business School, Department of Management and Marketing, University College Cork, Ireland

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Dr Peter Davidson Consultant Advisor, Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Senior Scientific Adviser (Evidence Use), Wessex Institute, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

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

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Wellbeing Research, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, 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 Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

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

Professor Ken Stein Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

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

Professor Martin Underwood Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of editors: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk