© This manuscript version is made available under the CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0 license https:// creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/

EVALUATION OF WRITTEN SELF-ADMINISTERED INTERVENTIONS

A systematic review and meta-analysis of written self-administered psychosocial interventions among adults with a physical illness

Lambert, S. D., Beatty, L., McElduff, P., Levesque, J.[¥], Lawson, C., Jacobsen, P., Turner, J., & Girgis, A. (2017). A systematic review and meta-analysis of written self-administered psychosocial interventions among adults with a physical illness. *Patient Education and Counseling* (impact factor: 2.821),100(12), 2200-2217.

Sylvie Lambert ^aIngram School of Nursing, McGill University, Wilson Hall, 3506 University Street, Montreal, Canada H3A 2A7

^bPsycho-Oncology Research Group, Ingham Institute for Applied Medical Research, South Western Sydney Clinical School, UNSW Sydney, The University of New South Wales, Liverpool, Australia (affiliation where the work was initiated)

- Lisa Beatty ^cSchool of Psychology, Flinders University, Adelaide Australia
- **Patrick McElduff**^dSchool of Medicine and Public Health, The University of Newcastle, HMRI building, John Hunter Hospital Campus, New Lambton Heights, Australia
- Janelle V. Levesque ^bPsycho-Oncology Research Group, Ingham Institute for Applied Medical Research, South Western Sydney Clinical School, UNSW Sydney, The University of New South Wales, Liverpool, Australia

Catalina Lawsin ^eSchool of Psychology, The University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

Paul Jacobsen ^fDivision of Population Science, Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, USA

Jane Turner^g Mental Health Centre, The University of Queensland, Herston, Australia

Afaf Girgis ^bPsycho-Oncology Research Group, Ingham Institute for Applied Medical Research, South Western Sydney Clinical School, UNSW Sydney, The University of New South Wales, Liverpool, Australia

Corresponding author at:

Dr Sylvie D. Lambert, Assistant Professor, Ingram School of Nursing, McGill University and Research Associate, St. Mary's Research Centre, Wilson Hall, 3506 Sherbrooke Street, Montreal, Quebec, Canada H3A 2A7 Tel (cell). +15147973762, Tel (fax). +15143988455 e-mail. <u>sylvie.lambert@mcgill.ca</u>

Keywords: self-help; anxiety; depression; chronic disease self-management; meta-analysis;

knowledge translation

Abstract

Objective: The cost of implementing professionally-led psychosocial interventions has limited their integration into routine care. To enhance the translation of effective psychosocial interventions in routine care, a self-administered format is sometimes used. The meta-analysis examined the efficacy of **written** self-administered, psychosocial interventions to improve outcomes among individuals with a physical illness.

Methods: Studies comparing a **written** self-administered intervention to a control group were identified through electronic databases searching. Pooled effect sizes were calculated across follow-up time points using random-effects models. Studies were also categorised according to three levels of guidance (self-administered, minimal contact, or guided) to examine the effect of this variable on outcomes.

Results: Forty manuscripts were retained for the descriptive review and 28 for the metaanalysis. Findings were significant for anxiety, depression, distress, and self-efficacy. Results were not significant for QOL and related domains as well as coping. Purely self-administered were efficacious for depression, distress, and self-efficacy; only guided interventions had an impact on anxiety.

Conclusions: Findings showed that **written** self-administered interventions show promise across a number of outcomes.

Practice Implications: Self-administered interventions are a potentially efficacious and costeffective approach to address some of the most common needs of patients with a physical illness.

1. Introduction

The diagnosis of a chronic physical illness often challenges individuals' usual ways of functioning, and represents a turning point in their life [1]. Although most individuals are able to adjust to their physical illness [1], they nonetheless remain more vulnerable to anxiety and depression than people from the general population [2, 3]. The World Health Organisation health survey reported that between 9.3% and 23.0% of individuals with one or more chronic physi cal illness has comorbid depression [3]. In turn, anxiety and depression have been associated with decreased treatment adherence, compromised treatment decision-making and self-care, and increased incidence of side effects and health risk behaviours [4, 5]. Hence, much effort has been devoted to developing psychosocial interventions to improve individuals' ability to cope with the challenges brought on by a physical illness.

Despite variation in terms of theoretical background, content, and mode of delivery, psychosocial interventions essentially target the psychological and behavioural processes known to predict maladjustment by providing techniques such as lifestyle management, stress management, problem-solving, education, social support, and coping skills training [6]. These interventions are most commonly hypothesised to reduce anxiety and depression and improve quality of life (QOL) [6, 7]. Numerous trials have supported this hypothesis [2, 6, 8, 9]. With this empirical support, many national and international bodies recommend psychosocial interventions to complement medical care [10, 11].

Despite the benefits of psychosocial interventions, issues pertaining to their accessibility and delivery linger [12]. Most psychosocial interventions are offered face-to-face, rendering them labour intensive and costly, whereby the resources required for their implementation often exceed the capacity of health care settings. Furthermore, there is evidence to suggest that psychosocial interventions may not be accessed by patients due to personal preference [13], geographical barriers, mobility issues [12], direct cost, and stigma [14]. Also, psychosocial interventions are often offered during working hours in urban centres,

limiting their access for patients who work full-time or live in rural and remote areas [15]. Given that most interventions are planned over several sessions, it is not uncommon for a significant proportion of participants to drop-out [16]. This suggests that service providers need to consider expanding the range of therapeutic options that individuals can access. The addition of a self-administered approach may accommodate patients who otherwise would not access therapy.

Self-administered interventions (also termed self-help or self-directed) address some of the issues surrounding access to professionally-led, face-to-face psychosocial interventions, including providing patients greater flexibility in terms of when and how they engage with the intervention content. Self-administered interventions have a long-history in psychology, with several meta-analyses supporting their acceptability and efficacy in the treatment of depression and anxiety [17, 18]. Less attention has been given to the efficacy of this mode of delivery in managing a physical illness and its consequences. Only recently has Matcham et al. [19] examined the effect of written self-administered interventions among individuals experiencing physical health complaints, documenting their efficacy in reducing depression (no effect noted on anxiety and distress). The present meta-analysis adds to the Matcham et al. [19] review by: (a) examining the efficacy of written self-administered psychosocial interventions that are grounded in therapeutic approaches used in professionally-led interventions such as Cognitive Behavioural Therapy (excluding information-only interventions); (b) not only including anxiety and depression as primary outcomes, but also a number of additional secondary outcomes often postulated to be affected by self-administered interventions; (c) examining the differential effect of three levels of guidance: self-administered, minimal guidance, and guided; and (d) tracking impact across short- and long-term follow-up time points.

2. Methods

2.1 Methodological Framework

The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement was used [20].

2.2 Eligibility Criteria

2.2.1 Study type

Appropriate studies were defined as published (or in-press) randomised controlled trials (RCT) or quasi-randomised trials (i.e., participants not randomized to the control or intervention group) in a peer-reviewed journal where (a) a group of adults with a physical illness who received a written self-administered intervention was compared with a control group (usual care, an attention control, or wait list control), and (b) the outcome(s) included anxiety and depression, distress, QOL (general, disease-specific, and by domain), self-efficacy, and/or coping.

2.2.2 Population

Adults with a physical illness were the target population. Eating disorders and insomnia were excluded, because these are by definition psychiatric conditions. Studies examining individuals with a traumatic injury were also excluded.

2.2.3 Interventions

Studies included evaluated written self-administered (e.g., book, booklet, workbook), psychosocial (therapeutic) interventions (i.e., focused on providing strategies to help patients manage the physical and/or psychosocial challenges brought upon by an illness). The written material could be complemented by another media (e.g., DVD), but the core component of the intervention was a written, printed document. Interventions were excluded if they: (a) were structured self-management interventions led by a health professional; (b) provided illnessrelated information only; (c) included a pharmacological component; or (d) solely focused on exercise or diet. The review was not extended to online interventions, as written interventions still remain a popular resource used in clinical practice and a preferred format for patients, and not to confound results with variables pertaining to using computers and online interventions (e.g., e-health literacy) [21]. Interventions were the informal caregiver was actively engaged were also excluded due to the differential effect of dyadic versus individual-level interventions [22]. Based on Glasgow & Rosen [23], the type of support provided was categorised as self-administered (i.e., no contact with a clinician/the research team), minimal contact (i.e., contact with a clinician/the research team in the form of an initial orientation session), and guided (i.e., regular contacts with a clinician/the research team).

2.2.4 Outcomes

The primary outcomes were anxiety and depression. The secondary outcomes were distress, QOL (general, disease-specific, and by domain), self-efficacy, and coping.

2.3 Information Sources and Study Selection

Eligible studies were primarily identified through an electronic search of CINAHL, MEDLINE, PsychINFO and Web of Science. All studies were published between 1980 and May 2016, in English. Limits applied were 'human' and 'all adults'. Secondary strategies included (a) perusing the reference lists of manuscripts retrieved, (b) scanning the reference lists of previous reviews, (c) contacting researchers known to conduct work in this area, and (d) using the '*find similar*' function in the databases.

2.3.1 Search

The following keywords and MeSH terms were generated: (a) *terms related to self-help*: "self-care", "self-management", "self-directed", "self-help", "self-administered", "bibliotherapy", "unguided", OR "self-action"; (b) *terms related to intervention:* "program evaluation", "treatment outcome", OR "intervention"; (c) *terms related to design:* "randomized controlled trials", "clinical trials", OR quasi-experimental; and (d) *terms related to outcomes:* "stress", "adaptation", "depression", "anxiety", OR "QOL". All titles and abstracts retrieved by

electronic searching were downloaded to a reference management database. The full electronic search strategy used for one database is included in Appendix A.

2.3.2 Study Selection

Initial assessment of eligibility was performed by the first author for all databases based on the titles and abstracts. The primary database searches were replicated by one other author. Full-texts of citations meeting the inclusion criteria were then obtained. All full-texts retrieved were independently examined by at least two authors to confirm inclusion/exclusion.

2.4 Data Extraction

Data were extracted using a standardized form based on the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [24]. Data were extracted by the first author and then verified by a co-author or a trained research assistant. When authors used more than one instrument to measure the same outcome, extracted data were reported from the outcome most often used across studies. For clarity, a measure was always coded to capture the same concept, even if the authors might have labelled it differently. When studies had more than one experimental arm, only those arms that met the inclusion criteria were included. As most studies assessed outcomes over time, the data extracted were categorised into three time frames: T1 – baseline to < 3 months post-intervention, T2 – 3 months to < 6 months postintervention, and T3 – \geq 6 months post-intervention.

2.4.1 Quality Assessment

The methodological quality of studies was assessed by at least two authors independently. The criteria used are those suggested by the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool [24] and Chambless and Hollon [25] to evaluate key methodological features of the studies reviewed, and included (a) an appropriate control condition; (b) the sample size at least 25-30 per group; (c) the study reported a power calculation; (d) inclusion criteria specified; (e) information about the psychometric properties of the measures provided; (f) adequate

generation of allocation sequence; (g) allocation to conditions concealed; (h) blinding; and (i) methods to manage incomplete outcome data mentioned.

2.5 Data Analysis

A random effects meta-analysis was undertaken to determine the pooled effect of the interventions, at each time point, using the standardised mean difference (SMD) in change from baseline. A random effects model was favored to incorporate heterogeneity in this metaanalysis.[26] Although some studies did report an estimate of the difference between groups in change from baseline, in general this information had to be calculated from other data that were reported (mean and standard deviation at each time point or the mean within group change). When the only data reported were the mean at each time point, it was assumed the correlation between the baseline measure and the follow-up measure was 0.5 to be able to calculate the standard deviation of the within person change. The random effects model was used as a conservative approach to account for different sources of variation among studies. The metan program in STATA (version 13) was used to undertake the analyses. The analysis then focused on examining the extent to which the overall SMDs varied according to the level of guidance. Statistical heterogeneity was assessed using Higgin's I² statistic, which describes the percentage of variation between studies above that expected by chance alone [24]. The significance level for all statistical tests was set at p < 0.05 and all tests were two-sided. Twelve studies did not report sufficient data for inclusion in the meta-analysis, and the results of these studies are reported narratively instead. Attempts were made to contact the authors to obtain the additional data needed; however, as many studies were published a few years ago, the data were not easily accessible.

3. Results

3.1 Flow of Studies through the Review

A total of 3858 study titles were screened (see Figure 1). The secondary search strategies yielded more than 600 additional titles that were also screened. Of these, 622 abstracts were reviewed, and then 255 manuscripts were considered for full-text review. Of the 255 full-texts that were screened, 40 were retained for the descriptive review and 28 for the meta-analysis. There was no strong evidence of systematic publication bias based on the funnel plots for the two primary outcomes; however, it is noted that no non-significant, small studies were found (Appendix B).

3.2 Description of Included Studies

A detailed description of included studies is provided in Table 1. Most studies were conducted in the USA (n = 17), followed by the United Kingdom (n = 8). Thirty studies used a two-group RCT design, six studies used a three-group RCT design, and three studies used a four-group RCT design. Only one study used a quasi-experimental design.

3.3 Participants

The sample size across studies ranged from 24 to 921. Most studies included more women than men, and the mean age of participants ranged from 20.7 to 73.2 years. Physical conditions included were cancer (n = 12), osteoarthritis or rheumatoid arthritis (n = 4), irritable bowel syndrome (n = 4), tinnitus (n = 3), asthma (n = 3), angina pectoris or post-myocardial infarction (n = 2), HIV (n = 2), or pain (n = 2), or coronary artery disease, acquired chronic physical impairment, hearing loss, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, post-ICU hospitalisation, type 2 diabetes, Meniere's disease, or heart failure (n = 1).

3.4 Description of the Interventions

The majority of the interventions included a combination of disease- and treatmentrelated information as well as information on coping with typical challenges. The inclusion of social comparison information through testimonials or quotes from others in a similar situation was also common [15, 27-34]. Slightly more than half of the studies delivered intervention content using a workbook/booklet and an audiotape/DVD/CD [15, 28, 33-51].

Eighteen interventions were self-administered, seven were categorised as minimal contact/support, and 18 interventions as guided (see Table 1). Minimal support was typically limited to a one-time, face-to-face orientation session (range = 5 - 30 minutes). Most studies employing guided support offered phone call follow-ups, ranging from one phone call to weekly phone calls for the duration of the intervention [37, 44, 45, 49, 52-55]. Three studies offered group sessions [30, 34, 46]. The remaining studies provided a mix of telephone, mail, and/or face-to-face support [29, 43, 51, 56-61].

3.5 Methodological Quality Assessment

Results of the methodological quality assessment are included in Table 2. Although the inclusion criteria were typically specified, almost three quarters of the studies did not report power size calculation or did not have sufficient power to detect a statistically significant difference of moderate size. With respect to comparison groups, interventions were compared to wait list control, usual care, or attention control groups. Twenty five studies gave information about the reliability and/or validity of the measures used. Slightly more studies (n = 23) gave sufficient information about how the allocation sequence was generated than about whether it was concealed (n = 18). Strategies to manage incomplete outcome data were reported in 21 studies.

3.6 Outcomes: Narrative Review and Meta-Analysis

3.6.1 Primary outcomes3.6.1.1 Anxiety

Figure 2 displays the Forest plots of the SMDs for the 14 studies entered in the metaanalysis. The pooled effect size of -0.17 (95% CI = -0.32 to -0.02) of the 12 studies measuring anxiety at T1 was significant. Similarly, the pooled effect size for the six studies at T2 was also significant (SMD = -0.28, 95% CI = -0.47 to -0.09). At T3, the SMD for the only study [59] entered in the meta-analysis was not significant. Of the four studies [15, 40, 41, 52] not entered in the meta-analysis, only one reported significantly lower anxiety in the intervention group than in the control group [40].

3.6.1.2 Depression

For the 19 studies entered in the meta-analysis (see Figure 3), the effect sizes were significant across all three time points. The largest effect size was noted among the 15 studies at T1: SMD= -0.35 (95% CI = -0.55 to 0.16). The second largest effect size was noted at T3, which is based on two studies: SMD= -0.33 (95% CI = -0.57 to -0.08). At T2, the pooled effect size among eight studies was slightly lower: SMD= -0.25 (95% CI = -0.44 to -0.06). Two [32, 40] of the six [15, 32, 34, 40, 41, 52] studies not included in the meta-analysis also favoured the intervention. Goeppinger et al. [34] found that the minimal contact home study intervention had no impact on depression; however, the guided small group intervention did.

3.6.2 Secondary outcomes

Findings for the secondary outcomes are summarised in Table 3.

3.6.2.1 Distress

Six studies [27, 30, 31, 38, 45, 62] were entered in the meta-analysis for distress. The only significant pooled effect size was at T2, based on two studies, SMD = -0.39 (95% CI = -0.53 to -0.26). Only one [32] of the four [32, 37, 39, 57] studies not included in the meta-analysis favoured the intervention on some aspects of distress or perceived stress.

3.6.2.3 Global quality of life

The six studies [30, 33, 43, 53, 55, 59] entered in the meta-analysis did not result in significant pooled effect sizes. Two studies not entered in the meta-analysis [15, 28, 35, 40, 56] found a significant difference between the intervention and control groups on QOL [35, 56].

3.6.2.4 Disease-specific quality of life

Nine studies [<u>30</u>, <u>31</u>, <u>44</u>, <u>46</u>, <u>54</u>, <u>58</u>, <u>61-63</u>] were considered for the meta-analysis. None of the pooled effect sizes were significant. For the three studies [<u>29</u>, <u>57</u>, <u>64</u>] not included in the meta-analysis, only one [<u>57</u>] found improvements in disease-specific QOL in the intervention group in comparison to the control group.

3.6.2.5 Mental adjustment

Four [30, 33, 50, 60] studies were considered for the meta-analysis. None of the pooled effect sizes were significant. Only one [40] of the four [28, 29, 40, 41] studies not included in the meta-analysis found a significant impact of mental health on this outcome.

3.6.2.6 Physical functioning

None of the pooled effect sizes were significant for the five [30, 33, 35, 38, 60] studies included in the meta-analysis. For the studies not included in the meta-analysis [28-30, 34, 40, 41, 52], only one [52] favoured the intervention over the control group.

3.6.2.7 Social functioning

For social functioning, four [$\underline{30}$, $\underline{33}$, $\underline{38}$, $\underline{60}$] studies were included in the meta-analysis. None of the pooled effect sizes were significant. Only one of the studies [$\underline{28}$, $\underline{40}$] not included in the meta-analysis found that participants in the intervention group reported fewer role limitations because of emotional problems in comparison to the control group [$\underline{40}$].

3.6.2.8 Self-efficacy

Five [35, 38, 47, 49, 60] studies were included in the meta-analysis. Two studies evaluated the effect of interventions on self-efficacy at T1, and the overall pooled effect size was significant, SMD = 0.34, 95% CI = 0.06 to 0.62. The three studies that evaluated self-efficacy at T2 support a persistent, significant effect (SMD = 0.36, 95% CI = 0.26 to 0.46).

One of the two studies [56, 63] not included in the meta-analysis also found that the intervention had a positive impact on self-efficacy [56, 63].

3.6.2.9 Coping

Three types of coping were considered: Helplessness-Hopelessness, Anxious Preoccupation, and Cognitive Avoidance. Two [27, 45] of the six [15, 27, 28, 34, 37, 45] studies measuring this outcome were considered for the meta-analysis. Across all coping types, the effect sizes were not significant. However, most studies not entered in the meta-analysis found some support for the effects of the interventions on coping [15, 28, 34, 37].

3.7 Subgroup Analysis Based on Level of Guidance

Table 4 shows the subgroup analysis based on the three levels of guidance. Whereas the purely self-administered and minimally guided interventions had no impact on anxiety, guided interventions yielded significant results for this outcome. Conversely, depression may be reduced regardless of whether the intervention is purely self-administered or guided. Purely self-administered interventions also seem particularly efficacious in reducing distress and enhancing self-efficacy. For the remaining secondary outcomes none of the interventions types were found to have a differential impact.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

4.1 Discussion

Forty studies were reviewed to examine the efficacy of written self-administered psychosocial interventions in reducing anxiety, depression, and distress and enhancing QOL, self-efficacy, and coping among adults with a physical illness. Of note, almost half of the studies reviewed were published in the last six years, with most favouring a self-administered format because of its potential to reach a large number of individuals, in a cost-effective manner. Although self-administered interventions are increasingly delivered online [65],

booklets remain a preferred format for patients, and popular mode to deliver self-administered interventions.

4.1.1 Methodological Quality

Few studies met all methodological quality criteria. Reviews have found that journal endorsement of the CONSORT guidelines improves reporting [66, 67]. However, overall, completeness of reporting remains sub-optimal, with items often omitted similar to the ones for the studies included in this review: generation of random allocation sequence [68, 69] and defining the methods of allocation concealment [68]. Many studies included in this review opted for a waitlist control group; however, a waitlist control group might create a sense of expectancy and does not control for non-specific treatment effects (e.g., attention given to the intervention group) [70]. Alternatively, the choice by some authors to opt for an active or attention control group might have undermined the efficacy of some studies by the control condition becoming an unintended intervention.

4.1.2 Adherence

Whether participants are receiving an adequate therapy dose to provide benefits is a critical issue in the context of self-administered interventions, as individuals might be willing to receive a minimal-intensity intervention, but this does not guarantee its use [65, 71]. In turn, low adherence might be underestimating the impact of the intervention. Most often, adherence in the studies reviewed was measured by extent of use (e.g., amount of time spent reading the manual) [15, 28, 30, 32, 33, 38, 39, 41, 45, 52, 53, 58, 59, 62]. Though few of these studies then systematically reported adherence data or used this information in the analysis. Although use is an important aspect of adherence, more importantly is whether the intervention impacts illness management skills and behaviours. Few studies measured and/or reported on the actual behaviour changes of participants as a result of the intervention [29, 34, 40, 62, 63].

4.1.3 Efficacy: Primary and Secondary Outcomes

The current review found at best mixed evidence for the efficacy of written selfadministered interventions in improving reported outcomes among individuals with a physical illness. For the primary outcomes, the interventions had less of an effect on anxiety than depression in the short- and long-term, but comparable effects were noted for the intermediary time point. These findings are comparable to those of the review by Matchman et al. [19]. Providing self-administered materials seemed to ameliorate anxiety particularly following a myocardial infarction [43], for individual undergoing a percutaneous coronary intervention [60], and among individuals with Meniere disease [63] or COPD [51]. Although lack of convincing efficacy of psychosocial interventions on anxiety has often been attributed to low baseline anxiety scores, for many of the studies reviewed that used the HADS, baseline scores were within the borderline anxiety range, overcoming the potential for floor effect [72]. Of note, for depression, intervention effects were found across all time points.

For the secondary outcomes, findings were not significant for neither QOL nor its related domains. Such findings emphasize that psychosocial interventions might show little or no change in such 'distal' outcomes, as these depend on factors that are not directly influenced by the interventions [73]. For this reason, researchers are increasingly advocating for the evaluation of more proximal outcomes [73]. Proximal outcomes are conceptualised to be more directly affected by an intervention and can be clearly identified from the content and goals of the intervention. Many of the interventions reviewed are grounded in the principles of self-management, whereby increasing participants' confidence or self-efficacy to carry out a behaviour necessary to reach a desired goal was a central aim [74]. Despite this, few studies included measures of self-efficacy [35, 38, 47, 49, 56, 63]. This meta-analysis did support the impact of self-administered interventions on this outcome. However, it did not support the interventions' efficacy on another proximal outcome, coping.

4.1.4 Efficacy: Level of Guidance

The sub-groups analyses revealed that providing guidance was critical to impact on anxiety and depression. Although the ES was lower, purely self-administered interventions were also efficacious for depression. This finding emphasizes that one key mechanism of action of the guided self-administered interventions that sets these apart from the other two types of self-administered intervention is the therapeutic relationship. Previous research has shown that therapeutic alliance is moderately, positively associated with the success of treatment [75-77]. This is further supported by the finding that none of the sub-group analyses justified a short orientation session, which are often highly resource intensive, despite being brief. However, sub-group analyses seemed to support the efficacy of purely self-administered interventions on outcomes of distress and self-efficacy. These sub-group analyses corroborated those of other reviews [19, 65, 78], and emphasize that interventions with no therapeutic contact can still have meaningful effects.

4.1.5 Limitations

This review used reproducible methods. Despite this, a number of limitations are noteworthy. For some outcomes, the number of studies evaluated was small or significant heterogeneity was noted. Also, few studies examined whether the mechanism of actions of the interventions were efficacious by measuring behaviour change. Another limitation is the conceptual overlap among the outcomes and the potential heterogeneity introduced by the different scales used to measure the same outcome. The sub-optimal reporting of methodological elements in reviewed studies limits the extent to which definitive conclusions can be made. Finally, most studies were conducted with well-educated, Caucasian patients, limiting the generalizability of findings to other populations.

4.1.6 Research Implications

Future studies need to compare the efficacy of different levels of guidance directly, and examine their cost-effectiveness more thoroughly. Also, future studies could focus on identifying the percentage of an intervention required for participants to be considered

treatment-completers. The impact of tailoring these interventions to individuals' needs has also not been examined. Future research is needed for some physical conditions, such a pain, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. Future studies should also assess the efficacy of selfadministered interventions among individuals with diverse cultural and linguistic backgrounds. In the present review, interventions focusing exclusively on diet and/or exercise were excluded not to confound the effects of psychosocial interventions mostly focused on coping. However, there is also an increased interest in home-based physical activity interventions, with two systematic review already published on the topic [79, 80].

4.2 Conclusion

Written self-administered interventions for individuals with a physical illness seem efficacious in reducing anxiety, depression and distress and improving self-efficacy. However, findings need to be interpreted with caution, as the methodological quality of the research reviewed needs to be improved to strengthen the evidence-base in this field.

4.3 Practice Implications

A challenge for health systems is ensuring that the economic determinants alone do not determine treatment options for patients. Health professionals who offer counselling provide not only empathic engagement, but also exploration of misperceptions and provision of highlytailored information, which can be closely aligned with patient needs and revised based on changing circumstances. Health systems ideally provide a suite of services incorporating both face-to-face and self-administered options. One key clinical implication of the findings is to match the level of guidance to the psychosocial outcome being targeted.



Figure 1. PRISMA flow chart of search process



Figure 2. Standard mean differences for Anxiety. 95% CI indicates 95% confidence interval; • = effect sizes calculated for each study by outcome; \diamond = the overall standard mean difference obtained for the outcome across studies at each time interval. T1 – baseline to < 3 months post-intervention, T2 – 3 months to < 6 months post-intervention, and T3 – > 6 months post-intervention.



Figure 3. Standard mean differences for Depression. 95% CI indicates 95% confidence

interval; • = effect sizes calculated for each study by outcome; \Diamond = the overall standard mean

difference obtained for the outcome across studies at each time interval.

T1 – baseline to < 3 months post-intervention, T2 – 3 months to < 6 months post-intervention,

and T3 -> 6 months post-intervention.

Table 1.	
Summary table	of raviou

Summary tab	ole of reviewed studies				
Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
			Cancer		
Aguado Loi et al. [33] USA	Evaluate a self- administered stress management intervention among	N = 220 patients with cancer undergoing chemotherapy (T = 111, C = 109)	Minimal contact or support	T = Self-administered stress management therapy (booklet + DVD) C = Usual care	T = C anxiety, depression, across QOL domains
RCT (2 groups)	patients with cancer receiving chemotherapy	Mean age: T = 57.5 (SD = 11.9), C = 56.2 (SD = 12.0)			
		% female: T = 73.4%; C = 85.6%			
Angell et al. [27] USA	Evaluate the impact of a workbook-journal among women with	N = 98 adult women with a primary breast cancer (T = 55, C = 43)	Self- administered	T = Community-based, interactive workbook + pack of educational resources	T = C PTSD, mood disturbance (extracted as distress) and coping.
RCT (2 groups)	primary breast cancer	Mean age: 58.6 (no SD reported)		C = Pack of breast cancer educational resources	Some within- group/interaction
		% female: 100%			between-group effects
Beatty, Koczwara et al. [15]	Evaluate the efficacy of a self-help workbook among women recently	N = 49 women recently diagnosed with breast cancer (stage 0 -II) (T = 25, C = 24)	Self- administered	T = Self-help workbook (relaxation and meditation, coping with side effects, emotional adjustment, body image and identity, social support,	T > C PTSD, helplessness - hopelessness, cognitive avoidance
Australia	diagnosed with breast cancer	Mean age: 55.2 (SD = 12.7)		survivorship) + CD C = Information booklet	T = C anxiety, depression, QOL,
KC1 (2 groups)		% female: 100%			anxious preoccupation
Beatty, Oxlad et al. [28]	Evaluate the efficacy of a self-help workbook among	N = 40 women with stage I/II breast cancer, who finished treatment	Self- administered	T = Self-help workbook (maintaining medical partnership, physical well-being, feeling alone,	T > C venting coping T = C on all other coping subscales; global

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
Australia	breast cancer survivors	within the past 3 months $(T = 20, C = 20)$		family and friends, emotional recovery, spirituality, seeking	QOL, mental health, and physical and social
RCT (2 groups)		Mean age: 53.1 (SD = 11.4)		closure, moving forward, living the life you want, local and national	functioning
		% female: 100%		C = Wait list control	
Gil et al. [37]	Evaluate the long-	N = 483 recurrence-free	Guided	T = 4 x weekly telephone calls; each focussing on one of four skills	At 20 months (primary and point) $T > C$
USA	uncertainty	5-9 years post-treatment		relaxation, pleasant imagery,	cognitive reframing,
RCT (2 groups)	management intervention for older breast cancer	for breast cancer (T = 229, C = 254)		calming self-talk, and distraction. Calls #3 and #4 also guided through use of self-help manual + audiotape	knowledge, information sought and helpfulness, use of distraction.
	survivors	Mean age: T White = 64.47 (SD = 8.48) T Af		C = Usual care	personal growth,
		Am = 64.52 (SD = 8.52),			T = C distress, problem-
		C White = 64.24 (SD = 8.77). C Af Am = 65.19			solving, coping self- statement.
		(SD = 10.41)			praying/hoping,
		% female: 100%			ignoring, increasing behavioural activities,
					catastrophizing, and
Jacobsen et al.	Evaluate the efficacy	N = 382 adults diagnosed	Minimal	T1 = 60 min stress management	$T_2 > C OOL$ (better
[40]	and costs of a patient	with cancer who had not	contact or	session by mental health	physical functioning,
USA	self-administered	received IV chemotherapy previously	support	professional - paced abdominal	greater vitality, and better mental health and
UDIA	management training	and were scheduled to		progressive muscle relaxation and	fewer role limitations
RCT (3 groups)		receive minimum 4		relaxing mental imagery, and coping	because of emotional
		(T1 = 125, T2 = 125, C =		T2 = Coping with Chemotherapy	T1 = C OOL items
		132)		booklet + Active Relaxation	T2 > C anxiety,

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
		Mean age: 56 (SD = 12)		audiotape reflecting the same 3 components as T1	depression
		% female: 76%		C = Usual care	
Jacobsen et al. [41] USA	Evaluate the separate and combined effects of stress management training and home-	N = 286 adults with cancer, scheduled to receive chemotherapy for at least 9 weeks, but have	Minimal contact or support	T1 = Stress management training, including video, booklet and audio recording <i>Coping with</i> <i>Chemotherapy</i> Video	T = C QOL T3 > C depressive symptoms, anxiety (only between baseline
RCT (4 groups)	based exercise	at reast 9 weeks, but have $ChemometrupyVideonot receivedT2 = Video and booklet Steppchemotherapy within theForward: A Guide to Exercisepast 2 months (T1 = 69,During Chemotherapy, andT2 = 62, T3 = 77, C =pedometer. Info and instruction78)engaging in regular exercise$	ceivedT2 = Video and booklet Steppingotherapy within theForward: A Guide to Exercisemonths (T1 = 69,During Chemotherapy, and52, T3 = 77, C =pedometer. Info and instructions on engaging in regular exercise while	and 6 weeks) T3 < C anxiety (between 6 and 12 weeks) T1 = T2 = C depressive	
		Mean age: T1 = 57.42 (SD = 10.58), T2 = 58.72 (SD = 11.77), T3 = 57.71 (SD = 11.98), C = 57.22 (SD = 10.98)		undergoing chemo T3 = stress management (T1) plus home-based exercise (T2) C = Access to full range of psychosocial services offered at	symptoms and anxiety
		% female: T1 = 67%, T2 = 61%, T3 = 69%, C = 74%		participating site + National Cancer Institute booklet <i>Chemotherapy and</i> <i>You</i>	
Krischer et al. [49]	Evaluate the efficacy of a stress management	N = 310 adults with cancer who were scheduled to receive a	Minimal contact or support	T = Videotape, booklet (education about radiotherapy and stress, and instruction in paced breathing, active	T = C anxiety, depression, mental QOL T > C mental health
USA	intervention in	minimum 12		relaxation, positive thinking), and	
RCT (2 groups)	radiotherapy for cancer	during a 21-day period $(T = 154, C = 156)$		min meeting with clinician who explained nature and purpose of	
		Mean age: T = 60.3, C = 61.6		intervention C = Usual care	

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
		% female: T = 71.4%, C = 71.8%		~ ~ ~	
Mishel et al. [45] USA RCT (2 groups)	Test the efficacy of a theoretically-based uncertainty management intervention delivered to older long-term breast cancer survivors	N = 509 survivors who were 5-9 years post breast cancer treatment (T = 244, C = 265) Mean age: T = 64.3 (SD = 8.32), C = 64.5 (SD = 9.39) % female: 100%	Guided	T = Two main components - cognitive strategies delivered via audiotapes (emotion-focused coping responses), and behavioural strategies packaged in self-help manual (management skills, information on side effects, and cancer resources). Women guided through intervention via 4 x weekly telephone sessions with study nurse C = Usual care	T > C cognitive reframing, cancer knowledge, patient- provider communication, social support satisfaction, castrophizing (extracted as helplessness- hopelessness for African American sub-group) amount and helpfulness of information/resources obtained T = C problem solving, ignoring sensations (extracted as cognitive avoidance), distress
Phillips et al. [46]	Evaluate whether self- directed stress management and/or	N = 391 adults with cancer, scheduled to receive chemotherapy for	Minimal contact or support	Same as study Jacobsen et al. [41]	SM > C perceived ability to relax EX and SMEX > C
USA	home-based exercise training led to	\geq 9 weeks (T1 = 101, T2 = 90, T3 = 102, C = 98)			awareness of tension SMEX > C perceived
RCT (4 groups)	improvements in specific stress management skills	Mean age: T1 = 57.35 (SD = 11.51), T2 = 59.05 (SD = 11.69), T3 = 59.60			ability to get needs met SM = EX = SMEX = C coping confidence

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
		(SD = 11.56), C = 56.40 (SD = 11.65)	X	~ ~ ~	SMEX > C increased perceived ability to use
		% female: T1 = 65%, T2 = 66%, T3 = 66%, C = 66%			SM techniques
Stefanopoulou et al. [55]	Examine the effects of a guided self-help cognitive-behavioural	N = 68 men with prostate cancer undergoing androgen deprivation	Guided	T = 4-week intervention consisting of a booklet that included information about hot flashes and	T > C in reduction of hot flushes and night sweats (HFNS)
UK	treatment (CBT)	therapy $(T = 33, C = 35)$		night sweats, cognitive therapy and	problem-rating and
RCT (2 groups)	intervention among men with prostate cancer undergoing androgen deprivation therapy	Mean age: $T = 67.97$ (SD = 7.7), $C = 69.71$ (SD = 7.9) % female: 0%		behavioural strategies, CBT strategies for managing sleep, suggestions for maintaining changes in the context of prostate cancer. Guidance included a telephone call from a psychologist C = Usual care	weekly frequency at 6 weeks T = C in reduction of HFNS problem-rating and weekly frequency at 32 weeks; depression; anxiety and QOL at 6 and 32 weeks
Stiegelis et al. [32]	Examine whether an informational self- management	N = 209 adults diagnosed with cancer undergoing radiotherapy treatment	Self- administered	T = <i>Coping with Cancer</i> - The booklet contained general and specific information about cancer	T (patient with high uncertainty, less control) > C tension.
Netherlands	intervention is useful	(T = 103; C = 106)		and cancer treatment, information	anger, depression
RCT (2 groups)	for patients after final treatment with radiotherapy who perceive little control	Mean age: $T = 60.3$ (SD = 12.5, C = 60.6 (SD = 11.7)		about possible coping strategies, and social comparison information, which consisted of short stories of other patients	(extracted as distress) T = C fatigue, vigour
	and report uncertainty	64%		C = Usual care	
		Osteoarthriti	s or rheumatoid	arthritis	

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]	
Fries et al. [35]	Examine the	N = 809 patients with	Self-	T = Health assessment	T > C function and	
USA	mail-delivered arthritis self-	rheumatoid arthritis (T = $375, C = 434$)	administered	participants, leading to the computer-generation of	as QOL), exercise times/week, self-	
RCT (2 groups)	management program Mean age: $T = 63.6$ (SD = 0.7), $C = 63.4$ (SD = 0.7)	Mean age: T = 63.6 (SD = 0.7), C = 63.4 (SD = 0.7)			individualised intervention recommendation letters and progress reports. Also received <i>The Arthritis</i>	efficacy, pain, tender joint count, doctor visits
		% female: T = 71%, C = 73%		and exercise videotape C = Wait list control		
Garnefski et al. [48]	Examine a cognitive– behavioral self-help program (CBS)	N = 82 adults with some form of rheumatic disease and mild to	Guided	T = CBS described in Garnefski, Kraaij & Schroevers [36] C = Wait list	T > C depressed mood, anxiety, coping self- efficacy	
Netherlands	program with minimal coaching in people	moderate depressive symptoms ($T = 41, C =$			efficacy	
RCT (2 groups)	with rheumatic	41)				
	disease and depressive symptoms	Mean age: T = 49.12 (SD = 9.79), C = 47.61 (SD = 12.62)				
		% female: T = 90.2%, C = 92.7%				
Goeppinger et al. [38]	Determine the effectiveness of an arthritis self-	N = 921 adults diagnosed with osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis,	Self- administered	T = The Arthritis Self-Management Toolkit - "Self Test" to determine how arthritis affects life and self-	T > C health-related behaviours, self- efficacy, depression,	
USA	management Toolkit	fibromyalgia, or with chronic joint symptoms (T = 458, C = 463)		tailor use of Toolkit, information sheets on working with health care team exercise medications healthy	pain, fatigue, disability (extracted as physical functioning) distress	
101 (2 groups)		Mean age: $T = 54.3$ (SD = 12.2), $C = 53.4$ (SD = 12.3)		eating, fatigue, pain management, community resources and dealing with emotions, information sheets	activity limitation (extracted as social functioning)	

EVALUATION OF	WRITTEN SELF	-ADMINISTERED	INTERVENTIONS
L'ILCIIION OI			In the Entronto

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
		% female: T = 84.6%, C = 86.2%	B	on process components of action planning, problem solving, deciding what to try, individualising exercise program, <i>The Arthritis Handbook</i> , audio relaxation and exercise CDs and audio CD of all information sheet content C = 4-month wait list control	T = C medical care utilisation, self-rated health
Goeppinger et al. [34] USA RCT (3 groups)	Examine the effectiveness of two models of arthritis self-care intervention: the home study and the small group model	N = 374 adults with arthritis (HS = 121, SG = 100, C = 153) Mean age: 62.44 (SD = 11.25) % female: 87%	T1 = Minimal contact or support T2 = Guided	Bone Up On Arthritis delivered to all participants (emphasised self- care, problem identification and problem solving), via two different pathways: T1 = Home study model: 6 lessons, accompanied by booklet and audiotape, mailed to participants' homes T2 = Small group model: Same lesson number and content as T1 model (except for audiotape) + informal 2 hour class; lessons held in community sites C = Wait list control	T1 & T2 > C arthritis knowledge, self-care behaviour, and feelings of helplessness T1 = T2 = C depression, function, and pain T2 > T1 pain and depression T1 > T2 perceived helplessness
		Irritable b	owel syndrome	(IBS)	
Lackner et al. [57] USA RCT (3 groups)	Test the effects of self-administered CBT	N = 75 adult patients with IBS symptoms of at least moderate severity (T1 S-CBT = 23, T2 MC-CBT = 25, C = 27) Mean age: T1 = 48 13	Guided (T2 extracted)	T1 = 10 weekly 1 hour therapist-led sessions involving education on stress and IBS, self-monitoring of stress, muscle relaxation, cognitive restructuring and training in problem solving + weekly home exercises	T1 and T2 > C adequate relief from abdominal pain and bowel symptoms, patient global improvement, reduced QOL

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
		(SD = 18.2), T2 = 41.9 (SD = 13.6), C = 49.7 (SD = 17.6)		T2 = Minimal contact CBT, T1 content delivered using self-study materials. 4 x 60 min clinic visits +	impairment and severity of IBS symptoms, but T1 = T2 for same T1 = T2 = C distress
		% female: T1 = 91.3%, T2 = 76%, C = 92.6%		problems C = Wait list control	11 - 12 - C distress
Moss-Morris et al. [59]	Test the efficacy of a manualized CBT- based self-	N = 64 primary care patients with IBS (T = 31; C = 33)	Guided	T = A structured 7-week manualized program that was self-administered in conjunction with a 1-hour face-to-	T > C adjustment (extracted as QOL), relief, IBS symptom
New Zealand RCT (2 groups)	management program for IBS	Mean age: T = 40.0 (SD = 18.0), C = 39.0 (SD = 15.9)	face therapy session and two 1-hourseveringtelephone sessions $T = C$ $C = Usual care$	severity, anxiety T = C depression	
		% female: T = 73%; C = 73%			
Robinson et al. [30]	Test the impact of two self-help interventions (a comprehensive	N = 420 adults with IBS (T1 = 141, T2 = 139, C = 140)	T1 = Self- administered	T1 = Self-help guidebook (information about lifestyle, diet, and pharmacological and	T1 > C GP visits (T2 = C for same) T1 > C hospital visits
	self-help guidebook and a self-help group)	Mean age: 40 (SD = 14.4)	T2 = Guided	alternatives therapies) T2 = Self-help guidebook (as above)	T1 and T2 > C perceived symptom severity, but T1 = T2 for same T1 = C General QOL and domains
RC1 (3 groups)	3 groups) in patients with functional bowel disease	% female: 89%.		+ invitation to attend one-off 2-hour self-help group meeting C = Usual care	
					T1 and T2 = C patient global impression, distress, disease-specific
					T1 and T2 > C improvement IBS symptoms (T1 = T2 for

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
					same) T2 > C physical functioning T1 = T2 = C symptoms
Sanders et al. [31] USA RCT (2 groups)	Examine the efficacy of a self-help book in reducing IBS symptoms when compared to a wait list control	N = 28 adults with IBS (T = 17, C = 11) Mean age: T = 56.9 (SD = 14.6), C = 41.8 (SD = 10.3) % female: T = 71.4%, C = 88.9%	Self- administered	T = Breaking the Bonds of IBS - a self-help guide for IBS symptom management using CBT. The book also contains quotations and stories from patients and information related to the digestive system, diagnostic medical tests, diet, and available medical and psychological treatments C = Wait list control	T = C disease-specific QOL, constipation, diarrhea, bloating, psychological symptoms (distress) T > C pain and GI average symptoms
			Tinnitus		
Kaldo et al. [54] Sweden RCT (2 groups)	Examine the efficacy of a CBT-based self- help book supplemented with weekly telephone calls on tinnitus distress	N = 72 adults with tinnitus (T = 34, C = 38) Mean age: T = 45.9 (SD = 13.0), C = 48.5 (SD = 15.7) % female: T = 50%, C = 47%	Guided	T = CBT-based self-help book, including information, defining treatment goals, relaxation exercises, sound-based tools, cognitive restructuring, sleep management, evaluation, relapse prevention + 7 telephone calls with therapist x 6 weeks to evaluate progress, give advice and gain feedback on progress C = Wait list control	T > C tinnitus annoyance and distress (extracted as disease- specific QOL), anxiety, depression, tinnitus loudness, quality of sleep T = C perceived stress
Malouff et al. [62] Australia	Examine the efficacy of a cognitive- behavioural based self-help book in	N = 162 individuals experiencing distress related to tinnitus (T = 84; C = 78)	Self- administered	T = Cognitive-behavioural based self-help book C = Wait list control	T > C distress T = C tinnitus-related distress (disease- specific QOL)

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
RCT (2 groups)	assisting individuals experiencing distress related to tinnitus	Mean age: T = 57.3 (SD = 13.7), C = 57.8 (SD = 13.3)		<u> </u>	
		% female: T = 49%; C = 39.7%			
Nyenhuis et al. [51]	Compare the efficacy of a cognitive- behavioural	N = 304 adults with idiopathic tinnitus for 2- 26 weeks and not	T1 = Guided $T3 = Self_{-}$	All treatments based on CBT- oriented <i>Tinnitus Coping Training</i>	T1 and T2 > C tinnitus distress T3 = C tinnitus distress
Germany	intervention to the	receiving any other	administered	T1 Group = Contents of manual presented in 4×2 -hour meetings	T1 > C depressive symptoms but T2 and
RCT (4 groups)	control condition	psychological treatment (T1 Group = 71, T2 Internet = 79, T3 Bibliotherapy = 77, C = 77)		with psychologist, including progressive muscle relaxation (PMR) and exercises given to complete at home T2 Internet = Complete manual	T3 = C T1, T2 and T3 = C psychosomatic discomfort
		Mean age (all): 48.5 (SD = 12.8)		given, with content written as web pages and PMR instructions	
		% female: Overall = 45.4%		downloadable T3 Bibliotherapy = Complete manual given, with PMR CD C = Booklet containing information	
			Asthma	on unintus	
Hockemeyer & Smyth. [39]	Examine the feasibility and effectiveness of a	N = 54 college students diagnosed with asthma (T = 27, C = 27)	Self- administered	T = Tape-recorded deep-breathing relaxation exercise, CBT, and a 20- minute exercise in which	T = C perceived stress levels T > C pulmonary
USA	stress management workbook	Mean age: 20.70 (SD = 5.37)		participants were to write about a stressful life event	function
RCT (2 groups)		% female: T = 55.6% C = 51.9%		C = Parallel workbook to treatment group, which differed only in	

Author	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of	Intervention and comparison	Outcome (s) [±]
<u> </u>			guiuaice	content. Audiotapes contained asthma education, 'problem-solving' exercises (brain teasers) instead of CBT exercises and writing about personal time-management plans instead of stressful life events	
Mancuso et al. [29] USA RCT (2 groups)	Evaluate the impact of an educational intervention in the primary care setting designed to improve asthma knowledge and self-efficacy on QOL and need for emergency department visit and hospitalizations	N = 180 individuals with asthma (T = 90, C = 90) Mean age: T = 42 (SD = 14), C = 43 (SD = 13) % female: T = 83%, C = 84%	Self- administered	T = Workbook + brief review with study personnel + assistance with generating contract to adopt behaviour to improve asthma. Weekly telephone contacts for 12 weeks to encourage workbook reading and perseverance with contract. Then telephone contacts every 3 months per controls C = Three brochures from American Lung Association + telephone contacts every 3 months to enquire about interval emergency department visits and hospitalisations for asthma	24 months (primary endpoint). T = C asthma-related QOL, general physical and mental QOL, emergency department visits and hospitalisations for asthma
Mancuso et al. [58] USA RCT (2 groups)	Test an educational intervention to improve self- management by increasing asthma knowledge and self- efficacy in patients presenting to the ED for asthma	N = 296 adults with asthma (T = 148; C = 148) Mean age: T = 45 (SD = 13), C = 43 (SD = 14) % female: T = 66%, C = 77%.	Self- administered	T = Workbook + brief review with study personnel and training in inhaler use + assistance with generating contract to adopt behaviour to improve asthma. Weekly telephone contacts for 8 weeks, then same contact schedule as for C group the following year C = Three brochures from American Lung Association + brief review of	8 weeks (primary endpoint). T = C Asthma-related QOL, ED visits

Author	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome (s) [±]
country			guiuanee	these materials with study personnel and telephone contact at weeks 4, 8, 12, 16 and 52 weeks	
		Angina pectoris o	r post-myocard	ial infarction	
Lacey et al. [43]	Evaluate the impact of the <i>Heart Manual</i> ,	N = 152 patients following a myocardial	Guided	T = <i>Heart Manual</i> - self-help package that includes rehabilitation	T > C anxiety and depression T = C general health
UK	cardiac rehabilitation	91)		relaxation exercises + audiotape and	r = C general health status (QOL)
Quasi- experimental (2 groups)	provision, after acute myocardial infarction	Mean age: $T = 67.7$ (SD = 11.6), $C = 66.9$ (SD = 11.5)		an exercise plan. Facilitator provided support by telephone or face-to-face meeting during the first	
		% female: T = 34.4%; C = 33%		C = Usual care	
Lewin et al. [44] UK	Evaluate the effect of a cognitive behavioural disease management program.	N = 142 individuals diagnosed with angina pectoris in the preceding 12 months (T = 68, C =	Guided	T = <i>The Angina Plan</i> - workbook and audiotaped relaxation program provided during interview with nurse + brief telephone calls at end	T > C anxiety and depression, angina attacks, use of glyceryl Trinitrate (GTN) and
RCT (2 groups)	in patients newly diagnosed with angina pectoris	74) Mean age: $T = 66.74$ (SD = 9.37), $C = 67.64$ (SD = 9.01)		of weeks 1, 4, 8 & 12 to discuss goals C = Routine educational sessions - personal risk factors identified by nurse and how to reduce, questions, discuss impact of condition on life, written materials	physical limitations T = C pain, duration of event, angina stability, angina frequency,
		% female: T = 43%, C = 38%			disease perception (extracted as disease- specific QOL)
			HIV		
Eller et al. [76]	Examine the effects of the HIV/AIDS	N = 222 HIV-positive individuals (T = 124, C =	Minimal contact or	T = HIV/AIDS Symptom Management Manual	T = C depression
USA	Symptom Management Manual	98)	support	C = Manual titled " <i>Nutritional Care</i> and Support for People Living with	

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]	
RCT (2 groups)	compared with a nutrition manual	Mean age: T = 42.7 (SD = 9.8), C = 43.6 (9.4)		HIV/AIDS"		
	among people living with HIV/AIDS	% female: T = 39.5%, C = 44.9%				
Kraaij et al. [42]	Examine the effectiveness of a	N = 44 individuals with HIV (T1 = 13, T2 = 16,	T1= Self- administered	T1 = CBS program - Workbook, work program and CD-ROM	T1 > C depressive symptoms	
Netherlands RCT (3 groups)	cognitive-behavioural self-help (CBS)intervention in people with HIV	C = 15) Mean age: T1 = 45.62 (SD = 6.55), T2 = 55.31 (SD = 6.86), C = 46.60 (SD = 7.43)		 (relaxation, cognitive restructuring, goal formulation and self-efficacy improvement) T2 = Structured writing intervention (SWI): website-based four weekly 	T2 = C depressive symptoms	
		% female: T1 = 15.4%, T2 = 6.2%, C = 13.3%		to describe thoughts and feelings C = Wait list control		
			Pain			
Burton et al. [64]	Determine the impact of an educational	N = 162 individuals seeking treatment for	Self- administered	T = <i>The Back Book</i> (spine is strong, interpreting back pain, being active	T > C improvement in beliefs about activity	
UK	booklet among patients seeking	nonspecific low back pain (T = 83, C = 79)		is best way to get back to feel better, and positive attitudes are important)	and beliefs about inevitable consequences	
RCT (2 groups)	treatment for low back pain	Mean age: T = 42.6 (SD = 10.9), C = 44.7 (SD = 12.2)		C = Handy Hints- traditional biomedical information about spinal anatomy and damage, advice to rest,	of back trouble T = C improvement in disability and pain	
		% female: T = 49%, C = 61%		focus on pain rather than on activity	specific QOL)	
Johnston et al. [53]	Evaluate an Acceptance Commitment Therapy	N = 24 adults who experience chronic pain (T = 12, C = 12)	Guided	T = ACT-based book titled <i>Living</i> Beyond Your Pain + workbook (weekly reading requirements, space	T > C QOL, anxiety T = C acceptance, satisfaction with life,	
New Zealand	(ACT) based self-help book for people with	Median age: 43 % female: 62.5%		to write and complete exercises from book and list of questions relating to	values illness, pain, depression	

Author Country	Aim(s)	s) Sample		Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]	
RCT (2 groups)	chronic pain		guruunee	the weekly content that were to be asked at telephone calls) C = Wait list control		
		Corona	ary artery disea	se		
Furuya et al. [60] Brazil	Examine the effects of an educational program with telephone follow-up	N = 60 patients preparing for their first percutaneous coronary intervention (T = 34, C =	Guided	T = Program consisted of three booklets: Percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty, Going home after your coronary angioplasty, and	T > C anxiety T = C QOL and related domains, self-efficacy, depression, and	
RCT (2 groups)	to improve self-care in patients who underwent percutaneous coronary intervention	32) Mean age: T = 63.3 (SD = 12.4), C = 60.6 (SD =8.7) % female: T = 40%, C = 46.7%		How to take care of your heart and your health. Guidance provided through initially individual instruction and three telephone calls C = Usual care	medication adherence	
		Acquired chro	onic physical im	pairment		
Garnefski et al. [36] Netherlands RCT (2 groups)	Examine the efficacy of a cognitive- behavioural self-help (CBS) program in people with acquired chronic physical	N = 32 adults with acquired chronic physical impairments and depressive symptoms (T = 15, C = 17)	Self- administered	T = CBS program (workbook, work program and CD-ROM, which focused on: relaxation, changing maladaptive cognitions, and the attainment of personal life goals) C = No resource supplied until study completion	T > C depression	
	impairments	Mean age: T = 49.20 (SD = 15.60); C = 45.59 (16.03)				
		% female: T = 86.7% C = 82.4%				
		I	Hearing loss			

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]				
Garnefski & Kraaij [47] Netherlands	Examine the effectiveness of a CBS program in people with acquired deafness	N = 45 adults with acquired deafness and at least mild depression and/or anxiety (T = 19, C = 26)	Self- administered	T = CBS described in Garnefski, Kraaij & Schroevers [36] C = No resource supplied until study completion	T < C depression and anxiety				
RCT (2 groups)		Mean age: T = 59.05 (SD = 15.30); C = 55.61 (SD = 14.86)							
		% female: T = 38.5% C = 61.5%							
Chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD)									
Howard & Dupont [50] UK RCT (2 groups)	Examine the comparative effectiveness of a cognitive-behavioural manual versus information booklets for adults with COPD	N = 222 adults with COPD (T = 112, C = 110) Mean age: T = 71.2 (SD = 10.4), C = 73.2 (SD = 11.4) % famels: T = 56% C =	Guided	T = Self-help intervention, including CBT-based COPD breathlessness manual. Initial in-person session followed by two telephone calls C = COPD Booklets from the British Lung Foundation	T > C Accident & Emergency (A&E) visits, anxiety, depression, dyspnea, fatigue, emotional function, mastery (control)				
		59%			T=C in hospital admissions				
		post-I(CU hospitalisatio	on					
Jones et al. [52]	Evaluate a 6-week rehabilitation program	N = 126 patients who had been admitted to	Guided	T = Routine ICU follow-up + 6- week rehabilitation package + self-	6 months (primary endpoint). T > C				
UK	post-ICU on patients' physical and	ICU \ge 48 hrs and ventilated (T = 69, C =		directed exercise program + telephone calls	physical function $T = C$ depression,				
RCT (2 groups)	psychological recovery	57) Mean age: T = 57 (SD = 17), C = 59 (SD = 16) % female: T = 46.4%, C		C = Routine ICU follow-up (followed up on ward after ICU discharge, 3 x telephone calls once at home, ICU follow-up clinic at 8 weeks and 6 months)	perceived social support, anxiety, PTSD symptoms				

Author	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of	Intervention and comparison	Outcome (s) [±]			
Country		- 42 1%	guidance	groups				
		<u> </u>	vne 2 diabetes					
Moriyama et al. [56]	Examine the efficacy of a self-management education program for	N = 65 outpatients with type 2 diabetes (T = 42; C = 23)	Guided	T = Self-management textbook + < 30 min of monthly interviews based on the program + biweekly	T > C QOL, dietary changes T = C self-efficacy,			
Japan	type 2 diabetes	Mean age: $T = 66.4$ (SD		telephone calls from a nurse educator for 12 months	triglyceride, cholesterol			
RCT (2 groups)		= 9.2), C = 65.2 (SD = 8.5)		C = Textbook, describing the clinical characteristics, treatment	prevention, abdominal			
		% female: T = 59.5%; C = 56.2%		methods available, and self-control measures for diabetes	stage, BP, body weight, HbA1C			
Meniere's disease								
Yardley & Kirby [63] UK RCT (3 groups)	Examine the effectiveness of booklet-based education in vestibular rehabilitation and symptom control techniques to manage vertigo and dizziness in Meniere disease	N = 360 members of the Meniere's Society, experiencing symptoms of dizziness or imbalance over the past 12 months (T1 =120, T2 = 120; C = 120) Mean age: T1 = 58.0 (SD = 11.4); T2 = 60.0 (13.6); C = 59.7 (SD = 11.8) % female: T1 = 72.5; T2 = 62.5%, C = 70.8%	T2 = Self- administered	T1 = Vestibular rehabilitation booklet explained how inadequate central compensation could contribute to symptoms and daily balance training exercises introduced T2 = Symptom control-based education booklet explained how stress could augment symptoms of dizziness and nausea and introduced stress-reduction techniques C = Wait list control	(T1 = T2) > C = improvement in health, enablement (entered as self-efficacy) T1 > C = symptoms, anxiety, handicap, beliefs T2 > C handicap (extracted as disease- specific QOL) T1 = T2 = C depression T2 = C symptoms, anxiety, beliefs			
		E F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F F	Ieart Failure					
Yu et al. [61]	Examine the effectiveness of a	N = 160 heart failure patients (T = 80, C = 80)	Guided	T = Guided health education including face-to-face education	T > C medication adherence, QOL and			
China	guided booklet-based health education	Mean age: $T = 59.7$ (SD		sessions to introduce booklet on heart failure and relevant self-	physical and emotional domains, anxiety,			

Author Country	Aim(s)	Sample	Level of guidance	Intervention and comparison groups	Outcome(s) [±]
RCT (2 groups)	intervention	= 11.3), C = 59.0 (SD = 10.3) % female: T = 36.2%, C= 32.5%		management strategies, augmented by weekly follow-up telephone calls when discharged home x 4 weeks C = Usual care	depression
Notes 1 - most in	tomrantion on the nuit	moment and accordance outcomes of	intomast in this m	envious non-onted only and only intention	to tract outcome a are

Notes. \pm = post-intervention on the primary and secondary outcomes of interest in this review reported only, and only intention-to-treat outcomes are reported (where these analyses were conducted); T = treatment condition; C = control condition; QOL = quality of life; CBT = cognitive behavioural therapy; IBS = irritable bowel syndrome; HbA1c = glycosylated haemoglobin; T > C = treatment significantly superior to control; T < C = control superior to treatment; T = C = no significant differences between.

Table 2. Methodological quality of included studies

Author	Comparison condition	N > 25 per group	Power for moderate effect	Inclusion criteria specified	Psychometric properties of measures	Adequate sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding	Incomplete outcome data addressed
Aguado Loi et al. [33]	Usual care	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Angell et al.	Attention control	+	-	+	+	-	-	+	-
Beatty, Koczwara et al.	Attention control	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
Beatty, Oxlad et al. [28]	Wait list control	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
Burton et al. [64]	Attention control	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
Eller et al. [76]	Attention control	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
Fries et al. [35]	Wait list control	+	-	-	+	-	-	-	-
Furuya et al. [60]	Usual care	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	-
Garnefski et al. [36]	Wait list control	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
Garnefski & Kraaij. [47]	Wait list control	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-
Garnefski et al. [48]	Wait list control	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	+
Gil et al. [37]	Usual care	+	-	+	+	-	-	_	-
Goeppinger et	Wait list	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	+

Author	Comparison condition	N > 25 per group	Power for moderate effect	Inclusion criteria specified	Psychometric properties of measures	Adequate sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding	Incomplete outcome data addressed
al. [38]	control								
Goeppinger et al. [34]	Wait list control	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-
Hockemeyer & Smyth [39]	Attention control	+	-	+	+	-	-	-	-
Howard & Dupont [50]	Attention control	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	-
Jacobsen et al. [40]	Usual care	+	-	+	+	+	+	-	+
Jacobsen et al. [41]	Attention control	+	-	+	-	+	-	-	-
Johnston et al. [53]	Wait list control	-	-	+	-	-	-	-	+
Jones et al. [52]	Usual care	+	-	+	-	-	+	+	-
Kaldo et al. [54]	Wait list control	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	+
Kraaij et al. [42]	Wait list control	-	-	+	+	+	-	-	-
Krischer et al. [49]	Usual care	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
Lacey et al.[43]	Usual care	+	-	+	-	-	_	-	-
Lackner et al. [57]	Wait list control	-	-	+	-	+	-	-	+
Lewin et al. [44]	Attention control	+	-	+	+	-	+	+	+
Malouff et al. [62]	Wait list control	+	-	+	+	-	+	-	-

Author	Comparison condition	N > 25 per group	Power for moderate effect	Inclusion criteria specified	Psychometric properties of measures	Adequate sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding	Incomplete outcome data addressed
Mancuso et al.	Attention	+	+	+	+	-	-	+	+
[29]	control								
Mancuso et al.	Attention	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
[58]	control								
Mishel et al.	Usual care	+	-	+	+	+	-	-	-
[45]									
Moriyama et al.	Attention	+	-	+	-	-	-	-	-
[56]	control								
Moss-Morris et	Usual care	+	-	+	-	+	+	+	+
al. [59]									
Nyenhuis et al.	Attention	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+
[51]	control								
Phillips et al.	Attention	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
[46]	control								
Robinson et al.	Usual care	+	-	+	-	+	+	-	+
[30]									
Sanders et al.	Wait list	-	-	+	-	+	+	-	-
[31]	control								
Stefanopoulou	Usual care	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
et al. [55]									
Stiegelis et al.	Usual care	+	+	+	+	-	-	-	-
[32]									
Yardley &	Wait list	+	+	+	-	+	+	-	+
Kirby, [63]	control								
Yu et al. [61]	Usual care	+	+	+	+	-	_	_	+

Notes. + criteria clearly described in manuscript and met; — criteria not met or not enough information in manuscript to assess whether met or remained unmet. * = if blinding not possible/not appropriate and a justification was provided, + was given. Attention = some material provided to participants. Usual care = no treatment provided beyond usual care.

Table 3.

SMDs at each time point for the secondary outcomes

Time points		T1			Τ2			Т3	
	# studies	SMD (95% CI)	$I^{2}(\%)$	# studies	SMD (95% CI)	I ² (%)	# studies	SMD (95% CI)	$I^{2}(\%)$
Outcomes									
Distress	2	-0.07 (-0.44 - 0.30)	0	2	-0.39 (-0.530.26)	0	2	-0.08 (-0.22 - 0.06)	0
Global QOL	5	0.21 (-0.09 - 0.51)	51.4	2	0.40 (-0.52 - 1.32)	80.8*	2	0.48 (-0.28 - 1.25)	85.9*
Disease-	5	-0.19 (-0.47 - 0.09)	67.3*	5	-0.15 (-0.36 - 0.06)	61.9*	2	-0.32 (-0.82 - 0.17)	83.1*
specific QOL									
Mental	2	0.02 (-0.15 - 0.20)	0	1	0.50 (-0.02 - 1.01)		1	0.11 (-0.14 - 0.36)	
adjustment									
Physical	1	0.03 (-0.26 - 0.31)		3	-0.07 (-0.52 - 0.38)	93.6*	1	-0.13 (-0.05 - 0.31)	
functioning									
Social	1	0.15 (-0.13 - 0.42)		2	-0.03 (-0.77 - 0.72)	87.5*	1	0.03 (-0.22 - 0.28	
functioning									
Self-efficacy	2	0.34 (0.06 - 0.62)	19.2	3	0.36 (0.26 - 0.46)	0	0		
Coping									
Helplessness-	1	-0.09 (-0.49 -					1	-0.11 (-0.28 - 0.07)	
Hopelessness		0.31)							
Cognitive	1	-0.25 (-0.15 -					1	0.19 (-0.06 - 0.29)	
avoidance		0.65)							
Anxious	1	-0.26 (-0.66 - 0.14)							
preoccupation									

Note. SMD = Standard mean difference. I^2 = Higgin's I^2 statistic. CI = confidence interval. -- = only one study in that category or no study for that time point. * = p ≤ 0.05 . T1 – baseline to < 3 months post-intervention, T2 – 3 - < 6 months post-intervention, T3 – ≥ 6 months.

Outcomes	Level of guidance	Number of	SMD (95% CI)	I ² (%)
	1	2	0.15 (0.45 0.15)	18.5
Anviotu		$\frac{2}{2}$	-0.13(-0.43-0.13)	18.5
Allxicty	2	10	$\frac{0.12(-0.00-0.30)}{0.28(0.51-0.24)}$	0
		<u> </u>	$\frac{-0.38(-0.310.24)}{0.25(-0.49 - 0.02)}$	57.5*
Doprossion	2	3	$\frac{-0.23(-0.490.02)}{0.23(-0.61 - 0.16)}$	82.0*
Depression	3		-0.23(-0.01-0.10)	53.8*
		5	-0.40(-0.030.20)	<u> </u>
Distross	2	<u> </u>	-0.24 (-0.430.03)	+5.0
D1511 C55	2	<u> </u>		
Clobal OOI		1	$\frac{-0.09(-0.27 - 0.08)}{0.12(0.13 - 0.38)}$	
	2	1	$\frac{0.12(-0.13 - 0.38)}{0.13(0.15 - 0.40)}$	
	3	1	$\frac{0.13(-0.13-0.40)}{0.32(0.27-0.91)}$	
Disassa-spacific		<u>4</u> 5	$\frac{0.32(-0.27 - 0.91)}{0.15(-0.38 - 0.08)}$	51.0
OOI		<u> </u>	-0.13 (-0.38 - 0.08)	51.9
QUL	2	5		 <u> </u> <u> </u>
Montal Haalth		<u>J</u>	$\frac{-0.20(-0.03-0.10)}{0.11(0.14, 0.36)}$	02.1
Wiental Health		1	$\frac{0.11(-0.14-0.30)}{0.02(-0.15-0.10)}$	0
	2	<u> </u>	$\frac{0.02(-0.13 - 0.19)}{0.50(-0.02 - 1.01)}$	0
Dhygiaal Haalth		2	$\frac{0.30(-0.02 - 1.01)}{0.04(-0.42 - 0.25)}$	02.7*
r nysicai meaith		<u> </u>	-0.04(-0.45-0.55)	95.7
	2	1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.03 (-0.23 - 0.30) \\ 0.15 (-0.07 - 0.38) \end{array}$	
Social functioning	<u> </u>	2	$\frac{0.13(-0.07 - 0.38)}{0.18(-0.57 - 0.20)}$	0
Social functioning	<u> </u>	1	-0.16(-0.37 - 0.20)	00.2 ·
	2	1	$\begin{array}{c} 0.13 (-0.13 - 0.42) \\ 0.40 (-0.11 - 0.01) \end{array}$	
	<u> </u>	1	0.40(-0.11-0.91)	
Self-efficacy	2	<u> </u>	$\frac{0.37(0.27 - 0.47)}{0.24(0.04 - 0.52)}$	0
	2	1	0.24 (-0.04 - 0.52)	
<u> </u>	3	2	$\frac{0.35(-0.06-0.77)}{0.00(-0.40-0.21)}$	32.3
Coping –	2	<u> </u>	-0.09 (-0.49 - 0.31)	
Helplessness-	2	0		
Hopelessness	3	1	-0.11 (-0.28 - 0.07)	
Coping –		1	0.25 (-0.15 - 0.65)	
Cognitive	2	0		
Avoidance	3	1	0.12 (-0.06 - 0.29)	

Table 4.

Impact of self-directed psychosocial interventions according to level of guidance

Note. --- = no studies available in that category. 1 = self-administered, 2 = minimal guidance, and 3 = guided. -- = only one study in that category or no study for that time point. Coping – Anxious Preoccupation not included, as all studies evaluated self-administered interventions. SMD = Standard mean difference. I^2 = Higgin's I^2 statistic. CI = confidence interval. * = p ≤ 0.05 **Conflicts of interest:** None

Acknowledgements and funding

Dr Lambert was supported by a National Health and Medical Research Council Research Fellowship (APP1012869) initially and then by an FRQS Junior 1 Research Scholar Award. Funders had no role in the design of this review and the manuscript submitted.

Statement of authors' contribution

All authors have made substantial contributions to: 1) the conception and/or design of the review, acquisition of data, or analysis and interpretation of data; 2) drafting the manuscript or revising it critically; and 3) final approval of the version submitted

References

[1] E. Martz, H. Livneh, Coping with chronic illness and disability: Theoretical, empirical, and clinical aspects, Springer Science+Business, New York, New York, 2007.

[2] D.M. Clarke, K.C. Currie, Depression, anxiety and their relationship with chronic diseases: A review of the epidemiology, risk and treatment evidence, Med J Aust 190 (2009) S54-60.

[3] S. Moussavi, S. Chatterji, E. Verdes, A. Tandon, V. Patel, B. Ustun, Depression, chronic diseases, and decrements in health: Results from the World Health Surveys, Lancet 370 (2007) 851-58.

[4] National Comprehensive Cancer Network, Distress Management Clinical Practice Guidelines, National Comprehensive Cancer Network, 2012.

[5] E.H. Lin, W. Katon, M. Von Korff, C. Rutter, G.E. Simon, M. Oliver, P. Ciechanowski,

E.J. Ludman, T. Bush, B. Young, Relationship of depression and diabetes self-care, medication adherence, and preventive care, Diabetes Care 27 (2004) 2154-60.

[6] E.M. Fekete, M.H. Antoni, N. Schneiderman, Psychosocial and behavioral interventions for chronic medical conditions, Curr Opin Psychiatry 20 (2007) 152-7.

[7] K. Galway, A. Black, M. Cantwell, C.R. Cardwell, M. Mills, M. Donnelly, Psychosocial interventions to improve quality of life and emotional wellbeing for recently diagnosed cancer patients, Cochrane Database Syst Rev 11 (2012) CD007064.

[8] R.L. Osborn, A.C. Demoncada, M. Feuerstein, Psychosocial interventions for depression, anxiety, and quality of life in cancer survivors: Meta-analyses, Int J Psychiatry Med 36 (2006) 13-34.

[9] N. Crepaz, W.F. Passin, J.H. Herbst, S.M. Rama, R.M. Malow, D.W. Purcell, R.J.Wolitski, Meta-analysis of cognitive-behavioral interventions on HIV-positive persons' mental health and immune functioning, Health Psychol 27 (2008) 4-14.

[10] National Cancer Control Initiative National Breast Cancer Centre, Clinical Practice Guidelines for the Psychosocial Care of Adults with Cancer, National Breast Cancer Centre, Camperdown, NSW, 2003.

[11] National Institute of Clinical Excellence, Guidance on cancer services: Improving supportive and palliative care for adults with cancer, National Institute of Clinical Excellence (NICE), London, 2004.

[12] T. Regan, S. Lambert, B. Kelly, Uptake and attrition in couple-based interventions for cancer: perspectives from the literature, Psychooncology 22 (2013) 2639-47.

[13] S.D. Lambert, B. Kelly, A. Boyes, A. Cameron, C. Adams, A. Proietto, A. Girgis, Insights into preferences for psychooncology services among women with gynaecologic cancer following distress screening, Journal of the National Comprehensive Cancer Network 12 (2014) 899-906.

[14] L. Barney, K. Griffiths, H. Christensen, A. Jorm, Exploring the nature of stigmatising beliefs about depression and help-seeking: Implications for reducing stigma, BMC Public Health 9 (2009) 61.

[15] L.J. Beatty, B. Koczwara, J. Rice, T.D. Wade, A randomised controlled trial to evaluate the effects of a self-help workbook intervention on distress, coping and quality of life after breast cancer diagnosis, Med J Aust 193 (2010) S68-S73.

[16] I.N. Ackerman, R. Buchbinder, R.H. Osborne, Challenges in evaluating an arthritis selfmanagement program for people with hip and knee osteoarthritis in real-world clinical settings, J Rheumatol 39 (2012) 1047-55.

[17] R.J. Gregory, S. Schwer Canning, T.W. Lee, J.C. Wise, Cognitive bibliotherapy for depression: A meta-analysis, Professional Psychology: Research and Practice 35 (2004) 275-80. [18] T. Haug, T. Nordgreen, L.G. Öst, O.E. Havik, Self-help treatment of anxiety disorders: A meta-analysis and meta-regression of effects and potential moderators, Clin Psychol Rev 32 (2012) 425-45.

[19] F. Matcham, L. Rayner, J. Hutton, A. Monk, C. Steel, M. Hotopf, Self-help interventions for symptoms of depression, anxiety and psychological distress in patients with physical illnesses: A systematic review and meta-analysis, Clin Psychol Rev 34 (2014) 141-57.

[20] D. Moher, A. Liberati, J. Tetzlaff, D.G. Altman, T.P. Group., Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: The PRISMA statement, Ann Intern Med 151 (2009) 264-9.

[21] C. D. Norman, H. A Skinner, eHealth Literacy: Essential Skills for Consumer Health in a Networked World. J Med Internet Res 8 (2006) e9.

[22] T. Regan, S.D. Lambert, A. Girgis, B. Kelly, J. Turner, K. Kayser, Do couple-based interventions make a difference for couples affected by cancer? BMC Cancer 12 (2012) 279.
[23] R.E. Glasgow, G.M. Rosen, Behavioral bibliotherapy: A review of self-help behavior therapy manuals, Psychol Bull 85 (1978) 1-23.

[24] J.P.T. Higgins, S.G. Thompson, J.J. Deeks, D.G. Altman, Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses, Br Med J (Clin Res Ed) 327 (2003) 557-60.

[25] D.L. Chambless, S.D. Hollon, Defining empirically supported therapies, J Consult Clin Psychol 66 (1998) 7-18.

[26] J.A.C. Sterne, A.J. Sutton, J.P.A. Ioannidis, N. Terrin, D.R. Jones, J. Lau, J. Carpenter, G. Rücker, R.M. Harbord, C.H. Schmid, J. Tetzlaff, J.J. Deeks, J. Peters, P. Macaskill, G. Schwarzer, S. Duval, D.G. Altman, D. Moher, J.P.T. Higgins, Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials, BMJ 343 (2011) d4002.

[27] K.L. Angell, M.A. Kreshka, R. McCoy, P. Donnelly, J.M. Turner-Cobb, K. Graddy, H.C. Kraemer, C. Koopman, Psychosocial intervention for rural women with breast cancer: The Sierra-Stanford Partnership, J Gen Intern Med 18 (2003) 499-507.

[28] L. Beatty, M. Oxlad, B. Koczwara, T.D. Wade, A randomised pilot of a self-help workbook intervention for breast cancer survivors, Support Care Cancer 18 (2010) 1597-603.
[29] C.A. Mancuso, W. Sayles, J.P. Allegrante, Randomized trial of self-management education in asthmatic patients and effects of depressive symptoms, Ann Allergy Asthma Immunol 105 (2010) 12-19.

[30] A. Robinson, V. Lee, A. Kennedy, L. Middleton, A. Rogers, D.G. Thompson, D. Reeves, A randomised controlled trial of self-help interventions in patients with a primary care diagnosis of irritable bowel syndrome, Gut 55 (2006) 643-8.

[31] K.A. Sanders, E.B. Blanchard, M.A. Sykes, Preliminary study of a self-administered treatment for irritable bowel syndrome: Comparison to a wait list control group, Appl Psychophysiol Biofeedback 32 (2007) 111-9.

[32] H.E. Stiegelis, M. Hagedoorn, R. Sanderman, F.T.C. Bennenbroek, B.P. Buunk, Acm, G. Botke, A.V. Ranchor, The impact of an informational self-management intervention on the association between control and illness uncertainty before and psychological distress after radiotherapy, Psychooncology 13 (2004) 248-59.

[33] C.X. Aguado Loi, T.R. Taylor, S. McMillan, M. Gross-King, P. Xu, M.K. Shoss, V. Huegel, Use and helpfulness of self-administered stress management therapy in patients undergoing cancer chemotherapy in community clinical settings, J Psychosoc Oncol 30 (2012) 57-80.

[34] J. Goeppinger, M.W. Arthur, A.J. Baglioni, Jr., S.E. Brunk, C.M. Brunner, A reexamination of the effectiveness of self-care education for persons with arthritis, Arthritis Rheum 32 (1989) 706-16.

[35] J.F. Fries, C. Carey, D.J. McShane, Patient education in arthritis: Randomized controlled trial of a mail-delivered program, J Rheumatol 24 (1997) 1378-83.

[36] N. Garnefski, V. Kraaij, M. Schroevers, Effects of a cognitive behavioral self-help program on depressed mood for people with acquired chronic physical impairments: A pilot randomized controlled trial, Patient Educ Couns 85 (2011) 304-7.

37] K.M. Gil, M.H. Mishel, M. Belyea, B. Germino, L.S. Porter, M. Clayton, Benefits of the uncertainty management intervention for African American and White older breast cancer survivors: 20-month outcomes, Int J Behav Med 13 (2006) 286-94.

[38] J. Goeppinger, K.R. Lorig, P.L. Ritter, S. Mutatkar, F. Villa, Z. Gizlice, Mail-delivered arthritis self-management tool kit: a randomized trial and longitudinal followup, Arthritis Rheum 61 (2009) 867-75.

[39] J. Hockemeyer, J. Smyth, Evaluating the feasibility and efficacy of a self-administered manual-based stress management intervention for individuals with asthma: Results from a controlled study, Behav Med 27 (2002) 161-72.

[40] P.B. Jacobsen, C.D. Meade, K.D. Stein, T.N. Chirikos, B.J. Small, J.C. Ruckdeschel, Efficacy and costs of two forms of stress management training for cancer patients undergoing chemotherapy, J Clin Oncol 20 (2002) 2851-62.

[41] P.B. Jacobsen, K.M. Phillips, H.S. Jim, B.J. Small, L.A. Faul, C.D. Meade, L. Thompson, C.C. Williams, Jr., L.S. Loftus, M. Fishman, R.W. Wilson, Effects of self-directed stress management training and home-based exercise on quality of life in cancer patients receiving chemotherapy: A randomized controlled trial, Psychooncology 22 (2013) 1229-35.

[42] V. Kraaij, A. van Emmerik, N. Garnefski, M.J. Schroevers, D. Lo-Fo-Wong, P. van Empelen, E. Dusseldorp, R. Witlox, S. Maes, Effects of a cognitive behavioral self-help program and a computerized structured writing intervention on depressed mood for HIV-infected people: A pilot randomized controlled trial, Patient Educ Couns 80 (2010) 200-4.

[43] E.A. Lacey, R.J. Musgrave, J.V. Freeman, A.M. Tod, P. Scott, Psychological morbidity after myocardial infarction in an area of deprivation in the UK: Evaluation of a self-help package, Eur J Cardiovasc Nurs 3 (2004) 219-24.

[44] R.J.P. Lewin, G. Furze, J. Robinson, K. Griffith, S. Wiseman, M. Pye, R. Boyle, A randomised controlled trial of a self-management plan for patients with newly diagnosed angina, Br J Gen Pract 52 (2002) 194-6, 199-201.

[45] M.H. Mishel, B.B. Germino, K.M. Gil, M. Belyea, I.C. Laney, J. Stewart, L. Porter, M. Clayton, Benefits from an uncertainty management intervention for African-American and Caucasian older long-term breast cancer survivors, Psychooncology 14(11) (2005) 962-78.
[46] N. Nyenhuis, S. Zastrutzki, C. Weise, B. Jager, B. Kroner-Herwig, The efficacy of minimal contact interventions for Acute Tinnitus: A Randomised Controlled Study, Cognitive Behaviour Therapy 42 (2013) 127-38.

[47] K.M. Phillips, H.S. Jim, B.J. Small, T. Tanvetyanon, W.S. Roberts, P.B. Jacobsen, Effects of self-directed stress management training and home-based exercise on stress management skills in cancer patients receiving chemotherapy, Stress Health 28 (2012) 368-75.

[48] N. Garnefski, V. Kraaij, Effects of a cognitive behavioral self-help program on emotional problems for people with acquired hearing loss: A randomized controlled trial, J Deaf Stud Deaf Educ 17 (2012) 75-84.

[49] N. Garnefski, V. Kraaij, M. Benoist, Z. Bout, E. Karels, A. Smit, Effect of a cognitive behavioral self-help intervention on depression, anxiety, and coping self-efficacy in people with rheumatic disease, Arthritis Care Res 65 (2013) 1077-84.

[50] M.M. Krischer, P. Xu, C.D. Meade, P.B. Jacobsen, Self-administered stress management training in patients undergoing radiotherapy, J Clin Oncol 25 (2007) 4657-62.

[51] C. Howard, S. Dupont, 'The COPD breathlessness manual': a randomised controlled trial to test a cognitive-behavioural manual versus information booklets on health service use, mood

and health status, in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, NPJ Prim Care Respir Med 24 (2014) 14076.

[52] C. Jones, P. Skirrow, R.D. Griffiths, G.H. Humphris, S. Ingleby, J. Eddleston, C.Waldmann, M. Gager, Rehabilitation after critical illness: a randomized, controlled trial, CritCare Med 31 (2003) 2456-61.

[53] M. Johnston, M. Foster, J. Shennan, N.J. Starkey, A. Johnson, The Effectiveness of an acceptance and commitment therapy self-help intervention for chronic pain, Clin J Pain 26 (2010) 393-402.

[54] V. Kaldo, S. Cars, M. Rahnert, H.C. Larsen, G. Andersson, Use of a self-help book with weekly therapist contact to reduce tinnitus distress: A randomized controlled trial, J Psychosom Res 63 (2007) 195-202.

[55] E. Stefanopoulou, O. Yousaf, E.A. Grunfeld, M.S. Hunter, A randomised controlled trial of a brief cognitive behavioural intervention for men who have hot flushes following prostate cancer treatment (MANCAN), Psychooncology 24 (2015) 1159-66.

[56] M. Moriyama, M. Nakano, Y. Kuroe, K. Nin, M. Niitani, T. Nakaya, Efficacy of a selfmanagement education program for people with type 2 diabetes: results of a 12 month trial, Jpn J Nurs Sci 6 (2009) 51-63.

[57] J.M. Lackner, J. Jaccard, S.S. Krasner, L.A. Katz, G.D. Gudleski, K. Holroyd, Self-administered cognitive behavior therapy for moderate to severe irritable bowel syndrome: clinical efficacy, tolerability, feasibility, Clin Gastroenterol Hepatol 6 (2008) 899-906.
[58] C.A. Mancuso, M.G.E. Peterson, T.J. Gaeta, J.L. Fernandez, R.H. Birkhahn, L.A. Melniker, J.P. Allegrante, A randomized controlled trial of self-management education for asthma patients in the emergency department, Ann Emerg Med 57 (2011) 603-12.
[59] R. Moss-Morris, L. McAlpine, L. Didsbury, M. Spence, A randomized controlled trial of self-management education for

a cognitive behavioural therapy-based self-management intervention for irritable bowel syndrome in primary care, Psychol Med 40 (2010) 85-94.

[60] R.K. Furuya, E.C. Arantes, C.A. Dessotte, M.A. Ciol, J.M. Hoffman, A. Schmidt, R.A. Dantas, L.A. Rossi, A randomized controlled trial of an educational programme to improve self-care in Brazilian patients following percutaneous coronary intervention, J Adv Nurs 71 (2015) 895-908.

[61] M.M. Yu, S.Y. Chair, C.W.H. Chan, K.C. Choi, A health education booklet and telephone follow-ups can improve medication adherence, health-related quality of life, and psychological status of patients with heart failure, Heart Lung 44 (2015) 400-7.

[62] J.M. Malouff, W. Noble, N.S. Schutte, N. Bhullar, The effectiveness of bibliotherapy in alleviating tinnitus-related distress, J Psychosom Res 68 (2010) 245-51.

[63] L. Yardley, S. Kirby, Evaluation of booklet-based self-management of symptoms in Meniere disease: A randomized controlled trial, Psychosom Med 68 (2006) 762-9.

[64] A.K. Burton, G. Waddell, K.M. Tillotson, N. Summerton, Information and advice to patients with back pain can have a positive effect. A randomized controlled trial of a novel educational booklet in primary care, Spine 24 (1999) 2484-91.

[65] L. Beatty, S. Lambert, A systematic review of internet-based self-help therapeutic interventions to improve distress and disease-control among adults with chronic health conditions, Clin Psychol Rev 33 (2013) 609–62.

[66] L. Turner, L. Shamseer, D.G. Altman, K.F. Schulz, D. Moher, Does use of the CONSORT Statement impact the completeness of reporting of randomised controlled trials published in medical journals? A Cochrane review, Syst Rev 1 (2012) 60.

[67] A.C. Plint, D. Moher, A. Morrison, K. Schulz, D.G. Altman, C. Hill, I. Gaboury, Does the CONSORT checklist improve the quality of reports of randomised controlled trials? A systematic review, Med J Aust 185 (2006) 263-7.

[68] D. Strech, B. Soltmann, B. Weikert, M. Bauer, A. Pfennig, Quality of reporting of randomized controlled trials of pharmacologic treatment of bipolar disorders: A systematic review, J Clin Psychiatry 72 (2011) 1214-21.

[69] C. Ntala, P. Birmpili, A. Worth, N.H. Anderson, A. Sheikh, The quality of reporting of randomised controlled trials in asthma: A systematic review, Prim Care Respir J 22 (2013) 417-24.

[70] P.A. Kinser, J.L. Robins, Control group design: Enhancing rigor in research of mind-body therapies for depression, Evid Based Complement Alternat Med 2013 (2013) 140467.

[71] S.D. Lambert, A. Girgis, J. Turner, T. Regan, H. Candler, B. Britton, S. Chambers, C. Lawsin, K. Kayser, "You need something like this to give you guidelines on what to do":Patients' and partners' use and perceptions of a self-directed, coping skills training resource, Support Care Cancer 21 (2013) 3451-60.

[72] S. Schneider, A. Moyer, S. Knapp-Oliver, S. Sohl, D. Cannella, V. Targhetta, Preintervention distress moderates the efficacy of psychosocial treatment for cancer patients: A meta-analysis, J Behav Med 33 (2010) 1-14.

[73] R. Osborne, G. Elsworth, K. Whitfield, The Health Education Impact Questionnaire (heiQ): An outcomes and evaluation measure for patient education and self-management interventions for people with chronic conditions, Patient Educ Couns 66 (2007) 192-201.
[74] K. Lorig, H. Holman, Self management education: History, definition, outcomes and mechanisms, Ann Behav Med 26 (2003) 1-7.

[75] A. O. Horvath, R. P., The alliance. In: Psychotherapy relationships that work: Evidence-based responsiveness. Edited by Norcross JC. New York, NY: Oxford University Press; (2002) 37-69.

[76] A. O. Horvath, A.C. Del Re, C. Fluckiger, D. Symonds, Alliance in individual psychotherapy. Psychotherapy **48**(2011) 9-16.

[77] D. J. Martin, J. P. Garske, M. K. Davis, Relation of the therapeutic alliance with outcome and other variables: a meta-analytic review. J Consult Clin Psychol 68 (2000) 438-450.

[78] P. Farrand, J. Woodford, Impact of support on the effectiveness of written cognitive behavioural self-help: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Clin Psychol Rev 33 (2013) 182-95.

[79] A. P. Clegg, S. E. Barber, J. B. Young, A. Forster, S. J. Iliffe, Do home-based exercise interventions improve outcomes for frail older people? Findings from a systematic review. Rev Clin Gerontol 22(2011) 68-78.

[80] J. R. Jaggers, W. Dudgeon, S. N. Blair, X. Sui, S. Burgess, S. Wilcox S, G. A. Hand, A home-based exercise intervention to increase physical activity among people living with HIV: study design of a randomized clinical trial. BMC Public Health 13(2013) 502.