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ABSTRACT

Background: Home-based psychotherapy delivered via telehealth has not been investigated in the context of intensive trauma-focused treatment for individuals with severe or Complex posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD).

Objective: To examine the feasibility, safety and effectiveness of an intensive treatment programme containing prolonged exposure, EMDR therapy, physical activities and psycho-education, delivered via home-based telehealth.

Method: The treatment was delivered within four consecutive days during the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic. The sample consisted of six (four female) patients suffering from severe or Complex PTSD resulting from exposure to multiple traumatic events, mostly during early childhood. Four of them fulfilled the diagnostic criteria of complex PTSD. Outcome measures were the Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5), the PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5), and the International Trauma Questionnaire (ITQ).

Results: CAPS-5 and PCL-5 scores decreased significantly from pre- to post-treatment (Cohen’s d 1.04 and 0.93), and from post-treatment to follow-up (Cohen’s d 0.92 and 1.24). Four of the six patients lost their PTSD or Complex PTSD diagnostic status. No patient dropped out, no personal adverse events and no reliable symptom worsening occurred.

Conclusions: The results suggest that intensive, trauma-focused treatment of severe or Complex PTSD delivered via home-based telehealth is feasible, safe and effective, and can be a viable alternative to face-to-face delivered intensive trauma-focused treatment.

La seguridad y la efectividad del tratamiento intensivo para el TEPT complejo entregado por medio de telesalud desde la casa

Antecedentes: La psicoterapia desde la casa entregada por medio de telesalud no ha sido investigada en el contexto del tratamiento intensivo centrado en el trauma para individuos con trastorno de estrés postraumático (TEPT) severo o Complejo.

Objetivo: Examinar la factibilidad, seguridad y efectividad de un programa de tratamiento intensivo que contiene exposición prolongada, terapia EMDR, actividades físicas y psicoeducación, entregadas por medio de telesalud desde el hogar.

Método: El tratamiento fue llevado a cabo dentro de cuatro días consecutivos durante el brote de la pandemia del COVID-19. La muestra consistió de seis pacientes (cuatro mujeres) que sufrían de TEPT severo o Complejo como resultado de la exposición a eventos traumáticos múltiples, la mayoría durante la infancia temprana. Cuatro de ellos cumplieron con los criterios diagnósticos del TEPT complejo. Las medidas de resultado fueron la Escala de TEPT Administrada por el Médico para el DSM-5 (CAPS-5 en su sigla en inglés), la Lista de Chequeo para el TEPT (PCL-5 en su sigla en inglés), y el Cuestionario Internacional de Trauma (ITQ en su sigla en inglés).

Resultados: Los puntajes de CAPS-5 y PCL-5 disminuyeron significativamente desde el pre al posttratamiento (d de Cohen 1.04 y 0.93), y desde el posttratamiento al seguimiento (d de Cohen 0.92 y 1.24). Cuatro de los seis pacientes perdieron su estado diagnóstico de TEPT o TEPT Complejo. Ningún paciente abandonó el tratamiento, no hubo eventos adversos personales y no hubo empeoramiento confiable de los síntomas.

Conclusiones: Los resultados sugieren que el tratamiento intensivo centrado en el trauma de TEPT severo o Complejo entregado por medio de telesalud desde la casa es factible, seguro y efectivo, y puede ser una alternativa viable al tratamiento intensivo centrado en el trauma entregado en persona.

通过家庭远程医疗提供的复杂性 PTSD 密集治疗的安全性和有效性

背景: 尚未在针对重度 (或复杂性) 创伤后应激障碍 (PTSD) 患者的聚焦创伤密集治疗的背景下，考察通过家庭远程医疗提供的心理治疗。
1. Introduction

As far as we are aware, it has never been investigated whether home-based telehealth trauma-focused therapy is suitable for people with severe or Complex PTSD when delivered in an intensive and brief format. Conversely, there is evidence indicating that intensive forms of trauma-focused treatments yield significant symptom reduction in Complex PTSD patients in a short time period (e.g. Voorendonk, De Jongh, Roozendael, & Van Minnen, 2020), whereas meta-analytic evidence (Turgoose, Ashwick, & Murphy, 2018) shows that telehealth yields similar outcomes regarding PTSD compared to traditional, face-to-face, treatment. Therefore, the purpose of the present study was to examine the feasibility, safety and effectiveness of a brief intensive treatment programme containing individual prolonged exposure and EMDR therapy (in total eight sessions) that was delivered in a home-based telehealth format during a period of four consecutive days. The sample consisted of a small group of six patients suffering from severe or Complex PTSD resulting from exposure to multiple traumatic events who were scheduled for our regular inpatient intensive treatment programme, but suddenly could not be treated face-to-face due to the outbreak of the COVID-19 pandemic.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

The six study participants (four women) took part in the online consecutive days treatment programme in the spring of 2020 delivered by the Psychotrauma Expertise Centre (PSYTREC), a mental health centre in The Netherlands. All patients were indicated after intake for a face-to-face inpatient brief and intensive trauma-focused treatment programme. However, due to the consequences of COVID-19 pandemic, face-to-face treatments could not be undertaken, and as an alternative, patients were invited to participate in an online variant of the programme. About one third of them responded positively to this invitation, of which this group of six was one of the first. The mean age of this group of participants was 38.7 years (SD = 16.07). All patients had experienced multiple interpersonal trauma’s, including childhood sexual abuse (n = 3) and physical abuse (n = 4).

2.2. Procedure

During intake written informed consent was obtained from the study participants, who all took part in the evaluation of the standard PSYTREC care package for which medical ethical exemption has been granted (IRB00002991, FWA00017598). Patients were referred by their general practitioner, psychiatrist or psychologist, after which they were invited for two intake sessions on location to assess whether they fulfilled the DSM-5 criteria for PTSD. Inclusion criteria were: being classified as having PTSD, being at least 18 years old, and having sufficient knowledge of the Dutch language. Exclusion criteria was: having attempted suicide in the three months prior to intake.

During the first face-to-face intake session, the Dutch version of the Clinical Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5; Boeschoten et al., 2018), the Life Events Checklist for DSM-5 (LEC-5; Boeschoten, Bakker, Jongedijk, & Olff, 2014), and the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (M.I.N. I. PLUS; Overbeek, Schruers, & Griez, 1999) were administered and carried out by trained clinical psychologists. Between the two intakes, self-report instruments were filled out online, including the PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL-5; Boeschoten et al., 2014), and the International Trauma Questionnaire (ITQ; Eidhof, Ter Heide, Boeschoten, & Olff, 2018). During the second face-to-face intake session a personal treatment plan and a case conceptualization were made; that is, memories of the traumas were ordered, using a sequence whereby the most disturbing memories were to be processed first. Adverse events and attrition were monitored for the duration of the study by therapists and staff. All patients received four days of intensive, trauma-focused treatment which they underwent at home. At post-treatment, one week after the last
treatment day, the PCL-5, and the ITQ were completed online at home. Also, the CAPS-5 was administered online which was conducted by a research assistant who was blind to the treatment progress of the patients. At the follow-up at four weeks after treatment, the CAPS-5, the PCL-5, and the ITQ were used again.

### 2.3. Treatment

During their treatment patients stayed at home or at a place where there was enough privacy to attend the psychotherapy and psycho-education part of the programme, and enough space to do the exercises, albeit patients were encouraged to go outdoors for physical activities. Therapy consisted of four consecutive days comprising each day an online individually administered prolonged exposure therapy session (90 minutes) and an EMDR therapy session (90 minutes), six hours of physical activities, and three hours of psycho-education in between the sessions and in the evening. This treatment programme was applied as described earlier (Van Woudenberg et al., 2018), but adapted for use via telehealth (see supplementary file 1). There was no preparation or stabilization phase prior to the start of the treatment. Five or 10 min before the therapy session would start a secure link for videoconferencing (Therapieland; https://therapieland.nl/) was sent to the patients. Each session was delivered by a different psychologist, according to the principles of ‘therapist rotation’ (Van Minnen et al., 2018). Therapists who provided therapy sessions worked at home and were trained in prolonged exposure and EMDR therapy.

### 2.4. Statistical analysis

The analyses were conducted with SPSS 24 (IBM SPSS). To compare the pre-treatment CAPS-5 and the PCL-5 scores with those of post-treatment, and the post-treatment mean scores with those of the one-month follow-up, paired samples t-tests were conducted. Because specific hypotheses were formulated, one-tailed tests were performed. A reliable change (RC) index was calculated to determine whether individuals experienced clinical reliable symptom worsening on the CAPS-5, PCL-5, and ITQ from pre- to post-treatment, and from pre-treatment to one-month follow-up. For within-group effect sizes, Cohen’s $d$ was calculated using the pre-treatment, post-treatment and one-month follow-up means, and standard deviations of the relevant outcome measures. The level of significance for all statistical analyses in this study was set at $a = .05$.

### 3. Results

This study contained six participants. Besides PTSD, most of the patients also suffered from multiple and comorbid psychiatric conditions (i.e. depression, panic disorder, social phobia, eating disorder, obsessive compulsive disorder, avoidant personality disorder). Two individuals reported moderate to high suicidality based upon the M.I.N.I. PLUS. Three of the six patients were overtly reluctant and quite sceptical towards the remotely administered intensive programme, but gave it a chance.

#### 3.1. Safety

No participants dropped out of treatment and no significant symptom worsening occurred either on the CAPS-5, PCL-5, ITQ from pre-to post-treatment, and from pre-treatment to one-month follow-up. No adverse events associated with online treatment were reported.

#### 3.2. Results of treatments

There were no missing data on the CAPS-5, the PCL-5, or the ITQ. Despite the low number of study participants, the scores were normally distributed. Table 1 shows the PTSD symptom severity (CAPS-5 follow-up, PCL-5 follow-up, and ITQ follow-up).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient</th>
<th>CAPS-5</th>
<th>Diagnostic status CAPS-5</th>
<th>PCL-5</th>
<th>Diagnostic status PCL-5</th>
<th>ITQ</th>
<th>Diagnostic status ITQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>PTSD</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>CPTSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>41.33</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>52.12</td>
<td>30.17</td>
<td>24.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>11.36</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI</td>
<td>12.54</td>
<td>13.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CAPS-5: Clinical Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5
PCL-5: PTSD Checklist for DSM-5
ITQ: International Trauma Questionnaire (ITQ)
NA: not meeting diagnostic criteria of PTSD (CAPS-5), nor (C)PTSD (ITQ)
ES: effect size; pre-post, post-FU
RCI: reliable change index; pre-post, pre-FU
and PCL-5), and patients’ diagnostic status according to the CAPS-5 and ITQ. Figure 1 displays patients’ individual trajectories.

Regarding the overall effect, as displayed in Figure 2, the slope of the PTSD-symptoms as indexed with the CAPS-5 shows a significant decrease from pre- to post-treatment \([t(5) = 2.56, p < .05; \text{Cohen’s } d = 1.04]\), and from post-treatment to one-month follow-up \([t(5) = 2.25, p < .05; \text{Cohen’s } d = 0.92]\). Patients’ mean scores on the PCL-5 declined significantly from pre- to post-treatment \([t(5) = 2.29, p < .05; \text{Cohen’s } d = 0.93]\), and from post-treatment to one-month follow-up \([t(5) = 3.04, p < .05; \text{Cohen’s } d = 1.24]\).

### 3.3. Loss of diagnosis

Four of five of the patients showed a loss of PTSD (CAPS-5) or Complex PTSD diagnosis (ITQ) at post-treatment and follow-up. One patient maintained her diagnostic status (both on the CAPS-5 and ITQ), and one patient maintained her diagnostic status of PTSD on the CAPS-5, while she fulfilled the diagnostic criteria of Complex PTSD (ITQ) at post-treatment and follow-up (Table 1).

### 4. Discussion

To our knowledge, this is the first study to evaluate the effectiveness of a full remotely applied intensive trauma-focused therapy programme for individuals with severe or Complex PTSD. The results are supportive of the notion that intensive trauma-focused therapy of two sessions per day delivered by home-based telehealth is feasible, safe and effective. Figure 1 shows that two participants showed no change. The cause of this is unclear: whether this is due to telehealth as treatment modality, whether the treatment was too
short, or whether this would not also had happened if this person had been treated face-to-face. Four of the six participants improved significantly during the programme with regard to their posttraumatic symptomatology showing large effect-sizes. They no longer met the diagnostic criteria for PTSD, or Complex PTSD, after treatment. Importantly, during treatment no personal adverse events, dropout or reliable symptom worsening occurred. These results are in line with other studies showing that remotely offered psychotherapy is a viable and effective treatment option (e.g. Acieno et al., 2017; Turgoose et al., 2018). The present findings differ in that these were achieved in only four days.

This study has a number of drawbacks that are mainly related to the design of the study. A small study such as this one, with few participants, and without a control group, is particularly vulnerable to selection bias and placebo effects. Also, this was a self-selected group of which only one-third responded positively to the invitation to participate in the online variant of the treatment programme. Accordingly, conclusions about the acceptability of the treatment should be considered in light of this. Hence, studies on intensive trauma-focused treatment delivered by home-based telehealth with a longer follow-up period than just four weeks are clearly necessary to verify the effects found here.

In conclusion, the results are promising and show that home-based telehealth can be a viable alternative to face-to-face delivered intensive trauma-focused treatment.
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