Published in final edited form as:

Am J Geriatr Psychiatry. 2017 October ; 25(10): 1109–1119. doi:10.1016/j.jagp.2017.04.015.

Harnessing Peer Support in an Online Intervention for Older Adults with Depression

Kathryn N Tomasino, PhD^{1,2}, Emily G Lattie, PhD^{1,2}, Joyce Ho, PhD^{1,2}, Hannah L Palac, MS^{1,2}, Susan M Kaiser, MA, MPH^{1,2}, and David C Mohr, PhD^{1,2}

¹Center for Behavioral Intervention Technologies

²Northwestern University, Feinberg School of Medicine

Abstract

Objective—This pilot study evaluated the feasibility and efficacy of 2 methods of delivering a cognitive behaviorally informed internet intervention for depression for adults 65-years and older.

Methods—Forty-seven participants were enrolled and assigned to receive one of 2 versions of the internet intervention, either delivered individually (III) or with peer support (II+PS), or to a wait list control group (WLC). Primary outcomes included change in depressive symptoms from baseline to post-intervention (week 8), site use, self-reported usability, and coach time. Secondary outcomes included measures of social support and isolation and anxiety.

Results—Follow-up data was provided by 85.1% (40/47) of enrolled participants. There were significant differences in depression change across groups ($F_{2,37} = 3.81$, $P = .03$). Greater reductions in depressive symptoms for the III ($P = .02$) and II+PS ($P = .03$) compared to WLC, and significantly less coach time was required to support II+PS ($P = .003$).

Conclusions—These results highlight the potential of cognitive-behaviorally informed internet interventions for older adults with depression, and indicate that peer supported programs are both acceptable and equivalent to individually-delivered internet interventions. Including peer support may be a viable and potentially more cost-effective option for disseminating online treatments for depression for older adults.

Keywords

depression; internet interventions; peer support; online; technology

Corresponding author: Kathryn Noth Tomasino, PhD, Northwestern University, Center for Behavioral Intervention Technologies, 750 North Lake Shore Drive, Floor 10, Chicago, IL 60611, kathryn.noth@northwestern.edu, Phone: 312-503-4605 or 630-842-1459, Fax: 312-503-2777.

Conflicts of Interest: No disclosures to report.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

INTRODUCTION

Depression in later life is common and undertreated (1), and is associated with decreased quality of life and increased rates of disability (2), morbidity, and mortality (3). Untreated depression is burdensome for society, substantially increasing healthcare utilization and costs (4, 5). Despite numerous evidence-based interventions shown to effectively reduce late-life depression (6), many older adults experience barriers that limit access to care (7, 8).

The internet offers opportunities for depression treatment that could dramatically impact older adults' access to care (9). Programs delivered online have several advantages as they remove restrictions imposed by clinics, such as hours, clinician availability, and geographical restrictions, thus resolving transportation and mobility related barriers. Internet interventions also offer access to care from anywhere with a working internet connection, at any time, and as often as needed. This enhanced accessibility offers a more private, and potentially more comfortable, treatment option.

Many internet interventions that target behavior change and symptom reduction are based on cognitive behavioral therapy (CBT), and such interventions have been developed for a wide range of mental health problems. The efficacy of CBT-based internet interventions for treating depression in younger and middle-aged adults is well established (10) (11). While older adults have historically been underrepresented in this research (12), emerging evidence supports their efficacy and acceptability for reducing symptoms of depression and anxiety in adults over 60 (13–17).

Despite these positive results, self-guided internet interventions tend to see high rates of dropout and poor adherence (18). Human support can reduce problems with attrition and engagement, and most studies demonstrate that internet interventions provided with support produce better outcomes (19). However, the inclusion of human supporters reduces intervention scalability due to the cost of providing care and limited availability of supporters (20). Thus, the need for innovative solutions to improve engagement and manage attrition has been voiced (21).

Peer support could potentially promote engagement, while decreasing costs and increasing reach by reducing the need for professional support. To date, few researchers have attempted to harness peer support in online interventions for depression. While there has been some evidence that peer support can improve adherence to internet interventions and reduce depression (22), a large trial found that peer support reduced adherence to internet training relative to internet training alone (23).

The aim of this study was to explore the feasibility of using peer support to reduce the coach time required for an internet intervention for depressed older adults. The intervention was delivered either individually (individual internet intervention; III) or with peer support (internet intervention with peer support; II+PS), relative to a waitlist control (WLC). Primary outcomes included change in depression, use, self-reported usability, and coach time; secondary outcomes included self-reported social support and isolation, and anxiety. We hypothesized that greater symptom reduction would be observed for III and II+PS

relative to WLC, that II+PS would require less coach time, and that both III and II+PS would demonstrate feasibility and acceptability as evaluated by site use and usability ratings.

METHODS

Participants

Participants were recruited from clinical research registries, online and community advertisements, and clinic referral. Participants needed to read and speak English, be at least 65-years old, have elevated depressive symptoms at screening (score of ≥ 8 on the Patient Health Questionnaire-8 or score of >7 on the Geriatric Depression Scale-15), have a telephone, email address, basic internet skills and internet access. Participants were excluded if they were receiving or planning to receive psychotherapy during the trial or if they met criteria for a diagnosis for which participation could be inappropriate (e.g., psychotic disorder, cognitive impairment).

Procedures

This study was approved by the Northwestern University institutional review board, registered on the Clinical Trials Registry as NCT02841787. Figure 1 shows participant flow and allocation. Potential participants were directed to a website to complete a general screener used for multiple trials. Individuals who indicated interest in this study specifically or agreed to be screened for all studies and who met preliminary screening criteria were contacted to complete phone screening. Participants meeting eligibility after screening were invited to complete informed consent and a baseline eligibility assessment including online questionnaires and telephone administration of the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (24), and the Telephone Interview of Cognitive Symptoms (25). Participants who remained eligible were invited to participate.

Because participants assigned to the II+PS progressed through the program as a group, proper randomization would require recruiting a participant pool large enough to be randomized to all 3 arms, all eligible on the same day. As this was a small pilot, this was not feasible. Therefore, group assignment was performed in blocks of 10–12, and assignment order was pre-specified as follows: II+PS, WLC, II+PS, III. Two groups were allocated to II+PS to provide additional experience with this novel intervention component. WLC participants received access to III following the 8-week waiting period. Assessments were administered online at baseline (2 weeks prior to intervention start) and week 8 via REDCap (26). Participants could earn up to \$155 for completing research assessments. Compensation was not dependent on participation in the intervention or coaching.

Intervention

MoodTech is an 8-week online intervention for depression based on CBT principles developed for adults 65-years and older. It was built on the *ThinkFeelDo* platform (27) and was accessible via computers, tablets, and mobile phones. There were 16 lessons (2/week) that included didactic content and followed 2 character storylines (see Table, Supplemental Digital Content 1). Each lesson ended with directions to practice skills using program tools. Tools focused on core skills: 1) cognitive restructuring (Think); 2) mood and emotion

monitoring (Feel); 3) behavioral activation (Do); 4) relaxation/mindfulness (Relax); and 5) goal setting (Achieve).

Peer support features were designed to promote social engagement and adherence via accountability (28). Features included profiles and an “activity feed” that displayed lesson completion, “status” posts, and participant-selected tool content. Participants interacted by “liking” or “commenting” on the activity feed, and through a “nudge” feature that sent an automated e-mail to another participant. These features aimed to support the development of bond (e.g., profiles, “status”, “likes”) and accountability (e.g., “likes”, “comments,” and “nudges”).

Coaching & Group Moderation

Individual coaching and group moderation were provided by 2 clinical psychologists (KNT, JH) and were based on the Efficiency Model of Support (29). Individual coaching was provided via phone calls and messages. Coaches used a dashboard to view participant activity and responses to a weekly symptom questionnaire, and to send and receive messages.

For both III and II+PS, participants had an orientation call with their coach on the first day of the program to establish goals and set expectations for contact. Coaches were instructed to keep this call to 45 minutes. For III, coaches provided weekly coaching to all participants via brief (10–15 minute) calls and messages, depending on participant’s preference. In these interactions, coaches were instructed to reinforce progress and address problems that could interfere with benefit (i.e., failure points) by helping participants overcome technical problems (usability), encouraging use (engagement), answering conceptual questions (knowledge) and supporting skill application to specific problems (fit, implementation) (29). Coaches also responded to all participant messages, and outreached when participants were unresponsive for >1 week. Coaches tracked all time spent on phone and message communications.

For II+PS, coaches primarily interacted with participants through group moderation. Moderation involved daily (weekday) review of the feed to monitor safety, identify unanswered questions, and reinforce use. Templated discussion questions and group use statistics (e.g., % lessons completed) were posted weekly. Individual coaching was provided in 2 cases: upon request, or when the moderator determined that outreach was indicated (e.g., if a participant failed to login for >1 week; a question to the group went unanswered for >48 hours; use of site features in a manner that could negatively impact others). Moderators tracked all time spent on individual coaching. Group moderation time was not formally tracked as it was a high frequency/low time activity, and was estimated at 2 minutes/weekdays.

Measures

Clinical and social outcomes were assessed using self-report questionnaires. The Patient Health Questionnaire 9-item (PHQ-9) (30) and the Generalized Anxiety Disorder 7-item (GAD-7)(31) measured depression and anxiety, respectively. The Patient Reported Outcome Measurement Information System (PROMIS) Social Isolation 6-items evaluated social

isolation, including feelings of being avoided, excluded, detached or disconnected from others (32). The Social Provisions Scale (SPS) (33) measured social support, providing a total score and 6 subscales (attachment, social integration, reassurance of worth, reliable alliance, guidance, and opportunity for nurturance). MoodTech usability, acceptability, and satisfaction were assessed using the System Usability Scale (SUS) (34), which provides a measure of overall usability, and the USE questionnaire (35), which measures usability dimensions (usefulness, satisfaction, ease of use, ease of learning).

Use was examined using sessions, lesson completion, and use of peer support features. A session was defined as a sequence of user-initiated actions separated by <10-minutes between events. Sessions were examined rather than logins to provide a more accurate understanding of use (e.g., connectivity problems can cause logins without user actions, artificially inflating use).

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were computed for demographic, clinical characteristics, and social outcome measures. Differences in baseline characteristics between groups were compared using a 1-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for age, the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests for all other continuous characteristics, and chi-square or Fisher's exact test for categorical variables. Associations between clinical characteristics and change in outcome measures were assessed using Spearman correlation coefficients for continuous variables and either 2-sample t-tests for 2-group categorical variables or 1-way ANOVAs for categorical variables with 3 groups. Differences in coaching time, program use (e.g., sessions), and usability ratings were calculated using 2-sample t-tests; differences in weekly lesson completion were compared using Fisher's exact tests. 1-way ANOVAs evaluated group differences in change in clinical outcomes from baseline to week 8. Pairwise comparisons for significant omnibus tests were conducted using 2-sample t-tests. Within-group differences between baseline and week 8 outcomes were evaluated using paired t-tests. Unless otherwise specified, $\alpha = 0.05$ for 2-sided tests were used to determine statistical significance. All analyses were performed using SAS, version 9.4 (Cary, NC, USA).

RESULTS

Participants—47 participants were enrolled and assigned to one of 3 groups: II +PS (N=23), WLC (N=12), or III (N=12). Baseline characteristics are presented in Table 1. Tests of baseline characteristics between groups did not indicate any significant differences (p 's > .10). Flow through the study is depicted in Figure 1. Participants were included in outcome analyses if they completed assessments at both baseline and week 8; 85.1% (40/47) met this criterion. Because this was a small pilot study with very low rates of missing data, intent-to-treat analyses were not conducted.

Primary Outcomes

Depression—Reductions in depression were significant for III and II+PS groups, but not for WLC (see Table 2). Significant differences were found in depression change between

groups ($F_{2,37}=3.81$, $p=.03$). Pairwise comparisons revealed differences in depression change between III and WLC ($t_{19}=2.5$, $p=.02$) and between II+PS and WLC ($t_{29}=2.22$, $p=.03$). No significant differences in depression change were found between III and II+PS ($t_{28}=.41$, $p=.68$).

Attrition & Site Use—Two of 11 participants who initiated III (18%) and 4 of 23 participants who initiated II+PS (17%) withdrew (see Figure 1). Mean number of sessions across the 8-week intervention was 45.6 ($SD=24.9$) for III ($N=11$) and 49.1 ($SD=35.8$) for II+PS ($N=23$); differences were not significant ($p>.50$). Average number of lessons completed (III: $M=11.7$, $SD=3.8$; II+PS: $M=11.3$, $SD=4.5$; $p>.50$) was not significantly different between groups ($p>.50$). Table 3 displays weekly sessions and lesson completion; no significant differences were found between groups for any week ($p's > .10$). Use of peer support features was generally high, though variability was observed across participants ($M=48.8$, $SD=85.8$, range 0–392). Nearly all II+PS participants (22/23) used at least 1 peer support feature (see Table 4). “Comment” and “like” features were used by most participants (83%) at least once; less than half used “status” or “nudge” features (44% and 39%, respectively).

Usability & Acceptability—Per industry standards, a SUS score of 68 is average and scores >70 considered “acceptable,” with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes (36). At week 8, III participants' ($N=9$) overall usability ratings were average ($M=68.75$, $SD=16.09$), while II+PS ratings ($N=21$) were below average ($M=60.5$, $SD=16.69$), but not significantly different from III. Scores on USE subscales ranged from 0 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree), and fell in the average to below average range for both groups. III participants' ($N=9$) mean scores were 4.39 ($SD=1.45$) for usefulness, 3.82 ($SD=1.34$) for ease of use, 4.48 ($SD=1.8$) for ease of learning, and 4.48 ($SD=1.8$) for satisfaction. II+PS participants' ($N=21$) mean scores were 4.05 ($SD=1.3$) for usefulness, 3.55 ($SD=1.28$) for ease of use, 3.46 ($SD=1.53$) for ease of learning, and 3.52 ($SD=1.31$) for satisfaction. No significant differences were found between groups on any subscale ($p's > .10$).

Coaching—Average number of and time spent on messages and calls and group moderation were examined. Significant differences were found between III and II+PS (see Table 5). Total coaching minutes was significantly greater for III compared to II+PS ($t_{26}=3.32$, $p=.003$). Compared to II-PS participants, III participants received nearly twice the messages ($t_{26}=4.70$, $p<.001$) and coaches spent more than twice the time on average messaging III participants ($t_{26}=3.56$, $p=.001$). Differences in number of calls and call time were not significant ($p's > .05$).

Secondary Outcomes

Anxiety—Change in anxiety was significantly different between groups ($F_{2,36}=5.96$, $p=.006$; see Table 2). Pairwise comparisons indicated significant differences comparing III and WLC ($t_{19}=4.58$, $p<.001$) and II+PS and WLC ($t_{29}=2.39$, $p=.03$), but differences between III and II+PS were not significant ($t_{26}=1.12$, $p=.28$). Table 2 presents Ms and SDs and t-tests of within-group differences for each group.

Social Support & Isolation—Social isolation scores were converted to T-scores. Baseline scores fell in the average range (33) for all groups (III: $M=55.9$, $SD=4.8$; II+PS: $M=57.4$, $SD=6.3$; WLC: $M=54$, $SD=6.7$). Change in social isolation was not significantly different between groups ($p>.10$), and change was not significant within each group ($p's>.10$).

No significant differences were found between groups on change in total SPS ($p>.10$), or any subscale ($p's>.10$). Significant change was observed within II+PS group on SPS total score ($t_{18}=-2.26$, $p=.04$), and guidance ($t_{18}=-2.36$, $p=.04$) and reliable alliance ($t_{18}=-2.15$, $p=.03$) subscales. Examination of within-group change was not significant for III and WLC for SPS total score or subscales ($p's>.05$).

DISCUSSION

This pilot study demonstrates the feasibility and preliminary efficacy of MoodTech, and indicates that adults 65 and older will use and can benefit from coached internet interventions for depression delivered individually and with peer support. Compared to a WLC, reductions in depression were observed for all participants who received MoodTech, with an average drop of 5 points on the PHQ-9. The present findings are consistent with reductions in depression observed in the only prior RCT (17) to evaluate the efficacy of a guided internet intervention for depressed adults 60 years and older, and extends these findings to a slightly older sample ($M=69.6$ years, $SD=4.1$, range 65–83). Program usage was high, with an average of 45 sessions for III and 49 for II+PS, and retention was good for both groups (approximately 80%). Retention and usage are similar other trials of internet interventions with older adults (15–17) and higher relative to trials with younger adults (<65 years) (37).

Significantly less time was spent coaching participants when peer support was included, suggesting that embedding peer support in internet interventions could reduce coach time, thus increasing cost-effectiveness. Notably, compared to coach time reported in the previously mentioned RCT ($M=45.07$, $SD=32.51$) (17), coach time in the present study was about 89 minutes more for III and 47 minutes more for II+PS. Our procedures included an initial 45-minute orientation call, which significantly increased coach time per person for both methods of delivery. Reducing or eliminating this call, or conducting this call with groups of participants, could result in coach times comparable to the RCT for II+PS. III coach time could be further reduced by altering coach guidelines regarding the maximum coach minutes/week to align with guidelines from the prior RCT (10 minutes/week).

Usability scores indicate that MoodTech is acceptable and generally satisfactory in its current form, without significant usability issues. However, overall average and neutral ratings suggest that there is room for improvement. Uptake of peer support features was high, suggesting participants were motivated to interact with and support each other, yet usability ratings were lower for II+PS, possibly due to frustration with the design of peer support features. While all but 1 participant used either the “like” or “comment” features at least once, several participants expressed confusion about how and where to view “likes” and “comments” and less than half used the “status” or “nudge” features. Further, while

instructions regarding use of peer support features were provided during the orientation call and within the program, coach feedback indicated that there was confusion regarding the location and function of the “status” feature, as well as the function of the “nudge” feature, which participants ultimately used to deepen established connections with other group members (i.e., reinforce bond) rather than to engage disengaged participants (i.e., accountability). Coaches also received negative feedback about the location and functionality of the activity feed, with some participants expressing disappointment regarding the feed functionality and how this limited their ability to connect with others.

Low-average usability ratings, combined with feedback from coaches, point to various design improvements that should be considered for future iterations. First, font size could be manually increased for lessons, but this was not possible for other aspects of the program (e.g., tools), which was problematic. To increase accessibility and satisfaction, the size of all aspects of the program should be adjustable. Second, coaches noted that some participants struggled to complete the practice assignments because the instructions were embedded in lessons. Incorporating interactive tools into the lessons, or featuring practice assignments on the homepage, could resolve this issue. Third, for II+PS, the activity feed should be displayed somewhere prominent. Last, because certain activities were automatically posted to the feed, participant posts were quickly buried, and interacting with peers required motivation, patience, and solid understanding feed functionality. Thus, the design of the activity feed should be altered to support (versus thwart) peer interactions; e.g., specific types of posts “pop to the top.”

Finally, while no significant differences were seen between groups on change in social support, significant increases on overall support and subscales of guidance and reliable alliance were observed for II+PS, suggesting that peer support adds unique benefit that could confer larger protective benefits (38, 39). Due to limited follow-up, we cannot know the nature of these increases in social support. They may be temporary, reflecting the tangible increase in peer support from the intervention. Alternatively, perhaps they reflect a perspective shift; e.g., due to social learning/comparison that changed participants’ willingness to utilize existing support (40).

This study had several strengths, including that participants were older ($M=69$ years) than prior trials of internet interventions. To our knowledge, this was the first internet intervention for depressed older adults to embed peer support. Peer support has previously been provided separately from online interventions (23), requiring extra effort from participants to complete both. This study demonstrates the potential benefits of embedding peer support, including improved adherence compared to a prior trial (23) and reduced burden on participants. Several limitations should be considered. First, this field trial used blocked, non-random enrollment. It is possible that unmeasured differences across the treatment arms (e.g., participants who enrolled early in the recruitment period may have been more motivated than those who enrolled later) account for these findings. Findings should therefore be interpreted as supporting further investigation rather than encouraging implementation. The sample size was relatively small, and was primarily non-Hispanic White and highly educated. While this sample was somewhat representative of individuals who historically participate in online interventions, the feasibility and acceptability of this

program remains unknown for more diverse samples, and for those who do not have pre-existing familiarity with the internet and would not volunteer to participate. Finally, it was not possible to blind coaches to intervention condition, which could have biased time spent coaching.

Conclusion

This study demonstrated feasibility, acceptability and preliminary efficacy of MoodTech and highlights the potential benefits of including peer support in online interventions for older adults with depression. User feedback and usability data suggest that further design work is required to develop a technology platform that more fully meets the needs of older adults. Further examination of the role of individual coaching and group moderation is also warranted, such as testing differences in outcome in response to systematic variation in the amount and type of human support. These basic design questions notwithstanding, this study supports the conduct of larger scale RCTs to validate the use of peer support in internet interventions for older adults, and extending this work to evaluate long-term effects.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

Acknowledgments

Source of Funding: This study was funded by NIMH P20MH090318, R01MH095753, PI: David C. Mohr.

This project was supported by the National Institutes of Health grants P20 MH090318 and R01MH095753. Recruitment for the study included use of ResearchMatch, a national health volunteer registry that was created by several academic institutions and supported by the U.S. National Institutes of Health as part of the Clinical Translational Science Award (CTSA) program, and the Aging Research Registry, a database of approximately older people in the Chicagoland area who have expressed a willingness to participate in research studies on the provision of care to aging patients and that was created and is supported by Northwestern University's Buehler Center on Aging, Health, and Society. REDCap electronic data tools hosted at Northwestern University were used in this trial. REDCap is supported at the Feinberg School of Medicine by the Northwestern University Clinical and Translational Science (NUCATS) Institute. Research reported in this publication was supported, in part, by the National Institutes of Health National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, Grant Number UL1TR001422. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, et al. Lifetime prevalence and age-of-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the national comorbidity survey replication. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 2005; 62:593–602. [PubMed: 15939837]
2. Lenze EJ, Rogers JC, Martire LM, et al. The association of late-life depression and anxiety with physical disability: A review of the literature and prospectus for future research. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2001; 9:113–135. [PubMed: 11316616]
3. Schulz R, Drayer RA, Rollman BL. Depression as a risk factor for non-suicide mortality in the elderly. *Biol Psychiatry*. 2002; 52:202–225.
4. Bock JO, Hajek A, Weyerer S, et al. The impact of depressive symptoms on healthcare costs in late life: Longitudinal findings from the agemoode study. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2016:3–11.
5. Lupp M, Sikorski C, Motzek T, et al. Health service utilization and costs of depression in late life - a systematic review. *Curr Pharm Des*. 2012; 74:1–23.
6. Wilson K, Mattram PG, Vassilas C. Psychotherapeutic treatments for older depressed people (review). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008

7. Landreville P, Landry J, Baillargeon L, et al. Older adults' acceptance of psychological and pharmacological treatments for depression. *J Gerontol B Psychol Sci Soc Sci*. 2001; 56B:P285–P291.
8. Ell K. Depression care for the elderly: Reducing barriers to evidence based practice. *Home Health Care Serv Q*. 2006; 25:115–148. [PubMed: 16803741]
9. Hoeft TJ, Hinton L, Liu J, et al. Directions for effectiveness research to improve health services for late-life depression in the united states. *Am J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2016; 24:18–30. [PubMed: 26525996]
10. Andersson G, Cuijpers P, Carlbring P, et al. Guided internet-based vs. Face-to-face cognitive behavior therapy for psychiatric and somatic disorders: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Psychiatry*. 2014; 13:288–295. [PubMed: 25273302]
11. Arnberg FK, Linton SJ, Hultcrantz M, et al. Internet-delivered psychological treatments for mood and anxiety disorders: A systematic review of their efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness. *PloS One*. 2014; 9:1–13.
12. Crabb RM, Cavanagh K, Proudfoot J, et al. Is computerized cognitive-behavioural therapy a treatment option for depression in late-life? A systematic review. *Br J Clin Psychol*. 2012; 51:459–464. [PubMed: 23078214]
13. Mewton LS, Perminder S, Andrews G. A naturalistic study of the acceptability and effectiveness of internet-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy for psychiatric disorders in older australians. *PloS One*. 2013; 8:1–5.
14. Jones S, Hadjistavropoulos H, Soucy J. A randomized controlled trial of guided internet-delivered cognitive behaviour therapy for older adults with generalized anxiety. *J Anxiety Disord*. 2016; 37:1–9. [PubMed: 26561733]
15. Dear BF, Zou J, Titov N, et al. Internet-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy for depression: A feasibility open trial for older adults. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*. 2013; 47:169–176. [PubMed: 23152358]
16. Staples LG, Fogliati VJ, Dear BF, et al. Internet-delivered treatment for older adults with anxiety and depression: Implementation of the wellbeing plus course in routine clinical care and comparison with research trial outcomes. *BJPsych Open*. 2016; 2:307–313. [PubMed: 27703794]
17. Titov N, Dear BF, Ali S, et al. Clinical and cost-effectiveness of therapist-guided internet-delivered cognitive behavior therapy for older adults with symptoms of depression: A randomized controlled trial. *Behavior Therapy*. 2015; 46:193–205. [PubMed: 25645168]
18. Donkin L, Christensen H, Naismith SL, et al. A systematic review of the impact of adherence on the effectiveness of e-therapies. *J Med Internet Res*. 2011; 13:e52. [PubMed: 21821503]
19. Baumeister H, Reichler L, Munzinger M, et al. The impact of guidance on internet-based mental health interventions — a systematic review. *Internet Interventions*. 2014; 1:205–215.
20. Muñoz RF. The efficiency model of support and the creation of digital apothecaries. *Clinical Psychol (New York)*. 2016
21. Rice S, Gleeson J, Davey C, et al. Moderated online social therapy for depression relapse prevention in young people: Pilot study of a 'next generation' online intervention. *Early Interv Psychiatry*. 2016:1–13.
22. Duffecy J, Sanford S, Wagner L, et al. Project onward: An innovative e-health intervention for cancer survivors. *Psychooncology*. 2013; 22:947–951. [PubMed: 22438297]
23. Griffiths KM, Mackinnon AJ, Crisp DA, et al. The effectiveness of an online support group for members of the community with depression: A randomised controlled trial. *PloS One*. 2012; 7:1–9.
24. Sheehan DV, Lecrubier Y, Sheehan KH, et al. The mini-international neuropsychiatric interview (M.I.N.I.): The development and validation of a structured diagnostic psychiatric interview for DSM-IV and ICD-10. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 1998; 59:22–33.
25. Brandt J, Spencer M, Folstein M. The telephone interview for cognitive status. *Neuropsychiatry Neuropsychol Behav Neurol*. 1988; 1:111–117.
26. Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, et al. Research electronic data capture (redcap)—a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform*. 2009; 42:377–381.

27. Schueller, SM., Mohr, DC. Initial field trial of a coach-supported web-based depression treatment. Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Pervasive Computing Technologies for Healthcare (PervasiveHealth); 20–23 May 2015; Istanbul. IEEE; 2015. p. 25-28.
28. Mohr DC, Cuijpers P, Lehman K. Supportive accountability: A model for providing human support to enhance adherence to ehealth interventions. *J Med Internet Res*. 2011; 13:e30. [PubMed: 21393123]
29. Schueller SM, Tomasino KN, Mohr DC. Integrating human support into behavioral intervention technologies: The efficiency model of support. *Clin Psychol (New York)*. 2016:1–19.
30. Kroenke K, Spitzer RL, Williams JB. The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2001:606–613. [PubMed: 11556941]
31. Spitzer RL, Kroenke K, Williams JB, et al. A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder. *Arch Intern Med*. 2006; 166:1092–1097. [PubMed: 16717171]
32. Hahn EA, Devellis RF, Bode RK, et al. Measuring social health in the patient-reported outcomes measurement information system (promis): Item bank development and testing. *Qual Life Res*. 2010; 19:1035–1044. [PubMed: 20419503]
33. Cutrona, CE., Russell, DW. The provisions of social relationships and adaptations to stress, in *Advances in personal relationships*. Perlman, WHJD., editor. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press; 1987. p. 37-67.
34. Brooke J. Sus-a quick and dirty usability scale. *Usability evaluation in industry*. 1996; 189:4–7.
35. Lund A. Measuring usability with the use questionnaire. *Usability Interface*. 2001; 8:3–6.
36. Sauro, J. A practical guide to the system usability scale: Background, benchmarks & best practices. Measuring Usability LLC; 2011.
37. Christensen H, Griffiths KM, Farrer L. Adherence in internet interventions for anxiety and depression. *J Med Internet Res*. 2009; 11:e13. [PubMed: 19403466]
38. Cutrona C, Russell D, Rose J. Social support and adaptation to stress by the elderly. *Psychol Aging*. 1986; 1:47–54. [PubMed: 3267379]
39. Russell DW, Cutrona CE. Social support, stress, and depressive symptoms among the elderly: Test of a process model. *Psychol Aging*. 1991; 6:190–201. [PubMed: 1863388]
40. White M, Dorman SM. Receiving social support online: Implications for health education. *Health Educ Res*. 2001; 16:693–707. [PubMed: 11780708]

Figure 1.
Participant flow through the study.

Table 1

Sample demographic characteristics

Variable	N (%) or Median (IQR)			
	Total N=47	III N=12	II + PS N=23	WLC N=12
Age (years), mean $\pm$ SD	69.6 $\pm$ 4.1	69.2 $\pm$ 3.4	69.5 $\pm$ 4.3	70 $\pm$ 4.7
Gender				
Female	32 (68.1%)	8 (66.7%)	16 (69.6%)	8 (66.7%)
Male	15 (31.9%)	4 (33.3%)	7 (30.4%)	4 (33.3%)
Ethnicity				
Not Hispanic or Latino	46 (97.9%)	12 (100%)	22 (95.7%)	12 (100%)
Hispanic or Latino	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.4%)	0 (0%)
Race				
Black/African American	2 (4.3%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.4%)	1 (8.3%)
White	41 (87.2%)	11 (91.7%)	19 (82.6%)	11 (91.7%)
More than one race	3 (6.4%)	1 (8.3%)	2 (8.7%)	0 (0%)
Declined to report	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.4%)	0 (0%)
Annual gross household income (x1000)	41 (29–50)	37.5 (33–45)	37 (22.2–50)	50 (34–115)
Marital Status				
No Partner	29 (61.7%)	8 (66.7%)	16 (69.6%)	5 (41.7%)
Partner	18 (38.3%)	4 (33.3%)	7 (30.4%)	7 (58.3%)
Education				
Some High School	1 (2.1%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (8.3%)
Some College	7 (14.9%)	1 (8.3%)	5 (21.7%)	1 (8.3%)
2-yr College (Associate's)	7 (14.9%)	0 (0%)	5 (21.7%)	2 (16.7%)
4-yr College (Bachelor's)	13 (27.7%)	3 (25%)	6 (26.1%)	4 (33.3%)
Master's Degree	12 (25.5%)	5 (41.7%)	5 (21.7%)	2 (16.7%)
Doctoral Degree (PhD, MD, JD)	7 (14.9%)	3 (25%)	2 (8.7%)	2 (16.7%)
Employment Status				
Employed	10 (21.3%)	3 (25%)	4 (17.4%)	3 (25%)
Retired	34 (72.3%)	9 (75%)	18 (78.3%)	7 (58.3%)
Unemployed/Disability	3 (6.4%)	0 (0%)	1 (4.4%)	2 (16.7%)
Insured	46 (100%)	12 (100%)	22 (100%)	12 (100%)
Medicare	40 (87%)	10 (83.3%)	19 (86.4%)	11 (91.7%)
Medicaid	4 (8.7%)	1 (8.3%)	3 (13.6%)	0 (0%)
Taking antidepressant medication				
No	31 (67.4%)	7 (58.3%)	17 (77.3%)	7 (58.3%)
Yes	15 (32.6%)	5 (41.7%)	5 (22.7%)	5 (41.7%)

Notes: III: individual internet intervention. II+PS: internet intervention with peer support. WLC: wait list control. Tests of baseline characteristics between groups were conducted using a 1-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) for age, the nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis tests for all other continuous characteristics, and chi-square or Fisher's exact test for categorical variables. No significant differences were found between groups for any baseline characteristic (p 's > .10).

Table 2

Within-group differences for PHQ-9 and GAD-7

Group	Measure	Baseline	Week 8	Difference	t	df	Cohen's d	p
III (N=9)	PHQ-9	10.6± 3.2	5.1± 2.8	-5.4 ± 2.4	6.8	8	2.27	<.001
	GAD-7	6.1± 2.1	2.3± 1.9	-3.8 ± 2.8	4.09	8	1.36	<.01
II+PS (N=19)	PHQ-9	11.2± 5.4	6.4± 4.2	-4.8 ± 4.4	4.77	18	1.09	<.001
	GAD-7	6.7± 4.8	4.7± 3.5	-2 ± 4.4	1.95	17	0.46	0.07
WLC (N=12)	PHQ-9	9.3± 3.7	8.2± 5.7	-1.1 ± 4.7	.79	11	0.23	0.44
	GAD-7	5.8± 4	7.2± 4.7	1.3 ± 2.3	-1.97	11	-0.57	0.08

Notes: Possible range of scores for the PHQ-9 was 0–27 and for the GAD-7 was 0–21. Scores are reported as means and standard deviations. Mean differences were evaluated using paired t-tests for each group separately. PHQ-9; Patient Health Questionnaire, 9-items; GAD-7; Generalized Anxiety Disorder Scale, 7 items. II+PS; internet intervention with peer support. WLC; wait list control. df: degrees of freedom.

Table 3

Use of the MoodTech intervention: Weekly site sessions & lesson completion

Week	Site Sessions		Lesson Completion	
	M ± SD	N, %	N, %	N, %
	III N=11	II+PS N=23	III N=11	II+PS N=23
1	9.2 ± 4.4	11 ± 6.8	1 10, 91	22, 96
			2 11, 100	20, 87
2	7 ± 4.1	7.5 ± 6.2	3 11, 100	21, 91
			4 9, 82	17, 74
3	6.2 ± 4.5	7.2 ± 6.1	5 10, 91	19, 83
			6 9, 82	13, 56
4	5.8 ± 4.8	5.7 ± 6.5	7 9, 83	17, 74
			8 8, 73	16, 70
5	5.1 ± 4.6	5.4 ± 5.1	9 9, 82	16, 70
			10 7, 63	18, 78
6	4.4 ± 3.4	4.6 ± 5.1	11 8, 73	17, 74
			12 4, 36	11, 48
7	4.2 ± 2.9	3.4 ± 3.2	13 5, 45	14, 61
			14 5, 45	11, 48
8	4.4 ± 3.6	4.2 ± 3.6	15 8, 73	14, 61
			16 6, 55	14, 61

Notes: 2-sample t-tests comparing site sessions were not significant for any week ($p' \leq .10$). Fisher's exact tests comparing groups on lesson completion were not significant for any week ($p' \leq .20$). M: Mean, SD: standard deviation, III: individual internet intervention, II+PS: internet intervention with peer support.

Table 4

Use of peer support features.

Feature	Participants	Min	Max	M	SD
# of times used					
Like	N, % 19, 82.6%	1	227	25.7	52
Comment	19, 82.6%	1	96	20.3	23.6
Nudge	9, 39.1%	1	24	5.7	8.2
Status	10, 43.5%	2	48	19.7	16.6

Notes: N represents the participants who use the specified tool once or more. Descriptives include only participants who used the specified tool at least once. Min: minimum. Max: maximum. M: mean. SD: standard deviation. Number of times used represents total 8-week trial.

Table 5

Average coaching time per participant by group.

	Messages			Calls			Moderation		Total time	
	N	M ± SD	minutes	M ± SD	number	minutes	M ± SD	number	M	minutes
III	9	65.22 ± 29.92	14.78 ± 2.11	69.11 ± 22.35	2.33 ± 1.00	na				134.33 ± 28.43
II + PS	19	31.74 ± 19.60	7.58 ± 4.32	53.74 ± 18.44	1.84 ± .83	6.96				92.43 ± 32.36

differences. Minutes on group moderation are estimated; see Methods section for more information. M: mean. SD: standard deviation. III: individual internet intervention. II+PS: internet intervention with peer support