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|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study details**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Reference** | Manthey, L., Vehreschild, V., & Renner, K. (2016). Effectiveness of two cognitive interventions promoting happiness with video-based online instructions. J Happiness Stud, 17, 319-339. doi: 10.1007/s10902-014-9596-2 |   **Study design**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | £ | Individually-randomized parallel-group trial | | £ | Cluster-randomized parallel-group trial | | £ | Individually randomized cross-over (or other matched) trial |   **For the purposes of this assessment, the interventions being compared are defined as**   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | Experimental: | Best Possible Selves intervention & Gratitude intervention | Comparator: | Placebo control |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias** | Subjective well-being (Satisfaction With Life Scale; Diener, 1975), (Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE; Diener et al., 2009). |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Specify the numerical result being assessed.** In case of multiple alternative analyses being presented, specify the numeric result (e.g. RR = 1.52 (95% CI 0.83 to 2.77) and/or a reference (e.g. to a table, figure or paragraph) that uniquely defines the result being assessed. | Post-intervention outcomes for both intervention groups and the placebo control (see table 2. Journal article). |   **Is the review team’s aim for this result…?**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | £ | to assess the effect of *assignment to intervention* (the ‘intention-to-treat’ effect) | | X | to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention* (the ‘per-protocol’ effect) |   **If the aim is to assess the effect of *adhering to intervention***, select the deviations from intended intervention that should be addressed (at least one must be checked):  X occurrence of non-protocol interventions  £ failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome  X non-adherence to their assigned intervention by trial participants  **Which of the following sources were obtained to help inform the risk-of-bias assessment? (tick as many as apply)**  X Journal article(s) with results of the trial  £ Trial protocol  £ Statistical analysis plan (SAP)  £ Non-commercial trial registry record (e.g. ClinicalTrials.gov record)  £ Company-owned trial registry record (e.g. GSK Clinical Study Register record)  £ “Grey literature” (e.g. unpublished thesis)  £ Conference abstract(s) about the trial  £ Regulatory document (e.g. Clinical Study Report, Drug Approval Package)  £ Research ethics application  £ Grant database summary (e.g. NIH RePORTER or Research Councils UK Gateway to Research)  £ Personal communication with trialist  £ Personal communication with the sponsor |

## Risk of bias assessment

Responses underlined in green are potential markers for low risk of bias, and responses in red are potential markers for a risk of bias. Where questions relate only to sign posts to other questions, no formatting is used.

**Domain 1: Risk of bias arising from the randomization process**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **1.1 Was the allocation sequence random?** | 1.1 “Interested subjects were asked to register with their email address on the website www.gluecksstudie.com which provided information on the study and people in charge. Subjects were randomized automatically into one of the three conditions, i.e. best possible selves, gratitude or control condition.”  1.2 “Subjects in all three conditions were provided with the same information, i.e. that the goal of the study on hand was to increase happiness and that scientifically established exercises would be used. The groups were not aware of their group status, i.e. if they were in the experimental or in the control group.” | NI  Answer ‘Yes’ if a random component was used in the sequence generation process. Examples include computer-generated random numbers.  Answer ‘No’ if no random element was used in generating the allocation sequence or the sequence is predictable.  Answer ‘No information’ if the only information about randomization methods is a statement that the study is randomized. |
| **1.2 Was the allocation sequence concealed until participants were enrolled and assigned to interventions?** | Y  Answer ‘Yes’ if the trial used any form of remote or centrally administered method to allocate interventions to participants, where the process of allocation is controlled by internet-based randomization service providers.  Answer ‘No’ if there is reason to suspect that the enrolling investigator or the participant had knowledge of the forthcoming allocation. |
| **1.3 Did baseline differences between intervention groups suggest a problem with the randomization process?** | Figure 2 indicates similar group sizes.  “Table 1 shows a detailed description of the sample’s demographics”. Visual inspection of the table doesn’t indicate any differences between demographic characteristics at baseline.  “Preliminary analysis showed no significant differences in SWB among the three groups at pre-intervention. A one-factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with group assignment as between-subjects factor with three levels turned out not to be significant for the dependent variables SWLS, PA, NA, and DEP, Pillai’s trace V = .03, F(8, 908) = 1.526, p = .14. The intercorrelations between the different dependent variables are shown in Table 2.” | N  Answer ‘Yes’ if there are imbalances that indicate problems with the randomization process, including:  (1) substantial differences between intervention group sizes, compared with the intended allocation ratio; or  (2) a substantial excess in statistically significant differences in baseline characteristics between intervention groups, beyond that expected by chance; or  (3) imbalance in one or more key prognostic factors, or baseline measures of outcome variables, that is very unlikely to be due to chance and for which the between-group difference is big enough to result in bias in the intervention effect estimate. |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Low |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias arising from the randomization process? |  | NA |

Domain 2: Risk of bias due to deviations from the intended interventions (*effect of adhering to intervention*)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **2.1. Were participants aware of their assigned intervention during the trial?** | 2.1 “Then they received the link to their online instruction video. In the following 8 weeks they were asked to complete their assigned exercise once a week. After the end of the intervention, participants received an email inviting them to the post-intervention questionnaire which assessed the same measures as pre-intervention. In all three groups participants received online video instructions explaining the exercise and a downloadable exercise sheet.”  2.2 Delivery was through fully automated digital video instructions. | N |
| **2.2. Were carers and people delivering the interventions aware of participants' assigned intervention during the trial?** | N |
| **2.3. [If applicable:] If Y/PY/NI to 2.1 or 2.2: Were important non-protocol interventions balanced across intervention groups?** |  | NA |
| **2.4. [If applicable:] Were there failures in implementing the intervention that could have affected the outcome?** |  | NA |
| **2.5. [If applicable:] Was there non-adherence to the assigned intervention regimen that could have affected participants’ outcomes?** | “Dropout Attrition from pre- to post-intervention was n = 208 (31.2 %). Furthermore, 3.5 % were excluded due to non-usage attrition (Fig. 1).” | Y |
| **2.6. If N/PN/NI to 2.3, or Y/PY/NI to 2.4 or 2.5: Was an appropriate analysis used to estimate the effect of adhering to the intervention?** | A one-way MANOVA with repeated measures, a second orthogonal contrast using the weights k = (1, -1, 0) comparing the two conditions BPS and gratitude, and a moderated hierarchical regression were performed.  “Controlling for frequency of performing the exercise did not change any of the results.” However, this single line is considered to provide a lack of information to sufficiently regard this as a proper instrumental variable analysis or inverse probability weighting, as no further results or analysis were provided. | NI |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | High |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to deviations from intended interventions? |  | Unpredictable |

Domain 3: Missing outcome data

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **3.1 Were data for this outcome available for all, or nearly all, participants randomized?** | Out of 666 participants randomised, 71 dropped out and 4 were excluded due to non-usage attrition in the Gratitude intervention, 75 dropped out and 12 were excluded due to non-usage attrition in the BPS intervention, and 62 dropped out and 7 were excluded due to non-usage attrition in the control intervention. A total of 231 participants’ data out of 666 randomised was not available. | N  The appropriate study population for an analysis of the intention to treat effect is all randomized participants.“Nearly all” should be interpreted as that the number of participants with missing outcome data is sufficiently small that their outcomes, whatever they were, could have made no important difference to the estimated effect of intervention.For continuous outcomes, availability of data from 95% of the participants will often be sufficient. |
| **3.2 If N/PN/NI to 3.1: Is there evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data?** | “Age, t(664) = .08, p = .94, pre-test levels of life satisfaction, t(663) = 1.07, p = .29, PA, t(664) = .59, p = .55, and NA, t(664) = -.65, p = .51 as well as the experimental condition, v2 (2) = 2.11, p = .35 were not significantly different between subjects who dropped out and those who did not. In contrast, there was a significant association between dropout attrition and gender, v2 (1) = 4.93, p = .03. For women the odds of staying in the study were 1.58 times higher than for men. Furthermore, the odds of staying in the study were 2.05 times higher for participants enrolled at FernUniversita¨t in Hagen than for external participants, v2 (1) = 16.81, p\.001.” | N  Evidence that the result was not biased by missing outcome data may come from: (1) analysis methods that correct for bias; or (2) sensitivity analyses showing that results are little changed under a range of plausible assumptions about the relationship between missingness in the outcome and its true value. However, imputing the outcome variable, either through methods such as ‘last-observation-carried-forward’ or via multiple imputation based only on intervention group, should not be assumed to correct for bias due to missing outcome data. |
| **3.3 If N/PN to 3.2: Could missingness in the outcome depend on its true value?** | “Age, t(664) = .08, p = .94, pre-test levels of life satisfaction, t(663) = 1.07, p = .29, PA, t(664) = .59, p = .55, and NA, t(664) = -.65, p = .51 as well as the experimental condition, v2 (2) = 2.11, p = .35 were not significantly different between subjects who dropped out and those who did not. In contrast, there was a significant association between dropout attrition and gender, v2 (1) = 4.93, p = .03. For women the odds of staying in the study were 1.58 times higher than for men. Furthermore, the odds of staying in the study were 2.05 times higher for participants enrolled at FernUniversita¨t in Hagen than for external participants, v2 (1) = 16.81, p\.001.” | PY  If loss to follow up, or withdrawal from the study, could be related to participants’ health status, then it is possible thatmissingness in the outcome was influenced by its true value. However, if all missing outcome data occurred for documented reasons that are unrelated to the outcome then the risk of bias due to missing outcome data will be low (for example, failure of a measuring device or interruptions to routine data collection).In time-to-event analyses, participants censored during trial follow-up, for example because they withdrew from the study, should be regarded as having missing outcome data, even though some of their follow up is included in the analysis. Note that such participants may be shown as included in analyses in CONSORT flow diagrams. |
| **3.4 If Y/PY/NI to 3.3: Is it likely that missingness in the outcome depended on its true value?** | PN  Reasons for answering ‘Yes’ are:  1.Differences between intervention groups in the proportions of missing outcome data.  2.Reported reasons for missing outcome data provide evidence that missingness in the outcome depends on its true value.  3.Reported reasons for missing outcome data differ between the intervention groups.  4.The circumstances of the trial make it likely that missingness in the outcome depends on its true value. For example, in trials of interventions to treat schizophrenia it is widely understood that continuing symptoms make drop out more likely.  Answer ‘No’ if the analysis accounted for participant characteristics that are likely to explain the relationship between missingness in the outcome and its true value. |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Some concerns |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing outcome data? |  | Unpredictable |

Domain 4: Risk of bias in measurement of the outcome

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **4.1 Was the method of measuring the outcome inappropriate?** | “The Satisfaction with Life Scale (SWLS; Diener et al. 1985; Pavot and Diener 1993) consists of five questions which are rated on 7-point Likert-type scales ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores on this measure indicate greater satisfaction with life. A validation study with the German version of the SWLS found one single factor with high internal consistency (a = .92; Glaesmer et al. 2011). In the study at hand Cronbach’s a ranged from a = .86 in pre-test (n = 435), a = .88 in post-test (n = 435), and a = .89 in follow-up (n = 322).  Participants completed a German version of the Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (SPANE; Diener et al. 2009) to evaluate their feelings in the last week. The SPANE consists of 12 items divided into two subscales for positive (PA) and negative (NA) feelings with six items each (e.g. pleasant, happy, unpleasant, sad). Ratings were given on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (very rarely or never) to 5 (very often or always) indicating how much every feeling had been experienced in the last week. Prior studies have reported Cronbach’s a = .84 for PA and a = .80 for NA (Diener et al. 2009). In this study a coefficients ranged from a = .92 (PA)/.82 (NA) in pre-test (n = 435), a = .91 (PA)/.85 (NA) in post-test (n = 435) to a = .93 (PA)/.88 (NA) in follow up (n = 322).” | N  Answer ‘Yes’ or ‘Probably yes’ if the method of measuring the outcome is inappropriate, for example because:  (1) it is unlikely to be sensitive to plausible intervention effects (e.g. important ranges of outcome values fall outside levels that are detectable using the measurement method); or  (2) the measurement instrument has been demonstrated to have poor validity. |
| **4.2 Could measurement or ascertainment of the outcome have differed between intervention groups?** | Same measures and method was used in each condition:  “After the end of the intervention, participants received an email inviting them to the post-intervention questionnaire which assessed the same measures as pre-intervention.” | N  Comparable methods of outcome measurement (data collection) involve the same measurement methods and thresholds, used at comparable time points. Differences between intervention groups may arise because of ‘diagnostic detection bias’ in the context of passive collection of outcome data, or if an intervention involves additional visits to a healthcare provider, leading to additional opportunities for outcome events to be identified. |
| **4.3 If N/PN/NI to 4.1 and 4.2: Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?** | Methods and information provided was exactly the same in each condition:  “Subjects in all three conditions were provided with the same information, i.e. that the goal of the study on hand was to increase happiness and that scientifically established exercises would be used. The groups were not aware of their group status, i.e. if they were in the experimental or in the control group … Then they received the link to their online instruction video. In the following 8 weeks they were asked to complete their assigned exercise once a week.” | N  Answer ‘No’ if outcome assessors were blinded to intervention status. For participant-reported outcomes, the outcome assessor is the study participant. |
| **4.4 If Y/PY/NI to 4.3: Could assessment of the outcome have been influenced by knowledge of intervention received?** |  | NA  Knowledge of the assigned intervention could influence participant-reported outcomes (such as level of pain), observer-reported outcomes involving some judgement, and intervention provider decision outcomes. They are unlikely to influence observer-reported outcomes that do not involve judgement, for example all-cause mortality. |
| **4.5 If Y/PY/NI to 4.4:** **Is it likely that assessment of the outcome was influenced by knowledge of intervention received?** | NA  This question distinguishes between situations in which (i) knowledge of intervention status could have influenced outcome assessment but there is no reason to believe that it did (assessed as ‘Some concerns’) from those in which (ii) knowledge of intervention status was likely to influence outcome assessment (assessed as ‘High’). When there are strong levels of belief in either beneficial or harmful effects of the intervention, it is more likely that the outcome was influenced by knowledge of the intervention received. Examples may include patient-reported symptoms in trials of homeopathy, or assessments of recovery of function by a physiotherapist who delivered the intervention. |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Low |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias in measurement of the outcome? |  | NA |

Domain 5: Risk of bias in selection of the reported result

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Signalling questions** | **Comments** | **Response options** |
| **5.1 Were the data that produced this result analysed in accordance with a pre-specified analysis plan that was finalized before unblinded outcome data were available for analysis?** | No pre-specified analysis plan was found. | NI  If the researchers’ pre-specified intentions are available in sufficient detail, then planned outcome measurements and analyses can be compared with those presented in the published report(s). To avoid the possibility of selection of the reported result, finalization of the analysis intentions must precede availability of unblinded outcome data to the trial investigators. |
| **Is the numerical result being assessed likely to have been selected, on the basis of the results, from...** |  |  |
| **5.2. ... multiple eligible outcome measurements (e.g. scales, definitions, time points) within the outcome domain?** |  | NI  Answer ‘Yes’ or ‘Probably yes’ if:  There is clear evidence (usually through examination of a trial protocol or statistical analysis plan) that a domain was measured in multiple eligible ways, but data for only one or a subset of measures is fully reported (without justification), and the fully reported result is likely to have been selected on the basis of the results. Selection on the basis of the results can arise from a desire for findings to be newsworthy, sufficiently noteworthy to merit publication, or to confirm a prior hypothesis. For example, trialists who have a preconception, or vested interest in showing, that an experimental intervention is beneficial may be inclined to report outcome measurements selectively that are favourable to the experimental intervention.  Answer ‘No’ or ‘Probably no’ if:  There is clear evidence (usually through examination of a trial protocol or statistical analysis plan) that all eligible reported results for the outcome domain correspond to all intended outcome measurements.  Or  There is only one possible way in which the outcome domain can be measured (hence there is no opportunity to select from multiple measures).  or  Outcome measurements are inconsistent across different reports on the same trial, but the trialists have provided the reason for the inconsistency and it is not related to the nature of the results.  Answer ‘No information’ if:  Analysis intentions are not available, or the analysis intentions are not reported in sufficient detail to enable an assessment. |
| **5.3 ... multiple eligible analyses of the data?** |  | NI  There is clear evidence (usually through examination of a trial protocol or statistical analysis plan) that a measurement was analysed in multiple eligible ways, but data for only one or a subset of analyses is fully reported (without justification), and the fully reported result is likely to have been selected on the basis of the results. |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | Some concerns |
| Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result? |  | Unpredictable |

Overall risk of bias

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk-of-bias judgement** |  | High |
| Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome? |  | Unpredictable |
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