

STUDY PROTOCOL

A feasibility study of eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR) in people with an at-risk mental state (ARMS) for psychosis

Contents

List of abbreviations.....	3
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION	4
Study title:.....	4
Funding	4
BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE	5
Aims and Objectives.....	7
METHODS: PARTICIPANTS, INTERVENTIONS, OUTCOMES	8
Study design.....	8
Study setting	8
Participants	8
Inclusion criteria.....	8
Exclusion criteria	8
Recruitment	8
Patient identification	8
Standard recruitment procedure, eligibility and baseline assessment	11
Consent	11
METHODS: ASSIGNMENT OF INTERVENTIONS	12
Randomization scheme.....	12
Blinding	12
Intervention and Treatment as usual	12
Intervention: EMDR	12
Control: Treatment as usual	13
OUTCOMES	13
Primary outcome	13
Secondary outcomes.....	13
METHODS: DATA COLLECTION, MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS	14
Sample size.....	14
Quantitative data collection	14
Qualitative data collection.....	15
Timing of Data Collection (see Schedule of Events and Gantt Chart).....	16
Data Analysis.....	16
Data management	17

METHODS: MONITORING	17
Safety assessments and monitoring	17
Adverse Events (AE)	17
ETHICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS	19
Peer review	19
Insurance.....	19
Sponsorship.....	19
Amendments.....	19
Confidentiality.....	19
Protocol compliance	20
Notification of serious breaches to GCP and/or the protocol	20
Post-trial care.....	20
Reimbursement	20
Patient and public involvement	20
Dissemination policy.....	20
Appendix	22
Schedule of events.....	22
References	23

List of abbreviations

AE	Adverse Event
ARMS	At risk mental state
AWP	Avon & Wiltshire NHS Mental Health Partnership Trust
BRTC	Bristol Randomised Trials Collaboration
CBT	Cognitive Behavioural Therapy
EMDR	Eye-movement desensitisation and reprocessing
PIS	Participant Information Sheet
PTSD	Post-traumatic stress disorder
RCT	Randomised Controlled Trial
REC	Research Ethics Committee
SAE	Serious Adverse Events
TAU	Treatment as usual

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Study title:

A feasibility study of eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR) in people with an at-risk mental state (ARMS) for psychosis

Short title:

Trauma-focused therapy in people at-risk of psychosis

Funding

This study is funded by the University of Bristol's NIHR Biomedical Research Centre (BRC)

BACKGROUND AND RATIONALE

Psychotic illnesses are one of the leading causes of disability with more than 21 million people affected worldwide (World Health Organization, 2017). People with psychotic disorders, such as schizophrenia, experience significant functional impairment and are at greater risk of premature mortality (Saha, Chant, & McGrath, 2007).

The core features of psychotic illnesses are delusions and hallucinations. The onset of psychosis is usually preceded by a prodromal phase which is characterized by a series of non-specific or attenuated psychotic symptoms and behavioural changes. Studies show that about 70% of all patients with psychosis present prodromal symptoms which may last from a few months to 5 years (Hafner et al., 1998; Hafner, Maurer, Loffler, & Riecher-Rossler, 1993; Alison R. Yung, 2007). While the peak age of onset of psychosis is age 20-25, a sharp increase in incidence occurs from about age 15 (Kirkbride et al., 2012).

The most well-known criteria for identifying people with a particularly high risk of developing a psychotic illness (said to have an at-risk mental state (ARMS)) were developed by Yung et al in 2004 (A. R. Yung et al., 2005). The criteria state that to be identified as at high risk, the individual must present at least one of the following:

1. Attenuated psychotic symptoms within the last year, at least a few times per week, lasting for at least one week but no more than 5 years
2. Brief intermittent psychotic symptoms (BLIPS) which remit spontaneously within 7 days
3. Strong genetic vulnerability to psychosis (first degree relatives have a diagnosis of psychotic disorders) accompanied by a decline in psychosocial functioning

Not everybody identified as being at risk will develop psychosis. Approximately 22% of ARMS individuals will make a transition to psychosis within 1 year and 36% of them within 3 years, although transition rates vary over time and with the age of the patient and the treatment received (Fusar-Poli et al., 2012).

Various interventions for the prevention of psychosis have been employed including supportive counselling, CBT, family therapy, intensive community support, omega 3 fatty acids and olanzapine. Despite this there is still limited evidence on the effectiveness of interventions, and reliable recommendations are missing. A recent meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials comparing psychological, pharmacological and nutritional interventions with treatment as usual showed that there is moderate quality evidence for the effectiveness of CBT, very low quality evidence for omega 3 fatty acids and low to very low evidence for integrative therapies in preventing transition to psychosis within a year (Stafford, Jackson, Mayo-Wilson, Morrison, & Kendall, 2013). NICE guidelines currently recommend CBT as a first-line treatment (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2014) for people with ARMS.

Research investigating the environmental risk factors for psychosis show that trauma plays a major role in the development of psychosis (Grubaugh, Zinzow, Paul, Egede, & Frueh, 2011; Morrison, Frame, & Larkin, 2003). Recent meta-analyses (Kraan, Velthorst, Smit, de Haan, &

van der Gaag, 2015; Matheson, Shepherd, Pinchbeck, Laurens, & Carr, 2013) showed that trauma is significantly more prevalent in people with ARMS and people with psychosis than in controls. For example, the mean prevalence of childhood trauma in psychosis high-risk samples is 86.8%, while in people not at high risk it ranged from 42.7 to 60% (Kraan et al., 2015).

It has been suggested that one of the core features of schizophrenia, namely hallucinations, represent a re-living of the traumatic experiences (Morrison et al., 2003). A survey on auditory hallucinations in people with schizophrenia (N = 199) showed that in 39% of the people voices were replays of previous memories. Of these, 23% were identical and 71% were similar replays (McCarthy-Jones et al., 2014). Research into the mechanisms which mediate the relationship between trauma and psychotic symptoms has proposed that poor contextual integration of traumatic memories and high dissociative tendencies may be some of the factors responsible for this association (Geddes, Ehlers, & Freeman, 2016; Steel, 2015).

Post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) symptoms, such as re-experiencing of the traumatic event in the form of flashbacks or nightmares, avoidance of reminders of the trauma and hyper-arousal, are common in psychotic populations, although not always recorded in patients' clinical notes. For example, a systematic review showed that the mean prevalence of undetected PTSD in psychotic populations was 28% (95% CI 19-37%) (Zammit et al., in press). Despite strong evidence showing that trauma is a key factor in the development of psychosis (Hardy, 2017), no studies have yet investigated whether a trauma focused therapy could prevent or at least delay the onset of psychosis in people at high risk.

Eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing (EMDR) is a trauma-focused therapy in which memory representations of traumatic life experiences are processed in order to decrease the distress and change the dysfunctional beliefs related to the traumatic event. This is done through an eight-phase treatment which aims to address past memories, present triggers and future templates. Typically, an EMDR session lasts from 60 to 90 minutes and, depending on trauma severity and life circumstances, treatment is likely to be between 8 and 12 sessions, or more in severe and multiple trauma.

EMDR has a strong evidence base as a trauma-focused therapy and NICE guidelines recommend either EMDR or trauma-focused CBT (TF-CBT) for the treatment of PTSD (National Institute for Health and Care Excellence, 2005). Early meta-analyses comparing the efficacy of CBT versus EMDR in PTSD showed that these therapies yield comparable results (Benish, Imel, & Wampold, 2008; Bisson & Andrew, 2007; Seidler & Wagner, 2006; Watts et al., 2013). More recently it was found that EMDR was slightly superior to trauma-focused CBT on total PTSD symptoms (SMD = -0.43, 95%CI -0.86, -0.01, z=1.00, p=0.05), intrusion and arousal scores, but was comparable to CBT on avoidance symptoms (Chen, Zhang, Hu, & Liang, 2015).

A recent randomized controlled trial comparing EMDR with treatment as usual in patients with chronic psychosis showed that EMDR significantly reduced paranoid delusions post treatment but not auditory hallucinations (de Bont et al., 2016). However, this RCT did not specifically

focus on reducing psychotic symptoms, and as such the EMDR protocol was not tailored for psychotic experiences.

In ARMS populations, a meta-analysis showed that there is limited evidence for the use of CBT in preventing psychosis (Stafford et al., 2013). There was low to moderate quality evidence that CBT had a moderate effect on transition to psychosis at 12 months follow-up (RR 0.64, 95% CI 0.44, 0.93). However, this effect was no longer significant in sensitivity analysis at 18 months follow-up (RR 0.55, 95% CI 0.25, 1.19).

Although EMDR has comparable efficacy to TF-CBT, the two forms of therapy are different. While TF-CBT seeks to directly identify and restructure negative beliefs about the self and the consequences of trauma, EMDR does this indirectly, relying more on the integration of emotional, cognitive, sensory, physical, and contextual information to allow adaptive processing of traumatic memories to occur (though re-structuring of negative beliefs is also a key element of EMDR). Unlike TF-CBT, EMDR does not require patients to give a detailed description of the trauma, which may be distressing for patients, and this may make EMDR more acceptable than TF-CBT in patients with ARMS. In comparison with TF-CBT, EMDR does not involve any homework, which may be more suitable for people with a disorganized lifestyle, such as those with ARMS. Moreover, people with depression have described homework as the most challenging aspect of CBT because it triggered negative memories of school homework and brought back challenges with regards to discrete completion of homework tasks (Barnes et al., 2013). Indeed, studies in ARMS population showed that some patients did not like the homework and the structure of CBT (Addington et al., 2011), and that up to 50% of people with psychosis did not engage with CBT in clinical services (RCPsych, 2014). In light of the evidence showing the impact of trauma in psychosis and the limitations of CBT in people with ARMS, and the effectiveness of EMDR in people with PTSD, it would seem that EMDR might be potentially beneficial to patients with ARMS.

Aims and Objectives

The overarching aim of this study is to establish whether it would be feasible to conduct a large multi-centre RCT to evaluate the clinical and cost-effectiveness of EMDR to prevent the onset of psychosis in people with an at-risk mental state.

Objectives:

- 1) To explore patients' and therapists' views of EMDR as a treatment for ARMS
- 2) To investigate patients' and therapists' views of the study design and study materials
- 3) To estimate the rate of recruitment and retention to inform the large-scale RCT
- 4) To refine the eligibility criteria, screening and recruitment procedures
- 5) To optimize the EMDR protocols and learn about the factors which affect the implementation of EMDR
- 6) To understand what treatment as usual (TAU) consists of for patients with ARMS

METHODS: PARTICIPANTS, INTERVENTIONS, OUTCOMES

Study design

The study consists of a feasibility trial with a nested qualitative study. This is a two-arm randomized feasibility trial where participants will be randomly allocated at the level of the individual either to EMDR or TAU. Outcomes will be collected at 4, 8 and 12 months post-randomization.

Study setting

Recruitment will take place in the Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust. The intervention will be delivered within the Early Intervention Services within the Trust. People who have attenuated symptoms of psychosis are usually referred to these services by their GPs for an initial assessment.

Participants

Inclusion criteria

- Those aged 16 years or over who are at risk of psychosis (as defined in the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States (CAARMS) (A. R. Yung et al., 2005)
- Presence of at least one positive symptom (perceptual abnormality, unusual thought, or non-bizarre ideas) scored ≥ 3 on CAARMS
- History of traumatic experience as defined in ICD-10 F43.1, occurring prior to onset of first positive symptom
- Presence of 1 or more symptoms of re-living, avoidance, hyper-arousal, or cognitive distortions in relation to the traumatic experience (assessed using the PTSD Checklist for DSM-V (PCL5) during the last month (Bovin et al., 2016))

Exclusion criteria

- People with past history of treated or untreated psychotic illness or learning disability
- Current use of antipsychotics
- Currently receiving psychological therapy
- Completed a trauma-focused psychological therapy in the last 2 years
- Insufficient fluency in English
- Lacking mental capacity to provide valid informed consent

Recruitment

Patient identification

Participants will be identified via two routes:

EMDR in ARMS Study Protocol Version 1 (11.01.2018) IRAS ID: 240073

1. Early Intervention services
2. Everybody included

1. *Early intervention services*

The research team will present the project at face-to-face meetings with health professionals from the Early Intervention Teams, within the Avon and Wiltshire Mental Health Partnership NHS Trust (AWP). The researchers will explain the aims and design of the study, and inform clinicians about the study's inclusion/exclusion criteria. Clinicians working in the Early Intervention Services routinely screen people, who have been referred to the service by their GP, for ARMS using the CAARMS tool.

Researchers will identify clinical teams who would be willing to take part in the study and ask them to identify potential participants via three routes: a) during routine clinic appointments, b) invitations by mail sent out by clinicians, and c) invitations by mail sent out by CSO.

a). At the end of the initial consultation, clinicians will introduce the study to patients who have met the ARMS criteria within the past 3 months using a very short information sheet. Those patients willing to hear more about the study will be asked to complete Section 1 of the Expression of Interest (EOI) form, and provide their contact details. Completed EOI forms will then be either collected by researchers or returned to them by fax. On receiving a completed EOI, a member of the research team will phone the individual, describe the study, answer any questions they have and, if the individual is willing to take part, agree a time and place for the researcher to meet with them to complete the eligibility assessment and sign the consent form. Following the telephone call, the researcher will post the individual a full participant information sheet and a letter confirming the time and place that has been agreed. For individuals who agree to meet with the researcher, standard recruitment procedures will be implemented (see the standard recruitment procedures below).

Individuals who do not want to hear more about the study will be asked to complete section 2 of the EOI form, which asks for information on age, gender, reasons for nonparticipation and willingness to take part in a short interview. Those who agree will be interviewed at their earliest convenience. Interviews with decliners will provide valuable information on the acceptability of EMDR and will also highlight concerns and potential misunderstandings about the study. As in previous situations where the ethics committee approved studies which explored patients' reasons for declining to take part in randomised controlled trials (Barnes et al., 2012), this information will help us identify ways to improve recruitment to this study and any future full-scale RCT.

b). Sometimes individuals who are assessed for ARMS are not informed about their diagnosis at the end of the assessment but are sent a letter detailing their diagnosis after this appointment. In this case, in addition to the letter informing individuals of their diagnosis, for those meeting the ARMS criteria, clinicians will also enclose a brief information sheet about the study and an EOI form. On receiving a completed EOI, a member of the research team will telephone individuals who want to hear more about the study, describe the study in more detail and answer any questions they have. As above, following the telephone call, the researcher will post the individual a full participant information sheet and a letter confirming

the time and place that has been agreed. For individuals who agree to meet with the researcher, standard recruitment procedures will be implemented (see the standard recruitment procedure below). Patients who do not reply will be followed up with a phone call by the CSO within a week of receiving the documents. As described under section a), we will also recruit decliners for interview.

c). NIHR Clinical Studies Officers (CSO) will pre-screen patients using the patient record system (RIO) and liaise with the care team about suitable patients. CSO or another member of the clinical team will post suitable patients a cover letter, the EOI and a brief information sheet. A member of the research team will telephone individuals who want to hear more about the study, describe the study in more detail and answer any questions they have. If the individual is willing to take part, a convenient time and place will be agreed to meet with the researcher to complete the eligibility assessment and sign the consent form. Following the telephone call, the researcher will post the individual a full participant information sheet and a letter confirming the time and place that has been agreed. For individuals who agree to meet with the researcher, standard recruitment procedures will be implemented (see the standard recruitment procedure below). Patients who do not reply will be followed up with a phone call by the CSO within a week of receiving the documents. As described under section a), we will also recruit decliners for interview.

2. *“Everyone included” within AWP*

‘Everyone Included’ is a standard approach to research in AWP, whereby service users are routinely informed about relevant research opportunities by post, unless individuals have expressed a preference not to receive such information. As is standard practice, potential participants will be identified via an automated search of the electronic patient record system (RIO) based on the study’s inclusion/exclusion criteria. The search will be authorized and requested by a member of AWP Research and Development (R&D), who are part of the clinical team and conducted by information analysts within AWP.

The AWP R&D department will send a ‘Research Opportunity Letter’ on behalf of the research team to potential participants briefly explaining what this study is about and what it involves. The ‘Research Opportunity Letter’ will be reviewed by independent members of the Everyone Included Review Panel (includes service users, carers, clinicians and researchers), who decide whether the study is appropriate.

The letter does not contain any disclosing information (e.g. personal references to diagnosis) and invites individuals to make contact with the Everyone Included team if they are interested in participating. The letter explains how to contact the Everyone Included team (by post using a free post reply slip) and is signed by the Director of Research & Development. If individuals do not respond, nothing further will happen. If they respond, their expression of interest form will be passed to the research team, who will contact potential participants via their preferred method of communication and provide them with full information about the study via the Participant Information Sheet. This will be followed up with a phone call within a week of receiving the documents. If individuals agree to meet with the researcher, standard recruitment procedures will be implemented (see below).

Standard recruitment procedure, eligibility and baseline assessment

Individuals interested in taking part will be invited to a face-to-face appointment with a researcher to establish eligibility, answer questions about participation, and seek written informed consent.

In order to establish eligibility for the study, patients will be asked to complete the following scales:

- The Life-events Checklist for DSM-5 (Gray, Litz, Hsu, & Lombardo, 2004)
- The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire (Bernstein & Fink, 1998)
- The PTSD Checklist for DSM-5 (PCL5) (Bovin et al., 2016)

In addition to completing these questionnaires, patients recruited via the Everyone Included route who have not been seen by a clinician for more than a month, will also be administered the CAARMS tool to establish eligibility for the study. The CAARMS tool will be administered by clinical staff and CSOs.

Those who are eligible will be asked for written informed consent for their participation in the trial. Those consenting will be asked to provide details of their sociodemographic data (education, occupation, home ownership) and baseline data will be collected using the following quantitative measures:

- Severity of psychotic symptoms: the Positive and Negative Symptoms Scale (PANSS) (Kay, Fiszbein, & Opler, 1987), the Positive Symptom Rating Scale (PSYRAT) (Haddock, McCarron, Tarrier, & Faragher, 1999), and the Community Assessment of Psychotic Experiences (CAPE-42) (Stefanis et al., 2002)
- Severity of depression and anxiety: the Patient Health questionnaire (PHQ-9) for depression (Kroenke, Spitzer, & Williams, 2001) and the Generalized Anxiety Disorder Questionnaire (GAD-7) for anxiety (Spitzer, Kroenke, Williams, & Lowe, 2006)
- Impaired functioning: Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS) (Mundt, Marks, Shear, & Greist, 2002)
- Health status: EQ-5D-5L (Herdman et al., 2011)
- Drug use: The Drug Abuse Screening Test (DAST 10) (Skinner, 1982)

Data will also be collected on medication use via self-report measures.

Individuals who do not meet the inclusion criteria will be thanked for their time and interest in the study, and will be explained why the study is not suitable for them.

Consent

The process of consenting young people (16 and 17 years old) to this study will follow the DoH Reference Guide to Consent and the GMC Guidelines, which provide the guide that all health professionals need to take into account in obtaining consent. Although young people may be more vulnerable than adults, they are presumed to be able to give consent to their treatment, similarly to adults. As for adults, if young people decline to take part in the study their decision

will be fully respected and accepted.

Researcher will make clear that participants have the right to withdraw from the study at any point without giving any reasons. However, it will also be mentioned that should they choose to withdraw, any feedback on their experiences in study participation would be greatly appreciated as this will inform research team on future design of the full-scale RCT.

METHODS: ASSIGNMENT OF INTERVENTIONS

Randomization scheme

Consented patients will be randomized to one of the two groups: 1) EMDR or 2) TAU. Randomization will take place by means of a remote automated telephone service administered by the Bristol Randomised Trials Collaboration (BRTC). This will ensure that allocations are concealed from the recruiting researcher. Randomization will be minimized by psychotic symptom severity and patients will be categorized based on the positive symptoms of CAARMS (i.e, sum of Unusual Thoughts, Non-Bizarre Ideas, and Perceptual Abnormalities Global Ratings scales), with cut-off at 11 on this scale. Participants will be notified of their group allocation within 48 hours of the baseline assessment.

Blinding

The main outcome of the study is transition to psychosis at 1 year follow-up. The diagnosis of psychotic illness during the follow-up period will be made by the clinical team. Although independent of the study, it may be that clinicians who assess and diagnose people in the follow-up period will not be blind to patients' treatment allocation in the study. To avoid bias in outcome measurement, researchers extracting data on psychotic illness diagnosis from clinical records will be blind to patients' treatment allocation. We will judge the success of blinding by asking researchers extracting data to record whether they thought the participant was allocated to EMDR or TAU therapy.

Intervention and Treatment as usual

Intervention: EMDR

Patients allocated to this arm of the study will receive up to 12 sessions of manualized, weekly, face-to-face EMDR therapy (Logie et al, 2016). Each session will last approximately 90 minutes.

Therapeutic sessions will take place at the Early Intervention Services. The first 2-4 sessions of EMDR focus on establishing the therapeutic alliance, preparation for EMDR and stabilization techniques, assessment and identification of targets, cognitions, emotions and bodily sensations. The following 8-10 sessions will focus on desensitisation, installation of positive cognitions and body scan for past, present and future stressful situations.

Treatment has been manualized by clinicians from the Lancaster NHS Trust and individualized to target psychotic symptoms. Therapeutic sessions will be delivered by EMDR UK & Europe trained therapists who will receive training based on the Lancaster manual for the study. All EMDR therapists will have at least one year of experience, and monthly supervision with an EMDR consultant will be in place. Written permission will be sought for recording therapeutic sessions. 10% of the sessions will be randomly sampled for fidelity and evaluated by accredited EMDR therapists independent of the study, using the EMDR fidelity checklist (Leeds et al, 2016).

Control: Treatment as usual

Treatment as usual in Early Intervention Services is quite heterogeneous and it consists of discharge back to the referrer, sign-posting to other services, CBT, family therapy, psycho-education and non-specific support. Trauma-focused therapy is not part of TAU in people at high risk of psychosis.

Given the heterogeneity of TAU, one of the objectives of this feasibility study is to establish with more precision what standard care is for people with ARMS in the Early Intervention Services. It may be that if TAU is very different across intervention teams the future RCT will need to standardize/restrict it to a single form of treatment in order to aid data interpretation.

OUTCOMES

The primary outcome is transition to psychosis which will be assessed at 12 months post-randomization from clinical records or, if patients have dropped out of EIS, researchers will invite participants for an appointment where it will be established whether they transitioned to psychosis. The secondary outcomes are severity of psychotic symptoms, PTSD, depression, anxiety, impaired functioning, health status and medication use which will be assessed at baseline, 4, 8 and 12 months post-randomization. Resource use will be assessed at 4, 8 and 12 months post randomization. There will be face-to-face appointments and data will be collected by the research team.

Primary outcome

- Transition to psychosis: ICD-10 diagnosis of psychotic disorder from clinical records or via the CAARMS

Secondary outcomes

- Severity of psychotic symptoms: PANSS, PSYRAT and CAPE-42
- Severity of PTSD symptoms: PCL-5
- Severity of depression and anxiety: PHQ-9 and GAD-7
- Impaired functioning: Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS)
- Health status: EQ-5D-L

- Drug use: DAST 10
- Medication use
- Resource data use – we will ask questions about resource use including information on: a) use of primary care and community care services (GP visits, use of community health care services), b) secondary care services (number of out-patient visits, reason for visit; inpatient admissions, length of stay and reason), c) use of social services and disability payments received, d) time off school or work, d) personal expenditure (private healthcare and therapies, over-the-counter medication, travel costs associated with health visits); productivity loss due to time off work or study.

METHODS: DATA COLLECTION, MANAGEMENT AND ANALYSIS

Sample size

Forty patients with ARMS will be recruited and randomly allocated to EMDR or TAU (20 in each arm). Sample size was informed by literature guidelines (Teare et al, 2014) and pragmatic reasons concerning potential difficulties accessing this population. We are proposing to collect data on outcomes that will be used to design a future RCT. This feasibility study will not be powered to detect important clinical differences between EMDR and TAU groups but such a number would provide estimates of the completion and retention rates that would further assist in planning the recruitment for a future RCT.

For example, if 70% of those randomized to EMDR complete the intervention, the 95% confidence intervals would be 45% and 88%. Similarly, if 75% of those randomised are followed up to 1 year, the 95% confidence intervals for the retention rate would be 58% and 87%. We estimate that there will be approximately 143 patients with ARMS referred to EI services in AWP over the study recruitment period (13 months). A recently conducted scoping study in AWP showed that 24 out of 30 referrals (80%) to the EI services had a history of trauma occurring prior to the onset of their psychotic experiences. Based on this and previous reports in the literature, we estimate that 75% of ARMS patients are likely to be eligible for the study. Of these, based on recruitment rates from psychological therapy trials in ARMS patients, we estimate that 50% of eligible patients will be willing to take part, allowing recruitment to be completed in 13 months.

Quantitative data collection

Data will be collected via clinician-rated measures administered face-to-face by clinicians, researchers or CRNs, self-report questionnaires, and electronic clinical record searches. Registers will be consulted for transition to psychosis purposes and also to collect data on TAU among people at risk of psychosis in AWP. This information will assist with the planning

of future RCT.

The primary outcome is transition to psychosis and it will be assessed at 12 months post-randomization as follows:

- Transition to psychosis: ICD-10 diagnosis of psychotic disorder from clinical records or, if patients have dropped out of EIS, researchers will invite them for an appointment where via the CAARMS it will be established whether they transitioned to psychosis

The secondary outcomes are severity of psychotic symptoms, PTSD, depression, anxiety, impaired functioning, health status and medication use which will be assessed at baseline, 4, 8 and 12 months post-randomization as follows:

- Severity of psychotic symptoms: interviewer rated via the PANSS and the PSYRAT, and self-reported using the CAPE-42
- Severity of PTSD symptoms: self-reported using the PCL-5
- Severity of depression and anxiety: self-reported using the PHQ-9 and the GAD-7
- Impaired functioning: Work and Social Adjustment Scale (WSAS)
- Health status: self-reported EQ-5D
- Medication use: medical records and self-reported

Resource use data will be collected at 4, 8 and 12 months post-randomization as follows:

- Resource use data: we will ask questions about resource use including information on: a) use of primary care and community care services (GP visits, use of community health care services), b) secondary care services (number of out-patient visits, reason for visit; inpatient admissions, length of stay and reason), c) use of social services and disability payments received, d) time off school or work, d) personal expenditure (private healthcare and therapies, over-the-counter medication, travel costs associated with health visits); productivity loss due to time off work or study.

Baseline and follow-up assessments will be conducted face-to-face at the Early Intervention Services or at participants' homes. If the appointment takes place at people's homes, researchers will abide by the lone workers policy within the University of Bristol. The eligibility/baseline assessment session will last about 90 minutes, and each follow-up session will last about 60 minutes. Data will be collected by the research team. Assessors at 4, 8, and 12 months follow-up will be blinded to treatment allocation. Success of blinding will be evaluated at each assessment.

Qualitative data collection

We will conduct in-depth individual interviews with all the therapists who deliver EMDR in the study and with most of the study participants (20 EMDR intervention, 10 TAU). Up to 10 "decliners" will be interviewed. To encourage participation, and because well-planned interviews can gather the same material as those conducted face-to-face (Sturges et al, 2004), therapists, study participants and decliners will be given the choice of being interviewed in

person or over the telephone.

Therapists will be interviewed after they have finished delivering the intervention within the study. The interviews will explore their views and experiences of delivering EMDR to patients with ARMS, how they think this treatment could be better tailored to this patient group, and what support, training and resources they think therapists would need if the intervention was evaluated in a large scale RCT. The interviews will also be used to explore their views of the training and supervision they received, and their views on the study materials and the design of a future RCT. The interviews will last up to an hour.

Interviews with patients who completed treatment or stopped early will explore patients' views and experiences of the treatment received (EMDR or TAU), identify how treatment delivery could be refined to increase its acceptability, and learn how study materials and procedures could be improved. People who completed the study will be interviewed within a month of completing their 4-month follow-up measures, and those who stopped early will be interviewed within a month of doing so in order to minimize difficulties with recall. The interviews will last up to an hour.

Interviews with 'decliners' will be conducted at patients' earliest convenience (see the Standard recruitment, eligibility and baseline assessment section). Interviews will explore decliner's views of the study and EMDR, and their reasons for declining to take part. This will help us identify way to improve recruitment to this study and any future full-scale RCT. These interviews will last about 15 minutes. They will be conducted early on in the study, as their findings may indicate how the patient information sheets or recruitment process for the feasibility study could be modified to improve recruitment.

Topic guides will be developed for each set of interviews, to ensure consistency across data collection. The therapist and study participant guides will be developed in parallel to ensure key areas are discussed with both practitioners and patients. This will allow their views to be triangulated, increasing the confidence with which study conclusions can be drawn. With interviewee consent, the interviews will be audio-recorded and fully transcribed.

[Timing of Data Collection \(see Schedule of Events and Gantt Chart\)](#)

Data Analysis

All interviews will be fully transcribed and anonymised. Two researchers will independently read and code samples of patient and therapist interviews. The codes and themes identified will be discussed and three preliminary coding frames developed. Where possible, similar codes will be used for the three datasets, as this will assist with triangulation of patients' and therapists' views. After agreeing on the coding frames, transcripts will be uploaded to NVivo and coded electronically. Data for each code will be summarized in tables, and codes for each dataset grouped under themes. Comparisons within and across data sets will be made.

Quantitative data will be analysed in Stata. For this feasibility study, we will calculate: (1) the

proportion of patients with ARMS consenting to take part in the study; (2) the proportion completing the baseline assessment and entering the randomised phase; (3) for those in the intervention group, the number of EMDR sessions attended and the proportion completing 8 or more sessions; (4) the proportion completing follow-up assessments at 4, 8 and 1 year post-randomisation. Feasibility outcomes such as recruitment and retention rates will be calculated with 95% confidence intervals using the exact binomial method. We will also compare the primary outcome - proportion of individuals who transition to psychosis at one year – between groups, and the confidence intervals for the effect size will be calculated to assist the planning of the future RCT. We will also compare continuous outcomes such as the severity of psychotic symptoms, depression, anxiety, PTSD symptoms and quality of life to show the frequency of data completion, mean and standard deviation for the two groups.

Data management

Completed questionnaires will be stored securely in compliance with University of Bristol Data Security policies and the Data Protection Act 1998. All data will be entered onto a secure database by a member of the research team. Personal details and administrative data will be entered onto a secure database held on the University of Bristol server, and non-identifiable data will be entered onto a secure web-based database (REDCap) via a secure internet link maintained by University of Bristol Information Services. The Clinical Trials Unit (BRTC) database team will develop and set-up the databases.

Data collected on paper or questionnaires will be identifiable only by Patient Identification Number (PIN). This data will be stored in a secure locked cabinet in a locked room with limited access. Information capable of identifying individuals will be held on the database with passwords restricted to authorised study staff only.

METHODS: MONITORING

Safety assessments and monitoring

Adverse Events (AE)

In this study we will use the recommendations for defining and reporting adverse events and harm as outlined by Parry, Crawford and Duggan (2016).

An Adverse Event refers to:

- A significant episode during or shortly after treatment (e.g. suicide, suicide attempts, mental health related hospital admissions) which if related to or directly caused by treatment amount to harm or severe harm
- A sustained and clinically significant deterioration i.e. a worsened mental state after therapy is complete, which can include the emergence of new symptoms.
- A report of a negative experience of the EMDR sessions and perceived harm on the part of the participant when interviewed for the nested qualitative study.

Serious Adverse Events (SAE)

A serious adverse event is any untoward occurrence that:

- Results in death
- Is life-threatening
- Requires hospitalisation or prolongation of existing hospitalisation
- Results in persistent or significant disability or incapacity
- Anything the investigator deems to be of clinical significance

This study will monitor closely any serious adverse events which may occur whilst patients participate in the trial.

Participants, researchers and clinical staff should notify any adverse event which they believe may have occurred as a result of the trial intervention or the research process. On notification of such an adverse event which may be related to the research process or intervention, a researcher or member of site staff should complete an adverse event report form within 5 working days, paying specific attention to information regarding the nature and timescale of events i.e. when the event started, were there any specific changes to medication or behaviour preceding the event. Further information should be requested from the participant, clinical team or GP as necessary. A completed form should be securely sent to the Chief Investigator for review and assessment of relatedness and expectedness as follows:

1. Confirmation of seriousness (whether the adverse event is an AE or SAE)
2. Causality – i.e. relatedness of the event to the study intervention, according the following definitions:

Unrelated – where an event is not considered to be related to the study intervention

Possibly – although a relationship to the study intervention cannot be completely ruled out, the nature of the event, the patient's underlying condition, concomitant medication or temporal relationship make other explanations possible

Probably – the temporal relationship and absence of a more likely explanation suggest the event could be related to the study intervention

Definitely – Known effects of the study intervention suggest that study intervention is the most likely cause.

3. Expectedness of the event. Is the event an anticipated event even if the research had not been taking place?

Serious Adverse Event reporting

All SAEs will be reported to the Chief Investigator within 24 hours of awareness of the SAE. All SAEs that occur in relation to the intervention must be recorded, together with data including date of onset and resolution, outcome, severity and causality for the intervention.

All SAEs of a related and unexpected nature will require onward reporting to the main REC, and this will be facilitated by the Chief Investigator, in accordance with any procedures of the Sponsor.

Related and unexpected SAEs will be immediately reported to the Sponsor. In addition, all investigators will be notified, and the TSC will be notified in accordance with Sponsor procedures and timeframe. SAEs which after review are not thought to be treatment related will be brought to the TSC's attention at their next scheduled meeting. The numbers and details of AEs and SAEs will be reported to the Trial Management Group and Trial Steering Committee regularly.

ETHICAL AND REGULATORY CONSIDERATIONS

Peer review

This study has been reviewed by the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre.

Approval will be sought from NHS REC and HRA. Confirmation of Capacity and Capability will be sought from Avon and Wiltshire Partnership NHS Trust.

Insurance

The University of Bristol has arranged Public Liability insurance to cover the legal liability of the University as Research Sponsor in the eventuality of harm to a research participant arising from management of the research by the University.

Sponsorship

University of Bristol will act as a sponsor for the study.

Amendments

Protocol amendments will be presented to the Study Steering Committee for consideration and will be implemented only when approved by the NHS Research Ethics Committee.

Confidentiality

Consented patients will be assigned a Participant Identification Number (PIN) which will help researchers to identify patients throughout the study without disclosing patient identity. PINs will replace personal identifiable data in all research related documents. Any personally identifiable information (consent forms) and PIN allocation will be kept separately from the collected data and will be stored securely in a place with limited access. Any personally identifiable information will be transferred from the NHS to the University on an encrypted USB or digitally via nhs.net.

Audio recordings of interviews will be password protected. Audio recordings of therapeutic sessions will be taken from NHS premises only via secure electronic means or encrypted

USBs, and destroyed immediately once the supervision is completed. All local databases are password protected.

Protocol compliance

Protocol deviations will be clearly documented and reported to the Sponsor (see the Standard Operating Procedures around patient safety)

Notification of serious breaches to GCP and/or the protocol

The sponsor will be notified immediately of any situation where a breach to the protocol has taken place. The sponsor will further notify the licensing authority in writing of any serious breach of the protocol within 7 days of becoming aware of the breach.

Post-trial care

EMDR therapists working in the EI services may provide EMDR therapy to participants who took part in the study as part of TAU provided there are available resources to do so.

Reimbursement

Participants will be reimbursed for their travel expenses incurred for the three follow-up assessments. Participants will also be offered £10 as a thank you for their time at each follow-up assessment.

Patient and public involvement

Public and patient involvement (PPI) played an important role in this study. This research idea was initially presented in February 2016 at a PPI event which gathered together people with lived experiences of psychosis, their carers, clinicians, academics, commissioners, and service providers. Further on, this idea was presented at the Hearing Voices Network, a support group for people who hear voices and their families.

Service users have given important feedback on the research questions, recruitment strategies, and the measures used in this study. PPI will continue to be a key component of the feasibility study. In particular, we anticipate that the PPI group will: (i) ensure that the views of patients who have had a psychotic illness are heard at every stage of the study; (ii) inform any developments of the intervention to make sure these are acceptable to the target population, (iii) ensure patient documentation is easy to understand to maximise response and retention rates; and (iv) help interpret and disseminate study findings among patients and the public. PPI involvement will also benefit this research by ensuring that the study's protocol meets the needs and expectations of individuals at high risk of, or with psychosis.

Dissemination policy

The results of this study will be disseminated through publications and conferences. Findings from this feasibility trial will be published in psychiatry journals compliant with NIHR Open

Access policy. The results of this trial will also be presented at relevant conferences such as the Royal College of Psychiatrists International Congress, the UK Psychological Trauma Society Conference and the IEPA Early Intervention in Mental Health Annual Conference.

The findings of the protocol will also be presented to clinical staff at one of the quarterly Early Intervention Services Network meetings, and to the Trauma Clinical Network and the Psychological Therapies Service within AWP NHS Trust. The results of this trial will also be presented at the Bristol Health Partners Psychosis Health Integration Team annual meeting, which is attended by people who experience psychosis and their families, academics, mental health professionals, commissioners and service providers. Findings will also be presented to relevant Clinical Commissioning Groups.

The PPI group will assist with disseminating findings to their own contacts including the Early Intervention Service users group, and the Hearing Voices Network. Findings will also be sent to patients and therapist who took part in the study.

Appendix

Schedule of events

Activity/Event	Completed by	Baseline	4 months follow-up	8 months follow-up	12 months follow-up
Screening for ARMS	Clinician				
Eligibility Assessment	R or CRN				
Informed Consent	R or CRN	√			
Demographics	P	√			
The Life-Events Checklist	P	√			
The Childhood Trauma Questionnaire	P	√			
CAPE-42	P	√	√	√	√
CAARMS	Clinician or R or CRN	√			√
PANSS	R or CRN	√	√	√	√
PSYRAT	R or CRN	√	√	√	√
PCL-5	P	√	√	√	√
PHQ-9	P	√	√	√	√
GAD-7	P	√	√	√	√
WSAS	P	√	√	√	√
EQ-5D-5L	P	√	√	√	√
Medication use	P	√	√	√	√
Qualitative Interview	R		√		
Adverse events	P, R, CRN		√	√	√

C = Clinicians; R = Researcher; CRN=Clinical Research Network; P=Participant

References

- Addington, J., Epstein, I., Liu, L., French, P., Boydell, K. M., & Zipursky, R. B. (2011). A randomized controlled trial of cognitive behavioral therapy for individuals at clinical high risk of psychosis. *Schizophr Res*, *125*(1), 54-61. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2010.10.015
- Barnes, M., Sherlock, S., Thomas, L., Kessler, D., Kuyken, W., Owen-Smith, A., . . . Turner, K. (2013). No pain, no gain: depressed clients' experiences of cognitive behavioural therapy. *Br J Clin Psychol*, *52*(4), 347-364. doi:10.1111/bjc.12021
- Barnes, M., Wiles, N., Morrison, J., Kessler, D., Williams, C., Kuyken, W., . . . Turner, K. (2012). Exploring patients' reasons for declining contact in a cognitive behavioural therapy randomised controlled trial in primary care. *Br J Gen Pract*, *62*(598), e371-377. doi:10.3399/bjgp12X641492
- Benish, S. G., Imel, Z. E., & Wampold, B. E. (2008). The relative efficacy of bona fide psychotherapies for treating post-traumatic stress disorder: a meta-analysis of direct comparisons. *Clin Psychol Rev*, *28*(5), 746-758. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2007.10.005
- Bernstein, D. P., & Fink, L. (1998). *Childhood Trauma Questionnaire: A retrospective self-report manual*. San Antonio: TX: The Psychological Corporation.
- Bisson, J., & Andrew, M. (2007). Psychological treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*(3), Cd003388. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD003388.pub3
- Bovin, M. J., Marx, B. P., Weathers, F. W., Gallagher, M. W., Rodriguez, P., Schnurr, P. P., & Keane, T. M. (2016). Psychometric properties of the PTSD Checklist for Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders-Fifth Edition (PCL-5) in veterans. *Psychol Assess*, *28*(11), 1379-1391. doi:10.1037/pas0000254
- Chen, L., Zhang, G., Hu, M., & Liang, X. (2015). Eye movement desensitization and reprocessing versus cognitive-behavioral therapy for adult posttraumatic stress disorder: systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Nerv Ment Dis*, *203*(6), 443-451. doi:10.1097/NMD.0000000000000306
- de Bont, P. A., van den Berg, D. P., van der Vleugel, B. M., de Roos, C., de Jongh, A., van der Gaag, M., & van Minnen, A. M. (2016). Prolonged exposure and EMDR for PTSD v. a PTSD waiting-list condition: effects on symptoms of psychosis, depression and social functioning in patients with chronic psychotic disorders. *Psychol Med*, *46*(11), 2411-2421. doi:10.1017/S0033291716001094
- Fusar-Poli, P., Bonoldi, I., Yung, A. R., Borgwardt, S., Kempton, M. J., Valmaggia, L., . . . McGuire, P. (2012). Predicting psychosis: meta-analysis of transition outcomes in individuals at high clinical risk. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, *69*(3), 220-229. doi:10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2011.1472
- Geddes, G., Ehlers, A., & Freeman, D. (2016). Hallucinations in the months after a trauma: An investigation of the role of cognitive processing of a physical assault in the occurrence of hallucinatory experiences. *Psychiatry Res*, *246*, 601-605. doi:10.1016/j.psychres.2016.10.081
- Gray, M. J., Litz, B. T., Hsu, J. L., & Lombardo, T. W. (2004). Psychometric properties of the life events checklist. *Assessment*, *11*(4), 330-341. doi:10.1177/1073191104269954
- Grubaugh, A. L., Zinzow, H. M., Paul, L., Egede, L. E., & Frueh, B. C. (2011). Trauma exposure and posttraumatic stress disorder in adults with severe mental illness: a critical review. *Clin Psychol Rev*, *31*(6), 883-899. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2011.04.003
- Haddock, G., McCarron, J., Tarrier, N., & Faragher, E. B. (1999). Scales to measure dimensions of hallucinations and delusions: the psychotic symptom rating scales (PSYRATS). *Psychol Med*, *29*(4), 879-889.

- Hafner, H., Maurer, K., Loffler, W., an der Heiden, W., Munk-Jorgensen, P., Hambrecht, M., & Riecher-Rossler, A. (1998). The ABC Schizophrenia Study: a preliminary overview of the results. *Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol*, 33(8), 380-386.
- Hafner, H., Maurer, K., Loffler, W., & Riecher-Rossler, A. (1993). The influence of age and sex on the onset and early course of schizophrenia. *Br J Psychiatry*, 162, 80-86.
- Hardy, A. (2017). Pathways from Trauma to Psychotic Experiences: A Theoretically Informed Model of Posttraumatic Stress in Psychosis. *Front Psychol*, 8, 697. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00697
- Herdman, M., Gudex, C., Lloyd, A., Janssen, M., Kind, P., Parkin, D., . . . Badia, X. (2011). Development and preliminary testing of the new five-level version of EQ-5D (EQ-5D-5L). *Qual Life Res*, 20(10), 1727-1736. doi:10.1007/s11136-011-9903-x
- Kay, S. R., Fiszbein, A., & Opler, L. A. (1987). The positive and negative syndrome scale (PANSS) for schizophrenia. *Schizophr Bull*, 13(2), 261-276.
- Kirkbride, J. B., Errazuriz, A., Croudace, T. J., Morgan, C., Jackson, D., Boydell, J., . . . Jones, P. B. (2012). Incidence of schizophrenia and other psychoses in England, 1950-2009: a systematic review and meta-analyses. *PLoS One*, 7(3), e31660. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0031660
- Kraan, T., Velthorst, E., Smit, F., de Haan, L., & van der Gaag, M. (2015). Trauma and recent life events in individuals at ultra high risk for psychosis: review and meta-analysis. *Schizophr Res*, 161(2-3), 143-149. doi:10.1016/j.schres.2014.11.026
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. L., & Williams, J. B. (2001). The PHQ-9: validity of a brief depression severity measure. *J Gen Intern Med*, 16(9), 606-613.
- Matheson, S. L., Shepherd, A. M., Pinchbeck, R. M., Laurens, K. R., & Carr, V. J. (2013). Childhood adversity in schizophrenia: a systematic meta-analysis. *Psychol Med*, 43(2), 225-238. doi:10.1017/S0033291712000785
- McCarthy-Jones, S., Trauer, T., Mackinnon, A., Sims, E., Thomas, N., & Copolov, D. L. (2014). A new phenomenological survey of auditory hallucinations: evidence for subtypes and implications for theory and practice. *Schizophr Bull*, 40(1), 231-235. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbs156
- Morrison, A. P., Frame, L., & Larkin, W. (2003). Relationships between trauma and psychosis: a review and integration. *Br J Clin Psychol*, 42(Pt 4), 331-353. doi:10.1348/014466503322528892
- Mundt, J. C., Marks, I. M., Shear, M. K., & Greist, J. H. (2002). The Work and Social Adjustment Scale: a simple measure of impairment in functioning. *Br J Psychiatry*, 180, 461-464.
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2005). Post-traumatic stress disorder: management. Retrieved from <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg26>
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2014). Psychosis and schizophrenia in adults: prevention and management. Retrieved from <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg178/chapter/1-recommendations#preventing-psychosis-2>
- RCPsych. (2014). Report of the Second Round of the National Audit of Schizophrenia (NAST). Retrieved from <http://www.rcpsych.ac.uk/workinpsychiatry/qualityimprovement/nationalclinicalaudits/nationalschizophreniaaudit/reports.aspx>
- Saha, S., Chant, D., & McGrath, J. (2007). A systematic review of mortality in schizophrenia: is the differential mortality gap worsening over time? *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 64(10), 1123-1131. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.64.10.1123
- Seidler, G. H., & Wagner, F. E. (2006). Comparing the efficacy of EMDR and trauma-focused cognitive-behavioral therapy in the treatment of PTSD: a meta-analytic study. *Psychological Medicine*, 36(11). doi:10.1017/s0033291706007963
- Skinner, H. A. (1982). The drug abuse screening test. *Addict Behav*, 7(4), 363-371.

- Spitzer, R. L., Kroenke, K., Williams, J. B., & Lowe, B. (2006). A brief measure for assessing generalized anxiety disorder: the GAD-7. *Arch Intern Med*, 166(10), 1092-1097. doi:10.1001/archinte.166.10.1092
- Stafford, M. R., Jackson, H., Mayo-Wilson, E., Morrison, A. P., & Kendall, T. (2013). Early interventions to prevent psychosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ*, 346, f185. doi:10.1136/bmj.f185
- Steel, C. (2015). Hallucinations as a trauma-based memory: implications for psychological interventions. *Front Psychol*, 6, 1262. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01262
- Stefanis, N. C., Hanssen, M., Smirnis, N. K., Avramopoulos, D. A., Evdokimidis, I. K., Stefanis, C. N., . . . Van Os, J. (2002). Evidence that three dimensions of psychosis have a distribution in the general population. *Psychol Med*, 32(2), 347-358.
- Watts, B. V., Schnurr, P. P., Mayo, L., Young-Xu, Y., Weeks, W. B., & Friedman, M. J. (2013). Meta-analysis of the efficacy of treatments for posttraumatic stress disorder. *J Clin Psychiatry*, 74(6), e541-550. doi:10.4088/JCP.12r08225
- World Health Organization. (2017). Schizophrenia. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/mental_health/management/schizophrenia/en/
- Yung, A. R. (2007). Identification and treatment of the prodromal phase of psychotic disorders: perspectives from the PACE Clinic. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*, 1(3), 224-235. doi:10.1111/j.1751-7893.2007.00033.x
- Yung, A. R., Yuen, H. P., McGorry, P. D., Phillips, L. J., Kelly, D., Dell'Olio, M., . . . Buckby, J. (2005). Mapping the onset of psychosis: the Comprehensive Assessment of At-Risk Mental States. *Aust N Z J Psychiatry*, 39(11-12), 964-971. doi:10.1080/j.1440-1614.2005.01714.x
- Zammit, S., Lewis, C., Dawson, S., Colley, H., McCann, H., Piekarski, A., . . . Bisson, J. (in press). Systematic review of undetected post-traumatic stress disorder in secondary care mental health services. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*.