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ABSTRACT

This is a protocol for a Cochrane Review (Intervention). The objectives are as follows:

To assess the effects of psychological interventions designed to improve adherence to disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) in adults with multiple sclerosis (MS) in terms of adherence. This will be considered in relation to levels of adherence in a comparison group.

Secondary objectives are to assess the impact of interventions on potential predictors of adherence such as motivation, self-efficacy beliefs and healthcare engagement to DMTs adherence.

BACKGROUND

Description of the condition

Among the autoimmune diseases of the central nervous system (CNS), multiple sclerosis (MS) is the most common inflammatory neurologic disease among young and middle-aged adults. MS is caused by a complex array of genetic and environmental factors that contribute to an increased prevalence among females born in temperate climates (Courtney 2009). Patients typically present with a relapsing-remitting course of the disease that is characterised by periodic exacerbations, followed by recovery and stretches of relative stability (Lublin 1996). Eventually, most patients convert to a secondary progressive course that is characterised by a gradual accumulation of disability (Confavreux 2006). Lifespan is minimally impacted in MS; however, the disease contributes to physical, emotional, and cognitive symptoms that substantially reduce participants’ overall quality of life (Amato 2001; Benedict 2005). Although there is no cure for MS, several disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) have been shown to reduce the number and severity of exacerbations.
of exacerbations, as well as slow disease progression and improve quality of life (Castro-Borrero 2012; Kieseier 2008). DMTs represent a broad class of drugs that are designed to alter immune system functioning, reduce the occurrence of MS relapses and slow disease progression. Different therapies are available for the treatment of multiple sclerosis including immunosuppressants, immunomodulators, and monoclonal antibodies. The benefits of therapy are preventive and not directly observed by patients. Randomised trials show that DMTs contribute to a 33% to 68% reduction in relapse rates, a 35% to 83% reduction in new central nervous system lesion activity, and up to a 50% reduction in disability progression (Bosch-Capblanch 2007; Freedman 2008; Goodin 2008; Johnson 2009; Linker 2008). A recent study showed that DMTs significantly decreased new cortical lesion development and cortical atrophy progression compared with untreated patients, with faster and more pronounced effects seen with subcutaneous interferon (IFN) beta-1a than with intramuscular IFN beta-1a or glatiramer acetate (GA) (Calabrese 2012). Absolute risk reductions for MS exacerbations range from 11% to 43% with the average number of patients needed to treat to prevent one exacerbation ranging from two to nine (Zakaria 2015).

Natalizumab and IFNβ-1 are superior to all other treatments for preventing clinical relapses and disability progression in the short term (24 months) in people with relapsing-remitting MS (RRMS). The IFNβ-1b (Betaseron), GA, and mitoxantrone are also effective, with moderate-quality data, for preventing relapse and disability progression in RRMS in the short term (Filippini 2013). Another recent Cochrane review assessing the benefits and the extent of adverse events associated with 15 disease-modifying drugs showed that alemtuzumab, natalizumab, and fingolimod are more effective than other drugs for preventing relapses (Tramacere 2015). For preventing irreversible disability worsening in the short term (24 months), only natalizumab shows a beneficial effect on the basis of moderate-quality evidence. Despite evidence of efficacy for natalizumab, participants must also confront the possibility of more severe adverse events (SAE), including the risk of death due to progressive multifocal leukoencephalopathy (PML). Other SAE including thrombosis of the jugular vein and allergic reactions leading to treatment discontinuation were found in some studies. However, the treatments for which information on SAEs were available included in this review were associated with a statistically non-significant higher proportion of people with at least one SAE compared with placebo (Tramacere 2015).

Unfortunately, typical of many chronic diseases, a near majority of people with MS may not receive the benefits of the DMTs due to poor adherence (Bruce 2011), which can take many forms. People with MS may disregard their healthcare providers’ recommendations, discontinue treatments prematurely, miss doses, or have difficulty following treatment instructions. Several actuarial research studies suggest that between 30% and 50% of people with MS prematurely discontinue their DMTs (Giovannoni 2012; Reynolds 2010; Tan 2011; Wong 2011). Moreover, among people who continue to take DMTs, a fifth may miss more than 20% of their prescribed doses (Bruce 2010a). As a result, these people have an increased risk of experiencing exacerbations, new brain lesions, and worsening disability (Freedman 2008).

Relatively little research has examined factors that contribute to poor DMT adherence in MS, but researchers have argued that people with MS and others with chronic illness may be at especially high risk of premature treatment discontinuation and poor long-term adherence because treatments do not typically reduce acute symptoms (Bruce 2011). Thus, while people with MS are less likely to develop future symptoms when on medication, they do not experience any improvements in their daily activities while on the medications. In fact, frequently, they experience side-effects from the medications, and may therefore feel they are experiencing a reduction in quality of life without any apparent benefit. Side-effects such as stomach upset, flu-like symptoms, injection site reactions can make adherence challenging and almost all of the drugs included in a recent Cochrane review were associated with a higher proportion of participants who withdrew due to adverse events compared to placebo (Tramacere 2015). Studies of discontinuation and adherence maintenance have found that DMT side-effects and perceived lack of DMT efficacy are among the most consistent predictors of adherence in MS (Jokubaitis 2013; Rinon 2011; Turner 2007). Complacency has also been evident among people who have reported being “too busy” to adhere (Bruce 2011; Devonshire 2011; Hancock 2011). Other barriers that have been shown to be associated with poor adherence include medication costs, lack of provider support, and neuropsychiatric disability (including negative affect, fatigue, cognitive impairment, and needle phobia) (Bruce 2010a; Bruce 2010b; Koudriatseva 2012; Mohr 1999; Patti 2010; Rinon 2011). The fact that patients frequently discontinue treatments suggests that there is patient dissatisfaction with current DMTs. Indeed, the frequent use of complementary and alternative medicines (by an estimated 57% to 70% of patients with MS) also supports the view that conventional therapies are not adequately meeting patient needs (Giovannoni 2012; Nayak 2003; Page 2003). Indeed, there are reasonable motives for some people to decline the use of DMTs. With the increased availability of various evidence-based treatments, it is important that people have access to adequate information in order to make informed choices and minimise the possible negative effects of treatment. In this context, it is imperative to evaluate which strategies are most effective to enhance informed choice and subsequent adherence (Foster 2012; Köpke 2014; Stacey 2014).

Description of the intervention

Adherence interventions typically use educational, psychological and/or behavioural techniques to help people follow agreed-upon treatment recommendations. A variety of different strategies have been suggested for improving adherence in MS, including struc-
tured education programs, regular nurse assistance, and psychological interventions (Berger 2005; Nieuwlaat 2014). These interventions are designed to help people overcome common barriers to poor adherence and typically include face-to-face, individual or group therapy, telephone, or web-based contacts. Easthall's meta-analysis (Easthall 2013), showed that cognitive-based behaviour change techniques are effective interventions in eliciting improvements in medication adherence and are likely to be greater than the behavioural and educational interventions largely used in current practice. Evidence is limited on whether these approaches are broadly applicable or affect long-term medication adherence and health outcomes (Viswanathan 2012).

Adherence interventions are usually multi-modal or ‘complex’ (Craig 2008), in that they include several components that may or may not interact. These could incorporate a combination of educational, psychological and behavioural techniques to support people with MS to follow agreed-upon treatment recommendations. Our focus in this review is whether these complex interventions work in their entirety but, we will extract detailed descriptions (where available) of the individual intervention components and process and contextual factors in line with guidance for the description and reporting of trials of complex interventions (Hoffman 2014; Möhler 2012). We will include interventions mostly, or wholly, based on psychological theories and practice, which aim to improve adherence to DMTs. Experimental interventions will include those focusing on initiation of a DMT for the first time and those which are re-initiating a DMT, as well as increasing the percentage of prescribed doses taken, in those already taking a DMT. We will include all kinds of strategies and all modalities to deliver them. The comparison group could include standard treatment, no intervention, placebo treatment or another active intervention aimed to increase adherence to DMTs. Standard treatment varies across sites and countries; it usually consists of basic education about symptom management, information and support, options for pharmacologic and nonpharmacologic management, family issues, instruction for self-administration, and information on the incidence and management of side-effects. We will consider all modalities to deliver them.

How the intervention might work

The focus of this review is on psychological interventions that aim to improve adherence directly by increasing participants’ motivation to adhere to recommendations to take DMT. Motivational interventions may attempt to enhance the perceived importance and benefits of DMT and address potential barriers. In addition, the interventions may work by providing education and increasing participants’ self-efficacy and skills to use treatment as prescribed. We will also consider interventions that directly or indirectly increase adherence to DMTs such as cognitive-behavioural interventions to teach anxiety-reduction skills, challenge phobic anxiety through exposure, and address maladaptive thoughts through cognitive restructuring. A combination of these approaches may improve adherence by both increasing patient motivation and offering supports that help people overcome barriers to change.

Why it is important to do this review

Adherence to DMTs is essential to maximise treatment benefit and to ensure the cost-effectiveness of treatments. Enhancing adherence has the potential to lead to improved health outcomes among people with MS. Little is known about the types or efficacy of adherence interventions that have been used in MS. No published systematic reviews address this specific question to date. A Cochrane Review (Nieuwlaat 2014) assessed the results of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) of interventions to help people adhere to prescribed medications, however adherence to DMT treatments by people with MS is not addressed in this review and it does not focus specifically on psychological interventions.

OBJECTIVES

To assess the effects of psychological interventions designed to improve adherence to disease-modifying therapies (DMTs) in adults with multiple sclerosis (MS) in terms of adherence. This will be considered in relation to levels of adherence in a comparison group. Secondary objectives are to assess the impact of interventions on potential predictors of adherence such as motivation, self-efficacy beliefs and healthcare engagement to DMTs adherence.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

We will include randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and cluster-RCTs in which a psychological intervention addressing adherence to DMT in adults is compared to standard treatment, no treatment/placebo treatment or another active intervention and where adherence is assessed. We will not consider a follow-up period as an exclusion criterion. Cross-over trials will also be included.

Types of participants

We will include adults (18 years and over) diagnosed with all types of clinically definite MS (regardless of psychiatric comorbidities
or level of disability) and clinically isolated syndrome (CIS), defined according to the Poser (Poser 1983) and revised McDonald (McDonald 2001; Polman 2005; Polman 2011) criteria. The revised McDonald criteria for MS diagnosis will be applied when people have experienced a typical CIS (or progressive paraparesis/cerebellar/cognitive syndrome in the case of suspected primary progressive MS (PPMS). Participants could include those starting on any form of DMT for the first time or those who are re-initiating a DMT, regardless of the amount of prior use of therapy. Studies that include people with MS and people with other health conditions will be excluded unless the results for people with MS have been presented separately.

**Types of interventions**

We will include interventions, mostly or wholly based on psychological theories and practice, which aim to improve adherence to DMTs versus standard treatment, no intervention, placebo treatment or another intervention. Interventions could include those focusing on initiation of a DMT for the first time and those who are re-initiating a DMT, as well as improving adherence amongst those already taking DMTs. Interventions can address patients, providers and caregivers.

**Types of outcome measures**

**Primary outcomes**

The primary outcome of the review will be adherence to DMTs; adherence will be evaluated in terms of percentage of:

- percentage of doses taken;
- percentage above a threshold of number of doses;
- proportion of participants starting DMT;
- proportion of participants stopping medication; and
- others used in the literature on adherence to DMTs in people with MS.

We will examine short-term (less than three months after randomisation) and long-term (greater than three months after randomisation) outcomes separately. We will include studies with a measure of adherence regardless if it is a primary or secondary outcome in the studies.

**Secondary outcomes**

We will also include outcomes related to:

- motivation to adhere;
- self-efficacy to adhere; and
- healthcare engagement (e.g. attending a neurology appointment to discuss re-initiation of DMTs).

We will include adverse effects of the adherence interventions such as increased anxiety or needle pricks/infections in the context of needle phobia interventions (but not adverse effects of the DMT treatments themselves as this is not the focus of the current review).

**Search methods for identification of studies**

**Electronic searches**

The Information Specialist will search the Trials Register of the Cochrane Multiple Sclerosis and Rare Diseases of the CNS Group, which, among other sources, contains trials from:

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (2016, most recent issue);
- MEDLINE (PubMed) (1966 to date);
- Embase (Embase.com) (1974 to date);
- Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature (CINAHL) (EBSCOhost) (1981 to date);
- Latin American and Caribbean Health Science Information Database (LILACS) (Bireme) (1982 to date);
- ClinicalTrials.gov (http://clinicaltrials.gov); and
- World Health Organization (WHO) International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (apps.who.int/trialsearch).

Information on the Group’s Trials Register and details of search strategies used to identify trials can be found in the ‘Specialised Register’ section within the Cochrane Multiple Sclerosis and Rare Diseases of the Central Nervous System Group’s module. The keywords that we will use to search for trials for this review are listed in Appendix 1.

**Searching other resources**

In addition we will:

- screen reference lists and published reviews for additional trials;
- search dissertations and theses from System for Information on grey Literature in Europe (Single) and conference proceedings, congress abstracts, reports, professional society meetings and websites of the main MS associations;
- contact researchers working on this topic and especially lead authors of identified trials to identify studies;
- Search for meeting abstracts from MS associations to identify other published or unpublished peer-reviewed trials.
Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies
We will assess studies according to the methods highlighted in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins 2011a). Two review authors, one a content expert (AC, MCG), will independently screen titles and abstracts identified from the search for their relevance for inclusion in the review. Studies will be reviewed for relevance based on study design, types of participants and interventions. The full-text publications of those deemed either eligible or potentially eligible will be obtained as well as those for which it is unclear. We will identify and exclude duplicates and will collate multiple reports of the same study so that each study is the unit of interest rather than reports. The two review authors will independently screen the full-text publications and identify studies for inclusion in the review according to the predetermined eligibility criteria. Eligibility criteria will be assessed in a prespecified order. Reasons for exclusion of studies will be recorded in the table ‘Characteristics of excluded studies’. Disagreements about whether a study should be included will be resolved by discussion among the two review authors (AC, MCG) and, if necessary, a third review author (KG) will be consulted to arbitrate.

Review authors will not be masked to the name(s) of the author(s) institution(s) or publication source at any level of the review.

Data extraction and management
Data extraction will be undertaken by a content expert and a methodologist (JB, PWT). We will design a data extraction form. Data will be extracted independently using the bespoke form. We will extract the following information from the included studies.

- Date, country and clinical setting of trial.
- Study design.
- Rationale: aim of the intervention (e.g. DMT initiation or re-initiation, or both).
- Eligibility criteria.
- Participant characteristics (e.g. age, gender, years since diagnosis, type of MS, degree of disability, psychiatric diagnosis).
- Description of intervention (intent (e.g. reduce needle phobia, increase confidence etc.) duration, frequency, how delivered, who delivered, format of delivery, training of person delivering, whether adapted for MS, whether concomitant interventions were given).
- Type of comparison group(s) and, if appropriate, description of the duration, frequency, how delivered, who delivered, format of delivery, training of person delivering, whether adapted for MS, and whether concomitant interventions were given.
- Comparability of baseline characteristics between treatment and control groups.
- Description of follow-up.
- Outcomes measured, whether primary or secondary, and when they were recorded.
- Number enrolled in trial and in each group.
- Presence of sample size calculation.
- Numbers included at each follow-up in each group.
- Attempts at masking.
- Description of randomisation and allocation concealment.
- Intention-to-treat principle - whether participants were analysed in the group to which they were originally assigned, number and reasons for dropout and withdrawal in each group, and missing data assumptions used in the analysis. If data have been analysed separately using both intention-to-treat and per protocol approaches, preference will be given to the former.
- For nominal outcomes (denominator and numerator in each category for each group).
- For interval and ordinal data (N, mean, standard deviation (SD) for each group) or (N, median, interquartile range (IQR) or range) as appropriate.
- Notes: funding source and any potential conflicts of interest for the authors.

Once data have been extracted, descriptive information on clinical populations, interventions and outcomes will be passed to the Clinical Heterogeneity Group to review. This review will be undertaken blinded to study results. The Clinical Heterogeneity Group will decide which studies are similar enough in clinical and methodological content for combination in a meta-analysis to make sense, and will consist of three review authors members of the team (ST, DC, AC) with expertise in psychological interventions.

We will include studies reported as full text, those published as abstract only, and unpublished data. We will contact Chief Investigators to provide additional (unpublished) relevant information if necessary. One review author (PT) will enter the extracted data into RevMan software (RevMan 2015) and a second review author (ST) will cross-check the data entry. All studies that meet the inclusion criteria will be summarised in the ‘Characteristics of included studies’ table provided in RevMan software (RevMan Manager 2015) developed by Cochrane and will include details related to design, participants, interventions and outcomes.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies
Two review authors (AC, ST) will independently assess the risk of bias in included studies with any disagreements resolved by discussion or arbitration by a third review author (PT). The risk assessment for each included study will be presented in the ‘Risk of bias’ table. We will contact the study authors for additional information about the study methods as necessary. Two review authors (ST, PWT) will assess the included articles (without masking of source and authorship) for study quality us-
We will perform statistical analyses using the statistical software provided by Cochrane. For continuous variables, we will calculate mean differences (MDs) or standardised mean differences (SMDs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) and for dichotomous variables, we will present risk ratios (RRs) with 95% CIs and number needed to treat for an additional beneficial outcome (NNTB) (such as percentage above a threshold of number of doses or proportion starting DMT) or number needed to treat for an additional harmful outcome (NNTH) (such as proportion stopping medication). Where the same outcome measure is expressed as a continuous variable in some studies and dichotomous in others, we will initially analyse them separately, but we will also conduct an additional analysis transforming the effect size estimates from the latter to SMDs in order to facilitate a meta-analysis. Where the same outcome variable is expressed in both continuous and dichotomous forms within the same study, we will prioritise the former. We will undertake meta-analysis only when the studies are sufficiently homogeneous in terms of participants, interventions and outcomes to provide a meaningful summary.

Dealing with missing data
If trial level data are missing or inadequate, we will contact the primary authors (by email, letter or telephone) to obtain additional information or further clarification.

Assessment of heterogeneity
We will assess clinical and methodological heterogeneity by considering the characteristics of participants, interventions, study designs and outcomes. We will attempt to blind this group to study results.

Assessment of reporting biases
If we are able to pool more than 10 trials, we will use funnel plots to explore the possibility of publication bias. A comprehensive search strategy, which includes searching for unpublished studies (grey literature), and searching trials registers (see Search methods for identification of studies) will be used to minimise reporting biases. We will contact the authors for the full data or the reason for not publishing the data, where data are not reported or published in full.
Data synthesis

We will present a narrative synthesis of the included studies describing major characteristics and results. If studies are sufficiently similar in terms of participants, eligibility criteria, interventions (type and intent) and outcomes (including the time frame of follow-up), as determined by the Clinical Heterogeneity Group, we will consider meta-analysis as described in the assessment of heterogeneity section. See section on Measures of treatment effect for details of analysis.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

Results from studies will only be pooled if blinded assessment of clinical and methodological heterogeneity determines that they are similar enough. If there are sufficient studies, it is anticipated that the main analysis will consist of a series of meta-analyses on subgroups of clinically and methodologically homogenous studies. However, we will also use meta-regression techniques to see whether study level characteristics (such as type of intervention) impact on effect size.

Sensitivity analysis

A sensitivity analysis will be conducted when one or more studies have a high risk of introducing bias (for example inadequate data, withdrawals by more than 40% of the participants, nearly total non-adherence to the protocol, or very poor or non-adjusted comparability in the baseline criteria).

'Summary of findings' table

We will present the overall quality of the evidence for each outcome according with the methods of the GRADE (Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation) Working Group (GRADE Working Group 2004) approach, which takes into account five criteria not only related to internal validity (risk of bias, inconsistency, imprecision, publication bias), but also to external validity, such as directness of results (Guyatt 2008). For each comparison, two review authors will independently rate the quality of evidence for each outcome as 'high', 'moderate', 'low', or 'very low' using (GRADEprofiler 2011). We will resolve any discrepancies by consensus, or, if needed, by arbitration by a third review author. For each comparison, we will present a summary of the evidence for the main outcomes in a 'Summary of findings' table, which provides key information about the best estimate of the magnitude of the effect in relative terms and absolute differences for each relevant comparison of alternative management strategies; numbers of participants and studies addressing each important outcome; and the rating of the overall confidence in effect estimates for each outcome (Guyatt 2008; Schünemann 2011). If meta-analysis is not possible, we will present results in a narrative 'Summary of findings' table.

We will create a 'Summary of findings' table using the following outcomes:

- adherence to treatment (DMTs);
- motivation to adhere;
- self-efficacy to adhere;
- healthcare engagement (e.g., attending a neurology appointment to discuss re-initiation of DMTs).
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