

---

## Evidence Brief: Video Telehealth for Primary Care and Mental Health Services

---

February 2019

### Prepared for:

Department of Veterans Affairs  
Veterans Health Administration  
Health Services Research & Development Service  
Washington, DC 20420

### Prepared by:

Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP)  
Coordinating Center  
Portland VA Health Care System  
Portland, OR  
Mark Helfand, MD, MPH, MS, Director

### Authors:

#### Investigators:

Stephanie Veazie, MPH  
Donald Bourne, MPH  
Kim Peterson, MS  
Johanna Anderson, MPH



**U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs**

Veterans Health Administration  
Health Services Research & Development Service

## PREFACE

The VA Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP) was established in 2007 to provide timely and accurate syntheses of targeted healthcare topics of importance to clinicians, managers, and policymakers as they work to improve the health and healthcare of Veterans. These reports help:

- Develop clinical policies informed by evidence;
- Implement effective services to improve patient outcomes and to support VA clinical practice guidelines and performance measures; and
- Set the direction for future research to address gaps in clinical knowledge.

The program is comprised of four ESP Centers across the US and a Coordinating Center located in Portland, Oregon. Center Directors are VA clinicians and recognized leaders in the field of evidence synthesis with close ties to the AHRQ Evidence-based Practice Center Program and Cochrane Collaboration. The Coordinating Center was created to manage program operations, ensure methodological consistency and quality of products, and interface with stakeholders. To ensure responsiveness to the needs of decision-makers, the program is governed by a Steering Committee comprised of health system leadership and researchers. The program solicits nominations for review topics several times a year via the [program website](#).

Comments on this evidence report are welcome and can be sent to Nicole Floyd, Deputy Director, ESP Coordinating Center at [Nicole.Floyd@va.gov](mailto:Nicole.Floyd@va.gov).

**Recommended citation:** Veazie S, Bourne D, Peterson K, Anderson J. Evidence Brief: Video Telehealth for Primary Care and Mental Health Services. VA ESP Project #09-199; 2019. Posted final reports are located on the ESP [search page](#).

This report is based on research conducted by the Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP) Center located at the **Portland VA Health Care System, Portland, OR**, funded by the Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Health Administration, Health Services Research and Development. The findings and conclusions in this document are those of the author(s) who are responsible for its contents; the findings and conclusions do not necessarily represent the views of the Department of Veterans Affairs or the United States government. Therefore, no statement in this article should be construed as an official position of the Department of Veterans Affairs. No investigators have any affiliations or financial involvement (eg, employment, consultancies, honoraria, stock ownership or options, expert testimony, grants or patents received or pending, or royalties) that conflict with material presented in the report.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Executive Summary .....                                  | 1  |
| Key Findings .....                                       | 1  |
| Evidence Brief .....                                     | 4  |
| Background .....   | 4  |
| Introduction .....                                       | 4  |
| Purpose .....  | 5  |
| Scope .....  | 5  |
| Key Questions .....                                      | 5  |
| Eligibility Criteria .....                               | 6  |
| Methods .....  | 7  |
| Results .....  | 9  |
| Literature Flow .....                                    | 9  |
| Treatment of Post-traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD) ..... | 10 |
| KQ 1: Process and Access Outcomes .....                  | 10 |
| KQ 2: Costs .....  | 11 |
| KQ 3: Clinically Significant Outcomes .....              | 11 |
| Treatment of Major Depressive Disorder .....             | 13 |
| All Outcomes .....                                       | 13 |
| Treatment of Chronic Pain .....                          | 15 |
| All Outcomes .....                                       | 15 |
| Diagnosis of Mental Health Conditions .....              | 15 |
| KQ 1: Process and Access Outcomes .....                  | 16 |
| KQ 2: Costs .....  | 16 |
| KQ 3: Clinically Significant Outcomes .....              | 17 |
| Summary and Discussion .....                             | 19 |
| Limitations .....  | 19 |
| Limitations of Primary Studies .....                     | 19 |
| Limitations of Rapid Review Methods .....                | 20 |
| Gaps and Future Research .....                           | 20 |
| Clinical and Policy Implications .....                   | 21 |
| Costs and Access Issues .....                            | 21 |
| Special Populations .....                                | 21 |

Conclusions..... 22

Acknowledgments..... 23

    Operational Partners..... 23

    Peer Reviewers..... 23

References..... 24

**TABLES AND FIGURES**

Table 1. Summary of Findings..... 2

Table 2. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for PTSD..... 12

Table 3. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for MDD ..... 14

Table 4. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for Chronic Pain..... 15

Table 5. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for Diagnosis of Mental Health  
Conditions ..... 17

Figure 1: Literature Flowchart..... 9



## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

### Key Findings

- Video delivery of mental health treatments are likely similar to in-person treatments in terms of patient satisfaction (for both Major Depressive Disorder [MDD] and Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder [PTSD]), number of sessions completed (PTSD), quality of life (both MDD and PTSD), response (MDD), and remission rates (both MDD and PTSD).
- Video delivery of mental health treatments are associated with lower or similar implementation costs (PTSD and MDD) and health care utilization costs (MDD only) compared to in-person treatments.
- Evidence is emerging on the use of video for diagnosis of mental health conditions as well as the use of video for treatment of chronic pain.
- There is a lack of evidence on the use of video in primary care for conditions other than chronic pain, as well as a lack of information on the impact of video in both mental health and primary care on important access outcomes, including wait times, frequency of use, and provider productivity.

The telehealth-related provisions in the Veterans Affairs (VA) Maintaining Systems and Strengthening Integrated Outside Networks (MISSION) Act of 2018 allows VA providers to administer care to Veterans using telehealth, regardless of where in the United States the provider or Veteran is located – including care that occurs across state lines or outside a VA facility. The goal is to expand access and increase patient satisfaction, while providing equal or better quality of care. Telehealth can be provided for many different clinical conditions and through many different technologies, and primary care and mental health have been identified as 2 priority areas for VA telehealth services. In this review, we evaluated synchronous video conferencing versus in-person delivery of health care for Veterans treated in primary care or mental health settings on key access, process, cost, and clinical outcomes.

Among the 30 included articles (1 systematic review, 23 randomized controlled trials (RCTs)/follow-up analyses and 6 observational studies/follow-up analyses, sample size range:16-839), most examined mental health treatments for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) and major depressive disorder (MDD). Five articles examined diagnosis of a range of mental health conditions, and 1 examined treatment of chronic pain.

Overall, evidence suggests that video treatment is similar to in-person treatment on outcomes of patient satisfaction, number of sessions completed, cost and cost-effectiveness, and clinically significant outcomes such as quality of life. Evidence was strongest (moderate strength) for the treatment of PTSD and MDD for patient satisfaction and certain clinically significant outcomes. Strength of evidence was low or insufficient for other conditions and outcomes, as they were

### Background

The ESP Coordinating Center (ESP CC) is responding to a request from the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) Office of Connected Care/Telehealth for an evidence brief on video telehealth in mental health/primary care. Findings from this evidence brief will be used to inform the VA MISSION Act questions as directed by Congress.

### Methods

To identify studies, we searched MEDLINE®, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, and other sources up to October 2018. We used prespecified criteria for study selection, conducted data abstraction, and rated internal validity and strength of the evidence.

PROSPERO  
Registration:  
CRD42019120145

reported in single, small studies of fair to poor quality. The most important methodological limitations that lowered our confidence in the findings were inadequate information on randomization and allocation procedures, inadequate control for potential confounders in observational studies, high (> 20%) overall attrition rates, and potential for biased assessment due to knowledge of treatment group assignment. We did not identify any studies that directly examined the access outcomes of interest such as wait times, frequency of use, or provider productivity.

Future research should explore the use of video for diagnosis and treatment of mental health disorders on these access outcomes, as well as for the use of video in primary care. Future research should also address the methodological limitations of the existing literature, specifically by better reporting of randomization and allocation procedures, masking outcome assessors, ensuring better adherence to the intervention, and using techniques to better minimize the possibility of a placebo effect, for example through a sham telehealth control group.

**Table 1. Summary of Findings**

| <b>Condition/<br/>Treatment<br/>or<br/>diagnosis</b>           | <b>KQ 1: Process and access<br/>outcomes</b>  | <b>KQ 2: Costs</b>   | <b>KQ 3: Clinically significant<br/>outcomes</b>  |
|--|---|--|---|
| PTSD/<br>Variety of<br>treatments                              | Moderate SOE<br><br>Video treatments are similar to in-person treatments on patient satisfaction and number of sessions completed based on 1 fair-quality SR of 14 studies and 1 poor-quality cohort study (Total N=886).<br><br>No studies examined access outcomes. | Low SOE<br><br>Video treatments are associated with reduced implementation costs compared to in-person treatments due to reduced personnel travel costs based on 1 fair-quality RCT (N=74).  | Low SOE<br><br>Video treatments are similar to in-person treatments on quality of life and treatment remission based on 4 fair-quality RCTs (Total N=321).                    |
| MDD/<br>Variety of<br>treatments                               | Moderate SOE<br><br>Video treatments are similar to in-person treatments on patient satisfaction based on 1 good-quality and 2 fair-quality RCTs (Total N=481).<br><br>No studies examined access outcomes.   | Low SOE<br><br>Video treatments are associated with similar or lower health care costs than in-person treatments and are cost-effective even when accounting for costs of providing Veterans with laptops or videophones based on 1 good-quality and 1 fair-quality RCT (Total N=362). | Low SOE<br><br>Video treatments are similar to in-person treatments on quality of life, response, and remission based on 1 good-quality and 1 fair-quality RCT (Total N=360). |
| Chronic<br>pain/<br>Acceptance<br>and<br>commitment<br>therapy | Low SOE<br><br>Video acceptance and commitment therapy is similar to in-person therapy  | No studies on costs.   | Low SOE<br><br>Video acceptance and commitment therapy is similar to in-person therapy  |

|  |   |  |   |
|--|---|--|---|
|  | on patient satisfaction in 1 fair-quality RCT (N=128).  |  | on quality of life in 1 fair-quality RCT (N=128). |
|  | No studies examined access outcomes.  |  |   |
| MH conditions/<br>Diagnostic batteries | Low SOE<br><br>There is good agreement and similar patient satisfaction outcomes associated with video and in-person clinical interviews for a range of mental health disorders, although the evidence on diagnostic agreement for PTSD is mixed, based on 2 fair and 1-poor quality studies (Total N=99)<br><br>No studies examined access outcomes. | Low SOE<br><br>Video diagnosis is associated with reduced implementation costs for both new and established telehealth clinics compared to in-person diagnosis based on 1 fair-quality study (N=53). | No studies on clinically significant outcomes.    |

Abbreviations: KQ = key question; MDD = major depressive disorder; MH = mental health; PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder; RCT = randomized controlled trial; SOE = strength of evidence; SR = systematic review

# EVIDENCE BRIEF

## BACKGROUND

The Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP) Coordinating Center (ESP CC) is responding to a request from the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) Office of Connected Care/Telehealth for an evidence brief on video telehealth (VT) in mental health/primary care. Findings from this evidence brief will be used to respond to Congressional inquiry regarding the Veterans Affairs (VA) Maintaining Systems and Strengthening Integrated Outside Networks (MISSION) Act.

## INTRODUCTION

Among their many innovative efforts to increase Veterans' access to high-quality health care services – particularly for Veterans living in rural and remote locations – the US Department of Veterans Affairs has built a telehealth program that has recently been described as the largest in the nation.<sup>1</sup> Telehealth in the VHA is defined as: "The wider application of care and case management principles to the delivery of health care services using health informatics, disease management and telehealth technologies to facilitate access to care and improve the health of designated individuals and populations with the intent of providing the right care in the right place at the right time."<sup>2</sup> Telehealth (also referred to as telemedicine, telecare, teletherapy, eHealth, and mHealth)<sup>3</sup> encompasses a wide range of technologies (*eg*, real-time or 'synchronous' interactive teleconferencing or videoconferencing, 'asynchronous' acquisition of data, images, sounds, and/or video that are stored and forwarded for later clinical evaluation, messaging), clinical applications, and settings (*eg*, home, another health care site, community).<sup>4</sup>

VA Telehealth Services are available for more than 50 clinical uses,<sup>5</sup> and mental health and primary care are among the most frequently used.<sup>6</sup> There is a high prevalence of mental illness,<sup>7</sup> chronic disease,<sup>8</sup> and multi-morbidities<sup>8</sup> among Veterans, as well as transportation barriers to accessing care for those living in rural areas.<sup>9</sup> Only about half of those who indicate that they want care actually receive it,<sup>10</sup> and national surveys of US military Veterans indicate that living in rural areas is one of the greatest barriers impeding access to health care.<sup>11</sup> To address these issues, beginning in 2011, VA has launched a number of telemental health expansion efforts, such as adding millions of dollars in telehealth equipment and new types of telehealth staff.<sup>12</sup> In 2016, VA established 4 regional telemental health (TMH) hubs to enhance mental health care access for Veterans living in rural areas or in areas with identified access challenges.<sup>13</sup> These expansion efforts have led to continued increases in telehealth encounters.<sup>13</sup> For example, in the Western Telehealth Network, from fiscal year 2017 to 2018, the number of new telehealth referrals increased from 810 to 2,696 (232.84%), and 81.2% of Veterans served in 2018 were from rural areas.<sup>5</sup>

However, qualitative interviews with VA telemedicine providers indicate the following as barriers to use of telehealth services: technical challenges, inadequate patient and provider education and training, need for additional telehealth providers, and patient and provider preferences for in-person (IP) care.<sup>14</sup> One additional barrier to the growth of VA telehealth delivery is clinic space, as historically patients have been required to be physically present in a VA clinic or medical center to receive telehealth care. In 2018, several key initiatives were introduced to help reduce these barriers and improve Veteran access to VA health care. First, Section 151 of the US Department of Veterans Affairs MISSION Act of 2018 was enacted into



law to extend legislative authority to clinicians working at any VA facility to offer care through telehealth, regardless of clinician or patient location – including across state lines. Second, on June 11, 2018, the "Anywhere to Anywhere" regulation was published through the Office of Management and Budget, which provided more specific guidance on how to implement the MISSION Act. Third, the encrypted VA Video Connect App was developed to provide Veterans with secure and private access to telehealth from any mobile or web-based device.<sup>15</sup> Finally, in December 2018, after hosting an Anywhere to Anywhere Together Summit with the public sector, VA announced the development of some new partnerships with T-Mobile, Walmart, and Phillips designed to further increase access by offering free hosting of VA Video Connect Apps on all service devices and creating new remote examination spaces at Veterans Service Organization posts across the nation.<sup>1</sup> Together, the legislation and regulation provide the foundation for telehealth to improve access, capacity, and quality across VA. Within 1 year of its enactment, the MISSION Act requires VA to submit a report to Congress to provide data on provider and patient satisfaction, the effect of telemedicine on patient wait times, health care utilization, and other measures.

To assist in answering VA MISSION Act questions and to inform evidence-based development of new initiatives and strategic planning approaches to manage the additional increased volume of telehealth encounters projected under the "Anywhere to Anywhere" regulation and legislation, the VA Office of Connected Care and the Office of Telehealth is interested in identifying the Veterans, conditions, treatments, and/or implementation strategies in which telehealth are most likely to be beneficial. In 2016, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality Evidence-based Practice Center (AHRQ EPC) program used an evidence map approach to provide an overview of 58 telehealth systematic reviews published through 2015.<sup>16</sup> It broadly concluded that there is sufficient evidence to support the effectiveness of telehealth for psychotherapy as part of behavioral health based on the availability of a sizable quantity of evidence with some consistency in benefits. A 2018 evidence map produced by the VA Durham ESP Center focusing specifically on telehealth for women found that outside of postpartum depression, little evidence is available focusing on use of telehealth for women's mental health needs.<sup>17</sup> These evidence maps provide an overall interpretation of where the evidence was adequate, but were not designed to provide a comprehensive review of any specific aspect application of telehealth – including identification of the most promising uses of synchronous VT between patient and provider for primary care and mental health in Veterans.

## **PURPOSE**

The purpose of this report is to synthesize the evidence on VT in mental health/primary care.

## **SCOPE**

This evidence brief will address the following key questions and inclusion criteria:

### **Key Questions**

Key Question 1: How do VT and usual IP mental health or primary care treatment modalities compare on certain process and access outcomes?

Key Question 2: How do VT and usual IP mental health or primary care treatment modalities compare in the costs, including travel costs, from furnishing health care?

Key Question 3: How do VT and usual IP mental health or primary care treatment modalities compare in clinically significant patient health outcomes?

### Eligibility Criteria

The ESP included studies that met the following criteria:

- **Population:** US Veterans receiving mental health or primary care services
- **Intervention:** Synchronous VT (excluding asynchronous, add-on, and multifaceted interventions)
- **Comparator:** IP care of same service (excluding telephone, IP of a different service, or studies with no comparator)
- **Outcomes:** Access/wait times, frequency of use, productivity of health care providers, patient/provider satisfaction, cost, clinically significant patient health outcomes (*ie*, response, remission)
- **Timing:** Any
- **Setting:** Mental health/primary care
- **Study design:** Any. Using a best evidence approach, we will prioritize evidence from systematic reviews and multisite comparative studies that adequately controlled for potential patient-, provider-, and system-level confounding factors. Inferior study designs (*eg*, single-site, inadequate control for confounding, noncomparative) will only be accepted to fill gaps in higher-level evidence.

## METHODS

To identify articles relevant to the key questions, our research librarian used keyword and MeSH terms on telehealth and Veterans to search Ovid MEDLINE, PsycINFO, Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials, Evidence-Based Medicine (EBM) Reviews- Health Technology Assessment, National Institute for Health Care and Excellence (NICE), and the National Library of Medicine. We searched for articles published from 1994 (initiation of the first telehealth studies in VA<sup>18</sup>) to October 2018. We searched PROSPERO as well as telehealth and health care websites for in-progress studies (see Appendix A in Supplemental Materials for complete search strategies). Additional citations were identified from hand-searching reference lists and consultation with content experts. We limited the search to published and indexed articles involving human subjects available in the English language.

Study selection was based on the eligibility criteria described above. We included parent studies of follow-up analyses (either subgroup analyses or analyses of multiple studies), even if the parent study did not report an outcome of interest. For frequency of use, we sought data on whether VT enabled Veterans to access care more easily or frequently. However, in the absence of these outcomes, we considered number of sessions completed to be a relevant proxy outcome. For clinically significant outcomes, we considered mean differences in quality of life and functionality, as well as the percent of participants that met clinical thresholds for response and remission. In some cases, we report study results that were not outcomes of interest if they were important to the interpretation to the study (*eg*, diagnostic agreement). Titles and abstracts were reviewed by one investigator and checked by another. Full-text articles were reviewed by one investigator and checked by another. All disagreements were resolved by consensus.

For studies that were included in the Turgoose 2018 systematic review, we relied on their prior data abstraction and internal validity assessments. We contacted the first author of this review requesting information on how they rated the internal validity of their included studies. Although they were willing to disclose this information, unfortunately, the data were no longer available. For all other published studies and additional outcome data used in our review, such as costs and clinically significant outcomes, we used predefined criteria to rate the internal validity of unique included studies. We used the ROBIS tool to rate the internal validity of systematic reviews,<sup>19</sup> the Drug Effectiveness Review Project (DERP) tool to rate controlled trials,<sup>20</sup> and the United States Preventive Services Task Force criteria to rate cohort studies.<sup>21</sup> In this report, we used study quality as a proxy for risk of bias, where a good-quality study is at low risk of bias, a fair-quality study is at unclear risk of bias, and poor-quality study is at high risk of bias. We abstracted data from all studies and results for each included outcome. All data abstraction and internal validity ratings were first completed by one reviewer and then checked by another. All disagreements were resolved by consensus.

We informally graded the strength of the evidence based on the AHRQ Methods Guide for Comparative Effectiveness Reviews by considering study limitations (includes study design and aggregate quality), consistency, directness, and precision of the evidence.<sup>22</sup> Ratings typically range from high to insufficient, reflecting our confidence that the evidence reflects the true effect.

Because data were heterogenous, we synthesized data qualitatively by grouping treatment studies by condition.


The complete description of our full methods can be found on the PROSPERO international prospective register of systematic reviews (<http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/>; registration number CRD42019120145). A draft version of this report was reviewed by peer reviewers as well as clinical leadership. Their comments and our responses are presented in the Supplemental Materials (see Appendix E).

## RESULTS

### LITERATURE FLOW

The literature flow diagram (Figure 1) summarizes the results of the search and study selection processes (see Appendix B in Supplemental Materials for full list of excluded studies).

**Figure 1: Literature Flowchart**



Searches resulted in 1,407 unique and potentially relevant articles. We included 30 total relevant articles.<sup>23-51</sup> This included 1 recent systematic review,<sup>48</sup> 23 randomized controlled trials and follow-up analyses (RCTs),<sup>23-33,35-42,49-51</sup> and 6 observational studies and follow-up analyses.<sup>34,43-47</sup> Fourteen of the included RCTs/analyses<sup>27,28,30,31,33,36-41,49-51</sup> were captured by the recent systematic review,<sup>48</sup> but we elected to include them separately because we analyzed additional

outcomes not covered in the review. For a list of excluded and ongoing studies, see Appendices 2 and 4 in Supplemental Materials.

## TREATMENT OF POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS DISORDER (PTSD)

We identified 12 total relevant studies<sup>27-31,33,34,36-41,43-45,47-51</sup> (1 systematic review,<sup>48</sup> 9 RCTs,<sup>27-31,33,36-41,49-51</sup> and 2 cohort studies<sup>43-45,47</sup>) that examined VT versus IP treatment for PTSD (Table 2). Eight of these studies<sup>27,28,30,31,33,36-41,49-51</sup> were included in the systematic review.<sup>48</sup>

### KQ 1: Process and Access Outcomes

No studies reported on direct access outcomes such as wait times, frequency of use, or productivity of health providers. However, a fair-quality 2018 systematic review<sup>48</sup> found that VT was similar to IP treatment for PTSD on the proxy outcome of number of sessions completed as well as patient satisfaction.

This systematic review summarized evidence on Veterans receiving telehealth (40 articles on VT therapy and 1 article on telephone-based therapy) for PTSD, including prolonged exposure therapy, cognitive processing therapy, cognitive behavioral therapy, behavioral activation, eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing, anger management, mindfulness, and general coping and psychoeducation interventions. Of 41 included studies, 28 were experimental (including 11 strong quality, 8 moderate quality, 8 weak quality, and 1 whose quality was not reported). Of these, 14 articles of 839 participants met inclusion criteria for our review.

The review reports that “no studies found significant differences in attrition between tele-therapy and in-person treatments, with one finding that those receiving tele-therapy attended significantly more sessions” and “there were no differences in the number of sessions attended before dropout occurred, except for one study which suggested that those receiving tele-therapy attended more sessions before dropping out of treatment.” The review also found that “no studies found any significant differences in satisfaction and acceptability between tele-therapy and in-person treatment groups, with most reporting high levels of satisfaction with both.”

The main strengths of the review were its broad inclusion of all studies examining video or telephone-based treatment for PTSD, including both RCT and observational studies, as well as a synthesis of a variety of outcomes relevant to patients, providers, and health systems. Limitations of the review include not reporting on data extraction processes; not reporting which studies had strong, moderate, and weak quality ratings; and not incorporating quality ratings into the interpretation of studies. Although we could not determine which studies received particular quality ratings, we did repeat quality assessment on a convenience sample of 5 studies<sup>30,36,38,39,41,50,51</sup> included in the Turgoose 2018 review that reported additional outcomes on costs or clinically significant outcomes. We rated all 5 studies as fair quality due to a lack of information on randomization procedures, high overall attrition rates or differential attrition rates between groups, and lack of information on whether outcome assessors were masked. These ratings were on average more critical than the Turgoose 2018 review ratings. It is therefore possible that we would have rated the studies more critically than Turgoose 2018; however, given there was a large number of studies and they all showed consistent results on patient satisfaction and number of sessions completed, this difference had little impact on our interpretation of the findings.

We identified one additional poor-quality prospective cohort study<sup>47</sup> of VT versus IP prolonged exposure therapy for 47 Veterans with combat-related PTSD that was not included in Turgoose 2018 which found similar results on number of sessions completed.

We have moderate confidence that VT is similar to IP treatment on outcomes of patient satisfaction and number of sessions completed. The main limitations of this evidence include a lack of information on randomization procedures, high overall attrition rates or differential attrition rates between groups, and lack of information on whether outcome assessors were masked and that number of sessions is an indirect measurement for access outcomes.

### **KQ 2: Costs**

One fair-quality RCT<sup>36,41</sup> assessed costs of VT versus IP anger management treatment for 74 male Veterans with PTSD and anger problems living in remote areas of Hawaii. The study evaluated the costs as of 2012 of personnel (clerk, information technician, and psychologist) for both groups, costs of procuring video equipment (2 Tanberg clinical videoconferencing units) for the VT group, and travel costs for a psychologist to travel from Honolulu to remote Hawaiian clinics for the IP group. The study found that mean costs per patient were significantly lower for VT than IP treatment (\$79 vs \$792), and the effect was still seen after adjusting for improvements in patient anger outcomes (savings of \$703 to \$710 in VT group depending on the anger scale used). In both treatment groups, participants traveled to a local VA to receive treatment, so there were no potential savings to Veterans in terms of travel time or costs.

We have low confidence that VT is associated with reduced costs compared to IP PTSD treatment. Evidence is limited to 1 small fair-quality RCT conducted among Veterans living in Hawaii, who may have unique geographical access issues that may not be representative of rural Veterans living in the contiguous US.

### **KQ 3: Clinically Significant Outcomes**

Evidence from 4 fair-quality RCTs<sup>29,38,39,50,51</sup> suggests that VT and IP treatment of PTSD result in similar quality of life and remission outcomes after 8-12 sessions. One RCT<sup>50</sup> of 52 Veterans examined the effect of 8-12 sessions of VT versus IP prolonged exposure therapy and found no differences between groups on PTSD remission (46% vs 40% no longer had diagnosis of PTSD post-treatment). Another RCT<sup>51</sup> of 18 Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom Veterans examined the effect of 10 sessions of VT versus IP cognitive behavioral therapy. This study found no difference between groups in SF-36 physical health (4.4% vs 4.5% improvement) or SF-36 mental health (45.8% vs 37.9% improvement), although no statistical analyses were conducted due to the small sample size. Another analysis<sup>29</sup> combined data from 2 RCTs,<sup>38,39</sup> one of 125 male Veterans with PTSD and one of 126 female civilians and Veterans with PTSD, receiving 12 sessions of cognitive processing therapy. There were no differences between VT and IP groups on the Quality of Life Inventory, with both groups showing improvements at post-treatment and 6-month follow-up.

We have low confidence that VT is equivalent to IP treatment on clinically significant outcomes. Major methodological limitations of the evidence include a lack of information on randomization procedures and attrition rates greater than 20%. Of note, many additional studies reported mean differences in symptoms between VT versus IP groups; however, these data did not meet criteria for clinically significant outcomes.

**Table 2. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for PTSD**

| <b>Author Year<br/>Sample Size<br/>Mean age<br/>% male<br/>Therapy type</b>   | <b>KQ1: Process and access<br/>results</b>  | <b>KQ2: Cost results</b>  | <b>KQ3: Veteran health<br/>outcomes</b>  |
|---|---|---|--|
| Turgoose 2018 <sup>48</sup><br>N (14 relevant<br>studies)=886<br>Mean age: NR<br>% male: NR<br>Various therapies  | Patient satisfaction: NSD,<br>"with most reporting high<br>levels of satisfaction with<br>both" treatments  | NR  | NR   |
| Tuerk 2010 <sup>47</sup><br>N=47<br>Mean age: 39.0<br>years<br>% male: 94%<br>Prolonged exposure<br>treatment   | Treatment completion<br>(telemedicine vs in-person):<br>75% vs 83%<br><br>Sessions attended by<br>completers (mean ± SD):<br>10.0 ± 6.3 vs 10.1 ± 3.8 | NR  | NR   |
| Greene 2010, <sup>30</sup><br>Morland 2010, <sup>36</sup><br>Morland 2013 <sup>41</sup><br>N=125<br>Mean age: 55 years<br>% male: 100%<br>Anger management<br>therapy | Reported in Turgoose 2018   | Unadjusted mean<br>costs: Significantly<br>lower for<br>telemedicine (\$79,<br>CI \$73-84) than in-<br>person (\$792, CI<br>\$727-856) delivery<br>( <i>P</i> =.01) | NR   |
| Yuen 2015 <sup>50</sup><br>N=52<br>Mean age: 44 years<br>% male: 98%<br>Prolonged exposure<br>therapy   | Reported in Turgoose 2018   | NR  | No differences in post-<br>treatment rates of PTSD<br>diagnoses between<br>telemedicine and in-person<br>groups: 46% vs 40% no<br>longer had diagnosis of<br>PTSD, 27% vs 30% had<br>subclinical symptoms, 27%<br>vs 30% had diagnosis,<br>$\chi^2(2)=.62$ , <i>P</i> =.73 |
| Ziemba 2014 <sup>51</sup><br>N=18<br>Mean age: NR<br>% male: 90%<br>Cognitive behavioral<br>therapy   | Reported in Turgoose 2018   | NR  | Both telemedicine and in-<br>person groups improved on<br>physical health (SF-36<br>physical health) 4.4% vs<br>4.5% improvement ( <i>P</i> =NR)<br>and mental health (SF-36<br>mental health) 45.8% vs<br>37.9% improvement ( <i>P</i> =NR).                              |
| Glassman 2017 <sup>29</sup> ,<br>Morland 2014 <sup>38</sup> ,<br>Morland 2015 <sup>39</sup><br>N=251<br>Mean age: 50.8<br>years<br>% male: 50%                        | Reported in Turgoose 2018   | NR  | No effect of treatment<br>modality on QoL over the<br>treatment and follow-up<br>period for men and women<br>( <i>P</i> >.33)  |



---

Group (men) or individual (women) cognitive processing therapy

---

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; IP = in-person; NSD = described as not significantly different, but *P*-value not reported; NR = not reported; PTSD = posttraumatic stress disorder; QoL = quality of life; SF = short form; VT = video telemedicine

## TREATMENT OF MAJOR DEPRESSIVE DISORDER

We identified 3 RCTs<sup>23-26,35,42,52</sup> that examined VT versus IP treatment for Major Depressive Disorder (MDD) (Table 3).

### All Outcomes

The strongest evidence supporting the use of VT as an alternative to IP care comes from 1 good-quality RCT of 241 elderly Veterans with MDD.<sup>24,25,52</sup> This study found that VT was similar to IP care in patient satisfaction, quality of life, response, remission, and cost-effectiveness at the 12-month post-baseline assessment. Treatment involved 8 weeks of Behavioral Activation Therapy (BAT), and outcomes were assessed at 12 months post-baseline. Strengths of this study include: it met the highest standards for randomization, allocation concealment, and outcome assessor blinding methods; drop-outs were below 20%; it evaluated a wide range of clinically important outcomes over the longest-term follow-up period of 12 months; and it was the most applicable to the Anywhere to Anywhere initiative in that it was the only RCT of MDD VT to evaluate home-based delivery. However, as it focused specifically on elderly Veterans and, like all other RCTs, used a technology that is now obsolete (replaced by the new VA Video Connect encrypted app for mobile devices), it is ultimately unclear how the findings apply to current care delivery conditions in a broader range of Veterans. However, it would be reasonable to anticipate that use of newer technology in younger Veterans might only be more favorable.

Otherwise, overall, the 3 fair- to good-quality RCTs (N = 481) demonstrated that, compared to IP care, telehealth for MDD was consistently comparable in patient satisfaction,<sup>24,35,42</sup> quality of life,<sup>24</sup> response,<sup>42,52</sup> remission,<sup>42</sup> and cost-effectiveness.<sup>23,25,26</sup> None of the RCTs reported any access, wait times, frequency of use, or health care provider productivity outcomes. One RCT reported similar average numbers of visits for VT versus IP treatment.<sup>42</sup> However, the relevance of this finding to home-based telehealth is unclear, as in this RCT Veterans randomized to telehealth were still seen in the same clinic they initially presented to for care – just by a psychiatrist in different locations.<sup>42</sup> Also in this same RCT, psychiatrist satisfaction, as measured by a 17-item scale developed for the RCT, was statistically significantly greater when seeing Veterans for IP care versus by VT ( $t = -2.2$ ,  $df = 79$ ,  $P < .05$ ). However, authors questioned the clinical importance of the difference, noting that satisfaction was still high in both groups.

Although direct technology costs of providing Veterans with videophones<sup>25</sup> or laptops<sup>35</sup> were generally higher than travel costs of same-room care, because the VHA care utilization was consistently similar or lower<sup>23,25,42</sup> and improvements in Quality Adjusted Life Years (QALYs) were similar, Independent Cost Effectiveness Ratio (ICER) analyses found telehealth to be a cost-effective option.<sup>23,25</sup>

Because patient satisfaction was consistently similar across multiple studies, the strength of this evidence is moderate. For other outcomes reported by 1 or 2 small studies, the strength of that evidence is low.<sup>23,25</sup>

**Table 3. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for MDD**

| Author Year<br>Sample Size<br>Mean age<br>% male<br>Therapy type  | KQ1: Process and<br>access results   | KQ2: Cost results  | KQ3: Veteran health<br>outcomes  |
|---|--|--|--|
| Egede 2015, <sup>52</sup><br>2016, <sup>24</sup> 2017, <sup>26</sup><br>2018 <sup>25</sup><br>N=241<br>Mean age: 63.9<br>years<br>% male: 97.5%<br>Behavioral<br>Activation Therapy | Patient satisfaction via<br>CPOSS at 12 months:<br>36.7 vs 37.2; mean<br>difference= -.01, <i>P</i> =.72   | Direct costs: \$800-900<br>(device costs) vs<br>\$437.92 (travel costs)<br><br>Health care utilization<br>costs: \$687.91 vs<br>\$1,359.49<br><br>12-month ICER: (positive<br>number favors<br>telemedicine)<br>Mean: 5,892.34<br>Median: -787.85  | QoL (SF-36): No<br>significant difference at 12<br>months on any of 8<br>subscales: mean<br>difference ranged from -<br>1.9 points (95% CI -8.3 to<br>4.5) for pain to 2.5 (95%<br>CI -5.7 to 10.8) for<br>physical health<br><br>GDS Response (%<br>reduction NR): 22% vs<br>20%; absolute difference,<br>2.06 (90% CI -7.46 to<br>11.58) |
| Luxton, 2016 <sup>35</sup><br>Bounthavong,<br>2018 <sup>23</sup><br>N=121<br>Mean age: 35.15<br>years<br>% male: 82%<br>Behavioral<br>Activation<br>Treatment (BAT)                 | Patient satisfaction via<br>CSQ: 28.8 vs 29.3; NSD   | Total direct cost per<br>patient: Lower when<br>technology provided by<br>patients (\$19,177 vs<br>\$20,322) vs by<br>government (\$71,974 vs<br>\$20,322)<br><br>Cost per additional<br>quality-adjusted life year<br>gained: Lower when<br>technology provided by<br>patients (-\$158,506)<br>than by government<br>(+\$14,434,503), but<br>telehealth dominant<br>when both scenarios<br>combined | NR   |
| Ruskin 2004 <sup>42</sup><br>N=119<br>Mean age: 50 years<br>% male: 88%<br>Psychotropic<br>medication,<br>psychoeducation,<br>and brief supportive<br>counseling                    | Average number of visits:<br>6.5; <i>t</i> =0.2, <i>df</i> =117, <i>P</i> =NS<br><br>Patient satisfaction at visit<br>8 (4-point Likert scale<br>rating agreements with<br>19-item scale developed<br>for the study): fell<br>between “agree” and<br>“strongly agree”, mean<br>NR ( <i>t</i> =1.3, <i>df</i> =74, <i>P</i> =NS). | Per-session institutional<br>costs: \$86.16 vs \$63.25<br>( <i>t</i> =3.2, <i>P</i> <.001).<br>However, costs were<br>equal if psychiatrist<br>traveled 22 miles and<br>less if they traveled >22<br>miles.<br><br>VHA care utilization:<br>“equal” ( <i>t</i> =.7, <i>P</i> =NS).   | Response (50%<br>improvement on HDS):<br>49% vs 43%; $\chi^2=0.4$ ,<br><i>df</i> =1, <i>P</i> =NS<br><br>Remission (HDS≤7): 39%<br>vs 35%; $\chi^2=0.2$ , <i>df</i> =1,<br><i>P</i> =NS  |

Psychiatrist satisfaction (17-item scale developed for the study): greater for patients seen in person than by video ( $t=-2.2$ ,  $df=79$ ,  $P<.05$ )

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; CPOSS = Charleston Psychiatric Outpatient Satisfaction Scale; CSQ = Client Satisfaction Questionnaire; GDS = Geriatric Depression Scale; HDS = Hamilton Depression Scale; ICER = Incremental Cost Effectiveness Ratio; IP = in-person; MDD = major depressive disorder; NS = non-significant; NSD = described as not significantly different, but  $P$ -value not reported; NR = not reported; QoL = quality of life; SF = short form; VHA = Veterans Health Administration; VT = video telemedicine

## TREATMENT OF CHRONIC PAIN

We identified 1 RCT<sup>32</sup> examining VT versus IP treatment for chronic pain (Table 4).

### All Outcomes

This fair-quality RCT of 128 Veterans found that a VT-delivered 8-week acceptance and commitment therapy was similar to IP delivery in terms of patient satisfaction at 8 weeks and quality of life at 6 months (Table 4).

Because the evidence on treatment for chronic pain on quality of life and patient satisfaction is limited to this single small study with differences in attrition (28% in VT vs 14% in IP group) between groups, the strength of evidence is low.

**Table 4. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for Chronic Pain**

| Author Year<br>Sample Size<br>Mean age<br>% male<br>Therapy type  | KQ1: Process and access results                          | KQ2: Cost results | KQ3: Veteran health outcomes  |
|---|--|-------------------|---|
| Herbert 2017 <sup>32</sup><br>N=128<br>Mean age: 52 years<br>% male: 82%<br>Acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT) | Patient satisfaction via CSQ: 4.40 vs 4.47; NSD, $P=.53$ | NR                | Measured as mean difference (VT minus IP) in change (95% CI):<br>SF12-MCS: -1.72 (-6.13 to 2.7)<br>SF12-PCS: -2.2 (-5.46 to 1.07) |

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; CSQ = Client Satisfaction Questionnaire; IP = in-person; NSD = described as not significantly different; NR = not reported; SF12-MCS = Mental Component Summary; SF12-PCS = Physical Component Summary; VT = video telemedicine

## DIAGNOSIS OF MENTAL HEALTH CONDITIONS

We identified 3 studies<sup>34,43-46</sup> (2 within-subject cross-over design<sup>34,43-45</sup> and 1 prospective cohort)<sup>46</sup> that examined VT versus IP-delivered structured clinical interviews to diagnose mental health disorders (Table 5).

## KQ 1: Process and Access Outcomes

Use of VT as an alternative to IP shows some promise for clinical interviews and diagnosis of mental health conditions in terms of diagnostic agreement and patient satisfaction based on 1 fair-quality crossover study<sup>43-45</sup> (N = 53) of multiple mental health conditions, 1 poor-quality crossover study<sup>34</sup> (N = 30) of PTSD, and 1 fair-quality prospective cohort study (N = 16) of dementia.<sup>46</sup> While there was disagreement between 2 studies of different PTSD clinical interview methods, the stronger findings from the higher-quality study that used the DSM-III Structured Clinical Interview did not find good agreement between VT and IP approaches.<sup>53</sup>

The fair-quality study<sup>43-45</sup> of multiple mental health conditions randomized 53 American Indian Veterans with a known prevalence of lifetime psychiatric disorders to 1 of 2 clinical interview sequences, receiving VT first or IP first. The clinical interview was conducted using the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-III. The study found generally fair or good agreement in diagnoses between modalities, including substance abuse or dependence, MDD, dysthymia, and generalized anxiety disorder, but not PTSD, with no significant differences between modalities in terms of patient satisfaction. Study authors noted that the VT may not have worked as well for diagnosis of PTSD because it is an internalizing, rather than externalizing, disorder. The poor-quality study<sup>34</sup> of exclusively PTSD diagnosis utilized the same crossover design to assess VT versus IP administration of the Clinician-administered PTSD (CAPS) Scale to 30 trauma-exposed Veterans and found strong agreement between modalities on PTSD diagnosis and high levels of satisfaction with both groups. Both studies had issues related to selection bias, as they relied on participants already diagnosed with mental health disorders for the study sample. For the fair-quality study of multiple mental health conditions, 8 years had lapsed since the clinical interview was conducted for a previous study, which is likely long enough to “wash out” the effect of completing the interview. In the poor-quality study of exclusively PTSD, however, some participants were drawn from a group psychotherapy class and others from a participant recruitment database, and no analysis was conducted on the potential role of receiving treatment on the likelihood of receiving a diagnosis. It should also be noted that neither study used the DSM-V, which is the current standard for PTSD diagnosis,<sup>53</sup> although the fair-quality study used the DSM-III.

The fair-quality study of dementia diagnosis examined VT versus IP diagnosis of dementia in 16 residents 60 years and older of a Washington State Veterans’ Home.<sup>46</sup> Diagnoses by VT agreed 100% with diagnoses by IP examinations. All patients agreed with statements indicating a preference to utilize VT versus traveling for an IP examination, and most patients (93.7%) reported understanding the video physician as well as if the examination had been in person. Physicians reported satisfaction with the VT 71.4% of the time.

Strength of evidence is low that administration of clinical interviews for mental health diagnosis by VT or IP are similar in terms of diagnostic agreement and patient satisfaction. Each clinical area was only supported by 1 or 2 fair- or poor-quality studies with considerable selection bias issues. There was also disagreement between studies on the utility of VT for diagnosis in PTSD.

## KQ 2: Costs

One fair-quality study<sup>44,45</sup> among 53 American Indian Veterans in Colorado evaluated costs of delivering VT versus IP clinical interviews for mental health diagnoses. Study authors created 2 cost models: 1 for established telehealth clinics and 1 for new telehealth clinics. Both models

included costs of personnel for VT and IP groups, costs of data transmission for the VT group, and travel costs for IP group. The model for new clinics included the costs of procuring and installing videoconferencing equipment. Researchers found that the VT group was less expensive than IP (annual costs as of 2005 of \$20,199 at established telehealth clinic vs \$24,474 at new clinic vs \$33,841 at IP clinic based on high salary costs). For both VT and IP groups, Veterans accessed care in their community at a Tribal Veterans Center (VT group) or a private office (IP group). It is unclear if there were any differences in distance traveled or costs to Veterans, as these were not measured.

Because only 1 study was identified that had methodological limitations due to its crossover design (described above), strength of evidence is low that VT is associated with lower implementation costs than IP diagnosis of mental health disorders.

### KQ 3: Clinically Significant Outcomes

No studies were identified.

**Table 5. Outcomes for Comparison of VT Versus IP Visits for Diagnosis of Mental Health Conditions**

| Author Year<br>Sample Size<br>Mean age<br>% male<br>Therapy type   | KQ1: Process and access results   | KQ2: Cost results   | KQ3: Veteran health outcomes |
|--|---|---|------------------------------|
| Shore 2007a, <sup>45</sup><br>Shore 2007b, <sup>44</sup><br>Shore 2008 <sup>43</sup><br>N=53<br>Mean age: 54 years<br>% male: 100%<br>PTSD diagnostic assessment | Patient satisfaction: 4.59 vs 5.68; NSD   | Assessment costs: Cheaper at established telemedicine clinic (\$20,199) vs new clinic (\$24,474) vs in-person clinic (\$33,841), based on high salary costs | NR                           |
| Litwack 2014 <sup>34</sup><br>N=30<br>Mean age: 53 years<br>% male: 90%<br>PTSD diagnostic assessment  | Patient satisfaction: "high levels" with both, including:<br>(a) "how comfortable they felt with the clinician" (t(28)=.95, P=.35)<br>(b) "how comfortable they felt with the interview material" (t(28)=.00, P=1.00)<br>(c) "the convenience of the assessment" (t(28)=1.31, P=.20)                                  | NR  | NR                           |
| Shores 2004 <sup>46</sup><br>N=16<br>Mean age: 78 years<br>% male: 94%<br>Examination for dementia   | Telemedicine patient survey (mean ± SD):<br>(a) I understand what the health care provider told me as well as if it had been in person (4.5 ± 0.06)<br>(b) The telemedicine visit was private enough for me to ask the questions I wanted to (4.7 ± 0.5)<br>(c) The telemedicine technology saved me time (4.8 ± 0.4) | NR  | NR                           |

- 
- (d) I would choose to have a  
telemedicine visit again ( $4.8 \pm 0.4$ )  
(e) I would rather use telemedicine than  
travel to the clinic ( $4.8 \pm 0.6$ )
- 

Abbreviations: CI = confidence interval; IP = in-person; NSD = described as not significantly different, but *P*-value not reported; NR = not reported; SD = standard deviation; VT = video telemedicine

## SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

This rapid review builds on previous evidence synthesis work on telehealth<sup>16,17,48</sup> by focusing specifically on the effectiveness of VT versus IP treatment for Veterans and by examining process and access outcomes (*eg*, patient satisfaction, frequency of use), costs, and clinically significant outcomes (*eg*, response, remission, and quality of life). Video delivery of mental health treatments are likely similar to IP treatments in terms of patient satisfaction (both MDD and PTSD), number of sessions completed (PTSD), quality of life (both MDD and PTSD), response (MDD), and remission rates (both MDD and PTSD). Video delivery of mental health treatments may also be associated with lower or equivalent implementation costs (PTSD and MDD) and health care utilization costs (MDD only) compared to IP treatments. Although we identified evidence on VT versus IP for treating chronic pain and diagnosing mental health disorders, our confidence in the findings are low. We did not identify any evidence on the effect of VT versus IP treatments on important access outcomes including wait times, panel size, or productivity of health care providers. We also did not identify any studies on the treatment of mental health disorders other than PTSD or MDD (*eg*, bipolar disorder), nor did we find any studies of other conditions treated in primary care other than chronic pain (*eg*, diabetes and hypertension).

It is perhaps not surprising that the large majority of studies in this review were focused on mental health conditions and about half were specifically focused on rural and remote populations, given VA's focus on utilizing telehealth to improve access to mental health care. Additionally, many mental health treatments, including cognitive behavioral therapy, anger management therapy, and behavioral activation, require multiple, frequent (1+ time a week), intensive (1+ hour) appointments that involve building trust and rapport between a clinician and a patient. Compared to other forms of telehealth, VT may be best suited for these conditions as it allows for incorporation of nonverbal communication cues including facial expressions and body language.

Along those lines, it is also not surprising that we did not identify many studies on VT for primary care. Primary care treatments can require physical examinations or lab tests which can be more difficult to conduct by video. In addition, many aspects of primary care treatment, such as following up on a patient's treatment progress or sending lab results, can be completed with less intensive communication such as messaging or phone calls. We identified several studies<sup>54,55</sup> that integrated video into a multimodal telehealth primary care intervention, such as home-based tele-monitoring or coordinated care. In these interventions, video was used to deliver counseling or otherwise check in with patients self-managing chronic conditions, while other aspects of self-management were completed via apps or monitoring devices. While outside the scope of this review, the utility of VT as one aspect of a multimodal primary care telehealth intervention is an important research question that is currently being explored.

## LIMITATIONS

### Limitations of Primary Studies

The majority of studies in this review were poor or fair quality. Most randomized studies did not adequately describe randomization processes (*ie*, by computer-generated number, drawing lots) or whether allocation was adequately concealed (*ie*, concealing group assignments in opaque

envelopes). Many studies also reported high levels of attrition (*ie*, above 20%) or did not report whether attrition varied between groups. Cohort studies had additional issues with selection bias, as they sometimes gave patients the option of whether they would like to receive VT or IP treatment and did not control for important confounders between these groups or, in the case of diagnosis, drew from patient groups that were already receiving treatment that may have resulted in reduced symptoms.

Because studies could not mask providers or patients to the treatment condition, there may have been a placebo effect favoring the VT intervention. A placebo effect can occur if patients, providers, and outcome assessors believe that the new treatment (VT) is more desirable or effective than usual care (IP). While no studies in this review included a “sham” intervention (*eg*, VT intervention that checked in periodically with participants or delivered general education but not a manualized treatment) that would have ruled out the possibility of a placebo effect, several noted that a non-inferiority design was sufficient as their primary concern was whether VT was at least as effective as IP. Furthermore, several studies<sup>23-26,29,32,35,38,39,51</sup> attempted to control for the potential that outcome assessors were influencing results by masking them to treatment condition. Several studies also attempted to minimize the effect that provider variation (*eg*, variation in experience, licensure, rapport, or fidelity to intervention) might have in driving differences in outcomes by having the same provider deliver both VT and IP treatments<sup>30,32,36,41,51</sup> and/or monitoring provider fidelity to intervention.<sup>23,32,35,42-45</sup>

Finally, while it is promising that patients reported high levels of satisfaction with both VT and IP treatments, satisfaction data can be unreliable as patients may be reluctant to criticize an intervention.

### Limitations of Rapid Review Methods

First, when compared to dual independent review, our rapid review methods of single reviewer assessment of titles and abstract with second reviewer checking may have resulted in missing eligible studies. Second, our prioritization of best evidence meant that we did not extract and conduct data analysis on all 14 relevant studies from Turgoose 2018. Instead, for those 14 studies, we relied on the author’s summary on patient satisfaction and number of sessions attended, as well as the overall quality of experimental studies. As discussed in the findings section, this may have resulted in a more optimistic assessment of the studies’ quality; however, it likely would not have affected the final conclusions. Third, our rapid timeline meant we could not examine all important to the evaluation of VT, including safety, technological issues, and therapeutic alliance, so it is possible we are missing important information related to implementation of VT.

### Gaps and Future Research

Although one of the main drivers for telemedicine is to reduce barriers to treatment, such as distance, information on access outcomes is lacking. No studies reported on the effect of telemedicine regarding wait times, panel size, productivity of health care providers or other direct access measures. We also found a dearth of studies on VT versus IP treatment conducted in the primary care setting, which, as discussed earlier, is likely due to the fact that telehealth delivered in primary care is more often used as 1 component among complex multimodal interventions, rather than as an overall replacement to IP care.



One key issue in this field is the advancement of technology. On one hand, the technology needed for VT continues to improve, and at the same time, the prices for products like webcams are decreasing. However, this often means that, between the time a study is conducted and the publication of its results, the technology has advanced, limiting the applicability of findings. In 2018, VA Video Connect became the standard application for VT delivery, a technology that was not examined in any of our included studies. Future research should explore the use of this technology, especially as it has the potential to increase access to care by enabling Veterans to receive treatment at home.

We identified 6 ongoing studies (see Appendix D in Supplemental Materials), all of which focused on the treatment for mental health or substance abuse disorders in Veterans. Unfortunately, it is not clear that any of these studies will directly and sufficiently address existing gaps in the literature. Therefore, concerted research of better quality is still needed in the specific limitation areas we outlined in detail above, including reporting on access outcomes and the use of up-to-date technology. Studies should also take measures to minimize performance and measurement biases by using masked raters to assess outcomes and ensure high fidelity to treatment protocol via external compliance monitoring.

## CLINICAL AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

### Costs and Access Issues

While we found evidence that VT is associated with similar or reduced implementation costs as in-person care, the reality is that telemedicine is likely to lead to more implementation costs, at least initially, as it is serving new patients not currently being served, as opposed to patients switching from in-person to remote care. For example, 1 study found that lower costs for VT groups were driven largely by the reduced need to pay for clinicians to travel to remote areas to deliver care, and in the study where the VA provided laptops, VT was cheaper when clinicians had to travel more than 22 miles to provide care. However, paying clinicians to travel to remote areas does not typically happen in practice, so the reality is that those Veterans living in remote areas would likely not receive this care. This further iterates the need for future research to assess whether VT is increasing Veterans' access to care, as well as leading to reduction in other types of costs (such as health care utilization costs).

Along the same lines, as implementation of telehealth expands, consideration should be given to ensuring that Veterans who need access to health services have access to these services. One example is ensuring there are sufficient numbers of telehealth providers to meet demand. Another example is ensuring common processes between physical VA facilities and telehealth centers so that a patient does not need to complete similar assessments, for example an initial intake assessment, multiple times, or have a delay in treatment due to the need for multiple assessments.

### Special Populations

Several studies<sup>29,32,38,39,42,50,52</sup> noted that they specifically excluded patients with substance abuse or dependence, active psychosis, or suicidal or homicidal ideation. One study<sup>24</sup> conducted in Veterans with depression noted that 10% of those with depression also have co-occurring substance abuse issues. Because these populations were excluded from these studies, we cannot say whether VT is safe or effective in these groups; however, it should be noted that these

criteria are consistent with what is currently being used to assess patients for suitability for telehealth care.

## CONCLUSIONS

Findings from this rapid evidence brief indicate that VT is a promising alternative to IP treatments for a range of mental health conditions, especially PTSD and depression, in terms of patient satisfaction and clinically important outcomes. It is important to note there is a lack of evidence on how the availability of video treatments has affected important access and process issues, including wait times, frequency of use, and provider productivity. Evidence is emerging on the use of VT for diagnosis of mental health conditions, as well as the use of VT for chronic pain treatments.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This topic was developed in response to a nomination by the Veterans Health Administration (VHA) Office of Connected Care/Telehealth for an evidence brief on VT in mental health/primary care. The scope was further developed with input from the topic nominators (*ie*, Operational Partners) and the ESP Coordinating Center.

In designing the study questions and methodology at the outset of this report, the ESP consulted several technical and content experts. Broad expertise and perspectives were sought. Divergent and conflicting opinions are common and perceived as healthy scientific discourse that results in a thoughtful, relevant systematic review. Therefore, in the end, study questions, design, methodologic approaches, and/or conclusions do not necessarily represent the views of individual technical and content experts.

The authors gratefully acknowledge Julia Haskin, MA and Emilie Chen, BA for their editorial support, Katherine Mackey MD MPP, Staff Physician at VA Portland Health Care System and Clinical Investigator for the VA ESP Coordinating Center, for her clinical input, and Sara Maspaitella, Business Operations Manager at Western Telemental Health Network (WTN) for her insights on VA telehealth implementation.

### Operational Partners

Operational partners are system-level stakeholders who have requested the report to inform decision-making. They assure VA relevance; help develop and approve final project scope and timeframe for completion; provide feedback on draft report; and provide consultation on strategies for dissemination of the report to field and relevant groups.

#### **Kevin Galpin, MD**

Executive Director, Telehealth Services  
Office of Connected Care/Telehealth

#### **Leonie Heyworth, MD, MPH**

Synchronous Telehealth Lead  
Office of Connected Care/Telehealth

### Peer Reviewers

The Coordinating Center sought input from external peer reviewers to review the draft report and provide feedback on the objectives, scope, methods used, perception of bias, and omitted evidence. Peer reviewers must disclose any relevant financial or non-financial conflicts of interest. Because of their unique clinical or content expertise, individuals with potential conflicts may be retained. The Coordinating Center and the ESP Center work to balance, manage, or mitigate any potential nonfinancial conflicts of interest identified.

## REFERENCES

1. Ogrysko N. VA's telehealth program is already the largest in the nation. It's about to get bigger. *Federal News Network* <https://federalnewsnetwork.com/veterans-affairs/2018/12/vas-telehealth-program-is-already-the-largest-in-the-nation-its-about-to-get-bigger/>. Accessed January 14, 2019.
2. US Department of Veterans Affairs. About VA Telehealth Services. <https://www.telehealth.va.gov/about/index.asp>. Accessed January 14, 2019.
3. The Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology. What is telehealth? How is telehealth different from telemedicine? <https://www.healthit.gov/faq/what-telehealth-how-telehealth-different-telemedicine>. Accessed January 14, 2019.
4. Hempel S, Taylor SL, Solloway MR, et al. Evidence Map of Tai Chi. VA-ESP Project. #ESP 05-226. 2014; <https://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/publications/esp/taichi.cfm>.
5. Western Telemental Health Network. *WTN / FY 2018 Final Report*. US Department of Veterans Affairs; 2018.
6. Office of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs. VA Announces Telemental Health Clinical Resource Centers During Telemedicine Association Gathering. <https://www.va.gov/opa/pressrel/pressrelease.cfm?id=2789>. Accessed January 14, 2019.
7. Seal KH, Metzler TJ, Gima KS, Bertenthal D, Maguen S, Marmar CR. Trends and risk factors for mental health diagnoses among Iraq and Afghanistan veterans using Department of Veterans Affairs health care, 2002-2008. *Am J Public Health*. 2009;99(9):1651-1658.
8. Yoon J, Zulman D, Scott JY, Maciejewski ML. Costs associated with multimorbidity among VA patients. *Med Care*. 2014;52 Suppl 3:S31-36.
9. Syed ST, Gerber BS, Sharp LK. Traveling towards disease: transportation barriers to health care access. *Journal of Community Health*. 2013;38(5):976-993.
10. Hoge CW, Auchterlonie JL, Milliken CS. Mental health problems, use of mental health services, and attrition from military service after returning from deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan. *JAMA*. 2006;295(9):1023-1032.
11. Weeks WB, Kazis LE, Shen Y, et al. Differences in health-related quality of life in rural and urban veterans. *Am J Public Health*. 2004;94(10):1762-1767.
12. VHA Telehealth Quarterly. In. *VHA Telehealth Quarterly*. Vol 11. Washington, DC: VHA Office of Telehealth Services; 2012.
13. Western Telemental Health Network. *WTN Background*. US Department of Veterans Affairs.
14. Hopp F, Whitten P, Subramanian U, Woodbridge P, Mackert M, Lowery J. Perspectives from the Veterans Health Administration about opportunities and barriers in telemedicine. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2006;12(8):404-409.
15. US Department of Veterans Affairs. VA Video Connect. <https://mobile.va.gov/app/va-video-connect>. Accessed January 14, 2019.
16. Totten AM, Womack DM, Eden KB, et al. Telehealth: mapping the evidence for patient outcomes from systematic reviews. 2016.
17. Goldstein KM, Gierisch JM, Alishahi A, et al. Telehealth Services Designed for Women: An Evidence Map. VA ESP Report. #09-010. 2017; <https://www.hsrd.research.va.gov/publications/esp/womens-telehealth.cfm>.

18. Darkins A. The growth of telehealth services in the Veterans Health Administration between 1994 and 2014: a study in the diffusion of innovation. *Telemed J E Health*. 2014;20(9):761-768.
19. Whiting P, Savović J, Higgins JPT, et al. ROBIS: A new tool to assess risk of bias in systematic reviews was developed. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2016;69:225-234.
20. McDonagh MS, Jonas DE, Gartlehner G, et al. Methods for the drug effectiveness review project. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*. 2012;12:140-140.
21. Appendix VI. Criteria for Assessing Internal Validity of Individual Studies. <https://www.uspreventiveservicestaskforce.org/Page/Name/appendix-vi-criteria-for-assessing-internal-validity-of-individual-studies>. Accessed January 14, 2019.
22. Berkman ND, Lohr KN, Ansari M, et al. *Grading the Strength of a Body of Evidence When Assessing Health Care Interventions for the Effective Health Care Program of the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality: An Update Methods Guide for Effectiveness and Comparative Effectiveness Reviews*. Rockville, MD; 2013.
23. Bounthavong M, Pruitt LD, Smolenski DJ, Gahm GA, Bansal A, Hansen RN. Economic evaluation of home-based telebehavioural health care compared to in-person treatment delivery for depression. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24(2):84-92.
24. Egede LE, Acierno R, Knapp RG, Walker RJ, Payne EH, Frueh BC. Psychotherapy for depression in older veterans via telemedicine: effect on quality of life, satisfaction, treatment credibility, and service delivery perception. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2016;77(12):1704-1711.
25. Egede LE, Dismuke CE, Walker RJ, Acierno R, Frueh BC. Cost-effectiveness of behavioral activation for depression in older adult veterans: in-person care versus telehealth. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2018;79(5):28.
26. Egede LE, Gebregziabher M, Walker RJ, Payne EH, Acierno R, Frueh BC. Trajectory of cost overtime after psychotherapy for depression in older Veterans via telemedicine. *J Affect Disord*. 2017;207:157-162.
27. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Grubaugh AL, Elhai JD, Yim E, Knapp R. Therapist adherence and competence with manualized cognitive-behavioral therapy for PTSD delivered via videoconferencing technology. *Behav Modif*. 2007;31(6):856-866.
28. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Yim E, Grubaugh AL, Hamner MB, Knapp RG. A randomized trial of telepsychiatry for post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2007;13(3):142-147.
29. Glassman LH, Mackintosh MA, Talkovsky A, et al. Quality of life following treatment for PTSD: comparison of videoconferencing and in-person modalities. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2017.
30. Greene CJ, Morland LA, Macdonald A, Frueh BC, Grubbs KM, Rosen CS. How does tele-mental health affect group therapy process? Secondary analysis of a noninferiority trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2010;78(5):746-750.
31. Gros DF, Lancaster CL, Lopez CM, Acierno R. Treatment satisfaction of home-based telehealth versus in-person delivery of prolonged exposure for combat-related PTSD in veterans. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24(1):51-55.
32. Herbert MS, Afari N, Liu L, et al. Telehealth versus in-person acceptance and commitment therapy for chronic pain: a randomized noninferiority trial. *J Pain*. 2017;18(2):200-211.

33. Hernandez-Tejada MA, Zoller JS, Ruggiero KJ, Kazley AS, Acierno R. Early treatment withdrawal from evidence-based psychotherapy for PTSD: telemedicine and in-person parameters. *Int J Psychiatry Med.* 2014;48(1):33-55.
34. Litwack SD, Jackson CE, Chen M, et al. Validation of the use of video teleconferencing technology in the assessment of PTSD. *Psychol Serv.* 2014;11(3):290-294.
35. Luxton DD, Pruitt LD, Wagner A, Smolenski DJ, Jenkins-Guarnieri MA, Gahm G. Home-based telebehavioral health for U.S. military personnel and veterans with depression: A randomized controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol.* 2016;84(11):923-934.
36. Morland LA, Greene CJ, Rosen CS, et al. Telemedicine for anger management therapy in a rural population of combat veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder: a randomized noninferiority trial. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2010;71(7):855-863.
37. Morland LA, Hynes AK, Mackintosh MA, Resick PA, Chard KM. Group cognitive processing therapy delivered to veterans via telehealth: a pilot cohort. *J Trauma Stress.* 2011;24(4):465-469.
38. Morland LA, Mackintosh MA, Greene CJ, et al. Cognitive processing therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder delivered to rural veterans via telemental health: a randomized noninferiority clinical trial. *J Clin Psychiatry.* 2014;75(5):470-476.
39. Morland LA, Mackintosh MA, Rosen CS, et al. Telemedicine versus in-person delivery of cognitive processing therapy for women with posttraumatic stress disorder: a randomized noninferiority trial. *Depress Anxiety.* 2015;32(11):811-820.
40. Morland LA, Pierce K, Wong MY. Telemedicine and coping skills groups for Pacific Island veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder: a pilot study. *J Telemed Telecare.* 2004;10(5):286-289.
41. Morland LA, Raab M, Mackintosh MA, et al. Telemedicine: a cost-reducing means of delivering psychotherapy to rural combat veterans with PTSD. *Telemed J E Health.* 2013;19(10):754-759.
42. Ruskin PE, Silver-Aylaiian M, Kling MA, et al. Treatment outcomes in depression: comparison of remote treatment through telepsychiatry to in-person treatment. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2004;161(8):1471-1476.
43. Shore JH, Brooks E, Savin D, Orton H, Grigsby J, Manson SM. Acceptability of telepsychiatry in American Indians. *Telemed J E Health.* 2008;14(5):461-466.
44. Shore JH, Brooks E, Savin DM, Manson SM, Libby AM. An economic evaluation of telehealth data collection with rural populations. *Psychiatr Serv.* 2007;58(6):830-835.
45. Shore JH, Savin D, Orton H, Beals J, Manson SM. Diagnostic reliability of telepsychiatry in American Indian veterans. *Am J Psychiatry.* 2007;164(1):115-118.
46. Shores MM, Ryan-Dykes P, Williams RM, et al. Identifying undiagnosed dementia in residential care veterans: comparing telemedicine to in-person clinical examination. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry.* 2004;19(2):101-108.
47. Tuerk PW, Yoder M, Ruggiero KJ, Gros DF, Acierno R. A pilot study of prolonged exposure therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder delivered via telehealth technology. *J Trauma Stress.* 2010;23(1):116-123.
48. Turgoose D, Ashwick R, Murphy D. Systematic review of lessons learned from delivering tele-therapy to veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare.* 2018;24(9):575-585.
49. Wierwille JL, Pukay-Martin ND, Chard KM, Klump MC. Effectiveness of PTSD telehealth treatment in a VA clinical sample. *Psychol Serv.* 2016;13(4):373-379.

50. Yuen EK, Gros DF, Price M, et al. Randomized controlled trial of home-based telehealth versus in-person prolonged exposure for combat-related PTSD in veterans: preliminary results. *J Clin Psychol*. 2015;71(6):500-512.
51. Ziemba SJ, Bradley NS, Landry LA, Roth CH, Porter LS, Cuyler RN. Posttraumatic stress disorder treatment for Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom combat veterans through a civilian community-based telemedicine network. *Telemed J E Health*. 2014;20(5):446-450.
52. Egede LE, Acierno R, Knapp RG, et al. Psychotherapy for depression in older veterans via telemedicine: a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2015;2(8):693-701.
53. Department of Veterans Affairs, Department of Defense. VA/DOD Clinical Practice Guideline for the Management of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder and Acute Stress Disorder. 2017; <https://www.healthquality.va.gov/guidelines/MH/ptsd/VADoDPTSDCPGFinal.pdf>.
54. Chumbler NR, Neugaard B, Kobb R, Ryan P, Qin H, Joo Y. Evaluation of a care coordination/home-telehealth program for veterans with diabetes: health services utilization and health-related quality of life. *Eval Health Prof*. 2005;28(4):464-478.
55. Hopp F, Woodbridge P, Subramanian U, Copeland L, Smith D, Lowery J. Outcomes associated with a home care telehealth intervention. *Telemed J E Health*. 2006;12(3):297-307.

---

# Evidence Brief: Video Telehealth for Primary Care and Mental Health Services

## Supplemental Materials

---

February 2019

### Prepared for:

Department of Veterans Affairs  
Veterans Health Administration  
Health Services Research & Development Service  
Washington, DC 20420

### Prepared by:

Evidence Synthesis Program (ESP)  
Coordinating Center  
Portland VA Health Care System  
Portland, OR  
Mark Helfand, MD, MPH, MS, Director

### Authors:

#### Investigators:

Stephanie Veazie, MPH  
Donald Bourne, MPH  
Kim Peterson, MS  
Johanna Anderson, MPH



**U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs**

Veterans Health Administration  
Health Services Research & Development Service



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Table of Contents .....                                 | i  |
| Appendix A. Search Strategies .....                     | 1  |
| Appendix B. List of Excluded Studies.....               | 6  |
| Appendix C. Evidence Tables.....                        | 14 |
| Data Abstraction of Included Systematic Reviews .....   | 14 |
| Data Abstraction of Included Primary Studies.....       | 15 |
| Data Abstraction of Observational Studies .....         | 15 |
| Data Abstraction of RCTs .....                          | 17 |
| Quality Assessment of Included Systematic Reviews ..... | 26 |
| Quality Assessment of Included Primary Studies .....    | 26 |
| Quality Assessment of Observational Studies.....        | 26 |
| Quality Assessment of RCTs.....                         | 27 |
| Appendix D. Ongoing Studies .....                       | 30 |
| Appendix E. Peer Review Comment Table .....             | 32 |
| References.....   | 34 |

## APPENDIX A. SEARCH STRATEGIES

| 1. Database Searching<br>Date Searched: 10/10/18 |  |
|--|--|
| Source:  | Strategy:  |
| MEDLINE  | <p>Database: Ovid MEDLINE(R) and Epub Ahead of Print, In-Process &amp; Other Non-Indexed Citations, Daily and Versions(R) &lt;1946 to October 09, 2018&gt;<br/>Search Strategy:</p> <p>-----</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 exp Veterans/ (14447)</li> <li>2 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (6405)</li> <li>3 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (6405)</li> <li>4 exp Veterans Health/ (1002)</li> <li>5 exp "United States Department of Veterans Affairs"/ (7130)</li> <li>6 veteran*.mp. (37614)</li> <li>7 exp Iraq War, 2003-2011/ (2744)</li> <li>8 exp Afghan Campaign 2001-/ (2520)</li> <li>9 (Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation New Dawn or Operation Iraqi Freedom).mp. (1106)</li> <li>10 or/1-9 (40152)</li> <li>11 exp Telemedicine/ (23556)</li> <li>12 (telehealth or telemedicine).mp. (23306)</li> <li>13 exp Patient Care/ (874952)</li> <li>14 exp Therapeutics/ (4218351)</li> <li>15 exp Health Services/ (1959980)</li> <li>16 exp Diagnosis/ (7970144)</li> <li>17 exp Professional-Patient Relations/ (135317)</li> <li>18 exp Health Services Accessibility/ (101459)</li> <li>19 exp Health Behavior/ (285993)</li> <li>20 or/11-19 (11219262)</li> <li>21 exp *Telecommunications/ (53000)</li> <li>22 exp *Computer Communication Networks/ (47727)</li> <li>23 21 or 22 (96451)</li> <li>24 20 and 23 (55212)</li> <li>25 11 or 12 or 24 (61744)</li> <li>26 10 and 25 (761)</li> <li>27 limit 26 to english language (759)</li> </ol> <p>*****</p> |
| Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews          | <p>Database: EBM Reviews - Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews &lt;2005 to October 03, 2018&gt;<br/>Search Strategy:</p> <p>-----</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 veteran*.mp. (202)</li> <li>2 (telemedic\$ or telehealth\$ or teleradiol\$ or teledermat\$).mp. (122)</li> <li>3 (tele-medic\$ or tele-heal\$ or tele-radiol\$ or tele-dermat\$).mp. (33)</li> <li>4 (emedicine or ehealth or e-medicine or e-health).mp. (89)</li> <li>5 2 or 3 or 4 (153)</li> <li>6 1 and 5 (12)</li> </ol> <p>*****</p>   |
| PsycINFO   | <p>Database: PsycINFO &lt;1806 to October Week 1 2018&gt;<br/>Search Strategy:</p> <p>-----</p>  |



|              |  |
|--------------|--|
|              | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 exp Veterans/ (11819)</li> <li>2 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (0)</li> <li>3 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (0)</li> <li>4 exp Veterans Health/ (0)</li> <li>5 exp "United States Department of Veterans Affairs"/ (0)</li> <li>6 veteran*.mp. (20867)</li> <li>7 exp Iraq War, 2003-2011/ (0)</li> <li>8 exp Afghan Campaign 2001-/ (0)</li> <li>9 (Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation New Dawn or Operation Iraqi Freedom).mp. (853)</li> <li>10 or/1-9 (21103)</li> <li>11 exp Telemedicine/ (4502)</li> <li>12 (telehealth or telemedicine).mp. (5023)</li> <li>13 exp Patient Care/ (769)</li> <li>14 exp Therapeutics/ (0)</li> <li>15 exp Health Services/ (0)</li> <li>16 exp Diagnosis/ (166361)</li> <li>17 exp Professional-Patient Relations/ (0)</li> <li>18 exp Health Services Accessibility/ (0)</li> <li>19 exp Health Behavior/ (26888)</li> <li>20 or/11-19 (198183)</li> <li>21 exp *Telecommunications/ (13281)</li> <li>22 exp *Computer Communication Networks/ (0)</li> <li>23 21 or 22 (13281)</li> <li>24 20 and 23 (582)</li> <li>25 11 or 12 or 24 (5287)</li> <li>26 10 and 25 (279)</li> <li>27 limit 26 to english language (278)</li> </ol> <p style="text-align: center;">*****</p> |
| <p>CCRCT</p> | <p>Database: EBM Reviews - Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials &lt;September 2018&gt;<br/>                 Search Strategy:</p> <p>-----</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1 exp Veterans/ (799)</li> <li>2 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (284)</li> <li>3 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (284)</li> <li>4 exp Veterans Health/ (30)</li> <li>5 exp "United States Department of Veterans Affairs"/ (274)</li> <li>6 veteran*.mp. (4541)</li> <li>7 exp Iraq War, 2003-2011/ (67)</li> <li>8 exp Afghan Campaign 2001-/ (66)</li> <li>9 (Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation New Dawn or Operation Iraqi Freedom).mp. (90)</li> <li>10 or/1-9 (4577)</li> <li>11 exp Telemedicine/ (1870)</li> <li>12 (telehealth or telemedicine).mp. (3104)</li> <li>13 exp Patient Care/ (37952)</li> <li>14 exp Therapeutics/ (272564)</li> <li>15 exp Health Services/ (81627)</li> <li>16 exp Diagnosis/ (305134)</li> <li>17 exp Professional-Patient Relations/ (2396)</li> <li>18 exp Health Services Accessibility/ (870)</li> <li>19 exp Health Behavior/ (14521)</li> <li>20 or/11-19 (433838)</li> <li>21 exp *Telecommunications/ (1352)</li> </ol>   |



|  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <p>22 exp *Computer Communication Networks/ (0)<br/>                 23 21 or 22 (1352)<br/>                 24 20 and 23 (1306)<br/>                 25 11 or 12 or 24 (3573)<br/>                 26 10 and 25 (215)<br/>                 27 limit 26 to english language (153)</p> <p>*****</p>  |
| <p><a href="#">HTA:</a><br/>                 Health Technology Assessments</p> | <p>Database: EBM Reviews - Health Technology Assessment &lt;4th Quarter 2016&gt;<br/>                 Search Strategy:<br/>                 -----</p> <p>1 exp Veterans/ (3)<br/>                 2 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (0)<br/>                 3 exp Hospitals, Veterans/ (0)<br/>                 4 exp Veterans Health/ (0)<br/>                 5 exp "United States Department of Veterans Affairs"/ (3)<br/>                 6 veteran*.mp. (24)<br/>                 7 exp Iraq War, 2003-2011/ (0)<br/>                 8 exp Afghan Campaign 2001-/ (0)<br/>                 9 (Operation Enduring Freedom or Operation New Dawn or Operation Iraqi Freedom).mp. (0)<br/>                 10 or/1-9 (24)<br/>                 11 exp Telemedicine/ (124)<br/>                 12 (telehealth or telemedicine).mp. (120)<br/>                 13 exp Patient Care/ (449)<br/>                 14 exp Therapeutics/ (3246)<br/>                 15 exp Health Services/ (1874)<br/>                 16 exp Diagnosis/ (3483)<br/>                 17 exp Professional-Patient Relations/ (33)<br/>                 18 exp Health Services Accessibility/ (36)<br/>                 19 exp Health Behavior/ (56)<br/>                 20 or/11-19 (6725)<br/>                 21 exp *Telecommunications/ (0)<br/>                 22 exp *Computer Communication Networks/ (0)<br/>                 23 21 or 22 (0)<br/>                 24 20 and 23 (0)<br/>                 25 11 or 12 or 24 (132)<br/>                 26 10 and 25 (1)<br/>                 27 limit 26 to english language (1)</p> <p>*****</p> |
| <p><a href="#">NICE</a><br/>                 (NHS Evidence)</p>                | <p>Search: (telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth) and veteran</p>  |
| <p><a href="#">NLM</a></p>   | <p>Search: (telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth) and veteran</p>  |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <p><b>2. Systematic reviews currently under development</b><br/>                 Date Searched: 10/10/18</p> |  |
| <p><b>Source:</b></p>  | <p><b>Strategy:</b></p>  |
| <p><a href="#">PROSPERO</a></p>  | <p>Search: (telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth) and veteran</p> |

**3. Current Guidelines**



| <b>Date Searched: 10/10/18</b>                      |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Source:</b>                                      | <b>Strategy:</b>  |
| <a href="#">VA/DoD Clinical Practice Guidelines</a> | N/A   |
| <a href="#">Guideline Central</a>                   | Search: telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth |

| <b>4. Grey Literature</b>  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>Date Searched: 10/10/18</b>   |   |
| <b>Source:</b>   | <b>Strategy:</b>  |
| <a href="#">AHRQ</a>   | Search: (telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth) and veteran   |
| <a href="#">CADTH</a>  | Search: (telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth) and veteran   |
| <a href="#">ECRI Institute</a>   | Search: (telehealth or telecare or telemedicine or eHealth) and veteran   |
| VA Products: VATAP, PBM, HSR&D publications, VA ART Database                                       | A. <a href="http://www.hsr.d.research.va.gov/research/default.cfm">http://www.hsr.d.research.va.gov/research/default.cfm</a><br>B. <a href="http://www.research.va.gov/research_topics/">http://www.research.va.gov/research_topics/</a><br>C. <a href="http://art.puget-sound.med.va.gov/default.cfm">http://art.puget-sound.med.va.gov/default.cfm</a><br>Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">American Telemedicine Association</a>  | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth   |
| <a href="#">United States Department of Health &amp; Human Services</a>                            | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth   |
| <a href="#">Healthcare Information and Management Systems Society (HIMSS)</a>                      | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth   |
| <a href="#">United States Office of the Assistant Secretary for Planning and Evaluation (ASPE)</a> | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth   |
| <a href="#">Personal Connected Health Alliance</a>   | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth   |
| <a href="#">Centers for Medicare &amp; Medicaid Services (CMS)</a>                                 | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <a href="#">The Office of the National Coordinator for Health Information Technology</a> | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">Wireless-Life Sciences Alliance</a>  | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">United States Health Resources and Services Administration</a>               | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">National Institute of Standards and Technology</a>                           | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">Markle Foundation</a>  | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">National Center for Telehealth and Technology (T2)</a>                       | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">New York Academy of Medicine Library of Grey Literature</a>                  | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |
| <a href="#">California Healthcare Foundation</a>   | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth |

#### 5. Primary literature currently under development

Date Searched: 10/10/18


| Source:   | Strategy:   |
|---|---|
| <a href="#">Clinicaltrials.gov</a>                                  | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth; mHealth; veteran |
| <a href="#">metaRegister of Controlled Trials (mRCT)</a>            | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth; mHealth; veteran |
| <a href="#">UK Clinical Trials Gateway</a>                          | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth; mHealth; veteran |
| <a href="#">WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform</a> | Search: telehealth; telecare; telemedicine; eHealth; mHealth; veteran |

## APPENDIX B. LIST OF EXCLUDED STUDIES

Exclude reasons: 1=Ineligible population, 2=Ineligible intervention, 3=Ineligible comparator, 4=Ineligible outcome, 5=Ineligible setting, 6=Ineligible study design, 7=Ineligible publication type, 8=Outdated or ineligible systematic review

| #   | Citation  | Exclude reason |
|-----|---|----------------|
| 1.  | Abraham C, Rosenthal DA. Merging home and health via contemporary care delivery: program management insights on a home telehealth project. <i>Computers, Informatics, Nursing</i> . 2008;26(5):273-281.   | E2             |
| 2.  | Acierno R, Gros DF, Ruggiero KJ, et al. Behavioral activation and therapeutic exposure for posttraumatic stress disorder: a noninferiority trial of treatment delivered in person versus home-based telehealth. <i>Depression &amp; Anxiety</i> . 2016;33(5):415-423.                   | E4             |
| 3.  | Acierno R, Knapp R, Tuerk P, et al. A non-inferiority trial of Prolonged Exposure for posttraumatic stress disorder: in person versus home-based telehealth. <i>Behaviour Research &amp; Therapy</i> . 2017;89:57-65.   | E4             |
| 4.  | Acosta MC, Possemato K, Maisto SA, et al. Web-delivered CBT reduces heavy drinking in OEF-OIF veterans in primary care with symptomatic substance use and PTSD. <i>Behavior Therapy</i> . 2017;48(2):262-276.   | E2             |
| 5.  | Ahrendt AD, Kattelmann KK, Rector TS, Maddox DA. The effectiveness of telemedicine for weight management in the MOVE! Program. <i>Journal of Rural Health</i> . 2014;30(1):113-119.   | E3             |
| 6.  | Alrajab S, Smith TR, Owens M, Aren0 JP, Caldito G. A home telemonitoring program reduced exacerbation and healthcare utilization rates in COPD patients with frequent exacerbations. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2012;18(10):772-776.                                  | E2             |
| 7.  | Ana EJS, Martino S, Gebregziabher M. Impact of telehealth in-home-messaging devices on alcohol use in dually diagnosed veterans. <i>Drug and Alcohol Dependence</i> . 2015;156.   | E7             |
| 8.  | Anderson J, Godwin KM, Petersen NJ, Willson P, Kent TA. A pilot test of videoconferencing to improve access to a stroke risk-reduction programme for Veterans. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2013;19(3):153-159.  | E3             |
| 9.  | Andrews SM, Sperber NR, Gierisch JM, et al. Patient perceptions of a comprehensive telemedicine intervention to address persistent poorly controlled diabetes. <i>Patient Preference &amp; Adherence</i> . 2017;11:469-478.   | E2             |
| 10. | Arena J, Dennis N, Devineni T, Maclean R, Meador K. A pilot study of feasibility and efficacy of telemedicine-delivered psychophysiological treatment for vascular headache. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2004;10(4):449-454.   | E3             |
| 11. | Azevedo KJ, Weiss BJ, Webb K, Gimeno J, Cloitre M. Piloting specialized mental health care for rural women veterans using STAIR delivered via telehealth: implications for reducing health disparities. <i>Journal of Health Care for the Poor &amp; Underserved</i> . 2016;27(4A):1-7. | E3             |
| 12. | Baldonado A, Rodriguez L, Renfro D, Sheridan SB, McElrath M, Chardos J. A home telehealth heart failure management program for veterans through care transitions. <i>Dimensions of Critical Care Nursing</i> . 2013;32(4):162-165.  | E7             |
| 13. | Barnett TE, Chumbler NR, Vogel WB, Beyth RJ, Qin H, Kobb R. The effectiveness of a care coordination home telehealth program for veterans with diabetes mellitus: a 2-year follow-up. <i>American Journal of Managed Care</i> . 2006;12(8):467-474.                                     | E2             |
| 14. | Barnett TE, Chumbler NR, Vogel WB, Beyth RJ, Ryan P, Figueroa S. The cost-utility of a care coordination/home telehealth programme for veterans with diabetes. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2007;13(6):318-321.  | E2             |

|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
| 15. | Barnwell SV, Juretic MA, Hoerster KD, Van de Plasch R, Felker BL. VA Puget Sound Telemental Health Service to rural veterans: a growing program. <i>Psychological Services</i> . 2012;9(2):209-211.  | E7 |
| 16. | Baskin DS. Telemedicine and telemental health: Addressing the barriers to providing psychotherapy through video teleconferencing. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering</i> . 2014;74(12-B(E)):No Pagination Specified.   | E7 |
| 17. | Battaglia C, Peterson J, Whitfield E, et al. Integrating motivational interviewing into a home telehealth program for veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder who smoke: a randomized controlled trial. <i>Journal of Clinical Psychology</i> . 2016;72(3):194-206.  | E2 |
| 18. | Bauer MS, Krawczyk L, Miller CJ, et al. Team- based telecare for bipolar disorder . <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2016;22(10):855-864.  | E3 |
| 19. | Bendixen RM, Levy C, Lutz BJ, Horn KR, Chronister K, Mann WC. A telerehabilitation model for victims of polytrauma. <i>Rehabilitation Nursing Journal</i> . 2008;33(5):215-220.  | E5 |
| 20. | Bendixen RM, Levy CE, Olive ES, Kobb RF, Mann WC. Cost effectiveness of a telerehabilitation program to support chronically ill and disabled elders in their homes. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2009;15(1):31-38.   | E5 |
| 21. | Beste LA, Glorioso TJ, Ho PM, et al. Telemedicine specialty support promotes hepatitis C treatment by primary care providers in the Department of Veterans Affairs. <i>American Journal of Medicine</i> . 2017;130(4):432-438.e433.  | E5 |
| 22. | Beste LA, Mattox EA, Pichler R, et al. Primary care team members report greater individual benefits from long- versus short-term specialty telemedicine mentorship. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2016;22(8):699-706.   | E2 |
| 23. | Bittner AK, Wykstra SL, Yoshinaga PD, Li T. Telerehabilitation for people with low vision. <i>Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews</i> . 2014(3).   | E7 |
| 24. | Bounthavong M, Pruitt LD, Smolenski DJ, Gahm GA, Bansal A, Hansen RN. Economic evaluation of in-home telehealth compared to in-person treatment delivery for managing depression. <i>Value in Health</i> . 2016;19(3):A189.  | E7 |
| 25. | Bowen ME, Bosworth HB, Roumie CL. Blood pressure control in a hypertension telemedicine intervention: does distance to primary care matter? <i>Journal of Clinical Hypertension</i> . 2013;15(10):723-730.   | E2 |
| 26. | Brainerd L, Hawkins SY. Enrollment of veterans into a heart failure home telehealth program. <i>Home Health Care Management &amp; Practice</i> . 2016;28(3):155-160.   | E7 |
| 27. | Brooks E, Novins DK, Noe T, et al. Reaching rural communities with culturally appropriate care: a model for adapting remote monitoring to American Indian veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2013;19(4):272-277.  | E3 |
| 28. | Brown N. Telemental health versus face-to-face treatment: An examination of Operation Enduring Freedom and Operation Iraqi Freedom veterans' preferences for mental health services. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering</i> . 2018;79(4-B(E)):No Pagination Specified. | E7 |
| 29. | Bumgarner DJ, Polinsky EJ, Herman KG, et al. Mental health care for rural veterans: A systematic literature review, descriptive analysis, and future directions. <i>Journal of Rural Mental Health</i> . 2017;41(3):222-233.   | E8 |
| 30. | Chandler HK, McAndrew LM, Ciccone DS. Telemedicine treatment for veterans with gulf war illness [abstract]. <i>Psychosomatic medicine</i> . 2013;[71st Annual Scientific Meeting of the American Psychosomatic Society; 2013 Mar 13-16; Miami, FL United States](3):A-108.   | E7 |
| 31. | Chen TC, Christofferson DE, Hamlett-Berry K, et al. A tobacco cessation treatment model using telehealth: a pilot evaluation in Veterans. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2014;20(3):161-163.  | E2 |
| 32. | Chumbler NR, Mann WC, Wu S, Schmid A, Kobb R. The association of home-   | E4 |





|     |  |    |
|-----|--|----|
|     | telehealth use and care coordination with improvement of functional and cognitive functioning in frail elderly men. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2004;10(2):129-137.   |    |
| 33. | Chumbler NR, Neugaard B, Kobb R, Ryan P, Qin H, Joo Y. Evaluation of a care coordination/home-telehealth program for veterans with diabetes: health services utilization and health-related quality of life. <i>Evaluation &amp; the Health Professions</i> . 2005;28(4):464-478.                | E3 |
| 34. | Chumbler NR, Neugaard B, Ryan P, Qin H, Joo Y. An observational study of veterans with diabetes receiving weekly or daily home telehealth monitoring. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2005;11(3):150-156.  | E2 |
| 35. | Chumbler NR, Vogel WB, Garel M, Qin H, Kobb R, Ryan P. Health services utilization of a care coordination/home-telehealth program for veterans with diabetes: a matched-cohort study. <i>Journal of Ambulatory Care Management</i> . 2005;28(3):230-240.   | E2 |
| 36. | Clapp JD, Kemp JJ, Cox KS, Tuerk PW. Patterns of change in response to prolonged exposure: implications for treatment outcome. <i>Depression &amp; Anxiety</i> . 2016;33(9):807-815.   | E2 |
| 37. | Coulton S, Coulton K. Promoting and sustaining independence in a community setting: Kent telehealth evaluative development pilot: a study into the management of people with long term conditions. <i>Kent County Council</i> . 2010.  | E7 |
| 38. | Crowley MJ, Edelman D, McAndrew AT, et al. Effectiveness of a scalable telemedicine intervention for veterans with persistent poor diabetes control. <i>Diabetes</i> . 2015;64(5).   | E7 |
| 39. | Crowley MJ, Edelman D, McAndrew AT, et al. Practical telemedicine for veterans with persistently poor diabetes control: a randomized pilot trial. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2016;22(5):376-384.   | E2 |
| 40. | Dang S, Gomez-Orozco CA, van Zuilen MH, Levis S. Providing dementia consultations to veterans using clinical video telehealth: results from a clinical demonstration project. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2018;24(3):203-209.   | E3 |
| 41. | Dang S, Sanchez A, Oropesa L, Roos BA, Florez H. Telehealth-assisted care coordination of older veterans with Type 2 diabetes lowers coronary heart disease risk despite clinical inertia. <i>Diabetes Technology &amp; Therapeutics</i> . 2010;12(12):995-1001.                                 | E2 |
| 42. | Darkins A, Kendall S, Edmonson E, Young M, Stressel P. Reduced cost and mortality using home telehealth to promote self-management of complex chronic conditions: a retrospective matched cohort study of 4,999 veteran patients. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2015;21(1):70-76. | E2 |
| 43. | Desko L, Nazario M. Evaluation of a clinical video telehealth pain management clinic. <i>Journal of Pain &amp; Palliative Care Pharmacotherapy</i> . 2014;28(4):359-366.   | E3 |
| 44. | DeYoung N, Shenal BV. The reliability of the Montreal Cognitive Assessment using telehealth in a rural setting with veterans. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2018;1357633X17752030.   | E2 |
| 45. | Dracup CAJ. The effect of a Care Coordination/Home Telehealth Program on veteran behavioral health patients and recidivism. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences</i> . 2012;72(7-A):2375.   | E7 |
| 46. | Dugas M. Individual differences in regulatory mode moderate the effectiveness of a pilot mHealth trial for diabetes management among older veterans. <i>Plos one</i> . 2018.   | E1 |
| 48. | Elliott J, Chapman J, Clark DJ. Videoconferencing for a veteran's pain management follow-up clinic. <i>Pain Management Nursing</i> . 2007;8(1):35-46.  | E3 |
| 49. | Fields B, Pathak P, McCloskey S, et al. Remote ambulatory management of veterans with obstructive sleep apnea. <i>Sleep</i> . 2014;37(31).   | E5 |
| 50. | Flodgren G, Rachas A, Farmer AJ, Inzitari M, Shepperd S. Interactive telemedicine: effects on professional practice and health care outcomes. <i>Cochrane Database Syst Rev</i> . 2015(9):Cd002098.  | E1 |
| 51. | Fortney JC, Maciejewski ML, Tripathi SP, Deen TL, Pyne JM. A budget impact analysis  | E2 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
|     | of telemedicine-based collaborative care for depression. <i>Medical Care</i> . 2011;49(9):872-880.  |    |
| 52. | Fortney JC, Pyne JM, Kimbrell TA, et al. Telemedicine-based collaborative care for posttraumatic stress disorder: a randomized clinical trial. <i>JAMA Psychiatry</i> . 2015;72(1):58-67.   | E2 |
| 53. | Franklin CL, Cuccurullo LA, Walton JL, Arseneau JR, Petersen NJ. Face to face but not in the same place: A pilot study of prolonged exposure therapy. <i>Journal of Trauma &amp; Dissociation</i> . 2017;18(1):116-130.   | E3 |
| 54. | Gabrielian S, Yuan A, Andersen RM, et al. Chronic disease management for recently homeless veterans: a clinical practice improvement program to apply home telehealth technology to a vulnerable population. <i>Medical Care</i> . 2013;51(3 Suppl 1):S44-51.   | E2 |
| 55. | Garcia MM, Lindstrom KJ. Telebehavioral health: practical application in deployed and garrison settings. <i>US Army Medical Department Journal</i> . 2014:29-35.  | E7 |
| 56. | Gehrman P, Bellamy S, Medvedeva E, et al. Telehealth delivery of group CBT-I is noninferior to in-person treatment in veterans with PTSD. <i>Sleep</i> . 2018;Conference: 32nd annual meeting of the associated professional sleep societies, SLEEP. 2018. United states 41(Supplement 1):A141-A142.                                    | E7 |
| 57. | Gilmore AK, Davis MT, Grubaugh A, et al. "Do you expect me to receive PTSD care in a setting where most of the other patients remind me of the perpetrator?": Home-based telemedicine to address barriers to care unique to military sexual trauma and Veterans Affairs hospitals. <i>Contemporary Clinical Trials</i> . 2016;48:59-64. | E7 |
| 58. | Goetter EM, Bui E, Ojserkis RA, Zakarian RJ, Brendel RW, Simon NM. A systematic review of dropout from psychotherapy for posttraumatic stress disorder among Iraq and Afghanistan combat veterans. <i>Journal of Traumatic Stress</i> . 2015;28(5):401-409.   | E4 |
| 59. | Goetter EM, Bui E, Ojserkis RA, Zakarian RJ, Brendel RW, Simon NM. "A systematic review of dropout from psychotherapy for posttraumatic stress disorder among Iraq and Afghanistan combat veterans": Erratum. <i>Journal of Traumatic Stress</i> . 2015;28(6):590.  | E7 |
| 60. | Gould CE, Zapata AML, Bruce J, et al. Development of a video-delivered relaxation treatment of late-life anxiety for veterans. <i>International Psychogeriatrics</i> . 2017;29(10):1633-1645.   | E2 |
| 61. | Gros DF, Yoder M, Tuerk PW, Lozano BE, Acierno R. Exposure therapy for PTSD delivered to veterans via telehealth: predictors of treatment completion and outcome and comparison to treatment delivered in person. <i>Behavior Therapy</i> . 2011;42(2):276-283.   | E4 |
| 62. | Grubbs KM, Fortney JC, Dean T, Williams JS, Godleski L. A comparison of mental health diagnoses treated via interactive video and face to face in the veterans healthcare administration. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2015;21(7):564-566.  | E4 |
| 63. | Grubbs KM, Fortney JC, Kimbrell T, et al. Usual care for rural veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder. <i>Journal of Rural Health</i> . 2017;33(3):290-296.  | E4 |
| 64. | Hill RD, Luptak MK, Rupper RW, et al. Review of Veterans Health Administration telemedicine interventions. <i>American Journal of Managed Care</i> . 2010;16(12 Suppl HIT):e302-310.  | E8 |
| 65. | Hopp F, Woodbridge P, Subramanian U, Copeland L, Smith D, Lowery J. Outcomes associated with a home care telehealth intervention. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2006;12(3):297-307.  | E3 |
| 66. | Horton J. Improving self-management in patients with chronic conditions. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering</i> . 2017;77(10-B(E)):No Pagination Specified.   | E7 |
| 67. | Interian A, King AR, St Hill LM, Robinson CH, Damschroder LJ. Evaluating the implementation of home-based videoconferencing for providing mental health services. <i>Psychiatric Services</i> . 2018;69(1):69-75.   | E4 |

|     |   |    |
|-----|---|----|
| 68. | Ishani A, Christopher J, Palmer D, et al. Telehealth by an interprofessional team in patients with CKD: a randomized controlled trial. <i>American Journal of Kidney Diseases</i> . 2016;68(1):41-49.   | E4 |
| 69. | Jaconis M, Santa Ana EJ, Killeen TK, Badour CL, Back SE. Concurrent treatment of PTSD and alcohol use disorder via telehealth in a female Iraq veteran. <i>American Journal on Addictions</i> . 2017;26(2):112-114.                               | E3 |
| 70. | Jia H, Chuang HC, Wu SS, Wang X, Chumbler NR. Long-term effect of home telehealth services on preventable hospitalization use. <i>Journal of Rehabilitation Research &amp; Development</i> . 2009;46(5):557-566.                                  | E2 |
| 71. | Jia H, Feng H, Wang X, Wu SS, Chumbler N. A longitudinal study of health service utilization for diabetes patients in a care coordination home-telehealth programme. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2011;17(3):123-126.          | E2 |
| 72. | Joseph AM. Care coordination and telehealth technology in promoting self-management among chronically ill patients. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2006;12(2):156-159.  | E2 |
| 73. | Kehle SM, Greer N, Rutks I, Wilt T. Interventions to improve veterans' access to care: a systematic review of the literature. <i>Journal of General Internal Medicine</i> . 2011;26 Suppl 2:689-696.  | E4 |
| 74. | Kincade K. Telemedicine supports primary-care delivery at outlying VA centers. <i>Telemedicine &amp; Telehealth Networks</i> . 1998;4(2):8, 10-11.  | E7 |
| 75. | Kirkizlar E, Serban N, Sisson JA, Swann JL, Barnes CS, Williams MD. Evaluation of telemedicine for screening of diabetic retinopathy in the Veterans Health Administration. <i>Ophthalmology</i> . 2013;120(12):2604-2610.                        | E5 |
| 76. | Klee A, Stacy M, Rosenheck R, Harkness L, Tsai J. Interest in technology-based therapies hampered by access: A survey of veterans with serious mental illnesses. <i>Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal</i> . 2016;39(2):173-179.                  | E2 |
| 77. | Klobucar TF, Hibbs R, Jans P, Adams MR. Evaluating the effectiveness of an aggressive case management and home telehealth monitoring program for long-term control of A1C. <i>Professional Case Management</i> . 2012;17(2):51-58; quiz 59-60.    | E2 |
| 78. | Krupnick JL, Green BL, Amdur R, et al. An Internet-based writing intervention for PTSD in veterans: A feasibility and pilot effectiveness trial. <i>Psychological Trauma</i> . 2017;9(4):461-470.   | E2 |
| 79. | Leach M, Garcia G, Ganzer N. Implementation and evaluation of a pharmacist-run mental health treatment clinic via clinical video telehealth. <i>The Mental Health Clinician</i> . 2016;6(3):159-164.  | E3 |
| 80. | Levy CE, Spooner H, Lee JB, Sonke J, Myers K, Snow E. Telehealth-based creative arts therapy: Transforming mental health and rehabilitation care for rural veterans. <i>The Arts in Psychotherapy</i> . 2018;57:20-26.                            | E3 |
| 81. | Lightstone AJ, Bailey S, Voros P. Collaborative music therapy via remote video technology to reduce a veteran's symptoms of severe, chronic PTSD. <i>Arts &amp; Health</i> . 2015;7(2):123-136.   | E3 |
| 82. | Lindsay JA, Kauth MR, Hudson S, et al. Implementation of video telehealth to improve access to evidence-based psychotherapy for posttraumatic stress disorder. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2015;21(6):467-472.                   | E3 |
| 83. | Luxton DD, O'Brien K, Pruitt LD, Johnson K, Kramer G. Suicide risk management during clinical telepractice. <i>International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine</i> . 2014;48(1):19-31.  | E3 |
| 84. | Luxton DD, Pruitt LD, O'Brien K, Kramer G. An evaluation of the feasibility and safety of a home-based telemental health treatment for posttraumatic stress in the U.S. Military. <i>Telemedicine Journal and E-Health</i> . 2015;21(11):880-886. | E3 |
| 85. | Luxton DD, Pruitt LD, O'Brien K, et al. Design and methodology of a randomized clinical   | E7 |

|      |   |    |
|------|---|----|
|      | trial of home-based telemental health treatment for U.S. military personnel and veterans with depression. <i>Contemporary Clinical Trials</i> . 2014;38(1):134-144.   |    |
| 86.  | Maieritsch KP, Smith TL, Hessinger JD, Ahearn EP, Eickhoff JC, Zhao Q. Randomized controlled equivalence trial comparing videoconference and in person delivery of cognitive processing therapy for PTSD. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2016;22(4):238-243.                 | E4 |
| 87.  | Marton K, Kanas N. Telehealth modalities for group therapy: Comparisons to in-person group therapy. <i>International Journal of Group Psychotherapy</i> . 2016;66(1):145-150.   | E7 |
| 88.  | Menon AS, Kondapavalru P, Krishna P, et al. Evaluation of a portable low cost videophone system in the assessment of depressive symptoms and cognitive function in elderly medically ill veterans. <i>Journal of Nervous &amp; Mental Disease</i> . 2001;189(6):399-401.                      | E4 |
| 89.  | Merriel SW, Andrews V, Salisbury C. Telehealth interventions for primary prevention of cardiovascular disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. <i>Preventive Medicine</i> . 2014;64:88-95.   | E1 |
| 90.  | Miller CJ, McInnes DK, Stolzmann K, Bauer MS. Interest in use of technology for healthcare among Veterans receiving treatment for mental health. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2016;22(10):847-854.  | E2 |
| 91.  | Moeckli J, Stewart KR, Ono S, et al. Mixed-methods study of uptake of the Extension for Community Health Outcomes (ECHO) telemedicine model for rural Veterans With HIV. <i>Journal of Rural Health</i> . 2017;33(3):323-331.   | E2 |
| 92.  | Moo LR, Jafri Z, Morin PJ. Home-based video telehealth for veterans with dementia. <i>Federal Practitioner</i> . 2014;31(12):36-38.   | E6 |
| 93.  | Morland LA, Greene CJ, Grubbs K, et al. Therapist adherence to manualized cognitive-behavioral therapy for anger management delivered to veterans with PTSD via videoconferencing. <i>Journal of Clinical Psychology</i> . 2011;67(6):629-638.  | E3 |
| 94.  | Muir S, de Boer K, Meyer D, M. N. Barriers and facilitators of videoconferencing psychotherapy implementation in military health care environments: a systematic review.  | E7 |
| 95.  | Niles BL, Klunk-Gillis J, Ryngala DJ, Silberbogen AK, Paysnick A, Wolf EJ. Comparing mindfulness and psychoeducation treatments for combat-related PTSD using a telehealth approach. <i>Psychological Trauma</i> . 2012;4(5):538-547.   | E7 |
| 96.  | Owen R. Adapting and Implementing the Blended Collaborative Care Model in CBOCs. CRE 12-310.  | E7 |
| 97.  | Painter JT, Fortney JC, Austen MA, Pyne JM. Cost-Effectiveness of Telemedicine-Based Collaborative Care for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. <i>Psychiatric Services</i> . 2017;68(11):1157-1163.   | E2 |
| 98.  | Parker S, Prince A, Thomas L, et al. Electronic, mobile and telehealth tools for vulnerable patients with chronic disease: a systematic review and realist synthesis. <i>BMJ Open</i> . 2018;8(8):e019192.  | E1 |
| 99.  | Porcari CE, Amdur RL, Koch EI, et al. Assessment of post-traumatic stress disorder in veterans by videoconferencing and by face-to-face methods. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2009;15(2):89-94.  | E3 |
| 100. | Price M, Gros DF. Examination of prior experience with telehealth and comfort with telehealth technology as a moderator of treatment response for PTSD and depression in veterans. <i>International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine</i> . 2014;48(1):57-67.                                 | E3 |
| 101. | Pruitt LD, Vuletic S, Smolenski DJ, Wagner A, Luxton DD, Gahm GA. Predicting post treatment client satisfaction between behavioural activation for depression delivered either in-person or via home-based telehealth. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2018:1357633X18784103. | E4 |
| 102. | Pyne JM, Fortney JC, Tripathi SP, Maciejewski ML, Edlund MJ, Williams DK. Cost-   | E2 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | effectiveness analysis of a rural telemedicine collaborative care intervention for depression. <i>Archives of General Psychiatry</i> . 2010;67(8):812-821.   |    |
| 103. | Riegler LJ, Neils-Strunjas J, Boyce S, Wade SL, Scheifele PM. Cognitive intervention results in web-based videophone treatment adherence and improved cognitive scores. <i>Medical Science Monitor</i> . 2013;19:269-275.                          | E2 |
| 104. | Rubin R. VA Using telemedicine to provide therapy to rural veterans with PTSD. <i>JAMA</i> . 2018;319(16):1648.  | E7 |
| 105. | Russo JE, McCool RR, Davies L. VA telemedicine: an analysis of cost and time savings. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2016;22(3):209-215.   | E2 |
| 106. | Rutledge T, Skoyen JA, Wiese JA, Ober KM, Woods GN. A comparison of MOVE! versus TeleMOVE programs for weight loss in Veterans with obesity. <i>Obesity Research &amp; Clinical Practice</i> . 2017;11(3):344-351.                                 | E2 |
| 107. | Salisbury C, O'Cathain A, Thomas C, et al. Telehealth for patients at high risk of cardiovascular disease: pragmatic randomised controlled trial. <i>British Medical Journal</i> . 2016.   | E1 |
| 108. | Samii A, Ryan-Dykes P, Tsukuda RA, Zink C, Franks R, Nichol WP. Telemedicine for delivery of health care in Parkinson's disease. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2006;12(1):16-18.   | E5 |
| 109. | Shore JH, Brooks E, Anderson H, et al. Characteristics of telemental health service use by American Indian veterans. <i>Psychiatric Services</i> . 2012;63(2):179-181.   | E3 |
| 110. | Shore JH, Manson SM. Telepsychiatric care of American Indian veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder: bridging gaps in geography, organizations, and culture. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2004;10 Suppl 2:S-64-69.           | E3 |
| 111. | Shore JH, Manson SM. The American Indian veteran and posttraumatic stress disorder: a telehealth assessment and formulation. <i>Culture, Medicine &amp; Psychiatry</i> . 2004;28(2):231-243.   | E3 |
| 112. | Shore P, Goranson A, Ward MF, Lu MW. Meeting veterans where they're @: a VA Home-Based Telemental Health (HBTMH) pilot program. <i>International Journal of Psychiatry in Medicine</i> . 2014;48(1):5-17.  | E3 |
| 113. | Smith MW, Hill ML, Hopkins KL, Kiratli BJ, Cronkite RC. A modeled analysis of telehealth methods for treating pressure ulcers after spinal cord injury. <i>International Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Applications</i> . 2012;2012:729492.        | E5 |
| 114. | Smolenski DJ, Pruitt LD, Vuletic S, Luxton DD, Gahm G. Unobserved heterogeneity in response to treatment for depression through videoconference. <i>Psychiatric Rehabilitation Journal</i> . 2017;40(3):303-308.                                   | E4 |
| 115. | Sorocco KH, Bratkovich KL, Wingo R, Qureshi SM, Mason PJ. Integrating care coordination home telehealth and home based primary care in rural Oklahoma: a pilot study. <i>Psychological Services</i> . 2013;10(3):350-352.                          | E7 |
| 116. | Srivastava A, Do JM, Sales VL, Ly S, Joseph J. Impact of patient-centred home telehealth programme on outcomes in heart failure. <i>Journal of Telemedicine &amp; Telecare</i> . 2018:1357633X18775852.  | E2 |
| 117. | Strachan M, Gros DF, Ruggiero KJ, Lejuez CW, Acierno R. An integrated approach to delivering exposure-based treatment for symptoms of PTSD and depression in OIF/OEF veterans: preliminary findings. <i>Behavior Therapy</i> . 2012;43(3):560-569. | E4 |
| 118. | Strachan M, Gros DF, Yuen E, Ruggiero KJ, Foa EB, Acierno R. Home-based telehealth to deliver evidence-based psychotherapy in veterans with PTSD. <i>Contemporary Clinical Trials</i> . 2012;33(2):402-409.  | E7 |
| 119. | Tan G, Teo I, Srivastava D, et al. Improving access to care for women veterans suffering from chronic pain and depression associated with trauma. <i>Pain Medicine</i> . 2013;14(7):1010-1020.   | E3 |
| 120. | Thorp SR, Fidler J, Moreno L, Floto E, Agha Z. Lessons learned from studies of   | E7 |

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
|      | psychotherapy for posttraumatic stress disorder via video teleconferencing. <i>Psychological Services</i> . 2012;9(2):197-199.   |    |
| 121. | Totten AM, Womack DM, Eden KB, et al. Telehealth: mapping the evidence for patient outcomes from systematic reviews. 2016.   | E1 |
| 122. | Turner TH, Horner MD, Vankirk KK, Myrick H, Tuerk PW. A pilot trial of neuropsychological evaluations conducted via telemedicine in the Veterans Health Administration. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2012;18(9):662-667.   | E4 |
| 123. | Wakefield BJ, Holman JE, Ray A, et al. Effectiveness of home telehealth in comorbid diabetes and hypertension: a randomized, controlled trial. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2011;17(4):254-261.  | E2 |
| 124. | Wakefield BJ, Ward MM, Holman JE, et al. Evaluation of home telehealth following hospitalization for heart failure: a randomized trial. <i>Telemedicine Journal &amp; E-Health</i> . 2008;14(8):753-761.   | E3 |
| 125. | Whealin JM, Seibert-Hatalsky LA, Howell JW, Tsai J. E-mental health preferences of Veterans with and without probable posttraumatic stress disorder. <i>Journal of Rehabilitation Research &amp; Development</i> . 2015;52(6):725-738.   | E3 |
| 126. | Wong MY-S. Application of behavioral telehealth in the assessment of PTSD: Factors affecting patient and clinician satisfaction using videoteleconferencing (VTC) technology. <i>Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering</i> . 2003;63(12-B):6111. | E7 |
| 127. | Wynn SD, Sherrod RA. Providing mental health care to veterans in rural areas: using telehealth in mobile clinics. <i>Journal of Psychosocial Nursing &amp; Mental Health Services</i> . 2012;50(6):22-28.  | E7 |
| 128. | Young LB, Foster L, Silander A, Wakefield BJ. Home telehealth: patient satisfaction, program functions, and challenges for the care coordinator. <i>Journal of Gerontological Nursing</i> . 2011;37(11):38-46.   | E3 |

## APPENDIX C. EVIDENCE TABLES

### DATA ABSTRACTION OF INCLUDED SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

| Author Year                | Aims Search details Eligibility criteria   | Numbers and designs of included studies applicable to present review; sample sizes  | Patient characteristics from included studies applicable to present review  | Intervention characteristics from included studies applicable to present review  | Overall results (stratified by Key Question)  |
|----------------------------|--|---|---|--|---|
| Turgoose 2018 <sup>1</sup> | <p>Teletherapy for Veterans with PTSD.</p> <p>CINAHL, PubMed, and PsycInfo databases plus searches in <i>Journal of Telehealth and Telecare</i> and <i>Journal of Telehealth and e-Health</i>. No information on search dates.</p> <p>Articles included if they reported on use of teletherapy (eg, videoconferencing, telephone) for PTSD with ex-service personnel and excluded if they reported on online-only interventions.</p> | <p>Out of 41 included studies, sample size ranged from 1-600 participants. 28 studies had experimental designs, 8 were non-experimental (surveys, or study descriptions only), 3 were single case studies, 1 was qualitative, 1 was a retrospective cost analysis, and 1 was a secondary data analysis.</p> <p>13 studies looked at attrition, drop-out and attendance rates. Authors did not report the number of studies that looked at patient satisfaction.</p> | <p>40 studies were conducted in US Veterans and 1 in Canadian Veterans. In most studies, participants had limited access to treatment due to living in remote or rural areas.</p> | <p>In most cases, participants received specific equipment and software from the VHA. In 3 cases, participants used Skype or another videoconferencing application available on a smartphone. In 23 studies, participants traveled to local clinics for appointments. In 6 studies, participants received treatment in group settings.</p> <p>Interventions included:<br/>                     -Prolonged exposure (15 studies)<br/>                     -Cognitive processing therapy (8)<br/>                     -Cognitive behavioral therapy (5)<br/>                     -Behavioral activation (3)<br/>                     -Eye-movement desensitization and reprocessing (1)<br/>                     -Anger management (2)<br/>                     -Mindfulness (1)<br/>                     -General coping and psychoeducation interventions (2)</p> <p>Follow-up duration not reported, but authors found that reductions in PTSD symptoms were present at 3 and 6 months after treatment for all but 1 study examining effectiveness.</p> | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>                     "No studies found significant differences in attrition between tele-therapy and in-person treatments, with one finding that those receiving tele-therapy attended significantly more sessions. There were no differences in the number of sessions attended before dropout occurred, except for one study which suggested that those receiving tele-therapy attended more sessions before dropping out of treatment."</p> <p>"No studies found any significant differences in satisfaction and acceptability between tele-therapy and in-person treatment groups, with most reporting high levels of satisfaction with both."</p> |

Abbreviations: PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder; VHA= Veterans Health Administration



## DATA ABSTRACTION OF INCLUDED PRIMARY STUDIES

### Data Abstraction of Observational Studies

| Author Year   | Study Design<br>Sample Size<br>Location               | Patient Characteristics   | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up  | Setting   | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key Question)  |
|---|---|---|--|---|--|
| Litwack 2014 <sup>2</sup>   | Within-subject crossover study<br>N=30<br>New England | Trauma-exposed Veterans<br><br>IE criteria: English-speaking<br>Age (mean): 53 years<br>Sex: 90% male<br>Race: 79% white<br>Rurality: NR                    | Participants completed PTSD diagnostic assessment both in person and via video.<br><br>Assessments were administered 2 weeks apart by a doctoral-level clinician.                            | Video location: VA Medical Center<br><br>In-person location: VA Medical Center                          | <b>KQ1:</b><br>Veterans reported high levels of satisfaction with both video and in-person diagnostic assessment including:<br>(a) "how comfortable they felt with the clinician," $t(28)=-.95, P=.35$<br>(b) "how comfortable they felt with the interview material," $t(28)=.00, P=1.00$<br>(c) "the convenience of the assessment," $t(28)=1.31, P=.20$                                   |
| Shore 2007a, <sup>3</sup><br>Shore 2007b, <sup>4</sup><br>Shore 2008 <sup>5</sup> | Within-subject crossover study<br>N=53<br>Colorado    | Rural Vietnam-era American Indians<br><br>IE criteria: None<br>Age (mean): 54 years<br>Sex: 100% male<br>Race: 100% American Indian<br>Rurality: 100% rural | Participants completed mental health diagnostic assessment both in person and via video.<br><br>Assessments were administered less than 2 weeks apart (average 10.8 days) by a psychiatrist. | Video location: Community Tribal Veterans Center<br><br>In-person location: Private office in community | <b>KQ1:</b><br>There were no significant differences between patients' overall mean satisfaction between video and in-person groups (4.59 vs 4.68, $P=NR$ ).<br><br><b>KQ2:</b><br>It is cheaper to assess mental health through telehealth than in-person (\$20,199 at established telehealth clinic vs \$24,474 at new clinic vs \$33,841 at in-person clinic based on high salary costs). |



| Author Year              | Study Design Sample Size Location           | Patient Characteristics   | Intervention vs Comparator Follow-Up   | Setting   | Overall Results (Stratified by Key Question)   |
|--------------------------|---|---|--|---|--|
| Shores 2004 <sup>6</sup> | Prospective Cohort<br>N=16<br>Seattle, WA   | Veterans residing at either of two Washington State Veterans' Homes.<br><br>IE Criteria: ≥60 years and screened positive for dementia using the 7-Minute Screen<br>Age (mean): 78 years<br>Sex: 94% male<br>Race: NR<br>Rurality: NR                              | Video vs in-person examination for dementia conducted by different geriatric psychiatrists.<br><br>Average time between the telehealth and in-person examination was 8.2 days. | Video location: Veterans' Home using a VCON Armada Cruiser 384 videoconference system<br><br>In-person location: NR | <b>KQ1:</b><br>Telehealth patient survey (mean ± SD):<br>(a) I understand what the health care provider told me as well as if it had been in person (4.5 ± 0.06)<br>(b) The telehealth visit was private enough for me to ask the questions I wanted to (4.7 ± 0.5)<br>(c) The telehealth technology saved me time (4.8 ± 0.4)<br>(d) I would choose to have a telehealth visit again (4.8 ± 0.4)<br>(e) I would rather use telehealth than travel to the clinic (4.8 ± 0.6) |
| Tuerk 2010 <sup>7</sup>  | Prospective cohort<br>N=47<br>Southeast, US | Veterans diagnosed with combat-related PTSD<br><br>Age: mean 39.0<br>Sex: 94% male<br>Race: 64% white<br>IE criteria: Diagnosis of combat-related PTSD via DSM-IV<br>Rurality: 26% (Telehealth option was only made available for patients living in rural areas) | Video vs in-person prolonged exposure treatment for 8 to 15 weekly 90-minute sessions. Delivered by clinical psychologists.  | Video: CBOC using a Tanburg 1000 MXP<br><br>In-person: VAMC   | <b>KQ1:</b><br>Treatment completion (telehealth vs in-person): 75% vs 83%<br><br>Sessions attended by completers (mean ± SD): 10.0 ± 6.3 vs 10.1 ± 3.8   |

Abbreviations: IE = Inclusion/Exclusion criteria; PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder; VA = Veterans Affairs; NR= not reported; DSM-IV = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 4; VAMC = Veterans Affairs Medical Center; SD = standard deviation



**Data Abstraction of RCTs**

| Author<br>Year<br>N   | Study<br>Design<br>Sample<br>Size<br>Location | Patient Characteristics  | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up  | Setting  | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key<br>Question)   |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| Egede 2015, <sup>8</sup><br>Egede 2016, <sup>9</sup><br>Egede<br>2017, <sup>10</sup><br>Egede<br>2018 <sup>11</sup> | RCT<br>N=241<br>South<br>Carolina             | Elderly Veterans with depression<br><br>Age (mean): 63.9 years<br>Sex: 97.5% male<br>Race: 59.3% white<br>IE criteria: DSM-IV criteria for major depressive disorder and stabilization of antidepressant medication for $\geq 4$ weeks<br>Rurality: NR | Video vs in-person individualized psychotherapy for 8 weeks (60-minute session once per week). Therapists were Master's-level counselors with at least 5 years of clinical experience. Follow-up: 12 months. | Video location: In-home videophone operating via standard telephone service<br><br>In-person location: VA medical center | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>Satisfaction (CPOSS): No significant difference at any time</p> <p><b>KQ2:</b><br/>Healthcare Utilization Costs: (telehealth vs. in-person)<br/>\$687.91 vs \$1,359.49</p> <p>ICEEs at 12-months:<br/>(positive number favors telehealth)<br/>Mean: 5,892.34<br/>Median: -787.85</p> <p><b>KQ3:</b><br/>QoL (SF-36): No significant difference at 12 months<br/>QALYs: No significant difference at 12 months</p> <p>% Difference in treatment response at 12 months (Telemedical minus in-person)<br/>BDI: 1.05% (90% CI -8.30 to 10.41)<br/>GDS: 1.66% (90% CI -7.20 to 10.52)<br/>SCID: -3.68% (90% CI -15.53 to 8.16)</p> |



| Author<br>Year<br>N  | Study<br>Design<br>Sample<br>Size<br>Location         | Patient Characteristics  | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up  | Setting   | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key<br>Question)  |
|--|---|--|--|---|---|
| Glassman<br>2017, <sup>12</sup><br>Morland<br>2014, <sup>13</sup><br>Morland<br>2015 <sup>14</sup> | Secondary<br>analysis of 2<br>RCTs<br>N=251<br>Hawaii | Male Veterans with PTSD and<br>female Veterans and civilians with<br>PTSD<br><br>IE criteria: Diagnosis of PTSD; stable<br>medication regimen; no active<br>psychosis, severe cognitive<br>impairment, homicidal or suicidal<br>ideation, substance abuse, or<br>organic psychological condition<br>Age (mean): 50.8 years<br>Sex: 50% male<br>Race: 59% white<br>Rurality: 100% | Video vs in-person group<br>(men) or individual (women)<br>cognitive processing therapy<br>(Twelve 90-minute sessions<br>over 6 weeks) delivered by<br>pairs of doctoral-level<br>therapists/social worker.<br>Follow-up: 6 months | Video location: Local VA clinic<br>or vet center used Tanberg 880<br>model health care system<br>video teleconferencing<br>equipment. Research assistant<br>sat in room and intervened in<br>cases of technological<br>difficulties or clinical<br>emergencies.<br><br>In-person location: VAMC | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>Men in video and in-person<br/>groups had similar ratings of<br/>satisfaction on Charleston<br/>Psychiatric Outpatient<br/>Satisfaction Scale-VA (mean<br/>± SD): 66.7 ± 11.6 vs 63.9 ±<br/>10.7, <i>P</i>=.36</p> <p>Proportion of treatment<br/>completers (10/12 sessions)<br/>did not differ between<br/>telehealth and in-person<br/>groups: 76.2% vs 79.4%,<br/><i>P</i>=NR</p> <p>Women in video group had<br/>lower rates of satisfaction<br/>than in-person: 66.5 vs 70.8,<br/><i>P</i>=.03</p> <p><b>KQ3:</b><br/>There was no effect of<br/>treatment modality on QOL<br/>over the treatment and<br/>follow-up period for men and<br/>women (<i>P</i>&gt;.33)</p> |

| Author Year N   | Study Design Sample Size Location | Patient Characteristics  | Intervention vs Comparator Follow-Up  | Setting  | Overall Results (Stratified by Key Question)   |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Greene 2010 <sup>15</sup> , Morland 2010 <sup>16</sup> , Morland 2013 <sup>17</sup> | RCT<br>N=125<br>Hawaii            | Male rural combat Veterans.<br><br>IE criteria: PTSD and anger problems; stable medication for 2 months; no active psychotic disorder, homicidal/suicidal ideation, cognitive impairment or substance dependence.<br>Age (mean): 55 years<br>Sex: 100% male<br>Race: 33% white<br>Rurality: 100% rural | Video teleconferencing vs in person-delivered group anger management therapy (12-session manual-based CBT intervention delivered by doctoral-level therapists).<br>Follow-up: 6 months. | Video location: Veterans met at local VA, therapist teleconferenced in<br><br>In-person location: Veterans and therapist met at local VA | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>No significant differences in number of sessions attended between groups (mean ± SD): 10.3 ± 2.5, <i>P</i>=.29. Did not differ based on sub-group analyses.</p> <p>No significant differences in satisfaction with care between groups as measured with Charleston Psychiatric Outpatient Satisfaction Scale (mean ± SD): 62.5/80 ± 13.1, <i>P</i>=.94. Did not differ based on sub-group analyses of island.</p> <p><b>KQ2:</b><br/>Unadjusted mean costs were significantly lower for telehealth (\$79, CI \$73-84) than in-person (\$792, CI \$727-856) delivery (<i>P</i>=.01).</p> |

| Author Year N              | Study Design Sample Size Location | Patient Characteristics  | Intervention vs Comparator Follow-Up   | Setting  | Overall Results (Stratified by Key Question)   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Herbert 2017 <sup>18</sup> | RCT<br>N=128<br>San Diego, CA     | Veterans with chronic pain<br><br>IE Criteria: Moderate/severe chronic pain for >6 months, no serious or unstable medical or psychiatric condition, no SI.<br>Age (mean): average 52 years<br>Sex: 82% male<br>Race: 47% white<br>Rurality: NR | Video vs in person 8-week ACT delivered by graduate-level therapists. Follow-up: 6 months. | Video location: VA site of their choice (La Jolla Medical Center, Mission Valley Outpatient Clinic, or the Oceanside, Escondido, or Chula Vista CBOCs).<br><br>In-person location: La Jolla Medical Center | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>No differences in mean satisfaction in video vs in-person groups as measured by CSQ: 4.40 vs 4.47, <i>P</i> = .53</p> <p><b>KQ3:</b><br/>Measured as mean difference (telehealth minus in-person) in change (95% CI):<br/>BPI Severity: -.06 (-.72 to .60)<br/>SF12-MCS: -1.72 (-6.13 to 2.7)<br/>SF12-PCS: -2.2 (-5.46 to 1.07)<br/>CPAQ: 3.45 (-3.13 to 10.03)<br/>MPI: .31 (.02–.60)<br/>PHQ-9: 1.22 (-.88 to 3.32)<br/>PSS-20: -4.01 (-11.01 to 3.00)<br/>PSQ: -.14 (-1.69 to 1.42)</p> |

| Author<br>Year<br>N  | Study<br>Design<br>Sample<br>Size<br>Location | Patient Characteristics  | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up   | Setting   | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key<br>Question)  |
|--|---|--|---|---|---|
| Luxton<br>2016, <sup>19</sup><br>Bounthavong<br>2018 <sup>20</sup> | RCT<br>N=121<br>Oregon and<br>Washington      | Military personnel and Veterans with depression<br><br>Age (mean): 35.15 years<br>Sex: 82% male<br>Race: 70% white<br>IE criteria: Met diagnostic criteria for minor depressive disorder or major depressive disorder, as determined by the SCID-I/P. If taking psychoactive medications, has maintained a stable regimen for a minimum of 30 days prior to study entry. Excluding those currently undergoing psychotherapy for depression or suicidal ideation.<br>Rurality: NR | Video vs in-person BATD treatment for 50-60-min sessions every week for 8 weeks. Follow-up: 12 weeks. | Video: In-home, Dell M6500 laptop computer and Tandberg Precision HD Webcam<br><br>In-person: In-office | <b>KQ1:</b><br>CSQ: b= -.53 (95% CI -2.11 to 1.05)<br><br><b>KQ2:</b><br>Total direct cost per patient (telehealth vs in-person):<br>Scenario 1 (technology provided by patients): \$309.31 vs \$406.44<br>Scenario 2 (technology provided by government): \$1,160.87 vs \$406.44<br><br>ICER (negative number favors telehealth):<br>Scenario 1: -\$158,506<br>Scenario 2: \$14,434,503<br><br><b>KQ3:</b><br>NR, but slightly lower mean improvements on hopelessness and depression scales |

| Author<br>Year<br>N          | Study<br>Design<br>Sample<br>Size<br>Location | Patient Characteristics   | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up   | Setting  | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key<br>Question)  |
|------------------------------|---|---|---|--|---|
| Ruskin<br>2004 <sup>21</sup> | RCT<br>N=119<br>Maryland                      | <p>Veterans with MH disorder (MDD, dysthymic disorder, adjustment disorder, mood disorder due to medical condition, or depressive disorder not otherwise specified)</p> <p>IE criteria: No bipolar disorder, schizophrenia, or substance use or dependence in past year<br/>Age (mean): 50 years<br/>Sex: 88% male<br/>Race: 61% white<br/>Rurality: NR</p> | <p>Video vs in person antidepressant medication management, psychoeducation, and brief supportive counseling (eight 20-minute visits with a psychiatrist). Follow-up: 6 months.</p> | <p>Video location: VA Medical Center or CBOC using personal computer-based videoconferencing equipment</p> <p>In-person location: VAMC or CBOC</p> | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>No significant difference between groups in number of visits (telehealth vs. in-person): 6.5 vs 6.5</p> <p>No significant difference between groups in patient satisfaction at visit 4, 6, or 8</p> <p>Psychiatrist satisfaction greater for patients seen in person than by video (t=-2.2, df=79, P&lt;.05)</p> <p><b>KQ2:</b><br/>Per-session institutional costs were \$86.16 for telehealth vs \$63.25 in-person (t=3.2, P&lt;.001). However, costs were equal if psychiatrist traveled ≤22 miles and less if they traveled &gt;22 miles.</p> <p>Groups had equal utilization of VHA care (t=.7, P=NS).</p> <p><b>KQ3:</b><br/>No significant difference between telehealth vs in-person groups in response to treatment (50% improvement on Hamilton depression scale): 49% vs. 43%, χ<sup>2</sup>=0.4, df=1, P=NS</p> <p>No significant difference</p> |

| Author<br>Year<br>N | Study<br>Design<br>Sample<br>Size<br>Location | Patient Characteristics | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up | Setting | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key<br>Question)  |
|---------------------|---|-------------------------|---|---------|---|
|                     |   |                         |   |         | between telehealth vs in-person groups in remission (score of 7 or less on Hamilton depression scale). 39% vs 35%, $\chi^2=0.2$ , $df=1$ , $P=NS$ |



| Author<br>Year<br>N     | Study<br>Design<br>Sample<br>Size<br>Location | Patient Characteristics   | Intervention vs Comparator<br>Follow-Up   | Setting   | Overall Results<br>(Stratified by Key<br>Question)  |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|
| Yuen 2015 <sup>22</sup> | RCT<br>N=52<br>Southeast<br>US                | Veterans with PTSD<br><br>IE criteria: Diagnosis of PTSD, stable medication regimen, no alcohol or substance disorder or dependence, no active psychotic disorder or severe suicidal ideation<br>Age (mean): 44 years<br>Sex: 98% male<br>Race: 54% white<br>Rurality: NR | Video vs in-person prolonged exposure therapy administered by Master's-level therapist (eight to twelve 90-minute sessions).<br>Follow-up: 13 weeks | Video location: home-based videoconferencing equipment via tablet or computer that used Jabber, Facetime, or Skype software<br><br>In-person location: NR | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>100% of program completers in both groups reported being satisfied or very satisfied with treatment</p> <p>76.5% of telehealth vs 90.5% of in-person completers were very comfortable or comfortable when communicating with the therapist (<math>\chi^2(3)=3.98</math>, <math>P=.26</math>).</p> <p>76.9% of telehealth vs 95% of in-person completers rated communication with the therapist as excellent or very good (<math>\chi^2(3)=2.77</math>, <math>P=.43</math>).</p> <p>23.1% of telehealth vs 14.3% of in-person completers were unlikely to use services again (<math>\chi^2(4)=3.72</math>, <math>P=.45</math>).</p> <p><b>KQ3:</b><br/>No differences in post-treatment rates of PTSD diagnoses between telehealth and in-person groups: 46% vs 40% no longer had diagnosis of PTSD, 27% vs 30% had subclinical symptoms, 27% vs 30% had diagnosis, <math>\chi^2(2)=0.62</math>, <math>P=.73</math></p> |

| Author Year N             | Study Design Sample Size Location | Patient Characteristics   | Intervention vs Comparator Follow-Up   | Setting  | Overall Results (Stratified by Key Question)  |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|
| Ziemba 2014 <sup>23</sup> | RCT<br>N=18<br>Georgia            | OEF/OIF Veterans with PTSD<br><br>IE criteria: Diagnosis of PTSD or suspicion of PTSD, stable medication regimen<br>Age: NR<br>Sex: 90% male<br>Race: 79% black<br>Rurality: NR | Video vs in-person cognitive behavioral therapy delivered by a licensed clinical therapist (10 sessions).<br>Follow-up: 15 weeks | Video location: Civilian community clinic<br><br>In-person location: Civilian community clinic | <p><b>KQ1:</b><br/>Overall satisfaction scores were similar between telehealth and in-person groups: 98.1% vs 92.1%, <math>P&gt;.05</math></p> <p><b>KQ3:</b><br/>Both telehealth and in-person groups improved on physical health (SF-36 physical health) 4.4% vs 4.5% improvement (<math>P=NR</math>) and mental health (SF-36 mental health) 45.8% vs 37.9% improvement (<math>P=NR</math>).</p> |

Abbreviations: IE = Inclusion/Exclusion criteria; RCT = randomized clinical trial; PTSD = post-traumatic stress disorder; VA = Veterans Affairs; NR = not reported; DSM-IV = Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders 4; VAMC = Veterans Affairs Medical Center; CPOSS = Charleston Psychiatric Outpatient Satisfaction Scale; ICER = incremental cost-effectiveness ratio; QoL = Quality of Life; SF-36 = 36-item Short Form; QALY = Quality-adjusted Life Year; BDI = Beck Depression Inventory; GDS = Geriatric Depression Scale; SCID = Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV; CBT = Cognitive Behavioral Therapy; ACT = Acceptance and Commitment Therapy; BATD = Behavioral Activation Treatment for Depression; CSQ = Client Satisfaction Questionnaire; MH = mental health; MDD = major depressive disorder; CBOC = Community Based Outpatient Clinics; NS = not significant; OEF/OIF = Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom

\*Included primary studies in which data abstraction was not performed because relevant information was already reported in Turgoose 2018<sup>1</sup>; Frueh 2007a<sup>24</sup>; Frueh 2007b<sup>25</sup>; Gros 2018<sup>26</sup>; Hernandez-Tejada 2014<sup>27</sup>; Morland 2004<sup>28</sup>; Morland 2011<sup>29</sup>; Wierwille 2016<sup>30</sup>



## QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF INCLUDED SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS

| Author Year                | Study eligibility criteria (high, unclear, low)   | Identification and selection of studies (high, unclear, low)   | Data collection and study appraisal (high, unclear, low)  | Synthesis and findings (high, unclear, low)   | Overall risk of bias (high, unclear, low)  |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|---|--|
| Turgoose 2018 <sup>1</sup> | Low<br><br>No limitations on comparators or outcomes. No information on whether protocol was created, but criteria are open-ended so there is limited potential for bias. | Low<br><br>Search strategy is appropriate and no limits on date. Limited to English-language full-text articles. No grey literature or reference searches. | Unclear<br><br>No description of data abstraction process and authors only report main findings with no effect sizes or P-values. Only info on included study design is that 15/18 of experimental studies had control group. | Unclear<br><br>Narrative analysis appropriate for goal of "lessons learned" - however, QA assessments could have been incorporated into the findings. | Unclear<br><br>For the goal of providing "lessons learned", the study selection and narrative analyses were appropriate. However, authors did not provide key pieces of information on processes ( <i>ie</i> , Was a protocol created?; How was data extraction completed?), and did not incorporate QA findings into synthesis. |

## QUALITY ASSESSMENT OF INCLUDED PRIMARY STUDIES

### Quality Assessment of Observational Studies

| Author Year   | Risk of selection bias? (high, unclear, low)   | Risk of performance bias? (high, medium, low)   | Risk of attrition bias? (high, medium, low)   | Risk of detection bias? (high, medium, low)   | Overall risk of bias (high, unclear, low) |
|---|--|---|---|---|---|
| Litwack 2014 <sup>2</sup>   | High<br><br>Participants were recruited from two different groups (an internal participant recruitment database or from group psychotherapy from a local clinic). Those in psychotherapy likely already have a diagnosis so these are not new cases. | High<br><br>No control for people currently in treatment vs those not in treatment.   | Low<br><br>Only 1/30 participants were excluded from analysis and all participants completed all assessments. | Unclear<br><br>Unknown if telehealth or in-person assessments were blinded to results.      | High                                      |
| Shore 2007a <sup>3</sup> ,<br>Shore 2007b <sup>4</sup> ,<br>Shore 2008 <sup>5</sup> | Unclear<br><br>Randomization procedure not described, but groups similar at baseline.  | Unclear<br><br>Crossover study design. The time interval between assessments could have introduced symptom changes affecting the reliability. | Low<br><br>Attrition was 12%, did not differ between groups.  | Unclear<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Unclear if outcome assessors masked. | Unclear                                   |

| Author Year              | Risk of selection bias? (high, unclear, low)   | Risk of performance bias? (high, medium, low)       | Risk of attrition bias? (high, medium, low)  | Risk of detection bias? (high, medium, low)                                  | Overall risk of bias (high, unclear, low) |
|--------------------------|--|---|--|--|---|
| Shores 2004 <sup>6</sup> | Unclear<br>All patients in Veteran home care meeting criteria. Patients randomized to which diagnoses to get first, but demographics between groups not presented. | Low<br>No other diagnoses or interventions ongoing. | Low<br>All patients received both examinations.  | Low<br>Clinicians blinded to clinical examination score and other diagnosis. | Unclear                                   |
| Tuerk 2010 <sup>7</sup>  | High<br>Only patients in rural areas were offered placement in the telehealth group. Selection was determined by patient preference.                               | Unclear<br>Not reported                             | Unclear<br>10% of in-person group lost to follow-up, attrition not reported for video group. | Unclear<br>Not able to blind to assessment modality.                         | High                                      |

### Quality Assessment of RCTs

| Author Year   | Risk of selection bias? (high, unclear, low)   | Risk of performance bias? (high, medium, low)                                 | Risk of attrition bias? (high, medium, low)   | Risk of detection bias? (high, medium, low)                              | Overall risk of bias (high, unclear, low) |
|---|--|---|---|--|---|
| Egede 2015, <sup>8</sup><br>Egede 2016, <sup>9</sup><br>Egede 2017, <sup>10</sup><br>Egede 2018 <sup>11</sup> | Low<br>Computerized randomization with allocation concealment.   | Low<br>90% fidelity by providers, and 80% of patients completed all sessions. | Low<br>15-17% attrition, imputed missing data, and no differences in outcomes between missing vs not missing. | Low<br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Outcome assessors masked. | Low                                       |
| Glassman 2017, <sup>12</sup><br>Morland 2014, <sup>13</sup><br>Morland 2015 <sup>14</sup>                     | Unclear<br>Block randomization by war era for men, unclear how women were randomized. No significant differences between groups at baseline. | Unclear<br>75%-79% attended 10/12 sessions.                                   | Unclear<br>Attrition was 28%-33% at 6 months, did not differ between groups.                                  | Low<br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Outcome assessors masked. | Unclear                                   |

| Author Year   | Risk of selection bias? (high, unclear, low)   | Risk of performance bias? (high, medium, low)   | Risk of attrition bias? (high, medium, low)  | Risk of detection bias? (high, medium, low)   | Overall risk of bias (high, unclear, low) |
|---|--|---|--|---|---|
| Greene 2010, <sup>15</sup><br>Morland 2010, <sup>16</sup><br>Morland 2013 <sup>17</sup> | Unclear<br><br>Randomization procedure not described, allocation concealed.  | Low<br><br>90% completion rate.   | Unclear<br><br>11-20% attrition at 3 months, 20-33% attrition at 6 months. ITT analysis conducted.   | Unclear<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Outcome assessors not delivering care at that facility, but unclear if masked. | Unclear                                   |
| Herbert 2017 <sup>18</sup>  | Low<br><br>Randomization by study statistician, allocation concealed. No significant group demographic differences at baseline.                      | Unclear<br><br>Adherence not reported.  | Unclear<br><br>28% attrition in telehealth vs 14% in-person. ITT analysis conducted.   | Low<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Outcome assessors masked.  | Unclear                                   |
| Luxton 2016, <sup>19</sup><br>Bounthavong 2018 <sup>20</sup>                            | Low<br><br>Computer randomization, unclear allocation concealment, no differences in baseline characteristics.                                       | Unclear<br><br>50-85% completed treatment, no differences in completion between intervention groups.            | Unclear<br><br>No differences between groups, ITT analysis, total attrition 32%.   | Low<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Outcome assessors masked.  | Unclear                                   |
| Ruskin 2004 <sup>21</sup>   | Unclear<br><br>Utilized a block randomization procedure based on age and depression severity. No significant differences between groups at baseline. | Low<br><br>One participant crossed over from the telehealth to the control group due to technical difficulties. | Unclear<br><br>Attrition from 27% to 30% between groups. Time x group effects analysis that used last observation carried forward.   | Unclear<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Unclear if outcome assessors masked.   | Unclear                                   |
| Yuen 2015 <sup>22</sup>   | Unclear<br><br>Block randomization procedure based on race. No significant differences between groups at baseline.                                   | Unclear<br><br>Not reported   | Unclear<br><br>Attrition was 30%, did not significantly differ between groups. Missing data for 2% to 19% depending on outcome, but no differences between participants missing vs not missing data. | Unclear<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Unclear if outcome assessors masked.   | Unclear                                   |

| <b>Author<br/>Year</b>    | <b>Risk of selection bias? (high, unclear, low)</b>                                 | <b>Risk of performance bias? (high, medium, low)</b>                      | <b>Risk of attrition bias? (high, medium, low)</b> | <b>Risk of detection bias? (high, medium, low)</b>                           | <b>Overall risk of bias (high, unclear, low)</b> |
|---------------------------|---|---|--|--|--|
| Ziamba 2014 <sup>23</sup> | Unclear<br><br>Computerized randomization, but unclear if allocation was concealed. | Unclear<br><br>72% completed all assessments in the specified time frame. | Unclear<br><br>Not reported.                       | Low<br><br>Cannot mask patients or care providers. Outcome assessors masked. | Unclear  |

\*Included primary studies in which quality assessment was not performed because relevant information was already reported in Turgoose 2018<sup>1</sup>; Frueh 2007a<sup>24</sup>; Frueh 2007b<sup>25</sup>; Gros 2018<sup>26</sup>; Hernandez-Tejada 2014<sup>27</sup>; Morland 2004<sup>28</sup>; Morland 2011<sup>29</sup>; Wierwille 2016<sup>30</sup>

## APPENDIX D. ONGOING STUDIES

| Principle Investigator  | Identifier       | Title   | Description  | Status/Timeframe   |
|---|------------------|---|--|--|
| Alejandro Interian, PhD<br><br>VA New Jersey Health Care System   | NCT02475954      | Telehealth Cognitive Behavioral Therapy for Depression in Parkinson's Disease (PD)  | The proposed study will be the first to explore a novel and innovative, PD-informed psychotherapy package for depressed Veterans with PD and their Caregivers, delivered through video-to-home telehealth.   | Status: Recruiting<br><br>Estimated Completion Date: June 30, 2020                     |
| Amanda K. Gilmore<br><br>Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Medical University of South Carolina | W81XWH-14-1-0264 | "Do you expect me to receive post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) care in a setting where most of the other patients remind me of the perpetrator?": Home-based telehealth to address barriers to care unique to military sexual trauma and VA hospitals | A Department of Defense-funded project designed to compare the feasibility and efficacy of delivering prolonged exposure (PE) for PTSD in-person versus via home-based telehealth for female Veterans with military sexual trauma.   | Status: NR<br><br>Estimated Completion Date: NR  |
| Leslie Morland, Psy.D.<br><br>VA San Diego Healthcare System  | NCT03110302      | In-Home Exposure Therapy for Veterans With (PTSD)   | The main study goal is to compare PE conducted in three different ways: (1) PE that is office-based (OB; Veterans come to a VA clinic and meet with a therapist via telehealth, using videoconferencing technology), (2) PE delivered via home-based telehealth (HBT; Veterans stay at home and meet with the therapist via telehealth, using videoconferencing technology), and (3) PE delivered in home, in person (IHIP; the therapist goes to the Veterans' homes to provide the psychotherapy). | Status: Not recruiting<br><br>Estimated Completion Date: June 2017 (No results posted) |
| Marc I. Rosen, MD<br><br>VA Connecticut Healthcare System West Haven Campus                                     | NCT03566459      | Medication-Assisted Treatment (MAT) for Opioid Use Disorders (OUDs)   | The program involves increasing prescribing rates of MAT for OUD in community based outpatient clinics using telehealth.   | Status: Recruiting<br><br>Estimated Completion Date: March 31, 2019                    |

| <b>Principle Investigator</b>  | <b>Identifier</b> | <b>Title</b>  | <b>Description</b>   | <b>Status/Timeframe</b>  |
|--|-------------------|---|--|--|
| Richard R. Owen, MD<br><br>Central Arkansas Veterans Healthcare System | NCT02713217       | Implementing a Blended Care Model That Integrates Mental Healthcare and Primary Care Using Telehealth and Care Management for Patients With Depression or Alcohol Use Disorder in Small Primary Care Clinics (Tele-PCMHI) | The goal of this proposed project is to implement a "blended" combination of integrated care models that have been adapted for smaller CBOCs using telehealth technologies, and evaluate the acceptability and effectiveness of the blended, telehealth-based, integrated care model.  | Status: Invitation only<br><br>Estimated Completion Date: February 1, 2021                 |
| Samuel Muir<br><br>Swinburne University of Technology                  | CRD42018107103    | Barriers and facilitators of videoconferencing psychotherapy implementation in military health care environments: a systematic review   | The main objective of this review is to synthesize existing research investigating factors identified by practitioners and staff that affect the capacity of military health care providers to implement videoconferencing psychotherapy (VCP) services. All research designs will be eligible for inclusion. However, studies must include the perspectives, experiences, or attitudes of mental health practitioners involved in VCP implementation efforts. | Status: In-progress<br><br>Estimated Completion Date: October 31, 2018 (No results posted) |



## APPENDIX E. PEER REVIEW COMMENT TABLE

| Comment #  | Reviewer # | Comment   | Author Response   |
|--|------------|---|---|
| <i>Are the objectives, scope, and methods for this review clearly described?</i>   |            |   |   |
| 1  | 1          | Yes   | None  |
| 2  | 2          | Yes   | None  |
| <i>Is there any indication of bias in our synthesis of the evidence?</i>   |            |   |   |
| 3  | 1          | No  | None  |
| 4  | 2          | No  | None  |
| <i>Are there any <u>published</u> or <u>unpublished</u> studies that we may have overlooked?</i>   |            |   |   |
| 5  | 1          | No  | None  |
| 6  | 2          | No  | None  |
| <i>Additional suggestions or comments can be provided below. If applicable, please indicate the page and line numbers from the draft report.</i> |            |   |   |
| 7  | 1          | Overall the report is good and clear. The comments below are mostly minor suggestions.  | None.   |
| 8  | 1          | Executive Summary<br>Key Points:<br>While I know you want to keep the key points short, I would suggest writing out MDD the first time as it is now as well known of an abbreviation as PTSD.   | Wrote out "Major Depressive Disorder" and "Post-traumatic Stress Disorder" in Key Findings.   |
| 9  | 1          | The last bullet is not clear. I would suggest revising the end of the sentence by replacing "use " with impact<br>...as well as a lack. of information on the impact of video in both mental health and primary care on important access outcomes, including wait times, frequency of use, and provider productivity. | Changed the last bullet of the Key Points to say "...as well as a lack of information on the impact of video in both mental health and primary care..." |
| 10   | 1          | Executive Summary Text<br>p. 1 line 48. Suggest Among the 30 included article rather than 'our'.  | Changed p. 1, line 48 to "Among the 30 included articles..."  |
| 11   | 1          | Lines 52-53: I suggest saying how many articles address Dx and pain. You can say fewer and put the numbers in (), but there is no reason to be specific in the first part of the paragraph and vague in the rest.   | Changed p. 1, lines 52-53 to "Five articles examined diagnosis...and one examined treatment of chronic pain."   |
| 12   | 1          | p. 2 line 8-9. Is it the access outcomes that are direct or the examination? Saying 'that directly examined access outcomes such as...might read better, but you may want to keep it depending on your  | Changed p. 2, line 8-9 to "...that directly examined the access outcomes of interest..."  |

|    |   |  |  |
|----|---|--|--|
|    |   | meaning.   |  |
| 13 | 1 | Table 1 and Overall structure<br>Given that there is little or no evidence on access outcomes, would it be possible to separate KQ1 in to 1a process and 1b access? This would make it clearer that the SOEs are for Process and there is a lack of evidence for Access. When they are combined in the table this is not evident | <i>Table 1 and overall structure: Added a sentence to each condition/intervention row under KQ1 to indicate no studies examined access outcomes.</i> |
| 14 | 1 | Table 1<br>The wording of the statement varies...some say on outcomes (On quality of life), some 'in-terms of' (in terms of quality of life). It would help to make them the same...so the reader is not looking for a reason for the difference.  | <i>Table 1: Changed "in terms of" to "on."</i>   |
| 15 | 1 | Full Text<br>In the sentence that opens each section, it might be helpful to we identified # articles either reporting the results of or about # studies. Using 'of' does not read as well.  | <i>Full text: In each section, deleted the phrases about the number of articles.</i>   |
| 16 | 1 | p. 4 line 19, suggest changing 'those 'to Veterans so it is clear it is the Veterans not the services or efforts in rural locations.   | <i>P. 4, line 19: Changed to "...particularly for Veterans living in rural and remote locations..."</i>  |
| 17 | 2 | None at this time.   | <i>None</i>  |

## REFERENCES

1. Turgoose D, Ashwick R, Murphy D. Systematic review of lessons learned from delivering tele-therapy to veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24(9):575-585.
2. Litwack SD, Jackson CE, Chen M, et al. Validation of the use of video teleconferencing technology in the assessment of PTSD. *Psychol Serv*. 2014;11(3):290-294.
3. Shore JH, Savin D, Orton H, Beals J, Manson SM. Diagnostic reliability of telepsychiatry in American Indian veterans. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2007;164(1):115-118.
4. Shore JH, Brooks E, Savin DM, Manson SM, Libby AM. An economic evaluation of telehealth data collection with rural populations. *Psychiatr Serv*. 2007;58(6):830-835.
5. Shore JH, Brooks E, Savin D, Orton H, Grigsby J, Manson SM. Acceptability of telepsychiatry in American Indians. *Telemed J E Health*. 2008;14(5):461-466.
6. Shores MM, Ryan-Dykes P, Williams RM, et al. Identifying undiagnosed dementia in residential care veterans: comparing telemedicine to in-person clinical examination. *Int J Geriatr Psychiatry*. 2004;19(2):101-108.
7. Tuerk PW, Yoder M, Ruggiero KJ, Gros DF, Acierno R. A pilot study of prolonged exposure therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder delivered via telehealth technology. *J Trauma Stress*. 2010;23(1):116-123.
8. Egede LE, Acierno R, Knapp RG, et al. Psychotherapy for depression in older veterans via telemedicine: a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet Psychiatry*. 2015;2(8):693-701.
9. Egede LE, Acierno R, Knapp RG, Walker RJ, Payne EH, Frueh BC. Psychotherapy for depression in older veterans via telemedicine: effect on quality of life, satisfaction, treatment credibility, and service delivery perception. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2016;77(12):1704-1711.
10. Egede LE, Gebregziabher M, Walker RJ, Payne EH, Acierno R, Frueh BC. Trajectory of cost overtime after psychotherapy for depression in older Veterans via telemedicine. *J Affect Disord*. 2017;207:157-162.
11. Egede LE, Dismuke CE, Walker RJ, Acierno R, Frueh BC. Cost-effectiveness of behavioral activation for depression in older adult veterans: in-person care versus telehealth. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2018;79(5):28.
12. Glassman LH, Mackintosh MA, Talkovsky A, et al. Quality of life following treatment for PTSD: comparison of videoconferencing and in-person modalities. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2017.
13. Morland LA, Mackintosh MA, Greene CJ, et al. Cognitive processing therapy for posttraumatic stress disorder delivered to rural veterans via telemental health: a randomized noninferiority clinical trial. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2014;75(5):470-476.
14. Morland LA, Mackintosh MA, Rosen CS, et al. Telemedicine versus in-person delivery of cognitive processing therapy for women with posttraumatic stress disorder: a randomized noninferiority trial. *Depress Anxiety*. 2015;32(11):811-820.
15. Greene CJ, Morland LA, Macdonald A, Frueh BC, Grubbs KM, Rosen CS. How does tele-mental health affect group therapy process? Secondary analysis of a noninferiority trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2010;78(5):746-750.
16. Morland LA, Greene CJ, Rosen CS, et al. Telemedicine for anger management therapy in a rural population of combat veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder: a randomized noninferiority trial. *J Clin Psychiatry*. 2010;71(7):855-863.

17. Morland LA, Raab M, Mackintosh MA, et al. Telemedicine: a cost-reducing means of delivering psychotherapy to rural combat veterans with PTSD. *Telemed J E Health*. 2013;19(10):754-759.
18. Herbert MS, Afari N, Liu L, et al. Telehealth versus in-person acceptance and commitment therapy for chronic pain: a randomized noninferiority trial. *J Pain*. 2017;18(2):200-211.
19. Luxton DD, Pruitt LD, Wagner A, Smolenski DJ, Jenkins-Guarnieri MA, Gahm G. Home-based telebehavioral health for U.S. military personnel and veterans with depression: A randomized controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2016;84(11):923-934.
20. Bounthavong M, Pruitt LD, Smolenski DJ, Gahm GA, Bansal A, Hansen RN. Economic evaluation of home-based telebehavioural health care compared to in-person treatment delivery for depression. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24(2):84-92.
21. Ruskin PE, Silver-Aylaiian M, Kling MA, et al. Treatment outcomes in depression: comparison of remote treatment through telepsychiatry to in-person treatment. *Am J Psychiatry*. 2004;161(8):1471-1476.
22. Yuen EK, Gros DF, Price M, et al. Randomized controlled trial of home-based telehealth versus in-person prolonged exposure for combat-related PTSD in veterans: preliminary results. *J Clin Psychol*. 2015;71(6):500-512.
23. Ziemba SJ, Bradley NS, Landry LA, Roth CH, Porter LS, Cuyler RN. Posttraumatic stress disorder treatment for Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom combat veterans through a civilian community-based telemedicine network. *Telemed J E Health*. 2014;20(5):446-450.
24. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Yim E, Grubaugh AL, Hamner MB, Knapp RG. A randomized trial of telepsychiatry for post-traumatic stress disorder. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2007;13(3):142-147.
25. Frueh BC, Monnier J, Grubaugh AL, Elhai JD, Yim E, Knapp R. Therapist adherence and competence with manualized cognitive-behavioral therapy for PTSD delivered via videoconferencing technology. *Behav Modif*. 2007;31(6):856-866.
26. Gros DF, Lancaster CL, Lopez CM, Acierno R. Treatment satisfaction of home-based telehealth versus in-person delivery of prolonged exposure for combat-related PTSD in veterans. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2018;24(1):51-55.
27. Hernandez-Tejada MA, Zoller JS, Ruggiero KJ, Kazley AS, Acierno R. Early treatment withdrawal from evidence-based psychotherapy for PTSD: telemedicine and in-person parameters. *Int J Psychiatry Med*. 2014;48(1):33-55.
28. Morland LA, Pierce K, Wong MY. Telemedicine and coping skills groups for Pacific Island veterans with post-traumatic stress disorder: a pilot study. *J Telemed Telecare*. 2004;10(5):286-289.
29. Morland LA, Hynes AK, Mackintosh MA, Resick PA, Chard KM. Group cognitive processing therapy delivered to veterans via telehealth: a pilot cohort. *J Trauma Stress*. 2011;24(4):465-469.
30. Wierwille JL, Pukay-Martin ND, Chard KM, Klump MC. Effectiveness of PTSD telehealth treatment in a VA clinical sample. *Psychol Serv*. 2016;13(4):373-379.