

## Correspondence

Edited by Kiriakos Xenitidis and  
Colin Campbell

## Contents

- Has mental health harnessed the digital revolution?
- Selective reporting of results in guidelines
- Does previous experience of antidepressants form the expectations necessary for a placebo response?
- Methodological considerations in determining the effects of films with suicidal content

### Has mental health harnessed the digital revolution?

In their editorial, Hollis *et al*<sup>1</sup> focus on the third of three digital revolutions – access to real-time patient data ('connected health') – but also highlight the benefits of the first two revolutions – unlocking value in electronic medical records and new forms of access that allow patients direct control.

How far have the first two digital revolutions embedded benefits for patient care in mental health? The first revolution (word-processing, from the 1960s) allowed people with little training to prepare, edit and duplicate high-quality documents. The second comes with the internet: ability to access, transmit, share and edit these documents. From these two revolutions, what can patients (and carers and professionals) expect as the outputs of the mental health IT system?

A basic expectation is that, before every face to-face clinical encounter, the IT system can easily deliver an accurate background history, account of recent treatment, and up-to-date care plan. (This list could be extended to include a summary history, complete history, and non-stigmatising vulnerability and risk history.) The safety of these documents is assured by accessibility (so that they are used and reviewed often) and accuracy (confirmed by patients and carers). They must be easily readable, to be safely understood, and actually used (as unread documents do not convey information).

The quality of these 'output' documents must convey respect for patients, carers and professionals and the interactions between them. For patients and carers, documents summarising core parts of their present or past lives must carry real-world acceptability in appearance and structure. Clinical staff able to take pride in their documentation (being clear, respectful, accurate and useful) will welcome sharing them with patients, carers and other professionals. Finally (as in the ordinary world) the IT system should save time for professionals (and patients and carers), freeing up treatment time.

Simple IT technology can deliver this for professionals, patients and carers. Hollis *et al*<sup>1</sup> note that mental health patients' use of technology is similar to the general UK population, with three-quarters of adults accessing the internet daily, half via a smart phone. I have only anecdotal knowledge of how far mental health IT is delivering the benefits of the first two revolutions.

Hollis *et al*<sup>1</sup> summarise key challenges for the third revolution in connected health:

'first, ensuring that patients and their needs remain at the centre of technology development and implementation; second, rapidly increasing the evidence base for the clinical effectiveness of digital technology; third, ensuring that the opportunity

provided by data sharing between patients, carers and clinicians does not threaten privacy and undermine public trust. Finally, patients, clinicians and NHS commissioners require an agreed framework to evaluate the core features of new technologies including usability, content, safety, clinical- and cost-effectiveness'.

These still apply with equal force to the first two digital revolutions.

- 1 Hollis C, Morriss R, Martin J, Amani S, Cotton R, Denis M, et al. Technological innovations in mental healthcare: harnessing the digital revolution. *Br J Psychiatry* 2015; **206**: 263–5.

**Alastair Forrest**, Head of School of Psychiatry, Health Education Kent, Surrey and Sussex, UK. Email: AForrest@kss.hee.nhs.uk

doi: 10.1192/bjp.207.6.560

### Selective reporting of results in guidelines

Taylor and Perera<sup>1</sup> argue persuasively that the 2014 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) schizophrenia guideline<sup>2</sup> promotes cognitive-behavioural therapy (CBT) and other psychosocial interventions beyond the evidence. Its conclusions with respect to CBT also seem open to another charge, that of selective reporting: the highlighting of favourable results while unfavourable ones are suppressed.<sup>3</sup>

In its clinical evidence summary (p. 232), NICE states that 'when compared with standard care, CBT was effective in reducing rehospitalisation rates up to 18 months following the end of treatment'. NICE actually examined rehospitalisation rates in three of the large series (more than 100) of meta-analyses they carried out (data available at [www.nccmh.org.uk](http://www.nccmh.org.uk)). One of these compared CBT with standard care at up to 18 months and found a significant effect (5 trials, 910 patients, relative risk (RR) 0.76, 95% CI 0.61–0.94). Another compared CBT with standard care at 2–4 years and failed to find a significant advantage (2 trials, 513 patients, RR 0.82, 95% CI 0.64–1.05). The third meta-analysis compared CBT with 'other active treatments' (which consisted in all but one case of putatively inactive control interventions such as befriending and supportive counselling) at up to 2 years; this was again non-significant (5 trials, 506 patients, RR 1.07, 95% CI 0.86–1.33). The findings of the two negative meta-analyses are not mentioned in the NICE guideline. Neither does NICE mention that CBT was not found to be effective against relapse when compared with either standard care (3 trials, 460 patients, RR 0.85, 95% CI 0.50–1.41) or other active treatments (4 trials, 416 patients, RR 1.05, 95% CI 0.85–1.30). This omission is difficult to understand given the obvious relationship between relapse and rehospitalisation.

NICE goes on to state that 'CBT was shown to be effective in reducing symptom severity as measured by total scores on items, such as the PANSS and BPRS, both at end of treatment and at up to 12 months' follow-up'. This was the case in the comparison between CBT and standard care, where there was a significant effect for CBT at the end of treatment (13 trials, 1356 patients, standardised mean difference (SMD) –0.27, 95% CI –0.45 to –0.10), as well as in meta-analyses of 6- and 12-month follow-up data. However, the findings were non-significant in the comparisons between CBT and 'other active treatments' both at end of treatment (6 trials, 396 patients, SMD –0.13, 95% CI –0.32 to 0.07) and at all follow-up points. Once again, NICE conveys an impression of uniform evidence of effectiveness against symptoms, whereas the reality is that an entire subset of pre-planned meta-analyses gave negative results.

Selective reporting arises when authors fail to publish data altogether, or when they arbitrarily decide which analyses and results to report in a publication. The NICE 2014 recommendations