TITLE: Can we mitigate the psychological impacts of social isolation using behavioural activation? Long-term results of the UK BASIL Urgent Public Health COVID-19 pilot randomised controlled trial and living systematic review

Authors from the BASIL trials and living meta-analysis collective

Elizabeth Littlewood¹, Dean McMillan¹,², Carolyn A. Chew-Graham³, Della Bailey,¹ Samantha Gascoyne¹, Claire Sloan¹, Lauren Burke¹, Peter Coventry¹,¹⁰ Suzanne Crosland¹, Caroline Fairhurst¹, Andrew Henry¹⁴, Catherine Hewitt¹, Kalpita Baird¹, Eloise Ryde¹⁴, Leanne Shearmur⁵, Gemma Traviss-Turner⁵, Rebecca Woodhouse¹, Judith Webster⁹, Nick Meader⁹, Rachel Churchill⁹, Elizabeth Eddy¹, Paul Heron¹,¹ Nisha Hickin¹² Roz Shafran¹³, Osvaldo P. Almeida¹¹, Andrew Clegg⁵, Tom Gentry⁶, Andrew Hill⁹, Karina Lovell⁷, Sarah Dexter Smith⁴, David Ekers¹⁴, Simon Gilbody¹²*

*Corresponding author, e-mail: simon.gilbody@york.ac.uk Telephone number: 01904 321370

Declared competing interests of authors: none

1. Department of Health Sciences, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK
2. Hull York Medical School, University of York, York, YO10 5DD, UK
3. School of Medicine, Keele University, Staffordshire, ST5 5BG, UK
4. Tees, Esk and Wear Valleys NHS FT, Research & Development, Flatts Lane Centre, Middlesbrough, TS6 0SZ, UK
5. Leeds Institute of Health Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9NL, UK
6. Age UK, 7th Floor, One America Square, 17 Crosswall, London, EC3N 2LB
7. Division of Nursing, Midwifery & Social Work, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL
8. Patient and Public Representative, UK
9. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, University of York, UK.
10. York Environmental Sustainability Institute, University of York, YO10 5NG
11. Medical School, University of Western Australia, Perth, Australia.
12. Department of Psychology, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, UK
13. UCL Great Ormond Street Institute of Child Health, 30 Guilford Street, London, UK

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.
Abstract [currently 248 words]

Background

Behavioural and cognitive interventions remain a credible approach in preventing loneliness and depression. There was a need to rapidly generate and assimilate trial-based data during COVID-19.

Objectives

We undertook a COVID-19 parallel pilot RCT of behavioural activation for depression and loneliness [the BASIL-C19 trial ISRCTN94091479]. We also assimilate these data in a COVID-19 living systematic review [PROSPERO CRD42021298788].

Methods

Primary care participants (>=65 years) with long-term conditions were computer randomised to Behavioural Activation (n=47) versus care-as-usual (n=49). The single blinded primary outcome was the PHQ-9. Secondary outcomes included loneliness (De Jong Gierveld Scale). Data from the BASIL-C19 trial were included in a random effects meta-analysis of depression and loneliness.

Findings

The 12 months adjusted mean difference for PHQ-9 was -0.70 (95% CI -2.61 to 1.20) and for loneliness was -0.39 (95% CI -1.43 to 0.65). Secondary 12-month trial outcomes suggested evidence of benefit for behavioural activation.

The BASIL-C19 meta-analysis (13 trials) found short-term reductions in depression (standardised mean difference [SMD]=-0.31, 95%CI -0.51 to -0.11) and loneliness (SMD=-0.48, 95%CI -0.70 to -0.27). There were few long-term trials, but there was evidence of some benefit (loneliness SMD=-0.20, 95%CI -0.40 to -0.01; depression SMD=-0.20, 95%CI -0.47 to 0.07).

Discussion

We found a signal of effect in reducing loneliness and depression in the BASIL trial. Living meta-analysis provides strong evidence of short-term benefit for loneliness and depression.

Clinical implications

Scalable behavioural and cognitive approaches should be considered as population-level strategies for depression and loneliness on the basis of the living systematic review.

Funding

This study was funded by National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Programme Grants for Applied Research (PGfAR) RP-PG-0217-20006.
Author summary

Why was this study done?

Older people with long-term conditions have been impacted by COVID-19 pandemic restrictions and have experienced social isolation. In turn, this puts them at risk for depression and loneliness, and these are bad for health and wellbeing. Psychosocial approaches, such as behavioural activation, could be helpful.

Trial-based evidence is needed to demonstrate if it is possible to prevent the onset, or mitigate the impact, of loneliness and depression.

There are few studies of brief psychosocial interventions to mitigate depression and loneliness, and it is important to know how emerging trial-based data adds to existing evidence.

What did the researchers do and find?

There was preliminary evidence that levels of loneliness were reduced at 3 months when behavioural activation was offered.

At longer term (12-month) follow-up there were signals of ongoing positive impact.

When BASIL-C19 data were assimilated into a living systematic review there is clear evidence of impact of brief psychological interventions on depression and loneliness in the short-term. More research into the longer-term impact is needed.

What does all this mean?

Behavioural activation now shows evidence of benefit which will be useful for policy makers in offering support to people who are socially isolated.

This research knowledge will be useful once the COVID-19 pandemic has passed, since loneliness is common in older populations and effective scalable solutions will be needed to tackle this problem.

As new trial-based data emerges, our living systematic review and meta-analysis will be updated since this is an area of active research.
Introduction

The mental health of the population deteriorated during the COVID-19 pandemic. Many people reported social isolation, and the incidence of depression and anxiety particularly increased for older people and those with medical vulnerabilities. A plausible mechanism for this deterioration was that COVID-19 restrictions led to disruption of daily routines, loss of social contact and heightened isolation and increased loneliness, which are each powerful precipitants of mental ill health.

Social isolation, social disconnectedness, perceived isolation and loneliness are known to be linked to common mental health problems, such as depression in older people. Loneliness is a risk factor for depression and seems detrimental to physical health and life expectancy. It is recognised that strategies that, for instance, maintain social connectedness could be important in ensuring the mental health of older people, particularly during the pandemic and in the planning for post-pandemic recovery (including the management of people with Long Covid).

The need for research to mitigate the psychological impacts of COVID-19, particularly loneliness, was highlighted as a priority, and we responded by designing and delivering one of a small number of psychotherapy trials programmes.

Behavioural activation (BA) is an evidence-based psychological treatment that explores how physical inactivity and low mood are linked and result in a reduction of valued activity. Small scale trials of BA delivered to socially-isolated older people have produced encouraging preliminary results, but there is not yet sufficient research evidence to support whole-scale adoption, or to inform the population response to COVID-19 or in planning for post-pandemic recovery. We therefore adapted an ongoing work programme into the role of BA in multiple long term conditions in early-2020 to answer the following overarching question: 'Can we prevent or ameliorate depression and loneliness in older people with long-term conditions during isolation?'.

In this paper we present the long-term (12-month) results of the BASIL-C19 trial (Behavioural Activation in Social Isolation): a pilot randomised controlled trial (RCT) of manualised BA, adapted specifically to be delivered at scale and remotely (via the telephone or video call) for older adults who became socially isolated as a consequence of COVID-19. The long-term (12-month outcomes) complement the already-published short-term (up to 3 months) outcomes of the BASIL-C19 trial. This is a rapidly evolving area, and we therefore present the results of the BASIL-C19 trial alongside all randomised data in a prospective evidence synthesis and cumulative meta-analysis (a ‘living systematic review’).
Trial methods

Study design and participants

The BASIL-C19 pilot RCT was the first and only mental health trial adopted by the National Institute for Health and Care Research (NIHR) Urgent Public Health programme (adopted on 28th May 2020). The BASIL-C19 pilot was designed to provide key information on methods of recruitment and training for intervention practitioners (hereafter BASIL Support Workers [BSWs]). The trial was registered on 9th June 2020 (ISRCTN94091479) and participants were recruited between 23rd June and 15th October 2020. Older adults with long-term conditions were identified as being a ‘high risk group’ for loneliness and depression as a consequence of social isolation under COVID-19 restrictions. They were recruited from primary care registers in the North East of England. Eligible and consenting participants were randomised to receive either usual primary care (with signposting to resources to support mental health during COVID) from their general practice or Behavioural Activation intervention in addition to usual care. Methods, recruitment, intervention uptake, retention, experience of the BA intervention for our target population, and acceptability of the intervention are described in full in the short-term results paper.

Inclusion criteria: Based on the Academy of Medical Sciences definition of multimorbidity we recruited older adults (65 years or over) with two or more physical long-term conditions (LTCs) on primary care registers in two general practices in the North East of England. Participants included those subject to English Government guidelines regarding COVID-19 self-isolation, social distancing and shielding as relevant to their health conditions and age (though this was not a requirement and these requirements changed during the study period).

Exclusion criteria: Older adults who had cognitive impairment, bipolar disorder /psychosis/ psychotic symptoms, alcohol or drug dependence, in the palliative phase of illness, had active suicidal ideation, were currently receiving psychological therapy, or are unable to speak or understand English.

Potentially eligible participants were telephoned and those who expressed an interest in the study were contacted by a member of the research team to determine eligibility, obtain consent and collect baseline data. Interested patients could also complete an online consent form or contact the study team directly.

Randomisation, concealment of allocation and masking

Eligible and consenting participants were randomised 1:1 to BA intervention or usual care using simple randomisation via an automated computer data entry system, administered remotely by the York Trials Unit, University of York. Participants, general practices, study clinicians, or BSWs were
Intervention (Behavioural Activation):

The intervention (BA within a collaborative care framework) has been described elsewhere \(^{16}\) and was adapted for the purposes of the BASIL-C19 trial. The main adaptation was the use of telephone delivery, and the use of functional equivalence to maintain social interactions. Intervention participants were offered up to eight sessions over a 4 to 6 week period delivered by trained BSWs, accompanied by a BASIL Behavioural Activation booklet.

Sessions were delivered by BSWs remotely via telephone or video call, according to participant preference. The first session was scheduled to last approximately one hour, with subsequent sessions lasting approximately 30 minutes.

Comparator (usual GP care with signposting): Participants in the control group received usual care as provided by their current NHS and/or third sector providers. In addition, control participants were ‘signposted’ to reputable sources of self-help and information, including advice on how to keep mentally and physically well (e.g., Public Health England (PHE) ‘Guidance for the public on the mental health and wellbeing aspects of coronavirus (COVID-19)’ \(^ {17}\) and Age UK \(^ {18}\)).

Outcome measures

Demographic information obtained at baseline included: age, sex, long-term condition type, socio-economic status, ethnicity, education, marital status, and number of children.

The overarching aim of the BASIL-C19 pilot trial was to test the feasibility of the intervention and the methods of recruitment, randomisation and follow-up \(^ {19}\). The primary clinical outcome was self-reported symptoms of depression, assessed by the PHQ-9 \(^ {20}\), where higher scores initiate greater levels of depressive symptomatology. The PHQ-9 was administered at baseline, one, three and 12 months post-randomisation. Other secondary clinical outcomes measured at baseline, one, three and 12 months were health related quality of life (SF-12v2 mental component scale (MCS) and physical component scale (PCS)) \(^ {21}\), anxiety (GAD-7) \(^ {22}\), perceived social and emotional loneliness (De Jong Gierveld Scale - 11 items loneliness scale) and questions relating to COVID-19 circumstances and adherence to government guidelines \(^ {23}\). Findings from one and three month outcomes have been presented elsewhere \(^ {12}\), along with information on intervention compliance.

Sample size & statistical analysis

Sample size: Sample size calculations were based on estimating attrition and standard deviation (SD) of the primary outcome. We aimed to recruit 100 participants. The intervention was delivered
by BSWs and allowed for potential clustering by BSWs assuming an inter-cluster correlation (ICC) of 0.01 and mean cluster size of 15 based upon previous studies. The effective sample size was therefore 88. Anticipating 15-20% of participants would be lost to follow-up (17% in the CASPER trial of older adults), this would result in an effective sample size of at least 70 participants, which is sufficient to allow reasonably robust estimates of the SD of the primary outcome measure to inform the sample size calculation for a definitive trial.

Statistical analysis: This study is reported as per the Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials (CONSORT) guideline. The flow of participants through the pilot trial is shown in a CONSORT flow diagram [Figure 1]. Differences in the clinical outcomes between the two groups were compared at 12 months. This was done using a covariance pattern, mixed-effect linear regression model incorporating all post-randomisation time points. Treatment group, time point, a treatment-by-time interaction and the baseline score of the outcome of interest were included as fixed effects, and participant as a random effect (to account for the repeated observations per participant).

Different covariance structures were applied to the model. An unstructured covariance pattern for the correlation between the observations for a participant over time was specified in the final model based on Akaike’s Information Criterion (AIC) (smaller value preferred).

An estimate of the difference between treatment groups in all outcome measures was extracted from the models for the 12-month time point, and overall, with a 95% confidence interval (CI) as preliminary estimates of effect, but this pilot trial was not powered to show efficacy. Model assumptions were checked as follows: the normality of the standardised residuals was visually assessed using a QQ plot, and homoscedasticity by means of a scatter plot of the standardised residuals against fitted values. No concerning deviations were noted.

Prospective meta-analysis of trial-based data

Using all trial data to February 2022 we then updated an earlier Cochrane and non-Cochrane meta-analysis of cognitive or behavioural interventions to prevent or mitigate loneliness and depression in adult populations in light of the BASIL-C19 results. The planned living systematic review and meta-analysis protocol was registered on the PROSPERO database (review protocol CRD42021298788).

We updated Cochrane searches of PubMed, EMBASE and PsycINFO from inception to February 2022. Eligible interventions included first, second, or third wave cognitive behavioural therapies (CBT) seeking to improve or prevent loneliness, as well as other CBT interventions where the focus is on improving common mental health problems but in which loneliness or a related construct is measured as an outcome. We studied depression and loneliness as the main outcomes of interest, under the advice of the BASIL Lived Experience Advisory Panel. We calculated a standardised mean
difference (SMD) with 95% CI. SMD represents the size of the intervention effect of each study compared with the between-participant variability in outcome measurements recorded in each individual study. We categorised the post-intervention outcomes into short-term outcomes (< 6 months, including end of treatment time points), medium-term (≥6 to <12 months), and long-term outcomes (≥12 months). If a study reported follow-up outcomes at more than one time point within one of these time frames, we selected the outcome at the latest point within the time frame. We conducted a random effects meta-analysis, and included the BASIL-C19 study evidence. We tested for small study bias using Egger’s approach and test\textsuperscript{27}.

**Role of Funding Source**

BASIL C-19 was funded by the NIHR Programme Grants for Applied Research (PGfAR) programme (RP-PG-0217-20006). The scope of our pre-existing research into multi-morbidity in older people was extended at the outset of the COVID-19 pandemic with the agreement of the funder to consider loneliness and depression in this vulnerable group. The NIHR PGfAR programme had no role in the writing of this manuscript or the decision to submit it for publication.

**Ethical approval**

Ethical approval for the BASIL-C19 study was granted by Yorkshire & The Humber - Leeds West Research Ethics Committee on 23/04/2020 (The Old Chapel, Royal Standard Place, Nottingham, NG1 6FS, UK; +44 (0)207 104 8018; leedswest.rec@hra.nhs.uk), ref: 18/YH/0380 (approved as substantial amendment 02 under existing NIHR IRAS249030 research programme).
Results

Participant recruitment, characteristics and follow-up

Ninety-six participants were randomised using computer random number generation with concealment of allocation at the York Trials Unit (47 to the BA intervention group; and 49 to usual care with signposting group), of which 80 (83.3%) completed the 12-month follow-up and valid scores were available for 79 (82.3%). See Figure 1 [CONSORT flow diagram].

The mean age of randomised participants was 74 years (SD 5.5) and most were White (n=92, 95.8%). Nearly two-thirds of the sample were female (n=59, 61.5%) (Table 1), and the most common long-term health problems were cardiovascular conditions. Mean depression scores were indicative of mild depression (BA mean = 7.5, SD 6.2; usual care mean = 6.0, SD 5.6). There was reasonable balance in baseline characteristics at randomisation between the two groups.

Outcome data and between-group comparisons at 12 months

Eighty randomised participants (83.3%) completed the 12-month follow-up and valid primary and secondary outcome data were available for 79 (82.3%) participants (one participant commenced the questionnaire but then felt too unwell to continue and did not complete any of the outcome measures). At 12 months, unadjusted between-group mean differences favoured the intervention for the PHQ-9, GAD-7, De Jong Social Loneliness and the SF-12 MCS, and usual care for De Jong total and the Emotional Loneliness subscale, and the SF-12 PCS. The adjusted mean difference between groups in the PHQ-9 indicated lower severity in the intervention group at 12 months (-0.70, 95% CI -2.61 to 1.20), with an overall difference of -0.41 (95% CI -1.65 to 0.83) across all time points. The adjusted mean difference for the total De Jong Gierveld score indicated lower severity in the intervention group at 12 months (-0.39, 95% CI -1.43 to 0.65), with an overall difference of -0.32 (95% CI -0.97 to 0.34) across all time points. The direction of effect in long-term follow up was consistent, with all outcomes favouring behavioural activation, though the majority were non-significant (Table 1). For mental health-related quality of life (the SF12 mental component score) there was an overall benefit across all time points (3.22, 95% CI 0.22 to 6.21).
Table 1. Unadjusted and adjusted mean differences between the BA and usual care groups by time point

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcome</th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Adjusted(^a)</th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Adjusted(^a)</th>
<th>Unadjusted</th>
<th>Adjusted(^a)</th>
<th>Adjusted(^a)</th>
<th>Adjusted(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PHQ-9</strong></td>
<td>-1.44 (-3.66, 0.77)</td>
<td>-0.39 (-2.70, 1.91)</td>
<td>0.19 (-1.36, 1.75)</td>
<td>-0.59 (-2.92, 1.74)</td>
<td>-0.70 (-2.61, 1.20)</td>
<td>-0.41 (-1.65, 0.83)</td>
<td>0.19 (-1.36, 1.75)</td>
<td>-0.59 (-2.92, 1.74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GAD-7</strong></td>
<td>-0.54 (-2.52, 1.44)</td>
<td>-0.16 (-2.09, 1.78)</td>
<td>0.31 (-1.08, 1.70)</td>
<td>-0.97 (-2.93, 0.98)</td>
<td>-0.67 (-2.31, 0.97)</td>
<td>-0.18 (-1.35, 0.98)</td>
<td>0.20 (-1.33, 1.73)</td>
<td>-0.16 (-2.09, 1.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Jong Giesveld scale (total)</strong></td>
<td>0.13 (-1.14, 1.41)</td>
<td>-0.86 (-2.14, 0.43)</td>
<td>-0.87 (-1.56, -0.18)</td>
<td>0.07 (-1.31, 1.45)</td>
<td>-0.39 (-1.43, 0.65)</td>
<td>-0.32 (-0.97, 0.34)</td>
<td>0.28 (-0.51, 1.06)</td>
<td>-0.86 (-2.14, 0.43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Jong Giesveld Emotional Loneliness Subscale</strong></td>
<td>0.07 (-0.68, 0.81)</td>
<td>-0.36 (-1.09, 0.36)</td>
<td>-0.37 (-0.85, 0.11)</td>
<td>0.19 (-0.70, 1.08)</td>
<td>-0.05 (-0.74, 0.65)</td>
<td>-0.16 (-0.57, 0.26)</td>
<td>0.14 (-0.39, 0.67)</td>
<td>-0.36 (-1.09, 0.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>De Jong Giesveld Social Loneliness Subscale</strong></td>
<td>0.07 (-0.68, 0.81)</td>
<td>-0.50 (-1.22, -0.23)</td>
<td>-0.50 (-1.00, -0.01)</td>
<td>-0.12 (-0.84, 0.60)</td>
<td>-0.33 (-0.88, 0.22)</td>
<td>-0.14 (-0.55, 0.26)</td>
<td>0.14 (-0.42, 0.69)</td>
<td>-0.50 (-1.22, -0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SF-12v2 (Physical Component Score)</strong></td>
<td>1.40 (2.32, 6.22)</td>
<td>0.81 (4.16, 5.77)</td>
<td>0.11 (4.46, 4.67)</td>
<td>-0.04 (-5.39, 5.38)</td>
<td>-0.53 (-4.15, 3.09)</td>
<td>-0.27 (-2.73, 2.18)</td>
<td>0.34 (4.17, 4.85)</td>
<td>0.81 (4.16, 5.77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SF-12v2 (Mental Component Score)</strong></td>
<td>3.60 (-1.17, 8.37)</td>
<td>2.09 (-2.48, 6.65)</td>
<td>1.26 (-2.64, 5.15)</td>
<td>2.17 (-2.54, 6.89)</td>
<td>3.61 (-0.22, 7.44)</td>
<td>3.22 (0.22, 6.21)</td>
<td>1.91 (-2.64, 5.15)</td>
<td>2.09 (-2.48, 6.65)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)adjusted for the baseline score of the outcome; \(^b\)positive difference indicates better health in intervention group
Living systematic review, incorporating BASIL-C19 data with all available trials data

We identified 13 studies (including BASIL-C19) that evaluated cognitive or behavioural interventions and reported either loneliness or depression outcomes (or both) (Gilbody-BASIL 2021, Choi 28, Pepin 2021 28, Kall 2020 29 30, Kall 2021 31, Soucy 2019 32, Williams 2004 33, Zhang 2018 34, Cohen-Mansfield 2018 35, Cresswell 2012 36, Jarvis 2019 37, Theeke 2016 38 and Almeida 2022 39. When we pooled data, twelve studies assessed loneliness in the short-term (>=6 months) and there was strong evidence of benefit for cognitive or behavioural interventions (986 participants, SMD=-0.48, 95%CI -0.70 to -0.27, I²=64.3%). Four studies assessed loneliness in the long-term (>=12 months) and there was some evidence of benefit (321 participants, SMD=-0.20, 95%CI -0.40 to -0.01, I² = 0%). Nine studies assessed depression in the short-term, and there was strong evidence of benefit (775 participants, SMD=-0.31, 95%CI -0.51 to -0.11, I² = 38.0%). Four studies assessed depression in the long-term, at 12+ months, and although favouring cognitive or behavioural interventions the 95% CI was wider due to fewer studies reporting at this time point (324 participants, SMD=-0.20, 95%CI -0.47 to 0.07, I² = 35.7%). No studies reported medium term (>=6 to <12 month) data. In all analyses the level of between-study heterogeneity was low to moderate. Where it was possible to test for small study and publication bias, there was evidence of funnel plot asymmetry for short term loneliness (Egger test p<0.05), but not for short term depression (Egger test p=0.76).

<Figures 2 & 3: meta-analysis here>

Discussion

The BASIL-C19 trial is an external pilot trial, designed to test an adapted intervention and to refine trial procedures before undertaking a full-scale trial. To our knowledge, this is one of only a small number of trials undertaken during the COVID-19 pandemic to mitigate the psychological impact of the pandemic and its restrictions 9. We demonstrate that it was possible to trial a scalable intervention, and achieve good follow-up rates under pandemic conditions. We have previously reported the short-term outcomes 12, and here we present the 12-month outcomes alongside a ‘living systematic review and meta-analysis’, undertaken during the pandemic to evaluate accumulating evidence of cognitive and behavioural approaches in the prevention of depression and loneliness. Our main finding is that the BASIL-C19 pilot trial results add to a growing body of trial-based research that demonstrates that brief psychological interventions can potentially offer clinical benefit for preventing both depression and loneliness. We also demonstrate the relative absence of
long-term follow up data, but note a signal of effect at 12 months and the BASIL-C19 trial is one of only three trials to assess longer term outcomes.

Research to date has shown behavioural approaches to be highly effective in the treatment of depression among older people \(^{10,16,40,41}\) and the preliminary results of the BASIL-C19 trial support this approach under COVID-19 restrictions and in mitigating loneliness \(^{42}\) in an at-risk population.

Our pilot trial was also undertaken rapidly and during the COVID-19 pandemic in early 2020; the time elapsed between the onset of the pandemic and the recruitment of the first participant was less than 3 months. We chose to study the impact of a plausible psychosocial intervention to mitigate depression and loneliness in an at-risk population of older people with multiple long term conditions. It is important that interventions to tackle the higher rates of depression and loneliness in all age groups are also developed and evaluated.

The BASIL-C19 trial was not designed or powered to detect effectiveness, and a fully-powered pragmatic trial (BASIL+, ISRCTN63034289), is now underway to test for robust effects and replicate signals of effectiveness in important secondary outcomes such as loneliness \(^{43}\).

The COVID-19 pandemic prompted a number of studies to understand the impacts of COVID-19, \(^{44}\) but there have been very few studies to evaluate psychosocial interventions to mitigate psychological impact \(^9\). A clinical priority and policy imperative is to identify a brief and scalable intervention to prevent and mitigate loneliness, particularly in older people \(^{45}\). The BASIL trials programme (including a living systematic review) will be informative in improving the mental health of populations in socially isolated at-risk populations after the pandemic has passed \(^7\). We also emphasise that we have used, for the first time, the technique of ‘living systematic review’ to describe the impact of cognitive and/or behavioural interventions in preventing depression and loneliness in the face of social isolation and this will be updated in line with future and emerging trial based evidence. The living systematic review demonstrates that there are now multiple small-scale trials of interventions for loneliness. The strong meta-analytic signal of effect in reducing loneliness in the short term should be interpreted with some caution, since there is a potential small study bias and larger studies are needed. We note that there was a rapid rise in application of living systematic review \(^{13}\) during the COVID pandemic, and this is one of a number of reviews that have been undertaken by the mental health research community to rapidly assimilate knowledge to inform practice and policy \(^{46}\). An enduring legacy of the COVID pandemic might be the coupling of trials programmes with living systematic reviews, as presented in this report.
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Figure 1: BASIL CONSORT flow diagram

Note: Withdrawals are cumulative at each time point. Patients who did not complete the questionnaire at month 1 but did not formally withdraw were still sent the questionnaire at the next time point and may have resumed it.
Figures 2 & 3: Living meta-analysis of behavioural and cognitive trials targeting loneliness and depression in socially isolated populations

### Loneliness - short and long term outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>SMD with 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>short term</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams 2004</td>
<td>-0.36 [-0.67, -0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creswell 2012</td>
<td>-0.22 [-0.66, 0.22]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theeke 2016</td>
<td>-0.91 [-1.72, -0.10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zhang 2018</td>
<td>-0.65 [-1.26, -0.04]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohen Mansfield 2018</td>
<td>-0.26 [-0.71, 0.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soucy 2019</td>
<td>-0.21 [-0.83, 0.41]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis 2019</td>
<td>-1.92 [-2.81, -1.03]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 2020</td>
<td>-0.68 [-1.15, -0.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi 2020</td>
<td>-0.48 [-0.90, -0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbody 2021</td>
<td>-0.29 [-0.52, -0.06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 2021</td>
<td>-1.01 [-1.50, -0.52]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida 2022</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.32, 0.32]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneity:</strong> r² = 0.08, I² = 64.29%, H² = 2.80</td>
<td>-0.48 [-0.70, -0.27]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of ( \theta_1 = \theta_2 ); Q(11) = 28.92, p = 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>SMD with 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi 2020</td>
<td>-0.35 [-0.77, 0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 2020</td>
<td>-0.06 [-0.66, 0.54]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbody 2021</td>
<td>-0.13 [-0.46, 0.21]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida 2022</td>
<td>-0.22 [-0.63, 0.19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Heterogeneity:</strong> r² = 0.00, I² = 0.00%, H² = 1.00</td>
<td>-0.20 [-0.40, 0.01]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Test of ( \theta_1 = \theta_2 ); Q(3) = 0.90, p = 0.83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Depression - short and long term outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>SMD with 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short term</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams 2004</td>
<td>-0.06 [-0.38, 0.26]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theeke 2016</td>
<td>-0.22 [-0.99, 0.55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soucy 2019</td>
<td>-0.47 [-1.09, 0.15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jarvis 2019</td>
<td>0.02 [-0.71, 0.75]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 2020</td>
<td>-0.40 [-0.87, 0.07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi 2020</td>
<td>-0.74 [-1.16, -0.31]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbody 2021</td>
<td>-0.08 [-0.52, 0.37]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 2021</td>
<td>-0.74 [-1.23, -0.25]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida 2022</td>
<td>-0.15 [-0.48, 0.17]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity:</td>
<td>$r^2 = 0.03$, $I^2 = 38.00%$, $H^2 = 1.61$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.31 [-0.51, -0.11]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of $\theta = \theta_0$: $Q(8) = 12.17$, $p = 0.14$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>SMD with 95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long term</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choi 2020</td>
<td>-0.59 [-1.02, -0.16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 2020</td>
<td>-0.05 [-0.66, 0.57]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gilbody 2021</td>
<td>-0.13 [-0.50, 0.23]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almeida 2022</td>
<td>0.00 [-0.40, 0.40]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity:</td>
<td>$r^2 = 0.03$, $I^2 = 35.70%$, $H^2 = 1.56$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.20 [-0.47, 0.07]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test of $\theta = \theta_0$: $Q(3) = 4.54$, $p = 0.21$