

1 **Trialling an Optimised social Groups intervention in services to Enhance social connecTedness and**
2 **mental Health in vulnERable young people (TOGETHER): Study protocol for a feasibility randomised**
3 **controlled trial**

4
5 Claire Vella*¹, Dr Clio Berry², Dr Matthew J. Easterbrook¹, Dr Anna-Marie Bibby-Jones³, Dr Daniel
6 Michelson⁴, Dr Leanne Bogen-Johnston¹, Professor David Fowler¹

7
8 ¹ University of Sussex, UK

9 ² Brighton and Sussex Medical School, UK

10 ³ Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust, UK

11 ⁴ King's College London, UK

12

13 *Corresponding author information: Claire Vella, School of Psychology, University of Sussex, Falmer, BN1

14 9QH, UK, (e-mail: c.vella@sussex.ac.uk).

15

16 **Availability of data and materials:**

17 No datasets were generated or analysed during the current study. All relevant data from this study will be made
18 available upon study completion.

19

20 **Abstract**

21 **Background:** Calls have been made to rethink the mental health support currently available for young people.

22 This study aims to help re-focus and reduce the inaccessibility of mental health services by offering an adapted
23 version of a theoretically-driven, evidence-based, guided psychosocial intervention known as ‘Groups 4 Health’
24 (G4H). To date, the G4H intervention has mainly been trialled in Australia, with promising positive effects on
25 social connection, mental health and well-being. The present study examines the feasibility of running a
26 randomised controlled trial when delivering the G4H intervention for young people in the UK.

27

28 **Methods:** The TOGETHER study is a feasibility randomised controlled trial of an adapted version of the G4H
29 intervention. Participants are aged 16-25, currently experiencing mental health difficulties and recruited from

30 mental health services. The target sample size is 30, with 15 in each trial arm. Participants are randomly

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

31 allocated to either G4H plus treatment as usual, or treatment as usual alone. The primary outcomes of interest
32 are the feasibility of recruitment, randomisation, data collection and retention to the study at 10 and 14 week
33 follow up, as well as the acceptability, and accessibility of the study protocol and G4H intervention.

34

35 **Discussion:** The results of this study will indicate if further optimisation is required to improve the feasibility,
36 acceptability and accessibility of the intervention and study protocol procedures as perceived by end users and
37 practitioners. This offers a significant opportunity to support the local and national demand for accessible,
38 innovative, and effective psychosocial youth mental health support.

39

40 **Trial registration:** ISRCTN registry (ISRCTN12505807). Registration date: 11/04/2022.

41

42 **Keywords**

43 Social connection; social groups intervention; mental health; young people; feasibility study

44

45 **Background**

46 Severe and enduring mental health problems begin in adolescence, often emerging between the age of 15 and
47 25 years¹. Despite a clear need to focus on young people's mental health, concerns about the availability and
48 adequacy of mental health support have risen considerably, with an increasing narrative from young people that
49 their needs are not being met²⁻⁴. This is often particularly true for vulnerable young people, such as those with
50 complex and severe mental health difficulties, unstable or inactive employment, and low socioeconomic status,
51 who may disengage from, or may not meet the diagnostic entry thresholds for the standard NHS youth mental
52 health services.

53

54 Calls have been made for the government to commit to a recovery plan for young people that rethinks the
55 mental health support currently available⁵. Recommendations have been made to utilize the thousands of
56 professionals working with young people who currently have limited or no training in psychological
57 approaches⁴. Recommendations have also been made to implement practice innovations that directly address
58 social isolation⁶⁻⁷. Research has consistently shown that the presence, severity and longevity of physical and
59 mental health problems in young people is associated, and often preceded, by increased loneliness and

60 diminished social interactions^{4,8-9}. In contrast, social connection and multiple group memberships are associated
61 with improvements in mental health symptoms¹⁰, well-being¹¹, and resilience¹².

62

63 Vulnerable young people have been associated with smaller social networks¹³ and the presence of social
64 disability¹⁴. Assisting young people to engage in social relationships and activities, may help to prevent the
65 onset and longevity of severe mental illness, as well as reduce the use of mental health services over time¹⁴⁻¹⁶.
66 Addressing the underlying social causes of mental ill health is now also particularly pertinent following the
67 prolonged social restrictions enforced to control the spread of the COVID-19 virus¹⁷⁻¹⁸. It is evident that young
68 people with complex needs, i.e. co-present mental health and social difficulties, when they can access services,
69 receive varying packages of support within a complex landscape of youth and mental health services¹⁹. The
70 provision of interventions focused on social factors is variable and often poor. Services often aim to focus on
71 diagnostic remission, symptom reduction, or a narrow promotion on paid employment. Such approaches do not
72 always well match the typical heterogeneity of youth mental health presentations, nor necessarily what is most
73 meaningful to young people themselves²⁰. Services supporting youth mental health should aim to strengthen
74 resilience in social and existential (i.e. life meaning) domains, and serve the higher-order processes of social
75 participation and recovery²⁰.

76

77 This study aims to address the urgent need to re-focus youth mental health support towards enhancing social
78 connection. It also aims to help reduce the inaccessibility and burden on mental health services by offering an
79 evidence-based psychosocial intervention, known as 'Groups 4 Health' (G4H)²¹, to clinical, health and
80 community youth services. G4H is a modularised, guided psychosocial intervention that does not require
81 extensive training to use. The intervention is built on the social identity approach to health, which proposes that
82 positive social identities (identities based on beneficial group memberships) provide the psychological resources
83 necessary to promote and maintain good physical and mental health²². G4H targets social connection and
84 loneliness (through group-based belonging) with concomitant benefits for mental health and well-being²³⁻²⁴.

85

86 Trials so far have shown that the G4H intervention is associated with improvements in social connectedness,
87 depression, anxiety, stress and life satisfaction for young people and adults from clinical, student and general
88 population samples who are experiencing loneliness or low mood through an increase in positive social
89 identities²¹. Trials have also indicated that loneliness is reduced considerably more when participants have

90 received the G4H intervention, than compared to a matched no-treatment control group, a treatment as usual
91 group, and group cognitive behavioural therapy²³⁻²⁵.

92

93 To date, the G4H intervention has mainly been trialled in Australia, using a group-based delivery format. The
94 recruited samples also tend to be adults, who meet the criteria for clinical symptoms of depression. Only one
95 registered study has focused on the G4H intervention in the UK, and this study similarly focuses on the
96 adaptation of the intervention for adults accessing treatment for depression in secondary care services. Questions
97 therefore remain about the transferability of the intervention to, not just young people in UK based services, but
98 also vulnerable young people with complex mental health and support needs. Based on the research team's
99 extensive experience of working on trials with young people with complex social and mental health needs, as
100 well as a recent consultation with a specialist children and young people's mental health service, it is considered
101 that the intervention may be more accessible to vulnerable young people when delivered individually. Further
102 research is now needed to understand the feasibility, accessibility and acceptability of the intervention when
103 delivered in this way. In the context of a complex youth mental health service landscape, there is a need to better
104 understand what types of services could feasibly deliver a brief manualised social groups and connectedness
105 intervention, and in what types of services this intervention may be effective. Moreover, the recommendations
106 to utilise professionals with limited or no training in psychological approaches to augment youth mental health
107 service provision⁴ does not necessarily mean that these professionals want to or will deliver the type of
108 intervention being tested in this study. Thus, there is a need to explore the mechanisms and contextual factors
109 that may affect the future uptake and implementation of the intervention, in both research and clinical contexts.

110

111 The present study will be the first known to examine the feasibility of delivering the G4H intervention with
112 vulnerable young people in UK based community, health and youth mental health services. This study will also
113 examine the feasibility parameters related to the design of a randomised controlled trial, in such UK based
114 services. The results will indicate if further optimisation or adaptations are required to improve the feasibility,
115 acceptability and accessibility of the intervention and study protocol procedures, as perceived by end users and
116 (actual and potential) intervention providers. Findings will also provide valuable information from actual and
117 potential intervention providers regarding their perspectives around intervention implementation. This will
118 inform the overarching intervention implementation strategy, ensuring too that future research studies accurately

119 reflect this intended end deployment. This study offers a significant opportunity to better meet the local and
120 national demand for accessible, innovative, and effective youth mental health support.

121

122 **Aims**

123 The project aims to evaluate the feasibility, acceptability and accessibility of a randomised controlled trial
124 delivering an adapted social connection intervention (Groups 4 Health; G4H) to young adult service-users who
125 are currently experiencing mental health difficulties.

126 ***Primary research questions:***

- 127 1) Is it feasible to conduct a randomised controlled trial for the G4H intervention when delivered to young
128 service-users accessing community, health and/or youth mental health services?
- 129 2) Is the G4H intervention feasible to deliver to young service-users involved in community, health and/or
130 youth mental health services?
- 131 3) Is the G4H intervention safe and acceptable according to both the young service-users receiving the
132 intervention, and the practitioners delivering the intervention?
- 133 4) What changes are indicated to improve the safety, acceptability, accessibility and feasibility of the
134 intervention?

135 ***Secondary research questions:***

- 136 5) What is the most suitable primary outcome for a future larger trial of the G4H intervention?
- 137 6) What are the attitudes, experiences and contextual factors relevant to the implementation of an intervention
138 for social connectedness by practitioners' working with young people with mental health problems?
- 139 7) What are young people's experiences and perceptions of the benefits and harm of identification with online-
140 based social groups?

141

142 **Methods**

143 **Trial design**

144 TOGETHER is a single-blind, parallel-group feasibility randomised controlled trial, and a multi-site single time-
145 point online practitioner implementation survey. Participants aged 16-25 who are currently experiencing mental
146 health difficulties will be independently randomised to receive either an adapted version of the G4H intervention
147 alongside treatment as usual, or treatment as usual only. The trial will run in the context of community, health

148 and/or youth mental health service settings in the South East of England. The practitioner implementation
149 survey will run in service settings nationally. The CONSORT (Consolidated Standards of Reporting Trials)
150 Statement and CONSORT Checklists will be used to report the trial. For this protocol, the SPIRIT (Standard
151 Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials) Figure and Checklist are provided (See Supporting
152 Information file S1).

153

154 **Participants**

155 The study will recruit trial young adult participants, intervention providers and practitioner survey respondents.
156 See Supporting Information file 2 for the eligibility criteria to take part as an intervention provider and
157 practitioner survey respondent. The trial aims to recruit 30 young adult participants, providing 15 participants in
158 each trial arm.

159

160 ***Inclusion criteria:***

- 161 1. Aged 16 – 25 years old
- 162 2. Accessing a community, health and/or youth mental health service involved in the study
- 163 3. Be experiencing current mental health difficulties (operationalised by a rating of 60 or below on the Global
164 Assessment Scale [GAS])
- 165 4. Able to read, write and speak in English/ OR are non-English speaking but have access to an interpreter; to
166 the degree they can give informed consent, are able to fully understand and participate in both the
167 assessment questions and intervention content

168 ***Exclusion criteria:***

- 169 1. Be at immediate and serious risk to self or others (assessed at the point of referral/eligibility review)
- 170 2. Be currently participating, or be confirmed to participate in another interventional research study in which
171 they are receiving an intervention that targets social isolation or utilises psychological therapy
- 172 3. Be expected to be discharged, or be known to be unable to seek support from the referring service, in the 16
173 weeks following a referral to the trial being made (14-week research involvement + 2 weeks allowing for
174 any missed/rearranged meetings)

175

176 **Intervention**

177 ***G4H***

178 The intervention is G4H plus TAU. G4H is a theoretically driven, evidence-based, manualised intervention
179 designed to improve social connection and well-being through facilitating integration to social groups²⁶. The
180 intervention is delivered via five sessions, each taking approximately 60 to 90 minutes. The first four sessions
181 are delivered weekly, and the final session is delivered one month later. The G4H sessions are supplemented
182 with a workbook, offering a summary of the main learning points and space to complete activities. The five
183 sessions aim to: raise awareness of the value and benefits of groups for health; develop a social map to identify
184 existing connections and possible areas for social growth; train skills to maintain and use existing networks,
185 and/or reconnect with valued groups; explore if existing connections reflect the important aspects of the self,
186 and create an action plan; reinforce key messages and troubleshoot any problems experienced with
187 implementing the developed social action plan.

188
189 The G4H intervention is delivered by trained intervention providers who are either working in the services who
190 have agreed to be involved in the trial or are associated members of the research team with relevant experience.
191 Following consultation with practitioners and young people (see PPI section), the trial offers an adapted version
192 of G4H (see Patient and Public Involvement section). For this study, the sessions are typically delivered in a 1:1
193 format, with the option to take part in sessions as a group. The intervention sessions are held either online or in-
194 person; allowing services to follow their usual policies and/or procedures for contact with service-users.

195 ***TAU***

196 The control comparator is treatment as usual. This consists of any support, medication or interventions that
197 participants may be receiving from any statutory or non-statutory public services and/or private services.

198

199 ***Intervention training & adherence***

200 Those who have consented to be intervention providers in the study are invited to a group training session
201 delivered by a member of the Groups 4 Health team. The training session may be held in-person or online using
202 videoconferencing facilities. Intervention providers are provided with a copy of the intervention manual and
203 workbook and asked to follow the detailed intervention manual where possible. For each delivered session of
204 the intervention, intervention providers are asked to complete an intervention adherence form. Questions
205 relating to perceived fidelity to the intervention, and perceived barriers to maintain fidelity to the intervention
206 are asked in a semi-structured interview with intervention providers.

207

208 **Outcomes**

209 ***Primary outcomes***

210 The primary outcomes of interest are:

- 211 1. Number of potential service-user participants referred
- 212 2. Number of intervention providers who consent to take part
- 213 3. Number and proportion of referred potential service-user participants who consent to take part in the study
- 214 4. Number and proportion of referred potential service-user participants found to be eligible
- 215 5. Number and proportion of consenting eligible participants who are retained in the study at post-intervention
216 (10 week follow up) and until the last time point (14-week follow up)
- 217 6. Number and proportion of survey measures completed by each participant for each time-point
- 218 7. Number and proportion of consenting eligible service-user participants who take part in all five G4H
219 sessions
- 220 8. Number and proportion of intervention adherence components completed for each session and across the
221 whole G4H intervention
- 222 9. Number and nature of adverse events experienced by study participants
- 223 10. Number and proportion of breaks in blinding

224

225 The key feasibility parameters for the study include:

- 226 • $\geq 50\%$ of referred potential participants will be found to be eligible
- 227 • $\geq 80\%$ of consenting eligible participants will be retained in the study at each follow up time point
- 228 • $\geq 80\%$ data completeness
- 229 • $\geq 80\%$ of participants allocated to receive G4H will complete at least four sessions
- 230 • $\geq 80\%$ of the core G4H intervention items will be delivered

231

232 ***Secondary outcome***

233 The secondary outcome is defining the primary outcome for a future larger trial of the G4H intervention.

234

235 ***Participant perspectives of feasibility, acceptability, accessibility, and safety***

236 To assess the feasibility, acceptability, accessibility and safety of the G4H intervention and study protocol from
237 a participant perspective, qualitative data are collected from the young people and intervention providers

238 involved in this study. To further understand the attitudes, experiences and contextual factors related to the
239 implementation of an intervention for social connectedness, both quantitative and qualitative data drawing on
240 Normalisation Process Theory²⁷ is also collected via the study practitioner national survey.

241

242 **Recruitment and procedure**

243 The trial will run in the context of community, health and/or youth mental health service settings in the South
244 East of England. The study aims to include: the Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust Children and
245 Adolescent's Assertive Outreach Team; a Sussex, Kent or Surrey based Primary Care service; a Sussex-based
246 YMCA youth advice centre or residential service. The practitioner implementation survey will be open to NHS
247 and non-NHS services across the UK.

248 To recruit young adult participants, all organisations who have agreed to be involved in the trial are provided
249 with the young adult-focused participant information sheet, study information video (with video transcript),
250 study poster, referral information sheet and referral form. The involved organisations are asked to discuss the
251 study opportunity and/or share the study documents with potential eligible young people. Potential participants
252 who are interested and provide verbal permission to be contacted by the researcher, are referred by the involved
253 organisation. Researchers then invite potential participants to provide informed consent and to be screened for
254 study eligibility. Eligible participants are then invited to complete the baseline assessment and, upon doing so,
255 are randomised. All randomised participants are invited to complete two post-allocation follow up assessments
256 at 10 and 14 weeks. Participants receive £20 in vouchers (£60 in total) for each assessment time point. Please
257 refer to Fig. 1 (SPIRIT figure) for the schedule of enrolment, allocation, intervention and assessments. For
258 information about the recruitment and consent process for intervention providers and practitioner survey
259 respondents, see Supporting Information file 2.

260 All trial participants are invited to complete a semi-structured interview (either post 10 week follow up
261 assessment or post intervention delivery, as relevant to the type of participant). Verbal consent to be audio-
262 recorded is obtained. Across the trial, all personal information and research data is collected online, on a day and
263 a time suitable for the participant; either independently or with a researcher in-person or via telephone or email.
264 If required, a member of the research team may read study documents to the individual, and/or record
265 participant responses on their behalf (with participant permission).

266

267 **Fig. 1. Standard Protocol Items: Recommendations for Interventional Trials (SPIRIT); Schedule of**
268 **enrolment, interventions and assessments.**

269

270 **Ethical approval and consent to participate:**

271 Ethical approval for the study was provided by the Health Research Authority, Berkshire Research Ethics
272 Committee (Reference: 22/SC/0040). Participants are required to provide written informed consent to take part
273 and are provided with the relevant participant information sheet at least 24 hours prior.

274

275 **Adverse events**

276 All adverse events will be categorised and recorded from the point of randomisation until completion of the final
277 follow up assessment for young adult participants, and from the point of informed consent until post-
278 intervention interview for intervention providers. All serious adverse events, and suspected, unexpected, serious
279 adverse reactions (SUSARs) will be reported to study sponsor and NHS research ethics committee as
280 appropriate.

281

282 **Randomisation & Blinding**

283 The randomisation procedure and allocation sequence is set up by an independent member of the research team
284 and will be masked from all other study team members. Randomisation, stratified by trial site, is completed
285 using the Sealed Envelope online service²⁸. Treatment allocation is emailed to an unblind trial coordinator who
286 contacts each trial participant (via phone, email or preferred contact method) to inform them of the group they
287 have been allocated to. The referring service, participant's GP, and secondary care mental health service (where
288 relevant) are informed of the participant's informed consent to the study and allocated treatment group. For
289 participants allocated to receive G4H alongside treatment as usual, an assigned intervention provider is advised
290 to set-up arrangements to start delivering the intervention as soon as possible. Research workers responsible for
291 data collection from each follow up assessment battery are kept blind (where possible) to treatment allocation to
292 facilitate unbiased, and objective assessments. All trial participants, intervention providers and referring services
293 are asked not to reveal the allocation group to the assessor. Trial allocation is stored in a file not accessible to
294 blinded members of the team. Breaks in blinding are monitored and recorded. Qualitative interviews are
295 completed by an unblind member of the team.

296

297 **Patient and Public Involvement**

298 This protocol is informed by the feedback received from stakeholders and young people aged 18-25 with lived
299 experience of mental health problems. The concept of the study, involving an intervention that targets social
300 connectedness for young people's mental health, was presented and supported as an interesting and useful
301 opportunity by experts by experience at a Young People's involvement in Digital Mental Health research group
302 event organised by the University of Nottingham and Emerging Minds research network, as well as by
303 stakeholders from Sussex Partnership NHS Foundation Trust (notably the chief medical officer, and
304 practitioners from a specialist youth mental service). The research team engaged in a process of co-production to
305 optimise the chosen intervention to overcome any perceived immediate accessibility issues for our target
306 population. Key adaptations were made following informal interviews with four young adults with lived
307 experience (paid for their time) and a focus group with five practitioners from a specialist youth mental health
308 service. These include: offering the delivery of the G4H intervention in a 1:1 format; flexibility to deliver online
309 or in-person; adapting content language; and option to use modified scales for session activities.

310

311 **Sample Size**

312 The trial aims to recruit 30 young adult participants, providing 15 participants in each trial arm. The target
313 sample size exceeds the recommended minimum sample size for feasibility studies²⁹, and a power calculation
314 was not undertaken as the study focus is on feasibility goals and not the statistical significance of treatment
315 effects³⁰. Similarly, the sample size of intervention providers is not pre-determined and is dependent on the
316 number of eligible practitioners in each of the services involved in this study. This feasibility study aims to
317 monitor the number of intervention providers who consent to take part to inform the design of a larger RCT
318 study. The study will also recruit a minimum of 100 survey respondents from UK services involved in
319 supporting young people aged 16-25 to complete the practitioner implementation survey.

320

321 **Data Management**

322 All personal and research data (online, electronic or paper-based) is processed in accordance with the General
323 Data Protection Regulation and Data Protection Act (2018). Data is stored confidentially and securely with log
324 in/password protection and/or in locked filing cabinets on NHS premises. All research data is pseudo-
325 anonymised with a unique participant identification number. Participant personal information is stored
326 separately in a password protected file. Only fully anonymised data is available for the use of other genuine

327 researchers or as a part of publication transparency. Participant consent for anonymised data to be shared outside
328 of the research team is provided during the informed consent process.

329

330 **Analysis**

331 This study collects both quantitative and qualitative research data. Quantitative data will be evaluated using
332 descriptive statistics (count, proportions, mean, median, standard deviation, IQR, range & reliable change
333 analysis) as appropriate. Participant flow through the study will be reported in line with the CONSORT 2010
334 statement - extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials³¹. Qualitative data transcribed verbatim into text
335 files will be analysed using framework analysis. Missing data will be handled according to best practice
336 guidelines³² and will be evaluated with respect to the amount and nature of the missing data, and any substantive
337 patterns related to the missing data. The level of missing data will be reported.

338

339 **Discussion**

340 There is an urgent need to reduce the inaccessibility and burden on mental health services. Services often aim to
341 focus on diagnostic remission, symptom reduction, or a narrow promotion on paid employment, and the
342 provision of interventions focused on social factors is variable and often poor. Evidence suggests that assisting
343 young people to enhance their sense of social connectedness and to engage in social relationships and activities
344 may help to prevent the onset and longevity of severe mental illness, as well as reduce the use of mental health
345 services over time. This study will be the first known to examine the feasibility, accessibility and acceptability
346 of delivering a short, evidence-based psychosocial intervention, known as 'Groups 4 Health' (G4H), for
347 vulnerable young people in UK based community, health and youth mental health services. The study seeks to
348 uniquely investigate the transferability of the intervention to young people in UK-based services, and in
349 particular the accessibility of the intervention for vulnerable young people when delivered individually. The
350 mechanisms and contextual factors that may affect the future uptake and implementation of the intervention in
351 research and clinical contexts will also be explored. Such research offers a significant opportunity to better
352 understand and meet the local and national demand for accessible, innovative, and effective social-based youth
353 mental health support. The study team plan to work with key stakeholders to co-produce videos and a lay
354 summary of the study results to disseminate broadly through clinical, research, academic and public engagement
355 activities. The findings will also be published in peer-reviewed journals and presented at local and international
356 conferences.

357

358 ***Protocol changes***

359 The study sponsor and NHS Research Ethics Committee are notified of amendments to the study protocol.

360 Amendments are not enforced until the relevant approvals have been received. All amendments made to the

361 study protocol since commencement of the trial are shown in Table 1.

362

Table 1. Amendments to protocol

Area	Change
Design	Inclusion of a multi-site practitioner implementation survey; reduced service-user participant recruitment to a total of 30 participants; inclusion of additional safeguarding criteria and procedures
Data Collection	Changes to assessment battery: Addition of modified Client Service Receipt Inventory to 10 week and 14 week follow up
Recruitment Procedure	Use of a study information video
Trial Timeline	3-month study extension; 2-month study extension

363

364 ***Trial status***

365 Recruitment of participants commenced in May 2022 and will be open until the end of June 2023. Delivery of

366 the intervention will continue until the end of August 2023, and the collection of research data will continue

367 until early October 2023.

368

369 ***Authors' contributions***

370 CV took responsibility for the main drafting of the protocol and manuscript. All authors made substantial

371 contributions to the conception and design of the study and the development of the protocol. All authors read

372 and approved the final manuscript.

373

374 ***Acknowledgements***

375

376 ***Supporting Information***

377 Supporting Information file S1 – SPIRIT Checklist

378 Supporting Information file S2 – Eligibility criteria and recruitment processes for intervention providers and
379 practitioner survey respondents.

380

381 **References**

- 382 1. Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O, Jin R, Merikangas KR, Walters EE. Lifetime prevalence and age-of-
383 onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. *Arch Gen*
384 *Psychiatry*. 2005 Jun 1;62(6):593–602. doi:10.1001/archpsyc.62.6.593
- 385 2. Plaistow J, Masson K, Koch D, Wilson J, Stark RM, Jones PB, et al. Young people’s views of UK mental
386 health services. *Early Intervention in Psychiatry*. 2014;8(1):12–23.
- 387 3. Frith E. Progress and challenges in the transformation of children and young people’s mental health care:
388 A report of the Education Policy Institute’s Mental Health Commission. 2016 Aug. Available from:
389 <https://epi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/progress-and-challenges.pdf>
- 390 4. Young Minds. Coronavirus: Impact on young people with mental health needs. Survey 4: February 2021.
391 2021 Feb. Available from: [https://www.youngminds.org.uk/media/esifqn3z/youngminds-coronavirus-](https://www.youngminds.org.uk/media/esifqn3z/youngminds-coronavirus-report-jan-2021.pdf)
392 [report-jan-2021.pdf](https://www.youngminds.org.uk/media/esifqn3z/youngminds-coronavirus-report-jan-2021.pdf)
- 393 5. Crenna-Jennings W, Hutchinson J. Access to child and adolescent mental health services in 2019.
394 Education Policy Institute. 2020 Jan. Available from: [https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/34811/1/Access-to-](https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/34811/1/Access-to-CAMHS-in-2019_EPI.pdf)
395 [CAMHS-in-2019_EPI.pdf](https://dera.ioe.ac.uk/id/eprint/34811/1/Access-to-CAMHS-in-2019_EPI.pdf)
- 396 6. Department of Health. Future in mind: Promoting, protecting and improving our children and young
397 people’s mental health and wellbeing. NHS England; 2015 Mar 17. Available from:
398 [https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414024/C](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414024/Childrens_Mental_Health.pdf)
399 [hildrens_Mental_Health.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/414024/Childrens_Mental_Health.pdf)
- 400 7. O’Sullivan R, Lawlor B, Burns A, Leavey G. Will the pandemic reframe loneliness and social isolation?
401 *The Lancet Healthy Longevity*. 2021 Feb; 2(2):e54–55. doi:[https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568\(20\)30066-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2666-7568(20)30066-0)
- 402 8. Cross SPM, Scott J, Hickie IB. Predicting early transition from sub-syndromal presentations to major
403 mental disorders. *BJPsych Open*. 2017 Sep;3(5):223–7.
- 404 9. Banerjee D, Rai M. Social isolation in Covid-19: The impact of loneliness. *Int J Soc Psychiatry*. 2020
405 Sep;66(6):525–7.

- 406 10. Foster CE, Horwitz A, Thomas A, Opperman K, Gipson P, Burnside A, et al. Connectedness to family,
407 school, peers, and community in socially vulnerable adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review*.
408 2017 Oct 1;81:321–31.
- 409 11. Jose PE, Ryan N, Pryor J. Does Social Connectedness Promote a Greater Sense of Well-Being in
410 Adolescence Over Time? *J Res Adolesc*. 2012 Jun;22(2):235–51.
- 411 12. Scarf D, Moradi S, McGaw K, Hewitt J, Hayhurst JG, Boyes M, Ruffman T, Hunter JA. Somewhere I
412 belong: Long-term increases in adolescents’ resilience are predicted by perceived belonging to the
413 in-group. *Brit J Soc Psychology*. 2016 Sep;55(3):588-99.
- 414 13. Visentini C, Cassidy M, Bird VJ, Priebe S. Social networks of patients with chronic depression: A
415 systematic review. *J Affect Disord*. 2018 Dec 1;241:571–8.
- 416 14. Hodgekins J, French P, Birchwood M, Mugford M, Christopher R, Marshall M, et al. Comparing time use
417 in individuals at different stages of psychosis and a non-clinical comparison group. *Schizophrenia Res*.
418 2015 Feb 1;161(2):188–93.
- 419 15. Kogstad RE, Mönness E, Sörensen T. Social Networks for Mental Health Clients: Resources and Solution.
420 *Community Ment Health J*. 2013 Feb 1;49(1):95–100.
- 421 16. Maulik PK, Eaton WW, Bradshaw CP. The Effect of Social Networks and Social Support on Mental
422 Health Services Use, Following a Life Event, among the Baltimore Epidemiologic Catchment Area
423 Cohort. *J Behav Health Serv Res*. 2011 Jan 1;38(1):29–50.
- 424 17. Bu F, Steptoe A, Fancourt D. Who is lonely in lockdown? Cross-cohort analyses of predictors of
425 loneliness before and during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Public Health*. 2020 Sep 1;186:31–4.
- 426 18. Gayer C, Latham R, Zerbi CE, Strang L, Hall VM, Knowles G, et al. Impacts of social isolation among
427 disadvantaged and vulnerable groups during public health crises. *Economic and Social Research Council*.
428 2020 Jun 1. Available from: [https://www.careknowledge.com/media/47410/3563-social-isolation-2-cs-](https://www.careknowledge.com/media/47410/3563-social-isolation-2-cs-v3.pdf)
429 [v3.pdf](https://www.careknowledge.com/media/47410/3563-social-isolation-2-cs-v3.pdf)
- 430 19. Berry C, Hodgekins J, French P, Clarke T, Shepstone L, Barton G, Banerjee R, Byrne R, Fraser R, Grant
431 K, Greenwood K. PRODIGY: Prevention and treatment of long-term social disability amongst young
432 people with emerging severe mental illness: A randomised controlled trial of clinical and cost-
433 effectiveness of Social Recovery Therapy. *Br J Psychiatry*. 2022 Mar 1;220(3):154-162.
434 doi: [10.1192/bjp.2021.206](https://doi.org/10.1192/bjp.2021.206)

- 435 20. van Os J, Guloksuz S, Vijn TW, Hafkenscheid A, Delespaul P. The evidence-based group-level
436 symptom-reduction model as the organizing principle for mental health care: time for change?. *World*
437 *Psychiatry*. 2019 Feb;18(1):88-96.
- 438 21. Haslam C, Jetten J, Cruwys T, Dingle G, Haslam SA. *The new psychology of health: Unlocking the social*
439 *cure*. Routledge; 2018 May 1.
- 440 22. Jetten J, Haslam SA, Cruwys T, Greenaway KH, Haslam C, Steffens NK. Advancing the social identity
441 approach to health and well-being: Progressing the social cure research agenda. *European J Soc*
442 *Psychology*. 2017 Dec;47(7):789-802.
- 443 23. Haslam C, Cruwys T, Haslam SA, Dingle G, Chang MX. Groups 4 Health: Evidence that a social-identity
444 intervention that builds and strengthens social group membership improves mental health. *J Affect Disord*.
445 2016 Apr 1;194:188-95.
- 446 24. Haslam C, Cruwys T, Chang MX, Bentley SV, Haslam SA, Dingle GA, Jetten J. GROUPS 4 HEALTH
447 reduces loneliness and social anxiety in adults with psychological distress: Findings from a randomized
448 controlled trial. *J Consult Clin Psychology*. 2019 Sep;87(9):787.
- 449 25. Cruwys T, Haslam C, Rathbone JA, Williams E, Haslam SA. Groups 4 Health protects against
450 unanticipated threats to mental health: Evaluating two interventions during COVID-19 lockdown among
451 young people with a history of depression and loneliness. *J Affect Disord*. 2021 Dec 1;295:316-22.
- 452 26. Haslam C, Cruwys T, Haslam SA, Bentley SV, Dingle GA, Jetten J. GROUPS 4 HEALTH manual
453 (version 3.0). Social identity and groups network (SIGN): University of Queensland, Australia. 2016.
- 454 27. May CR, Mair F, Finch T, MacFarlane A, Dowrick C, Treweek S, Rapley T, Ballini L, Ong BN, Rogers
455 A, Murray E. Development of a theory of implementation and integration: Normalization Process Theory.
456 *Implement Sci*. 2009 Dec;4(1):1-9.
- 457 28. sealed envelope [Internet]. London: Clerkenwell Workshops. c2001. Available from:
458 <https://www.sealedenvelope.com>
- 459 29. Julious SA. Sample size of 12 per group rule of thumb for a pilot study. *Pharmaceutical Statistics: The*
460 *Journal of Applied Statistics in the Pharmaceutical Industry*. 2005 Oct;4(4):287-91.
- 461 30. Arain M, Campbell MJ, Cooper CL, Lancaster GA. What is a pilot or feasibility study? A review of
462 current practice and editorial policy. *BMC Medical Res Methodol*. 2010 Dec;10(1):1-7.

- 463 31. Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, Lancaster GA. CONSORT
464 2010 statement: extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *BMJ*. 2016 Oct 24;355:i5239.
465 doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i5239>
- 466 32. Graham JW. Missing data analysis: Making it work in the real world. *Annual Review of Psychology*. 2009
467 Jan 10;60:549-76.
468

TOGETHER	STUDY PERIOD						
	Enrolment		Allocation	Post-allocation	Close-out		
	Screening	Baseline		Intervention (weeks)	Follow up (weeks)		
TIMEPOINT	** <i>-t1</i>	*** <i>-t2</i>	0	8	10	14	
*ENROLMENT: Informed consent Eligibility screen Allocation	X						
	X						
			X				
*INTERVENTIONS: <i>G4H+TAU</i> <i>Treatment as usual (TAU)</i>				↔			
				↔			
*ASSESSMENTS: <i>Screening Assessment:</i> <i>Demographics survey</i> <i>Global Assessment Scale</i> <i>DSM-5 self-rated level 1 cross-cutting symptom measure</i> <i>Social and Mental Health Assessment:</i> <i>Social Connectedness Scale</i> <i>Multiple Identities Scale (from Exeter Identity Transition Scales)</i> <i>Social Identity Continuity (from Exeter Identity Transition Scales)</i> <i>New Group Memberships (from Exeter Identity Transition Scales)</i> <i>Time Use Survey</i> <i>Patient Health Questionnaire-9</i> <i>Generalised Anxiety Disorder-7</i> <i>Prodromal Questionnaire</i> <i>UCLA Loneliness Scale-8</i> <i>Satisfaction with Life Scale</i> <i>Social Hope Scale</i> <i>Perceived Social Support</i> <i>Client Service Receipt Inventory</i> <i>(Modified) Edinburgh Adverse Effects of Psychological Therapy Scale</i> <i>Participant perspective of feasibility:</i> <i>Semi-structured interview</i>							
	X						
	X						
	X						
		X				X	X
		X				X	X
						X	X
						X	X
		X				X	X
		X				X	X
		X				X	X
		X				X	X
		X				X	X
						X	X
						X	
						X	

medRxiv preprint doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.07.04.23292217>; this version posted July 5, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license.

*The number and proportion of participants that complete each stage of the study and/or each measure or intervention session relates to the primary outcomes for this feasibility study.

**Eligibility screening will be completed as soon as possible after informed consent. However, no restrictions are placed on whether these should be completed in a single visit or two visits.

***Baseline assessment will be completed as soon as possible after confirmation of eligibility. Where eligibility can be confirmed by the researcher immediately there are no restrictions on whether the baseline assessment be completed in the same single visit or across multiple visits arranged with the participant for a later date.

Figure