

**Title: Exploring the Perspectives of Clients and Clinicians Regarding Digitally Delivered Psychotherapies Utilized for Trauma-Affected Populations.**

**Short title: Perspectives on Digital Psychotherapy for Trauma-Affected Populations.**

**Authors:** Sidney Yap<sup>1,3</sup>, Rashell Wozniak<sup>2</sup>, Katherine Bright<sup>3</sup>, Matthew RG Brown<sup>3,4</sup>, Lisa Burbach<sup>1</sup>, Jake Hayward<sup>5</sup>, Olga Winkler<sup>1</sup>, Kristopher Wells<sup>6</sup>, Chelsea Jones<sup>3</sup>, Phillip R. Sevigny<sup>3,8</sup>, Megan McElheran<sup>9</sup>, Keith Zukiwski<sup>10</sup>, Andrew J Greenshaw<sup>1</sup>, Suzette Brémault-Phillips<sup>3,7</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>2</sup>School of Clinical Child Psychology, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>3</sup>Heroes in Mind, Advocacy, and Research Consortium, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>4</sup>Department of Computing Science, Faculty of Science, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>5</sup>Department of Emergency Medicine, Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>6</sup>Department of Child and Youth Care, Faculty of Health and Community Studies, MacEwan University, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada

<sup>7</sup>Department of Occupational Therapy, Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>8</sup>Faculty of Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, AB, Canada

<sup>9</sup>Wayfound Mental Health Group, Calgary, AB, Canada

<sup>10</sup>Haikai Health, Edmonton, AB, Canada

**Correspondence:**

**Sidney Yap**  
**syap@ualberta.ca**

## Abstract:

During the COVID-19 pandemic, many clinical sites shifted towards digital delivery of mental health services. However, there is still much to learn regarding using digitally delivered psychotherapies in trauma-affected populations, including military members, Veterans, and public safety personnel. This study examined perceptions of psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations, as reported by Canadian military members, Veterans, and public safety personnel who completed such interventions and mental health clinicians who provided them. Specifically, we explored the imposed shift to digital health use, what changed with this rapid shift, what needs, problems, and solutions arose, and important future considerations associated with delivering trauma-focused and adjunct treatments digitally.

Quantitative survey data were collected from 11 Canadian patients (military members, Veterans, and public safety personnel with post-traumatic stress injury) and 12 Canadian mental health clinicians. Survey questions were adapted from the Alberta Quality Matrix for Health (AQMH) and Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) model. As a follow-up, participants were invited to participate in either a semi-structured qualitative interview or focus group to further explore their perspectives on digitally delivered trauma-focused and adjunct therapies. Four clients and 19 clinician participants participated in an interview or focus group.

In survey and interview/focus group results, patient and clinician participants reported that digitally delivered trauma and adjunct therapies offered similar treatment effectiveness as in-person delivery while also improving treatment access. Participants indicated unique advantages of digital delivery, including the increased accessibility of treatment, cost effectiveness, and

more efficient use of resources. However, some participants struggled with using digital platforms and felt less comfortable working in a digital environment. Further research with a larger, more diverse population is required to corroborate our results and identify other avenues in which psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations can be engaged with and improved upon.

**Key Words:** Web Based Intervention, Psychotherapy, Access to Therapies, Trauma, Trauma-focused Psychotherapy, Health Services, Military, Veteran, Public Safety Personnel, Implementation Science

#### **Author Summary:**

Many mental health service sites were faced with rapid and unexpected shifts towards digital delivery of mental health services to comply with mandated physical distancing restrictions put in place during the COVID-19 pandemic. There is still much to learn regarding using digitally delivered psychotherapies in trauma-affected populations, including military members, Veterans, and public safety personnel. This study examined perceptions of Canadian military members, Veterans, and public safety personnel who completed, and mental health clinicians who provided, psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. This exploration aims to increase our understanding of the strengths and limitations of this mode of delivery. Patient and clinician participants reported that psychotherapies for trauma-affected populations offered similar treatment effectiveness as in-person delivery, while also improving treatment access. Participants indicated unique advantages of digital delivery, including increased accessibility of treatment, cost effectiveness, and more efficient use of resources. Some participants reported struggling with the use of, and felt less comfortable working on, digital

platforms. Further research with larger, more diverse populations is required to confirm our results and identify other avenues for using, and improving on, psychotherapies for trauma-affected populations.

# 1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic substantially impacted mental health and approaches to service delivery. In Canadian poll results, over 40% of individuals reported experiencing mental distress early in 2021 when COVID-19 related precautions were commonplace (Statistics Canada, 2021). The pandemic further stressed groups at high risk for potentially psychologically traumatic event exposures (PPTs, e.g., exposure to actual or threatened death, serious injury, or sexual violence) (APA, 2022; Heber et al., 2023). Such groups include public safety personnel (PSP) and frontline healthcare workers, as well as currently serving military members and Veterans (Carleton et al., 2018; Heber et al., 2023). PPTs can have physical impacts (e.g., digestive distress, cardiovascular disease), result in behavioral challenges (e.g., maladaptive responses like burnout, alcoholism, suicidality), and induce post-traumatic stress injuries (PTSI, e.g., post-traumatic stress disorder [PTSD], major depressive disorder) (APA, 2022).

Even prior to the pandemic, trauma-affected populations like PSP, Veterans and military members experienced a higher risk of mental health difficulties. A pre-COVID-19 survey found that 44.5% of Canadian PSP self-reported a mental disorder diagnosis (Carleton et al., 2018). Further, 23.2% of this Canadian PSP population yielded a positive screen for PTSD (Carleton et al., 2018). Public Safety Personnel also exhibit elevated psychopathology despite prior treatment, indicating clinical complexity and the potential need for transdiagnostic, specialized, or ongoing

mental health support (McCall et al., 2021). Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) Regular Force Veterans exhibited similar prevalence for PTSD (16%) as PSP. Additionally, this population reported mood disorder prevalence of 21% and anxiety disorder prevalence of 15% (Van Til et al, 2016).

These unique mental health challenges may have been compounded by the COVID-19 pandemic (Clemente-Suarez et al., 2021). According to the Public Health Agency of Canada, those who met criteria for PTSD during the pandemic were more likely to report being impacted by the pandemic (and mandatory public health restrictions and protocols) in terms of physical health problems, difficulties in meeting financial obligations/essential needs, and facing challenges in personal relationships with household members. These individuals were also more likely to report symptoms of anxiety and depression within the past two weeks, greater lifetime suicidal thoughts, and increased use of alcohol and cannabis (Public Health Agency of Canada, 2021).

Transformation in service delivery was prompted by the escalation of mental health concerns due to COVID-19 and the need to adhere to physical distancing mandates and government restrictions. While utilizing digital modalities to deliver psychotherapeutic interventions was not a novel innovation when the COVID-19 pandemic began (see Gros et al., 2018 for a review), the pandemic required an unprecedented rapid transition from in-person to digital methods (e.g., teletherapy, telemedicine, eHealth, mobile health) (Torous & Keshavan, 2020). Considering mental health consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic (Statistics Canada, 2021; WHO, 2022), digital mental health interventions (DMHI) offered a cost-effective alternative to in-person mental health treatment while complying with public health requirements for physical distancing during the pandemic (Philippe et al, 2022). Such interventions allowed for access to timely and secure trauma therapies that are critical to supporting the transdiagnostic needs of PSP, military

135 members, and Veterans (Smith-MacDonald, 2020). Accordingly, the COVID-19 pandemic  
136 greatly accelerated uptake of DMHI (Bautista & Schueller, 2022).

137 Research indicates that digitally delivered Prolonged Exposure (PE), Eye Movement  
138 Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) and Trauma-Focused Cognitive Behavioral Therapy  
139 (TF-CBT) may be effective at reducing PTSD symptomatology (Jones et al., 2020; Perri et al.,  
140 2021). DMHI generally provides clients with increased convenience, comfort, and access to  
141 treatment (APA, 2015; Titov et al., 2019). Increased access to care can lead to substantial cost  
142 and time savings for clients (Philippe et al., 2022). DMHI may also aid in decreasing stigma  
143 related to accessing mental health care (Lattie et al., 2022).

144 Despite promising findings supporting the use of DMHI for general mental health care, evidence  
145 supporting the wide scale use of DMHI for clients experiencing PTSI is comparatively scarce.  
146 Few randomized controlled trials (RCTs) have directly compared the effectiveness of digitally  
147 delivered and in-person trauma interventions (Fleuty & Almond, 2020; Jones et al., 2020). Some  
148 Veteran clients reported that DMHI were negatively impacted due to Internet connection issues  
149 and because therapy delivery felt distant and impersonal in the digital environment (Fleuty &  
150 Almond, 2020). Those with greater symptom severity may also be less likely to complete  
151 treatment programs delivered digitally, as reported in a recent study evaluating the use of  
152 Internet-Delivered Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (ICBT) in PSP (Beahm et al., 2021). There is a  
153 clear need to explore mitigation of potential risks and disadvantages of using digital trauma  
154 interventions for those experiencing PTSI, including appropriate assessment of client  
155 compatibility, obtaining consent in a secure manner, ensuring safety in the context of suicidal  
156 ideation or behavior, adapting therapy protocol to the digital environment, and ensuring ongoing  
157 client privacy (Jones et al., 2020).

Clinician experiences and comfort with delivering DMHI can also be an important contributor to treatment success. Most clinicians supporting those with mental health challenges did not have prior experience providing digital services, trauma-specific or otherwise, prior to the COVID-19 pandemic (Békés et al., 2021; Aafjes-van Doorn et al., 2022). Clinicians have reported many concerns with providing DMHI, including a lack of emotional connection with patients, increased distraction (for both client and clinician), concerns with privacy and confidentiality, and clinician work-life balance (Békés et al., 2021). Maintaining participant engagement in digitally delivered group-based treatments is an additional challenge, with therapists perceiving online psychotherapy groups to be less effective, in addition to a lack of specific training for providing online group therapy (Gullo et al., 2022). The highlighted research primarily focused on DMHI generally and did not identify how the shift to digital delivery affected PPTE-focused treatments specifically. Taken together, these challenges may contribute to the low acceptability of DMHI among clinicians (Fluety and Almond, 2020), even with the knowledge that DMHI may provide many unique benefits. Further, until the pandemic, many healthcare regulatory bodies did not provide specific guidelines regarding the utilization of DMHI; as such, many healthcare providers reported a lack of clarity with provision of PPTE-focused therapies in the digital environment, given the lack of regulatory direction.

Most current research into the use of DMHI for the purpose of trauma-focused treatment centers almost exclusively on military and Veteran populations in the United States. This geographic focus highlights a critical lack of research specifically examining the experiences of Canadian PSP, military members, and Veterans who have received psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. Differences in social and cultural upbringing, differing experiences with the healthcare system, and having comparatively less access to large urban centers compared to

those living in the United States may impact how Canadians interact with and experience DMHI. Further research is needed to better understand if and how psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations can be utilized for Canadians seeking treatment following exposure to PPTE.

The aim of this study was to investigate the perceptions of digitally delivered psychotherapies in use for trauma-affected populations, as reported by Canadian military members, Veterans, and PSP who have undergone these interventions. Additionally, the study sought insights from mental health clinicians who provided such interventions to these populations. To understand the strengths and weaknesses of these interventions, the methodological approach included surveys adapted from the Alberta Quality Matrix for Health (AQMh) and the Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT), as well as semi-structured interviews and focus groups.

## 2. Methods

The current study used an embedded mixed-methods design (Barkin, Schlundt, & Smith, 2013) in a community-engaged research setting (Esmail, Moor, & Rein, 2015). Client and clinician study participants completed a battery of surveys administered using Research Electronic Data Capture (REDCap), a secure web application used for building and managing online surveys and databases (Harris et al., 2009; Harris et al., 2019). Both the client and clinician versions of the survey included demographics, and a customized version of the AQMH and UTAUT survey. Participants were invited to participate in either a 30–60-minute semi-structured interview or focus group, conducted over Zoom, to explore further their perspectives on psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations.



Study data were stored on the REDCap server and a dedicated, encrypted, and password-protected research drive hosted by the Faculty of Rehabilitation Medicine at the University of Alberta. Ethics approval was obtained from the University of Alberta's Health Research Ethics Board (Pro00109065).

## 2.1 Participant Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

### Clients

Currently serving military members, Veterans, and PSP who were receiving or who have received digitally delivered trauma therapy from a mental health clinician in Canada, either through an Operational Stress Injury Clinic (military member and Veteran clients only) or private provider, were recruited. All client participants had a current or prior primary diagnosis of PTSD and/or a trauma-related mental health disorder, which may have stemmed from operational injuries or past adverse experiences (e.g., adverse childhood events). Individuals who were under 18 years of age, and/or unable to provide informed written consent, and/or not fluent in English were excluded from the study.

### *Mental Health Clinicians*

Clinician participants included multidisciplinary mental health clinicians and providers (e.g., psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers, and nurse practitioners) practicing in Canada who provided psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations to Canadian military members, Veterans, and PSP. Participants who were not able to provide informed written consent and/or were not fluent in English were also excluded.

## 2.2 Recruitment and Data Collection

Word of mouth, snowball, and purposeful sampling strategies were used to recruit participants from partner and non-partner mental health clinics. Clinics were provided with study recruitment materials and information, which were passed onto potential client and clinician participants. Interested participants who completed a consent to contact form over REDCap were contacted by a member of the research team by telephone or email to discuss the study, determine eligibility, and assess their willingness to participate voluntarily. Recruitment took place between January 2022 to March 2023.

A link to a REDCap webpage was shared with eligible and interested individuals to access and complete the informed consent form. Participants who provided informed consent completed survey measures and/or a semi-structured interview or focus group. Surveys were iteratively developed based on the AQMH (Health Quality Council of Alberta, 2017) and UTAUT (Venkatesh et al., 2003) by the research team. These measures were crafted to maximally align survey language with each AQMH and UTAUT dimension, integrating principles of equity, diversity, and inclusion, minimizing survey burden, and maximizing data quality, collection, and analyses. Data collection took place from February 2022 to May 2023.

## 2.3 Tools and Measures

### *Alberta Quality Matrix for Health Survey (AQMH)*

The AQMH was created in 2005 based on the work of *Crossing the Quality Chasm: A New Health System for the 21st Century* (Institute of Medicine (IOM), 2001). The AQMH can be used to organize information about complex health systems for analyses and create awareness of

quality in service delivery. The AQMH has the following two components: (1) dimensions of quality, which focuses on aspects of the patient and client experience; and (2) areas of need, which divides services provided by the health system into four distinct but related categories (being healthy, getting better, living with illness or disability, and end of life). The components are each considered across the following six dimensions:

1. Acceptability: health services are respectful and responsive to user needs, preferences, and expectations.
2. Accessibility: health services are obtained in the most suitable setting at a reasonable time and distance (for this paper, accessibility is analogous to access to care and does not refer to designing services for people with disabilities).
3. Appropriateness: health services are relevant to user needs and are based on accepted or evidence-based practice.
4. Effectiveness: health services are based on scientific knowledge to achieve desired outcomes.
5. Efficiency: resources are optimally used in achieving desired outcomes.
6. Safety: services mitigate risks to avoid unintended or harmful results.

The research team iteratively developed a survey based on the AQMH and previous literature (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the AQMH and the survey adapted from the AQMH). The AQMH survey consisted of 10 questions, scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The conversion allowed participants to rate the quality-of-service of in-person and digital delivery of trauma therapies along AHQM dimensions, using one question to assess each of the following ten criteria: ease of use, convenience, acceptability, practicality, accessibility, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency, safety, and fit.

## *Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) Survey*

The UTAUT model was developed by Venkatesh et al. (2003) as a synthesis of eight technology acceptance models. The UTAUT is designed to assess the acceptance of new technology and may explain up to 70% of the variance in intention to use technologies (Venkatesh et al., 2003). The UTAUT has well established construct and content validity. The six factors influencing technology use as measured by the UTAUT include:

1. Performance Expectancy: assesses whether the participant believed that digital delivery would improve the performance of the job they were trying to complete. If belief in digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations was high, participants would be more likely to use the technology.
2. Effort Expectancy: the degree of ease associated with using digital delivery. If participants perceived digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations to have low Effort Expectancy, it would be expected that they would be more likely to use it.
3. Social Influence: the extent to which individuals surrounding the participant perceived the usefulness of digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations and how much these important other's influenced participant's use.
4. Facilitating Conditions: the extent to which conditions, such as organizational and technical infrastructure, surrounding the participant support the use of digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations.

5. Behavioral Intention: the degree to which participants had a conscious plan to utilize digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. This construct in turn predicts Use Behavior and technology acceptance.
6. Use Behavior: the extent to which participants used digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations.

The research team iteratively developed both client and clinician participant surveys based on the UTAUT content and components, as well as previous literature (see Appendix 1 for a copy of the UTAUT and the surveys adapted from the UTAUT). The UTAUT surveys consisted of 18 questions, scored on a 7-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Each of the 6 UTAUT constructs was measured individually, with 3 questions asked per construct. All construct scores were then combined to assess the overall useability of the technology used for digitally delivered trauma therapy (Venkatesh et al., 2003).

### ***Interviews and Focus Groups***

Qualitative data, collected via 30–60-minute semi-structured solo interviews (n=7) or focus groups (n=2) conducted and recorded over Zoom (Archibald et al., 2019), served to further explore participant perspectives on psychotherapies for trauma-affected populations. Separate focus groups were facilitated by members of the study team for both client and clinician participants using a semi-structured interview and focus group guide. Key topics of discussion included the previous and current state of using psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic; barriers to, facilitators of, and recommendations for the use of psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations to deliver mental health services to military members, Veterans, and PSP; acceptance and methods

of delivery for psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations; clinical effectiveness; and needs, including infrastructure and implementation. See Appendix 2 for copies of interview scripts used for client and clinician interviews and focus groups.

Focus groups were purposely heterogeneous with respect to professional representation and experience with using psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. This design allowed for broad crosstalk and pollination of complementary and alternative ideas, experiences, and conversation, resulting in rich comprehensive data such that sufficient information power was reached (Malterud, Siersma, & Guassora, 2016).

## 2.4 Quantitative Data Analysis

After completion of data collection, all data were de-identified prior to analysis. De-identified survey data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics software (Version 28.0) (IBM Corp., 2021), while NVIVO 13 (2021, R1) was used to facilitate qualitative analysis of de-identified interview and focus group data.

Descriptive statistics were calculated for each survey variable for client and clinician participants. Non-parametric analyses were conducted due to the relatively small sample size of each participant group. Paired-samples Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were used to assess within-subject differences ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) in median AQMH survey dimension scores between digitally delivered and in-person psychotherapies. One-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank tests were also used to assess statistically significant within-subject differences ( $p \leq 0.05$ ) between observed and reference median UTAUT survey dimension scores, where the reference score was 12 (i.e., neutral score, based on the sum of three total questions per UTAUT dimension asked on a Likert scale from 1 to 7, where 4 is the median score for each question). In total, 20 tests were

conducted for the AQMH survey results (10 for clients and 10 for clinicians) and 12 tests were conducted for the UTAUT survey results (6 for clients and 6 for clinicians). To address multiple comparisons across the 32 statistical tests, the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure was used to control the False Discovery Rate (FDR). A summary of statistical tests can be found in Appendix 3.

## 2.5 Qualitative Data Analysis

Video-recorded interviews and focus groups were transcribed using Adobe Premiere Pro, with transcription accuracy checked by a research team member (SY or RW), and thematically analyzed both deductively and inductively following an iterative process (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Deductively, initial codes were developed based on interview and focus group topics and study objectives. Inductive coding involved identifying themes that emerged from collected data. Coding for each interview and focus group was independently conducted by two research team members (SY, RW) after which a senior researcher (SBP) reviewed and refined the codes. These were then combined and tabulated into preliminary themes. Analysis of preliminary themes by the larger research team followed, with differences being resolved through discussion. A proposed thematic theory then underwent collective analysis, where preliminary themes were modified, and key quotes isolated to illustrate the selected themes. The final thematic narrative was then prepared. The Standard for Reporting Qualitative Research was used to guide the reporting process (O'Brien et al., 2014).

## 3. Results

### 3.1 Demographics

#### *Client Participants*

Eleven Canadian military members, Veterans, and PSP completed survey measures. Client participants had an average age of  $50 \pm 10.5$  years (range: 34 to 61 years old) and self-identified as female ( $n=3$ ), male ( $n=8$ ), as Caucasian ( $n=9$ ) and Aboriginal/Metis ( $n=2$ ). No participants identified as transgender or gender diverse. Our participants self-reported being in the CAF ( $n=7$ ), police force ( $n=2$ ), or as a paramedic ( $n=1$ ), or a correctional worker ( $n=1$ ), with an average length of service of  $21 \pm 9.6$  years (range: 5 to 38 years). Most participants ( $n=8$ ) reported having received some form of psychotherapeutic treatment, including CBT ( $n=5$ ), CPT ( $n=1$ ), EMDR ( $n=3$ ), and PE ( $n=2$ ), for their trauma prior to participating in the current study. Our data, however, did not allow us to distinguish between those who had experience receiving in-person trauma therapy from those who had not received non-trauma specific therapy previously. Four participants had received digitally delivered therapies prior to engaging in the study, while 7 were receiving digitally delivered therapies for the first-time during study participation. All participants had received psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations via video conferencing, with some reporting having received additional services via telephone ( $n=3$ ).

Four client participants took part in a semi-structured interview (comprising: 2 females, 2 males; 3 Caucasian, 1 Aboriginal/Metis). Participants self-reported being in the CAF ( $n=2$ ) or police force ( $n=2$ ) with an average length of service of  $19 \pm 11.9$  years (range: 5 to 31 years). Two



participants reported having received some form of psychotherapeutic treatment, including CBT (n=2), EMDR (n=2), and PE (n=1), for their trauma prior to participating in the current study. One participant had received digitally delivered therapies prior to engaging in the study, while three were receiving digitally delivered therapies for the first-time during study participation.

### ***Mental Health Clinicians***

Twelve Canadian mental health clinicians completed survey measures. Clinician participants self-identified as female (n=9), male (n=3), Caucasian (n=12), with an average age of 46±8.3 years (range: 33 to 58 years). No participants identified as transgender or gender diverse. Clinician participants held a variety of clinical roles, including registered psychologist (n=4), social worker (n=4), psychiatrist (n=2), and mental health therapist (n=2). Workplaces were highly varied and included working at a community mental health clinic (n=5), the provincial health authority (n=3), private practice (n=3), or a regional health service (n=1). On average, the clinicians had 14±6.3 years (range: 5 to 25 years) of clinical experience and 9±5.3 years (range: 3 to 16 years) of experience specifically providing trauma therapies. Clinician participants reported using several therapeutic modalities within the digital environment, including Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (n=7) (it was unknown if CBT interventions were specifically trauma-focused), Cognitive Processing Therapy (n=6), Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (n=10), Prolonged Exposure (n=4), Somatic therapy (n=2), Mindfulness/Self-Compassion (n=3), Dialectical Behavior Therapy based therapy (n=5), Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (n=2), and Neurotherapy (n=1). These modalities were used to treat symptoms related to diverse psychological traumas, including, but not limited to, operational/occupational injuries, adverse childhood events, and sexual abuse/rape. Several participating clinicians (n=5) had not used any form of digital delivery prior to the COVID-19 pandemic. At the time of study participation, six

clinicians exclusively provided digitally delivered care, while the remaining six clinicians provided a combination of digitally delivered and in-person care.

In total, 24 clinician participants took part in a semi-structured interview or focus group. Three clinicians participated in a semi-structured interview (2 female, 1 male), while the remaining 21 participated in one of two focus groups (focus group 1: 19 females, 2 males; focus group 2: 12 females, 2 males); there were no differences in participant sex and gender identity. Participating clinician workplaces included a community mental health clinic ( $n=12$ ), within the provincial health authority ( $n=10$ ), or private practice ( $n=2$ ). On average, the clinicians had  $13\pm9.7$  years (range: 0 to 40 years) of clinical experience and  $6\pm4.4$  years (range: 0 to 15 years) of experience specifically providing trauma therapies.


## 3.2 Survey Results

### 3.2.1 Client Participants Survey Results

#### *Alberta Quality Matrix for Health (AQMH) Survey*

Participants rated convenience ( $p = 0.011$ ), practicality ( $p = 0.011$ ), accessibility ( $p = 0.012$ ), and efficiency ( $p = 0.014$ ) scores statistically significantly higher for the digital delivery of trauma therapy compared to in-person delivery. There were no statistically significant differences in client participant ratings for the ease of use, acceptability, appropriateness, effectiveness, safety, and fit dimensions between digital and in-person delivered trauma therapies (Figure 1, Table 1).

**Figure 1.** Box and whisker plots indicating client participant (n=11) median AQMH survey scores, first and third quartiles, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median scores for digital delivery vs in-person therapy based on paired sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons. Blue refers to digital delivery; orange refers to in-person delivery. • indicates outlier.



**Table 1.** Client participant (n=11) median AQMH survey scores with interquartile ranges. \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median scores for digital delivery vs in-person therapy based on paired sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons.

AQMH Dimension	Client In-Person Score	Client Digital Delivery Score	P-value
Ease of Use	3 (3)	6 (2)	0.201
Convenience	4 (1)	6 (1.5)	0.011*
Acceptability	5 (4)	6 (1.5)	0.109

Practicality	4 (1.5)	6 (1)	0.011*
Accessibility	4 (3)	7 (1.5)	0.012*
Appropriateness	5 (2.5)	6 (1.5)	0.131
Effectiveness	5 (3.5)	6 (2)	0.18
Efficiency	5 (1.5)	6 (2)	0.014*
Safety	4.5 (2.5)	5.5 (2.5)	.44
Fit	4.5 (2.5)	6 (2.5)	.109

426


#### 427 *Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) Survey*

428 All client participants agreed that digitally delivered trauma therapy services were a viable  
429 alternative to in-person delivery. Client participants indicated they somewhat agreed, agreed, or  
430 strongly agreed with the Effort Expectancy (score: 16/21), Performance Expectancy (score:  
431 17/21), Behavioral Intention (score: 18/21), and Use Behavior (score: 15/21) constructs. Analysis  
432 revealed that only Performance Expectancy ( $p=0.011$ ) scores were significantly different  
433 compared to expected median scores. Client participants also indicated that they neither agreed  
434 nor disagreed with the Social Influence (score: 12/21) and Facilitating Conditions (score: 13/21)  
435 constructs (Figure 2, Table 2).

436

437

438 **Figure 2.** Box and whisker plots indicating client participant (n=11) median UTAUT construct  
 439 scores, first and third quartile, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference  
 440 (p<0.05) between median score and a reference score of 12 (total score of three questions asked  
 441 based on Likert scale 1-7) based on one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for  
 442 multiple comparisons. • indicates outlier.



443

444

445 **Table 2.** Client participant (n=11) median UTAUT survey scores with interquartile ranges.  
 446 \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median score and a reference score of 12 (total score  
 447 of three questions asked based on Likert scale 1-7) based on one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank  
 448 test, corrected for multiple comparisons.

UTAUT Dimension	Client Median Agreement Score (interquartile range)	P-value
Performance Expectancy	17 (6)	0.011*
Effort Expectancy	16 (8)	0.032

Social Influence	12 (4)	0.67
Facilitating Conditions	13 (3)	0.368
Behavioral Intention	18 (4)	0.057
Use Behavior	15 (6)	0.182

449

### 450 3.2.2 Mental Health Clinician Participant Survey Results

#### 451 *Alberta Quality Matrix for Health (AQMH) Survey*

452 There were no statistically significant differences between Clinician participant AQMH scores  
 453 for digitally delivered vs. in-person therapy for all 10 AQMH dimensions: ease of use,  
 454 convenience, acceptability, accessibility, practicality, appropriateness, effectiveness, efficiency,  
 455 safety, and fit (Figure 3, Table 3).

456

457

458


459

460

461

462

**Figure 3.** Box and whisker plots indicating clinician participant (n=12) median AQMH survey scores, first and third quartiles, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median scores for digital delivery vs in-person therapy based on paired sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons. Blue refers to digital delivery; orange refers to in-person delivery. • indicates outlier.



**Table 3.** Clinician participant (n=12) median AQMH survey scores with interquartile ranges. \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median scores for digital delivery vs in-person therapy based on paired sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons.

AQMH Dimension	Clinician In-Person Score	Clinician Digital Delivery Score	P-value
Ease of Use	5.5 (2.5)	5.5 (1)	0.943
Convenience	5 (3)	5.5 (2.5)	0.681
Acceptability	5 (1.75)	5 (2.5)	0.952

Practicality	5 (2.5)	6 (1.75)	0.114
Accessibility	4 (2.75)	6 (1)	0.020
Appropriateness	6 (1.75)	6 (1)	0.046
Effectiveness	6 (1)	6 (1)	0.194
Efficiency	6 (1)	6 (0.75)	0.785
Safety	5 (2)	6 (1)	0.492
Fit	6 (2)	6 (1.75)	0.395


473

#### 474 *Unified Theory of Acceptance and Use of Technology (UTAUT) Survey*

475 Overall, clinician participants strongly agreed that digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for  
476 trauma-affected populations were a viable option when compared to in-person trauma therapies.  
477 Clinician participants indicated slight agreement, agreement, or strong agreement with the Effort  
478 Expectancy (18/21), Performance Expectancy (18.5/21), Behavioral Intention (21/21), Use  
479 Behavior (18.5/21), and Social Influence (16/21) constructs. Analysis revealed that Behavioral  
480 Intention ( $p=0.002$ ), Performance Expectancy ( $p=0.003$ ), Use Behavior ( $p=0.004$ ), and Effort  
481 Expectancy ( $p=0.012$ ) scores were significantly different compared to expected median score of  
482 4 (on Likert scale 1-7), surviving FDR multiple comparison correction. Clinician participants  
483 indicated that they neither agreed nor disagreed with the Facilitating Conditions (15/21)  
484 construct (Figure 4, Table 4).



**Figure 4.** Box and whisker plots indicating clinician participant (n=12) median UTAUT construct scores, first and third quartiles, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median score and a reference score of 12 (total score of three questions asked based on Likert scale 1-7) based on one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons. • indicates outlier.



**Table 4.** Clinician participant (n=12) median UTAUT survey scores with interquartile ranges. \*=Significant difference (p<0.05) between median score and a reference score of 12 (total score of three questions asked based on Likert scale 1-7) based on one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons.

UTAUT Dimension	Clinician Median Agreement Score (interquartile range)	P-value
Performance Expectancy	18.5 (2)	0.003*
Effort Expectancy	18 (4)	0.012*

Social Influence	16 (7)	.017
Facilitating Conditions	15 (13)	0.593
Behavioral Intention	21 (3)	0.002*
Use Behavior	18.5 (5)	0.004*

496

### 497 **3.3 Interview Results**

498 Thematic analysis of the interview data isolated five main themes with regard to psychotherapies  
 499 utilized for trauma-affected populations: (1) Digital delivery similar to in-person care; (2)  
 500 Unique benefits of digital delivery; (3) Digital delivery and reduced emotion; (4) Concerns  
 501 regarding digital delivery; and (5) Future directions and recommendations.

#### 502 ***Theme 1: Digital delivery similar to in-person care (Table 5)***

503 Client participants (4/4) felt very comfortable receiving digitally delivered psychotherapies  
 504 utilized for trauma-affected populations. This comfort reportedly stemmed from their familiarity  
 505 using digital platforms such as Zoom in their occupations and daily lives, as these platforms saw  
 506 increased usage following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic (Karl, Peluchette, and  
 507 Aghakhani, 2022).

508 Clinician participants (18/24) also shared that they felt that psychotherapies utilized for trauma-  
 509 affected populations provided similar quality of care as in-person delivery. In particular, clinician

participants shared that patient assessments and certain treatment modalities, including EMDR and CBT, were easy to adapt to the digital environment and resulted in successful administration of digitally delivered treatment with no discernable differences to in-person delivery.

Table 5. Digital Delivery Similar to In-person Care

Sub Theme	Description and Supportive Quotes
5.1 Therapy Effectiveness	<p>Certain psychotherapeutic modalities translated very well to digital delivery. This left clinician participants to perceive that digital delivery conferred similar quality of care as in-person delivery.</p> <p><i>“I’ve had people who’ve done full courses of treatment doing EMDR online, I’ve actually never met them in person. It was beautiful, very effective.” [Clinician participant 3]</i></p>
5.2 Connection with Therapist	<p>Being comfortable and familiar with working in digital environments made client participants feel more ready to engage with digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations, which in turn aided in developing a strong therapeutic alliance with their clinician.</p> <p><i>“I didn’t because I had used it. I’ve been using it since the beginning of COVID with my work that I was doing. [...] I felt just as close to the virtual therapist as the in-person one. I did feel a real sense of bonding with them and feeling as if I could disclose things and talk to them[.] I didn’t find it different in that sense[.] I made a very strong connection with the therapist very quickly. She was excellent. Very experienced, and I felt very comfortable with her.” [Client participant 4]</i></p>

## Theme 2: Unique benefits of digital delivery (Table 6)

Client and clinician participants all agreed that the most crucial benefit of digital delivery was that it increased the accessibility of psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. Having digital therapy sessions allowed for more flexible scheduling, allowing client participants

518 to attend sessions without sacrificing other responsibilities (e.g., not missing work or childcare  
519 responsibilities) and clinician participants to reach clients living in remote locations.

520 Some clinician participants (8/24) revealed that digital delivery aided in their therapeutic duties  
521 in creative ways not thought of when delivered in-person care. This led to clinicians conducting  
522 more comprehensive assessments of clients or creating more comfortable therapeutic  
523 environments for clients.

524 Table 6. Unique Benefits of Digital Delivery

Sub Theme	Description and Supportive Quotes
6.1 Increased access to therapeutic services	<p>Client participants indicated that the increased accessibility to treatment offered by digital delivery made it easier to attend therapy sessions.</p> <p><i>“I did find it much easier to schedule, schedule around where I was, where [my therapist was]. And it was also easy for adjustments too if I needed to postpone or change or if he needed some extra time from something else. It was a lot easier to communicate [and] arrange schedules that way, which made for less [absences or appointments] missed.” [Client participant 1]</i></p> <p><i>“I mean, if you're a, let's say you're a single, single mother with two kids and you know you can't make it downtown or you can't make it to wherever right to go and do your sessions, then you know you have to skip this one, skip that one and then eventually you're just like [inaudible] I'm not even going to bother phoning them anymore. Versus, oh, it's 1:00 I should turn on my computer and have a quick little chat with somebody here who can help me through a lot. I think it would help a lot of people[.]” [Client participant 3]</i></p> <p>Clinician participants noted that digital delivery allowed them to reach clients living in remote areas. Prior to the rise of digitally delivered psychotherapy, such clients would typically have to spend large amounts of resources to travel to urban centers to receive treatment. If clients did not have access to these resources, they would not be able to receive treatment.</p>

	<p><i>“[A]s you know we work with clients in the NorthWest Territories, and it’s kind of revolutionized care for them, because going through the old system you know they had to go to a mental health clinic, it was it was really hard for them because they were in small communities[...] The other thing is that for people who are far away, before they couldn’t take part in groups, cause it took too long to get here, now they can join any group they want.” [Clinician participant 4]</i></p>
6.2 Online delivery allowed for more comprehensive assessment	<p>Working digitally allowed clinician participants to see into their clients’ homes, allowing for a better understanding of their situation and clarifying next treatment steps.</p> <p><i>“[W]orking virtually actually allowed me a better assessment of what was going on. So, you know, I had one client who talked a lot about, um, you know, how messy his house is and how he can’t keep up with household tasks, and he’s just kinda failing, he has zero motivation to do the dishes. And so I actually had him bring me over and show me the dishes[...] working virtually allowed me to do CBT in action rather than kind of talking about it theoretically. So rather than talking about you know how starting you know avoiding avoidance with doing kind of small tasks improved mood, and I did this with more than one client, you know they would talk about this thing they are avoiding, you know I would have them take a step.” [Clinician participant 3]</i></p>
6.3 Changing to online delivery encouraged emergence of additional therapeutic techniques	<p>Providing digital care allowed clinician participants to be more creative with their therapeutic space. For one clinician, this meant seeking out ways to make the therapeutic space more comfortable for their clients in a way they would not have done had they only provided in-person therapy.</p> <p><i>“And it helps, most of them actually [like] to use sounds. And in my office, interestingly the sound is just beep, beep, beep, beep, back and forth. And on the computer there’s 30 sounds I can choose from. And so one guy[,] mainly for the calm place, I use a very simple sort of wood chopping sound during processing. But if we go to a calm place at the end of the session, one guy his calm place is a BC River Canyon where there’s a river. So we put the river back and forth and then another guy likes the beach so we put the beach back and forth in [hears] you know, the sound of the wave. So that’s kind of neat to be able to do</i></p>

	<i>that.” [Clinician participant 18]</i>
--	--

525 **Theme 3: Digital delivery and reduced emotion (Table 7)**

526 For 2 client participants, working in a digital environment left them experiencing fewer emotions  
527 compared to when they had received in-person care. One participant experienced less stress  
528 receiving digitally delivered care, while the other experienced fewer emotions in general  
529 working in the digital environment.

530 Table 7. Digital Delivery and Reduced Emotion

Sub Theme	Description and Supporting Quotes
7.1 Reduced emotion compared to in-person care	<p>One client participant shared the stress and danger of traveling to a clinic to receive treatment. Although digital delivery alleviated this stress, it is unclear if this stress is related to therapeutic content needing to be worked on.</p> <p><i>“[It added] more stress [for] me going into therapy back then at the [Occupational Stress Injury] clinic, [being] over medicated [and] driving back and forth, not understanding what was going on in my head[...].” [Client participant 2]</i></p> <p>One client participant felt that they did not experience the same range of emotions when receiving digital care as they did in-person. This may also indicate that digital delivery may be blocking therapeutic content that should be addressed.</p> <p><i>“[...]for some reason I didn't get as emotional as [I] knew I probably would have if I'd been in person.” [Client participant 4]</i></p>

531 **Theme 4: Concerns regarding digital delivery (Table 8)**

532 Some client participants (2/4) found that attending digital sessions could be somewhat resource  
533 intensive, with attendance typically requiring a general knowledge of using digital platforms,  
534 having access to a working computer, stable high speed internet connection, web camera with

clear picture, a quiet and private space to attend the session, and access to a support person nearby and available in the event of an adverse emotional response. Client participants (3/4) also raised concerns over family members or significant others overhearing their trauma therapy sessions, raising questions regarding the security and privacy of digitally delivered services. Such challenges left some client participants (2/4) feeling disconnected from their clinician and the therapeutic experience in general, leading to less effective treatment and a less intimate therapeutic relationship. For these participants, this left the impression that psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations may not be an adequate replacement for in-person delivery for some patients or contexts.

Clinician participants (14/24) indicated that a major barrier to providing digitally delivered psychotherapies for trauma-affected populations was the lack of preparedness stemming from the sudden shift to using digital platforms following the onset of the COVID-19 pandemic. Clinicians shared that they received little to no support to prepare for delivering digital psychotherapies for trauma-affected populations and were tasked with troubleshooting technical issues with very limited support, leading to frustration and discomfort. These challenges greatly impacted many clinicians' therapeutic ability, disrupting the flow of treatment and leaving them feeling like they were losing control over the therapeutic environment.

Clinician participants also raised concerns that digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations may not provide effective treatment for certain clients. Specifically, clinician participants feared that clients with highly avoidant behavior, dissociative tendencies, complex trauma, or emotional dysregulation may not attain the same benefits from digitally delivered trauma therapy as in-person.

Table 8. Concerns Regarding Digital Delivery

Sub Theme	Description and Supporting Quotes
8.1 Privacy	<p>Client participants felt uncomfortable at the idea that other people could hear their digital therapy sessions.</p> <p><i>“Yes, so that was a little awkward because, you know, if somebody was in my house and I had to go to a different room, there was always the thought of “Can they hear me? Are they listening?” I mean, generally I was not in a house of somebody I couldn't trust anyways. But, you know, those are private sessions that you want to keep to yourself.” [Client participant 1]</i></p> <p><i>“There [are] certain things about [my] experiences that I would prefer my family not to know about[,] that I keep to myself, right? You know, [my] five year old is sitting on the couch right now while we're doing this. So, you know, that's a little bit of a negative.” [Client participant 3]</i></p> <p>Clinician participants felt a lack of control over the therapeutic space when working digitally, affecting their ability to provide care.</p> <p><i>“I could add that I have significantly less control, if not no control, over the confidential therapeutic space, at least on the end of the client in virtual therapy[...] [Clinician participant 2]</i></p>
8.2 Safety	<p>Clinician participants shared concerns about client safety. In particular, clinician participants were unsure of how to respond to dangerous relationships their clients were a part of or adverse events their clients would experience when working digitally.</p> <p><i>“If a client is in a relationship that has violence or has a history of domestic violence[,] that has been something that's come up for me[,] and I've had to kind of check in with the client every time, is your partner home, are they able to hear it hear in and listen in on this, and I was able to sort of contract with the client around having sessions when the partner was not home.” [Clinician participant 2]</i></p> <p><i>“[There] sort of [has to be] concerns for safety. How do I help my client that's having an over-the-top reaction or</i></p>



	<p><i>different reactions if there's something[?] [Y]ou're not there to deal with it directly, you know, especially then if they cut the mic or whatever, it can [happen] abruptly then you know, and you're like what the hell is happening there? I can't be there. No. So yeah, it doesn't come up very often, hardly at all. But, you know, there's something to be concerned about.”</i>  <i>[Clinician participant 18]</i></p>
8.3 Technological Literacy	<p>Client and clinician participants acknowledged that technological literacy varies widely between individuals, and expressed concern with the lack of support being provided to those not comfortable with using digital platforms. Further, participants noted that it is unclear if digital delivery truly allows for equitable access to care.</p> <p><i>“He had to be able to talk to me through[,] to talk me through [going] on the Jane chat thing that we, right? He had to talk me through it over the phone, right, because I'm not[,] I'm not into all this stuff so[...] [I was frustrated because] I hate computers, data, and I was just like, I don't know how to operate it.” [Client participant 3]</i></p> <p><i>“[A gap that should be addressed is providing] practical training in using Zoom and troubleshooting issues for clinicians who aren't as tech savvy.” [Clinician participant 8]</i></p> <p><i>“Virtual care operates on the assumption clients have access to technology to support this, not all clients may have the funds and or literacy to access this technology” [Clinician participant 13]</i></p>
8.4 Digital Environment Contributing to Emergence of Avoidance Behaviors	<p>Clinician participants expressed concern that the shift to digital delivery was followed by the emergence of avoidant behaviors in their clients. As avoidance (implicit and explicit) may contribute to treatment resistance/poor treatment response, these concerns must be addressed moving forward.</p> <p><i>“I've had a few people who are a combination of really avoidant, so [strong] avoidance component of PTSD, and then also tend to have maybe some [obsessive compulsive] personality traits, where they're a combination of, if we're doing CPT for example, um there's kind of a lot of really subtle avoidance, and and often sort of getting into uh rumination in the session rather than focusing on their [stuck point][...]” [Clinician participant 7]</i></p>

	<p><i>“[W]hat I’m finding is that [clients are] starting to isolate more at home, and not engaging in their community or getting out, and everything has defaulted back to the caregivers in the home, it’s that trust. So I-I really noticed that in a couple of clients who were already highly anxious and highly avoidant. So I don’t think it [the] virtual serves a good purpose in that sense.” [Clinician participant 9]</i></p>
--	--

558 **Theme 5: Future directions and recommendations (Table 9)**

559 Client and clinician participants indicated several recommendations for integrating digital  
560 delivery into psychotherapy care for trauma-affected populations, including increasing the  
561 opportunities for and the spread of hybrid care, a combination of digital and in-person  
562 therapeutic services.

563 Table 9. Future Directions and Recommendations

Sub Theme	Description and Supporting Quotes
9.1 Hybrid care	<p>Client and clinician participants shared a common belief that hybrid care would offer a balance between providing the care clients are seeking with the delivery method they prefer.</p> <p><i>“Yeah, I think maybe something like you're offering them both and if people are selecting virtual because they can get in quicker, letting them know that it could be transitioned [by] agreement or in particular what the therapist thinks would be best if you could transition into in-person somewhere down the road during the therapy. If, if that's if it looks like it's needed. You wouldn't get absolutely stuck with one if [you] chose it. Similarly, you could switch from in-person to virtual, maybe as you're coming to the end of your therapy.” [Client participant 4]</i></p> <p><i>“Perhaps like increasing [digital delivery or hybrid care] [...] to provide clients with the care they are seeking.” [Clinician participant 17]</i></p>
9.2 Increasing spread	<p>Clinician participants encouraged the wider spread of digital delivery such that more clients would have the opportunity to receive care.</p>

	<p><i>“Perhaps like increasing [digital delivery or hybrid care] outside of the Edmonton zone. [...] So if people are interested in these groups, so having it more accessible, we got better in terms of the handouts, having it all prepackaged, everything ready to go before the group because initially we were going between all the sessions, session one, session two and so forth. So I think we're more organized, but improving it [and] having more flexibility.” [Clinician participant 17]</i></p> <p>A clinician participant also encouraged other clinicians to be open to providing digital care.</p> <p><i>“And I think the other thing is just to, you know, embrace [digital delivery] [and] recognize that there are some really significant benefits to it. You know, try it out and see because I know some people are just really reluctant to even try it, you know, some people never [used] online delivery through [the pandemic]. [Clinician participant 19]</i></p>
--	---

Taken together, survey and interview data indicate that clients and clinicians believe that digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations have several unique benefits, including better accessibility to treatment and greater client autonomy, all while offering similar therapeutic outcomes as in-person delivery. Several factors, including technical difficulties inherent in use of digitally delivered treatments and potential security and psychological safety, were concerning for study participants. Further investigation is warranted to address the concerns and the recommendations made by client and clinician participants.

## 4.0 Discussion

The current study provides preliminary evidence of client and clinician support regarding the use of DMHI in the context of providing psychotherapy to military members, Veterans, and PSP who have experienced trauma. Client and clinician study participants reported that digitally delivered

psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations appeared to offer similar treatment quality of care as in-person delivery while also improving treatment access.

Our study also provides insight into the implementation of new DMHIs in the Canadian context. Canadian clients and mental health clinicians face many unique challenges, including potentially having to travel long distances from remote regions to urban centers to access evidence-based specialized trauma treatment. Clinicians must provide care that is acceptable and appropriate for multiple diverse populations, including Indigenous groups. This unique perspective was a priority for the research team and highlights the importance of co-designing services, keeping in mind the specific needs, such as treatment accessibility and appropriateness, of clients and clinicians. Further, this study provides an update on previous research in the field (Smith-MacDonald et al., 2020), enabling a better understanding of shifts in attitude and usage of psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations over the COVID-19 pandemic. These findings may play an important role when considering the expansion of DMHI services within the general healthcare system and for delivering care to individuals living in rural or remote communities.

AQMH survey data indicated that client and clinician participants expressed no statistically significant differences in their assessments of service quality between digitally delivered and in-person trauma therapies. This is consistent with previous research suggesting equivalent quality care is attainable via digital or in-person service delivery modalities (Jones et al., 2020, Perri et al., 2021). Client and clinician interview data endorsed the findings of the AQMH survey. In addition, client participants rated the convenience, practicality, accessibility, and efficiency of psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations higher than in-person delivery, corroborating previous research on the unique advantages of DMHI (e.g., increased cost-

effectiveness, time savings, and access to therapy compared to in-person care) (Fluety and Almond, 2020; Jones et al., 2020). These dimensions of healthcare appear to be highly valued by clients receiving such therapies. Further research is yet needed to verify our results and better understand if these dimensions of healthcare ought to be prioritized within healthcare programs.

Digital delivery of psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations appeared to be acceptable based on the UTAUT-related questions for client and clinician participants. UTAUT-related questions also indicated that Social Influence and Facilitating Conditions did not appear to be as important to client and clinician participants. This would appear to indicate that client and clinician participants were willing to use digitally delivered psychotherapies despite a lack of perceived support from important others (e.g., family) or the organizations they work for (e.g., mental health clinics). Perhaps this points to client safety and treatment needs overriding client and clinician needs for social and organizational support with regards to using DMHI, including psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. However, clinicians reported a range of results regarding organizational support, indicating that this factor may be context and clinician dependent. Organizational support therefore requires further study, as it is unclear whether sufficient support is being provided to clinicians to maintain the long-term use of digitally delivered psychotherapies. Finally, although there are moderators known to influence Behavioral Intention and overall technology acceptance, due to the limited sample size, the influence of these moderators was not evaluated.

Client and clinician participants raised some concerns regarding the support provided when receiving or providing digitally delivered psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations during interview and focus group sessions. Specifically, client participants shared concerns regarding accessing the appropriate technology required to attend digitally delivered

sessions, while clinician participants expressed frustration stemming from a lack of training and easily accessible technological support. Similar findings were found in a qualitative study conducted in the United States which recommended that, among other factors, providing equitable device distribution and digital literacy training for clients, and adequate technology and support for mental health providers and local behavioral health departments, would be necessary for the successful implementation of DMHI (Zhao et al., 2023). Further research is needed to better understand if these factors should be prioritized when implementing DMHI, including psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations.

Other considerations regarding implementation moving forward are the formation of the therapeutic relationship and management of client distress in the digital environment. Some client participants expressed difficulties in forming a strong therapeutic relationship and emotional connection with their clinician, in line with previous research indicating that individuals who have experienced interpersonal trauma may have difficulties developing a strong therapeutic alliance (Lawson, Skidmore, and Akay-Sullivan, 2020). Such difficulties may, in part, relate to why clinician participants felt less control over the therapeutic environment and worried more about clients experiencing distress when providing digital care. This points to a need to create clinical practice supports and guidelines regarding managing client crises when working in a digital environment. Further, for the safety of mental health clinicians, future guidelines should clarify the legal protections clinicians have when providing DMHI. Finally, it would be useful to further evaluate if there are differences in implementation depending on the context in which a clinician provides clinical services (e.g., is DMHI implementation more likely in a clinic-based setting versus an independent practice).

## Limitations and Future Directions

There were several study limitations which must be acknowledged. First, all recruitment and surveys in the current study were in English, which limited responses from non-English speaking communities. Second, the age and experience of our clinician population may have biased our results. The clinician participants for the current study had an average of 14 years of clinical experience, and the clinician experience providing DMHI services may have been different had our population been younger and less experienced. Similar limitations have been described in previous research (Gullo et al., 2022). Finally, the sample size and the diversity of our study population were relatively limited, which precluded analyzing certain mediating effects. For example, although there are moderators known to influence Behavioral Intention and overall technology acceptance, due to the limited sample size, the influence of these moderators was not evaluated. Similarly, potential gender and sex differences were not explored given the limited sample size.

Future studies with larger sample sizes would be useful to replicate the findings reported here and to explore potential moderating factors, such as differences related to gender, sex, and sexual orientation with regards to the acceptance of digitally delivered care.

## Conclusion

Client and mental health clinician participants shared common perspectives that demonstrated unique benefits and barriers of digitally receiving/providing psychotherapies utilized for trauma-affected populations. Given the high rate of PTSIs within this client base, it is critical that they have access to, and clinicians are able to provide, the highest quality interventions in a secure, cost-effective, and accessible manner.

Our results suggest that digital delivery offers an accessible and practical way for Canadian military members, Veterans, and PSP to receive trauma therapy. Further, client and clinician participants indicated that hybrid care, a mixture of digital and in-person delivery, should be expanded upon in the future to ensure client populations are receiving care through their preferred delivery method. This study adds to the growing body of evidence supporting the use of DMHI in trauma-affected populations. Ultimately, the livelihoods of trauma-affected populations may be directly impacted and improved with the use of DMHI.

## Acknowledgements

Funding support for this project was provided by the following agencies:

- Government of Alberta through the Supporting Psychological Health in First Responders (SPHIFR) grant program;
- Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) through the Knowledge Synthesis: COVID-19 in Mental Health & Substance Use grant competition.

We at HiMARC would like to thank the Edmonton Operational Stress Injury Clinic for their support and contributions to this project.

## References

- Aafjes-van Doorn K, Békés V, Luo X, Prout TA, Hoffmann L. Therapists' resilience and posttraumatic growth during the COVID-19 pandemic. *Psychol Trauma*. 2022 Apr;14(S1):S165–S173.
- American Psychological Association. What you need to know before choosing online therapy[internet]. American Psychological Association; 2015 [cited 31 January 2023]. Available at: [www.apa.org/topics/telehealth/online-therapy](http://www.apa.org/topics/telehealth/online-therapy)
- American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (5th-ed-TR). APA;2022. 1120p.
- Archibald MM, Ambagtsheer RC, Casey MG, Lawless M. Using Zoom videoconferencing for qualitative data collection: perceptions and experiences of researchers and participants. *Int J Qual Methods*. 2019 Sep 11;18:1-8.
- Barkin S, Schlundt D, Smith P. Community-engaged research perspectives: then and now. *Acad Pediatr*. 2013 Mar-Apr;13(2):93-97.



694 Bautista J, Schueller SM.(2022). Digital mental health deserves investment but the questions are  
695 which interventions and where? *AJOB Neurosci.* 2022 Jul-Sep;13(3):191–193.

696 Beahm JD, McCall HC, Carleton RN, Titov N, Dear B, Hadjistavropoulos HD. Insights into  
697 internet-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy for public safety personnel: exploration of client  
698 experiences during and after treatment. *Internet Interv.* 2021 Nov 10;26:100481.

699 Békés V, Aafjes-van Doorn K, Luo X, Prout TA, Hoffmann L. Psychotherapists' challenges with  
700 online therapy during COVID-19: concerns about connectedness predict therapists' negative  
701 view of online therapy and its perceived efficacy over time. *Front Psychol.* 2021 Jul  
702 22;12:705699.

703 Braun V, Clarke, V. Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology. *Qual Res Psychol.* 2006;3:77–101.

704 Carleton RN, Afifi TO, Turner S, Taillieu T, Duranceau S, LeBouthillier DM, et al. (2018)  
705 Mental disorder symptoms among public safety personnel in Canada. *Can J Psychiatry.* 2018  
706 Jan;63(1):54–64.

707 Clemente-Suárez VJ, Martínez-González MB, Benitez- Agudelo JC, Navarro-Jimenez E,  
708 Beltran-Velasco AI, Ruisoto P, et al. The impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on mental  
709 disorders. a critical review. *Int J Environ Res Public Health.* 2021 Sep 24;18(19):10041.

710 Esmail L, Moore E, Rein A. Evaluating patient and stakeholder engagement in research: moving  
711 from theory to practice. *J Comp Eff Res.* 2015 Mar;4(2):133-145.

712 Fleuty K, Almond MK. Remote access therapy for veterans with psychological problems: current  
713 state of the art. *Mil Med.* 2020 Aug;185(7-8):e1046-e1050.

714 Gros DF, Lancaster CL, López CM, Acierno R. Treatment satisfaction of home-based telehealth  
715 versus in-person delivery of prolonged exposure for combat-related PTSD in veterans. *J Telemed*  
716 *Telecare.* 2018 Jan;24(1):51-55.

717 Gullo S, Lo Coco G, Leszcz M, Marmarosh CL, Miles JR, Shechtman Z, et al. Therapists'  
718 perceptions of online group therapeutic relationships during the COVID-19 pandemic: a survey-  
719 based study. *Group Dyn-Theor Res.* 2022 Jun;26(2):103–118.

720 Harris PA, Taylor R, Thielke R, Payne J, Gonzalez N, Conde JG. Research electronic data  
721 capture (REDCap) – a metadata-driven methodology and workflow process for providing  
722 translational research informatics support. *J Biomed Inform.* 2009 Apr;42(2):377-381.

723 Harris PA, Taylor R, Minor BL, Elliot V, Fernandex M, O'Neal L, et al. The REDCap  
724 consortium: building an international community of software partners. *J Biomed Inform.* 2019  
725 Jul;95:103208.

726 Health Quality Council of Alberta. Healthcare quality and safety management: a framework for  
727 Alberta. Report, Calgary, Alberta, Canada, 2017 July.

728 Heber A, Testa V, Groll D, Ritchie K, Tam-Seto L, Mulligan A, et al. Glossary of terms: a  
729 shared understanding of the common terms used to describe psychological trauma, version 3.0.  
730 *Health Promot Chronic Dis Prev Can.* 2023;43(10/11).

731 IBM Corp. Released 2021. IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 28.0. Armonk, NY: IBM  
732 Corp.

733 Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Quality of Health Care in America. Crossing the  
734 quality chasm: a new health system for the 21st century. Washington (DC): National Academies  
735 Press (US); 2001. 360p.

736 Jones C, Miguel-Cruz A, Smith-MacDonald L, Cruikshank E, Baghoori D, Chohan AK, et al.  
737 Virtual trauma-focused therapy for military members, veterans, and public safety personnel with  
738 posttraumatic stress injury: systematic scoping review. JMIR Mhealth Uhealth. 2020 Sep  
739 21;8(9):e22079.

740 Karl KA, Peluchette JV, Aghakhani N. Virtual work meetings during the COVID-19 pandemic:  
741 the good, bad, and ugly. Small Group Res. 2022 Jun;53(3):343-365.

742 Lattie EG, Stiles-Shields C, Graham AK. An overview of and recommendations for more  
743 accessible digital mental health services. Nat Rev Psychol. 2022 Jan 26;1:87–100.

744 Lawson DM, Skidmore ST, Akay-Sullivan S. The influence of trauma symptoms on the  
745 therapeutic alliance across treatment. J Couns Dev. 2020 Jan 2;98(1):29–40.

746 Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample size in qualitative interview studies: guided by  
747 information power. Qual Health Res. 2016 July 10;26(13):1753–1760.

748 McCall HC, Landry CA, Ogunade A, Carleton RN, Hadjistavropoulos HD. Why do public safety  
749 personnel seek tailored internet-delivered cognitive behavioural therapy? An observational study  
750 of treatment-seekers. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2021 Nov;18(22):11972.

751 O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for Reporting Qualitative  
752 Research. Acad Med. 2014 Sep;89(9):1245–1251.

753 Perri RL, Castelli P, La Rosa C, et al. COVID-19, isolation, quarantine: on the efficacy of  
754 internet-based eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR) and cognitive-behavioral  
755 therapy (CBT) for ongoing trauma. Brain Sci. 2021 Apr;11(5):579.

756 Public Health Agency of Canada. Cycle 2: Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD)  
757 during the COVID-19 pandemic [internet]. Public Health Agency of Canada, 2021 [cited 9  
758 November 2023]. Available from: [https://www.canada.ca/en/public-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/diseases-conditions/cycle-2-symptoms-posttraumatic-stress-disorder-covid-19-pandemic.html)  
759 [health/services/publications/diseases-conditions/cycle-2-symptoms-posttraumatic-stress-](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/diseases-conditions/cycle-2-symptoms-posttraumatic-stress-disorder-covid-19-pandemic.html)  
760 [disorder-covid-19-pandemic.html](https://www.canada.ca/en/public-health/services/publications/diseases-conditions/cycle-2-symptoms-posttraumatic-stress-disorder-covid-19-pandemic.html)

761 Smith-MacDonald L, Jones C, Sevigny P, White A, Laidlaw A, Voth M, et al. The experience of  
762 key stakeholders during the implementation and use of trauma therapy via digital health for  
763 military, veteran, and public safety personnel: qualitative thematic analysis. JMIR Form Res.  
764 2021 Aug 12;5(8):e26369.

765 Statistics Canada (2021) Survey on COVID-19 and mental health (SCMH). Statistics Canada,  
766 2021 [cited 30 January 2023]. Available from:  
767 [www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=5330](http://www23.statcan.gc.ca/imdb/p2SV.pl?Function=getSurvey&SDDS=5330)

- 768 Titov N, Hadjistavropoulos HD, Nielssen O, Mohr DC, Andresson G, Dear BF. (2019) From  
769 research to practice: ten lessons in delivering digital mental health services. J Clin Med. 2019  
770 Aug;8(8):1239.
- 771 Torous J, Keshavan M. Covid-19, mobile health and serious mental illness. Schizophr Res. 2020  
772 Apr;218:36–37.
- 773 van Til L, Sweet J, Poirier A, McKinnon K, Sudom K, Dursun S, et al. Well-being of Canadian  
774 regular force veterans: findings from LASS 2016 survey. Charlottetown (PE): Veterans Affairs  
775 Canada Research Directorate, Technical Report; 2017 June 23. 41p.
- 776 Venkatesh V, Morris MG, Davis GB, Davis FD. User acceptance of information technology:  
777 toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly. 2003 Sep;27(3):425–478.
- 778 Zhao X, Stadnick NA, Ceballos-Corro E, Castro Jr J, Mallard-Swanson K, Palomares KJ, et al.  
779 Facilitators of and barriers to integrating digital mental health into county mental health services:  
780 qualitative interview analyses. JMIR Form Res. 2023 May 16;7:e45718.

781

## 782 **Supportive Information Captions**

### 783 **Figure captions:**

784 **Figure 1.** Box and whisker plots indicating client participant (n=11) median AQMH survey  
785 scores, first and third quartiles, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference  
786 ( $p<0.05$ ) between median scores for digital delivery vs in-person therapy based on paired  
787 sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons. Blue refers to digital  
788 delivery; orange refers to in-person delivery. ● indicates outlier.

789 **Figure 2.** Box and whisker plots indicating client participant (n=11) median UTAUT construct  
790 scores, first and third quartile, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference  
791 ( $p<0.05$ ) between median score and a reference score of 12 (total score of three questions asked  
792 based on Likert scale 1-7) based on one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for  
793 multiple comparisons. ● indicates outlier.

794 **Figure 3.** Box and whisker plots indicating clinician participant (n=12) median AQMH survey  
795 scores, first and third quartiles, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant difference  
796 ( $p<0.05$ ) between median scores for digital delivery vs in-person therapy based on paired  
797 sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test, corrected for multiple comparisons. Blue refers to digital  
798 delivery; orange refers to in-person delivery. ● indicates outlier.

799 **Figure 4.** Box and whisker plots indicating clinician participant (n=12) median UTAUT  
800 construct scores, first and third quartiles, and minimum and maximum scores. \*=Significant  
801 difference ( $p<0.05$ ) between median score and a reference score of 12 (total score of three  
802 questions asked based on Likert scale 1-7) based on one-sample Wilcoxon signed-rank test,  
803 corrected for multiple comparisons. ● indicates outlier.




Figure 1




Figure 2




Figure 3




Figure 4