

1 **Implementation of an internet-based stress management program in micro- and**
2 **small-sized enterprises: A study protocol for a pre-post feasibility study of the**
3 **effectiveness-implementation hybrid type 2 trial**

4

5

6 **Natsu Sasaki (MD, PhD)**, nasasaki-ty@umin.ac.jp

7 Department of Mental Health, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo,
8 Japan.

9 **Taichi Shimazu (MD, PhD)**, tshimazu@ncc.go.jp

10 Division of Behavioral Sciences, National Cancer Center Institute for Cancer Control, National
11 Cancer Center, Tokyo, Japan

12 **Hajime Takeno (MPH)**, haj1takeno@gmail.com

13 Department of Mental Health, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo,
14 Japan.

15 **Sayaka Ogawa (MS)**, ogawa-sayaka@g.ecc.u-tokyo.ac.jp

16 Department of Mental Health, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo,
17 Japan.

18 **Utako Sawada (PhD)**, utako@m.u-tokyo.ac.jp

19 Department of Psychiatric Nursing, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo,
20 Tokyo, Japan.

21 **Akizumi Tsutsumi (MD)**, akizumi@kitasato-u.ac.jp

22 Department of Public Health, Kitasato University School of Medicine, Sagamihara, Japan.

23 **Kotaro Imamura (PhD)***, kouima-ty@umin.ac.jp

24 Department of Mental Health, Graduate School of Medicine, The University of Tokyo, Tokyo,
25 Japan.

26

27 * Correspondence to: kouima-ty@umin.ac.jp

28 Department of Digital Mental Health, Graduate School of Medicine,
29 The University of Tokyo, Tokyo, Japan

30 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo, 113-0033, JAPAN

31 Tel: +81-3-5841-3612 Fax: +81-3-5841-3392 E-mail: kouima-ty@umin.ac.jp

32

33 **Abstract**

34 **Background:** Text-based self-guided internet-based stress management programs can improve
35 mental health among workers. However, such mental health programs have scarcely been
36 implemented in micro- and small-sized enterprises (MSEs), which are lacking in occupational
37 healthcare services.

38 **Objectives:** This paper describes a study protocol for a pre-post feasibility study of an
39 effectiveness-implementation hybrid type 2 trial of text-based internet-based programs
40 (“WellBe-LINE”) in MSEs with less than 50 employees. This feasibility study primarily aims to
41 evaluate trial methods for future effectiveness-implementation hybrid type 2 trials.

42 **Methods:** For this study protocol, an internet- and text-based self-care intervention program
43 using the LINE app (a popular message tool in Japan) will be prepared according to
44 evidence-based psychoeducational topics. Based on our online survey findings, personalized
45 algorithms will be implemented according to employees’ gender, age, and psychological distress
46 levels. A pre-post design feasibility study will be conducted on ten companies to evaluate trial
47 methods (e.g., recruitment, penetration, and procedures). The primary outcome will involve
48 individual-level penetration, defined as the proportion of the number of employees who register
49 for the program divided by the total number of invited employees at the company. The
50 progression criterion specifies that more than 50% of the recruited companies obtain 60%

51 individual penetration. Finally, acceptability, appropriateness, feasibility, and cost will be
52 measured using quantitative internet-based questionnaires and qualitative interviews.

53 **Discussion:** This pre-post feasibility study for future effectiveness-implementation hybrid type
54 2 trials will provide in-depth knowledge about the successful implementation of text-based,
55 semi-personalized, self-care mental health interventions in real-world settings using both
56 quantitative and qualitative data.

57 **Conclusions:** This feasibility study will help validate the effectiveness of text-based
58 interventions using a widely used social networking service (SNS) tool for employees in MSEs.

59 **Trial registration:** UMIN clinical trial registration: UMIN000046960 (registration date:
60 February 21, 2022)
61 https://center6.umin.ac.jp/cgi-open-bin/ctr/ctr_view.cgi?recptno=R000053570

62

63 **Keywords:** Internet-based intervention, Stress prevention, Occupational health, Implementation
64 science, Health equity, Mixed-methods

65

66

67 **Contributions to the literature**

68 • Internet-based mental health interventions in micro- and small-sized enterprises have not been
69 implemented yet.

70 • This feasibility study plans to test the implementation strategies to achieve high penetration in
71 employees.

72 • This study can provide insights into occupational health implementation in a disadvantaged
73 context.

74

75

76 **Background**

77 Worldwide, mental health problems in the workplace impact individual health-related disability
78 and productivity loss (1, 2). Micro-, small-, or medium-sized enterprises (MSMEs) are
79 important targets for mental health interventions (3) as they represent about 90% of businesses
80 and more than 50% of employment worldwide (4). However, MSMEs, especially micro- and
81 small-sized enterprises (MSEs) with fewer than 50 employees, are less likely to implement
82 health promotion programs because of limited resources, such as cost, access, and time (5).
83 Thus, offering evidence-based programs alone may not be valuable for employees. While
84 implementing the primary prevention of mental health in MSMEs is challenging (3), preventive
85 interventions for mental health is generally more effective when used by a large populations (6).
86 Therefore, increasing the adoption and penetration (reach) of health promotion programs are
87 key objectives. To achieve high penetration, interventions and strategies specific for MSEs must
88 consider implementation barriers.

89 Previous studies have identified barriers to the implementation of mental and health
90 interventions in small companies (7-12): low leadership engagement of employers (7), lack of
91 knowledge about the impact on business (8), limited resources (9, 12), limited time and money
92 (11), regulations (no legal requirement) (12), lack of understanding on the necessity of the
93 interventions and suboptimal approach (10). Additionally, job-related stressors between small

94 and large companies varied (13). In small companies, poor psychosocial factors at work and
95 poor communication are strongly associated with job stress (13). Therefore, personalized
96 intervention content and specific delivery strategies to overcome organizational barriers in
97 MSEs are needed.

98 Internet-based interventions may solve problems of implementing mental health
99 interventions in MSEs. Internet-based intervention is feasible, cost-effective, and accessible
100 (14-16), meeting the needs of MSEs. A comparison of face-to-face and internet-based
101 interventions revealed no differences in their effectiveness in treating common mental disorders
102 (17, 18). Despite the small effect size, even text message-delivered interventions have been
103 proven to be effective for stress management (19).

104 Moreover, tailoring (or personalizing) messages in internet-based interventions proving
105 even more effective in stimulating changes in health behavior (20). Internet-based and
106 personalized text message interventions may thus be suitable for improving the acceptance of
107 employees, leading to successful implementation in MSEs. Acceptability, appropriateness, and
108 feasibility have been suggested as important implementation aspects of mental health
109 interventions (21-24). However, few studies have not been conducted yet examined the
110 effectiveness and implementation outcomes of internet-based interventions for MSEs without
111 some recent protocols (25, 26). Therefore, methods to improve implementation outcomes (i.e.,

112 implementation strategy) should be developed and examined.

113 As MSME managers have little motivation to implement the program (5, 7), a specific
114 implementation strategy personalized to the context should be adopted. According to the Expert
115 Recommendations for Implementing Change (ERIC), educating stakeholders (employees,
116 employers/managers, and recruiters) is a possible strategy if leadership engagement can be a
117 barrier in the context (27, 28).

118 Informing employers about the importance of preventive measures in mental health and
119 effective procedures for introducing the program to employees may increase their adoption.
120 However, no study has investigated the effect of internet-based interventions on MSEs with
121 such implementation strategies (i.e., educating employers). Previous implementation research
122 for mental health interventions using the internet or technologies suggested the negative attitude
123 of stakeholders (and, particularly, the users) for internet-based interventions (more preference
124 for face-to-face) (29, 30) and require education for providers (31)

125 Hybrid-type designed studies can be conducted between effectiveness studies and
126 implementation research (32). The hybrid type 2 design can be used to test the effectiveness in
127 general practice settings without controlling/ensuring delivery of the intervention and
128 implementation process (32). Moreover, feasibility and pilot studies (33) can help build and test
129 effective implementation strategies by addressing uncertainties around design and methods and

130 identifying potential causal mechanisms (34). According to the CONSORT 2010 statement:
131 Extension to randomized pilot and feasibility trials, pilot or feasibility studies should have clear
132 criteria for deciding whether to progress to the next full trial (35). Because there are still many
133 uncertainties in MSEs settings and less evidence is available in implementation research, a pilot
134 feasibility study is important to obtain insights about how we should act in the next stage.

135

136 *Aims and objectives*

137 This pre-post feasibility study on a future effectiveness-implementation hybrid type 2 trial aims
138 to evaluate the implementation trial procedures of text-based online programs in micro- and
139 small-sized enterprises with less than 50 employees.

140 The objectives of this feasibility study, in preparation for a future trial, are as follows:

- 141 1. To evaluate the feasibility of trial methods and strategies by setting individual-level
142 penetration as an indicator of successful implementation (primary outcome).
- 143 2. To evaluate the feasibility of recruitment, procedures, and strategies for disseminating
144 the program.
- 145 3. To evaluate the acceptability, appropriateness, fidelity, and cost, among recruiters,
146 employers/managers, and users.
- 147 4. To ensure no harm on psychological distress of the users.

148

149 **Methods/Design**

150 ***Program outline of “WellBe-LINE”***

151 The text-based self-care intervention program “WellBe-LINE,” which was customized for
152 employees in MSEs, will be set in the LINE app (commonly used SNS chat tool in Asian
153 countries) based on evidence-based psychological contents. One text message will be sent once
154 per week and includes a website link (URL) for more information. **Figure 1** presents an outlook
155 on the message. The portal website (<https://wellbeing-kokoro.com/>) contains more than 100
156 articles on mental health, comprising topics about problem solving (36), acceptance and
157 commitment therapy (37), self-compassion (38), sleep hygiene (39), cognitive behavioral
158 therapy for insomnia (40), and physical activity (41). **Figure 2** presents the procedures for
159 starting the program and the intervention schedules.

160

161 **Figure 1. Outlook of “WellBe-LINE”.**

162 **Figure 2. Procedures of starting “WellBe-LINE” and schedule of the intervention.**

163

164 ***Personalization***

165 Personalizing programs are effective at creating changes in health behavior (20), maximizing

166 effectiveness despite the low intensity of the program. We provide 16 scenarios according to the
167 16 groups (gender*four age category*psychological distress [$K6 \geq 5$, or $K6 < 5$]) by screening
168 check when participants started the program. **Supplementary File 1** presents Detailed
169 information about the personalized program.

170

171 “WellBe-LINE” provides messages in order of rank, from highest to low (week 1 to 8).

172 **Supplementary File 2** reports the final personalized scenario for the 16 groups.

173

174 *Study design*

175 In the feasibility study, A one-repeated-measure (pre-post) design will be used . Measurements
176 will be taken at baseline (pre) and 8 weeks afterwards (post). Data collected will then be used to
177 further refine the intervention, recruitment, procedures, strategy for disseminating, and power of
178 a subsequent cluster RCT, which is a hybrid type 2 trial. This study protocol was approved by
179 the Research Ethics Committee of the Graduate School of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine,
180 University of Tokyo (2021190NI-1)). The trial registration is available elsewhere
181 (UMIN000046960).

182

183 *Participants*

184 At the organizational level, companies with fewer than 50 employees will be recruited. At the
185 individual level, employees over 18 years old will be recruited, regardless of their employment
186 contract (e.g., part time). As this study examines the implementation of preventive programs for
187 all employees, no further exclusion criteria is needed.

188

189 ***Recruitment and procedure***

190 To activate MSEs' employers/managers, we will use a pre-existing trustful pipe with the MSEs.
191 Five licensed social insurance consultants (recruiters), who were Patient Public Involvement
192 (PPI) members, recruited MSEs that they had a relationship with. recruiters provide the research
193 information and invitation to demo program (short version of "WellBe-LINE" which finish one
194 week). If the invited company is interested in participating in the research, the recruiter will
195 provide contact information for researchers. The researchers will then coordinate with the
196 employers/managers on the date of the online meeting (described in the next paragraph).

197 After the meeting, researchers provide one poster and one original clear file for each
198 employee. Using a template, researchers will also e-mail employees to invite employees to
199 participate in the program. The researcher will provide one "code" for each company.
200 Employers/managers inform employees about the present research by the way they fit the
201 company (e.g., e-mail, posters, and other ways of appealing them). Employees who participate

202 in the program must enter the code after registering for the program via their personal LINE
203 account. Research details will then be explained on the LINE chat, and they will provide their
204 consent by pushing the button to start answering the baseline survey. Employees select their sex
205 and age categories. They also answer six questions about psychological distress (measured by
206 K6). The program automatically recognizes their characteristics (sex \times age \times distress [5+ high
207 or low]) and starts the program.

208

209 ***Online meeting with employers/managers (implementation strategy)***

210 Licensed social insurance recruiters engage in the recruitment process to motivate relevant
211 employers and managers to participate in the study. After obtaining agreement, researchers will
212 provide 30–45 minutes of online semi-structured lectures (meetings) with employers and
213 managers via zoom to determine the situation at the company and provide knowledge about
214 behavioral changes and an effective way to invite employees for participation and attain high
215 penetration. A previous qualitative study suggested that fundamental factors influencing the
216 implementation of workplace health promotion in SMSEs entail the leadership engagement of
217 employers (7). **Table 1** presents and justifies the contents of the semi-structured lecture with
218 implementation strategy specification guidelines introduced by Proctor et al. (42) for each
219 component. Semi-structured lectures will then be conducted using Microsoft PowerPoint.

220 Psychological techniques for engaging employees are based on classical behavioral psychology
221 related to motivation theory (43-46) and processing fluency related to health information (47).

222

223 ----- **Table 1** should be inserted here -----

224

225 *Measurements*

226 Outcomes will be measured using online self-report questionnaires and interviews with
227 participants (employees), employers/managers, and licensed social insurance consultants
228 (recruiters). **Table 2** presents outcomes measured for each stakeholder.

229

230 ----- **Table 2** should be inserted here -----

231

232 *Implementation outcome*

233 - *Penetration (primary)*

234 Individual-level penetration is calculated as the proportion of the number of employees who
235 register for the program divided by the total number of employees at the company. The
236 progression criterion (35) is that over 50% of the recruited companies obtain 60%
237 individual-level adoption. The rationale for setting this goal is that from the results of an online

238 survey of 1000 employees at MSEs, we asked the question, “If the company you work for
239 provided you with information about the program registering as a friend on LINE regarding
240 information useful for mental health and work, would you be willing to do so?” Specifically,
241 44.8% of the respondents answered “Yes or “Fairly agree” to the question. For the second
242 question, “Please select one app or social networking site that you are most likely to use (or
243 most prefer) when receiving mental health or work-related information.” Meanwhile, 35% of
244 the respondents answered “do not want to receive such self-care information.” From these
245 results, it is assumed that the estimated participation ratio would be 45-65%, and that 60% of
246 the company's own employees would be registered as friends on LINE, which would be
247 considered a high level of penetration at the individual level. If we do not achieve the
248 progression criteria [32], the entire process and delivery of the program will be revised based on
249 the findings of the present feasibility study.

250

251 - *Acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility*

252 Acceptability, appropriateness, and feasibility were measured using questionnaires and
253 interviews with employees (users) and employers/managers. Implementation outcome scales for
254 digital mental health (iOSDMH) will be used in a questionnaire to assess three domains of
255 implementation outcomes (24). The iOSDMH has three versions (i.e., users, providers,

256 managers, and policymakers). The items of the iOSMDH were developed through a literature
257 review, and the outcome was organized according to Proctor’s implementation outcomes (22).
258 The response options include a four-point rating for users and five-point rating for providers,
259 and for managers or policy makers, with the added option of “Don’t know.” In this study
260 protocol, employees will then be asked to use iOSDMH for users and employers/managers by
261 iOSDMH for providers. If employers and managers (or people who are concerned and provide
262 the program in the company) are clearly separated, iOSDMH will be used by managers,
263 policymakers, and providers, respectively.

264

265 - *Fidelity*

266 Fidelity will be assessed through interviews with employers/managers and licensed social
267 insurance consultants (recruiters) about the implementation strategy. The authors will provide
268 them with materials for the invitation of employees and companies. Although the method of
269 recruiting can be personalized according to the user’s context and local culture, in post
270 interviews (T2), the extent to which they made arrangements deviated from the originally
271 planned way of invitation will be assessed.

272

273 - *Cost*

274 Cost will be assessed through interviews with employers/managers and licensed social
275 insurance consultants (recruiters). The time and money spent on program implementation will
276 be assessed using a questionnaire. Additionally, whether the reward from the implementation
277 matches cost will be assessed. Participating organizations will not incur direct implementation
278 costs in “WellBe-LINE” and will not be charged for the use of the program during the study.

279

280 *Health outcome*

281 - *Users' psychological distress*

282 Psychological distress was measured using K6 (Kessler 6) (48, 49). Respondents will be asked to
283 report how frequently they had experienced the following six symptoms in the past 4 weeks: felt
284 nervous, hopeless, restless or fidgety, worthless, depressed, and felt that everything was an effort.
285 Response options included “none of the time,” “a little of the time,” “some of the time,” “most of the
286 time,” and “all of the time. Scores range from 0 to 24. The Japanese version of the K6 exhibits good
287 reliability and validity (50). K6 works well as the CIDI Short Form in identifying cases of clinically
288 significant mental disorders (51). Scores over 5 are judged as having moderate psychological distress
289 and can be used as a cutoff point for high or low distress (52, 53).

290

291 - *Work performance (HPQ)*

292 Work performance will be evaluated using one item of the WHO Health and Work Performance
293 Questionnaire (HPQ) (54). Participants will then be asked to rate their overall work performance
294 over the past four weeks. Items were scored on an 10-point scale ranging from 0 (worst) to 10 (best),
295 with high scores indicating good work performance. The Japanese version of the HPQ exhibits good
296 reliability (55).

297

298 - *Work engagement (UWES-3)*

299 The ultra-short form of the Utrecht Work Engagement Scale, three items (UWES-3) will be used
300 to assess work engagement (56). The UWES-3 consists of three subscales (i.e., vigor, dedication
301 and absorption) with each of one item. The UWES-3 is a self-reported seven-point rating scale
302 (0 = never; 6 = everyday). The mean score of the three UWES subscales, and total score is
303 computed by adding the scores and dividing the sum by the number of items in each subscale.
304 The Japanese version of the UWES-3 exhibits good reliability and validity (57).

305

306 - *Job satisfaction*

307 Job satisfaction will be measured using one item from the Brief Job Stress Questionnaire
308 (BJSQ) (58) on a four-point Likert scale. Higher scores indicated higher job satisfaction.

309

310 - *Euthymia*

311 Euthymia is a transdiagnostic construct for well-being and represents psychological flexibility, a
312 unifying outlook on life, and resistance to stress (59, 60). The euthymia Scale (ES) is a 10-item
313 index with dichotomous options (False = 0; True = 1). This results in total scores ranging from 0 to
314 10, indicating better euthymic state for higher scores. The Japanese version of the ES has high
315 concurrent validity and sensitivity as a clinimetric scale (61).

316

317 - *Good relationship with co-workers*

318 The original one-item measurement (“I can work well with my colleagues”) will be used to
319 assess relationships with co-workers on a four-point Likert scale.

320

321 - *Trust management*

322 Trust in management is measured by one item (“I can trust with the management of my
323 organization”) from the new BJSQ (62) on a four-point Likert scale.

324

325 - *Cares about employees*

326 The following original one-item measurement will be included at the request of the PPI partner:

327 “Using company research funds, the Wellbe-LINE program was developed to support the

328 mental health of people working at companies with less than 50 employees. How much did the
329 introduction of this program make you feel that your company cares for its employees?" A
330 four-point Likert scale is used for measurement.

331

332 ***Process outcome***

333 - *Block rate*

334 LINE accounts can reject or "block" contact from other accounts. We will assess this rate of
335 blocking by system detection.

336

337 - *Uncomfortable experience/harms*

338 Uncomfortable experience/harm will be assessed using five items from the iOSDMH (24). Time
339 consumption, mental symptoms, induced dangerous experiences regarding safety, physical
340 symptoms, and excessive pressure on regular learning will be measured for employees (users) in
341 the questionnaire. Employers/managers and recruiters will be asked to rate the following item:
342 "This program does not result in negative side effects (e.g., physical or psychological
343 symptoms)." The response options were four-point rating scales for users and five-point rating
344 scales for providers (managers or policy makers), with the added option of "Don't know."

345

346 - *Adherence (completion rate)*

347 Whether employees read or engaged with messages could not be accurately detected in LINE
348 owing to technical limitations. Instead, we asked employees to answer four questions related to
349 adherence in the follow-up survey: “How many times did you read the LINE message?,” “How
350 many times did you visit the website?,” “Did you visit other websites when you received a
351 notification on LINE?,” and “Did you read other related articles in the website?”

352

353 ***Analysis***

354 *Sample size*

355 A previous review suggested that 25 employees are needed if the effect size is likely to be
356 moderate to large to test the efficacy (63). However, this study protocol aims to determine
357 sample size. We set the target sample size to 10 companies (200 employees) based not on the
358 accuracy of the results (e.g., 95% CI) but on the feasibility of relevant resources. This study
359 protocol will support our decision to proceed to the next large trial and will be utilized for our
360 revisions to the program and implementation strategy.

361

362 *Quantitative data*

363 Health outcomes will be evaluated using a paired t-test between pre-(T1) and post-intervention

364 (T2) according to protocol. The effect sizes and 95% CIs were calculated using Cohen's d only
365 for those who completed the post-intervention questionnaire. Statistical significance was
366 defined as $P < 0.05$. IBM SPSS Statistics® version 28 was used for all analyses.

367

368 *Analysis of qualitative data*

369 To adapt the implementation strategy (i.e., online meetings with employers/managers) and
370 program into the real context, descriptive data from the interview will be summarized according
371 to the Consolidated Framework for Implementation Research (CFIR) (64). We will describe the
372 process and experience of making decisions for future cluster RCT.

373

374 *Patient and Public Involvement (PPI)*

375 PPI facilitates enhanced quality, appropriateness of research, and development of user-friendly
376 research materials (65). In our study, seven PPI partners knew about the real context of MSEs:
377 four licensed social insurance consultants, one occupational health physician who provided
378 services in MSEs, one employer in MSEs (one of co-authors, HT), and one manager in the
379 Tokyo Chamber of Commerce and Industry who organized the “Health and Productivity
380 Management.” These PPI partners have participated in all research stages, including the
381 program development, user-relevant research questions, user-friendly materials, more

382 appropriate recruitment strategies for studies, discussion of the interpretation of data, and
383 dissemination of study results. The PPI process is described based on the PPI handbook and
384 reporting checklists (66, 67).

385

386 **Discussion**

387 This study protocol paper aims to evaluate implementation outcomes via the “WellBe-LINE” in
388 MSEs with less than 50 employees. “WellBe-LINE” is a text-based, semi-personalized, self-care
389 mental health intervention program through the LINE app. The program sends messages with
390 content considered effective at preventing mental issues (36-41). This pre-post feasibility study
391 for future effectiveness-implementation hybrid type 2 trials will provide in-depth knowledge
392 about the successful implementation of self-care interventions in real-world settings using both
393 quantitative and qualitative data. Any adverse events and/or unsuccessful procedures will be
394 utilized to identify alternative strategies before proceeding to the next full trial.

395

396 This study protocol will apply the specific implementation strategy wherein researchers meet
397 with employers/managers online for 30–45 minutes to encourage them to invite employees to
398 participate in the “WellBe-LINE” Program. This strategy is based on previous findings of
399 leadership engagement being a considerable barrier in the health program implementation (7).

400 Furthermore, PPI partners who engaged in all research stages will provide essential suggestions
401 in implementation, leading to a positive impact on field-specific studies (65).

402

403 *Limitation*

404 This study protocol has several limitations. First, the sample size may not be adequate to detect
405 significant effectiveness in reducing psychological distress owing to the pilot nature of this
406 study. Second, this study protocol lacks a control group; the true impact of the implementation
407 strategy can only be determined in the next step. Third, generalizability is limited owing to the
408 recruitment process. Hence, MSEs highly interested in health promotion should be included in
409 this study. However, this study protocol primarily aims to test the implementation outcomes,
410 including adoption and feasibility, in the accessible sample. Future studies could engage and
411 recruit MSEs with high heterogeneity may be required in the. Fourth, individual-level adoption
412 may be affected by personal beliefs about mental health issues in the workplace (e.g., social
413 desirability(68), fear of stigmatizations(69), concerns about negative impact at the
414 workplace(70)). Thus, factors not related to the implementation strategy can be considered if the
415 outcomes are evaluated.

416

417 **Conclusion**

418 MSEs are less likely to implement health promotion programs worldwide, although many
419 employees work there. The low-cost and easy-to-access self-care program “WellBe-LINE”
420 targeted specifically at the needs of MSEs can be a solution, despite its low intensity, if the
421 penetration of employees is applicable. The wide range of evaluations proposed in this study
422 protocol will provide valuable suggestions for implementing preventive health promotion
423 measures in MSEs.

424

425 **Abbreviations**

426 BJSQ: Brief Job Stress Questionnaire

427 MSEs: Micro-, or small-sized enterprises

428 MSMEs: Micro-, small-, or medium-sized enterprises

429 PPI: Patient and Public Involvement

430

431 **Declarations**

432 **Ethics approval and consent to participate:** This study protocol was approved by the
433 Research Ethics Committee of the Graduate School of Medicine/Faculty of Medicine, The
434 University of Tokyo, No.2021190NI-(1).

435

436 **Consent for publication:** Not applicable.

437

438 **Availability of data and materials:** The data related to the present study protocol are available
439 from the corresponding author, KI, upon reasonable request.

440

441 **Competing interests:** NS reports personal fees from Medilio Inc., outside the submitted work.

442

443 **Funding:** This work was supported by a work-related diseases clinical research grant.

444 2020 (200401-01) and JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP22K03168. Sponsors had no role in
445 the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the
446 data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript
447 for publication.

448

449 **Authors' contributions:** KI was in charge of this study protocol, supervised the process, and
450 provided his expert opinion. AT provided expert suggestions regarding the study concept as a
451 supervisor. NS and KI organized the study design. SO and US supported the study management.
452 HT analyzed the pilot data and created an algorithm for the program. Collaborator TS provided
453 his expert opinion from the viewpoint of implementation science and ensured that questions
454 related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work were appropriately investigated and
455 resolved. NS and KI wrote the first draft of the manuscript, and all the other authors critically
456 revised the manuscript. All the authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

457

458 **Acknowledgements:** This study protocol was supported by the National Center Consortium in
459 Implementation Science for Health Equity (N-EQUITY) funded by the Japan Health Research
460 Promotion Bureau (JH) Research Fund (2019-(1)-4) and JH Project Fund (JHP2022-J-02).

461

462

463 **References**

- 464 1. Cotton P, Hart PM. Occupational wellbeing and performance: A review of
465 organisational health research. *Australian Psychologist*. 2003;38(2):118-27.
- 466 2. World Health Organization. Mental Health in the Workplace 2019 [Available from:
467 https://www.who.int/mental_health/in_the_workplace/en/].
- 468 3. Hogg B, Medina JC, Gardoki-Souto I, Serbanescu I, Moreno-Alcazar A, Cerga-Pashoja
469 A, et al. Workplace interventions to reduce depression and anxiety in small and
470 medium-sized enterprises: A systematic review. *Journal of affective disorders*.
471 2021;290:378-86.
- 472 4. Bank TW. Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) Finance 2022 [Available from:
473 <https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/sme/finance>].
- 474 5. McCoy K, Stinson K, Scott K, Tenney L, Newman LS. Health promotion in small
475 business: a systematic review of factors influencing adoption and effectiveness of
476 worksite wellness programs. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*.
477 2014;56(6):579-87.
- 478 6. Arango C, Díaz-Caneja CM, McGorry PD, Rapoport J, Sommer IE, Vorstman JA, et al.
479 Preventive strategies for mental health. *The Lancet Psychiatry*. 2018;5(7):591-604.
- 480 7. Saito J, Odawara M, Takahashi H, Fujimori M, Yaguchi-Saito A, Inoue M, et al.
481 Barriers and facilitative factors in the implementation of workplace health promotion
482 activities in small and medium-sized enterprises: a qualitative study. *Implement Sci*
483 *Commun*. 2022;3(1):23.
- 484 8. Hughes MC, Patrick DL, Hannon PA, Harris JR, Ghosh DL. Understanding the
485 Decision-Making Process for Health Promotion Programming at Small to Midsized Businesses.
486 *Health Promotion Practice*. 2009;12(4):512-21.
- 487 9. Hannon PA, Garson G, Harris JR, Hammerback K, Sopher CJ, Clegg-Thorp C. Workplace
488 Health Promotion Implementation, Readiness, and Capacity Among Midsize Employers in
489 Low-Wage Industries: A National Survey. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine*.
490 2012;54(11).
- 491 10. Pavlista V, Angerer P, Diebig M. Barriers and drivers of psychosocial risk
492 assessments in German micro and small-sized enterprises: a qualitative study with owners
493 and managers. *BMC public health*. 2021;21(1):1376.
- 494 11. Taylor A, Pilkington R, Montgomerie A, Feist H. The role of business size in
495 assessing the uptake of health promoting workplace initiatives in Australia. *BMC public*
496 *health*. 2016;16(1):1-8.
- 497 12. Masi D, Cagno E. Barriers to OHS interventions in Small and Medium-sized

- 498 Enterprises. *Safety science*. 2015;71:226-41.
- 499 13. Lai Y, Saridakis G, Blackburn R. Job Stress in the United Kingdom: Are Small and
500 Medium-Sized Enterprises and Large Enterprises Different? *Stress and health : journal of*
501 *the International Society for the Investigation of Stress*. 2015;31(3):222-35.
- 502 14. Heber E, Ebert DD, Lehr D, Cuijpers P, Berking M, Nobis S, et al. The Benefit
503 of Web- and Computer-Based Interventions for Stress: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis.
504 *J Med Internet Res*. 2017;19(2):e32.
- 505 15. Carolan S, Harris PR, Cavanagh K. Improving Employee Well-Being and
506 Effectiveness: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Web-Based Psychological
507 Interventions Delivered in the Workplace. *J Med Internet Res*. 2017;19(7):e271.
- 508 16. Stratton E, Lampit A, Choi I, Calvo RA, Harvey SB, Glozier N. Effectiveness of
509 eHealth interventions for reducing mental health conditions in employees: A systematic
510 review and meta-analysis. *PloS one*. 2017;12(12).
- 511 17. Barak A, Hen L, Boniel-Nissim M, Shapira Na. A comprehensive review and a
512 meta-analysis of the effectiveness of internet-based psychotherapeutic interventions.
513 *Journal of Technology in Human services*. 2008;26(2-4):109-60.
- 514 18. Cuijpers P, Donker T, van Straten A, Li J, Andersson G. Is guided self-help as
515 effective as face-to-face psychotherapy for depression and anxiety disorders? A systematic
516 review and meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies. *Psychological medicine*.
517 2010;40(12):1943-57.
- 518 19. Berrouiguet S, Baca-García E, Brandt S, Walter M, Courtet P. Fundamentals for
519 Future Mobile-Health (mHealth): A Systematic Review of Mobile Phone and Web-Based Text
520 Messaging in Mental Health. *J Med Internet Res*. 2016;18(6):e135.
- 521 20. Noar SM, Benac CN, Harris MS. Does tailoring matter? Meta-analytic review of
522 tailored print health behavior change interventions. *Psychol Bull*. 2007;133(4):673-93.
- 523 21. Vis C, Mol M, Kleiboer A, Bührmann L, Finch T, Smit J, et al. Improving
524 Implementation of eMental Health for Mood Disorders in Routine Practice: Systematic Review
525 of Barriers and Facilitating Factors. *JMIR Ment Health*. 2018;5(1):e20.
- 526 22. Proctor E, Silmere H, Raghavan R, Hovmand P, Aarons G, Bunger A, et al. Outcomes
527 for implementation research: conceptual distinctions, measurement challenges, and
528 research agenda. *Adm Policy Ment Health*. 2011;38(2):65-76.
- 529 23. Weiner BJ, Lewis CC, Stanick C, Powell BJ, Dorsey CN, Clary AS, et al. Psychometric
530 assessment of three newly developed implementation outcome measures. *Implement Sci*.
531 2017;12(1):108.
- 532 24. Sasaki N, Obikane E, Vedanthan R, Imamura K, Cuijpers P, Shimazu T, et al.
533 Implementation Outcome Scales for Digital Mental Health (iOSDMH): Scale Development and

- 534 Cross-sectional Study. *JMIR Form Res.* 2021;5(11):e24332.
- 535 25. Arensman E, O'Connor C, Leduc C, Griffin E, Cully G, Ni Dhalaigh D, et al. Mental
536 Health Promotion and Intervention in Occupational Settings: Protocol for a Pilot Study
537 of the MENTUPP Intervention. *International journal of environmental research and public*
538 *health.* 2022;19(2).
- 539 26. Engels M, Boss L, Engels J, Kuhlmann R, Kuske J, Lepper S, et al. Facilitating
540 stress prevention in micro and small-sized enterprises: protocol for a mixed method study
541 to evaluate the effectiveness and implementation process of targeted web-based
542 interventions. *BMC public health.* 2022;22(1):591.
- 543 27. Waltz TJ, Powell BJ, Fernández ME, Abadie B, Damschroder LJ. Choosing
544 implementation strategies to address contextual barriers: diversity in recommendations
545 and future directions. *Implementation Science.* 2019;14(1):42.
- 546 28. Waltz TJ, Powell BJ, Matthieu MM, Damschroder LJ, Chinman MJ, Smith JL, et al.
547 Use of concept mapping to characterize relationships among implementation strategies and
548 assess their feasibility and importance: results from the Expert Recommendations for
549 Implementing Change (ERIC) study. *Implement Sci.* 2015;10:109.
- 550 29. Topococo N, Riper H, Araya R, Berking M, Brunn M, Chevreul K, et al. Attitudes
551 towards digital treatment for depression: a European stakeholder survey. *Internet*
552 *interventions.* 2017;8:1-9.
- 553 30. Mohr DC, Siddique J, Ho J, Duffecy J, Jin L, Fokuo JK. Interest in behavioral
554 and psychological treatments delivered face-to-face, by telephone, and by internet. *Annals*
555 *of Behavioral Medicine.* 2010;40(1):89-98.
- 556 31. Andersson G, Titov N, Dear BF, Rozental A, Carlbring P. Internet - delivered
557 psychological treatments: from innovation to implementation. *World psychiatry : official*
558 *journal of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA).* 2019;18(1):20-8.
- 559 32. Curran GM, Bauer M, Mittman B, Pyne JM, Stetler C. Effectiveness-implementation
560 hybrid designs: combining elements of clinical effectiveness and implementation research
561 to enhance public health impact. *Med Care.* 2012;50(3):217-26.
- 562 33. Eldridge SM, Lancaster GA, Campbell MJ, Thabane L, Hopewell S, Coleman CL, et
563 al. Defining Feasibility and Pilot Studies in Preparation for Randomised Controlled
564 Trials: Development of a Conceptual Framework. *PLoS one.* 2016;11(3):e0150205.
- 565 34. Pearson N, Naylor PJ, Ashe MC, Fernandez M, Yoong SL, Wolfenden L. Guidance for
566 conducting feasibility and pilot studies for implementation trials. *Pilot Feasibility Stud.*
567 2020;6(1):167.
- 568 35. Eldridge SM, Chan CL, Campbell MJ, Bond CM, Hopewell S, Thabane L, et al. CONSORT
569 2010 statement: extension to randomised pilot and feasibility trials. *Pilot and*

- 570 Feasibility Studies. 2016;2(1):64.
- 571 36. D'zurilla TJ, Goldfried MR. Problem solving and behavior modification. Journal
572 of abnormal psychology. 1971;78(1):107.
- 573 37. Hayes SC, Levin ME, Plumb-Villardaga J, Villatte JL, Pistorello J. Acceptance and
574 commitment therapy and contextual behavioral science: examining the progress of a
575 distinctive model of behavioral and cognitive therapy. Behav Ther. 2013;44(2):180-98.
- 576 38. Neff K. Self-compassion: The proven power of being kind to yourself: Harper
577 Collins; 2011.
- 578 39. Hauri P. Current concepts: the sleep disorders. Kalamazoo, MI: The Upjohn Company.
579 1977.
- 580 40. Cheng SK, Dizon J. Computerised cognitive behavioural therapy for insomnia: a
581 systematic review and meta-analysis. Psychotherapy and psychosomatics.
582 2012;81(4):206-16.
- 583 41. Mammen G, Faulkner G. Physical activity and the prevention of depression: a
584 systematic review of prospective studies. American journal of preventive medicine.
585 2013;45(5):649-57.
- 586 42. Proctor EK, Powell BJ, McMillen JC. *Understanding the*: recommendations for
587 specifying and reporting. Implement Sci. 2013;8:139.
- 588 43. Bandura A. Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change.
589 Psychological review. 1977;84(2):191.
- 590 44. Atkinson JW. An introduction to motivation. 1964.
- 591 45. Deci EL, Cascio WF, Krusell J. Cognitive evaluation theory and some comments on
592 the Calder and Staw critique. 1975.
- 593 46. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Overview of self-determination theory: An organismic
594 dialectical perspective. Handbook of self-determination research. 2002;2:3-33.
- 595 47. Okuhara T, Ishikawa H, Goto E, Okada M, Kato M, Kiuchi T. Processing fluency effect
596 of a leaflet for breast and cervical cancer screening: A randomized controlled study in
597 Japan. Psychology, health & medicine. 2018;23(10):1250-60.
- 598 48. Kessler RC, Andrews G, Colpe LJ, Hiripi E, Mroczek DK, Normand SL, et al. Short
599 screening scales to monitor population prevalences and trends in non-specific
600 psychological distress. Psychological medicine. 2002;32(6):959-76.
- 601 49. Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ, Epstein JF, Gfroerer JC, Hiripi E, et al.
602 Screening for serious mental illness in the general population. Archives of general
603 psychiatry. 2003;60(2):184-9.
- 604 50. Sakurai K, Nishi A, Kondo K, Yanagida K, Kawakami N. Screening performance of
605 K6/K10 and other screening instruments for mood and anxiety disorders in Japan. Psychiatry

- 606 and clinical neurosciences. 2011;65(5):434-41.
- 607 51. Kessler RC, Barker PR, Colpe LJ, Epstein JF, Gfroerer JC, Hiripi E, et al.
608 Screening for Serious Mental Illness in the General Population. Archives of general
609 psychiatry. 2003;60(2):184-9.
- 610 52. Prochaska JJ, Sung HY, Max W, Shi Y, Ong M. Validity study of the K6 scale as
611 a measure of moderate mental distress based on mental health treatment need and utilization.
612 International journal of methods in psychiatric research. 2012;21(2):88-97.
- 613 53. Nishi D, Imamura K, Watanabe K, Ishikawa H, Tachimori H, Takeshima T, et al.
614 Psychological distress with and without a history of depression: Results from the World
615 Mental Health Japan 2nd Survey (WMHJ2). Journal of affective disorders. 2020;265:545-51.
- 616 54. Kessler RC, Barber C, Beck A, Berglund P, Cleary PD, McKeenas D, et al. The world
617 health organization health and work performance questionnaire (HPQ). Journal of
618 occupational and environmental medicine. 2003;45(2):156-74.
- 619 55. Kawakami N, Inoue A, Tsuchiya M, Watanabe K, Imamura K, Iida M, et al. Construct
620 validity and test-retest reliability of the World Mental Health Japan version of the World
621 Health Organization Health and Performance Questionnaire Short Version: a preliminary
622 study. Industrial health. 2020:2019-0090.
- 623 56. Schaufeli WB, Salanova M, González-Romá V, Bakker AB. The measurement of
624 engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. Journal of
625 Happiness studies. 2002;3(1):71-92.
- 626 57. Schaufeli WB, Shimazu A, Hakanen J, Salanova M, De Witte H. An Ultra-Short Measure
627 for Work Engagement: The UWES-3 Validation Across Five Countries. 2017.
- 628 58. Shimomitsu T, Ohno H, Maruta T, Tanigawa T. Investigation research report
629 concerning prevention of disease related to work in 1997 the Ministry of Labor: III Stress
630 measurement research group report. Tokyo: Tokyo Medical University. 2000:101-69.
- 631 59. Fava GA, Bech P. The Concept of Euthymia. Psychother Psychosom. 2016;85(1):1-5.
- 632 60. Fava GA, Guidi J. The pursuit of euthymia. World psychiatry : official journal
633 of the World Psychiatric Association (WPA). 2020;19(1):40-50.
- 634 61. Sasaki N, Carrozzino D, Nishi D. Sensitivity and concurrent validity of the
635 Japanese version of the Euthymia scale: a clinimetric analysis. BMC Psychiatry.
636 2021;21(1):482.
- 637 62. Inoue A, Kawakami N, Shimomitsu T, Tsutsumi A, Haratani T, Yoshikawa T, et al.
638 Development of a short version of the new brief job stress questionnaire. Industrial health.
639 2014;52(6):535-40.
- 640 63. Hertzog MA. Considerations in determining sample size for pilot studies. Research
641 in Nursing & Health. 2008;31(2):180-91.

- 642 64. Damschroder LJ, Aron DC, Keith RE, Kirsh SR, Alexander JA, Lowery JC. Fostering
643 implementation of health services research findings into practice: a consolidated
644 framework for advancing implementation science. *Implement Sci.* 2009;4:50.
- 645 65. Brett J, Staniszewska S, Mockford C, Herron-Marx S, Hughes J, Tysall C, et al.
646 Mapping the impact of patient and public involvement on health and social care research:
647 a systematic review. *Health Expectations.* 2014;17(5):637-50.
- 648 66. National Institute for Health Research. Patient and Public Involvement in Health
649 and Social Care Research. 2018.
- 650 67. Staniszewska S, Brett J, Simera I, Seers K, Mockford C, Goodlad S, et al. GRIPP2
651 reporting checklists: tools to improve reporting of patient and public involvement in
652 research. *BMJ (Clinical research ed).* 2017;358:j3453.
- 653 68. Podsakoff PM, Organ DW. Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and
654 prospects. *Journal of management.* 1986;12(4):531-44.
- 655 69. Wheat K, Brohan E, Henderson C, Thornicroft G. Mental illness and the workplace:
656 conceal or reveal? *Journal of the royal society of medicine.* 2010;103(3):83-6.
- 657 70. Jones AM. Disclosure of mental illness in the workplace: A literature review.
658 *American Journal of Psychiatric Rehabilitation.* 2011;14(3):212-29.
- 659
- 660



Screening

Gender, age, distress



Menu list

Access to website
Read articles any time



Text messages

Sent once per week




Quick choice

Closed question (Yes or No)
Recommended articles

Figure 1. The outlook of “WellBe-LINE”.

Registration



Automatic text delivery (8 weeks)




Figure 2. Procedures of starting “WellBe-LINE” and schedule of the intervention.