Remote parent-implemented intervention for young children on the autism spectrum during the Covid-19 home-confinement period in Geneva, Switzerland: the experience of parents and therapists.

Corresponding author: Hilary Wood de Wilde, M.Sc.,
Hilary.De-Wilde@etu.unige.ch

Wood de Wilde H[1,2], Kojovic N[2], Robertson C[3], Karr C[4], Ackman L[4], Caccia F[4], Costes A[3], Etienne M[3], Franchini M[3], Gentaz E[2], Schaer M[1]

1. Autism Brain & Behavior Lab, Department of Psychiatry, Faculty of Medicine, University of Geneva, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland
2. Laboratoire du Développement Sensori-moteur Affectif et Social, FPSE, University of Geneva, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland
3. Fondation Pôle Autisme, 1204, Geneva, Switzerland
4. Département de l'instruction publique, de la formation et de la jeunesse, Office médico-pédagogique, 1201, Geneva, Switzerland

Summary

Background
At the start of the Covid-19 pandemic, autism intervention programs in Geneva, Switzerland converted their in-person services to a remote, videoconferencing format in order to accommodate a state-mandated period of home-confinement. The new format permitted an increase in the frequency with which therapists interacted with parents, specifically a substantial increase in the dosage of parent-implemented intervention sessions. The current study aimed to measure the experience of a diverse population of families as they received these intensive services via telehealth for the first time.

Methods
Forty-eight children, receiving in-centre or in-school autism intervention services at the time of the home-confinement orders, were offered two 1-hour sessions, five days a week, of remote parent-implemented intervention or remote direct intervention. Families facing potential barriers to access were provided with toys or technical support as needed. Satisfaction questionnaires were completed by families and therapists at three time points over a two-month period. Child progress was monitored using the Early Start Denver Model Curriculum Checklist for Young Children with Autism.

Findings
Parents maintained high levels of participation and satisfaction with the remote services, regardless of socio-economic or cultural background. They particularly appreciated the more frequent family-therapist interaction, at an average of 8·75 hours of parent coaching per week, made possible by the telehealth format. The majority of parents reported an improvement in their use of the intervention techniques following the period of intensive parent coaching. Child progress followed a pattern of continued significant improvement across developmental domains over the home-confinement period.

Interpretation
These findings suggest that a more frequent dosage of parent-implemented autism intervention sessions than previously studied is not only feasible with remote delivery, but is appreciated by families from varying socio-economic and cultural backgrounds.

Funding
This research was supported by grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation (#190084 and 51NF40 – 185897) and by the Fondation Pôle Autisme. The funders were not involved in the study design.

Introduction

In the spring of 2020, with the spread of the Covid-19 pandemic, social distancing measures prevented many families with children on the autism spectrum from accessing in-person early intervention services.[1–3] The preschool years represent a critical developmental period in which children who receive evidenced-based intervention can make significant gains in language, cognitive and adaptive functioning.[4,5] Faced with home-confinement orders and cancelled programs, many caregivers and professionals looked for alternative ways to maintain intensive early intervention instruction.[1–3] The current article reports on 45 families in Geneva, Switzerland who replaced their child's in-person intervention program with remote telehealth sessions for a two-month period.

The majority of sessions provided were Parent-Implemented Intervention (PII; also referred to as 'parent coaching'), where a caregiver is coached to use techniques that foster engagement with the child and promote the child's learning.[6,7] Research has shown PII to be a valuable part of early intervention in autism.[6–8] Coaching parents remotely via telehealth has also proven feasible, a cost-effective way to increase access to high quality services.[2,9–11]

The effect of either in-person or remote PII has usually been studied at the dosage of one to three hours per week.[6,9,12,13] This frequency appears to be arbitrarily determined, based perhaps on the funding available, or on an estimation of how often caregivers would agree to participate in sessions, or of how much time they required between sessions to consolidate their learning.[12] Recent research, however, suggests that parents and their children may benefit from more frequent PII sessions.[12,14] In order to define an optimal frequency, one in which the caregiver manages to acquire the intervention skills quickly while still maintaining a high level of overall satisfaction, there needs to be a better understanding of how families of young autistic children, and the professionals working with them, experience a higher dosage of PII sessions. The current study examines the engagement and satisfaction of parents and therapists as they experienced a substantial increase in parent coaching sessions provided via videoconference.

Importantly, these parents represent a diverse population. Research has, until recently, tended study parent coaching with volunteers who were typically white, college-educated mothers, and not employed outside the home.[2,10,11] Less is known about how working parents, fathers, families with lower socioeconomic status or families from diverse cultural backgrounds experience these autism services.[15–17] This has meant that the majority of caregivers who could potentially benefit from PII services are not well represented in the literature.[11,17] Researchers have begun to look at how evidence-based practices, proven to work in clinical autism research settings, can be adapted to work in diverse community settings.[15,17–19] The Covid-19 home-confinement period in Geneva created a situation in which all families from community-based autism intervention programs received services via videoconference, enabling us to assess the feasibility of providing intense, remote parent coaching to families from many walks of life.

Methods

Context of Covid-19 home-confinement in Switzerland

On the 16th of March, 2020, in response to the initial outbreak of the Covid-19 pandemic, the Swiss Federal Office of Public Health ordered a nationwide closure of all non-medical services, including schools and childcare centres. Our intervention centres re-opened gradually starting April 27th, 2020 with schools re-opening May 11th, 2020 (figure 1). Given the uncertainty of the situation at the time, families were given the option to continue sessions online through to the end of May, and despite subsequent social distancing measures, schools and intervention centres have remained open to date.

Participants

Children: All 48 children enrolled in three intensive intervention programs at the time of the home-confinement were offered remote services (table 1). These participants were part of an already established longitudinal study on the developmental trajectories of young autistic children.[20] Forty-three children had a diagnosis of Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD) according to the DSM-5,[21] confirmed using a full-battery evaluation. Five toddlers were suspected of having autism but did not have a confirmed diagnosis.

Caregivers: The 45 families (three families had siblings enrolled) had varying socioeconomic status levels, with 38% considered low-income as indexed by the cost-of-living standards in Switzerland (table 1). Educational attainment also varied, with 39% having secondary school or less. Five children came from single-parent households. Parents came from 29 different countries of origin and spoke 15 different languages at home (table 2). All families provided their written consent for the study, in accordance with protocols approved by the institutional review board of the University of Geneva.

Therapists: All 45 early intervention therapists working in the intervention programs at the time of the home-confinement, participated in the study. They were all female, aged between 25 and 38 years old.

Intervention received prior to home-confinement: Three programs

1) Centre for Early Intervention in Autism (Centre d'Intervention Précoce en Autisme / CIPA): Thirty children aged 24 to 54 months received 20 hours a week of in-centre, therapist-delivered intervention services using the Early Start Denver Model (ESDM).[22] ESDM is an evidenced-based Naturalistic, Developmental Behavioural Intervention (NDBI) for young children on the autism spectrum.[5] In addition, parents initially receive 12 sessions of once-a-week, in-person parent coaching using the Parent-Implemented Early Start Denver Model (P-ESDM). P-ESDM is an effective PII intervention aimed at coaching caregivers as they learn to embed social-communicative learning opportunities for their child into daily routines.[7] Parents met with their child's lead therapist one to two times a month, as needed, following the initial P-ESDM sessions. The CIPA program is subsidised by State, private foundation and federal disability insurance funds, and available to children living in the State of Geneva. Children typically remain in the CIPA for two years (see table 1 for intervention duration prior to confinement period).

2) The Boussole Program: Five young children suspected of having autism, aged 8 to 24 months, were receiving eight hours a week of in-home and in-centre, therapist-delivered ESDM intervention, and two hours of P-ESDM coaching. The Boussole is subsidised by private foundation and insurance funds.

3) The CIPA Inclusion Program (CIPA-I): Thirteen children aged 4·7 to 6·6 years were receiving 13 to 24 hours of one-to-one in-school intervention services per week. They had all completed the CIPA program prior to starting school. Seven were in their first year of school and six in their second year. The CIPA-I program is provided for two years, and is funded by Geneva's Department of Public Education.

Table 1. Description of the sample of children (n = 48) and their families (n = 45) included in the study

Measures		CIPA (*n* = 30)	Boussole (*n* = 5)	CIPA-I (*n* = 13)	All intervention centers (*n* = 48)
Age at the onset of the confinement period *Mean (SD)*		3·39 (±0·79)	1·34 (±0·49)	5·67 (±0·63)	3·79 (±1·49)
Sex (female/male)		3 / 27	3 / 2	1 / 12	7 / 41
Intervention duration prior to the confinement period (in years)					
	Mean (SD)	1·07 (±0·51)	0·33 (±0·26)	3·24 (±0·71)	1·58 (±1·78)
	Range (min-max)	0·08 - 1·74	0·04 - 0·59	2·37 - 4·51	0·04 - 4·51
Age at diagnosis/#start of the intervention *Mean (SD)*		2·41 (±0·44)	1·13 (±0·37)#	2·50 (±0·40)	2·30 (±0·58)
ADOS-CSS at diagnosis *Mean (SD)*		7·83 (±1·91)	-*	8·15 (±1·46)	7·93 (±1·77)
Mullen Early Learning Scales Developmental Quotient (MSEL DQ) at diagnosis *Mean (SD)*		60·8 (±18·4)	70·8 (±14·1)	60·8 (±15·9)	61·6 (±17·3)
VABS-II Adaptive Behavior Composite at diagnosis *Mean (SD)*		78·7 (±10·00)	77·8 (±8·85)	81·8 (±7·07)	79·5 (±9·13)
Household organization					
	One parent/two parents	3 /28	1/ 4	2 / 11	6 / 45
Parent's ethnicity					
	European	17 (56%)	2(40%)	4 (31%)	23 (48%)
	Admixed American	2(7%)	-	2 (15%)	4 (8%)
	African	3(10%)	1(20%)	1 (8%)	5 (11%)
	Asian	4(13%)	2(40%)	3 (23%)	9 (19%)
	Asian+European	2(7%)	-	1 (8%)	3 (6%)
	Admixed American+European	2(7%)	-	2 (15%)	4 (8%)
Parents' education (higher of the two when applicable)					
	Elementary school	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (6%)
	High school	10 (33%)	5(38%)	1 (20%)	16 (33%)
	Post secondary	18 (60%)	8 (62%)	3 (60%)	29 (61%)
Household income at diagnosis**					
	Low income (<60k CHF)	8 (27%)	4 (80%)	6 (46%)	18 (38%)
	Mid income (60-140k CHF)	13 (43%)	-	2 (15%)	15 (31%)
	High income (> 140k CHF)	9 (30%)	1 (20%)	5 (39%)	15 (31%)

Notes· * Children in this group were not administered ADOS (young age /lack of motor autonomy)
** Source: Swiss Federal Statistics Office-SFSO, Statistics on Income and Living Conditions SILC-2018, version 07.10.2019.

Table 2. List of parent's countries of origin and languages spoken to children at home

Parents' countries of origin (All centres, N=90)			Languages spoken to children at home (Number of families)	
Bangladesh (1)	Korea (1)	Russia (1)	Albanian (2)	Korean (1)
Bolivia (3)	Kosovo (3)	Senegal (2)	Arabic (2)	Polish (1)
Brazil (6)	Lebanon (1)	Singapore (1)	Bengali (1)	Portuguese (6)
Colombia (2)	Moldavia (1)	Spain (4)	English (7)	Russian (1)
DR Congo (2)	Netherlands (2)	Swedish (1)	French (34)	Spanish (8)
Egypt (1)	Nicaragua (1)	Switzerland (20)	Fula (1)	Filipino (3)
France (8)	Pakistan (1)	Syria (2)	Hungarian (11)	Wolof (1)
Guinea (2)	Philippines (6)	Tunisia (1)	Italian (1)	
Hungary (3)	Poland (2)	Tajikistan (1)		
Italy (5)	Portugal (6)			

Telehealth intervention during Covid-19 home-confinement

Each child's program was individualised for remote delivery, taking into account parameters such as the parents' availability, their level of access to technology, and the child's likelihood to attend to a therapist via screen. The families were offered two 1-hour sessions a day, Monday to Friday, of either: 1) Remote Parent-Implemented Intervention (PII), where the therapist provides parent coaching using P-ESDM,[7] or 2) Remote Direct Intervention (DI) between child and therapist where the therapist works on the child's learning objectives using ESDM strategies, proposing interactive activities like singing songs, discussing topics and playing turn-taking games.

Therapist participation and training

All therapists were licensed psychologists with a minimum of a master's degree. They had been trained in the use in of the ESDM approach, meeting fidelity in clinical practice on the ESDM Fidelity Rating System.[22] Within the team, 15 credentialed ESDM therapists supervised the children's programs, overseen by an ESDM certified trainer. Therapists had no prior experience in telehealth service provision, and were provided with a one-day emergency training prior to their first session. The majority of sessions were recorded for supervisory purposes and reviewed via during weekly team clinic meetings, which were also held online.

Materials

ZOOM software (Zoom Video Communications, Inc., Version 4·4; https://zoom.us/) was used for videoconferencing sessions. Parents were asked to set up their computer, smartphone or tablet in a place where the therapist would be able to have a clear view of a play area or of the child's work area. Each lead therapist contacted the child's parents to explain how to install the ZOOM software. They discussed materials to have available such as toys, felt markers and paper. A toy-lending program was arranged for families in need. Each family had a copy of the book An Early Start for Your Child with Autism: Using Everyday Activities to Help Kids Connect, Communicate, and Learn[23] (French, English or other translations). When appropriate, the therapists also suggested videos, website links and ideas for activities in line with each child's intervention objectives.

Measures

<u>Parent and therapist satisfaction questionnaires:</u> Satisfaction questionnaires were sent via e-mail to both parents and therapists after the first remote intervention session, at 3 weeks, and after their final online session. Participants responded to questions on a Likert seven-point scale ranging from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree" and multiple-choice questions, and were given the opportunity to add written comments pertaining to their experience with the services.

<u>The Early Start Denver Model Curriculum Checklist for Young Children with Autism (ESDM-CC):</u> For this study, the ESDM-CC[24] was used to monitor developmental progress in the children's learning objectives, in light of the drastic change to our service delivery model. The children in the Boussole and the CIPA are typically evaluated using the ESDM-CC every 12 weeks. This evaluation helps parents and therapists decide which learning targets they will prioritize in the child's treatment plan over the following three-month period. The ESDM-CC evaluates areas of expected child development at 4 levels: 9-18 months, 18-24 months, 24-36 months and 36-48 months, covering domains such as communication, social skills,

motor skills and cognition.[22] For this study, we looked specifically at domains that span all four levels: receptive and expressive language, social skills (including joint attention in level 2), and play. Skills are evaluated as being "A" (acquired, consistent, and generalised); "P" (Partial or emerging); "N" (child is unable or unwilling to perform the skill); or "X" (no opportunity or not tested). We considered a child's current developmental age range to be where the majority (50% or more) of the skill items were rated as an "A". If the highest level had an equal number of acquired and not-yet acquired skills, the child was considered between two levels for that skill (i.e., 1 / 2), and were converted into numerical levels for the purpose of the statistical analyses (1 / 2 = 1·5; 2 /3 = 2·5, etc.). To compare the magnitude of progress during in-person intervention sessions, we considered three time points: T1- ESDM-CC three-months prior to the Pre-Confinement ESDM-CC; T2 - Pre-Confinement ESDM-CC; T3 - Post-Confinement ESDM-CC.

Statistical Analyses

We used the Mann Whitney test to examine group differences in program satisfaction, as the measures did not follow a normal distribution (Shapiro-Wilk test). We compared the parents' and therapists' overall experience and satisfaction with the remote intervention, as well as the change in satisfaction between the first day and the third week of treatment. To illustrate child developmental progress, we used the Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test to compare the global and subdomain scores of the ESDM-CC between the three time points, as the measures were not normally distributed. Statistical analyses were conducted using GraphPad Prism v.8 and SPSS v.25 software: (https://www.ibm.com/analytics/spss-statistics-software). All results in our study were considered significant at the p value of 0.05. The False Discovery Rate (FDR) was controlled using Benjamini-Hochberg procedure.[25]

Results

Program participation

All 48 children and their 45 families, as well the 45 therapists of the CIPA, Boussole and CIPA-I programs, participated in the remote sessions during the confinement period (figure 1; table 3). Thirty-four of the 35 children from the CIPA and Boussole programs received Remote Parent-Implemented Intervention (PII), of which 11 also had some sessions of Remote Direct Intervention (DI). One older child in the CIPA (3 years, 9 months), and all 13 of the children in the CIPA-I program received only DI, although their parents were in the background. Therapists adapted the length of sessions to the needs and availability of the families, with sessions lasting between 30 and 90 minutes (figure 1).

Remote sessions were offered over a period of 2 months, with a seven-workday break over the Easter holiday (figure 1). During the time when all families were in home-confinement, services were provided for a total of 19 days for the families in the CIPA and Boussole (between March 20th and April 27th, 2020) and 29 days for the CIPA-I (between March 20th and May 11th, 2020). Children in the CIPA received an average of 8·75 sessions (7·3 (±2·2) hours) of primarily PII sessions per week. The children in the CIPA-I received an average of 7·06 sessions (5·41 (±0·92) hours) of DI per week (table 3).

Thirty-four families, including 56 individual parents, participated in the PII sessions. Twenty-seven percent of the PII sessions were done with fathers, 54% with mothers, 14% with both mother and father present, and 2 % with a childcare provider (table 3). Fifty-nine percent of the families used a computer, 24% a tablet, while 16% participated via smartphone. One family did not have access to a wi-fi connection and was coached via landline telephone.



Figure 1. Remote therapy sessions distribution across three centres (y axis: CIPA, n = 30; Boussole, n = 5; CIPA-I, n = 13) for the two-month confinement period (timeline: x axis). Each row represents sessions for one child. Individual sessions are depicted in coloured rectangles (blue = PII and red = DI). Session duration (30-60 -90 minutes) is proportional to the width of the rectangles.

Table 3. Description of the remote intervention sessions

Measures		CIPA (*n* = 30)		Boussole (*n* = 5)		CIPA-I (*n* = 13)		All three centers (*n* = 48)	
		Mean (SD)	*Range (min-max)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (min-max)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (min-max)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (min-max)*
Total number of sessions over the entire period		39·6 (±11·0)	18 - 68	36·4 (±12·8)	21 - 51	46·8 (±6·03)	30 - 53	39·7 (±11·1)	18 - 68
Total intervention time (in hours)		31·3 (±12·1)	12·3 - 63·8	34·4 (±13·5)	15·8 - 48·3	35·9 (±5·27)	22 - 44	32·9 (±10·8)	12·3 - 63·8
Average frequency of sessions per week during main confinement period *		8·75 (±1·93)	4·47 - 13·7	7·05 (±1·61)	4·47 - 8·42	7·06 (±1·08)	3·97 - 8·28	8·12(±1·87)	3·97 - 13·7
Average intervention time (in hours) per week during main confinement period *		7·3 (±2·2)	3·22 - 11·1	6·75 (±2)	3·36 - 8·16	5·41 (±0·92)	2·89 - 6·72	6·73 (±2·06)	2·89 - 11·1
Type of remote sessions:					-				
	Parent Implemented	32·3 (±13·9)	0 - 58	36·4 (±12·8)	21 - 51	1·85 (±3·29)	0 - 11	24·5 (±18·2)	0 - 58
	Direct Intervention	4·87 (±8·62)	0 - 30	-	-	45·0 (±6·68)	29 - 53	15·2 (±19·9)	0 - 53
Parent Implemented interventions conducted with (in percent):									
	Mothers	52·4 (±37.4)	0 - 100	66·2 (±29·5)	25 - 96	-	-	53·9 (±36·8)	0 - 100
	Fathers	26·4 (±33·2)	0 - 100	25·2 (±31·4)	0 - 70	-	-	27·2 (±33·4)	0 - 100
	Both parents	13·5 (±23·2)	0 - 100	7·80 (±9.55)	0 - 24	-	-	13·9 (±23·5)	0 - 100
	Other caregivers (e.g. nannies)	2·08 (±7·92)	0 - 44	0·80 (±1·79)	0 - 4	-	-	2·14 (±8·03)	0 - 44

Note : * Confinement period for all children in CIPA and Boussole programs: March 20th to 27.04; for CIPA-1: March 20th to May 11th, 2020.

Parent and Therapist Satisfaction

Forty-two of the 45 families and all 45 therapists filled out all three time-points of the satisfaction questionnaires. Parent(s) who participated in the coaching or were present during the DI sessions completed the questionnaires. We divided the questionnaire responses into the following four areas of interest (figures 2-5):

1) Experience and satisfaction with online format: Parents reported general satisfaction with the remote format, with 88% saying they felt comfortable with the technology and their role in the telehealth intervention, and only 9% reporting technical difficulties (figure 2). While 29% found it was harder to understand the therapist via videoconference, nearly all parents (90%) felt motivated to try and apply new techniques with their child following a remote session, and 89% felt the sessions were useful and helped the child to progress. At the end of the home-confinement period, when asked what they found most challenging, 50.3% of parents said it was controlling the home environment around them during the sessions (i.e., siblings and other distractions), while 33% felt it was managing their own child's behaviours. Only one parent found it difficult to play with their child while being observed remotely (figure 3, A1).



Figure 2. Parents' satisfaction with the remote intervention delivery was assessed at week 3. Questions were assessed on a 7-point Likert scale (Strongly Disagree-Strongly agree). The percentages of categories of responses are represented on the figure with the exception of the neutral response "Neither agree nor disagree" (point "4" on the Likert scale).



Figure 3. Satisfaction questionnaire administered following the final remote session. Panels A and B illustrate multiple choice question answers for parents and therapists respectively. The percentage of responses is denoted on the figure except for neutral responses (point "4" on the Likert scale): C Responses of the parents (n = 47); D therapists (n =45).

2) <u>Parent experience of increased dosage (frequency of sessions)</u>: Nearly all parents (93%) felt that checking in daily with their child's therapist made them feel supported in their efforts, and 86% felt that they learned more about ESDM techniques and were applying them more than before receiving the daily sessions (figure 3). Likewise, 84% of parents felt that they made progress in their ability to use the intervention techniques and 79% felt that the weeks of online daily sessions helped them to have a better understanding of their child's learning objectives and how to work on them. Following the period of remote delivery, we asked the parents and therapists what, for them, is the ideal frequency of the remote sessions. To our surprise, 58% of parents and 60% of therapists felt that 2 sessions a day ideal, while 28% of parents and 35% of therapists felt that one-session a day would have been better. None of the parents or therapists said they preferred the typical rate of 1x a week, however, two families and three therapists said they would have preferred only 2-3 sessions per week (figure 3, A2 & B2).

3) Relationship between parent-reported satisfaction and socioeconomic status. Families were divided into three groups based on their annual income (table 1). Overall, we did not find significant group differences in regards to participation or assessment of therapy sessions, but noted a tendency for lower-income families to be more unanimously positive about the services. All three groups reported that the sessions were very useful and helped their child progress, with less variance in the low-income group (figure 4, B). All groups reported high motivation to apply intervention strategies and valued the daily check-ins with the therapist. Mid-income families reported less technical issues compared to both low-income ($U = 70{\cdot}5$; $p = 0{\cdot}07$) and high-income families $U = 48$; $p = 0{\cdot}04$) however, this last comparison did not withstand the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure for FDR control.[25]



Figure 4. Comparison of parents' perception of remote sessions across three income groups defined according to the Swiss Federal Statistics Office guidelines: A: technology issues during remote sessions, B: perception of remote intervention usefulness; C: parents' motivation to try new techniques; D: perceived importance of daily checking in with the therapists of their child.

4) Comparison of parent and therapist satisfaction and perceptions: Overall, the therapists tended to be more hesitant about the telehealth format than the parents. In our assessment of parents' comfort level with the new format, we found significant group differences between parents and therapists, with therapists perceiving the parents as less comfortable with the format than the parents actually were, both at Week 1($U = 649$; $p = 0{\cdot}004$, $d = 0{\cdot}6$) and Week 3 ($U = 986$; $p = 0{\cdot}001$, $d = 0{\cdot}6$) (figure 5). Similarly, parents tended to perceive the therapists as more comfortable with the telehealth format than the therapists actually reported feeling. We found group differences both at Week 1 ($U = 339$; $p < 0{\cdot}001$, $d = 1{\cdot}4$) and Week 3 ($U = 963$; $p < 0{\cdot}001$, $d = 0{\cdot}6$). However, therapists showed a significantly higher estimation of their own comfort with the service delivery format at Week 3 compared to Week 1 ($U = 1023$; $p < 0{\cdot}001$, $d = 0{\cdot}7$).

We also found group differences for how useful the parents and therapists felt the daily sessions were. Parents perceived the sessions as being more useful than the therapists did, both at Week 1 ($U = 687$; $p = 0{\cdot}012$, $d = 0{\cdot}5$) and at Week 3 ($U = 1145$; $p = 0{\cdot}029$, $d = 0{\cdot}4$). However, the difference at Week 3 did not hold statistical significance after the Benjamini-Hochberg correction for multiple comparison.[25] When we asked both parents and therapists whether they felt it was important to continue early intervention services remotely, we detected group differences at Week 1, with therapists having a slightly lower estimation of the importance to continue intervention during this period ($U = 778$; $p = 0{\cdot}020$, $d = 0{\cdot}4$). However, by the third week, both groups strongly agreed that it was important to continue the services remotely.

In the final questionnaire, we asked parents which characteristic they liked most about the therapist working with them (figure 3, A3). Thirty-seven percent of parents reported that the therapists "level of concern for my child" was what they appreciated most, with the others appreciating their "patience" (19%), "level of knowledge" (16%), "encouragement" (14%), and positivity (14%). Likewise, when the therapists were asked what characteristic they most appreciated in the parents 44% answered that it was the parents' "perseverance", while others felt it was the parents' "positivity" (25%), "punctuality" (16%), "appreciation of my work" (11%), and "flexibility" (4%) that they liked most (figure 3, B3).



Figure 5. Week 1 and Week 3 comparison of change in parents' and therapists' impressions with regards to: parental comfort with the new, remote format of intervention (upper left); therapists' comfort with the remote format of intervention (upper right); perception of remote intervention usefulness (lower left) and family perception of importance to continue the online intervention (lower right). The effect size is expressed using Cohen's d and significance level are defined as follows: * $p < 0{\cdot}05$,** $p < 0{\cdot}01$, *** $p \leq 0{\cdot}001$, **** $p \leq 0{\cdot}0001$.

Monitoring progress during telehealth services using the ESDM Curriculum Checklist

We aimed to measure the magnitude of change across different developmental domains assessed by the ESDM-CC following the intervention received during home-confinement. We compared the ESDM-CC global and sub-domain scores between three time points using Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed rank test. As depicted in figure 6, in all domains but expressive language we observed a pattern of continued significant improvement between all ESDM-CC evaluations, without any stagnation of progress related to the confinement period (between T2 and T3). For expressive language, the improvement observed between T2 and T3 did not reach significance level ($p=0{\cdot}06$). Global scores showed significant change post (T3) compared to prior confinement (T2); $Z = -2{\cdot}71$, $p = 0{\cdot}007$, $r = 0{\cdot}36$, with a slightly higher change observed in the period preceding the confinement ($Z = -3{\cdot}04$, $p = 0{\cdot}002$, $r = 0{\cdot}41$). However, the change observed in three out of four assessed domains, namely Receptive Communication, Social Skills and Play was higher during the Confinement Period (T2-T3) ($Z = -3{\cdot}03$, $p = 0{\cdot}002$, $r = 0{\cdot}40$, $Z = -3{\cdot}07$, $p = 0{\cdot}002$, $r = 0{\cdot}41$, $Z = -3{\cdot}45$, $p = 0{\cdot}001$, $r = 0{\cdot}46$ respectively) compared to the pre-confinement change T1-T2 ($Z = -2.82$, $p = 0{\cdot}005$, $r = 0{\cdot}38$, $Z = -2{\cdot}81$, $p = 0{\cdot}005$, $r = 0{\cdot}38$, $Z = -2{\cdot}94$, $p = 0{\cdot}003$, $r = 0{\cdot}39$ respectively). This global effect might be driven by a lesser change evidenced in the Expressive Communication domain during T2-T3 ($Z = -1{\cdot}38$, $p = 0{\cdot}17$, $r = 0{\cdot}18$) compared to the pre-confinement period ($Z = -3{\cdot}60$, $p < 0{\cdot}001$, $r = 0{\cdot}47$).



Figure 6. Bar plots depicting the change in ESDM curriculum checklist (ESDM-CC) levels at 3 time points: T1-ESDM-CC 3 months before Pre-Confinement ESDMCC, T2-Pre-Confinement ESDM-CC, T3 Post-Confinement ESDM-CC. The magnitude of change is expressed in effect size $r = Z/\sqrt{N}$ (Rozenthal, 1991) and significance level are denoted as follows: ** $p < 0{\cdot}01$, *** $p \leq 0{\cdot}001$, **** $p \leq 0{\cdot}0001$.

Discussion

Remote delivery of parent-implemented intervention

Prior to Covid-19, remote delivery of autism services was mostly considered for families living far from service providers.[2,13] The current study found that a telehealth format can be helpful to families regardless of where they live. For example, some of our working parents were able to join sessions during their breaks, while other parents appreciated the ease of having a coaching session at home while their younger child napped. For separated parents, it meant they could hear the same information without being physically in the same room. As de Nocker and Toolan's systematic review of telehealth autism services suggests,[9] increased accessibility, in particular for underserved communities, requires us to be open to flexible intervention solutions.[9,15,16,26,27]

Importantly, delivering services via videoconference allows professionals to work in the natural context of the child's home, albeit virtually, instead of a clinic setting.[6,28] Our programs had always provided in-person home visits, however, due to commuting time, only at an average rate of once-a-month. In the current study, both parents and therapists remarked on the benefits of having more frequent "in-home visits", finding it helpful to have sessions in the environment in which the parent-child interaction typically takes place. Parents were able to show the therapists challenging behaviours as they occurred, or prop their computer on the lunch table while getting help with their child's feeding skills. This finding supports what other authors have identified as the importance of working on real-life situations in their natural context.[10,12,14,26,28] Telehealth services in autism have usually been considered an alternative to the preferable in-person meetings. The current study challenges this idea, suggesting the importance of a 'hybrid' PII model, where families benefit from both the live interaction of in-person coaching and the flexibility and reduced cost of remote intervention sessions.

High dosage of parent-implemented intervention

The telehealth format made possible an increased dosage of PII sessions, a key goal of which is to help parents acquire strategies to increase their child's engagement and learning, and ultimately to encourage developmental progress.[6,12,29] The idea of a higher dosage of parent coaching was explored in a recent study by Rogers and her colleagues,[12] where they compared weekly parent coaching with an enhanced program that involved bi-weekly sessions, demonstrating that caregivers who received the additional coaching made significantly greater gains in interaction skills with their child. Given the unique circumstances of the current study, we were not able to measure parent acquisition of skill, however, the majority of parents did report that the daily sessions helped them feel more confident in their ability to use and apply the intervention techniques. Parents also felt they learned more with the daily PII format than they had with the weekly, in-centre coaching sessions received prior to the pandemic. This lends support to the idea that a higher frequency of parent coaching sessions is appreciated by caregivers and could potentially lead to a more rapid acquisition and application of skills.[12–14]

Similarly, a 2014 randomized controlled study[14] demonstrated significantly greater improvements in child outcome in families receiving PII sessions two- or three-times a week compared to those receiving group parent training once a week. The current study did not include pre- and post-testing to measure child outcome, however, through analysis of our regular, quarterly monitoring of child developmental progress using the ESDM-CC, we observed a pattern of continued significant improvement across all developmental domains, except expressive language, where improvements were considerable but did not reach significance level. Although these findings do not allow us to draw conclusions on the efficacy of intensive PII, they do suggest that we should consider other forms of parent coaching than the once-a-week session, such as offering more frequent sessions at the beginning of treatment, when the parents are first learning the techniques, and checking-in more often thereafter, to support ongoing implementation.

Experience of a diverse population

The current study supports previous research showing that remote provision of autism intervention, including parent coaching, is not only feasible but well received by parents.[2,6,10,11] Unlike the majority of studies on parent-implemented intervention, however, our sample included comparable numbers of low-, mid- and high-income families, as well as parents with lower educational attainment, working parents, fathers, single parents and families representing different cultural groups.[6,9,11,12,17] This provided us with a more realistic picture of how telehealth autism services work in a community setting. We found that nearly all of the families, regardless of background, were highly motivated to acquire the intervention tools, and appreciative of the regular support they received.

As Stahmer and her colleagues found in a 2019 study on improving access to autism services,[17] income-based disparities, race and ethnicity have been shown to impact an autistic child's access to care, with their families more likely to face barriers to participation. In the current study, home-confinement reduced some of these barriers, such as long working hours and transportation to and from therapy sessions. Nevertheless, our families of lower socioeconomic status tended to face more challenges, such as a smaller living space, fewer toys and materials, and lack of a computer and dependable internet connection. The fact that they were just as engaged in and satisfied with the sessions as their higher-income counterparts, suggests that families from diverse backgrounds regard their child's programs very much as do those who, until recently, have been predominantly represented in the literature. However, for telehealth intervention to be more inclusive of traditionally underserved children, programs should ensure access to a computer, internet connection, toys and materials; and offer flexible scheduling to accommodate working-parents.

Comparison of parent and therapist experience

Responses to the questionnaires revealed significant differences, indicating that the therapists perceived the parents as being less at ease with the telehealth format than the parents reported feeling. Conversely, the parents tended to perceive their therapists as being more comfortable than the therapists reported feeling. These findings suggest that professionals may underestimate the readiness of families to participate in remote parent coaching, and may themselves come across as more confident than they actually feel. As with other studies looking at parent satisfaction with autism services,[30] most of the parents in the current study reported that their therapist's "level of concern for their child" was the characteristic they most appreciated, while therapists reported appreciating the parents' "perseverance" and "positivity".

Limitations and future considerations

The main limitations of the current study stem from that which made it possible: the unexpected circumstance of providing autism intervention services during a sudden period of home-confinement. We had no opportunity to randomise groups, complete formal measures of child or parent outcome, or trial our questionnaires. The beginning of the Covid-19 pandemic was a period of great uncertainty, and this may have influenced parents' willingness to participate, in an effort to maintain continuity of their child's program. It is also possible that the home-confinement condition meant that families had more free time to participate in parent coaching, however this is debatable, as the majority of parents in our study continued to work from home while also managing their children.

The level of satisfaction with the increased frequency of PII was high and pervasive. It may well have confounded the satisfaction reported with the telehealth format. This is somewhat of a moot point, however, since the increased frequency would not have been possible without the cost- and time-saving videoconference technology. The parents' willingness to try remote intervention may have also been influenced by the fact that they already knew the therapists they would be videoconferencing with. This fact may also have impacted their level of engagement and satisfaction with the sessions.[1,27]

The Covid-19 pandemic disrupted our programs for children on the autism spectrum, forcing us to re-think our service delivery model and giving us the chance to experience more frequent interaction with their families. Although we have returned to primarily in-person therapy, the telehealth period reminded us of the importance of parent-therapist partnership, and helped us imagine a future in which videoconferencing allows an increased frequency of parent coaching in the virtual home environment, opening up services to far more children in our community.

Acknowledgments

We express our gratitude for the tremendous effort of all the families and clinicians of the CIPA, Boussole and CIPA-Inclusion programs. We further acknowledge Prof. Stephan Eliez, of the Fondation Pôle Autisme, as well as the research team of the Autism Brain & Behavior Lab, for their help in making this research project possible.

Funding

This research was supported by grants from the Swiss National Science Foundation (#190084 and 51NF40 – 185897) and by the Fondation Pôle Autisme. The funders were not involved in this study and had no role other than to provide financial support.

Conflict of Interest Statement

The Authors declare that there is no conflict of interest.

Bibliography

1 Kronberg J, Tierney E, Wallisch A, Little LM. Early Intervention Service Delivery via Telehealth During COVID-19: A Research-Practice Partnership. Int J Telerehab 2021; **13**. DOI:10.5195/ijt.2021.6363.

2 Ellison KS, Guidry J, Picou P, Adenuga P, Davis TE. Telehealth and Autism Prior to and in the Age of COVID-19: A Systematic and Critical Review of the Last Decade. Clin Child Fam Psychol Rev 2021; **24**: 599–630.

3 Crockett JL, Becraft JL, Phillips ST, Wakeman M, Cataldo MF. Rapid Conversion from Clinic to Telehealth Behavioral Services During the COVID-19 Pandemic. Behav Analysis Practice 2020; **13**: 725–35.

4 Fuller EA, Kaiser AP. The Effects of Early Intervention on Social Communication Outcomes for Children with Autism Spectrum Disorder: A Meta-analysis. J Autism Dev Disord 2020; **50**: 1683–700.

5 Schreibman L, Dawson G, Stahmer AC, et al. Naturalistic Developmental Behavioral Interventions: Empirically Validated Treatments for Autism Spectrum Disorder. J Autism Dev Disord 2015; **45**: 2411–28.

6 Oono IP, Honey EJ, McConachie H. Parent-mediated early intervention for young children with autism spectrum disorders (ASD). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013; published online April 30. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD009774.pub2.

7 Rogers SJ, Estes A, Lord C, et al. Effects of a Brief Early Start Denver Model (ESDM)–Based Parent Intervention on Toddlers at Risk for Autism Spectrum Disorders: A

Randomized Controlled Trial. Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry 2012; **51**: 1052–65.

8 Green J, Charman T, McConachie H, et al. Parent-mediated communication-focused treatment in children with autism (PACT): a randomised controlled trial. The Lancet 2010; **375**: 2152–60.

9 de Nocker YL, Toolan CK. Using Telehealth to Provide Interventions for Children with ASD: a Systematic Review. Rev J Autism Dev Disord 2021; published online July 16. DOI:10.1007/s40489-021-00278-3.

10 Vismara LA, McCormick CEB, Wagner AL, Monlux K, Nadhan A, Young GS. Telehealth Parent Training in the Early Start Denver Model: Results From a Randomized Controlled Study. Focus Autism Other Dev Disabl 2018; **33**: 67–79.

11 Ingersoll B, Berger NI. Parent Engagement With a Telehealth-Based Parent-Mediated Intervention Program for Children With Autism Spectrum Disorders: Predictors of Program Use and Parent Outcomes. J Med Internet Res 2015; **17**: e227.

12 Rogers SJ, Estes A, Vismara L, et al. Enhancing Low-Intensity Coaching in Parent Implemented Early Start Denver Model Intervention for Early Autism: A Randomized Comparison Treatment Trial. J Autism Dev Disord 2019; **49**: 632–46.

13 Parsons D, Cordier R, Vaz S, Lee HC. Parent-Mediated Intervention Training Delivered Remotely for Children With Autism Spectrum Disorder Living Outside of Urban Areas: Systematic Review. J Med Internet Res 2017; **19**: e198.

14 Wetherby AM, Guthrie W, Woods J, et al. Parent-Implemented Social Intervention for Toddlers With Autism: An RCT. Pediatrics 2014; **134**: 1084–93.

15 Mirenda P, Colozzo P, Smith V, et al. A Randomized, Community-Based Feasibility Trial of Modified ESDM for Toddlers with Suspected Autism. J Autism Dev Disord 2022; published online Jan 13. DOI:10.1007/s10803-021-05390-1.

16 Rogers SJ, Stahmer A, Talbott M, et al. Feasibility of delivering parent-implemented NDBI interventions in low-resource regions: a pilot randomized controlled study. J Neurodevelop Disord 2022; **14**: 3.

17 Stahmer AC, Vejnoska S, Iadarola S, et al. Caregiver Voices: Cross-Cultural Input on Improving Access to Autism Services. J Racial and Ethnic Health Disparities 2019; **6**: 752–73.

18 Nahmias AS, Pellecchia M, Stahmer AC, Mandell DS. Effectiveness of community-based early intervention for children with autism spectrum disorder: a meta-analysis. J Child Psychol Psychiatr 2019; **60**: 1200–9.

19 Rogers SJ, Stahmer A, Talbott M, et al. Feasibility of Delivering Parent-Implemented NDBI Interventions in Low Resource Regions: A Pilot Randomized Controlled Study. In Review, 2020 DOI:10.21203/rs.3.rs-105121/v1.

20 Robain F, Franchini M, Kojovic N, Wood de Wilde H, Schaer M. Predictors of Treatment Outcome in Preschoolers with Autism Spectrum Disorder: An Observational Study in the Greater Geneva Area, Switzerland. J Autism Dev Disord 2020; **50**: 3815–30.

21 American Psychiatric Association. Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, Fifth Edition. American Psychiatric Association, 2013 DOI:10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596.

22 Rogers SJ, Dawson G. Early Start Denver Model for young children with autism: promoting language, learning, and engagement. New York: Guilford Press, 2010.

23 Rogers SJ, Dawson G, Vismara LA. An early start for your child with autism: using everyday activities to help kids connect, communicate, and learn. New York: Guilford Press, 2012.

24 Rogers SJ, Dawson G. Early Start Denver Model curriculum cheklist for young children with autism. New York: Guilford Press, 2010.

25 Benjamini Y, Hochberg Y. Controlling the False Discovery Rate: A Practical and Powerful Approach to Multiple Testing. Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological) 1995; **57**: 289–300.

26 Vivanti G, Kasari C, Green J, Mandell D, Maye M, Hudry K. Implementing and evaluating early intervention for children with autism: Where are the gaps and what should we do?: Gaps and priorities for intervention research. Autism Research 2018; **11**: 16–23.

27 Haine-Schlagel R, Rieth S, Dickson KS, Brookman-Frazee L, Stahmer A. Adapting parent engagement strategies for an evidence-based parent-mediated intervention for young children at risk for autism spectrum disorder. J Community Psychol 2020; **48**: 1215–37.

28 Marino F, Chilà P, Failla C, et al. Tele-Assisted Behavioral Intervention for Families with Children with Autism Spectrum Disorders: A Randomized Control Trial. Brain Sciences 2020; **10**: 649.

29 Shire SY, Gulsrud A, Kasari C. Increasing Responsive Parent–Child Interactions and Joint Engagement: Comparing the Influence of Parent-Mediated Intervention and Parent Psychoeducation. J Autism Dev Disord 2016; **46**: 1737–47.

30 Estes A, Swain DM, MacDuffie KE. The effects of early autism intervention on parents and family adaptive functioning. Pediatr Med 2019; **2**: 21–21.

Measures		CIPA (*n* = 30)	Boussole (*n* = 5)	CIPA-I (*n* = 13)	All intervention centers (*n* = 48)
Age at the onset of the confinement period *Mean (SD)*		3·39 (±0·79)	1·34 (±0·49)	5·67 (±0·63)	3·79 (±1·49)
Sex (female/male)		3 / 27	3 / 2	1 / 12	7 / 41
Intervention duration prior to the confinement period (in years)					
	Mean (SD)	1·07 (±0·51)	0·33 (±0·26)	3·24 (±0·71)	1·58 (±1·78)
	Range (min-max)	0·08 - 1·74	0·04 - 0·59	2·37 - 4·51	0·04 - 4·51
Age at diagnosis/[#]start of the intervention *Mean (SD)*		2·41 (±0·44)	1·13 (±0·37)[#]	2·50 (±0·40)	2·30 (±0·58)
ADOS-CSS at diagnosis *Mean (SD)*		7·83 (±1·91)	-*	8·15 (±1·46)	7·93 (±1·77)
Mullen Early Learning Scales Developmental Quotient (MSEL DQ) at diagnosis *Mean (SD)*		60·8 (±18·4)	70·8 (±14·1)	60·8 (±15·9)	61·6 (±17·3)
VABS-II Adaptive Behavior Composite at diagnosis *Mean (SD)*		78·7 (±10·00)	77·8 (±8·85)	81·8 (±7·07)	79·5 (±9·13)
Household organization					
	One parent/two parents	3 /28	1/ 4	2 / 11	6 / 45
Parent's ethnicity					
	European	17 (56%)	2(40%)	4 (31%)	23 (48%)
	Admixed American	2(7%)	-	2 (15%)	4 (8%)
	African	3(10%)	1(20%)	1 (8%)	5 (11%)
	Asian	4(13%)	2(40%)	3 (23%)	9 (19%)
	Asian+European	2(7%)	-	1 (8%)	3 (6%)
	Admixed American+European	2(7%)	-	2 (15%)	4 (8%)
Parents' education (higher of the two when applicable)					
	Elementary school	2 (7%)	0 (0%)	1 (20%)	3 (6%)
	High school	10 (33%)	5(38%)	1 (20%)	16 (33%)
	Post secondary	18 (60%)	8 (62%)	3 (60%)	29 (61%)
Household income at diagnosis**					
	Low income (<60k CHF)	8 (27%)	4 (80%)	6 (46%)	18 (38%)
	Mid income (60-140k CHF)	13 (43%)	-	2 (15%)	15 (31%)
	High income (> 140k CHF)	9 (30%)	1 (20%)	5 (39%)	15 (31%)

Notes· * Children in this group were not administered ADOS (young age /lack of motor autonomy)
** Source: Swiss Federal Statistics Office-SFSO, Statistics on Income and Living Conditions SILC-2018, version 07.10.2019.

Parents' countries of origin (All centres, N=90)			Languages spoken to children at home (Number of families)	
Bangladesh (1)	Korea (1)	Russia (1)	Albanian (2)	Korean (1)
Bolivia (3)	Kosovo (3)	Senegal (2)	Arabic (2)	Polish (1)
Brazil (6)	Lebanon (1)	Singapore (1)	Bengali (1)	Portuguese (6)
Colombia (2)	Moldavia (1)	Spain (4)	English (7)	Russian (1)
DR Congo (2)	Netherlands (2)	Swedish (1)	French (34)	Spanish (8)
Egypt (1)	Nicaragua (1)	Switzerland (20)	Fula (1)	Filipino (3)
France (8)	Pakistan (1)	Syria (2)	Hungarian (11)	Wolof (1)
Guinea (2)	Philippines (6)	Tunisia (1)	Italian (1)	
Hungary (3)	Poland (2)	Tajikistan (1)		
Italy (5)	Portugal (6)			

Remote intervention sessions



Measures		CIPA (*n* = 30)		Boussole (*n* = 5)		CIPA-I (*n* = 13)		All three centers (*n* = 48)	
		Mean (SD)	*Range (min-max)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (min-max)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (min-max)*	*Mean (SD)*	*Range (min-max)*
Total number of sessions over the entire period		39·6 (±11·0)	18 - 68	36·4 (±12·8)	21 - 51	46·8 (±6·03)	30 - 53	39·7 (±11·1)	18 - 68
Total intervention time (in hours)		31·3 (±12·1)	12·3 - 63·8	34·4 (±13·5)	15·8 - 48·3	35·9 (±5·27)	22 - 44	32·9 (±10·8)	12·3 - 63·8
Average frequency of sessions per week during main confinement period *		8·75 (±1·93)	4·47 - 13·7	7·05 (±1·61)	4·47 - 8·42	7·06 (±1·08)	3·97 - 8·28	8·12(±1·87)	3·97 - 13·7
Average intervention time (in hours) per week during main confinement period *		7·3 (±2·2)	3·22 - 11·1	6·75 (±2)	3·36 - 8·16	5·41 (±0·92)	2·89 - 6·72	6·73 (±2·06)	2·89 - 11·1
Type of remote sessions:					-				
	Parent Implemented	32·3 (±13·9)	0 - 58	36·4 (±12·8)	21 - 51	1·85 (±3·29)	0 - 11	24·5 (±18·2)	0 - 58
	Direct Intervention	4·87 (±8·62)	0 - 30	-	-	45·0 (±6·68)	29 - 53	15·2 (±19·9)	0 - 53
Parent Implemented interventions conducted with (in percent):									
	Mothers	52·4 (±37.4)	0 - 100	66·2 (±29·5)	25 - 96	-	-	53·9 (±36·8)	0 - 100
	Fathers	26·4 (±33·2)	0 - 100	25·2 (±31·4)	0 - 70	-	-	27·2 (±33·4)	0 - 100
	Both parents	13·5 (±23·2)	0 - 100	7·80 (±9.55)	0 - 24	-	-	13·9 (±23·5)	0 - 100
	Other caregivers (e.g. nannies)	2·08 (±7·92)	0 - 44	0·80 (±1·79)	0 - 4	-	-	2·14 (±8·03)	0 - 44

Note : * Confinement period for all children in CIPA and Boussole programs: March 20th to 27.04; for CIPA-1: March 20th to May 11th, 2020.


Strongly Disagree
Disagree
Somewhat Disagree
Neither Agree Nor Disagree
Somewhat Agree
Agree
Strongly Agree
1. I often have technical diffculties during my videoconferencing sessions (diffculty understanding how the Zoom sofware works, problems with the video, sound, or internet connection...)
62
19
2
2
5
2
2. I feel comfortable with the use of technology in the context of these intervention sessions and with my role in the intervention
2
7
7
17
64
3. I feel that these sessions are useful for my child and have helped him/her to progress
5
2
10
29
50
4. I find it is more diffcult for me or my child to understand what the therapist is trying to convey to us by videoconference than if we were in the same room
33
19
7
7
17
5
5. After a video conference session, I feel motivated to try and apply new techniques with my child in our everyday routines
2
14
31
45
6. I feel that I am learning more about ESDM techniques and applying them more than before receiving daily meetings with my child's therapist
5
5
12
36
38
7. Checking in with my child's therapist each day makes me feel supported during this time
2
5
12
24
57
-100
-80
-60
-40
-20
0
20
40
60
80
100

Parent report

A1
Most Difficult



A2
Number of Sessions



A3
Learned More



A4
Most Apreciated



Therapist report

B1
Most Difficult



B2
Number of Sessions



B3
Learned More



B4
Most Apreciated



C Parents



D Therapists




A
I often have technical diffculties during remote intervention sessions
7
5
3
1
Low income families
Mid income families
High income families
B
Remote therapy sessions are useful & allow child to progress
7
5
3
1
Low income families
Mid income families
High income families
C
I feel motivated to try and apply new techniques with my child in our everyday routines
7
5
3
1
Low income families
Mid income families
High income families
D
Checking in with my therapist everyday makes me feel supported in my efforts
7
5
3
1
Low income families
Mid income families
High income families


Week 1
Week 3
**
d = 0·6
**
d = 0·6
Parent is comfortable with remote intervention format
7
5
3
1
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression


Week 1
Week 3
****
d = 0·7
****
d = 1·4
***
d = 0·6
Therapist is comfortable with remote intervention format
7
5
3
1
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression


Week 1
Week 3
*
d = 0·5
Remote therapy sessions are useful & allow child to progress
7
5
3
1
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression


Week 1
Week 3
*
d = 0·4
Family considers important to continue remote therapy sessions
7
5
3
1
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression
Parents' Impression
Therapists' Impression


***
r = 0·45
***
r = 0·41
**
r = 0·36
***
r = 0·47
**
r = 0·38
***
r = 0·40
****
r = 0·48
***
r = 0·47
ns
r = 0·18
***
r = 0·45
**
r = 0·38
***
r = 0·41
****
r = 0·51
**
r = 0·39
***
r = 0·46
T1
T2
T3
ESDM-CC level
0
1
2
3
4
Global Level
Receptive Communication
Expressive Communication
Social Skills
Play