medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

App-Based CBT, Mindfulness, and ACT Exercises: Their Immediate Impact on Anxiety - A Randomised Controlled Trial

Dr Fabian Kahl*[1], Julia Fabienne Sandkühler*[2], Dr Magda Zena Sadurska[3, 4], Peter Brietbart[5], Spencer Greenberg[4, 5], Dr Jan Brauner[6, 7, 8]

* contributed equally

[1] Department of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, University of Hamburg, Germany

[2] Department of Psychology, University of Bonn, Germany

[3] Insthea Ltd, UK

[4] Spark Wave, USA

[5] Mind Ease Labs Ltd, UK

[6] Department of Health, Witten/Herdecke University, Germany

[7] Department of Computer Science, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

[8] Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford, United Kingdom

Corresponding author: Julia Fabienne Sandkühler, email: jf.sandkuehler@gmail.com, Department of Psychology, University of Bonn, Kaiser-Karl-Ring 9, 53111 Bonn, Germany

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background. Anxiety disorders are a significant societal and individual burden. Psychotherapy, while effective, is often inaccessible, leading to the rise of technology-based solutions like psychotherapeutic mobile apps. This study assesses the immediate impact of twelve exercises from the Mind Ease app, incorporating cognitive behavioural therapy, mindfulness, and acceptance and commitment therapy, on anxiety.

Methods. In a parallel, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial with 1108 participants, we compared the effects of these exercises against two controls: reading about anxiety and normal activities. Efficacy was measured with a custom scale validated against the state subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory.

Results. All twelve exercises significantly reduced anxiety more than controls ($p = 0.002$ to $<.001$, $\eta^2_P = .06$ to $.37$, $d = 0.5$ to 1.5).

Conclusions. The twelve psychotherapeutic exercises proved highly effective at immediately mitigating feelings of anxiety. Future trials should explore its long-term effects.

Trial registration. The trial was prospectively registered (clinicaltrials.gov identifier: NCT05850975, https://osf.io/36ukh).

Key words. Anxiety, psychotherapy, RCT, cognitive behavioural therapy, acceptance and commitment therapy, mindfulness, access, app, eHealth, mHealth

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Background

Anxiety is one of the most prevalent psychological issues in today's society, contributing significantly to the global burden of disease (World Health Organization, 2017). Individuals grappling with anxiety may experience significant impairment in their daily life, affecting their social, occupational, and personal realms. Psychotherapy, particularly cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT), mindfulness-based therapies, and acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT), is effective in managing anxiety disorders (A-tjak et al., 2015; Hofmann et al., 2012). However, access to psychotherapy is limited by several barriers including the availability of therapists, cost, stigma associated with mental health treatment, and logistical challenges such as transportation and time (Firth et al., 2017).

Recent advancements in technology have allowed for the development of psychotherapy apps, which may provide a viable solution to these barriers. Such apps can be widely disseminated and can be used at a convenient time and place, thereby increasing accessibility to therapy. One such app, Mind Ease, offers exercises based on CBT, mindfulness, and ACT. It aims to offer an accessible and effective self-help tool to manage anxiety. However, to date, no external randomised controlled trials have been conducted to examine its efficacy.

Studies on both face-to-face, as well as digital psychotherapeutic interventions, have almost exclusively focused on long-term effects. While these are very relevant, understanding immediate impacts is also important, as they are valuable in themselves and likely crucial for compliance. Moreover, most existing studies focus on single therapeutic modalities and a mix of exercises, or, less commonly, one exercise, leaving a gap in our understanding of how different therapeutic approaches and individual exercises directly compare to each other, e.g. (A-tjak et al., 2015; Burton & King, 2008; Firth et al., 2017; Fischer et al., 2020). This is also important for the growing integrative trend in psychotherapy (Hayes & Hofmann, 2017).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to examine the immediate effects of the 12 different interventions, as presented in the Mind Ease app, on anxiety levels. We conducted a parallel, double-blind, placebo-controlled, randomised trial with an intention to establish the efficacy of this app in comparison to control conditions.

We hypothesised that 1) each exercise would be more effective at reducing immediate anxiety than the control conditions and 2) the average exercise would be more effective at reducing immediate anxiety than the control conditions.

Methods

Trial design

We conducted a parallel, double-blind, randomised, placebo-controlled trial. Participants were randomly allocated to either one of the twelve exercises offered by the Mind Ease app or one of two control conditions, namely reading an informational text about anxiety or carrying on with regular activities. The allocation ratio was 1 for each of the twelve exercises and 1.5 for each of the two control groups. The trial design and participant flow are summarised in Figure 2. We follow the CONSORT reporting guidelines for parallel-group randomised trials (Schulz et al., 2011). The trial was preregistered at clinicaltrials.gov (identifier: NCT05850975) and osf.io (https://osf.io/36ukh).

Participants

Participants were aged 18 or above. They were recruited online via the Positly platform, which uses Amazon Mechanical Turk, and completed a brief screening survey, which assessed their anxiety levels. Only participants who responded to at least two of the three

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

slider questions (see outcome section) by saying they felt “quite bad/worried/tense” (score of 67 points) or worse were invited to take part in the study.

Interventions

Exercises

The app's exercises drew primarily from third wave cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT), encompassing classic CBT, mindfulness, and acceptance and commitment therapy (ACT) (Hayes & Hofmann, 2017). Empirical studies have demonstrated the efficacy of these therapies in managing anxiety disorders (A-tjak et al., 2015; Hofmann et al., 2012; Khoury et al., 2013). Some exercises were rooted in Positive Psychology (Seligman et al., 2005).

The app included 12 exercises. "Reframing" and "Cognitive Therapy" employed the standard CBT technique of cognitive restructuring (Hofmann, 2011). Exercises "Reflective Writing" and "Gratitude Practice" were based on Positive Psychology (Seligman et al., 2005). "Calming Visualization" employed guided imagery, used across several therapies including CBT (Hofmann, 2011). "Dare Response" was inspired by a method in the book “DARE” (McDonagh, 2015) and integrated exposure and emotional reappraisal from classic CBT, and committed action from ACT (Hayes et al., 2016; Hofmann, 2011). The largely mindfulness-based exercises were "Mindful Breathing", "Guided Mindfulness", "In Flow With Fear", and "Defusion" (Hayes et al., 2016; Kabat-Zinn, 2009). "Deep Breathing" and "Muscle Relaxation" constituted two physiology-oriented relaxation exercises (Conrad & Roth, 2007; Zaccaro et al., 2018). See the appendix for detailed descriptions of each exercise.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Control conditions

There were two control conditions: One control group was instructed to do what they would ordinarily do for seven minutes (the expected average duration of the interventions), until a bell chimed (measurement-only control). The other control group was given an informational text about anxiety to read (Rector, 2005) (reading control). See the appendix for the text and exact instructions given to participants.

Similarity of interventions

The reading control was superficially similar to the exercises, because the exercises also included reading texts. Measurement-only participants had the two anxiety measurements as well as the delay between them in common with the other groups. The measures, texts and exercises were on the same platform and in the same visual style for all participants.

Changes after the trial commenced

Originally, participants could also be randomised into a group that received an exercise selected by Mind Ease's machine learning algorithm (rather than random allocation to an exercise). However, after the first 82 participants had been assigned to this group, we found a bug in the data processing for the ML algorithm. This meant that participants had not received the right recommendations. This bug only affected the ML algorithm in the study, and not the algorithm used in the public version of the Mind Ease app. We discarded the data of these 82 participants. As recruiting was slower and more expensive than expected (see section on sample size), we would not have been able to power this group to an acceptable extent anymore, so we stopped the allocation to this group.

Outcomes

Our primary outcome was the anxiety score calculated as the average response to three slider questions (Figure 1). These questions were asked before and after the interventions.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

In these three questions, participants were asked to report how they were feeling at that moment, moving a slider from “very bad” to “very good”, “very worried” to “very calm”, and “very tense” to “very relaxed”, respectively. The range of possible scores for the primary outcome was 0 (no anxiety) to 100 (high anxiety). Participants did not see these numbers on their interface.



Figure 1. The three slider questions as presented to participants.

We used the three slider questions, because they took a very short time and were already part of the app. To ensure they were an adequate measure of anxiety and also to be able to give equivalent scores in a widely known scale, we conducted a separate pre-study to validate the scale. This pre-study consisted of determining the correlation of the primary outcome (3-slider average) with the state subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). The STAI state subscale consists of 20 self-report items (e.g. “I feel calm”) on a 4-point Likert scale from “not at all” to “very much so”. The pre-study was conducted with 199 participants. The correlation was $r(197) = 0.872$, $p < .001$ (see results).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Sample size

We originally preregistered a total sample size of 5550 completed participants (370 participants per exercise group, 555 participants per control group). However, when we had recruited 582 participants (39 per exercise group and 57 per control group), we noticed that recruitment was substantially slower and more expensive than expected, so we would not be able to recruit the preregistered number of participants. An interim analysis and new sample size calculation showed that the effect sizes were larger than expected, so we would nevertheless be able to power the study adequately. We therefore updated the preregistration to a recruitment goal of 1126 participants (75 per exercise group and 113 per control group), i.e. about twice the number of participants we had recruited at that point. In the end, 1108 participants completed the study. As preregistered, we excluded those with a baseline anxiety score below 50, leaving us with 1092 participants (on average 73 per active treatment and 112 per control group). Finally, after also excluding participants based on a time criterion (see statistical methods), there were 1054 participants, on average 106 in each control group and 70 in each active treatment group.

Randomisation and blinding

GuidedTrack was used to randomly assign the interventions to participants. Staff did not interact with participants. Participants were not told whether they were in an intervention or in a control group. To make participants think they were not in a control group despite not receiving any intervention, measurement-only participants were told that “we would like to test changes in mood over short periods of time”.

Statistical methods

Following the methods outlined in our preregistration, we conducted mixed ANOVAs with time (pre vs post intervention) as the within-subjects variable, intervention (exercise vs

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

control) as the between-subjects variable and anxiety score as the dependent variable. We applied the Greenhouse-Geisser correction to all our analyses but the correction did not change any value. In addition, we performed Welch t-tests of the improvement scores, which is essentially the same analysis as the ANOVA, except slightly more robust as it does not assume equal variances. The results of these two methods were similar. See the appendix for SE and SD of the pre and post scores.

In addition, we checked the robustness of our normality-assuming ANOVAs by performing 5%- and 20%- winsorised ANOVAs as well as a robust ANOVA which uses trimming and bootstrapping (performed with the sppi functions in the WRS2 R package) (Field, 2013; Wilcox, 2011).

As preregistered, we excluded participants with a baseline anxiety level below 50 in the 3-slider average (equivalent to a score of 48 on the STAI state subscale). We performed analyses including participants who took less than 3 and more than 30 minutes, as well as without these participants (time criterion). We implemented this time criterion, because participants who spent too little time on the exercise cannot have performed it properly. Participants who took more than 30 minutes (in one case, over 7000 minutes) likely did other things than just the treatment between the two anxiety assessments. In addition, anxiety fluctuates over time, so a large variation in time taken brings in noise. The results of the analyses with and without the time criterion are virtually the same. We did not think of preregistering a time criterion, but because it makes sense to have it, we focus on the analysis with the time criterion in this paper and report the results without the time criterion in the appendix.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Results

Pre-study - validation of the primary outcome

We used the three slider questions, because they took a very short time and were already part of the app. To ensure they were an adequate measure of anxiety and also to be able to give equivalent scores in a widely known scale, we conducted a separate pre-study to validate the scale. This pre-study consisted of determining the correlation of the primary outcome (3-slider average) with the state subscale of the State-Trait Anxiety Inventory (STAI). The STAI state subscale consists of 20 self-report items (e.g. “I feel calm”) on a 4-point Likert scale from “not at all” to “very much so”. The 3-slider average correlated positively and highly significantly with the STAI state subscale, $r(197) = 0.872$, $p < .001$, without excluding any outliers. After excluding one obvious outlier based on visual inspection of the scatterplot (3-slider average of 27 and STAI state subscale score of 76), the result was very similar, $r(196) = 0.893$, $p < .001$. See the appendix for a scatterplot of the data including the outlier. The results of the linear regression (excluding the outlier) are: STAI state subscale score = 3-slider average * 0.55 + 20.66.

Participant flow

Participant flow through the study, including the numbers allocated to each intervention, are presented in Figure 2.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 2. Participant flow through the study.

Recruitment

Participants were recruited on Positly and tested on GuidedTrack between 11/03/2023 and 19/07/2023.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Baseline data

For participant characteristics at baseline, see Table 1.

Table 1: Participant characteristics at baseline

	Total	Active treatments	Measurement-only control	Reading control
N	1054	842	107	105
Age in years: range (M, SD)	21-92 (39, 11)	21-92 (39, 11)	23-72 (39, 11)	22-73 (39, 11)
Sex (% female)	66%	65%	69%	71%
Anxiety (STAI state subscale score equivalent)	61.2 (6.1)	61.1 (6.1)	61.1 (6.2)	61.5 (6.1)

Data is given as mean (standard deviation) or as percentage. To facilitate interpretation, the STAI state subscale score equivalent of the 3-slider score is given, calculated based on our pre-study as STAI state subscale score = 3-slider average * 0.55 + 20.66.

Confirmatory analysis

In this section we present our preregistered confirmatory analyses. The average intervention was significantly more effective than the control conditions at reducing anxiety (vs. reading control: $p < .001$, $\eta^2_P = 0.063$, $d = 0.8$; vs. measurement-only control: $p < .001$, $\eta^2_P = 0.059$, $d = 0.8$). In addition, each individual exercise was significantly more effective than the measurement-only control (Figure 4 and Table 2) as well as the reading control (see appendix). The skew for the pre and post distributions of interventions ranged from -0.4 to 0.4, with kurtosis ranging from -1.1 to 1.6 (see appendix). The results were similar for winsorised as well as bootstrap and trimmed ANOVAs done as robustness checks (see appendix).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



Figure 3. Pre and post intervention means of the anxiety scores for all exercises together and the two control groups together. The anxiety score is the STAI state subscale equivalent. The error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.



Figure 4. Reduction in anxiety, given in STAI state subscale equivalent, for the twelve exercises and two controls. Error bars represent 95% confidence intervals.

Table 2: Comparing exercises to measurement-only control

		ANOVA		**T-test**		**Regression**		
Exercise	N	***p***	η^2_P	***d* [95% CI]**	**Improv. diff.**	**beta**	***p***	**Type**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

					(M, SE)			
All exercises	842	**< .001**	**0.059**	**0.8 [0.6; 1.0]**	6.38 (0.55)	0.24	<.001	NA
Cognitive Therapy	67	**< .001**	**0.058**	**0.5 [0.2; 0.8]**	3.4 (1.2)	0.10	.005	CBT
Deep breathing	68	**< .001**	**0.072**	**0.6 [0.3; 0.9]**	3.0 (0.8)	0.08	.018	physiol.
Reframe your Fears	71	**< .001**	**0.094**	**0.7 [0.3; 1.0]**	4.3 (1.1)	0.13	<.001	CBT
Gratitude Practice	71	**< .001**	**0.124**	**0.8 [0.5; 1.1]**	4.7 (1.0)	0.14	<.001	positive
In Flow With Fear	68	**< .001**	**0.16**	**0.9 [0.6; 1.2]**	6.3 (1.2)	0.17	<.001	mindful.
Dare Response	71	**< .001**	**0.17**	**0.9 [0.6; 1.2]**	5.7 (1.0)	0.17	<.001	CBT, ACT
Guided Mindfulness	72	**< .001**	**0.191**	**1.0 [0.7; 1.3]**	6.5 (1.1)	0.19	<.001	mindful.
Reflective Writing	61	**< .001**	**0.215**	**1.1 [0.7; 1.4]**	7.5 (1.3)	0.22	<.001	positive
Defusion	74	**< .001**	**0.264**	**1.2 [0.9; 1.5]**	9.0 (1.3)	0.29	<.001	ACT
Muscle Relaxation	69	**< .001**	**0.274**	**1.3 [0.9; 1.6]**	8.0 (1.1)	0.25	<.001	physiol.
Calming Visualization	76	**< .001**	**0.287**	**1.3 [1.0; 1.6]**	8.7 (1.1)	0.27	<.001	CBT
Mindful Breathing	74	**< .001**	**0.37**	**1.5 [1.2; 1.9]**	9.5 (1.0)	0.30	<.001	mindful.

The difference in improvement is given in STAI state subscale equivalent score (mean, standard error). Type denotes whether an exercise is based primarily on CBT, ACT, mindfulness, positive psychology or whether it is a physiology-oriented relaxation exercise. P and η^2_P are given of the interaction of the mixed ANOVAs with time (pre vs post intervention) as the within-subjects variable, intervention (exercise vs measurement-only control) as the between-subjects variable and anxiety score as the dependent variable. There were 107 participants in the measurement-only control group. Cohen's d of the improvement score is given. For details on means, standard deviations and standard errors pre and post intervention separately, see the appendix. The regression used STAI state subscale equivalent scores, with the improvement score as the outcome variable, and pre score and exercise as predictor (dummy variables with the measurement-only control group as the comparator).

Exploratory analysis

While our study was not designed to be powered for comparisons between exercises, exploratory analyses (Table 3) showed that the effects of the exercises differed more than would be expected by chance.

Table 3: Comparing exercises to each other

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

	CT	Deep B.	Reframe.	Grat.	Flow	Dare	Guid.M.	R. Writ.	Defus.	PMR	C. Vis.	d(exerc.)	M
CT	/											**0.5**	3.4
Deep B.	.05, .766	/										**0.6**	3.0
Reframe.	.11, .506	-.19, .269	/									**0.7**	4.3
Grat.	-.17, .324	-.26, .123	-.05, .766	/								**0.8**	4.7
Flow	-.33, .057	-.43, .013	-.23, .185	-.19, .265	/							**0.9**	6.3
Dare	-.30, .084	-.42, .015	-.18, .283	-.14, .408	.07, .700	/						**0.9**	5.7
Guid.M.	-.38, .027	-.50, .003	-.27, .111	-.23, .166	-.03, .877	-.10, .554	/					**1.0**	6.5
R. Writ.	-.47, .009	-.61, .001	-.37, .037	-.34, .055	-.14, .439	-.22, .223	-.12, .501	/				**1.1**	7.5
Defus.	-.62, .0003	-.75, <.0001	-.52, .002	-.49, .003	-.28, .094	-.37, .026	-.27, .103	-.15, .393	/			**1.2**	9.0
PMR	-.57, .001	-.74, <.0001	-.46, .007	-.44, .011	-.20, .241	-.30, .083	-.19, .273	-.05, .764	.11, .522	/		**1.3**	8.0
C. Vis.	-.64, .0002	-.79, <.0001	-.53, .002	-.51, .002	-.28, .099	-.37, .024	-.27, .107	-.14, .437	.02, .894	-.09, .587	/	**1.3**	8.7
Mindf. B.	-.78, <.0001	-1.00, <.0001	-.67, <.0001	-.66, .0001	-.39, .025	-.51, .003	-.38, .012	-.23, .192	-.06, .719	-.19, .254	-.09, .586	**1.5**	9.5

Cohen's d and two-sided p-value of Welch t-test for comparison between two exercises is given (unadjusted for multiple testing). Data with the time criterion is used. Light green: p < .05. Full green: p < .001. The last two columns show the effect size d and the mean M of each exercise when compared to the measurement-only control. Abbreviations used for the names of the exercises: CT = Cognitive Therapy, Deep B. = Deep Breathing, Reframe. = Reframe Your Fears, Grat. = Gratitude Practice, Flow = In Flow with Fear, Dare = Dare Response, Guid. M. = Guided Mindfulness Meditation, R. Writ. = Reflective Writing, Defus. = Defusion, PMR = (Progressive) Muscle Relaxation, C.Vis. = Calm Visualisation, Mindf. B. = Mindful Breathing.

One way of seeing that the differences between exercises seem to be different from what would be expected by chance is that Bonferroni-adjusting for 66 tests would give a significance threshold for p of .05/66 = .0008, and there are nine comparisons that meet this adjusted significance threshold. Twenty-nine comparisons (40%) had p < .05. This is very different from the 5% comparisons expected to have p < .05 by chance and thus seems to suggest that there might be some real differences between the exercises.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Discussion

The primary objective of our study was to examine the immediate effects of twelve app-based exercises---based on cognitive behavioural therapy, mindfulness, and acceptance and commitment therapy---on anxiety levels. While most of the literature has focused on the very important long term effects of these approaches, understanding immediate impacts is also important, as they are valuable in themselves and likely crucial for compliance. This may be particularly true for self-guided treatments, which lack a therapist who can reinforce compliance. In addition, our study allowed an exploratory comparison of the effects of individual exercises in the same setting. By contrast, previous literature has tended to look at a mix of exercises of one school, or less commonly, one exercise (e.g. (A-tjak et al., 2015; Burton & King, 2008; Firth et al., 2017; Fischer et al., 2020).

Our results revealed that the app interventions were significantly more effective than the control conditions at reducing immediate anxiety. The Cohen's d effect sizes for the different exercises ranged from 0.5 (traditionally considered "medium") to 1.5, with all but two of the twelve exercises over d = 0.8 (traditionally considered "large"). We consider the improvements for all exercises in the app to be clinically relevant. This interpretation is supported by a previous study which found d = 0.5 to be a clinically relevant reduction in anxiety (Bauer-Staeb et al., 2021), as well as roughly by a Cochrane review (Madsen et al., 2020) using the rule of thumb of a 10% improvement being clinically relevant, which translates to d = 0.67 in our study. Cognitive restructuring with the aid of a cognitive distortion list had the smallest effect size (d = 0.5), while mindful breathing had the largest effect size (d = 1.5). Interestingly, deep breathing had a much smaller effect size than mindful breathing (d = 0.6 vs d = 1.5). This seems to suggest that the mindfulness component in mindful breathing made this exercise so effective. It seems intuitive that

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

progressive muscle relaxation and the visualisation exercise were among the most effective exercises, as they are relaxation exercises. Similarly, it was to be expected that immediate positive effects would be achieved by deep breathing, another relaxation exercise, and the positive-psychology exercises of gratitude journaling and reflective writing. Relaxation exercises and the positive-focused exercises have previously been found to have positive immediate effects on anxiety e.g. (Burton & King, 2008; Pawlow, 2002). It is less obvious that cognitive restructuring and even exposure exercises like the “Dare Response” would reduce immediate anxiety, as these methods are not designed for immediate relief. It is encouraging that they did, seeing as there is strong evidence that they are important methods for long term improvement in anxiety. Future research could explore the differences between these exercises further.

These findings align with existing research demonstrating the efficacy of cognitive behavioural therapy, mindfulness, and acceptance and commitment therapy in the management of anxiety (A-tjak et al., 2015; Hofmann et al., 2012; Khoury et al., 2013). In comparison to traditional psychotherapy, which can be impeded by factors such as therapist availability and stigma associated with mental health treatment, digital interventions are more accessible and less stigmatising. Our study supports the growing body of evidence indicating the potential of smartphone-based interventions (Firth et al., 2017) as well as self-guided therapies more generally (Fischer et al., 2020) in managing mental health issues. However, the average treatment effect found in the present study (d = 0.8) is twice as large as the average treatment effect for anxiety found in a recent meta-analysis on self-guided therapies (d = 0.4) (Fischer et al., 2020), and more than twice as large as the average treatment effect for anxiety found in a recent meta-analysis on smartphone-based mental health interventions (Firth et al., 2017). One reason for this discrepancy might be that the present study tested immediate effects while the studies in the meta-analyses tested long-term effects. Considering that the exercises found in the Mind Ease app were previously tested internally and selected by the creators of the app based on their efficacy,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

the finding that all exercises were effective at all was not surprising to us (private correspondence).

Our study is not without limitations. The study design was focused on immediate effects, thus limiting our understanding of the long term efficacy of these exercises. However, the psychotherapy approaches the exercises are based on (CBT, ACT, mindfulness) have well-studied positive long term effects. This study likely underestimates the real treatment effect when using the app for two reasons 1) The participants in this study were recruited through the platform Positly (which uses Amazon Mechanical Turk). These participants were likely less intrinsically interested in the exercises and thus might have put less effort into them than app users would. 2) When using the real app, users do not just have access to one randomly allocated exercise, but all exercises, psychoeducational content, notifications and motivational messaging. Future research could thus investigate the effectiveness over the long-term, across different types of anxiety disorders, using different recruitment methods, and of the app as a whole.

In conclusion, our findings suggest that the twelve app-based exercises we examined had in some cases medium and in most cases large immediate positive effects on anxiety. Considering its accessibility and ease of use, app-based psychotherapy holds potential as a scalable method to alleviate anxiety symptoms in a wide range of individuals, providing an accessible adjunct or alternative to traditional psychotherapy.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Declarations

Authors' contributions

FK, JFS, MZS, PB, SP, and JB conceived of and designed the study. FK wrote the proposal for the ethics committee. FK and JFS preregistered the study. FK ran the participant testing on Positly. JFS analysed the data. JFS wrote and revised the manuscript. JB was the senior author of the study. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

We thank Mind Ease for funding the study and for providing technical support. We thank the participants.

Ethical approval and consent to participate

Ethical approval was obtained from the ethics committee of the University of Oxford (reference number R82884/RE001). Participants gave informed consent to participate before being enrolled.

Consent for publication

This manuscript contains only anonymised data. Participants gave consent for the publication of this data.

Availability of data and materials

The appendix, protocol, data, code, and output of this study are openly available at the Open Science Framework, https://osf.io/36ukh.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Competing interests

FK and JFS were funded by Mind Ease for this research project. MZS was funded by Spark Wave for this research project, which is a part owner of Mind Ease. PB was the CEO and SG the founder of Mind Ease. The conflicts of interest were managed as follows: The funder was involved in planning the study but had no role in data collection, the analysis or interpretation of data, the writing of the report (apart from limited feedback), or the decision to submit the article for publication. Mind Ease had committed in written form to allowing publication irrespective of the results of the study. The study methods and analyses were preregistered. JB had the final say over decisions and was not funded by Mind Ease or associated organisations.

Funding

Funding was provided by Mind Ease Labs Ltd (Third Floor South, One Jubilee Street, Brighton, East Sussex, BN1 1GE, UK).

References

A-tjak, J. G. L., Davis, M. L., Morina, N., Powers, M. B., Smits, J. A. J., & Emmelkamp, P. M. G. (2015). A meta-analysis of the efficacy of acceptance and commitment therapy for clinically relevant mental and physical health problems. In *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics* (Vol. 84, Issue 1, pp. 30–36). S. Karger AG Basel, Switzerland. https://karger.com/pps/article-abstract/84/1/30/282854

Bauer-Staeb, C., Kounali, D.-Z., Welton, N. J., Griffith, E., Wiles, N. J., Lewis, G., Faraway, J. J., & Button, K. S. (2021). Effective dose 50 method as the minimal clinically important difference: Evidence from depression trials. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *137*, 200–208.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Burton, C. M., & King, L. A. (2008). Effects of (very) brief writing on health: the two-minute miracle. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *13*(Pt 1), 9–14.

Conrad, A., & Roth, W. T. (2007). Muscle relaxation therapy for anxiety disorders: it works but how? *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, *21*(3), 243–264.

Field, A. (2013). *Discovering Statistics Using IBM SPSS Statistics*. SAGE.

Firth, J., Torous, J., Nicholas, J., Carney, R., Pratap, A., Rosenbaum, S., & Sarris, J. (2017). The efficacy of smartphone-based mental health interventions for depressive symptoms: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *World Psychiatry: Official Journal of the World Psychiatric Association* , *16*(3), 287–298.

Fischer, R., Bortolini, T., Karl, J. A., Zilberberg, M., Robinson, K., Rabelo, A., Gemal, L., Wegerhoff, D., Nguyễn, T. B. T., Irving, B., Chrystal, M., & Mattos, P. (2020). Rapid Review and Meta-Meta-Analysis of Self-Guided Interventions to Address Anxiety, Depression, and Stress During COVID-19 Social Distancing. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, 563876.

Hayes, S. C., & Hofmann, S. G. (2017). The third wave of cognitive behavioral therapy and the rise of process-based care. *World Psychiatry: Official Journal of the World Psychiatric Association* , *16*(3), 245–246.

Hayes, S. C., Strosahl, K. D., & Wilson, K. G. (2016). *Acceptance and Commitment Therapy, Second Edition: The Process and Practice of Mindful Change*. Guilford Publications.

Hofmann, S. G. (2011). *An Introduction to Modern CBT: Psychological Solutions to Mental Health Problems*. John Wiley & Sons.

Hofmann, S. G., Asnaani, A., Vonk, I. J. J., Sawyer, A. T., & Fang, A. (2012). The Efficacy of Cognitive Behavioral Therapy: A Review of Meta-analyses. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *36*(5), 427–440.

Kabat-Zinn, J. (2009). *Wherever You Go, There You Are: Mindfulness Meditation in Everyday Life*. Hachette UK.

Khoury, B., Lecomte, T., Fortin, G., Masse, M., Therien, P., Bouchard, V., Chapleau, M.-A., Paquin, K., & Hofmann, S. G. (2013). Mindfulness-based therapy: a comprehensive

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.11.27.23299083; this version posted November 29, 2023. The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.
It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *33*(6), 763–771.

Madsen, B. K., Zetner, D., Møller, A. M., & Rosenberg, J. (2020). Melatonin for preoperative and postoperative anxiety in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* , *12*(12), CD009861.

McDonagh, B. (2015). *Dare: The New Way to End Anxiety and Stop Panic Attacks*. BMD Publishing.

Pawlow, L. A. (2002). *The Impact of Abbreviated Progressive Muscle Relaxation on Salivary Cortisol*.

Rector, N. A. (2005). *Anxiety disorders an information guide*.

Schulz, K. F., Altman, D. G., Moher, D., & CONSORT Group. (2011). CONSORT 2010 statement: updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *International Journal of Surgery* , *9*(8), 672–677.

Seligman, M. E. P., Steen, T. A., Park, N., & Peterson, C. (2005). Positive psychology progress: empirical validation of interventions. *The American Psychologist*, *60*(5), 410–421.

Wilcox, R. R. (2011). *Introduction to Robust Estimation and Hypothesis Testing*. Academic Press.

World Health Organization. (2017). *Depression and other common mental disorders: global health estimates*. Geneva: World Health Organization.

Zaccaro, A., Piarulli, A., Laurino, M., Garbella, E., Menicucci, D., Neri, B., & Gemignani, A. (2018). How Breath-Control Can Change Your Life: A Systematic Review on Psycho-Physiological Correlates of Slow Breathing. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *12*, 353.