Full title: Accessibility and public availability of treatment protocols and manuals for evidence-based psychological interventions for severe mental disorders: A systematic survey of randomized trials

Chrysanthi Blithikioti, PhD[1], https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4569-9639

Giuliano Tomei, PhD[1], https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1516-1830

Fabrizio Visconti, Msc[1], https://orcid.org/0009-0007-2774-8616

Irene Gómez Gómez, PhD[2], https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8014-6955

Ioana Alina Cristea, PhD[1], https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9854-7076

[1] Department of General Psychology, University of Padova, Italy

[2] Department of Psychology, Universidad Loyola Andalucía, Spain

Correspondence to:

Ioana Alina Cristea

Department of General Psychology, University of Padova

Via Venezia 8, 35131, Padova, Italy

e-mail: ioanaalina.cristea@unipd.it

phone: +390498276595

Word-count: 3473

Abstract

Question: The components of evidence-based psychological interventions for mental disorders are described in protocols and manuals, but are these resources accessible or publicly available?

Study selection and analysis: We surveyed randomized controlled trials (RCTs) from six large network meta-analyses of psychological interventions for severe mental disorders (psychotic, borderline personality disorder, substance use disorder, bipolar disorder, anorexia nervosa, bulimia nervosa). Between January and December 2024, we searched for protocols and manuals with a multipronged approach (published protocol, trial registries, author contact, commercial availability. We report the proportion of trials and intervention arms for which protocols or manuals were (1) accessible, i.e., retrievable by any method, and (2) publicly available.

Findings: We included 260 RCTs, with 401 active intervention arms. We retrieved published protocols for 20 RCTs (8%, 95% confidence interval/CI 5% to 12%). For the remaining 240 trials, we contacted 450 authors. Authors shared protocols for 43 trials (18%, 95% CI 13% to 23%), refused to share for 73 (30%, 95% CI 25% to 37%) and did not respond for 101 (42%, 95% CI 36% to 49%). Protocols or manuals were retrievable for 318 (79%, 95% CI 75% to 83%) and publicly available for 88 (22%, 95% CI 18% to 26%) active intervention arms, respectively.

Conclusions: Access to detailed descriptions of psychological interventions, even using multiple methods, is difficult, hampering examinations of treatment components. Relying only on open-access resources and sharing from authors allows access to about one third of trial protocols or manuals.

Funding: European Union (European Research Council)

Key messages

What is already known on this topic: Access to treatment protocols or manuals, which detail the ingredients of psychological interventions and conditions of application, is paramount to evaluating these treatments. There is no previous systematic overview of the accessibility of protocols and manuals.

What this study adds: In a large-scale evaluation of 401 evidence-based psychological interventions for severe mental disorders, studied in 260 randomized trials, sourced from 6 large network meta-analyses, we could retrieve a detailed intervention description, operationalized as a protocol or manual, for about 80% of the active interventions. Almost half of the protocols or manuals were only available commercially, and only around a fifth were publicly available. The retrieval rates are based on a resource-intensive, multipronged approach, through searching multiple sources (papers, trials registries, Google for commercially available manuals) and extensive author contact.

How this study might affect research, practice or policy

Our findings invite to reflection on the utility of developing and evaluating treatments for which the full list of ingredients and conditions of application (the equivalent of the label in drug regulation) are largely inaccessible to the public and difficult to access by other researchers. To improve dissemination of effective psychological treatments- a global mental health priority, public availability of treatment manuals is crucial. Funders, journals, and trial registries could require sharing of treatment protocols, at least for research purposes.

Background

Psychological interventions for mental disorders are complex, including multiple, potentially interacting, components[1]. They are effectively "packages", composed of an array of elements, such as practices or techniques, spanning behavioural, interpersonal, cognitive and emotional domains[2]. There is currently no systematically developed, comprehensive taxonomy of components of psychological interventions for adult mental disorders. Identifying active ingredients was identified as a stringent research priority in position papers such as *The Institute of Medicine* report on psychosocial interventions[3] and *The Lancet Psychiatry Commission*[4] on psychological treatments research. Conversely, a classification of active ingredients has been developed for common mental disorders in youth[5], based on 322 randomized controlled trials (RCTs) that tested 615 different treatment protocols, distilled in 41 discrete clinical techniques

Without knowledge of active ingredients, psychological interventions are evaluated as a whole or across broad categories (e.g., cognitive behavioral therapy/CBT). This level of analysis is broad and imprecise, significantly curtailing the investigation of variability in treatment response and of potential mechanisms of action. To address this problem, The European Research Council (ERC)-funded *"Disentangling psychological interventions for mental disorders into a taxonomy of active ingredients"*(DECOMPOSE) project (https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101042701) aims to dismantle psychological interventions for severe mental disorders into their constituent elements and subsequently integrate these in an unified, cross-disorder taxonomy, with uniform labels and definitions. A crucial prerequisite for achieving this goal is access to detailed descriptions of the interventions. Trials of psychological interventions are often poorly reported[6 7], and interventions in particular are cursorily and incompletely described[8] as "packages" simply referencing the manual. Therefore, access to the

intervention protocols or manuals is crucial for identifying constituent elements. Though treatment protocols or manuals are analogous to the package insert or labels for drugs, systematic evaluations of their availability have been scarce. No previous research attempted to retrieve treatment protocols or manuals for evidence-based psychological interventions across multiple mental disorders.

Objective

We report the first large-scale survey using RCTs selected from network meta-analyses (NMAs) of psychological interventions for severe mental disorders. We examine what proportion of protocols or manuals (1) can be retrieved, using a multiplicity of approaches, and (2) are publicly available, a key factor in dissemination.

Study selection and analysis

Selection of studies

The methodology was a survey of randomized trials, sampled from network meta-analyses. The study was not a systematic review since no systematic search conducted to identify the studies. As there are no dedicated reporting guidelines for this study type, we used the PRISMA reporting guidelines insofar as possible.

To assemble a large collection of evidence-based psychological interventions, we relied on published NMAs as a source of building a large cohort of RCTs. Network meta-analyses combine large collections of trials, with various comparators, thereby ensuring that even interventions studied less frequently are represented. We focused on severe mental disorders, which received limited attention in terms of identifying and evaluating treatments components. Meta-analyses were selected based on recency, number of included trials, and if possible, inclusion of psychological interventions as a stand-alone, not adjunctive, treatment. Our goal was to have a non-exhaustive sample of relatively recent NMAs of psychological interventions, from which to then select RCTs. We included the following NMAs: schizophrenia and psychotic[9], bipolar disorders[10], eating disorders (bulimia[11] and anorexia nervosa[12]), substance use disorders[13] and borderline personality disorder[14]. From each of the six NMAs, we selected all included RCTs and for each RCT, all active intervention arms. Active arms were defined as any psychological intervention delivered according to a protocol or manual (i.e., excluding not otherwise specified arms, like treatment as usual).

Identification and retrieval of treatment protocols

We used a multipronged approach combining various sources of information, to identify intervention protocols or manuals for RCTs and arms. Protocols were defined as detailed

descriptions or the intervention, for example by session or by modules, developed for the purpose of the trial. Manuals were defined as the full description of the intervention, usually as a book written by the treatment developer. First, for each trial report, one researcher (CB, GT, FV, IGG) perused the description of treatment arms in the Methods section and extracted any reference to a protocol or manual. Supplementary material was also checked for any protocols included with the publication. For all references identified, we examined if they contained a detailed description of the intervention. Second, trial registration numbers, when available, were extracted from each paper. Trial registrations checked for the presence of any protocol. Third, for the studies where no detailed intervention description was identified with the first two approaches, we extracted the names of the first, last and corresponding author. We queried Google for their current e-mail addresses. If no valid addresses were found, we searched for others from the author team. A common mail template (S1 Text) was developed, which included information about the objectives of the project (i.e., identifying active ingredients of psychological treatments) and a complete trial reference, and asked authors if they could provide the treatment protocols for the interventions used in the trial. The text explicitly stated that for our purposes both published and unpublished protocols, such as the ones developed *ad hoc* for use in the trial, were valid sources of information. Emails were sent to first authors, followed by last and corresponding, depending on the e-mail addressed identified. In case of no replies, reminders we sent between 2 and 8 weeks after the first mail. We sent additional reminders if authors claimed to send materials subsequently and did not follow-back. If no reply was received, other authors were contacted. We also reached out to other authors when those contacted indicated others had retained the protocol or manual. Fourth, if no treatment protocols were identified in steps 1-3, we searched Google for the manuals cited in the trial reports for

each active intervention arm to assess if they were commercially or publicly available. For each protocol or manual retrieved, we checked if it was publicly available, defined as access with no restrictions, as for example open-access manuals or publications, preprints, post-prints and others.

Data extraction and synthesis

For each trial, we noted how many protocols or manuals we retrieved as (1) published (as supplement to the trial report or as separate publications), (2) from trial registries and (3) through author contact. These results were summarized by trial and by disorder, considering the protocol retrieved if it was available for at least one of the intervention arms. As some of the trials tested more than one active interventions, we also tabulated protocol or manual availability by active treatment arms. For step 4, we only report results by arm, given that in multi-arm trials, only some of the protocols would have to be retrieve by purchasing them, where others had already been obtained.

For each disorder, we considered total number of arms with protocols or manuals (1) *accessible*, i.e. retrieval from any source (published paper, trial registry, author contact, commercially available) and (2) *publicly available*.

Results are presented descriptively, as counts and proportions, with 95% confidence intervals (CI), calculated with the Clopper-Pearson method in Stata/SE version 16.1.

Findings

Selection of trials

From the 6 selected network meta-analyses, we identified 260 independent RCTs with a total of 401 intervention arms. Figure 1 presents a PRISMA-type flow diagram of the selection and identification of the studies and protocols.

Retrieval of treatment protocols and manuals by trial

Steps 1 and 2 were conducted between January and April 2024. As shown in Table 1, we retrieved protocols (published independently or as supplements) for 20/260 trials (8%, 95% CI 5% to 20%). We identified trial registration numbers for 72/260 trials (28%, 95% CI 22% to 34%) (Table 1, S2 Table). For 12/260 studies (5%, 95% CI 2% to 8%), trial registries contained intervention protocols, all of which had been identified previously, leading to 20 trials (8%, 95% CI 5% to 12%) with intervention protocols after step 1 and 2 of our procedure, leading to 240 trials without published protocols for step 3.

Table 1. Retrieval of intervention descriptions from published protocols and trial registrations

	RCTs	Protocol (published)[i)]	% protocol published (95% CI)[ii)]	Trial registration	% registered (95% CI)[ii)]	Description (registration)
Psychosis	93	5	5% (2% to 12%)	21	23% (15% to 32%)	3
BPD	43	5	12% (4% to 25%)	16	37% (23% to 53%)	3
SUD	50	1	2% (0.5% to 11%)	13	26% (15% to 40%)	0
Bipolar	40	6	15% (6% to 30%)	11	27% (15% to 44%)	4

Anorexia	13	3	23% (5% to 54%)	6	46% (19% to 75%)	2
Bulimia	21	0	0%	5	24% (8% to 47%)	0
TOTAL	**260**	**20**	**8% (5% to 12%)**	**72**	**28% (22% to 34%)**	**12**

Note. BPD, Borderline personality disorder; CI, confidence interval; SUD, Substance Use Disorder; RCT, randomized controlled trial
[i)] As supplement or as separate paper
[ii)] Out of total number of trials

In step 3, we could not identify any e-mail address for 11/240 trials (4%, 95% CI 2% to 8%). For the remaining 230 trials (229 trials without a protocol and one that was initially erroneously classified as having no published protocol), we contacted a total of 450 authors between April and July 2024. Author replies are classified in Table 2 and S1 Table.

Table 2. Retrieval of intervention descriptions through author contact

	RCTs	**No email**	**AU contacted**	**Positive replies[i)]**	**Negative replies[ii)]**	**No reply**
Psychosis	88	4	131	21	17	46
BPD	38	1	133	9	21	7
SUD	50[iii)]	3	53	13	8	26
Bipolar	34	2	42	6	8	18
Anorexia	10	0	41	4	4	2
Bulimia	21	1	50	3	15	2
TOTAL	**241**	**11**	**450**	**56**	**73**	**101**

Note. AU, Author; BPD, Borderline personality disorder; SUD, Substance Use Disorder; RCT, randomized controlled trial

[i)] Include RCTs for which the authors sent the protocol/manual or extra information other than the protocol or manual

[ii)] Include RCTs for which the authors did not send the protocol/manual; referred us to commercially available manuals, suggesting purchasing; promised to follow-up, but did not; other reasons for refusal

[iii)] One trial was initially erroneously classified as having no published protocol and authors were contacted.

We classified responses as positive for 56 of the 240 trials with no protocols (23%, 95% CI 18% to 29%). Of these, for 43/240 (18%, 95% CI 13% to 23%) trials, authors provided us with the protocol (in English or another language) or the manual of the intervention. For 13 trials (5%, 95% CI 3% to 9%), the authors sent additional information that did not contain the intervention protocol, manual or detailed description: extra references and papers (9), a PhD thesis (1), a Master thesis (1), a protocol from a trial registry (1), the document submitted for ethical approval (1)

We classified responses as negative for 73/240 trials (30%, 95% CI 25% to 37%). Of these, for 33 trials (14%, 95% CI 10% to 19%), the authors responded that the protocol was not available or that they had no access. For 21 trials (9%, 95% CI 5% to 13%), authors referred us to published, commercially available versions of the protocol or manual, suggesting we purchase these. For 13 trials (5%, 95% CI 3% to 9%), authors promised to follow-up, but never did, despite reminders, or forwarded our request to other members of the research team who would send the protocol. Finally, for 6 trials (3%, 95% CI 0.9% to 6%), authors refused to provide any materials for the following reasons: unspecified personal reasons (1), not involved in treatment development (1), intervention not manualized (1) protocol is retained by first author who cannot be contacted due to unexpected incident (1), no justification given (2). For the remaining 101

trials (42%, 95% CI 36% to 49%) we received no answer from any of the contacted authors, despite reminders.

Finally, in Step 4, we looked for commercially available manuals for the trials where we had identified nothing in previous steps. Public and commercial availability of manuals or protocols were checked between November and December 2024.

Accessibility and public availability of treatment protocols by arm

As shown in S3 Table and Figure 1, overall, protocols or manuals were retrievable for 318 of 401 active intervention arms (79%, 95% CI 75% to 83%), considering all the approaches (published paper, trial registry, author contact, available commercially).

Of these, for 88 active arms, protocols or manuals were publicly available (22%, 95% CI 18% to 26%) and for 46 (11%, 95% CI 9% to 15%) we had obtained them from the authors. For 184 active interventions (46%, 95% CI 41% to 51%), protocols or manuals were only available commercially.

Conclusions and clinical implications

In a large-scale evaluation of 401 evidence-based psychological interventions for severe mental disorders, studied in 260 randomized trials, sourced from 6 large network meta-analyses, we could retrieve a detailed intervention description, operationalized as a protocol or manual, for about 80% of the active interventions. Considering publicly available protocols or manuals only, this rate was reduced by almost 4 times, at 22%. Almost half of the protocols or manuals were only available commercially (as pay-walled publications or books that could be purchased). The retrieval rate is based on a resource-intensive, multipronged approach, which involved searching multiple sources (papers, trials registries, Google for commercially available manuals), as well as extensive author contact. Only 8% of the trials were associated to a protocol (published separately or as supplement), describing the intervention in detail. Under 30% of the trials were registered, and in only 5% of the trials the registration contained detailed intervention descriptions. Author contact led to the retrieval of an additional 43 protocols, amounting to around 20% of the trials with no protocol previously identified from reports and trial registries and 11% of the total active intervention arms. Of the 450 authors contacted, we received no reply, despite reminders, for around 40% of the trials. For another 30% of trials, authors declined to provide protocols or manuals, frequently suggesting we purchase them, despite the fact we clearly indicated our use was exclusively for research. For 5% of the trials, we could not identify contact data. Therefore, author contact led to positive, helpful replies for around a quarter of the trials.

Psychological treatments for mental disorders are *de facto* medical treatments, and treatment protocols and manuals could be viewed as analogous to the package inserts or labels in drug regulation, where the ingredients, indications, usage, dose, administration and other details

are specified. Therefore, it is concerning that for a fifth of active intervention arms, we could not retrieve *any* protocol or manual, not even for purchase. Importantly, we selected interventions studied in randomized controlled trials included in network meta-analyses. These allow for the combination of large collections of trials, even for interventions studied infrequently, and are considered the highest level of evidence in treatment guidelines[15]. Consequently, we can be reasonably certain that our analysis covered most evidence-based interventions for these disorders. Moreover, we considered severe mental disorders, for which interventions are often specialized, based on distinct theoretical models, and tested in few trials. It is likely that several of these have specific and distinct components, not found in other treatments packages, and difficult to characterize in the absence of a detailed intervention description,

Without access to protocols or manuals, at least for explicit research purposes such as the identifying active ingredients in the DECOMPOSE project, the content of psychological interventions remains a black box. Consequently, meta-analyses examining the differential efficacy of treatment components ("component network meta-analyses"[16]) are severely limited to descriptions of the interventions in the paper and supplement. Completeness of reporting for psychological interventions, for example as assessed with the Template for Intervention Description and Replication (TIDieR)[17], received very little study. However, the few existent analyses showed inadequate reporting for interventions (including psychological) for alcohol use disorders[18] and for psychological interventions for pain after knee replacement[19]. We could not identify any analysis of completeness of intervention reporting for other mental disorders. Similarly, examinations of the availability of treatment manuals for psychological interventions have been quasi non-existent, except for a small analysis of 27 trials set in low- and middle-income countries[20]. Of the 19 trials that reported using a manual, only 8 were referenced in the

bibliography and only 2 were publicly available. However, the authors did not also attempt to retrieve manuals, as we have done here. One planned scoping review[21] aims to characterize book-based psychotherapy manuals published up to 2022, with no results reported yet.

A little over a fifth of active intervention arms had publicly available protocols or manuals. Relying only on open-access resources and sharing from authors, a researcher would be able to access about one third of trial protocols or manuals. These findings are in stark contrast with recent calls for making treatment manuals for psychological interventions freely available, particularly as many interventions were developed with public funds[22]. Public access to treatment manuals is also key to treatment dissemination, particularly in low resourced settings, where access to and uptake of psychological treatments are woefully insufficient. For example, for schizophrenia there has been limited implementation of psychosocial interventions, with a median treatment gap of 69%, reaching 89% in low-income countries[23]. Similarly, for research purposes, it is unreasonable to expect most researchers would have the resources of going through the cost- and time-intensive process of manual retrieval we employed. Relatedly, author contact, the most immediate retrieval method if a protocol is not publicly available, produced modest results. Only 43 additional protocols were sent by authors, amounting to only 11% of all active intervention arms. Most authors were either not available or not willing to share.

Our study has several limitations. First, we only focused on severe mental disorders, for which psychological interventions are highly specialized and tested in few trials. Therefore, it is more likely that developers would be protective of the manuals and that there are fewer similar interventions, with overlapping components. Similar evaluations could be conducted for more common mental disorders, like depression or anxiety, where protocols are tested in more trials and where distinct protocols often share multiple components. Second, we did not contact all

authors involved in the trial. However, given our extensive procedure, it is very likely we reached the lead authors or treatment developers. Third, for the approximately one fifth of active arms for which we did not manage to retrieve a manual, it could still have been possible to identify one, perhaps by retrieving hard copies of older manuals. We also did not tabulate the cases in which the authors made adaptions or modifications of a previous manual. In such cases, if modifications are reasonably described, the original manual could supplant the missing protocol. Fourth, we did not attempt to tabulate results by unique intervention arms, which might have improved retrieval rates is the same protocol had been used in more trials. As many trials described changes and adaptations of existent manuals, we often could not be sure that the same intervention had been employed across multiple trials. Moreover, it is likely that if the same intervention had been used in more trials, the same protocol would been referenced, so we would have identified it. Fifth, we did not check whether other entities, such as funders, could have retained a copy of the intervention manual. It is also possible that some trial reports contained a sufficiently complete intervention description to allow for identification of components, but in the absence of a protocol, we could not be sure the intervention was described completely.

Overall, our findings show that access to detailed descriptions of psychological interventions is challenging and burdensome, hampering much-needed examinations of treatment components. The field could reflect on the utility of developing and evaluating treatments for which the full list of ingredients and conditions of application (the equivalent of the label in drug regulation) is largely inaccessible to the public and difficult to access by other researchers. To improve dissemination of effective psychological treatments, acknowledged as a global mental health priority[24], public availability of treatment manuals is crucial. Funders could consider mandating sharing of the treatment protocol, at least for research purposes. Some medical

journals such as *Lancet* and *JAMA* family journal, *New England Journal of Medicine*, *Plos Medicine* or *Nature Medicine* currently mandate the inclusion of trial protocols for published randomized trials, a policy that should be generalized across journals. Trial registries could also require the inclusion of the trial protocol. However, it would be important to make sure intervention descriptions in trial protocols are detailed and complete. More systematic investigations into completeness of intervention reporting of psychological interventions for mental disorders, for example through using TIDieR, could provide an estimate of the feasibility of identifying active ingredients based on what is reporting in the paper or in trial protocols shared with publication. Finally, systematic investigation into the accessibility of treatment manuals and protocols are necessary to establish for what proportion of evidence-based psychological interventions can we ascertain what was contained in the treatment delivered.

References

1. Kühne F, Ehmcke R, Härter M, et al. Conceptual decomposition of complex health care interventions for evidence synthesis: a literature review. *Journal of evaluation in clinical practice* 2015;21(5):817-23. doi: 10.1111/jep.12384 [published Online First: 2015/05/23]
2. Singla DR, Kohrt BA, Murray LK, et al. Psychological Treatments for the World: Lessons from Low- and Middle-Income Countries. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 2017;13(1):149-81. doi: 10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-045217
3. Committee on Developing Evidence-Based Standards for Psychosocial Interventions for Mental D, Board on Health Sciences P, Institute of M. The National Academies Collection: Reports funded by National Institutes of Health. In: England MJ, Butler AS, Gonzalez ML, eds. Psychosocial Interventions for Mental and Substance Use Disorders: A Framework for Establishing Evidence-Based Standards. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US) 2015.
4. Holmes EA, Ghaderi A, Harmer CJ, et al. The Lancet Psychiatry Commission on psychological treatments research in tomorrow's science. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2018;5(3):237-86. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(17)30513-8
5. Chorpita BF, Daleiden EL. Mapping evidence-based treatments for children and adolescents: application of the distillation and matching model to 615 treatments from 322 randomized trials. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology* 2009;77(3):566-79. doi: 10.1037/a0014565 [published Online First: 2009/06/03]
6. Nutu D, Gentili C, Naudet F, et al. Open Science Practices in Clinical Psychology Journals: An Audit Study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 2019 doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/abn0000414
7. Grant SP, Mayo-Wilson E, Melendez-Torres GJ, et al. Reporting Quality of Social and Psychological Intervention Trials: A Systematic Review of Reporting Guidelines and Trial Publications. *PLOS ONE* 2013;8(5):e65442. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0065442
8. Hoffmann TC, Oxman AD, Ioannidis JP, et al. Enhancing the usability of systematic reviews by improving the consideration and description of interventions. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2017;358:j2998. doi: 10.1136/bmj.j2998
9. Mc Glanaghy E, Turner D, Davis GA, et al. A network meta-analysis of psychological interventions for schizophrenia and psychosis: Impact on symptoms. *Schizophrenia research* 2021;228:447-59. doi: 10.1016/j.schres.2020.12.036 [published Online First: 2021/02/13]
10. Miklowitz DJ, Efthimiou O, Furukawa TA, et al. Adjunctive Psychotherapy for Bipolar Disorder: A Systematic Review and Component Network Meta-analysis. *JAMA Psychiatry* 2021;78(2):141-50. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.2993
11. Slade E, Keeney E, Mavranezouli I, et al. Treatments for bulimia nervosa: a network meta-analysis. *Psychological medicine* 2018;48(16):2629-36. doi: 10.1017/s0033291718001071 [published Online First: 2018/05/08]
12. Solmi M, Wade TD, Byrne S, et al. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of psychological interventions for the treatment of adult outpatients with anorexia nervosa: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *The lancet Psychiatry* 2021;8(3):215-24. doi: 10.1016/s2215-0366(20)30566-6 [published Online First: 2021/02/19]
13. De Crescenzo F, Ciabattini M, D'Alò GL, et al. Comparative efficacy and acceptability of psychosocial interventions for individuals with cocaine and amphetamine addiction: A

systematic review and network meta-analysis. *PLoS medicine* 2018;15(12):e1002715. doi: 10.1371/journal.pmed.1002715
14. Setkowski K, Palantza C, van Ballegooijen W, et al. Which psychotherapy is most effective and acceptable in the treatment of adults with a (sub)clinical borderline personality disorder? A systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Psychological medicine* 2023;53(8):3261-80. doi: 10.1017/s0033291723000685 [published Online First: 2023/05/19]
15. Leucht S, Chaimani A, Cipriani AS, et al. Network meta-analyses should be the highest level of evidence in treatment guidelines. *European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience* 2016;266(6):477-80. doi: 10.1007/s00406-016-0715-4
16. Caldwell DM, Welton NJ. Approaches for synthesising complex mental health interventions in meta-analysis. *Evidence-based mental health* 2016;19(1):16-21. doi: 10.1136/eb-2015-102275 [published Online First: 2016/01/23]
17. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, et al. Better reporting of interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2014;348:g1687. doi: 10.1136/bmj.g1687 [published Online First: 2014/03/13]
18. Vassar M, Pollard J, Rorah D, et al. Assessment of the completeness of intervention reporting of randomized clinical trials for alcohol use disorders: Effect of the TIDieR checklist and guide. *Drug Alcohol Depend* 2020;208:107824. doi: 10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2019.107824 [published Online First: 2020/02/06]
19. Whale K, Wylde V, Beswick A, et al. Effectiveness and reporting standards of psychological interventions for improving short-term and long-term pain outcomes after total knee replacement: a systematic review. *BMJ open* 2019;9(12):e029742. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2019-029742
20. Watts S, van Ommeren M, Cuijpers P. Open access of psychological intervention manuals. *World Psychiatry* 2020;19(2):251-52. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/wps.20756
21. Wislocki K, Tran ML, Petti E, et al. The Past, Present, and Future of Psychotherapy Manuals: Protocol for a Scoping Review. *JMIR Res Protoc* 2023;12:e47708. doi: 10.2196/47708 [published Online First: 2023/06/30]
22. Cuijpers P, Boyce N, van Ommeren M. Why treatment manuals of psychological interventions should be freely available. *The Lancet Psychiatry* 2024;11(5):325-26. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(24)00071-3
23. Lora A, Kohn R, Levav I, et al. Service availability and utilization and treatment gap for schizophrenic disorders: a survey in 50 low- and middle-income countries. *Bulletin of the World Health Organization* 2012;90(1):47-54, 54a-54b. doi: 10.2471/blt.11.089284 [published Online First: 2012/01/25]
24. Patel V, Saxena S, Lund C, et al. The Lancet Commission on global mental health and sustainable development. *The Lancet* 2018;392(10157):1553-98. doi: 10.1016/S0140-6736(18)31612-X

Figure captions

Fig 1. Flow diagram of study selection and retrieval of protocols and manuals for active intervention arms

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

All metadata and data extracted for this study, except for personal data (name and e-mail contact of authors contacted), along with the data dictionary, are publicly available on the Zenodo repository DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14543415.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding

This work is supported by an European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant "Disentangling psychological interventions for mental disorders into a taxonomy of active ingredients" (Grant Agreement 101042701 – DECOMPOSE, principal investigator Ioana Alina Cristea, project URL https://cordis.europa.eu/project/id/101042701), funded by the European Union. Chrysanthi Blithikioti, Giuliano Tomei, Fabrizio Visconti and Ioana Alina Cristea are supported from DECOMPOSE.

Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them. The

funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

Conceptualization: IAC

Data curation: CB, GT, FV, IGG

Formal analysis: CB, IAC

Funding acquisition: IAC

Investigation: CB, GT, FV, IGG

Methodology: IAC

Project administration: IAC

Supervision: IAC

Validation: CB, GT, FV, IGG

Visualization: CB, IGG

Writing-original draft: IAC, CB

Writing- review and editing: GT, FV, IGG


Network meta-analyses (N=6)
Randomized controlled trials (N=260)
Active intervention arms (N= 401)
No protocol retrieved) (N= 83)
Protocol publicly available (N= 88)
Protocol available from authors (N= 46)
Protocol commercially available (N= 184)