Table 4. Results and predictors relating to the actual acceptability of online and mobile phone-delivered interventions for people with SMI measured by intervention use, module completion rates, and participant satisfaction.

Study reference(s)	Measures of acceptability		Demographic & clinical	Supported vs
	Intervention use & completion rates	Participant satisfaction	characteristics	unsupported
Alvarez-Jimenez	12/20 - used HORYZONS for full 4 weeks	15/20 - had a positive experience (75%);	Not reported (NR)	Not applicable
et al (2013) [47]	(60%); 14/20 - used HORYZONS for ≥3 weeks (70%).	18/20 - would recommend to others (90%); 14/20 - felt it would be a useful long-term treatment option (70%).		(NA)
	3/20 - completed all 7 modules (15%); 9/20 - completed ≥4 modules (45%);			
	12/20 - completed ≥3 modules (60%); 19/20 - completed ≥1 module (95%).			
Gleeson et al (2013)	As above	20/20 - 'agreed' or 'strongly agreed' that HORYZONS was safe & confidential (100%); 18/20 - felt moderation had contributed to safety (90%).	NR	N/A
[40]				
Kuosmanen et al (2009)	NR	All groups (n = 311): 3.09/4 - mean satisfaction score	NR	N/A
[50]		IT education (n = 100): 3.16/5 - mean satisfaction score for meeting technical-scientific care needs; 3.01/4 - mean satisfaction score for meeting information care needs; 3.03/4 - mean satisfaction score for interaction/support care needs.		
Kuosmanen et al (2010)	NR	21/21 - agreed website contained relevant information (100%); 15/21 - agreed website provided new information (72%);	NR	N/A
[2-]		20/21 - agreed website was easy to use (95%) 16/18 - agreed website appearance was successful (90%)		
Pitkänen et al	IT education:	NR	NR	N/A

(2012)	87/100 - attended ≥3/5 sessions (87%). Conventional education:			
[53]	86/106 - attended ≥3/5 sessions (81%).			
Anttila et al (2012) [54]	73/93 - attended all 6 sessions (79%).	NR	No relationship between session attendance &: Age: P = .576; Sex: P = .784; Basic education: P = .969; Vocational education: P = .976 No relationship between session attendance & Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF): P = .093	N/A
Smith et al (2011) [57]	13/24 (54.2%) - posted ≥1 message on discussion forum. 16/24 (66.6%) - completed ≥75% of the program (of total 47 subsections).	NR	NR	N/A
Barnes et al (2015) [59]	Study group: 85/113 - completed 'majority' of sessions (75%). Control group: 83/120 - completed 'majority' of sessions (69%).	NR	NR	N/A
Ben-Zeev et al (2013) [40]	NR	10/12 - 'strongly agreed' or 'agreed' with ease of use (83%); 10/12 - found the system 'helpful' or 'somewhat helpful' (83%).	NR	NR
Ben-Zeev et al	Participants used FOCUS on 86.5% of the	30/32 - satisfied with ease of use (93.7%)	No relationship between	N/A

[60]	study days (total study duration = 1 month): Week 1: average use = 6.7/7 days Week 2: average use = 5.9/7 days	29/32 - satisfied with focus (90.6%); 28/32 - would recommend to a friend (87.5%); 24/32 - would like to use FOCUS often (75%);	FOCUS use &: baseline cognitive functioning, negative symptoms, & persecutory ideation (all <i>P</i> > .05).	
Depp et al (2010) [62]	78% - median percentage of completed surveys (2 week study duration; 4 daily prompts).	Participant ratings (n = 10): 9/10 – median satisfaction rating; 5/5 – median rating for 'I would use this device again'; 5/5 – median rating for 'this could be helpful to me in the future'.	NR	N/A
Depp et al (2015) [63]	65% - compliance in PRISM condition (10 week study duration; 2 daily prompts).	Participant ratings (n = 41): 10/10 – median satisfaction rating; 5/5 – median rating for 'I would use this device again'; 5/5 – median rating for 'a device like this could help me'.	No relationship between compliance &: Age: P = .278; Education: P = .528 No relationship between compliance &: Montgomery Asberg Depression Rating Scale (MADRS): P = .717; Young Manic Rating Scale (YMRS): P = .451; Illness Intrusiveness Scale (IIS): P = .636	N/A
Depp et al (2010) [62]	6/8 (75%) - showed 'consistent engagement' with texts (3 sets of 4 texts daily; 12 week study duration).	NR	NR	N/A
Granholm et al (2012)	Mean rate of valid assessment responses (3 sets of 4 texts daily; 12 week study duration; n = 42):	Participant ratings (n = 42): 3.15/4 – mean helpfulness rating	NR	N/A

[64]	Question 1 - medication adherence: mean = 86%; Question 1 - socialization: mean = 83%; Question 1 - auditory hallucinations: mean = 86%; Question 2 - medication adherence: option 1 mean = 85%; option 2 mean = 85%; Question 2 - socialization: option 1 mean = 78%; option 2 mean = 85%; Question 3 - auditory hallucinations: option 1 mean = 85%; option 2 mean = 84%			
Forchuk et al (2015) [65], personal communication with L Warner, June 2015	NR	Mean satisfaction scores after 12 months: Smartphone – psychotic disorder (n = 234): 5.8/7 – ease of use; 6.4/7 – helpfulness; 5.4/7 – simplicity. Smartphone – personality disorder (n = 24): 4.9/7 – ease of use; 6.3/7 – helpfulness; 5.1/ - simplicity. LSR – psychotic disorder (n = 234): 5/7 – ease of use; 5.5/7 – helpfulness; 5.1/7 – simplicity. LSR – personality disorder (n = 24): 5.1/7 – ease of use; 5.6/7 – helpfulness; 3.9/7 – simplicity.	NR	N/A
Gottlieb et al (2013) [66]	17/21 (81%) - completed ≥60% of the lessons (out of 10 total lessons).	Participant satisfaction ratings (n = 16): 82.4% - felt program was very good/helpful; 88.2% - felt right amount of information was covered; 88.2% - felt website was useful; 76.5% - would be very willing to recommend	NR	N/A

		to others; 52.9% found program very interesting.		
Holländare et al (2015)	NR	Participant satisfaction ratings (n = 4) 50% - fairly satisfied or very satisfied; 50% - neither satisfied nor dissatisfied.	NR	N/A
Kane et al (2013) [68]	NR	Participant ratings (n = 27): 70% - found concept easy to understand; 78% - would like to receive mobile medication reminders; 89% - felt system could be useful.	NR	N/A
Lauder et al (2015)	n = 156: 48% - completed all 5 modules; 75.4% - completed ≥3 modules; 86.2% - completed ≥2 modules.	NR	NR	N/A
Lieberman et al (2011)	n = 64: 84/90 - mean number of days rated	NR	NR	N/A
Miklowitz et al (2012) [73]	n = 19 Weekly text or emails sent for symptom ratings; duration 1–44 months: 81% - average percentage of texts or email prompts responded to.	NR	NR	N/A
Murray et al (2015)	NR	12/16 - would recommend to others (66.7%).	NR	N/A
Nicholas et al (2010) [75]	All conditions: 160/358 - returned all 8 workbooks (44.7%); 263/358 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks (73.5%). BEP + IS: 98/121 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks (81%);	NR	Males completed on average 0.98 fewer workbooks than females; Participants >30 completed on average 1.04 more workbooks.	Adherence significantly higher in BEP + IS compared with BEP: $P = .01$

	BEP: 80/120 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks. (66.7%).		Educational attainment did not predict workbook completion. Levels of symptomology & baseline depression & anxiety scores did not predict workbook completion.	
Proudfoot et al (2012) [76]	All conditions: 301/407 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks (74%); 158/407 - returned 8/8 workbooks (38.8%). BEP + IS: 107/134 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks (79.9%); BEP: 96/139 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks (69.1%); Attentional control: 98/134 - returned ≥4/8 workbooks (73.1%).	NR	Relationship between number of workbooks returned &: Age: P < .001 Sex: P < .001. No relationship between number of workbooks returned & educational attainment. Euthymia, depression scores, & anxiety scores did not predict number of workbooks returned.	Number of workbooks returned significantly higher in BEP + IS compared with BEP: $P < .05$ Number of workbooks returned not significantly different between BEP + IS & attentional control or BEP & attentional control: $P > .05$
Pijnenborg et al (2010) [77]	NR	32/46 - gave positive evaluations (70%); 19/46 - felt text messages were effective (41%); 22/46 - were willing to continue with text messages after intervention finished (47%).	NR	N/A
Rizvi et al (2011)	Study duration: 10–14 days 85% - mean compliance with daily	22/22 - would use tool on own initiative (100%);	NR	N/A

[31]	assessments.			
[00]		n = 176:		
		DBT coach was helpful 96.8% of the time;		
		Participant satisfaction ratings (n = 22):		
		4.05/5 – mean score for 'how likely is it that		
		you would use this in your treatment?';		
		3.8/5 – mean score for overall helpfulness; 3.32/5 – mean score for enjoyment.		
		3.32/3 — mean score for enjoyment.		
Rotondi et al	16/16 (100%) - 'engaged' with treatment	11/16 - rated 'very much' or 'extremely' for	Significant positive	N/A
(2005, 2010)	(contribution in forum on ≥13 visits & use of	ease of use (68.8%);	relationship between	
[78,79]	educational material on ≥4 visits).	15/16- rated 'very much' or 'extremely' for value of website (93.8%).	severity of positive symptoms & increased	
[, 0,, 0]		value of wedsite (ostovo).	SOAR access:	
			P = .009;	
			increased SOAR usage: <i>P</i> = .005	
Rotondi et al	NR	Participant ratings (n = 38)	NR	N/A
(2015)		4.01/5 – mean rating for 'easy to use		
1001				
[80] Simon et al	After 21 days:	NR	NR	Coaching
(2010)	Coaching group (n = 64):			group showed
	24/64 - returned after sign-up (38%);			significantly
[81]	12/64 - started or updated any section of			higher use of
	recovery plan (19%); 6/64 - used medication & side effects self-			website after 21 days in all
	monitoring (10%);			but 2
	5/64 - used goal progression self-monitoring			components.
	(8%);			
	5/64 - used warning sign self-monitoring (8%);			
	10/64 - used discussion groups (16%); 7/64 - used peer-to-peer messages (11%)			
	7704 used peer-to-peer messages (1170)			
	Program-only group (n = 54):			
	5/54 - returned after sign-up (9%);			
	0/54 - started or updated any section of recovery plan (0%);			
	0/54 - used any self-monitoring tools & social			

	networking (0%).			
Todd et al (2014) [83]	9/15 - average number of completed modules (60%). n = 61: 29% - completed 1–5 modules; 31% - completed 6–14 modules; 34% - completed all 15 modules.	NR	NR	N/A
van der Krieke et al (2012) [84]	NR	n = 15: 73.6/90 - mean satisfaction score; 13/15 - would recommend to others (86%); 12/15 - agreed website provided meaningful information (80%); 9/15 - agreed they would use website in the future (60%);	NR	N/A
van der Krieke et al (2013) [85]	34/48 (71%) - used 'full functionality' of decision aid.	22/29 - felt well informed (76%); 22/29 - felt the advice helped them reflect (76%); 20/27 - would recommend to others (74%); 20/28 - easy to use (71%); 12/27 - said it helped them prepare to meet with clinicians (44%).	NR	N/A
Wenze et al (2014) [86]	n = 14 25.64 /28 (91.57%) - average completion of sessions	Participant ratings (n = 14): 4.29/5 – average score for overall satisfaction; 4.25/5 – average score for helpfulness; 4.46/5 – average score for ease of use.	No significant relationship between completion rates &: manic symptoms: $P = .77$; depressive scores: $P = .06$ (association at 10% level) No significant relationships between overall satisfaction or ease of use &:	

	manic symptoms: $P > .10$; depressive scores: $P > .10$.
	No significant relationship between perceived helpfulness &: depressive scores: $P > .10$; manic symptoms: $P = .07$ (association at 10% level).