|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | | | | |  | | | | | **Waiting-list control group** | |  |
| **Protocol-driven feedback** | | | | | **Feedback on demand** | | | | |
|  | Baseline | 2nd assess- ment | Difference compared to waiting list | | | Baseline | 2nd assess- ment | Difference compared to waiting list | | | Baseline | 2nd assess-ment | N per condition |
| Outcome measure | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean* | 95% CI | *p* | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean* | 95% CI | *p* | *Mean (SD)* | *Mean (SD)* | *N* |
| **CIS fatigue severity1** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Sensitivity analysis 1* | 50·7 (5·3) | 36·5 (14.7) | -8·1 | -12·0 to -4·3 | <0·0001 | 49·9 (4·9) | 37·1 (13·2) | -7·0 | -10·6 to -3·5 | 0·0001 | 49·5 (5·3) | 43·9 (10·1) | 80/80/80 |
| *Sensitivity analysis 2* | 50·7 (5·3) | 36·5 (14·7) | -7·8 | -11·6 to -3·9 | 0·0001 | 49·9 (4·9) | 37·1 (13·2) | -6·6 | -10·2 to -3·1 | 0·0003 | 49·5 (5·3) | 43·5 (10·4) | 80/80/80 |
| *Per-protocol analysis* | 50·4 (5·4) | 37·0 (15·0) | -7·5 | -11·6 to -3·4 | 0·0004 | 49·4 (5·2) | 35·2 (13·3) | -8·7 | -12·5 to -4·8 | <0·0001 | 49·5 (5·3) | 44·1 (10·3) | 65/56/76 |
| **Chalder fatigue questionnaire,** completers | 23·5 (5·7) | 16·7 (8·6) | -3·4 | -5·7 to -1·0 | 0·0048 | 24·0 (5·1) | 17·5 (7·5) | -3·0 | -5·2 to -0·8 | 0·0073 | 24·7 (5·0) | 20·8 (7·3) | 75/77/76 |
| **Work and social adjustment scale,** completers2 | 23·6 (6·7) | 16·2 (10·4) | -5·3 | -7·9 to -2·6 | 0·0001 | 22·2 (6·3) | 15·4 (9·3) | -5·1 | -7·6 to -2·7 | <0·0001 | 23·0 (6·9) | 20·8 (9·2) | 73/74/75 |
| **Actigraphy, mean waken score,**  **completers** | 65,4 (17,5) | 73,2 (20,7) | 5,8 | ,5 to 11,0 | 0·0324 | 70,7 (17,6) | 78,8 (21,7) | 9,3 | 4,0 to 14,6 | 0·0008 | 67,6 (18,1) | 66,4 (21,5) | 59/68/60 |

**Table 1** Supplement; Sensitivity analysis, per-protocol analysis and post-hoc analysis of outcome on CFQ, WSAS and actigraphy.

*Note.* SD = standard deviation; 95% CI = 95% confidence interval; 1CIS Checklist Individual Strength; Patients included in per-protocol analysis: at least four CDC symptoms, started treatment, complete data, no other treatments for fatigue during study.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Protocol-driven feedback** | **Feedback on demand** | **Waiting list** | **Protocol-driven feedback versus waiting list,** | **Feedback on demand versus waiting list,** | **Missing data, N** |
| ***p* (*χ2*)** | ***p* (*χ2*)** |
| **Fatigue severity1** | 2/78 (2·6%) | 5/79 (6·3%) | 5/76 (6·6%) | 0·25 | 0·95 | 2/1/4 |
| **Overall impairment2** | 2/75 (2·7%) | 3/77 (3·9%) | 6/76 (7·9%) | 0·15 | 0·30 | 5/3/4 |
| **Physical functioning3** | 6/76 (7·9%) | 2/77 (2·6%) | 3/76 (2·6%) | 0·30 | 0·65 | 4/3/4 |
| **Psychological distress4** | 8/75 (10·7%) | 6/77 (7·8%) | 12/75 (16%) | 0·62 | 0·29 | 5/3/5 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | **Not assessed** |
| **N with self-reported adverse events** | 4/38 (10·5%) | 7/39 (17·9%) | 12/46 (26·1%) | 0·14 | 0·75 | 42/41/34 |
| *Fatigue* | 0 | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |
| *Pain* | 4 | 2 | 5 |  |  |  |
| *Distress* | 0 | 3 | 2 |  |  |  |
| *Other* | 0 | 1 | 4 |  |  |  |
| **Patient-reported ICBT side effects\*** | 3/37 (8·1%) | 3/38 (7·9%) | ^^ | - | - | 43/42 |

**Table 2** Supplement; Number of patients with symptom exacerbation at second assessment

1CIS: Checklist Individual Strength, 2SIP: Sickness Impact Profile, 3SF-36 physical functioning subscale, 4SCL-90: Symptom Checklist-90 items. Clinically significant change criterion was defined as RCI <- 1.96; \*4/75 were temporary complaints; of the remaining two patients, one reported headaches and one lost her job during ICBT; ^^not assessed in the control (waiting-list) group

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Internet variables** | **Protocol-driven feedback** | **Feedback on demand** |
| *M* login frequency | 37 | 39 |
| *\*M* login time (min) | 17 | 19 |
| Started treatment (number; %) | 76/80 (95%) | 74/80 (93%) |
| Full adherence (number; %) | 13/80 (16%) | 15/80 (19%) |
| Adherence without opening the ‘preventing relapse’ module (number; %) | 39/80 (49%) | 74/80 (93%) |

**Table 3** Supplement; Internet login variables per ICBT condition

Full adherence to protocol-driven feedback format: Opened all treatment modules and sent at least 12 emails.

Full adherence to feedback-on-demand format: Opened all treatment modules. \**Note*: Data was lost of 11 patients (four from the protocol-driven feedback condition; 7 from the feedback on demand condition) and could not be traced.