

The Treatment of PTSD in Refugees and Asylum Seekers using Imagery Rescripting within an NHS setting

Journal:	<i>Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy</i>
Manuscript ID	BCP-02089-22.R1
Manuscript Type:	Main
Keywords:	PTSD, refugee, asylum seeker, imagery rescripting, case series
Abstract:	<p>Background: Refugees and asylum seekers present with high levels of PTSD, whilst little research has been conducted to assess the effectiveness or acceptability of psychological interventions for this group. Imagery rescripting is effective in reducing distressing intrusive memories within a range of conditions. The current study evaluates this approach for the treatment of PTSD in refugees and asylum seekers within a UK NHS service.</p> <p>Aims: To evaluate the clinical outcomes of using imagery rescripting for the treatment of PTSD in U.K. based refugees and asylum seekers.</p> <p>Method: Ten adult service-users from an NHS specialist service with a primary diagnosis of PTSD were recruited as part of routine service delivery. A multiple baseline design was used with participants randomly allocated to a baseline varying from 5 to 9 weeks. A baseline wait-period was followed by up to 5 sessions of psychoeducation and treatment preparation, in turn followed by up to 10 sessions of imagery rescripting. The Posttraumatic Symptom Scale (PSS) and Physical Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) were collected every week during baseline, at end of treatment and weekly for 5-weeks after treatment, and again at 12-weeks follow-up. Data were analysed with mixed regression.</p> <p>Results: Results indicate a significant improvement both in PTSD symptoms and mood, and that this was attributable to the imagery rescripting phase of the intervention, and not the passage of time or non-specific therapy factors.</p> <p>Conclusions: Evidence indicates imagery rescripting to be a safe and effective treatment choice for PTSD in refugees and asylum seekers.</p>

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

**The Treatment of PTSD in Refugees and Asylum Seekers using Imagery Rescripting
within an NHS setting**

Steel, Craig^{1,2*}, Young, Kerry³, Akbar, Sameena³, Chessell, Zoe³, Stevens, Adele⁴, Vann,
Millay³ & Arntz, Arnoud⁵.

*Correspondence: craig.steel@hmc.ox.ac.uk

¹ Oxford Health NHS Foundation Trust, U.K.

² University of Oxford. U.K.

³ Central and North West London NHS Foundation Trust, U.K.

⁴ Berkshire Healthcare NHS Foundation Trust, U.K.

⁵ University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

The data that support the findings of this study are available on request from the
corresponding author, [CS]. The data are not publicly available due to data containing
information that could compromise the privacy of research participants.

Corresponding Author: Craig Steel, The Oxford Institute of Clinical Psychology Training and
Research, Warneford Hospital, Oxford, OX3 7JX. Tel: 0044 1865 226366. E-mail:
craig.steel@hmc.ox.ac.uk.

Abstract

Background: Refugees and asylum seekers present with high levels of PTSD, whilst little research has been conducted to assess the effectiveness or acceptability of psychological interventions for this group. Imagery rescripting is effective in reducing distressing intrusive memories within a range of conditions. The current study evaluates this approach for the treatment of PTSD in refugees and asylum seekers within a UK NHS service.

Aims: To evaluate the clinical outcomes of using imagery rescripting for the treatment of PTSD in U.K. based refugees and asylum seekers.

Method: Ten adult service-users from an NHS specialist service with a primary diagnosis of PTSD were recruited as part of routine service delivery. A multiple baseline design was used with participants randomly allocated to a baseline varying from 5 to 9 weeks. A baseline wait-period was followed by up to 5 sessions of psychoeducation and treatment preparation, in turn followed by up to 10 sessions of imagery rescripting. The Posttraumatic Symptom Scale (PSS) and Physical Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) were collected every week during baseline, at end of treatment and weekly for 5-weeks after treatment, and again at 12-weeks follow-up. Data were analysed with mixed regression.

Results: Results indicate a significant improvement both in PTSD symptoms and mood, and that this was attributable to the imagery rescripting phase of the intervention, and not the passage of time or non-specific therapy factors.

Conclusions: Evidence indicates imagery rescripting to be a safe and effective treatment choice for PTSD in refugees and asylum seekers.

Key Words: PTSD, Refugees, Asylum Seekers, Imagery Rescripting, Case Series

Introduction

Forced migrants have often experienced distressing events before claiming asylum. This group presents with a wide range of mental health problems which can be a challenge to the mental health system of their host nation (see Pollard and Howard, 2021). A common diagnosis is posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD), with individuals having experienced war, torture, rape and persecution. These events are often severe and sustained and result in high levels of PTSD, with a recent review indicating a prevalence of 31% (Blackmore et al., 2020). The individuals are also likely to experience other stressors, such as housing problems and social isolation whilst facing the challenge of acclimatising to a new culture.

The UK guidelines for the treatment of PTSD (NICE, 2018) indicate the use of trauma-focused psychological interventions, such as trauma-focused cognitive behavioural therapy (CBT) and Eye Movement Desensitisation and Reprocessing (EMDR). However, this guideline is based on clinical trials that typically have not included refugees or asylum seekers. Psychological interventions for this group have been developed from cognitive behavioural approaches to PTSD (Grey and Young, 2008). To date the most widely researched intervention for PTSD in this group is Narrative Exposure Therapy (NET) (Lely et al., 2019; Raghuraman et al., 2020), which involves up to 12 sessions of 90 minutes (Schauer et al., 2011). The most recent review and meta-analysis of psychological interventions for PTSD in refugees and asylum seekers identified 15 studies, each of which had some form of control group or waitlist comparison in order to be eligible (Thompson et al., 2018). There was a large effect size for the outcome of interventions comprised of CBT, EMDR and NET. However, follow-up data was limited to two NET studies which produced a moderate effect.

There are a number of treatment protocols under the umbrella term ‘trauma-focused CBT’. These approaches typically involve a phase of work in which the individual ‘relives’ the traumatic incident in order to integrate events back into memory and reduce emotional distress (Ehlers and Clark, 2000). Imagery rescripting (ImRs) is a technique aimed at reducing unwanted intrusions through modifying the meaning and emotions attached to a distressing memory. The process involves getting the individual to first vividly imagine the start of the traumatic memory and then to incorporate a new, rewritten, safer ending with the aid of the therapist. ImRs has been shown to be effective in reducing PTSD symptoms (e.g. Alliger-Horn et al., 2015; Arntz et al., 2007; Boterhoven de Haan et al., 2020; Ehlers et al., 2003; Grunert et al., 2007; Hackman, 2011; Smucker et al., 1995). ImRs is also associated with a reduction in intrusive cognitions (i.e. images, nightmares, flashbacks, voices, thoughts) within a number of other conditions, such as social phobia, snake phobia, depression, obsessive compulsive disorder, body dysmorphic disorder, eating disorders and personality disorders (for literature review and meta-analysis, see Arntz, 2012; Morina et al., 2017). To date, there has been one published case series reporting large effects of ImRs in reducing PTSD within a refugee population (Arntz et al., 2013). This group were based in The Netherlands during their treatment. Given that research into the treatment of PTSD in refugees and asylum seekers is limited, it would seem important to build on this case series and explore options for a choice in treatments (alongside NET) which will be of value to both patients and clinicians. This is due both to the fact that no current treatment is 100% successful, as well as ImRs requiring less training for current CBT therapists than either NET or EMDR. Also, although based on clinical experience rather than empirical data, there is a hypothesis that the mechanism of change through the use of ImRs relates to the meaning of the traumatic event (rather than re-contextualising a memory), which is an issue that this clinical group often struggle with. In addition, positive emotions are more likely to be

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

experienced through a rescript, which may encourage therapists to undertake a trauma-focused intervention with refugees and asylum seekers.

The current study aims to assess the effectiveness of ImRs for PTSD within asylum seekers being treated within a UK National Health Service (NHS) setting. Alongside effectiveness outcomes, information will be obtained which informs the development of the treatment for this group, including the appropriate number of sessions. The intervention package included up to 5 sessions of psychoeducation and preparing people for treatment and up to 10 sessions of ImRs. A case series design was adopted to embed the study within the routine delivery of an NHS service set up specifically for asylum seekers. A variable baseline design was employed to enhance the extent to which any changes observed during the treatment phase could be attributable to the treatment and not to non-treatment changes which may occur over time. This is because using different baseline wait-periods reduces the likelihood that changes occur after a specific amount of time (as the hypothesis is that changes start with the switch from baseline to treatment, rather than after a specific time), and randomization of participants to different baseline wait-periods reduces the likelihood that specific people would spontaneously change after a specific baseline wait-period (which might occur with non-random allocation). The psychoeducation and treatment preparation phase enabled comparison to a phase on non-specific treatment effects.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited from the treatment waiting list of a London NHS clinic set up specifically to treat the mental health problems of asylum seekers and based in London, UK.

Participants were eligible if they (a) were aged 18-65 (b) provided informed consent (c) had a current presentation consistent with a DSM-5 diagnosis of PTSD as assessed by the CAPS (Weathers et al., 2013) based on traumas experienced prior to entry to the U.K. (d) had a score of >20 on the PSS (Foa et al., 1993) at screening (f) had the ability to communicate with therapist, either in English or through an interpreter (g) had a fixed residence (i.e not homeless, a temporary residence was eligible). Exclusion criteria were (a) a current diagnosis of schizophrenia or bipolar disorder type 1 (b) an IQ under 80 (c) presented with an acute suicide risk (d) substance dependence (e) had started a new medication within 3 months before start of the study and (f) if more than one of the weekly assessments during the wait list period was missed, then the participant was excluded from the study and offered treatment as usual within the service.

Fifty-two potential participants were considered for eligibility, while twenty-three service-users gave consent to participate in the study between January 2017 and March 2019. At the time of providing consent, the length of time individuals had already been on the service treatment waiting list was between 4 and 36 months. Eight people withdrew from the study before being randomised to a waitlist length. Post-randomisation, 2 individuals withdrew before baseline data collection started, and 3 withdrew as more detailed clinical information indicated that they were not eligible and different treatment options were agreed. Two participants began ImRs sessions, however during treatment clinical information indicated that they were not eligible and ImRs may therefore not be the appropriate treatment option. They were offered alternative interventions. Fig. 1 presents the study consort diagram. Table 1 gives an overview of the participant demographics of the participants including country of origin. The types of trauma reported included torture, rape and being forced to watch executions.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

Procedure

All referrals to the service were routinely screened for posttraumatic stress disorder using the Clinician Administered PTSD Scale (Weathers et al., 2013), with those reaching the diagnostic threshold being placed on a waiting list for trauma-focused treatment. The main treatment offered by the service was Narrative Exposure Therapy (NET), which is recommended for refugees with PTSD by National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE, 2018). Individuals on the treatment waiting list were approached and given the opportunity to receive psychological treatment in the form of imagery rescripting (ImRs) as part of the current study. Potential participants were provided with information about their treatment choice, i.e. standard treatment in the form of NET or ImRs, including the typical number of sessions involved and the approach to working with trauma memories.

Information was provided both verbally and in writing. Translation was provided where needed, and at least 48 hours were given before informed consent was obtained.

The baseline assessment included the CAPS, PSS, PHQ-9, and the collection of socio-demographic data. The patient was told that they would be randomly allocated to a wait-period of either 5, 6, 7, 8 or 9 weeks after baseline assessment before the intervention began. Patients were not immediately told the wait-period length, to minimise the impact on their presentation of the expectation of therapy commencing. They were told that a member of the team would be in contact two weeks prior to the start of therapy, and that they would not know the wait-period until that contact. When the baseline assessments were complete, a member of the service would contact a study team member (CS) who would use an online random number generator to inform the service of the length of wait-period required. Data was collected by assistant psychologists during all phases of the study.

Design

The study design is a multiple baseline case series design with a randomised duration of waitlist. The functioning of the individual in the treatment phase, and changes in functioning, are compared with his/her functioning, and changes in functioning, during the baseline phase (on an individual and a group level).

Following baseline assessment (CAPS, PSS and PHQ-9), each participant was randomised (single-block) to a wait-period of 5,6,7,8 or 9 weeks. The PSS and PHQ-9 were then administered every week via a telephone call during the baseline phase. If more than one of the weekly assessments during the waiting period was missed, then the participant was excluded from the study and offered alternative treatment within the service.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

During the week prior to the intervention starting, and the week after it completed, data was collected via the daily recording of the frequency of spontaneous intrusive trauma memories, gained either by telephone contact, using a mobile phone or an online platform with daily reminders.

Following the wait-period phase, a ‘Psychoeducation and Treatment Preparation’ phase was provided (hereafter called preparation phase), which included 5 sessions to be completed within up to 8 weeks. Then a ‘Treatment’ phase commenced, immediately after the previous phase was complete, and included up to 10 sessions within up to 20 weeks. Follow-up assessments (PSS and PHQ-9) took place, either in-person or via telephone, at weekly intervals for 5-weeks post-intervention and again at 12-weeks post-intervention. A follow-up CAPS assessment took place in person at 5-weeks post-intervention.

Instruments

Primary Outcomes

Post-traumatic Symptom Scale (PSS; Foa et al., 1993) was administered to assess PTSD symptom severity. The PSS is a 17-item self-report questionnaire measuring PTSD symptoms of re-experiencing, avoidance and arousal. Respondents rate the frequency of symptoms on a 5-point scale (0 = not at all, 4 = five or more times per week/almost always). The PSS has demonstrated good construct validity, internal consistency, and test–retest reliability (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .91$; Foa et al., 1993). The total score constituted the measure of PTSD severity.

The Physical Health Questionnaire 9 (PHQ-9, Kroenke and Spitzer, 2002), is the major

depressive disorder (MDD) module of the full PHQ-9, which scores each of the nine DSM-IV criteria as "0" (not at all) to "3" (nearly every day). The scale has been demonstrated to be a valid and reliable measure of depression severity (Kroenke, Spitzer & Williams, 2001).

Secondary Outcomes

Clinician-administered PTSD Scale (CAPS-5; Weathers et al., 2013) was used for the diagnosis of PTSD. CAPS is one of the most frequently used interviews for establishing PTSD (Blake et al., 1995). The interview covers the diagnostic criteria for PTSD according to DSM-V . For each criterion, intensity and frequency over the previous month is measured on a scale from 0 to 4. An internal consistency of $\alpha = .88$ is reported (Weathers et al., 2018).

Daily Measure of Intrusions. A one-week diary in which the self-reported frequency of daily spontaneous trauma-related intrusions is recorded. Participants also rated the accuracy of their records on a 0 (none recorded) -10 (all recorded) scale.

Treatment and Therapists

All participants received practical support from the service alongside the study treatment protocol, including help with housing and immigration issues. This included access to routine symptom management and activity groups and a support worker. No other active trauma-focused treatment was offered to participants whilst they were involved in the study. Prior to being in the study, all participants would have been offered support in the form of psychoeducation about PTSD, grounding and behavioural activation. Aside from basic

grounding strategies, participants had not received any other stabilisation for emotion regulation interventions from the service.

The preparation phase (5 sessions) involved psychoeducation about PTSD, teaching grounding skills to manage dissociation and preparing the participant for the process of imagery rescripting. The therapist and patient then developed a list of discrete traumatic events which the patient wanted to rescript. These were then placed in a preliminary order.

During the treatment (imagery rescripting) phase (10 sessions), the therapist explained the technique in detail, and started the application. Examples of imagined rescripting included: imagining pushing their torturer from a cliff; stabbing or shooting their torturer; imagining abusers being sealed up below the earth; being rescued by a therapist or another safe person and then flying away from prison; imagining torturers having to wear a dress and dance for them; telling abusers that they are shameful and seeing them rejected by others; receiving forgiveness from loved ones; providing decent and loving burials for loved ones who have been murdered; imagining Superman stopping a beheading.

The intervention was delivered by 5 therapists. All were clinical psychologists with between 4 and 20 years of experience in delivering trauma focused interventions with this population. Initial training was delivered by team member AA over 2-days. All sessions were recorded, where consent was given, and used for weekly supervision.

Statistical Analysis

The weekly measures (PSS, PHQ9) were analysed with mixed regression, following Vlaeyen et al. (2001), Ferron et al. (2009), and Arntz et al. (2013). With this method results of individual cases are statistically pooled, while controlling for autocorrelation (caused by

repeated assessments over time). For the repeated part (autocorrelation) the best fitting covariance structure was chosen from the AR1 and ARMA11 options. For the fixed part the initial predictors were phase (wait-period (which was the reference category), preparation, treatment, post-treatment, follow-up) and time centred within each phase (except for the 12-week follow-up assessment that was a single measurement). If estimation convergence allowed, random parts (slope of time, intercept) were added. Nonsignificant time-within-phase predictors were deleted from the model stepwise, at $p > .10$. The resulting model was compared to a model with time as only fixed predictor, to test the hypothesis that changes due to treatment offer a superior explanation of the data than the mere passage of time. Model comparisons were based on ML estimation, the other models were based on REML estimation (Verbeke & Molenberghs, 2000). Residuals of the final model were checked on the assumption of normal distribution. Effect sizes Cohen's d were estimated on the basis of the parameter estimates of the fixed part and the standard deviation of the baseline.

The change in CAPS scores was tested by a paired t-test, the effect size of the change expressed as the average change divided by the SD of the baseline assessment. The change in number of intrusions per week was tested with negative binomial regression, suitable for counts, with SPSS Generalized Linear Models for repeated measures (Generalized Estimating Equations). The analysis was repeated controlling for the accuracy ratings by participants as a running covariate.

Results

All ten participants completed the number of treatment sessions that was considered suitable and provided follow-up data. Three participants had a 5-week wait-period, 2 had 6-weeks, 2

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

had 7-weeks, 1 had 8-weeks and 2 had 9-weeks. The preparation (psychoeducation and treatment preparation) phase included all 5 sessions for all participants, delivered within 5 to 9 weeks ($M = 6.8, SD = 1.3$). The ‘Treatment’ phase included a range of 6 to 10 sessions ($M = 9.2, SD = 1.4$) delivered within 8 to 19 weeks ($M = 13.6, SD = 3.4$). All participants received the number of sessions required to deliver the protocol, which was under 10 sessions for four participants. No participants dropped out of treatment after receiving their first session, and no serious adverse events were attributable to the intervention.

PTSD Symptoms

PSS

ARMA11 had the best fit and was therefore used as the covariance structure for the repeated part. A random slope for week was added to the model. Table 2 shows the results of the fixed part, for the initial (full) model, for the reduced model after stepwise deletion of the N.S. time-within-preparation and time-within-baseline effects, and for the model with only time as predictor. Note that main effects of phase are estimated at the midpoint of phase, not at the end. However, effect sizes represent the effect at the end of each phase, compared to wait-period. The fit of the final model (phase, time-within-treatment, time-within-follow-up; $-2LL = 1566.72$) was superior to the fit of the model with time only ($-2LL=1578.24$), $\chi^2(5)=11.52, p=.042$. The distribution of the residuals showed no remarkable deviation from the normal distribution. Figure 2 illustrates the results of the mixed regression analysis, i.e. the general pattern of the PSS scores over time. What can be seen is that during the wait-period (baseline), there was on average no change in PSS, nor was there in the preparation

phase. With the application of ImRs, PSS scores started to reduce, which continued during the 5 weeks post-treatment. The mean PSS score at 12-week follow-up indicates a stable effect on the PSS.

The results indicate that PTSD symptoms did not reduce because of the passage of time, nor because of treatment preparation (i.e., nonspecific attention and empathy). Rather, treatment brought about a reduction in PTSD symptoms, which continued during the weeks after treatment had ended. This pattern of results is in support of the hypothesis that ImRs brought about the reduction of PTSD-symptoms, rather than time or nonspecific attention.

 INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE

 INSERT FIGURE 2 ABOUT HERE

CAPS

A paired t-test showed a significant reduction on the CAPS-total score, from a baseline mean of 45.92 ($SD = 7.0$) to a follow-up mean of 26.88 ($SD = 10.9$), $t(9) = 5.11$, $p < .001$, Cohen's $d = 2.72$. Six of the ten participants CAPS scores fell below the diagnostic threshold for PTSD at the follow-up assessment.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Intrusion Diary

The mean number of intrusions recorded in a self-report diary during the week prior to treatment starting was 32.4 (SD = 30.6) compared with 19.3 (SD = 17.4) during the week following treatment (Cohen’s d = 0.43). The GEE Negative Binomial Regression indicated a non-significant reduction, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 2.73$, p=.099. When controlled for accuracy of recording, the difference became significant, Wald $\chi^2(1)=6.63$, p=.01.

Mood

ARMA11 was the best fitting the covariance structure for the repeated part. A random slope for week was added to the model. Table 3 shows the results of the fixed part, for the initial (full) model, for the reduced model after stepwise deletion of the N.S. time-within-preparation and time-within-baseline effects, and for the model with only time as predictor. (Again, main effects of phase are estimated at the midpoint of phase, not at the end; and effect sizes represent the effect at the end of each phase, compared to wait-period.) The fit of the final model (phase, time-within-treatment, time-within-follow-up; -2LL = 1155.865) was superior to the fit of the model with time only (-2LL=1169.106), $\chi^2(5)=13.24$, p=.021. The distribution of the residuals showed no remarkable deviation from the normal distribution. Figure 3 illustrates the results of the fixed part of the mixed regression analysis of the PHQ9. During wait (baseline), there was on average no change in PHQ9 scores, nor was there in the preparation phase. With the application of ImRs, PHQ9 scores started to reduce, which

continued during the 5 weeks post-treatment. The mean PHQ9 score at 12-week follow-up indicates a stable effect on the PHQ9. Individual participants PSS scores over each phase can be seen in Figure 4.

The findings indicate that mood did not improve due to time or nonspecific therapist attention. The ImRs treatment phase is associated with mood improvement.

INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE

INSERT FIGURE 4 ABOUT HERE

Discussion

A large effect size was obtained using imagery rescripting for the treatment of PTSD symptoms within asylum seekers, along with a reduction in the self-report of intrusive memories. These results are in line with the outcomes obtained using ImRs to treat PTSD within the non-refugee populations (Morina et al., 2017) and those obtained using other trauma-focused psychological interventions within refugee populations (Thompson et al., 2018). It is also in line with the one previous case series published using ImRs to treat PTSD

1
2
3 in refugees (Arntz et al., 2013). Whilst larger studies are required to replicate this result, it
4
5 would seem reasonable to conclude that ImRs is a viable and promising treatment option for
6
7 this group.
8
9

10
11 The evidence base for the maintenance of treatment gains is limited within this
12
13 population (Thompson et al., 2018). It is therefore quite striking that the symptom reduction
14
15 gained during the treatment phase of this study was not only maintained, but continued
16
17 during the 5-week post treatment phase at a similar rate to the treatment phase, and was
18
19 maintained at 12-weeks. Studies using ImRs to treat PTSD in other populations have shown
20
21 similar patterns of outcome (Boterhoven de Haan et al., 2020). Although the mechanisms for
22
23 this effect are yet to be determined, it may be that the direct focus on the meaning of the
24
25 trauma within this approach results in secondary changes in mood and anxiety, which
26
27 produce a positive cycle of change over a period of time. However, it should also be noted
28
29 that this group exhibited severe levels of PTSD. Although a large treatment effect was
30
31 obtained, the mean CAPS score of 27 at follow-up suggests that significant clinical needs
32
33 remained. This is further demonstrated by four participants still exhibiting diagnostic levels
34
35 of PTSD symptoms at follow-up. These outcomes are in line with recent systematic reviews
36
37 which evidenced the effectiveness of psychological interventions in this group, but concluded
38
39 that wider social and welfare interventions are also likely to be required (Hamid et al., 2019;
40
41 Tribe et al., 2019). It should be noted that the current study was conducted within a multi-
42
43 disciplinary service, with ImRs being evaluated as the core psychological intervention.
44
45 However, it is not proposed that ImRs would be, or should be, the only help offered to
46
47 asylum seekers presenting with PTSD.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55
56 The clinicians delivering the ImRs intervention in this study observed that the most
57
58 likely reasons for some participants benefitting less were the same as those associated with a
59
60 non-refugee population. These reasons included avoidance, in the form of passive

1
2
3 engagement within the rescripting or recalling non-vivid memories. In some cases, there was
4
5 difficulty in distinguishing between rumination and intrusive memories, with the former not
6
7 being responsive to the current intervention. Also, in common with other complex cases with
8
9 high levels of varied traumatic experiences, a 10-session limit was not always sufficient.
10
11 Future studies should test whether more sessions of ImRs leads to a reduction in CAPS scores
12
13 to within the nonclinical level, at least for those that show a response to the initial 10
14
15 sessions. However, it may also be the case that ImRs has the potential for large effects over a
16
17 relatively short number of sessions within individuals where one main specific target can be
18
19 readily identified. Thus, a treatment protocol will ultimately require a flexible number of
20
21 sessions based on clinical presentation.
22
23
24
25

26
27 Although there was no control group, the varied wait-period (baseline) and repeated
28
29 measures design did allow for analysis to control for the expected symptom change over time
30
31 without treatment. The largest limitation of the current study was that the assessments were
32
33 conducted by service staff who were not blind to the phase of the study, i.e. whether the
34
35 participant was in a treatment phase. This may have led to inflated effect size outcomes, if the
36
37 awareness of phase biased assessments in line with our hypothesis (i.e., treatment should
38
39 reduce symptoms). Although adequate for a case series, the current sample was small and
40
41 therefore reduces generalisability of the results. There were varied reasons that those who
42
43 were assessed for eligibility did not take part in the study. Thirteen people decided to take the
44
45 standard treatment offered by the service (NET). Anecdotally, this was most likely to be due
46
47 to the long waiting-list already experienced, and a desire to stick with what was considered
48
49 routine treatment rather than 'experimental'. A relatively large number of potential
50
51 participants withdrew from the study after consent, which may have also impacted on
52
53 generalisability. However, we are familiar with people from this group frequently needing to
54
55 delay and stagger their interventions to accommodate difficulties in their lives. It is likely that
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 this group would be more adversely affected by the research methodology restrictions that
4
5 others. Whilst generalisability is limited, our main conclusion from this issue is the need for
6
7 flexibility in the delivery of ImRs within routine services, as with all other interventions. A
8
9 final limitation was the use of PSS, based on the DSM-IV, while the CAPS-5 is based on the
10
11 DSM-5. It is of note that the CAPS-5 demonstrated symptom reduction while the PSS
12
13 suffered a ceiling effect.
14
15

16
17 The results of the current study contribute to two important debates in the field; the
18
19 role of stabilisation within trauma-focused interventions, and the trans-cultural suitability of
20
21 such treatments. There has been a longstanding view that individuals who have experienced
22
23 severe trauma require a period of stabilisation (including emotion regulation coping
24
25 strategies) in order to cope with the emotional demands of a trauma-focused intervention
26
27 (Cloitre et al., 2012). This assumption has been questioned (de Jongh et al., 2016), with the
28
29 current results suggesting that there were no adverse effects due to the lack of a prolonged
30
31 stabilisation phase.
32
33

34
35 There is an important debate about whether psychological interventions developed in
36
37 the West are appropriate for non-Western cultures. Issues raised include the potential for the
38
39 underlying assumptions embedded within Western interventions to be discordant with other
40
41 cultures. A review of psychological interventions for torture survivors (Patel et al., 2016)
42
43 refers to a number of ethical concerns regarding research in this area, mainly around
44
45 assessment using unfamiliar cultural frameworks and language, and that dropout rates may
46
47 indicate harm (although harm itself was not evidenced). Conversely, researchers who have
48
49 developed culturally appropriate treatments for PTSD, such as Narrative Exposure Therapy
50
51 (Schauer et al., 2011), caution against denying evidence-based treatment to refugees on the
52
53 basis of culture. Arguably, imagery rescripting is a culturally appropriate intervention. It is
54
55 led by the patient and they can rescript in line with their own values, beliefs and cultures. The
56
57
58
59
60

current study did produce measurable benefits in terms of distress reduction, and no participants dropped out of the intervention once they had received their first session, suggesting a level of acceptability. Given the objective benefits obtained we would argue that removing the opportunity for the intervention should only be based on observed and documented adverse events.

To conclude, the current study suggests that imagery rescripting is a viable, effective and culturally-flexible treatment option for PTSD within an NHS clinical service.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank the service-users and staff at the Woodfield Trauma Service London. In particular Bahar Pourghobad, Rachel Clarke, Lynette Meredith, Aminah Cheema, Hibah Hassan, Katy Trevithick, Beth Adams, Harriet Ward, Eleanor Forrester and Roisin McCarthy for their help in data collection.

Ethics Statement: The authors have abided by the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and the Code of Conduct as set out by the APA. The study protocol was approved by NHS South Central Research Ethics Committee (15/SC/0402). Ethical approval included informed consent for the results to be published.

Conflict of Interest: AA offers training in ImRs, mainly for trial therapists of scientific studies. The remuneration goes to the university to support research. KY and SA have been paid to provide ImRs training as part of UK CPD programmes.

Funding: This research did not receive any specific grant from any funding agency, commercial or not-for-profit sectors.

References

- Alliger-Horn, C., Zimmermann, P. and Mitte, K.** (2015). Comparative effectiveness of IRRT and EMDR in war-traumatized German soldiers. *Trauma and Violence*, 3, 204-215.
- Arntz, A.** (2011). Imagery Rescripting for Personality Disorders. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 18(4), 466-481. doi: 10.1016/j.cbpra.2011.04.006
- Arntz, A.** (2012). Imagery Rescripting as a Therapeutic Technique: Review of Clinical Trials, Basic Studies, and Research Agenda. *Journal Of Experimental Psychopathology*, 3(2), 189-208. doi: 10.5127/jep.024211
- Arntz, A., Tiesema, M. and Kindt, M.** (2007). Treatment of PTSD: A comparison of imaginal exposure with and without imagery rescripting. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 38(4), pp.345-370. doi: 10.1016/j.jbtep.2007.10.006.
- Arntz, A., Sofi, D. and van Breukelen, G.** (2013). Imagery Rescripting as treatment for complicated PTSD in refugees: A multiple baseline case series study. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 51, 274-283.
- Blackmore, R., Botle, J., Fazel, M., Ranasinha, B., Gray, K.M., Fitzgerald, G. et al.** (2020). The prevalence of mental illnesses in refugees and asylum seekers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Medicine*. 17:e1003337.
- Blake, D., Weathers, F., Nagy, L., Kaloupek, D., Gusman, F., Charney, D., et al.** (1995). The development of a clinician-administered PTSD scale. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 8(1), 75-90. doi: 10.1002/jts.2490080106
- Boterhoven de Haan, K., Lee, C., Fassbinder, E., Van Es, S., Menninga, S., Meewisse, M., et al.** (2020). Imagery rescripting and eye movement desensitisation and reprocessing as treatment for adults with post-traumatic stress disorder from childhood trauma: Randomised clinical trial. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 217(5), 609-615. doi:10.1192/bjpp.2020.158.
- Cloitre, M., Courtois, C. A., Ford, J. D., Green, B. L., Alexander, P. and Briere, J.** (2012). The ISTSS expert consensus treatment guidelines for complex PTSD in adults. Retrieved from http://www.istss.org/AM/Template.cfm?Section=ISTSS_Complex_PTSD_Treatment_Guidelines_&Template=/CM/ContentDisplay.cfm&ContentID=5185.

- De Jongh, A., Resick, P. A., Zoellner, L. A., van Minnen, A., Lee, C. W., Monson, C. M., et al.** (2016). Critical analysis of the current treatment guidelines for complex PTSD in adults. *Depression and Anxiety*, 00, 1-11. doi: 10.1002/da.22469
- Ehlers, A. and Clark, D.M.** (2000). A cognitive model of posttraumatic stress disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 38(4), 319-345. doi: 10.1016/S0005-7967(99)00123-0
- Ehlers, A., Clark, D., Hackmann, A., McManus, F., Fennell, M., Herbert, C., et al.** (2003). A Randomized Controlled Trial of Cognitive Therapy, a Self-help Booklet, and Repeated Assessments as Early Interventions for Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60(10), 1024. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.60.10.1024
- Ferron, J. M., Bell, B. A., Hess, M. R., Rendina-Gobioff, G., & Hibbard, S. T.** (2009). Making treatment effect inferences from multiple-baseline data: The utility of multilevel modeling approaches. *Behavior Research Methods*, 41(2), 372-384.
- Foa, E., Riggs, D., Dancu, C. and Rothbaum, B.** (1993). Reliability and validity of a brief instrument for assessing post-traumatic stress disorder. *Journal Of Traumatic Stress*, 6(4), 459-473. doi: 10.1002/jts.2490060405
- Grey, N. and Young, K.** (2008). Cognitive Behaviour Therapy with Refugees and Asylum Seekers Experiencing Traumatic Stress Symptoms. *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 36, 3-19. doi:10.1017/S1352465807003918
- Grunert, B., Weis, J., Smucker, M. and Christianson, H.** (2007). Imagery rescripting and reprocessing therapy after failed prolonged exposure for post-traumatic stress disorder following industrial injury. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 38(4), 317-328. doi: 10.1016/j.jbtep.2007.10.005
- Hackmann, A.** (2011). Imagery Rescripting in Posttraumatic Stress Disorder. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*, 18(4), 424-432. doi: 10.1016/j.cbpra.2010.06.006
- Hamid, A., Patel, N. and Williams, A. C. de C.** (2019). Psychological, social, and welfare interventions for torture survivors: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *PLoS Medicine*. 16. e1002919.
- Kroenke, K. and Spitzer, R.** (2002). The PHQ-9: A New Depression Diagnostic and Severity Measure. *Psychiatric Annals*, 32(9), 509-515. doi: 10.3928/0048-5713-20020901-06
- Kroenke, K., Spitzer, R. and Williams, J.** (2001). The PHQ-9. *Journal Of General Internal Medicine*, 16(9), 606-613. doi: 10.1046/j.1525-1497.2001.016009606.x
- Lely, J., Smid, G., Jongedijk, R., Knipscheer, J. and Kleber, R.** (2019). The effectiveness of narrative exposure therapy: a review, meta-analysis and meta-regression analysis, *European Journal of Psychotraumatology*, 10:1, 155034. doi: 10.1080/20008198.2018.1550344

- Morina, N., Lancee, J. and Arntz, A. (2017).** Imagery rescripting as a clinical intervention for aversive memories: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Behavior Therapy And Experimental Psychiatry*, 55, 6-15. doi: 10.1016/j.jbtep.2016.11.003
- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. (2018).** Post-traumatic stress disorder NG116. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng116>
- Patel, N., C de C Williams, A. and Kellezi, B. (2016).** Reviewing outcomes of psychological interventions with torture survivors: Conceptual, methodological and ethical Issues. *Torture*. 26, 2-16.
- Pollard, T. and Howard, N. (2021).** Mental healthcare for asylum-seekers and refugees residing in the United Kingdom: a scoping review of policies, barriers, and enablers. *International Journal of Mental Health Systems*. 60, <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13033-021-00473-z>.
- Raghuraman, S., Stuttard, N. and Hunt, N. (2021).** Evaluating narrative exposure therapy for post-traumatic stress disorder and depression symptoms: A meta-analysis of the evidence base. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy*, 28, 1-23. doi: 10.1002/cpp.2486
- Schauer, M., Schauer, E., Neuner, F. and Elbert, T. (2011).** *Narrative exposure therapy: A short-term treatment for traumatic stress disorders*. Hogrefe Publishing.
- Smucker, M., Dancu, C., Foa, E. and Niederee, J. (1995).** Imagery Rescripting: A New Treatment for Survivors of Childhood Sexual Abuse Suffering from Posttraumatic Stress. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 9(1), 3-17. doi: 10.1891/0889-8391.9.1.3
- Thompson, C.T., Vidgen, A. and Roberts, N.P. (2018).** Psychological interventions for post-traumatic stress disorder in refugees and asylum seekers: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 63, 66-79. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2018.06.006
- Tribe R., Sendt K. and Tracy D. (2019).** A systematic review of psychosocial interventions for adult refugees and asylum seekers. *Journal of Mental Health*. 28, 662-676. doi: 10.1080/09638237.2017.1322182
- Verbeke, G., and Molenberghs, G. (2000).** *Linear Mixed Models for Longitudinal Data*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Vlaeyen, J., De Jong, J., Geilen, M., Heuts, P., & Van Breukelen, G. (2001).** Graded exposure in vivo in the treatment of pain-related fear: a replicated single-case experimental design in four patients with chronic low back pain. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 39, 151-166.
- Weathers, F.W., Blake, D.D., Schnurr, P.P., Kaloupek, D.G., Marx, B.P. and Keane, T.M. (2013).** *The Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5 (CAPS-5)*. [Assessment] Available from www.ptsd.va.gov.
- Weathers, F., Bovin, M., Lee, D., Sloan, D., Schnurr, P., Kaloupek., et al. (2018).** The

Clinician-Administered PTSD Scale for DSM-5: Development and initial
psychometric evaluation in military veterans. *Psychological Assessment*, 30, 383-395.
doi: 10.1037/pas0000486.

For Peer Review

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

Figure 1. CONSORT flow diagram




Figure 2. Estimated fixed means for the PSS from the final mixed regression model.




Figure 3. Estimated fixed means for the PHQ9 from the final mixed regression model.




Figure 4. Individual participant PSS Total Scores across all Phases




Table 1. Baseline characteristics of the sample

Variable		Mean (SD/ Number (%)
Age (years)	(range = 23-59)	40.1 (10.9)
Gender	Female	5 (50%)
	Male	5 (50%)
Country of Origin	Albania	1 (10%)
	Lebanon	1 (10%)
	Iran	4 (40%)
	Iraq	1 (10%)
	Kuwait	1 (10%)
	Syria	1 (10%)
	DR of Congo	1 (10%)
Religion	Catholic	1 (10%)
	Muslim	7 (70%)
	Christian	2 (20%)
Marital Status	Single	4 (40%)
	Married	4 (40%)
	Divorced	1 (10%)
	Widowed	1 (10%)
Educational level (highest completed)	Primary school	1 (10%)
	Middle school	2 (20%)
	3rd year of Secondary School	1 (10%)
	GCSE	1 (10%)
	Undergraduate Degree	3 (30%)
	A-level and 2 years college	1 (10%)
	Master's Degree	1 (10%)
Language of treatment	English	6 (60%)
	Arabic	4 (40%)
Duration of PTSD (years)	(range = 3 – 25)	12 (8.39)
Age of first trauma	(range = 7 – 32)	19.99 (7.63)
Secondary Axis Diagnoses	Depressive Episode	3 (30%)
	None	7 (70%)
Treatment Duration (months)	(range = 4-36)	16.2 (8.80)

Table 2. Results of the fixed part of the mixed regression analyses of the PSS.

Parameter	Effect	s.e.	d.f.	t	p	95%		Cohen's
						Confidence		
						Interval		
						Lo	Hi	
	estimate							d
<i>Initial model</i>								
Intercept	39.17	1.62	20.81	24.24	<.001	35.81	42.53	
Exploration	-1.46	1.67	79.78	-0.88	0.38	-4.79	1.86	0.31
imagery rescripting	-3.37	2.35	34.59	-1.44	0.160	-8.15	1.40	1.25
post treatment (5 weeks)	-8.48	3.01	21.91	-2.82	0.010	-14.72	-2.24	1.97
follow-up (12 week)	-9.84	3.81	15.65	-2.58	0.020	-17.94	-1.74	1.77
time-within-baseline	-0.24	0.37	99.84	-0.65	0.52	-0.97	0.49	
time-within-exploration	-0.12	0.54	116.02	-0.22	0.83	-1.19	0.95	
time-within-imagery	-0.79	0.32	95.62	-2.45	0.016	-1.43	-0.15	
rescripting								
time-within-post-	-1.24	0.55	117.38	-2.26	0.026	-2.33	-0.15	
treatment								
<i>Final model</i>								
Intercept	39.08	1.55	21.32	25.21	<.001	35.86	42.30	
Exploration	-0.71	1.27	221.29	-0.56	0.58	-3.23	1.80	0.13
imagery rescripting	-2.62	1.90	71.08	-1.38	0.17	-6.41	1.16	1.13
post treatment	-7.80	2.75	33.57	-2.84	0.008	-13.39	-2.21	1.85
follow-up	-8.98	3.52	23.21	-2.55	0.018	-16.26	-1.69	1.61

time-within-imagery	-0.82	0.31	95.13	-2.59	0.011	-1.44	-0.19
rescripting							
time-within-post-	-1.23	0.55	116.64	-2.26	0.026	-2.31	-0.15
treatment							

Time only model

Intercept	39.52	1.67	18.57	23.59	<.001	36.01	43.03
Time	-0.26	0.13	14.20	-2.02	0.063	-0.54	0.02

Note. REML estimations. Baseline was the reference category. Time in weeks. Main phase effects are estimated at the mid-point of the phase, not at the end. Cohen's d (= mean change / SD) based on model estimations at the end of the pertinent phase, with respect to baseline (numerator), and baseline SD (denominator). The phase effects represent the average difference between that phase and baseline (estimated by the intercept). For example, in the initial model the post-treatment effect is a decrease of -8.48 at the middle of the post-treatment phase, compared to halfway baseline (39.17). Hence, the estimated PSS score halfway post-treatment is 39.17-8.48 = 30.69. The time within phase effects represent the average change in PSS scores per week during the pertinent phase. For example, a time-within-post-treatment effect of -1.24 in the initial model means that every week in the post-treatment period there was a mean reduction of 1.24 points on the PSS.

Table 3 Results of the fixed part of the mixed regression analyses of the PHQ9.

Parameter	Effect				p	95%		Cohen's d
						Confidence		
						Interval		
						Lo	Hi	
<i>Initial model</i>								
Intercept	20.61	1.13	11.48	18.17	<.001	18.13	23.09	
preparation	0.25	0.77	59.54	0.33	0.38	-1.29	1.80	-0.02
imagery rescripting	-1.54	1.18	34.06	-1.31	0.16	-3.93	0.84	0.73
post treatment (5 weeks)	-4.72	1.56	23.30	-3.03	0.006	-7.94	-1.49	1.55
follow-up (12 week)	-5.63	1.92	14.15	-2.93	0.011	-9.75	-1.51	1.49
time-within-baseline	-0.10	0.16	70.69	-0.60	0.52	-0.41	0.22	
time-within-preparation								
	-0.09	0.23	102.48	-0.39	0.83	-0.54	0.37	
time-within-imagery rescripting	-0.27	0.14	66.00	-1.89	0.063	-0.55	0.01	
time-within-post-treatment	-0.57	0.23	108.16	-2.46	0.016	-1.04	-0.11	
<i>Final model</i>								
Intercept	20.55	1.11	11.09	18.45	<.001	18.10	22.99	
preparation	0.63	0.57	170.82	1.10	0.271	-0.50	1.76	-0.17
imagery rescripting	-1.06	0.92	79.00	-1.15	0.252	-2.90	0.77	0.60
post treatment (5 weeks)	-4.24	1.38	40.22	-3.08	0.004	-7.03	-1.45	1.42
follow-up (12 week)	-5.08	1.73	22.64	-2.93	0.008	-8.67	-1.49	1.34
time-within-imagery rescripting	-0.27	0.14	67.33	-1.92	0.059	-0.55	0.01	
time-within-post-treatment	-0.57	0.23	111.30	-2.47	0.015	-1.03	-0.11	
<i>Time only model</i>								
Intercept	20.71	1.20	11.62	17.22	<.001	18.08	23.34	
Time	-0.15	0.07	12.36	-2.28	0.041	-0.30	-0.01	

Note. REML estimations. Baseline was the reference category. Time in weeks. Main condition effects are

estimated at the mid-point of the phase, not at the end. Cohen's d ($= \text{mean change} / \text{SD}$) based on model estimations at the end of the pertinent phase, with respect to baseline (numerator), and baseline SD (denominator).

For Peer Review