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ABSTRACT

Introduction Previous reviews of mobile messaging for individuals with musculoskeletal pain have shown positive effects on pain and disability. However, the configuration of digital content, method of presentation and interaction, dose and frequency needed for optimal results remain unclear. Patient preferences concerning such systems are also unclear. Addressing these knowledge gaps, incorporating evidence from both experimental and observational studies, may be useful to understand the extent of the relevant literature, and to influence the design and outcomes of future messaging systems. We aim to map information that could be influential in the design of future mobile messaging systems for individuals with musculoskeletal pain conditions, and to summarise the findings of efficacy, effectiveness, and economics derived from both experimental and observational studies.

Methods and analysis We will include studies describing the development and/or use of mobile messaging to support adults (≥18 years) with acute or chronic musculoskeletal pain. We will exclude digital health studies that lack a mobile messaging component, or those targeted at other health conditions unrelated to the bones, muscles and connective tissues, or involving surgical or passive data about the user’s
targeted at other health conditions unrelated to the bones, muscles and connective tissues, or involving surgical or

Strengths and limitations of this study

 ► This review will be the first to map the extent of current knowledge relating to the design and use of mobile messaging interventions for individuals with musculoskeletal pain conditions, incorporating information from both experimental and observational studies.

 ► This protocol is guided by the Joanna Briggs Institute Manual for Evidence Synthesis guidelines and follows the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping reviews.

 ► Our study is limited to peer-reviewed studies published in the English language, and indexed in four online databases; while our search strategy is broad and covers common relevant health research databases, it is possible that some information of relevance to our review questions will not be captured.

 ► This study will map the literature; as is common practice with scoping reviews, we will not assess risk of bias, nor the quality of the evidence.

INTRODUCTION

Consumer mobile devices such as smartphones and tablets have become ubiquitous; recent surveys have estimated that 88% of adults in the UK, 91% in Australia and 97% in the Middle-East own or have access to a smartphone.1 Mobile devices allow both the capture and the display of information, and are an inexpensive, convenient and an easy-to-use way to provide some health-related services; this use is commonly referred to as ‘mHealth’.

mHealth applications may capture data in many ways. For example, the user may be engaged actively through prompts to complete health diaries, or to respond to prompts to complete ecological momentary assessments which involve the repeated collection of individuals’ behaviours and experiences in their natural environment.2 Built-in cameras can be used to capture still images or short video clips for screening and diagnosis, and passive data about the user’s
movements can be collected using the accelerometer, GPS and from add-on devices such as wearables. Similarly, mHealth applications can deliver information or interventions in many ways: for instance, by providing health-related information in plain or multimedia format; push messages for medication reminders; or ecological momentary interventions. With the increase in computational power and the availability of the internet, it is possible to create sophisticated mHealth applications that can adapt to the needs of the individual, thus becoming a mechanism to deliver personalised care.

mHealth has been applied across the spectrum of health disciplines and across the continuum of care, with examples in health promotion, behaviour change, prevention, screening, diagnosis, risk assessment and prognosis, therapy, monitoring, patient self-management, and survivorship care. Recent syntheses provide some evidence for the efficacy of mHealth: a 2018 systematic review of systematic reviews (23 reviews; 79665 participants) and a 2019 meta-analysis (64 studies; 10296 participants) both reported health outcomes favouring mHealth interventions in chronic disease. Important outcomes included increased physical activity, improvements in the management of asthma, improvements in the symptoms of pulmonary disease and heart failure, better glycaemic control in children with diabetes, improved management of blood pressure in hypertensive patients, weight reduction in overweight and obese patients and improved adherence to antiretrovirals treatments for patients with HIV. Improved health service outcomes included reductions in mortality and hospitalisation, and improved attendance rates. While the evidence so far is encouraging, the authors highlighted that outcomes are mixed, that no long-term studies have yet been reported, and that the methodological quality of included studies was generally low.

While there have been many clinically focused reports of mHealth interventions, there have been fewer health economic evaluations, and those that have been conducted have focused on higher-income countries. A 2017 systematic review of economic evaluations of mHealth interventions found that 29 (83%) of 39 included studies reported that mHealth was cost-effective, provided cost-savings or was otherwise economically beneficial. The quality of the reporting was described as being of moderate-to-high quality, but because a high proportion of studies reported positive outcomes, the authors cautioned that publication bias may be present. Most of the included studies (27 (69.2%) of 39) were focused on behaviour change communication, and of those, most (20 (74.1%) of 27) showed an economic benefit. Outpatient clinic attendance (eg, reminders to attend) was the largest focus area (7 (17.95%) of 39) of which 6 (85.7%) of 7 studies showed an economic benefit. Short message service (SMS) was the main communication technique used (22 (56.41%) of 29) of studies, of which 17 (77.3%) of 22 studies showed an economic benefit.

In this review, we focus on health-related interactions provided by SMS, or by push notifications delivered through applications installed on a mobile device, for individuals with musculoskeletal (MSK) pain conditions. The area has been reviewed previously: a recent systematic review of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) explored the effectiveness of mHealth/digital health for managing MSK conditions. Twenty-five of the 19 included studies (all RCTs; 1086 participants) involved aspects of messaging, with 4 of 5 reporting that the digital interventions were associated with statistically significant improvements in pain and functional disability. A second review (11 RCTs; 1607), focused specifically on the effectiveness of text messaging for the management of MSK pain. Five studies assessed text messaging as an adjunct to usual care, with improvements found to treatment adherence. In a further five studies, text messaging was assessed as one component of a complex intervention with small but inconsistent effects on pain, functioning, adherence, and quality-of-life. In the remaining study, similar effects on functioning were found when text messaging was compared with telephone counselling.

While systematic reviews have shown positive effects on pain and disability, it is unclear what configuration of digital content, method of presentation, dose and frequency may achieve optimal results. Further, it is unclear what patients may prefer in terms of each of these aspects. Such information may be useful to optimise the design and outcomes achieved by future systems; to identify such information, we must look beyond RCTs.

To our knowledge, no reviews have examined factors that may be important in the design and development of messaging systems for individuals with MSK pain. Similarly, the findings from observational studies of messaging for MSK pain have not been synthesised; consequently, there is a gap in information to guide the development of future messaging systems for this patient group. We conducted a preliminary search of PROSPERO, MEDLINE, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews and Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) Evidence Synthesis and did not identify any current or underway scoping reviews or systematic reviews with this topic focus.

Our aims are threefold: first, to map how mobile messaging has been used for individuals with MSK pain; second, to identify information that could be useful in the design of future messaging interventions for these individuals; and third, because few RCTs have been conducted in the area, and their focus has been solely on effectiveness, to explore and summarise the findings of efficacy, effectiveness and economics derived from both previous experimental and observational messaging studies for individuals with MSK pain.

**Review questions**

1. In the context of MSK pain conditions, for which individuals, with which problems, and for what purpose has messaging on mobile devices been used (eg,
medication reminders, alert, education, motivation, prevention, and data collection)?

2. What information exists to guide the development of mobile messaging for MSK conditions (eg, frequency of texts, length of texts, duration of intervention, and theoretical basis)?

3. How have patients’ preferences been included in the design of a study, and how have their preferences been assessed?

4. What methods have been used to evaluate the use of mobile messaging for MSK conditions (eg, how were outcomes assessed; what processes were involved)?

5. Does the literature support the efficacy, effectiveness, and economics of messaging on mobile devices for individuals with MSK conditions?

Inclusion criteria

Participants

We will include studies involving adults (≥18 years) experiencing acute or chronic MSK condition (eg, back pain, neck pain, arthritis and osteoarthritis). The term ‘MSK conditions’ describes those conditions that affect muscles, bones, joints and related tissues.45 MSK conditions comprise over 150 diagnoses,45 and in 2017, it was the highest contributor to global disability (as measured by the years lived with disability).45 46

We will exclude studies concerning individuals with spinal cord injury, mild traumatic brain injury and moderate-to-severe orthopaedic injuries, and conditions relating to mobile phone overuse. We will also exclude studies targeted at other health conditions unrelated to the bones, muscles and connective tissues (eg, diabetes, asthma, cancer and stroke), studies involving surgical patients, or studies involving solely healthy individuals.

Concept

We aim to map papers that describe patient-focused, health-related messaging provided on consumer mobile devices such as mobile phones, tablets, personal digital assistants and wearables. Specifically, we will include: (1) papers describing the development and/or evaluation of mobile messaging to support the target population. All types of support will be included (eg, medication reminders, education, motivational messaging, harm prevention and data collection); (2) papers describing messaging delivered by any of the following methods: push notifications arising from mobile applications, SMS or multimedia messaging service (MMS); and (3) studies that involved messaging as an adjunct to an intervention (eg, a psychological intervention combined with SMS reminders or a physiotherapy intervention delivered via an application which included notification reminders).

We will exclude papers that describe the use of other platforms, such as web-based systems or email messages, but that lack any mobile messaging component. We will also exclude studies that provide support other than by mobile messaging support (eg, telephone counselling or reminders by email).

Context

We will include papers in any contextual setting (eg, healthcare facility, hospital, workplace, or university) and conducted in any country.

For studies describing the development of relevant messaging applications, we will include reviews and papers describing experimental/observational/qualitative studies of messaging applications irrespective of study design. For evaluation studies, we will include papers, including reviews, describing economic studies of mobile messaging to support the target population.

We will exclude conference abstracts and editorials because they provide only limited information. We will exclude protocols because they describe proposed work rather than results. While it may be beneficial to include searches of the grey literature, dissertations and literature in languages other than English, doing so would be beyond the resources available to this project. Therefore, our focus is to map what has been published in the peer-reviewed literature, as indexed in the main medical, nursing, allied health and psychology electronic databases.

METHODS AND ANALYSIS

We developed this protocol using the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis,47 Section 11.2 for protocol development48 and the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses extension for scoping reviews (PRISMA-ScR).49 This protocol has been registered with the Open Science Framework (https://osf.io/8mzya; DOI: 10.17605/OSF.IO/8MZYA; registered 19 October 2020).

Search strategy

We have completed electronic database searches using PubMed, CINAHL (via EBSCOhost), Embase and PsycINFO (via APA PsycNET); all searches were conducted on 6 August 2020. We used search strings that described messaging and MSK concepts. We also manually searched the reference lists of relevant papers. We first developed the search strategy for PubMed and subsequently translated it for the other three databases (online supplemental tables S1–S4). Because of resource limitations, we included only papers published in the English language. Finally, because the field of digital health and the capabilities of consumer technology change rapidly, we limited our search to include only papers published in the last 10 years, thus excluding older papers that may not be relevant to contemporary technology and its use.

Screening, inclusion and exclusion process

We will export the results from the electronic database searches to reference management software (Endnote V.X9) and then subsequently export to Covidence50 for further processing. There will be three selection stages: in the first stage, two independent reviewers will screen all titles and abstracts. In the second stage, two pairs of independent reviewers will assess the full-text of eligible papers. A third reviewer will mediate disagreements as
First, we will describe the results of our searches and Reporting of results. We will resolve any disagreements through discussion, and if a consensus cannot be reached, a third author will mediate until a consensus is met. Where appropriate, we will contact the authors of studies to obtain missing information. In the final stage, we will manually search for additional papers in the included papers’ reference lists.

Data extraction
Two independent authors will extract the data from each selected study; we created a draft data extraction form (Table 1). We will revise this draft as needed after two team members have trialled it with a sample of five included studies. We will resolve any disagreements through discussion, and if a consensus cannot be reached, a third author will mediate until a consensus is met. Where appropriate, we will contact the authors of studies to obtain missing information.

Reporting of results
First, we will describe the results of our searches and selection process in a PRISMA flow diagram, reporting the findings according to the PRISMA-ScR checklist. Second, we will map the available knowledge in a tabular format by the research question (online supplemental tables S5–S7; adapted from the JBI manual) and according to the paper’s purpose: (1) papers describing aspects of the development of messaging systems, (2) studies of the evaluation of messaging systems, and (3) studies of the development and/or development of messaging systems.

Online supplemental table S5 will tabulate the main characteristics of the included literature as follows: primary author’s name, the country where the study was conducted, the design of the study, the primary MSK pain focus of the study (eg, neck, back), study aim(s) (eg, to provide information, behaviour change, data collection and/or development of messaging systems), messaging method (eg, SMS/MMS, app push) and whether messaging was used as an adjunct to another intervention.

Online supplemental table S6 will tabulate the results of the literature relating to aspects of the development of messaging systems. This table will contain information related to messaging content (ie, the format of messaging, eg, text, images, video), theoretical framework, whether the system provided any adaptivity of content according to perceived needs of the user, and messaging dose and behaviour (ie, message frequency, length, timing and adaptivity), measures collected (type of measure, eg, a visual analogue pain score and method of collection) and user experience (eg, any results relating to acceptability, usability, and user preferences).

Online supplemental table S7 will tabulate the results relating to evaluation studies of messaging systems for people with MSK pain. This table will contain information about: outcomes assessed (ie, pain, disability, psychological measures, economics, experience), the primary endpoint (eg, pain in the last week, measured at 6 months postintervention), duration of the intervention and summary findings (whether the findings favour the digital intervention, favour control or are equivocal). The results tables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1 Draft extraction form</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delivery mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaging characteristics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaging duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study aims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attrition rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messaging as an additional support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Findings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patients’ preferences</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MMS, multimedia messaging service; SMS, short message service.
may be further refined during the synthesis process by the team members, as per the JBI manual. Finally, we will provide a narrative summary of the mapped evidence in order to address our aims and research questions.

Patient and public involvement
It was not appropriate or possible to involve patients or the public in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

DISCUSSION
This review will be the first to map the extent of current knowledge relating to the design and use of mobile messaging interventions for managing MSK pain conditions, incorporating information from both experimental and observational studies. This protocol is guided by the JBI Manual for Evidence Synthesis guidelines and follows the PRISMA extension for scoping reviews. The evidence from experimental studies of the effectiveness of text messaging interventions for managing MSK pain conditions has recently been comprehensively synthesised.33 We will build on this work by describing studies relating to the design of messaging systems for MSK conditions, and by synthesising the results from both experimental and observational studies. Because we aim to map the literature, as is common practice with scoping reviews, we will not assess the methodological quality or risk of bias of included studies.40 Further, the quality of the evidence of relevant experimental studies has already recently been critically appraised.33

Our study is limited to peer-reviewed studies published in the English language and indexed in four online databases. We anticipate that information of most relevance to our questions will be contained in the peer-reviewed literature. While a broader approach may be desirable, we have insufficient resources to translate articles from languages other than English or to examine the grey literature. While our search strategy is broad and covers common relevant health research databases, we acknowledge that it is possible that some information of relevance to our review questions may not be captured.

ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION
As a review of the available literature, this study does not require formal ethical approval. We will disseminate the findings through publication in a peer-reviewed journal, relevant conferences and relevant consumer forums.
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