

INPLASY

What relevance does logotherapy have for current practice in clinical and health psychology? A systematic review protocol

INPLASY202480019

doi: 10.37766/inplasy2024.8.0019

Received: 03 August 2024

Published: 04 August 2024

Lima, I; Duarte, C.

Corresponding author:

Cidália Duarte

cidalia@fpce.up.pt

Author Affiliation:

Faculdade de Psicologia e Ciências da Educação da Universidade do Porto.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Support - None.

Review Stage at time of this submission - Data extraction.

Conflicts of interest - None declared.

INPLASY registration number: INPLASY202480019

Amendments - This protocol was registered with the International Platform of Registered Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (INPLASY) on 04 August 2024 and was last updated on 04 August 2024.

INTRODUCTION

Review question / Objective This systematic review aims to assess the relevance of logotherapy for current practice in clinical and health psychology, and to determine its therapeutic benefits. The information collected will try to answer the following research questions: (1) In which areas of clinical and health psychology has logotherapy been applied to improve the well-being and/or quality of life of adults with physical and/or mental health problems? (2) What are the characteristics of the implemented intervention programs (e.g., frequency and duration of sessions, individual or group sessions, specific intervention strategies)? (3) What outcome measures have most commonly been used to evaluate the effectiveness of logotherapy as an intervention strategy? (4) What is the effectiveness of logotherapy as an intervention strategy to improve the well-being and/or quality of life of adults with physical and/or mental health problems?

Rationale Logotherapy, developed by Viktor Frankl, is a form of existential psychotherapy that proposes finding meaning in life as a crucial component of psychological well-being. In recent years, there has been a renewed interest in meaning-oriented therapies, driven by a growing recognition of the role that existential factors play in mental health. Despite its application to various conditions such as depression, anxiety, and chronic illness, the effectiveness of logotherapy in modern therapeutic settings remains underexplored and not fully established. This systematic review seeks to address this gap by providing a comprehensive evaluation of logotherapy's implementation and effectiveness. Additionally, it aims to compare logotherapy with other therapeutic approaches to better understand its relative efficacy. By elucidating these aspects, this review will offer valuable insights into the practical application of logotherapy and its potential contributions to contemporary psychotherapy practices.

Condition being studied Physical and/or mental health conditions in adults who have benefited from logotherapy interventions.

METHODS

Search strategy Database searches will be conducted in the EBSCOhost database (Academic Search Complete, APA PsycArticles, APA Psycinfo, Psychology and Behavioral Science Collection), Web of Science (Core Collection), PubMed, and SciELO. This search will be complemented by a manual search in Scopus and through a review of the selected articles' reference lists to minimise source selection bias. The database search will be conducted using the terms (logotherapy OR logo therapy OR logo-therapy) AND (disease OR disorder OR impairment OR pathology OR psychopathology) AND (efficacy OR impact OR effect OR outcome) AND (adult OR adults), and will be performed without restrictions regarding the publication date. All searches will be conducted considering the full text (or all fields).

Participant or population Adults with physical and/or mental health problems who have been exposed to logotherapy intervention programs, with no exclusions based on ethnicity or gender.

Intervention Logotherapy.

Comparator Logotherapy interventions will be compared with control conditions, where participants have not received any psychotherapy, or with alternative interventions, such as cognitive-behavioural therapy.

Study designs to be included Primary studies published in peer-reviewed scientific journals (e.g., randomised controlled trials, quasi-experimental studies, observational studies).

Eligibility criteria The following inclusion criteria will be considered: (1) logotherapy as an intervention strategy, (2) studies with outcome measures, (3) presence of physical and/or mental health problems, and (4) adult population. The exclusion criteria will be: (1) studies where the intervention does not involve logotherapy (e.g., interventions focused on meaning but not based on the principles developed by Frankl); (2) studies without outcome measures; (3) absence of physical and/or mental health problems (e.g., healthy ageing); and (4) population under 18 years of age.

Information sources Database searches will be conducted in the EBSCOhost database (Academic

Search Complete, APA PsycArticles, APA Psycinfo, Psychology and Behavioral Science Collection), Web of Science (Core Collection), PubMed, and SciELO. This search will be complemented by a manual search in Scopus and through a review of the selected articles' reference lists to minimise source selection bias.

Main outcome(s) Indicators of physical and/or psychological well-being and quality of life, which can be either quantitative (e.g., questionnaires, scales, tests) or qualitative (e.g., interviews), used to assess the effectiveness of logotherapy as an intervention strategy.

Additional outcome(s) Characteristics of the implemented logotherapy programs, including factors such as the frequency and duration of sessions, whether sessions are conducted individually or in groups, and the specific intervention strategies used. Understanding the characteristics of logotherapy programs helps clarify how different variables (e.g., session frequency and duration) might influence the effectiveness of the intervention.

Data management Search results will be exported to the reference management software EndNote to automatically remove duplicate studies. Subsequently, articles will be screened based on their titles and abstracts. The eligibility of the selected studies will be assessed through a full-text review, conducted independently by two researchers. Any disagreements will be resolved through discussion until consensus is reached.

Quality assessment / Risk of bias analysis To evaluate the risk of bias in the studies included in this systematic review, tools from the Cochrane Collaboration will be used to assess the methodological quality of each article. The evaluation of randomised clinical trials will be performed using RoB 2.0 (Sterne et al., 2019), which assesses five domains of bias: (1) bias arising from the randomization process, (2) bias due to deviations from intended interventions, (3) bias from missing outcome data, (4) bias in measurement of the outcome, and (5) bias in selection of the reported result. For non-randomized studies, the evaluation was performed using ROBINS-I (Sterne et al., 2016), which assesses seven domains of bias: (1) bias due to confounding, (2) bias in selection of participants into the study, (3) bias in classification of interventions, (4) bias due to deviations from intended interventions, (5) bias due to missing data, (6) bias in measurement of outcomes, and (7) bias in selection of the reported results. Finally, the

online application robvis (<https://mcguinlu.shinyapps.io/robvis/>) will be used to create the graphs of this analysis. The bias quality assessment will be carried out independently by two independent researchers, and disagreements will be discussed until consensus is reached.

Strategy of data synthesis After assessing the eligibility of the articles through a full-text review, relevant qualitative information will be extracted for each research question. The extracted variables will include the following: authors, year of publication, country of origin, sample characteristics (number of participants, age, and gender), study design, type of disease or psychopathology, summary of intervention strategies, outcome measures, and a summary of the most significant results.

Subgroup analysis Not planned.

Sensitivity analysis Not planned.

Language restriction English, French, Spanish, and Portuguese.

Country(ies) involved Portugal.

Keywords Logotherapy; health psychology; clinical psychology; adults; well-being; quality of life.

Dissemination plans Master's dissertation and publication in peer-reviewed journal.

Contributions of each author

Author 1 - Inês Lima - Masters student at Faculdade de Psicologia e Ciências da Educação, Universidade do Porto.

Email: up199704663@edu.fpce.up.pt

Author 2 - Cidália Duarte - Supervisor and Assistant Professor at Faculdade de Psicologia e Ciências da Educação, Universidade do Porto.

Email: cidalia@fpce.up.pt

References

Sterne, J. A. C., Hernán, M. A., Reeves, B. C., Savović, J., Berkman, N. D., Viswanathan, M., Henry, D., Altman, D. G., Ansari, M. T., Boutron, I., Carpenter, J. R., Chan, A.-W., Churchill, R., Deeks, J. J., Hróbjartsson, A., Kirkham, J., Jüni, P., Loke, Y. K., Pigott, T. D., ... & Higgins, J. P. T. (2016). ROBINS-I: A tool for assessing risk of bias in non-randomised studies of interventions. *BMJ*, 355, i4919. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.i4919>

Sterne, J. A. C., Savović, J., Page, M. J., Elbers, R. G., Blencowe, N. S., Boutron, I., Cates, C. J., Cheng, H. Y., Corbett, M. S., Eldridge, S. M.,

Emberson, J. R., Hernán, M. A., Hopewell, S., Hróbjartsson, A., Junqueira, D. R., Jüni, P., Kirkham, J. J., Lasserson, T., Li, T., ... & Higgins, J. P. T. (2019). RoB 2: A revised tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ*, 366, l4898. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.l4898>