Results The structure of Octopus would lead to a raft of improvements:

- Smaller author groups (for the smaller publication units) give more accessibility, meritocracy/accountability.
- It encourages fast publication (to establish priority).
- It values each part of the scientific process regardless of subsequent or previous work (e.g. data can be published regardless of size or what it suggests about previous work) removing the pressures for questionable research practices.
- It values perceptive reviewing and hence collaboration.
- It allows obvious flagging of potential issues in publications or with conflicts of interest.
- It removes many potential causes of bias (e.g. removing first names in favour of initials in author lists).

It could also replace the wasteful process of grant funding submissions and improve the hiring/promotion systems within institutions by providing a crowd-sourced view of the quality of work.

Conclusions Octopus is not technically difficult to achieve and is now being built, with support and grants from several sources. It has the potential to change the way that scientific work is funded, carried out and shared - for the better.

Results After excluding people ineligible for the study or with missing or unreliable data, our sample comprised 395 participants. When asked if they read the conflicts of interest disclosure when they viewed the decision aid, 197 participants (49.9%) responded ‘Yes’ (AHL: 55.3%; LHL: 44.4%). Of participants who reported reading the disclosure, 72 (36.5%) gave a correct answer when asked, ‘Are any of the authors of the decision aid paid by the company that sells Abbatide or Benedent?’ (AHL 34.9%; LHL 38.6%). Overall, 18.2% of participants reported reading the disclosure and correctly recalled whether a conflict of interest was disclosed, with the lowest proportion (5.3%) observed for the basic, negative disclosure.

Conclusions A minority of study participants reported reading and correctly recalled the content of a financial conflicts of interest disclosure in a fictional decision aid. Whether these findings can be generalised to actual decision aid users is uncertain. Our recruitment of members of the public and use of a simulated illness scenario, although motivated by ethical considerations, may have weakened the salience of both the decision aid and the disclosure. On the other hand, knowledge of study participation along with the relative prominence of the disclosure in the fictional decision aid may have amplified participants’ attention to it. Altogether, we tentatively conclude that disclosure of financial conflicts of interest in patient decision aids may not have the desired effect and advocate further research attention to optimal methods of addressing this issue.
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Objectives Patient decision aids are regarded as a strategy for engaging patients in decision-making, facilitating evidence translation, and reducing low-value healthcare. However, financial conflicts of interest among authors of these resources have the potential to bias their content and undermine their usefulness. The prevailing quality framework in this field – the International Patient Decision Aids Standards – requires that decision aids disclose author financial conflicts of interest. However, to our knowledge, no research has examined whether such disclosure has the desired effect. Our objective was to conduct a simulated pilot study of how members of the public perceive and respond to financial conflicts of interest disclosure in patient decision aids.

Methods We conducted an Internet-based between-subjects fractional factorial experiment. Participants were English-speaking adults in the United States invited by a research recruitment service. Quotas were imposed so the sample was composed equally of patients with adequate (AHL) and limited health literacy (LHL). Participants were asked to imagine they had been diagnosed with an illness, were presented with a fictional one-page decision aid on three treatment options (No Treatment, Abbatide, Benedent), and were advised either that they found it online or received it from a doctor. The decision aid featured a financial conflicts of interest disclosure either negative or positive in content and either basic or enhanced in detail and design. Participants completed several measures. Two items administered to verify the effectiveness of our experimental manipulation are the primary focus of this analysis.
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PERCEIVED EFFECT OF WEB-BASED SELF-HELP TOOL TO REDUCE DEPRESSIVE SYMPTOMS

Aytalina Azarova. Cambridge University, Cambridge, United Kingdom

Objectives The objective of this study was to evaluate the perceived scope of effect across users of a web-based cognitive-behavioral therapeutic (CBT) mobile application for treatment of anxiety and mild depression (N=4711). In addition, the study sought to determine the potential preliminary effectiveness of the application in delivering self-administered CBT.

Method Participants (N=4711) were recruited from the users of the mobile application and were divided into three groups according to the length of use of the application. There was a significant difference in the scope of perceived outcomes between the first and the second group: Cohen’s $d=0.56$, $95\%$CI[$0.49-0.62$] and between first and third group Cohen’s $d=0.80$, $95\%$CI[$0.72-0.88$]. No significant differences were detected between second and third groups. The fact that many users spontaneously referred to a high level of psychological benefits in open questions suggests subjects perceived these as a notable benefit of using the method.

Results Participants in group one experienced a limited scope of effect compared to the medium and long-standing users in groups two and three. Subjects in these groups reported perceiving tangible changes in a wider range of areas as a result of usage, particularly regarding reduced symptoms of depression and anxiety. This study also explores the evidence base and novel research opportunities connected to the application. Collected data provides useful insights into how subjects typically interact with this application, a specific feature of which is that it can dynamically adapt to user’s goals and needs.