

Using a Wireless Electroencephalography Device to Evaluate E-Health and E-Learning Interventions

Tanya Mailhot ▼ Patrick Lavoie ▼ Marc-André Maheu-Cadotte ▼ Guillaume Fontaine ▼ Alexis Cournoyer ▼ José Côté ▼ France Dupuis ▼ Thierry Karsenti ▼ Sylvie Cossette

Background: Measuring engagement and other reactions of patients and health professionals to e-health and e-learning interventions remains a challenge for researchers.

Objective: The aim of this pilot study was to assess the feasibility and acceptability of using a wireless electroencephalography (EEG) device to measure affective (anxiety, enjoyment, relaxation) and cognitive (attention, engagement, interest) reactions of patients and healthcare professionals during e-health or e-learning interventions.

Methods: Using a wireless EEG device, we measured patient ($n = 6$) and health professional ($n = 7$) reactions during a 10-minute session of an e-health or e-learning intervention. The following feasibility and acceptability indicators were assessed and compared for patients and healthcare professionals: number of eligible participants who consented to participate, reasons for refusal, time to install and calibrate the wireless EEG device, number of participants who completed the full 10-minute sessions, participant comfort when wearing the device, signal quality, and number of observations obtained for each reaction. The wireless EEG readings were compared to participant self-rating of their reactions.

Results: We obtained at least 75% of possible observations for attention, engagement, enjoyment, and interest. EEG scores were similar to self-reported scores, but they varied throughout the sessions, which gave information on participants' real-time reactions to the e-health/e-learning interventions. Results on the other indicators support the feasibility and acceptability of the wireless EEG device for both patients and professionals.

Discussion: Using the wireless EEG device was feasible and acceptable. Future studies must examine its use in other contexts of care and explore which components of the interventions affected participant reactions by combining wireless EEG and eye tracking.

Key Words: e-health • e-learning • electroencephalography • engagement • pilot study

Nursing Research, January/February 2018, Vol 67, No 1, 43–48

Physical inactivity, smoking, hypercaloric diet, and other unhealthy behaviors are priority targets for disease prevention and management (Cardiometabolic Risk Working Group: Executive Committee, 2011). To address

these risk factors, patients must initiate changes in their behaviors, and healthcare professionals must support those changes (Garvey, Arathuzik, Miller, & Ard, 2016; The Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration, 2015). Over the last decade, an increasing number of Web-based e-health and e-learning interventions have been developed and tested for these purposes (Cook et al., 2008). For patients, e-health interventions provide a learning environment that can support behavior change (Wantland, Portillo, Holzemer, Slaughter, & McGhee, 2004). For healthcare professionals, e-learning can facilitate the acquisition of the knowledge and skills required to support patients in health behavior change (Cook et al., 2008).

However, recent studies have shown that the effectiveness of e-health and e-learning interventions is limited by dropout rates of 50%–80% (Cugelman, Thelwall, & Dawes, 2011; Krebs, Prochaska, & Rossi, 2010; Norman et al., 2007). A possible explanation for these numbers resides in the lack of user engagement, which is essential to sustain user participation and to achieve positive outcomes (Perski, Blandford,

Tanya Mailhot, RN, PhD, is Postdoctoral Fellow, Faculty of Nursing and Faculty of Medicine, Université de Montréal, Montréal Heart Institute Research Center, Canada ("spell out province in bio).

Patrick Lavoie, RN, PhD, is Postdoctoral Fellow, William F. Connell School of Nursing, Boston College, Massachusetts.

Marc-André Maheu-Cadotte, RN, BSc, is Doctoral Student and **Guillaume Fontaine, RN, MSc**, is Doctoral Student, Faculty of Nursing, Université de Montréal, Montréal Heart Institute Research Center, Canada.

Alexis Cournoyer, MD, is Doctoral Student, Université de Montréal, Hôpital du Sacré-Coeur de Montréal, Canada.

José Côté, RN, PhD, is Professor, Faculty of Nursing, Université de Montréal, and Researcher, Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal Research Center, Canada.

France Dupuis, RN, PhD, is Associate Professor, Faculty of Nursing, Université de Montréal, and Researcher, Sainte-Justine Research Center, Montréal, Canada. **Thierry Karsenti, MA, MEd, PhD**, is Professor, Faculty of Education Sciences, Université de Montréal, Canada.

Sylvie Cossette, RN, PhD, is Professor, Faculty of Nursing, Université de Montréal, and Researcher, Montréal Heart Institute Research Center, Canada.

Copyright © 2018 Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. All rights reserved.

DOI: 10.1097/NNR.0000000000000260

West, & Michie, 2017). Engagement can be divided into a behavioral and a psychological component (Clark & Mayer, 2016). Behavioral engagement is reflected in overt actions of users during the interventions—clicking, writing, or ticking boxes, for instances. Psychological engagement, on the other hand, is reflected in the mental activity of users toward the learning goals, making it a more difficult construct to measure. Both forms of engagement are closely linked with other affective and cognitive reactions involved in learning, including attention, interest, enjoyment, relaxation, and anxiety.

Thus, evaluating user engagement and other affective and cognitive reactions in e-health and e-learning interventions is a top research priority (Michie, Yardley, West, Patrick, & Greaves, 2017). Among the existing measurement methods, electroencephalography (EEG) allows for real-time assessment of electrical signals in various parts of the brain. It can detect patterns of mental activity associated with affective and cognitive reactions, including engagement (Li & Lu, 2009; Mampusti et al., 2011; Murugappan et al., 2008). However, EEG devices require users to wear dozens of electrodes while remaining completely still during the test, not to mention the specialized training required to interpret the results (Acharya, Hani, Cheek, Thirumala, & Tsuchida, 2016). Beside EEG devices, other methods are more commonly used to evaluate affective and cognitive reactions after online interventions. These methods involve users' self-rating of their reactions on visual analog scales (VAS) but do not provide real-time assessments during the interventions (Funke & Reips, 2012; Kuhlmann, Reips, Wienert, & Lippke, 2016; Reips & Funke, 2008).

In response to these challenges, wireless EEG devices have been developed. Although they cannot be substituted to full-scale EEG for diagnostic purposes, these devices are cheaper and use less electrodes, which reduces the time required for installation and allows users to move during measurement. The devices come with interpretation software products that compute real-time scores for different affective and cognitive reactions. Up to now, wireless EEGs' tracings have been compared to full-scale EEGs and their validity was supported (Badcock et al., 2015), but the validity of the software interpretations remains to be scrutinized. Nevertheless, wireless EEG devices are a promising and practical method to measure users' real-time reactions that could be used to evaluate e-health or e-learning interventions. Accordingly, the aim of this pilot study was to assess the feasibility and acceptability of using a wireless EEG device to measure affective and cognitive reactions of patients and healthcare professionals during e-health or e-learning interventions.

METHODS

This prospective pilot study was conducted between April and May 2017 in a Canadian cardiology hospital. The study was

approved by the institutional review board (#2017-2134) and registered at the ISRCTN registry (<https://www.isrctn.com>; ISRCTN12825237).

Participants

Based on anticipated recruitment rate, we aimed to approach 20 eligible participants over 2 months. Eligible participants were either patients expecting discharge from a coronary care unit or professionals from the same setting. Written consent was obtained from all participants.

Procedure

Upon enrolment, participants completed a sociodemographic questionnaire, including age, gender, and education. A research assistant then installed and calibrated a wireless EEG device on their head. Participants were instructed to start the first session of an e-health or e-learning intervention on a laptop computer. Patients completed the procedure in their hospital room, and healthcare professionals completed it in a closed office during a work shift. These conditions reflected the course of events on the unit. There was a possibility that participants could be interrupted to receive or provide regular care at any time during the sessions. If they had not been interrupted after 10 minutes, the research assistant ended the experiment and asked participants to complete a questionnaire about their reactions to the intervention.

E-Health and E-Learning Interventions

Two interventions were used—one for patients and one for healthcare professionals. Patients navigated through the first session of TAVIE@COEUR (Cossette et al., 2017), an e-health intervention designed to promote adherence to cardiovascular medication. Professionals viewed the first session of MOTIV@COEUR (Fontaine et al., 2016), an e-learning intervention on motivational interviewing. A typical timeline of the first 10 minutes of each intervention with actions assumed to promote behavioral engagement (clicks and questions) is presented in Figure 1. In both online interventions, participants navigated through videos of a nurse providing topic-relevant explanations ("N" in Figure 1). They had to click on "continue" buttons to move from one video to the next.

Patients watched videos of a nurse addressing the importance of taking cardiovascular medication as prescribed (3 segments \times 1 minute/segment) and on behaviors related to medication (3 segments \times 1 minute/segment). They also viewed a video of a patient sharing his experience with cardiovascular medication (2.5 minutes). On two occasions, they had to answer yes/no questions; they also had to complete a questionnaire on drugs they were taking at home ("Q" in Figure 1), and they were presented with a short text on these drugs ("T" in Figure 1).

In the first video watched by healthcare professionals (2 minutes), a nurse introduced brief motivational interviewing



FIGURE 1. Typical timeline of the interventions. The MOTIV@Coeur timeline was used for patients, and the TAVIE@Coeur timeline was used for professionals. Navigation through videos is identified with “N.” Clicking on “continue” buttons to move from one video to the next is identified as “Click.” Completing a questionnaire corresponds to “Q” and “Questionnaire,” whereas reading a short text corresponds to “T.”

and the learning objectives for MOTIV@COEUR. In the second video (11 minutes), the nurse presented the theoretical basis of motivational interviewing. On three occasions, videos showed text to emphasize the nurse’s explanations (“T” in Figure 1).

Data Collection

Emotive and Cognitive Reactions Participant reactions were measured with a wireless EEG device and VAS. The EPOC+ wireless EEG device (Figure 2) from EMOTIV (San Francisco, CA) was used. The EPOC+ uses 14 electrodes that are positioned per the 10–20 international positioning system for EEGs (Acharya et al., 2016). Interpretation software for the device (MyEmotiv) computes real-time scores for six affective and cognitive reactions: anxiety, attention, engagement, enjoyment, interest, and relaxation. Scores range from 0 to 100, with higher scores indicating higher-intensity reactions.




FIGURE 2. EPOC+ wireless EEG device from Emotiv. A person wearing the wireless EEG headset is shown navigating through the MOTIV@Coeur intervention.

During the sessions, participant scores were recorded every minute for each of the six reactions. Therefore, a total of 60 scores per participant (10 scores \times 6 reactions) was expected. Of note, the software requires a sufficient signal quality to compute the reactions, with some reactions requiring a higher signal quality than others. Accordingly, it was possible that the software would not provide scores for some reactions if the signal quality was not sufficient. Because there was no previous report of the number of scores to expect, we estimated that obtaining 75% of possible scores was acceptable.

Immediately after the session, participants rated the degree to which they experienced the six affective and cognitive reactions measured by the wireless EEG device by tracing an X on a 10-cm VAS. The distance from the beginning of the VAS to the X was measured and transformed into a 0–100 score (e.g., 67 mm = 67 points).

Feasibility and Acceptability Indicators drawn from the literature on pilot studies (Feeley & Cossette, 2016) were assessed and compared for patients and healthcare professionals: number of eligible participants who consented to participate, reasons for refusal, time to install and calibrate the wireless EEG device, number of participants who completed the full 10-minute sessions, participants’ comfort when wearing the device, signal quality, and number of observations obtained for each reaction. A VAS was also used to measure participant comfort while wearing the wireless EEG device.

Analyses

Data were summarized with descriptive statistics, including frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation (or median and minimum/maximum value if normality of the distribution was not achieved). Because the sample size was small, groups were compared on the basis of visual inspection.

Although the validity and reliability of the software interpretation was beyond the scope of this pilot study, the participant scores on the reactions for which we obtained at least 75% of possible observations were graphed. The curves from the graphed scores were compared to participant self-rating of their reactions during the intervention. A search for differences in trends among patients' and professionals' scores was performed; as they had been exposed to different interventions, different trends were expected.

RESULTS

During the study period, 18 eligible participants (10 patients and 8 professionals) were approached. Of those, 13 were recruited and enrolled (six patients and seven professionals). The recruitment rates were high at 60% for patients and 87.5% for professionals. Reasons for refusal included being too tired or not interested. On average, patients were 58 years old (range: 53–65); healthcare professionals were 36 years old (range: 26–54). Patients identified mostly as male ($n = 4$, 67%), and half had completed a college education ($n = 3$, 50%). Healthcare professionals identified mostly as female ($n = 4$, 57%), were all nurses, and all had completed a university degree ($n = 7$, 100%).

Feasibility and acceptability results are reported in Table 1. For both groups, the median time to install and calibrate the wireless EEG device was shorter or equal to other reports (2–5 minutes; Harrison, 2013); it took longer to install the device on patients than on professionals. All participants completed at least 7 minutes of the sessions. Approximately half of the patients ($n = 3/6$, 50%) and the professionals ($n = 4/7$, 57%) completed the full 10-minute sessions. Patients were interrupted mostly because a healthcare professional walked into their room; healthcare professionals were interrupted because one of their assigned patients required care.

Comfort scores were generally high and similar for both groups. Comfort scores for participants who did ($Mdn = 8.7$) and did not ($Mdn = 7.9$) complete the sessions were also similar. Nevertheless, visual inspection of the comfort scores revealed that patients and professionals who did not complete the sessions reported higher comfort scores. Thus, it appeared that participants ended the sessions because of contextual factors and not because of uncomfortableness with the wireless EEG device. However, healthcare professionals who completed the sessions reported slightly lower comfort scores than those who did not. This could mean that wearing the wireless EEG device for a longer period increases discomfort. Signal quality was generally high throughout the sessions. We were unable to obtain any observations from one healthcare professional, even if the signal quality was moderate at 85% during the experiment. This participant was removed from the subsequent parts of the analyses.

In the protocol, we planned to calculate the number of observations obtained over 10 minutes. Half of participants stopped the sessions after 7 minutes. Therefore, most of the missing observations in the last 3 minutes of the experiment were due to the interruption of the procedure and not to the wireless EEG device. Thus, the first 7 minutes of the experiment were used for analyses. As shown in Table 1, at least 75% of possible observations for professionals' attention, engagement, enjoyment, and interest were obtained. This threshold was not reached for anxiety and relaxation. Results for patients were similar, except for enjoyment, which approached but did not reach the 75% threshold. However, the threshold was reached with healthcare professionals, and we decided to keep enjoyment for further analyses.

Affective and cognitive reactions are presented in Figure 3. Trends in patient and professional scores on attention, engagement, enjoyment, and interest for the first 7 minutes of the

TABLE 1. Feasibility and Acceptability

Variable	Patients ($n = 6$)		Professionals ($n = 7$)	
	<i>Mdn</i>	Range	<i>Mdn</i>	Range
Install/calibrate (minutes)	2.5	1–10	1.0	1–4
Signal quality	92	55–100	100	85–100
Comfort (score)	8.7	4.6–9.5	7.7	2.5–9.7
Completed session	8.7	7.9–9.4	6.5	2.9–9.7
Did not complete session	8.8	4.6–9.5	7.7	2.5–8.1
Observations (first 7 minutes)	<i>j</i> ^a	(%)	<i>J</i> ^a	(%)
Anxiety	11	(26.2)	20	(47.6)
Attention	39	(92.3)	42	(100.0)
Engagement	37	(88.1)	36	(85.7)
Enjoyment	31	(73.8)	41	(97.6)
Interest	40	(95.2)	42	(100.0)
Relaxation	24	(57.1)	24	(57.1)

Note. Results are presented for the first 7 minutes, because approximately half of the participants did not complete an entire 10-minute session. There were 42 possible observations for both patients and professionals (7 minutes \times 6 patients or professionals). *j* = number of observations; *Mdn* = median. ^aBased on data from seven patients and six professionals.

experiment were similar to the VAS scores measured after the experiment. On the EEG and the VAS, professionals scored higher than patients. As expected, the wireless EEG scores varied throughout the sessions, providing real-time information on participant reaction; this variation was not reflected in the single VAS measures obtained after the intervention. The difference in patient and professional curves reflects that they were exposed to different interventions and suggests that the wireless EEG device provides a measure that was reactive to the interventions, which supports its potential.

DISCUSSION

These results support the feasibility and the acceptability of using a wireless EEG device to evaluate e-health and e-learning interventions with hospitalized patients and healthcare professionals. Recruitment rates were high, installation and

Data obtained with the wireless EEG device are promising.

calibration of the device were feasible within a reasonable time, participants were comfortable, and the device yielded the expected number of observations for most reactions. Data obtained with the wireless EEG device are promising; they show variations in the intensity of reactions that are known to affect the outcomes of e-health and e-learning interventions. The strengths of this exploratory study include participants' blinding to their EEG scores and the absence of missing data for the VAS scores. Feasibility and acceptability were assessed in naturalistic clinical conditions, thereby increasing the applicability of the results to real-world settings and future nursing research. However, this is also a limit of the study: Some sessions were interrupted by clinical events on the unit, resulting in missing EEG data. Although appropriate for a pilot study, the sample size was small, and we only approached 18 out of the possible 20 participants because of administrative issues. It is also important to note that all participants in this study came from one setting and were clinically stable—patients were expecting discharge, and professionals were assumed to be healthy.

Conclusions

Considering the strengths and limitations of this study, the results suggest that the use of wireless EEG device warrants further investigation. The next step would be to examine what components of the interventions affected participant reactions. This could be achieved by combining wireless EEG and eye-tracking measurements with a larger sample of patients and professionals. Such studies could lead to adjustments of e-health and e-learning interventions to increase their effectiveness regarding behavior change and knowledge/skill acquisition. Also, it appears relevant to test the wireless EEG device in other care settings and with patients who present with different clinical states.

Accepted for publication October 11, 2017.

The paper was accepted under the Editorship of Susan J. Henly.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

This study received funding from the Montréal Heart Institute Foundation. The authors would like to acknowledge the valuable contribution of Alain Vadeboncoeur, MD, Jean Lambert, PhD, Julien Terrier, RN MSc, and Luc Dubé, PhD, to this study.

Corresponding author: Tanya Mailhot, RN, PhD, Faculty of Nursing and Faculty of Medicine; Université de Montréal, Montréal Heart Institute Research Center, 5000 Bélanger Street, S-2490, Montréal, QC H1T 1C8, Canada (e-mail: t.mailhot@uMontréal.ca).

REFERENCES

- Acharya, J. N., Hani, A. J., Cheek, J., Thirumala, P., & Tsuchida, T. N. (2016). American Clinical Neurophysiology Society guideline 2: Guidelines for standard electrode position nomenclature. *Neurodiagnostic Journal*, *56*, 245–252. doi:10.1080/21646821.2016.1245558




FIGURE 3. Descriptive results for attention, engagement, enjoyment, and interest. Dotted lines represent the mean scores obtained with the wireless EEG device at each time point. Full lines represent the mean VAS score obtained after the online interventions. Scores for professionals are presented in blue; patient scores are in black.

- Badcock, N. A., Preece, K. A., de Wit, B., Glenn, K., Fieder, N., Thie, J., & McArthur, G. (2015). Validation of the Emotiv EPOC EEG system for research quality auditory event-related potentials in children. *PeerJ*, 3, e907. doi:10.7717/peerj.907
- Cardiometabolic Risk Working Group: Executive Committee, Leiter, L. A., Fitchett, D. H., Gilbert, R. E., Gupta, M., Mancini, G. B., ... Ur, E. (2011). Cardiometabolic risk in Canada: A detailed analysis and position paper by the Cardiometabolic Risk Working Group. *Canadian Journal of Cardiology*, 27(2), e1-e33. doi:10.1016/j.cjca.2010.12.054
- Clark, R. C., & Mayer, R. E. (2016). *E-learning and the science of instruction: Proven guidelines for consumers and designers of multimedia learning* (4th ed.). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Cook, D. A., Levinson, A. J., Garside, S., Dupras, D. M., Erwin, P. J., & Montori, V. M. (2008). Internet-based learning in the health professions: A meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 300, 1181-1196. doi:10.1001/jama.300.10.1181
- Cossette, S., Côté, J., Rouleau, G., Robitaille, M., Heppell, S., Mailhot, T., ... Guertin, M.-C. (2017). A Web-based tailored intervention to support illness management in patients hospitalized for an acute coronary syndrome: A pilot study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research Cardio*, 1(2), e4. doi:10.2196/cardio.7342
- Cugelman, B., Thelwall, M., & Dawes, P. (2011). Online interventions for social marketing health behavior change campaigns: A meta-analysis of psychological architectures and adherence factors. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 13(1), e17. doi:10.2196/jmir.1367
- Feeley, N., & Cossette, S. (2016). Pilot studies. In S. J. Henly (Ed.), *The Routledge international handbook of advanced quantitative methods in nursing research* (pp. 199-212). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Fontaine, G., Cossette, S., Heppell, S., Boyer, L., Mailhot, T., Simard, M.-J., & Tanguay, J.-F. (2016). Evaluation of a Web-based e-learning platform for brief motivational interviewing by nurses in cardiovascular care: A pilot study. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 18(8), e224. doi:10.2196/jmir.6298
- Funke, F., & Reips, U.-D. (2012). Why semantic differentials in Web-based research should be made from visual analog scales and not from 5-point scales. *Field Methods*, 24, 310-327. doi:10.1177/1525822X12444061
- Garvey, W. T., Arathuzik, G., Miller, G. D., & Ard, J. (2016). Lifestyle therapy in the management of cardiometabolic risk: Diabetes prevention, hypertension, and dyslipidemia. In J. I. Mechanick & R. F. Kushner (Eds.), *Lifestyle medicine: A manual for clinical practice* (pp. 245-267). Cham, Switzerland: Springer International.
- Harrison, T. (2013). *The Emotiv mind: Investigating the accuracy of the Emotiv EPOC in identifying emotions and its use in an Intelligent Tutoring System* (Unpublished honours report). University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand. Retrieved from www.cosc.canterbury.ac.nz/research/reports/HonsReps/2013/hons_1302.pdf
- Li, M., & Lu, B. L. (2009). Emotion classification based on gamma-band EEG. *Conference Proceedings of the IEEE Engineering in Medicine and Biology Society, 2009*, 1323-1326. doi:10.1109/IEMBS.2009.5334139
- Krebs, P., Prochaska, J. O., & Rossi, J. S. (2010). A meta-analysis of computer-tailored interventions for health behavior change. *Preventive Medicine*, 51, 214-221. doi:10.1016/j.ypmed.2010.06.004
- Kuhlmann, T., Reips, U.-D., Wienert, J., & Lippke, S. (2016). Using visual analogue scales in eHealth: Non-response effects in a lifestyle intervention. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 18(6), e126. doi:10.2196/jmir.5271
- Mampusti, E. T., Ng, J. S., Quinto, J. J., Teng, G. L., Suarez, M. T. C., & Trogo, R. S. (2011, October). *Measuring academic affective states of students via brainwave signals*. Paper presented at the Third International Conference on Knowledge and Systems Engineering, Hanoi, Vietnam. Retrieved from http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/stamp/stamp.jsp?arnumber=6063471
- Michie, S., Yardley, L., West, R., Patrick, K., & Greaves, F. (2017). Developing and evaluating digital interventions to promote behavior change in health and health care: Recommendations resulting from an international workshop. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 19(6), e232. doi:10.2196/jmir.7126
- Murugappan, M., Rizon, M., Nagarajan, R., Yaacob, S., Zunaidi, I., & Hazry, D. (2008, August). *Lifting scheme for human emotion recognition using EEG*. Paper presented at the 2008 International Symposium on Information Technology, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. doi:10.1109/ITSIM.2008.4631646. Retrieved from http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/iel5/4625945/4631638/04631646.pdf
- Norman, G. J., Zabinski, M. F., Adams, M. A., Rosenberg, D. E., Yaroch, A. L., & Atienza, A. A. (2007). A review of eHealth interventions for physical activity and dietary behavior change. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 33(4), 336-345. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2007.05.007
- Perski, O., Blandford, A., West, R., & Michie, S. (2017). Conceptualising engagement with digital behaviour change interventions: A systematic review using principles from critical interpretive synthesis. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 7(2), 254-267. doi:10.1007/s13142-016-0453-1
- Reips, U.-D., & Funke, F. (2008). Interval-level measurement with visual analogue scales in Internet-based research: VAS generator. *Behavior Research Methods*, 40, 699-704. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.699
- The Emerging Risk Factors Collaboration. (2015). Association of cardiometabolic multimorbidity with mortality. *JAMA*, 314, 52-60. doi:10.1001/jama.2015.7008
- Wantland, D. J., Portillo, C. J., Holzemer, W. L., Slaughter, R., & McGhee, E. M. (2004). The effectiveness of Web-based vs. non-Web-based interventions: A meta-analysis of behavioral change outcomes. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 6(4), e40. doi:10.2196/jmir.6.4.e40

Read and Send Letters to the Editor

Nursing Research now publishes Letters to the Editor in the print journal. To submit a Letter to the Editor you should login to Editorial Manager here: <http://www.editorialmanager.com/nres/default.aspx> and choose article type 'Letter to the Editor.' Authors of articles referenced in the Letter will be given the opportunity to respond.

Previous Letters published can be found on the publisher's website: <http://journals.lww.com/nursingresearchonline/Pages/LetterstotheEditor.aspx>.