**Table 1: Demographic variables between intervention and control group**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variables** | **Intervention group (N=59)**  **n (%)** | **Control group (N=60)**  **n (%)** |
| **Age** |  |  |
| 25 years or less | 21 (36) | 16 (27) |
| 26-35 years | 18 (31) | 19 (32) |
| 36-45 years | 18 (31) | 21 (35) |
| 46 years or more | 2 (3) | 4 (7) |
| **Marital status** |  |  |
| Never married | 7 (12) | 7 (12) |
| Currently married | 41 (70) | 47 (78) |
| Separated | 3 (5) | 3 (5) |
| Widowed | 8 (14) | 3 (5) |
| **Education** |  |  |
| None | 41 (70) | 41 (68) |
| Primary | 9 (15) | 10 (17) |
| Secondary | 6 (10) | 6 (10) |
| 10 years or above | 3 (5) | 3 (5) |
| **Occupation** |  |  |
| Paid work | 10 (17) | 16 (27) |
| House keeping | 48 (81) | 41 (68) |
| **Respondent husband’s occupation** |  |  |
| Paid work | 19 (43) | 13 (28) |
| Self-employed | 18 (41) | 22 (47) |
| Unemployed | 1 (2) | 2 (4) |
| **Financially empowered** | 27 (46) | 26 (43) |
| **Nuclear family structure** | 16 (27) | 16 (27) |
| **Family size** |  |  |
| ≥2 children younger than 7 years old | 17 (29) | 22 (37) |

**Table 2: Comparison of outcomes between control and intervention groups on intention to treat analysis**

| **Primary and secondary outcomes** | **Time** | **N** | **Intervention group**  **Mean (SD)** | **N** | **Control**  **group**  **Mean (SD)** | **Linear Mixed Model** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Difference in least squares mean (95%CI)** | **p-value** |
| Hospital Anxiety & Depression Rating Scale (Depression and Anxiety combined) | Baseline | 59 | 20.15(7.13) | 60 | 24.15(7.58) | -4.65(-7.35,-1.95) | 0.0009 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 15.70(9.04) | 58 | 23.21(8.32) |
| Hospital Anxiety Rating Scale (Anxiety score) | Baseline | 59 | 10.81(3.68) | 60 | 13.13(3.94) | -2.62(-4.37,-0.86) | 0.0039 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 7.59(4.66) | 58 | 11.52(4.59) |
| Hospital Depression Rating Scale (Depression score) | Baseline | 59 | 9.34(4.38) | 60 | 11.02(4.32) | -2.48(-4.00,-0.96) | 0.0016 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 8.11(5.13) | 58 | 11.69(4.42) |
| WHO DAS (Functionality) | Baseline | 59 | 30.24(6.62) | 60 | 31.92(7.20) | -5.37(-8.97,-1.76) | 0.0040 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 24.44(8.90) | 58 | 30.86(8.64) |
| PSYCHLOPS | Baseline | 55 | 14.69(3.31) | 60 | 15.63(3.39) | -4.49(-6.41,-2.58) | <0.0001 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 9.22(4.97) | 57 | 14.21(3.98) |
| PCL (PTSD symptoms) | Baseline | 59 | 28.47(15.80) | 60 | 36.53(16.73) | -2.79(-9.51,3.94) | 0.4128 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 17.65(15.59) | 58 | 24.02(16.26) |
| PHQ (Generalized distress) | Baseline | 59 | 11.42(5.71) | 60 | 13.23(6.92) | -1.06(-3.59,1.48) | 0.4112 |
| One Week post intervention | 54 | 10.06(6.45) | 58 | 12.05(6.09) |

**Table 3: Qualitative interview results**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective** | **Theme** | **Quote (source)** |
| Acceptability to participants | Participants learnt useful skills to manage their problems | *This was a very good experience. I am satisfied. We learned some techniques here that we didn’t knew before. We discussed our problem in groups and tried to solve them. (Client)*  *This was easy for me to implement the skills because these were solving my problems and my tension and the heaviness of my head improved, so I practised them regularly. (Client)*  *I had very good relation with my helper and I liked her because she came for us, we learned a lot that changed our lives, I trusted her and told her all my problems, our tensions were reduced because of her, she taught us such skills that we didn’t knew, and those skills solved a lot of our problems, it changed our behaviours. (Client)* |
| Acceptability to families | Recognizable improvement in condition | *I think this is a very good program because the participant from our house improved a lot. (Client family)*  *My family realized that these sessions are regarding health so I was allowed to attend the sessions and they trusted the lay-helper. (Client)* |
| Acceptability to lay-helpers | Lay-helpers learnt the skills | *At the start it was difficult because I have no idea of the work. But then it all went well. I not only managed peoples’ problems and learnt the skills but also learned to manage my own routine problems. (Lay-helper)*  *Very friendly, they trusted us, they frankly shared their problems with us. If they could not share any problem during the session in front of other participants they spoke to us during break time. (Lay helper)*  *The participant realized that it is working and their small problems started resolving, this motivated them to continue. (Lay helper)* |
| Feasible for LHWs to act as intervention facilitators | LHWs respected and trusted in the community | *I had a very good experience with the program; as all of the participants gathered in my health house, collectively listened everyone problems and then discussed the solutions. I even learnt new skills which improved my own health as well. (LHW)*  *I am officially working in this catchment area, so all these people know me and trust me. That’s the reason they send their women to my house. (LHW)* |
| Barriers and challenges | Confidentiality issues | *If in any session there were two or three participants from the same house that made it difficult to let the participants share their problems. (Lay helper)*  *I was not able to share my problems because of my family member in the same group. (Client)* |
| Monetary expectations | *Participants wanted some monetary incentives and when it was not provided they lost interest and they were not punctual. (Lay helper)*  *Everyone believed that there would be some monetary incentives for the participants, but there was none. (Client)* |
| Long session duration | *There was plenty of household chores to be done in the house, so at times the family got annoyed, the session duration was too long. (Client)*  *The sessions were too long and families have reservations, as the participants have to do work back home. (Lay helper)* |