Appendix 18d: Computerised cognitive behavioural therapy for panic disorder GRADE evidence profiles

CCBT versus waitlist control for panic disorder	
CCBT versus information control for panic disorder	
CCBT versus any control (waitlist or information control) for panic disorder	
CCBT versus face-to-face CBT for panic disorder	
CCBT versus bibliotherapy for panic disorder	
CCD1 versus vivilouierapy for partie disorder	

CCBT versus waitlist control for panic disorder

			O1:t						Summary	of findings		
			Quality asses	sment			No. of	patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	ССВТ	Waitlist control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Measure o	of general anxi	ety (Better indic	cated by lower valu	ıes)								
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	51	50	-	SMD 1.29 lower (1.72 to 0.86 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Measure o	of depression (Better indicated	by lower values)									
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	51	50	-	SMD 0.84 lower (1.39 to 0.29 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Measure o	of Quality of L	ife (psychologic	cal) (Better indicate	ed by lower value	es)							
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	51	50	-	SMD 0.55 lower (0.95 to 0.15 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Non-pani	c-free status (c	inician and self	f-report) - Non-ren	nission (1-month	post-treatment n	o longer fulfils pa	nic disor	der diagnos	tic criteria)			
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	Very serious ¹	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	21/51 (41.2%)	49/51 (96.1%)	RR 0.44 (0.12 to 1.55)	538 fewer per 1000 (from 845 fewer to 528 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
							(41.2%)	100%	10 1.55)	560 fewer per 1000 (from 880 fewer to 550 more)	VERT LOW	
Discontin	uation due to a	ny reason										
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	5/51	3/50 (6%)	RR 1.48 (0.2	29 more per 1000 (from 48 fewer to 587 more)	⊕⊕⊕О	
							(9.8%)	5.8%	to 10.79)	28 more per 1000 (from 46 fewer to 568 more)	MODERATE	

¹ High heterogeneity (>80%) ² 95% confidence interval including no effect

Health economic profile

Internet Psyk	Internet Psykiatri versus waiting list												
Study & country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£)1	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹						
Guideline analysis (model 3) UK	Minor limitations ²	Directly applicable ³	• Time horizon: 1 year	£115.62	0.052	£2,216/QALY	Probability of Internet Psykiatri being cost effective at £20,000/QALY: 85.3%						

CCBT versus information control for panic disorder

			Orgality acces						Summary o	of findings		
			Quality asses	Silient			No.	of patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CCBT	information control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Measure (of general anxi	ety (Better indi	cated by lower val	ues)								
	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	31	27	-	SMD 0.1 lower (0.77 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Measure o	of panic severit	y (Better indica	ited by lower valu	es)								
	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	Serious ²	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	31	27	-	SMD 1.9 lower (3.04 to 0.76 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Measure (of depression (Better indicated	d by lower values)									
	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	31	27	-	SMD 0.57 lower (1.1 to 0.04 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Measure (of Quality of li	fe (Psychologic	al) (Better indicate	d by lower valu	es)							
	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	12	9	-	SMD 0.25 lower (1.12 lower to 0.61 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Non-pani	c-free status (c	linician and sel	f-report)									
	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	9/31	25/27 (92.6%)	RR 0.32	630 fewer per 1000 (from 407 fewer to 759 fewer)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$	
							(29%)	91.7%	(0.18 to 0.56)	624 fewer per 1000 (from 403 fewer to 752 fewer)	HIGH	

Costs expressed in 2009 UK pounds
 Limited evidence base (2 RCTs); intervention currently not available in the UK
 Analysis conducted to assist guideline development; NHS and personal social services perspective; QALYs estimated based on EQ-5D

Discontin	Discontinuation due to any reason													
2	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Serious ¹	None				150 fewer per 1000				
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness				7/27 (25.9%)		(from 231 fewer to 163				
							3/31		RR 0.42	more)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$			
							(9.7%)		(0.11 to 1.63)	145 fewer per 1000	MODERATE			
								25%		(from 222 fewer to 157				
										more)				

¹ 95% confidence interval including no effect

Health economic profile

Panic online	e versus informa	tion control					
Study & country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£)1	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Klein et al., 2006 Australia	Potentially serious limitations ²	Partially applicable ³	Time horizon: 6 weeks Cost-consequence analysis	£141	See GRADE clinical profile above	Non-applicable	No statistical analysis of costs
Guideline analysis (model 1) UK	Minor limitations ⁴	Directly applicable ⁵	Time horizon: 1 year	£354.96	0.046	£7,599/QALY	Probability of cost effectiveness at £20,000/QALY: 92%

- 1. Costs converted and uplifted to 2009 UK pounds, using purchasing power parity (PPP) exchange rates (http://www.oecd.org/std/ppp) and the UK HCHS inflation index; assuming study cost year 2004
- 2. Short time horizon; intervention costs only considered; various panic, anxiety and cognition outcomes measured (cost-consequence analysis)
- 3. Australian study; narrow perspective (intervention costs only considered); local prices used; no QALYs estimated but outcome measures considered relevant in guideline systematic review of clinical evidence
- 4. Limited evidence base (2 RCTs); intervention currently not available in the UK
- 5. Analysis conducted to assist guideline development; NHS and personal social services perspective; QALYs estimated based on EQ-5D

² Moderate heterogeneity (50-80%)

CCBT versus any control (waitlist or information control) for panic disorder

			Quality asses					Sun	nmary of fir	ndings		
	- ,						ľ	No. of patients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	ССВТ	Any control (waitlist or information control)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Measure	of general anx	iety (Better inc	licated by lower v	values)								
4	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	Serious ¹	Serious ²	No serious imprecision	None	82	77	-	SMD 0.7 lower (1.41 lower to 0.01 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Measure	of panic sever	ity (Better indi	cated by lower va	ılues)								
4	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	Serious ²	No serious imprecision	None	82	77	-	SMD 1.78 lower (2.26 to 1.31 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Measure	of depression	(Better indicat	ed by lower value	es)			•					
4	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	Serious ²	No serious imprecision	None	82	77	-	SMD 0.72 lower (1.05 to 0.4 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Measure	of Quality of	Life (Psycholog	gical) (Better indi	cated by lower v	alues)							
3	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	63	59	1	SMD 0.5 lower (0.86 to 0.14 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Non-Pan	ic-free status (clinician and s	elf-report)									
4	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	Serious ¹	Serious ²	No serious imprecision	None	30/82	74/78 (94.9%)	RR 0.38 (0.19 to	588 fewer per 1000 (from 209 fewer to 768 fewer)	⊕⊕OO	
							(36.6%)	94.6%	0.78)	587 fewer per 1000 (from 208 fewer to 766 fewer)	LOW	
Disconti	nuation due to	any reason										
4	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	Serious ²	Serious ³	None	8/82	10/77 (13%)	RR 0.72	36 fewer per 1000 (from 101 fewer to 182 more)	⊕⊕OO	
							(9.8%)	14.4%	(0.22 to 2.4)	40 fewer per 1000 (from 112 fewer to 202 more)	LOW	

¹ Moderate heterogeneity (50-80%)

² Different comparator ³ 95% confidence interval including no effect

CCBT versus face-to-face CBT for panic disorder

			Quality assessn						Summary	of findings		
			Quality assessi	ileiit			No. of	patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	ССВТ	Face-to- face CBT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Measure o	of general anxi	ety (Better indica	ated by lower value	es)								
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	Serious ¹	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	67	62	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.41 lower to 0.62 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Measure o	of depression (l	Better indicated	by lower values)									
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	70	63	-	SMD 0.13 higher (0.22 lower to 0.47 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Measure o	of Quality of Li	fe - QOL (Psych	ological) (Better in	dicated by lower	values)	•	•	<u> </u>	•		•	•
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	65	62	-	SMD 0.09 higher (0.26 lower to 0.44 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Panic-free	e-status (clinicia	an and self-repo	rt)	·	-				<u> </u>			•
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	35/71 (49.3%)	33/64 (51.6%) 47.9%	RR 0.95 (0.61 to 1.46)	26 fewer per 1000 (from 201 fewer to 237 more) 24 fewer per 1000 (from 187 fewer to 220 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Discontin	uation due to a	ny reason										
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ²	None	8/71 (11.3%)	5/64 (7.8%) 8.8%	RR 1.41 (0.48 to 4.2)	32 more per 1000 (from 41 fewer to 250 more) 36 more per 1000 (from 46 fewer to 282 more)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$	

¹ Moderate heterogeneity (50-80%) ² 95% confidence interval including no effect

Health economic profile

Study & country	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental cost (£)¹	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect) ¹	Uncertainty ¹
Panic Onlin	e versus face-to-fac	ce CBT					
Guideline analysis (model 2) UK	Minor limitations ²	Directly applicable ³	Time horizon: 1 year	-£303.00	-0.023	£126,849/QALY	Probability of Panic Online being cost effective at £20,000/QALY: 71%
Internet Psy	kiatri versus face-t	o-face CBT					
Guideline analysis (model 4) UK	Minor limitations ²	Directly applicable ³	Time horizon: 1 year	-£433.50	0.012	CCBT dominant	Probability of Internet Psykiatri being cost effective at £20,000/QALY: 95%

- 1. Costs uplifted to 2009 UK pounds using the UK HCHS inflation index.
- Limited evidence base (1 RCT); intervention currently not available in the UK
- 3. Analysis conducted to assist guideline development; NHS and personal social services perspective; QALYs estimated based on EQ-5D

CCBT versus bibliotherapy for panic disorder

Health economic profile

Panic Onlin	Panic Online versus therapist-assisted self-administered CBT											
Study &	Limitations	Applicability	Other comments	Incremental	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect)1	Uncertainty					
country				cost (£)¹								
Klein et	Potentially	Partially	Time horizon: 6 weeks	-£14	See GRADE	Non-applicable	No significant difference in costs					
al., 2006	serious	applicable ³	 Cost-consequence 		clinical profile							
Australia	limitations ²		analysis		above							

- 1. Costs converted and uplifted to 2009 UK pounds, using purchasing power parity (PPP) exchange rates (http://www.oecd.org/std/ppp) and the UK HCHS inflation index; assuming study cost year 2004.
- 2. Short time horizon; intervention costs only considered; various panic, anxiety and cognition outcomes measured (cost-consequence analysis)
- 3. Australian study; narrow perspective (intervention costs only considered); local prices used; no QALYs estimated but outcome measures considered relevant in guideline systematic review of clinical evidence