1 High intensity psychological interventions for GAD

1.1 CBT vs comparator for GAD

			Quality asse	comont					Summary	of findings		
			Quality asses	ssilleitt			No o	f patients		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	comparator	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs WLC (B	etter indicated by	lower values)								
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	199	199	1	SMD 0.63 lower (0.83 to 0.42 lower)	HIGH	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs AR (Bet	ter indicated by lo	wer values)								
8		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	154	149	-	SMD 0.01 lower (0.22 lower to 0.23 higher)	MODERATE	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs psychod	lynamic therapy (Better indicated	by lower values)							
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ²	no serious imprecision	none	64	57	-	SMD 0.45 lower (0.81 to 0.08 lower)	MODERATE	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs NDT (a	dults) (Better indi	cated by lower va	alues)	,		,				
1	randomised trials	serious³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.69 lower (1.35 to 0.02 lower)	MODERATE	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs NDT (o	lder adults) (Bette	r indicated by lo	wer values)							
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	18	13	-	SMD 0.25 lower (0.97 lower to 0.46 higher)	MODERATE	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs other ac	tive treatment (A)	(M) (Better indic	ated by lower va	lues)						
	randomised trials	serious³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	35	16	-	SMD 0.13 lower (0.78 lower to 0.53 higher)	LOW	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs other ac	tive treatment (dis	scussion) (Better	indicated by lov	ver values)						•
	randomised trials	serious³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.13 lower (0.78 lower to 0.53 higher)	LOW	
Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC	(Better indicated	by lower values)	,		,				
	randomised trials	serious³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	237	237	-	SMD 1.09 lower (1.33 to 0.84 lower)	MODERATE	
Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs AR (Better indicated b	y lower values)								
6	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	131	118	-	SMD 0.15 lower (0.4 lower to 0.1 higher)	LOW	
Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs psyc	hodynamic therap	y (Better indicat	ed by lower valu	ies)						

2	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	64	57	_	SMD 0.46 lower (0.9 to	
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		01			0.02 lower)	HIGH
,		<u> </u>	Γ (adults) (Better i	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , 	, ,	•	1	İ	i -		
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.93 lower (1.61 to 0.25 lower)	MODERATE
Anxiety (clinician rated	l) - CBT vs ND	Γ (older adults) (B	etter indicated by	lower values)		·				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	18	13	=	SMD 0.01 lower (0.72 lower to 0.7 higher)	MODERATE
Non remi	ssion - CBT v	s WLC									
5	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	65/130	109/129 (84.5%)	RR 0.62 (0.51	321 fewer per 1000 (from 211 fewer to 414 fewer)	
							(50%)	81.3%	to 0.75)	309 fewer per 1000 (from 203 fewer to 398 fewer)	HIGH
Non resp	onse - CBT vs	WLC									
5	randomised trials	serious ³	serious ⁴	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	64/106	107/113 (94.7%)	RR 0.67 (0.53	312 fewer per 1000 (from 152 fewer to 445 fewer)	
							(60.4%)	93.8%	to 0.84)	310 fewer per 1000 (from 150 fewer to 441 fewer)	LOW
Non resp	onse - CBT vs	AR									
4	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁵	serious ¹	none	53/91 (58.2%)	42/87 (48.3%) 46.7%	RR 1.11 (0.86	53 more per 1000 (from 68 fewer to 212 more) 51 more per 1000 (from 65 fewer to 205 more)	
Non resp	onse - CBT vs	NDT (adults)					•			·	
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	12/23	16/20 (80%)	RR 0.65 (0.42	,	
							(52.2%)	72.5%	to 1.02)	254 fewer per 1000 (from 421 fewer to 14 more)	LOW
Non resp		other active tre	atment (EUC)								
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	32/70 (45.7%)	33/64 (51.6%)	RR 0.89 (0.63 to 1.26)	57 fewer per 1000 (from 191 fewer to 134 more)	MODERATE
							(±3.7 /0)	62.3%	10 1.20)	69 fewer per 1000 (from 231 fewer to 162	WODERATE

										more)	
Anxiety	(clinician rated) - CBT vs othe	r active treatment	(AXM) (Better i	ndicated by low	er values)				morej	
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	35	16	-	SMD 0.59 lower (1.19 lower to 0.01 higher)	LOW
Depress	sion (self rated)	- CBT vs WLC	Better indicated b	y lower values)							
10	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	201	200	-	SMD 0.81 lower (1.11 to 0.51 lower)	HIGH
Depress	ion (clinician ra	ated) - CBT vs V	VLC (Better indica	ted by lower va	lues)						<u> </u>
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	94	97	1	SMD 0.74 lower (1.11 to 0.36 lower)	HIGH
Depress	ion (self rated)	- CBT vs AR (B	etter indicated by	lower values)							
7	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	141	129	-	SMD 0.18 lower (0.5 lower to 0.13 higher)	MODERATE
Depress	ion (clinician ra	ted) - CBT vs A	R (Better indicate	d by lower valu	es)						
3	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁶	serious ¹	none	78	68	1	SMD 0.08 lower (0.4 lower to 0.25 higher)	LOW
Depress	sion (clinician ra	ated) - CBT vs N	NDT (Better indica	ited by lower va	lues)						
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.71 lower (1.38 to 0.05 lower)	MODERATE
Depress	ion (self rated)	- CBT vs Other	active treatments	AXM (Better in	dicated by lower	values)		_			
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	35	16	-	SMD 0.76 lower (1.37 to 0.15 lower)	HIGH
Depress	sion (self rated)	- CBT vs other	active treatments-	Discussion (Bet	ter indicated by	lower values)					
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious¹	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.27 lower (0.93 lower to 0.39 higher)	LOW
Depress	ion (self rated)	- CBT vs Psych	odynamic therapy	(Better indicate	d by lower valu	es)				•	•
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ²	no serious imprecision	none	64	57	-	SMD 0.76 lower (1.21 to 0.31 lower)	MODERATE
Depress	sion (self rated)	- CBT vs Other	active treatments	EUC (Better inc	licated by lower	values)					
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	66	50	-	SMD 0.34 lower (0.71 lower to 0.03 higher)	MODERATE
Worry -	CBT vs WLC (I	Better indicated	by lower values)								
9	randomised trials	no serious limitations	very serious ⁷	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	reporting bias ⁸	183	183	-	SMD 1.13 lower (1.58 to 0.68 lower)	VERY LOW
Worry -	CBT vs AR (Be	tter indicated b	y lower values)								
6	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious¹	none	130	119	-	SMD 0.02 lower (0.27 lower to 0.23 higher)	MODERATE
Worry -	CBT vs psycho	dynamic therap	y (Better indicate	d by lower value	es)						
		no serious	1							SMD 0.32 lower (0.84	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness						lower to 0.21 higher)	MODERATE	
Worry - (CBT vs other a	ctive treatment	ts-EUC (Better ind	cated by lower v	alues)			1		,	•	
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	66	50	-	SMD 0.9 lower (1.29 to 0.52 lower)	HIGH	
QOL - C	BT vs WLC (Be	etter indicated	by lower values)									
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	serious ⁴	serious ⁹	serious ¹	none	27	28	-	SMD 1.59 lower (3.77 lower to 0.59 higher)	VERY LOW	
QOL - C	BT vs Psychod	ynamic therap	y (Better indicated	by lower values)								
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	35	29	-	SMD 0.15 lower (0.34 lower to 0.65 higher)	LOW	
QOL - C	BT vs Other ac	tive treatments	s-EUC (SF-12 Men	al) (Better indica	ted by lower va	lues)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	66	50	-	SMD 0.47 lower (0.84 to 0.1 lower)	HIGH	
QOL - C	BT vs Other ac	tive treatments	s-discussion group	(QOL-energy) (H	Better indicated	by lower values)					 	
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.18 lower (0.84 lower to 0.47 higher)	LOW	
Non resp	onse - CBT vs	NDT (older ac	dults)									
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	21/26	13/20 (65%)	RR 1.24 (0.86			
							(80.8%)	72.5%	to 1.8)	174 more per 1000 (from 101 fewer to 580 more)	MODERATE	
Non resp	onse - CBT vs	other active tr	eatment (Discussion	on group)								
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	20/26	19/26 (73.1%)	`	37 more per 1000 (from 168 fewer to 322 more)]	
							(76.9%)	62.3%	to 1.44)	31 more per 1000 (from 143 fewer to 274 more)		
Anxiety	`	- 	er active treatment		p (Better indica	ted by lower value	es)	-	<u> </u>	1		
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.72 lower to 0.59 higher)	LOW	
Depressi	on (self rated)	- CBT vs NDT	(adults) (Better in	dicated by lower	values)							
1	randomised trials	serious³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.9 lower (1.58 to 0.22 lower)	MODERATE	
Depressi	on (self rated)	- CBT vs NDT	(older adults) (Be	ter indicated by	lower values)							
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	18	13	-	SMD 0.24 higher (0.48 lower to 0.95 higher)	MODERATE	
Depressi			ther active treatme	, ,	1, (1	· · · · · ·		1	_		
1	randomised	serious ³	no serious	no serious	serious ¹	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.33 lower (0.98		

	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			1	1	1	lower to 0.33 higher)	LOW
Journal C	1	ldomadulto) (P	etter indicated by							lower to 0.55 fligher)	LOW
orry - C	,	, ,	no serious		serious ¹	L		I	I	CMD 0.0(1 (0.79	
		no serious limitations	inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious	none	18	13	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.78 lower to 0.65 higher)	MODERATE
JONNEY C	I .		ndicated by lowe							lower to 0.05 fligher)	MODERATE
offy - C		serious ³		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			T	I	I	CMD 0.07 1 (1.65	
	trials	serious ⁵	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19	18	-	SMD 0.97 lower (1.65 to 0.28 lower)	MODERATE
Jorry - (tivo troatmont	s (discussion gp)			-)				to 0.28 lower)	WODERATE
offy - C	1	serious ³	no serious	no serious	serious ¹	none		l	i	SMD 0.17 lower (0.82	
	trials	serious	inconsistency	indirectness	serious	none	18	18	-	lower to 0.49 higher)	LOW
OI - CI	1 1	tivo troatmonte	-EUC (SF-12 Phys		icated by lower v	zaluos)				lower to 0.42 flighter)	LOW
JL - CL	1	no serious	no serious	no serious	serious ¹	none	<u> </u>	ı	ı	SMD 0.02 higher (0.34	
		limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	Serious ²	none	66	50	-		MODERATE
OL - CI			-discussion group		ectioning) (Rotter	indicated by I	ower values)			lower to 0.55 Higher)	WODERTIE
OL-CI		serious ³	no serious	no serious	serious ¹	none	,			SMD 0.59 lower (1.26	
	trials	serious	inconsistency	indirectness	serious	none	18	18	-	lower to 0.08 higher)	LOW
OL - CI		l tive treatments	-discussion group		le) (Better indica	ited by lower v	alues)			iower to olde ingiter)	2011
OL CI	randomised	serious ³	no serious	no serious	serious ¹	none	ĺ	I	I	SMD 0.11 lower (0.76	
	trials	Scrious	inconsistency	indirectness	Scrious	Horic	18	18	-	lower to 0.54 higher)	LOW
on rem	ission - CBT vs	AR								8 1	
	1	no serious	serious ⁴	no serious	serious1	none		_		38 fewer per 1000	
		limitations		indirectness				47/75		(from 232 fewer to 257	
							44/81	(62.7%)	RR 0.94 (0.63		
							(54.3%)		to 1.41)	33 fewer per 1000	LOW
								55%		(from 204 fewer to 225	
										more)	
on remi	ission - CBT vs	other active t	eatment (discuss	ion gp)	_		_		_		
		serious³	no serious	no serious	serious ¹	none				40 fewer per 1000	
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness				13/26 (50%)		(from 240 fewer to 315	
							12/26		RR 0.92 (0.52	,	
							(46.2%)		to 1.63)	40 fewer per 1000	LOW
										(from 240 fewer to 315	
								50%		`	
								50%		more)	
	nuation due to	1						50%		more)	
	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	10 (07)		PP 4 4 (6 =	more) 48 more per 1000 (from	
Piscontir 2	randomised	1		no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	43/258	31/258 (12%)	RR 1.4 (0.7	more) 48 more per 1000 (from 36 fewer to 215 more)	
	randomised	no serious	no serious			none	43/258 (16.7%)		RR 1.4 (0.7 to 2.79)	more) 48 more per 1000 (from	HIGH

	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	21/172 (12.2%)	29/162 (17.9%) 17.4%	RR 0.75 (0.43 to 1.31)	45 fewer per 1000 (from 102 fewer to 55 more) 43 fewer per 1000 (from 99 fewer to 54 more)	HIGH
		any reason - C		1		1		1	1	1 1000 (6	
	randomised trials	serious ^{3,10}	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹¹	serious ¹	none	12/49	9/40 (22.5%)	RR 1.02 (0.49	4 more per 1000 (from 115 fewer to 252 more)	
							(24.5%)	22.5%	to 2.12)	4 more per 1000 (from 115 fewer to 252 more)	VERY LOW
Discontin	uation due to	any reason - C	BT vs psychodyna	mic therapy	_	_					
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ²	serious ¹	none	6/69	12/73 (16.4%)	RR 0.54 (0.21	76 fewer per 1000 (from 130 fewer to 59 more)	
							(8.7%)	15.4%	to 1.36)	71 fewer per 1000 (from 122 fewer to 55 more)	MODERATE
Discontir	uation due to	any reason - C	BT vs other active	treatments-AXM			•		!		
	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	4/40	6/25 (24%)	RR 0.42 (0.13	139 fewer per 1000 (from 209 fewer to 79 more)	
							(10%)	24%	to 1.33)	139 fewer per 1000 (from 209 fewer to 79 more)	LOW
Discontir	uation due to	any reason - C	BT vs other active	treatments (EUC)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	4/70	14/64 (21.9%)	RR 0.26 (0.09	162 fewer per 1000 (from 55 fewer to 199 fewer)	
							(5.7%)	24%	to 0.75)	178 fewer per 1000 (from 60 fewer to 218 fewer)	HIGH
Discontin	uation due to	any reason - C	BT vs other active	treatments (Disc	ussion gp)						
1	randomised trials	serious³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	8/26	8/26 (30.8%)	KK 1 (0.44 to	0 fewer per 1000 (from 172 fewer to 388 more)	LOW
1.050/	C. 1						(30.8%)	24%	2.26)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 134 fewer to 302 more)	LOW

¹ 95% confidence interval include no effect

² duration for treatment is average of 15 wks and control is average of 30 wks

³ High attrition bias and completor analysis ⁴ Moderate heterogeneity (50-80%)

Anxiety (update): High intensity psychological interventions GRADE profiles

Economic profile

Individual	CBT versus wa				_		
Study & country	Limitation s	Applicability	Other comments	Increment al cost (£)1	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect)	Uncertainty
Guideline analysis UK	Potentially serious limitations 2	Directly applicable ³		£1,125	n/a	n/a	Not estimated
Group CB1	versus waitin	g list					
Study & country	Limitation s	Applicability	Other comments	Increment al cost (£)1	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect)	Uncertainty ¹
Guideline analysis UK	Potentially serious limitations	Directly applicable ³		£300-350	n/a	n/a	£300-350

^{1.} Costs expressed in 2009 UK pounds

1.2 AR vs comparator for GAD

			Quality asses	cmont					Summary	of findings		
			Quality asses	SHCII			No of	patients		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	AR comparator Absolute					Importance
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - A	AR vs WLC (Bet	ter indicated by lo	wer values)								
3	randomised no serious no serious no serious no no serious no no serious no se							59	-	SMD 0.49 lower (0.86 to		

⁵ Half of the trials were Cognitive Therapy while other half were CBT

⁶ Treatment varies and include: Worry exposure, cognitive therapy and manualised CBT

⁷ High heterogeneity (>80%)

⁸ Funnel plot inspected (egger's test p-value=0.02)

⁹ Treatment varies: CBT and acceptance based BT

^{2.} Simple cost analysis; only intervention costs considered; resource use estimated based on data reported in RCTs included in the guideline systematic review supported by the GDG expert opinion

^{3.} Cost analysis conducted to assist guideline development; NHS perspective

¹⁰ High detection bias

¹¹ The studies target different population (adults and older adults)

							()	80%	,	(from 72 fewer to 544 fewer)		
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	10/23 (43.5%)	16/20 (80%)	RR 0.54 (0.32 to 0.91)	368 fewer per 1000 (from 72 fewer to 544 fewer) 368 fewer per 1000	MODERATE	
Non resp	onse - AR vs N	DT	•		•			•				
							(37.5%)	100%	to 0.72)	610 fewer per 1000 (from 280 fewer to 790 fewer)	MODERATE	
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	6/16	20/20 (100%)	RR 0.39 (0.21	610 fewer per 1000 (from 280 fewer to 790 fewer)		
Non resp	onse - AR vs W	ЛС		!	,	!				,		
1	1	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.61 lower (1.28 lower to 0.06 higher)	LOW	
Worry - A		tter indicated by		maneciness	Imprecision					0.31 lower)	THGH	
2	randomised	no serious	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	54	50	-	SMD 0.7 lower (1.1 to 0.31 lower)	HIGH	
Worry - A		tter indicated b	y lower values)	manectiess						lower to 0.2 higher)	LOW	
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	serious ³	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	53	51	-	SMD 0.47 lower (1.14 lower to 0.2 higher)	LOW	
Depression	on (clinician ra	ted) - AR vs WI	LC (Better indicate	ed by lower valu	es)							
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.36 lower (1.02 lower to 0.29 higher)	LOW	
Depression	on (self rated)	AR vs NDT (B	etter indicated by	lower values)	,	1				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	42	40	-	SMD 0.54 lower (0.98 to 0.1 lower)	HIGH	
Depression	on (self rated) -	AR vs WLC (B	etter indicated by	lower values)								
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.82 lower (1.51 to 0.14 lower)	LOW	
Anxiety (clinician rated	- AR vs NDT (Better indicated b	y lower values)								
3	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	63	61	-	SMD 1 lower (1.38 to 0.62 lower)	HIGH	
Anxiety (clinician rated) - AR vs WLC (Better indicated b	y lower values)								
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	18	18	-	SMD 0.48 lower (1.14 lower to 0.19 higher)	LOW	
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - A	AR vs NDT (Bet	ter indicated by l	ower values)								
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision					0.13 lower)	HIGH	

Discontin	Discontinuation due to any reason - AR vs WLC													
3		no serious limitations		no serious indirectness	serious²	none	15/70 (21.4%)	11/71 (15.5%)	RR 2.2 (0.37 to 13.19)	186 more per 1000 (from 98 fewer to 1889 more)	LOW			
							(21.470)	3.2%	10 13.19)	38 more per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 390 more)	LOW			
Discontin	iscontinuation due to any reason - AR vs NDT													
1	randomised trials	serious ¹		no serious indirectness	serious²	none	5/23	2/20 (10%)	RR 2.17 (0.47	117 more per 1000 (from 53 fewer to 900 more)				
							(21.7%)	10%	to 10)	117 more per 1000 (from 53 fewer to 900 more)	LOW			

¹ High attrition bias and completor analysis

Economic profile

AR versus w	vaiting list						
Study & country	Limitation s	Applicability	Other comments	Increment al cost (£) ¹	Incremental effect	ICER (£/effect)	Uncertainty
Guideline analysis UK	Potentially serious limitations ²	Directly applicable ³		£1,125	n/a	n/a	Not estimated

^{1.} Costs expressed in 2009 UK pounds

1.3 Psychodynamic therapy vs other comparator for GAD

	Ouality assessment							Sun	nmary of fin	dings		
	Quality assessment							No of patients Effect				Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Psychodynamic therapy	other comparator	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance

² 95% confidence interval include no effect

³ Moderate heterogeneity (50-80%)

^{2.} Simple cost analysis; only intervention costs considered; resource use estimated based on data reported in RCTs included in the guideline systematic review supported by the GDG expert opinion

^{3.} Cost analysis conducted to assist guideline development; NHS perspective

xiety - psycho	odynam	nic vs active c	ontrol (self rate) (Better indicated	l by lower value	s)					
randon trials	mised s	serious¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	29	35	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.31 lower to 0.67 higher)	LOW
xiety - psycho	odynam	nic vs NDT (se	elf rate) (Better in	dicated by lowe	er values)						
randor trials]	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	15	16	-	SMD 0.47 higher (0.24 lower to 1.19 higher)	MODERATE
xiety - psycho	odynam	nic vs active c	ontrol (clinician r	ate) (Better indi	cated by lower v	values)					
randor trials	mised s	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	29	35	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.41 lower to 0.57 higher)	LOW
xiety - psycho	odynam	nic vs NDT (c	linician rateI) (Be	tter indicated by	y lower values)			_			
randon trials		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	15	16	-	SMD 0.25 lower (0.95 lower to 0.46 higher)	MODERATE
pression - Psy	ychodyi	namic therapy	y vs active contro	l (self rate) (Bett	er indicated by	lower values)					
randon trials	mised s	serious¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	29	16	-	SMD 0.24 higher (0.38 lower to 0.85 higher)	LOW
pression - psy	ychodyi	namic vs ND	Γ (self rate) (Bette	er indicated by l	ower values)						
randon trials		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	15	16	-	SMD 0.12 higher (0.58 lower to 0.83 higher)	MODERATE
pression - ps	ychodyi	namic vs ND	Γ (clinician rate) (Better indicated	l by lower value	s)			•		
randon trials		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	15	16	-	SMD 0.08 lower (0.78 lower to 0.63 higher)	MODERATE
L - Psychody	ynamic	therapy vs act	tive control (Bette	er indicated by 1	ower values)				•		
randon trials	mised s	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	29	16	-	SMD 0.01 lower (0.62 lower to 0.61 higher)	LOW
n remission -	- Psycho	dynamic vs N	NDT								
randon trials		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	8/15 (53.3%)	14/16 (87.5%)	RR 0.61 (0.37 to	341 fewer per 1000 (from 551 fewer to 9 more)	
							8/15 (53.3%)	87.5%	1.01)	341 fewer per 1000	HIGH
								87.5%		(from 551 fewer to 9 more)	

1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	9/45 (20%)	6/25 (24%)	RR 0.83 (0.34 to	41 fewer per 1000 (from 158 fewer to 257 more)		
							7, 20 (2072)	24%	2.07)	41 fewer per 1000 (from 158 fewer to 257 more)	LOW	
Disconti	nuation due to	any reason- p	sychodynamic V	S NDT								
1			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	1/15 (6.7%)	2/16 (12.5%)	RR 0.53 (0.05 to	59 fewer per 1000 (from 119 fewer to 536 more)		
							1/ 13 (0.7 %)	12.5%	5.29)	59 fewer per 1000 (from 119 fewer to 536 more)	MODERATE	

¹ high attrition bias and completor analysis ² 95% confidence interval include no effect

1. CBT vs WLC (subgroup analysis) for GAD

	Quality assessment								Summary of findings					
			Quality asses	ssineit			No	of patients		Effect				
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	WLC (subgroup analysis)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance		
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs WLC(ad	lults) (Better indi	ated by lower va	lues)									
	trials		no serious inconsistency	indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	137	127	-	SMD 0.59 lower (0.85 to 0.33 lower)	HIGH			
	,	CBT vs WLC (o	lder adults) (Bette	r indicated by lo	wer values)	1								
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	47	56	-	SMD 0.72 lower (1.12 to 0.32 lower)	HIGH			
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs WLC (in	ndiv sessions) (Be	tter indicated by	lower values)									
		no serious limitations¹	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	141	135	-	SMD 0.56 lower (0.8 to 0.32 lower)	HIGH			
Anxiety (SELF-rated) - (CBT vs WLC (g	roup sessions) (Be	etter indicated by	lower values)									
	randomised trials	serious¹	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	43	48	-	SMD 0.83 lower (1.26 to 0.39 lower)	MODERATE			
Anxiety (clinician rated) -CBT vs WLC	(adults) (Better in	ndicated by lower	r values)									
		no serious limitations	serious ²		no serious imprecision	none	175	165	-	SMD 1.14 lower (1.46 to 0.83 lower)	MODERATE			
Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC	(older adults) (B	etter indicated by	y lower values)									

2 randomised trials no serious limitations no serious inconsistency indirectness imprecision no serious no serious no serious no serious no serious inconsistency indirectness imprecision no serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious no serious no serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious no serious serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious no serious serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious no serious serious serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious no serious serious serious serious serious serious no serious no serious no serious no serious seri	MODERATE MODERATE
Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC (indiv sessions) (Better indicated by lower values) 8	MODERATE
8 randomised serious¹ no serious no serious no serious no serious no serious indirectness imprecision Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC (group sessions) (Better indicated by lower values) 2 randomised trials no serious no serious no serious no serious no serious inconsistency indirectness³ imprecision 43 48 - SMD 1.32 lower (1.78 to 0.86 lower) Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	
trials inconsistency indirectness imprecision 179 173 - to 0.77 lower) Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC (group sessions) (Better indicated by lower values) 2 randomised trials no serious no serious no serious inconsistency indirectness imprecision 43 48 - SMD 1.32 lower (1.78 to 0.86 lower) Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	
Anxiety (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC (group sessions) (Better indicated by lower values) 2 randomised trials no serious no serious no serious none inconsistency indirectness none inconsistency indirectness none indirectness none inconsistency indirectness none	
2 randomised trials no serious no	MODERATE
trials inconsistency indirectness³ imprecision 43 48 - to 0.86 lower) Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	MODERATE
trials inconsistency indirectness³ imprecision 43 48 - to 0.86 lower) Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	MODERATE
Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	
	ļļ.
7 randomised no serious serious no serious no serious no no local local SMD 0.73 lower (1.13	
trials limitations indirectness imprecision 139 128 - 300 100 110 110 110 110 110 110 110 110	MODERATE
Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (older adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,
2 randomised no serious no serious no serious no serious no no serious no ser	
trials limitations inconsistency indirectness imprecision 47 56 - 50.044 lower)	HIGH
	HIGH
Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC (indiv sessions) (Better indicated by lower values)	1
7 randomised no serious serious no serious no serious no	
trials limitations indirectness imprecision 143 130 0.32 lower)	MODERATE
Non remission - CBT vs WLC (adults)	
3 randomised no serious serious ⁴ serious ³ no serious none 327 fewer per 1000	
trials limitations imprecision 56/65 (86.2%) (from 52 fewer to 508	
32/65 RR 0.62 fewer)	
(49.2%) (0.41 to 0.94) 309 fewer per 1000	LOW
81.3% (from 49 fewer to 480	
fewer)	
Depression (self rated) - CBT vs WLC(group sessions) (Better indicated by lower values)	,
2 randomised serious¹ no serious no serious no no serious no no serious no se	
trials inconsistency indirectness imprecision 43 48 - 0.52 lower	MODERATE
Depression (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC(adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	
2 randomised serious ¹ serious ² serious ³ no serious none SMD 0.87 lower (1.63	
trials imprecision 47 41 - to 0.11 lower)	VERY LOW
Depression (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC(older adults) (Better indicated by lower values)	
2 randomicad sarious no sarious no sarious no sarious nono	
trials inconsistency indirectness imprecision 47 56 - to 0.19 lower)	MODERATE
Depression (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC (indiv sessions) (Better indicated by lower values)	WODERTIE
	1
3 randomised serious no serious n	LOW
	LOW
Depression (clinician rated) - CBT vs WLC (group sessions) (Better indicated by lower values)	1
1 randomised serious no serious no serious serious none 18 21 - SMD 0.4 lower (1.04	1 0111
trials inconsistency indirectness indirectness indirectness inconsistency indirectness inconsistency indirectness indirectness inconsistency indirectness indirectness inconsistency indirectness indirectnes	LOW

Vorry - C	CBT vs WLC (a	dults) (Better i	ndicated by lower	values)							
		no serious limitations	very serious ⁶	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	121	111	-	SMD 1.15 lower (1.81 to 0.5 lower)	LOW
Jorry - C	CBT vs WLC (c	lder adults) (Be	etter indicated by	lower values)							
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	47	56	-	SMD 0.89 lower (1.33 to 0.46 lower)	HIGH
orry - C	CBT vs WLC (i	ndiv sessions) (Better indicated	y lower values)							
		no serious limitations	serious ²	serious ³	no serious imprecision	none	125	119	-	SMD 1.16 lower (1.81 to 0.52 lower)	LOW
orry - C	CBT vs WLC (g	roup sessions)	(Better indicated	by lower values)							
	trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	43	48	-	SMD 0.85 lower (1.28 to 0.41 lower)	MODERATE
on rem	ission - CBT v	s WLC (older ac	lults)								
				no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	33/65	53/64 (82.8%)	RR 0.62 (0.47 to 0.8)	315 fewer per 1000 (from 166 fewer to 439 fewer)	
							(50.8%)	83.7%		318 fewer per 1000 (from 167 fewer to 444 fewer)	HIGH
Ion resp	onse - CBT vs	WLC (adults)									
random trials		no serious limitations	serious ²	serious ³	imprecision 44/46 (95.7%) (from 7.7)	411 fewer per 1000 (from 77 fewer to 612 fewer)					
							(50%)	93.8%	(0.36 to 0.92)	403 fewer per 1000 (from 75 fewer to 600 fewer)	LOW
lon resp	onse - CBT vs	WLC (older ad	ults)		•	•					
	randomised trials	no serious limitations			no serious imprecision	none	41/65	60/64 (93.8%)	RR 0.69	291 fewer per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 478 fewer)	
						(63.1%)	94.2%	(0.49 to 0.98)	292 fewer per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 480 fewer)	MODERATE	

¹ High attrition bias and completer analysis ² Moderate heterogeneity (50-80%)

³ Difference in treatment principles ⁴ Borderline heterogeneity (45-50%)

⁵ 95% confidence interval include no effect

⁶ High heterogeniety (>80%)