APPENDIX 16: COMPLETE METHODOLOGY CHECKLISTS FOR CLINICAL STUDIES

1.1	Service delivery models	2
1.1	1.1 Systematic reviews	2
	CLEARY2008	2
1.1	1.2 RCTs	3
	BURNAM1995	
	CHANDLER2006	6
	DRAKE1998	9
	ESSOCK2006	12
	MORSE2006	15
1.2	Psychological/ psychosocial interventions	18
1.2	2.1 RCTs	18
	BAKER2006	
	BARROWCLOUGH2001	20
	EDWARDS2006	22
	GRAEBER2003	24
	HELLERSTEIN1995	26
	JERRELL1995	29
	KAVANAGH2004	
	RIES2004	33
	SCHMITZ2002	35
	TRACY2007	37
	WEISS2007	39
	WEISS2009	41
1.2	2.2 Observational studies	44
	ANDERSON1999	
	DELEON2000	
	DRAKE1997	52
	HO1999	54
	MANGRUM2006.	
	NUTTBROCK1998	
	JAMES2004	
	HELMUS2003	
	LYKKE2010	64
	SANTANA2007	66
	TYRER2010	
	WEISS2000	
1.3	Pharmacological interventions	73
1.3	3.1 Systematic reviews	

BUCHANAN2009 (PORT)	73
GASAS2008	
GREEN2008	74
HJORTHOJ2009	75
POTVIN2009	
SAN2007	
SMELSON2008	76
TIET2007	77
VORNIK2006	78
WOBROCK2008	78
1.3.2 RCTs	79
BROWN2009	79
KEMP2009	81
NEJTEK2009	83
SWARTZ2008	85

1.1 SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS

1.1.1 Systematic reviews

Study ID	CLEARY2008
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.1/1.2.2
Checklist completed by: Craig Whittington (CW)	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	Yes
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

1.1.2 RCTs

Stud	dy ID	BURNAM1995	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	cklist completed by: LS		
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes (except significant differences between groups in terms of marital status):	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion ly direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
	Low risk of bias Likely direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation)	en groups in the care provided, apart	
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Unclear/unknown risk			

Likely	direction of effect:		
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete tre N=211 in treatment, n =65 in control. At 3 m experimental, n=18 dropped out in control in experimental, n=0 dropped out in control experimental, n=11 dropped out in control.	nonth follow up, n=40 dropped out in At 6 months, n=8 additional dropped out	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group we n.=56 for experimental, n=27 for control	ere no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa direction of its effect?	s attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
	Low risk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		
D. Dete	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	d, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Based o	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa	s detection bias present? If so, what is the
likely d	irection of its effect?	
Low ris	k of bias	
Likely c	lirection of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	CHANDLER2006	
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.1	
Che	cklist completed by: LS		
A. S	selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion	was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
like	ly direction of its effect?		
Unc	lear/unknown risk		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation)	en groups in the care provided, apart	
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
L	Low risk of bias Unclear/unknown risk High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			

C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	 a. How many participants did not complet N=11 (out of 103) disappeared after jail. 	e treatment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group we N= 31 lost to follow-up	ere no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa rection of its effect?	s attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	Low risk of bias	
Likely d	irection of effect:	
D. Dete	ction bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	d, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion warrection of its effect?	s detection bias present? If so, what is the

Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely direction of effect:	

Study ID	DRAKE1998
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS	
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)
A1 An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2 There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3 The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	on was selection bias present? If so, what is the
Low risk of bias	
Likely direction of effect:	
B. Performance bias (systematic differences betw from the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart
B1 The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2 Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3 Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion the likely direction of its effect?	on was performance bias present? If so, what is
Low risk of bias	
Likely direction of effect:	

C. Attri	tion bias (systematic differences between the co	omparison groups with respect to loss of
purticip	unito)	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal	
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to	Yes
	allow for differences in length of follow-up)	
C2	a. How many participants did not complet	Ŭ 1
	: n=20(out of 223) were lost to attrition (n=1	
	relocations) all other participants remained	in the 3-year study.
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment	
	completion (that is, there were no important	No (attrition was higher for the SCM
	or systematic differences between groups in	,
	terms of those who did not complete	group than for the ACT group):
	treatment)	
C3	a. For how many participants in each grou N=20	p were no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect	
	to the availability of outcome data (that is,	
	there were no important or systematic	Yes
	differences between groups in terms of those	ies
	for whom outcome data were not available).	
	,	
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa rection of its effect?	s attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	Low risk of bias	
Likely d	lirection of effect:	
D. Dete	ction bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	ed, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	Yes
	follow-up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes
<i>D</i> 2	outcome	103
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
D3		ies
D4	determine the outcome	V.
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes
	participants' exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Based o	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa	Less detection hise present? If so, what is the
	rection of its effect?	is detection bias present: if so, what is the
TINCLY U	rection of its effect;	

Low risk of bias	
Likely direction of effect:	

Study ID		ESSOCK2006
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.1
Che	cklist completed by: LS	
A. S	belection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the
like	ly direction of its effect?	
Low	risk of bias	
Like	ely direction of effect:	
	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation)	en groups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

C. Attri	tion bias (systematic differences between the co ants)	omparison groups with respect to loss of
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete tre N=19 (out of n=198) lost to follow-up (n=5 died, n=8 relocated)	Ŭ 1
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group we n=145 (out of n=179) completed every asses assessments.	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wairection of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the
Low ris	sk of bias	
Likely c	lirection of effect:	
D. Dete	ction bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	d, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa irection of its effect?	is detection bias present? If so, what is the
minery a.		

Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely direction of effect:	

Study ID		MORSE2006
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Se	election bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)
1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
1	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
	d on your answers to the above, in your opinion direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the
Uncle	ear/unknown risk	
Likel	y direction of effect:	
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

partici	rition bias (systematic differences between the opents)	comparison groups with respect to loss of	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=47		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	No (two groups differed in terms of the final sample had fewer days of alcohol use and more days of stable housing).	
C3	a. For how many participants in each grown N=47	up were no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w direction of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
Low	risk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		
D. Det	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ed, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w direction of its effect?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the	

Low risk of bias	
Likely direction of effect:	

1.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTIONS

1.2.1 RCTs

Study ID		BAKER2006	
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	cklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
Uno	likely direction of its effect? Unclear/unknown risk Likely direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear (raters were blind)	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is			
the likely direction of its effect?			

Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely d	Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attri	tion bias (systematic differences between the co pants)	omparison groups with respect to loss of	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complet All in control arm completed treatment, n=8 some, and n=46 completed all treatments (o	3 completed 0 treatments, n=11 completed	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N=119 (out of n=130) completed baseline, 15 week and 6 month follow-up, and n= completed fourth assessment at 12 months			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Likely d	Likely direction of effect:		
D. Dete	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding and prognostic	
	factors	
Based or	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa	s detection bias present? If so, what is the
likely di	rection of its effect?	
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		BARROWCLOUGH2001	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
B3 Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation Ye		Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so, what is	
L	ow risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between tricipants)	the comparison groups with respect to loss of	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up		
C2	a. How many participants did not com N=17 and n=15 (n=32 out of 36) did no months → 3 deaths, n=2 refused to com	ot complete assessment at 9 months, and at 12	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there wer no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who on not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each an n=5	group were no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome da (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Vos	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
D. I	Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascert	tained, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	

D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
	outcome		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Based o	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the		
likely d	likely direction of its effect?		
Low ris	Low risk of bias		
Likely c	Likely direction of effect:		

Stu	Study ID EDWARDS2006		
Stu		LDVVINDS2000	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart			
from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior likely direction of its effect?	was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Lo	ow risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	attrition bias (systematic differences between the icipants)	e comparison groups with respect to loss of	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? End of treatment: n= 1 in CAP dropped out, n=1 in PE dropped out. At 6 months post- intervention, n=6 dropped out (CAP), n=6 (PE)		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	t	
C3	C3 a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N=24 nonparticipants (ITT) n=47 randomized		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of thos for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion by direction of its effect?	was attrition bias present? If so, what is the	

Low risk of bias			
Likely o	Likely direction of effect:		
D. Dete	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertai	ned, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion	was detection bias present? If so, what is the	
likely d	likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely o	Likely direction of effect:		

Stu	dy ID	GRAEBER2003
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between t		he comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2		No
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes (except more Hispanics than any other ethnic group)

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Unclear/unknown risk			
Like	ely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior likely direction of its effect?	was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up	Yes	
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? All participants (n=30) completed treatment		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme		
	completion (that is, there were no importar or systematic differences between groups in		
	terms of those who did not complete	1 165	
	treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 2/15 were not assessed at follow-up periods		
• •			

	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the
likely	direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ed, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w direction of its effect?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the
Uncle	ar/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	HELLERSTEIN1995
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any	Yes

	confounding factors equally across groups)		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion by direction of its effect?	was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
	lear/unknown risk		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
U	Unclear/unknown risk		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up	Yes Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not com Whole ITT sample n= 18/47 were non-s		

	outpatient sessions after hospital charge (.n=7 experimental, n=11 control subjects)	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each grou 25/29 treatment started completers 4 month follow-up.	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wairection of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	Low risk of bias	
Likely d	lirection of effect:	
D. Dete	ction bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	ed, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa irection of its effect?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the
Unclear	/unknown risk	
Likely d	lirection of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	JERRELL1995	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	cklist completed by: LS		
A. S	selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No (randomly assigned cohort reported lower housing stability, lower family interaction, lower personal well-being) when compared to the clinician assigned group.	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low	Low risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
U	Unclear/unknown risk		

CAH	trition bias (systematic differences between the c	omnarison groups with respect to loss of
	cipants)	omparison groups with respect to loss of
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complet n/a (no retention or attrition rates reported	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each ground n/a	p were no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wardirection of its effect?	is attrition bias present? If so, what is the
Unc	elear/unknown risk	
Likely	y direction of effect:	
	etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	ed, diagnosed or verified)
D. De		Yes
D. De	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	
		Yes
D1	follow-up The study used a precise definition of	Yes Yes
D1 D2	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome A valid and reliable method was used to	

Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
Study ID	KAVANAGH2004	
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1 An appropriate method of randomisation was		

A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)				
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was			
	used to allocate participants to treatment	Yes		
	groups (which would have balanced any	ies		
	confounding factors equally across groups)			
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation			
	(such that investigators, clinicians and	Unclear		
	participants cannot influence enrolment or	Officieal		
	treatment allocation)			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,	No (SC in hospital longer on average		
	including all major confounding and	than SOS patients, and SOS patients more		
	prognostic factors	confident in controlling substance use) but		
		these did not predict outcomes.		

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

Unclear/unknown risk

Likely direction of effect:

B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)

-	B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes			
	B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear			
	В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear (Raters were blind who were assessing abstinence)			

the fixely direction of its effect:			
the likely direction of its effect? Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect participants)	ct to loss of		
All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)			
C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? All completers (n=25)			
b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment) Yes treatment			
a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 2/13 participants in the SOS and 6/12 participants in SC were not assessed at 12 months. 1 participant additionally could not be contacted for follow-up.			
b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available). Yes			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1 The study had an appropriate length of follow-up			
D2 The study used a precise definition of outcome Yes			
D3 A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome Yes			

D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	No		
	participants' exposure to the intervention			
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes		
	important confounding and prognostic			
	factors			
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion	n was detection bias present? If so, what is the		
like	ly direction of its effect?			
Low	v risk of bias			
Like	ely direction of effect:			
Ct	1 ID	DIECOOA		
Stu	dy ID	RIES2004		
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2		
Che	ecklist completed by: LS			
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was			
	used to allocate participants to treatment	Yes		
	groups (which would have balanced any	res		
	confounding factors equally across groups)			
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation			
	(such that investigators, clinicians and	Unclear		
	participants cannot influence enrolment or	Unclear		
	treatment allocation)			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and	Yes		
	prognostic factors			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the				
likely direction of its effect?				
Low risk of bias				
I : I called Himsettians of affects				
Likely direction of effect:				
рр	lanfannan a hia (anatamati - 1:00			
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			

Yes

The comparison groups received the same

care apart from the intervention(s) studied

B1

B2		rticipants receiving care were kept 'blind' to atment allocation	Un	clear
В3		lividuals administering care were kept ind' to treatment allocation	Un	clear
		n your answers to the above, in your opinion y direction of its effect?	wa	s performance bias present? If so, what is
U	ncle	ear/unknown risk		
Like	ely d	lirection of effect:		
		tion bias (systematic differences between thants)	ie co	omparison groups with respect to loss of
C1		All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up))	Yes
C2 b. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N= data not reported			e treatment in each group?	
		b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	ıt	Yes
C3 a.For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N= data not reported			re no outcome data available?	
		b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of thos for whom outcome data were not available)	se	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				
Low risk of bias				
Likely direction of effect:				
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)				
D1		The study had an appropriate length of follow-up		No

D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
	outcome		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	No (maybe contact authors – as statistic	
	determine the outcome	used is not described in detail, and no	
		tables)	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Unclear	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Unclear	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the			
likely direction of its effect?			
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			

Stu	dy ID	SCHMITZ2002		
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2		
Checklist completed by: LS				
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes (except for marital status, and MM group reported more depressive and manic symptoms than MM+ CBT group)		
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Unclear/unknown risk				
Likely direction of effect:				

B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)				
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	3	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Une	clear	
B3 Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation		Un	Unclear	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	n was	s performance bias present? If so, what is	
U	nclear/unknown risk			
Like	ely direction of effect:			
	ttrition bias (systematic differences between t icipants)	ne co	mparison groups with respect to loss of	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=24			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	nt	Yes (non-significant by by-group comparisons favored the MM+ CBT group over MM group for treatment completion)	
C3				
	b. The groups were comparable with respet to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of the for whom outcome data were not available.	se	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				
Unclear/unknown risk				

Likely direction of effect:			
D. Det	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			

Stu	dy ID	TRACY2007
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)
A1 A2	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups) There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	yes unclear
A3	including all major confounding and prognostic factors	yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Low risk of bias				
Like	Likely direction of effect:			
	erformance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation)	reen groups in the care provided, apart		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	yes		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	to unclear		
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	unclear		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	on was performance bias present? If so, what is		
Unk	known/unclear risk of bias			
Like	ely direction of effect:			
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the cicipants)	the comparison groups with respect to loss of		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up	Yes		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete N= 4 out of 30 did not complete the students.			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatmed completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	cant		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group N=4 (out of 30)	up were no outcome data available?		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of tho for whom outcome data were not available	yes yes		

	on your answers to the above, in your opinion	was attrition bias present? If so, what is the
likely o	direction of its effect?	
Low	risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. Det	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ned, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	no
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion direction of its effect?	was detection bias present? If so, what is the
Unkno	own/unclear risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	WEISS2007
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear

A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and	Yes	
	prognostic factors		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
like	y direction of its effect?		
Unc	Unclear/unknown risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
LIK	ry direction of effect.		
D D		a success to the same one that send	
	erformance bias (systematic differences between	n groups in the care provided, apart	
iron	n the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same		
	care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to		
	treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept	Unclear (partial - the psychologist and	
	'blind' to treatment allocation	raters were blind but the research assistants	
		were not):	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	was performance bias present? If so, what is	
the	likely direction of its effect?		
	1 / 1 · · 1		
U	nclear/unknown risk		
Lile	ely direction of effect:		
LIKE	ry direction of effect.		
C. A	attrition bias (systematic differences between th	e comparison groups with respect to loss of	
participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
CI	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to	V	
	allow for differences in length of follow-up	Yes	
	5		
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?		
	N=7 (out of 31) discontinued treatment in integrated group therapy arm, n=14 (out of		
	31) discontinued in group drug counseli		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme		
	completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in		
	terms of those who did not complete	1 165	
	treatment)		
	arcament)		

C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available?		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes	
Based	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
likely	direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ed, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wadirection of its effect?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the	
Low r	isk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		

Study ID	WEISS2009	
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		

A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was		
	used to allocate participants to treatment	Yes	
	groups (which would have balanced any		
4.2	confounding factors equally across groups)		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation		
	(such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or	Yes	
	treatment allocation)		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
113	including all major confounding and	Yes	
	prognostic factors	163	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
	ly direction of its effect?	was selection bias present. If so, what is the	
Low	risk of bias		
LOW	TISK OF DIAS		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between	n groups in the care provided, apart	
fron	n the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same		
	care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to		
	treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept		
	'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	was performance bias present? If so, what is	
	the likely direction of its effect?		
_			
L	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of			
	icipants)	ie companison groups with respect to loss of	
Part	icipatic)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal		
	length of time (or analysis was adjusted to	Yes	
	allow for differences in length of follow-up		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete	treatment in each group?	
	N= 6/31 (integrated group therapy), 6/3		
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	W 1 0	

	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group we N= 3/61 no outcome data available (95% of month follow-up points)	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa irection of its effect?	s attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	v risk of bias	
Likely d	lirection of effect:	
D. Dete	ction bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	d, diagnosed or verified)
	·	,,,,,
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D1 D2	,	
	follow-up The study used a precise definition of	Yes
D2	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes Yes
D2 D3	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes Yes Yes
D2 D3 D4 D5 Based on	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
D2 D3 D4 D5 Based of likely di	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors n your answers to the above, in your opinion was	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes
D2 D3 D4 D5 Based or likely di	follow-up The study used a precise definition of outcome A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors n your answers to the above, in your opinion was irection of its effect?	Yes Yes Yes Yes Yes

1.2.2 Observational studies

Study	ID	ANDERSON1999
Guide	line topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.3
Check	list completed by: LS	
A. Selo	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	selection bias present? If so, what is
Ţ	Jnclear/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between gro he intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was s the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
	Unclear/unknown risk	

Likely direction of effect:			
	C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treats 135 out of 360 (high dropout rate for MICA referr group)	0 1	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Not reported	no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was a ly direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely (direction of effect:		
D. Dete	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Unclear	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Unclear/unknown risk			

Study	7 ID	BLANKERTZ1994
<u> </u>		
Guid	eline topic:	Review question no: 1.2.3
Checl	klist completed by: LS	
A. Sel	lection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	l on your answers to the above, in your opinion was kely direction of its effect?	selection bias present: If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	rformance bias (systematic differences between gro the intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was is the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
	Low risk of bias	

	direction of effect:	
	rition bias (systematic differences between the con	nparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 89 out of 135 overall		ment in each group?
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were 89 out of 135 had outcome data available	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was a ely direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias (although very high attr	rition)
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes (3 months)
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Unclear
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was a likely direction of its effect?	detection bias present? If so, what
	Low risk of bias	

Study	· ID	BRUNETTE2001
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.3
	clist completed by: LS	1
	lection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No
the lik	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was sely direction of its effect? High risk of bias	selection bias present: if so, what is
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between gro the intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was is the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
Uncle	ar/unknown risk	

Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 3 out of 43 in long term group, no mention of how many participants at follow-up in short-term groups	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 3 out of 43 in long term group, no mention of how many participants at follow-up in short-term group	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was a ly direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Likely (direction of effect:	
D. Dete	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely direction of effect:	

Study	· ID	DELEON2000
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.3
Checl	klist completed by: LS	
A. Sel	lection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was cely direction of its effect?	selection bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between gro the intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
Based	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was is the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,

Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely (Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attri	tion bias (systematic differences between the com	parison groups with respect to	
loss of	participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 119/183 in TC1 followed up at 12 months 65/93 in TC2 followed up at 12 months 48/66 in TAU received 12 month baseline interviews		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	No (completed did significantly better on multiple outcomes)	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were 119/183 in TC1 followed up at 12 months 65/93 in TC2 followed up at 12 months 48/66 in TAU received 12 month baseline intervie		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was a ly direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely o	direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Based o	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was o	detection bias present? If so, what	
is the lil	is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

		,
Study	ID	DRAKE1997
Guide	line topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.1
Check	list completed by: Laura Shields	
A. Sele	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?	
L	ow risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between gro he intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No

В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind'	
	to treatment allocation	No
D 1		(1. (2.1)
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was pathe likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
what is	the likely direction of its effect:	
1	Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely o	lirection of effect:	
	tion bias (systematic differences between the con participants)	nparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length	
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr	nent in each group?
	12 of 59 in standard treatment vs. 18 of 158 in inte	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment	
	completion (that is, there were no important or	Yes
	systematic differences between groups in terms	
	of those who did not complete treatment)	
C3	For how many participants in each group were no	
	12 of 59 in standard treatment vs. 18 of 158 in inte b. The groups were comparable with respect to	grated with treatment.
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there	
	were no important or systematic differences	V
	between groups in terms of those for whom	Yes
	outcome data were not available)	
D 1		
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was a	attrition bias present? If so, what is
the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Based o	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was o	detection bias present? If so, what
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study	ID	HO1999
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.1
Check	clist completed by: LS	
A. Sel	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes (note: consecutive enrolled participants, pre-post design)
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	selection bias present? If so, what is
τ	Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between gro the intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No

В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
	Low risk of bias		
Likely o	direction of effect:		
	tion bias (systematic differences between the comparticipants)	nparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	How many participants did not complete treatme Not reported	ent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	For how many participants in each group were no Not reported	o outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely o	Likely direction of effect:		
D. Dete	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Unclear	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Based o	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the lil	is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

Study	ID	MANGRUM2006	
Guide	Guideline topic: PSM Review question no: 1.2.1		
Check	list completed by: LS		
A. Sele	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)	
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Unclear (two groups were randomly allocated, the third was allocated by geographical location, which could have influenced the outcomes)	
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes (except for geographical location in the non-equivalent control group)	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
L	ow risk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	

В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind'		
	to treatment allocation	Unclear	
D 1		(1. (2.1)	
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was perfect the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,	
what is	the likely direction of its effect:		
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely o	lirection of effect:		
	tion bias (systematic differences between the com participants)	nparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length		
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	How many participants did not complete treatme	l nt in each group?	
C _	Data was not reported	in in each group.	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	completion (that is, there were no important or	Yes	
	systematic differences between groups in terms	165	
	of those who did not complete treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?	
	Data was not reported	T	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to		
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences		
	between groups in terms of those for whom	Yes	
	outcome data were not available)		
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was a	attrition bias present? If so, what is	
the like.	the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
טט	determine the outcome	165	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	Unclear	
	exposure to the intervention		

D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding/prognostic factors		
Based o	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was o	detection bias present? If so, what	
is the lil	is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

Likely direction of effect.		
Study	· ID	NUTTBROCK1998
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.3
Check	clist completed by: LS	
A. Sel	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was	selection bias present? If so, what is
the lik	xely direction of its effect?	
Uncle	ar/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between grothe intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
1	Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely d	lirection of effect:	
	tion bias (systematic differences between the com	parison groups with respect to
	participants)	1
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length	
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	Yes
	differences in length of follow-up)	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatr	nent in each group?
	Of the 169 residents who completed treatment in a	a therapeutic community, 123/169
	completed 2 months of treatment, 72/169 completed	1 ,
	12 months.	, , 1
	C	1 (, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
	Community residents – 106/121 started two mont	ths of treatment, 67/121 completed
	6 months, 45/121 completed 12 months.	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment	
	completion (that is, there were no important or	Yes
	systematic differences between groups in terms	
_	of those who did not complete treatment)	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were As above	no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to	
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there	
	were no important or systematic differences	Vac
	between groups in terms of those for whom	Yes
	outcome data were not available)	
	·	
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was a	attrition bias present? If so, what is
the likel	y direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Likely d	lirection of effect:	
D. Dete	ction bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes

D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Psychological Interventions

Study	ID	JAMES2004
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Check	clist completed by: LS	
A. Sel	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,	
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely	direction of effect:		
	ition bias (systematic differences between the corparticipants)	nparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treat 29/32 for intervention group , 29/31 for control g		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were 29/32 for intervention group, 29/31 for control group.		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			
D. Dete	D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		

Likely direction of effect:

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	No
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		

Study	ID	HELMUS2003
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Check	list completed by: LS	
A. Sel	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart		

from the intervention under investigation)

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,	
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely	direction of effect:		
	ition bias (systematic differences between the corparticipants)	nparison groups with respect to	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes	
C2	How many participants did not complete treatments. Not reported	ent in each group?	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes	
C3			
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is	
	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely	Likely direction of effect:		
D. Det	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	, diagnosed or verified)	

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	N/A (within-subjects reversal
	up	design)
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what		
1 0/1 0		

is the likely direction of its effect?

Low risk of bias

Study	y ID	LYKKE2010
Guid	leline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Chec	klist completed by: LS	
A. Se	election bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes No Unclear N/A
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes No Unclear N/A
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes No Unclear N/A
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
	Low risk of bias Unclear/unknown risk	High risk of bias
Likel	y direction of effect:	
	rformance bias (systematic differences between gro the intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes No Unclear N/A
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes No Unclear N/A
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes No Unclear N/A
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was s the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
	Low risk of bias Unclear/unknown risk	High risk of bias
Likely	direction of effect:	
	rition bias (systematic differences between the cor f participants)	nparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 34 out of 102 dropped out overall	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were Not reported but can assume it is 34 of 102	e no outcome data available?
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained	, diagnosed or verified)

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	No
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	No
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding/prognostic factors	
D 1	, ,1 1	1 ((1) () () ()

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

Low risk of bias

Study	y ID	SANTANA2007
Guid	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Chec	klist completed by: LS	
A. Se	election bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likel	y direction of effect:	
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart		

B1	The comparison groups received the same care	
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to	
DZ	treatment allocation	Yes
	treatment anocation	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind'	
	to treatment allocation	Yes
Based o	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was	performance bias present? If so,
what is	the likely direction of its effect?	
	•	
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
C. Attr	ition bias (systematic differences between the con	nparison groups with respect to
	participants)	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length	
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	Yes
	differences in length of follow-up)	165
<i>C</i> 2		1 2
C2	How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?	
	N 21 ((II) (II) () (II) ()	(50) 21 ((1)
	N=2 lost to follow up in month 1 in GMI group (out of 50), n=2 lost to follow-up at
	month 1 in TAAC group (out of 51)	
	N=6 dropped out at month 3 in GMI group	
	N=8 dropped out in month 3 in TAAC group	T
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment	
	completion (that is, there were no important or	Yes
	systematic differences between groups in terms	
	of those who did not complete treatment)	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	no outcome data available?
	48/50 at month 1 for GMI group, 49/51 for TAA	C group
	44/50 at month 3 for GMi group, 43/51 for TAAC	C group
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to	
	the availability of outcome data (that is, there	
	were no important or systematic differences	Yes
	between groups in terms of those for whom	
	outcome data were not available)	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was	attrition bias present? If so, what is
1 41 111	ly direction of its offect?	

	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study	· ID	TYRER2010
Guide	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Check	klist completed by: LS	
A. Sel	lection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is		

the likely direction of its effect?

]	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	formance bias (systematic differences between gro the intervention under investigation)	oups in the care provided, apart
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was is the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	rition bias (systematic differences between the corf participants)	nparison groups with respect to
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? n=52 in original trial, however n=19 in nidotherapy group, and n=18 in control group had comorbid substance misuse and were used for this guideline. Therefore n=37 2 drop outs (n=1 death from nidotherapy, n=1 drop out from control)	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	For how many participants in each group were n	o outcome data available?
	Nidotherapy group: 1/19 no outcome data at 6 m outcome data at 12 month follow-up Control: 1 out of 18 no outcome data at 6 month, month follow-up	-

b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)

Yes

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

Low risk of bias

Likely direction of effect:

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-	Yes
	up	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Unclear (as outcomes were part
		of a secondary analysis)
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
	determine the outcome	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants'	Yes
	exposure to the intervention	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes
	important confounding/prognostic factors	

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?

Unclear/unknown risk

Study	ID	WEISS2000
Guide	line topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selo	ection bias (systematic differences between the co	mparison groups)
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	No (potential selection-bias)

		-		
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or			
	analysis to balance the comparison groups for	Unclear		
	potential confounders?			
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,			
	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes		
	factors			
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is				
the likely direction of its effect?				
the likely direction of its effect:				
Unclear/unknown risk of bias				
Likely direction of effect:				
B. Perf	ormance bias (systematic differences between gro	oups in the care provided, apart		
from the intervention under investigation)				
B1				
DI	The comparison groups received the same care			
	apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to			
	treatment allocation	No		
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind'			
	to treatment allocation	Unclear		
Based o	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so,			
what is the likely direction of its effect?				
	Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:				
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to				
loss of participants)				
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length			
CI				
	of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for	Yes		
	differences in length of follow-up)			
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?			
	2 dropouts of 21 patients (both in first cohort of the study sequentially assigned to			
	treatment)	, 1 , 5 G		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment			
	completion (that is, there were no important or			
	systematic differences between groups in terms	Yes		
	of those who did not complete treatment)			
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available?			

	All, both drop outs of treatment continued to do assessments.		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was a ly direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is	
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes	
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes	
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			

1.3 PHARMACOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS

1.3.1 Systematic reviews

Study ID	BUCHANAN2009 (PORT)
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	Unclear
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

Study ID	GASAS2008
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes

The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	Unclear
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

Study ID	GREEN2008
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Unclear
Study quality is assessed and reported	Unclear
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	No

Study ID	HJORTHOJ2009
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	Yes
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

Study ID	POTVIN2009
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
	Yes/ No/ Unclear
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes/ No/ Unclear Yes

The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	No
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

Study ID	SAN2007
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
	Yes/ No/ Unclear
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	Yes (but not reported for each study)
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

Study ID	SMELSON2008
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	

In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
	Yes/ No/ Unclear
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Unclear
Study quality is assessed and reported	No
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	No

Study ID	TIET2007
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
	Yes/ No/ Unclear
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	No
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

Study ID	VORNIK2006
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
	Yes/ No/ Unclear
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Unclear
Study quality is assessed and reported	No
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	No

Study ID	WOBROCK2008
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	Chose one option for each question
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes

The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	No
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

1.3.2 RCTs

Stu	dy ID	BROWN2009	
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 2.1.1	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between	the comparison groups)	
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low	Low risk of bias		
Like	Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	

B2 Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
B3 Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion the likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the participants)	he comparison groups with respect to loss of	
C1 All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up	Yes	
after week 2 (n=2 naltrexone, n=2 place placebo patients after week 4, n=1 placebo patients after week 8, n=1 placebo patient week 10, and n=1 placebo patient after b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no important	trexone group, n=2 placebo), n=4 dropouts bo), n=1 naltrexone patient after week 3, n=2 bo patient after week 5, n=2 naltrexone nt after week 9, n=2 patients in placebo after week 11.	
or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	n Yes	
C3 a. For how many participants in each group N=7 of 50 (did not return after baseline)		
b. The groups were comparable with respet to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of the for whom outcome data were not available	Yes se	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
High potential for bias on some outcomes (high attrition)		
Likely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	No	
	follow-up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
	outcome		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Based	on your answers to the above, in your opinion	was detection bias present? If so, what is the	
likely	direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

Stu	dy ID	KEMP2009
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1
Che	cklist completed by: LS	
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		

Likely direction of effect:			
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinio likely direction of its effect?	n was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Low	risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up	100	
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=13 (out of 16) in lithium group, n=10 of 15 in lithium and divalproex group, n=118 discontinued out of 149 enrolled in open stabilization phase		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no importation or systematic differences between groups it terms of those who did not complete treatment)	ent nt	
C3	C3 a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N=same as above		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of the for whom outcome data were not available	Yes Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinionly direction of its effect?	n was attrition bias present? If so, what is the	

High potential for bias (Very high attrition rate in open maintenance phase of trial) Likely direction of effect: D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified) D1 The study had an appropriate length of No follow-up The study used a precise definition of D2Yes outcome A valid and reliable method was used to D3Yes determine the outcome Investigators were kept 'blind' to D4 Yes participants' exposure to the intervention Investigators were kept 'blind' to other D5 Yes important confounding and prognostic factors Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect? Low risk of bias Likely direction of effect:

Stu	dy ID	NEJTEK2009
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1
Che	ecklist completed by: LS	
A. S	Selection bias (systematic differences between t	he comparison groups)
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?				
Low	Low risk of bias			
Like	ely direction of effect:			
	Performance bias (systematic differences between the intervention under investigation)	een groups in the care provided, apart		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes		
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	o Yes		
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	on was performance bias present? If so, what is	s 	
Low	Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:				
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			f	
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up	o Yes		
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? In the risperidone group (n=38): n=12 withdrew or lost to follow-up, n=7 medication noncompliane,n=7 protocol noncompliant, n=3 medical reasons (other,) n=3 incarcerated. In the quetiapine group (n=42): n=13 withdrew or lost to follow-up, n=7 medication noncompliant, n=9 protocol noncompliant, n=2 medical reasons (other), n= 3incarcerated			
CC	b. The groups were comparable for treatmed completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups it terms of those who did not complete treatment)	ant s in Yes		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group N= 2 out of 96	up were no outcome data available?		

	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wadirection of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	d, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low r	isk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	SWARTZ2008
Gui	ideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any	Yes

	confounding factors equally across groups)		
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes	3
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors		(but accounted for in analysis)
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior y direction of its effect?	ı was	s selection bias present? If so, what is the
Low	risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	3
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	3
В3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	3
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	N/A (no follow-up)
C2	a. How many participants did not complete No illicit substance use group : n=105 d		O 1

	(of 192) for quetiapine, n=121(of 176) for risperidone, n=99 (of 133) for perphenazine, and n=77(of 100) for ziprasidone		
	and it 77(or 100) for ziprasidone		
	For those in the illicit substance use group : $n = 105$ (of 142) for olanzapine, $n=113$ (of 137) for quetiapine, $n=124$ (of 157) for risperidone, $n=92$ (of 124) for perphenazine, and $n=68$ (of 82) of ziprasidone		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	completion (that is, there were no important		
	or systematic differences between groups in	Yes	
	terms of those who did not complete		
	treatment)		
C3	a. For how many participants in each group we	ere no woutcome data available?	
	N=same as above		
	b. The groups were comparable with respect		
	to the availability of outcome data (that is,		
	there were no important or systematic	Yes	
	differences between groups in terms of those	165	
	for whom outcome data were not available).		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the			
likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias (time to discontinuation was the primary outcome; other outcomes are more			
prone to bias)			
Likely direction of effect:			
Zinciy	and choir of circum		
D. Dete	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	ed, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	No	
	follow-up		
D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes	
	outcome		
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes	
	determine the outcome		
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	Yes	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Based o	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa	as detection bias present? If so, what is the	
likely direction of its effect?			
Low risk of bias			

Likely direction of effect:	