Author(s):
Date: 2010-04-06
Question: Should pure self-help vs comparator be used for pure GAD, mixed anxiety disorders or both population?
Settings:
Bibliography:

			Quality asses	smont					Summary	of findings		
			Quality asses	sment			No of	patients		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	pure self- help	comparator	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Non remi	ission - Mixed	anxiety popula	tion-pure self help	vs TAU								
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	12/18 (66.7%)	15/16 (93.8%)	RR 0.71 (0.5 to 1.01)	272 fewer per 1000 (from 469 fewer to 9 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
							(00.770)	94.5%	10 1.01)	274 fewer per 1000 (from 472 fewer to 9 more)	THOT	
Anxiety -	Mixed anxiety	population- Pu	re bibliotherapy v	s Non active cor	trol (Better indi	cated by lower va	lues)					
4	randomised trials	serious¹	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	86	56	-	SMD 0.76 lower (1.12 to 0.4 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Anxiety-l	Pure GAD pop	ulation- Pure b	ibliotherapy vs W	LC (Better indica	ted by lower va	lues)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	17	18	-	SMD 1.06 lower (1.77 to 0.35 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Anxiety -	combined pop	oulation-Pure se	elf help vs TAU (B	etter indicated b	y lower values)							
1	randomised trials	serious²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	18	16	-	SMD 0.7 lower (1.4 to 0.01 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Non remi	ission - Mixed	anxiety popula	ion-pure self help	vs non active co	ontrol	•	•	•				
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	25/39 (64.1%)	35/37 (94.6%)	RR 0.68 (0.53 to 0.87)	fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
							(04.170)	94.5%	10 0.07)	302 fewer per 1000 (from 123 fewer to 444 fewer)	WODERATE	
Anxiety -	combined pop	oulation-Pure se	elf help vs non act	ive control (Bette	er indicated by l	ower values)	•	,				
6	randomised trials	serious¹	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	153	124	-	SMD 0.74 lower (0.99 to 0.49 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Discontin	nuation due to	any reason - mi	xed anxiety popul	ation- Pure bibli	iotherapy vs non	active control)						
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ³	serious ⁴	none	2/41	5/39 (12.8%)	RR 0.5 (0.09	64 fewer per 1000 (from 117 fewer to 236 more)	$\oplus \oplus OO$	
							(4.9%)	12.7%	to 2.84)	64 fewer per 1000 (from 116 fewer to 234 more)	LOW	
Anxiety-l			omputer mindfuln					I		 		
1	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	50	50	-	SMD 0.61 lower (1.01 to	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$	

	1 .	I.		F .	-	1	1		1			
		limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision					0.21 lower)	HIGH	
Depressio	on - Mixed anx	ciety populatio	n-pure bibliothera	py vs non activ	e control (Better	indicated by l	ower values)					
	randomised	serious ¹	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	57	28	_	SMD 0.78 lower (1.27 to		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		37	20	-	0.3 lower)	MODERATE	
Ion remi	ssion - Mixed	anxiety popula	tion-pure self hel	p vs WLC								
	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none		20/21		333 fewer per 1000		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		13/21		RR 0.65 (0.46	(from 76 fewer to 514	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$	
							(61.9%)	(93.270)	to 0.92)	fewer)	HIGH	
							(01.970)	94.5%	10 0.92)	331 fewer per 1000 (from	111011	
								94.570		76 fewer to 510 fewer)		
nxiety -	combined pop	oulation-Pure s	elf help vs WLC (Better indicated	by lower values	s)						
	randomised	serious ¹	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	135	108		SMD 0.74 lower (1.01 to		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		133	100	_	0.48 lower)	MODERATE	
iscontin	uation due to	any reason - pi	ıre GAD populati	on- Pure bibliot	herapy vs WLC							
	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	serious4	none		1 /10 /5 20/)		53 more per 1000 (from		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness			2/19	1/19 (5.3%)	RR 2 (0.2 to	42 fewer to 1013 more)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$	
							(10.5%)	27.9%	20.24)	279 more per 1000 (from	MODERATE	
								27.9%		223 fewer to 5368 more)		
iscontin	uation due to	any reason - pr	are GAD populati	on- Pure compu	ter mindfulness	therapy vs W	LC (Copy)					
	randomised	serious ⁵	no serious	no serious	no serious	none		E0 /11E		227 fewer per 1000		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		32/116	58/115 (50.4%)	RR 0.55 (0.39	(from 116 fewer to 308	⊕⊕⊕О	
							(27.6%)	(30.4%)	to 0.77)	fewer)	MODERATE	
							(27.070)	27.9%	10 0.77)	126 fewer per 1000 (from	WODERITE	
								27.970		64 fewer to 170 fewer)		
iscontin	uation due to	any reason - co	mbined populatio	on- Pure self hel	p vs non active	control						
	randomised	serious ¹	no serious	serious ³	no serious	none		64/185		152 fewer per 1000		
	trials		inconsistency		imprecision		36/187	(34.6%)	RR 0.56 (0.4	(from 76 fewer to 208	⊕⊕OO	
							(19.3%)	(34.070)	to 0.78)	fewer)	LOW	
							(15.5%)	27.9%	10 0.70)	123 fewer per 1000 (from	LOW	
								27.970		61 fewer to 167 fewer)		
iscontin	uation due to	any reason - co	mbined population	n- Pure self hel	lp vs WLC							
	randomised	serious ¹	no serious	no serious	no serious	none		62/155		180 fewer per 1000		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		34/156		RR 0.55 (0.37	(from 72 fewer to 252	0000	
							(21.8%)	(40%)	to 0.82)	fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
							(21.070)	27.9%	10 0.02)	126 fewer per 1000 (from	WODERITE	
								27.970		50 fewer to 176 fewer)		
iscontin	uation due to	any reason - co	mbined population	on- Pure self hel	p vs WLC (Copy	y)						
	randomised	serious ²	no serious	no serious	serious ⁴	none		2/18 (11.1%)		11 fewer per 1000 (from		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			2/20	2/ 10 (11.1%)	RR 0.9 (0.14	96 fewer to 527 more)		
		•	1	1	1	ı	1 4.5		1		T OTAT	
							(10%)	27.9%	to 5.74)	28 fewer per 1000 (from	LOW	

majority completer analysis and unclear bias which may likely inflate the effect size
 Unclear attrition bias and completer analysis
 different comparison group (WLC and TAU)
 95% confidence interval include no effect
 High attrition bias and completer analysis

Author(s):
Date: 2010-04-06
Question: Should guided self help vs comparator be used for pure GAD, mixed anxiety disorders or both population?
Settings:
Bibliography:

			Ouglitz accor	om on t					Summary (of findings		
			Quality asses	sment			No of	patients		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	guided self help	comparator	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Anxiety -	mixed anxiety	population- gu	ided bibliotherap	y vs WLC (Bette	r indicated by lo	ower values)						
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	27	33	-	SMD 0.62 lower (1.14 to 0.1 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Anxiety -	mixed anxiety	population-gui	ided bibliotherap	y vs TAU (Better	indicated by lo	wer values)						
2			no serious inconsistency	serious ²	serious³	none	80	44	-	SMD 0.15 higher (0.22 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Anxiety-p	ure GAD pop	ulation-guided	CCBT vs WLC (B	etter indicated b	y lower values)							
1			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	24	21	-	SMD 1.22 lower (1.86 to 0.57 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Anxiety -	combined pop	oulation-guided	self help vs non a	active control (Be	etter indicated b	y lower values)						
4	randomised trials	serious¹	serious ⁴	serious ^{2,5}	serious³	none	131	98	-	SMD 0.38 lower (0.99 lower to 0.24 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Anxiety -	combined pop	oulation-guided	self help vs WLC	(Better indicate	d by lower value	es)						
2	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	serious ⁵	no serious imprecision	none	51	54	-	SMD 0.89 lower (1.47 to 0.31 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Depression	n - mixed anx	iety population	-guided bibliothe	rapy vs WLC (Be	tter indicated b	y lower values)						
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious³	none	27	33	-	SMD 0.44 lower (0.95 lower to 0.08 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Depression	n - mixed anx	iety population	-guided bibliothe	rapy vs TAU (Be	tter indicated by	y lower values)						
2		no serious limitations	serious ⁴	serious²	serious³	none	78	44	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.78 lower to 0.84 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Depression	on-pure GAD	population-guio	ded CCBT vs WLC	C (Better indicate	d by lower valu	es)						
1			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	24	21	-	SMD 0.85 lower (1.46 to 0.23 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Depression	on - combined	population-gui	ded self help vs n	on active ctrl (Be	tter indicated b	y lower values)						
4	randomised trials	serious¹	serious ⁴	serious ^{2,5}	serious³	none	129	98	-	SMD 0.31 lower (0.86 lower to 0.25 higher)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Depression	on - combined	population-gui	ded self help vs V	VLC (Better indic	ated by lower v	alues)						

		1			1				1	1		
2		serious ¹	no serious	serious ⁵	no serious	none	51	54	_	SMD 0.63 lower (1.02	⊕⊕OO	
	trials		inconsistency		imprecision		01			to 0.23 lower)	LOW	
Worry - n	nixed anxiety p	opulation-guid	led bibliotherapy	vs TAU (Better i	ndicated by low	er values)						
1	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	serious ³	none	53	26		SMD 0.17 higher (0.3	⊕⊕⊕О	
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness			33	26	-	lower to 0.64 higher)	MODERATE	
Worry-pu	ıre GAD popu	lation-guided C	CCBT vs WLC (Bet	ter indicated by	lower values)	•					<u> </u>	
1	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none	0.4	24		SMD 0.93 lower (1.55	$\oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus$	
		limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		24	21	-	to 0.32 lower)	HIGH	
Non rem	ission - combi	ned population-	guided self help v	s non active con	trol					,	1	
2	randomised	serious ¹	very serious ⁶	serious ⁵	serious ³	none				261 fewer per 1000		
	trials							62/69		(from 611 forezon to 520		
							53/72	(89.9%)	RR 0.71 (0.32	more)	⊕000	
							(73.6%)		to 1.59)	251 fewer per 1000 (from	VERY LOW	
								86.6%		589 fewer to 511 more)		
Non remi	ission - mixed	anxiety populat	tion-guided biblio	therapy vs WLC								
1	randomised	serious ¹	no serious	no serious	no serious	none		42/48		0 fewer per 1000 (from		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		42/48	(87.5%)		122 fewer to 140 more)	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$	
					1		(87.5%)	,	1.16)	0 fewer per 1000 (from	MODERATE	
								87.5%		122 fewer to 140 more)		
Worry -co	ombined popu	lation-guided s	elf help vs non act	tive control (Bett	er indicated by	lower values)					•	
2	randomised	no serious	serious ⁶	serious ⁵	serious ³	none	77	47		SMD 0.36 lower (1.44	⊕000	
	trials	limitations					//	4/	-	lower to 0.71 higher)	VERY LOW	
Non-rem	ission- pure G	AD population	guided CCBT vs	WLC								
1	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none		20/21		495 fewer per 1000		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		11 /04	20/21	DD 0 40 (0 21	(from 238 fewer to 657		
			_				11/24 (45.8%)	(95.2%)	RR 0.48 (0.31	fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
							(45.8%)	05.70/	to 0.75)	446 fewer per 1000 (from	пібп	
								85.7%		214 fewer to 591 fewer)		
Non-resp	onse-pure GA	D population-g	uided CCBT vs W	/LC								
1	randomised	no serious	no serious	no serious	no serious	none		21/21		370 fewer per 1000		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	imprecision		15/04		DD 0 /2 /0 4/	(from 130 fewer to 540	0000	
			_				15/24 (62.5%)	(100%)	RR 0.63 (0.46 to 0.87)	fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
							(62.3%)	00.50/	10 0.67)	335 fewer per 1000 (from	пібп	
								90.5%		118 fewer to 489 fewer)		
Discontin	nuation due to	any reason - M	ixed anxiety popu	lation-guided bi	bliotherapy vs (WLC						
1	randomised	serious ¹	no serious	no serious	serious ³	none		15/40		125 more per 1000		
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			01 / 47	15/48	DD 1 4 /0 02	(from 53 fewer to 428	0000	
							21/47	(31.3%)	RR 1.4 (0.83	more)	⊕⊕OO	
İ							(44.7%)	12.00/	to 2.37)	52 more per 1000 (from	LOW	
İ								12.9%		22 fewer to 177 more)		
Discontin	nuation due to	any reason - M	ixed anxiety popu	lation-guided bi	bliotherapy vs T	AU						
			, , ,		1,7							

2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	serious ⁴	serious ²	serious³	none	9/96 (9.4%)	6/57 (10.5%) 12.9%	RR 0.57 (0.03 to 9.99)	45 fewer per 1000 (from 102 fewer to 946 more) 55 fewer per 1000 (from 125 fewer to 1160 more)	⊕OOO VERY LOW	
Discontin	nuation due to	any reason - pt	ıre GAD populati	on-guided CCBT	vs WLC							
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	6/24 (25%)	2/21 (9.5%)	RR 2.62 (0.59 to 11.64)	154 more per 1000 (from 39 fewer to 1013 more)	⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
							(2370)	9.5%	10 11.04)	154 more per 1000 (from 39 fewer to 1011 more)	THOIT	
Discontin	nuation due to	any reason - co	mbined populatio	n-guided self he	elp vs non active	control						
4	randomised trials	no serious limitations¹	no serious inconsistency	serious ²	serious ³	none	36/168 (21.4%)	23/126 (18.3%) 12.9%	RR 1.42 (0.7 to 2.91)	77 more per 1000 (from 55 fewer to 349 more) 54 more per 1000 (from 39 fewer to 246 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Discontir	nuation due to	any reason - co	mbined populatio	n-guided self he	lp vs WLC							
2	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁵	serious ³	none	27/72 (37.5%)	17/69 (24.6%)	RR 1.5 (0.91 to 2.47)	123 more per 1000 (from 22 fewer to 362 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	
							(37.376)	12.9%	10 2.47)	64 more per 1000 (from 12 fewer to 190 more)	VERT LOW	

quasi-RCT

treatment group not comparable (treatment only and treatment plus TAU)

95% confidence interval include no effect

moderate heterogeneity (50-80%)

different target population (mixed anxiety and pure GAD population)

high heterogeneity (>80%)

Author(s):
Date: 2010-04-06
Question: Should group psychoeducation (CBT) vs comparator be used for pure GAD, mixed anxiety disorders or both population?
Settings:
Bibliography:

			Oveliter					Sumr	nary of find	lings		
			Quality asses	ssment			No of patie	nts		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	group psychoeducation (CBT)	comparator	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Anxiety -	mixed anxiet	y population-p	sychoeducationa	l group vs WLC	(Better indicate	ed by lower values	s)					
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	25	24	-	SMD 0.34 lower (0.9 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Anxiety-	pure GAD po	pulation-psych	oeducational gro	up vs WLC (Bet	ter indicated by	lower values)						
1	randomised trials	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	22	11	-	SMD 0.7 lower (1.45 lower to 0.04 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Anxiety -	combined po	pulation-psych	noeducational gro	oup vs WLC (Bet	ter indicated by	y lower values)						
2	randomised trials	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	serious ³	no serious imprecision	none	47	35	-	SMD 0.47 lower (0.92 to 0.02 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Depressi	on - mixed an	xiety populatio	n-psychoeducati	onal group vs W	LC (Better indi	cated by lower va	lues)					
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	25	24	-	SMD 0.49 lower (1.06 lower to 0.08 higher)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	
Depressi	on- pure GAD	population-ps	sychoeducational	group vs WLC	Better indicate	d by lower values)			'		
1	randomised trials	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	22	11	-	SMD 0.51 lower (1.25 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Depressi	on - combined	d population-ps	sychoeducational	group vs WLC	(Better indicate	d by lower values)					
2	randomised trials	serious ²	no serious inconsistency	serious ³	no serious imprecision	none	47	35	-	SMD 0.5 lower (0.95 to 0.05 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Worry - r	nixed anxiety	population-psy	ychoeducational ;	group vs WLC (l	Better indicated	by lower values)		*				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	25	24	-	SMD 0.36 lower (0.93 lower to 0.2 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Disconti	nuation due to	any reason-pu	ire GAD populat	ion-psychoeduc	ational group v	s WLC						
1	randomised	very serious ^{2,4}	no serious	no serious	serious1	none	4/26 (15.4%)	0/11 (0%)	RR 4 (0.23	0 more per 1000	⊕000	

trials	inconsistency	indirectness			to 68.57)	(from 0 fewer to 0	VERY LOW	
						more)		
						0 more per 1000		
				0%		(from 0 fewer to 0		
						more)		

^{1 95%} confidence interval include no effect 2 quasi-RCT 3 different target population (pure GAD and mixed anxiety) 4 high selection bias and completer analysis

Author(s):
Date: 2010-04-12
Question: Should Group CBT vs Group Anxiety Management Training be used for mixed anxiety population?
Settings:
Bibliography:

			Quality assess	mant				Sı	ımmary of fi	ndings		
			Quality assess	inent			I	No of patients		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Group CBT	Group Anxiety Management Training	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Discontin	uation due to	any reason										
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	9/25 (36%)	8/24 (33.3%)	RR 1.08 (0.5 to 2.33)	27 more per 1000 (from 167 fewer to 443 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
							(3070)	0%	10 2.33)	0 more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 more)	WODERTIE	
Anxiety (I	Better indicate	ed by lower val	ues)									
	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	25	24	-	SMD 0.16 higher (0.4 lower to 0.72 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Depressio	n (Better indi	cated by lower	values)									
	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	25	24	-	SMD 0.1 higher (0.46 lower to 0.66 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Worry (Be	etter indicated	by lower valu	es)									
	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	25	24	-	SMD 0.28 lower (0.84 lower to 0.29 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	

¹ 95% confidence interval include no effect

Author(s):
Date: 2010-04-12
Question: Should Pure bibliotherapy vs Pure audiotherapy be used in pure GAD population?
Settings:
Bibliography:

			Ouality assessr					Sum	mary of f	indings		
			Quality assessi	nent			No of patients Effect					
No of studies							Pure bibliotherapy	Pure audiotherapy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Anxiety (Better indicate	d by lower valu	es)									
	randomised trials			no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	11	11	-	SMD 0.55 lower (1.4 lower to 0.31 higher)		

¹ 95% confidence interval include no effect

Author(s):
Date: 2010-04-12
Question: Should Guided CBT bibliotherapy vs High intensity CBT be used for mixed anxiety population?
Settings:
Bibliography:

			Quality assess					Su	mmary of fir	ndings		
			Quality assess	ment			No of pat	ients		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Guided CBT bibliotherapy	High intensity CBT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Discontin	uation due to	any reason										
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	6/53 (11.3%)	9/63 (14.3%)	RR 0.79 (0.3 to 2.08)	30 fewer per 1000 (from 100 fewer to 154 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
								0%	10 2.00)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 0 more)	IVIO DEIGITE	
Anxiety (Better indicate	d by lower val	ues)									
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	53	63	-	SMD 0.3 higher (0.07 lower to 0.67 higher)		
Depression	on (Better indi	cated by lower	values)									
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	53	63	-	SMD 0.25 higher (0.11 lower to 0.62 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Worry (Bo	etter indicated	by lower valu	es)									
	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	53	63	-	SMD 0.28 higher (0.09 lower to 0.64 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	

¹ 95% confidence interval include no effect