APPENDIX 15: GRADE EVIDENCE PROFILE TABLES

1.1 SERVICE DELIVERY MODELS

1.1.1 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing integrated service models with standard care

			Quality assess	mont				Summar	y of findi	ngs		
			Quality assess	smem			No of pati	ents		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	INTEGRATED SERVICE MODELS	STANDARD CARE	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substanc	e use: 1. Subs	tance use rating	g (high=poor) - by	y 6 months (Bett	er indicated b	y lower values)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations		no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.14 higher (0.26 lower to 0.54 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Subs	tance use rating	g (high=poor) - by	y 12 months (Be	tter indicated	by lower values)						
1	randomised trials			no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.22 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Subs	tance use rating	g (high=poor) - by	y 18 months (Be	tter indicated	by lower values)	•			•		
1	randomised trials			no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.15 lower (0.55 lower to 0.25 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Subs	tance use rating	g (high=poor) - by	y 24 months (Be	tter indicated	by lower values)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations		no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.05 higher (0.35 lower to 0.45 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Days	used substance	es - by 6 months ((Better indicated	l by lower val	ues)	•	÷				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations		no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.33 lower to 0.48 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

Substanc	ce use: 2. Days	used substan	ces - by 12 month	s (Better indicat	ed by lower v	alues)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.3 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	ce use: 2. Days	used substand	ces - by 18 month	s (Better indicat	ed by lower v	alues)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.09 higher (0.31 lower to 0.49 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	ce use: 2. Days	used substand	ces - by 24 month	s (Better indicate	ed by lower v	alues)						
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	SMD 0.13 higher (0.28 lower to 0.53 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service u	ise: 1. Days in	stable commu	nity residences (1	not in hospital) -	by 6 months	(Better indicated	by lower values)					•
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	MD 3.17 higher (0.52 lower to 6.86 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service u	ise: 1. Days in	stable commu	nity residences (1	not in hospital) -	by 12 month	s (Better indicated	l by lower values)					
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	46	49	-	MD 2.84 higher (2.07 lower to 7.75 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service u	ise: 1. Days in	stable commu	nity residences (1	not in hospital) -	by 18 month	s (Better indicated	l by lower values)					
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	46	49	-	MD 6.46 higher (1.36 to 11.56 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Service u	ise: 1. Days in	stable commu	nity residences (1	not in hospital) -	by 24 months	s (Better indicated	l by lower values)					
1	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	46	49	-	MD 5.7 higher (0.59 to 10.81 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size not met. ² CI includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.1.2 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing integrated assertive community treatment with integrated case management

			Orreliter erees	t				Summar	y of finding	çs		
			Quality assess	sment			No o	of patients		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	INTEGRATED ACT	CLINICAL CASE MANAGEMENT	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Death - b	by 36 months											
2		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	7/208 (3.4%)	6/213 (2.8%)	RR 1.18 (0.39 to 3.57)	5 more per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 72 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 1. Not	in remission -	by 36 months - a	lcohol								
1		no serious limitations		no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	43/75 (57.3%)	34/68 (50%)	RR 1.15 (0.84 to 1.56)	75 more per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 280 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 1. Not	in remission -	by 36 months - d	rugs								
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	26/45 (57.8%)	26/40 (65%)	RR 0.89 (0.63 to 1.25)	72 fewer per 1000 (from 240 fewer to 162 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Subs	stance abuse (S	SATS, low=poor)	[skewed data]	- by 6 month	s (Better indicate	d by lower values	5)				
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	198	181	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.17 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Subs	stance abuse (S	SATS, low=poor)	[skewed data]	- by 12 month	hs (Better indicat	ed by lower value	es)				
2				no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	192	182	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.23 lower to 0.39 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Subs	stance abuse (S	SATS, low=poor)	[skewed data]	- by 18 montl	hs (Better indicat	ed by lower value	es)				
	trials		inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	193	182	-	SMD 0.02 lower (0.22 lower to 0.19 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Subs	stance abuse (S	SATS, low=poor)	[skewed data]	- by 24 month	ns (Better indicat	ed by lower value	es)		1		
2		no serious limitations		no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	184	181	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.14 lower to 0.37	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

				1						1.1.		1
										higher)		
Substan	1	,			5	hs (Better indicate	ed by lower value	es)				1
2	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	185	173	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.1 lower to 0.31 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substan	ce use: 2. Subs	stance abuse (SATS, low=poor)	[skewed data]	- by 36 mont	hs (Better indicate	ed by lower value	es)				
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	183	177	-	SMD 0.05 higher (0.15 lower to 0.26 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Service u	use: 1. Days in	stable comm	unity residences	(not in hospital	l) - by 12 mon	ths (Better indica	ted by lower valu	ues)				
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	197	181	-	MD 10 lower (38.61 lower to 18.6 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service 1	use: 1. Days in	stable comm	unity residences	(not in hospital	l) - by 24 mon	ths (Better indica	ted by lower valu	ues)				
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	194	183	-	MD 8.54 higher (4.46 lower to 21.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service ı	use: 1. Days in	stable comm	unity residences	(not in hospital	l) - by 36 mon	ths (Better indica	ted by lower valu	ues)				
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	186	178	-	MD 5.17 higher (9.2 lower to 19.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functior	ning: 1. Averag	ge general sco	re (GAS, low=po	or) - by 6 mont	hs (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	87	75	-	SMD 0.13 higher (0.18 lower to 0.43 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functior	ning: 1. Averag	ge general sco	re (GAS, low=po	or) - by 12 mon	ths (Better in	dicated by lower	values)					
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	89	82	-	SMD 0.07 higher (0.23 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functior	ning: 1. Averag	ge general sco	re (GAS, low=po	or) - by 18 mon	ths (Better in	dicated by lower	values)					
1	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	90	86	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.18 lower to 0.41 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functior	ning: 1. Averag	ge general sco	re (GAS, low=po	or) - by 24 mon	ths (Better in	dicated by lower	values)					1
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	81	85	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.13 lower to 0.48 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

Functio	ning: 1. Averag	ge general sco	re (GAS, low=po	or) - by 30 mon	ths (Better in	dicated by lower	values)					
1	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	84	80	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.37 lower to 0.24 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functio	ning: 1. Averag	ge general sco	ore (GAS, low=po	or) - by 36 mon	ths (Better in	dicated by lower	values)					-
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	85	85	-	SMD 0.04 higher (0.26 lower to 0.34 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfac	tion: Average	general score	(QOLI, low=poo	r) - by 6 months	6 (Better india	cated by lower va	lues)					
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	189	172	-	SMD 0.07 lower (0.28 lower to 0.14 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfac	tion: Average	general score	(QOLI, low=poo	r) - by 12 month	ns (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	193	179	-	SMD 0.01 higher (0.19 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfac	tion: Average	general score	(QOLI, low=poo	r) - by 18 month	ns (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	194	183	-	SMD 0.06 higher (0.17 lower to 0.29 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfac	tion: Average	general score	(QOLI, low=poo	r) - by 24 month	ns (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	186	184	-	SMD 0.01 higher (0.2 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfac	tion: Average	general score	(QOLI, low=poo	r) - by 30 month	ns (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	188	178	-	SMD 0.02 higher (0.19 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Satisfac	tion: Average	general score	(QOLI, low=poo	r) - by 36 month	ns (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	190	183	-	SMD 0.07 higher (0.13 lower to 0.27 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size not met. ² CI includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.1.3 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing staffed accommodation with standard care

			Oreality and					Summary of	findings			
			Quality assess	ment			No of patie	nts		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	STAFF ACCOMMODATION	STANDARD CARE	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substance	e use: 1. Days	used alcohol (l	ow=poor) - 3 mor	ths (Better indi	cated by lowe	r values)						
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	57	47	-	SMD 0.32 lower (0.71 lower to 0.07 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 1. Days	used alcohol (l	ow=poor) - 6 mor	ths (Better indi	cated by lowe	r values)		•		•		•
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	49	48	-	SMD 0 higher (0.4 lower to 0.4 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 1. Days	used alcohol (l	ow=poor) - 9 mor	ths (Better indic	cated by lowe	r values)		-				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	45	37	-	SMD 0.05 lower (0.49 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Level	of alcohol use	(low=poor) - 3 m	onths (Better ind	licated by lov	ver values)		•	•			
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	57	47	-	SMD 0.21 lower (0.6 lower to 0.18 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Level	of alcohol use	(low=poor) - 6 m	onths (Better ind	licated by lov	ver values)		•	•		•	
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	49	48	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.46 lower to 0.33 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Level	of alcohol use	(low=poor) - 9 m	onths (Better inc	licated by lov	ver values)						
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	45	37	-	SMD 0.21 lower (0.65 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Days	used drugs (lov	w=poor) - 3 mont	hs (Better indica	ted by lower	values)			-			
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	57	47	-	SMD 0.22 lower (0.61 lower to 0.17 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Days	used drugs (lov	w=poor) - 6 mont	hs (Better indica	ted by lower	values)						

1 randomised trials no serious limitations no serious inconsistency no serious indirectness very serious ^{1,2} none 49 48 - SMD 0.11 lower (0.51 lower to 0.28 higher) Substance use: 3. Days used drugs (low=poor) - 9 mont+s (Better indicated by lower values) none 49 48 - SMD 0.04 lower (0.51 lower to 0.28 higher) 1 randomised trials no serious limitations no serious indirectness very serious ^{1,2} none 45 37 - SMD 0.04 lower (0.48 lower to 0.39 higher) Substance use: 4. Severity of drug use (low=poor) - 3 morths (Better indicated by lower values) none 45 37 - SMD 0.14 lower (0.52 lower to 0.39 higher) 1 randomised trials no serious limitations no serious serious limitectness no serious ^{1,2} none 57 47 - SMD 0.14 lower (0.52 lower to 0.29 higher)	 ⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC ⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Image: Instance use: 4. Severity of drug use (low=poor) - 3 months (Better indicated by lower values) none 45 37 - SMD 0.04 lower (0.48 lower to 0.39 higher) 1 randomised trials no serious no serious no serious no serious no serious no serious 10 - SMD 0.04 lower (0.48 lower to 0.39 higher) Substance use: 4. Severity of drug use (low=poor) - 3 months (Better indicated by lower values) none 45 37 - SMD 0.14 lower (0.52 lower to 0.25) 1 randomised no serious limitations no serious inconsistency no serious serious ^{1,2} none 57 47 - (0.52 lower to 0.25)	
trials limitations inconsistency indirectness serious ^{1,2} 45 37 - (0.48 lower to 0.39 higher) Substance use: 4. Severity of drug use (low=poor) - 3 months (Better indicated by lower values) very none 57 47 - SMD 0.14 lower (0.52 lower to 0.25)	
1 randomised trials no serious inconsistency no serious indirectness very serious ^{1,2} none 57 47 SMD 0.14 lower (0.52 lower to 0.25)	
trials limitations inconsistency indirectness serious ^{1,2} 57 47 - (0.52 lower to 0.25	0000
higher)	LOW CRITIC
Substance use: 4. Severity of drug use (low=poor) - 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1randomised trialsno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnessvery serious ^{1,2} none4948-SMD 0.18 lower (0.57 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Substance use: 4. Severity of drug use (low=poor) - 9 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1randomised trialsno serious limitationsno serious inconsistencyno serious 	⁶ ⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Functioning: 1. % time on streets (low=poor) - 3 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1randomised trialsno serious limitationsno serious inconsistencyno serious indirectnessvery serious ^{1,2} none serious ^{1,2} 5747-SMD 0.04 higher (0.35 lower to 0.42 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Functioning: 1. % time on streets (low=poor) - 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1randomised trialsno serious limitationsno serious inconsistencyno serious 	⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Functioning: 1. % time on streets (low=poor) - 9 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1randomised trialsno serious limitationsno serious inconsistencyno serious 	⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Functioning: 2. % time in independent housing (low=poor) - 3 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1randomised trialsno serious limitationsno serious inconsistencyno serious 	⊕⊕OO LOW CRITIC
Functioning: 2. % time in independent housing (low=poor) - 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)	
1 randomised no serious no serious no serious very none 49 48 - SMD 0.22 lower	⊕⊕OO CRITIC

	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}					(0.61 lower to 0.18 higher)	LOW	
Function	ing: 2. % time	in independen	t housing (low=p	oor) - 9 months (Better indica	ted by lower valu	es)					
1	randomised trials			no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	45	37	-	SMD 0.22 higher (0.22 lower to 0.66 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size not met. ² CI includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL/PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTIONS

1.2.1 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing CBT with standard care

			Quality assess	mont					Summary	of findings		
			Quality assess	ment			No of	patients		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT	standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Substance	e use: 1. Using	substances - by 1	l month - alcohol o	or drugs								
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	9/31 (29%)	18/30 (60%)	RR 0.48 (0.26 to 0.9)	31 fewer per 100 (from 6 fewer to 44 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Using	substances - by 3	3 months - alcohol									
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	7/25 (28%)	1/21 (4.8%)	RR 5.88 (0.79 to 44.03)	23 more per 100 (from 1 fewer to 205 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Using	substances - by 3	3 months - drugs									
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	12/25 (48%)	5/21 (23.8%)	RR 2.02 (0.85 to 4.8)	24 more per 100 (from 4 fewer to 90 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Using	substances - by 3	3 months - alcohol	or drugs								
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	20/31 (64.5%)	26/30 (86.7%)	RR 0.74 (0.55 to 1)	23 fewer per 100 (from 39 fewer to 0 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Any su	ibstance (skewed	d data) - average so	core (ASI) by 3 m	onths (Better i	ndicated by lower	values)		•			
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,3}	none	31	31	-	MD 0.07 lower (0.16 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Any su	bstance (skewed	d data) - average so	core (ASI) by 6-9 i	nonths (Better	r indicated by low	er values)	•	•			
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,3}	none	31	31	-	MD 0.06 lower (0.16 lower to 0.04 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Any su	bstance (skewed	d data) - days repo	rting any substan	ce use (ASI) b	y 3 months (Better	indicated	l by lower v	alues)			
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2,3}	none	31	30	-	MD 2.1 lower (5.9 lower to 1.7 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Any su	ıbstance (skewed	d data) - days repo	rting any substan	ce use (ASI) b	y 6 months (Better	indicated	l by lower v	alues)			
1	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2,3}	none	31	30	-	MD 2.7 lower (7.25 lower to 1.85 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 4. Drugs	use - by 3 month	ns (skewed data) (l	Better indicated b	y lower values	5)						

2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,3}	none	54	49	-	MD 0.05 higher (1.55 lower to 1.66 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 5. Drugs	use - by 6 montl	hs (skewed data) -	days reporting dr	ug use (ASI)	by 6 months (Bette	r indicated	by lower v	alues)			
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2,3}	none	29	28	-	MD 3.7 lower (7.99 lower to 0.59 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	bstance use: 6. Alcohol use - by 3 months (skewed data) (Better indicated by lower values)											
2	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2,3}	none	54	49	-	MD 1.95 lower (4.48 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance use: 7. Alcohol use - by 6 months (skewed data) - days reporting alcohol use (ASI) by 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)										•		
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2,3}	none	29	28	-	MD 0 higher (3.66 lower to 3.66 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size not met.

² Cl includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

³ Skewed data.

1.2.2 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing MI with standard care

			Ouality access	mont				S	ummary of fi	ndings		
			Quality assess	ment			No of pati	ents		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Motivational interviewing	standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Substanc	e use: 1. Not a	bstinent or not	improved on all s	ubstances - by 12	2 months							
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	5/13 (38.5%)	9/12 (75%)	RR 0.51 (0.24 to 1.1)	37 fewer per 100 (from 57 fewer to 8 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Not a	bstaining from	alcohol - by 3 mor	nths								
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	6/15 (40%)	10/13 (76.9%)	RR 0.52 (0.26 to 1.03)	37 fewer per 100 (from 57 fewer to 2 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Not a	bstaining from	alcohol - by 6 mor	iths	•			•				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	5/15 (33.3%)	12/13 (92.3%)	RR 0.36 (0.17 to 0.75)	59 fewer per 100 (from 23 fewer to 77 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Other	measures of al	cohol use (skewed	l data) (Better in	dicated by low	wer values)		•				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	15	13	-	SMD 1.29 lower (2.12 to 0.46 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Other	measures of al	cohol use (skewed	l data) - drinking	g days - by 6 r	nonths (Better ind	icated by lower v	alues)	•			•
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,3}	none	15	13	-	SMD 1.29 lower (2.12 to 0.46 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size not met. ² CI includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

³ Skewed data.

1.2.3 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing CBT plus MI with standard care

			Orrality and					Su	mmary of fir	ndings		
			Quality assess	ment			No of paties	nts		Effect		Importance
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT + motivational interviewing	standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Death - b	y about 1 year	•										
2		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	4/83 (4.8%)	3/83 (3.6%)	RR 1.25 (0.22 to 7.28)	1 more per 100 (from 3 fewer to 23 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Avera	ige number of a	different drugs us	ed during the pa	st month (OI	I, high = poor) - I	by 3 months (Better i	ndicated b	y lower valu	es)		
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	58	61	-	MD 0.37 higher (0.01 lower to 0.75 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Avera	ige number of a	lifferent drugs us	ed during the pa	st month (OT	I, high = poor) - I	by 6 months (Better i	ndicated b	y lower valu	es)		
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	58	61	-	MD 0.19 higher (0.22 lower to 0.6 higher)		CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Avera	ige score - alcoł	nol (skewed data)	- alcohol - estim	ated daily con	sumption - past	month - 3 months (Be	etter indica	ited by lower	values)		•
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	21	31	-	MD 1.57 higher (0.9 lower to 4.04 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Avera	ige score - alcoł	nol (skewed data)	- alcohol - estim	ated daily con	nsumption - past	month - 6 months (Be	etter indica	ted by lower	values)		
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	21	31	-	MD 1.21 higher (1.07 lower to 3.49 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Avera	ige score - alcoł	nol (skewed data)	- alcohol - estim	ated daily con	nsumption - past	month - 12 months (I	Better indic	ated by lowe	er values)		
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	18	28	-	MD 1.39 higher (1.1 lower to 3.88 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Avera	ige score - ampl	hetamine (skewed	l data) - ampheta	mine- estima	ted daily consum	ption - past month -	3 months (Better indica	ted by lower values)		
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	11	9	-	MD 0.09 higher (0.4 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Avera	ige score - ampl	hetamine (skewed	l data) - ampheta	amine- estima	ted daily consum	ption - past month -	6 months (Better indica	ted by lower values)		•
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	11	9	-	MD 1.28 lower (2.79 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Avera	ige score - ampl	hetamine (skewed	l data) - ampheta	nmine- estima	ted daily consum	ption - past month -	12 months	(Better indic	ated by lower values		
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	9	8	-	MD 0.13 higher (0.11 lower to 0.37 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

Substance	use: 4. Avera	ge score - cann	abis (skewed data) - cannabis- est	imated daily	consumption - pas	st month - 3 months	(Better ind	icated by lov	ver values)		
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	39	34	-	MD 0.57 lower (4.27 lower to 3.13 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance use: 4. Average score - cannabis (skewed data) - cannabis- estimated daily consumption - past month - 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)												
1 ra	andomised	no serious	no serious	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	39	34	-	MD 0.7 higher (4 lower to 5.4 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance use: 4. Average score - cannabis (skewed data) - cannabis- estimated daily consumption - past month - 12 months (Better indicated by lower values)												
1 ra	andomised	no serious	no serious	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	29	29	-	MD 4.41 higher (1.4 lower to 10.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functionin	g: 1. Average	e global functio	ning score (GAF,	low = poor) - 3 r	months (Bette	r indicated by low	ver values)					
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	58	61	-	MD 2.7 lower (7.05 lower to 1.65 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functioning: 1. Average global functioning score (GAF, low = poor) - 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)												
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	58	61	-	MD 0.09 lower (3.7 lower to 3.52 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Functionin	g: 1. Average	e global functio	ning score (GAF,	low = poor) - 9 1	nonths (Bette	r indicated by low	ver values)					
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	17	15	-	MD 8.44 higher (0.48 to 16.4 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Functionin	g: 1. Average	e global functio	ning score (GAF,	low = poor) - 12	months (Bett	er indicated by lo	wer values)					
	andomised rials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	61	68	-	MD 4.89 higher (2.62 lower to 12.39 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functionin	g: 1. Average	e global functio	ning score (GAF,	low = poor) - 18	months (Bett	er indicated by lo	wer values)			• • • •		•
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	15	13	-	MD 6.68 higher (5.24 lower to 18.6 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functionin	g: 2. Average	e social function	ning score (SFS, lo	ow = poor) - by e	end of 9 mont	h treatment (Bette	r indicated by lower	values)				
tr	rials		inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	17	15	-	MD 5.01 higher (0.55 lower to 10.57 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
	0 0	e social function	ning score (SFS, lo	pw = poor) - by 1	12 months (3 1	nonths following	treatment end) (Bett	er indicate	d by lower v			T
		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	17	15	-	MD 7.27 higher (0.86 to 13.68 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
CLinclude	s both 1) no	offect and 2) and	preciable benefit o	r approciable ba	rm							

¹ CI includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

² Optimal information size not met.

1.2.4 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing social skills training/ psychoeducation with standard care

			01			Summary of findings						
			Quality assess	sment			No of patients		Effect			
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Social skills training/psychoeducation	standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substand	Substance use: 1. Average score - C-DIS-R Drugs (skewed data) - C-DIS-R DRUGS by 6 months (Better indicated by lower values)											
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	21	25	-	MD 2.99 lower (5.51 to 0.47 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	Substance use: 1. Average score - C-DIS-R Drugs (skewed data) - C-DIS-R DRUGS by 12 months (Better indicated by lower values)											
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	21	25	-	MD 2.47 lower (5.76 lower to 0.82 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substand	Substance use: 1. Average score - C-DIS-R Drugs (skewed data) - C-DIS-R DRUGS by 18 months (Better indicated by lower values)											
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	7	18	-	MD 0.79 lower (3.35 lower to 1.77 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Aver	age score - C-D	DIS-R Alcohol (sk	ewed data) - C-	DIS-R Alcoho	ol by 6 months (B	etter indicated by lower value	es)				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	21	25	-	MD 1.81 lower (3.41 to 0.21 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Aver	age score - C-D	IS-R Alcohol (sk	ewed data) - C-	DIS-R Alcoho	ol by 12 months (Better indicated by lower valu	ies)	•			
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	21	25	-	MD 0.71 lower (2.54 lower to 1.12 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Aver	age score - C-D	OIS-R Alcohol (sk	ewed data) - C-	DIS-R Alcoho	ol by 18 months (Better indicated by lower valu	1es)				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	7	18	-	MD 0.04 higher (2.27 lower to 2.35 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Function	ning: 1. Averag	ge role function	ing score (RFS, h	high = better fur	nctioning) - by	y 6 months (Bette	r indicated by lower values)					
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	22	25	-	MD 0.61 higher (1.63 lower to 2.85 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

Functioning: 1. Average role functioning score (RFS, high = better functioning) - by 12 months (Better indicated by lower values)												
1	trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ¹	none	22	25	-	MD 1.07 higher (1.15 lower to 3.29 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Function	Functioning: 1. Average role functioning score (RFS, high = better functioning) - by 18 months (Better indicated by lower values)											
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	7	18	-	MD 2.55 lower (6.24 lower to 1.14 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ning: 2. Averag	e social adjust	ment score (SAS	, high = better f	unctioning) -	by 6 months (Bet	ter indicated by lower values)					
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	22	25	-	MD 0.92 lower (6.58 lower to 4.74 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 2. Averag	e social adjust	ment score (SAS	, high = better f	unctioning) -	by 12 months (Be	tter indicated by lower values)				
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	22	25	-	MD 2.58 higher (3.39 lower to 8.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 2. Averag	e social adjust	ment score (SAS	, high = better f	unctioning) -	by 18 months (Be	tter indicated by lower values)				
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	7	18	-	MD 4.66 lower (15.29 lower to 5.97 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service u	use: Days in ho	ospital (skewe	d data) (Better in	dicated by lowe	r values)							
1	randomised trials	no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ^{1,2}	none	16	13	-	MD 1.8 higher (4.46 lower to 8.06 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size not met.

² CI includes both 1) no effect and 2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.2.5 GRADE profile for RCTs comparing contingency management with standard care

			Quality according	L	Summary of findings							
			Quality assessment		No of paties	nts		Effect				
No of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Contingency management	standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substance use: 1. No. of days/weeks of drug use (confirmation by urine drug screen) - Days of cocaine use (Better indicated by lower values)												
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	serious ²	none	15	15	-	SMD 1.04 lower (1.8 to 0.28 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	Substance use: 2. No. of days/weeks of alcohol use (confirmation by breathalyzer) (Better indicated by lower values)											
2		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	serious ²	none	37	34	-	SMD 1.21 lower (1.68 to 0.73 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 3. No. of d	ays/weeks using	both drugs and alco	hol (confirma	ation by urin	e or breathalyzer) -	weeks (Better indica	ited by low	er values)			
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	serious ²	none	22	19	-	SMD 0.82 lower (1.47 to 0.17 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	Substance use: 4. Alcohol positive breathalyzer samples (Better indicated by lower values)											
1		no serious limitations	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	serious ²	none	15	15	-	SMD 0.97 lower (3.03 to 0.91 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Research conducted in US; both intervention and control difficult to generalise to UK setting.

² Optimal information size not met.