# APPENDIX 16: COMPLETE METHODOLOGY CHECKLISTS FOR CLINICAL STUDIES

1.1	Service delivery models	2
1.	1.1 Systematic reviews	2
	CLEARY2008	
1	1.2 RCTs	3
1,	BURNAM1995	
	CHANDLER2006	
	DRAKE1998	
	ESSOCK2006	
	ESSOCR2006	
	MOR3E2000	15
1.2	Psychological/ psychosocial interventions	18
1	2.1 RCTs	18
1,	BAKER2006	
	BARROWCLOUGH2001	
	EDWARDS2006	
	GRAEBER2003	
	HELLERSTEIN1995	
	JERRELL1995	
	KAVANAGH2004	
	RIES2004	
	SCHMITZ2002	
	TRACY2007	
	WEISS2007	
	WEISS2007	
1.	2.2 Observational studies	
	ANDERSON1999	
	DELEON2000	
	DRAKE1997	
	НО1999	
	MANGRUM2006	
	NUTTBROCK1998	58
	JAMES2004	60
	HELMUS2003	62
	LYKKE2010	64
	SANTANA2007	66
	TYRER2010	68
	WEISS2000	70
1 0		
1.3	Pharmacological interventions	
1.	3.1 Systematic reviews	73

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

# **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

Stu	dy ID	BURNAM1995	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Checklist completed by: LS			
A. 5	election bias (systematic differences between f	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 (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			
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	
B3	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. 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.	honth 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	s attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
	lirection of its effect? Low risk of bias direction of effect:		
D. Det	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	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 ris	Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			

Study ID		CHANDLER2006			
Gui	ideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.1			
Che	ecklist completed by: LS				
A. 5	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)	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 ly direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the			
Unc	clear/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			
B3	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				
Like	Likely direction of effect:				

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 comple	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?		
	N=11 (out of 103) disappeared after jail.			
	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 were no outco N= 31 lost to follow-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	Yes		
	differences between groups in terms of those			
	for whom outcome data were not available).			
	l on your answers to the above, in your opinion w direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is the		
likely	, , ,	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is the		
likely Likely	direction of its effect?			
likely Likely	direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias         y direction of effect:         etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain         The study had an appropriate length of follow-up			
likely Likely <b>D. De</b> D1	direction of its effect? Low risk of bias y direction of effect: etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain The study had an appropriate length of	ned, diagnosed or verified)		
likely Likely D. De D1 D2	direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias         y direction of effect:         etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain         The study had an appropriate length of follow-up         The study used a precise definition of	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes		
likely Likely <b>D. De</b> D1 D2	direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias         y direction of effect:         etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain         The study had an appropriate length of 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	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes Yes		
likely Likely D. De D1 D2 D3	direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias         y direction of effect:         etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain         The study had an appropriate length of 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	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes Yes Yes Unclear		
likely Likely D. De D1 D2 D3	direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias         y direction of effect:         etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain         The study had an appropriate length of         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	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes Yes Yes		
likely Likely D. De D1 D2 D3 D4	direction of its effect?         Low risk of bias         y direction of effect:         etection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain         The study had an appropriate length of 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	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes Yes Yes Unclear		

Unclear/unknown risk

Study ID		DRAKE1998			
Gui	ideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.1			
Checklist completed by: LS					
A. 5	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			
	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			
Lov	v risk of bias				
Like	ely direction of effect:				
	<b>B.</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	Yes			
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. Attri particij	ition 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 : n=20(out of 223) were lost to attrition (n=1 relocations) all other participants remained	1 refused to continue, $n=7$ deaths, $n=2$
	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 (attrition was higher for the SCM group than for the ACT group):
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 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 lirection of its effect? Low risk of bias	is attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	direction of effect: 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	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa lirection of its effect?	s detection bias present? If so, what is the

Low risk of bias

Study ID		ESSOCK2006			
Gui	ideline topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 1.2.1			
Che	ecklist completed by: LS				
A. 5	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)	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 ly direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the			
Lov	v risk of bias				
Like	ely direction of effect:				
	Performance bias (systematic differences between more 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			
B3	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					
Like	Likely direction of effect:				

C. Attri particip	tion bias (systematic differences between the c 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	N=19 (out of n=198) lost to follow-up (n=5 withdrew or refused participation, n=6 died, n=8 relocated)	
	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
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa irection of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the
Low ris	sk of bias	
	lirection of effect:	
	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
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?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the

Unclear/unknown risk

Study ID		MORSE2006	
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.1	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	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)	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear	
	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	
Unc	clear/unknown risk		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Performance bias (systematic differences between more 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	
B3 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			
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

	rition bias (systematic differences between the c ipants)	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 group were no outcome data available? N=47			
	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		
Low	direction of its effect? risk of bias 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 w direction of its effect?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the		

Low risk of bias

## 1.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL/ PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTIONS

#### 1.2.1 RCTs

Study ID	BAKER2006		
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2		
<b>Checklist completed by:</b> 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)	Unclear		
A3 The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes		
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinio likely direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the		
Unclear/unknown risk			
Likely direction of effect:			
<b>B.</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	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?			

Uncl	ear/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	
<u> </u>		
C. Attri particij	ition 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 complete treatment in each group? All in control arm completed treatment, n=8 completed 0 treatments, n=11 consome, and n=46 completed all treatments (out of 65)		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
C3 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, a 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
	l on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa lirection 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 or	n your answers to the above, in your opinion wa	s detection bias present? If so, what is the
likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		BARROWCLOUGH2001
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2
Che	ecklist 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)	Yes
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 ly direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the
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

	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes	
	l on your answers to the above, in your opinion kely direction of its effect?	was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Lo	w risk of bias		
Likel	y direction of effect:		
	trition bias (systematic differences between th cipants)	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	Yes	
	allow for differences in length of follow-up)		
C2	months $\rightarrow$ 3 deaths, n=2 refused to comp	complete assessment at 9 months, and at 12	
	<ul> <li>b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who din not complete treatment)</li> </ul>	Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each g n=5	coup were no outcome data available?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome dat (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in 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. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

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 v	vas detection bias present? If so, what is the
likely d	lirection of its effect?	
Low ris	sk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	EDWARDS2006	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	Selection bias (systematic differences between f	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	Likely direction of effect:		

	Performance bias (systematic differences between n the intervention under investigation)	en gr	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	Uno	clear
B3	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?	i was	performance bias present? If so, what is
L	ow risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between th ticipants)	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 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in eac End of treatment: n= 1 in CAP dropped out, n=1 in PE dropp intervention, n=6 dropped out (CAP), n=6 (PE)		ē 1	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no importan or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	t	Yes
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 those for whom outcome data were not available	se	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior ly direction of its effect?	ı was	attrition bias present? If so, what is the

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
	1	
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
	e i	
	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?	-
<u> </u>		
Low ri	isk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
J		

Stu	dy ID	GRAEBER2003	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	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)	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?					
Unc	Unclear/unknown risk				
Like	Likely direction of effect:				
B. F	Performance bias (systematic differences betwee	n groups in the care provided, apart			
from	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			
B3	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			
Ŭ	Inclear/unknown risk				
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	Yes			
	allow for differences in length of follow-up				
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 importan				
	or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete	n Yes			
	treatment)				
L	. /	1			
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	N <sub>1</sub>
	differences between groups in terms of those	Yes
	for whom outcome data were not available).	
	,	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion v	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is the
likely	direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
5		
D. Det	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ned, diagnosed or verified)
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of	Yes
D2	outcome	<u> </u>
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to	Yes
D4	determine the outcome	No
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to	INO
	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 v	vas detection bias present? If so, what is the
likely	direction of its effect?	
Unclea	ar/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	
Linciy		

Stu	dy ID	HELLERSTEIN1995	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	ecklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	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 opinior y direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
Unc	lear/unknown risk		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between n 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	
B3	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	ly 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		
C2	a. How many participants did not com Whole ITT sample n= 18/47 were non-s		

	outpatient sessions after hospital charge (.r	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	<ul> <li>a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available?</li> <li>25/29 treatment started completers 4 month follow-up, 17/29 completed 8 month follow-up.</li> </ul>		
	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	
Likely	direction of effect:		
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ed, diagnosed or verified)	
	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-upThe study used a precise definition of	, ,	
D1 D2	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes	
D1 D2 D3	<ul> <li>The study had an appropriate length of follow-up</li> <li>The study used a precise definition of outcome</li> <li>A valid and reliable method was used to</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	
D1 D2 D3 D4	<ul> <li>The study had an appropriate length of follow-up</li> <li>The study used a precise definition of outcome</li> <li>A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome</li> <li>Investigators were kept 'blind' to</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes	
D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 Based	<ul> <li>The study had an appropriate length of follow-up</li> <li>The study used a precise definition of outcome</li> <li>A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome</li> <li>Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention</li> <li>Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes Unclear Unclear	
D1 D2 D3 D4 D5 Based likely	<ul> <li>The study had an appropriate length of follow-up</li> <li>The study used a precise definition of outcome</li> <li>A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome</li> <li>Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention</li> <li>Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors</li> <li>on your answers to the above, in your opinion w</li> </ul>	Yes Yes Yes Unclear Unclear	

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

Stu	dy ID	JERRELL1995	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	cklist completed by: LS		
A. S	election 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.	
Low	likely direction of its effect? Low risk of bias Likely direction of effect:		
	erformance bias (systematic differences between n the intervention under investigation) The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	en groups in the care provided, apart Yes	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No	
B3	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			

	rition bias (systematic differences between the c ipants)	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 treatment in each group? 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 grou n/a	ip 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	
likely	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa direction of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
	lear/unknown risk v direction of effect:		
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	ed, diagnosed or verified)	
	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	ed, diagnosed or verified) Yes	
D1		ç ,	
D1 D2	The study had an appropriate length of follow-upThe study used a precise definition of	Yes	
<b>D. De</b> D1 D2 D3 D4	<ul> <li>The study had an appropriate length of follow-up</li> <li>The study used a precise definition of outcome</li> <li>A valid and reliable method was used to</li> </ul>	Yes Yes	

Low risk of bias

Stu	dy ID	KAVANAGH2004	
Gui	ideline 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 prognostic factors	No (SC in hospital longer on average than SOS patients, and SOS patients more confident in controlling substance use) but these did not predict outcomes.	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	*	
Unc	likely direction of its effect? Unclear/unknown risk Likely direction of effect:		
	<b>B.</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	Unclear (Raters were blind who were assessing abstinence)	

	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa ly direction of its effect?	s performance bias present? If so, what is
	ear/unknown risk	
Likely o	direction of effect:	
C. Attri particip	ition 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 completers (n=25)	te 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	<ul> <li>a. For how many participants in each grou</li> <li>2/13 participants in the SOS and 6/12 partiments. 1 participant additionally could no</li> </ul>	cipants in SC were not assessed at 12
	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 lirection of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the
	Low risk of bias	
Likely o	direction of effect:	
D. Dete	ection 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	No	
	participants' exposure to the intervention		
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic		
	factors		
Based of	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas detection bias present? If so, what is the	
likely d	lirection of its effect?		
Low ris	Low risk of bias		
Likely	Likely direction of effect:		

Stu	dy ID	RIES2004	
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2	
Che	Checklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	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)	Unclear	
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>B.</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						
20	'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear					
Base	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	was performance bias present? If so, what is					
	likely direction of its effect?	······································					
the							
Unclear/unknown risk							
Like	ely direction of effect:						
	5						
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	N <sub>1</sub> .					
	allow for differences in length of follow-up	Yes					
	andw for differences in length of follow-up						
C2	b. How many participants did not com	plete treatment in each group?					
	N= data not reported	01					
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme	nt					
	completion (that is, there were no importan						
	or systematic differences between groups in	Yes					
	terms of those who did not complete						
	treatment)						
C3	C3 a.For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N= data not reported						
	b. The groups were comparable with respe	t					
	to the availability of outcome data (that is,						
	there were no important or systematic						
	1 P	Yes					
	differences between groups in terms of those						
	for whom outcome data were not available	•					
D							
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior	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	No					
1	follow-up						

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 v	was detection bias present? If so, what is the				
likely o	likely direction of its effect?					
E						
Unclear/unknown risk						
Likely	direction of effect:					

Study ID		SCHMITZ2002				
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2				
Che	ecklist completed by: LS					
A. 5	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)	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>B.</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	Unclear				
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion likely direction of its effect?	was j	performance bias present? If so, what is			
U	nclear/unknown risk					
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)		Yes			
C2	a. How many participants did not com N=24	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=24				
	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 (non-significant by by-group omparisons favored the MM+ CBT group over MM group for treatment ompletion)			
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N=24, n=22 gave outcome data					
	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)	e	Yes			
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion ly direction of its effect?	was a	attrition bias present? If so, what is the			
	Unclear/unknown risk					
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertai	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				
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	TRACY2007	
Guideline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2	
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
<ul> <li>A1 An appropriate method of randomisation used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across group</li> <li>A2 There was adequate concealment of alloc (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment treatment allocation)</li> </ul>	t yes ps) cation	
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?       Item to the selection bias present? If so, what is the selection bias present? If so, what is the selection 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			
B3	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?	was performance bias present? If so, what is			
Unk	Unknown/unclear risk of bias				
Like	Likely direction of effect:				
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between th ticipants)	ne 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 stud	0 F			
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no importan or systematic differences between groups ir terms of those who did not complete treatment)	nt			
C3	a. For how many participants in each group N=4 (out of 30)	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)	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?			
y	risk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertai	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	
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?			
Unknown/unclear risk of bias			
Likely direction of effect:			

Study ID		WEISS2007
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 1.2.2
Che	ecklist completed by: LS	
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between		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	
Dee	prognostic factors		
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior ly direction of its effect?	was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
пке	ly direction of its enect?		
Unc	lear/unknown risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
ВР	erformance bias (systematic differences betwee	on groups in the care provided anart	
	n the intervention under investigation)	in groups in the care provided, apart	
D1			
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	N	
	care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes	
De			
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
	treatment allocation	Unclear	
B3	Individuals administering care were kept	Unclear (partial - the psychologist and	
	'blind' to treatment allocation	raters were blind but the research assistants	
		were not):	
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?		
U	nclear/unknown risk		
T ilu	ely direction of effect:		
LIK	By direction of effect.		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between th	e comparison groups with respect to loss of	
part	cicipants)		
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			
C2	N=7 (out of 31) discontinued treatment in integrated group therapy arm, n=14 (out of		
	31) discontinued in group drug counseling arm.		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme	0	
	completion (that is, there were no importan		
	or systematic differences between groups in	n Yes	
	terms of those who did not complete		
	treatment)		

	For how many participants in each group we	
b.	The groups were comparable with respect	
to	the availability of outcome data (that is,	
th	ere were no important or systematic	Yes
di	fferences between groups in terms of those	165
fo	r 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

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)				
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	Yes		
	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	Unclear		
	participants' exposure to the intervention			
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes		
	important confounding and prognostic			
	factors			
Based	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	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 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			
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior y direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the			
Low	risk of bias				
Like	ly direction of effect:				
	<b>B.</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 allocationYes				
	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	) Yes			
C2	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N= 6/31 (integrated group therapy), 6/30 (group drug counseling)				

	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 v	vere no outcome data available?	
	N= 3/61 no outcome data available (95% of sample completed all data throughout 6		
	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	Yas	
	differences between groups in terms of those	Yes	
	for whom outcome data were not available).		
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
likely	direction of its effect?		
	ow risk of bias		
Likely	v direction of effect:		
5			
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	ned, diagnosed or verified)	
D1	The study had an appropriate length of	Yes	
	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	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other	Yes	
D5	important confounding and prognostic	Yes	
	important confounding and prognostic factors		
Based	important confounding and prognostic factors on your answers to the above, in your opinion v		
Based	important confounding and prognostic factors		
Based likely	important confounding and prognostic factors on your answers to the above, in your opinion v direction of its effect?		
likely	important confounding and prognostic factors on your answers to the above, in your opinion v		
Based likely Low	important confounding and prognostic factors on your answers to the above, in your opinion v direction of its effect? v risk of bias		
Based likely Low	important confounding and prognostic factors on your answers to the above, in your opinion v direction of its effect?		

### 1.2.2 Observational studies

Study	ID	ANDERSON1999		
Guide	line topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 1.2.3		
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		
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	selection bias present? If so, what is		
the likely direction of its effect?				
Unclear/unknown risk				
Likely direction of effect:				
	ormance 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		
B3	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:	
C. Att	rition bias (systematic differences between the con	nparison groups with respect to
	f 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? 135 out of 360 (high dropout rate for MICA referrals, 100 out of 135, 35 from the 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	C3 a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Not reported	
	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	direction of effect:	
D. Det	tection 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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was likely direction of its effect?	detection bias present? If so, what
	Unclear/unknown risk	

01 1 1			
Study ID		BLANKERTZ1994	
Guidel	ine topic:	<b>Review question no:</b> 1.2.3	
Checkl	ist 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)	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	selection bias present? If so, what is	
the like	ely direction of its effect?		
L	Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:			
	<b>B.</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	
B3	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	direction of effect:	
C Atta	rition hige (systematic differences between the con	narican groups with respect to
	rition bias (systematic differences between the con Eparticipants)	iparison 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	C2 a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 89 out of 135 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 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 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. Det	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 ikely direction of its effect?	detection bias present? If so, what
	Low risk of bias	

Study I	ID	BRUNETTE2001	
Guideline topic: PSM		<b>Review question no:</b> 1.2.3	
Checkl	ist completed by: LS		
A. Sele	ction 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	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was	selection bias present? If so, what is	
the like	ely direction of its effect?		
Н	High risk of bias		
Likely	direction of effect:		
	ormance bias (systematic differences between gro ne 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	
B3	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	r/unknown risk		

C. Att	direction of effect: rition bias (systematic differences between the con	nparison groups with respect to
1055 01 C1	f participants)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 g 3 out of 43 in long term group, no mention of how many partici short-term groups		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)	Yes
C3 a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data avail 3 out of 43 in long term group, no mention of how many participants at 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 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- 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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was	detection bias present? If so, what
is the l	ikely direction of its effect?	

Unclear/unknown risk

Study	ID	DELEON2000
Guide	line topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.3
Check	list completed by: LS	-
	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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	selection bias present? If so, what is
I	low 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	Unclear
B3	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. Attr	ition bias (systematic differences between the com	parison groups with respect to
	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	<ul> <li>a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available?</li> <li>119/183 in TC1 followed up at 12 months</li> <li>65/93 in TC2 followed up at 12 months</li> <li>48/66 in TAU received 12 month baseline interviews</li> </ul>	
	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
	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	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 a	letection bias present? If so, what
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	Low 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	

B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	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:	
	rition 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 treat 12 of 59 in standard treatment vs. 18 of 158 in int	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 For how many participants in each group were no outcome d 12 of 59 in standard treatment vs. 18 of 158 in integrated with		
	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. Det	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	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:		

Study	ID	HO1999	
Guide	line topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	
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	
	Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
τ	Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely	Likely direction of effect:		
	ormance 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	

B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No
	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	
Likely	direction of effect:	
	rition bias (systematic differences between the cor 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 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 outcome data available? Not reported	
	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
Unclea	ur/unknown risk	
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- 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 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	MANGRUM2006	
Guide	line topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 1.2.1	
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)	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?		
I	Low risk of bias		
Likely	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	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:	
	rition 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	How many participants did not complete treatme Data was 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 a. For how many participants in each group were r Data was 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 ely direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Unclear/unknown risk	
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- 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	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	NUTTBROCK1998
Guide	line topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.3
	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)	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 like	ely direction of its effect?	
Unclea	nr/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
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	No

	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was p the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,
	Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely c	lirection of effect:	
	tion bias (systematic differences between the com participants)	parison 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?
	Of the 169 residents who completed treatment in a completed 2 months of treatment, 72/169 completed 12 months.	1 5 .
	Community residents – 106/121 started two months 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 systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
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 between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
	n 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 o	lirection 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	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	Guideline 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	No	
B3	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 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 treats 29/32 for intervention group , 29/31 for control g	<b>e i</b>	
	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 g		
	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	Likely direction of effect:		
D. Det	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	, diagnosed or verified)	

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

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

Study	ID	HELMUS2003
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>B.</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	Unclear	
	n your answers to the above, in your opinion was the likely direction of its effect?	performance bias present? If so,	
	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	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, just reported that for each CM grou SD): 61%(35%) for Group 1, 65%(32%) for Group	up, group attendance rates were (m,	
	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. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)			

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

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
is the l	ikely direction of its effect?	
	Low risk of bias	
<u>т •1 1</u>	1: .:	
Likely	direction of effect:	

Study	7 ID	LYKKE2010
Guid	eline topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
Checl	klist completed by: LS	
A. Se	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 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
Likely	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 No Unclear N/A
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes No Unclear N/A
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes No Unclear N/A
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was 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:	
	ition 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	a. How many participants did not complete treat 34 out of 102 dropped out 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 Not reported but can assume it is 34 of 102	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 ly direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. Det	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained,	diagnosed or verified)

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

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

Study	ID	SANTANA2007
Guide	line topic: PSM	Review question no: 1.2.2
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)	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 ely direction of its effect?	selection bias present? If so, what is

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 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 Alls		
	ition 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	Yes
	differences in length of follow-up)	
C2	How many participants did not complete treatme	ent in each group?
	N=2 lost to follow up in month 1 in CMI group (	wet of E(), p=2 lost to follow up of
	N=2 lost to follow up in month 1 in GMI group (a month 1 in TAAC group (out of 51)	Sut of 50), h=2 lost to follow-up at
	N=6 dropped out at month 3 in GMI group	
	N=8 dropped out in month 3 in TAAC group	
	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		no outcomo data available?
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were	
	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	0
	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
	between groups in terms of those for whom	Yes
	between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	
	between groups in terms of those for whom	

Likely	v 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
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	

Study	ID	TYRER2010
Guide	line topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was ely direction of its effect?	selection bias present? If so, what is

	Low risk of bias	
Likely	v 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
B3	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? Low risk of bias	performance bias present? If so,
C. Att	v 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	<ul> <li>a. How many participants did not complete treat n=52 in original trial, however n=19 in nidotheral group had comorbid substance misuse and were n=37</li> <li>2 drop outs (n=1 death from nidotherapy, n=1 dr 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)</li> </ul>	py group, and n=18 in control used for this guideline. Therefore
C3	For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Nidotherapy group: 1/19 no outcome data at 6 month follow up, 6 out of 18 no outcome data at 12 month follow-up Control: 1 out of 18 no outcome data at 6 month, 5 out of 18 no outcome data at 12 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
	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- up	Yes
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 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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was likely direction of its effect?	detection bias present? If so, what
	Unclear/unknown risk	
Likely	direction of effect:	

Study	ID	WEISS2000
Guide	ine topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection 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 potential confounders?	Unclear	
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline,		
	including all major confounding and prognostic	Yes	
	factors		
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was	selection bias present? If so, what is	
the lik	kely direction of its effect?		
	Unclear/unknown risk of bias		
Likely	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	
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to		
	treatment allocation	No	
B3	Individuals a dministoring care ware least (blind)		
<b>D</b> 3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear	
Based	l 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	y direction of effect:		
5			
C. At	trition bias (systematic differences between the con	nparison groups with respect to	
	of 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)		
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)		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or	Yes	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms	Yes	
<u>C3</u>	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or		

	All, both drop outs of treatment continued to do	accomente
l	An, bout 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 ely direction of its effect?	attrition bias present? If so, what is
	Low risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
D. Det	tection 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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion was likely direction of its effect?	detection bias present? If so, what

Likely direction of effect:
# **1.3 PHARMACOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS**

# 1.3.1 Systematic reviews

Study ID	BUCHANAN2009 (PORT)
Guideline topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	<b>Review question no:</b> 2.1.1/2.3.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	I
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	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	<b>Review question no:</b> 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	<b>Review question no:</b> 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		<b>Review question no:</b> 2.1.1	
Che	ecklist 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)	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	v risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Performance bias (systematic differences between n 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	Yes	
		165	
B3	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?	was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Low	v risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between th cicipants)	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	<ul> <li>a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group?</li> <li>N=3 dropped out after week 1 (n=1 naltrexone group, n=2 placebo), n=4 dropouts after week 2 (n=2 naltrexone, n=2 placebo), n=1 naltrexone patient after week 3, n=2 placebo patients after week 4, n=1 placebo patient after week 5, n=2 naltrexone patients after week 8, n=1 placebo patient after week 9, n=2 patients in placebo after week 10, and n=1 placebo patient after week 11.</li> </ul>		
	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)	t	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group N=7 of 50 (did not return after baseline)		
	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)	e Yes	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinion ly direction of its effect?	was attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
Hi	igh potential for bias on some outcomes (high att	rition)	
Like	Likely direction of effect:		

#### DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

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 r	isk of bias	

Stu	dy ID	KEMP2009	
Gui	deline topic: PSM	<b>Review question no:</b> 2.1.1	
Che	Checklist completed by: LS		
A. 5	election 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	
	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		

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	
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior ikely direction of its effect?	was p	performance bias present? If so, what is
Low	risk of bias		
Like	ly direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)			parison 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=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		n lithium and divalproex group, n=118
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no importan or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	nt t	Yes
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 those for whom outcome data were not available)	e	Yes
	ed on your answers to the above, in your opinior y direction of its effect?	was a	ttrition bias present? If so, what is the

High potential for bias (	Very high attrition	rate in open maintena	nce 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		
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 o	direction of its effect?	_	
-			
Low ri	Low risk of bias		
Likely	Likely direction of effect:		

Stu	dy ID	NEJTEK2009
Gui	deline topic: PSM	Review question no: 2.1.1
Che	ecklist 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)	Yes
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 ly direction of its effect?	n was selection bias present? If so, what is the	
Low	v 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	Yes	
B3	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?	n was performance bias present? If so, what is	
Low	v risk of bias		
Like	ely direction of effect:		
	Attrition bias (systematic differences between the cicipants)	ne 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	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		
	b. The groups were comparable for treatme completion (that is, there were no importan or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	nt n Yes	
C3	a. For how many participants in each group N= 2 out of 96	o 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 v direction of its effect?	vas attrition bias present? If so, what is the
J	risk of bias	
Likely	direction of effect:	
5		
D. De	tection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertain	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
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion w direction of its effect?	vas detection bias present? If so, what is the
Low r	isk of bias	
Likelv	direction of effect:	

Stu	dy ID	SWARTZ2008		
Guideline topic: PSM		Review question no: 2.1.1		
Che	ecklist 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		
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	No (but accounted for in analysis)		
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>B.</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 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 treatment in each group? No illicit substance use group : n=105 discontinued out of 188 for olanzapine, n=156			

	(of 192) for quetiapine, n=121( of 176) for ri	speridone, n=99 (of 133) for perphenazine,	
	<ul> <li>and n=77(of 100) for ziprasidone</li> <li>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</li> </ul>		
	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 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 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 lirection of its effect?	as attrition bias present? If so, what is the	
Low : prone f	risk of bias (time to discontinuation was the prim to bias)	nary outcome; other outcomes are more	
Likely	direction of effect:		
D. Det	ection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertaine	ed, 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	Yes	
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes	
	on your answers to the above, in your opinion wa lirection of its effect?	as detection bias present? If so, what is the	
<u> </u>			

### Likely direction of effect: