APPENDIX 16: COMPLETE METHODOLOGY CHECKLISTS FOR CLINICAL STUDIES

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

Study ID		BURNAM1995
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 (except significant differences between groups in terms of marital status):
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
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 treatment in each group? N=211 in treatment, n =65 in control. At 3 month follow up, n=40 dropped out in experimental, n=18 dropped out in control. At 6 months, n=8 additional dropped out in experimental, n=0 dropped out in control. At 9 months, n=8 dropped out in experimental, n=11 dropped out in control.	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? n.=56 for experimental, n=27 for control	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	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
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		CHANDLER2006
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	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?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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?		
Low risk of bias	Unclear/unknown risk	High risk of bias
Likely direction of effect:		

C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not 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 terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? N= 31 lost to follow-up	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Unclear/unknown risk
Likely direction of effect:

Study ID		DRAKE1998
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? : n=20(out of 223) were lost to attrition (n=11 refused to continue, n=7 deaths, n=2 relocations) all other participants remained in the 3-year study.	
	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 group were no outcome data available? N=20	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Low risk of bias
Likely direction of effect:

Study ID		ESSOCK2006
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	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 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
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 treatment in each group? 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	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? n=145 (out of n=179) completed every assessment, n=34 did not complete all 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
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
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Unclear/unknown risk
Likely direction of effect:

Study ID		MORSE2006
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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 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
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
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?		

Low risk of bias
Likely direction of effect:

1.2 PSYCHOLOGICAL/ PSYCHOSOCIAL INTERVENTIONS

1.2.1 RCTs

Study ID		BAKER2006
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
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)	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?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear (raters were blind)
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? All in control arm completed treatment, n=8 completed 0 treatments, n=11 completed some, and n=46 completed all treatments (out of 65)	
	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, and n=97 completed fourth assessment at 12 months	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear

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

Study ID		BARROWCLOUGH2001
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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=17 and n=15 (n=32 out of 36) did not complete assessment at 9 months, and at 12 months → 3 deaths, n=2 refused to complete assessments	
	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=5	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes

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

Study ID		EDWARDS2006
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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? End of treatment: n= 1 in CAP dropped out, n=1 in PE dropped out. At 6 months post-intervention, n=6 dropped out (CAP), n=6 (PE)	
	b. The groups were comparable for 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=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).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

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

Study ID		GRAEBER2003
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)	No
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes (except more Hispanics than any other ethnic group)

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
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
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 treatment in each group? All participants (n=30) completed treatment	
	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? 2/15 were not assessed at follow-up periods

	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
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
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

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

	confounding factors equally across groups)	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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 treatment in each group? Whole ITT sample n= 18/47 were non-starters upon failing to attend at least 2	

	outpatient sessions after hospital charge (.n=7 experimental, n=11 control subjects)	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 25/29 treatment started completers 4 month follow-up, 17/29 completed 8 month follow-up.	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		JERRELL1995
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	No (randomly assigned cohort reported lower housing stability, lower family interaction, lower personal well-being) when compared to the clinician assigned group.
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low 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	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 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 group were no outcome data available? n/a	
	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 direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Low risk of bias
Likely direction of effect:

Study ID		KAVANAGH2004
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was 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.
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear (Raters were blind who were assessing abstinence)

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 treatment in each group? All completers (n=25)	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 2/13 participants in the SOS and 6/12 participants in SC were not assessed at 12 months. 1 participant additionally could not be contacted for follow-up.	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes

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

Study ID		RIES2004
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)	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 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
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	b. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N= data not 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 group were no outcome data available? N= data 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No

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

Study ID		SCHMITZ2002
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)	Unclear
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes (except for marital status, and MM group reported more depressive and manic symptoms than MM+ CBT group)
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
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 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 comparisons favored the MM+ CBT group over MM group for treatment completion)
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).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		

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

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)		
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 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was performance bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unknown/unclear risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N= 4 out of 30 did not complete the study	
	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=4 (out of 30)	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	yes

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	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
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)	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?		
Unclear/unknown 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 (partial – the psychologist and raters were blind but the research assistants were not):
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 treatment in each group? N=7 (out of 31) discontinued treatment in integrated group therapy arm, n=14 (out of 31) discontinued in group drug counseling arm.	
	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?	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	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
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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
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)	Yes
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 were 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 differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available).	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

1.2.2 Observational studies

Study ID		ANDERSON1999
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.3
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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 treatment in each group? 135 out of 360 (high dropout rate for MICA referrals, 100 out of 135, 35 from the TLC 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 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		

Likely direction of effect:

Study ID		BLANKERTZ1994
Guideline topic:		**Review question no:** 1.2.3
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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	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. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 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 no outcome data available? 89 out of 135 had outcome data available	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias (although very high attrition)		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of 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
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		BRUNETTE2001
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.3
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
High 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
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 treatment in each group? 3 out of 43 in long term group, no mention of how many participants at follow-up in short-term groups	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 3 out of 43 in long term group, no mention of how many participants at follow-up in short-term group	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
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
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Unclear
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

Unclear/unknown risk
Likely direction of effect:

Study ID		DELEON2000
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.3
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	The method of allocation to treatment groups was unrelated to potential confounding factors (that is, the reason for participant allocation to treatment groups is not expected to affect the outcome(s) under study)	Yes
A2	Were any attempts made within the design or analysis to balance the comparison groups for potential confounders?	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
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 treatment in each group? 119/183 in TC1 followed up at 12 months 65/93 in TC2 followed up at 12 months 48/66 in TAU received 12 month baseline interviews	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	No (completed did significantly better on multiple outcomes)
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? 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 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 direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear

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

Study ID		DRAKE1997
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: Laura Shields		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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	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?		
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 treatment in each group? 12 of 59 in standard treatment vs. 18 of 158 in integrated with treatment.	
	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? 12 of 59 in standard treatment vs. 18 of 158 in integrated with treatment.	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	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	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		HO1999
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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. 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	How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Not 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	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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No

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

Study ID		MANGRUM2006
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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?		
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
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	How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Data was not 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 group were no outcome data available? Data was 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	Yes
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Unclear

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

Study ID		NUTTBROCK1998
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.3
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
B3	Individuals administering care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	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?		
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 treatment in each group? Of the 169 residents who completed treatment in a therapeutic community, 123/169 completed 2 months of treatment, 72/169 completed six months, 43/169 completed 12 months. 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 no outcome data available? 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
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
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	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Psychological Interventions

Study ID		JAMES2004
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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
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 treatment in each group? 29/32 for intervention group , 29/31 for control 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 no outcome data available? 29/32 for intervention group , 29/31 for control group	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
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
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	No
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

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

B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Unclear
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	How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? Not 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	For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Not reported, just reported that for each CM group, group attendance rates were (m, SD): 61%(35%) for Group 1, 65%(32%) for Group 2, 69%(29%) for Group 3.	
	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 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	N/A (within-subjects reversal design)
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	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		LYKKE2010
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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 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 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
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 Unclear/unknown risk High risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
C. Attrition bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups with respect to loss of participants)		
C1	All groups were followed up for an equal length of time (or analysis was adjusted to allow for differences in length of follow-up)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 34 out of 102 dropped out overall	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	a. For how many participants in each group were no outcome data available? Not reported but can assume it is 34 of 102	
	b. The groups were comparable with respect to the availability of outcome data (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those for whom outcome data were not available)	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		

D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	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	No
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		SANTANA2007
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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	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)	Yes
C2	How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=2 lost to follow up in month 1 in GMI group (out of 50), n=2 lost to follow-up at month 1 in TAAC group (out of 51) N=6 dropped out at month 3 in GMI group N=8 dropped out in month 3 in TAAC group	
	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? 48/50 at month 1 for GMI group, 49/51 for TAAC group 44/50 at month 3 for GMi group, 43/51 for TAAC 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
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
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding/prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		TYRER2010
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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	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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? n=52 in original trial, however n=19 in nidotherapy group, and n=18 in control group had comorbid substance misuse and were used for this guideline. Therefore n=37 2 drop outs (n=1 death from nidotherapy, n=1 drop out from control)	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in terms of those who did not complete treatment)	Yes
C3	For how many participants in each group were 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
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
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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk		
Likely direction of effect:		

Study ID		WEISS2000
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 1.2.2
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison 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 factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Unclear/unknown risk 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	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 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 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?	

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

1.3 PHARMACOLOGICAL INTERVENTIONS

1.3.1 Systematic reviews

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

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

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

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

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

Study ID	POTVIN2009
Guideline topic: PSM	**Review question no:** 2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	***Chose one option for each question*** **Yes/ No/ Unclear**
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
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	SAN2007
Guideline topic: PSM	**Review question no:** 2.1.1/2.5.1
Checklist completed by: CW	
SCREENING QUESTIONS	
In a well-conducted, relevant systematic review:	***Chose one option for each question*** **Yes/ No/ Unclear**
The review addresses an appropriate and clearly focused question that is relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The review collects the type of studies you consider relevant to the guideline review question	Yes
The literature search is sufficiently rigorous to identify all the relevant studies	Yes
Study quality is assessed and reported	Yes (but not reported for each study)
An adequate description of the methodology used is included, and the methods used are appropriate to the question	Yes

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

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

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

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

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

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

1.3.2 RCTs

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

B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? 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.	
	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=7 of 50 (did not return after baseline) so n=43 had usable 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).	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?		
High potential for bias on some outcomes (high attrition)		
Likely direction of effect:		

D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of 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
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	KEMP2009
Guideline topic: PSM	**Review question no:** 2.1.1
Checklist completed by: LS	

A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		

Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? N=13 (out of 16) in lithium group, n=10 of 15 in lithium and divalproex group, n=118 discontinued out of 149 enrolled in open stabilization phase	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no 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=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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		

High potential for bias (Very high attrition rate in open maintenance phase of trial)		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of 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
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		NEJTEK2009
Guideline topic: PSM		**Review question no:** 2.1.1
Checklist completed by: LS		
A. Selection bias (systematic differences between the comparison groups)		
A1	An appropriate method of randomisation was used to allocate participants to treatment groups (which would have balanced any confounding factors equally across groups)	Yes
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
A3	The groups were comparable at baseline, including all major confounding and prognostic factors	Yes

Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was selection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		
Likely direction of effect:		
B. Performance bias (systematic differences between groups in the care provided, apart from the intervention under investigation)		
B1	The comparison groups received the same care apart from the intervention(s) studied	Yes
B2	Participants receiving care were kept 'blind' to treatment allocation	Yes
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)	Yes
C2	a. How many participants did not complete treatment in each group? **In the risperidone group (n=38)**: n=12 withdrew or lost to follow-up, n=7 medication noncompliane,n=7 protocol noncompliant, n=3 medical reasons (other,) n=3 incarcerated. **In the quetiapine group (n=42):** n=13 withdrew or lost to follow-up, n=7 medication noncompliant, n=9 protocol noncompliant, n=2 medical reasons (other), n= 3incarcerated	
	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= 2 out of 96	

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

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

	confounding factors equally across groups)	
A2	There was adequate concealment of allocation (such that investigators, clinicians and participants cannot influence enrolment or treatment allocation)	Yes
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. 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 risperidone, n=99 (of 133) for perphenazine, and n=77(of 100) for ziprasidone For those in the illicit substance use group : n = 105(of 142) for olanzapine, n=113(of 137) for quetiapine, n=124(of 157) for risperidone, n=92(of 124) for perphenazine, and n=68 (of 82) of ziprasidone	
	b. The groups were comparable for treatment completion (that is, there were no important or systematic differences between groups in 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
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was attrition bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias (time to discontinuation was the primary outcome; other outcomes are more prone to bias)		
Likely direction of effect:		
D. Detection bias (bias in how outcomes are ascertained, diagnosed or verified)		
D1	The study had an appropriate length of follow-up	No
D2	The study used a precise definition of outcome	Yes
D3	A valid and reliable method was used to determine the outcome	Yes
D4	Investigators were kept 'blind' to participants' exposure to the intervention	Yes
D5	Investigators were kept 'blind' to other important confounding and prognostic factors	Yes
Based on your answers to the above, in your opinion was detection bias present? If so, what is the likely direction of its effect?		
Low risk of bias		

Likely direction of effect: