

Appendix 16c: Evidence profile tables A16-35 to A16-36 (treatment settings)

Settings	2
Table A16-35. Residential treatment versus day treatment	2
Table A16-36. Prison therapeutic communities	4

Settings

Table A16-35. Residential treatment versus day treatment

Quality assessment

No of studies	Design	Limitations	Consistency	Directness	Other considerations
Abstinence (3-4 month follow up) (Alterman 1993, Schneider 1996)					
2	Randomised trials	No limitations	No important inconsistency	Some uncertainty (-1) ¹	Imprecise or sparse data (-1) ²
Abstinence (6-7 month follow up) (Alterman 1993, Greenwood 2001)					
2	Randomised trials	No limitations	No important inconsistency	Some uncertainty (-1) ¹	Imprecise or sparse data (-1) ²

Summary of findings

Outcome	No of patients		Effect		Quality
	Residential	Day Treatment	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	
Abstinence (3-4 month follow up)	47/88 (53.4%)	39/80 (48.8%)	RR 1.14 (0.57 to 2.28)	-	⊕⊕○○ Low
Abstinence (6-7 month follow up)	85/193 (44%)	64/162 (39.5%)	RR 1.07 (0.75 to 1.51)	-	⊕⊕○○ Low

Footnotes:

1. No UK studies
2. CIs compatible with benefit and no benefit

Table A16-36. Prison therapeutic communities

Quality assessment

No of studies	Design	Limitations	Consistency	Directness	Other considerations
Reincarceration (12 month follow up) (Sacks 2004, Wexler 1999)					
2	Randomised trials	No limitations	No important inconsistency	Some uncertainty (-1) ¹	None

Summary of findings

Outcome	No of patients		Effect		Quality
	Prison TC	Prison Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	
Reincarceration (12 month follow up)	151/500 (30.2%)	165/354 (46.6%)	RR 0.48 ² (0.20 to 1.12)	-	⊕⊕⊕○ Moderate

Footnotes:

1. No UK studies
2. RR < 1 favours TC