

Editorial Manager(tm) for European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry  
Manuscript Draft

Manuscript Number: ECAP-D-08-00177R1

Title: A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents

Article Type: Original Contribution

Keywords: Obsessive compulsive disorder, Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, Randomised controlled trial, Treatment, Young people

Corresponding Author: Dr Tim I Williams, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil.

Corresponding Author's Institution: Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust

First Author: Tim I Williams, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil.

Order of Authors: Tim I Williams, M.A., M.Sc., D.Phil.; Paul M Salkovskis, Ph.D.; Liz Forrester, Ph.D.; Sam Turner, D.Clin. Psych.; Hilary White, D.Clin.Psych.; Mark A Allsopp, M.D.

**Abstract:** Background: Cognitive behaviour therapy for young people with obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) has become the treatment of first choice. However the literature is largely based on studies from specialist academic departments and uses methods emphasising exposure and response prevention. In this study we report on a randomised controlled trial of CBT for young people carried out in typical outpatient clinic conditions which focused on responsibility cognitions.

**Design:** A randomised controlled trial comparing 10 sessions of manualised cognitive behavioural treatment with a 12 week waiting list for adolescents and children with OCD. Assessors were blind to treatment allocation.

**Participants:** 21 consecutive patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder aged between 9 and 18 years.

**Results:** The group who received treatment improved more than a comparison group who waited for three months. The second group were treated subsequently using the same protocol and made similar gains.

**Conclusion:** Cognitive behaviour therapy can be delivered effectively to young people with obsessive compulsive disorder in typical outpatient settings.

**Response to Reviewers:** Thank you for your consideration of our submission to European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. We have made the following changes to the manuscript in view of the referee's comments. The changes made are described in the order in which they appear in the referee's comments.

Referee's paragraph 1 and 2

I have altered the second paragraph of the introduction to make it clearer that this study was intended to identify whether the Salkovskis model of CBT was usable with young people. I have therefore strengthened the argument for the importance of responsibility cognitions in the introduction, while acknowledging that other models might be supported. A more detailed argument could be produced if

there was space in the journal. In general the introduction and discussion have been substantially rewritten.

Referee's paragraph 3

We have altered the introduction to de-emphasise the non-academic service based component of the study.

Referee's paragraph 4

The in and exclusion criteria are now described – see also the CONSORT diagram.

Referee's paragraph 5

Further details of the patients have been described including medication, comorbidities and comparability of patients at baseline. Since treatment history was not part of the inclusion or exclusion criteria we have not described it further.

Referee's paragraph 6

We have included further descriptions of the measures that are new to this study, and included information about the CRIQ. Detailed information about these measures is also available on <http://psychology.iop.kcl.ac.uk/ocdkids/questionnaires/questionnaires.aspx> and in the book edited by Waite & Williams (2009). The MASC results are now included in the revised manuscript. They were missed out due to an oversight.

Referee's paragraph 7

We have explained that there was no further treatment during the follow-up.

Referee's paragraph 8

We have attempted to make clear that the purpose of the study was not to provide a comparison with other treatments which would require a much larger sample size, but rather to demonstrate that this model of treatment was usable in a clinic setting with young children.

Referee's paragraph 9

While it would be fair to state that our approach was strongly cognitive, it would not be correct to claim that it was purely cognitive. This treatment approach emphasises cognitive change as a means to enable behavioural change. Nevertheless we have attempted to de-emphasise the cognitive approach used here to satisfy the referee's concerns.

Referee's paragraph 10

We have rephrased our point to remove the implied criticism of the Cochrane review

Referee's paragraph 11

We have removed the word somewhat from the sentence.

Referee's paragraph 12

We have clarified the effect sizes used here. Because of the way that the data from the POTS trial has been reported it is not possible to report the Morris & Deshon type effect size.

Referee's paragraph 13

We have clarified the table to show that the POTS trial contained a placebo condition.

We hope that the revised paper now meets the conditions for publication in ECAP,

Running Head: RCT of CBT for young people with OCD

**A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment  
for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents**

Tim I. Williams,  
Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust  
& School of Psychology, University of Reading

Paul M. Salkovskis, Liz Forrester  
Institute of Psychiatry, London

Sam Turner, Hilary White, Mark A. Allsopp  
Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust

Keywords: Obsessive compulsive disorder, Cognitive Behaviour Therapy, Randomised  
controlled trial, Treatment, Young people

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Dr. T. I. Williams, School of  
Psychology, University of Reading, Earley Gate, Reading, RG6 6AL

E-mail: [sxswiams@reading.ac.uk](mailto:sxswiams@reading.ac.uk)

## Abstract

**Background:** Cognitive behaviour therapy for young people with obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD) has become the treatment of first choice. However the literature is largely based on studies from specialist academic departments and uses methods emphasising exposure and response prevention. In this study we report on a randomised controlled trial of CBT for young people carried out in typical outpatient clinic conditions which focused on responsibility cognitions.

**Design:** A randomised controlled trial comparing 10 sessions of manualised cognitive behavioural treatment with a 12 week waiting list for adolescents and children with OCD. Assessors were blind to treatment allocation.

**Participants:** 21 consecutive patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder aged between 9 and 18 years.

**Results:** The group who received treatment improved more than a comparison group who waited for three months. The second group were treated subsequently using the same protocol and made similar gains.

**Conclusion:** Cognitive behaviour therapy can be delivered effectively to young people with obsessive compulsive disorder in typical outpatient settings.

A randomised controlled trial of cognitive behavioural treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents

Obsessive compulsive disorder is a particularly severe and disabling psychological disorder. Recent epidemiological studies suggest that it affects around 1.9 to 3.2% of the adult population and may have a one year prevalence rate of up to 4% in late adolescence [12]. Follow-up studies have shown that it has a chronic relapsing course such that 50% of adult patients report their first symptoms in childhood or adolescence and 50% of patients with obsessive compulsive disorder in adolescence will continue to suffer disabling effects from OCD in adulthood [2, 7, 34]. An effective treatment for OCD in adolescence could offer significant savings for the health service and improved quality of life for many patients.

For adults pharmacological treatments (selective serotonin re-uptake inhibitors; SSRIs) have been shown to reduce the level of symptomatology, but in up to 90% of patients these gains are lost within seven weeks of stopping treatment [33]. The benefits of SSRIs for young people with OCD have also been demonstrated (see Geller et al., [16] for a meta-analysis) but there are concerns about the safety of medication in young people on the grounds of both physiology and risk taking behaviour. Although controversial, these concerns impact on the acceptability of pharmacotherapy. In adults it is known that SSRIs do not enhance short-term adherence to psychological treatment, and in the long term their use may impair the efficacy of psychological treatments [15].

Recent expert consensus guidelines suggest that cognitive behavioural treatments are the first choice treatments for children and adolescents with OCD [20, 25] although a Cochrane review concluded only that “behavioural or cognitive-behaviour therapy appears to be a promising treatment

1  
2  
3  
4 for OCD in children and adolescents” [26]. Until recently there have been few trials which examine  
5  
6 the effectiveness of cognitive behavioural therapy for young people, based on the assumption that  
7  
8 adult based research would generalise. In general controlled trials have demonstrated that CBT  
9  
10 techniques used for adults have generalised well [4, 6, 9, 11, 21]. The largest of these trials [21]  
11  
12 demonstrated that both medication and cognitive behavioural therapy were effective treatments for  
13  
14 OCD. However there was a significant site by treatment interaction such that in one site cognitive  
15  
16 behaviour therapy was significantly more effective than medication whereas in the other site  
17  
18 medication was found to be more effective. Other controlled trials of CBT for young people have  
19  
20 found similar beneficial effects of CBT compared with medication [4, 11].  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

28         The components of cognitive behaviour therapy for children have often been poorly  
29  
30 specified. Two components have been used by most studies – exposure and response prevention  
31  
32 (E/RP) and anxiety management [4, 6, 9, 11, 21]. Bolton and Perrin [9] have demonstrated that  
33  
34 E/RP alone (with minimal anxiety management) is sufficient to achieve significant benefits. De Haan,  
35  
36 Hoogduin, Buitelaar & Keijsers [11] investigated the use of targeted cognitive techniques including  
37  
38 manipulating responsibility cognitions demonstrating comparable effects for CBT and medication.  
39  
40 Two studies have delivered CBT in group format [4,6], without compromising the effect of CBT.  
41  
42 Furthermore, Barrett, Healy-Farrell & March [6] involved parents in treatment with beneficial effects.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50         An alternative to managing anxiety around exposure and response prevention is to target  
51  
52 cognitions specific to OCD. A number of candidate cognitive processes have been suggested and a  
53  
54 systematic review of cognitions related to OCD symptoms in young people [27] suggested that three  
55  
56 models have some support: increased responsibility; meta-cognitions, and thought-action fusion.  
57  
58 These models are difficult to distinguish empirically, because the processes overlap. An appraisal of  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 responsibility for intrusive thoughts is a form of meta-cognition (thinking about thoughts) and the  
5  
6 appraisal that ones thoughts might result in actions or events occurring is of no significance unless  
7  
8 one appraises oneself as responsible for the thought. Evidence for responsibility cognitions being  
9  
10 specific to OCD in adults has been provided by Salkovskis and his coworkers who demonstrated that  
11  
12 they differentiate patients with OCD from those with other emotional disorders [30].  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 Studies with young people have not shown the clarity of the link between responsibility and  
20  
21 OCD expected from the adult results [27]. Other aspects of cognition such as thought action fusion  
22  
23 [7, 18], and perfectionism [18] are correlated with symptoms of OCD in young people, although these  
24  
25 relationships are substantially mediated by responsibility cognitions [18, 22]. Reynolds and Reeves [27]  
26  
27 point out however that the relationships between these cognitive processes are unclear and may be  
28  
29 mediated or moderated by other factors such as low mood. The robustness of the responsibility  
30  
31 cognitions model in adults and the evidence that responsibility cognitions seem to be problematic in  
32  
33 children with OCD suggest that there is utility in examining the extent to which CBT which  
34  
35 concentrated on responsibility cognitions could be used to treat OCD.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42  
43 Salkovskis and his colleagues (e.g. Salkovskis, 1998 [27]) have developed a package of  
44  
45 cognitive behavioural treatment methods which concentrates on responsibility cognitions. The  
46  
47 components that seem to be particularly important are:

- 48  
49 1. normalising the nature of unpleasant intrusive cognitions;
- 50  
51 2. identifying the nature of the link between the thoughts and the feelings of  
52  
53 discomfort/anxiety and subsequent neutralising rituals;
- 54  
55 3. examining the logical nature of the links, and putting them to the test by means of  
56  
57 behavioural experiments;  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4 4. comparing real danger with the worry about causing harm - i.e. discriminating
- 5
- 6 between thinking about and acting upon;
- 7
- 8
- 9 5. helping the patient to identify that the effect of attempting to control the thoughts
- 10 leads to recurrence of the thoughts or images;
- 11
- 12
- 13 6. helping the patient to consider alternative non-threatening accounts of their
- 14
- 15 obsessive problems.
- 16
- 17

18 The therapy also includes psychoeducation about anxiety and an explanation of how trying to carry  
19 out exposure and response prevention might seem difficult. Although some exposure work was  
20 undertaken, it was always explained in terms of finding out what happens to cognitions and emotions.  
21 The therapists did not insist on waiting until the uncomfortable feelings had subsided as is required  
22 by exposure and response prevention. A pilot study [35] of this form of CBT with young people  
23 suggested that the changes in symptoms were paralleled by the changes in the responsibility beliefs  
24 which initiate and maintain compulsive behaviours. The techniques also affect metacognition in that  
25 they alter the beliefs about the nature and meaning of cognitions associated with OCD. This form of  
26 CBT differs from that used in the POTS trial [21] in its concentration on cognitions. The treatment  
27 does not aim to teach the children to resist the impulse to carry out compulsions, but rather to  
28 identify and change the misconceptions underlying the motivation to carry out compulsions. A much  
29 larger study would be needed to test this form of CBT against other forms of CBT or indeed a purely  
30 behavioural treatment such as that in Bolton & Perrin [9].  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Methods

Young people were recruited to the trial with a primary diagnosis of obsessive compulsive disorder based on a semi structured interview for mental health problems (ADIS-C [32]). In total 21 young people aged 9 to 18 years (mean age 13 years 7 months; 13 boys, 8 girls) were recruited from 22 cases referred by Child and Adolescent Mental Health Teams or Family Doctors for the trial (see figure 1 for CONSORT diagram). Children were included if OCD was the major problem, and it had been present for at least six months. Children were excluded if they were unable to speak and understand English fluently, if they had co-occurring psychosis or autism spectrum disorder. At initial assessments 11 presented with no other clinical diagnoses, while four received diagnoses of generalised anxiety disorder, four specific phobia, four separation anxiety, two ADHD, two social phobia, and one dysthymia. (the numbers do not add up to 10 because only two had one additional diagnosis, the others having up to three additional diagnoses). Seven of the participants were taking medication throughout the trial and had been taking the same dose for twelve weeks prior to the trial (two on paroxetine 5 mg/day, 3 on fluoxetine 20mgs/day, one on fluvoxamine 50 mgs per day, one on clomipramine 50 mgs/day). There was no significant multivariate difference between the groups at initial assessment ( $F(6,13) = 0.58, N.S.$ ) The therapists for the trial (TW, HW, ST) were clinical psychologists employed by the National Health Service (NHS) in England to work in community child and adolescent mental health clinics. All treatment took place in NHS clinics and was recorded on audio tape if the young person consented.

1  
2  
3  
4 *Procedure*  
5  
6  
7  
8

9       Once consent was received for taking part in the trial the participants were allocated to either  
10 immediate treatment (10 one hour sessions) or a 12 week waiting list. Allocation was carried out on a  
11 predetermined random number schedule with no replacements by the trial administrator. Participants  
12 in the waiting list condition were informed that they would have to wait twelve weeks for therapy, but  
13 they were given the phone number of the lead clinician (TW) to contact in the case of a significant  
14 deterioration in OCD.  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

25       Assessments were conducted at the beginning and end of treatment (and/or waiting list  
26 period), and 12 weeks after the end of treatment. All assessments were completed in the child's home  
27 unless specifically requested to be elsewhere. Assessors were blind to the allocation of the  
28 participants, and the participants were instructed not to reveal whether they had received treatment.  
29  
30 The assessors completed two semi-structured interviews: Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive  
31 Compulsive Scale (C-YBOCS [31]), to assess OCD symptoms and the ADIS-C [32] a semi-structured  
32 interview to assess the presence of other comorbid disorders. Participant completed measures  
33 included Child Depression Inventory [16], Obsessions and Compulsions Inventory (OCI, [13])  
34 modified for children, Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children [18], the Children's Responsibility  
35 Attributions Scale (CRAS), the Children's Responsibility Interpretations questionnaire (CRIQ). Both  
36 the CRIQ and the CRAS are instruments modified from the adult measures of responsibility  
37 cognitions published in Salkovskis et al., [30]). The CRAS is scored such that increasing score  
38 indicates a decreasing level of responsibility attributions, whereas the other self report scales are  
39 scored such that increasing score indicates increasing difficulties. An unpublished study by the first  
40 author found that the internal reliability of the CRAS was good in a large normative sample of 13-14  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 year olds (Cronbach's alpha = 0.85). The internal reliability in a sample of young people with mental  
5  
6 health problems for the other scales was also high (OCI - Cronbach's alpha = 0.93; RIQ frequency –  
7  
8 Cronbach's alpha = 0.86; RIQ belief Cronbach's alpha = 0.85). Copies of these measures are  
9  
10 available on <http://psychology.iop.kcl.ac.uk/ocdkids/questionnaires/questionnaires.aspx>.  
11  
12  
13  
14

### 15 16 *Treatments*

17  
18 Cognitive behaviour therapy was based on the principles outlined by Salkovskis [28].  
19  
20 Participants worked with their therapists to understand the cognitive distortions which maintain their  
21  
22 obsessive compulsive disorder. The aim of treatment is to alter responsibility cognitions, primarily by  
23  
24 doing experiments both in session and at home. For instance, one common belief encountered in  
25  
26 OCD is that the sufferer is uniquely responsible for harm occurring if certain rituals are not carried  
27  
28 out satisfactorily. The therapist and the participant would agree during the session to carry out an  
29  
30 experiment designed to see what happens if responsibility is shared. Another common task during  
31  
32 therapy is to attempt to elicit the worrying intrusive thoughts and examine whether they have real  
33  
34 meaning or are just thoughts. Treatment fidelity was ensured through clinic notes, regular meetings of  
35  
36 the therapist team and audiotapes of treatment sessions.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 Participants were allocated by the trial administrator to the two groups using a table of  
43  
44 random numbers. Only the trial administrator was aware which participants were in which group.  
45  
46 One participant from each group chose to leave the trial during the first phase, their results have been  
47  
48 extrapolated on the conservative assumption that no change occurred as a result of either  
49  
50 intervention.  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Results

### *Plan of analysis*

The primary measure of OCD symptoms is the CYBOCS. We report first an analysis of covariance of the CYBOCS score at three months post baseline assessment (with baseline CYBOCS as the covariate), at which stage only one of the two groups will have received an active treatment. This analysis tests the hypothesis that there will be a group effect at three months. We will then repeat the analysis of covariance of the CYBOCS scores at six months post base line when both groups will have received treatment. This analysis tests the hypothesis that there will be a period by group effect on the analysis of the CYBOCS scores at three and six months. Finally we will analyse the secondary measures (i.e. self-report data) in the same way using initial values of the measure as the covariate.

Two clients dropped out of the study during the first phase (one from each condition). In the following analyses the last observation was carried forward from the last available observation. This is therefore an intention to treat analysis.

### *Analysis of primary measure*

Figure 2 shows the mean CYBOCS scores at baseline, three months and six months. The analysis of covariance (baseline CYBOCS as covariate) of the CYBOCS at 3 months showed a significant group effect ( $F(1) = 7.07, p=0.016$ ). The figure shows that this is due to a much improved CYBOCS score for the group treated with CBT first. The group that were allocated to the waiting list showed little or no improvement over the same period. Cohen's effect size ( $d$ ) for the difference between the two groups divided by the mean standard deviation was calculated as 1.07, which Cohen (1988) suggested was a large treatment effect.

At 6 months the analysis of covariance of CYBOCS (using baseline CYBOCS as covariate) showed no group effect as expected since both groups had received treatment, although there was a

1  
2  
3  
4 trend towards a significant effect of the covariate ( $F(1,19) = 3.70, p = 0.07$ ) suggesting that the severity  
5  
6 of OCD at the beginning of the trial influences the outcome. As can be seen from figure 2 both  
7  
8 groups had improved significantly and the group that was treated first showed continuing slight  
9  
10 improvement.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15

### 16 *Analysis of secondary measures*

17  
18 Analysis of the secondary data (the self report questionnaires OCI, CRAS, CDI, CRIQ  
19  
20 frequency, CRIQ belief – see table 1) used the same procedures – i.e. analysis of covariance using the  
21  
22 baseline value of the measure as the covariate. There were no statistically significant group effects at  
23  
24 three months (OCI –  $F(1,19) = 0.29, p = 0.59$ ; CDI –  $F(1,19) = 0.49, p = 0.49$ ; CRIQ frequency –  $F(1,$   
25  
26  $19) = 2.07, p = 0.17$ ; CRIQ belief –  $F(1, 19) = 0.90, p = 0.36$ ; CRAS  $F(1, 19) = 0.41, p = 0.53$ ; MASC –  
27  
28  $F(1,19) = 0.008, p = 0.929$ ) but there were significant effects of the covariate for each measure (OCI –  
29  
30  $F(1, 19) = 11.19, p = 0.004$ ; CDI –  $F(1, 19) = 12.20, p = 0.003$ ; CRIQ frequency –  $F(1, 19) = 13.06$ ;  
31  
32  $p = 0.002$ ; CRIQ belief –  $F(1, 19) = 17.26, p = 0.001$ ; CRAS  $F(1, 19) = 27.12, p < 0.001$ ), except the  
33  
34 MASC ( $F(1,19) = 0.13, p = 0.72$ ). Inspection of table 2 shows that show that the groups were improving  
35  
36 on all measures at the three month point.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 A second analysis of covariance was carried out to determine if the treatment was effective for  
43  
44 both groups using data from baseline and at six months after both groups had received CBT. The  
45  
46 results showed that there was only a significant time effect ( $F(1, 19) = 53.14, p < 0.001$ ) and no group  
47  
48 ( $F(1, 19) = 0.06, p = 0.82$ ) or interaction effect ( $F(1, 19) = 0.73, p = 0.40$ ). As is shown in figure 1 the  
49  
50 changes in CYBOCS are largest when the groups are receiving treatment. Overall the CYBOCS  
51  
52 scores of the participants reduced from 22.12 (s.e. = 1.08) to 9.64 (s.e. = 1.79). Analysis of the  
53  
54 secondary data also showed significant changes from baseline to six months (OCI –  $F(1,19) = 18.35,$   
55  
56  $p < 0.001$ ; CDI –  $F = 23.16, p < 0.001$ ; RIQB –  $F(1,19) = 32.8, p < 0.001$ ; RIQF –  $F(1,19) = 25.15,$   
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
 2  
 3  
 4  $p < 0.001$ ; RAS –  $F(1,19) = 10.75$ ,  $p = 0.004$ ; MASC –  $F(1,19) = 22.81$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ), but no group effects  
 5  
 6 (OCI –  $F(1,19) = 0.45$ ,  $p = 0.51$ ; CDI –  $F(1,19) = 0.53$ ,  $p = 0.48$ ; RIQB –  $F(1,19) = 0.30$ ,  $p = 0.59$ ; RIQF  
 7  
 8 –  $F(1,19) = 0.003$ ,  $p = 0.38$ ; RAS –  $F(1,19) = 0.89$ ,  $p = 0.36$ ; MASC –  $F(1,19) = 0.30$ ,  $p = 0.60$ ) or interaction  
 9  
 10 effects (OCI –  $F(1,19) = 1.41$ ,  $p = 0.25$ ; CDI –  $F(1,19) = 0.42$ ,  $p = 0.53$ ; RIQB –  $F(1,19) = 1.03$ ,  $p = 0.32$ ;  
 11  
 12 RIQF –  $F(1,19) = 0.83$ ,  $p = 0.38$ ; RAS –  $F(1,19) = 2.08$ ,  $p = 0.17$ ; MASC –  $F(1,19) = 0.27$ ,  $p = 0.61$ ). Table 1  
 13  
 14 shows the means and standard deviations for all the measures.  
 15  
 16  
 17  
 18  
 19  
 20

21 We followed the recommendations of Morris and Deschon, (2002 cited in Abramowitz et al.  
 22  
 23 [1]) to calculate the effect size as the difference between the immediately pre-treatment CYBOCS and  
 24  
 25 the post treatment CYBOCS divided by the pre-treatment standard deviation (effect size = 2.62)  
 26  
 27 which also allows for the calculation of the effect size of the placebo. This effect size was compared  
 28  
 29 with those from other published trials which included a control group (see table 2). The results from  
 30  
 31 this study fall within the range of values reported heretofore.  
 32  
 33  
 34  
 35  
 36  
 37

## 38 Discussion

39  
 40  
 41  
 42 Cognitive behaviour therapy largely based on the use of experiments to tackle the cognitive  
 43  
 44 bias of excessive personal responsibility produced a significantly greater reduction in OCD symptoms  
 45  
 46 of the participants than a waiting list condition. Being placed on the waiting list first did not affect the  
 47  
 48 power of the subsequent treatment. The self-report measures showed a statistically significant  
 49  
 50 reduction in self-reported symptoms over the two time periods but did not demonstrate an effect of  
 51  
 52 treatment. The study also shows only small changes in symptoms for the young people placed on the  
 53  
 54 waiting list (cf. Abramovitz et al. [1]) therefore confirming the chronic nature of obsessive compulsive  
 55  
 56 disorder in young people. This adds to the body of evidence in favour of CBT for OCD in young  
 57  
 58  
 59  
 60  
 61  
 62  
 63  
 64  
 65

1  
2  
3  
4 people. In view of the potential problems associated with medication, the results of this study support  
5  
6 the view that young people with OCD should therefore be offered CBT as the first line treatment by  
7  
8 Child and Adolescent mental health services.  
9

10  
11  
12  
13  
14 This is the first randomised controlled study of a CBT approach based on responsibility  
15  
16 cognitions (following Salkovskis [27,28]) with young people. Although the numbers treated in this  
17  
18 trial were small, the demonstration that the treatment was as effective on the waiting list group  
19  
20 demonstrates that waiting for treatment had no effect on eventual outcome and increases the power  
21  
22 of the study. The study was carried out in routine health service outpatient settings and thus  
23  
24 demonstrates that the effectiveness of cognitive behaviour therapy is not restricted to specialist or  
25  
26 university research clinics, an effect also seen in the De Haan study [11]. The three month follow up  
27  
28 of the group that was treated first suggests that, at least at first, the participants continued to improve  
29  
30 after cessation of treatment.  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36

37  
38 The failure of the self-report measures to demonstrate a difference between the groups at the  
39  
40 three month point is difficult to explain. Although a failure to find changes in depression symptoms is  
41  
42 not unusual in trials of CBT for OCD [25], we had predicted a change in OCD symptoms paralleling  
43  
44 responsibility cognitions as was found in a pilot study [35]. One possibility is that as found by Anholt  
45  
46 et al. [3] the changes in behaviour rather than the changes in cognitions were the most significant  
47  
48 feature of treatment. However it is also possible that the hope that someone else was going to help  
49  
50 with the problem improved the subjective feelings tapped by self report measures including the  
51  
52 appraisals of responsibility, but did not alter the assessor rated severity. Yet another possibility is that  
53  
54 the self-report measures are not valid in this population. Further research on the validity and  
55  
56 reliability of self-report measures would be helpful.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7 Other trials of CBT with young people have tended to concentrate on managing the anxiety  
8 or discomfort experienced when undertaking exposure and response prevention (e.g. [4,6,21]). The  
9 effect size observed in this trial is somewhat less than those seen in previous trials of CBT for young  
10 people with OCD (mean effect size 1.98 – Table 3 in Abramovitz et al. [1]), although the differences  
11 in the methods of effect size calculation make the comparison somewhat problematic.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Differences in the treatment offered may also be important in determining the effectiveness  
22 of the intervention. There are two lines of evidence: intra-trial site differences and inter-trial  
23 differences. The POTS trial compared CBT using E/RP and management of the distress associated  
24 with OCD with a placebo medication condition but found considerable site differences for both the  
25 CBT and a third medication only condition [21]. (Unfortunately because the site data is only reported  
26 as Hedge's  $g$  effect sizes, we were unable to compare effect sizes using the Morris & DeShon method  
27 [24] and calculated Hedge's  $g$  effect sizes in the following text). The Hedge's  $g$  effect size for the  
28 POTS trial form of CBT varied from 0.51 in Chapel Hill to 1.6 in Pennsylvania (a statistically  
29 significant difference). The Hedge's  $g$  effect size in this trial (1.07) falls within that range. Bolton &  
30 Perrin [9] demonstrated the benefits of E/RP alone compared with a wait list (Hedge's  $g$  effect size  
31 1.23).  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

50 Our study does not provide information on the relative merits of different forms of CBT.  
51 The difficulty with attempting such a comparison is that the effect sizes of different models of CBT  
52 appear to be comparable (see previous paragraph). Of more interest in clinical practice are issues such  
53 as the use of combinations of medication and CBT and the involvement of the family. Studies with  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4 adults have begun to show that offering medication first diminishes the subsequent effectiveness of  
5  
6 CBT [15].  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Most of the studies on CBT with young people have included the parents in treatment  
12  
13 sessions, although Bolton and Perrin [9] only provided feedback at the end of each session. Recent  
14  
15 work by Barrett, Healy-Farrell & March [6] showed that very substantial reductions in OCD could be  
16  
17 obtained by the use of family management components in the treatment package. The families of  
18  
19 young people with OCD differ in some important respects from the families of young people with  
20  
21 anxiety disorders [5, 12]. Barrett's study demonstrated that the parents were less confident in their  
22  
23 child's ability, less rewarding of independence, and were less likely to use positive problem solving  
24  
25 than the parents of children with anxiety disorders. Derisley et al. [11] found that parents tended to  
26  
27 use avoidant coping techniques as well as having more symptoms of mental health problems. The  
28  
29 NICE guidelines too [24] suggest that the contribution of the family to the treatment of young people  
30  
31 with OCD needs further investigation. However the involvement of families in the treatment of  
32  
33 other emotional disorders in young people has not always been successful [10]. Nevertheless it would  
34  
35 be worth investigating whether a family component focused on problem solving strategies and  
36  
37 developing confidence in the child's abilities would be helpful in increasing the effect of the CBT  
38  
39 used in this study as has been partially demonstrated by Barrett, Healy-Farrell & March [6].  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## References

1. Abramowitz, J. S., Whiteside, S. R., & Deacon, B. J. (2005). The effectiveness of treatment for pediatric obsessive-compulsive disorder: A meta-analysis. Behavior Therapy, *36*(1), 55-63.
2. Allsopp, M., & Verduyn, C. (1989). A Follow-up of Adolescents with Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. British Journal of Psychiatry, *154*, 829-834.
3. Anholt, G. E., Kempe, P., de Haan, E., van Oppen, P., Cath, D. C., Smit, J. H., et al. (2008). Cognitive versus Behavior Therapy: Processes of Change in the Treatment of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder. Psychother Psychosom, *77*(1), 38-42.
4. Asbahr, F. R., Castillo, A. R., Ito, L. M., Latorre, M. D., Moreira, M. N., & Lotufo-Neto, F. (2005). Group cognitive-behavioral therapy versus sertraline for the treatment of children and adolescents with obsessive-compulsive disorder. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *44*(11), 1128-1136.
5. Barrett, P., Shortt, A., & Healy, L. (2002). Do parent and child behaviours differentiate families whose children have obsessive-compulsive disorder from other clinic and non-clinic families? Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, *43*, 597-607.
6. Barrett, P., Healy-Farrell, L., & March, J. S. (2004). Cognitive-behavioral family treatment of childhood obsessive-compulsive disorder: A controlled trial. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *43*, 46-62.
7. Barrett, P., & Healy-Farrell, L. (2003). Perceived responsibility in juvenile obsessive-compulsive disorder: An experimental manipulation. Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, *32*, 430-441.
8. Bolton, D., Luckie, M., & Steinberg, D. (1995). Long-Term Course of Obsessive-Compulsive Disorder Treated in Adolescence. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, *34*, 1441-1450.

- 1  
2  
3  
4 9. Bolton, D., & Perrin, S. (2008). Evaluation of exposure with response-prevention for obsessive  
5 compulsive disorder in childhood and adolescence. Journal of Behavior Therapy and  
6  
7  
8  
9 Experimental Psychiatry, 39, 11-22.
- 10  
11 10. Bodden, D. H. M., Bögels, S. M., Nauta, M. H., De Haan, E., Ringrose, J., Appelboom, C., et al.  
12  
13 (2008). Child Versus Family Cognitive-Behavioral Therapy in Clinically Anxious Youth: An  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000
12. Derisley, J., Libby, S., Clark, S., & Reynolds, S. (2005). Mental health, coping and family-  
functioning in parents of young people with obsessive-compulsive disorder and with anxiety  
disorders. British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44, 439-444.
13. Douglass, H. M., Moffitt, T. E., Dar, R., McGee, R., & et al. (1995). Obsessive-compulsive  
disorder in a birth cohort of 18-year-olds: Prevalence and predictors. Journal of the American  
Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34, 1424-1431.
14. Foa, E. B., Kozak, M. J., Salkovskis, P. M., Coles, M. E., & Amir, N. (1998). The validation of a  
new obsessive-compulsive disorder scale: The Obsessive-Compulsive Inventory. Psychological  
Assessment, 10, 206-214.
15. Foa, E. B., Liebowitz, M. R., Kozak, M. J., Davies, S., Campeas, R., Franklin, M. E., Huppert, J.  
D., Kjernisted, K., Rowan, V., Schmidt, A. B., Simpson, H. B., & Tu, X. (2005). Randomized,  
placebo-controlled trial of exposure and ritual prevention, clomipramine, and their combination

- 1  
2  
3  
4 in the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 162, 151-  
5  
6  
7 161.
- 8  
9 16. Geller, D. A., Biederman, J., Stewart, S. E., Mullin, B., Martin, A., Spencer, T., & Faraone, S. V.  
10  
11 (2003). Which SSRI? A meta-analysis of pharmacotherapy trials in pediatric obsessive-  
12  
13 compulsive disorder. American Journal of Psychiatry, 160, 1919-1928.
- 14  
15  
16 17. Kovacs, M. (1992). The children's depression inventory manual. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- 17  
18  
19 18. Libby, S., Reynolds, S., Derisley, J., & Clark, S. (2004). Cognitive appraisals in young people with  
20  
21 obsessive-compulsive disorder. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 45, 1076-1084.
- 22  
23  
24 19. March JS (1997). Technical Manual for the Multidimensional Anxiety Scale for Children  
25  
26 (MASC). New York: Multi-Health Systems.
- 27  
28  
29 20. March, J.S., Frances, A., Carpenter, D. and Kahn, M.D., (1997) Treatment of obsessive-  
30  
31 compulsive disorder. The Expert Consensus Panel for obsessive-compulsive disorder. Journal  
32  
33 of Clinical Psychiatry, 58 Suppl 4, 2-72.
- 34  
35  
36 21. March, J. S., Foa, E., Gammon, P., Chrisman, A., Curry, J., Fitzgerald, D., Sullivan, K., Franklin,  
37  
38 M., Huppert, J., Rynn, M., Zhao, N., Zoellner, L., Leonard, H., Garcia, A., Freeman, J., & Tu, X.  
39  
40 (2004). Cognitive-behavior therapy, sertraline, and their combination for children and  
41  
42 adolescents with obsessive-compulsive disorder - The Pediatric OCD Treatment Study (POTS)  
43  
44 randomized controlled trial. Journal of the American Medical Association, 292, 1969-1976.
- 45  
46  
47 22. Mather, A., & Cartwright-Hatton, S. (2004). Cognitive predictors of obsessive-compulsive  
48  
49 symptoms in adolescence: A preliminary investigation. Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent  
50  
51 Psychology, 33, 743-749.
- 52  
53  
54 23. Matthews, L., Reynolds, S., & Derisley, J. (2006). Examining cognitive models of obsessive  
55  
56 compulsive disorder in adolescents. Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 35(02), 149-163.  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 24. Morris, S.B. and DeShon, R.P. (2002) Combining Effect Size Estimates in Meta-Analysis With  
5 Repeated Measures and Independent-Groups Designs. Psychological Methods, 7, 105–125.  
6  
7  
8  
9 25. National Collaborating Centre for Mental Health (2006) Obsessive compulsive disorder: Core  
10 interventions in the treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder and body dysmorphic disorder.  
11 National Clinical Practice Guideline Number 31. London: The British Psychological Society &  
12 The Royal College of Psychiatrists.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18 26. O’Kearney R.T., Anstey, K.J., & von Sanden, C. (2006) Behavioural and cognitive behavioural  
19 therapy for obsessive compulsive disorder in children and adolescents. Cochrane Database of  
20 Systematic Reviews, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD004856. DOI:10.1002/14651858.CD004856.pub2.  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26 27. Reynolds, S., & Reeves, J. (2008). Do Cognitive Models of Obsessive Compulsive Disorder  
27 Apply to Children and Adolescents? *Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy*, 36(04), 463-471.  
28  
29  
30 28. Salkovskis, P. M. (1998). Psychological approaches to the understanding of obsessional  
31 problems. In R. P. Swinson, M. M. Antony, S.J. Rachman, and Richter, M.A. (Ed.), Obsessive-  
32 compulsive Disorder: theory, research and treatment. New York: Guilford.  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37 29. Salkovskis, P. M. (1999). Understanding and treating obsessive-compulsive disorder. Behaviour  
38 Research and Therapy, 37, s29-52.  
39  
40  
41  
42 30. Salkovskis, P., Wroe, A., Gledhill, A., Morrison, N., Forrester, E., Richards, C., Reynolds, M., &  
43 Thorpe, S. (2000). Responsibility attitudes and interpretations are characteristic of obsessive  
44 compulsive disorder. Behaviour Research and Therapy, 38, 347-372.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 31. Scahill, L., Riddle, M. A., McSwiggin Hardin, M., Ort, S. I., King, R. A., Goodman, W. K.,  
50 Cicchetti, D., & Leckman, J. F. (1997). Children's Yale-Brown Obsessive Compulsive Scale:  
51 reliability and validity. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry,  
52 36, 844-852.  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4 32. Silverman, W. K., & Albano, A. M. (1996). Anxiety disorders interview schedule for DSM-IV:  
5  
6 Child and parent versions. San Antonio: The Psychological Corporation.  
7  
8  
9 33. Simpson, H. B., Franklin, M. E., Cheng, J. F., Foa, E. B., & Liebowitz, M. R. (2005). Standard  
10  
11 criteria for relapse are needed in obsessive-compulsive disorder. Depression and Anxiety, 21, 1-  
12  
13 8.  
14  
15  
16 34. Thomsen, P. H., & Mikkelsen, H. U. (1995). Course of obsessive compulsive disorder in  
17  
18 children and adolescents. A prospective follow-up study of 23 Danish cases. Journal of the  
19  
20 American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 34, 1432-1440.  
21  
22  
23 35. Williams, T., Salkovskis, P., Forrester, E. A., & Allsopp, M. A. (2002). Changes in Symptoms of  
24  
25 OCD and Appraisal of Responsibility During Cognitive Behavioural Treatment: A Pilot Study.  
26  
27 Behavioural and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 30, 69-78.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

## Author Note

Tim I Williams is Honorary Research Fellow at the School of Psychology, University of Reading and Consultant Clinical Psychologist with the Berkshire Healthcare NHS Trust. Professor Salkovskis and Dr Forrester are at the Department of Psychology at the Institute of Psychiatry, Kings College, University of London. Dr Mark Allsopp is Consultant Child and Adolescent Psychiatrist, Berkshire Adolescent Service, Berkshire Healthcare Foundation Trust, Wokingham Hospital.

This research was supported by a grant (SPGS 808) from the National Health Service Responsive Funding Scheme to the first author.



Table 1

*Means (s.e.) of self-report measures at baseline, three months (after first phase – one group treated) and six months (after second phase – both groups treated)*

Measure	Baseline		3 months		6 months	
	CBT	WL	CBT	WL	CBT	WL
CYBOCS	23.09 (1.22)	21.05 (1.84)	12.09 (2.25)	19.60 (2.03)	9.23 (2.45)	10.10 (2.74)
OCI	59.30 (8.28)	73.55 (8.26)	45.00 (8.30)	60.30 (9.62)	37.10 (8.73)	34.30 (5.51)
CDI	17.85 (2.76)	14.67 (1.82)	12.9 (2.62)	12.78 (2.92)	10.50 (2.41)	9.06 (2.56)
MASC	59.8 (6.87)	66.3 (6.74)	49.7 (5.90)	56.6 (6.69)	41.1 (4.40)	43.0 (7.28)
CRAS	49.00 (6.00)	51.00 (8.10)	58.00 (7.54)	63.63 (6.15)	58.00 (8.03)	74.13 (8.31)
CRIQ Belief	634.38 (103.66)	781.11 (152.50)	563.13 (99.26)	537.78 (150.76)	320.63 (86.94)	332.22 (102.34)
CRIQ Frequency	29.25 (4.31)	31.44 (5.14)	25.38 (3.90)	19.33 (5.45)	16.75 (4.36)	13.89 (4.35)

Table 2

*Effect sizes on CYBOCS calculated according to Morris and Schon (2002) for controlled studies of CBT in young people.*

Study	Individual CBT effect size	Waiting list or placebo control effect size
This study	-2.61792	-0.24914
March et al. 2004 (placebo)	-2.6087	-0.81818
De Haan et al. 1998	-2.10169	N/A
Barrett et al. 2004	-3.55349	0.198543

Table notes: Negative numbers indicate improved CYBOCS scores. N/A indicates that the study did not include a waiting list control


Figure Captions


*Figure 1.* Consort diagram.

*Figure 2.* Mean CYBOCS scores for both groups at baseline, three months and six months. Error bars represent standard errors of the mean at each time point.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65





1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65



The University of Reading

School of Psychology

*Head of Department*  
Dr. J. Ellis

Earley Gate  
Reading RG6 6AL

The Editor  
European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry

*Phone* +44 (0)118 3786604  
*Fax* +44 (0)118 3786715  
*Email* [sxswiams@reading.ac.uk](mailto:sxswiams@reading.ac.uk)  
*Web* [www.rdg.ac.uk/](http://www.rdg.ac.uk/)

Monday, 30 March 2009

Dear Sir,

Submission no.

Thank you for your consideration of our submission to European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry. We have made the following changes to the manuscript in view of the referee's comments. The changes made are described in the order in which they appear in the referee's comments.

Referee's paragraph 1 and 2

I have altered the second paragraph of the introduction to make it clearer that this study was intended to identify whether the Salkovskis model of CBT was usable with young people. I have therefore strengthened the argument for the importance of responsibility cognitions in the introduction, while acknowledging that other models might be supported. A more detailed argument could be produced if there was space in the journal. In general the introduction and discussion have been substantially rewritten.

Referee's paragraph 3

We have altered the introduction to de-emphasise the non-academic service based component of the study.

Referee's paragraph 4

The in and exclusion criteria are now described – see also the CONSORT diagram.

Referee's paragraph 5

Further details of the patients have been described including medication, comorbidities and comparability of patients at baseline. Since treatment history was not part of the inclusion or exclusion criteria we have not described it further.

Referee's paragraph 6

We have included further descriptions of the measures that are new to this study, and included information about the CRIQ. Detailed information about these measures is also available on <http://psychology.iop.kcl.ac.uk/ocdkids/questionnaires/questionnaires.aspx> and in the book edited by Waite & Williams (2009). The MASC results are now included in the revised manuscript. They were missed out due to an oversight.

Referee's paragraph 7

We have explained that there was no further treatment during the follow-up.

Referee's paragraph 8

We have attempted to make clear that the purpose of the study was not to provide a comparison with other treatments which would require a much larger sample size, but rather to demonstrate that this model of treatment was usable in a clinic setting with young children.

Referee's paragraph 9

There is a consistent thread in this referee's comments that suggests that they have over-emphasised the cognitive nature of our approach. While it would be fair to state that our approach was strongly cognitive, it would not be correct to claim that it was purely cognitive. This treatment approach emphasises cognitive change as a means to enable behavioural change. Nevertheless we have attempted to de-emphasise the cognitive approach used here to satisfy the referee's concerns.

Referee's paragraph 10

We have retained the sentence about O'Kearney et al.'s Cochrane review being overly pessimistic, but removed the phrase about the number of studies included. We hope that the referee would agree that the review might be considered over-pessimistic, the use of the word suggests indicates that we are not stating this as a fact but rather as an opinion.

Referee's paragraph 11

We have removed the word somewhat from the sentence.

Referee's paragraph 12

We have clarified the effect sizes used here. Because of the way that the data from the POTS trial has been reported it is not possible to report the Morris & Descon type effect size.

Referee's paragraph 13

We have clarified the table to show that the POTS trial contained a placebo condition.