RESEARCH REPORT

The efficacy of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy in treating depressive and anxiety disorders: a meta-analysis of direct comparisons

PIM CUIJPERS¹⁻³, MARIT SIJBRANDIJ^{1,2}, SANDER L. KOOLE^{1,2}, GERHARD ANDERSSON^{4,5}, AARTJAN T. BEEKMAN^{2,6}, CHARLES F. REYNOLDS III⁷

¹Department of Clinical Psychology, VU University Amsterdam, Van der Boechorststraat 1, 1081 BT Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ²EMGO Institute for Health and Care Research, VU University and VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ³Leuphana University, Lünebrug, Germany; ⁴Department of Behavioural Sciences and Learning, Swedish Institute for Disability Research, University of Linköping, Sweden; ⁵Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Psychiatry Section, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden; ⁶Department of Psychiatry, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands; ⁷Department of Psychiatry, University of Pittsburgh School of Medicine, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Although psychotherapy and antidepressant medication are efficacious in the treatment of depressive and anxiety disorders, it is not known whether they are equally efficacious for all types of disorders, and whether all types of psychotherapy and antidepressants are equally efficacious for each disorder. We conducted a meta-analysis of studies in which psychotherapy and antidepressant medication were directly compared in the treatment of depressive and anxiety disorders. Systematic searches in bibliographical databases resulted in 67 randomized trials, including 5,993 patients that met inclusion criteria, 40 studies focusing on depressive disorders and 27 focusing on anxiety disorders. The overall effect size indicating the difference between psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy after treatment in all disorders was g=0.02 (95% CI: -0.07 to 0.10), which was not statistically significant. Pharmacotherapy was significantly more efficacious than psychotherapy in dysthymia (g=0.30), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling (g=0.33), and

Key words: Psychotherapy, antidepressant medication, depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, dysthymia, obsessive-compulsive disorder, metaanalysis

(World Psychiatry 2013;12:137-148)

Depressive and anxiety disorders are highly prevalent (1,2) and associated with high levels of service use, a considerable disease burden (3), substantial economic costs (4-6). and a significant loss of quality of life for patients and their relatives (7,8). Several efficacious treatments for depressive and anxiety disorders are available, including different forms of psychotherapy and antidepressant medication (9-11). Although both types of treatment have been found to be efficacious, it is not known whether they are equally efficacious for all types of depressive and anxiety disorders. There is evidence from meta-analyses of studies comparing psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy directly that they are about equally efficacious in depression (12) and generalized anxiety disorder (GAD) (13). It is not clear whether this is true for all depressive and anxiety disorders. For example, for obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) and social anxiety disorder (SAD), no meta-analyses of direct comparisons between psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy have been conducted yet, even though a considerable number of such comparative trials have been carried out.

Furthermore, it remains unclear whether all types of psychotherapy and all types of antidepressant medications have comparable effects. In one previous meta-analysis, we found that treatment with selective serotonin reuptake inhibitors (SSRIs) was somewhat more effective than treatment with psychotherapy (12), whereas tricyclic antidepressants (TCAs) and psychotherapy were equally effective. A re-analysis of those data, however, showed that there were no significant differences between psychotherapy and SSRIs after adjusting for differential drop-out from both treatments. Another metaanalysis confirmed that psychotherapy and SSRIs were equally effective, when only *bona fide* psychotherapies were included (14).

It is also possible that there are differences between different forms of psychotherapy. There are some indications from meta-analytic research that interpersonal psychotherapy (IPT) may be somewhat more efficacious than other psychotherapies in the treatment of depression (15,16), although this is not confirmed in all meta-analyses (17). There are also some indications that psychodynamic psychotherapy (18) and non-directive supportive counselling (19) may be somewhat less efficacious than other psychotherapies. Given these potential differences between psychotherapies, it is conceivable that the differential effects of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy may depend on the type of psychotherapy. Earlier meta-analyses may have failed to detect these differential effects because of the small number of included studies and the resulting lack of statistical power.

We report here the results of an overall meta-analysis of the studies in which psychotherapy and antidepressant medication for depressive and anxiety disorders were directly compared with each other.

METHODS

Identification and selection of studies

Several strategies were used to identify relevant studies. We searched four major bibliographical databases (PubMed, PsycInfo, EMBASE and the Cochrane database of randomized trials) by combining terms indicative of each of the disorders with terms indicative of psychological treatment (both MeSH terms and text words) and randomized controlled trials. We also checked the references of 116 earlier meta-analyses of psychological treatments for the included disorders. Details of the searches and exact search strings are given in Figure 1.

We included randomized trials in which the effects of a psychological treatment were directly compared with the effects of antidepressant medication in adults with depressive disorder, panic disorder with or without agoraphobia, GAD, SAD, OCD, or post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Only studies in which subjects met diagnostic criteria for the disorder according to a structured diagnostic interview such as the Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV (SCID), the Composite International Diagnostic Interview (CIDI) or the Mini International Neuropsychiatric Interview (MINI) - were included. Comorbid mental or somatic disorders were not used as an exclusion criterion. Studies on inpatients, adolescents and children (below 18 years of age) were excluded. We also excluded maintenance studies, aimed at people who had already recovered or partly recovered after an earlier treatment, and studies on other types of medication, such as benzodiazepines for anxiety disorders. Studies in English, German, Spanish and Dutch were considered for inclusion.

Quality assessment and data extraction

We evaluated the quality of included studies using the Cochrane Collaboration "risk of bias" assessment tool (20). This tool assesses possible sources of bias in randomized trials, including the adequate generation of allocation sequence, the concealment of allocation to conditions, the prevention of knowledge of the allocated intervention (masking of assessors), and dealing with incomplete outcome data (this was rated as positive when intention-to-treat analyses were conducted, meaning that all randomized patients were included in the analyses). The assessment was conducted by two independent researchers, and disagreements were solved through discussion.

We also coded the participant characteristics (disorder, recruitment method, target group); the type of antidepressant which was used (SSRI, TCA, monoamine oxidase inhibitor (MAOI), other or protocolized treatment including several antidepressants); and the characteristics of the psychotherapy (format, number of sessions, and type of psychotherapy). The types of psychotherapy we identified were cognitive-behavioral therapy (CBT), IPT, problem-solving therapy, non-directive supportive counselling, psychodynamic psychotherapy, and others. Although CBTs used a mix of different techniques, we clustered them together in one group. We rated a therapy as CBT when it included cognitive restructuring or a behavioral approach (such as exposure and response prevention). When a therapy used a mix of CBT and IPT, we rated it as "other", along with other therapeutic approaches.

Meta-analyses

For each comparison between a psychotherapy and a pharmacotherapy, the effect size indicating the difference between the two groups at post-test (Hedges' g) was evaluated. Effect sizes were calculated by subtracting (at posttest) the average score of the psychotherapy group from the average score of the pharmacotherapy group, and dividing the result by the pooled standard deviation. Because some studies had relatively small sample sizes, we corrected the effect size for small sample bias (21).

In the calculations of effect sizes in studies of patients with depressive disorders, we used only those instruments that explicitly measured symptoms of depression. In studies examining anxiety disorders, we only used instruments that explicitly measured symptoms of anxiety. If more than one measure was used, the mean of the effect sizes was calculated, so that each study provided only one effect size. If means and standard deviations were not reported, we used the procedures of the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (version 2.2.021) to calculate the effect size using dichotomous outcomes; and if these were not available either, we used other statistics (such a t value or p value). To calculate pooled mean effect sizes, we also used the Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software. Because we expected considerable heterogeneity among the studies, we employed a random effects pooling model in all analyses.

We only examined the differential effects at post-test and did not look at the longer-term effects. The types of outcomes reported at follow-up and the follow-up periods differed widely between studies. Furthermore, some studies reported only naturalistic outcomes, while others delivered booster sessions and maintenance treatments during the whole follow-up period or part of it. Because of these large differences, we decided it was not meaningful to pool the results of these outcomes.

As a test of homogeneity of effect sizes, we calculated the I² statistic. A value of 0% indicates no observed heterogeneity, and higher values indicate increasing heterogeneity, with 25% as low, 50% as moderate, and 75% as high heterogeneity (22). We calculated 95% confidence intervals around I² (23) using the non-central chi-squared-based approach within the Heterogi module for Stata (24).

We conducted subgroup analyses according to the mixed effects model, in which studies within subgroups are pooled

	Depression	GAD	SAD	Panic	OCD/PTSD	Total				
21,729 references identi	fied by literature	search								
Pubmed	3320	547	296	849	91	5103				
Cochrane	2988	1309	752	1436	128	6613				
PsycInfo	2710	337	246	424	32	3749				
Embase	4389	372	661	764	78	6264				
Total	13407	2565	1955	3473	329	21729				
		\Downarrow								
After removal of duplicates										
	9860	1562	1228	2032	221	14903				
		\Downarrow								
Earlier meta-analyses ch	necked for refere	ences								
	42	7	14	26	27	116				
		\Downarrow								
Full-text papers retrieved	d									
	1344	136	247	493	58	2278				
		\Downarrow								
Reasons for exclusion										
No correct comparison	235	49	83	169	27	563				
Duplicate study	306	32	24	52	5	419				
No diagnosis	165	32	52	112	2	363				
No control group	167	7	39	33	3	249				
No psychotherapy	151	7	1	76	3	238				
Other reason	280	8	41	40	10	379				
Total	1304	135	240	482	50	2211				
\downarrow										
Included in meta- analysis	40	1	7	11	OCD: 6 PTSD: 2	67				

CAD

CAD

Donio

propolon

Total

GAD – generalized anxiety disorder, SAD – social anxiety disorder, OCD – obsessive-compulsive disorder, PTSD – post-traumatic stress disorder

Figure 1 Selection and inclusion of studies

with the random effects model, while tests for significant differences between subgroups are conducted with the fixed effects model. For continuous variables, we used metaregression analyses to test whether there was a significant relationship between the continuous variable and the effect size, as indicated by a Z value and an associated p value.

We tested for publication bias by inspecting the funnel plot on primary outcome measures and by Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill procedure (25), which yields an estimate of the effect size after the publication bias has been taken into account. We also conducted Egger's test of the intercept to quantify the bias captured by the funnel plot and test whether it was significant.

Multivariate meta-regression analyses were conducted with the effect size as the dependent variable. To decide which variables should be entered as predictors in the regression model, we first defined a reference group within each category of variables. To avoid collinearity among the predictors of the regression model, we first examined whether high correlations were found among the variables that could be entered into the model. Next, we calculated the correlations between all predictors (except the reference variables). Because no correlations were higher than r=0.60, all predictors could be entered in the regression models. Multivariate regression analyses were conducted in STATA MP, version 11 for Mac.

RESULTS

Selection and inclusion of studies

After examining a total of 21,729 abstracts (14,903 after removal of duplicates), we retrieved 2,278 full-text papers for

Table 1 Selected characteristics of included studies

Study	Disorder	Psychotherapy	Medication	Quality*	Country
Bakhshani et al (26)	GAD	CBT (n=7)	TCA (n=7)	+	Iran
Bakker et al (27)	PAN	CBT (n=35)	SSRI (n=32)	+	Europe
			TCA (n=32)		
Barber et al (28)	MDD	DYN (n=51)	Mixed/other (n=55)	++	USA
Barlow et al (29)	PAN	CBT (n=65)	TCA (n=83)	++	USA
Barrett et al (30)	Mood	PST (n=80)	SSRI (n=80)	+ + + +	USA
Bedi et al (31)	MDD	Counseling (n=39)	Mixed/other (n=44)	+ +	Europe
Black et al (32)	PAN	CBT (n=25)	SSRI (n=25)		USA
Blackburn & Moore (33)	MDD	CBT	Mixed/other	+	Europe
Blanco et al (34)	SAD	CBT (n=32)	MAOI (n=35)	+ + + +	USA
Blomhoff et al (35)	SAD	BT (n=98)	BT (n=98) SSRI (n=95) +++++		Europe
Browne et al (36)	DYS	IPT (n=122)	(n=122) SSRI (n=117) +++ -		Canada
Clark et al (37)	PAN	CBT (n=16)	CBT (n=16) TCA (n=16)+-		Europe
Dannon et al (38)	PAN	CBT (n=23)	SSRI (n=27)		Israel
David et al (39)	MDD	CBT (n=56)	SSRI (n=57)	++	Europe
		REBT (n=57)			
Davidson et al (40)	SAD	CBT (n=42)	SSRI (n=39)	+ + + +	USA
Dekker et al (41)	MDD	DYN (n=59)	Mixed/other (n=44)	+-	Europe
Dunlop et al (42)	MDD	CBT (n=41)	SSRI (n=39)	+ + + +	USA
Dunner et al (43)	DYS	CBT (n=9)	SSRI (n=11)	+-	USA
Elkin et al (44)	MDD	IPT (n=61)	TCA (n=57)	+ + + +	USA
		CBT (n=59)			
Faramarzi et al (45)	MDD	CBT (n=29)	SSRI (n=30)	+-	Iran
Finkenzeller et al (46)	MDD	IPT (n=23)	SSRI (n=24)	+ - + +	Europe
Foa et al (47)	OCD	BT (n=19)	TCA (n=27)	+-	USA
Frank et al (48)	MDD	IPT (n=160)	SSRI (n=158)	++	USA
Frommberger et al (49)	PTSD	CBT (n=10)	SSRI (n=11)		Europe
Hegerl et al (50)	Mood	CBT (n=52)	SSRI (n=76)	+ + + +	Europe
Heimberg et al (51)	SAD	CBT (n=28)	MAOI (n=27)	++	USA
		Counseling (n=26)			
Hendriks et al (52)	PAN	CBT (n=20)	SSRI (n=17)	+ + + +	Europe
Hoexter et al (53)	OCD	CBT (n=13)	SSRI (n=13)	+ - + -	Brazil
Hollon et al (54)	MDD	CBT (n=25)	TCA (n=57)	++	USA
Jarrett et al (55)	MDD	CBT (n=36)	MAOI (n=36)	+ + + +	USA
Keller et al (56)	MDD	CBASP (n=226)	SNRI (n=220)	+ + + +	USA
Kolk et al (57)	PTSD	EMDR (n=24)	SSRI (n=26)	++	USA
Koszycki et al (58)	PAN	CBT (n=59)	SSRI (n=62)	+ + + +	Canada
Lesperance et al (59)	MDD	IPT (n=67)	SSRI (n=75)	+ + + +	Canada
Loerch et al (60)	PAN	CBT (n=14)	MAOI (n=16)	++	Europe
Markowitz et al (61)	DYS	IPT (n=23)	SSRI (n=24)	++	USA
		Counseling $(n=26)$			
Marshall et al (62)	MDD	CBT (n=37)	Mixed/other $(n=30)$		Canada
		IPT (n=35)			
Martin et al (63)	MDD	IPT (n=13)	SNRI (n=15)	+	Europe

Table 1	Selected	characteristics	of included	studies	(continued)
---------	----------	-----------------	-------------	---------	-------------

Study	Disorder	Psychotherapy	Medication	Quality*	Country
McBride et al (64)	MDD	CBT (n=21)	Mixed/other (n=21)		Canada
McKnight et al (65)	MDD	CBT	TCA		USA
McLean & Hakstian (66)	MDD	DYN (n=44)	TCA (n=49)	+-	Canada
		BT (n=42)			
Miranda et al (67)	MDD	CBT (n=90)	Mixed/other (n=88)	+ + + +	USA
Mohr et al (68)	MDD	CBT (n=20)	SSRI (n=15)	+	USA
		Supp Ex (n=19)			
Mörtberg et al (69)	SAD	CBT ind (n=32)	Mixed/other (n=33)	+ + + +	Europe
		CBT grp (n=35)			
Murphy et al (70)	MDD	CBT (n=22)	TCA (n=24)	+ + - +	USA
Murphy et al (71)	MDD	PST (n=29)	TCA (n=27)	+ + + +	Europe
Mynors-Wallis et al (72)	MDD	PST gp (n=39)	SSRI (n=36)	+ + + +	Europe
		PST n (n=41)			
akatani et al (73) OCD		BT (n=10)	SSRI (n=10)	+-	Japan
Nazari et al (74)	OCD	EMDR (n=30)	SSRI (n=30)	+-	Iran
Oosterbaan et al (75)	SPH	CBT (n=28)	MAOI (n=27)	++	Europe
Prasko et al (76)	SPH	CBT (n=22)	MAOI (n=20)	+-	Europe
Ravindran et al (77)	DYS	CBT (n=24)	SSRI (n=22)	+ + + -	Canada
Reynolds et al (78)	MDD	IPT (n=16)	TCA (n=25)	++	USA
Rush et al (79)	MDD	CBT (n=19)	TCA (n=22)	++	USA
Salminen et al (80)	MDD	DYN (n=26)	SSRI (n=25)	+	Europe
Schulberg et al (81)	MDD	IPT (n=93)	TCA (n=91)	+ +	USA
Scott & Freeman (82)	MDD	CBT (n=29)	TCA (n=26)	+ + + +	Europe
		Counseling (n=29)			
Shamsaei et al (83)	MDD	CBT (n=40)	SSRI (n=40)	+ - + -	Iran
Shareh et al (84)	OCD	CBT (n=6)	SSRI (n=6)		Iran
Sharp et al (85)	PAN	CBT (n=29)	SSRI (n=29)		Europe
Sharp et al (86)	Mood	Counseling (n=112)	Mixed/other (n=106)	+ + + +	Europe
Sousa et al (87)	OCD	CBT (n=25)	SSRI (n=25)	+-	Brazil
Spinhoven et al (88)	PAN	CBT (n=20)	SSRI (n=19)	+	Europe
Thompson et al (89)	MDD	CBT (n=36)	TCA (n=33)	+	USA
Van Apeldoorn et al (90)	PAN	CBT (n=36)	Mixed/other (n=37)	+ + + +	Europe
Weissman et al (91)	MDD	IPT (n=23)	TCA (n=20)	+-	USA
Williams et al (92)	Mood	PST (n=113)	SSRI (n=106)	+ + + +	USA

*A positive or negative sign is given for four quality criteria: allocation sequence, concealment of allocation to conditions, blinding of assessors, and intention-totreat analysis

GAD – generalized anxiety disorder, PAN – panic disorder with or without agoraphobia, MDD – major depressive disorder, Mood – mixed mood disorder, SAD – social anxiety disorder, DYS – dysthymic disorder, OCD – obsessive-compulsive disorder, PTSD – post-traumatic stress disorder, CBT – cognitive-behavioral therapy, DYN – psychodynamic therapy, PST – problem-solving therapy, BT – behavior therapy, IPT – interpersonal psychotherapy, REBT – rational emotive behavior therapy, CBASP – cognitive behavioral analysis system of psychotherapy, EMDR – eye movement desensitization and reprocessing, Supp Ex – supportive-expressive therapy, ind – individual format, grp – group format, gp – delivered by a general practitioner, n – delivered by a nurse, TCA – tricyclic antidepressant, SSRI – selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor, MAOI – monoamine oxidase inhibitor, SNRI – serotonin-norepinephrine reuptake inhibitor

further consideration. We excluded 2,211 of the retrieved papers. The flow chart describing the inclusion process, including the reasons for exclusion, is presented in Figure 1. A total of 67 studies met the inclusion criteria for this metaanalysis. Selected characteristics of the included studies (26– 92) are reported in Table 1.

Characteristics of included studies

In the 67 studies, a total of 5,993 patients participated (3,142 in the psychotherapy and 2,851 in the pharmacotherapy conditions). Forty studies focused on depressive Table 2 Comparative effects of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy: subgroup analyses

		Ν	g	95% CI	\mathbf{I}^2	95% CI	р
All studies		78	0.02	-0.07 to 0.10	62	52 to 70	
Possible outliers remov	red	68	-0.07	-0.14 to 0.01	41	21 to 56	
One effect size per stud	ly (highest)	67	0.06	-0.03 to 0.15	62	51 to 71	
One effect size per stud	ly (lowest)	67	0.03	-0.07 to 0.12	62	51 to 71	
Mood disorders							
	Any mood disorder	48	-0.03	-0.14 to 0.08	52	0 to 47	0.0
	Major depression	39	0.02	-0.10 to 0.13	46	22 to 63	
	Dysthymia	5	-0.30	-0.60 to -0.00	55	0 to 83	
	Mixed mood disorders	4	-0.14	-0.45 to 0.17	64	0 to 88	
Anxiety disorders							
	Any anxiety disorder	30	0.10	-0.05 to 0.25	71	59 to 80	
	Panic disorder	12	0.00	-0.28 to 0.28	62	28 to 79	
	SAD	9	-0.03	-0.34 to 0.28	74	50 to 87	
	OCD	6	0.64	0.20 to 1.08	72	36 to 88	
	Other	3	0.24	-0.39 to 0.86	0	0 to 90	
Psychotherapy type							
	Cognitive-behavioral therapy	49	0.09	-0.03 to 0.20	60	46 to 71	0.1
	Interpersonal psychotherapy	11	-0.09	-0.31to 0.14	65	33 to 82	
	Problem-solving therapy	5	-0.04	-0.36 to 0.27	0	0 to 79	
	Counseling	6	-0.33	-0.64 to -0.02	69	27 to 87	
	Other	7	0.07	-0.21 to 0.34	67	27 to 85	
Treatment format							
	Individual	62	0.02	-0.08 to 0.12	61	48 to 70	0.8
	Group	14	0.03	-0.18 to 0.25	71	50 to 83	
Pharmacotherapy							
	SSRI	37	0.01	-0.12 to 0.13	58	40 to 71	0.0
	TCA	20	0.21	0.04 to 0.39	52	19 to 71	
	MAOI	7	-0.05	-0.34 to 0.25	83	65 to 91	
	Mixed/protocol/other	14	-0.19	-0.37 to 0.00	49	5 to 72	
Recruitment							
	Only clinical samples	36	0.07	-0.06 to 0.20	55	34 to 69	0.5
	Also community recruitment	35	-0.03	-0.16 to 0.10	65	50 to 76	
	Other recruitment method	7	-0.04	-0.34 to 0.25	76	49 to 89	
Country							
	USA	31	-0.07	-0.21 to 0.07	52	28 to 68	0.1
	Europe	29	0.03	-0.11 to 0.17	56	34 to 71	
	Other	18	0.15	-0.04 to 0.34	76	62 to 85	
Quality							
	Score 0–1	31	0.10	-0.06 to 0.25	69	56 to 79	0.4
	Score 2–3	23	-0.03	-0.19 to 0.13	65	46 to 78	
	Score 4	24	-0.02	-0.17 to 0.12	38	0 to 62	

All subgroup analyses were conducted with the random effects model; a positive effect size indicates superior effects of psychotherapy; the p values indicate whether the effect sizes in the subgroups differ significantly from each other; significant values are highlighted in bold

SAD - social anxiety disorder, OCD - obsessive-compulsive disorder, SSRI - selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor, TCA - tricyclic antidepressant, MAOI - monoamine oxidase inhibitor

Bakkor et al (27)etrowine Bakkor et al (27)etrowine Bakkor et al (27)etrowine Bakkor et al (28) Barone et al (28) Davator et al (29) Davator et al (29)	Study	g	95% CI	р	Hedges'g and 95% Cl
Bakker et al (27)	Bakhshani et al (26)	-0.19	-1.17 to 0.79	0.70	→
Barbor et al (28) Barbor et al (29) Barbor et al (29) Barbor et al (29) Barbor et al (20) Barbor et al (20) Barbor et al (20) Barbor et al (20) Davids et al (20) Davids et al (20) Davids et al (30) Davids et al (40) Davids et al					
Banchow et al (29) Bornt et al (30) Bornt et al (31) Bornt et al (35) Bornt et al (36) Bornt et al (36) Bornt et al (37) Bornt et al (36) Bornt et al (37) Bornt et al (36) Bornt et al (37) Bornt et al (40) Down et al (30) Bornt et al (41) Bornt et al (41) Bornt et al (41) Bornt et al (41) Bornt et al (41) Down et al (42) Down et al (43) Down et al (41) Down et al (42) Down et al (41) Down et al (41) Down et al (42) Down et al (42) Down et al (43) Down et al (
Barcet et al (30) Bed et al (31) Blackbur (3) Blackbur (4) Blackbur (4					
Bedi et al (31) Black et al (32) Black et al (32) Black et al (32) Black et al (33) Black et al (34) Black et al (35) Clark et al (37) David et al (39) Clark et al (37) David et al (39) Clark et al (37) David et al (39) Devide et al (44) Devide et al (46) Frank et al (46) Heredrey et al (47) Devide et al (56) Heredrey et al (47) Devide et al (57) Heredrey et al (48) Heredrey et al (49) Heredrey et al (49) Heredrey et al (49) Devide et al (50) Heredrey et					
Blackburn & Koore (3) Blackburn & Koore (3) Darnon et al (3) Darnon et al (3) Darnon et al (3) David et al (3) Durlop et al (42) Durlop et al (43) Durlop et al (44) Elkin et al (44) Frommerger et al (46) From et al (47) Heinberg et al (47) Heinberg et al (47) Holton 4 al (53) Durlop et al (50) Curl 4 Heinberg et al (40) Durlop et al (47) Holton 4 al (53) Durlop et al (51) Curl 4 Heinberg et al (51) Curl 4 Holton 4 al (52) Holton 4 al (53) Holton 4 al (53) Holton 4 al (53) Holton 4 al (63) Holton 4 blot 28					
Blance 14 (34) Blance 14 (35) Blance 14 (35) Blance 14 (35) Device 14 (39) Device 14 (49) Device 14 (49)					
Blomhoff et al (35) Erwene et al (37) Clark et al (37) Clark et al (37) Davids et al (39) Dunkop et al (39) Dunkop et al (40) Dunkop et al (41) Dunkop et al (42) Dunkop et al (42) Dunkop et al (43) Elkin et al (44) Elkin et al (44) Elkin et al (44) Frommer et al (45) Fromesenger et al (46) Fromesenger et al (46) Fromesenger et al (46) Fromesenger et al (46) Fromesenger et al (46) Dunkop et al (42) Dunkop et al (43) Elkin et al (44) Fromesenger et al (46) Fromesenger et al (46) Dunkop et al (47) Height et al (41) Dunkop et al (42) Dunkop et al (47) Fromesenger et al (48) Fromesenger et al (49) Height et al (41) Dunkop et al (42) Dunkop et al (47) Fromesenger et al (48) Fromesenger et al (49) Dunkop et al (47) Dunkop et al (47) Dunkop et al (47) Dunkop et al (48) Height et al (40) Dunkop et al (47) Dunkop et al (47) Dunkop et al (48) Height et al (50) Courselling Markowiz et al (61) Dunkop et al (65) Dunkop et al (75) Dunkop et al (75					
Browne et al (36) Clark et al (37) Danton et al (38) Dark dt et al (39) David et al (39) David et al (39) Device tal (40) Dunner et al (41) Device tal (41) Dunner et al (42) Dunner et al (42) Dunner et al (42) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (42) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (46) Dunner et al (47) From beigner et al (48) Dunner et al (49) Dunner et al (49) Dunner et al (41) Dunner et al (41) Dunner et al (42) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (44) Dunner et al (46) Dunner et al (46) Dunner et al (47) From beigner et al (48) Dunner et al (49) Dunner et al (49) Dunner et al (49) Dunner et al (49) Dunner et al (41) Dunner et al (41) Dunner et al (41) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (43) Dunner et al (41) Dunner et al (50) CuBT Heigener et al (42) Dunner et al (50) Dunner et al (70)	Blanco et al (34)	-0.23	-0.70 to 0.24		
Clark et al (37) 1.11 0.38 to 1.84 0.00 Dannon et al (39) - CBT 0.04 0.70 20 40 70 70 David et al (39) - CBT 0.04 0.73 to 0.41 0.83 David et al (30) - CBT 0.04 0.73 to 0.41 0.83 David et al (41) - 00 - 0.75 to 0.03 to 0.64 Duning et al (42) - 00 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Dunner et al (42) - 00 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Dunner et al (42) - 00 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Dunner et al (42) - 00 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Dunner et al (42) - 00 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Dunner et al (43) - 0.02 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Dunner et al (44) - 0.02 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Promabile et al (46) - 0.04 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Promabile et al (46) - 0.04 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Promabile et al (46) - 0.04 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Promabile et al (46) - 0.04 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.066 Promabile et al (46) - 0.04 - 0.75 to 0.03 0.07 Heimberg et al (50) - 0.02 - 0.75 to 1.03 0.000 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.01 - 0.35 to 0.13 0.55 - 0.78 Jarret et al (55) - 0.02 - 0.75 to 0.23 0.34 Heloin et al (51) - 0.01 - 0.24 to 0.14 0.040 Cossevel et al (56) - 0.04 - 0.24 to 0.16 0.696 Kok et al (57) - 0.22 - 0.67 to 0.23 0.34 Heloin et al (51) - 0.01 - 0.02 + 0.71 0.03 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.01 - 0.02 + 0.71 0.03 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.01 - 0.01 - 0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - CBT - 0.31 - 0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - CBT - 0.31 - 0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Markowiz et al (61) - DUT - 0.67 - 0.24 0.05 to 0.25 0.97 MucLean & Hakstian (66) - DTN - 0.02 - 0.75 to 0.23 0.34 Markowiz et al (61) - DUT - 0.07 + 0.24 0.05 to 0.25 0.97 MucLean & Hakstian (66) - DTN - 0.24 - 0.58 to 0.32 0.39 Markowiz et al (61) - DUT - 0.07 + 0.25 0.03 0.07 Markowiz et al (61) - DUT - 0.07 + 0.25 0.03 0.07 Markowiz et al (61) - DUT - 0.07 + 0.25 0.03 0.07 Markowiz et al (61) - DUT - 0.07 + 0.25 0.03 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.07 + 0.25 0.03 Markowiz et al (71) - 0.24 - 0.38 to 0.35 0.37 Markowiz et al (72) - 0.05 to 0.25 0.38 Markowiz et al (72) - 0.05 to 0.25 0.38 Markowiz et al (71) 0.04 - 0.38 to 0.36 0.07 Markowiz et al (71) 0.04 - 0.38 to 0.36 0.07 Markowiz et al (72)					
Damon et al (38) 0.21 0.21 0.34 to 0.76 0.45 0.77 0.32 to 0.42 0.79 0.35 0.41 0.83 0.44 1.039 - REBT 0.04 0.33 to 0.41 0.83 0.54 to 0.28 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.55 0.59 0.39 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.43 0.45 0.55 0.44 0.45 0.57 0.45 0.55 0.44 0.45 0.57 0.45 0.55 0.5					
David et al (39) - CBT 0.06 -0.32 to 0.42 0.79 David et al (39) - REBT 0.04 -0.33 to 0.41 0.83 Davidson et al (40) -0.13 -0.54 to 0.28 0.54 David et al (42) -0.11 -0.56 to 0.35 0.68 0.59 0.69 Duno et al (42) -0.11 -0.56 to 0.35 0.68 0.69 Duno et al (42) -0.11 -0.11 -0.56 to 0.35 0.68 0.69 Duno et al (42) -0.11 -0.11 -0.12 0.04 Etkine et al (45) -0.11 -0.22 -0.37 to 0.33 0.91 Frammazi et al (45) -0.11 -0.22 -0.37 to 0.33 0.91 Frammazi et al (45) -0.11 -0.25 to 0.13 0.50 Hegeni et al (46) -0.11 -0.35 to 0.72 0.54 From terg et al (49) 0.21 -0.35 to 0.13 0.50 Hegeni et al (47) -0.00 -0.38 to 0.72 0.54 Hence et al (47) -0.01 -0.44 to 0.19 0.00 Frammazi et al (50) -0.21 -0.44 0.14 0.40 Hence et al (50) -0.21 -0.47 to 0.33 0.000 Hence et al (50) -0.21 -0.47 to 0.33 0.000 Hence et al (50) -0.21 -0.47 to 0.33 0.000 Hence et al (50) -0.22 -0.67 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.16 0.69 0.30 Hollon et al (51) -0.001.99 to 0.55 0.74 0.54 0.55 0.74 0.54 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.50 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.50 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.50 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.50 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.50 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.50 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.55 0.74 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.55 0.75 0.45 0.15 0.55 0.75 0.45 0					
Davids et al (39) – REBT 0.04 -0.33 to 0.41 0.83 0.54 0.54 0.54 0.54 0.54 0.54 0.55 0.54 0.55 0.55					
Dekker et al (41) -0.40 $-0.79 \text{ to} -0.01$ 0.05 Durnop et al (42) -0.10 $-0.59 \text{ to} 0.53$ 0.68 Durnop et al (42) -0.17 $-0.44 \text{ to} 0.21$ 0.44 Elkin et al (44) -DPT $-0.42 \text{ to} 0.21$ 0.44 Faramazi et al (45) 0.44 \text{ to} 1.77 0.00 0.41 \text{ to} 1.77 0.00 Frank et al (44) -DPT -0.02 -0.37 \text{ to} 0.33 0.01 Hegref et al (45) 0.24 -0.33 \text{ to} 0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -0.00 - 0.39 \text{ to} 0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -0.01 - 0.34 \text{ to} 0.39 0.36 Heimberg et al (51) -0.03 + 0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -0.03 + 0.037 0.37 Holon et al (57) 0.46 -0.16 + 0.08 0.37 Keiler et al (61) -0.06 -1.26 + 0.08 0.33 Holon et al (57) 0.46 0.15 + 0.77 0.06 Kostycki et al (61) 0.06 -1.26 + 0.08 0.33 Markowiz et al (61) -0.28 + 0.53 0.33 0.39 Markowiz et al (61) 0.31<					
Dunnop et al (42) - 0.10 -0.59 to 0.39 0.669 Dunnop et al (44) - 0.2T - 0.14 -0.49 to 0.21 0.44 Eikin et al (44) - 0.ET - 0.14 -0.49 to 0.21 0.44 Eikin et al (44) - 0.ET - 0.14 -0.49 to 0.21 0.44 Finder zeller et al (45) 0.17 - 0.38 to 0.72 0.54 Frank et al (47) - 0.00 - 0.41 to 1.45 0.00 Frank et al (41) - 0.01 - 0.41 to 1.50 0.04 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.01 - 0.38 to 0.33 0.91 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.80 0.13 to 10.32 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.80 0.55 0.74 Head ta (42) - 0.027 - 0.33 to 0.33 0.91 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.80 0.55 0.74 Head ta (42) - 0.027 - 0.38 to 0.33 0.93 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.76 0.23 0.03 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.76 to 0.23 0.03 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.76 to 0.23 0.03 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.022 - 0.67 to 0.23 0.03 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.015 - 0.00 0.03 Keller et al (65) 0.014 - 0.24 to 0.16 0.66 Kok et al (57) 0.05 0.74 Jarrett et al (65) 0.013 - 0.10 to 1.00 0.01 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.015 - 0.02 0.023 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.017 - 0.67 - 1.28 to -0.08 0.03 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.017 - 0.67 - 1.28 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - 0.ET - 0.31 - 0.78 to 0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - 0.ET - 0.31 - 0.78 to 0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (63) - 0.02 - 0.05 to 0.52 0.57 Murphy et al (63) - 0.07 - 0.23 to 1.71 0.01 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.07 - 0.23 to 1.71 0.01 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.07 - 0.25 to 0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - 0.ET - 0.31 - 0.78 to 0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (63) - 0.04 - 1.38 to 0.10 0.09 Mothrid et al (63) - 0.07 N - 0.23 to 0.52 0.37 Natatani et al (7) - 0.22 - 0.05 to 0.25 0.38 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.01 - 0.04 to 0.42 0.03 10 0.25 Mortherg et al (63) - 0.07 N - 0.44 to 0.42 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 - 0.25 to 0.58 0.77 Markowiz et al (61) - 0.01 - 0.04 to 0.02 0.03 Shareh et al (70) 0.32 - 0.25 to 0.58 0.73 Natatani et al (70) 0.32 - 0.25 to 0.58 0.74 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 - 0.25 to 0.59 0.75 Natatani et al (70) 0.43 - 0.07 to 0.51 0.05 Spintoven et al (80) 0.21 - 0.75					
Dummer et al (43) -0.34 -1.18 b0.50 0.43 Elkin et al (44) - CBT -0.42 -0.37 to 0.33 0.91 Faramazi et al (45) 0.44 -0.47 0.02 -0.37 to 0.33 0.91 Frinkerzeller et al (46) 0.17 -0.38 to 0.72 0.54 -0.44 -0.47 0.00 Frank et al (47) 1.00 0.43 to 1.53 0.50 0.54 -0.55 0.54 From the grave et al (49) 0.29 -0.35 to 0.13 0.50 0.54 -0.54 -0.64 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.06 -0.75 0.07 0.45 -0.75 0.77 0.06 -0.75 0.76 -0.75 0.77 0.06 -0.76 0.23 0.34 -0.54 -0.54 -0.56 -0.77 0.06 -0.72 0.77 0.06 -0.72 0.77 0.06 -0.72 0.77 0.06 -0.28 0.50 0.77					
Elkin et al (44) – ICBT - 0.14 - 0.49 to 0.21 0.04 Elkin et al (44) – ICBT - 0.22 - 0.37 to 0.33 0.91 Faramarzi et al (45) 0.17 - 0.38 to 0.72 0.54 Foa et al (47) - 1.00 0.41 to 1.47 0.00 Frank et al (49) 0.10 - 0.34 to 0.14 0.40 Fromberger et al (49) 0.10 - 0.34 to 0.14 0.40 Fromberger et al (49) 0.10 - 0.34 to 0.14 0.40 Heimberg et al (51) - CBT - 0.80 - 0.35 to 1.30 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - CBT - 0.90 - 1.45 to 0.35 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - CBT - 0.90 - 1.47 to -0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.075 - 0.19 to 0.39 0.03 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.075 - 0.19 to 0.39 0.03 Heimberg et al (51) - 0.075 - 0.19 to 0.39 0.03 Keller et al (56) 0.04 - 0.24 to 0.14 0.55 0.74 Jarrett et al (55) 0.04 - 0.24 to 0.14 0.55 Koa cet al (57) 0.45 - 0.10 to 1.00 0.11 Keller et al (51) - 0.075 - 0.19 to 0.37 0.45 Lesperance et al (59) 0.13 - 0.28 0.034 Markowiz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 - 1.28 to -0.18 0.037 Markowiz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 - 1.28 to -0.18 0.037 Markowiz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 - 1.28 to -0.18 0.037 Markowiz et al (62) - CBT - 0.31 - 0.78 to 0.18 0.29 Markowiz et al (61) - CBT - 0.61 - 1.10 to 0.12 0.01 Markowiz et al (62) - CBT - 0.31 - 1.07 to 0.13 0.038 Markowiz et al (63) 0.01 - 0.25 to 0.52 0.97 Mother et al (68) - Sup EX - 0.38 to 0.61 0.53 Markowiz et al (61) - CBT - 0.24 - 0.38 to 0.30 - 0.53 Markowiz et al (61) - CBT - 0.24 - 0.38 to 0.51 0.53 Markowiz et al (61) - CBT - 0.24 - 0.35 to 0.52 0.97 Mother et al (68) - Sup EX - 0.38 to 0.61 0.53 Markowiz et al (71) 0.21 - 0.25 to 0.58 0.27 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 - 0.25 to 0.58 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 - 0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Moros-Wallis et al (72) - m - 0.24 - 0.35 to 0.52 0.38 Nakatani et al (73) 0.37 to 14 to 0.08 0.30 Nakatani et al (73) 0.37 to 14 to 0.08 0.30 Shareh et al (60) - 0.11 - 0.36 to 0.72 0.42 Murphy et al (81) - 0.03 - 0.25 to 0.58 0.24 Murphy et al (74) 0.50 0.72 0.42 Murphy et al (76) 0.53 0.72 0.42 Murphy et al (70) 0.7 0.43 - 0.75 to 0.51 0.53 Sousa et al (70) 0.7 0.44 to 0.48 0.02					
Elkin et al (44) – IPT - 0.02 -0.37 to 0.33 0.91 Faramazi et al (45) 0.74 0.41 to 147 0.00 Finkenzeller et al (46) 0.77 -0.38 to 0.72 0.54 Frank et al (47) 1.00 0.41 to 159 0.00 Frank et al (47) -0.02 -0.35 to 1.13 0.50 Heinerberg et al (49) 0.29 -0.35 to 1.13 0.50 Heinerberg et al (49) 0.20 -0.35 to 0.13 0.50 Heinerberg et al (49) 0.20 -0.35 to 0.31 0.02 Heinerberg et al (49) 0.22 -0.35 to 0.13 0.50 Heinerberg et al (51) -0.021 -0.39 to 0.35 0.74 Jarrett et al (55) 0.022 -0.37 to 0.23 0.34 Holon et al (55) 0.022 -0.37 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (55) 0.022 -0.37 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (56) 0.04 0.05 0.054 Lesperance et al (59) 0.46 0.15 to 0.77 OL 20 Ch et al (51) 0.07 -0.22 10.77 0.00 Lesperance et al (59) 0.46 0.15 to 0.70 Markowiz et al (61) -IPT -0.67 -1.28 to 0.02 Markowiz et al (61) -0.07 0.23 10.71 0.01 Markowiz et al (61) -0.07 0.23 10.71 0.01 Markowiz et al (61) -0.07 0.23 10.72 0.54 MeLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstan (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 Mortear (68) -Supr E. 0.36 -0.13 to 0.11 0.01 Markowiz et al (61) -0.07 0.22 to 0.58 0.05 Numphy et al (66) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 Mortear et al (69) -0.97 0.22 to 0.58 0.05 Name et al (69) -0.97 0.02 -0.25 to 0.58 0.27 Mortear et al (70) 0.22 -0.25 to 0.58 0.27 Mortear et al (70) 0.52 0.55 0.11 Markowiz et al (70) 0.52 0.55 0.11 Mortear et al (70) 0.52 0.55 0.11 Markowiz et al (70) 0.52 0.55 0.11 Mortear et al (70) 0.52 0.55 0.55 Namezi et al (70) 0.52 0.55 0					
Finkenzeller et al (46) 0.17 -0.38 to 0.72 0.54 Foa et al (47) 1.00 0.41 to 1.59 0.00 Frank et al (43) -0.10 -0.34 to 0.14 0.40 Frommberger et al (51) -0.08 -0.39 to 0.39 1.00 Heimberg et al (51) -0.08 -1.35 to 0.25 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -0.08 -1.35 to 0.25 0.04 Heindrik et al (52) 0.24 -0.39 to 0.39 0.36 Hoexter et al (53) -0.25 -0.06 74 Jarrett et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.67 0.45 Keiler et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.67 0.54 Keiler et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.67 0.54 Keiler et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.67 0.54 Lesperance et al (50) 0.47 0.54 0.54 Markowitz et al (61) -0.08 0.61 0.20 Markowitz et al (62) -0.54 0.55 0.74 Markowitz et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.16 0.20 Markowitz et al (63) -0.74 -0.76 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Foak et al (47) 1.00 0.41 to 1.59 0.00 Frank et al (49) 0.29 -0.55 to 1.13 0.50 Heigheit al (51) -0.08 0.00 -0.38 to 0.39 1.00 Heimberg et al (51) -counseling -0.80 -1.37 to -0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -counseling -0.80 -1.47 to -0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -counseling -0.39 to 0.55 0.74 Jarrett et al (55) -0.22 -0.67 to 0.39 0.34 Keller et al (57) -0.44 -0.24 to 1.60 0.69 Lesperance et al (67) -0.64 -0.128 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (61) -0.07 -1.26 to 0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) -0.07 -1.26 to 0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) -0.01 -0.66 -1.38 to 1.00 0.11 Markowitz et al (62) -0.21 -0.23 0.24 0.20 Markowitz et al (63) -0.44 -0.38 to 0.3 0.39 0.30 Markowitz et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.21 0.21 0.21 0.21	Faramarzi et al (45)	0.94	0.41 to 1.47		
Frank et al (48) -0.10 -0.34 to 0.14 0.40 Frommberger et al (50) 0.00 -0.39 to 0.39 1.00 Heimberg et al (51) - counseling -0.90 -1.35 to -0.25 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - counseling -0.90 -1.35 to -0.25 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - counseling -0.90 -1.47 to -0.33 0.00 Hendriks et al (52) 0.24 -0.39 to 0.37 0.45 Hoexter et al (53) -0.25 -0.06 0.34 Holton et al (54) 0.08 -0.37 to 0.55 0.74 Jarrett et al (55) -0.04 - 0.24 to 0.16 0.69 0.47 0.26 to 1.6 Keiler et al (56) -0.04 - 0.24 to 0.16 0.69 0.36 -0.45 Losch et al (50) 0.13 to 0.77 0.00 0.14 0.54 Lesperance et al (50) -0.46 -1.38 to 0.16 0.20 0.37 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.66 -1.38 to 0.16 0.20 0.37 Marshall et al (65) -0.41 -0.58 to 0.30 0.97 McLean & Hakstain (66) - DYN 0.01 -0.58 to 0.30 0.97 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Frommberger et al (49) 0.29 -0.55 to 1.13 0.50 Heigher I al (50) 0.00 -0.39 to 0.39 1.00 Heimberg et al (51) - CBT -0.80 -1.35 to -0.25 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - CCUNseling 0.90 -1.47 to -0.33 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) -0.23 0.36 0.45 Holon et al (55) -0.22 0.67 to 2.33 0.34 Keller et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.16 0.69 Lesperance et al (57) 0.45 -0.10 to 1.00 0.11 Kosk et al (61) - counseling -0.69 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - counseling -0.69 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - DYN 0.01 -0.58 to 0.53 0.36 Mort et al (63) - CBT 0.16 0.49 to 0.51 0.63 0.49 Mort et al (63) - CBT 0.16					
Heger et al (51)0.00-0.39 to 0.391.00Heimberg et al (51)-CBT-0.80-1.35 to -0.250.00Hendriks et al (52)-0.90-1.47 to -0.330.00Hendriks et al (53)-0.35-1.09 to 0.870.45Holbor et al (55)-0.22-0.67 to 0.230.34Keller et al (55)-0.22-0.67 to 0.230.34Keller et al (55)-0.22-0.67 to 0.230.34Lesperance et al (56)-0.44-0.24 to 0.160.69Korxyki et al (61)0.97-0.23 to 0.54-0.44Markowitz et al (61)-0.67-1.26 to -0.120.02Marshall et al (62)-CBT-0.61-1.10 to -0.12Marshall et al (62)-CBT-0.61-1.10 to -0.12Marshall et al (62)-CBT-0.62-0.85 to 0.33McLean & Hakstian (66) - DTN0.01-0.50 to 0.52Morber et al (63)-0.71-0.24Morber et al (63)-D3PMorber et al (63)-D3EMorber et al (64)-0.22Morber et al (65)-D41Morber et al (65)-D74Morber et al (62)-D74Morber et al (63)-D74Morber et al (64)-D22Morber et al (75)0.65Nazari et al (76)0.65Nazari et al (76)0.65<					
Heimberg et al (51) - CBT -0.80 -1.35 to -0.25 0.00 Heimberg et al (51) - counseling 0.24 -0.39 to 0.87 0.45 Hoxtor et al (52) -0.32 0.03 0.36 Holton et al (54) 0.08 -0.39 to 0.55 0.74 Jamet et al (55) -0.24 -0.67 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.16 0.69 Lesperance et al (57) 0.45 -0.10 to 1.00 0.11 Keller et al (61) 0.97 -0.28 to 0.54 0.54 Lesperance et al (57) 0.46 0.15 to 0.77 0.00 Markowitz et al (61) - CDT -0.67 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - COT -0.64 -1.38 to 0.16 0.09 Markowitz et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 1.01 0.09 McLeans & Hakstian (66) - DTN 0.61 -0.04 to 0.51 0.16 Morbred at (63) -DT 0.24 -0.53 to 0.55 0.11 Morbred at (63) -DT 0.24 -0.38 to 0.30 0.36 Morbred at al (63) -DT 0.24 -0.38 to 0.50 0.					
Heimberg et al (51) - counseling -0.90 -1.47 to -0.33 0.00 Hendriks et al (52) -0.35 -1.09 to 0.39 0.36 Holbon et al (54) 0.08 -0.39 to 0.55 0.74 Jarrett et al (55) -0.22 -0.67 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (55) -0.04 to 0.24 to 0.16 0.66 Koszycki et al (56) 0.145 0.01 to 1.00 0.11 Koszycki et al (61) - IPT -0.67 -1.26 to -0.12 0.02 Markowitz et al (61) - IPT -0.67 -1.26 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - CET -0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - DET -0.31 -0.78 to 0.55 0.37 Marshall et al (62) - DET -0.62 -0.85 to 0.33 0.39 McLean & Hakstian (66) - DTN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) - DTN 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morr et al (63) - CET 0.62 0.85 to 0.35 0.51 Morr et al (63) - Supp Ex -0.53 0.05 0.51 Mynors-Walls et al (72) - n 0.22 -0.26 to 0.25 0.38					
Holoc et al (53) Holoc et al (54) Jarret et al (55) Holoc et al (55) Holoc et al (55) Holoc et al (56) Holoc et al (57) Holoc et al (59) Holoc et al (50) Holoc et al (50) Holoc et al (59) Holoc et al (50) Holoc et al (50) Holoc et al (50) Holoc et al (50) Holoc et a					
Hollon et al (54) 0.08 -0.39 to 0.55 0.74 Jarret te al (55) -0.22 -0.67 to 0.23 0.34 Keller et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.16 0.69 Kok ket al (57) 0.45 -0.10 to 1.00 0.11 Koszycki et al (51) 0.47 -0.28 to 0.54 0.54 Lesperance et al (59) 0.48 0.15 to 0.77 0.00 Markowitz et al (61) - PT -0.67 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - DPT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marshall et al (62) - DPT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.11 McLean & Hakstian (66) - DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) - DYN 0.11 0.021 to 0.51 to 0.31 0.11 Morb et al (68) - Sup Ex -0.66 -0.68 to 0.29 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) - DYN 0.11 -0.61 to 0.29 0.97 Morb et al (68) - Sup Ex -0.66 10.029 0.98					
Jarret et al (55) Keller et al (56) Kolk et al (57) Koszycki et al (58) Other et al (59) Other et					
Keller et al (56) -0.04 -0.24 to 0.16 0.69 Kolk et al (57) 0.45 -0.10 to 1.00 0.01 Koszycki et al (58) 0.43 -0.28 to 0.54 0.54 Lesperance et al (59) 0.46 0.15 to 0.77 0.00 Loerch et al (61) -027 -0.23 to 1.71 0.01 Markowitz et al (61) -027 -0.23 to 1.71 0.01 Marshall et al (62) -027 -0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) -027 -0.63 -1.28 to 0.01 0.09 Marshall et al (62) -027 -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McLean & Hakstian (66) -DTV 0.01 -0.56 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) -DT 0.22 0.33 to 1.11 0.01 Morber et al (68) -CBT 0.22 -0.23 to 0.55 0.11 Morber et al (68) -OT 0.22 -0.25 to 0.80 0.11 Morber et al (69) -OT 0.22 0.25 to 0.35 0.41 Murby et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.80 0.23 0.38					
Kolk et al (57) 0.45 -0.10 to 1.00 0.11 Koszycki et al (58) 0.43 -0.28 to 0.54 0.54 Lesperance et al (69) 0.46 0.15 to 0.77 0.00 Loerch et al (61) 0.97 0.23 to 1.71 0.01 Markowitz et al (61) -courseling -0.66 -1.28 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) -CET -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marshall et al (62) -DET -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.99 McKnight et al (65) -0.41 -0.57 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) – DT -0.64 -0.38 to 0.31 0.29 McLean & Hakstian (66) – DT -0.64 -0.64 0.81 0.63 Mohr et al (68) -DET 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Mohr et al (68) -DET 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morber gt al (69) – IDT 0.21 -0.36 to 0.25 0.38 0.43 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – n 0.21 -0.36 to 0.22 0.38 0.43 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – n 0.21 -0.36 to 0.25 0.38 <					
Koszycki et al (58) 0.13 -0.28 to 0.54 0.54 Lesperance et al (59) 0.46 0.15 to 0.77 0.00 Loerch et al (61) - IPT -0.67 -1.28 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - courseling -0.67 -1.28 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McBiene et al (64) -0.26 -0.85 to 0.33 0.39 McChean & Hakstian (66) - DT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Michean & Hakstian (66) - DT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Morth et al (63) -CDF 0.16 -0.44 to 0.51 0.63 Murby et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.89 0.27					
Loerch et al (60) 0.007 0.23 to 171 0.01 Markowitz et al (61) - counseling 0.69 - 1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (62) - CBT 0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - CPT 0.61 - 1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marshall et al (62) - DT 0.61 - 1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marshall et al (63) 0.04 - 0.64 - 1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McBride et al (64) 0.26 - 0.68 to 0.33 0.39 McKnight et al (65) 0.41 - 1.57 to 0.75 0.49 McLean & Hakstian (66) - BT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) 0.05 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) - BT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Morther et al (68) - CBT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Morther et al (69) - grp 0.19 -0.28 to 0.30 0.27 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 - 0.25 to .089 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - gp 0.16 - 0.66 to 0.25 0.38 Nakatani et al (73) 0.66 - 0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.12 0.01 Rashind et al (77) 0.47 - 0.78 to 1.05 0.11 Saminen et al (76) 0.66 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 - 0.78 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.66 0.01 to 1.59 0.01 Saminen et al (80) - 0.11 to .03 0.02 0.42 0.44 Soti & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.79 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Saminen et al (80) - 0.41 -0.38 to .70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.79 0.63 0.026 0.84 Schulberg et al (81) - 0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Schulberg et al (81) - 0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Schulberg et al (86) - 0.24 -0.38 to .70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.70 0.53 0.56 Shrap et al (86) - 0.24 -0.32 0.026 0.84 Schulberg et al (86) - 0.24 -0.38 to .70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.70 0.53 0.56 Shrap et al (86) -0.24 -0.24 0.51 Thompson et al (80) -0.24 -0.26 to 1.00 0.59 Wiliams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Wiliams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Wiliams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Weissman et al (90) -0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Wiliams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overail 0.00 0.02 -0.07 to .01 0.74					
Markowitz et al (61) - (PT) -0.67 -1.26 to -0.08 0.03 Markowitz et al (61) - counseling 0.69 -1.26 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - PPT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marking et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McKnight et al (65) -0.41 -1.57 to .7.5 0.49 McLean & Hakstian (66) - BT 0.62 -0.33 to 0.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Mohr et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Mohr et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Mohr et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morber gt al (69) - grp 0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - p -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - n -0.26 -0.65 to 0.25 0.38 Nakatani et al (73) 0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (76) 0.65 0.94 to 1.26 0.04				0.00	
Markowitz et al (62) - cBT -0.69 -1.26 to -0.12 0.02 Marshall et al (62) - IPT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Marshall et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McBride et al (64) -0.26 -0.85 to 0.33 0.39 McKnight et al (65) -0.41 -1.57 to 0.75 0.49 McLean & Hakstian (66) - DT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Morb ret al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morbreg et al (69) - Ind 0.41 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 Mortberg et al (69) - grp 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - gp 0.16 -0.44 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (75) 0.57 0.44 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.63 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Osterbaan et al (71) 0.427 0.43 0.00 Prasko et al (76) 0.63 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Raynolds et al					
Marshall et al (62) - CBT -0.31 -0.78 to 0.16 0.20 Marshall et al (62) - IPT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Martin et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McKnight et al (65) -0.71 -0.75 0.49 McKnight et al (66) - DT -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Morber et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morber et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morber et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morber et al (68) - GBT 0.16 -0.41 to 0.29 0.41 Morber et al (68) - GBT 0.16 -0.41 to 0.29 0.42 Morber et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - p -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (77) 0.40 0.57 0.42 Markatini et al (76) 0.65 0.24 0.89 Nazari et al (71) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Rawindran et al (76) <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
Marshall et al (62) - IPT -0.61 -1.10 to -0.12 0.01 Martin et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McKnight et al (64) -0.26 -0.85 to 0.33 0.39 McKnight et al (65) -0.41 -1.57 to 0.75 0.49 McLean & Hakstian (66) – DTN 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.50 0.11 Mohr et al (68) – CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Mortherg et al (69) – Ind 0.41 -0.36 to 0.50 0.11 Mortherg et al (69) – Ind 0.41 -0.28 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.26 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – gp -0.16 -0.65 to 0.44 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.00 -0.02 -0.97 Natari et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 -0.97 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.20 0.15 -0.97 Schuberg et al (81) -0.02 -0.90 to 0.24					
Martin et al (63) -0.64 -1.38 to 0.10 0.09 McBride et al (64) -0.26 -0.85 to 0.33 0.39 McKnight et al (65) -DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstain (66) – BT 0.62 -0.35 to 0.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Mohr et al (68) – CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 McMrby et al (69) – Ind 0.41 -0.08 to 0.90 0.10 Mortberg et al (69) – grp 0.19 -0.22 -0.25 to 0.62 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – gp -0.02 -0.56 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – n -0.20 -0.56 to 0.42 0.38 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Ravindran et al (76) 0.57 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>					
McBride et al (64) -0.26 -0.85 to 0.33 0.39 McKnight et al (65) -0.41 -1.57 to 0.75 0.49 McLean & Hakstian (66) – DTN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLean & Hakstian (66) – BT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.55 0.11 Mohr et al (68) – CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.31 0.29 Mortberg et al (69) – ind 0.41 -0.08 to 0.90 0.10 Mortberg et al (69) – grp 0.19 -0.28 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – n -0.20 -0.65 to 0.25 0.38 Nazari et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.10 0.03 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.67 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.26 0.04 Rush et al (79) 0.90 to -0.04 0.03 0.53 Scott & Freem					
McLear & Hakstian (66) – DYN 0.01 -0.50 to 0.52 0.97 McLear & Hakstian (66) – BT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Mohr et al (68) – CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Morberg et al (69) – ind 0.41 -0.08 to 0.90 0.10 Morbberg et al (69) – grp 0.19 -0.28 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.26 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – n -0.20 -0.65 to 0.25 0.38 Nakatani et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.90 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) – CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Schulberg et al (86) -0.44 0.05 0.01 Shareh et al (8				0.39	
McLean & Hakstian (66) – BT 0.62 0.13 to 1.11 0.01 Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Mohr et al (68) – CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Mohr et al (68) – Supp Ex -0.36 -1.03 to 0.31 0.29 Mörtberg et al (69) – ind 0.41 -0.08 to 0.90 0.10 Mörtberg et al (69) – ind 0.41 -0.08 to 0.90 0.10 Mörtberg et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – gp -0.16 -0.66 to 0.25 0.38 Nakatani et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.66 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) – CDH 0.77 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Schulberg et al (86) -0.23 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Miranda et al (67) -0.24 -0.53 to 0.05 0.11 Mohr et al (68) - CBT 0.16 -0.49 to 0.81 0.63 Mohr et al (68) - Supp Ex -0.36 -1.03 to 0.31 0.29 Mörtberg et al (69) - ind 0.41 -0.08 to 0.90 0.10 Mörtberg et al (69) - grp 0.19 -0.28 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - gp -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - n -0.20 -0.65 to 0.25 0.38 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.44 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (78) 0.66 -0.11 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.94 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 0.21 0.00 Shareh et al (86) -0.21 -0.86 0.21 0.99 Shareh et al (86) -0.24 0.51 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 0.80 0.21 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Veissman et al (91) 0.24 <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>					
Mohr et al $(68) - CBT$ 0.16-0.49 to 0.810.63Mohr et al $(68) - Supp Ex$ -0.36-1.03 to 0.310.29Mörtberg et al $(69) - ind$ 0.41-0.08 to 0.900.10Mörtberg et al $(69) - grp$ 0.19-0.28 to 0.660.43Murphy et al (70) 0.32-0.25 to 0.890.27Murphy et al (71) 0.21-0.30 to 0.720.42Mynors-Wallis et al $(72) - gp$ -0.16-0.61 to 0.290.49Nazari et al (73) -0.06-0.94 to 0.820.89Nazari et al (75) 0.570.04 to 1.100.03Prasko et al (76) 0.650.04 to 1.260.04Ravindran et al (77) 0.47-0.18 to 1.120.15Reynolds et al (78) 0.66-0.11 to 1.310.10Rush et al (79) 0.900.21 to 1.590.01Salminen et al (81) -0.03-0.32 to 0.260.84Scott & Freeman $(82) - CBT$ 0.17-0.36 to 0.700.53Scott & Freeman $(82) - CBT$ 0.17-0.36 to 0.700.53Sharp et al (85) -0.23-0.99 to 0.530.56Sharp et al (86) -0.24-0.620.05Spinhoven et al (89) 0.31-0.18 to 1.800.21Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.21-0.84 to 0.820.99Weissman et al (91) 0.24-0.62 to 1.100.59Weissman et al (92) 0.07-0.22 to 0.360.64Overall0.02-0.07 to 0.100.74					
Mohr et al (68) – Supp Ex -0.36 -1.03 to 0.31 0.29 Mörtberg et al (69) – grp 0.19 -0.28 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – gp -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) – n -0.20 -0.65 to 0.25 0.38 Nakatani et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schubberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) – CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) – CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 0.56					
Mörtberg et al (69) - grp 0.19 -0.28 to 0.66 0.43 Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - gp -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - n -0.20 -0.65 to 0.25 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.59 0.01 Salmine net al (80) -0.11 -0.66 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.21 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.21 0.00 Sharnsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.44 0.03 Share et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Share et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.55 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 0.84 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.66 0.09 Weilsman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 $-$					
Murphy et al (70) 0.32 -0.25 to 0.89 0.27 Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - gp -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.51 0.10 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Susa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.51 Sharp et al (86) -0.43 -0.21 to 0.05 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.43 -0.22 to 0.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (89)			-0.08 to 0.90		
Murphy et al (71) 0.21 -0.30 to 0.72 0.42 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - gp -0.16 -0.61 to 0.29 0.49 Mynors-Wallis et al (72) - n -0.20 -0.65 to 0.22 0.89 Nakatani et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (76) 0.66 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Sharpa et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et a					
Mynors-Wallis et al $(72) - gp$ -0.16-0.61 to 0.290.49Mynors-Wallis et al $(72) - n$ -0.20-0.65 to 0.250.38Nakatani et al (73) -0.06-0.94 to 0.820.89Nazari et al (74) 0.900.37 to 1.430.00Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.570.04 to 1.100.03Prasko et al (76) 0.650.04 to 1.260.04Ravindran et al (77) 0.47-0.18 to 1.120.15Reynolds et al (78) 0.6-0.11 to 1.310.10Rush et al (79) 0.900.21 to 1.590.01Salminen et al (80) -0.11-0.66 to 0.440.69Schulberg et al (81) -0.03-0.32 to 0.260.84Scott & Freeman $(82) - CBT$ 0.17-0.36 to 0.700.53Sharse et al (82) -0.23-0.99 to 0.040.03Sharp et al (85) -0.23-0.99 to 0.530.56Spinhoven et al (87) 0.630.00 to 1.260.51Thompson et al (89) 0.31-0.18 to 0.800.21Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43-0.92 to 0.060.09Weissman et al (91) 0.24-0.62 to 1.100.59Williams et al (92) 0.07-0.21 to 0.360.64Overall0.02-0.07 to 0.100.74					
Mynors-Wallis et al $(72) - n$ -0.20-0.65 to 0.250.38Nakatani et al (73) -0.06-0.94 to 0.820.89Nazari et al (74) 0.900.37 to 1.430.00Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.570.04 to 1.100.03Prasko et al (76) 0.650.04 to 1.260.04Ravindran et al (77) 0.47-0.18 to 1.120.15Reynolds et al (78) 0.6-0.11 to 1.310.10Rush et al (79) 0.900.21 to 1.590.01Salminen et al (80) -0.11-0.66 to 0.440.69Schulberg et al (81) -0.03-0.32 to 0.260.84Scott & Freeman $(82) - CBT$ 0.17-0.36 to 0.700.53Scott & Freeman $(82) - counseling$ 0.43-0.040.03Shareh et al (83) -0.23-0.99 to 0.530.56Sharp et al (86) -0.48-0.75 to -0.210.00Sousa et al (87) 0.630.00 to 1.260.51Thompson et al (89) 0.31-0.18 to 0.800.21Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43-0.92 to 0.060.09Weissman et al (91) 0.24-0.62 to 1.100.59Williams et al (92) 0.07-0.21 to 0.360.64Overall0.02-0.07 to 0.100.74					
Nakatani et al (73) -0.06 -0.94 to 0.82 0.89 Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Sharsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Sharse et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 0.05 to 3.0.56 0.55 Spinhoven et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (92)					
Nazari et al (74) 0.90 0.37 to 1.43 0.00 Oosterbaan et al (75) 0.57 0.04 to 1.10 0.03 Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (76) 0.66 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Sharse et al (81) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 0.05 0.05 Spinhoven et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.66 0.09 Weilsman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.					
Prasko et al (76) 0.65 0.04 to 1.26 0.04 Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.0		0.90		0.00	
Ravindran et al (77) 0.47 -0.18 to 1.12 0.15 Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>					
Reynolds et al (78) 0.6 -0.11 to 1.31 0.10 Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weilssman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.21 to 0.06 0.64 Overall 0.02<					
Rush et al (79) 0.90 0.21 to 1.59 0.01 Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Sharsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Sharsh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Salminen et al (80) -0.11 -0.66 to 0.44 0.69 Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Schulberg et al (81) -0.03 -0.32 to 0.26 0.84 Scott & Freeman (82) - CBT 0.17 -0.36 to 0.70 0.53 Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.90 to 0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 0.00 0.05 Spinhoven et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.23 6 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Scott & Freeman (82) - counseling 0.43 -0.10 to 0.96 0.11 Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74	Schulberg et al (81)	-0.03	-0.32 to 0.26	0.84	
Shamsaei et al (83) -0.47 -0.90 to -0.04 0.03 Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.21 to 0.86 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Shareh et al (84) 2.48 1.05 to 3.91 0.00 Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Sharp et al (85) -0.23 -0.99 to 0.53 0.56 Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Sharp et al (86) -0.48 -0.75 to -0.21 0.00 Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Sousa et al (87) 0.63 0.00 to 1.26 0.05 Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Spinhoven et al (88) -0.21 -0.84 to 0.42 0.51 Thompson et al (89) 0.31 -0.18 to 0.80 0.21 Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Van Apeldoorn et al (90) -0.43 -0.92 to 0.06 0.09 Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Weissman et al (91) 0.24 -0.62 to 1.10 0.59 Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Williams et al (92) 0.07 -0.22 to 0.36 0.64 Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
Overall 0.02 -0.07 to 0.10 0.74					
					-1,00 0,00 1.00 2,00
				-	

Favors pharmacotherapy Favors psychotherapy

CBT – cognitive-behavioral therapy, REBT – rationale emotive behavior therapy, IPT – interpersonal psychotherapy, DYN – psychodynamic therapy, BT – behavior therapy, Supp Ex – supportive-expressive therapy, ind – individual format, grp – group format, gp – delivered by a general practitioner, n – delivered by a nurse

Figure 2 Differential effects of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy (Hedges' g)

Table 3 Standar	dized regression c	oefficients of char	acteristics of p	sychotherapy a	nd pharmacotherapy	studies

		Full model			Parsimonious model			
		Coef.	95% CI	р	Coef.	95% CI	р	
Disorder								
	MDD	Ref.						
	Dysthymia	-0.01	-0.46 to 0.43					
	Other mood disorder	0.02	-0.42 to 0.45					
	Panic disorder	-0.10	0.42 to 0.21					
	SAD	0.12	-0.28 to 0.53					
	OCD	0.52	0.01 to 1.03	< 0.05	0.76	0.36 to 1.15	< 0.001	
	Other anxiety disorder	0.32	-0.30 to 0.95					
Recruitment from c	linical samples only	0.05	-0.17 to 0.26					
Adults in general vs	s. specific target group	-0.41	-0.70 to-0.13	< 0.01	-0.27	-0.50 to - 0.05	< 0.05	
Psychotherapy								
	CBT	Ref.						
	ITP	-0.16	-0.45 to 0.12					
	Counseling	-0.51	-0.92 to -0.19	< 0.05	-0.41	-0.72 to -0.09	< 0.05	
	Other therapy	-0.03	-0.39 to 0.33					
Pharmacotherapy								
	SSRI	Ref.						
	TCA	0.32	0.06 to 0.58	< 0.05	0.31	0.11 to 0.50	< 0.01	
	MAOI	0.07	-0.34 to 0.48					
	Other	-0.23	-0.51 to 0.05					
Individual psychoth	nerapy format	0.01	-0.27 to 0.28					
Number of psychotl	herapy sessions	0.01	-0.02 to 0.04					
Quality of study		0.00	-0.07 to 0.08					
Country								
	USA	Ref.						
	Europe	0.26	0.03 to 0.49	< 0.05	0.18	0.00 to 0.36	< 0.05	
	Other	-0.00	-0.31 to 0.31					
Constant		0.31	-0.29 to 0.91		0.09	-0.12 to 0.29		

MDD – major depressive disorder, SAD – social anxiety disorder, OCD – obsessive-compulsive disorder, CBT – cognitive-behavioral therapy, ITP – interpersonal psychotherapy, SSRI – selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor, TCA – tricyclic antidepressant, MAOI – monoamine oxidase inhibitor

disorders (32 on major depressive disorder, four on dysthymia, and four on mixed mood disorders) and 27 on anxiety disorders (11 on panic disorder with or without agoraphobia, six on OCD, seven on SAD, two on PTSD, and one on GAD). Many studies (n=32) recruited patients exclusively from clinical samples, and most (n=56) were aimed at adults in general instead of a more specific population (such as older adults or patients with a comorbid somatic disorder). Most psychotherapies (49 of the 78 that were examined in these studies) were characterized as CBT; 11 studies examined IPT, five problem-solving therapy, six non-directive counseling, four psychodynamic therapies, and the remaining three other therapies. Most therapies (n=62) used an individual treatment format, and the number of treatment sessions ranged from 6 to 20, with most therapies (n=45) having between 12 and 18 sessions. The

antidepressants that were examined in the studies included SSRIs (n=37), TCAs (n=20), SNRIs (n=2), MAOIs (n=7), and treatment protocols with different types of antidepressant medication (n=12). Most studies were conducted in the United States (n=27) or in Europe (n=23).

Quality assessment

The quality of the studies varied. Twenty-seven studies reported an adequate sequence generation, while the other 40 did not. Twenty-four studies reported allocation to conditions by an independent (third) party. Forty-nine studies reported blinding of outcome assessors or used only self-report outcomes, whereas 18 did not report blinding. Forty-two studies conducted intention-to-treat analyses (a post-treatment score was analyzed for every patient even if the last observation prior to attrition had to be carried forward or that score was estimated from earlier response trajectories). Twenty studies met all four quality criteria, four studies met three criteria, and the remaining 43 studies met two criteria or less.

Comparative effects of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy

The overall mean effect size indicating the difference between psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy at post-test for all 78 comparisons was 0.02 (95% CI: -0.07 to 0.10; Table 2), in favor of psychotherapy, but not significantly different from zero. Heterogeneity was moderate to high (I²=62; 95% CI: 52 to 70). The results of these overall analyses are presented in Figure 2.

Removing possible outliers (in which the 95% CI of the effect size did not overlap with the 95% CI of the pooled effect size) resulted in a small, non-significant effect size in favor of pharmacotherapy and somewhat lower heterogeneity ($I^2=41$; low to moderate).

In this meta-analysis, we included ten studies in which two psychological treatments were compared with the same pharmacotherapy group, as well as one study in which one psychological treatment was compared with two different types of antidepressant medication. This means that multiple comparisons from these studies, not independent from each other, were included in the same analysis, which may have resulted in an artificial reduction of heterogeneity and may have affected the pooled effect size. We examined the possible effects of this by conducting an analysis in which we included only one effect size per study. First, we included only the comparison with the largest effect size from these studies and then we conducted another analysis in which we included only the smallest effect size. As can be seen from Table 2, the resulting effect sizes as well as the levels of heterogeneity were comparable with the overall analyses.

We found no indications for publication bias. The effect size did not change after adjusting for publication bias according to Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill procedure, and according to this procedure no missing study had to be imputed.

Univariate moderator analyses

We examined whether there were significant differences between psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy in specific subgroups of studies. The results of these subgroup analyses are presented in Table 2. We found that the effect size was significantly associated with the type of disorder (p<0.01). More specifically, we found that pharmacotherapy was more efficacious than psychotherapy in dysthymia (differential effect size: g=-0.30; 95% CI: -0.60 to -0.00; $I^2=55$; 95% CI: 0 to 83). By contrast, psychotherapy was more efficacious than pharmacotherapy in OCD (differential effect size: g=0.64; 95% CI: 0.20 to 1.08; $I^2=72$; 95% CI: 36 to 88).

We also found that type of pharmacotherapy was significantly associated with the differential effect size (p<0.05). Treatment with a TCA was significantly less efficacious than psychotherapy (g=0.21; 95% CI: 0.04 to 0.39; $I^2=52$; 95% CI: 19 to 71), while there was no significant difference between other types of pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy. Furthermore, we found that treatment with non-directive supportive counseling was less efficacious than pharmacotherapy (g=-0.33; 95% CI: -0.64 to -0.02; $I^2=69$; 95% CI: 27 to 87).

We did not find that the effect size was associated with the treatment format in psychotherapy, recruitment method of patients, country where the study was conducted, or the quality of the study.

Multivariate meta-regression analyses

Because we found several important moderators of outcome in the univariate moderator analyses, we decided to conduct a multivariate meta-regression analysis in which we entered the relevant predictors simultaneously. The results of these analyses are presented in Table 3. The effects of psychotherapy were still significantly higher than those of pharmacotherapy in studies on OCD, even after adjusting for other characteristics of the included studies. We also found that non-directive supportive counseling was still significantly less efficacious than pharmacotherapy, and TCAs remained significantly less efficacious than psychotherapy. In dysthymia, psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy did no longer differ significantly from each other.

In the multivariate meta-regression analysis, the effects of two predictors became significant: studies in Europe had a higher pooled effect size (indicating superior effects of psychotherapy) than studies in other parts of the world, and pharmacotherapy was significantly more efficacious in studies among specific target groups (such as older adults and patients who also had a general medical disorder) than in those among adults in general.

We also conducted a (manual) back-step meta-regression analysis. In this analysis, we dropped the least significant variable in each step, until only significant predictors (p<0.05) were retained in the model (Table 3). In this parsimonious model, we found that the same predictors were significant as in the full meta-regression model.

DISCUSSION

In this meta-analysis, we found that the differences in effects between psychotherapy and antidepressant medication were small to non-existent for major depression, panic disorder and SAD. We also found evidence that pharmacotherapy was significantly more efficacious in dysthymia, and that psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious in OCD. Furthermore, pharmacotherapy was significantly more efficacious than non-directive counseling, and psychotherapy was significantly more efficacious than pharmacotherapy with TCAs. These associations remained significant when we controlled for other characteristics of the studies in multivariate meta-regression analysis, except for the differential effects in dysthymia, which were no longer significant. In these multivariate meta-regression analyses, we also found that psychotherapy was more efficacious in studies from Europe compared with those from other countries, and that pharmacotherapy was significantly more efficacious in studies among specific target groups than in those among adults in general.

The present results indicate that different kinds of antidepressants and psychotherapies have varying degrees of efficacy in treating depression and anxiety disorders. TCAs and nondirective counseling seemed to be less efficacious than the other treatments, although we found in an earlier meta-analysis that the lower effects of non-directive counseling may be caused in part by researcher allegiance (93). The finding that psychotherapy is less efficacious than pharmacotherapy in dysthymia is in line with earlier meta-analytic research (94). However, the number of studies is small and the difference was no longer statistically significant after adjusting for quality and other study characteristics. As such, the finding is not very stable and more research is needed to examine this issue.

In OCD, the outcomes are rather straightforward in that psychotherapy is clearly more efficacious than antidepressants, even adjusting for quality and other characteristics of the studies. This is the first meta-analysis to show that psychotherapy is more efficacious than pharmacotherapy. This finding is also important from a clinical perspective, because OCD is often regarded as the most severe anxiety disorder.

One of the strengths of this study is the broad range of disorders and treatments we included. But the study also has some limitations. First, for several disorders insufficient numbers of studies were available. We only had a few studies examining PTSD, GAD and dysthymia. Second, the quality of many of the included studies was not optimal. Third, because of the many differences between the studies, we only examined the differential effects of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy at post-test, and did not look at the longer-term effects. There are indications that psychotherapy may have sustained effects over the longer-term, while antidepressants do not have strong effects when the patients stop taking them (95). Fourth, we only considered the effects of treatments on the disorders they were designed to address. Finally, while it is well known that pharmacotherapies have several side effects, which are often reported in the studies, the idea that psychotherapies can have negative effects has only recently been recognized (96), and these negative effects are typically not reported in the studies. It was, therefore, not possible to compare psychotherapies and pharmacotherapies in terms of negative effects.

Despite the limitations, we can conclude that pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy have comparable effects in several depressive and anxiety disorders, but this is not true for all disorders, especially not for OCD and possibly dysthymia. Furthermore, most psychotherapies and pharmacotherapies are equally efficacious, but this again is not true for all treatments, especially for TCAs and non-directive supportive counseling. Finally, while treatments may be equal in effects, they may not be equal in terms of patient preferences and costs, which deserve further investigations across disorders.

References

- Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O et al. National Comorbidity Survey Replication. The epidemiology of major depressive disorder: results from the National Comorbidity Survey Replication (NCS-R). JAMA 2003;289:3095-105.
- Kessler RC, Berglund P, Demler O et al. Lifetime prevalence and ageof-onset distributions of DSM-IV disorders in the National Comorbidity Survey Replication. Arch Gen Psychiatry 2005;62:593-602.
- 3. Mathers CD, Loncar D. Projections of global mortality and burden of disease from 2002 to 2030. PLoS Med 2006;3:e442.
- Berto P, D'Ilario D, Ruffo P et al. Depression: cost-of-illness studies in the international literature: a review. J Ment Health Policy Econ 2000;3:3-10.
- 5. Greenberg PE, Birnbaum HG. The economic burden of depression in the US: societal and patient perspectives. Exp Opin Pharmacother 2005;6:369-76.
- Smit F, Cuijpers P, Oostenbrink J et al. Excess costs of common mental disorders: population based cohort study. J Ment Health Policy Econ 2006; 9:193-200.
- 7. Ustun TB, Ayuso-Mateos JL, Chatterji S et al. Global burden of depressive disorders in the year 2000. Br J Psychiatry 2004;184:386-92.
- Saarni SI, Suvisaari J, Sintonen H et al. Impact of psychiatric disorders on health-related quality of life: general population survey. Br J Psychiatry 2007;190:326-32.
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE). Depression; the treatment and management of depression in adults. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence: Holborn, 2009.
- Bauer M, Bschor T, Pfennig A et al. World Federation of Societies of Biological Psychiatry (WFSBP) guidelines for biological treatment of unipolar depressive disorders in primary care. World J Biol Psychiatry 2007;8:67-104.
- Bandelow B, Sher L, Bunevicius R et al. Guidelines for the pharmacological treatment of anxiety disorders, obsessive-compulsive disorder and posttraumatic stress disorder in primary care. Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract 2012;16:77-84.
- 12. Cuijpers P, van Straten A, van Oppen P et al. Are psychological and pharmacological interventions equally effective in the treatment of adult depressive disorders? A meta-analysis of comparative studies. J Clin Psychiatry 2008;69:1675-85.
- Mitte K. Meta-analysis of cognitive-behavioral treatments for generalized anxiety disorder: a comparison with pharmacotherapy. Psychol Bull 2005;131:785-95.
- 14. Spielmans GI, Berman MI, Usitalo AN. Psychotherapy versus second-generation antidepressants in the treatment of depression; a meta-analysis. J Nerv Ment Dis 2011;199:142-9.
- 15. Cuijpers P, van Straten A, Andersson G et al. Psychotherapy for depression in adults: a meta-analysis of comparative outcome studies. J Consult Clin Psychol 2008;76:909-22.
- Barth J, Munder T, Gerger H et al. Comparative efficacy of seven psychotherapeutic interventions for depressed patients: results of a network meta-analysis. Submitted for publication.
- 17. Cuijpers P, Geraedts AS, van Oppen P et al. Interpersonal psychotherapy of depression: a meta-analysis. Am J Psychiatry 2011;168: 581-92.
- Driessen E, Cuijpers P, de Maat SCM et al. The efficacy of shortterm psychodynamic psychotherapy for depression: a meta-analysis. Clin Psychol Rev 2010;30:25-36.

- Cuijpers P, Driessen E, Hollon SD et al. The efficacy of non-directive supportive therapy for adult depression: a meta-analysis. Clin Psychol Rev 2010;32:280-91.
- Higgins JPT, Green S (eds). Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions. Version 5.0.1. Cochrane Collaboration, 2008.
- 21. Hedges LV, Olkin I. Statistical methods for meta-analysis. San Diego: Academic Press, 1985.
- Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ 2003;327:557-60.
- Ioannidis JPA, Patsopoulos NA, Evangelou E. Uncertainty in heterogeneity estimates in meta-analyses. BMJ 2007;335:914-6.
- Orsini N, Higgins J, Bottai M et al. Heterogi: Stata module to quantify heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. Boston: Boston College Department of Economics, 2005.
- Duval S, Tweedie R. Trim and fill: a simple funnel-plot-based method of testing and adjusting for publication bias in meta-analysis. Biometrics 2000;56:455-63.
- Bakhshani NM, Lashkaripour K, Sadjadi SA. Effectiveness of short term cognitive behavior therapy in patients with generalized anxiety disorder. J Med Sci 2007;7:1076-81.
- Bakker A, van Dyck R, Spinhoven P et al. Paroxetine, clomipramine, and cognitive therapy in the treatment of panic disorder. J Clin Psychiatry 1999;60:831-8.
- Barber J, Barrett MS, Gallop R et al. Short-term dynamic psychotherapy versus pharmacotherapy for major depressive disorder: a randomized, placebo-controlled trial. J Clin Psychiatry 2012;73:66-73.
- 29. Barlow DH, Gorman JM, Shear MK et al. Cognitive-behavioral therapy, imipramine, or their combination for panic disorder: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2000;283:2529-36.
- 30. Barrett JE, Williams JW, Oxman TE et al. Treatment of dysthymia and minor depression in primary care: a randomized trial in patients aged 18 to 59 years. J Fam Pract 2001:50:405-12.
- Bedi N, Chilvers C, Churchill R et al. Assessing effectiveness of treatment of depression in primary care. Partially randomised preference trial. Br J Psychiatry 2000;177:312-8.
- Black DW, Wesner R, Bowers W et al. A comparison of fluvoxamine, cognitive therapy, and placebo in the treatment of panic disorder. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1993;50:44-50.
- Blackburn IM, Moore RG. Controlled acute and follow-up trial of cognitive therapy and pharmacotherapy in out-patients with current depression. Br J Psychiatry 1997;171:328-34.
- Blanco C, Heimberg RG, Schneier FR et al. A placebo-controlled trial of phenelzine, cognitive behavioral group therapy, and their combination for social anxiety disorder. Arch Gen Psychiatry 2010; 67:286-95.
- Blomhoff S, Haug TT, Hellström K et al. Randomised controlled general practice trial of sertraline, exposure therapy and combined treatment in generalised social phobia. Br J Psychiatry 2001;179:23-30.
- 36. Browne G, Steiner M, Roberts J et al. Sertraline and/or interpersonal psychotherapy for patients with dysthymic disorder in primary care: 6-month comparison with longitudinal 2-year follow-up of effectiveness and costs. J Affect Dis 2002;68:317-30.
- Clark DM, Salkovskis PM, Hackman A et al. A comparison of cognitive therapy, applied relaxation and imipramine in the treatment of panic disorder. Br J Psychiatry 1994;164:759-69.
- Dannon PN, Gon-Usishkin M, Gelbert A et al. Cognitive behavioral group therapy in panic disorder patients: the efficacy of CBGT versus drug treatment. Ann Clin Psychiatry 2004;16:41-6.
- 39. David D, Szentagotai A, Lupu V et al. Rational emotive behavior therapy, cognitive therapy, and medication in the treatment of major depressive disorder: a randomized clinical trial, posttreatment outcomes, and six-month follow-up. J Clin Psychol 2008;64:728-46.
- 40. Davidson JRT, Foa EB, Huppert JD et al. Fluoxetine, comprehensive cognitive behavioral therapy, and placebo in generalized social phobia. Arch Gen Psychiatry 2004;61:1005-13.

- 41. Dekker JJM, Koelen JA, Van HL et al. Speed of action: the relative efficacy of short psychodynamic supportive psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy in the first 8 weeks of a treatment algorithm for depression. J Affect Disord 2008;109:183-8.
- 42. Dunlop BW, Kelley ME, Mletzko TC et al. Depression beliefs, treatment preference, and outcomes in a randomized trial for major depressive disorder. J Psychiatr Res 2012;46:375-81.
- Dunner DL, Schmaling KB, Hendrickson H et al. Cognitive therapy versus fluoxetine in the treatment of dysthymic disorder. Depression 1996;4:34-41.
- 44. Elkin I, Shea MT, Watkins JT, Imber SD, Sotsky SM, Collins JF, et al. National Institute of Mental Health Treatment of Depression Collaborative Research Program. General effectiveness of treatments. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1989;46:971-82.
- 45. Faramarzi M, Alipor A, Esmaelzadeh S et al. Treatment of depression and anxiety in infertile women: cognitive behavioral therapy versus fluoxetine. J Affect Disord 2008;108:159-64.
- 46. Finkenzeller W, Zobel I, Rietz S et al. Interpersonal psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy for post-stroke depression. Feasibility and effectiveness. Nervenarzt 2009;80:805-12.
- 47. Foa EB, Liebowitz MR, Kozak MJ et al. Randomized, placebocontrolled trial of exposure and ritual prevention, clomipramine, and their combination in the treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. Am J Psychiatry 2005;162:151-61.
- Frank E, Cassano GB, Rucci P et al. Predictors and moderators of time to remission of major depression with interpersonal psychotherapy and SSRI pharmacotherapy. Psychol Med 2011;41:151-62.
- Frommberger U, Stieglitz RD, Nyberg E et al. Comparison between paroxetine and behaviour therapy in patients with posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD): a pilot study. Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract 2004; 8:19-23.
- 50. Hegerl U, Hautzinger M, Mergl R et al. Effects of pharmacotherapy and psychotherapy in depressed primary-care patients: a randomized, controlled trial including a patients' choice arm. Int J Neuropsychopharmacol 2010;13:31-44.
- 51. Heimberg RG, Liebowitz MR, Hope DA et al. Cognitive behavioral group therapy vs phenelzine therapy for social phobia: 12week outcome. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1998;55:1133-41.
- Hendriks GJ, Keijsers GP, Kampman M et al. A randomized controlled study of paroxetine and cognitive-behavioural therapy for late-life panic disorder. Acta Psychiatr Scand 2010;122:11-9.
- 53. Hoexter MQ, de Souza Duran FL, D'Alcante CC et al. Gray matter volumes in obsessive-compulsive disorder before and after fluoxetine or cognitive-behavior therapy: a randomized clinical trial. Neuropsychopharmacology 2012;37:734-45.
- 54. Hollon SD, DeRubeis RJ, Evans MD et al. Cognitive therapy and pharmacotherapy for depression: singly and in combination. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1992;49:774-81.
- 55. Jarrett RB, Schaffer M, McIntire D et al. Treatment of atypical depression with cognitive therapy or phenelzine: a double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1999;56:431-7.
- 56. Keller MB, McCullough JP, Klein DN et al. A comparison of nefazodone, the cognitive behavioral-analysis system of psychotherapy, and their combination for the treatment of chronic depression. N Engl J Med 2000;342:1462-70.
- 57. Kolk BA, Spinazzola J, Blaustein ME et al. A randomized clinical trial of eye movement desensitization and reprocessing (EMDR), fluoxetine, and pill placebo in the treatment of posttraumatic stress disorder: treatment effects and long-term maintenance. J Clin Psychiatry 2007;68:37-46.
- Koszycki D, Taljaard M, Segal S et al. A randomized trial of sertraline, self-administered cognitive behavior therapy, and their combination for panic disorder. Psychol Med 2011;41:373-83.
- 59. Lesperance F, Frasure-Smith N, Koszycki D et al. Effects of citalopram and interpersonal psychotherapy on depression in patients with coronary artery disease: the Canadian Cardiac

Randomized Evaluation of Antidepressant and Psychotherapy Efficacy (CREATE) trial. JAMA 2007;297:367-79.

- 60. Loerch B, Graf-Morgenstern M, Hautzinger M et al. Randomised placebo-controlled trial of moclobemide, cognitive-behavioural therapy and their combination in panic disorder with agoraphobia. Br J Psychiatry 1999;174:205-12.
- 61. Markowitz JC, Kocsis JH, Bleiberg KL et al. A comparative trial of psychotherapy and pharmacotherapy for "pure" dysthymic patients. J Affect Disord 2005;89:167-75.
- 62. Marshall MB, Zuroff DC, McBride C et al. Self-criticism predicts differential response to treatment for major depression. J Clin Psychol 2008;64:231-44.
- 63. Martin SD, Martin E, Rai SS et al. Brain blood flow changes in depressed patients treated with interpersonal psychotherapy or venlafaxine hydrochloride: preliminary findings. Arch Gen Psychiatry 2001;58:641-8.
- McBride C, Segal Z, Kennedy S et al. Changes in autobiographical memory specificity following cognitive behavior therapy and pharmacotherapy for major depression. Psychopathology 2007;40:147-52.
- 65. McKnight DL, Nelson-Gray RO, Barnhill J. Dexamethasone suppression test and response to cognitive therapy and antidepressant medication. Behav Ther 1992;1:99-111.
- McLean PD, Hakstian AR. Clinical depression: comparative efficacy of outpatient treatments. J Consult Clin Psychol 1979;47:818-36.
- Miranda J, Chung JY, Green BL et al. Treating depression in predominantly low-income young minority women: a randomized controlled trial. JAMA 2003;290:57-65.
- Mohr DC, Boudewyn AC, Goodkin DE et al. Comparative outcomes for individual cognitive-behavior therapy, supportive-expressive group psychotherapy, and sertraline for the treatment of depression in multiple sclerosis. J Consult Clin Psychol 2001;69: 942-9.
- 69. Mörtberg E, Clark DM, Sundin O et al. Intensive group cognitive treatment and individual cognitive therapy vs. treatment as usual in social phobia: a randomized controlled trial. Acta Psychiatr Scand 2007;115:142-54.
- 70. Murphy GE, Simons AD, Wetzel RD et al. Cognitive therapy and pharmacotherapy. Singly and together in the treatment of depression. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1984;41:33-41.
- Murphy GE, Carney RM, Knesevich MA et al. Cognitive behavior therapy, relaxation training and tricyclic antidepressant medication in the treatment of depression. Psychol Rep 1995;77:403-20.
- 72. Mynors-Wallis LM, Gath DH, Day A et al. Randomised controlled trial of problem solving treatment, antidepressant medication, and combined treatment for major depression in primary care. BMJ 2000;320:26-30.
- Nakatani E, Nakagawa A, Nakao T et al. A randomized controlled trial of Japanese patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder – effectiveness of behavior therapy and fluvoxamine. Psychother Psychosom 2005;74:269-76.
- 74. Nazari H, Momeni N, Jariani M et al. Comparison of eye movement desensitization and reprocessing with citalopram in treatment of obsessive-compulsive disorder. Int J Psychiatry Clin Pract 2011;15:270-4.
- 75. Oosterbaan DB, van Balkom AJLM, Spinhoven P et al. Cognitive therapy versus moclobemide in social phobia: a controlled study. Clin Psychol Psychother 2001;8:263-73.
- 76. Prasko J, Dockery C, Horacek J et al. Moclobemide and cognitive behavioral therapy in the treatment of social phobia. A six-month controlled study and 24 months follow up. Neuroendocrinol Lett 2006;27:473-81.
- 77. Ravindran AV, Anisman H, Merali Z et al. Treatment of primary dysthymia with group cognitive therapy and pharmacotherapy: clinical symptoms and functional impairments. Am J Psychiatry 1999;156:1608-17.
- 78. Reynolds CF, Miller MD, Pasternak RE et al. Treatment of bereavement-related major depressive episodes in later life: a controlled

study of acute and continuation treatment with nortriptyline and interpersonal psychotherapy. Am J Psychiatry 1999;156: 202-8.

- 79. Rush AJ, Beck AT, Kovacs M et al. Comparative efficacy of cognitive therapy and pharmacotherapy in the treatment of depressed outpatients. Cogn Ther Res 1977;1:17-38.
- Salminen JK, Karlsson H, Hietala J et al. Short-term psychodynamic psychotherapy and fluoxetine in major depressive disorder: a randomized comparative study. Psychother Psychosom 2008;77: 351-7.
- 81. Schulberg HC, Block MR, Madonia MJ et al. Treating major depression in primary care practice. Eight-month clinical outcomes. Arch Gen Psychiatry 1996;53:913-9.
- Scott AI, Freeman CP. Edinburgh primary care depression study: treatment outcome, patient satisfaction, and cost after 16 weeks. BMJ 1992;304:883-7.
- 83. Shamsaei F, Rahimi A, Zarabian MK et al. Efficacy of pharmacotherapy and cognitive therapy, alone and in combination in major depressive disorder. Hong Kong J Psychiatry 2008;18:76-80.
- 84. Shareh H, Gharraee B, Atef-Vahid MK et al. Metacognitive therapy (MCT), fluvoxamine, and combined treatment in improving obsessive-compulsive, depressive and anxiety symptoms in patients with obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD). Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci 2010;4:17-25.
- 85. Sharp DM, Power KG, Simpson RJ et al. Fluvoxamine, placebo, and cognitive behaviour therapy used alone and in combination in the treatment of panic disorder and agoraphobia. J Anxiety Disord 1996;10;219-42.
- 86. Sharp DJ, Chew-Graham C, Tylee A et al. A pragmatic randomised controlled trial to compare antidepressants with a community-based psychosocial intervention for the treatment of women with postnatal depression: the RESPOND trial. Health Technol Assess 2010;14:43.
- Sousa MB, Isolan LR, Oliveira RR et al. A randomized clinical trial of cognitive-behavioral group therapy and sertraline in the treatment of obsessive compulsive disorder. J Clin Psychiatry 2006;67:1133-9.
- 88. Spinhoven P, Onstein EJ, Klinkhamer RA et al Panic management, trazodone and a combination of both in the treatment of panic disorder. Clin Psychol Psychother 1996;3:86-92.
- 89. Thompson LW, Coon DW, Gallagher-Thompson D et al. Comparison of desipramine and cognitive/behavioral therapy in the treatment of elderly outpatients with mild-to-moderate depression. Am J Geriatr Psychiatry 2001;9:225-40.
- 90. van Apeldoorn FJ, van Hout WJPJ, Mersch PPA et al. Is a combined therapy more effective than either CBT or SSRI alone? Results of a multicenter trial on panic disorder with or without agoraphobia. Acta Psychiatr Scand 2008;117: 260-70.
- 91. Weissman MM, Prusoff BA, Dimascio A et al. The efficacy of drugs and psychotherapy in the treatment of acute depressive episodes. Am J Psychiatry 1979;136:555-8.
- 92. Williams JW, Barrett J, Oxman T et al. Treatment of dysthymia and minor depression in primary care: a randomized controlled trial in older adults. JAMA 2000;284:1519-26.
- Cuijpers P, Driessen E, Hollon SD et al. The efficacy of non-directive supportive therapy for adult depression: a meta-analysis. Clin Psychol Rev 2010;32:280-91.
- 94. Cuijpers P, van Straten A, Schuurmans J et al. Psychotherapy for chronic major depression and dysthymia: a meta-analysis. Clin Psychol Rev 2010;30:51-62.
- 95. Imel ZE, Malterer MB, McKay KM et al. A meta-analysis of psychotherapy and medication in unipolar depression and dysthymia. J Affect Disord 2008;110:197-206.
- 96. Barlow DH. Negative effects from psychological treatments. Am Psychol 2010;65:13-20.

DOI 10.1002/wps.20038