APPENDIX 15: GRADE EVIDENCE PROFILE TABLES

1.1	Service delivery models2	2
1.1.1	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing integrated service models	
with stand	lard care	2
1.1.2	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing integrated assertive	
communit	y treatment with integrated case management	4
1.1.3	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing staffed accommodation with	
standard c	care	7
1.2	Psychological and psychosocial interventions	9
1.2.1	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing cognitive behavioural therapy	
with stand	lard care	9
1.2.2	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing motivational interviewing	
with stand	lard care1	1
1.2.3	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing cognitive behavioural therapy	y
plus motiv	vational interviewing with standard care12	2
1.2.4	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing group psychotherapy with	
standard c	are15	5
1.2.5	GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing contingency management	
with stand	lard care17	7

1.1 Service delivery models

1.1.1 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing integrated service models with standard care

			O1:1					Su	ımmary o	f findings		
			Quality assessn	nent			No. of pat	ients		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Integrated service models	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substance	use: 1. Substa	nce-use rating (h	igh = poor) - by 6	months (better ir	ndicated by lo	wer values)						
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.14 higher (0.26 lower to 0.54 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 1. Substa	nce-use rating (h	igh = poor) - by 12	2 months (better i	indicated by 1	ower values)						
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.22 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 1. Substa	nce-use rating (h	igh = poor) - by 18	8 months (better i	indicated by l	ower values)						
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.15 lower (0.55 lower to 0.25 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 1. Substa	nce-use rating (h	igh = poor) - by 24	1 months (better i	indicated by 1	ower values)						
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.05 higher (0.35 lower to 0.45 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 2. Days u	sed substances -	by 6 months (bett	er indicated by lo	ower values)							
1	Randomised trials	- 10 00	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.33 lower to 0.48 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 2. Days u	sed substances –	by 12 months (bet	tter indicated by	lower values)							
1	Randomised trials	- 10 00000	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.3 lower to 0.51 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 2. Days u	sed substances –	by 18 months (bet	tter indicated by	lower values)					•		•
1	Randomised trials		No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.09 higher (0.31 lower to 0.49 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Days u	sed substances -	by 24 months (bet	tter indicated by	lower values)							
1	Randomised trials			No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	SMD 0.13 higher (0.28 lower to 0.53 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

Service us	se: 1. Days in sta	able community	residences (not in	hospital) - by 6 i	nonths (bette	r indicated by low	ver values)						
1			No serious inconsistency		Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	MD 3.17 higher (0.52 lower to 6.86 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL	
Service us	se: 1. Days in sta	able community	residences (not in	hospital) - by 12	months (bett	er indicated by lo	wer values)						
1			No serious inconsistency		Very serious ^{1,2}	None	46	49	-	MD 2.84 higher (2.07 lower to 7.75 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL	
Service us	ervice use: 1. Days in stable community residences (not in hospital) – by 18 months (better indicated by lower values)												
1			No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	46	49	-	MD 6.46 higher (1.36 to 11.56 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Service us	se: 1. Days in sta	able community	residences (not in	hospital) - by 24	months (bett	er indicated by lo	wer values)						
1			No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	46	49	-	MD 5.7 higher (0.59 to 10.81 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	

¹Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met. ²CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.1.2 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing integrated assertive community treatment with integrated case management

			Ouglitz accord					Sı	ummary of f	indings		
			Quality assess	ment			No.	of patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Integrated act	Clinical case management	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Death - b	y 36 months											
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	7/208 (3.4%)	6/213 (2.8%)	RR 1.18 (0.39 to 3.57)	5 more per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 72 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Not in	remission - by	36 months - alco	hol							•	
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	43/75 (57.3%)	34/68 (50%)	RR 1.15 (0.84 to 1.56)	75 more per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 280 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 1. Not in	remission - by	36 months - drug	gs .								
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	26/45 (57.8%)	26/40 (65%)	RR 0.89 (0.63 to 1.25)	72 fewer per 1000 (from 240 fewer to 162 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Substa	ance abuse (SA	TS, low = poor) (s	kewed data) – by	y 6 months (b	etter indicated by	lower value	es)				
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	198	181	-	SMD 0.03 higher (0.17 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Substa	ance abuse (SA	TS, low = poor) (s	kewed data) – by	y 12 months (l	etter indicated b	y lower valu	ies)			•	
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	192	182	-	SMD 0.08 higher (0.23 lower to 0.39 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Substa	ance abuse (SA	TS, low = poor) (s	kewed data) - by	y 18 months (I	etter indicated b	y lower valu	ies)			,	
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	193	182	-	SMD 0.02 lower (0.22 lower to 0.19 higher)		CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Substa	ance abuse (SA	TS, low = poor) (s	kewed data) - by	y 24 months (l	etter indicated b	y lower valu	ies)		·	!	•
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	184	181	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.14 lower to 0.37 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

Substan	ce use: 2. Subst	ance abuse (SA	TS, low = poor) (skewed data) – b	y 30 months	better indicated l	by lower valu	ies)				
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	185	173	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.1 lower to 0.31 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substan	e use: 2. Subst	ance abuse (SA	TS, low = poor) (skewed data) – b	y 36 months	better indicated l	by lower valu	ies)				
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	183	177	-	SMD 0.05 higher (0.15 lower to 0.26 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Service ı	se: 1. Days in	stable commun	ity residences (no	t in hospital) – b	y 12 months	(better indicated l	by lower valu	ies)				
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	197	181	-	MD 10 lower (38.61 lower to 18.6 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service ı	ıse: 1. Days in s	stable commun	ity residences (no	t in hospital) – b	y 24 months	(better indicated l	by lower valu	ies)				
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	194	183	-	MD 8.54 higher (4.46 lower to 21.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service ı	ıse: 1. Days in s	stable commun	ity residences (no	t in hospital) – b	y 36 months	(better indicated l	by lower valu	ies)				
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	186	178	-	MD 5.17 higher (9.2 lower to 19.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 1. Average	general score	(GAS, low = poor) - by 6 months	(better indica	ted by lower valu	es)		,	•		
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	87	75	-	SMD 0.13 higher (0.18 lower to 0.43 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 1. Average	general score	(GAS, low = poor) - by 12 months	(better indicate	ated by lower val	ues)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	89	82	-	SMD 0.07 higher (0.23 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 1. Average	e general score	(GAS, low = poor) - by 18 months	(better indicate	ated by lower val	ues)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	90	86	-	SMD 0.11 higher (0.18 lower to 0.41 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 1. Average	general score	(GAS, low = poor) - by 24 months	(better indicate	ated by lower val	ues)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	81	85	-	SMD 0.18 higher (0.13 lower to 0.48 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 1. Average	general score	(GAS, low = poor) - by 30 months	(better indicate	ated by lower val	ues)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	84	80	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.37 lower to 0.24 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

Appendix 15 5

Function	ing: 1. Average	general score	(GAS, low = poor) - by 36 months	(better indica	ated by lower val	ues)							
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	85	85	-	SMD 0.04 higher (0.26 lower to 0.34 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Satisfact	ion: Average ge	eneral score (Q	OLI, low = poor)	- by 6 months (b	etter indicate	d by lower values	s)							
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	189	172	-	SMD 0.07 lower (0.28 lower to 0.14 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Satisfact	ion: Average ge	eneral score (Q	OLI, low = poor)	- by 12 months (better indicat	ed by lower value	es)							
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	193	179	-	SMD 0.01 higher (0.19 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Satisfact	atisfaction: Average general score (QOLI, low = poor) - by 18 months (better indicated by lower values)													
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	194	183	-	SMD 0.06 higher (0.17 lower to 0.29 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Satisfact	ion: Average ge	eneral score (Q	OLI, low = poor)	- by 24 months (better indicat	ed by lower value	es)	<u> </u>	•	<u>'</u>		•		
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	186	184	-	SMD 0.01 higher (0.2 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Satisfact	ion: Average ge	eneral score (Q	OLI, low = poor)	- by 30 months (better indicat	ed by lower value	es)	<u> </u>	•	<u>'</u>		•		
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	188	178	-	SMD 0.02 higher (0.19 lower to 0.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		
Satisfact	Satisfaction: Average general score (QOLI, low = poor) - by 36 months (better indicated by lower values)													
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	190	183	-	SMD 0.07 higher (0.13 lower to 0.27 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL		

¹Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met. ²CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.1.3 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing staffed accommodation with standard care

			0. 111					Sumi	nary of fi	ndings		
			Quality assessm	nent			No. of pati	ents		Effect		
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Staff accommodation	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substance	e use: 1. Days us	sed alcohol (low	= poor) - 3 months	(better indicated	by lower valu	ies)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	57	47	-	SMD 0.32 lower (0.71 lower to 0.07 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 1. Days us	sed alcohol (low	= poor) - 6 months	(better indicated	by lower valu	ies)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	49	48	-	SMD 0 higher (0.4 lower to 0.4 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 1. Days us	sed alcohol (low	= poor) - 9 months	(better indicated	by lower valu	ıes)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	45	37	-	SMD 0.05 lower (0.49 lower to 0.38 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance use: 2. Level of alcohol use (low = poor) - 3 months (better indicated by lower values)												
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	57	47	-	SMD 0.21 lower (0.6 lower to 0.18 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Level of	f alcohol use (lov	w = poor) - 6 montl	ns (better indicate	d by lower va	lues)	•	•			•	
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	49	48	-	SMD 0.06 lower (0.46 lower to 0.33 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Level of	f alcohol use (lov	w = poor) - 9 montl	ns (better indicate	d by lower va	lues)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	45	37	-	SMD 0.21 lower (0.65 lower to 0.23 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Days us	sed drugs (low =	poor) - 3 months (better indicated b	y lower value	es)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	57	47	-	SMD 0.22 lower (0.61 lower to 0.17 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Days us	sed drugs (low =	poor) - 6 months (better indicated b	y lower value	es)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	49	48	-	SMD 0.11 lower (0.51 lower to 0.28 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Days us	sed drugs (low =	poor) - 9 months (better indicated b	y lower value	es)						
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	45	37	-	SMD 0.04 lower (0.48 lower to 0.39 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

Appendix 15 7

Cubolos	a usas A. Carranita	of days use (1-	ur = moon) 2 maanti	na (hattau in diest	ad by laws	aluac)								
Substance		<u> </u>	w = poor) - 3 montl		, ,	,				0 m 0 4 4 1				
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very	None	57	47	-	SMD 0.14 lower (0.52	⊕⊕OO	CRITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		-			lower to 0.25 higher)	LOW			
Substance	e use: 4. Severity	y of drug use (lov	w = poor) - 6 montl	ns (better indicate	ed by lower va	alues)								
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very	None	49	48		SMD 0.18 lower (0.57	$\oplus \oplus OO$	CRITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		49	40	-	lower to 0.22 higher)	LOW	CKITICAL		
Substance	e use: 4. Severity	of drug use (lov	w = poor) - 9 montl	s (better indicate	ed by lower va	alues)		•						
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very	None	45	0.17		SMD 0.16 lower (0.6	⊕⊕00	CDITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		45	37	-	lower to 0.28 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
Functioni	ng: 1. Percentag	e of time on stre	ets (low = poor) - 3	months (better i	ndicated by lo	ower values)	,	,						
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Verv	None		45		SMD 0.04 higher (0.35	⊕⊕00	CDITTICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		57	47	-	lower to 0.42 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
Functioni	Functioning: 1. Percentage of time on streets (low = poor) – 6 months (better indicated by lower values)													
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very	None	40	40		SMD 0.06 lower (0.46	⊕⊕00	CDITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		49	48	-	lower to 0.34 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
Functioni	ng: 1. Percentag	e of time on stre	ets (low = poor) - 9	months (better i	ndicated by lo	ower values)								
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very	None	45	0.17		SMD 0.1 higher (0.34	⊕⊕00	CDITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		45	37	-	lower to 0.54 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
Functioni	ng: 2. Percentag	e of time in inde	ependent housing (low = poor) - 3 m	onths (better	indicated by lower	r values)	,						
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Verv	None	F.77	457		SMD 0.16 lower (0.55	⊕⊕00	CDITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		57	47	-	lower to 0.23 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
Functioni	ng: 2. Percentag	e of time in inde	ependent housing (low = poor) - 6 m	onths (better	indicated by lower	r values)							
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Verv	None	40	40		SMD 0.22 lower (0.61	⊕⊕00	CDITICAL		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		49	48	-	lower to 0.18 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
Functioni	ng: 2. Percentag	e of time in inde	ependent housing (low = poor) - 9 m	onths (better	indicated by lower	r values)			,				
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Verv	None				SMD 0.22 higher (0.22	⊕⊕00	on		
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		45	37	-	lower to 0.66 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL		
1 Ontimal	: (,		abinerous outle	mes OIS = 400 par	eti simontal mat mat	l		<u> </u>				

¹Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met. ²CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.2 Psychological and psychosocial interventions

1.2.1 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing cognitive behavioural therapy with standard care

			Quality assessi	m om t					Summary	of findings		
			Quality assessi	nent			No. of	patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	СВТ	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Substanc	e use: 1. Using s	ubstances – by 1	month - alcohol o	or drugs								
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	9/31 (29%)	18/30 (60%)	RR 0.48 (0.26 to 0.9)	31 fewer per 100 (from 6 fewer to 44 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Using s	ubstances – by 3	months - alcohol									
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	7/25 (28%)	1/21 (4.8%)	RR 5.88 (0.79 to 44.03)	23 more per 100 (from 1 fewer to 205 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Using s	ubstances – by 3	months - drugs									
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	12/25 (48%)	5/21 (23.8%)	RR 2.02 (0.85 to 4.8)	24 more per 100 (from 4 fewer to 90 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 2. Using s	ubstances - by 3	months - alcohol	or drugs					•			
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	20/31 (64.5%)	26/30 (86.7%)	RR 0.74 (0.55 to 1)	23 fewer per 100 (from 39 fewer to 0 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Any su	bstance (skewed	data) – average sc	ore (ASI) by 3 mo	onths (better in	dicated by lower	values)			·		•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,3}	None	31	31	-	MD 0.07 lower (0.16 lower to 0.02 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Any su	bstance (skewed	data) – average sc	ore (ASI) by 6 to	9 months (bett	er indicated by lo	wer value	s)				•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,3}	None	31	31	-	MD 0.06 lower (0.16 lower to 0.04 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Any su	bstance (skewed	data) - days repor	ting any substan	ce use (ASI) b	y 3 months (better	indicated	by lower va	alues)			
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2,3}	None	31	30	-	MD 2.1 lower (5.9 lower to 1.7 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	e use: 3. Any su	bstance (skewed	data) – days repor	rting any substan	ce use (ASI) b	y 6 months (better	indicated	by lower va	alues)			
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2,3}	None	31	30	-	MD 2.7 lower (7.25 lower to 1.85 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

Substance	use: 4. Drugs ı	use - by 3 month	ıs (skewed data) (b	etter indicated by	lower values)						
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,3}	None	54	49	-	MD 0.05 higher (1.55 lower to 1.66 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 5. Drugs ı	use - by 6 month	s (skewed data) -	days reporting dr	ug use (ASI) b	y 6 months (better	r indicated	by lower v	alues)			
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2,3}	None	29	28	-	MD 3.7 lower (7.99 lower to 0.59 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 6. Alcoho	l use - by 3 mon	ths (skewed data)	(better indicated	by lower value	es)						
2	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2,3}	None	54	49	-	MD 1.95 lower (4.48 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 7. Alcoho	l use – by 6 mon	ths (skewed data)	- days reporting a	lcohol use (A	SI) by 6 months (b	etter indic	ated by low	ver values)			•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2,3}	None	29	28	-	MD 0 higher (3.66 lower to 3.66 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met.

² CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

³ Skewed data.

GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing motivational interviewing with standard care 1.2.2

			Quality assessn	a on t					Summary	of findings		
			Quality assessii	ient			No. of	patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	MI	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	importance
Substance	use: 1. Not abs	tinent or not im	proved on all subst	ances - by 12 mo	nths			,				
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	5/13 (38.5%)	9/12 (75%)	RR 0.51 (0.24 to 1.1)	37 fewer per 100 (from 57 fewer to 8 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 2. Not abs	taining from alc	ohol - by 3 months		•							
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	6/15 (40%)	10/13 (76.9%)	RR 0.52 (0.26 to 1.03)	37 fewer per 100 (from 57 fewer to 2 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substance	use: 2. Not abs	taining from alc	ohol - by 6 months	3								
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	5/15 (33.3%)	12/13 (92.3%)	RR 0.36 (0.17 to 0.75)	59 fewer per 100 (from 23 fewer to 77 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance use: 3. Other measures of alcohol use (skewed data) - drinking days - by 6 months (better indicated by lower values)												
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,3}	None	15	13	-	SMD 1.29 lower (2.12 to 0.46 lower)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met. ² CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

³ Skewed data.

1.2.3 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing cognitive behavioural therapy plus motivational interviewing with standard care

			Ouglitz accord	m om t					Summary	of findings		
			Quality assessi	nent			No. of	patients		Effect		Importance
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT+MI	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Death - b	y about 1 year											
3	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	6/246 (2.4%)	8/246 (3.3%)	RR 0.73 (0.22 to 2.41)	9 fewer per 1000 (from 25 fewer to 46 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
								3.1%		8 fewer per 1000 (from 24 fewer to 44 more)		
Substance	e use: 1. Averag	e number of diff	ferent drugs used	during the past m	onth (OTI, hig	gh = poor) - by 3 r	nonths (be	tter indicate	ed by lower va	lues)	•	•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	58	61	-	MD 0.37 higher (0.01 lower to 0.75 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 1. Average	e number of diff	ferent drugs used o	during the past m	onth (OTI, hig	gh = poor) - by 6 r	nonths (be	tter indicate	d by lower va	lues)	•	
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	58	61	-	MD 0.19 higher (0.22 lower to 0.6 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Averag	e score – alcohol	(skewed data) - e	stimated daily co	nsumption – p	oast month - 3 mo	nths (better	r indicated l	by lower valu	es)	•	•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	21	31	-	MD 1.57 higher (0.9 lower to 4.04 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Average	e score – alcohol	(skewed data) - e	stimated daily co	nsumption – p	oast month - 6 mo	nths (better	r indicated	by lower valu	es)		•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	21	31	-	MD 1.21 higher (1.07 lower to 3.49 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 2. Average	e score – alcohol	l (skewed data) – a	lcohol – estimated	d daily consur	nption - past mon	th - 12 moi	nths (better	indicated by	lower values)		
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	18	28	-	MD 1.39 higher (1.1 lower to 3.88 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Averag	e score - amphe	tamine (skewed da	ıta) – amphetamiı	ne – estimated	daily consumption	n – past m	onth - 3 mo	nths (better in	ndicated by lower value	es)	
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	11	9	-	MD 0.09 higher (0.4 lower to 0.58 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substance	e use: 3. Average	e score – amphe	tamine (skewed da	ıta) – amphetamiı	ne – estimated	daily consumption	n – past m	onth - 6 mo	nths (better in	ndicated by lower value	es)	
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Serious ¹	None	11	9	-	MD 1.28 lower (2.79	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$	CRITICAL

	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness						lower to 0.23 higher)	MODERATE	
Substar	nce use: 3. Averag	e score – amphe	,	ata) – amphetami	ne – estimated	daily consumpti	on – past me	onth - 12 m	onths (better	indicated by lower valu	ļ	
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	9	8	-	MD 0.13 higher (0.11 lower to 0.37 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 4. Averag	e score – cannal	bis (skewed data) -	- cannabis – estim	ated daily con	sumption - past	month - 3 m	onths (bette	er indicated b	y lower values)		
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	39	34	-	MD 0.57 lower (4.27 lower to 3.13 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 4. Averag	e score – cannal	bis (skewed data) -	cannabis – estin	ated daily con	sumption - past	month - 6 m	onths (bette	er indicated b	y lower values)		
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	39	34	-	MD 0.7 higher (4 lower to 5.4 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 4. Averag	e score – cannal	bis (skewed data) -	cannabis – estin	ated daily con	sumption - past	month - 12 1	months (bet	ter indicated	by lower values)		
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	29	29	-	MD 4.41 higher (1.4 lower to 10.22 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 7. TLFB: I	Percentage of da	ays abstinent main	substance (skew	ed data) – 12 m	onths (better ind	icated by lo	wer values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	138	137	-	MD 6.81 higher (2.07 lower to 15.69 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 7. TLFB: I	Percentage of da	ays abstinent main	substance (skew	ed data) - 18 m	onths (better ind	icated by lo	wer values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	130	128	-	MD 1.21 lower (10.74 lower to 8.32 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 7. TLFB: I	Percentage of da	ays abstinent main	substance (skew	ed data) – 24 m	onths (better ind	icated by lo	wer values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	129	117	-	MD 2.52 higher (7.42 lower to 12.46 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 8. TLFB: I	Percentage of da	ays abstinent all su	bstance (skewed	data) - 12 mon	ths (better indica	ted by lowe	er values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	137	136	-	MD 5.73 higher (2.62 lower to 14.08 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 8. TLFB: I	Percentage of da	ays abstinent all su	bstance (skewed	data) - 18 mon	ths (better indica	ted by lowe	er values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	129	127	-	MD 0.3 lower (9.14 lower to 8.54 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substa	nce use: 8. TLFB: I	Percentage of da	ays abstinent all su	bstance (skewed	data) - 24 mon	ths (better indica	ited by lowe	er values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious	None	130	117	-	MD 7.07 higher (2.32 lower to 16.46 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functio	ning: 1. Average ş	global function	ing score (GAF, lov	w = poor) - 3 mor	ths (better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	58	61	-	MD 2.7 lower (7.05 lower to 1.65 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Functio	ning: 1. Average §	global function	ing score (GAF, lov	w = poor) - 6 mor	ths (better ind	icated by lower v	alues)					
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Serious ¹	None	58	61	-	MD 0.09 lower (3.7	⊕⊕⊕О	CRITICAL

	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness						lower to 3.52 higher)	MODERATE		
_		ļ	J				- \			lower to 3.52 flighter)	WODERATE		
Func	Functioning: 1. Average global functioning score (GAF, low = poor) - 9 months (better indicated by lower values)												
1	Randomised	sed No serious No serious No serious Serious¹ None		MD 8.44 higher (0.48 to	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$	CDITICAL							
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness			17	15	-		MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Functioning: 1. Average global functioning score (GAF, low = poor) - 12 months (better indicated by lower values)													
3	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very serious	None	100	202		MD 1.87 higher (2.36	⊕⊕OO	CDITICAL	
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness			196	202	-	lower to 6.11 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL	
Func	Functioning: 1. Average global functioning score (GAF, low = poor) - 18 to 24 months (better indicated by lower values)												
2	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very serious	None	104	100		MD 0.69 higher (3.86	⊕⊕OO	CRITICAL	
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness			134	128	-	lower to 5.25 higher)	LOW		
Func	tioning: 2. Average s	social functionin	g score (SFS, low :	poor) - by end o	f 9 month tre	atment (better ind	icated by lo	ower values)				
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Very	None	17	45		MD 5.01 higher (0.55	⊕⊕OO	CDITICAL	
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness	serious ^{1,2}		17	15	-	lower to 10.57 higher)	LOW	CRITICAL	
Func	tioning: 2. Average s	social functionin	g score (SFS, low	= poor) - by 12 m	onths (3 mont	hs following treat	ment end) ((better indic	ated by lowe	r values)			
1	Randomised	No serious	No serious	No serious	Serious ¹	None	17	4.5	_	MD 7.27 higher (0.86 to	$\oplus \oplus \oplus O$	CDITICAL	
	trials	limitations	inconsistency	indirectness			17	15	-		MODERATE		

¹ Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met. ² CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.2.4 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing group psychotherapy with standard care

			01.1			Summary of findings						
			Quality assess	sment			No. of patients	Effect				
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Social-skills training/psychoeducation	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Substanc	e use: 1. Avera	ige score - C-D	OIS-R Drugs (ske	wed data) - C-D	IS-R DRUGS	by 6 months (be	tter indicated by lower value	s)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	21	25	-	MD 2.99 lower (5.51 to 0.47 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	e use: 1. Avera	ige score - C-D	OIS-R Drugs (ske	wed data) - C-D	IS-R Drugs b	y 12 months (bet	ter indicated by lower values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	21	25	-	MD 2.47 lower (5.76 lower to 0.82 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Substanc	ce use: 1. Avera	ige score - C-D	OIS-R Drugs (ske	wed data) - C-D	IS-R Drugs b	y 18 months (bet	ter indicated by lower values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	7	18	-	MD 0.79 lower (3.35 lower to 1.77 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	ce use: 2. Avera	ige score - C-D	OIS-R Alcohol (sk	ewed data) - C-	DIS-R Alcoh	ol by 6 months (b	etter indicated by lower valu	ies)				•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	21	25	-	MD 1.81 lower (3.41 to 0.21 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substanc	ce use: 2. Avera	ige score - C-D	OIS-R Alcohol (sk	ewed data) - C-	DIS-R Alcoh	ol by 12 months (better indicated by lower val	ues)	•			•
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	21	25	-	MD 0.71 lower (2.54 lower to 1.12 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Substand	ce use: 2. Avera	ige score - C-D	OIS-R Alcohol (sk	ewed data) - C-	DIS-R Alcoh	ol by 18 months (better indicated by lower val	ues)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	7	18	-	MD 0.04 higher (2.27 lower to 2.35 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Function	ing: 1. Average	e role function	ing score (RFS, h	igh = better fun	ctioning) - by	y 6 months (better	r indicated by lower values)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	22	25	-	MD 0.61 higher (1.63 lower to 2.85 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL

Function	ning: 1. Average	e role function	ning score (RFS, I	nigh = better fur	nctioning) - b	y 12 months (bett	er indicated by lower values)					
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	22	25	-	MD 1.07 higher (1.15 lower to 3.29 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Function	ning: 1. Average	e role function	ning score (RFS, l	nigh = better fur	nctioning) - b	y 18 months (bett	er indicated by lower values)					
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	7	18	-	MD 2.55 lower (6.24 lower to 1.14 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	Functioning: 2. Average social adjustment score (SAS, high = better functioning) - by 6 months (better indicated by lower values)											
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	22	25	-	MD 0.92 lower (6.58 lower to 4.74 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ning: 2. Average	e social adjust	ment score (SAS	, high = better fr	ınctioning) -	by 12 months (be	tter indicated by lower values	s)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	22	25	-	MD 2.58 higher (3.39 lower to 8.55 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Function	ning: 2. Average	e social adjust	ment score (SAS	high = better fo	ınctioning) -	by 18 months (be	tter indicated by lower values)				
1	Randomised trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	7	18	-	MD 4.66 lower (15.29 lower to 5.97 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Service	use: Days in ho	spital (skewed	d data) (better in	dicated by lowe	r values)		•					
1	trials	No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious ^{1,2}	None	16	13	-	MD 1.8 higher (4.46 lower to 8.06 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL

¹ Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met. ² CI includes both (1) no effect and (2) appreciable benefit or appreciable harm.

1.2.5 GRADE profile for randomised controlled trials comparing contingency management with standard care

			Ouglitz access	.amb	Summary of findings								
			Quality assessm	ient	No. of pation	ents		Effect					
No. of studies	Design	Limitations	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Contingency management	Standard care	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance	
Substance	Substance use: 1. Number of days/weeks of drug use (confirmation by urine drug screen) – days of cocaine use (better indicated by lower values)												
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	15	15	-	SMD 1.04 lower (1.8 to 0.28 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Substance	Substance use: 2. Number of days/weeks of alcohol use (confirmation by breathalyser) (better indicated by lower values)												
2		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	37	34	-	SMD 1.21 lower (1.68 to 0.73 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Substance	e use: 3. Numbe	r of days/weeks	using both drugs a	nd alcohol (confi	rmation by u	rine or breathalys	er) - weeks (better	indicated b	y lower v	values)			
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	22	19	-	SMD 0.82 lower (1.47 to 0.17 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	
Substance	e use: 4. Alcohol	positive breath	alyser samples (bet	tter indicated by	lower values)	1							
1		No serious limitations	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious ¹	None	15	15	-	SMD 0.97 lower (3.03 to 0.91 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL	

¹ Optimal information size (for dichotomous outcomes, OIS = 300 events; for continuous outcomes, OIS = 400 participants) not met.