

**Table O.50: Psychoeducational interventions for family carers versus any control**

Quality assessment							Summary of findings				
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With any control	With psychoeducation		Risk with any control	Risk difference with psychoeducation (95% CI)
<b>Carer health and well-being (depression) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
75 (1 study) 4 weeks	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>2</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to risk of bias, imprecision	35	40	-		The mean carer health and well-being (depression) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.84 standard deviations lower (1.31 to 0.36 lower)
<b>Carer health and well-being (burnout) – follow-up (Better indicated by lower values)</b>											
90 (1 study) 8 weeks	serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>2</sup>	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊕ VERY LOW <sup>1,2</sup> due to risk of bias,	45	45	-		The mean carer health and well-being (burnout) – follow-up in the intervention groups was 0.35 standard deviations

Quality assessment						Summary of findings				
					imprecision					lower (0.77 lower to 0.06 higher)
<sup>1</sup> Crucial limitation for one criterion or some limitations for multiple criteria sufficient to lower ones confidence in the estimate of effect <sup>2</sup> Optimal information size not met; small, single study										