

G.10 Managing non-cognitive symptoms

G.10.1 Interventions for treating illness emergent non-cognitive symptoms in people living with dementia

- What are the most effective pharmacological interventions for managing illness emergent non-cognitive symptoms, such as psychosis, depression, behavioural changes in people living with dementia?
- What are the most effective non-pharmacological interventions for managing illness emergent non-cognitive symptoms, such as psychosis, depression, behavioural changes in people living with dementia?

G.10.1.1 Anxiety and depression

Sertraline vs placebo (12-13 weeks)

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
3 (Banerjee, Lyketos, Weintraub)	Not serious	Serious ²	Not serious	Serious ³	348	MD -1.12 (-4.26, 2.01)	Low
Hamilton Depression Rating Scale – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Lyketos)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	44	MD -4.10 (-8.77, 0.57)	Low
Improvement in mADCS-CGIC – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Weintraub)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	131	OR 1.01 (0.52, 1.97)	Moderate
Mini Mental State Examination – higher numbers favour sertraline							
2 (Banerjee, Lyketos)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	217	MD -0.25 (-1.48, 0.97)	Moderate
Activities of daily living – lower numbers favour sertraline							
2 (Banerjee, Lyketos)	Not serious	Serious ²	Not serious	Serious ³	217	SMD 0.10 (-0.46, 0.65)	Low
NPI – lower numbers favour sertraline							
2 (Banerjee, Lyketos)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	217	MD 1.35 (-2.88, 5.58)	Moderate

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Quality of life (patient-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	173	MD 0.30 (-3.40, 4.01)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	173	MD -1.98 (-6.16, 2.21)	Low
Quality of life (patient-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	173	MD -3.44 (-10.86, 3.98)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	173	MD 0.61 (-5.8, 6.59)	Low
Carer burden (Zarit) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	173	MD -0.50 (-4.28, 3.27)	Moderate
Carer mental health (GHQ) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	173	MD 1.47 (0.06, 2.89)	High
SF-12 (physical) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	173	MD 1.28 (-1.48, 4.03)	Moderate
SF-12 (mental) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	173	MD -2.99 (-5.87, -0.11)	High
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proxy-reported outcomes. 2. i^2 value > 40%. 3. Non-significant result. 							

Sertraline vs placebo (24-39 weeks)

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
2 (Banerjee, Weintraub)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	281	MD 0.16 (-1.16, 1.49)	Low
Improvement in mADCS-CGIC – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Weintraub)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	131	OR 1.23 (0.64, 2.35)	Moderate
Mini Mental State Examination – higher numbers favour sertraline							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD -0.55 (-1.89, 0.79)	Moderate
Bristol Activities of Daily Living – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD 1.63 (-1.01, 4.27)	Moderate
NPI – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD 2.02 (-294, 6.97)	Moderate
Quality of life (patient-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD -1.76 (-5.75, 2.23)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD 2.69 (-1.77, 7.15)	Low
Quality of life (patient-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD -4.34 (-12.56, 3.88)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD -0.27 (-6.77, 6.24)	Low
Carer burden (Zarit) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD -0.09 (-4.15, 3.98)	Moderate
Carer mental health (GHQ) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD 0.43 (-1.09, 1.95)	Moderate
SF-12 (physical) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD -1.68 (-4.58, 1.22)	Moderate
SF-12 (mental) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	150	MD 0.09 (-2.94, 3.11)	Moderate
Any adverse events – lower numbers favour sertraline							
3 (Banerjee, Lyketos, Weintraub)	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ⁴	385	RR 1.59 (1.24, 2.05)	Moderate
Serious adverse events – lower numbers favour sertraline							
2 (Banerjee, Weintraub)	Not serious	Serious ²	Not serious	Very serious ⁵	347	RR 1.34 (0.51, 3.54)	Very low

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1. Proxy-reported outcomes. 2. i^2 value > 40%. 3. Non-significant result. 4. 95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval. 5. 95% CI crosses two line of a defined MID interval.							

Mirtazapine vs placebo (13 weeks)

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD 0.01 (-1.37, 1.38)	Moderate
Mini Mental State Examination – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -0.27 (-1.48, 0.94)	Moderate
Bristol Activities of Daily Living – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -0.04 (-2.44, 2.36)	Moderate
NPI – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -3.56 (-8.07, 0.96)	Moderate
Quality of life (patient-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -0.06 (-3.52, 3.39)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD 3.13 (-1.09, 7.35)	Low
Quality of life (patient-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD 2.00 (-5.18, 9.19)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD 3.62 (-2.31, 9.55)	Low
Carer burden (Zarit) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -1.11 (-4.93, 0.65)	Moderate
Carer mental health (GHQ) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -0.57 (-0.84, 1.98)	Moderate

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
SF-12 (physical) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD -0.53 (-2.20, 3.26)	Moderate
SF-12 (mental) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	180	MD 0.52 (-2.31, 3.36)	Moderate
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proxy-reported outcomes. 2. Non-significant result. 							

Mirtazapine vs placebo (39 weeks)

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -0.66 (-2.12, 0.79)	Moderate
Mini Mental State Examination – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -1.71 (-2.48, 0.14)	Moderate
Bristol Activities of Daily Living – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD 1.19 (-1.37, 3.75)	Moderate
NPI – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -1.51 (-6.25, 3.24)	Moderate
Quality of life (patient-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -0.03 (-3.80, 3.75)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported DEMQoL) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD 3.69 (-0.77, 8.16)	Low
Quality of life (patient-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -1.18 (-9.25, 6.89)	Moderate
Quality of life (carer-reported EQ-5D) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD 1.11 (-7.44, 5.21)	Low
Carer burden (Zarit) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -2.80 (-6.99, 1.38)	Moderate

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Carer mental health (GHQ) – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -0.61 (-2.12, 0.90)	Moderate
SF-12 (physical) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD 0.02 (-2.84, 2.88)	Moderate
SF-12 (mental) – higher numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	158	MD -0.31 (-3.28, 2.66)	Moderate
Any adverse events – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	215	RR 1.56 (1.06, 2.30)	Moderate
Serious adverse events – lower numbers favour sertraline							
1 (Banerjee)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Very serious ⁴	215	RR 0.92 (0.47, 1.82)	Low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Proxy-reported outcomes. 2. Non-significant result. 3. 95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval. 4. 95% CI crosses two line of a defined MID interval. 							

Psychological treatment vs usual care

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression – lower numbers favour treatment							
6 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ⁴	439	SMD -0.22 (-0.41, -0.03)	Low
Anxiety (RAID) – lower numbers favour treatment							
2 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	65	MD -4.57 (-7.81, -1.32)	Moderate
Anxiety (self-rating) – lower numbers favour treatment							
2 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Very serious ⁵	65	SMD 0.05 (-0.44, 0.54)	Very low
Anxiety (NPI-A) – lower numbers favour treatment							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	26	MD -2.40 (-4.96, 0.16)	Low
Quality of life (self-rating) – higher numbers favour treatment							
3 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	334	MD 0.37 (-1.01, 1.75)	Low
Quality of life (proxy-rating) – higher numbers favour treatment							
2 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	313	MD 0.66 (-0.77, 2.09)	Low
Activities of daily living – lower numbers favour treatment							
2 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ⁴	313	SMD -0.13 (-0.35, 0.09)	Low
Neuropsychiatric symptoms – lower numbers favour treatment							
2 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Serious ²	Not serious	Very serious ⁵	311	SMD -0.10 (-0.68, 0.48)	Very low
Mini Mental State Examination – higher numbers favour treatment							
4 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Not serious	Not serious	Serious ³	381	MD -0.97 (-2.01, 0.08)	Low
Caregiver depression – lower numbers favour treatment							
3 (Ortega systematic review)	Serious ¹	Serious ²	Not serious	Very serious ⁵	337	SMD -0.07 (-0.55, 0.41)	Very low
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of clarity about allocation concealment and blinding. 2. i^2 value > 40%. 3. Non-significant result. 4. 95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval. 5. 95% CI crosses two line of a defined MID interval. 							

PATH (Problem Adaptation Therapy) vs ST-CI (Supportive Therapy for Cognitively Impaired Older Adults)

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression (MADRS) – lower numbers favour PATH							
1 (Kiosses)	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Not serious	74	MD -0.60 (-1.06, -0.13)	Moderate
Depression (Rate of full remission: MADRS ≤7) – higher numbers favour PATH							
1 (Kiosses)	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Serious ²	74	HR 3.67 (1.20, 11.26)	Low
Depression (Rate of partial remission: MADRS ≤10) – higher numbers favour PATH							
1 (Kiosses)	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Serious ²	74	HR 2.85 (1.03, 7.91)	Low
Disability (WHODAS II) – lower numbers favour PATH							
1 (Kiosses)	Not serious	N/A	Serious ¹	Not serious	74	MD -0.67 (-1.14, -0.20)	Moderate
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Study also contains people with mild cognitive impairment 95% CI crosses one line of a defined MID interval 							

Structured depression management vs usual care (nursing-homes)

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression prevalence (Cornell scale >7) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD 0.6% (-5.6, 6.8)	Moderate
Depression prevalence (GDS8 >2) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD -4.5% (-15.0, 6.0)	Moderate
Severe depression prevalence (Cornell scale >11) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD 2.4% (-2.4, 7.2)	Moderate
Severe depression prevalence (GDS8 >4) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD -0.3% (-0.8, 0.1)	Moderate
Depression (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD 0.3 (-0.3, 0.9)	Moderate
Depression (GDS8) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD -0.3 (-0.7, 0.1)	Moderate
EQ-VAS – higher numbers favour intervention							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Leontjevas)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	393	MD 3.4 (0.5, 6.3)	High
1. Non-significant result.							

Psychogeriatric management vs usual care

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression z score* – lower numbers favour psychogeriatric case management							
1 (Brodaty)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	44	MD 0.03 (-0.65, 0.72)	Moderate
Depression z score* – lower numbers favour psychogeriatric consultation							
1 (Brodaty)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	45	MD -0.11 (-0.95, 0.74)	Moderate
Psychosis z score* – lower numbers favour psychogeriatric case management							
1 (Brodaty)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD 0.31 (-0.42, 1.04)	Moderate
Psychosis z score* – lower numbers favour psychogeriatric consultation							
1 (Brodaty)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	393	MD 0.25 (-0.50, 1.00)	Moderate
*Calculated as the highest standardised score on any of the trial outcome measures for that individual							
1. Non-significant result.							

Ambient bright light vs standard lighting

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression in men with bright morning light (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hickman)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	66	MD 2.62 (0.72, 4.52)	Low
Depression in men with bright evening light (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hickman)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	66	MD 1.13 (-0.69, 2.95)	Very low
Depression in men with bright all-day light (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hickman)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	66	MD 1.64 (-0.20, 3.48)	Very low
Depression in women with bright morning light (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hickman)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	66	MD -1.61 (-3.49, 0.27)	Very low
Depression in women with bright evening light (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Hickman)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	66	MD 0.09 (-2.11, 2.29)	Very low
Depression in women with bright all-day light (Cornell Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Hickman)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	66	MD 1.41 (-0.55, 3.37)	Very low
1. Crossover design with potentially serious confounding. Outcome assessment not adequately blinded. 2. Non-significant result.							

Active music therapy vs reading

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Quality of life (DQOL) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD 0.03 (-0.51, 0.57)	Low
Self-esteem (DQOL) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD 0.06 (-0.40, 0.52)	Low
Positive affect (DQOL) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD 0.12 (-0.33, 0.57)	Low
Absence of negative affect (DQOL) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD 0.04 (-0.33, 0.41)	Low
Feelings of belonging (DQOL) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD 0.11 (-0.27, 0.49)	Low
Sense of aesthetics (DQOL) – higher numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD -0.05 (-0.47, 0.37)	Low
Depression (Geriatric Depression Scale) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Cooke)	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	47	MD 0.24 (-1.46, 1.94)	Low
1. Crossover design with potentially serious confounding. 2. Non-significant result.							

Preferred music listening vs usual care

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Anxiety (RAID) – lower numbers favour intervention							

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
1 (Sung)	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	52	MD -0.42 (-2.92, 2.08)	Very low
1. Lack of appropriate blinding. Cluster randomised study with only 1 cluster. 2. Non-significant result.							

High-intensity exercise vs non-exercise activity program

Number of RCTs	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Geriatric Depression Scale (4 months) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Boström)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	183	MD -0.05 (-0.84, 0.75)	Moderate
Geriatric Depression Scale (7 months) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Boström)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	184	MD -0.06 (-0.89, 0.76)	Moderate
Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (4 months) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Boström)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	183	MD 0.06 (-1.60, 1.73)	Moderate
Montgomery-Asberg Depression Rating Scale (7 months) – lower numbers favour intervention							
1 (Boström)	Not serious	N/A	Not serious	Serious ¹	184	MD 0.16 (-1.57, 1.89)	Moderate
1. Non-significant result.							