

**GRADE table for pairwise meta-analysis of couple interventions (not included in NMA)**

**Table 34. Clinical evidence profile for comparison behavioural couples therapy versus waitlist**

Quality assessment							Number of participants		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Behavioural couples therapy	Waitlist	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Depression symptoms as measured by BDI change score (follow-up mean 15 weeks; better indicated by lower values)</b>												
1 (Beach 1992)	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	15	15	SMD 1.18 lower (1.96 to 0.4 lower)	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Marital adjustment as measured by DAS change score (follow-up mean 15 weeks; better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1 (Beach 1992)	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	15	15	SMD 1.21 higher (0.42 to 2.00 higher)	-	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

Abbreviations. BDI: Beck Depression Inventory; DAS: Dyadic Adjustment Scale

1 Very serious risk of bias due to unclear risk of selection bias (unclear randomisation method and unclear allocation concealment method), high risk of performance bias (non-blind), unclear risk of detection bias (blinding of outcome assessor unclear), unclear risk of attrition bias (drop-out not reported), and high risk of selective reporting bias (discontinuation not reported, and follow-up data cannot be extracted)

2 Imprecision downgraded by 1 level as the 95% confidence interval crosses thresholds for both clinically important benefit and no effect

**Table 35. Clinical evidence profile for comparison behavioural couples therapy versus CBT individual**

Quality assessment							Number of participants		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Behavioural couples therapy	CBT individual	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Depression symptoms as measured by BDI change score (follow-up mean 15 weeks; better indicated by lower values)</b>												
1	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	15	15	SMD 0.36 higher (0.36 lower to 1.08 higher)	-	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Marital adjustment as measured by DAS change score (follow-up mean 15 weeks; better indicated by higher values)</b>												
1	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious <sup>2</sup>	none	15	15	SMD 1.23 higher (0.44 to 2.02 higher)	-	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

Abbreviations. BDI: Beck Depression Inventory; DAS: Dyadic Adjustment Scale

1 Very serious risk of bias due to unclear risk of selection bias (unclear randomisation method and unclear allocation concealment method), high risk of performance bias (non-blind), unclear risk of detection bias (blinding of outcome assessor unclear), unclear risk of attrition bias (drop-out not reported), and high risk of selective reporting bias (discontinuation not reported, and follow-up data cannot be extracted)

2 Imprecision downgraded by 1 level as the 95% confidence interval crosses thresholds for both clinically important benefit and no effect

**Table 36. Clinical evidence profile for comparison CBT individual versus waitlist**

Quality assessment							Number of participants		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT individual	Waitlist	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
<b>Depression symptoms as measured by BDI change score (follow-up mean 15 weeks; better indicated by lower values)</b>												
1	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	15	15	SMD 1.44 lower (2.25 to 0.62 lower)	-	LOW	CRITICAL
<b>Marital adjustment as measured by DAS change score (follow-up mean 15 weeks; better indicated by higher values)</b>												

Quality assessment							Number of participants		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	CBT individual	Waitlist	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute		
1	randomised trials	very serious <sup>1</sup>	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious <sup>2</sup>	none	15	15	SMD 0.19 lower (0.91 lower to 0.52 higher)	-	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

Abbreviations. BDI: Beck Depression Inventory; DAS: Dyadic Adjustment Scale

1 Very serious risk of bias due to unclear risk of selection bias (unclear randomisation method and unclear allocation concealment method), high risk of performance bias (non-blind), unclear risk of detection bias (blinding of outcome assessor unclear), unclear risk of attrition bias (drop-out not reported), and high risk of selective reporting bias (discontinuation not reported, and follow-up data cannot be extracted)

2 Imprecision downgraded by 2 levels as 95% confidence interval crosses thresholds for both clinically important benefit and harm, and threshold for no effect