C.3 Cognitive therapy

Overview of the PICO structure

Definition of the	intervention					
	aims to identify and modify cognition regarding pain and disability. It is proposed that beliefs about the meaning of pain regarding control over pain can be directly modified using cognitive restructuring techniques such as imagery and attention					
PICO question						
Population and subgroups	Community-dwelling adults (aged 20 years and over) experiencing chronic primary low back pain, with or without leg pain, including older people (aged 60 years and older).					
	 Subgroups: Age (all adults and those aged 60 years and over) Gender and/or sex Presence of leg pain (radicular, non-radicular, mixed) Race/ethnicity - studies of populations who were historically marginalized compared with studies of those who were not Regional economic development - studies carried out in high-income countries compared with studies in low- to middle-income countries 					
Comparators	 a) Placebo/sham b) No or minimal intervention, or where the effect of the intervention can be isolated c) Usual care (described as usual care in the trial) 					

Critical outcomes constructs (all adults) Critical outcomes constructs (older adults, aged \geq 60 years)
• Pain
 Back-specific function/disability
 General function/disability
 Health-related quality of life
Psychosocial function Social portion
Social participation
• Self-efficacy
Adverse events (as reported in trials) Pain
 Back-specific function/disability
General function/disability
 Health-related quality of life
Psychosocial function
 Adverse events (as reported in trials)

Other Evidence-to-Decision (EtD) considerations

Summary of values and preferences								
All adults	Older people							
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	No evidence identified							

Summary of resource considerations					
All adults	Older people				

No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made	No evidence identified
based on experience of GDG members	

Summary of equity and human rights considerations							
All adults	Older people						
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	No evidence identified						

Summary of acceptability considerations							
All adults	Older people						
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	No evidence identified						

Summary of <i>feasibility considerations</i>							
All adults	Older people						
No evidence synthesis commissioned for all adults. Judgements made based on experience of GDG members	No evidence identified						

Summary of judgements

Domain	All adults	Older people			
Benefits	Trivial; uncertain	Uncertain			
Harms	Trivial; uncertain	Trivial; uncertain			
Balance benefits to harms	Uncertain	Uncertain			

Overall certainty	Very low	Very low			
Values and preferences	Important uncertainty or variability; possibly important uncertainty or variability	Important uncertainty or variability; possibly important uncertainty or variability			
Resource considerations	Moderate; large; varies	Moderate; large; varies			
Equity and human rights	Possibly reduced; no impact; uncertain; varies	Possibly reduced; no impact; uncertain; varies			
Acceptability	Probably yes; probably no; varies	Probably yes; probably no; varies			
Feasibility	Varies	Varies			

<u>GRADE Table 1</u>. What are the benefits and harms of cognitive therapy in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain) compared with <u>placebo</u>?

No trials.

<u>GRADE Table 2</u>. What are the benefits and harms of cognitive therapy in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain) compared with <u>no intervention</u>?

	Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cognitive therapy	No intervention	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% Cl)	Certainty	Importance
Pain - sh	ort term											
3	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	37	46	-	MD 2.74 lower (8.58 lower to 3.1 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	l, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d)						
Pain - inte	ermediate term	1										
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious ^c	not serious	serious ^b	none	5	6	-	MD 0.02 higher (0.98 lower to 1.02 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	l, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included stu	udy on this out	come)				
Pain - Ion	ig term											
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious ^c	not serious	serious ^b	none	4	5	-	MD 0.08 higher (0.93 lower to 1.09 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	l, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included stu	udy on this out	come)		•	•	
Back-spe	cific functiona	l status – sł	nort term									
4	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	133	93	-	SMD 0.1 lower (0.37 lower to 0.17 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	

			Certainty a	assessment			Nº o	f patients		Effect	Certainty	Importance
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cognitive therapy	No intervention	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% Cl)		
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	ed, only one included stu	udy on this out	come)	,			
Back-spe	cific functiona	l status - int	termediate term									
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious⁰	not serious	serious ^b	none	7	6	-	MD 4.09 lower (13.51 lower to 5.33 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	ed, only one included stu	udy on this out	come)				
Back-spe	cific functiona	l status - loi	ng term				- -					
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious ^c	not serious	serious ^b	none	6	5	-	MD 4.41 lower (14.11 lower to 5.29 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	n subarouns 1	2 3 and /	- not reported (n		rsis was performe	d, only one included stu	dy on this out	come)			verylow	
•	• ·		- 、	• • •	•	dentified that reported	•	•				
-	-	-	-	-	-			-	-	-	-	
						s identified that report				-		
-		-			-		-	-	_	-		
			e events: no stu			-		-		-	-	
					-							
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Psycholo	gical functioni											
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious ^c	not serious	serious ^b	none	8	7	-	MD 4.56 higher (7.66 lower to 16.78 higher)	⊕ 00 ○	

	Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect		
№ of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cognitive therapy	No intervention	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% Cl)	Certainty	Importance
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)				
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (anxiety)	- intermediate to	erm								
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious∘	not serious	serious ^b	none	7	6	-	MD 1.71 higher (10.65 lower to 14.07 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)				
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (anxiety)	- long term									
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious⁰	not serious	serious ^b	none	6	5	-	MD 6.23 lower (27.59 lower to 15.13 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)	1			
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (depress	ion) - short term	I								
2	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	24	25	-	MD 1.97 higher (1.41 lower to 5.34 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d)	_		<u> </u>		<u> </u>	
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (depress	ion) - intermedia	ate term								
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious⁰	not serious	serious ^b	none	7	6	-	MD 3.03 lower (10.6 lower to 4.54 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Domulatio		0.0 and 4				al ambu ana inalusta da 4						
ropulatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	uay on this out	come)				

			Certainty a	assessment			№ of patients		Effect			
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cognitive therapy	No intervention	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% Cl)	Certainty	Importance
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious ^c	not serious	serious ^b	none	6	5	-	MD 4.77 lower (12.33 lower to 2.79 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)				
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (coping)	- short term									
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious⁰	not serious	serious ^b	none	8	7	-	MD 29.46 higher (5.42 lower to 64.34 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)			••	
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (coping)	- intermediate te	rm								
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious∘	not serious	serious ^b	none	7	6	-	MD 27.26 higher (4.82 lower to 59.34 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)	1			
Psycholo	gical functioni	ng (coping)	- long term									
1	randomized trials	very seriousª	not serious⁰	not serious	serious ^b	none	6	5	-	MD 20.33 higher (8.31 lower to 48.97 higher)	⊕⊖⊖ ⊖ Very low	
Populatio	on subgroups 1	, 2, 3 and 4	- not reported (n	o subgroup analy	sis was performe	d, only one included st	udy on this out	come)		<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
Social pa	rticipation – sł	ort term, in	termediate term	or long term: no	studies identifie	ed that reported on th	is outcome					
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
Self-effica	acy – short teri	n, intermed	iate term or long	term: no studie	s identified that	reported on this outc	ome			I	II	

Certainty assessment							№ of patients		Effect			
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Cognitive therapy	No intervention	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% Cl)	Certainty	Importance
-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	

CI: confidence interval; MD: mean difference; SMD: standardized mean difference

Explanations

aRisk of bias downgraded by 2 levels: due to unclear or high risk of bias across all studies regarding random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants, blinding of care providers, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, selective reporting, similarity of groups at baseline, co-interventions, and compliance with the intervention.

^bImprecision downgraded by 1 level: low number of participants. ^cInconsistency not assessed because only one study included in this analysis.

<u>GRADE Table 3</u>. What are the benefits and harms of cognitive therapy in the management of community-dwelling adults (including older adults aged 60 years and over) with chronic primary low back pain (with or without leg pain) compared with <u>usual care</u>?

No trials.