



Appendix 5. Risk of bias assessments for studies included in the systematic review

Innehåll

Appendix 5. Risk of bias assessments for studies included in the systematic review	1
Studies of psychological interventions – CBT	2
Studies of psychological interventions – ACT.....	3
Studies of psychological interventions – MBSR	4
Studies of pharmacological interventions – Duloxetine	5
Studies of pharmacological interventions – Pregabalin.....	6
Studies of psychoeducational interventions	7
Studies of guided physical activity	8
Studies of acupuncture	9
Interventions evaluated in only one study.....	10

Studies of psychological interventions – CBT















		Risk of bias						
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Overall
Study	Alda 2011	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Castel 2012	-	+	-	+	+	+	-
	Falcão 2008	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
	Karlsson 2015	+	+	+	-	-	+	-
	Lumley 2017	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	McCrae 2019	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
	Vallejo 2015	+	-	+	-	+	+	-
	Woolfolk 2012	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

D1: Randomization process
D2: Deviations from intended interventions
D3: Missing outcome data
D4: Measurement of the outcome
D5: Selection of the reported result
D6: Conflict of interest


Judgement
- Unclear
+ Low

Studies of psychological interventions – ACT

Table 2. Risk of bias assessment for studies on treatment with ACT. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are presented.

		Risk of bias						
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Overall
Study	Luciano 2014							
	Simister 2018							

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest

Judgement
 Low

Studies of psychological interventions – MBSR

Table 3. Risk of bias assessment for studies on treatment with MBSR. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are presented.






















		Risk of bias						Overall
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	
Study	Cejudo 2019	-	-	+	-	+	+	-
	Schmidt 2011	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Sephton 2007	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
	Perez-Aranda 2019	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	VanGordon 2017	+	+	+	+	+	+	+

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest




Judgement
 - Unclear
 + Low

Studies of pharmacological interventions – Duloxetine

Table 4. Risk of bias assessment for studies on treatment with duloxetine. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are presented.






















		Risk of bias						
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Overall
Study	Arnold 2010							
	Arnold 2012							
	Murakami 2015							

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest




Judgement
 High
 Unclear
 Low

Studies of pharmacological interventions – Pregabalin

Table 5. Risk of bias assessment for studies on treatment with pregabalin. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are presented.

		Risk of bias						
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	Overall
Study	Arnold 2008							
	Ohta 2012							
	Pauer 2011							

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest

Judgement
 High
 Unclear
 Low

Studies of psychoeducational interventions

Table 6. Risk of bias assessment for studies of psychoeducational interventions. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are included.

Study	Risk of bias						Overall
	D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	
Barrenengoa-Cuadra 2021	+	-	+	-	+	+	-
Hammond 2006	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
Hsu 2010	+	-	+	+	+	X	-
Luciano 2011	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Musekamp 2019	-	-	-	-	+	+	-
Stuifbergen 2010	-	+	-	+	+	+	-

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest




Judgement
 X High
 - Unclear
 + Low

Studies of guided physical activity

Table 7. Risk of bias assessment for studies on treatment with guided physical activity. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are included.






















		Risk of bias						Overall
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	
Study	Altan 2009	+	-	+	+	+	+	-
	Baptista 2012	-	+	+	+	+	-	-
	Calandre 2009	+	-	-	-	+	+	-
	Carson 2010	-	-	+	+	-	+	-
	DaCosta 2005	+	-	-	+	-	+	-
	Fontaine 2010	-	+	-	+	+	+	-
	Haak 2008	-	-	+	-	+	+	-
	Kayo 2012	+	+	-	+	+	+	-
	Mannerkorpi 2010	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
	Paolucci 2016	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Richards 2002	+	-	+	+	-	+	-
	Wang 2010	+	+	+	+	+	X	+
	Wang 2018	+	+	-	+	+	+	-

D1: Randomization process
D2: Deviations from intended interventions
D3: Missing outcome data
D4: Measurement of the outcome
D5: Selection of the reported result
D6: Conflict of interest


Judgement
 High
 Unclear
 Low

Studies of acupuncture

Table 9. Risk of bias assessment for studies on treatment with acupuncture. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are included.

		Risk of bias						Overall
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	
Study	Assefi 2005							
	Targino 2008							
	Vas 2016							

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest




Judgement
 Low

Interventions evaluated in only one study

Table 10. Risk of bias assessment for interventions that have only been evaluated in one of the included studies. Only studies and outcomes with an overall risk of bias of low to moderate are included.

		Risk of bias						Overall
		D1	D2	D3	D4	D5	D6	
Study	Arnold 2007	-	+	-	+	+	X	-
	Ang 2013	-	-	+	-	+	+	-
	Broderick 2005	-	-	-	+	+	+	-
	Castro-Sanchez 2011 A	+	+	-	+	-	+	-
	Castro-Sanchez 2011 B	-	+	-	-	+	+	-
	Martinez 2014	+	-	-	+	+	+	-
	Mhalla 2011	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
	Miki 2016	+	+	+	+	+	X	+
	Ramzy 2017	+	-	+	+	-	+	-
	Scheidt 2013	-	-	+	-	+	+	-

D1: Randomization process
 D2: Deviations from intended interventions
 D3: Missing outcome data
 D4: Measurement of the outcome
 D5: Selection of the reported result
 D6: Conflict of interest

Judgement
 High
 Unclear
 Low