H.5 Non-pharmacological management

H.5.1 Psychological therapies

RQ8: What is the effectiveness of psychological therapies for AMD?

Problem solving treatment vs usual care (delayed treatment)

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Depression at 6 m	onths (better inc	dicated by lower v	alues)					
1 (Rovner 2007)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	206	RR 0.74 (0.44, 1.24)	LOW
Mean difference in	Hamilton Depre	ession Rating Sco	ore (6 months) (be	tter indicated by	lower values)			
1 (Rovner 2007)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	206	MD 0.01 (-1.14, 1.16)	LOW
No. of lost activitie	s at 6 months (b	etter indicated by	lower values)					
1 (Rovner 2007)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	206	RR 0.66 (0.45, 0.98)	LOW
Mean difference in	NEI VFQ-17 so	core at 6 months (better indicated by	higher values)				
1 (Rovner 2007)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	206	MD 1.48 (-1.05, 4.01)	LOW

- 1. Downgraded one level for single-masked design
- 2. Downgraded one level for confidence interval crossing 1 line of a defined minimal important difference
- 3. Downgraded one level for non-significant result

Problem solving treatment vs supportive therapy

Number of						Sample	Effect size (95%	
studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	size	CI)	Quality

© NICE 2018. All rights reserved. See Notice of rights.

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Targeted Vision F	unction at 6	months (better indi	cated by lower val	ues)				
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 0.03 (-0.21, 0.27)	VERY LOW
Activities Inventor	y at 6 month	s (better indicated	by lower values)					
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 0.01 (-0.29, 0.31)	VERY LOW
NEI-VFQ total sco	ore at 6 mont	ths (better indicated	by higher values)					
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Very serious ³	141	MD 1.60 (-2.71, 5.91)	VERY LOW
NEI-VFQ QoL So	cial Function	ing at 6 months (be	etter indicated by h	igher values)				
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 2.53 (-4.19, 9.25)	VERY LOW
NEI-VFQ QoL Me	ental Health (better indicated by	higher values)					
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 5.50 (-1.14, 12.14)	VERY LOW
NEI-VFQ QoL Ro	le Functionin	ng at 6 months (bett	ter indicated by hig	jher values)				
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD -0.70 (-6.17, 4.77)	VERY LOW
NEI-VFQ QoL De	pendency at	6 months (better in	ndicated by higher	values)				
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 6.10 (-1.55, 13.75)	VERY LOW
Control strategies	: selective pr	rimary control at 6 r	nonths (better indi	cated by higher v	/alues)			
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	141	MD -1.00 (-1.79, -0.21)	LOW
Control strategies	: compensat	ory primary control	at 6 months (bette	er indicated by hig	gher values)			
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 0.20	VERY LOW

[©] NICE 2018. All rights reserved. See Notice of rights.

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality	
							(-1.40, 1.80)		
Control strategies: selective secondary control at 6 months (better indicated by higher values)									
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 0.10 (-1.30, 1.50)	VERY LOW	
Control strategies:	compensator	y secondary contr	ol at 6 months (be	etter indicated by	higher values)				
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	141	MD 1.20 (-0.02, 2.42)	VERY LOW	
1 (Rovner 2013)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	,		MD 1.20 (-0.02, 2.42)	VI	

- Downgraded one level for single masked; unclear if important differences in those included and those lost to follow up
- 2. Downgraded one level for non-significant result
- 3. Downgraded one level for confidence interval crossing 2 lines of a defined minimal important difference

Psychosocial intervention programme vs usual care

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsisten cy	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Mean difference F	Positive affect (PANAS) score at	7-9 weeks follow	v up (better indicate	ed by lower values	3)		
1 (Birk 2004)	Non- randomised trial	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	22	MD -0.12 (-0.58, 0.34)	VERY LOW
Mean difference r	negative affect	(PANAS) score at	7-9 weeks (bett	er indicated by high	ner values)			
1 (Birk 2004)	Non- randomised trial	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	22	MD 0.53 (0.13, 0.93)	LOW
Mean difference g	geriatric depres	sion scale (GDS)	score at 7-9 we	eks (better indicated	d by higher values	s)		
1 (Birk 2004)	Non- randomised trial	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	22	MD 1.45 (0.31, 2.59)	LOW
Mean difference a	activities of dail	y living score at 7	-9 weeks (better	indicated by higher	values)			

[©] NICE 2018. All rights reserved. See Notice of rights.

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsisten cy	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality		
1 (Birk 2004)	Non- randomised trial	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	22	MD 6.10 (1.18, 11.02)	LOW		
Mean difference	Mean difference perceived autonomy at 7-9 weeks (better indicated by lower values)									
1 (Birk 2004)	Non- randomised trial	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	20	MD -1.80 (-3.62, 0.02)	VERY LOW		
Mean difference	active problem	orientation score a	at 7-9 weeks (be	etter indicated by lov	wer values)					
1 (Birk 2004)	Non- randomised trial	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	20	MD -3.50 (-7.22, 0.22)	VERY LOW		

^{1.} Downgraded one level for no randomisation performed; allocation sequence not adequately generated; unmasked; large proportional of drop outs; unclear if comparison group received any other psychosocial therapy during course of the study

Self-management vs waiting list for age-related macular degeneration

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Mean difference total	al profile of mod	od states (POMS	s) score at 6 month	ns (better indicated	by lower values)			
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	214	MD -11.78 (-18.43, -5.13)	LOW
Mean difference NE	I-VFQ-25 total	score at 6 month	ns (better indicated	d by higher values)				
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	213	MD 2.63 (0.23, 5.03)	LOW
Mean difference AM	D self-efficacy	scale total score	at 6 months (bett	er indicated by higl	ner values)			
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	213	MD 5.64 (2.11, 9.17)	MODERATE

[©] NICE 2018. All rights reserved. See Notice of rights.

^{2.} Downgraded one level for non-significant result

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Mean difference in I	POMS total s	core at 6 months a	among those with	depression at bas	eline (better indica	ated by lower valu	ies)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	51	MD -26.24 (-42.40, -10.08)	MODERATE
Mean difference in t	total NEI-VFC	Q-25 at 6 months a	mong those with	depression at bas	eline (better indica	ted by higher val	ues)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	50	MD 6.12 (0.12, 12.12)	LOW
Mean difference in I	POMS total s	core at 6 months a	among those witho	out depression at	baseline (better in	dicated by lower	values)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	162	MD 2.67 (-3.76, 9.10)	LOW
Mean difference in t	total NEI-VFC	Q-25 at 6 months a	mong those witho	out depression at b	paseline (better inc	licated by higher	values)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	161	MD -0.83 (-3.29, 1.63)	LOW
Mean difference in A	AMD self-effic	cacy score at 6 mo	onths amongst tho	se with depressio	n at baseline (bett	er indicated by hi	gher values)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Not serious	66	MD 9.87 (2.31, 17.43)	MODERATE
Mean difference in A	AMD self-effic	cacy score at 6 mo	onths amongst tho	se without depres	sion at baseline (b	etter indicated by	y higher values)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	161	MD 1.42 (-2.22, 5.06)	LOW
Mean difference in	geriatric depre	ession scale total	score at 6-months	amongst those w	rith a diagnosis of	depression at bas	seline (better indicate	ed by lower values)
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	32	MD -1.82 (-4.40, 0.56)	LOW
Mean difference Du	ıke Social Su	pport Index-11 sco	ore at 6 months an	nong those with d	epression at basel	ine (better indica	ted by higher values)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	32	MD 5.72 (-3.37, 14.81)	LOW
Mean difference life	orientation to	est at 6-months an	nongst those with	depression at bas	seline (better indica	ated by higher va	lues)	
1 (Brody 2002)	RCT	Serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ³	32	MD -0.87	LOW

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
							(-3.72, 1.98)	

- 1. Downgraded one level for single masked; unclear if important differences in those included and those lost to follow up
- 2. Downgraded one level for confidence interval crossing 1 line of a defined minimal important difference
- 3. Downgraded one level for non-significant result

Behavioural activation and low vision rehabilitation (LVR) vs supportive therapy and LVR

Number of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Sample size	Effect size (95% CI)	Quality
Mean difference total	profile of mo	od states (POMS)) score at 6 month	s (better indicated	by lower values)			
1 (Rovner 2014)	RCT	Very serious ¹	N/A	Not serious	Serious ²	188	RR 0.59 (0.29, 1.17)	VERY LOW
1 Downgraded	two levels fo	r single masked:	differences in has	alina characteristics	hetween those w	ho did and did n	ot complete follow-ur	1

- Downgraded two levels for single masked; differences in baseline characteristics between those who did and did not complete follow-up
- 2. Downgraded one level for confidence interval crossing 1 line of a defined minimal important difference