CBT compared with other psychotherapy for people with bulimia nervosa

Outcomes	№ of participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
				Risk with another psychotherapy	Risk difference with CBT
Number of people who did not show remission at end of treatment	1031 (10 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [1]	**RR 0.84** (0.72 to 0.97)	588 per 1000	494 per 1000 (423 to 570)
Mean bulimic symptom scores at the end of treatment	907 (10 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [1]	-	-	SMD **0.18 lower** (0.40 lower to 0.04 higher)
Mean bulimic symptom scores at the end of treatment- without Wilfley 1993	871 (9 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [1]	-	-	SMD **0.23 lower** (0.45 lower to 0.01 lower)
Number of people who dropped out due to adverse events	73 (2 RCT)	⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW [1,2,3]	**RR 1.00** (0.07 to 14.21)	28 per 1000	28 per 1000 (2 to 395)
Number of people who dropped out due to any reason	1128 (11 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [1]	**RR 1.11** (0.88 to 1.39)	246 per 1000	273 per 1000 (216 to 342)
Mean depression scores at the end of treatment	615 (9 RCT)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [1,2]	-	-	SMD **0.27 lower** (0.60 lower to 0.07 higher)
Mean depression scores at the end of treatment- Without Wilfley 1993	579 (8 RCT)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [1,2]	-	-	SMD **0.36 lower** (0.71 lower to 0.02 lower)
Mean end of trial scores of general psychiatric symptoms	117 (4 RCT)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [1,2]	-	-	SMD **0.18 lower** (0.55 lower to 0.18 higher)
Mean difference in psychosocial/interpersonal functioning at end of treatment	400 (5 RCT)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [1,2]	-	-	SMD **0.36 lower** (0.95 lower to 0.23 higher)
Mean difference in psychosocial/interpersonal functioning at end of treatment -without Wilfley 1993	364 (4 RCT)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW [1,2]	-	-	SMD **0.53 lower** (1.21 lower to 0.15 higher)
Mean weight/BMI at end of treatment	505 (6 RCT)	⊕⊕⊕◯ MODERATE [1]	-	-	SMD **0.04 higher** (0.13 lower to 0.22 higher)

***The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI). CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;**

1. Unclear or high risk of bias
2. Wide confidence intervals
3. Only two events, so extremely sparse data

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence
High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect
Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different
Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect
Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect