## Bilaga 6 Metaanalyser

## Meta-analyses: total population

## ACT compared to usual care

## 1.1 Average number of days in hospital per month

		ACT Standard care						Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Sytema 2007	3.4	5.4	58	4.3	7.3	57	3.7%	-0.90 [-3.25, 1.45]	
Killaspy 2006	9	8.9	124	8	7.8	119	4.6%	1.00 [-1.10, 3.10]	_ <b></b>
Lehman 1997	3.04	5.15	77	5.41	7	75	5.2%	-2.37 [-4.33, -0.41]	
Petersen 2005	5.11	7.7	263	6.57	8.73	244	9.0%	-1.46 [-2.90, -0.02]	
Salkever 1997	1.12	3.01	91	1.3	2.51	53	17.9%	-0.18 [-1.10, 0.74]	
Chandler 1996b (B)	0.67	2.55	115	0.96	2.07	114	29.2%	-0.29 [-0.89, 0.31]	
Chandler 1996b (A)	0.47	2.34	102	0.78	1.84	101	30.3%	-0.31 [-0.89, 0.27]	
Total (95% CI)			830			763	100.0%	-0.45 [-0.92, 0.02]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = 0.10; Chi² = 8.30, df = 6 (P = 0.22); l² = 28% Test for overall effect: Z = 1.89 (P = 0.06)									+ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$ $+$
									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 1.2 Admitted to hospital during study period

	ACT	Г	Standard	care		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Chandler 1996a (A)	27	127	28	129	16.1%	-0.00 [-0.11, 0.10]	
Chandler 1996a (B)	29	125	44	135	14.8%	-0.09 [-0.20, 0.01]	
Clarke 2000	54	117	25	61	9.3%	0.05 [-0.10, 0.20]	_ <b></b> -
Killaspy 2006	75	127	68	124	12.7%	0.04 [-0.08, 0.16]	
Lehman 1997	42	77	45	75	8.9%	-0.05 [-0.21, 0.10]	+
Petersen 2005	162	275	193	272	20.4%	-0.12 [-0.20, -0.04]	
Salkever 1997	31	104	32	69	9.8%	-0.17 [-0.31, -0.02]	<b>-</b> _
Stobbe 2014	4	32	4	30	8.1%	-0.01 [-0.18, 0.16]	<b>_</b>
Total (95% CI)		984		895	100.0%	-0.05 [-0.10, 0.00]	•
Total events	424		439				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 10.8	5, df = 7 (P	= 0.15)	; <b>i²</b> = 35%	)	
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 1.85 (	P = 0.0	6)				-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 1.3 Not remaining in contact with psychiatric services

	ACT	T .	Standard	care		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95%	CI
Stobbe 2014	6	32	15	30	5.2%	-0.31 [-0.54, -0.09]		
Sytema 2007	0	59	13	59	14.6%	-0.22 [-0.33, -0.11]	_ <b>_</b>	
Chandler 1996a (B)	14	125	39	135	16.8%	-0.18 [-0.27, -0.08]		
Chandler 1996a (A)	30	127	46	129	14.2%	-0.12 [-0.23, -0.01]		
Petersen 2005	21	275	47	272	24.6%	-0.10 [-0.15, -0.04]		
Killaspy 2006	2	127	11	124	24.7%	-0.07 [-0.13, -0.02]		
Total (95% CI)		745		749	100.0%	-0.14 [-0.19, -0.08]	•	
Total events	73		171					
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi <sup>a</sup>	<sup>2</sup> = 11.7	7, df = 5 (F	<sup>o</sup> = 0.04)	; I² = 58%	)	-1 -0.5 0	0.5 1
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 4.82 (	P < 0.0	0001)				Favours [experimental] Favours	

#### 1.4 Death - any cause

-	ACT	-	Standard	Standard care		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Petersen 2005	1	275	6	272	74.8%	-0.02 [-0.04, 0.00]	
Sytema 2007	1	59	2	59	8.3%	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.04]	<b>_</b> _
Killaspy 2006	3	127	4	124	16.0%	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.03]	
Stobbe 2014	5	32	3	30	1.0%	0.06 [-0.11, 0.22]	
Total (95% CI)		493		485	100.0%	-0.02 [-0.03, 0.00]	•
Total events	10		15				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 1.29	9, df = 3 (P	= 0.73);	I <sup>2</sup> = 0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.93 (	P = 0.0	5)				-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 1.5 Suicide

	ACT	Г	Standard	care		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Killaspy 2006	1	127	3	124	17.5%	-0.02 [-0.05, 0.01]	
Petersen 2005	1	275	4	272	66.4%	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.00]	
Sytema 2007	0	59	0	59	16.0%	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	<b>+</b>
Total (95% CI)		461		455	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.00]	•
Total events	2		7				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	: 0.00; Chi	i <sup>2</sup> = 0.5	5, df = 2 (P	= 0.76);	I² = 0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.54 (	(P = 0.1	2)				-0.1 -0.05 0 0.05 0.1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 1.6 Self-harm

	ACT	Г	Standard	tandard care		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Killaspy 2006	9	127	11	124	33.8%	-0.02 [-0.08, 0.05]	
Petersen 2005	22	275	27	272	66.2%	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.03]	
Total (95% CI)		402		396	100.0%	-0.02 [-0.06, 0.02]	•
Total events	31		38				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>z</sup> =	0.00; Chi	i <sup>z</sup> = 0.00	), df = 1 (P	<sup>2</sup> = 0.97);	I <b>²</b> = 0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.95 (	(P = 0.3	4)				-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 1.7 Global state (different scales)

		ACT		Stan	dard ca	re		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Killaspy 2006	-8.6	4.8	91	-9	5.9	75	26.1%	0.07 [-0.23, 0.38]	
Lehman 1997	45.9	13.9	67	39.1	13.7	58	20.2%	0.49 [0.13, 0.85]	_ <b></b>
Petersen 2005	51.18	15.01	205	48.67	15.92	164	47.4%	0.16 [-0.04, 0.37]	+=-
Stobbe 2014	-16	5	22	-16.1	6.7	14	6.4%	0.02 [-0.65, 0.69]	
Total (95% CI)			385			311	100.0%	0.20 [0.02, 0.37]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect			•	3 (P = 0	l.31); I²∍	= 16%			-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours control Favours experimental

#### 1.8 Homelessness

	ACT	Г	Standard	care		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Clarke 2000	26	117	11	61	19.8%	0.04 [-0.08, 0.16]	
Killaspy 2006	12	127	17	124	39.8%	-0.04 [-0.12, 0.04]	
Sytema 2007	1	59	5	59	40.4%	-0.07 [-0.15, 0.01]	-=-
Total (95% CI)		303		244	100.0%	-0.04 [-0.09, 0.02]	•
Total events	39		33				
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.00; Chi	i <sup>z</sup> = 2.59	9, df = 2 (P	= 0.27);	l² = 23%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.20 (	(P = 0.2	3)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

## 1.9 Not living independently

	ACT	Г	Standard	care		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Chandler 1996a (A)	20	127	31	129	19.8%	-0.08 [-0.18, 0.01]	
Chandler 1996a (B)	53	125	56	135	13.0%	0.01 [-0.11, 0.13]	_ <b>+</b> _
Lehman 1997	15	77	20	75	10.5%	-0.07 [-0.21, 0.06]	
Petersen 2005	36	275	38	272	56.8%	-0.01 [-0.07, 0.05]	<b>+</b>
Total (95% CI)		604		611	100.0%	-0.03 [-0.07, 0.02]	•
Total events	124		145				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Chi	<sup>2</sup> = 2.44	, df = 3 (P =				
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.26 (	P = 0.2	1)				-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 1.10 Mental state (different scales)

		АСТ		Stan	dard ca	are	:	Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Killaspy 2006	32.9	9	91	33.5	8.6	75	19.8%	-0.07 [-0.37, 0.24]	
Lehman 1997	-4.12	0.9	67	-3.77	0.83	58	14.7%	-0.40 [-0.76, -0.05]	<b>-</b>
Morse 2006	1.88	0.54	54	1.86	0.6	49	12.4%	0.03 [-0.35, 0.42]	
Petersen 2005	1.06	1.26	205	1.27	1.4	164	43.7%	-0.16 [-0.36, 0.05]	
Sytema 2007	38	10	45	42	11	36	9.5%	-0.38 [-0.82, 0.06]	
Total (95% CI)			462			382	100.0%	-0.17 [-0.31, -0.04]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect	•			= 4 (P =	0.41);1	²= 0%			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

## 1.11 Quality of life (different scales)

	ACT Standard care					are		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Chandler 1996b (A)	4.52	0.94	100	4.25	1.07	99	20.8%	0.27 [-0.01, 0.55]	
Chandler 1996b (B)	4.36	0.92	113	4.33	0.9	97	26.0%	0.03 [-0.22, 0.28]	-+-
Killaspy 2006	4.5	1	91	4.4	0.9	75	19.7%	0.10 [-0.19, 0.39]	
Lehman 1997	4.7	1.31	67	4.17	1.21	58	9.0%	0.53 [0.09, 0.97]	
Sytema 2007	4.5	1	45	4.3	1.2	36	7.4%	0.20 [-0.29, 0.69]	<b>-</b>
Thorup 2010	4.92	0.78	88	4.92	1.16	73	17.2%	0.00 [-0.31, 0.31]	-+-
Total (95% CI)			504			438	100.0%	0.15 [0.01, 0.28]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.00; Cł	ni² = 5.	49, df=						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.11	(P = 0	.03)		Favours control Favours experimental				

### 1.12 Satisfaction (different scales)

		АСТ		Stan	dard ca	are		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Chandler 1996b (A)	3.26	0.61	100	2.96	0.65	93	17.9%	0.47 [0.19, 0.76]	
Chandler 1996b (B)	3.07	0.59	112	2.98	0.68	91	18.4%	0.14 [-0.14, 0.42]	- <b>+</b> •
Killaspy 2006	77.2	20	91	70	20.6	75	16.9%	0.35 [0.05, 0.66]	
Morse 2006	4.99	0.89	54	4.67	1.03	49	13.4%	0.33 [-0.06, 0.72]	+
Petersen 2005	26.1	3.7	205	22.9	5.2	164	21.8%	0.72 [0.51, 0.93]	
Sytema 2007	22.6	4.5	45	20.5	7.2	36	11.6%	0.36 [-0.09, 0.80]	+
Total (95% CI)			607			508	100.0%	0.41 [0.22, 0.61]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.03; Cł	ni <b>≃</b> = 11	l.98, df	= 5 (P =	0.04);	I <sup>z</sup> = 58	%	_	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.20	(P < 0	.0001)						-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours control Favours ACT

#### ACT compared to non-intensive case management

#### Mean Difference Mean Difference Experimental Control IV, Random, 95% Cl SD Total Mean SD Total Weight IV, Random, 95% Cl Study or Subgroup Mean Drake 1998a 0.5 0.94 7 2.17 3.21 9 2.7% -1.67 [-3.88, 0.54] Drake 1998b 0.85 1.43 7.9% -0.56 [-1.85, 0.73] 16 1.41 2.06 14 Drake 1998c 1.5% 2.28 3.2 10 1.67 3.84 12 0.61 [-2.33, 3.55] Drake 1998d 1.04 2.44 13 0.63 0.91 11 6.4% 0.41 [-1.02, 1.84] Drake 1998e 1.08 4.15 1.39 2.36 27 -0.31 [-2.04, 1.42] 30 4.4% Drake 1998f 1.66 4.49 1.4% 0.82 [-2.24, 3.88] 10 0.84 2.33 13 Drake 1998g 2.05 3.06 0.87 0.92 3.0% 9 8 1.18 [-0.92, 3.28] Essock 1995 2.87 7.82 130 4.3 9.52 132 3.0% -1.43 [-3.54, 0.68] Essock 2006 0.64 1.9 99 0.72 1.3 99 63.9% -0.08 [-0.53, 0.37] Issakidis 1999 4 5.75 35 3.08 4.3 33 2.3% 0.92 [-1.48, 3.32] 2.8 4.74 Quinlivan 1995 -1.71 [-3.65, 0.23] 1.09 2.65 30 3.5% 30 Total (95% CI) 389 388 100.0% -0.15 [-0.52, 0.21] Heterogeneity: Tau<sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi<sup>2</sup> = 9.76, df = 10 (P = 0.46); l<sup>2</sup> = 0% -4 -2 ή ż Å Test for overall effect: Z = 0.83 (P = 0.41) Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 2.1 Average number of days in hospital per months

#### 2.2 Not remaining in contact with psychiatric services

	Experim	ental	Conti	ol		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Drake 1998	22	109	28	114	57.3%	-0.04 [-0.15, 0.07]	
lssakidis 1999	3	37	11	36	42.7%	-0.22 [-0.40, -0.05]	
Total (95% CI)		146		150	100.0%	-0.12 [-0.30, 0.05]	-
Total events	25		39				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.01; Chi <sup>a</sup>	²= 2.98,	df = 1 (P	= 0.08)	); I <sup>z</sup> = 66%	b	-1 -0.5 0 0.5
Test for overall effect	: Z = 1.35 (F	<sup>o</sup> = 0.18	)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 2.3 Death - any cause

	Experim	ental	Cont	rol		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Drake 1998	3	109	4	114	26.6%	-0.01 [-0.05, 0.04]	<b>_</b> _
Essock 1995	2	130	2	132	62.8%	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	-#-
lssakidis 1999	1	37	0	36	10.6%	0.03 [-0.05, 0.10]	
Total (95% CI)		276		282	100.0%	0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	
Total events	6		6				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.00; Chi <sup>z</sup>	= 0.64,	df = 2 (P	= 0.73)	); I² = 0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.08 (F	P = 0.93	)				-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

## Non-intensive case management compared to usual care

## 3.1 Average number of days in hospital per month

	Expe	erimen	tal	С	ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Björkman 2002	0.83	3.13	33	2.15	4.13	44	20.0%	-1.32 [-2.94, 0.30]	
Curtis 1998	1.77	1.79	146	1.02	1.18	143	29.5%	0.75 [0.40, 1.10]	•
Ford 1995	3.07	6.9	39	1.76	3.67	38	13.9%	1.31 [-1.15, 3.77]	- <b>+</b>
Lichtenberg 2008	7.92	7.17	122	10.17	8.5	95	16.0%	-2.25 [-4.38, -0.12]	
Marshall 1995	1.04	2.18	40	1.56	4.45	40	20.7%	-0.52 [-2.06, 1.02]	
Total (95% CI)			380			360	100.0%	-0.33 [-1.57, 0.92]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² =				-					
Test for overall effect	: Z = 0.52	? (P = 0	1.60)	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]					

### 3.2 Admitted to hospital

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Björkman 2002	15	33	27	44	12.0%	-0.16 [-0.38, 0.06]	• •
Curtis 1998	75	146	51	143	16.7%	0.16 [0.04, 0.27]	
Ford 1995	16	39	14	38	12.2%	0.04 [-0.18, 0.26]	
Lichtenberg 2008	87	122	70	95	16.4%	-0.02 [-0.14, 0.10]	
Malakouti 2015	16	98	20	54	15.2%	-0.21 [-0.36, -0.06]	← ■
Malakouti 2016	14	60	27	61	14.5%	-0.21 [-0.37, -0.05]	← ■
Marshall 1995	17	40	10	40	12.8%	0.17 [-0.03, 0.38]	
Total (95% CI)		538		475	100.0%	-0.03 [-0.16, 0.09]	
Total events	240		219				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.02; Chi <sup>z</sup>	= 26.05	5, df = 6 (F	P = 0.00	002); I <b>²</b> = 1	77%	-0.2 -0.1 0 0.1 0.2
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.48 (F	P = 0.63	)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

### 3.3 Death, any cause

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Björkman 2002	0	33	1	44	28.8%	-0.02 [-0.09, 0.04]	
Curtis 1998	11	147	10	145	34.1%	0.01 [-0.05, 0.07]	- <b>+</b> -
Ford 1995	3	39	0	38	16.0%	0.08 [-0.02, 0.17]	+
Marshall 1995	2	40	0	40	21.0%	0.05 [-0.03, 0.13]	
Total (95% CI)		259		267	100.0%	0.02 [-0.02, 0.06]	•
Total events	16		11				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:				= 0.29)	); I² = 19%	b	-0.5 -0.25 0 0.25 0.5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 3.4 Suicide

	Experim	ental	Contr	ol		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Björkman 2002	0	33	1	44	9.9%	-0.02 [-0.09, 0.04]	
Curtis 1998	1	147	2	145	80.9%	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.02]	
Ford 1995	1	39	0	38	9.2%	0.03 [-0.04, 0.09]	
Total (95% CI)		219		227	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.02]	•
Total events	2		3				
Heterogeneity: Tau² =	0.00; Chi²	= 1.09,	df = 2 (P	= 0.58)	); I² = 0%		-0.5 -0.25 0 0.25 0.5
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.52 (F	P = 0.60	)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

### 3.5 Global state (GAF)

	С	ontrol			АСТ			Mean Difference		Mean Differe	nce	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI		IV, Random, 9	5% CI	
Björkman 2002	52.3	14.6	22	55.3	17	33	32.6%	-3.00 [-11.42, 5.42]				
Li 2016	71.1	9.07	48	67.7	9.62	37	67.4%	3.40 [-0.62, 7.42]				
Total (95% CI)			70			70	100.0%	1.31 [-4.57, 7.19]		•		
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect:			⊢ -100	-50 0 Favours control Favo	50 Durs ACT	100						

### 3.6 Mental state (different scales)

	Expe	Experimental Control						Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Björkman 2002	102	68.5	27	81.4	55.1	33	15.1%	0.33 [-0.18, 0.84]	
Ford 1995	12.8	9.6	36	13.5	11.9	32	16.2%	-0.06 [-0.54, 0.41]	<b>_</b>
Gelkopf 2016	4.08	0.68	696	4.07	0.68	580	29.1%	0.01 [-0.10, 0.12]	+
Malakouti 2015	68.2	30.3	52	80.6	40.3	54	19.4%	-0.34 [-0.73, 0.04]	
Malakouti 2016	70.7	31.2	61	91.8	39.9	60	20.1%	-0.59 [-0.95, -0.22]	
Total (95% CI)			872			759	100.0%	-0.14 [-0.42, 0.14]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect:	•			-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours experimental Favours control					

### 3.7 QoL (different scales)

	Expe	erimen	tal	C	ontrol			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Björkman 2002	4.6	0.7	29	4.9	0.7	34	11.8%	-0.42 [-0.92, 0.08]	
Ford 1995	3.2	0.6	36	3	1.22	38	13.8%	0.20 [-0.25, 0.66]	
Gelkopf 2016	2.89	0.52	696	2.86	0.56	580	63.2%	0.06 [-0.05, 0.17]	
Marshall 1995	4.91	1.03	31	4.96	0.9	27	11.2%	-0.05 [-0.57, 0.47]	
Total (95% CI)			792			679	100.0%	0.01 [-0.18, 0.19]	<b>•</b>
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect			-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1 Favours control Favours ACT						

### 3.8 Satisfaction (different scales)

		ACT		Expe	erimen	tal		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Björkman 2002	4.54	0.58	28	3.91	1	32	15.8%	0.75 [0.22, 1.27]	
Li 2016	4.24	0.54	48	3.86	0.38	37	22.1%	0.79 [0.34, 1.23]	
Malakouti 2015	25.63	3.53	52	23.72	5.38	54	29.5%	0.42 [0.03, 0.80]	
Malakouti 2016	24.9	5.1	61	21.3	5.5	60	32.6%	0.67 [0.31, 1.04]	
Total (95% CI)			189			183	100.0%	0.63 [0.43, 0.84]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect					0.59);	I² = 0%			-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours control Favours ACT

# Sub group analyses: population with cooccurring substance abuse

## ACT compared to usual care

#### 4.1 Average number of days in hospital per month

		АСТ		Stan	dard ca	are		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Petersen 2007	4.54	6.45	42	6.98	8.69	40	25.7%	-2.44 [-5.77, 0.89]	
Lehman 1997	3.04	5.15	77	5.41	7	75	74.3%	-2.37 [-4.33, -0.41]	
Total (95% CI)			119			115	100.0%	-2.39 [-4.08, -0.70]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect				= 1 (P =	0.97);1	I² = 0%			-10 -5 0 5 10 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

#### 4.2 Global state (different scales)

		ACT		Stan	dard ca	ire		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Lehman 1997	45.9	13.9	67	39.1	13.7	58	60.0%	0.49 [0.13, 0.85]	
Petersen 2007	51.19	15.85	42	45.03	16.04	40	40.0%	0.38 [-0.05, 0.82]	
Total (95% CI)			109			98	100.0%	0.45 [0.17, 0.72]	◆
Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect	•		•	-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours control Favours experimental					

#### 4.3 Mental state (different scales)

		АСТ		Stan	dard c	are		Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Lehman 1997	-4.12	0.9	67	-3.77	0.83	58	37.6%	-0.40 [-0.76, -0.05]	
Morse 2006	1.88	0.54	54	1.86	0.6	49	33.6%	0.03 [-0.35, 0.42]	
Petersen 2007	1.35	1.49	42	1.43	1.31	40	28.7%	-0.06 [-0.49, 0.38]	
Total (95% CI)			163			147	100.0%	-0.16 [-0.43, 0.12]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.02; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2.96, df = 2 (P = 0.23); i <sup>2</sup> = 32%									
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.11 (P = 0.27)									Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

## ACT compared to non-intensive case management

## 5.1 Average number of days in hospital per month

	Experimental			Control				Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Drake 1998a	0.5	0.94	7	2.17	3.21	9	2.9%	-1.67 [-3.88, 0.54]	
Drake 1998b	0.85	1.43	16	1.41	2.06	14	8.7%	-0.56 [-1.85, 0.73]	<b>-</b> _
Drake 1998c	2.28	3.2	10	1.67	3.84	12	1.7%	0.61 [-2.33, 3.55]	
Drake 1998d	1.04	2.44	13	0.63	0.91	11	7.0%	0.41 [-1.02, 1.84]	<b>-</b>
Drake 1998e	1.08	4.15	30	1.39	2.36	27	4.8%	-0.31 [-2.04, 1.42]	
Drake 1998f	1.66	4.49	10	0.84	2.33	13	1.5%	0.82 [-2.24, 3.88]	
Drake 1998g	2.05	3.06	9	0.87	0.92	8	3.3%	1.18 [-0.92, 3.28]	
Essock 2006	0.64	1.9	99	0.72	1.3	99	70.0%	-0.08 [-0.53, 0.37]	<b>+</b>
Total (95% CI)			194			193	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	= 0.00; CI	hi² = 4.	97, df=	= 7 (P =	0.66);	I² = 0%			<u>t</u>
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.41 (P = 0.68)									-4 -2 U Z 4 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]