Evidensprofiler for NKR for farmakologisk behandling af bipolar lidelse – supplerende vedligeholdelsesbehandling efter depression

			Quality asse	essment					Summa	ary of Findings			
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event	rates (%)	Relative effect	Anticipated abso	lute effects		
Follow up							With Placebo	With Lithium	(95% CI)	Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Lithium (95% CI)		
Ny affektiv episode - Lithium (CRITICAL OUTCOME)													
1802 (7 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	548/936 (58.5%)	317/866 (36.6%)	RR 0.65 (0.54 to 0.77)	585 per 1000	205 fewer per 1000 (from 135 fewer to 269 fewer)		
Ny depre	ssiv ep	isode - Lithiu	u m (import <i>a</i>	ANT OUTCOME	≣)	1				1			
1597 (6 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	228/832 (27.4%)	161/765 (21%)	RR 0.78 (0.65 to 0.92)	274 per 1000	60 fewer per 1000 (from 22 fewer to 96 fewer)		
Ny manis	sk episc	ode - Lithium	(NOT IMPORT	TANT OUTCOM	ΛE)	J.							
1358 (5 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	240/713 (33.7%)	113/645 (17.5%)	RR 0.55 (0.41 to 0.73)	337 per 1000	151 fewer per 1000 (from 91 fewer to 19 fewer)		

1736 (6 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,4}	serious ⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.².4.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	668/903 (74%)	501/833 (60.1%)	RR 0.86 (0.74 to 0.99)	740 per 1000	104 fewer per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 192 fewer)
Død - Lit	:hium (CF	RITICAL OUTCOM	1E)	1			1			<u>'</u>	
988 (2 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁶	serious ^{5,7}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW ^{5,6,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	3/514 (0.58%)	1/474 (0.21%)	RR 0.33 (0.04 to 3.16)	6 per 1000	4 fewer per 1000 (from 6 fewer to 13 more)
Serious	adverse	event - Lith	ium (CRITICA	AL OUTCOME)					<u> </u>		
1103 (3 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{5,8}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2,3,5,8 due to indirectness, imprecision	29/583 (5%)	20/520 (3.8%)	RR 0.83 (0.48 to 1.44)	50 per 1000	8 fewer per 1000 (from 26 fewer to 22 more)
Weight g	gain eve	nts - Lithium	I (IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)							
1361 (4 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,9,10}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{2,9,10} due to indirectness	26/688 (3.8%)	51/673 (7.6%)	RR 1.97 (1.24 to 3.12)	38 per 1000	37 more per 1000 (from 9 more to 80 more)
Sedation	ı - Lithiu	I m (IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)								
1361 (4 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	serious ⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW¹.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	63/688 (9.2%)	57/673 (8.5%)	RR 1.05 (0.59 to 1.86)	92 per 1000	5 more per 1000 (from 38 fewer to 79 more)
Selvmor	d - Lithi	um (CRITICAL C	OUTCOME)		<u>I</u>						
1343 (4 studies)	no serious risk of	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,6}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,6}	11/703 (1.6%)	5/640 (0.78%)	RR 0.55 (0.19 to	16 per 1000	7 fewer per 1000 (from 13 fewer to 10 more)

	bias					due to indirectness			1.61)					
Kidney f	(idney failure - Lithium (CRITICAL OUTCOME)													
1003368	no	no serious	serious ¹²	no serious	undetected	⊕⊖⊝⊝	2202/999999	18/3369	-	Swedish backgrou	nd population			
(1 study)	serious risk of bias ¹¹	inconsistency		imprecision		VERY LOW ^{11,12} due to indirectness	(0.22%)	(0.53%)		2 per 1000	2 fewer per 1000 (from 2 fewer to 2 fewer)			
Glomeru	ılar Filtra	ation Rate (G	FR) (CRITICA	AL OUTCOME;	Better indicate	ed by lower values)								
679 (6 studies)	no serious risk of bias	serious ¹³	serious ¹⁴	serious ⁵	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{5,13,14} due to inconsistency, indirectness, imprecision	307	372	-	The mean glomerular filtration rate (gfr) in the control groups was GFR (ml/min)	The mean glomerular filtration rate (gfr) in the intervention groups was 6.22 lower (14.65 lower to 2.2 higher)			

¹ Both monotherapy and add-on studies
² Patients index episodes of both manic, depressive and mixed type

³ Majority of studies non-enriched

⁴ The majority of studies enriched for study drug

⁵ Wide CI crossing the decision threshold

⁶ Both enrichment and non-enrichment study

⁷ No events in one of the two studies

⁸ One study with no events

⁹ Only non-enrichment studies

¹⁰ Only monotherapy studies

Data for renal failure not based on renal biopsies in alle cases.
 Not certain that patients were bipolar disorder patients.
 Heterogeneity across studies, effect sizes differ in direction.

¹⁴ GFR is a surrogate outcome in relation to kidney failure

Question: Should Aripiprazol vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder? Bibliography: NKR Bipolar lidelse½

			Quality asse	ssment					Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	rent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipat	ed absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Aripiprazol		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Aripiprazol (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	e - Aripiprazo	(CRITICAL OU	JTCOME)						l	
927 (4 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	149/465 (32%)	90/462 (19.5%)	RR 0.61 (0.49 to 0.77)	320 per 1000	125 fewer per 1000 (from 74 fewer to 163 fewer)
Drop-out	- Aripipra	ZOI (CRITICAL C	UTCOME)			1				1	
161 (1 study) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,4}	serious ^{5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{2,3,4,5,6} due to indirectness, imprecision	55/83 (66.3%)	39/78 (50%)	RR 0.75 (0.58 to 0.99)	663 per 1000	166 fewer per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 278 fewer)
Død - Ari	piprazol (C	CRITICAL OUTCO	ME)								
416 (2 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,7}	serious ^{8,9}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{2,3,7,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	1/209 (0.48%)	1/207 (0.48%)	See comment ¹⁰	5 per 1000	0 fewer per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 20 more)
Selvmord	d - Aripipra	azol (CRITICAL (OUTCOME)				I				
834 (3 studies)	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{8,11}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,8,11} due to indirectness,	1/414 (0.24%)	1/420 (0.24%)	See comment ¹⁰	2 per 1000	1 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 10 more)

24-52 weeks						imprecision					
Serious a	adverse e	vent - Aripipr	azol (CRITICA	AL OUTCOME)							
917 (4 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ¹²	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,3,12} due to indirectness, imprecision	33/457 (7.2%)	24/460 (5.2%)	RR 0.74 (0.44 to 1.25)	72 per 1000	19 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 18 more)
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Aripipra	I ZOI (IMPORTA	ANT OUTCOME)							
927 (4 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.².³.9 due to indirectness, imprecision	61/465 (13.1%)	47/462 (10.2%)	RR 0.77 (0.54 to 1.1)	131 per 1000	30 fewer per 1000 (from 60 fewer to 13 more)
Ny manis	sk episod	e - Aripiprazo	(NOT IMPOR	TANT OUTCOME	Ξ)						
924 (4 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	68/462 (14.7%)	35/462 (7.6%)	RR 0.52 (0.36 to 0.77)	147 per 1000	71 fewer per 1000 (from 34 fewer to 94 fewer)
Weight g	ain event	s - Aripiprazo	(IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)					-		
873 (4 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{9,12}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW¹.2.3.9.12 due to indirectness, imprecision	19/434 (4.4%)	44/439 (10%)	RR 2.1 (0.86 to 5.09)	44 per 1000	48 more per 1000 (from 6 fewer to 179 more)
Sedation	- Aripipra	AZOI (IMPORTAN	T OUTCOME)								
834 (3 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{12,13}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW¹.2,3,12,13 due to indirectness, imprecision	9/414 (2.2%)	6/420 (1.4%)	RR 0.7 (0.25 to 1.94)	22 per 1000	7 fewer per 1000 (from 16 fewer to 20 more)
	İ										

Co-medication in add-on studies was lithium/valproate in one study, lamotrigene in one study and valproate in one study.

Enriched discontinuation study design

- ³ Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
- ⁴ Monotherapy
- ⁵ Small sample size
- ⁶ Wide CI
- ⁷ Co-medication was lithium/valproate in one study and valproate in one study
- ⁸ Only one event in each group combined ⁹ CI crosses zero
- ¹⁰ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ¹¹ Wide CI, the true effect may be higher rates of suicide in drug group
- ¹² Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
- ¹³ Very few events in each study

Question: Should Olanzapin vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality asse	ssment					Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	ent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate	d absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Olanzapin		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Olanzapin (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	- Olanzapin	(CRITICAL OUT	rcome)				•		I	
723 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	199/317 (62.8%)	151/406 (37.2%)	RR 0.57 (0.41 to 0.79)	628 per 1000	270 fewer per 1000 (from 132 fewer to 370 fewer)
Drop-out	- Olanzap	in (CRITICAL OU	TCOME)			L		•			<u> </u>
627 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ⁴	serious ^{3,5,6}	serious ^{7,8}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{3,4,5,6,7,8} due to indirectness, imprecision	224/271 (82.7%)	237/356 (66.6%)	RR 0.72 (0.48 to 1.08)	827 per 1000	231 fewer per 1000 (from 430 fewer to 66 more)
Død - Ola	I nzapin (CF	RITICAL OUTCOM	E)					•			
460 (2 studies) 48-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5,9}	serious ^{10,11}	undetected	See comment	0/184 (0%)	0/276 (0%)	See comment ¹²	See comment	0 fewer per 1000 (from 11.3 fewer to 11.3 more)
Selvmord	d - Olanza _l	pin (CRITICAL O	UTCOME)								
266 (1 study) 78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,13}	very serious ^{14,15,16}	undetected	⊕⊝⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,13,14,15,16} due to indirectness, imprecision	3/135 (2.2%)	0/131 (0%)	See comment ¹²	22 per 1000	22 fewer per 1000 (from 50 fewer to 10 more)

627 (2 studies) 48-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹⁷	serious ^{14,18}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW ^{14,17,18} due to indirectness, imprecision	42/271 (15.5%)	20/356 (5.6%)	RR 0.42 (0.25 to 0.7)	155 per 1000	90 fewer per 1000 (from 46 fewer to 116 fewer)
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Olanza	pin (IMPORTA	NT OUTCOME)		1	1				<u> </u>
723 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ¹⁶	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ Low ^{1,2,3,16} due to indirectness, imprecision	88/317 (27.8%)	95/406 (23.4%)	RR 0.78 (0.56 to 1.1)	278 per 1000	61 fewer per 1000 (from 122 fewer to 28 more)
Ny manis	⊥ sk episod	⊔ e - Olanzapin	I (NOT IMPORT	ANT OUTCOME)						
_											
723 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	91/317 (28.7%)	45/406 (11.1%)	RR 0.38 (0.27 to 0.53)	287 per 1000	178 fewer per 1000 (from 135 fewer to 210 fewer)
723 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	risk of bias				undetected	MODERATE ^{1,2,3}					1000 (from 135 fewer to
723 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	ain event no serious risk of bias	inconsistency			undetected	MODERATE ^{1,2,3}					1000 (from 135 fewer to
723 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks Weight g 719 (3 studies) 48-78 weeks	ain event no serious risk of bias	inconsistency s - Olanzapir no serious inconsistency	1	imprecision no serious		MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness ⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3}	(28.7%)	(11.1%) 85/405	(0.27 to 0.53)	1000 57 per	1000 (from 135 fewer to 210 fewer) 156 more per 1000 (from 73 more to

¹ Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
² Two monotherapy studies and one add-on study where co-medication was lithium/valproate
³ The majority of patients originate from enriched discontinuation design studies
⁴ Inconsistecy between the two studies, but not impacting decision
⁵ Enriched discontinuation study design
⁶ Monotherapy studies
⁷ CI crossing zero, but not substantially against intervention

⁸ Wide CI overlapping no effect

⁹ One monotherapy study and one add-on study with co-medication lithium/valproate

¹⁰ CI crosses zero
11 No events in either group
12 Based on too few events to calculate relative difference

Monotherapy
 Small sample size

Only one study with very few events
 Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
 Both enrichment and non-enrichment design studies

¹⁸ Wide CI

Question: Should Lamotrigin vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder? Bibliography: NKR Bipolar lidelse

			Quality asse	ssment					Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	vent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate	d absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Lamotrigin		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Lamotrigin (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episod	e - Lamotrigir	1 (CRITICAL OL	JTCOME)							
878 (5 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision ⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,4} due to indirectness	231/402 (57.5%)	235/476 (49.4%)	RR 0.85 (0.74 to 0.97)	575 per 1000	86 fewer per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 149 fewer)
Drop-out	- Lamotr	igin (CRITICAL O	UTCOME)					·			· L
653 (3 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,5}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,5} due to indirectness	245/280 (87.5%)	295/373 (79.1%)	RR 0.93 (0.88 to 0.98)	875 per 1000	61 fewer per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 105 fewer)
Død - Lar	motrigin (CRITICAL OUTCOI	ME)								
137 (1 study) 32 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,6}	very serious ^{7,8,9}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,6,7,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	0/69 (0%)	0/68 (0%)	See comment ¹⁰	See comment	-
Selvmord	d - Lamot	rigin (CRITICAL (OUTCOME)								
600 (3 studies) 32-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,11}	serious ^{12,13}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,11,12,13} due to indirectness, imprecision	3/258 (1.2%)	6/342 (1.8%)	See comment ¹⁰	12 per 1000	8 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 30 more)

Serious a	adverse e	vent - Lamotri	gin (CRITICA	AL OUTCOME)							
549 (4 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,3,6}	serious ¹⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹,3,6,14 due to indirectness, imprecision	25/285 (8.8%)	21/264 (8%)	RR 0.92 (0.54 to 1.58)	88 per 1000	7 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 51 more)
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Lamotriç	jin (import <i>i</i>	ANT OUTCOME)	1	· L		•			
701 (4 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3,6}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,6} due to indirectness	127/315 (40.3%)	76/386 (19.7%)	RR 0.51 (0.4 to 0.65)	403 per 1000	198 fewer per 1000 (from 141 fewer to 242 fewer)
Ny manis	sk episod	e - Lamotrigin	(NOT IMPOR	TANT OUTCOME)				1	•	
701 (4 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ¹⁵	serious ^{1,2,3,6}	serious ¹⁶	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,3,6,15,16} due to indirectness, imprecision	65/315 (20.6%)	119/386 (30.8%)	RR 1.33 (0.71 to 2.48)	206 per 1000	68 more per 1000 (from 60 fewer to 305 more)
Weight g	ain event	s - Lamotrigin	(IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)							
392 (2 studies) 76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5}	serious ¹⁷	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,5,17} due to indirectness, imprecision	11/165 (6.7%)	18/227 (7.9%)	RR 1.19 (0.58 to 2.46)	67 per 1000	13 more per 1000 (from 28 fewer to 97 more)
Sedation	- Lamotri	igin (IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)		1	1					
417 (2 studies) 76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5}	serious ¹⁸	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹,5,18 due to indirectness, imprecision	13/190 (6.8%)	21/227 (9.3%)	RR 1.36 (0.69 to 2.7)	68 per 1000	25 more per 1000 (from 21 fewer to 116 more)
1		1	1	1	1	1				1	

¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
² Patients with index episodes of various polarity
³ All monotherapy studies but one
⁴ Wide Cl, upper Cl boundary close to zero (no effect)
⁵ Monotherapy

- ⁶ Add-on study not specifying co-medication
- ⁷ Small sample size
- ⁸ No events in either group
- ⁹ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
- ¹⁰ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ¹¹ Two monotherapy studies and one add-on study not specifying co-medication
- ¹² Very few events in each study
- ¹³ Wide CI, the true effect may be higher rates of suicide in drug group
- ¹⁴ Wide CI overlapping no effect
- ¹⁵ Some, but not crucial heterogeneity across studies
- ¹⁶ Wide CI, true effect may be higher incidence of manic relapse in drug group
- ¹⁷ Wide CI, true effect may be much higher incidence of weight gain events in drug group
- ¹⁸ Wide CI, true effect may be much higher incidence of sedation in drug group

Question: Should Valproat vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality as	sessment					Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	ent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate effects	d absolute
							With Placebo	With Valproat		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Valproat (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	e - Valproat (0	CRITICAL OUT	COME)					1	1	
587 (3 studies) 24-52 weeks	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,4,5}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW¹.².3.4.5 due to risk of bias, indirectness	140/249 (56.2%)	127/338 (37.6%)	RR 0.73 (0.57 to 0.94)	562 per 1000	152 fewer per 1000 (from 34 fewer to 242 fewer)
Drop-out	- Valproa	(CRITICAL OUT	COME)		•				1	•	
501 (2 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{6,7}	serious ^{8,9}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW ^{6,7,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	115/204 (56.4%)	162/297 (54.5%)	RR 0.89 (0.71 to 1.11)	564 per 1000	62 fewer per 1000 (from 163 fewe to 62 more)
Død - Val	Iproat (CRIT	I TICAL OUTCOME)								1	1
220 (1 study) 24 weeks	serious ¹⁰	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{3,11,12}	very serious ^{13,14}	undetected	⊕⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{3,10,11,12,13,14} due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	2/110 (1.8%)	1/110 (0.91%)	See comment ¹⁵	18 per 1000	9 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 20 more)
Selvmord	d - Valproa	I I t (CRITICAL OU ^T	rcome)		1	1	1		1	1	
220 (1 study)	serious ¹⁰	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{3,12}	very serious ^{8,14,16}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{3,8,10,12,14,16} due to risk of bias.	0/110 (0%)	0/110 (0%)	See comment ¹⁵	See comment	-

24 weeks						indirectness, imprecision					
Serious a	adverse e	vent - Valpro	at (CRITICAL C	DUTCOME)							
220 (1 study) 24 weeks	serious ¹⁷	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{3,11,12}	very serious ^{9,18}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{3,9,11,12,17,18} due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	5/110 (4.5%)	4/110 (3.6%)	RR 0.8 (0.22 to 2.9)	45 per 1000	9 fewer per 1000 (from 35 fewer to 86 more)
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Valproa	it (important	OUTCOME)							
587 (3 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,4,5,11}	serious ^{9,19}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,4,5,9,11,19} due to indirectness, imprecision	80/249 (32.1%)	69/338 (20.4%)	RR 0.71 (0.42 to 1.2)	321 per 1000	93 fewer per 1000 (from 186 fewer to 64 more)
Ny manis	sk episod	e - Valproat (NOT IMPORTAN	IT OUTCOME)							
587 (3 studies) 32-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{7,20,21}	serious ⁹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{7,9,20,21} due to indirectness, imprecision	30/139 (21.6%)	38/228 (16.7%)	RR 0.75 (0.56 to 1.01)	281 per 1000	70 fewer per 1000 (from 124 fewer to 3 more)
Weight g	ain event	s - Valproat (MPORTANT OL	JTCOME)							
281 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{22,23,24}	no serious imprecision ²⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{22,23,24,25} due to indirectness	7/94 (7.4%)	39/187 (20.9%)	RR 2.8 (1.3 to 6.02)	74 per 1000	134 more per 1000 (from 22 more to 374 more)
Sedation	- Valproa	t (CRITICAL OUT	COME)								
281 (1 study) 32 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{22,23,24}	very serious ^{8,14}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{8,14,22,23,24} due to indirectness, imprecision	33/94 (35.1%)	78/187 (41.7%)	RR 1.19 (0.86 to 1.64)	351 per 1000	67 more per 1000 (from 49 fewer to 225 more)
1 .00/	1	1		l			1				

¹ 40% of total study population from open-label trial ² The majority of patients originate from enriched discontinuation design studies

- ³ Patients with index episodes of various polarity
- ⁴ One monotherapy study and two add-on studies
- ⁵ Co-medication lithium in one add-on study and lamotrigine in another
- ⁶ One add-on and one monotherapy study
- ⁷ Majority of participants from non-enriched study
- ⁸ Small sample size
- ⁹ Wide CI overlapping no effect
- ¹⁰ Open-label trial
- ¹¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
- ¹² Co-medication with lithium
- ¹³ Only one study with very few events
- ¹⁴ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
- ¹⁵ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ¹⁶ No events in either group
- ¹⁷ No explanation was provided
- ¹⁸ Very few events in each group
- ¹⁹ Some, but not crucial heterogeneity across studies
- ²⁰ Index episode manic in majority of patients
- ²¹ Co-medication in add-on study lamotrigine
- ²² Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
- ²³ Monotherapy
- ²⁴ Non-enriched study
- 25 Wide CI

Question: Should Quetiapin vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality asse	ssment				\$	Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study eve	ent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipat	ed absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Quetiapin		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Quetiapin (95% CI)
Ny affekti	iv episode	- Quetiapin	CRITICAL OUT	COME)							•
2718 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	670/1378 (48.6%)	287/1340 (21.4%)	RR 0.44 (0.36 to 0.54)	486 per 1000	272 fewer per 1000 (from 224 fewer to 311 fewer)
Drop-out	- Quetiapi	n (CRITICAL OUT	TCOME)								
2719 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ⁴	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,4} due to indirectness	946/1378 (68.7%)	615/1341 (45.9%)	RR 0.67 (0.54 to 0.82)	687 per 1000	227 fewer per 1000 (from 124 fewer to 316 fewer)
Død - Que	etiapin (CRI	I ITICAL OUTCOME	Ξ)								
2096 (3 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5,6}	serious ⁷	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW ^{1,5,6,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	4/1065 (0.38%)	2/1031 (0.19%)	See comment ⁸	4 per 1000	1 fewer per 1000 (from 0 more to 0 more)
Selvmord	l - Quetiap	in (CRITICAL OU	JTCOME)			1					
2096 (3 studies) 52-104	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5,6}	serious ⁹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,5,6,9} due to indirectness,	15/1065 (1.4%)	6/1031 (0.58%)	See comment ⁸	14 per 1000	7 fewer per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 10 more)

weeks						imprecision					
Serious a	adverse ev	/ent - Quetiar	D in (IMPORTAN	NT OUTCOME)							
2719 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ¹⁰	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW¹.2.3,10 due to indirectness, imprecision	54/1378 (3.9%)	36/1341 (2.7%)	RR 0.65 (0.24 to 1.74)	39 per 1000	14 fewer per 1000 (from 30 fewer to 29 more)
Ny depre	essiv episo	ode - Quetiap	ine (IMPORTA	NT OUTCOME)		1				ļ	· ·
2718 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	358/1378 (26%)	146/1340 (10.9%)	RR 0.42 (0.35 to 0.5)	260 per 1000	151 fewer per 1000 (from 130 fewer to 169 fewer)
Ny manis	sk episode	e - Quetiapine	(NOT IMPORT	ANT OUTCOME	Ξ)				<u> </u>		
2718 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	312/1378 (22.6%)	141/1340 (10.5%)	RR 0.48 (0.35 to 0.67)	226 per 1000	118 fewer per 1000 (from 75 fewer to 147 fewer)
Weight g	jain events	s - Quetiapin	(IMPORTANT O	UTCOME)							
2719 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	38/1378 (2.8%)	111/1341 (8.3%)	RR 2.93 (2.03 to 4.21)	28 per 1000	53 more per 1000 (from 28 more to 89 more)
Sedation	- Quetiap	I in (IMPORTANT C	OUTCOME)								
2719 (4 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	52/1378 (3.8%)	88/1341 (6.6%)	RR 1.31 (1.35 to 3.94)	31 per 1000	41 more per 1000 (from 11 fewer to 92 more)

- ¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
- ² Two monotherapy studies and two add-on studies, co-medication lithium/valproate
- ³ Depressive index episode in one study and index episode of various polarity in three studies
- Significant heterogeneity but all results favoring drug
 Two monotherapy studies and one add-on study, co-medication lithium/valproate
 Index episode depression in one study and of various polarities in two studies
- ⁷ CI crosses zero
- ⁸ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ⁹ Wide CI, the true effect may be higher rates of suicide in drug group
- ¹⁰ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold

Question: Should Risperidon vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder? Bibliography: NKR bipolar lidelse

			Quality asse	ssment					Summary of	f Findings	5
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	rent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipat	ed absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Risperidon		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Risperidon (95% CI)
Ny affekti	iv episode	- Risperidon	(CRITICAL OU	TCOME)	<u>I</u>		_			-	,
663 (3 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	178/327 (54.4%)	108/336 (32.1%)	RR 0.6 (0.49 to 0.73)	544 per 1000	218 fewer per 1000 (from 147 fewer to 278 fewer)
Drop-out	- Risperid	on (CRITICAL OU	JTCOME)					•		1	
694 (3 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	251/343 (73.2%)	186/351 (53%)	RR 0.73 (0.61 to 0.86)	732 per 1000	198 fewer per 1000 (from 102 fewer to 285 fewer)
Død - Ris	peridon (C	I RITICAL OUTCOM	IE)								
124 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,4,5}	very serious ^{6,7,8}	undetected	⊕⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,4,5,6,7,8} due to indirectness, imprecision	2/59 (3.4%)	1/65 (1.5%)	See comment ⁹	34 per 1000	19 fewer per 1000 (from 70 fewer to 40 more)
Selvmord	l - Risperio	don (CRITICAL C	UTCOME)								
694 (3 studies) 52-104	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{7,10}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,7,10} due to indirectness,	7/343 (2%)	3/351 (0.85%)	See comment ⁹	20 per 1000	9 fewer per 1000 (from 20 fewer to 10 more)

weeks						imprecision					
Serious a	dverse ev	vent - Risperio	don (IMPORTA	ANT OUTCOME)							
570 (2 studies) 78-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,11,12}	serious ^{6,13}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,6,11,12,13} due to indirectness, imprecision	57/284 (20.1%)	32/286 (11.2%)	RR 0.56 (0.38 to 0.84)	201 per 1000	88 fewer per 1000 (from 32 fewer to 124 fewer)
Ny depres	ssiv episc	de - Risperid	on (IMPORTA	NT OUTCOME)							
663 (3 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁸	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.8 due to indirectness, imprecision	48/327 (14.7%)	53/336 (15.8%)	RR 1.08 (0.75 to 1.55)	147 per 1000	12 more per 1000 (from 37 fewer to 81 more)
Ny manis	k episode	- Risperidon	(NOT IMPORT	ANT OUTCOME)						
663 (3 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	115/327 (35.2%)	43/336 (12.8%)	RR 0.36 (0.27 to 0.5)	352 per 1000	225 fewer per 1000 (from 176 fewer to 257 fewer)
Weight ga	ain events	s - Risperidon	(IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)							
691 (3 studies) 52-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ¹⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.14 due to indirectness, imprecision	34/341 (10%)	59/350 (16.9%)	RR 1.79 (0.79 to 4.08)	100 per 1000	79 more per 1000 (from 21 fewer to 307 more)
Sedation	- Risperio	lon (IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)	L							
388 (2 studies) 52-78 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,15,16}	serious ¹⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,14,15,16} due to indirectness, imprecision	4/192 (2.1%)	12/196 (6.1%)	RR 2.47 (0.83 to 7.35)	21 per 1000	31 more per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 132 more)

- ¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
- ² Two monotherapy studies and one add-on study not specifying co-medication
- ³ Index episode manic/mixed in two studies and various polarities in one study
- ⁴ Add-on study not specifying co-medication
- ⁵ Patients with index episodes of various polarity
- ⁶ Small sample size
- ⁷ Very few events in each group
- ⁸ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
- ⁹ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ¹⁰ Wide CI, the true effect may be higher rates of suicide in drug group
- ¹¹ Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
- 12 Monotherapy
- 13 Wide CI
- ¹⁴ CI crosses zero
- ¹⁵ One add-on and one monotherapy study
- ¹⁶ Manic/mixed index episode in majority of patients

Question: Should Perphenazin vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		Qı	uality assess	ment				Summary o	of Findings		
(studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev	rent rates (%)	Relative effect	Anticipate	d absolute effects
Follow up							With Placebo	With Perphenazin	(95% CI)	Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Perphenazin (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	- Perphenazi	n (CRITICAL C	UTCOME)							
37 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ¹	serious ^{2,3,4}	very serious ^{5,6,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5,6,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	2/18 (11.1%)	5/19 (26.3%)	RR 2.37 (0.52 to 10.7)	111 per 1000	152 more per 1000 (from 53 fewer to 1000 more)
Drop-out	- Perphen	I azin (CRITICAL C	UTCOME)				1				
37 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,4}	serious ^{5,8}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{2,3,4,5,8} due to indirectness, imprecision	3/18 (16.7%)	10/19 (52.6%)	RR 3.16 (1.03 to 9.66)	167 per 1000	360 more per 1000 (from 5 more to 1000 more)
Død - Per	phenazin	- not reported	l		l	1	-		I	1	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Selvmord	l - Perphe	nazin - not reporte	d			-	•			1	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Serious a	dverse ev	ent - Perphen	azin - not rep	orted	<u> </u>		1		I .	1	1

-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
ly depr	essiv epis	ode - Perpher	nazin (CRITIC	AL OUTCOME	Ξ)						
37 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,4}	very serious ^{5,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊝⊝ VERY LOW ^{2,3,4,5,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	0/18 (0%)	4/19 (21.1%)	RR 8.55 (0.49 to 148.33)	0 per 1000	-
Ny mani	isk episod	e - Perphenaz	in (IMPORTAN	NT OUTCOME)	1	1				<u> </u>
37 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,4}	very serious ^{5,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{2,3,4,5,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	2/18 (11.1%)	1/19 (5.3%)	RR 0.47 (0.05 to 4.78)	111 per 1000	59 fewer per 1000 (from 106 fewer to 420 more)
Weight (gain event	s - Perphenaz	Lin - not reporte	ed							
	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Sedatio	n - Perphe	nazin - not report	ed	•			,			- 1	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
² Enriched of Patients we Co-medical Small same Very few 6	discontinuation with a manic/mix ation various 'm	ted index episode lood stabilizers'	•	•					,	,	,

⁸ Wide CI

Question: Should Ziprasidon vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		Q	uality assess	sment					Summary	of Findings	;
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	vent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate	d absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Ziprasidon		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Ziprasidon (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	- Ziprasidon	CRITICAL OUT	ГСОМЕ)							,
238 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	36/111 (32.4%)	25/127 (19.7%)	RR 0.61 (0.39 to 0.94)	324 per 1000	126 fewer per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 198 fewer)
Drop-out	- Ziprasid	on - not reported			1	1				1	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Død - Zip	rasidon - n	ot reported			,		,	•		1	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Selvmore	d - Ziprasio	on - not reported			1	1				1	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Serious a	adverse ev	ent - Ziprasid	on (CRITICAL	OUTCOME)		,			-	-1	+
238 (1 study)	no serious	no serious	serious ^{1,2,3}	very	undetected	⊕⊝⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,6,7}	2/111	3/127	RR 1.31	18 per 1000	6 more per 1000 (from 14 fewer to 121 more)

26 weeks	risk of bias	inconsistency		serious ^{4,6,7}		due to indirectness, imprecision	(1.8%)	(2.4%)	(0.22 to 7.7)		
Ny depre	essiv episo	ode - Ziprasid	on (IMPORTAI	NT OUTCOME;			ı				
238 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{4,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	16/111 (14.4%)	16/127 (12.6%)	RR 0.87 (0.46 to 1.66)	144 per 1000	19 fewer per 1000 (from 78 fewer to 95 more)
Ny mani	sk episode	e - Ziprasidon	(NOT IMPORTA	ANT OUTCOM	Ξ)						
238 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{4,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	20/111 (18%)	9/127 (7.1%)	RR 0.39 (0.19 to 0.83)	180 per 1000	110 fewer per 1000 (from 31 fewer to 146 fewer)
Weight	gain events	s - Ziprasidon	(IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)							
239 (1 study) 26 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{4,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	6/112 (5.4%)	7/127 (5.5%)	RR 1.03 (0.36 to 2.97)	54 per 1000	2 more per 1000 (from 34 fewer to 106 more)
Sedation	n - Ziprasid	lon - not reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment

¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
2 Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
3 Co-medication with valproate/lithium
4 Small sample size
5 Wide CI, upper CI boundary close to zero (no effect)
6 Only one study with very few events
7 Wide CI, crossing decision threshold

Question: Should Paliperidon vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		Qı	uality assess	sment					Summary o	of Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	ent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated	absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Paliperidon	_	Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Paliperidon (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	- Paliperidon	(CRITICAL OL	JTCOME)	ļ.						,
290 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	104/144 (72.2%)	85/146 (58.2%)	RR 0.81 (0.68 to 0.96)	722 per 1000	137 fewer per 1000 (from 29 fewer to 231 fewer)
Drop-out	- Paliperio	lon - not reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Død - Pal	iperidon (CRITICAL OUTCOM	E)				<u>, </u>		,		
296 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{6,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,6,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	0/147 (0%)	2/149 (1.3%)	See comment ⁸	0 per 1000	-
Selvmore	d - Paliperi	don (CRITICAL O	UTCOME)			1				1	
295 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{4,7,9}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,7,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	0/147 (0%)	0/148 (0%)	See comment ⁸	See comment	-

Serious a	adverse ev	vent - Paliperio	don (CRITICA	AL OUTCOME)							
296 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{4,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	33/147 (22.4%)	16/149 (10.7%)	RR 0.48 (0.28 to 0.83)	224 per 1000	117 fewer per 1000 (from 38 fewer to 162 fewer)
Ny depre	essiv episo	ode - Paliperid	On - not repor	rted			<u> </u>		1		
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Ny manis	sk episode	e - Paliperidon	- not reported								
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Weight g	ain events	s - Paliperidon	(IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)			<u>, </u>				
296 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,10}	very serious ^{4,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,2,4,7,10} due to indirectness, imprecision	10/147 (6.8%)	12/149 (8.1%)	RR 1.18 (0.53 to 2.66)	68 per 1000	12 more per 1000 (from 32 fewer to 113 more)
Sedation	- Paliperi	don - not reported				1	1				
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	0/147 (0%)	0/149 (0%)	-	See comment	See comment

¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
² Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
³ Monotherapy

Monotherapy
 Small sample size
 Wide CI, upper CI boundary close to zero (no effect)
 Only one study with very few events
 Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
 Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
 No events in either group
 Co-medication in add-on studies was lithium/valproate in one study, lamotrigene in one study and valproate in one study.

Question: Should Lamotrigin vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality asse	ssment					Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	vent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate	d absolute effects
							With Placebo	With Lamotrigin		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Lamotrigin (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episod	e - Lamotrigiı	1 (CRITICAL OL	JTCOME)		1		•			
878 (5 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision ⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,4} due to indirectness	231/402 (57.5%)	235/476 (49.4%)	RR 0.85 (0.74 to 0.97)	575 per 1000	86 fewer per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 149 fewer)
Drop-out	- Lamotr	igin (CRITICAL O	UTCOME)					•			
653 (3 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,5}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,5} due to indirectness	245/280 (87.5%)	295/373 (79.1%)	RR 0.93 (0.88 to 0.98)	875 per 1000	61 fewer per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 105 fewer)
Død - Lar	motrigin (CRITICAL OUTCO	ME)								
137 (1 study) 32 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,6}	very serious ^{7,8,9}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,6,7,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	0/69 (0%)	0/68 (0%)	See comment ¹⁰	See comment	-
Selvmore	d - Lamot	rigin (CRITICAL (OUTCOME)		'				1	'	
600 (3 studies) 32-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,11}	serious ^{12,13}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,11,12,13} due to indirectness, imprecision	3/258 (1.2%)	6/342 (1.8%)	See comment ¹⁰	12 per 1000	8 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 30 more)

549 (4 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,3,6}	serious ¹⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW ^{1,3,6,14} due to indirectness, imprecision	25/285 (8.8%)	21/264 (8%)	RR 0.92 (0.54 to 1.58)	88 per 1000	7 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 51 more)
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Lamotr	i gin (IMPORT	ANT OUTCOME	Ξ)					<u> </u>	
701 (4 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3,6}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,6} due to indirectness	127/315 (40.3%)		RR 0.51 (0.4 to 0.65)	403 per 1000	198 fewer per 1000 (from 141 fewer to 242 fewer)
Ny manis	k episod	e - Lamotrigi	1 (NOT IMPOR	TANT OUTCOM	1E)				1	"	
701 (4 studies) 26-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency ¹⁵	serious ^{1,2,3,6}	serious ¹⁶	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.6,15,16 due to indirectness, imprecision	65/315 (20.6%)	119/386 (30.8%)	RR 1.33 (0.71 to 2.48)	206 per 1000	68 more per 1000 (from 60 fewer to 305 more)
Weight g	ain event	s - Lamotrigi	n (IMPORTAN)	OUTCOME)							
392 (2 studies) 76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5}	serious ¹⁷	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ Low¹,5,17 due to indirectness, imprecision	11/165 (6.7%)	18/227 (7.9%)	RR 1.19 (0.58 to 2.46)	67 per 1000	13 more per 1000 (from 28 fewer to 97 more)
Sedation	- Lamotr	i gin (IMPORTAN	T OUTCOME)								
417 (2 studies) 76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,5}	serious ¹⁸	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ Low¹,5,18 due to indirectness, imprecision	13/190 (6.8%)	21/227 (9.3%)	RR 1.36 (0.69 to 2.7)	68 per 1000	25 more per 1000 (from 21 fewer to 116 more)
¹ Enriched dis ² Patients wit ³ All monothe	rapy studies ber CI bounda	study design des of various polar	•					. ,	,		116 more)

- ⁶ Add-on study not specifying co-medication
- ⁷ Small sample size
- ⁸ No events in either group
- ⁹ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
- ¹⁰ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ¹¹ Two monotherapy studies and one add-on study not specifying co-medication
- ¹² Very few events in each study
- ¹³ Wide CI, the true effect may be higher rates of suicide in drug group
- ¹⁴ Wide CI overlapping no effect
- ¹⁵ Some, but not crucial heterogeneity across studies
- ¹⁶ Wide CI, true effect may be higher incidence of manic relapse in drug group
- ¹⁷ Wide CI, true effect may be much higher incidence of weight gain events in drug group
- ¹⁸ Wide CI, true effect may be much higher incidence of sedation in drug group

Question: Should Valproate vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality as	sessment				:	Summary of	Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	rent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate effects	d absolute
							With Placebo	With Valproate		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Valproate (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	e - Valproat (CRITICAL OUT	COME)	<u> </u>	<u>I</u>					
587 (3 studies) 24-52 weeks	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{2,3,4,5}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to risk of bias, indirectness	140/249 (56.2%)	127/338 (37.6%)	RR 0.73 (0.57 to 0.94)	562 per 1000	152 fewer per 1000 (from 34 fewer to 242 fewer)
Drop-out	- Valproa	(CRITICAL OUT	COME)			1			1	1	
501 (3 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{6,7}	serious ^{8,9}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{6,7,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	115/204 (56.4%)	162/297 (54.5%)	RR 0.89 (0.71 to 1.11)	564 per 1000	62 fewer per 1000 (from 163 fewer to 62 more)
Død - Val	Iproat (CRIT	I TICAL OUTCOME				l		•	1		
220 (1 study) 24 weeks	serious ¹⁰	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{3,11,12}	very serious ^{13,14}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{3,10,11,12,13,14} due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	2/110 (1.8%)	1/110 (0.91%)	See comment ¹⁵	18 per 1000	9 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 20 more)
Selvmore	d - Valproa	it (CRITICAL OU	ГСОМЕ)			,	1		•	1	+
220 (1 study)	serious ¹⁰	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{3,12}	very serious ^{8,14,16}	undetected	⊕⊝⊝ VERY LOW ^{3,8,10,12,14,16} due to risk of bias,	0/110 (0%)	0/110 (0%)	See comment ¹⁵	See comment	-

24 weeks						indirectness, imprecision					
Serious a	adverse e	vent - Valpro	at (CRITICAL (DUTCOME)							
220 (1 study) 24 weeks	serious ¹⁷	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{3,11,12}	very serious ^{9,18}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{3,9,11,12,17,18} due to risk of bias, indirectness, imprecision	5/110 (4.5%)	4/110 (3.6%)	RR 0.8 (0.22 to 2.9)	45 per 1000	9 fewer per 1000 (from 35 fewer to 86 more)
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Valproa	it (important	OUTCOME)					_		
587 (3 studies) 24-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,4,5,11}	serious ^{9,19}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,4,5,9,11,19} due to indirectness, imprecision	80/249 (32.1%)	69/338 (20.4%)	RR 0.71 (0.42 to 1.2)	321 per 1000	93 fewer per 1000 (from 186 fewer to 64 more)
Ny manis	k episode	e - Valproat (N	NOT IMPORTAN	NT OUTCOME)		1				l	
367 (2 studies) 32-52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{7,20,21}	serious ⁹	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{7,9,20,21} due to indirectness, imprecision	30/139 (21.6%)	38/228 (16.7%)	RR 0.75 (0.48 to 1.17)	216 per 1000	54 fewer per 1000 (from 112 fewer to 37 more)
Weight g	ain events	s - Valproat (MPORTANT O	JTCOME)	l					<u>l</u>	
281 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{22,23,24}	no serious imprecision ²⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{22,23,24,25} due to indirectness	7/94 (7.4%)	39/187 (20.9%)	RR 2.8 (1.3 to 6.02)	74 per 1000	134 more per 1000 (from 22 more to 374 more)
Sedation	- Valproa	t (CRITICAL OUT	COME)		1					1	1
281 (1 study) 32 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{22,23,24}	very serious ^{8,14}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{8,14,22,23,24} due to indirectness, imprecision	33/94 (35.1%)	78/187 (41.7%)	RR 1.19 (0.86 to 1.64)	351 per 1000	67 more per 1000 (from 49 fewer to 225 more)
1	1	lan fuana anan laha	1	I	L	1	1		1	1	_1

¹ 40% of total study population from open-label trial ² The majority of patients originate from enriched discontinuation design studies

- ³ Patients with index episodes of various polarity
- ⁴ One monotherapy study and two add-on studies
- ⁵ Co-medication lithium in one add-on study and lamotrigine in another
- ⁶ One add-on and one monotherapy study
- ⁷ Majority of participants from non-enriched study
- ⁸ Small sample size
- ⁹ Wide CI overlapping no effect
- ¹⁰ Open-label trial
- ¹¹ Enriched discontinuation study design
- ¹² Co-medication with lithium
- ¹³ Only one study with very few events
- ¹⁴ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
- ¹⁵ Based on too few events to calculate relative difference
- ¹⁶ No events in either group
- ¹⁷ No explanation was provided
- ¹⁸ Very few events in each group
- ¹⁹ Some, but not crucial heterogeneity across studies
- ²⁰ Index episode manic in majority of patients
- ²¹ Co-medication in add-on study lamotrigine
- ²² Patients with a manic/mixed index episode
- ²³ Monotherapy
- ²⁴ Non-enriched study
- ²⁵ Wide CI

Question: Should Oxcarbazepine vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality assess	sment				S	Summary of	f Findings	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect	Anticipated absolute effects	
Follow up							With Placebo	With Oxcarbazepine	(95% CI)	Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Oxcarbazepine (95% CI
Ny affekt	iv episod	le - Oxcarba	zepin (CRITICAL	OUTCOME)					1		
55 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2}	serious ^{3,4}	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,4} due to imprecision	18/29 (62.1%)	8/26 (30.8%)	RR 0.5 (0.26 to 0.94)	621 per 1000	310 fewer per 1000 (from 37 fewer to 459 fewer)
Drop-out	- Oxcarb	pazepin - not re	ported	-		1			1		1
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Død - Ox	carbazep	in - not reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Selvmord	d - Oxcar	bazepin - not r	reported			ı					
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Oxcarl	bazepin (IMPOI	RTANT OUTCO	ME)						
55 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2}	very serious ^{3,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,5} due to imprecision	9/29 (31%)	3/26 (11.5%)	RR 0.37 (0.11 to 1.23)	310 per 1000	196 fewer per 1000 (from 276 fewer to 71 more)

55 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2}	very serious ^{3,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,6} due to imprecision	8/29 (27.6%)	4/26 (15.4%)	RR 0.56 (0.19 to 1.64)	276 per 1000	121 fewer per 1000 (from 223 fewer to 177 more)
Serious	adverse e	event - Oxca	rbazepin (CRITI	CAL OUTCOM	l ΛΕ)						
55 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2}	very serious ^{5,7}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW¹.2.5.7 due to imprecision	3/29 (10.3%)	3/26 (11.5%)	RR 1.12 (0.25 to 5.05)	103 per 1000	12 more per 1000 (from 78 fewer to 419 more)
Weight	gain event	ts - Oxcarba	zepin (IMPORTA	NT OUTCOME	≣)						
55 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2}	very serious ^{3,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,6} due to imprecision	2/29 (6.9%)	5/26 (19.2%)	RR 2.79 (0.59 to 13.16)	69 per 1000	123 more per 1000 (from 28 fewer to 839 more)
OZ WOOKO											
	n - Oxcarb	pazepin - not re	eported								

<sup>Index episode not specified
Co-medication with lithium
Small sample size
Wide CI, upper CI boundary close to zero (no effect)
Wide CI overlapping no effect
Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
Very few events in each group</sup>

Question: Should Imipramine vs Placebo be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		Q	uality assess		Summary of Findings						
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision Publica bias		Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With Placebo	With Imipramine		Risk with Placebo	Risk difference with Imipramine (95% CI)
Ny affekti	iv episode	- Imipramin (CRITICAL OUT	COME)							
153 (2 studies) 24-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊝ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	31/80 (38.8%)	30/73 (41.1%)	RR 1.07 (0.67 to 1.71)	388 per 1000	27 more per 1000 (from 128 fewer to 275 more)
Drop-out	- Imiprami	n (CRITICAL OUT	COME)			1					T.
75 (1 study) 24 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,6}	very serious ^{4,7}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,4,6,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	29/38 (76.3%)	32/37 (86.5%)	RR 1.13 (0.91 to 1.41)	763 per 1000	99 more per 1000 (from 69 fewer to 313 more)
Død - Imi _l	pramin - no	t reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Selvmord	l - Imipram	in - not reported				1	L				1
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Serious a	dverse ev	ent - Imipram	in - not reporte	d		1					

-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Ny depre	ssiv episo	de - Imipramin	(IMPORTAN	r outcome)							
153 (2 studies) 24-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	very serious ^{8,9}	undetected	⊕⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	16/80 (20%)	11/73 (15.1%)	RR 0.78 (0.39 to 1.53)	200 per 1000	44 fewer per 1000 (from 122 fewer to 106 more)
Ny manis	sk episode	- Imipramin (N	OT IMPORTAI	NT OUTCOME)		1				1
153 (2 studies) 24-104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ¹⁰	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.².³.¹0 due to indirectness, imprecision	15/80 (18.8%)	19/73 (26%)	RR 1.41 (0.67 to 2.92)	188 per 1000	77 more per 1000 (from 62 fewer to 360 more)
Weight g	ain events	- Imipramin - r	ot reported								
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Sedation	- Imipram	in - not reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
If I is a set of the set of th	accetinuction of										

¹ Enriched discontinuation study design ² Co-medication with lithium

³ Patients with both manic/mixed and depressive index episodes in both stuides

⁴ Small sample size
⁵ Wide CI, true effect may be higher incidence of new affective episodes in drug group
⁶ Patients with index episodes of various polarity

Patients with index episodes of various polarity
 Wide CI overlapping no effect
 Very few events in each group
 Wide CI, true effect may bemore depressive relapses in drug group
 Wide CI, true effect may be higher incidence of manic relapse in drug group

Question: Should Olanzapin vs Lithium be used for Bipolar Disorder?

- Olanzapin no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2,3}	Imprecision PME) serious ⁴	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	(%) With Lithium	With Olanzapin	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated Risk with Lithium	Risk difference with Olanzapin (95% CI)
no serious inconsistency	no serious	, 	undetected		Lithium				
no serious inconsistency	no serious	, 	undetected	0.000					
inconsistency		serious ⁴	undetected	Τσσσο					
n - not reported				⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,4} due to imprecision	69/193 (35.8%)	53/202 (26.2%)	RR 0.73 (0.54 to 0.99)	358 per 1000	97 fewer per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 164 fewer)
	'	.	<u> </u>	_			1	.	
	-	-	-	See comment	<u></u>	-	-	See comment	See comment
ITICAL OUTCOM	ΛE)								
no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,5,6} due to imprecision	2/214 (0.93%)	0/217 (0%)	See comment ⁷	9 per 1000	9 fewer per 1000 (from 30 fewer to 10 more)
TICAL OUTCOM	1E)								
no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{2,3}	serious ⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{2,3,5} due to imprecision	1/214 (0.47%)	0/217 (0%)	RR 0.33 (0.01 to 8.03)	5 per 1000	3 fewer per 1000 (from 5 fewer to 33 more)
no	o serious consistency		no serious serious serious ⁵ indirectness ^{2,3}	o serious no serious serious serious undetected indirectness ^{2,3}	o serious consistency no serious indirectness ^{2,3} serious ⁵ undetected ⊕⊕⊕ MODERATE ^{2,3,5} due to imprecision	PICAL OUTCOME) o serious consistency no serious indirectness ^{2,3} serious ⁵ undetected to imprecision 1/214 (0.47%)	PICAL OUTCOME) o serious consistency indirectness ^{2,3} serious ⁵ undetected $\oplus \oplus \oplus \ominus$ $\oplus \oplus$ $\oplus \oplus$ $\oplus \oplus$ \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus \oplus	O serious consistency no serious indirectness ^{2,3} serious ⁵ undetected $\bigoplus \bigoplus	PICAL OUTCOME) o serious consistency no serious indirectness ^{2,3} serious ⁵ undetected moderate m

-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Ny depr	essiv epis	ode - Olanzar	DIN (IMPORTANT O	UTCOME)	•						
395 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness 1,2,3	serious ⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,5} due to imprecision	16/193 (8.3%)	28/202 (13.9%)	RR 1.67 (0.93 to 2.99)	83 per 1000	56 more per 1000 (from 6 fewer to 165 more)
Ny mani	isk episod	e - Olanzapin	(NOT IMPORTANT (OUTCOME)		'	1		•		
395 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁸	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,8} due to imprecision	49/193 (25.4%)	24/202 (11.9%)	RR 0.47 (0.3 to 0.73)	254 per 1000	135 fewer per 1000 (from 69 fewer to 178 fewer)
Sedatio	n - Olanza _l	oin - not reported	1	1	1	1			1		1
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Weight	gain event	s - OLA (IMPOF	RTANT OUTCOME)	<u>'</u>	_	,	1	_	<u>'</u>	!	1
341 (1 study) 52 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁸	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,8} due to imprecision	21/214 (9.8%)	64/127 (50.4%)	RR 5.14 (3.3 to 7.98)	98 per 1000	406 more per 1000 (from 226 more to 685 more)
1						_					

Study non-enriched for study drug

Patients with manic index episode

Monotherapy

Wide CI, close to no effect

Wide CI, crossing decision threshold

Low event rate

⁷ Based on too few events to estimate relative difference

⁸ Small total sample size

Question: Should Quetiapine vs Lithium be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		C	uality assess	ment					Summary	of Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	rent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated	l absolute effects
							With Lithium	With Quetiapine		Risk with Lithium	Risk difference with Quetiapine (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	- Quetiapin (CRITICAL OUTC	COME)				_			
768 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ Low ^{1,2,3,4} due to indirectness, imprecision	95/364 (26.1%)	91/404 (22.5%)	RR 0.86 (0.67 to 1.11)	261 per 1000	37 fewer per 1000 (from 86 fewer to 29 more)
Drop-out	- Quetiapi	n (CRITICAL OUT	COME)	L							
768 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.5.6 due to indirectness, imprecision	188/364 (51.6%)	152/404 (37.6%)	RR 0.73 (0.62 to 0.85)	516 per 1000	139 fewer per 1000 (from 77 fewer to 196 fewer)
Død - Qu	etiapin (CR	ITICAL OUTCOME)								
768 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁷	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.7 due to indirectness, imprecision	0/364 (0%)	0/404 (0%)	See comment ⁸	See comment	-
Selvmord	d - Quetiap	in (CRITICAL OU	TCOME)				1			1	Į.
768 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,9}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,9} due to indirectness,	3/364 (0.82%)	3/404 (0.74%)	RR 0.9 (0.18 to 4.44)	8 per 1000	1 fewer per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 28 more)

						imprecision					
Serious	adverse ev	⊣ ⁄ent - Quetiap	in (CRITICAL	OUTCOME)							
768 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,9}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	10/364 (2.7%)	5/404 (1.2%)	See comment ⁸	27 per 1000	15 fewer per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 0 more)
Ny depre	essiv episo	ode - Quetiapi	n (IMPORTAN	T OUTCOME;)						
768 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ¹⁰	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,3,10} due to indirectness, imprecision	49/364 (13.5%)	36/404 (8.9%)	RR 0.66 (0.44 to 0.99)	135 per 1000	46 fewer per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 75 fewer)
Ny manis	sk episode	e - Quetiapin (NOT IMPORTA	NT OUTCOM	E)						
768 (1 study) 104	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ⁴	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.4 due to indirectness, imprecision	46/364 (12.6%)	55/404 (13.6%)	RR 1.08 (0.75 to 1.55)	126 per 1000	10 more per 1000 (from 32 fewer to 70 more)
Weight g	jain events	s - Quetiapin (IMPORTANT O	UTCOME)							
822 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,5,6} due to indirectness, imprecision	23/418 (5.5%)	43/404 (10.6%)	RR 1.93 (1.19 to 3.15)	55 per 1000	51 more per 1000 (from 10 more to 118 more)
Sedation	ı - Quetiap	in (IMPORTANT C	OUTCOME)				1				
822 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.5.6 due to indirectness, imprecision	11/418 (2.6%)	27/404 (6.7%)	RR 2.54 (1.28 to 5.05)	26 per 1000	41 more per 1000 (from 7 more to 107 more)

- Monotherapy
 Study enriched for study drug
 Patients with index episode of various polarity
 Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
 Small total sample size

- ⁶ Wide CI
- ⁷ No events in either study group
- ⁸ Based on too few events to estimate relative difference
- Low event rate
 Wide CI, close to no effect

Question: Should Lamotrigine vs Lithium be used for Bipolar Disorder?

			Quality asse	essment					Summary o	of Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	ent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate	d absolute effects
							With Lithium	With Lamotrigine		Risk with Lithium	Risk difference with Lamotrigine (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episod	e - Lamotrigi	n (CRITICAL O	UTCOME)							
437 (2 studies) 52-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	74/164 (45.1%)	143/273 (52.4%)	RR 1.15 (0.94 to 1.41)	451 per 1000	68 more per 1000 (from 27 fewer to 185 more)
Drop-out	- Lamotr	igin (CRITICAL C	OUTCOME)								
447 (2 studies) 52-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision ⁵	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3,5} due to indirectness	146/167 (87.4%)	239/280 (85.4%)	RR 0.98 (0.92 to 1.04)	874 per 1000	17 fewer per 1000 (from 70 fewer to 35 more)
Død - Lar	notrigin -	not reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Selvmord	d - Lamot	rigin (CRITICAL	OUTCOME)								
463 (2 studies) 52-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2,3,4,5,6 due to indirectness, imprecision	3/189 (1.6%)	5/274 (1.8%)	RR 1.37 (0.32 to 5.92)	16 per 1000	6 more per 1000 (from 11 fewer to 78 more)

Serious a	dverse e	vent - Lamoti	rigin - not rep	orted							
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Ny depre	ssiv epis	ode - Lamotri	i gin (IMPORT	ANT OUTCOME)		· L					1
437 (2 studies) 52-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{5,7}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,5,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	56/164 (34.1%)	46/273 (16.8%)	RR 0.48 (0.34 to 0.67)	341 per 1000	178 fewer per 1000 (from 113 fewer to 225 fewer)
Ny manis	k episod	e - Lamotrigir	1 (NOT IMPOR	TANT OUTCOME	Ξ)	ł					1
102 (1 study) 76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,8,9}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,4,5,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	8/44 (18.2%)	20/58 (34.5%)	RR 1.9 (0.92 to 3.9)	182 per 1000	164 more per 1000 (from 15 fewer to 527 more)
Weight ga	ain event	s - Lamotrigii	n (IMPORTAN	Γ OUTCOME)							
391 (2 studies) 52-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	16/164 (9.8%)	18/227 (7.9%)	RR 0.81 (0.43 to 1.55)	98 per 1000	19 fewer per 1000 (from 56 fewer to 54 more)
Sedation	- Lamotri	i gin (IMPORTAN	T OUTCOME)								
391 (2 studies) 52-76 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.4.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	22/164 (13.4%)	21/227 (9.3%)	RR 0.69 (0.39 to 1.21)	134 per 1000	42 fewer per 1000 (from 82 fewer to 28 more)

¹ Monotherapy
² Patients with manic index episode in one study and depressive index episode in one study
³ Studies enriched for study drug
⁴ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold
⁵ Small total sample size
⁶ Low event rate

Wide CI
 Patients with manic index episode
 Study enriched for study drug

Question: Should Valproate vs Lithium be used for Bipolar Disorder? Bibliography: NKR bipolar lidelse

			Quality asse	essment					Summary	of Findings	;
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	ent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipate	d absolute effects
							With Lithium	With Valproate		Risk with Lithium	Risk difference with Valproate (95% CI)
Ny affekti	iv episode	- Valproat (C	RITICAL OUTC	OME)				•			·
558 (3 studies) 24-80 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.4.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	111/233 (47.6%)	135/325 (41.5%)	RR 0.99 (0.75 to 1.29)	476 per 1000	5 fewer per 1000 (from 119 fewer to 138 more)
Drop-out	- Valproat	(CRITICAL OUT	COME)			1				_	
558 (3 studies) 24-80 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	no serious imprecision	undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊝ MODERATE ^{1,2,3} due to indirectness	140/233 (60.1%)	179/325 (55.1%)	RR 0.85 (0.75 to 0.96)	601 per 1000	90 fewer per 1000 (from 24 fewer to 150 fewer)
Død - Val	proat (CRIT	ICAL OUTCOME)									
	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2}	serious ^{4,5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW¹.2.4.5.6 due to indirectness, imprecision	2/110 (1.8%)	3/110 (2.7%)	See comment	18 per 1000	9 more per 1000 (from 30 fewer to 50 more)
Selvmord	l - Valproa	t (CRITICAL OUT	COME)	l							
220 (1 study) 24 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2}	serious ^{5,7}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,5,7} due to indirectness, imprecision	0/110 (0%)	0/110 (0%)	-	See comment	-

Serious a	dverse e	vent - Valproa	at (CRITICAL C	OUTCOME)							
220 (1 study) 24 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2}	serious ^{4,5,6}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.4.5.6 due to indirectness, imprecision	5/110 (4.5%)	7/110 (6.4%)	See comment	45 per 1000	18 more per 1000 (from 40 fewer to 80 more)
Ny depre	ssiv episo	ode - Valproa	t (IMPORTANT	OUTCOME)		1		•			- 1
558 (3 studies) 24-80 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	55/233 (23.6%)	70/325 (21.5%)	RR 1.03 (0.62 to 1.7)	236 per 1000	7 more per 1000 (from 90 fewer to 165 more)
Ny manis	k episode	e - Valproat (N	IOT IMPORTAN	T OUTCOME)		<u> </u>	I				1
558 (3 studies) 24-80 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹.2.3.4.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	60/233 (25.8%)	85/325 (26.2%)	RR 1.1 (0.78 to 1.55)	258 per 1000	26 more per 1000 (from 57 fewer to 142 more)
Weight ga	ain events	s - Valproat (II	MPORTANT OU	ITCOME)							
338 (2 studies) 52-80 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,8}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,4,5,8} due to indirectness, imprecision	13/123 (10.6%)	40/215 (18.6%)	RR 1.56 (0.87 to 2.79)	106 per 1000	59 more per 1000 (from 14 fewer to 189 more)
Sedation	- Valproa	t (IMPORTANT O	JTCOME)				 				
338 (2 studies) 52-80 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,8}	serious ^{5,9}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW ^{1,2,5,8,9} due to indirectness, imprecision	26/123 (21.1%)	79/215 (36.7%)	RR 1.54 (1.06 to 2.25)	211 per 1000	114 more per 1000 (from 13 more to 264 more)

¹ Monotherapy
² Patients with index episode of various polarity
³ Two studies with non-enriched design, one study with enrichment for study drug
⁴ Wide CI, crossing decision threshold

Small total sample size
 Low event rate
 No events in either study group
 One study with enrichment design, one study with non-enrichment design
 Wide CI

Question: Should Imipramine vs Lithium be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		C	uality assess	ment					Summary	of Findings	
Participants (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev (%)	rent rates	Relative effect (95% CI)	Anticipated	d absolute effects
							With Lithium	With Imipramine	_	Risk with Lithium	Risk difference with Imipramine (95% CI)
Ny affekt	iv episode	- Imipramin (CRITICAL OUT	COME)							
78 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW ^{1,2,3,4,5} due to indirectness, imprecision	23/42 (54.8%)	29/36 (80.6%)	RR 1.47 (1.07 to 2.02)	548 per 1000	257 more per 1000 (from 38 more to 559 more)
Drop-out	- Imiprami	in - not reported				1					
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Død - Imi	pramin - no	t reported									
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Selvmore	d - Imipram	nin - not reported				1					
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Serious a	dverse ev	ent - Imipram	in - not reporte	d							
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment

-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Ny mani	sk episode	- Imipramin	(NOT IMPORTA	ANT OUTCOM	IE)		•		*	-	
78 (1 study) 104 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖ LOW¹.2.3.4.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	11/42 (26.2%)	19/36 (52.8%)	RR 2.02 (1.11 to 3.65)	262 per 1000	267 more per 1000 (from 29 more to 69 more)
Weight o	gain events	- Imipramin	- not reported		-				1		
	_	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	<u></u>	See	See comment
-											
Sedation	n - Imipram	in - not reported									
Sedation	- Imipram	in - not reported	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment

Question: Should Carbamazepine vs Lithium be used for Bipolar Disorder?

		Q	uality assess	ment					Summary o	f Findings	
Participants (studies)	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study ev	vent rates (%)	Relative effect	Anticipated	d absolute effects
Follow up							With Lithium	With Carbamazepine	(95% CI)	Risk with Lithium	Risk difference with Carbamazepine (95% CI)
Ny affekti	iv episode	e - Carbamaz	epin (CRITICA	AL OUTCOME	Ξ)						
228 (3 studies) 52-130 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW¹.2.3,4,5 due to indirectness, imprecision	37/120 (30.8%)	47/108 (43.5%)	RR 1.38 (0.94 to 2.02)	308 per 1000	117 more per 1000 (from 18 fewer to 314 more)
Drop-out	- Carbam	azepin (CRITIC	CAL OUTCOME)			1					1
228 (3 studies) 52-130 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,3}	serious ^{4,5}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW¹.2.3.4.5 due to indirectness, imprecision	55/113 (48.7%)	75/115 (65.2%)	RR 1.22 (0.86 to 1.74)	487 per 1000	107 more per 1000 (from 68 fewer to 360 more)
Død - Car	bamazep	i n (Critical ou	TCOME)			1					
103 (1 study) 130 weeks	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ^{1,2,6}	serious ^{4,5,7}	undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊝ LOW¹,2,4,5,6,7 due to indirectness, imprecision	1/43 (2.3%)	0/60 (0%)	See comment ⁸	23 per 1000	23 fewer per 1000 (from 80 fewer to 30 more)
Selvmord	l - Carban	nazepin (CRITI	CAL OUTCOME	<u>.</u>					_		
103 (3 studies)	no serious	no serious	serious ^{1,2,6}	serious ^{4,5,7}	undetected	⊕⊕⊝⊝ LOW ^{1,2,4,5,6,7}	0/60	2/43	RR 6.93 (0.34 to	0 per 1000	-

130 weeks	risk of bias	inconsistency				due to indirectness, imprecision	(0%)	(4.7%)	140.84)		
Serious a	adverse e	vent - Carbam	azepin - no	t reported	'			•		'	
	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	See comment	See comment	See comment
Ny depre	ssiv episo	ode - Carbama	nzepin - not	reported	<u>'</u>	,	•			<u>'</u>	
	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Ny manis	sk episode	e - Carbamaze	pin - not repo	orted	·				!	·	
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Weight g	ain events	s - Carbamaze	pin - not repo	orted		,	•				
	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
Sedation	- Carbam	azepin - not repo	orted								
-	-	-	-	-	-	See comment	-	-	-	See comment	See comment
³ One study ν ⁴ Wide Cl, cro ⁵ Small total : ⁶ Study non-e ⁷ Low event r	h index episod with enrichmer ossing decision sample size enriched for str ate		s with non-enrio	chment desigr	1	,					

⁸ Based on too few events to estimate relative difference